

## LADIES HOME KIPPLE

THE MAGAZINE WOMEN BELIEVE IN

*contents*

IMMORALITY IN THE MODERN VEIN by Mike Deckinger.....	2
THE WINGLESS ROOSTER by Charles Burbee.....	5
QUOTES AND NOTES by Ted Pauls.....	7
Confessions of an Alter Boy.....	7
On Civil Defense: The Home Mausoleum Plan.....	11
Crime and Punishment.....	19
The Just Society Revisited.....	21
Short Notes on Long Subjects.....	23
NIXON LOST IT! by Joe Pilati.....	27
A SONG OF SIXPENCE by The Readers.....	28

Kipple, a monthly journal of opinion and commentary, is published and edited by Ted Pauls, 1448 Meridene Drive, Baltimore 12, Maryland. Copies are available for letters of comment, exchange (by prior arrangement), contributions (articles, columns, verse, etc.), or the cash sum of 20¢ per issue. NOTE NEW SUBSCRIPTION RATE! Outstanding subscriptions will, of course, be honored at the old rate, a policy which should please those persons who slipped in under the wire (such as Midge West via John Boardman). --WOKLpress.



# immorality in the modern vein

Immorality is a curious term which seems to bear a number of varied interpretations. What may have been frowned upon by our ancestors can be considered permissible today, or, in some instances, should be. In motion pictures, in particular, the whole concept of immorality is a muddled, misunderstood topic, enforced by censors who apply the term to coincide with their own particular tastes, no matter how candid or confined they may be. Foreign films generally bear the commendable ten-

dency to explore immorality to a greater degree than Hollywood films, and as a result, the picture, if not very pleasant, is at least presented in a more accurate and skilled manner.

Religion, for one example, has long been a touchy subject (and still is today for Hollywood). Kid gloves treatment had long been the accepted manner of handling this theme until the Italian "The Miracle" opened in New York in 1951, invoking a cry of sacrilege, despite the inability of anyone to offer an accurate definition of the term. This use of more widespread freedom in depicting religion, both in complimentary and uncomplimentary viewpoints, appears today in such films as "La Dolce Vita" and Bunuel's "Viridiana".

But religion is only a small facet and the central theme of immorality fits more securely into sexual matters; adultery, debauchery, etc. Several years ago Roger Vadim's motion picture "Les Liaisons Dangereuses" opened in New York. The film was a modern adaptation of a famous eighteenth-century "wicked" novel of the same name written by Chardos de Laclos. The French government at first sought to ban its export, contending that it showed an untrue picture of French life (providing Vadim with some excellent publicity, by the way). Then shortly before it was scheduled to open the New York film review board announced that two deletions would have to be made in the film before it was suitable for public showing. Vadim was furious. He vowed that no one would tamper with his work, and threatened to withdraw the film entirely rather than submit to the mutilation. After some deliberation, the ever-ingenuous censor board hit upon a sure-fire system to retain the questionable scenes without exposing the impressionable audience to them. The original print of the film had the two scenes darkened, so that the characters appeared to be in the midst of a coal mine at midnight, thus relieving the consciences of the censors and keeping the public from



seeing the "wrong thing". This effect caused quite a few viewers to do some squinting, but sore eyes are a small price to pay for an unoffended mind.

"Les Liasons Dangereuses" enjoyed a long and profitable run in New York, and had the curious distinction of being a feature at both the top-grade art houses and the fleabag, dilapidated edifices specializing in sex films (where it was billed as "Dangerous Love Affair").

About a year after it opened in New York, a theatre in Montclair, New Jersey, announced the film would premiere in a short while, on an exclusive, reserved-seat basis as it had originally been shown in New York. The film opened, played for a short while, and was suddenly confiscated by the police and held as an "obscene film" after the local authorities had received several protests from the citizens. The town went through a minor storm, with one group of citizens upholding the removal of the "evil" film, and another demanding that it be returned at once. Astor Pictures, distributors of the film, threatened to sue the theatre for breaking the engagement, scores of letters filled the local papers, with opinions nearly evenly divided as to whether or not the film should have been removed. Those who supported the action did so on the grounds that it was an obscene, pornographic film which did not deserve a public showing, while those who opposed its removal were more incensed at the arbitrary and sudden action taken in cancelling the film, without choosing to debate its merits. The local police chief who had ordered the confiscation (and who later admitted he hadn't even seen it) said the act was hastened by the thought of all the children who would be exposed to it. This remark, in itself, was quite unusual, since the theatre in which the picture had played refused to allow anyone under 21 to enter, and thus it was virtually impossible for children to have seen the picture there.

After several months of fiery debate and town meetings, centered around the feverish activity of a small band of citizens to keep the film from being shown, it was announced that "Les Liasons Dangereuses" would resume performances in a short while. Several hours before it was scheduled to reopen, the film was seized again, this time on a citizen's warrant. The film, the authorities stated, would no longer be shown in the city. A film review board was formed, and, true to their word, the city fathers were steadfast in their refusal to allow the picture to be shown in the city; it seems unlikely that it ever will.

If, indeed, as many contended, "Les Liasons Dangereuses" had been an exercise in sex-drenched pornography, then there might have existed some justification, however slight, for ordering it banned.

But unfortunately, it isn't half as bad as the self-appointed town moral guardians would have you believe. In one word, "Les Liasons Dangereuses" is dreary. The acting is quite competently handled, but the story is unconvincing and implausible, and if the film is to evoke any emotion, it's sure to be boredom. Briefly, the plot concerns a husband and wife, both of whom engage in quite intimate extra-marital affairs, while the other partner is aware of what is going on and even assists. Then when the affair has been consummated they relate everything that has occurred, unconcerned with their former partners, their humility, or themselves. Both husband and wife (Jeanne Moreau and Gerald Philippe) perform their pre-arranged actions with skill and finesse, but at times, it seems, with ignorance. No explanation is offered as to why they behave this way, and their behavior is treated as some elaborate, harmless joke. They themselves seem to be unaware of the motivations for their actions, but are willing to perform because it is expected of them. They are ruthless, cold, uncaring (except for the end-



ing when the husband unsuccessfully seeks to prevent his wife from causing strife), and receive what could be considered an adequate punishment at the end. The film in no way condones their behavior, or intimates that justice overlooks them, and thus conforms to the rigid crime and retribution line that pervades television.

The shocking thing about "Les Liasons Dangereuses" is not the contrived, synthetic story, but rather the fact that such an inept theme is considered immorality and subject to public denunciation in the manner that a Salem judge would denounce a citizen suspected of witchcraft. The vociferous opponents of the film were apparently regarding as immorality anything that deviates from the norm, without scrutinizing the deviation or looking upon it in context with what is considered the norm. It is incomprehensible that the film would have any more influence in the incitement of a viewer to go thou and do likewise than would a typical western or crime show on television. We are presented with two unusual characters, behaving in an unusual manner, who appear to be doing it through some former condemnation, as if they must spend the rest of their lives in unsettled marital entanglements, which neither of them want but are powerless to resist.

Distinguishing right from wrong is a trait that everyone possesses to some degree, and anyone capable of viewing and comprehending what is being done by the couple in "Les Liasons Dangereuses" should have some awareness of the moral acception of their acts, and the rejection society would give them were they to display these habits more openly. Banning a film of this sort as pornography because of the possibility that it would influence others is the poorest and least valid excuse that could be given. The several "objectionable" scenes, depicting female nudity, are unessential to the story, and could have been deleted without harming the continuity. But I am completely opposed to this, precisely because their ineffectualness would render them harmless to most adult viewers (and might draw forth a few nervous snickers from any children).

But it's truly a disturbing sign when immorality is equated with a dislikeable couple, acting without explanation, who are adequately punished at the end. "Les Liasons Dangereuses" could have been done more skillfully, but Vadim honestly tried to produce a good film, despite the few bits inserted for pure sensationalism, and he must be commended for his effort, if nothing else.

Society would not tolerate the couple depicted in the film.

Society should not tolerate the individuals who seek to have a picture like this removed on the grounds of obscenity (it isn't) or an unnatural exertion on the viewers (which is absurd, in a situation of this sort). Valmont and his wife are two sad, pathetic individuals, to be looked upon with traces of contempt, disgust, and pity.

Admiration is not bred for sorts like these.

--Mike Deckinger

"The burning conviction that we have a holy duty toward others is often a way of attaching our drowning selves to a passing raft. What looks like giving a hand is often a holding on for dear life. Take away our holy duties and you leave our lives puny and meaningless. There is no doubt that in exchanging a self-centered for a selfless life we gain enormously in self-esteem. The vanity of the selfless, even those who practice utmost humility, is boundless." --Eric Hoffer, in "The True Believer," Mentor Book #MP434, 60¢.



# THE WINGLESS ROOSTER

BY CHARLES BURBEE

So they began to study the wingless rooster carefully, from all angles. At first it was apparent that he had no wings and after four days of diligent analysis it became obvious that he had no wings.

The Findings Committee wrote up a 180-page report which in detail described the rooster. It gave 26 reasons or theories explaining his lack of wings. The report went on to say that he was just an ordinary rooster with the normal instincts of his species except that he was wingless.

As soon as the report was published, trickles of European scientists began to arrive. They wanted to see for themselves this oddment of nature. A number of tests were devised. None of them bothered the rooster. In fact, he seemed to enjoy most of them, especially the ones which tested his food and sex drives. This left them more puzzled than before.

Knots of baffled scientists gathered day and night in the vast research labs. Amid odors of thousands of gallons of black coffee thousands of theories were brought forth. Were the birds developing into wingless beings preparatory to taking over earth? Mutating, as it were, into a higher type? Trading their wings for another organ? But close scrutiny had not uncovered any new organs. Therefore the trade must be an intellectual one. They set up IQ tests for him. He came out no better or worse than the rooster control group. This did not ease their minds. On the contrary, dismay and fear began to settle about them...perhaps the rooster was so smart he could hide his high intelligence from them. Hide it because of humans who would slay him and his kind before the chickens could revolt in force. Perhaps he was but the vanguard of fowldom.

They set up ESP tests and the rooster failed to show any trace of unusual perceptions. Now they began to fear for the existence of humanity. They had the prickly feeling that the rooster was studying them.

This rooster, to all intents and purposes, was an ordinary rooster except that he was wingless. This was almost irrefutable proof that he was not an ordinary rooster. It was sinister. Not only was he not an ordinary rooster, but he was so far above them in intelligence and perception that he could convince them, the most highly trained men in the land, that he was just an ordinary rooster.

The word went around--destroy this super being, this crafty entity. Destroy him now! Before he destroys us! But it must be done quickly. The very first blow must be fatal, lest he retaliate with unthinkable reprisals. A simple wring of the neck? Hardly. Starvation? No.

At the first tightening of a hand around his neck he might suddenly display incredible strength and make his escape. If they tried to starve or poison him he might refuse food and begin to draw energy by tapping the fabric of space.

Who would say what nameless forces he controlled?



They kept him in a chamber with lead walls 18 feet thick while they assembled the greatest panoply of death-dealing instruments in time of peace. Flame-throwers, anti-aircraft guns (he might soar unexpectedly on jets), poison gas, machine guns, rockets, artillery, guided missiles.

Came D-Day.

The armed forces came. Each man had been carefully screened for security reasons. Tight radio beams connected all branches of the service. In the nearby ocean half the navy stood by. One hundred fighter planes stood by, engines idling, while their pilots lounged nearby, cracking jokes in the face of death. The whole proving ground area was a mass of machines and men. Everyone was tight-lipped. Cigarettes were being thrown away half-smoked.

The rooster was placed in the target circle. He strutted about, pecking at the few blades of grass growing there. They were amazed at his courage.

In the sky a single plane circled overhead. No one knew, but it was whispered that it carried the Bomb, and if all else failed...

At the given word, all weapons were brought to bear on the rooster. He ignored them. Jaws were agape at his insouciance.

Suddenly he squawked, raced around a bit and dropped into the dirt, kicking a little. Not a weapon had been fired. Men, wearing asbestos suits, rushed recklessly to his twitching body. Examination showed that a small caliber projectile had entered his body where the left wing should have been and had not emerged from the other side.

He was dead.

Or so it seemed.

A small boy was brought over. Half-defiant, half-crying, he admitted he'd sneaked past the guards and had come in there to shoot gophers as he often did. Seeing the rooster, he thought he'd try a long-range shot. Sonic detectors had picked up the sound of the rifle's discharge and sixteen tracer lines had been slapped on him instantly. Radar-equipped jeeps had run him down.

"Did I do anything wrong?" he whimpered. They told him no and let him go.

They let the rooster lie there for five days under constant surveillance of the F.B.I. Floodlights lit the scene at night. When it seemed apparent that he was really dead they threw him into a huge pit and dumped carloads of corrosives on him, then filled the pit with reinforced concrete and quarantined the territory for two years.

The world had been saved.

--Charles Burbee

"Some blame science for modern man's predicament, complaining that the technicians have discovered forces for evil that render the future uncertain and precarious. We must understand that all physical force can be force for evil as well as for good; force itself has nothing to do with morals. Fire, steam, and electricity, all can kill or save. The gravity that keeps us afoot on our planet also plucks thousands of people from cliffs, bridges, windows, ladders, rooftops, and trees and plunges them to their death. Nature, some men are saddened to learn, is neutral. If modern forces are used for evil it is not the force we must criticize nor the men who discovered what God or nature had already decreed. It is the passion in the heart of man that makes these forces cataclysmically dangerous." --Steve Allen, in "Mark It and Strike It," Hillman Book #60-100, 60¢.



# QUOTES & NOTES

---

It would be impressive to say that the sub-titles within this column have been returned by popular demand, but as a matter of actual fact, that demand was made by a cheering throng of one: Professor Dean W. Boggs. In any event, Professor Boggs should be thrilled by this indication that his words carry such great weight, albeit tardily. Without further ado, let us proceed to the matters at hand.

## CONFESSIONS OF AN ALTER BOY

Religion has been discussed many times in the pages of this magazine, in this column as well as in independent articles and letters. But the focus of this commentary has usually been a specific religious idea or practice, and only rarely the validity of all religious belief. I have never, for example, written an article outlining my own beliefs on these matters, although many times in the course of various articles and comments the subject has been touched upon. At this time, then, I would like to take the opportunity to set down my own position at some length. I have long described myself as an agnostic, which, to me, suggests a person who does not share a belief in any religion, but who, on the other hand, is not prepared to summarily deny the validity of all religion. An agnostic, in other words, is a person who is simply not sure, but who, nevertheless, tends more towards atheism than towards theism. As a result of this tendency, the average theist is not ordinarily careful in discriminating between an agnostic and an atheist, since he feels that both are equally dangerous to his beliefs. As an agnostic by the definition previously given, however, I am not kindly disposed towards careless thinkers who identify me with the stereotyped picture they are likely to carry of an atheist. In my opinion, ardent theists and ardent atheists alike stand on shaky ground, since both hold an uncommonly strong belief in something which cannot be proven, and are thus prone to dogmatism. It is once again the attitude to which I am inclined, that of disliking black and white beliefs on matters which are varied shades of grey, which causes me to be attacked in turn by both positive sides of the issue--by theists and atheists, reactionaries and liberals, etc. (The latter problem is not at issue in this article, but since I introduced it I feel that I should mention that I don't consider my difficulties on this point to stem from moderate beliefs. The trouble, I believe, is that about half of the "liberals" aren't very liberal; they have prostituted the term to the point where it is merely a meaningless political division, not, as it should be, a philosophy.)

It is obviously incumbent upon even a middle-of-the-road person to have reasons for his attitude, particularly since he is likely to

---

A COLUMN BY TED PAULS



demand of theists that they present tenable reasons for their beliefs. Equally obvious, these reasons cannot be thought to be conclusive, since by definition an agnostic is uncertain. However this may be, I should like to take this opportunity to present my reasons for my incredulous attitude, with the prior understanding that they are inconclusive.

Perhaps, before beginning, I would do well to anticipate the obvious question. How, you may ask, can I arrive at even my admittedly equivocal conclusion on what I have conceded to be inconclusive evidence? The answer to that question lies in what is demanded by my brand of agnosticism as opposed to what is demanded by the majority of religious faiths: my philosophy of agnosticism requires belief in nothing that is not immediately able to be proved, whereas religious philosophy of almost any kind requires belief in one or more things which cannot be proven. Thus, the latter is in doubt before the first word of argument is spoken; the addition of logical reasons adds weight to the already existing disbelief.

Here, then, are what I take to be a series of rather valid reasons for doubting the alleged Truth of religion:

- a) The variety of religions and religious practices, the multitude of differing and contradictory beliefs.
- b) The history of religion, both that which we know and that which we may imply from observing the relatively "uncivilized" areas of our world.
- c) The specific beliefs within the various religions which are rendered invalid by logic and/or science.
- d) The lack of tangible proof favoring the existence of a Supreme Being.

a) The fact that different sects own different practices does not immediately preclude the possibility of all sects having valid beliefs, of course, but when many of these practices and philosophies are in addition contradictory, it is obvious that some of them must be false. Given, for example, a Roman Catholic who believes that one must not eat meat of any kind on Friday, but that all meat is proper on any other day; a Jew who believes that one must eat only kosher meat, regardless of the day; and a Hindu who believes that one must not eat beef under any circumstances, but that all other meats are quite acceptable--given these three individuals, each with mutually exclusive beliefs, it is apparent that two of them must of necessity be in error. All three might be wrong, but two of them must, particularly since, if they are all very ardent, each will consider the others to be blasphemers. The ones which you, as an individual, will think wrong depend upon the group of your own association, but if you are fortunate enough to be able to view this situation from an objective viewpoint, it is quickly apparent that the entire situation is vastly amusing. Here we have three men, perhaps each a pillar of his society, considering each other blasphemers. The situation is further confused when you take not three, but ten individuals of different beliefs. If each of these individuals firmly believes that his particular rites are the only valid ones, and that all other rites are blasphemous, then it is plain that at least nine of the gentlemen must be in error. Virtually every theist would agree with me to this point--insofar as admitting that other religions are invalid, theists are good sorts--but at this point they would shut their eyes and halt, just short of the precipice. I simply



carry this reasoning to the next logical step: if nine of ten sets of beliefs are erroneous, it is but a short step to the conclusion that the tenth may also be.

This, of course, is by no means conclusive evidence of anything; it proves only that the tenth may be invalid. It proves, to phrase the premise more accurately, that the tenth is no more likely to be true than the previous nine. However, this is an admission that few theists would be willing to make.

From this, then, we have a rule of sorts: In a series of irrational beliefs, none of which can be supported by logic or evidence, no one is more likely to be valid than its fellows.

b) This is an interesting point, particularly in view of the reaction it is likely to elicit from the theist. This situation should make a good thesis for a psychologist, if it hasn't already. Briefly, it is this: because of the various states of "civilization" which have and do exist on this planet, we are able to acquire information about religion from its roughest to its most perfect form. The conclusions to be drawn from this are readily apparent, but a staunch theist will nevertheless reject them out of hand by the simple expedient of denying that the "rough" forms of religion are, indeed, religion. If our hypothetical subject is, say, a Methodist, he will no doubt admit that the Catholic, Hebrew, Buddhist, and Orthodox faiths are religions, although he will probably question their validity; he may, if he is sufficiently open-minded, admit that the ancient civilizations of Egypt, Greece, Persia, etc. possessed religions, although he will no doubt condemn their barbarism. But he will on no account admit that the Dyak or Arapesh taboos constitute a religion; he will dismiss them as superstitions. In this way he may prevent himself from being forced to the conclusion that the contemporary religions are a product of social and cultural evolution, and that, since they stem from what even he would consider invalid beginnings (read: premises), they are themselves invalid.

The process by which religion began is not particularly obscure. When Homo sapiens first began to use the wonderful mind with which evolution endowed him, he was just intelligent enough to realize his puniness before nature, and out of fear it was necessary to find something outside himself from which he could look forward to protection, or for which he could blame the many ills which befell him. Man, in other words, feeling his own impotence, found it necessary to invent external causes for the brutality of nature, on the one hand, and the blessings of nature, on the other. It is probable that the first deities took the form of various demons (primarily the so-called natural elements: wind, lightning, water, sun; but also more abstract entities such as bad-hunting-from-unknown-cause, land-slides, etc.), and protective spirits (the spirits of very strong or brave ancestors). It is a temptation at this point to discuss at length the process by which these religious practices became more and more complicated with the addition and perfection of taboos, ritual chants and dances, physical regalia, largely due to man's inherent love of symbolism and the obsession to explain things, but a lengthy dissertation is not necessary. Suffice it to say that by this process, religion has evolved to its present state.

If this evolution had been universal--if, that is to say, only a single religion existed in this day and age--religion would indeed be a formidable adversary. But social evolution, like physical evolution, is not uniform, largely because of geographical distinctions and separations. Because of a lack of opportunity, the oyster has not changed perceptibly in 200,000,000 years; because of a similar lack of oppor-



tunity, the culture--and, hence, religion--of numerous groups in the backwaters of the populated world has not changed in thousands of years. Thus, the Dobu of New Guinea (specifically of Dobu Island in the d'Entrecasteaux group) had, until their discovery by the more "civilized" societies, a culture which had remained static for many thousands of years, and presents a picture of approximately what modern religions must have been like at one time. (Parenthetically, it should be noted that the distinctions between even primitive religions point to the fact that even they are not very close in time to their origin. However, most are similar in basic psychology, if not in specifics, and all are closer to each other than is any one to modern religion.)

A certain pattern of evolution is apparent even to a layman, although a professional anthropologist would undoubtedly be able to present a fuller pattern. Higher than the very primitive existing religions, though still not what a typical theist would be willing to term a "religion", is the American Indian religious order. These differ in point of geographical distinction as well, but I believe that they may logically be considered a single group. The Indian culture in general is more articulate than the very primitive ones discussed above, and thus it is to be expected that their religious beliefs would likewise be on a higher plane. The greatest distinction is the general (though not, I believe, universal) belief that one among the many spirits and dieties reigns supreme. Since given theism, monotheism is the logical outcome, this alone elevates the American Indian religion to a higher plane than that of the cultures to which I previously alluded, in which a single diety might or might not be stronger than the others.

Indians also form a part of the third division of cultures, in this case the American civilizations of Maya, Inca, and Aztec. Perhaps also part of this group would be the early civilizations of North Africa and Western Asia. The major distinguishing feature here is the social improvement which leads to the phenomenon of permanent cities, and thus to the construction of lasting temples. The dieties were still numerous, but a single one (often represented by the sun) was taken to be the most powerful.

A fourth level should probably be later Greek and Egyptian religions (and presumably the Asiatic religions at the same stage, but since I know so little about these, I have ignored them rather than to incorrectly categorize them). The distinguishing feature here is once again evolution towards monotheism, particularly noticeable in the Greek mythological system where Zeus (or Jupiter, as the Romans called him) emerges as the ruler of the gods.

A fifth level is probably constituted by early Christian religion (and the Hebrew beliefs of the same period), and the sixth would be the current materialistic view of religion.

This table may not be entirely accurate, particularly in its later stages, but I think it suffices to show that no boundary can be drawn between (1) what the theist considers (perhaps grudgingly, in some cases) to be religion, and (2) what he considers to be pagan superstition. The conclusion is inescapable: if our religions are but a more advanced state of what most devout theists would dismiss as "ignorant superstition", then are they properly to be considered any more than that in their own right?

c) This refers to a number of things, both in early religions and in our modern ones. Since it probably isn't cricket to criticize what was once, but is no longer, believed, I will confine my comments to just a few of the currently accepted premises which can be shown to be erroneous. The premise is simply that if the faithful can retain



faith in ideas and customs which have been proven to have no validity, then there might be equal cause to doubt those aspects for which there is no proof, one way or the other.

For example, certain sects have an unshakeable faith in the Christian Bible, and thus in the prediction of Archbishop Ussher that the world was created in 4004 B.C. (The fact that this guess is no proper part of the Bible is irrelevant--as is the fact that scholarly theologians no longer demand literal faith in the Bible--since a great many theists believe it regardless.) Common sense ought to be sufficient to deduce that this figure, or one 100 times larger, is absurd; at any rate, a working knowledge of the processes of geology, or even knowledge of the existence of carbon-dating and other systems, will serve to belie this idea.

For another example, there is the contemporary Christian idea of the benevolent God who will watch over our world to see that no harm comes to His people. History itself refutes this, and most recently the testament of six million civilians who died in the Nazi gas chambers.

There are many, many others which could be cited, but I fear that I would be accused of attacking straw men. Since all of us have knowledge of similar absurdities from our own experience with avid believers, I need spend no more time on this point.

d) This, of course, is proof of nothing but that doubt exists--which, as a matter of fact, it has been my purpose to prove throughout. The lack of tangible proof pointing to the existence of a God or Gods does not constitute a proof against that existence, of course; but it does constitute proof that reasonable doubt exists, and perhaps it proves a little more than that, when used in conjunction with the reasoning introduced in the third paragraph of this article.

I have attempted in the course of this article to give prime attention to several points which are not normally considered at length in discussions of this sort. In doing so, I have largely disregarded the scientific point of view except where it was necessary, and have concentrated on a utilitarian, historical basis for disbelief. If nothing else, this may furnish the theists in the audience with some new points to ponder in place of the tired old objections with which they usually deal. I expect to convince no one; but I enjoy the attempt.

-----  
"I alone know that I know nothing."  
-----

-----Democritus  
-----

#### ON CIVIL DEFENSE: THE HOME MAUSOLEUM PLAN

At one point in the history of this magazine, the major subject for discussion in the letter column was the possibility of a nuclear war, and the worth of a blast/fallout shelter program in specific. This particular morbid subject has not been discussed since early in 1962, but enough new names have been added to the mailing list in the interim to make worthwhile the renewal of that discussion. Once again, your beloved editor will start the ball rolling with an article, as he did in Kipple #18. However, other than its fatalistic viewpoint, this current article will have little in common with the earlier attempt. In #18, I wrote approximately one page on the subject, all of it concerned to one degree or another with the problem of fallout. This was obviously unfortunate, since fallout is only one aspect--and probably not the most important--of a nuclear war, but the readers took my lead and very nearly everyone who engaged in that discussion erred in much the same way, concerning themselves exclusively with one aspect of the situa-



tion. This was of great assistance to those readers who advocated a shelter program, since no single aspect of the problem presents insurmountable difficulties. This present article shall attempt to bypass this fault; within the limits of my knowledge on the problem, I will attempt to briefly cover all of the various problems inherent in a possible future nuclear war and a massive shelter program.

These problems not only occur during an actual shooting war, but extend for a considerable time both before and after the bombs are dropped. The first of these, the political ramifications of a shelter program, is a fault of the program itself, totally aside from the war which may or may not occur. Briefly, the political problem is this: any large-scale shelter program must of necessity be undertaken by the federal government, and this would inevitably increase the power of the government in certain areas. The government would be able to demand that schools, office buildings, and even private dwellings be equipped with shelters. Similar government interference into the lives of individuals is commonly encountered during war-time, but the restrictions and demands of a shelter program would not be confined to a certain specified time, but would extend indefinitely into the future. One Washington official has already suggested that home shelters be made compulsory, on the grounds that any family's failure to build a shelter weakens the national military posture. The gentleman's patriotism is laudable, but such a suggestion is intolerable in a free society. In some states, air raid drills are compulsory and failure to take cover has resulted in arrests. Any large-scale, government-directed program would result in making this procedure nationwide.

Not only political, but also social and economic pressure would be brought to bear on non-participants. Americans as a whole are notorious conformists, and any failure on the part of an individualistic family to build a shelter would probably result in social ostracism by their "safe", conforming neighbors. Since any extensive shelter program in effect conscripts every American adult to the cause of national defense, non-participants would be given much the same treatment as were conscientious objectors during World War Two: they would be jailed, ostracised, and/or terrorized.

The second problem of a shelter program is that it materially increases the possibility of a nuclear war. The fact that the Russians might be more inclined to launch an attack if we make a concentrated effort to "dig in" or "head for the hills" is only a part of the problem. More important, perhaps, is the type of military policy with which a vast shelter program is compatible. The people most enthusiastic about a shelter program are the "counter-force strategists" (largely, although not entirely, consisting of Air Force officers), who believe that any nuclear attack will be aimed at our bases, our retaliatory power. This tends to make the concept of nuclear war acceptable, but unfortunately the strategy is a weak one and it is becoming ever weaker as our bases increase in number, in strength, and in mobility (Polaris submarines). Most of our missile installations are so entrenched in concrete that nothing less than a direct hit will destroy them; moreover, the individual missiles on a base are separated by rather great distances, to insure that a single bomb can destroy no more than one. And even if we weren't gradually making the tactic useless, the Russians have never shown themselves to be great humanitarians, and there is no reason to assume that in the event of a nuclear war they would show any concern with sparing our cities.

The view is often discussed that the Russians would attack only our bases in the hope that we will attack only their bases--or, con-



versely, that we would attack only their bases in the hope that they would repay that favor in kind. It suffices to say that neither side is foolish enough to trust the other to be "nice guys".

The opposing strategy, the "stable-detrant strategy", is primarily a product of the Army and Navy, who, realizing that no country could hope to win or even survive a nuclear war, base their hopes on a sufficiently impressive retaliatory force constructed to remove from the Russians the temptation of striking first. No extensive shelter program is contemplated as a part of this strategy, since its only purpose is to make the hypothetical war so costly that Russia will not undertake it. Whatever faults there may be in this policy, it at least leaves room for negotiation on disarmament (although this is not always taken advantage of), whereas the counter-force policy is irrevocably committed to a brink-of-war foreign policy.

Thus a shelter program, constructed to assist our survival in time of war, has two strikes against it before the first bomb falls. From this point, its disadvantages become not only more readily obvious, but also more dangerous to our physical well-being. Let us consider the problems at various points as the war unfolds, from the viewpoint of advocates of civil defense as well as those opposed to it. In the fairy dream of a typical advocate of a shelter system, the opening moments of World War Three occur in approximately this manner: missiles are discovered by our radar coming over the North Pole. After a reasonable amount of time has passed during which it is ascertained that they are missiles, and not weather balloons or meteorites, the word is sent out to civil defense and other officials that we are under attack, and a "condition red" alert is ordered. Shortly thereafter, the sirens sound throughout the city, and, advise most advocates of civil defense (including the government), the population now has between fifteen and twenty minutes to take cover in their shelter. Mr. and Mrs. John Doe, upon hearing the sirens or receiving the alert over the radio, casually replace their books on the shelf, collect their children, and proceed to their Jim Dandy Basement Shelter, equipped with food, water, and two portable television sets.

This is, of course, an exaggerated picture, but surprisingly enough, many advocates of shelters possess an ideal picture nearly as foolish. If this were not a matter of such singular morbidity, the pious faith of the masses would be amusing. Let me now attempt to paint a slightly more realistic picture of the situation. Up until the time the sirens sound, the popular conception of events is more or less correct, although oversimplified. Before the Condition Red Alert is given, missiles are readied for firing (both defensive missiles intended to destroy enemy missiles and planes in the air, and offensive missiles aimed at Russian targets), bombers and fighters airborne, and our allies notified of the attack (if they haven't already been attacked in their own right). However, this procedure is of little interest to the average American, and so I have chosen to ignore it here. The procedures important to us at this time are those following the siren, and it is here that reality and fantasy diverge dramatically. First of all, the proposed warning time is correct only for certain areas, a fact overlooked more often than not by the advocates of civil defense. Perhaps Omaha, Nebraska, or Tulsa, Oklahoma, will have fifteen minutes to prepare for a bomb, but most of the larger metropolitan areas in this country will not. The warning time for an attack has been reduced drastically by the advent of nuclear-armed submarines; unfortunately, most advocates of civil defense (and the government CD agency) are either unaware of this innovation, or choose to ignore it. Cities reasonably



near the ocean (which means eight of the twelve largest metropolitan areas in the country) will have a warning time bordering on the ridiculous: Larry McCombs (see Kipple #21, page 44) estimates that Los Angeles, which will be attacked in all probability by missiles launched from submarines, will have a warning time of "less than a minute".

But even given the maximum time agreed upon by reputable authorities, fifteen minutes, what could be accomplished? (It should be noted here that thirty minutes is a figure often given; however, this is misleading since it refers to the amount of time from the first sighting of missiles until they reach their targets. This means that the military will have thirty minutes warning time, but the civilian population will not, since even Civil Defense personnel are not immediately informed of such a sighting.) Fifteen minutes seems like a long time under the circumstances presented by many shelter advocates, but, once again, these circumstances represent an ideal which cannot in reality be approached. They assume a tender home scene, typically American, in which Mr. and Mrs. John Doe are relaxing in their living room after a satisfying day's work, while the darling children are watching television or doing their homework. However, most reputable scientists agree that if the attack is a deliberately planned one, it will not occur at such a convenient time. The most favorable time from the Russian viewpoint is in the late morning or early afternoon of a weekday. This is, of course, the time when the majority of people could be expected to be away from home--and thus away from their shelters. Mr. Doe is at work, Mrs. Doe is at the supermarket or beauty shop, and the children are at school. Now, in a large metropolitan area, Mr. Doe very likely works in the city, and despite the possible existence of public shelters, he can probably be eliminated from our discussion. (The effects of nuclear weapons on the city will be discussed later in this article.) Mrs. Doe may be able to reach home in fifteen minutes, but this is by no means a certainty; she may be farther from home under normal conditions, or she may be relatively close but still unable to reach her home as a result of the mass panic likely to occur in such a situation. The case of Richard and Rosemary Hickey is probably a typical one in this respect. Says Rosemary (Kipple #22, page 35):

"Richard works a little over a mile away. He might be able to get to the shelter in ten minutes, if the adrenalin which he will probably charge through his arteries shows up in adequate amounts. It takes me a minimum of five minutes to get to my car, and, given a normal traffic pattern, fifteen minutes to drive home."

Actually, of course, since there will not be any such thing as a "normal traffic pattern", both Richard and Rosemary could be only half as far from home and yet still be on the street when the bomb struck. They live in Chicago, a city which would probably merit several fairly large nuclear devices.

If the projected public shelters are constructed, Dick and Rosemary could probably take shelter in one of those. This would not, however, solve an important part of their problem: they would still be in the city, and thus in the immediate blast area. In Baltimore, the only city about which I can speak with authority, various public buildings in the heart of the city have been designated as public shelters--buildings which would be vaporized by the explosion. Moreover, even if Dick and Rosemary found a safe public shelter, they would not likely take cover in the same shelter, and this would create a psychological



problem which will be discussed later.

Another problem is the "community shelters" which have been proposed in some areas. Although partially constructed with government funds, these shelters are distinctly different from the "public" shelters, since they are constructed and maintained for the use of a suburban community, or, in some areas, a village or small town. The people who maintain these shelters are not likely to admit strangers, since they will probably have space requirements for only a limited number. Similarly, those persons who do not have their own shelters for one reason or another, or who cannot reach their shelter, will not be allowed to intrude into other private shelters. The prospect of shooting friends, neighbors, and fellow human beings who pound on the door of your shelter and attempt to break in has been widely discussed and widely sanctioned. Since all shelters (whether public, community, or individual) are constructed with a limited number of tenants in mind, those who cannot reach a vacant shelter will be left outside, including infants and children. Nothing can be done about this, and these people are regretfully written off by the shelter advocates. However, they, too, constitute a psychological problem which will later be discussed.

Let us assume now that the warning time has elapsed, and many people have reached shelters. Mrs. Doe has managed to reach her basement shelter despite the widespread panic which renders many streets impassable; the Doe children take shelter in their school, either in a specially constructed and stocked area or (more likely) simply by crawling under their desks (a tactic introduced during World War Two and never revised, despite the million-fold improvement of bombs); and Mr. Doe finds his way to the basement or a specially constructed shelter in the basement of his office building.

The immediate problems of the bomb itself are the blast, the direct radiation, and the blinding flash of light. It is quite likely that a large city will receive one or even more twenty-megaton bombs. These are certainly now within the delivery capability of both camps, and they will become even easier to deliver in the future. Now, exactly what are the effects of a twenty-megaton bomb on a large city? The immediate effects (with which this article is presently concerned) are these: everything on or near the surface is completely disintegrated in an area which has the diameter of 4.5 miles, the diameter of the fireball; within an area of ten miles diameter, unreinforced two-story brick houses collapse, and there are 150-mph winds; within an area of 13 miles diameter, wooden houses collapse; within an 18 mile area, houses would be severely damaged and the blast casualty rate would be 20-40%; within a 21 mile area, most exposed clothing would be set afire; within 31 miles, there would be second-degree burns on exposed skin, canvas awnings, newspapers, dry rotten wood, etc. would be set afire; and windows would be shattered in an area having a diameter of 41 miles. These figures are all approximate, but accurate within reasonable limits. They are furnished by the Scientists' Committee for Radiation Information. There are many varying estimates, some more conservative and others less so. The official estimates of government Civil Defense organizations are generally conservative; however, a book written and published by the Baltimore Civil Defense Organization and distributed to fire-fighters, is somewhat more technical than the usual pap given to private citizens and its estimates are, surprisingly, extremely close to reality--and hence pessimistic. An additional problem is constituted by the retinal burns resulting from the flash of light, but so little research has been done into this area that there is no definitive comment to be made on the subject. Another area for discus-



sion is that of direct radiation; however, since anyone affected by this would probably be killed by the blast in any event, it is not an important consideration.

The above are rough figures; let us now translate them into situations for the Doe family. Mr. Doe, you recall, sought shelter in his office building in the city. If this building were within 2.25 miles of ground zero (the spot where the bomb explodes) it would be vaporized by the expanding fireball. If his building were twice as far from the center of the blast area, it would at best be severely damaged--all of the windows blown out, hurricane-force winds ripping apart the interior, all combustible material in the building set afire, etc. The building might also simply collapse, burying the shelter under tons of rubble. (In the figures given above, it is noted that "unreinforced two-story brick houses collapse" at this distance. This can be misleading, in that it seems to say that nothing else would collapse. However, what this really means is that houses of that description would inevitably collapse; other structures might collapse as well, and there is no guarantee that a specific building would not collapse.)

During this initial destruction, Mrs. Doe has reached her home and shelter (by some considerable good fortune, as shown above), and the children have taken shelter in school. If these structures are a sufficient distance from ground zero, they will survive the initial blast, although they will most assuredly be damaged to some extent. If they do survive, then they must be prepared for the secondary effects.

So far, our hypothetical nuclear explosion has progressed to the blast stage. Everyone within an area of 4.5 miles diameter (or, to state it more simply, a radius of 2.25 miles) is dead, despite all precautions. In a large city such as we are considering, there could be many thousands of people in this area. Furthermore, even conservative estimates show a casualty rate of 65% within the next area--from 2.25 to 5.00 mile radius--and this is only the immediate blast casualty percentage: most of the remaining 35% will die if they cannot flee the area within half an hour. And within a nine-mile radius, the immediate casualty rate is approximately 30%. All of these figures are conservative in at least one respect, for there will be many who are not immediately killed, but who will die later as a direct or indirect result of injuries sustained during the explosion.

Returning to Mr. Doe, we find that through some truly extraordinary good fortune, he is still alive. The building in which he huddles is now nothing more than a shell: all of the windows are blown out (or, rather, in), and the interior of every floor is blazing. If Mr. Doe is a reasonably intelligent person, he will realize that he cannot remain in the building, because within a maximum of half an hour after the blast a fire-storm may develop. This dreaded phenomenon is perhaps the most discussed and least understood aspect of a nuclear attack. A fire-storm is not the same as a conflagration, although either may result from a nuclear explosion. In a conflagration, the fire will expand in all directions from its point of origin (more rapidly in the direction of the wind), but it may pass over buildings or even entire blocks of buildings without touching them. A fire-storm is by nature of limited size--it can never increase beyond its original boundaries--but on the other hand, it destroys everything combustible within the area of its circumference--including the available oxygen. In different areas, the different types of fire are more dangerous; in Los Angeles, for instance, a conflagration would be more dangerous, since as a result of the nature of the surrounding areas, it would expand unchecked for perhaps hundreds of miles. In most cities, however, the fire-storm is the



most dangerous phenomenon. The Scientists' Committee for Radiation Information describes the fire-storm phenomenon:

"In the presence of a high density of small fires over a large area, a mass of fresh air rushes in from the periphery to replace the super-heated rising air. This may generate hurricane-force winds from time to time, especially at the edges of the fire area. The air movement is equivalent to the draft of a chimney under which a fire is burning. The inward winds fan the flames to encompass virtually everything combustible in the area into one huge fire. This set of events is called a fire-storm."

The dangers of the fire-storm to shelters are two: first, most shelters have exterior air intakes, and since the fire-storm consumes all available oxygen within its radius, all those who depended on an exterior air supply would suffocate; secondly, the fire-storm raises the surface temperature to an intolerable degree (10,000° F. is quite possible), so even those rare and expensive shelters containing an internal air supply would become crypts for their inhabitants as the heat from the fire above penetrated.

Since Mr. Doe realizes this danger, he must escape from the area. This is either extremely difficult, or actually impossible, depending upon his position. A fire-storm may be any size within reason, so there is no way to be certain that you are not in its area. The conditions for such a fire-storm exist in an area with a diameter of 31 miles, or within a radius of 15.5 miles from ground zero. It is unlikely that any single fire-storm would reach this size, however. Unfortunately, a bomb large enough to cause fires within this area (such as the twenty-megaton device in our hypothetical situation) may cause several fire-storms.

The chances of Mr. Doe escaping from the area within the half-hour allotted are slim indeed, despite his prior good fortune in remaining alive this long. He will probably be forced to walk, since cars within the secondary blast areas would have been tossed about by the blast and probably set afire as well. Even if he could acquire an automobile in working condition, there would be little chance of using it. Other autos (both as a result of the blast and the preceeding panic) would be blocking the streets, as well as collapsed houses and buildings, and probably rubble blown from the areas closer to the explosion. As an added difficulty, much of this rubble would probably be highly radioactive. Combined with the "immediate fallout", the radioactive dirt and other small particles from ground zero which falls to earth immediately, this rubble would probably give Mr. Doe a sufficiently large dose of radiation to kill him, even if he avoided the other obstacles.

In addition, many of the same problems will face Mr. Doe's family, unless their shelters are more than 15 miles from ground zero. Fifteen miles doesn't sound like a very great distance, but in a metropolitan area such as Baltimore, not only the entire city, but many of the outlying suburban areas, are within a 15 mile radius of the center of the city, the probable ground zero. Half the population of Maryland lives in and around Baltimore.

Having considered the initial effects of the bomb itself, I would like to devote space to an area which is generally ignored in such discussions: the psychological effects. These take many forms, and



cannot be too highly stressed as a danger to the inhabitants of a shelter. My knowledge in this area is not very great, but in any event it is obvious that the severe tensions of shelter life would be unbearable to many. First, there is the worry caused by the fact that many families would be separated, and the individual members thereof would not know whether their loved ones were dead or alive. Similarly, the great sense of loss acquired by the knowledge that millions were dead would contribute to this tension. The fact that in many cases people pounded on the door to be let in after the shelter had been sealed, and the constant thought that they had been left outside to die, would be an agonizing one to all but the most insensitive. Someone would tend to take charge within the shelter, but since all visible symbols of authority would have been destroyed, the possibility of mutiny is very high, and this would add to the trouble. If someone in the shelter were to die, their body could not be taken outside, and in the cramped quarters of a shelter, the live occupants would be constantly reminded of its presence. The fact that anyone who cracked up would have to be silenced in some manner--conceivably by killing them, if no other alternative were available--would increase the possibility of other victims; similarly, hysteria operates in a chain-like manner: if one person became hysterical, he or she would probably provide the spark for others, and so on until the entire complement of the shelter was in a state of hysteria. And over-riding all of this, the thought that when at last the doors open, nothing will be left.

Such are the psychological problems which are obvious to this layman; a psychologist might be able to think of a half-dozen other problems resulting from the intricacy of the human mind, particularly under stress. But there are also physical difficulties apart from the bomb itself. One of these is a problem I recall seeing discussed only once, by Victor Paschkis: in a shelter occupied by the maximum number of persons permissible, the warmth radiated by the bodies of the occupants gradually raises the interior temperature of the shelter. In a shelter containing twenty people, and a self-contained air supply, the temperature would be intolerable at the end of seven days. Since even the government conservatively admits that it will be necessary to remain in the shelter for ten days to two weeks, this is a deadly problem. The only solution is to increase the contemplated size of the shelter, while the number of persons accommodated remains the same.

Another physical problem of shelter-living is the fact that a large number of people crammed in a small space increases the possibility of disease, particularly since sanitary conditions are virtually non-existent. As an added difficulty, most shelters will not be fortunate enough for one of their occupants to be a doctor.

And last, but not least, there is fallout, the problems of which are manifold. It is unlikely that a nuclear war would immediately raise the background level of radiation to the point where it would be sufficient to kill all of the survivors, but the other effects of fallout would probably have much the same end. Most available water would be contaminated for a long period of time; a great number of animals would be killed, but insects, whose resistance to radiation is high, would thrive, and without their natural enemies among the more sensitive birds, they would probably constitute a very serious problem; most heretofore arable land would be worthless--as many as forty worthless plantings and harvests would be necessary before the land became uncontaminated; and though the background radiation would probably be insufficient to kill everyone outright, smaller amounts of radiation are sufficient to (1) kill about half the population, at its current level



of health (700-900 roentgens is inevitably fatal, 300-500 roentgens is fatal half the time), (2) lower the resistance to disease of the remaining population (a great danger in the post-atomic world, with its polluted water, thriving insects, and millions of human corpses), and (3) affect the genes of the survivors, either rendering them sterile or causing mutated monsters to be born.

The mistake previously made in the discussion of shelters was in considering each problem individually. No one of these difficulties would be fatal to our race; but I think it obvious that the combination would be impossible to cope with.

---

"Men would not have known the name of justice if there were no injustice."  
--Heraclitus

---

### CRIME AND PUNISHMENT

The concern with murder in various forms expressed by this column continues--or perhaps culminates--in this issue with the promised treatise on state murder, politely known as execution. Capital punishment has constituted a controversy of impressive proportions for a number of years, but, oddly enough, I have never taken a stand on this issue at any length. Some time ago, there was an interesting and, at times, heated discussion in Yandro on this matter, but Marion Bradley was doing such a praiseworthy job of scattering the legions of the opposition that I decided not to interfere. Finally, in Kipple #32, I briefly stated my opinion. At this writing, I have no idea whether or not there will be any lengthy comments on that brief paragraph, but I would at any rate like to expand on my position. The easiest method by which to accomplish this would appear to be by quoting and dealing with the comments of an advocate of capital punishment, preferably an articulate and sensible one. However, since I do not intend to base my entire argument on this refutation, perhaps I can be forgiven for lessening my task by choosing an inarticulate and nonsensical opponent. Fred Hunter, in Habakkuk #6 (July, 1961) states:

"Britain recently made alterations to the death penalty system. The alterations made it more difficult for the criminal to get himself hanged. 1961 so far promises to be a record year for murder, rape, criminal assault, etc. So much for progress. A retrograde step or two is called for. Hang all murderers. Hang the sex maniacs who assault or rape females under the age of 18. Castrate the rapists of women over the age of 18. Treat any sexual abnormalities with extreme harshness if such abnormalities directly offend the normal members of society. Hang also the insane murderer. It's all very well to say that prolonged treatment might effect a cure. The operative word is might, so why should the over-burdened taxpayer be made to keep alive a potential second-time murderer."

I'll leave it to Vic Ryan or other psychologists in the audience to define the specific nature of Mr. Hunter's attitude, but even to the layman it is obvious that we are faced here with a sick attitude, perhaps as dangerous in its own way as the sex maniacs with which it proposes to deal. A lengthy, point-by-point examination of this paragraph



is unnecessary, but I will repeat the three glaring examples of stupidity in the event that anyone missed their significance. First, Mr. Hunter would castrate the rapists of women over the age of 18. I am not at all certain just what this is intended to accomplish, but I feel that someone should point out to Mr. Hunter that the aberration is in the head of these sex maniacs, and removing their genitals will only force them to find a substitute if they should decide to repeat their crime. Secondly, Mr. Hunter demands harshness in dealing with abnormalities "which directly offend the normal members of society." Even if it were possible to find any "normal members of society" (no one is entirely normal, as has been shown many times), it would still be foolish to deal harshly with whatever happened to offend them. As a matter of fact, the paragraph I quoted would doubtless offend a great number of people who are adjudged relatively normal; I trust that Mr. Hunter would not mind if they dealt harshly with him for writing it. And thirdly, Mr. Hunter proposes the execution of murderers for financial considerations. The question "why should the over-burdened taxpayer be made to keep alive a potential second-time murderer" is without doubt the most nauseating question of the year. And here we leave Mr. Hunter, for it is unlikely that an intellect which could formulate such a hideous thesis would be moved by logical argument.

For the rest of the readers, it is now possible to present my arguments in opposition to capital punishment against this background without running to unnecessary length. Briefly, it is obvious that all of the positions favoring capital punishment boil down to a single motive: revenge. This is an entirely human motive, but it is not a philosophically acceptable one and it has--or should have--no place in a code of ethics formulated by any "civilized" society. It is obvious that the murder of a criminal is of no assistance at all to his victim, who has already suffered his actions. Execution as a preventive measure is neither effective nor humane: a murderer is not likely to repeat his act (unless insane), and, in any event, it isn't acceptable to execute him on the off chance that he might. Some lives may have been saved by this practice, but in opposition, consider how many criminals have been executed who would not have killed again. The only criminal likely to kill more than once would be one who is insane, and since the insane are in no way responsible for their actions, execution is more than inhumane--it is ghastly. All major religions oppose capital punishment, and one of the prime strictures of Christianity is "Thou shalt not kill." Also, capital punishment is discriminatory: it is the poor, the minority-group members who are executed. How many wealthy persons are executed in this country? And most damning of all, it is not effective. The crime rate in most areas abandoning capital punishment has either remained static or dropped slightly. Even without this concrete proof, it should have been obvious that execution cannot be a deterrent, since there are by and large three types of murders (and, hence, murderers): the cold, calculated murder for financial or other gain, in which the participant considers apprehension and execution a necessary risk; the insane murder, in which the participant is incapable of governing his actions and, thus, immune to any threat of punishment; and the crime of passion, in which there is no forethought and, as a result, no consideration of consequences.

It may be said that there are exceptions to these considerations, so in order to partially offset the effect of choosing a clay pigeon for a target above (Fred Hunter), I will now attempt to fit these rules to what is probably the most difficult case: Adolph Eichman. Actually, of course, most of the above considerations apply equal-



ly well in his case, but the horror and bestiality of his acts may incline us to forget this fact. But behold: the motive is still revenge, and it is still philosophically unacceptable; the victims were not assisted by his death; his execution prevented no future deaths, since it is inconceivable that he could ever again be in a position to command further deaths; his death is not likely to frighten current or future hatchet-men for mass movements such as Naziism, Communism, etc. Where, then, is the distinction?

Before John Boardman succumbs to apoplexy, I should point out that I shed no tears as a result of Eichman's execution. This, to me, shows that I am fallible, not that the philosophy itself is faulty. Capital punishment, whether in relation to a Chessman or an Eichman, is barbarous and uncivilized; it is wrong. One of these days all of us may realize that.

-----  
"The world is my country and to do good, my religion."     --Thomas Paine  
-----

### THE JUST SOCIETY REVISITED

Since my discussion with Kevin Langdon on the definition and application of that abstract quality known as "justice" began, I have been searching for a workable premise for the just society. The fact that it has taken me this long to find such a premise I can blame only on the fact that I am a product of my environment: Baltimore is the intellectual and cultural Sahara of the Western hemisphere. Ideas travel through the local atmosphere as sluggishly as ping-pong balls travel through a vat of molten tungsten. As with most of my better ideas, this one came to me as I lay in bed staring at the ceiling. I rarely fall into a slumber quickly, and on this particular occasion--4:30 a.m., December 21, 1962--I was even more hesitant than usual to relax my mind and allow myself to drift off to sleep. Running through my mind was a comment I had made to Carl Lazarus in Kipple #32, and I was making a sleepy attempt to discover in this comment the premise for which I had been searching. I doubt that the eventual result of this fitful search was original; since it entered my mind immediately in polished form, I presume that it is a passage once read and only recently recalled.

However that may be, I immediately jumped out of bed and, barely suppressing the urge to shout, "Eureka! Eureka!" I grabbed a handy slip of paper and scribbled onto it my premise, with the added command, "Write article!" (The spectacle of a person writing notes to himself in the middle of the night may appear ridiculous, but I realized from painful experience that if I simply trusted my memory to recall the premise in the morning, I would likely forget it entirely.)

This is what I wrote: "In the just society, any given situation should be approached with the aim in mind to provide the maximum of free choice for the individual."

This may appear to you to be absurdly simple and readily obvious, but I trust that you will forgive my simple-minded joy at verbalizing at long last my view of the just society. Previously I would have found necessary a lengthy treatise liberally sprinkled with examples in order to present my opinion of what the just society should be; now, although I fully intend to present that treatise in this article, it at least will not be necessary to repeat it constantly. Some perceptive individuals may now be aware to which comment to Lazarus I refer, but before I reiterate that particular example, I should like to present a rather more clear-cut--albeit hypothetical--one. On top of a lonely



mountain stands a small cell in which are interred two persons, you, the individual reader, and I, your beloved editor. Aside from copious supplies of food and water, the only other object in the cell is a copy of Irving Wallace's "The Chapman Report". You are absolutely overjoyed by the artistic qualities of the book (I trust you will forgive my low opinion of your taste), and I am offended by it. Out of the infinite variety of situations which may occur concerning the book, three are representative: (1) you may, by physical force or threat of force, coerce me into reading or listening to the book; (2) you may read it while I ignore it; or (3) I may destroy the book because it offends me. At this point, our analogy is rather strained, but the application of my premise from it is apparent. I presume that we would quickly agree that alternatives one and three are unfair and, thus, wrong. Alternative two appears to be the reasonable course. If you are a follower of Aristotle (which I am not in this particular case), you may say that alternative two represents the virtuous mean between two evil extremes, as represented by the first and third alternatives. Regardless of how each one of us might phrase the distinction, it is readily apparent that both the first and third alternatives are unjust, while the second is just within the limits of the situation. Following the second, we are both assured of our free choice; but following either the first or third, one of us is deprived of this choice.

Now let us see how this premise applies to several practical situations. Carl Lazarus commented in Kipple #32 that I had not the right to advocate "Better Red Than Dead" for the country as a whole when I personally admitted to preferring the opposite. The other people, he pointed out, have a similar "right to decide". Here is my reply: "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; (...) 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." As in most practical situations, there are only two alternatives under consideration here; while this circumstance gravely affects Aristotle's reasoning (as briefly covered above), it is perfectly compatible with my premise. The premise holds regardless of the number of alternatives offered.

But in that example, both alternatives are rather depressing, so it may not be the strongest possible one. Confining myself for the moment to the realm of relatively recent controversies, let us examine a less disturbing one: the school prayer issue. Again, there are two alternatives which have been suggested: (1) prayers are recited in the schools as a compulsory matter (and whether this compulsion is legal or social is of little consequence), or (2) they are not recited in the schools. By my previous reasoning, based once again on the premise, the second alternative is just, the first not. Under the second alternative, pious students may still exercise their free choice by praying (though not aloud) at any time they wish, while those who do not wish to pray are equally free to choose. Under the first alternative, however, this freedom is lost to the non-religious group. This is inconsequential to the members of the religious group, but it is certainly unfortunate from the viewpoint of the members of the first group, and it is equally unfortunate from an absolute viewpoint.



The public attitude towards contraceptives provides another example which has recently been widely discussed. Here there are, as a matter of fact, three alternatives, but in deference to the present length of this column I will not explore the ramifications of the third. This alternative is to make contraceptives mandatory under law, an obviously unjust practice, although one which may one day be necessary. The other two alternatives are the important ones; (a) making contraceptives available to all those who desire them; (b) suppressing their sale and use. For the reasons stated several times above, the first is the just alternative, the second unjust. If contraceptives are universally available, those who oppose them (on religious, moral, or other grounds) may fail to purchase or use them, and may verbally assault them or write books opposing them. If they are suppressed, however, those who desire to use them are unjustly deprived of their rights. Obviously, then, only the first alternative is acceptable in a just society.

Virtually any incident of censorship falls under the auspices of my premise. In any given case, we may make the reading of a book mandatory (which deprives those who do not wish to read it of their rights), prohibit it entirely (which deprives those who do wish to read it of their rights), or allow its free distribution without strictures of any sort (which would appear to be the obviously superior course). Of course, any film, speech, newspaper, thought, etc. could be substituted in that sentence for the book, and the premise would apply as readily.

I do not claim that this is any political panacea; far from it. The only claim I can reasonably make for this premise is that it leaves me better off in formulating my own opinions than I was before it occurred to me. Perhaps it will be of similar help to others who appear to have difficulty expressing their opinions on censorship in anything less than a four-page article.

---

"A great many people enjoy a war provided it's not in their neighborhood and not too bad." --Bertrand Russell

---

#### SHORT NOTES ON LONG SUBJECTS

Most of the readers appear to have been aware that "Jeffrey Lynn", whose letter bitterly assailing atheists and agnostics appeared in the letter section of Kipple #32, was and is a non-existent character. That letter was written, of course, by your beloved editor. I make this admission of the obvious here for the benefit of the relatively few individuals who took seriously the rantings of "Lynn". To these people, notably Chay Borsella, Enid Jacobs and anyone else who may write a similar letter after this section is stencilled, I most certainly owe an apology. I trust that their annoyance at "Lynn" will not now transfer to me. It was my intention to create, in Jeffrey Lynn, a character of such obvious stupidity that it should have been immediately apparent that legs were being pulled. The tip-off was--or should have been--the fact that I failed to reply to Mr. Lynn's accusations. Does anyone think I would have passed up such a splendid opportunity to show up the opposition, had it presented itself to me? However, my purpose in writing the letter was not merely to inspire controversy--we have, after all, enough of that. In the latest issue of Horizons, Harry Warner, in an excellent piece of fiction, revealed that he had found a letter of a religious nature from a Jeffrey Lynn of Allentown, Pennsylvania, in a recent issue of Kipple. He also commented, in the same par-



agraph, on my proclivity for inventing names and addresses and writing letters of comment to myself. My move was the obvious one. Horizons arrived on the eighth of the month and I fired back an issue of Kipple containing the alleged "Lynn" letter on the tenth, which is rather good reaction time.

Hang around, gang; next issue I'll reveal how I write letters under the names of Larry McCombs, Vic Ryan, John Boardman, and Derek Nelson...

I suspect that it is hopeless to attempt to change the opinions of John Boardman in regard to conservatives, but in the event that it is a possibility, I would not like it said that I gave up too soon. Here is a paragraph from Barry Goldwater's "The Conscience of a Conservative" which I had marked off for quoting when I first read the book. I disagree with the Senator, as it happens, but this is nevertheless a good example of John Boardman's recklessness in classing Goldwater with George Lincoln Rockwell.

"It so happens that I am in agreement with the objectives of the Supreme Court as stated in the Brown decision. I believe that it is both wise and just for negro children to attend the same schools as whites, and that to deny them this opportunity carries with it strong implications of inferiority. I am not prepared, however, to impose that judgment of mine on the people of Mississippi or South Carolina, or to tell them what methods should be adopted and what pace should be kept in striving toward that goal. That is their business, not mine. I believe that the problem of race relations, like all social and cultural problems, is best handled by the people directly concerned. Social and cultural change, however desirable, should not be effected by the engines of national power. Let us, through persuasion and education, seek to improve institutions we deem defective. But let us, in doing so, respect the orderly process of the law. Any other course enthrones tyrants and dooms freedom."

"The Wingless Rooster", which appears on pages five and six of this issue, was reprinted from The Incomplete Burbee, an anthology of material by Charles Burbee published in 1958 by Terry Carr, Ron Ellick, Pete Graham, and Dave Rike. This brief tale is, in my opinion, one of the finest pieces of material ever written by the legendary Mr. Burbee. However, my purpose in mentioning it was not merely to boast about the material in the current issue (although that was once a tradition in this magazine). I want to say simply that I believe this story deserves reprinting at least once every couple of years.

Incidentally, Charles Burbee's copy of this issue awaits addressing, if someone will kindly give me his current address. Mr. Fred Hunter's copy likewise lacks an address, since I don't have a record of his current one.

It occurs to me that I haven't recently dealt with any moronic clippings from the newspapers of the city, state, nation and world. I don't quite know the reason for this, except that I have found more interesting material elsewhere; it certainly wasn't because of any lack of stupidity in the aforementioned city, state, nation and world. Behold: "A 75-year-old widow was ordered today by the Church of England to remove the words 'Forever in My Thoughts' from her husband's tombstone." It seems that the Church, taking what one of its Vicars calls a "strong Christian line", does not believe that "strong expressions of affection or grief are appropriate."



Then there's the teacher who was fired from his position at Lincoln College for carrying a sign in a demonstration protesting the Cuban blockade. Ironically, the sign in question equated this country's policies with those of Russia. By firing the teacher for holding that particular opinion, the college officials did more to show the truth in his allegation than any ten-page dissertation on the occasional lapses of freedom in our society. When even occasionally an American is injured by other Americans for daring to voice a dissenting opinion, it is not a very favorable commentary on our system's superiority to the communist system.

A vaguely similar matter has been commented upon recently in the press. There appears to be a campaign underway to interdict the sale of goods made in Iron Curtain countries in stores of this country. In Columbus, Georgia, for example, any merchant who wishes to sell goods manufactured in a communist country must pay a "special license fee" of \$1,000. In other localities, the radical right-wing element has apparently not succeeded in having laws passed which discriminate against goods from communist countries (and, incidentally, considerably enrich the treasuries of the local governments), but they have discovered other workable methods. In some cities, printed cards are placed on such goods being displayed in stores. They read: "Buy your Communist slave-labor imports at..." with a space at the end for the name of the store. These, and other methods of doubtful legality, are apparently having the desired effect, particularly in small towns where business may depend on the whim of a few hundred people. I have no doubt but that the people spearheading this drive believe themselves to be accomplishing wonders in the war against "dirty, atheistic Communism", but most of the people I've spoken to appear to share my opinion that they are simply making fools of themselves. And I will state here, in bold type, for the benefit of any members of "The Committee to Warn of the Arrival of Communist Merchandise on the Local Business Scene" or "The Committee to Protect American Free Enterprise from Communist Slave-Labor Imports" who may be reading this, that I have no intention of suddenly acquiring a distaste for Polish ham. In the circles mentioned above, this juicy bit of information would doubtless brand me as a Communist and cause me to be ridden out of town on a Bulgarian salami.

Recently, the Baltimore City Health Department initiated a voluntary birth control program for married women on the welfare rolls, a surprisingly progressive and sensible idea for this prosaic and not usually sensible city. As might have been expected, many people were shocked at such a proposal, and their protestations have been appearing in the newspapers. Most of the complaints are unoriginal, but all are worth noting. One gentleman presented the tired, old plaint, "It's against the laws of nature." This is a comment which I have never understood. Evidently, a certain group of people feel that the laws of nature are something like the Loitering Statutes or the anti-trust laws; if you break them, terrible consequences will result. Actually, of course, the laws of nature are the limitations, as we understand them at a given time. At one time, no doubt, it was understood universally that man could not fly through the air; this was a "law of nature", but we have repealed it. Other scientific rules, known as the impotence principles (you can't square a circle, two competing populations cannot indefinitely inhabit the same ecological niche, etc.), might also qualify as laws of nature, and these too may one day be circumvented, if we can but find the means. However, there is no "law" of any kind covering the prevention of birth--only religious strictures. It isn't (and wasn't) considered impossible, as flight once was or as squaring a



circle still is; it is simply frowned upon by certain religious factions. Contraception no more violates a "law" of nature than does the eating of pork; they both simply violate certain beliefs.

Other commentators chose to ignore the word "voluntary", and hotly decried the innovation as one which "discriminated against the poor people" and "made laws for something which everybody might not want to do."

Oh well, the important point is that the program is in effect, not the misconceptions about it held by many people.

John Boardman forwards a clipping from the Humanist Newsletter, headed "The Subtlety of Satan" and quoting from Frazer's "The Golden Bough":

"Christians and pagans alike were struck by the remarkable coincidence between the death and resurrection of their respective dieties, and the coincidence formed a theme of bitter controversy between the adherents of the rival religions, the pagans contending that the resurrection of Christ was a spurious imitation of the resurrection of Attis, and the Christians asserting with equal warmth that the resurrection of Attis was a diabolical counterfeit of the resurrection of Christ. In these unseemly bickerings the heathen took what to a superficial observer might seem strong ground by arguing that their god was the older and therefore presumably the original, not the counterfeit, since as a general rule an original is older than its copy. This feeble argument the Christians easily rebutted. They admitted, indeed, that in point of time Christ was the junior diety but they triumphantly demonstrated his real seniority by falling back on the subtlety of Satan, who on so important an occasion had surpassed himself by inverting the usual order of nature."

The practice of including statistics of various sorts in this column every once in a while was initiated in #13, the first anniversary issue. Including such material in the first issue of a new year, however, seems a considerably more sensible idea, and since it can be of no possible interest to anyone save a few historians of our microcosm, such material is best tucked away in the dim recesses of this short notes section. During 1962, there were--not unexpectedly, for a monthly magazine--twelve issues of Kipple published, containing a total of 474 pages, or an average of 39.5 pages per issue. Of these pages, a total of 114 pages were devoted to "Quotes and Notes", or an average of 9.5 pages per issue; a total of 267 pages were comprised of letters, or an average of 22.25 pages per issue; a total of 73 pages, or just over 6 pages per issue on the average, were devoted to "outside" material (which is misleading in that it includes material written by me, but not included in "Quotes and Notes"); and the remaining 20 pages, or an average of 1.75 pages were issue, were given over to such trivia as covers, mailing wrappers, blank inside covers, fillers, etc. No doubt everyone is quite bored by this time (except Edmond Meskys, who is laughing hilariously), so to complete the effect I'll mention that all pages except those in #21 were duplicated on ABDick tan (or buff) Mimeotone paper, all stencils were ABDick #8960 (with cushion sheets and plastic films), and the ink used throughout is ABDick #1585. Finally, the mimeograph involved is a Sears-Roebuck Tower, costing \$35.00.

Once again this issue the Pinwheel J. Cadwalader method of telling everyone their status on my mailing list is in effect. If a number appears in the upper right of the address box on the mailing wrapper,



it is the number of the last issue you will receive unless you respond in some manner. The letter "T" indicates that we exchange magazines. A "C" means that you are represented in this issue with a contribution, either a letter or an article. "P" indicates your place on my permanent mailing list. And "S" means that this is a sample copy.

Here in the final stages of this marathon installment of "Quotes and Notes", I will take the opportunity to put to the readership a question which has bothered me for some time. Namely: why is the deck statistically stacked against a successful marriage between two members of our homey little sub-society, science fiction fandom? Why is the divorce/separation rate higher by far than the national average? Part of the answer obviously lies in the fact that the average science fiction fan is considerably different from the average American, but that still leaves the question unanswered. What is the peculiarity of our admittedly different society which makes marriage such a bad risk? Since I first encountered our charming little group, a rather tremendous number of marriages have fallen apart--some have been created and destroyed during my five-year tenure: Ted & Sylvia White, Terry & Miri Carr, Lee & Jane Jacobs, etc. Many others existed before I joined the ranks of this bohemian society, but have since fallen apart: Andy & Jean Young, Larry & Lee Shaw, Nick & Noreen Falasca, Jean & Annie Linard, Art & Trina Castillo, etc. I have several ideas as to reasons for this unusual mortality among marriages, but before presenting them I would like to know what reasons a few others might give.

--Ted Pauls

---

nixon      lost      it!                      BY      JOE      PILATI

Verse for three weeks after Election day

Say that medicare won't pass now,  
Morgenthau's out on his ass now,  
Barry has a right to sass now,  
Nixon lost it!

Say that Stuart Hughes was mangled,  
New York's Lib'ral Party strangled,  
George McGovern still entangled,  
Nixon lost it!

Say the Solid South ain't solid,  
Now one party is as squalid,  
As the other--how invalid!  
Nixon lost it!

Say the right-wing flag they're hoisting,  
Ten less lib'ral votes voicing,  
Still there's one cause for rejoicing,  
Nixon lost it!



# A Song OF SIXPENCE

ENID JACOBS :: BOX 257, STATE COLLEGE :: TOWSON 4, MD.

If Edmond Meskys subscribes to Kipple "largely for laughs", I'm sure he got more than his usual share of chuckles from reading the letter of one Jeffrey Lynn in #32. As for me, I don't know whether to laugh, scream, or simply gape in astounded horror. Jeffrey, in one short missive, has hit on every cliché and illogical pronouncement in the average unthinking theist's argument collection. (Yes, I'll admit that the average unthinking free-thinker has quite a few shining examples of lousy logic in his bag of tricks. The emphasis here is on unthinking, not on theist.)

Those first remarks about God "meaning" a given fetus to be born, it being a "sin" for anybody to prevent it's happening so are harmless enough--though completely illogical. I don't see where a god has anything at all to do with said fetus, nor do I believe in "sin". As a determinist (though not a fanatical one), I don't believe that anything is either "right" or "wrong", all things being relative, and all decisions depending on the heredity and past environment (not just the immediate family, but the complete background) of the person concerned. Thus, though I may not condone abortion for myself, I certainly cannot condemn another person for choosing it as a solution. When I say, "It is wrong for her to do this," I mean, "I think it is wrong"--nothing more. Nothing is really wrong or right--things just are. To drag in God and denounce abortion or anything else as a "sin" is to commit one of the oldest fallacies in the history of distorted logic--appeal to authority.

But Lynn's letter abounds with examples of poor logic. "Atheists and agnostics don't believe in anything--" Stop right there! One might reasonably assume, through denotive and connotative use of the words, that atheists don't believe in a diety, while agnostics say, "One cannot know." All right. But how can Lynn blithely assume that because neither fully accepts the concept of a god, neither believes in anything? I've heard the theists argue that God is everything--but never that everything is God. But to continue: "--nobody can ever be sure that they won't lie and cheat." True. Nobody can ever be sure whether any man won't, in certain circumstances, under certain emotional stress, lie and cheat. But why single out atheists and agnostics as potential cheaters and/or liars? Because they don't believe in the popular concept of a god? What a horrible rendering of cause-and-



effect! Stated syllogistically:

Major premise: Atheists and agnostics don't believe in the popular god.

Minor premise (unstated but implied): People who don't believe in the popular god lie and cheat.

Conclusion: Atheists and agnostics lie and cheat.

The theistic argument usually given here, I believe, is that it is the fear of the wrathful, ever-watching God breathing down our sinful necks that keeps us pure. I say it doesn't! I am an agnostic, and I would venture to say that people of our godless ilk are no more or less honest (and therefore to be trusted no more or less for public office) than are theists. (In fact, I've heard that there are less of us, proportionally speaking, in jails than there are more denominational people.) The real question, however, is not how honest we are, but whether or not our skepticism influenced our honesty and/or dishonesty. Of course, it did not, any more than the fear-of-God really influences a believer who is just about to commit a crime. Man is too great a rationalizer to let a mere God stand in his way; it is easy for him to convince himself that God really wants him to do whatever-it-is, or that he will make up for it by being twice as good next time, etc. Conversely, an ethical person can maintain his own standard of morality, without help from or fear of an all-seeing God.

Lynn's concluding statement about comments from people like Mike Deckinger not belonging in print is the perfect example of faulty reasoning. (And a few other things!) Because he doesn't agree with Deckinger's views, he--Mike--is automatically "wrong", to the extent that said views shouldn't appear in print anywhere. Good--er, God (?).

Derek Nelson: You point out that there is no logical justification to the heated opposition to the school prayers, as these prayers could not corrupt any but the most wavering agnostics. You're right--but: the prayers themselves could not "hurt" anyone; the day-to-day ritual of reciting them could "corrupt" or "hurt" the theistic majority. The acceptance and often compulsion--social or otherwise--behind these prayers implies a tacit approval on the part of the school, the community and the government for the concept of theism. This is "bad" for the theists raised in this atmosphere, for they unconsciously consider belief in a diety to be the "right" thing, the approved thing; almost the patriotic thing--lack of belief, on the other hand, takes on a sort of unsavory and almost subversive taint. If the U.S. had a state church, this attitude would be understandable, but, as a religious democracy--in name, at least--it is out of place. We have a small but definite minority of assorted freethinkers, deists, Ethical Culturists, Humanists, etc., which, according to our Constitution, is just about as much a part of our country as the religionists, and which must be accepted by them. But prayers in school go against this concept, as they give the majority the mistaken impression that they are somehow more important or valuable members of society than are the non-believers.

CHAY BORSELLA :: BOX 443 :: TOWSON STATE COLLEGE :: TOWSON 4, MARYLAND

In Kipple #32, Jeffrey Lynn writes, "Of course, atheists and agnostics don't believe in anything, so nobody can ever be sure they won't lie or cheat." Now wait a minute! Honesty has nothing at all to with whether or not a person believes in god. If a guy wants to believe in god, it's his own business. I personally won't accept one syllable of that book called the Bible--nor its god. I am perfectly justified in taking that stand. In all your records on religion, you don't have one ounce of solid evidence for the existence of a superior being. So, no



one ever needs to bother pondering over the hopelessly incomplete jigsaw puzzle the Christians have concocted in attempts to piece together a god. I don't believe in god because I don't believe in Santa Claus.

Since I have discarded the construct of a god, I can see that the future of this world is 100% in the hands of man. I know that only by practicing such elementary values as honesty, fairness and reason can the world continue to survive. If a church helps a person lead a respectable life, that's good. If a church aids in the establishment of a shallow respectability at the risk of breeding narrow-mindedness, that is not good. Atheists do not need the crutch of religion to make them see their duties. Sartre said that because there is just man, all things are possible; and because all things are possible, it is up to man to ascertain that all things do not occur.

For those people who can not abide by man's laws, we have an able police force. In the Middle Ages, we had none. The churches had to do the police-work then--and history will attest that they did a meager job of it. When one thinks of all the unearthly horrors that have been perpetrated under the label of "religion"...! Every man's god is different, and each man's god reflects his own ideal. Look at the sadist god of Calvin, the masochistic god of John Wesley. Jeffrey, I am not anti-Christian but I would like to think that I am post-Christian. I do believe in the world and I believe in the success of the future generations. I try to live by the laws of men and my own conscience; and I think the majority of us, disregarding religious beliefs or the lack thereof, try to do the same.

I could never justify abortion because I consider it the taking of a human life. I don't need a god to tell me its wrong; I don't need to be suspended over hell by a hair.

DOROTHY BRAUNSTEIN :: C/O ORLOVE :: 825 E. 13th ST. :: BROOKLYN 30, N.Y.

Sometimes infanticide is right, but in this particular case I think Mme. Vandeput was wrong. But what do you do in the case of a baby who has an inheritable disease, such as epilepsy? Such babies should be killed; it is better for them to die than to have their descendants suffer. I suppose, though, that sterilization is a better suggestion. You couldn't completely get rid of the disease, but the number of sick people could be lowered. Such people as you mention can lead almost-normal lives, but when these artificial aids--like artificial arms--are not available, you're in for trouble. ((Under what conditions would such devices not be available, short of the destruction of our civilization?)) To quote my biology teacher, "Good times for the individual are bad times for the race, and vice versa."

It is unfair, in re your hypothetical situation, to say that the dictator would be of the far right. It automatically makes some of your readers favor your argument without thinking (though sometimes I wonder if people like Boardman ever think).

On "The Power-Free Society", the comparison of democracy to a foot-race is very apt. Otherwise, however, I disagree with everything he says. Some people are naturally superior and they will rule--not in a dictatorship, preferably, but we do need some kind of government. People may be basically good, but by their actions they're not. Not at all. Men do want power, but that doesn't mean that I support tyranny. I'm sure that J.F.K., for example, wants and enjoys power, but he isn't power-mad.

Re segregation/integration: In some areas the Negroes have more rights than the white people. In the schools here, for example, colored students from poor neighborhoods may attend a junior high school of



their choice, while white students in similar conditions cannot. This is unfair to (a) the colored students who weren't chosen, (b) the colored students in the good schools, (c) the white students in the good schools (it lowers the level of the school), (d) the white students in the poor schools, since they don't have a chance to go to better ones, and (e) the colored students who were chosen, since everybody in the good schools hates them and the students in the bad schools hate them. This includes everyone. Of course, the Board of Education doesn't look at it from this point of view.

Derek Nelson's views on self-preservation are a mess. If he retaliates, isn't he an "attacker, bent on destruction", and thus forfeiting the right to exist? If he doesn't retaliate, on the other hand, he would be killed.

Christmas always seems sort of ridiculous, with everybody getting drunk to celebrate Christ's birthday. Oh well, at least the--er--spirit is there...

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

On the first section of "Quotes and Notes", I think Mrs. Vandeput committed a crime. As you pointed out, the infant would have led a near-normal life. It was pointless to kill it. The only time when the killing of a curably deformed baby is justified is when the child has a hereditary disease which is very serious; like Mongoloidism or epilepsy. There have been great epileptics, true, but I believe it would be for the better if they and the disease were removed. My general opinion, though, is unclear. One hole in the argument is that it is difficult to determine which hereditary diseases justify the death of people having them. Hemophilia? Myopia? (Hemophilia, for one, presents several impressive difficulties. First, those men who are actually infected with the disease cannot transmit it to future generations; only the female members of the family are capable of transmitting the disease. Moreover, only half of those will be carriers, as it were, of hemophilia, but there is no way to tell a carrier from a non-carrier until they marry and produce offspring. Even if the woman in question is a carrier, she will--statistically, if not actually--transmit the disease to only half her sons. Thus, the temptation to marry and bear children often outweighs the possible dangerous consequences; every woman is able to convince herself that, since the odds are in her favor, she won't be the unfortunate one. Hemophilia is a dreadful enough burden to justify, in many philosophies, the death of those who have it--but who would that be? The innocent male victim? The equally innocent female carrier? Both? It is problems of this sort which insure that my opinions on the entire realm of abortion/infanticide/sterilization will remain uncertain.))

I disagree with "The Power-Free Society". Not everyone is a genius, at least not by my definition. It is a loose term, meaning different things to different people. Still, there are many normal, functioning members of society who have no great talents. Most people desire power, although only a few have a mania for it. The application of power does not imply that most people cannot be trusted. There are some who can't; we need protection from them. Also, if there were little or no governmental power, somebody would take over eventually. I disagree with Roy Finch's premises, so I disagree with practically everything he says, except the foot-race analogy of what true democracy is.

"Better Red Than Dead", I think, should apply to the country; as you say, anyone who sincerely prefers death could commit suicide. I would prefer being Red, rather than have civilization destroyed, but,



as Carl says, it's unlikely that we'll ever be in such a position. I don't think that any system of government would last forever, or even as long as ancient Egypt.

My final (hah!) statement on abortion: It's morally equivalent to infanticide, but the former is preferable since it is less harmful, when properly done, both physically and emotionally, to the people already alive.

John Boardman: There's quite a difference between someone who says he's a conservative, and a real conservative. A socialist in the Communist Party might say that he's a conservative, you know... People often have mistaken notions about themselves and their ideas.

It seems to me to be unfair that the letter directly following Boardman's begins with an attack on him, and the one preceeding Deckinger's ends with an attack on him. I think this has happened before, too. (This is unintentional; the placement of letters in this section is based on numerous other factors, not the least of which is often the order in which they arrive. The "Lynn" letter was conceived when Mike's letter was the only one remaining to be published, so they would have had to appear together. The placing of Boardman's letter directly below one critical of him would have been difficult to avoid, since nearly everyone criticized John to some extent.)

Dorothy, it's what the baby will be that matters, not what it is. You don't show any outward signs of intelligence when you're sleeping; it's what you are when awake that matters. You can make an analogy to the fetus: it's what it is when born that matters.

Jeffrey Lynn: How do you know that the fetus is alive in the eyes of God? By some legends that were handed down by mouth for generations until finally recorded. I do not accept what the original was as word of God, but you may. Atheists and agnostics believe in some things; they merely don't believe in God. There are laws against perjury, which indicates that some people who believe in God may break their oath and are therefore untrustworthy. A person's honesty (or lack thereof) doesn't depend on the belief in God.

And to Mike Deckinger, who wishes to make prostitution compulsory for everyone under twenty-one--just think of those poor, tired infants...

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

As you probably know by now, Mrs. Vandeput was not sentenced by the jury, and the whole case is now considered a justifiable homicide. The whole matter of killing a drug-deformed child is so overloaded with variable factors and uncertainties that it would be impossible to state any clear-cut hypothesis about it. Take one angle; that the killing is being performed for the child's benefit. In other words, the action is done so as not to force the child to grow up in a world that will forever be strange, harsh, and probably cruel to him. What is eight days of suffering compared to a lifetime? But suppose the mother undergoes a mental breakdown at the sight of the deformed child. Suppose she has wanted a normal child for so long, that the fact that she now has an abnormal infant sends her into a dangerous state. Obviously, in this condition she is unfit to care for the child, for as long as it exists it symbolizes her failure in achieving an overpowering desire. In this case, it would be for the mother's own benefit, in addition to the child's, that its life be terminated painlessly.

But further on, Dorothy Braunstein's letter brings up an interesting, and unexplored point; that of the child placing total reliance on its mother. This is true, of course, and since the mother must make



all the big decisions in regards to her offspring's education, health, shelter, etc., she should also be considered competent to adjudge the child's status when it grows up. The argument that would be raised here is that death or suicide is no way to solve a problem, but I tend to disagree. Harking back to the discussion a few issues ago over whether or not an incurably ill person should have his life indefinitely prolonged through medicines and treatment, or be permitted the comfort and relaxation of euthanasia--similarities can be seen between the two instances. Awareness entails the need for defenses and aggressions to erect against society. Non-awareness (or death) simply means that the individual no longer must fear what reaction society will show towards him. Society no longer regards him as anything more than a motionless body, devoid of life, personality or meaning. In death we are all equal, and the wealthy monarch cannot die anymore painfully than the wretched street beggar.

The reason for the need for executions and capital punishment can be plainly stated, and you've done as much yourself by mentioning the term revenge. The human animal can experience varied emotions. It can love, and it can hate another to such a degree that the only way to satisfy this utter despisement is by taking the other's life. The reason capital punishment may not be as much of a deterrent to crime as it's supposed to be is not due to criminals losing all fear of punishment, but to criminals loosing fear of being apprehended. I'm sure a murderer knows full well that if he is caught gunning down an aged grocery store owner so that he can rob the cash register, he's in no position to expect mercy from the judge. But by the same token, despite the seriousness of the penalty, he figures he can get away safely with the crime. It's not a matter of abandoning the death penalty because it seems to be ineffective; it's more a matter of increasing the efforts means of locating the guilty parties. I'm sure that most criminals are aware that each time they break the law they are gambling, but the odds in their favor probably outweigh the possibilities of their being caught. Hence the crime. (No doubt this is one reason capital punishment fails to act as a deterrent, but I believe I mentioned several better ones in this issue's "Quotes and Notes". But even if capital punishment were an effective deterrent (which it isn't, and would not be even with better law enforcement agencies), this does not affect one iota the other objections, outlined elsewhere.)

Bill Plott's letter was most interesting. While I hadn't thought about it at the time, I would imagine that any southern paper, coming out in support of Meredith's admission, would be under fire. I wonder why there is such an overriding fear in the South, that would cause advocates of integration to ask that their names be omitted if their views are published. Can anything be closer to communism than an absolute distrust of one's fellow men to the point of attempting to disassociate oneself with any views that are not the accepted "norm"? If the majority would express their views and opinions, countering violence with violence if need be, then perhaps the segregation mess might be on the road to clearing up, instead of remaining as a noticeable blot. (I doubt that it will any good to reiterate this opinion, but for the record: if by "countering violence with violence" you mean defending oneself from attack, I agree; but if you refer to Boardman's eye-for-an-eye policy, then I would say that your position is entirely without ethical justification.)

Derek Nelson says that as a soldier he has been instructed to kill the enemy, who have undoubtedly received the same instructions. This is killing in self-defense, true, but a rather misguided self-de-



fense. During wars the individual infantry-man tends to lose his identity, and merely become an extension of the army. The fallacy is that he is not a robot, and indeed does share feelings and emotions. How many soldiers during the last war hated the enemy because they'd been told to, and how many hated because they had a need? Certainly there were the ubiquitous news reports telling of the enemies' moves (playing up the gains and minimizing the losses of whatever side was doing the reporting), but what these reports failed to recount was the feeling of the individual enemy soldier. He was as much a pawn as were the Americans. He has been taught to hate and kill by the high brass just as we have, and as soon as the war is over the brass conveniently tends to overlook their directions, as enemy country fraternizes with enemy country around the table, glasses raised in song. This is just one of the stupidities of war, where the individual at one point is expected to be a deadly fighting machine and at the other to accept his former enemies with open arms and minds. And who is decorated for all of this? Why naturally the generals and other officers who managed to transform their serfs into the most efficient war machines. This is an honorable achievement?

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

In Kipple #32, Jeffrey Lynn claims that atheists and agnostics should not be allowed to hold important public offices because "enough of them are so /dishonest/ that there's no point in trusting them". This is completely absurd, and I'm surprised that you didn't pounce on it, Ted. Since when have all, or most, atheists and agnostics been proven dishonest? I know of nothing inherent in atheism or agnosticism which makes its adherents unscrupulous--unless Jeffrey feels that all men are inherently dishonest unless they fear the wrath of a supreme diety. Jeff: How do you know that God believes that a fetus is a life?

John Boardman's letters are getting more and more ridiculous; he keeps bringing in personal experiences and allegations which can neither be proved or disproved. According to him, "conservatives" were responsible for the murder of nine people (whom I have never heard of--but I would be glad to be enlightened about them), but he then went on to say, in Kipple #32, that no man was imprisoned for these crimes. So how can he say that conservatives were responsible if the law could not find enough evidence to imprison anyone? (Well, it isn't too wild a conclusion to assume that the law didn't search very hard, either...) Assuming that these murders did occur and that John does know who was responsible (which I doubt), they are probably not conservatives under any reasonable interpretation of the term--and John Boardman's interpretation is usually not reasonable when it comes to political matters. He also compared the organization of Communists with the "organization" of conservatives in this country, clearly implying that both were dangerous groups. (Conservatives (by my definition) probably aren't any more or less dangerous than liberals, Republicans, Democrats, or members of the Prostitution Party. Right-wing radicals, however, are another matter; I consider the American National Party, the John Birch Society, and the Communist Party to be equally dangerous. I oppose, however, any laws or sanctions dealing with these groups in any special manner; they ought to be, in my sincere opinion, subject to the same laws and sanctions as any other group or individual, no more and no less.) This constant mud-splattering and formation of comparisons with insidious complications is common of John. I think that Buck Coulson and Loftus Becker Jr. did a fine job of refuting him.

Ben's argument against abortion seems to be based on the four



dimensional entity idea which is just a guess. This is certainly not a firm foundation for additional ideas. A fetus is not an independent living entity, being just a part of the mother. Just as the mother's arm would be amputated if it were necessary and if she gave her permission, the fetus should be removed if the mother wants it done and if circumstances warrant the removal. Certainly, there should be no objection to preventing an unhappy life (as would have been the case if Mrs. Finkbine's child been born, or if lack of the parents' marriage would have made the child unwanted) and unhappiness on the part of the parents; in many cases, abortion is best for all concerned.

I disagree with Roy Finch's article on the power-free society. Man is not created equal in ability--some people will naturally rise higher than others because of greater intelligence, talent, and perseverance. The best society is one in which each man starts at the same level and may rise as high as his ability and ambition allow. If there is an artificial ceiling, there will be dissatisfaction. Some individuals must wield power because society would collapse unless there was some force to keep order; it is reasonable that these should be the men with ability and initiative. Of course, there must be a good system of checks and balances to prevent too much accumulation or centralization of power. This explains why I support a free enterprise, democratic republic such as ours, with a few modifications to make for equal opportunity at the start of the "footrace". Thus, there should be a high inheritance tax, a non-graduated income tax, and free education through college, sponsored by state and local governments, for all those whose ability warrants it.

DICK SCHULTZ :: 19159 HELEN :: DETROIT 34, MICHIGAN

In our present society, the American society, there is a certain tendency for the people to feel adrift, lost from their previous standards and values: the church, their class, and others. These props have been kicked out from under them by movement of different classes and types here, the industrial revolution, the union-management conflicts, the rise of science, and the tied-in loss of faith in the Church. This is not a loss of faith in religion, but a loss of faith in the assumption that the Church knows all the answers. This resulted, for the first time in history, in the release of the populace from the old props onto their own two feet. Until we create new props (the cult of the Invincibility of Science, Status, Bureaucracy and Big Government, etc.), the people remain on their own. Without definite and universal symbols for each and every person to adhere to, strive for, live in, they herd together, emotionally and psychologically. This herding together produces conformity. If you wish to be part of the herd, you must act like the herd.

Outside of a few select people who are able to stand on their own feet, they all pick herds and stay in them. Some try for wealthy herds and try to Keep Up With The Joneses. Others reject the Society that isn't giving them a firm footing. They become the bohemians and beatniks. As per usual, some who need the psychological comfort of being supposedly independent make a mental evaluation of how many follow this herd and how many follow that one. "Fifty million belong to this herd, fifty thousand to this one, so I'll be Individualistic and Independent and join the smaller herd." (I wish I could remember who first made this comparison--I am forever indebted to him for that wonderful Truth.)

So, in the lack of other values and social iron-bound rules, the people turn to the rules of the herd. Conformity. This is a truth not



just limited to our nation and our time. Ask any historian. (I'm unique--instead of justifying my prejudices with the statement, "As any analyst will tell you..." I use the historian.)

Anyone who, in the midst of a cynical and sometimes penetrating dissection of a nation's mores and morals unequalled in any other period of history, can say that conformity isn't an important factor in his particular portion of society, has John Campbell's dowsing rods and cotton wads stuck so far up his eyes, ears, nostrils and mouth that it will take a major surgical operation to dislodge them. While every two-bit magazine hack takes out his typewriter and pens an article or novel hacking away at our society, he says conformity isn't present in his circle. When even Reader's Digest says that society isn't quite perfect at the moment, he says his is.

God knows our society is ridiculous enough without someone claiming that conformity is unknown to it. But it might be that such people are not being consciously fuggheaded. For who can live in our present suburbs today, the one-class communities, the one-income-range locals, the one-race exurbias, and say that there is class and race and income friction within those places? There isn't, and dissident elements are kept strictly out. Spelled o-u-t. In such a truly "classless" society, conformism is not forced. It is a natural reflex. Unconscious, and, because it is unconscious, unconditional. A person raised in such a sterile, laboratory condition would defend to the death the idea that he did not conform, was not a conditioned animal. For he would not seem conditioned. He would simply, through the eyes of his past life, see certain things as being "fit" and "right". Such and such are "just done" without reference to actual truths or facts or events or additional data. And that includes listening to rock and roll while a teenager, abhorring Elvis Presley when one is an adult, going steady at the age of sixteen, or any other manifestation of conformity--herd instinct--all of which is perfectly "normal" within the frame of reference of that particular environment. The truly intelligent are able to fit into almost any environment grouping; the shy and repressed are rejected. Not for being shy--but for not conforming.

As a side thought, intellectualism (real or pseudo) seems to be a normal reaction to rejection, whether by parents or The Group.

Everyone conforms to each other, in the real and active absence of anything else for the people to conform to. And naturally, you would be unaware of being a conformist, if such were neither forced nor an act.

On fallout shelters: The average shelter seems to be designed for a rural family, a rural area, a place that would escape the blasts, most of the immediate fallout (provided someone doesn't plaster the "target nation" again after the initial attack), and where a little extra percentage of survival may enable humanity itself to survive. Maybe. But frankly, I doubt it.

Me? I'm going to hope for the best and try like hell to be one of the lucky ones, one of the survivors. If you can call living in a radioactive world surviving. America, Europe, Japan and European Russia kaput. Kaput. That is a wonderfully descriptive term. It embodies all the essence of finality, the fulfillment of nility, the comprehensiveness of total nothingness. Aprois moi, nothing.

Well, that's one way to finish the Negro-white question...

Your comments on censorship remind me of something I wanted to say as re that subject several months ago. In an issue of Kipple published a few months back, you commented in an article on the subject that, in theory, you oppose all censorship; however, you later admitted



that you would be offended by a hypothetical religious cult whose practices included public sexual relations. This shows that however free-thinking you may consider yourself, you have still absorbed social conditioning to the extent that the mores and morals of our society have left their imprint upon you. Tell me, didn't you feel that censoring/restricting these mythical public sexual relations was simply "right"? (The original hypothetical situation was proposed in #22 by Harry Warner, who asked me what I'd think of a religious cult "that based its religion on the operation of public sexual relations in the most conspicuous spot in town". After mumbling a few incoherent words about censorship being necessary even when it wasn't morally right, I am ashamed to say that I swiftly changed the subject. Your perceptive analysis is quite right, of course; while there is no logical reason why a group of people shouldn't make love in the most conspicuous spot in town, I am nevertheless thoroughly croggled--shocked, that is to say, although not particularly offended--at the concept. If such a religious cult were formed, I would take no active part in any campaign to censor them, and I doubt that they would offend me. But I would be inclined to sputter like a runaway motor-boat: "But...but...who...why...that is...when...er...good grief!" Perhaps the term "startled" most nearly describes my reaction. So to that extent, I am still under the influence of the mores and morals of our society.) All of us have to absorb some of our society's patterns in order to have anything even remotely resembling a life within that society. So, we all conform to some extent, consciously or unconsciously. (My reaction as described above is no doubt partially a result of social conditioning of the type you describe, but I think it is also partially ascribable to embarrassment for the parties involved more directly in the situation. This may be social conditioning of another type. One experiences a similar feeling upon stumbling into a room and finding two people avidly making love. The reaction is not normally one of being offended (unless you are a prude), but rather--and this is particularly true of a shy person, such as myself--embarrassment for interrupting the ecstatic couple. Or, to name another situation, blundering into the wrong rest room would likely inspire the same reaction. I was once in such a situation, and my reaction was to emit a strangled gargle, turn around, and walk into the door in my haste to leave. Naturally, such a predicament is humorous in retrospect, but at the time I felt like the world's damndest fool. Whether this is attributable to social conditioning or not, I shall let others decide.)

Some censorship is never "right", it is never a Truth or an invariable law. But in order to keep our present society moving along at any rate at all, it is necessary to keep up various rules, laws, and patterns. So, I conform too.

By the way, what are your views on pornography? You have shown yourself quite ready to defend borderline erotica, but how about the hard-core stuff like Fanny Hill and A Thousand Nights In A Harem and suchlike? Do you believe that suppressing this is "necessarily right" or just an unnecessary bit of puritanical censorship? Should this material be sold legally and openly or should it remain suppressed? (You have given me the basis for a 42-page article, but out of respect for my ready cash reserves, I'll attempt to answer all of these questions in only a few lines. No definitive statement on this problem is possible, since there are so many facets. The problem most frequently introduced by advocates of censorship is that hard-core pornography, when allowed to circulate, often--perhaps inevitably--finds its way into the hands of children. Just how potent is this consideration is difficult



to determine. Children would be unlikely to comprehend even the most blatant pornography; however, this does not affect the unfortunate truth that there are several years between the age when (a) pornography is understood, and (b) it is no longer exciting to a normal mind. The word "normal" in that context is used rather broadly, too. However, the fact that pornography of no literary value can entice customers shows, I believe, a sickness of our society--one which education could eradicate, in company with a more lenient code of morals. My tentative solution to this problem would be to simultaneously initiate a vast program of sex education, broaden the moral basis of our society (with particular attention to a general acceptance of pre-marital sexual relations), and legalize all pornography. If my grasp of the situation is even reasonably accurate, the pornography would die out within a few years as the demand for it slackened and finally all but ceased. There would probably always be a certain small market, because there will probably always be a certain number of repressed individuals; but even these would likely be decreased in number, since children would not have to learn about sex behind the back fence but instead could learn openly and without restriction. To initiate such a massive program, however, it . . . would be necessary for someone who shares my opinions to be granted dictatorial powers. In other words, such a healthy attitude is likely to exist only in utopia--predicting science fiction stories.))

If it should remain suppressed, I remind you of your own teenage years. (I can remember mine well.) Did even the most innocuous of Beacon-type books or Thorne Smith stories or Playboy magazines excite a minor sexual reaction, a sense of awakening? Or in your blissful ignorance of the sexual act and lack of understanding of your own confused emotions, did you still need hard-core pornography or sex itself in order to awaken those desires and ideas? ((The former.)) Naturally! Anyone who is ignorant of more sophisticated and adult literature and reactions can (and will) get this awakening from whatever they can get ahold of. Taking hard-core pornography out of circulation will not kill this desire to learn or this sexual curiosity. It will just put money into the pockets of such as Beacon who stay clear of the law. They'll read some form somewhere, and I'd just as soon give the decently written pornography a chance to put the real smut and dirty-minded innuendo publishers out of business. Would "Who Pushed Paula" stand up against "Fanny Hill" in an open circulation fight, in an open literary test, in actual understanding and grasp of these powerful actions and desires of ours, for all of Fanny Hill's romanticism?

Like cheap contraceptives, open pornography is a crusade of mine. No use keeping the perverts and literary ghouls in business with their under-the-counter smut when an adult understanding of what our kids need to learn and vicariously experience could put them out of business.

In a repressed society, that which is suppressed is sought all the more avidly. Time for a change, anyone?

ROSEMARY HICKEY :: 2020 MOHAWK :: CHICAGO 14, ILLINOIS

On that school prayer issue: Youngsters are quite sensitive to the attitudes and opinions of their peers. In grammar school, it takes a lot of personal courage just to make an emergency visit to the toilet. No matter what the opinions and attitudes of the parents, most youngsters are not likely to exercise their right "to walk out" during the prayer--and thus incur the jeers, jibes, and possibly worse of the conforming, obedient "volunteers". (A point not mentioned previously is that in many families, the personal interpretation of their religious



beliefs precludes, forbids, bans (and worse) any religious exercise that isn't a part of the family religious structure. This means that these children too--if they're to obey and respect their parents and the family religion--will have to walk out of the room and incur the disapproval of their peers.)

Frankly, since the prayer in question is so short, the exodus and re-entry of the "objectors" would probably take considerably longer than the recitation of the prayer. So what more realistically happens is that a few youngsters who enjoy the attention-getting device of getting up and walking out of the room do so, while the others who feel uncomfortable in the situation compromise either by mouthing the words but not vocalizing them, or going through the ceremony with complete lack of sympathy or understanding.

So for the happiness and pleasure it gives the adults, children are reciting a sentence which becomes a formality, thus automatically negating the deep, worshipful feeling of the individual--the purpose of the prayer.

How fruitless an experience!

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

I have committed the unforgiveable sin. I have judged conservatives not by their words, but by their deeds. The readership of Kipple has leaped upon this position and condemned it strongly--although neither they nor I are fooled by the guarantees of freedom of speech and religion in the Soviet Constitution. I refrain with difficulty from commenting on the implications of this apparent blind spot.

The many accusations from Kipple readers that I am fomenting a civil war and advocating a St. Bartholomew's Day massacre of conservatives caused me to return to the "John Boardman Appreciation Issue" of Kipple and to my essay in Pointing Vector #10 which caused all the furor. I found that you, in Kipple #30, incorrectly represented the position I took in the essay "Satyagraha, Havlaga, Treblinka". In that essay I advocated liberal retaliation against conservative violence not as an immediate program of action, but as an eventuality which may have to be considered someday if conservative violence increases in intensity, or if the governments of southern states fail in their responsibility to protect their citizens from this violence. And what do I find but Ted Pauls advocating on page three of Kipple #32 a program not too far removed from this! (That, I should imagine, depends upon your definition of "far". I admitted that, given no alternative, I would attempt to assassinate a right-wing dictator who was indulging in murdering liberals, Negroes, Jews, etc. I could have easily used in this parable a left-wing dictator who implemented a program of wholesale execution of conservatives. This is a far cry from what you have proposed (and I quote): "...if the South is to become unsafe for liberals, then the North can be made unsafe for conservatives." (Pointing Vector #10.) "But if [conservatives] continue a state of open warfare against Negroes, Jews, liberals, and (often) innocent bystanders in the South, a counterattack in the North would be no less appropriate than the offensive which Sherman opened in 1864 to take the pressure off Grant in Virginia." (Kipple #31.) "I can recall a time when it was accounted a praiseworthy deed to kill Nazis. (...) Nazism has not changed since then. I would not like to think that America has changed." (Kipple #31.) In the first two quotations, you advocate killing/injuring Northern conservatives (at some future date, admittedly) if conservative violence continues in the South. The fact that your victims won't be the same conservatives is apparently considered irrelevant; such a senti-



ment is not worthy of you, John. It is analogous to the semi-literate Mississippian who reasons: "A n----- killed my father. I don't know who he is, but if I kill enough other n-----s I'll be satisfied." The third quotation refers to a comment that "The Nazi who is knocked on the head and pitched into a gutter today will not command a concentration camp tomorrow." Here your reasoning (equally unworthy of your intellect) is "I'll get him before he gets me."}}

To keep this whole discussion in perspective, here are the passages from that essay which deal with the matter:

"Some liberals claim that we violate the assumptions of our own political beliefs when we take violent action in defending ourselves against conservatism. But upon us rests the responsibility of self-defense so that liberal ideals may survive, and may exert a greater influence in American political, social, and economic life. The northern liberal, removed by distance from the battlefield upon which his southern brethren are engaged, can yet aid them where he is. Northern conservatives must be made to answer for the murders committed by their fellow-conservatives in the South. In formal debate or informal argument, conservatives should be charged with these murders and bombings. It is no less appropriate to grill a northern conservative about the crimes of southern conservatives than it is to grill an American Communist about the suppression of the Hungarian Revolution of 1956.

"If conservative violence continues to grow in the South, even more decisive measures may be necessary. It was not havlaga, but counterattack, that stayed the hand of the Arab murderers in Palestine in 1936. Similarly, if the South is to become unsafe for liberals, then the North can be made unsafe for conservatives. The choice lies with conservatives. Liberals should not let their lives be thrown away.

"The possible necessity of violent reaction to conservative violence should wait upon future developments in the case of most conservatives. Even now, they may come around to lawful procedures if the federal government makes it clear that it will prosecute vigorously the denial of civil rights, or the conservative use of political violence. (...) But for the American Nazi Party, and its British counterparts who have recently been raising their heads again, the need for counterattack becomes more immediate. These groups stand in a different legal position from other conservatives. In identifying themselves with the late German Reich, they assume the status of armed forces which have refused to honor the capitulation of 1945. Since this state of war has never been terminated, the Nazi parties now operating on the territory of the belligerents of World War II are in a state of war with the allied powers, including the United States." (Whether you plan to initiate your program of violent retribution against most conservatives now or later doesn't affect the arguments against its ethical acceptability. What you propose is wrong now; it will be equally wrong in twenty years, or twenty centuries. Our "battle" against the right-wing must be carried out within the bounds of law and justice: we can applaud the passage of just laws (such as the recent decree banning discrimination in federal-financed housing); we can applaud the implementing of just laws and the resistance to right-wing violence by the government, as in the James Meredith case; but we cannot support unjust sanctions against conservatives (or communists, for that matter) without destroying what I--and, I had hoped, you--think worthwhile about liberalism.}}

As I might have expected, several readers have identified liberalism with Communism, and accused me of promoting the latter with the former. This is an error of which neither liberals nor Communists have been guilty. The mutual recriminations of these two groups have been



manifest, noisy, and bitter for decades. The Americans for Democratic Action, which klucks like Kluckhohn have been attacking as, "at best", soft on Communism, was founded by liberals as a means of preventing Communists from trying to speak for the American left. In the election campaign of 1948 the ADA was brilliantly successful in this aim--though I question the devotion to liberal principles shown by the ultimate beneficiary of these efforts, President Truman.

Jeffrey Lynn: California had an atheist governor once, and it didn't hurt the state. (Culbert Olson, Dem., 1938-42.) By and large, the record in public office of men who do not believe in a supreme being or in punishments and rewards after death has been as good or better than that of their religious fellows. This country's five non-Christian presidents, all Unitarians (or Diests as they were once called), have not done too badly. John Adams proposed severe restraints upon liberty of speech and association, but Thomas Jefferson promptly led a successful movement against them. The other three, J.Q. Adams, Millard Fillmore, and William Taft, were run-of-the-mill. Name one atheist implicated in the Teapot Dome, RFC, Dixon-Yates, or Estes peculations.

Bill Plott: Please keep us posted. Kipple is fortunate to have someone right on the firing line, and I am looking forward to future bulletins.

Ben Orlove: American Communists will take over the USA about the same time that the cockroaches take over the Empire State Building. The fact that needed reforms in the American economic system could be attained by democratic means under the New Deal forever destroyed the appeal of Communism to the American people. How are you going to infiltrate anything without infiltrators?

Joe Pilati: As long as the Republican Party can come up with men like Jack Javits and John Lindsay, don't count it out entirely. As Max Weber pointed out decades ago, American political parties are pragmatic rather than programatic. If the Republican Party has to remake itself in the image of John Lindsay in order to win elections, it will do so. Its southern conservatives who object will probably set up a third party and die on the vine. The Republican platform of 1972 will probably be a substantial duplicate of the Democratic platform of 1960, and may even include a plank for federal health insurance.

Any conservative Kippler: I challenge you to propose a program which southern Negroes should follow in order to be allowed to vote. Leave aside for the time being school integration, sit-ins, or bus travel--just tell us how this most elementary political right may be attained. (Contestants may if they wish refer to a National Review article of some five years back declaring that southern whites have the right to keep Negroes from voting if the establishment of majority rule would change their "way of life".)

Any Kippler: Will you please stop trying to keep a fight going between me and Betty Kujawa? I have apologized to her privately and publicly, and she has been gracious enough to accept that apology. If that's good enough for her, it ought to be good enough for you. (There is room for only one squirrel in fandom, and that one's not Ratatöskr!)

The analogy of American conservatism as a network was first put forward by Frank Donner in his critique of HUAC, "The Un-Americans". Donner regards HUAC as an important part of this network. The concept has been elaborated by Ralph Ellsworth and the late Sarah Harris in their Fund for the Republic report, "The American Right Wing". The links between conservative groups and the military-industrial complex are discussed in detail by Irwin Suall ("The American Ultras") and Mike



Newberry ("The Fascist Revival"). The current dialog in the right wing between its "respectable" and "radical" elements, and the resulting internal pains, are discussed in "Men of the Far Right".

SETH JOHNSON :: 339 STILES ST. :: VAUX HALL, NEW JERSEY

There seems to be a good deal of confusion on the part of your readers as to what the score really is in re this right vs. left matter. If you will read most of the history of violence in politics, you will find that it is normally the right assaulting or otherwise molesting the left. Ever since the American Legion stoned the busloads of women and children leaving the Robeson concert in Peekskill, this has been the pattern. Liberals, leftists, and so forth establish picket lines and try to bring pressure to bear on various officials and departments of the government, and where violence occurs it is generally due to an otherwise peaceful demonstration being assaulted by right-wing youths or the police themselves.

In other words, I think Boardman has been right more or less all along. (I agree that political violence is largely caused by the right of center factions, but if we follow Boardman's suggestions this will cease to be true. When it ceases to be true, our principles are dead. This distinction, this variance of means to achieve ends, is one of the most powerful weapons which it is possible to utilize, and thus it would have practical value even if ethics and justice did not demand its retention. Ends, aims, goals are abstract concepts only vaguely understood by the Many, as Plato called the bulk of the populace. They can hardly be expected to comprehend that the end product of the liberal trend is inherently superior to the end product of the reactionary trend. Working tactics, however, are omnipresent symbols of the differences between the philosophies, symbols that have a significance for the common man, as he is called. He can see with his own eyes the difference: he can see integrationist demonstrators utilizing the pacifist tactics of Ghandi, while racists utilize bombs and beatings. He can see the distinction when, in liberal magazines, the opposing, conservative viewpoint is presented as a point of courtesy, whereas in the conservative or reactionary press, the liberal view is quoted out of context, if at all. (Unfortunately, I should add parenthetically that only a portion of the liberal press--of which Kipple is an extremely minute segment--has chosen to be liberal in this fashion.) He can certainly see the difference when Negro pickets are attacked and beaten by racists, but racists are allowed to picket unmolested by Negroes. I know several persons who, for these very reasons, have abandoned conservative organizations, while nevertheless retaining conservative political ideals: they still prefer the ends, but despise the means.)

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

Almost against my wishes I find myself taking the same confused position on "justifiable" homicide. The American ideal in law is "justice tempered with mercy", a logical contradiction in itself. But we must remember that men are not logical when they are personally involved in any sort of criminal action, as defendant or victim, which is why a computer could not be used in place of a jury. (If I were on trial for any major crime, I believe I would prefer to be judged by a computer (at least if I were innocent). The vast number of subconscious motives which move a juror rather frighten me, and when you think of it, it is really amazing that our legal system is so often just. For example, various jurors might be prejudiced against me because I could not honestly state at the outset that I believed in a god; others might



be prejudiced for a variety of reasons, dealing not only with my crime, but with my appearance, demeanor, and attitudes. It is also quite possible for one or more to be biased in my favor, which, while convenient, is equally unjust. Substituting computers for juries would eliminate bias in both directions.))

The Charter of the United Nations, chapter two, article four, reads as follows: "Membership in the United Nations is opened to all other peace-loving nations which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter." How the hell can you advocate the admission of Red China in the face of her latest action in India when this is brought out? ((What country is peace-loving when such a policy runs contrary to its own interests? Russia? Hardly. The United States? No, Cuba proved that. India itself? Hardly (remembering Goa). The only difference between China and the rest of the world is that China is less equivocal about its aims. Homo sapien is peace-loving when it is to his immediate advantage, war-loving when that suits his purpose, and non-committal the rest of the time.)) As for India's being "morally superior" to China, remember the gravestone of Mike O'Shay:

Here lies the body of Mike O'Shay  
Who died defending his right of way.  
His right was clear, his will was strong,  
But he's just as dead as if he'd been wrong.

Only with India they're not even defending their "right of way". If the choice is between a world-wide organization and a peace-loving organization, the former has to go. (Okay, so we aren't perfect ourselves, but China is so far from filling the requirements that her admission would be a mockery of the Charter and the end of any moral power the UN now has.) ((First, to clear up your apparent misapprehension, I did not state that India was morally superior to China (I don't usually care to belabor the obvious), but rather that India was morally superior to nearly everyone else, in that she advocated what was right rather than what was to her advantage. This entire situation is now hypothetical, since India has now taken what the press is fond of calling a "sensible" viewpoint, largely due to the fall from power of Mr. Krishna Menon and the cautious attitude of Mr. Nehru in order to forestall a possible military coup. Incidentally, "our" China is apparently as "peace-loving" as a snapping turtle. Too, the recent actions of the UN (whose Congo soldiers have taken to machine-gunning Belgian women) are hardly of a peace-loving nature. But then, another of Homo sap.'s faults is that he is not inclined to judge himself with the same yardstick he uses on his enemies; the standards we set for "us" and "them" are not even vaguely similar...))

Roy Finch, you are stark raving mad. How can you tell me that a janitor with an IQ of ninety is equal to a college professor or a doctor who have put in over ten years in school so that they might help society (and themselves, of course). The only way this country, and any other, can have such a high standard of living is through technology. If you doubt this, try living without electricity, gas, automobiles, and indoor plumbing. The only place where all people are naturally equal is the grave, where the able and the unfit rot in exactly the same manner. You don't like power, fine, but if all power in this country is abolished who is going to protect us from countries which haven't abolished it? But Finch's best line is "the true nature of man is not desiring power or domination". Haven't you ever read any history except Marx's? Or is the whole article a joke?



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

I would have supported the subjugation of the Negro in the Congo for at least another ten years until he was ready for independence. As it was, Lumumba shouted "self-determination of nations", the Belgians gave it to them, and the country collapsed. It would be a bad thing in Angola and Kenya today if suppression of the Negro was instantly stopped. The same goes for the Republic of South Africa. And, to switch continents, it would be a bad thing for India if they didn't suppress the Nagas of Assam. (It would be a "bad thing" for the southern whites if they didn't suppress the American Negro, but their viewpoint is not the important one to consider. Similarly, it might be a "bad thing" for India if they didn't suppress the Nagas, but how do the victims of the suppression feel? Suppression can always be justified by the suppressors....))

However, this is all pretty silly since, although subjugation is necessary at present, I wouldn't really care if every European territory (excepting islands) were suddenly given independence around the world. The African wants independence, so give it to him. He has the right to go to Hell his own way. As for whites, the European government should assist their emigration and if they don't leave, too bad for them. (Callous this morning, aren't we?))

Roy Finch sounds like a cross between an anarchist and a utopian socialist. Besides, the basis of his arguments is that man is fundamentally a pacifistic, intelligent, and "good" creature. The opposite of this is true, and he seems to forget that even if this condition is abnormal (which I doubt very much), the fact that the majority of people are this way makes it the norm. Finch's man would be the abnormal one in our society. And considering natural aristocrats, there is considerable difference between a man who is a genius at ruling and one who is a genius at tiddlewinks.

Capital punishment is essentially revenge, but it is revenge to good purpose. (!) It removes from society a danger not only to individuals but also to the social fabric itself. In your hypothetical situation revenge seems to me to be adequate reason for the removal of the murderer. Reason perhaps says wait; you are committing murder yourself. But reason could also say: The man is obviously guilty, society will remove him anyway (or, where capital punishment has been abolished--will let him get away with it), so I'm doing my duty. (No, you cannot have your cake and eat it too. If the fact that society will execute the criminal is sufficient justification for taking the law into one's own hands, the fact that society will not execute cannot also be used to justify revenge killing; and vice versa. If our society is set up in such a way as to provide for state executions, then this duty has been given to that abstract gestalt known as "society" because it was felt that single individuals were unfit to exercise it; if, on the other hand, our society refuses to allow state executions, then the feeling is that obviously the individual cannot take unto himself power denied to the collective wisdom of Society. Either way, revenge-murder by individuals is unacceptable to any form of civilization.) It may be morally wrong, but it's human nature.

On the question of assassination, you are making a personal value judgement that this man who is dictator is so evil that he must be removed. Your conclusion is yes, he must. Does Robert Welch have the right to assassinate Kennedy as a conscious agent of the Communists, or Gus Hall to do the same because he is a capitalist? Personally I agree with what you'd do, but I was just wondering... (Your point is well taken. In the final analysis, only my personal judgement would decide



whether or not I would attempt to assassinate our hypothetical dictator. There is no particular reason why this judgement should be any more sound than that of Welch or Hall (although I naturally believe it to be). I could point out that I specified that this hypothetical dictator must be committing mass executions, but that would be begging the question. If a dictatorship should emerge (a virtual impossibility), my position in the new society would be almost exactly the same as the position of Welch or Hall in this society: I would be considered a fanatic revolutionary.))

In Russia the duma that existed in 1917 held a majority of leftist delegates, thereby reflecting the mood of the country, which had elected them in reasonably clean elections. Kerensky was chosen from them to head a provisional government. Generally it reminds me of nothing so much as the electoral college and the system of electing your President, particularly as it was in the beginning.

If the opposition to school prayers is because they are compulsory in either a legal or social sense, I question your judgement. Social Security is compulsory, yet I don't see any stampede to free those who don't want it or need it from its chains. ((I, for one, would favor the necessary legislation to render Social Security voluntary.))

I had trouble convincing a Bircher girl I know that liberals aren't socialists and socialists aren't Reds, so I hope you enjoy yourself trying to convince Boardman that the same distinctions hold true in the opposite political wing.

If John Boardman is a liberal,  
Then Khrushchev ain't a Red  
For what can be more liberal,  
Than to want your opponent dead.

JOE PILATI :: 111 S. HIGHLAND AVE. :: PEARL RIVER, N.Y.

"The Pauls position" on this matter of infanticide is a reasonable one, but because of its very indecisiveness no lawmaker could take it. Indecisiveness cannot be a characteristic of the law--and might not "indecisiveness" in certain cases mean the same thing as "elasticity"? Your position is fine but it is very probably only acceptable as a personal position.

Would you really have assassinated Hitler in 1940? Given your usual level-headedness and liberalism, I doubt whether you would have, unless through some crazy Buck Rogers device you could have access to material not generally accepted until 1944 or 1945. ((I twice attempted to insert into that paragraph the qualification "given knowledge of his atrocities". I was unable to insert this statement grammatically, so I simply assumed that most readers would read that implication into my comments.))

Derek Nelson: Stuart Hughes certainly would be radical if we use the Pauls premise ("an extreme deviation from the norm"), but I think your characterization of him as "pro-Red (unwittingly?)" is unwarranted. To quote from a "Meet the Press" transcript of August 12, 1962:

"Mr. Clurman: You have suggested that we pull back and abandon many of our advanced bases in Europe. Now I ask you, sir--many of these points, in fact every one that I have mentioned, are points that the Soviet Union holds vis-a-vis the United States and its foreign policy. Are you at all disturbed by that association?

"Mr. Hughes: No. If they want to take up positions that I think are sensible, this is no fault of mine. It seems to me that what has ruined American political debate is people being afraid to take posi-



tions they believe in simply because the Soviet Union happens to hold the same positions. I differ with the Soviet Union of many other things. It seems to me that my independence of mind and statement is apparent...."

I believe that the Goldwater quotation now being bandied about so shamelessly in the letter column came from a speech to Washington's Gridiron Club or some similar club in which a satirical political speech is fully expected. President Kennedy has made such speeches, too. That Boardman would take this statement re Schlesinger, Bowles, et al. literally is pretty funny.

DAVE HULAN :: 228-D NIBLO DRIVE :: REDSTONE ARSENAL, ALABAMA

What is the pure sense of a hedonist? My definition was quoted out of Webster; my interpretation of what that definition means makes me a hedonist. It looks from here like the difference of opinion between us on this point boils down to a definition of "the pleasure-seeking instincts and dispositions"--I'm assuming that you accept my definition as quoted from Webster; if not, it's up to you to justify yours and not to me to justify mine.

To you, apparently, they refer solely to the physical appetites (cf. "...there are individuals to whom the terms are synonymous, and it is they who are truly hedonists"). I consider them to apply to every motivation of a man. Faced with any choice, a man must decide either to take a specific action or not to take it. A hedonist makes this choice on the basis of which will tend to give him pleasure (consciously, I mean--I think that everyone does this unconsciously, as I said), whether the pleasure be of sensual gratification, or intellectual enjoyment, or helping humanity, or avoiding being tortured, or what have you. This factor of consciously reaching decisions on the basis of pleasure is the essence of hedonism, not that pleasure is necessarily actively sought.

As far as my comments on trying to enjoy a forced situation as much as possible go, they aren't in themselves necessarily typical of hedonism--you're right on that point. But a hedonist is going to obey legal restraint, generally speaking, because the alternatives are mostly less pleasant than obeying (barring exceptionally strong convictions on certain points). And once bound in this manner, he continues to choose alternatives on the basis of pleasure, and doing as well as possible to attain pleasure within the system is certainly a hedonistic view. But you're right that in and of itself, trying to enjoy forced situations isn't necessarily hedonism.

Of course, this is really beside the point. If you want to call my ideas "Hulanism" instead of "hedonism" it wouldn't really matter to me--I simply felt that they were near enough to classic hedonism that I couldn't claim any originality for them. If you want to credit me with that much originality I'll accept the compliment (however backhanded) and go on from there.

Second point: you're right, of course. It was a red herring, intentionally so, thrust in to see how many would object to it and if anyone would swallow it. Unfortunately, no one reacted either way. But on the other hand, it wasn't really the crux of my argument; no good red herring has a really important place in an argument. It's just there to confuse the issue.

The crux of my argument was the question, "What do I owe humanity-as-a-whole?" Nothing in particular. I owe a great many individuals a great many things. I feel that I even owe the United States something. But this abstract entity called "humanity"? Not too ruddy much!



If my actions, undertaken for reasons of my own, end up benefitting humanity as a whole, fine--I certainly have nothing against the species. I'm one, after all. But as a reason for living, why? Why do you choose it? I don't question your right to; obviously it gives you pleasure. But can you give me any reason, other than that you just feel like it, why you should choose the good of humanity as a basis for decisions? I'm honestly curious--I've heard it said many times, but except for religious arguments (which I assume you reject) I've never heard any real reason given. (That abstract entity called humanity is simply you and I, plus a few billion people we don't happen to know. I believe, to begin with, that humanity is open to improvement in a number of ways, both material and intellectual. I believe also that in the second instance, the ultimate objective of this improvement should be a just society. The just society (an admittedly distant ideal) is not going to be given to us on a silver platter free of charge; it is the task of humanity to attain this state. It is, that is to say, the task of we individuals--ideally, all of us--to improve our society as much as we possibly can within our lifetimes. The fact that by far the majority of humanity could not care less is saddening, but it does not convince me to give up even my insignificant portion of the burden. These still may not be actual reasons, but rather simple restatements of the basic belief; unfortunately, words fail me to convey more precisely my point. Granting the premise that improvement is desirable, it is apparent that we and only we can secure for ourselves this improvement. (If you refuse to grant that initial premise, there is little point of continuing this discussion, since we would be broadcasting on totally different wave-lengths.))

Third point: You "might" regret your previous harsh manner of stating that I evince a disgustingly self-centered attitude? Tut-tut, man, let's not equivocate--do ya or don't ya? Not that I particularly care, since I freely admit I'm self-centered (in the sense that the closer something is to me, the more important it is to me, though there are a number of things and people that are more important to me than I am to myself), though I wouldn't choose the adjective "disgusting" to describe it. But I'm mildly curious as to what your attitude toward me as a person, as opposed to your well-known attitude toward my opinions, might be. (You would seem to be a person whom I could like, but I would be rather hesitant about asking your help in any particular, since from your in-print projections I would assume myriad strings attached to any favor from you. If I'm wrong about this, I apologize immediately for my lack of perception. And, incidentally, I do regret my use of the adjective "disgusting"; "startling" would be better.)

As far as your arguments proper on this point are concerned, I'll have to agree with you for once. As I said in my covering letter when I sent you the article, it was written in more of a hurry than I liked, and there were probably loose ends that I'd regret later. This was one. I was careless in my wording, and you very justifiably took me to task. I will say that a bad law (one that I consider bad, that is--which in some cases won't be the same as those you consider bad, though there is less difference between our views on the pragmatic level than there is on the theoretical) does bother me to some extent, though probably less than it does you because very few things bother me very much. Not as much as they seem to bother you, at any rate. I made that statement primarily in reference to a little spat that has been going on in SAPS and Discord and possibly elsewhere (quite desultorily) between Walter (Breen) and me for a year or so now; he thinks the government is so bad that it isn't worth defending, and I don't. The rea-



son, as I see it, is that the Government is stopping Walter from doing things he really wants to do--wants to do so much that he can't think of anything much worse. On the other hand, while I sympathize with him to the extent that I'll agree that he should be able to do the things he can't, I don't see any real alternative to our present system that isn't even worse. Within the system, I'll work as hard as anyone to change laws I consider bad (well, not as hard as anyone, but harder than most, let's say), but I don't care to throw out the baby with the bath. This is what I meant--what I said, as you pointed out, was quite different. I stand corrected.

I can't find my "World Almanac" at the moment, so I can't quote it, but I'm pretty sure that the UN Charter includes a pledge to use peaceful means only in seeking objectives, except in self-defense. And every nation that joins the UN is supposed to sign the Charter and agree to its provisions. This is enough of a farce already without admitting a nation which openly and without pretense subscribes to a philosophy of war--not to mention the fact that the UN is still officially at war with Red China. It may or may not be desirable from a pragmatic standpoint to have China in the UN (in point of fact I doubt if it would make the slightest difference), but from a legal standpoint it should be impossible. That many nations advocate it anyhow is good evidence of the respect for law that most of the members have--have you read "A Shade of Difference"? Do. It should be worth several pages in Quotes & Notes, I'd think.

Anyhow, what we have here is the question of what the UN is. As originally organized, it was an association of peace-loving states who organized themselves to keep peace in the world. On paper, it still is. And on paper, it was every right to refuse admission to Red China--it isn't necessarily supposed to be world-wide, after all. In point of fact, it has been from the beginning a debating society and a convenient place for diplomatic exchange, and from this pragmatic view it is probably true that it would be more pragmatic to admit Red China. But please, let's face the fact that it's expediency that calls for admission, and "right" to refuse it, and not the other way around.

Martin of Alabama is another example of a Republican in the South who out-Dixies the Dixiecrats. It seems fairly general that wherever they are, the Republicans are the more conservative (or rather, right-wing) of the two parties--in a state like New York, where the Democrats are practically Socialists, the Republicans are about as liberal as Kennedy. In a state like Alabama, where the Democrats are rather conservative, the Republicans are highly conservative. In a state like Mississippi, where the Democrats are right-wing radicals, there isn't any room for Republicans to the right of them and there aren't any Republicans, either. (There are some right-wing radical Democrats in Alabama, like our governor-elect Wallace--but the Republicans don't run against them, or if they do it's strictly pro forma so they can get a representative on the state election commission. And most of the Congressmen and both Senators are moderates.)

I enjoy hearing John Boardman squeal. He's about as liberal as Robespierre, of whom he rather reminds me, in views if not in ability. Robespierre sat on the left, too--but that doesn't make him a liberal, and neither is Boardman.

Eight deaths don't make a war (I've never heard of any of the cases he mentions, as it happens, except Till--and blaming that on "conservative political ideology" makes about as much sense as blaming the recent beatings in DC after that football game on the liberal ideology that let Negroes and whites attend a sporting event together),



but suppose it did--a war implies some sort of organization; is there any evidence of this in any of the cases he mentioned? There may be--as I say, I'm not familiar with most of them, or at least don't place the names. The question of whether or not anyone served time in jail for them is beside the point, anyhow--or would John care to abolish trial by jury? I wouldn't doubt it, from his other expressed sentiments, but I must confess a certain attachment to the old system. (It is true, however, that juries composed of white men in the South are not overly enthusiastic about convicting a white man for the murder of a Negro.)

On the rest of his arguments, I think you handled them well, and I agree with your statements. Except that I'm disappointed to see you still linking yourself with him in a "we"--it should be obvious by now that you and John Boardman are a lot further apart ideologically than, say, you and I are, despite the fact that you agree with most of the liberal ends and I disagree with at least some of them. But on the all-important (and I mean all-important--nothing else is worth a tinker's damn) question of means, I'd be willing to bet that a questionnaire would reveal that you and I are a helluva lot closer together than you and John are.

Derek Nelson's comments about the value of Cuba-based missiles are true, and you overlooked them in your arguments last issue against our action. I also agree, in general terms, with his indictment of Russell--though I wouldn't have phrased it exactly that way. I have read most of Russell's works, and think that he was (I?) one of the greatest thinkers of the 20th century, and probably the best writer/philosopher since Plato, but I lost a great deal of respect for him over his statements re Cuba. Granted that our blockade of Cuba might have led to nuclear war, it was Russia's action in putting them there in the first place that forced our hand. Yet not one word did he say against Russia--bah! It is so painfully obvious why so many alleged "neutrals" say nothing against Russia, but reserve all their condemnation for the US--they know that Russia doesn't give a happy damn about their opinion, and think that we might. So they don't waste time trying to persuade Russia; they confine their attacks to the US. They make me rather tired, even though I don't know exactly what to do about it, except quit reading the papers.

Since I didn't comment on your "Better Red Than Dead" editorial in #31, I won't go into any great detail about it except to comment on the comments. I do agree with your basic thesis, but also agree with Loftus Becker that it would be idiotic to make it an official policy of the country. It would save time and trouble just to announce our surrender and invite the Soviets to send over garrisons. But if I were confronted with the choice, for the country and the world, I'd choose to be Red too. As you point out, it's easy enough to get dead either way... I'm less optimistic than you about the chances for revolution anytime soon afterward, but then from your comments a month later, so are you.

Jeffrey Lynn makes an interesting point--namely this: how can you know you can trust an avowed atheist or agnostic. I know a great many agnostics, and most of them are as good as most religious people and as trustworthy (I wouldn't trust a stranger, whether he professed religion or not--and if I knew a person well and knew he was trustworthy his religion or lack thereof would make no difference, so from a practical standpoint it matters not to me--but it might make an interesting discussion sometime), but I've always wondered what their motivation was. How can you adduce your ethical principles out of mid-air, so to speak? I'm a hedonist, remember; I don't have any princi-



ples, only reactions to given situations...

Prostitution should be made compulsory, Mike? I've disagreed with a lot of things you've said, but this one takes the cake! Legal, yes--compulsory, not on yer ever-lovin' life!

AND I ALSO HEARD FROM

James Hamilton, Herbert Taliaferro, Richard & Rosemary Hickey, Fred Galvin, Kris Carey, Ronald Matthias, Skip Williamson, Bill Donaho, A. B. Snider, Larry Williams, Harry Warner, and Charles Wells.

-----ADDRESS CHANGES-----

Charles & Jane Wells, 200 Atlas, Apt. #1, Durham, N.C.  
John Quagliano, 534 Anastasia, Apt. 9B, Coral Gables, Florida  
Andy Main, 1820B Hearst Street, Berkeley 3, Calif.  
Marion Z. Bradley, 1674 Simmons Ave., Abilene, Texas

KIPPLE 33

FROM:

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

ORE, MD. (3)



SEND TO

35

Len Moffatt  
10202 Belcher  
Downy, Calif.

printed matter only

return requested

may be opened for inspection

contents: ideas -- must be  
kept in refrigerated sack

NOTE NEW SUBSCRIPTION PRICE!

Not all my enemies are fools;  
But all fools are my enemies.

I am, at times, my own worst enemy...

--Author Unknown