

An amateur journal of opinion and comment published and edited by Ted Pauls, 1448 Meridene Drive, Baltimore 12, Maryland, Kipple is available for letters of comment, contributions, exchanges, or the cash sum of 20¢ per issue. This magazine is the official organ of the Greater Metropolitan Baltimore Committee to Revive the Use of the Thumbscrew for Heretics (Inc.), a subsidiary of the National Association of Pious Sons of Martin Luther. Contributions to this crusade are gratefully received by this editor, or at headquarters: P. O. Box 656, Gen. Delivery, Bibleburgh, Kansas. -WOKL-

## I SEE BY THE PAPERS

Due to a sudden over-supply of both ideas and inspiration, your obedient servant managed to turn out in one week enough articles to fill the last four issues of this magazine, and so I have not recently had the opportunity to deal with some of the controversial material which has appeared in local newspapers. This unfortunate situation must be remedied immediately, particularly since the stack of clippings collected in the intervening months is threatening to topple and bury me alive. I suppose an apology is in order at the outset for those readers who evidently find no merit whatsoever in such material, but the psychological attitude which appears to accompany the new informality of the schedule and format prevents me from feeling particularly apologetic. It should only be necessary to point out that the word-by-word perusal of this magazine is not mandatory; examinations will not be given at the end of the semester on this material.

To begin on a light note, I have at hand a clipping entitled simply "Parents Call Dancing 'Sin'". It seems that a group of conscientious parents in Springfield, Missouri, protested that schools in the area were allowing certain "sinful" dances to be performed and, in fact, instructing pupils in the proper steps. Having read this far, you might think that the dances under attack are the Twist or the Cling or some other presumably titilating and singularly graceless exercise of the younger generation. That conclusion, however, is totally unwarranted. This particular group of parents apparently has no wish to engage in anything so prosaic as a criticism of the Twist; their objection is lodged against the "sinful" acrobatics of the square dance and the Virginia reel. And to think that I never believed Grandpa when he said, with a twinkle in his rheumy eye, that there was fun to be had at those church suppers...

A clipping with the unassuming headline "States' Rights Program Lags" caught my eye recently for the simple reason that I was not until very recently aware that such a program existed. Many individuals have defended states' rights in the past couple of years, of course, but it hadn't occurred to me that these individuals, with their many and varied interests, were closely knit into anything resembling a coherent Program, a united front, as it were. Nevertheless, such a program apparently does exist. Under the auspices of the Council of State Governments, a definitive program has been evolved which advocates, to put it mildly, some rather extreme ideas. Three such propositions currently head the agenda, and were it not for the appalling fact that legislatures of nine states have approved one or all of these measures, I would be inclined to treat the entire program lightly. The propositions



take the form of proposed constitutional amendments. The first of these is intended to make easier the process of amending the Constitution, by allowing the states to originate and pass amendments without such amendments being reviewed by Congress. On the surface, this appears harmless enough, but I am opposed in principle to any proposition which would render less troublesome the process of making major changes in our fundamental legal tenets. By the very fact that such changes are troublesome and complicated do we receive protection from actions taken without sufficient consideration, for the laborious process of shoving an amendment through both houses of Congress and through the legislatures of at least thirty-four states leaves ample opportunity for sober second thoughts. Under the current system, an amendment which is honestly desired by a thoughtful citizenry will be passed with only a little more trouble, whereas the product of a rash action may be reconsidered.

A second proposed amendment would divest Federal Courts of the power to reapportion states. It is hardly necessary to comment at great length on the injustice of this proposal: for many years, the situation in many states has been such that the state was controlled by rural interests despite their numerical inferiority to urban voters. The states have in most cases refused to act to right this wrong--a refusal of obvious causes, given human greed and the fact that the rural politicians who control these states are not overly concerned with injustice so long as they are on the winning side. Finally, the Federal Courts acted to rectify this abominable example of totalitarianism. As is to be expected, the rural interests which continue to dominate many states are now requesting the power to handcuff the courts, and thus retain their undemocratic rule.

But the third proposed amendment shows more vividly the true self-seeking, petty nature of those fuming advocates of states' rights. This amendment seeks to establish a Court of the Union to review (and reverse) the decisions of the Supreme Court involving what are broadly termed "the rights of the states". The proposal itself is merely startling; but the motive behind it is hideous. There is no provision to establish another court to review the decisions of this "Court of the Union, another court above it, still another above it, ad infinitum. This infinite progression of higher judicial bodies is obviously impossible. But the Council of State Governments has no intention of even attempting any such system, for they are in no way opposed to the principle of a supreme court. They object, instead, to the present Supreme Court. They are quite willing to cheerfully permit a supreme court (now called "The Court of the Union"), so long as it rules in their favor. This ghastly proposal, if passed at the instigation of a moribund league of petty oligarchs, would sound the death knell of democracy in this country.

The only cheerful note in all of this is that Maryland, I am happy to report, killed all three proposals in its current legislative session, despite the state's misapportionment, its southern sympathies, and the fulminating of many of its politicians against what they view as unfair treatment of individual states by the Supreme Court.

To take the short step from the astonishing to the unbelievable, perhaps I should mention the publicity recently accorded a fantastic group known as SINA, the Society for Indecency to Naked Animals. It appears that these fine people are thoroughly outraged at the callous manner in which dogs, cats, horses and other animals are allowed to flagrantly display their unclothed bodies, and they have decided to embark on a campaign to rectify this appalling situation. The Baltimore representatives of SINA (misnamed due to an error in a last will and testament) recently brought themselves to the attention of the public



at large by lodging a complaint with Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, who apparently has the unmitigated gall to ride a nude horse. Since this gross perversion obviously endangers the United States' moral leadership of the world, SINA has taken special pains to alleviate it. Various members of the organization even staged a protest demonstration in Washington as part of their crusade.

Actually, of course, a demonstration should have been unnecessary, since I am certain that Mrs. Kennedy is a reasonable woman. The superb logic and lucid reasoning of SINA's moral position should more than adequately serve to set her back upon the path of righteousness. Mr. G. Clifford Prout Jr. explained the organization's position in this excerpt, which comes as close to leaving me speechless as anything is ever likely to do:

"We feel we should clothe our animals because it would be consistent with our folkways and mores. In our society, we dictate that humans should wear clothing--and human beings are, biologically speaking, animals. Domestic animals share everything else with us, and should share our standards of propriety and decency. The sight of naked animals in our towns and streets places a great stress upon people--particularly younger people--who observe this inconsistency. Besides, there is a grave danger of people seeking vicarious thrills by looking at nude animals. The organization has maintained for some time that large numbers of nude pets constitute a cause of juvenile delinquency, prurience, and adult crime."

But it can at least be said of the SINA that they are relatively harmless crackpots who are not taken seriously even by the narrow-minded. Even if by some fantastic trick of fate their program were to become law, no permanent harm would be done and the final result might actually be amusing. (This assumes, of course, that you have the kind of mind which would find a sparrow wearing a brassiere amusing...) But all ardent crusaders are not equally harmless, and when crackpottery is less obvious, it is consequently more dangerous. A crusade with even a grain of sanity has the unfortunate potential for attracting sincere, though misguided zealots to its banner. The religious controversy which is still very much alive in the Baltimore press (and which will become considerably more lively when the Supreme Court hands down its ruling in the case of Murray vs. Baltimore Board of Education), furnishes an example of this tendency. While this magazine is more concerned with the extremes of opinion, it should be noted that there is evidence of a strong moderate camp on this issue, which holds that Mrs. Murray is quite correct in opposing the religious indoctrination in Baltimore schools, but that some way ought to be found to protect the rights of the theists as well. (In this connection, the moderates--and I include myself in that category--supported a recently defeated bill providing for one minute of silent meditation at the opening of the school day. This seems to me to be extremely fair to both sides, and the proposal will no doubt come up for consideration at the next legislative session if the Supreme Court rules against the city.) This moderate element could conduct reasonable and, no doubt, extremely fruitful discussions on this or any other matter, but unfortunately newspapers are less interested in fostering productive discussion than in printing exciting debates, so the majority of letters which appear represent an extreme viewpoint. Perhaps accidentally, Madalyn Murray is the only professed anti-religious extremist; the vast majority of the letters published in



the newspapers are written by overzealous theists.

For example, a gentleman with the dignified name of Denver Farley parroted the typical unthinking attack of the theist against the atheist. "It takes away faith, which is founded on evidence," he said of atheism, "and leaves a faith which is both without evidence and contrary to it." This is a splendid example of the type of inane comment which removes such debates from the realm of the productive and lowers them to the level of a dog-fight. On second thought, perhaps I am misjudging Mr. Farley's intellect--perhaps he really does have proof that atheism is contrary to evidence. If so, I am certain the world would appreciate it if he would make this information public, since this question has been pronounced unanswerable by the finest minds of the last several thousand years. But Mr. Farley continues his accusations: "It takes away hope and leaves dark pessimism." But of course, truth, not hope-for-the-sake-of-hope, should be our goal. A number of things provide hope (quack cancer cures, for example) without being particularly desirable. Our criterion for the desirability of a belief or philosophy should be whether or not it is true, not whether or not it is optimistic (read: convenient). And finally, Mr. Farley parrots this tired old plaint: "It takes away moral standards and the basis for morality, and puts in its place an explanation of morality which explains morality away and destroys respect for it." If the implication is to be that atheists have no morals, I cannot disprove it, but neither do I find it necessary to make the attempt. For it is a basic precept of our system of jurisprudence (and, by implication, of our entire society) that the burden of proof lies always with the accuser. If anyone should like to cite chapter and verse to prove that the average atheist lacks the moral fiber and character of the average theist, I would be most happy to listen. But until such time as this evidence is presented, I shall have to relegate this implication to the realm of the spurious and irresponsible.

On the distaff side, one May K. Jondo called for the continuation of prayer in the public schools for reasons which are, to put it charitably, highly unusual. I am not completely certain even now as to her specific reason, but I will quote the relevant passages of her epistle for your edification:

"I was growing up during World War II. How many, many times I heard people say, 'We cannot lose this war because we have God on our side.' Yes, I truly believe we did have Him on our side. At the beginning of the war, you must remember how desperate things looked? How could we possibly have come through so victoriously without some miraculous 'help'. (...)

"We gained our freedom through the Revolutionary War. We held our country together through the Civil War. We preserved our rights and held onto our freedom through two world wars. Truly, He must have been out for us. Now we are going to repay Him by refusing our children the right to say a prayer to Him, at the beginning of each school day."

Now, it appears to me that the good woman is advocating prayer in the public schools for one of two reasons, the first stated, the second implied. First, to "repay" God for his active assistance in striking down our enemies and preserving our Christian way of life; or, in the second case, as a sort of bribe to curry favor in the event that a diety's assistance is necessary in the future. Both of these motives,



you will forgive me, seem incredibly petty, somewhat on a level with the sort of hypocritical flattery which is termed, in the local vernacular, "brown-nosing".

Finally, since I seem to be compiling an encyclopedia of cliches which are frequently aimed at atheists, I should not neglect the relatively young (though popular) practice of equating any lessening of religious fervor with a trend towards Communism. Max K. Petzold, another outraged citizen protesting to the letter section of a local newspaper, covered this criticism adequately when he commented, "I say let the people who support this nation say once and for all whether we close out God and become barren in spirit, a perfect setup for communism to walk in and take over." The kind of mind which can successfully negotiate the running conclusion jump between the outlawing of a certain form of religious instruction and a "closing out of God" is truly amazing--frightening, but amazing.

To proceed to another topic which is of extreme interest to your obedient servant, it seems that something of a furor has been generated by what is allegedly a breach of academic freedom in a local college. Four Professors were dismissed from Frostburg State Teachers College in Maryland for no apparent reason, and they immediately lodged charges of a breach of academic freedom. Three other professors resigned in protest shortly thereafter. The professors claim that their liberal activities, which include requesting three books--"Lolita", "Lady Chatterly's Lover" and "Tropic of Cancer"--for use in their English classes, were responsible for their dismissal, an accusation which is hotly denied by the administrators of the school. The air is crackling with charges and counter charges, angry letters, promised investigations by the ACLU and the normal contradictions resulting from the by no means unusual inaccuracy of the press, and the cumulative effect of this is gross confusion. Those facts which have been established beyond doubt, however, lead me to the tentative conclusion that the teachers have a genuine complaint. No one, for example, has contested the fact that the administrators delayed by all possible means the ordering of the three books in question. One of the officials responsible for the dismissal of the instructors, Ivan C. Diehl, commented in an interview with a reporter from the Baltimore Evening Sun that one of the three disputed tomes, "Lady Chatterly's Lover", "is not a fit subject for college teaching." Continuing, he noted that "It is altogether too exciting for a young person. I at my age would never want to handle that book with a group of young people." Nor has anyone contested the academic qualifications of the four professors who were dismissed. The reasons given by the administrators for their action are, to say the very least, inadequate. Three of the teachers were charged with being "immature", but representatives of the administration refused to elucidate on this point. The only other reason apparently mentioned is the blanket statement that "Young professors should listen to reason and mature judgment and wise counseling." Finally, it is a matter of record that both the college and the town of Frostburg have a reputation for conservatism and some distinct reservations about academic freedom. Considering these points, it seems reasonable to conclude tentatively that, even lacking concrete proof, the four dismissed professors would appear to have a valid argument.

In Wayne, New Jersey, however, there was a classic instance of infringement on academic freedom, about which no doubt exists as to its injustice. Alfred Piaget Jr., an eighth-grade English and social studies teacher, was suspended from his position for one week on three charges, two indefensible and one apparently fabricated. Mr. Piaget, an agnostic, refused to say the words "under God" as part of the pledge of allegiance. In addition, he recommended that his students read several



books, among them John Steinbeck's "The Grapes of Wrath". Robert Ratcliffe, president of the Wayne board of education, also accused the instructor of "propagandizing his religious beliefs to the students", a charge which he has not succeeded in proving. Mr. Piaget has now returned to his teaching post but, according to Ratcliffe, only because he signed an affidavit promising to speak the words "under God" in the future. However, the instructor has promised to fight any ruling or law which dictates that he must say these words, although no apparent action has been taken along these lines yet.

A few miles away, in Jersey City, an even more incredible case of authoritarian practices in schools has come to light, originating at the parish high school of a Jersey City Roman Catholic Church. The notable restrictions of Catholic parochial schools should be no surprise, of course, but this particular example is unusually blatant even for a Catholic institution. It seems that the Rev. James A. Carey decided a few weeks ago that "steady dating" amongst his students was an unhealthy practice, and so he ordered that effective March 1st, students found "dating one person to the exclusion of all others" would be subject to immediate expulsion from school. This decision was prompted by the discovery of two pregnant students in the school, one sixteen and the other seventeen. They were promptly expelled. At this point, it should be noted that the situation as outlined so far is understandable--I happen to oppose such authoritarian practices, but I can concede that they might well be justified by reasonable, concerned parents and teachers. Beyond this, however, the matter becomes a rather infuriating bit of Inquisitorial nonsense, strikingly typical of the worst of Catholic thinking. There were no further expulsions as a result of "steady" dating, most of the students apparently preferring to abandon this practice rather than leave school. However, four additional male students were "requested" to withdraw a few days after the rule had gone into effect. Their offense? Father Carey could only say that he requested their withdrawal after they had "objected that the edict against steady dating was too strict." Let me repeat that in the event that anyone missed its significance: four students incurred the penalty demanded by the edict not because they broke the rule, but merely because they dared to object to its strictness. They were thrown out of school for showing a little courage; for questioning the Divine Right of petty autocrats; for thinking, rather than blindly obeying. It is a strained analogy, I know, but does it occur to anyone that if our nation operated along the lines of this school, anyone who criticized the existence of the death penalty would as a result be executed...? And does anyone now realize just why I would consider it a heinous misjudgement if federal funds were appropriated for the support of these schools, and, hence, perforce condoning and supporting these appalling abuses?

Of course, Father Carey had morality on his side: "These kids are putting themselves in an approximate occasion for sin," he said. "And although some don't even know it, they're committing sins all the time on dates."

We are all doubtless glad to know that Father Carey opposes sin, even though that alone hardly justifies trampling the rights of others. But even that is not an entirely accurate statement. It would be more accurate to say that Father Carey opposes sin when it doesn't interfere with his dogmatism to do so. For presumably he considers pregnancy out of wedlock a wicked sin--this is a reasonable conclusion, considering his prompt action in the case of the two girls previously cited--and consequently he ought reasonably to be expected to oppose illegitimacy. Yet, when the youngest of the two girls requested Father Carey's permission to marry and hence provide a home for the child, he staunchly refused to grant this permission, on the grounds that the girl was too



young for marriage. This is surely a specious objection, when compared to the matter of the child's welfare. In addition, it is an inconsistent position: if, in Father Carey's philosophy, the bearing of an illegitimate child is sufficient reason to expell two girls from school who were guilty of the act, clamp a rigid ban on "steady" dating amongst the entire student body, and expell four other students who merely dared to question these rulings...if illegitimacy is accounted that great a sin, then surely the Rev. Mr. Carey cannot in all conscience excuse his refusal to "legitimize" a baby simply because of his personal opinion that sixteen-year-old girls should not marry. Perhaps I am over-looking something fine and pure in his thinking, but it appears to me that the actions of this man are completely indefensible on any level.

-----  
"The most distressing repercussion of this lack of communication has been the rise in racism among Negroes, justified to some extent, but a grave symptom nevertheless. It only widens the gap that men of good will are trying desperately to bridge with understanding and compassion. It only strengthens the white racist's cause. The Negro who turns now, in the moment of near-realization of his liberties, and bares his fangs at a man's whiteness, makes the same tragic error the white racist has made.

"And it is happening on a wider scale. Too many of the more militant leaders are preaching Negro superiority. I pray that the Negro will not miss his chance to rise to greatness, to build from the strength gained through his past suffering and, above all, to rise beyond vengeance.

"If some spark does set the keg afire, it will be a senseless tragedy of ignorant against ignorant, injustice answering injustice--a holocaust that will drag down the innocent and right-thinking masses of human beings.

"Then we will all pay for not having cried for justice long ago." --John Howard Griffin, in "Black Like Me".

-----

#### MARTIN HELGESEN COMMENTS BELATEDLY ON #35

"Non-conformity is fun, but it is trivial; the important thing is individualism. The distinction is that non-conformity is merely being different for the sake of being different, or to shock or disconcert others. An example is the picture of President Millard Fillmore I have on my desk at work. Individualism, on the other hand, is doing what one wants to do or following one's own convictions whether or not it is the accepted thing. If I do something because I want to do it, and if I don't care whether everyone else is doing it or no one is, this is individualism.

"You misunderstand the argument for making tax funds available for those who use non-public schools. Any school which provides an adequate education is contributing to the common good of society. If tax money is to be spent on education because educated citizens are essential to the well-being of the nation, then it ought to be available to all schools, since they all produce educated citizens. If these funds are restricted to public schools, then those parents who exercise their right to choose a different type of school are required to pay what is, in effect, an extra tax above their fair educational tax share. There is a difference between a person who does not drive objecting to paying highway taxes because he wouldn't use the road and a person who does drive objecting to the state not spending any of his tax money to pave the roads in his town. (Nevertheless, I maintain that the parent whose child attends a private school is being no more "unfairly taxed" for



public education than is the taxpayer who has no children.))

"The establishment clause does not forbid government promotion of religion. It forbids the establishment of a state religion (i.e., a religion formally supported by the state above all others). Examples are Catholicism in Ireland, Islam in Egypt, Judaism in Israel, Lutheranism in Sweden, and Congregationalism in Massachusetts until 1833. This would not be the case if educational tax benefits were made available to all children, since all religious groups that wished to establish schools would be free to do so, not just Catholics. (These brief comments constitute what is undoubtedly the most provocative paragraph of the month. The establishment clause, as it appears in my copy of the Constitution, prohibits "an establishment of religion"--not, be it noted, an establishment of "a" religion, but an establishment of religion, per se. The acknowledged intent of the gentlemen who formulated that document was to make impossible the establishment of a single sect as the "state" religion, and they undertook to do this by attacking such a trend as its beginnings: "Who does not see," said James Madison, "that the same authority which can establish Christianity, in exclusion of all other religions, may establish with the same ease any particular sect of Christianity, in exclusion of all other sects?" Mr. Madison was the author of the First Amendment, and I presume that in composing that segment he followed his earlier sentiments--that we cannot establish Christianity or any other religion. But what constitutes an establishment of religion? Perhaps you do not consider religion to have been established when state or federal government funds are used to support a school system which includes among its academic subjects indoctrination in a specific religious sect; I do. Making funds available to (in your words) "all religious groups that wished to establish schools" does not solve the problem, since of necessity the degree of support will vary. Forgetting that for a moment, do you think that the taxpayers would be willing to support "all religious groups that wished to establish schools"? This would have to include minority sects which are rather frowned upon in most quarters, you know: Jehovah's Witnesses, the Rosicrucians, Quakers, Mormons, etc. Even if those difficulties were overcome, does it not violate the spirit of the Constitution to establish religion as opposed to irreligion? The purpose of the First Amendment, after all, is to prevent the persecution of one group by another. There are fewer people involved unpleasantly in the persecution of atheists by theists than there are in the persecution of Catholics by Protestants, but other than the number of individuals against whom the injustice is committed (which is hardly an important consideration when dealing with a matter of principle), I can see no difference whatever in the examples. Can you?))

"There are some factual errors in your description of the contraceptive problem. The two states with the birth control laws are Connecticut and Massachusetts. They were passed by a Protestant citizenry under the leadership of Anthony Comstock and friends at a time when Catholics had little political strength. It is worth noting that Rhode Island, the only state with a Catholic majority (about 60%), has no such laws.

"The Catholic Church teaches that it is the function of the law to enforce public order and the common good, not private morality. One example can be found in the 1957 Wolfenden Report in England, which considered, among other things, whether homosexuality should be illegal. The Catholic committee, like the general committee, recommended that acts done in private between consenting adults be excluded from the law.

"John Boardman destroys much of his own argument with one phrase, 'segregationists who call themselves conservatives'. However, I



doubt that this will impress him. It appears that what he is really seeking is The Final Solution to the Conservative Problem." (11 Lawrence Ave., Malverne, New York.)

-----  
"Do the churches have claims that the civil society must heed? A democracy functions best when it is cautious to the point of agnosticism in its acceptance of the superior claims of any of its citizens. Society is a better judge of the tactics and the means employed by its members than it is of the relative validity of their aims, partly on the eminently practical ground that what distinguishes one society from another is much less the relative elevation of principles than the quality of their day-to-day application. I am not sure that the objectives of the United States are superior to those of the Soviet Union. I am quite sure that the day-to-day operations of the American government and the relations between it and organizations of its own citizens are infinitely superior." --Robert Lekachman, in "The Churches and the Public".  
-----

#### JOE PILATI COMMENTS ON RELIGION

"I certainly hope that your justifiable admiration for Madalyn Murray's civil liberties stand is tempered with some disdain at her 'fundamentalist atheism' which is every bit as blindly dogmatic as the faith of the men who condemned Scopes. Mrs. Murray's articles in The Realist have admittedly been inspiring from the standpoint of her refreshing iconoclasm and singleness of purpose (and, of course, the seeming validity of her stand against the Lord's Prayer in schools if not against religion per se), but I have also been appalled by her orthodox narrowness. As an agnostic who would resent being called wishy-washy, I think I (and you?) have little in common with a woman who proclaims that 'OUR PRIMARY FIGHT IS AGAINST EVERY RELIGION. /Capitals hers/ Our secondary fight is for our constitutional right.' /The Realist #23, Feb. 1961, page 22./ Her fight is not against the abuses of religion, the intolerance it breeds (which is happily offset by such organizations as The National Conference of Christians and Jews, and the Anti-Defamation League), the demonstrably illogical precepts of hardcore fundamentalists, the social evils some religion has perpetrated. She is, by her own admission, fighting every religion. To my thinking, this is philosophically unacceptable. ((As an agnostic, I would naturally like to see a society in which agnosticism was the accepted norm for all reasonable citizens. I would like to see a society in which religion of the organized, ritualistic variety would be unnecessary. But I support no "fight against every religion", a concept which implies that I would be forcing my standards on others. My fight is against ignorance and dogma and blind faith of whatever persuasion; it takes the form of argument, not force, even in the most extreme cases (such as the fanatic anti-evolutionists, whom I consider quite insane, but against whom I would nevertheless support no measures intended to force a change in their beliefs).)) 'I am an American radical,' she claimed in the May 1961 Realist, adding: 'I will not, publicly, attack another segment of the American radical left...The radical left means more to me than my affronted honor.' ((I hesitate to attribute to this statement the quality of hypocrisy, until I am certain of Mrs. Murray's precise meaning. (I trust that her avowed refusal to attack publicly a segment of the radical left does not extend to a refusal to reply to your letter and my additional comments...?) If this statement was intended quite literally--viz., that she would not attack a segment of the American radical left because she herself belongs to that group--



then it is indeed hypocrisy. To believe that specific policies are erroneous or dangerous, and to fail to challenge them because they are advocated by associates in the political spectrum, is tantamount to acceptance of the philosophy popularized by Stephen Decatur: Our (country/family/religion/political wing/etc.) right or wrong. I, too, am a member of the American radical left, but this does not appear to me to be sufficient reason to ignore (and, by implication, tacitly support) actions or ideas which I consider to be erroneous or dangerous. Of course, Mrs. Murray may also mean that she does not disagree with any other segment of the radical left. But that seems unlikely, since the category includes Communists, anarchists, Greenwich-Village-nihilists, and similar intellectual midgets.)) I wonder if her list of unattackables on the left includes the Catholic Committee for Democratic Socialism of Chicago, for example. For that matter, does her 'fight...against every religion' encompass a fight against those portions of the papal encyclical Mater et Magistra which makes it basically a social-economic document? I get the feeling that for all her ranting about the desirability of courses in comparative religion and so forth, Mrs. Murray is utterly incapable of objectivity. I admire her short-range goal of banning prayer from the public schools, but I would be damned reluctant to have my hypothetical children educated along lines advocated by Madalyn Murray.

"You may not believe the incident I am about to relate, but it is Bertrand Russell's honest truth (which is my customary substitute for the phrase 'God's honest truth'). My chemistry teacher was discussing nitrogen and other singularly uninteresting (to me) subject matter when he began a sentence thusly: 'And furthermore, when we die and decompose....' Suddenly he stopped in mid-sentence and twitched as he muttered in a strangely apologetic tone, 'I don't want to offend anyone by saying that we all decompose....' A few gusts of laughter erupted in various sections of the classroom; I noticed that the laughing ones numbered four--myself, a pair of liberal Jews, and a wavering Roman Catholic. Further dismayed by these isolated irreverent reactions to his disclaimers of impiety, our hapless chemistry teacher raised his hand skyward and said, 'Don't laugh! A couple of years ago, one of the other members of the science department got in trouble for teaching about the skeletal system.' I'm still trying to figure out whose religion is offended by mention of the skeletal system..." (111 S. Highland Ave., Pearl River, New York.)

-----  
"The critical habit of thought, if usual in a society, will pervade all its mores, because it is a way of taking up the problems of life. Men educated in it cannot be stampeded by stump orators and are never deceived by dithyrambic oratory. They are slow to believe. They can hold things as possible or probable in all degrees, without certainty and without pain. They can wait for evidence and weigh evidence, uninfluenced by the emphasis of confidence with which assertions are made on one side or the other. They can resist appeals to their dearest prejudices and all kinds of cajolery. Education in the critical faculty is the only education of which it can be truly said that it makes good citizens." --William Graham Sumner, in "Folkways".  
-----

#### STEVE STILES COMMENTS BRIEFLY ON #37

"In regard to one of Harry Warner's comments, I have been interested in the research to 'educate' dolphins, to bring them into the sphere of man, so to speak. The poor dolphins... I can just imagine missionaries amongst these happy denizens of the deep, advocating a-



gainst free love. And what of the political potentials? There will rise up a distinction between dolphins--'good' dolphins and 'bad' dolphins--subscribers to different creeds. There will be five-year-plans, unionization, etc. And, of course, war will have to be introduced.

"C.S. Lewis has explored the problem of Christianity in relation to intelligent life forms on other planets. He has divided intelligent life forms into three categories: those who need no redemption, those who need it, and those for whom redemption is not possible. This whole debate strikes me as being rather funny. (That statement strikes me as being a rather startling understatement...) We cannot hope to meet intelligent life not of this earth, in my opinion, until interstellar flight is developed. That may take place tomorrow, of course, but a thousand years from now seems more likely. And, if the present trend of events continues, Christianity will be quite dead by that time. I already detect--and applaud--certain death-throes.

"I like Moffatt's quote from 'To Hell in a Handbasket', but while the point advanced is a more logical one than either complete acceptance or complete rejection of a religious idea, I find it somewhat less satisfying emotionally. I found it a difficult thing, in conducting an argument into which a rather offensive fanatic had forced me, to take this position. It's a conviction of unconviction, and nine times out of ten the religious individual will interpret the answer 'I don't know' as an admission of weakness or defeat. At the time of our discussion I found it necessary to advance atheistic arguments; seldom do these arguments 'convert' the Christian, Jew or whatever in the first dose, but they do interject an attitude of uncertainty, of doubt, conducive to an agnostic viewpoint. And, to the religious mind, there is no difference between the atheist and the agnostic; an agnostic, to them, is an atheist in drag.

"Ben Orlove: I suspect that all revolutionaries are looked upon with a certain amount of disfavor, particularly after Castro. Revolutions create the loose, unsettled situation which the communists are able to utilize more easily than our relatively stable form of government. This is unfortunate, and rather ironic since our country came about by a revolutionary process. What is more unfortunate is the fact that we find ourselves supporting the Batistas, the Francos, and other assorted dictators and military juntas of the world, which can only cause resentment in the lower strata of these countries. But, as the Daily News commented, 'The military junta in South Korea may be a dictatorship, but it is our dictatorship'...which is more to our discredit, I'm afraid." (1809 Second Ave., New York 28, New York.)

#### BILL PLOTT HAS SOME NOTES ON CENSORSHIP

"I have here a clipping dated March 9th, with a dateline in Waco, Texas. The head of the drama department and eleven of his staff members resigned from the faculty of Baylor University because the president of the University ordered that the campus production of Eugene O'Neill's 'Long Day's Journey Into Night' be closed. It seems that some of the viewers protested the play because of 'profanity and offensive words and phrases' in the dialogue. A happy note to that little fiasco came from San Antonio, where Trinity University hired the resigning head of the drama department and offered jobs to the rest of his staff. Is anybody looking for a good broad-minded school? Try Trinity--it may be a small school, but it apparently has 20th century administrators.

"I mentioned in a previous letter that the DAR in Alabama had protested a grade-school textbook because it was, quote, 'unAmerican', unquote. A similar thing happened in Mississippi also. Last December, the Mississippi Farm Bureau Federation petitioned Governor Ross Barnett



to investigate the members of the State Textbook Commission 'and appoint informed patriots'. The Farm Bureau group said, 'Taxpayer's dollars are going for school books that do not teach states rights, racial integrity, free enterprise and Americanism--the underlying principles of government in the state of Mississippi.'

"A book called 'Economic Problems of Today' printed material calling for 'redistribution of the wealth; government control of press, radio and television, and federal government control of basic industries such as electric power, steel and railroads. It praises the welfare state, the socialistic features of the New Deal and socialized medicine.' So said the bureau's resolution.

"Another book overemphasized the U.N., thereby threatening 'the sovereignty and security of the United States.' And another volume 'debunks the traditional fact that our forefathers came to these shores seeking religious freedom.'

"But here is the gem that really gets at my little old southern-fried, southern white protestant heart: 'The writings of Ralph Bunche, Langston Hughes and Mary McLeod Bethune are given more prominence in English literature than they deserve. These three Negroes have been closely identified with Communist and pro-Communist causes.' I really doubt the authenticity of that statement. After all, who in Mississippi would publicly say 'Negroes' instead of 'dirty black n-----'?" (P.O. Box 5598, University, Alabama.)

-----  
"The difficulty, my friends, is not to avoid death, but to avoid unrighteousness; for that runs faster than death. I am old and move slowly, and the slower runner has overtaken me, and my accusers are keen and quick, and the faster runner, who is unrighteousness, has overtaken them. And now I depart hence condemned by you to suffer the penalty of death--they too go their ways condemned by the truth to suffer the penalty of villainy and wrong; and I must abide by my award--let them abide by theirs. I suppose that these things may be regarded as fated--and I think that they are well." --Plato, in the dialogue "Apology" (Socrates speaking).  
-----

#### JEROME McCANN OFFERS A FEW THOUGHTS ON RACE RELATIONS

"In the last few issues of Kipple there has been a lot of discussion on freedom in our country. Foremost in this discussion was the matter of the equality of the Negro in our American society. Generally, it is felt by you and your readers that legislation is badly needed to insure equal rights for the Negro. True, such legislation is needed, particularly in the South. But basically this legislation is practically finished: First the Negro was freed by the Thirteenth Amendment; then the Fourteenth Amendment specifically made the Negro an American citizen; and the Fifteenth Amendment gave the right to vote to the Negro. If today the Negro can't vote it is because of one of two reasons: either he can't pass the literacy test or he is unable to produce a poll tax receipt. At present, there is a proposed Twenty-Fourth Amendment which would make the poll tax unconstitutional, and as for the literacy tests...well, I just hope someday the Negro will not have to worry about passing them. Legislation must not be used in the other areas in which you seem to think it would be effective, such as the integration of publicly-used places such as restaurants and theatres. Human beings must realize this necessity themselves or else they will rebel against what they consider an invasion of their private business. Only voluntary integration on their part would succeed. (Human beings are notoriously slow in acknowledging that which is right without prod-



ding of some sort. It was through the law and the energetic prodding of a few enlightened individuals that mental institutions were changed from dungeons to hospitals; it was much the same forces which inspired the reform of our penal system; it was, again, the law which imposed a prohibition against witch-burning on the superstitious masses. It is now the law which must insure the rights of the Negro (or of any other minority in this society) against the assaults of the masses or the ruling class which presumes to speak for the masses.))

"Now let's look at both sides in an intelligent manner. It is stated in our Constitution that all men are created equal, but anyone with an ounce of sense knows that this is not true. What this means simply is that all men are created equal in the eyes of the law and will receive equal treatment under it. Now, there is a big difference between this and the assumption that all men are literally 'equal'--start treating everybody 'equal' and you're going to have trouble. It is true that Negroes are often not given this equality of the law, yet there are much bigger and more unpleasant factors involved. One good example of this is the large percentage of unemployed Negroes. In Chicago alone, sixty percent of the people on the relief rolls are Negroes (while the Negro population of the city is but ten percent of the total). Need anymore be said? Of the Negroes who do work, the larger percentage occupy the lower income bracket, and since they make little money these people naturally live in the cheapest section of town, along with those who are on relief. Thus they go to certain schools, patronize certain stores, etc., with the result being natural segregation, which, while it sounds softer, is just as effective as that accomplished by any methods the segregationists could produce. What can be done about this? I'm sorry to say I don't know. Realize now that I'm not condemning Negroes as a race but rather as individual humans that are the sad victims of a sad situation. They have no cultural background in this country; they don't seem to fit into things. You might say the reason is loss of pride due to lack of home. Sure, they have been in this country since 1619, which is quite long, but they came here as slaves, with no possessions except muscles and sweat. We can always claim heritage to some other country through some ancestor who came to this country as a free man. You'd be surprised what a difference this makes. (You're right, I would...))

"Negroes are just too free of any obligations to society. Not hindered in any way, they simply multiply like rabbits. I don't care what anyone says, it is absolutely disgusting to find a Negro mother of five or six children who doesn't even know who fathered them. ((This statement would be a good deal more agreeable to me if you would change it in two significant ways: substitute "unfortunate", a factual statement given the mores of our society, for "absolutely disgusting", a value judgement; and delete "Negro", an unnecessary further classification of "mother of...(illegitimate)...children", unless, of course, you specifically mean to say that you would not be equally concerned with a white mother of several illegitimate children...)) If the mother doesn't even know about the children...how do they take this when they are old enough to know? Is it any wonder they run around like wild animals? Last year, 200,000 Negroes were born in Chicago; of this number, one-third were illegitimate! This accounted for a total of one-eighth of the illegitimate babies born in Chicago. Amazing, isn't it?

"A good example of why legislation is not the only thing needed is the 'help' Negroes receive in Chicago. This 'help' comes in the form of the Democratic machine headed by the honorable Mayor Richard J. Daley. The machine has a neat way of using the Negro population for its own political purposes. The slums of Chicago, which are generally populated by Negroes, are constantly being cleared out and replaced by



'projects' (special apartments). These modern buildings with exceedingly cheap rent accomplish little in the way of solving social problems, though they do make Chicago more beautiful. Otherwise, they accomplish only this: (1) they do a wonderful job of effectively segregating Chicago, as it's a rare thing to find an appreciable number of white families living in these buildings; (2) they keep the Negroes together in order to make it easier to obtain their bloc-vote; (3) they remove any pride left to the Negro, since they just live in these buildings and it isn't really home to them--no work on their part is necessary to keep these buildings in good condition. Of course, they praise Mayor Daley's work, especially when he insures their right to vote. Since the Negro population of Chicago is 900,000, with a good percentage of them eligible voters--Democratic voters--it is easy to see why the mayor goes out of his way to insure their right to vote; he'd be insane to do otherwise. The last election shows this in no uncertain terms: Mayor Daley won re-election this April by a small margin of some 137,000 votes. But the significance lies in the fact that in the Negro wards he received seventy-five to eighty-five percent of the vote. Since these wards have each between 17,000 and 25,000 votes, you can see that this was the key to the election. It is very obvious that the Negroes are the ones who elect the officials in this city. So long as such a political gold-mine exists, many high-placed officials are going to make certain things don't change. This hurts everybody, but primarily the Negro." (1453 N. Harding Ave., Chicago 51, Illinois.)

-----  
"...if there is any principle of the Constitution that more imperatively calls for attachment than any other it is the principle of free thought--not free thought for those who agree with us but freedom for the thought that we hate." --Oliver Wendell Holmes.  
-----

#### ON THE NATURE OF ARTISTIC APPRECIATION

It should be stated at the outset that the title of this essay is apt to be misleading, in that it implies a knowledge of what constitutes "artistic appreciation". Actually, nothing could be farther from the truth, and it is my intention in authoring this brief article to offer not answers, but questions, in the hope that someone will be able to provide me with the answers. What I have here chosen to term "artistic appreciation" could perhaps better be defined as communication, a sense of rapport with the artist, but these terms are, I think, grossly overused. Apparently, it has become the vogue to attribute "communication" or "rapport" to any appreciation of art or music which leaves one moderately satisfied, but what I have in mind when I use those terms is--from this subjective viewpoint, at least--a rare, vastly more satisfying experience. I am thoroughly capable of enjoying, for example, any reasonably well-performed piece of music, from mouldy-fig jazz to operatic arias. But the mere fact of enjoyment is satisfying only to a limited degree, and it palls into insignificance when compared to those rare moments when I seem to experience something more than simple "enjoyment".

If I cannot define or name this feeling, at least I can describe it, although I assure you that my meagre talent with words and the insufficiency of the English language will combine to render my description a mere shadow of the feeling to which I allude. It is, to begin with, concentration, but concentration to a degree not otherwise attainable: When reading a book, playing checkers, or analyzing a problem in logic, I am quite obviously concentrating; nevertheless, I am aware of my surroundings, even if only subconsciously: voices of other people,



automobiles on the highway, smells of cooking food, even the sensations transmitted by my nerves as a result of my posture in a chair manage to intrude on my thoughts. This concentration is at best only superficial. The other (and rare) type of concentration, however, is complete--or at least as complete as is possible to a conscious person. I see, hear, feel and smell nothing not directly connected with the object of the concentration (whether it be a book or a musical performance). Such a state is very nearly hypnotic, an assertion which is borne out by the fact that I once severely burned my hand while in this virtual trance by allowing a lighted cigarette to burn between my fingers. Ordinarily, of course, I would have felt the pain long before any damage was done.

But concentration is only a portion of this mental state: it is also emotion, albeit a type of emotion which I have never experienced under any other circumstances. Unfortunately, this emotion is absolutely impossible to describe, particularly in cold, dark print. It is not "an" emotion, such as anger, joy, envy, etc., but rather "emotion" itself, engulfing me in a tidal wave radiating out from the object of my attention. Most particularly, it is not merely sadness, although at times this particular emotion has been in evidence too: while in this state of extreme sensitivity, I have cried, but this is not the inevitable (or even normal) reaction. No doubt it will tax your tolerance of maudlin cliches even further when I say that during these periods, I experience what is commonly referred to as "a lump in the throat", even though I may at the same time be happy and satisfied.

I commented above that my description of this experience would probably be merely a shadow of the actual feeling. In reading again the preceding paragraphs, I discover that it is even less than that: it is but the afterthought of a vanished shadow.

But if I cannot adequately describe this experience, I can at least provide a few incidental observations which have a bearing on it. Apparently, it is in no way connected with my subjective likes and dislikes in the field of art, except insofar as they prevent me from exploring a specific area and thus from experiencing this feeling. I have little interest in art of the visual type, and I read primarily for information, with the result that stylistic excellence is usually a secondary consideration in my choice of books. But in other fields which broadly qualify as art (primarily musical performances), there is little enough parallel between my everyday preferences and the occasions on which I have experienced this feeling. Traditional jazz, folk-music, and the compositions of Beethoven, Mozart and Chopin form the top level of my preferences in music. Yet, the experience which I have ineptly described has made itself known while I was listening to such relatively prosaic performances as the singing of "Danny Boy" or an accordin solo. Such widely differing performances as Billy Holiday's rendition of "Gloomy Sunday" and Mimi Hines singing "San Francisco" have given rise to the same emotional experience.

In non-musical fields, the feeling has usually been less clear, more hesitant. At several points during the motion picture "Inherit the Wind", such a feeling arose, but it was apparently impossible to sustain such an experience for more than a few moments at a time. To further confuse and add variety to the concept, I should mention that a number of other motion pictures have had much the same effect, among them: "Duel in the Sun", "High Noon", and "On the Beach". It may be this time have occurred to many of you that all of the motion pictures and pieces of music which I have mentioned in this context have one quality in common: they are all, to one degree or another, sad. In reply to that possibility, I can only say that I have considered and rejected this connection more than once, because it was not the sad elements of these performances which were commanding my attention. For ex-



ample, while listening to "Gloomy Sunday" my attention (and, hence, reaction) was not directed at the sad words or music, but rather at the brilliance of the performance by Billy Holiday; while watching "Duel in the Sun", the hackneyed story-line was not of the least interest to me, but rather it was the splendid acting of Shirley Jones and other members of the cast to which my attention was directed. Much the same could be said of the other performances listed above.

Whatever this state of mind may actually be, I am reasonably certain of one thing: not everyone is capable of experiencing it. This sounds like the typical complaint of the conceited man, who conceives his intellectual and moral sensitivities as being immensely greater than those of most everyone else. But I believe that there is evidence to corroborate this hypothesis, no matter how intrinsically worthless its basis may be. None of the people with whom I have spoken about this emotional experience have the slightest idea what I'm talking about. Even given my clumsiness of expression, a hint of my meaning should come through in conversation, but all of those with whom I have discussed this concept have been utterly baffled. Of course, one excellent reason for this may be that I haven't yet broached the subject with anyone who deserves the appellation "intelligent": because of its highly personal nature, this is the first time I have been able to discuss it coherently with anyone other than a few relatives. Previous experience concerning aesthetic appreciation has shown that these people, kind and gentle though they may be, are incapable of receiving any but the most superficial enjoyment from any activity more "intellectual" in nature than a baseball game.

Therefore, I present the matter to Kipple's readership for consideration. Several possibilities seem likely to account for my overt reaction to certain aesthetic stimuli: (1) I am slowly going insane, and this over-reaction is a symptom; (2) I am unusually sensitive to artistry of certain types; (3) my over-active imagination induces a form of self-hypnosis, thereby causing the reaction. Larry and Noreen Shaw will obviously cheer the possibility of the first alternative being correct, the second appeals to my natural egotism, but the third seems most likely.

Passed on to Vic Ryan, Boy Psychologist, for immediate attention...

-----  
"Consider yourself to be dead, and to have completed your life up to the present time; then live out according to nature the remainder which is allowed you." --Marcus Aurelius, in "Meditations".  
-----

#### VIC RYAN COMMENTS ON #36 AND #37

"I was pleased to see the return of the extreme Ted Pauls--you know, the one who'd advocate immediate and comprehensive integration, as opposed to the somewhat less readily defined one who took rather nebulous stands on such issues as abortion and school prayers. Not that I think one is necessarily superior to the other, but the latter might conceivably generate the same sort of generalized ho-hum that characterizes Boardman's seemingly automatic assimilation of the liberal viewpoint, irregardless of the issue at hand. It isn't necessarily unthinking--in either instance--but it isn't necessarily as interesting as a little unpredictability, either.

"There's at least one instance where clothes 'regulate' behavior, although it's patently a self-instilled one. It's common practice hereabouts for students who are going drinking to dress in their very best clothing, for reasons other than the usual aura of maturity which may



or may not be necessary for purchasing liquor: if I'm dressed in my only decent suit, I'm sure as hell going to be just a little more careful about getting into a fight or anything else which might be financially disastrous. It seems as though people cling to their concern for material possessions long after the spirits have dulled their sense of physical danger. At least, it seems that way to me, and if you can't or won't confirm it from personal experience, I imagine I can get at least my roommate of last year and some of his friends to offer heartfelt confirmation: they made the mistake of getting stoned whilst wearing attire very much suited to kicking out all the windows at a local CTA stop. Needless to say, that's exactly what they did. (I will be very interested in the comments of other readers on this point, but I personally can neither confirm nor deny the theory, for drinking is not one of my vices. The reason for this is strictly practical, as opposed to moral: I become violently ill when imbibing any quantity of alcohol. I must say, though, in my capacity as a stodgy party-pooper, that I don't think much of the manner in which your friends release their tensions: suppose there had been a couple of children behind one of those windows they apparently enjoyed smashing...?)

"Larry McCombs: Of course a superior civil defense setup might make the public a little more willing to accept war, but I wasn't aware that the average person had much to say about it. I'm sure our top-level policy makers are as secure in today's missile protection areas as they'll ever be, but I doubt that makes them any the more likely to be willing to risk a war. I may place a lot of faith in American stupidity, and some of the notions popularly relegated to the shelter program no doubt justify that faith, but I just can't envision a propaganda effort on the part of the higher-ups that could conceivably lead to as secure a feeling as you seem to suggest--there are just certain facts about nuclear warfare that are impossible to gloss over, and, given a society in which free speech supposedly prevails, they're bound to crop up in the face of a government reassurance drive. The other alternative is strictly arbitrary, unsupported government action, and there just isn't a hell of a lot that can be done about that in any instance.

"While your article on the welfare state was interesting enough, I'm afraid I'll have to charge you with understating the conservative case, something you do remarkably infrequently. Near the end of the magazine, in response to a comment by Charles Wells, you said 'Well, I thought I succeeded in showing that this control of attire, while not particularly significant in itself, led to restrictions not as easily dismissed.' The italics are mine, put there to indicate a parallel that you may not have realized exists: if you can envision educational authoritarianism spreading from the insignificant (and perhaps even beneficial, for society as a whole) to the significant, why is the concept of a welfare government gradually expanding to take in a dangerously broad area of human activity so completely incomprehensible? (I am largely unconcerned with this possibility primarily because the structure of our Constitution and lesser laws is such as to generally protect individuals from any serious infringements on their rights. There are notable exceptions, of course, but this principle is operative as a general rule. So long as these constitutional precepts are followed, an authoritarian government is manifestly impossible; if these precepts should ever cease to be followed, we should of course be in very dire straits, but the way to prevent this is to fight each specific abuse as it occurs. This we are doing, and rather successfully so in many areas (viz., integration). To oppose various government programs aimed at providing or improving necessary services on the excuse that they could restrict freedom strikes me as patently absurd, when the foreseen restrictions are rendered impossible by the checks and balances of our



form of government. But none of these conditions are operative in the situation under which I warned of possible future restrictions leading from currently unimportant ones (that is, in the schools): schools do not have constitutions, courts, elected representatives, or checks and balances to protect the students; the only appeal of a student protesting an abuse is to the undependable court of public indignation. It is because of this basic difference that I think it imperative to interdict authoritarianism in its most basic--and least harmful--form in the schools, whereas I believe authoritarianism in the government to be impossible without revolutionary changes in the basic structure of our political system. (Parenthetically, I should anticipate the obvious query by noting that, in certain schools, "student courts" and elected "student governments" exist, but as they wield no real power, they are not analogous to their counterparts in the federal system.)) I'm afraid I have to admit a gnawing fear that the welfare progress is completely irreversible--now through expediency, in cases such as England's, where the socialism isn't replaced simply because a new party has come to power, later, perhaps, through impossibility. To me the trend toward greater and greater government aggrandizement seems inevitable; perhaps it isn't noxious as yet, and perhaps it won't be for millenia--but I think the danger is great enough to cause reflection at each succeeding step on the way. (I subscribe to the school of thought which considers irrelevant the amount of power vested in a government, so long as that power is used wisely. And it's up to us to see to it that the power is used wisely. To anticipate your obvious comment: I know that power corrupts, but in a form of government in which no single man or single group can take decisive action without consulting other men or groups, this doesn't particularly bother me. Of course, I suppose it's theoretically possible for one man to gain the support of the armed forces, kill or imprison all high government officials, and proclaim himself dictator, but there's little we can do about that slight possibility in any event, and I doubt that the existence or non-existence of welfare measures will materially effect the odds on that situation occurring.))

"My only objection to 'A Footnote on Truth and Reason' was that it sounded too much like 'Hugh Hefner's' Playboy Philosophy series. (Since I don't read Playboy, I'm not sure whether I should be amused or insulted...)

"I'll probably concede myself an Old and Tired person when the arguments one hears from a religious zealot cease to entertain me. If I had lived a hundred years earlier I probably would have gone to Bedlam to laugh at the lunatics, but, living as I do in an Enlightened century, I have to content myself with listening to the self-appointed missionaries. I don't have to argue or even string them along; try just sitting there, some time; even try seeming genuinely interested, and see how long it is before they begin to stammer and stutter, begin to question whether you really want to hear this, and do their damndest to try to find out what kind of audience you are. There's nothing that disturbs such people quite as much as an audience which gives no cue to its feelings; the poor guy just doesn't know whether to deliver Sermon One or Sermon Two, and the result is often highly entertaining confusion.

"There's a third solution to the population problem, and while it's a pretty ridiculous one, you may want to include it for the sake of completeness: reduce the population. Then we have several alternatives, such as letting it build up to the danger limit again (in the hopes that some new solution will have been found to the problem by the time the crisis is again full-blown), keeping it constant at a below-danger level, or reducing it further still.

"I'm afraid I'm just not in complete sympathy with Maarten Abeln.



I wouldn't suggest that the committee in charge of candidate selection choose only pro-American subjects; but it would seem only good sense to choose those who would benefit from the experience, and from the money which is being, in effect, given them. Obviously, someone with anti-American ideas isn't going to get anything from an educational experience over here.

"Obviously, Abeln doesn't quite fit into this category. He is critical, but perhaps not anti-American. I wouldn't even suggest that he follow the old 'Don't look a gift horse in the mouth' axiom, since the horse may or may not be Greek, and may or may not be a gift. But I would suggest that he's obviously not a too-intelligent person, if nothing else; his whole history seems to indicate an insistent desire to find everything wrong he could--and God only knows there's plenty to find--but not only did he criticize where his objects of criticism had no effective means of answering his charges, he didn't exercise what would be assumed to be simple good sense: waiting until completing his program before beginning his tirades. Instead, he merely appears childish, impetuous and eager to show what a big cheese he is; here he milks an education from the stupid Americans, then turns to show what idiots they truthfully are. He just seems like a little boy who can't wait to tell his older friends what stupidity exists in the world, while chances are they're fully aware of it." (My miscomprehension of this affair is partially attributable to inaccurate and incomplete newspaper coverage. Several readers, notably Rosemary Hickey, provided me with additional facts which considerably change the complexion of the incident. But I'm afraid that my false impression of the affair is also partially attributable to my natural bias in such cases: since I read the newspaper articles expecting to discover another example of an individual being victimized by Creeping Conformity, it's no great surprise that I did discover just that. As George Simpson has pointed out with regard to scientific theories, if you begin with the hypothesis and examine the facts in that context, you can prove just about anything... I liked best Rosemary's final comment on the matter: "If only your impression of the Abeln story were right; everything you said was so good!") (Box 308, 2309 Sheridan Road, Evanston, Illinois.)

-----  
"If I say that oysters are good, and you say they are nasty, we both understand that we are merely expressing our personal tastes, and that there is nothing to argue about. But when Nazis say that it is good to torture Jews, and we say it is bad, we do not feel as if we were merely expressing a difference of taste; we are even willing to fight and die for our opinion, which we should not do to enforce our view about oysters. Whatever arguments may be advanced to show that the two cases are analogous, most people will remain convinced that there is a difference somewhere, though it may be difficult to say exactly what it is. I think this feeling, though not decisive, deserves respect, and should make us reluctant to accept at all readily the view that all ethical judgements are wholly subjective." --Bertrand Russell, in "Human Society in Ethics and Politics".  
-----

#### MIKE DECKINGER HAS A FEW REMARKS ON #37

"Welfare allotments were originally intended as doles which would permit some unfortunate family to subsist until they gained the means to aid themselves. I doubt if it was ever the purpose of the government to intentionally support those on the program, so that complete reliance is placed on the weekly government check. The original motive was based on the 'heaven helps those who help themselves' prem-



ise, poetically harmonious but literally difficult. Unemployment is at a frighteningly sharp rate today, and in numerous instances government checks are the only thing that stands between the unemployed and starvation. Maintaining these benefits is imperative. I'm sure the vast majority receiving checks are sincerely in need of the money, and the consequences of ceasing these benefits to dislodge a few chisellers is disastrous and unwise, as you point out. The incentive to seek out new jobs and to raise one's living standards may be temporarily submerged under the deceptive influence of a barrage of handouts, but this flood reaches a saturation point, beyond which most persons on relief experience a noticeable distaste with their conditions and actively seek to correct them.

"Granted truth combats and overpowers falsity--and the desirability of the first condition is unquestionable--but what of the case when the subject is unable to determine the difference between truth and falseness. Returning to the old standby of superstition, a lightning bolt striking a tree and setting it on fire will be accepted by the ignorant caveman as a manifestation of the fire-god's wrath in directing his power towards the destruction of a tree. To an ignorant caveman, that statement is truth, basic and untarnished, and he will accept that far more readily than the explanation of climatic differences and combustion, et al. Truth must first be defined in relation to the individual accepting and using the truth, or else this truth can be transposed to mean anything. (In a case where the subject is unable to determine the difference between truth and falsehood, he will accept whichever explanation suits his fancy or conforms to his prejudices, or (hopefully) he will abstain from accepting any explanation until such time as one is proven. It is this latter course of action which I proposed to incorporate into my hypothetical educational system. The remainder of your comment was puzzling, in that I am quite unsure what precisely was the point you were attempting to make. What is thought to be true by the ignorant caveman (or the ignorant bushman, or the ignorant ditch-digger) does not necessarily have any relation to that which is true; truth is not relative, but the various interpretations of it are relative. Nevertheless, there must, in my opinion, be an absolutely true statement which can be made about every matter, and what is believed true is valid only insofar as it is consistent with the absolute truth. "The sun does not revolve around the earth" is an absolutely true statement which is also believed to be true by the majority of the inhabitants of this planet. But the same statement was no less true six hundred years ago, when what was believed to be true was its exact opposite. Of course, in many areas we simply do not know the absolutely true facts, but this does not mean that in these areas there is no fact which can be said to be absolutely true. "God exists" and "God does not exist" is one such area. One of these statements plainly must be true: if A is true, B must be false, and vice versa; and, therefore, if one is false, the other must be true, since they both cannot be true and both cannot be false. Our knowledge is as yet limited to the extent that we do not know which of these statements is true, and because we do not know and cannot prove the absolute truth of one of these statements, we choose to believe the one which appears to us most likely, or we abstain from accepting either. But this does not cause "truth" to be relative, but merely our interpretation of truth.)

"Len Moffatt has penned a very sensible and cogent defense of agnosticism. I'm usually less cordial than Len to self-appointed evangelists who seek to convert me through muddled religious tracts and ominous threats. The very fact that they approach me indicates that, to them, I am a sinner and a damned person, needing salvation and help. I resent the philanthropic desires that motivate such characters. Granting



that it may be a form of philanthropy in desiring to aid one's fellow man, it's nonetheless done with a smug, holier-than-thou outlook, as if the other finds my sinning understandable but distasteful. Whenever we are struck with a plague of Jehovah's Witnesses I carefully explain that we're all Druids here, and uninterested in their bunk. If that fails, I start quoting lines from the first section of Mark Twain's 'Letters From the Earth'.

"Why is the murder of Jesus considered such a heinous and unspeakable crime? As far as I can tell, the crucifixion in no way affected Christ's alleged mission, and, if anything, strengthened it, by martyring him. Suppose Jesus had not died on the cross, but instead lived his life preaching his doctrine, and died as an old, arthritic-stricken, weary-voiced, white-haired man? The best thing that could possibly have happened to Christianity was Jesus' martyrdom.

"Contrary to your remarks, I would not deem anyone 'unbelievably cruel and callous' for blatantly ignoring the population dilemma that will undoubtedly face us in, say, 2163. As you stated, lack of foresight is a definite human trait, and any date as far away as 2163 is apt to be tabled in the files of importance in favor of the more immediate events taking place next week and next month. This dangerous attitude, which argues that if we ignore it long enough it will go away, is composed of equal parts of ignorance and apathy. The ignorant ones are those who trust blindly in divine intervention of some sort, perhaps periodic manna drops, to relieve the overcrowded conditions. The apathetic ones include most everyone else, people who find that conditions of 100 years hence do not represent such a pressing problem to them. Nor can they be blamed for this thinking. The problem is not theirs to face; it's their grandchildren's. But since it is because of them that their grandchildren must face the problem, then the obligation does exist. Widespread birth control is only the first step to combat this, and the feeble gains that have been made in promoting birth control are so unimpressive, compared with what is required, that I hold no great hopes for any foreseeable easing of the situation." (31 Carr Place, Fords, New Jersey.)

-----  
"I have spoken of the separation of church and state as a device for the preservation and enhancement of religious liberty, rather than as a rule which furnishes direct guidance for public policy. This is not to disparage the formula; if we did not have it we should have to invent its equivalent in order to keep constantly before us the dual necessity that no ecclesiastical power shall be able to use the state to its own advantage, and that government shall keep its hands off ecclesiastical affairs. However, the separation doctrine has come to mean more than this--and properly so. Until fairly recently the chief preoccupation of legislatures and courts with this issue has been with sectarian controversy and the danger that the schools might become involved in it. Today, however, all religious doctrines are regarded as sectarian by a substantial part of the population. This is true even of the much talked of 'common core' of beliefs that are accepted by the major faith groups." --F. Ernest Johnson, in "Religion and the Schools".  
-----

#### CHAY BORSELLA COMMENTS ON RELIGION AND EXCHANGE STUDENTS

"The ultimate in the ridiculous was reached by a Baltimore mother who, in a letter to the Sun, suggested the following solution to the problem of prayers in the public schools: Let each child bring to school a sealed envelope from the parents, voting for or against the prayers. The majority's wishes would prevail. And then--the joke of the



week--the writer said that such a solution would give the children a good lesson in democratic procedure! My guess is that the Supreme Court won't hand down its decision in the Murray case until school lets out, so that the thing can simmer down over the summer months.

"Maarten Abeln sounds like a rare man of his species. Foreign exchange students simply must be modest, out-going, non-critical, conforming, god-fearing kids with permanent smiles plastered on their faces. If they fail at these prerequisites, they might start an international incident. It took me a dozen school years to discover the purpose of the exchange student--then one day it dawned on me: They're a stop-gap for the days when the school can't get anyone for their assembly program. Back in high school, one of these students apparently failed to make the grade. It seems that no one understood him when he spoke English, and he didn't understand anyone when they spoke any language. The poor kid was a forgotten man!

"With the coming (and, thankfully, passing) of Easter, religion has been permeating the atmosphere. On Easter Monday, a steady stream of Christian customers passed through the little store where I was working. Excessively chummy, a couple dozen of them must have asked me if I had enjoyed a happy and holy Easter day. Finally, I got tired of answering yes and barked out, 'I don't celebrate it!'--this, to a sweet old lady in an Easter hat. 'Pray, why not?' she demanded. 'Not religious,' I muttered. 'But,' she insisted, 'you do believe in the Lord?' Glaring her in the eye, I shook my head negatively. 'You mean,' she shrieked, 'that when they lie you in that hard cold ground, you think that's all there is?!' 'No ma'am,' I told her; 'I'm going to be cremated.' That got rid of her. All's safe until Xmas now, I guess." (Box 443, Towson State College, Towson 4, Maryland.)

#### HARRY WARNER COMMENTS ON #37

"It's hard to see how federal aid to education could be accomplished without lessening the willingness of state and local governments to pay the education bills. No matter how the federal money is controlled, directed, and rationed out, there won't be any way to be sure that the township or county heads wouldn't have increased the school tax rate or floated a new bond issue, if the money from the federal government hadn't become available. (Since, in either case, the people are providing the funds, it doesn't seem particularly relevant to me through which agency these funds are spent. The advantage of federal education subsidies is that through this central agency, funds may be provided for educational programs in areas whose residents cannot or will not provide these services themselves.) The even distribution of youngsters throughout the country indicates that the people will pay approximately the same bills, whether some of the money comes from the federal government or not. I believe the present system of substantial federal aid only in areas severely hurt by army camps or other government facilities is better.

"What kind of logic is Ruth Benedict trying to use in that quotation about Eskimos who fail to understand the nature of war? Failure of a primitive people to understand a custom or process does not mean anything in particular. I'm sure that they don't understand the reasons for explorations around the North Pole, and there are African tribes which can't recognize a drawing or photograph of a face because they cannot grasp the concept of an illustration.

"Isn't it likely that the population increase will follow much the same course as occurs in islands or geographically separated areas in historic times, whenever things get too crowded? People start killing one another in an effort to gain more lebensraum or they die off in large numbers for causes associated with badly crowded living condi-



tions or a low proportion of babies survive for lack of proper food and care. (Well, aside from the fact that these reactions are precisely what we are attempting to prevent, there is also the unfortunate fact that our advanced technology may enable us to bypass the normal checks on population and consequently face an even worse ultimate fate. In most populations of animals, as you know, the relationship between the population of animal A and that of animal B, on which the former feeds, is a homeostatic (that is, self-regulating) system of sorts: when the population A increases greatly, more B's are devoured, which consequently leads to starvation of many A's, thus returning the balance to where it was before A began its original "population explosion". Unfortunately, man's technology may circumvent this situation to such a degree that a decrease in the organisms he uses for food will lead not to an immediate decrease in man's population, but to a further decrease in the ranks of the food-organism. Thus: depletion of, say, beef, will lead only to more intensive slaughter of cows, and hence to their eventual extinction; lowered productivity of land will lead to even greater strains upon the land, and hence to its decimation (as occurred with the Dust Bowl several decades ago). These processes, like all runaway homeostatic systems, lead inevitably to complete breakdown and destruction.) I'd much rather see the human race run the risk of such things recurring than have government regulations on who can and can't have children, compulsory contraception, or what have you. An existing freedom is much more important to me than a possible future evil.

"I'm on the side of the Youth for Understanding Committee in the case of this Maarten Abeln. If I understand correctly the situation, this is an immature person who began to produce ex cathedra judgements in print after spending a few weeks or a few months in one milieu of a very large and varied nation. He has just as little justification for making authoritative statements about the United States as Khrushchev or John Gunther have for making speeches or writing books on the basis of their few weeks in other lands and conversations with a few members of the upper crust in those nations. There is also the small matter of decency and courtesy to one's hosts. I think that the world is too full of prejudice and distrust among nations for an organization aiming at international friendship to permit one of its activities to be used for Abeln's purposes. It would make much more sense for an exchange student to act as a good guest during his visit, think over his reactions for a while after he got home, then produce his polemics if he still felt the same way about the United States." (423 Summit Ave., Hagerstown, Md.)

#### SHORT NOTES ON LONG SUBJECTS

All magazines make errors, but Kipple appears to make more obvious ones than most other publications, such as referring to the Food and Drug Administration as a "commission". The latest in this series of miscues occurs in my article on artistic appreciation. Despite what I may have said there, it was Jennifer Jones, not Shirley Jones, who starred in the motion picture "Duel in the Sun". In crediting the latter Miss Jones with the portrayal of Pearl Chavez, I attributed to her superlative acting the like of which she is very probably not capable. Of course, even this error was a step in the right direction, for the rough draft draft of the article had credited the picture to, of all people, Carolyn Jones...

Politically-oriented readers of Kipple will probably find of interest the latest news of Baltimore's upcoming Mayoralty campaign. In #37, I noted that Hyman Pressman, the only Democratic politician who was apparently not a hypocrite, avowed his support for Theodore McKeldin, the Republican candidate. Recent events have forced this unusual relationship even closer. W. Rae Dempsey, Republican candidate for



Comptroller, withdrew recently as a result of the bankruptcy of a corporation he once headed, noting that he did not wish to handicap the GOP ticket with the insinuations which could be leveled at him. Mr. Pressman was requested by Mr. McKeldin to fill the vacant spot on the ticket, and the crusading lawyer consented after due consideration of the matter. His candidacy is being contested on a legal technicality, but it now appears that Baltimore voters will have their choice on May 7th between a coalition of Democratic political bosses, on the one hand, and a split ticket containing two of Baltimore's most well-known personalities, on the other. The doubtful legality of the GOP-cum-independent ticket may hurt their chances, but, all things considered, they appear to have a fairly good chance of unseating the incumbent Bosses. Yesterday, Baltimore's liberal newspaper, the Sun, formally announced its support of the McKeldin ticket; so far, I have seen no word with regard to preferences in the News-Post, Baltimore's other major newspaper, it seems likely that it, too, will support the McKeldin slate.

To explain again the esoteric symbols in the upper-right of the address box: a number is the number of the last issue you will receive under present circumstances; "T" indicates that we exchange magazines; "C" means that you are represented in this issue with a letter or contribution of some sort; and "P" indicates your place on my permanent mailing list. The absence of any symbol whatsoever probably means that you are receiving this issue for reasons best known to you.

AND I ALSO HEARD FROM:

Joe Pilati, Joe Staton, Ben Orlove, John Boardman, Mike Domina, Ron Sverdlove, Dick Schultz, Gordon Eklund, Betty Kujawa, Don Dohler, Len Moffatt, Redd Boggs (new address: 270 S. Bonnie Brae, Los Angeles 57, Calif.), Buck Coulson and Rosemary Hickey. The following should, with luck, appear next issue: Charles Crispen, Enid Jacobs, Ron Sverdlove, John Trimble, Ben Orlove and Derek Nelson. Maybe Postmaster General Day should use me as evidence that Congress should not cut his proposed budget...

FROM:

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



SEND TO

printed matter only  
return requested  
may be opened for inspection

Len Moffatt  
10202 Belcher  
Downy, Calif.

BO :: NYX :: CWS :: KCA :: BRS :: DT :: LAA :: CI :: WS :: MT ::  
SFG :: PP :: SLC :: MB :: PP :: LAD :: CC :: CR :: NYM :: HC45's ::