

This is an amateur journal of opinion and commentary published for the raznochintsy by Ted Pauls, 1448 Meridene Drive, Baltimore 12, Maryland. Copies of this frequently-issued periodical are available for letters of comment, exchanges with your magazine, contributions (articles, verse, etc.), or the cash sum of 20¢ per copy. A snide or facetious dedication generally appears in the colophon at this point, but this issue is very sincerely (and very pompously) dedicated to the people of Baltimore, who occasionally rise above themselves and do something significant. On May 7th, 1963, they threw out of office an assortment of political bosses, a long-delayed move.

PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION: AN OBITUARY

After several decades during which the spectre of "progressive" education, oriented towards "adjustment", dominated the educational pattern of this nation, the death knell is being sounded for this experiment. In California, the election of Dr. Max Rafferty to the post of Superintendent of Public Instruction is hastening the demise of the "life-adjustment" theory of education in that state. Other states will probably follow suit in the near future. In the opinion of this magazine, anything which can be done to further hasten the destruction of this moribund institution is a step well taken. Progressive education has permeated our intellectual atmosphere since the 1930's, and if it has not succeeded in entirely extinguishing individual initiative, it has at least made impressive inroads in approaching that goal. The single most important facet of progressive education is its insatiable desire to promote the cause of "adjustment to the group", a fancy and left-handed phrase meaning "conformity". Progressive education's singular achievement is the idealizing of the "average", the promotion of mediocrity. It is this appalling facet of the system which has produced at least one full generation of mediocre, group-adjusted people (one hesitates to term them "individuals", for they are not), whose greatest ambition in life is to be socially acceptable as an "average" person.

Proponents of progressive education will scoff at this point, bare their fangs, and prepare for a concentrated attack upon this upstart who dares to question the superiority of their System. Mere words, nay, even mere facts, cannot hope to stem the tide of this advancing horde. But for those of you whose minds are as yet open, uncluttered by dogma and stereotype, perhaps my few feeble words, and fewer facts, may give you something to think about.

Virtually every rational person is agreed that there is something wrong with our society, and the culprit is nearly as unanimously recognized: conformity. It is (and has always been) the nature of Homo sapiens to conform, to seek social acceptance, but because in this era the tendency is stronger and affects more people, it is consequently more of a problem. This tendency is nurtured and protected by the greater number of our institutions, but if any prime culprit were to be singled out, it would be the school system, primarily because that institution operates on minds which are too immature to successfully fight its advances and inroads. And in the past thirty years, the school system has promoted conformity as never before, largely because of the dominance of the tenets of "progressive education" in the educational system. This program seeks to promote "life-adjustment", "adjustment to

the group", and "the development of the total child". None of these aims appear particularly unsound or undesirable to most people, largely because they aren't aware of the meaning of these concepts. The third quoted objective of the progressive education program is particularly ludicrous, in that it forces the academically gifted child to attend classes in carpentry and basket-weaving, while it forces the academically retarded child to study mathematics and physics which he cannot possibly understand. The aim of this program appears to be to insure that each and every child leaving school possesses precisely the same capabilities and interests as every other child. Even if this objective were desirable, it would be impossible. Soviet Russia, whose methods are a good deal more efficient than those of progressive educators, has nevertheless not succeeded in creating a population of total carbon-copies.

But the objective is most assuredly not desirable. It promotes mediocrity at the expense of excellence, which is surely a studied idiocy if embarked upon intentionally. It is academically disastrous, and financially suicidal. Such a system may produce a good many competent, skilled (though frustrated and wishy-washy) technicians and engineers, but it will produce no creative geniuses, no inventors, no scientists, no individuals, except those who manage to achieve this goal in spite of the System. The financial difficulties are less significant, but nonetheless real. In an era when lack of sufficient funds for education is a recognized problem, the "development of the total child" theorists spend hundreds of thousands of badly-needed education dollars on vocational and recreational facilities. "Home economics" classrooms, filled with rows of shiny new ovens, cost sums of money which could be spent instead on laboratories. (Women have been learning to cook for thousands of years without the necessity of classrooms for the purpose. Are 20th century women suddenly incapable of this feat?) Gymnasiums are constructed, sometimes at such tremendous expense that a small, modest school would cost little more. Auditoriums, used for "assemblies" which most students would prefer not to attend, and for a presentation of the drama class once every year, consume fantastic sums of money. Through it all, academic subjects suffer.

If the program of "developing the total child" is ambiguous, the two remaining aims of progressive education in this country are appalling. "Life-adjustment" and "adjustment to the group" mean exactly the same thing, and together they refer to Conformity. The pursuit of excellence has become a pursuit of normalcy, and its concomitant quality, mediocrity. Some wit once described the "ideal student" in approximately these words: "His marks include one A, three B's, and a C; he is competent in all scholastic sports, and outstanding in at least one; he is attractive to and attracted by the opposite sex; he possesses only healthy, American, Christian opinions." This may be a fairly accurate description of the "average" or "normal" student in this country, but--I repeat--this is supposed to be the ideal, the objective at which every child is taught to aim. Whatever falls below this ideal standard is frowned upon as stupid; whatever lies above it is equally frowned upon as radical, egghead, unGodly, "unnatural" and abnormal.

The very best indictment of this educational system, however, may be the statements of persons whose connection with it has been extremely intimate: viz., teachers. Marion Bradley, who for a number of years desired to become a school teacher, gives here the impressions gained while she was studying at the Teachers College in Albany, New York:

"In the first semester of my junior year, however, I was exposed to--or, I should say, collided with--the

educational theories of the mid-forties; consisting, in brief, of the idea that a school's primary purpose was to adjust the student--gently if possible, otherwise by every trick in the book--to something called society.

"I discovered, to my lasting dismay, that the ideal student was the median or average student; that mediocrity was never to be disparaged, and excellence, if not positively dangerous, was at least a suspicious deviation from the norm."

After questioning this idea of "adjustment", Marion was reprimanded and given a lecture on the superiority of the "total", well-rounded child:

"While theoretically agreeing that youngsters should not live in a textbook world, the way this was presented made me feel that they wanted to abolish the superior and interested student in the same way they hoped to abolish the disciplinary problem and the retarded reader. And I resolved that nothing on earth could make me treat helpless adolescents that way, and gave up the idea of teaching as a career."

Marion later goes on to say (in an extremely fine article in Day-Star #20) that all progressive education is not oriented towards conformity, but since progressive education as it exists today is oriented in precisely that direction, the possibility that its theoretical aim may differ is irrelevant.

Larry McCombs did not abandon the idea of a teaching career because this indoctrination-towards-conformity was practiced, but, by his own admission, he may lose his position as an instructor if he decides to follow his conscience in the classroom. Shortly after beginning his first year of teaching at Oak Park High School, Larry wrote these perceptive comments (see Bane #7):

"...I am expected as one of my chief teaching duties to help students 'socialize', to become 'well-adjusted'. Although it is never expressed in so many words, what is wanted is that I should get all my students to conform to the ideal of the well-adjusted, normal, modern American teenager. The goal of adolescence in this system is not self-realization, but conformity to the norm. You should spend a week with fourteen-year-olds, as I've been doing recently. These kids are frightened to open their mouths--they just want the teacher to go away and leave them alone. They are embarrassed about their strange-sounding names, their skin blemishes, their lack or excess of physical development, their intelligence or lack thereof, and anything else that makes them a unique individual. They've been given a picture of the well-rounded teenager: competent but not too outstanding in school work, competent in all sports and outstanding in at least one, charming and socially at ease, dating fairly frequently, attracted by and attractive to the opposite sex, etc., etc. Everytime one notes that his personality differs from this norm, he experiences feelings of inferiority or guilt. It would make you cry to see the

results in stifled and inhibited children!

"If I had my way, none of my students would be well-adjusted! I'd like to make them aware of themselves--and disgusted with the system. If I taught them as I'd like to, they'd never be happy in this society--they'd spend their lives fighting it. But do I have the right to do that to them? I don't know yet, but I suspect that I may not be able to keep a job as a teacher long if I decide to follow my conscience!"

And what are the results of this tendency to conform, the fruits of this labor of the narrow-minded? Simply this: the ultimate subversion of the individual to the group; the inevitable destruction of all dissent, initiative, and creativity. The Inquisition eradicated dissent by the relatively simple expedient of executing all heretics. This society is too civilized to utilize such methods, but eliminating dissent by utilizing the schools as a mold to form only one type of thinking is ultimately the more dangerous method--because it is less obvious. Its avowed purpose is to produce more and more "average", normal students, with "average" interests, opinions, and capabilities. But this trend can only accomplish the destruction of freedom, by creating an atmosphere in which only "normal", socially acceptable ideas and people can exist. By this method, regimentation to a more perfect degree than has ever been dreamt of is possible.

Grim forebodings of this ultimate goal may be observed in most schools today. Controversial ideas are strictly verboten, and the questioning of current institutions is looked upon with suspicion. Controversy, after all, might inspire some of the students to think, and the ancient practice of thinking is definitely frowned upon in today's institutions of public instruction. Thinking apparently interferes with the all-important matter of "adjustment to the group".

But this jeremiad is unnecessary as a further knife into the body of progressive education, for that body is already near death. It will no doubt utter horrible roars in its dying gasps, and the thrashings of its dying corpse may be terrible to behold, but be that as it may, this once noble experiment has come to the end of its road. One of the persons who did a great deal to contribute to this state of affairs is Dr. Max Rafferty. Dr. Rafferty's policies could best be described as conservative, and his program for public instruction in California disagrees with my ideal conception of education on many points. But it must at least be admitted that what Dr. Rafferty will give to the state of California will be a noticeable improvement over the progressive educational system under which the state has been forced to labor for the past several decades. Indeed, no conceivable system could fail to be something of an improvement, unless it were one instituted by maniacs deliberately aiming at the worst possible system of education. Dr. Rafferty believes that the purpose of education is to teach, not to adjust; his school system will scrap such fluff as Applied Sandbox and "social studies" in favor of the straight, unvarnished teaching of specific subjects: history, geography, etc. There will be, to put it briefly, an emphasis on subject matter.

The end result of all this will probably be schools of the type common forty years ago, with modifications to meet our current needs. It will not be a panacea; it will not be the best of all possible educational systems, not by a long shot; but it will at least be an improvement in several significant areas over the system under which we are now burdened. It will produce individuals more readily than the current system, which is more interested in turning out Component Parts,

and it will produce students who aren't afraid to be superior to the class average. If Dr. Rafferty's renovations succeed even partially in promoting these qualities, they will be steps worth taking. And I trust that other states will follow the lead of California.

In closing, a word is in order with regard to Dr. Rafferty's conservatism, perhaps of concern to those readers of this newsletter who cannot readily separate politics from other areas of life. While it is true that some of the good doctor's policies are out in the general direction of right field, the stabilizing influence of the State Board of Education, an overwhelmingly liberal body, should serve to steer California's school policies in more moderate directions.

"I went through periods where atheism seemed, if not a comforting philosophy, at least a rational and methodical one. I carefully studied the arguments for the existence of God and the arguments against His existence and I learned that atheists are not the evil, bearded devils in human form that I had been led to believe as a child. Often they are vastly more intelligent than the average man and are frequently people of high ethical standards. Of course the fact that in our time atheism has been equated in the minds of many with communism has dreadfully obscured the issue. The fact is that there have always been atheists but that communism is a relatively modern phenomenon. If and when communism ever passes from the earth atheism will still be a philosophy that will appeal to a number of people. Through reading the works of various atheists, heretics, agnostics, rationalists, and humanists I realized at last that it is not hardness of heart or evil passions that move certain men to atheism or agnosticism, but a sort of perhaps overly scrupulous intellectual honesty. Although I think he is essentially right, the average believer rarely subjects his beliefs to a calm, critical examination--in fact he would probably not even know how to do so. Although I think that he is essentially wrong, the average atheist has usually arrived at his intellectual position through a long, tough-minded consideration of philosophical questions. In fact it seems to me that the average atheist is more interested in religion than the average Christian." --Steve Allen, in "Mark It and Strike It".

ENID JACOBS COMMENTS ON #36 AND #37

"Madalyn Murray, although I'm 100% sympathetic with her aims, amuses me slightly. She seems to have the knack of irritating and/or enraging everybody--even people who ought to be on her side. Just what she does that's so offensive isn't certain, but she has repeatedly been denounced as being 'rude' or having 'no manners'. None of her critics, however, seems to have said a word about the 'manners' of her tormenters. Somehow, I think they've broken a few rules of etiquette--not to mention a few of Mrs. Murray's windows--here and there. Actually, the worst social blunder Mrs. Murray has committed was declaring herself to be a non-believer. (Most of the papers describe her as an 'avowed' atheist, which seems to imply that atheism, like a psychotic uncle, should never be talked about.) It seems to me I've read somewhere that fifty years ago it was extremely bad taste to call oneself an atheist; and today, while it still is bad taste to be an unbeliever, it is even worse taste to be a demonstrative, revivalistic Christian. So we are progressing, by inches if not by miles.

"Carl Lazarus made a good point about the I.Q. tests that 'prove' Negroes to be inferior. Many of the I.Q. tests to appear to 'prove' this fact--as well as the facts that Americans are superior to foreigners, and that city dwellers are mentally ahead of mountaineers or coun-

try people. Of course, all that these tests really prove is that they are not culture-free, but are probably geared to a middle-class American background, presupposing the 'educational advantages' and opportunities that go with it. Thus, lower-class people or 'foreigners' to this particular environment would do less well in the test.

"Dress codes for high school students? I'm against them. If the problem is indecent--that is, 'distracting'--clothes, I can see the school authorities' point. But I think that the problem usually centers around exotic, sloppy, or 'non-conformist' dress. In this case, I believe that a high school student is certainly old enough to choose what sort of clothes he wants to wear, even if he is using the clothes as a means of asserting himself or rebelling against adult society--and to have his choice accepted, if not condoned, by the adult members of his world.

"Charles Wells: The notion that all religions must, of course, have a god is as widespread as it is short-sighted. It seems to disrupt most people's equilibria to think otherwise. Here at school, a psychologist, trying to reconcile old-time-religion with modern psychology, said that 'of course' the basic foundation--and common denominator--of all religions was a belief in a supreme deity. One student challenged him, making reference to the Ethical Society and other godless cults, but the speaker dismissed all these by explaining, 'Oh, I was talking about normal religions.' This, from a psychologist.

"Re 'A Few Malthusian Thoughts': You are right about the general non-awareness of people toward this problem. This almost conscious refusal to comprehend may result from the overwhelming horror that must accompany a comprehension of the implications of this problem--people don't like to think too deeply in any case, and when their thoughts lead to distasteful or terrifying conclusions, they are apt to recoil from them completely, push them aside, struggle back to their accustomed levels of perception, and speculate on whether or not Mrs. Jones next door is really having an affair with the dry-cleaning man. You forgot one other 'cure-all' scheme, Ted: the development by Science of a miraculous, super-duper protein-vitamin-carbohydrate pill, one of which would provide all of our nutritional needs for 24 hours. A friend of mine is earnestly awaiting the day when these pills will be on the market." (Box 257, Towson State College, Towson 4, Maryland.)

"I am certain that some will find my views disturbingly liberal, while a smaller but substantial proportion will criticize their conservatism." --Dr. Alan F. Guttmacher.

JOHN TRIMBLE HAS A FEW THOUGHTS ON SEGREGATION AND WELFARE

"Through my own experience, and from the experience of various friends and acquaintances, I have found that social security unemployment benefits have a tendency to remove the edge of urgency from unemployment. The unemployed person who collects his check from the state each week gets the feeling that he can live off the stipend, and, therefore, that he doesn't really need to hurry in finding a job. Granted, in areas with a large unemployed population due to recessionary tendencies, etc., unemployment benefits are necessary. I do object, however, when someone who's merely decided that he doesn't like working any longer can collect benefits after a short penalty period.

"Segregation is an evil and needs to be stamped out, and I don't think any intelligent, reasoning citizen of this nation can disagree with that pronouncement. However, I'm not at all sure that legislation to force integration in public buildings, utilities, businesses and

such can be effective. As Charles Wells pointed out in this issue, 'a change in attitudes of thought...is necessary.' And that will only come through integration and education peacefully and over a long period of time (by this decade in the next century, now...). In legislation for integration, where do you draw the line? Where does such legislation start infringing on the right of an apartment house owner to choose who tenants will be regardless of race, creed, etc.? Should integration-by-legislation be carried far enough, I can foresee the day when a bartender could be arrested for refusing to serve a man if the customer was any degree less than dead drunk. That's a little on the ridiculous side, but not so much as one might think." (5734 Parapet St., Long Beach 8, California.)

"One obvious question which must strike any one who sees or reads of magical practices must be: Why do they exist when they rest upon principles which often run counter to those we know to be true? Long ago Edward Tylor pointed out four reasons for this. First, some of the results aimed at by magic do actually occur, though for other reasons, or because there may be some real virtue in what is done or in the medicines used; secondly, in some cases trickery may be practised by the magician to deceive his fellows--though on the whole the magician believes as firmly in his magic as do others; thirdly, positive cases count for more than negative ones--even in our own experience we often ignore things which run counter to theories in which we believe; fourthly, there is the belief in the existence of counter-magic. If a rite fails to produce its end, then it is argued that the proper conditions have not been observed, or that some one else has magically conspired against it." --Raymond Firth, in "Human Types".

DEREK NELSON COMMENTS ON THE WELFARE STATE

"Those people today who oppose the Welfare State are being completely unrealistic. It is an established fact rooted to varying degrees in the traditions of almost all the Western countries. It cannot be eradicated, nor can the fantastic costs of such a scheme be trimmed very much.

"Most conservatives outside the United States try to evolve a system where both freedom and security exist together, rather than one surviving at the expense of the other. To take your first argument that we object to people living as parasites off welfare money, this is true. But the solution is not to end welfare, but rather to make a recipient of this assistance earn his keep by working at jobs that would not otherwise be done (such as painting armories--this was, I think, tried in Oregon).

"I'll ignore your second point since its relevance to Canada is small--the municipality handles most welfare up here, with grants from higher levels of government.

"Your third point, that government controls won't lead to a dictatorial society, is questionable. (The third argument in my article was that welfare programs would not lead to dictatorial controls. This statement has quite a different meaning from the statement that "government controls won't lead to a dictatorial society". In the future, when you decide to refute my arguments, kindly make certain that they are my arguments, not your fabrications.) Any government has the potential of becoming totalitarian, though I'll agree that, at present, it probably won't go this way. However, the government is but an extension of some of the people (usually the majority), who can impose controls upon all the people. This is what I object to, as a conservative. Most liberals

and socialists seem to have the idea that equality by compulsion is a desirable end in itself. (The liberal concept of equality is simply this: that a man be judged in any specific situation solely on the basis of his attributes and talents relevant to that situation, and not on the basis of irrelevant qualities such as color, creed, faith (or lack thereof), political affiliation, etc. This is not desired as an end in itself, but rather as a necessary prerequisite to a just society. (This equality is certainly desirable, but, in the philosophical sense, it is not desired as an end in itself, except insofar as this concept of equality is synonymous with "justice". The extent to which this is true is unknown; this is a rather obscure philosophical question, which, while interesting, is not necessarily explored in the resolving of this political question. Suffice it to say that equality, in the normal sense in which that term is employed in political discussions, is not an end in itself.) The fact that in many cases this legal and social equality must be instituted by compulsion is unfortunate, a grim indication of the depth and power of man's bigotry. But to cry "Unfair! Unfair!" when certain men are compelled to curb their own actions aimed at the subjugation or destruction of other men is idiocy. One might as well work toward the repeal of all laws, since they all, to one extent or another, restrict our right to do something: to kill, to rape, to enslave, to rob, etc. It is claimed by conservatives that legislating integration restricts the right of the proprietor to be a bigot. In actuality, he never possessed this right; he committed the action, but he never had the right to do so--only the privilege, guaranteed by law. What is legal and what is right are not synonymous, nor indeed are they invariably parallel. I do not possess the right to commit arson; it is also illegal. But if arson were legalized, I would nevertheless not possess the right to commit it. Similarly, segregation was never right; it is now, in addition, illegal in many areas.)

"The same sort of attitude, but much more terrifying, is prevalent in the slogan: 'The government's duty is to do what the individual will not do.' And, once again, since the government is an extension of the majority, it means the imposition of still more controls over the minority. The more welfare programs advocated, the greater the control. (I'm talking about plans that cover everyone, not such things as federal relief.) Also, whether or not you believe it absurd, it is a step toward socialism, particularly when new plans and schemes to 'help' the people are thought up each year, and soon become part and parcel of the liberal's dogma till a new scheme comes up. For instance: your support of Medicare for the aged will, in time, be superceded by your desire for complete Medicare--especially if the former is passed into law. (Whether or not I would support "complete Medicare" depends, of course, on the specific nature of the program--I have no intention of committing myself to a program without examining it. Nevertheless, it is safe to assume that a program of extensive "socialized medicine" could be proposed which I would support. Kindly explain why this is wrong? Your point must apparently be that it engenders controls and restricts freedom, but I see no need to comment on this line of thought until you have presented specific charges and examples.)

"And in federal aid to education, you are once more using compulsion as a weapon to force an unwilling school to accept federal money. (All that I propose to do is to give the citizenry an opportunity to decide whether or not they wish federal assistance in constructing and staffing schools. Because, you see, these citizens--whose children must attend inadequate schools staffed by incompetent instructors--are at present not allowed to decide for themselves whether or not these funds should be requested. Federal aid to education is obstructed by petty politicians and fulminating advocates of State's Rights, none of

whom are apparently concerned with the welfare of children. I happen to adhere to the antiquated idea that such matters should be decided by those persons directly concerned, not by professional politicians. If it were in my power to do so, I would initiate state-wide referendums on the matter of federal aid to education, and the opinion of the citizenry as expressed in the voting would be decisive. I have enough faith in the voting population to believe that they would request such federal aid, if the advantages and disadvantages were presented fairly.)) If a public school system wishes federal aid it should apply for it to the state, which applies to the federal government, as is done here in Canada. The Federal Government then gives the money with no strings attached to the province (or state), which uses it any way desired in the field of education. And no one forces them to take money they don't want. ((Are you aware that this is precisely what I proposed, with the single (and singular) difference that I provided that the people, not the state and local politicians, could request the funds?)) The Canadian plan has been in existence since the Second World War, although I believe that last year was the first time Quebec ever took the federal money.

This, generally, is the tragedy of the liberal position. For although we live in a free democracy, it is the foremost advocates of this system of government who wish to take away the most important liberty we have--the freedom to dissent." ((This must surely be the most incredible statement ever published in Kipple. I have devoted the majority of the pages in the last twenty issues of this magazine to defending dissenters and their causes; I have devoted a considerable portion of my time and energies over the past several years to vehemently (and, at times, violently) defending the right to dissent; I have shaken friendships and acquired bitter enemies by defending everyone from Gus Hall to George Lincoln Rockwell against those who would silence their dissent--and I am accused of attempting to stifle dissent! I am astonished. Once again, comment will be deferred until you offer something more concrete than a vague, all-inclusive accusation--if you have something more to offer as an argument.)) (18 Granard Blvd., Scarboro, Ontario, Canada.)

MARTIN HELGESEN COMMENTS ON #36 AND #37

"On your discussion of race in #36: I would probably classify myself as a moderate liberal according to your division. Your reference to 'assuring that the white man is not deprived of his right to deprive Negroes of their rights' misses the point. There is a danger that the government, in protecting the rights of some citizens, will assume so much control over personal lives that there will be a net loss of freedom for all citizens. It is of course necessary sometimes to restrict valid freedoms when they are abused to oppress others. However, we should remember that we are restricting a freedom and do so very carefully, reluctantly, and only when necessary. ((I agree completely, but who decides when such restrictions are and are not necessary?)) As you point out in #37, 'Any tampering with our freedom is important.'

"Larry McCombs: If you were a devout Catholic you would not--or at least should not--believe you have the right to force others into the Church, since this is contrary to the Church's teaching. This fact is clearly stated in recent papal documents, but is equally clear in the writings of St. Thomas Aquinas and of Alcuin, in the court of Charlemagne, to pick two examples.

"I don't quite see why Ben Orlove mentions Huntington's Chorea in the discussion of euthanasia. Is he suggesting that if a baby's parent dies of this disease, the baby should be killed instantly to protect him from dying of the disease 25-30 years in the future? If so,

why not kill all babies? They're all going to die of something eventually...

"It may surprise you, Ted, but I, as a Catholic, agree with the quotation from 'The Meaning of Evolution' on the last page of #36. I suspect I might possibly disagree with some other parts of the book, but that particular paragraph seems quite reasonable.

"On the other hand, Dr. Huxley's remark (quoted in #37) shows a fundamental lapse. He ignores the fact that one of the factors to be considered in determining 'what is best to do in particular circumstances' is the relevant moral law. I should think you would agree with me on the importance of the moral law, if not necessarily on what it says in this specific case. After all, you went so far as to brush aside Larry McCombs' practical questions on specific articles of clothing on the ground that the basic issue was whether a school board had the (moral) right to go beyond the law in imposing standards and restricting freedom of dress.

"John Boardman: The responsibility for the Crucifixion rests on all men who have ever lived and will ever live because of their sins. This is basic Christian doctrine. The Jews have as much guilt as everyone else, but no more." (11 Lawrence Ave., Malverne, New York.)

"The toleration of those that differ from others in matters of religion is so agreeable to the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and to the genuine reason of mankind, that it seems monstrous for men to be so blind as not to perceive the necessity and advantage of it in so clear a light. I will not here tax the pride and ambition of some, the passion and uncharitable zeal of others. These are faults from which human affairs can perhaps scarce ever be perfectly freed; but yet such as nobody will bear the plain imputation of, without covering them with some specious color; and so pretend to commendation, whilst they are carried away by their own irregular passions. But, however, that some may not color their spirit of persecution and unchristian cruelty with a pretense of care of the public weal and observation of the laws; and that others, under pretense of religion, may not seek impunity for their libertinism and licentiousness; in a word, that none may impose either upon himself or others, by the pretenses of loyalty and obedience to the prince, or of tenderness and sincerity in the worship of God; I esteem it above all things necessary to distinguish exactly the business of civil government from that of religion, and to settle the just bounds that lie between the one and the other. If this be not done, there can be no end put to the controversies that will be always arising between those that have, or at least pretend to have, on the one side, a concernment for the interest of men's souls, and, on the other side, a care of the commonwealth." --John Locke, in "A Letter Concerning Toleration".

THE TWENTY-FOURTH AMENDMENT by John Boardman

Do you engage in research under a government contract? Are you involved in public health work, federal construction of dams, or maintenance of national parks and forests? Do you teach in a school or college which receives federal funds? Or do you merely load parcel post packages on a mail train? Then you should know about a constitutional amendment now before Congress and the state legislatures which will cost you your job.

"1. The Government of the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial, financial or industrial enterprise except as specified in

the Constitution.

"2. The Constitution or laws of any State, or the laws of the United States shall not be subjected to the terms of any foreign or domestic agreement which would abrogate this amendment.

"3. The activities of the United States government which violate the intent and purposes of this amendment shall, within a period of three years from the date of ratification of this amendment, be liquidated and the properties and facilities affected shall be sold.

"4. Three years after the ratification of this amendment the sixteenth article of amendments to the Constitution of the United States shall stand repealed and thereafter Congress shall not levy taxes on personal incomes, estates, and/or gifts."

This amendment to the Constitution has been proposed by Representative James B. Utt (Rep., Calif., 35), with the support of the John Birch Society. Not only have they put it before Congress, but they are trying to bring it in through the back door by a never-used procedure under Article V of the Constitution. If two-thirds (34) of the states, by legislative action, approve this proposed amendment, Congress must call a convention for considering it and submitting it to the states for ratification. The approval of 38 states would then be necessary to add this amendment to the Constitution. Six states have already endorsed this amendment: Georgia, Louisiana, Nevada, South Carolina, Texas and Wyoming. The National Committee for Economic Freedom, one of the fronts which the John Birch Society admits it has established to promote its programs, is conducting vigorous and well-financed lobbying campaigns for this amendment in the other 44 states. California is the next immediate target.

Willis E. Stone, chairman of the NCEF, wrote in support of this amendment in the conservative monthly American Mercury that it would require the federal government to sell \$262,000,000,000 worth of property. (This is exaggerated, as it would be a forced sale and would bring correspondingly lower prices.) In particular, it would put into the hands of private industry 750,000,000 acres of federally-owned National Parks, National Forests, National Monuments, and other public property.

This is only the beginning. The third clause of this amendment would, as its proponents claim, take the federal government out of any business or profession which competes with private persons or firms, or performs services which private persons and firms can perform. Parcel Post competes with Railway Express, so it will go. The Public Health Service and Veteran's Administration Hospitals perform services performed by doctors and hospitals in private practice, so they will be shut down. The Morrill Act, which makes it possible for the income from the use of federal land to support hundreds of land-grant colleges, will be unconstitutional under this amendment. So will any form of federal aid to education, federal home loans, and all foreign aid.

The NCEF is clearly doing the work of the John Birch Society in promoting this amendment. Among members of the John Birch Society who are active in the NCEF are Thomas Anderson, Col. Laurence E. Bunker, James L. Doenges, A.G. Heinsohn Jr., the Louisiana segregationist and anti-Semite Kent Courtney, Joseph S. Kimmel Sr. of Republic Electric, Robert D. Love of Love Box Co., Charles W. Pavey, M.T. Phelps, and the

former Congressman John Rousselot.

This organization is concentrating its efforts in western and southern states, where there is a tradition of opposition to the authority of the federal government and where newly rich oil and mining millionaires are fearful that their riches will be taxed away from them. Needless to say, the projected abolition of the progressively graduated income tax is being well-financed by men who would stand to gain great sums of money by its end. Towards this end, they are willing to sacrifice virtually every power of the government except, of course, the power to raise and maintain the armed forces. The proponents of this "Liberty Amendment" carefully point out that the abolition of the income tax would not affect military expenditures. The mathematics of this statement is an arguable proposition, but it shows what the NCEF regards as the primary duty of government.

--John Boardman

"We present ourselves to each other as the inhabitants of a highly continent society, monogamous, virginal to the altar, each bride and groom sworn to forsake all others, and one and all so delicately sensitive to the manifestations of sex that we arrest persons for going nude and teach our children about storks or flowers rather than people. SLEWS of our most highly esteemed men and women are constantly at work protecting the morals of the young. Numerous otherwise satisfactory men are thrown into prison for half their lives because of acts of coitus they performed with females under ages that vary from sixteen to twenty-one, in different states. What is called lewdness and salacity in various forms of art and literature are denied the use of our mails; the authors thereof are also occasionally jailed. Innocence, which, on examination, appears to be neither more nor less than ignorance, is everlastingly lauded by the populace." --Philip Wylie, in "Generation of Vipers".

AL KRACALIK COMMENTS ON SCHOOL AUTHORITARIANISM

"Larry McCombs says, '...all students are required to go to a public school--does this mean that the school has no right to regulate dress?' You reply, 'Yes.' And I agree.

"Discussion of the farthest extremes--girls showing up for class nude or clad in bikinis, V-necklines, see-through fabricated skirts, and other assorted strip-tease garments--is pointless, because, as you say, such situations are automatically taken care of by law under categories such as indecent exposure, etc. I might also add here that I doubt very much if even the most rebellious teenagers would carry their rebellion to such extremes.

"I don't know what conditions are like at McCombs' school, but at Maine West here at Des Plaines, such articles of clothing as blue jeans, sweat shirts, black leather jackets with the standard Jolly Roger or what-have-you are considered 'tough' and 'sloppy', and are therefore forbidden. Such feminine fashions as tight slacks, short skirts, and shorts other than those of gym suits are ruled 'indecent', and these, too, are verboten. This is necessary and proper, say the faculty members. Baloney, says I. If fellows want to scream for all the world to hear how tough they are, that's their business--sooner or later, somebody is bound to cut them down to size. But the way to do it is not by telling such a youth that he needs a haircut or that he dresses sloppily--this attention is what they desire. The way to do it is just to wait until he pushes somebody too far and gets his teeth kicked in. And the complaints about short skirts or tight slacks being indecent is

such a ridiculously fuggheaded notion that it doesn't deserve sane rebuttal--it was once indecent for ladies to expose their ankles, too. So should we all run around in full-length, floor-sweeping robes so as not to embarrass anyone with our indecency? It's about time people got rid of their prehistoric inhibitions about their bodies. All cats are cast from the same mold, you know--kittens, too.

"The rules of our alma mater prohibit smoking. I don't think this is for the purpose of keeping minors from smoking--it's hardly enough to deter them from acquiring the habit. But think what would follow should the rule suddenly be lifted: the halls would be littered with cigarette butts, packs and ashes, and the clouds of tobacco smoke in the classroom would be enough to make one's eyes water. I'm convinced that the students would not use their freedom in this area wisely--adults don't, either: walk down any street in town, on days when the street-sweepers aren't operating, and you'll find cigarette butts in the curbing. Moreover, I don't smoke, so why should the no smoking rule bother me? (If you believe that such a rule infringes on a legitimate freedom, it should be incumbent upon you to oppose it (that is, it should "bother" you) whether it is your freedom or someone else's which is being infringed upon. As it happens, I do not consider the no smoking rules in schools an unreasonable inhibition, largely because of the potential fire hazard which would exist without the prohibition. However, the application of this rule to areas it was not originally intended to cover--i.e., across the street during lunch--is unreasonable.))

"Swearing: It's common American custom to release one's rebellious emotions in a few four-letter words, and it's about the most harmless method of venting one's anger I know of. If a teacher gets angry at a student, I wouldn't be the one to stop him from laying the cards out on the table--let him blow off some steam and tell the kid where to get off. With the real troublemakers, that's the only way to make them understand. Then, too, I've heard students shoot their mouths off to teachers. I've done it myself on occasion, though I don't remember employing profanity at any time. Hell knows (if I would have liked to, though, and if a kid's got a legitimate complaint and doesn't hit home any other way, I won't begrudge him his share of profanity. (If all else fails, he may vent his anger by returning to the school in the evening and breaking all the windows. This is probably as effective, and at least as childish, as cursing.))

"Finally, as re teenage rebellion in schools: read pages 310-313 of John Farris' 'Harrison High'. Now let's get something straight, people--school, as a rule, does not offer one damn thing; it takes anything it feels the student needs and crams it down his throat, like it or lump it. Our English class read Thoreau's 'Walden' as a required reading assignment this year. The teacher urged us to study carefully this fascinating man's philosophy--but would they urge us to take it to heart? Hell, no! My Chemistry teacher urged the class during one of his sermons to get educated--by reading the newspapers. Like a true HDT scholar (for the sake of experiment more than anything else), I retorted, 'What's so all-fired interesting about a newspaper?' He was flabbergasted and ashamed of my unstudious attitude. If I skip an assignment to pursue something else of interest--a new book, magazine article, or TV show--the reaction is that I ought to be defaced for neglecting my books. Do you get the idea? Teachers think they're doing us such a tremendous favor by filling our weary minds with the wisdom of the ages. They don't stop to consider the true value of what they teach, or of their methods of teaching it. They don't stop to listen to us (I mean really listen, not let it go in one ear and out the other); they don't stop to consider that maybe we don't want it all. Nobody need

protect me from my enemies--I'm quite capable of handling them myself; but Heaven deliver me from the would-be go-gooders." (1660 Ash Street, Des Plaines, Illinois.)

"One day after luncheon the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Kingsley Wood, came to see me on business at Number 10, and we heard a very heavy explosion take place across the river in South London. I took him to see what had happened. The bomb had fallen in Peckham. It was a very big one--probably a land-mine. It had completely destroyed or gutted twenty or thirty small three-story houses and cleared a considerable open space in this very poor district. Already little pathetic Union Jacks had been stuck up amid the ruins. When my car was recognized, the people came running from all quarters, and a crowd of more than a thousand was soon gathered. All these folk were in a high state of enthusiasm. They crowded round us, cheering and manifesting every sign of lively affection, wanting to touch and stroke my clothes. One would have thought I had brought them some fine substantial benefit which would improve their lot in life. I was completely undermined, and wept. Ismay, who was with me, records that he heard an old woman say, 'You see, he really cares. He's crying.' They were tears not of sorrow but of wonder and admiration." --Winston Churchill, in "Their Finest Hour".

CHARLES CRISPEN COMMENTS ON HIS RELIGION

"You have mentioned in past issues of Kipple that, as an agnostic, you are irritated by zealous theists who classify you as an atheist. I quite sympathize with your plight, largely because my own case is similar in spirit if not in substance: perhaps as many as 80% of the theists with whom I make an attempt to discuss religion leave with the unshakeable conviction that I am an atheist, whereas in point of fact I am a theist. I believe deeply (though, hopefully, not dogmatically) in the existence of God. This is a conclusion reached after many months of consideration, and at an earlier point in my life I actually was an atheist. Oddly enough, I ceased to be an atheist when I first became interested in physics, because it was at this time that I realized that those scientists who attempt to explain the universe without reliance on a Supreme Being not only fail to give an adequate answer, but compound the felony by ignoring the question. Physics, of course, depends upon cause-and-effect reasoning, and each effect becomes a cause in the next step of the argument. If we pursue this line of reasoning in the opposite direction, it is plain that every cause was at one time previously an effect. Plainly, then, there are only two possible alternatives: (1) that this cause=effect=cause reasoning may continue infinitely into the past, or (2) that there is a point at which we discover a cause that was not previously an effect. The first possibility seems unlikely, if only because this retrograde progression from the variety of the present world to the generalities of the past constantly decreases the number of possibilities with which to operate. The second alternative, however, appears to me likely, and since nothing in the physical sphere can be a cause without first having been an effect, our original cause must have been non-physical--viz., God.

"This appears to make me quite plainly a theist, but I have only outlined a portion of my beliefs: while I accept the concept of God, I reject unequivocally most of what is believed about that God. Even the traditional practice of referring to God as 'Him' is ludicrous: the term immediately implies a biological organism capable of sexual reproduction, an obvious absurdity when dealing with an abstract Essence. This is a minor point, surely, but it is typical of the extent of my

disagreement with 'organized' religion. To me, every coherent sect of religious belief which you could name is nothing more than a repository for the stupidities which individual human beings have believed about God for the last two thousand years. Some sects believe that the Bible, a document comparable in Christianity to Homer's epics, delivers the Truth; some sects place their faith in the heirarchy of their specific Church; others believe that God would be displeased by such insignificant human vices as drinking and gambling, or that God would be pleased at the spectacle of a few human beings shouting and rolling on the floor; and much, much more.

"But in my view, the Essence which permeates the universe and which I have chosen to call God has no interest whatever in human affairs. I doubt even if such an Essence could have a consciousness, in the sense that we use that word, but in any event I fail to understand why such an abstract force should be at all interested in the material plane of existence.

"And for this, I am considered an atheist." (c/o Ben Orlove, 845 E. 14th Street, Brooklyn 30, New York.)

"When you are in the right you can afford to keep your temper, and when you are in the wrong, you cannot afford to lose it." --Mahatma Gandhi.

I SEE BY THE PAPERS

John Boardman forwards a clipping from an Alexandria, Virginia, newspaper which briefly details an act of vandalism at the Alexandria City Hall. The incident itself is of no great significance as a news item: Two Confederate flags, on display at the entrance to the public building in connection with a civic celebration, were destroyed by person or persons unknown. The flags were shredded and the metal poles twisted into scrap. This is surely an innocuous item with which to begin one of Kipple's jeremiads, but I am a good deal more concerned with regard to the attitude apparent in John's accompanying note. "I thoroughly approve of such actions as this," he reveals, "and regret that I wasn't on hand to do it myself." Now, such vandalism is surely a product of unfettered childishness, strikingly similar to the methods employed by a crony of George Lincoln Rockwell, who vents his peevish anger by defacing a synagogue with a painted swastika. To deal in petty actions of this sort is not only wrong, but it is also unbecoming a liberal: it causes us to look exactly like the fools our enemies claim us to be.

Despite minor lapses such as the above, however, the illiberal, reactionary elements of our society manage to very nearly retain a monopoly on organized stupidity. Several impressive examples have been selected from recent newspapers for inclusion in this column, not the least of which concerns a thirty-eight year old controversy which refuses to lay down and die. In Memphis, Tennessee, a student teacher had the misfortune to schedule a debate on the theory of evolution in her classroom. This particular action runs contrary to Tennessee law, a fact which the teacher, Miss Martha Powell, no doubt considered before scheduling the debate. In this enlightened year 1963, however, it was not expected that such an inane law would be enforced. Unfortunately, to hold this optimistic view was to grossly overestimate the intelligence of the sort of person who invariably gravitates toward a position of minor authority in every public school system in the country. In an unparalleled act of calculated idiocy, Radford Rosebrough, principal of the Memphis high school at which the debate was supposed to take place,

unconditionally refused to allow any such discussion. It is common in these cases to place the blame for such actions upon hastily-organized groups of protesting parents. In this instance, however, absolutely no justification exists for such an accusation. Principal Rosebrough admitted that no parents had complained about the scheduled debate, but that "school policy is to avoid things of a controversial nature." This is understandable: controversy breeds independent thought, an enthusiastically discouraged quality in most public schools in this country.

But I do not wish to imply in any manner that such censorship is confined wholly or even largely to Tennessee, however much that state may be a haven to rabid fundamentalists. In point of fact, Tennessee is merely the focus of the controversy, not its entire setting. While Principal Rosebrough was smugly asserting that Memphis students were incapable of adult thought and therefore had to be protected from controversy, another school principal in another state was indulging in a similar exercise of flagrant damnfoolishness. In Rockford, Illinois, a high school drama teacher decided to present a dramatization of the Scopes trial. Despite the fact that Illinois does not similarly prohibit by law the teaching of Darwin's theories, and despite the fact that the play was not, in any event, instruction in such theories, it was ordered banned. Harold W. Moore, the principal of the Rockford high school in question, gave as his reason only the statement that he wished to keep controversy out of the schools. This dubious excuse is utterly unacceptable to every thinking person, but it is fully in keeping with the objectives of most American public schools (adequately covered, I feel, earlier in this issue). The intrusion of controversy into the curriculum is not likely to further the goal of creating "well-adjusted", mediocre graduates, since the very existence of controversy leads to the inescapable (though unpalatable) conclusion that certain elements of our society are subject to criticism and question.

No discussion of unofficial censors, that brave and gallant legion of inveterate despoilers of liberty, would be complete without quoting from the newspaper at least one letter written by a member of the species. The past few weeks have been so fruitful in this field that I am left with a difficult choice between the rantings of three truly exceptional paragons of virtue and morality. My final choice is a letter which appeared in a nameless New York newspaper and comes to my attention through the kind offices of Joe Pilati. It is written, appropriately enough, on All Fool's Day, and is signed by a woman named Gertrude Weissner. This clipping, representing the epitome of sanctimonious narrow-mindedness, makes a valuable addition to my famous Archives of Idiocy.

"The episodes presented on the television program 'The Defenders' for the last 3 weeks should be banned from T.V. They defile everything good or beautiful in life.

"Any writer that puts out bad literature does not have our young people's interest at heart. The world is confusing for youth today. No one can put that type of television show before the public. In my many years I've read thousands of books, some of which are not for the young. There are many beautiful books in the world. Why pick out those that are bad literature?

"'The Heathen' was a lot of bunk. I quote: 'There is no such thing as an atheist.' Where have they gained such foolish knowledge?

"It takes only one rotten apple to spoil the bunch. Another thing: in one of the television episodes a case went into court before a jury, but the judge tried to play God. He never let it go to the jury, because he decided the case for himself..."

"When any one has been given the ability to write, it is a nice feeling to know he does not write to upset the younger generation. We should not make it hard for our young to tell right from wrong. People who write and publish bad literature are just a little unbalanced. Most people who earn their living by writing trash don't even have the courage of their own convictions. They place themselves in a category of their own making, and it is hell."

Unofficial, unorganized censors, while generally creating a good deal of noise, are not particularly dangerous. They may rant and rave in the pages of local newspapers, viciously berate their neighborhood newsdealers, and occasionally succeed in having a book or motion picture banned. By and large, these minor gains are offset by the large number of otherwise susceptible persons who are alienated by the conspicuous narrowness of these pious zealots. Highly organized campaigns, spearheaded by persons learned in the art of demagogical oratory, should be of considerably more concern to opponents of book-burning. They are dangerous, first, because of their size and power, but an even more significant attribute of such organizations is the fact that they are headed by persons at least intelligent enough to conceal the inherent immorality of their cause. Far too many people, unable to appreciate the subtle nuances of authoritarianism underlying the plea, support these superficially reasonable crusades.

One such organization, "Citizens for Decent Literature", is apparently engaged in a campaign of singular enthusiasm in the environs of South Bend, Indiana. Betty Kujawa forwards a sample of the literature which is being distributed in her area. Headed "an Important Message!", it is, as I have implied, a document which even reasonably intelligent persons could conceivably consider a moderate appeal for an end to pornography. Since hard-core pornography is considered in bad taste by most of us (particularly when it finds its way into the grubby little hands of children), many people who would not otherwise consider themselves book-burners are nevertheless predisposed to agree with the basic premise of the leaflet. This basic appeal of the message is combined with the use of several tactics strikingly typical of censorship organizations: the use of emotional slogans ("The CHILD YOU SAVE from OBSCENE and PERVERTED matter may very well be YOUR OWN!"), and the identification of pornography with Communist subversion. The sum total of these various lines of thought is an anti-obscenity campaign which appeals quite readily to the naive, well-meaning individual.

Since naiveté, along with apathy, is the National Characteristic of this country, the danger of this organization is immediately obvious.

To thoroughly examine the entire leaflet for examples of the relatively subtle rabble-rousing techniques which are used throughout would be an extremely tedious and boring process. Two, however, are representative, and deserve attention. "When you find objectionable material on the newsstand," counsels the leaflet, "buy it and take it straight to the prosecutor's office at 209 Sherland Building." Apparently, the sympathizers of this Cause are such extremely perceptive individuals that they need not read a book or magazine in order to determine that it is "objectionable"! This may charitably be looked upon as

an oversight, on the grounds that the sentence was not intended to be interpreted literally and the organization considers the prior reading of such material too obvious to specifically mention. But even if we consider the deletion accidental, its effect upon the naive will be such as to cause the sentence to be literally interpreted and studiously practiced. It denotes, in any event, tacit approval of the practice of terming a piece of literature "obscene" without first reading it.

The second technique with which I propose to deal has not even the dubious defense that it is a careless omission: it is, in fact, a calculated device to mislead the ignorant. In one corner of the leaflet there appears the hammer-and-sickle emblem of Soviet Russia. Alongside this grim insignia, and under the heading of "Moscow's Plan of Psychopolitical Warfare", two quotations appear: "...by stimulating him with sex literature" and "corrupt the young...get control of all means of publicity". Note, please, that these are separate quotations, although the authors of the leaflet fail to punctuate them accordingly. The second quotation is referred to in the text, where it purports to be a direct excerpt from "a printed Communist doctrine on revolution". Whether this is an actual statement from a Communist document or a manufactured forgery cannot be proven. However, the first quotation is not mentioned in the text of the leaflet, is not a portion of the second excerpt, and is nowhere actually claimed to have been written by revolutionaries. But while no claims are made, the placement of the line and lack of punctuation is calculated to give the impression that the first statement is a prologue to the second, and hence also quoted from a Communist document. This is a craven and dishonest tactic, but unfortunately it is also subtle enough to escape notice if the reader is sufficiently panic-stricken by the reference to Communism.

Having expounded at great length on three singularly despicable matters, several additional clippings intended for use in this installment of "I See By the Papers" will only be mentioned briefly.

For instance, there is the case of a Catholic priest in Ashland, Wisconsin, who instructed his parishioners to steal books from the public library! "The Last Temptation of Christ" has been removed officially from the shelves of the Ashland public library," according to the Minneapolis Star, "after a Catholic priest told his parishioners not to return the book to the library on pain of mortal sin." The clergyman, Father Conran Schneider, is the chairman of a local committee investigating obscene books, and the book, by Nikos Kazantzakis, was brought to his attention by one of his flock. With regard to the copy of the tome in his possession, Father Schneider commented, "I'll have to return it to the librarian now and see that it's burned." The librarian apparently hasn't gone to that extreme, but he did promise to remove the book from the library shelves. Fred Galvin, who provided me with the clipping, was apparently too astonished to comment.

In Toccoa, Georgia, an eighth-grade English teacher was fired recently, apparently in connection with his recommendation of "Bell For Adano", a book which School Board members hotly denounced as "unfit for reading". Although the book is the major focus of controversy, an impressive list of additional charges have been lodged against the teacher, Frederick Adams, by the School Board: he "was careless about his appearance, did not practice sobriety, paid attention to women and girls, and tended to be moody and high-strung." The book, incidentally, immediately became a best-seller in the town of Toccoa.

Finally, I have decided to break precedent by ending this column on an optimistic note. The Maryland Youth Legislature, which for three days each year meets to give students an opportunity to study politics first-hand by introducing, debating, and voting on measures much in the manner of the state legislature, recently completed its 1963 session.

This youthful body distinguished itself by considering and "enacting" a number of bills which the actual legislature refuses to touch with a ten-foot pole. Their meritorious record includes: abolishing the death penalty, repealing the miscegenation law, requiring annual inspection of automobiles, outlawing the union shop as a condition for employment, repealing the black-and-white standard of judging insanity in criminal cases and creating a psychiatric board, and striking down the unit-vote system which allows the state to remain misapportioned. Two outstanding reasons for this record are (1) that the bills will not actually be passed into law, and thus their possible consequences need not be considered, and (2) that the student legislature need not worry about the reaction of organized minorities of constituents. Even granting that, however, it is plain that these students are far superior to the tin-plated politicians who currently stand at the helm of state government. It is a hopeful thought indeed that some of these students will be, to parrot a cliché, the Leaders of Tomorrow.

"That all advances in moral, political and aesthetic insight are due to the exceptionally gifted individual would be now fairly generally conceded by the citizens of most democratic communities. As a corollary, we demand that the individual should be free to follow the light as he sees it. We realize, of course, that in morals, in politics, in aesthetics, and in the realm of the spirit the light may lead him into what seem to us to be strange paths and it is always possible that he may be following a light that is not there. Worse still, we must concede that we may not be able to tell at the time whether it is the light of genius or a will o' the wisp that leads him. In other words, the originally gifted man is bound to shock his contemporaries, nor will they be able to distinguish the oddity in which his 'shockingness' consists from the eccentricity of the madman and the fool. Most perplexing of all, the same man may be compact of all three, playing the genius, the madman and the fool successively and sometimes even simultaneously."
--C.E.M. Joad, in "Philosophy".

BERNIE MORRIS HAS A FEW NOTES ON #38

"You seem shocked that many, if not all, religious people are religious for what it can get them. That a prayer is a 'bribe to curry favor in the event that a diety's assistance is needed' is not denied by the suppliant, though it might put in more pious terms.

"I am now tempted to go on to a general discussion of religion that would sooner or later become a diatribe. But I am becoming more than a little bored with seeing the typical Liberal view on religion, especially my own. Your fine observations on the disunity of liberals (in Enclave #2) didn't mention their views on theism, which are disgustingly uniform. If I do interject my views I want it to be in a place where it will do some good, or at least stir up some interesting replies. Conversely, what Kipple needs is the view of the Other Side. The only reader ever to seriously defend orthodox religion (sic. Christianity) was Tom Armistead, who was abused and ridiculed for his effort (and I must confess that I did my share of the ridiculing). If a liberal (in the classic sense) discussion on any subject is to take place, it cannot be one-sided. I'm sure that Mrs. M. (for Martyr?) Murray would not agree with me, but then, I think she is acting like a fool.

"To carry this to a more general level, I think a few intelligent conservative opinions would do Kipple immense good. The only such opinions appearing are those which you arbitrarily assign to conservatives. (I agree wholeheartedly that discussions are liberal only when

all sides are presented, but I'm afraid I have no control over this matter. Kipple's mailing list is open to anyone who cares to subscribe or write letters. If intelligent conservatives or intelligent Christians don't find the magazine interesting enough to read or comment upon, there's little I can do about it. But of course, the situation is not as one-sided as you have implied: there are conservatives and theists on my mailing list, though they represent a minority.))

"Practicing what I preach, I'd like to say a few more words about Mrs. Murray. For some reason, she reminds me of Robespierre. He was an utterly humorless SOB who had a self-appointed Mission and, by God (which he called Reason), he would make everyone else see it his way or die trying. He did both. Mrs. Murray also wants a State religion, only instead of deism it will be called atheism. To me both alternatives are abhorrent, and the abuse she generates in her neighbors (who believe it when they say, 'We're only doing it for your own good') is to be expected.

"Apropos of nothing, I will mention that we have a course here at MIT, Modern American Literature, which not only uses 'Lolita' but also Norman Mailer's 'Advertisements for Myself'. Mr. Mailer has a foul mouth, and on many political and cultural matters suffers from rectal-cranial inversion, but 'Lolita' is all about collecting butterflies, so that makes up for it." (420 Memorial Dr., Cambridge 39, Mass.)

MADALYN MURRAY REPLIES TO PILATI AND PAULS

"I am a fundamental atheist, blindly dogmatic, single purposed, full of orthodox narrowness, prating demonstrably illogical precepts of the philosophically unacceptable, forcing my standards on others because of hypocrisy, subscribing to 'left-ness right-or-wrong' idiocy, supporting erroneous and dangerous ideas, a ranting ignorant, incapable of objectivity, focused on a short-range goal--because you-all say so, honey chile, and because I need my belly laugh for today.

"In return, you are loving, kind, intelligent, honorable, objective, omniscient, omnipotent, logical, tolerant, considered, learned, understanding, accepting, correct and irrefutable--and from the sound of it all: very young. ((Sarcasm, although cleverly constructed and often amusing, rarely contributes to the type of productive discussion this periodical attempts to generate. If Joe Pilati and I are mistaken about your opinions and attitudes, then it seems to me that the very best way to disabuse us of our erroneous notions is to explain in detail your true position. If you refuse to attempt this chore, we cannot be blamed for our interpretation of your position, however mistaken it may be. Moreover, your reference to Joe's age (and mine, I suppose) is entirely irrelevant, and perhaps explains why, as Enid Jacobs mentions, you annoy even those who ought to be on your side. If Joe's criticism is valid, it is no defense to claim that he is young; if his criticism is not valid, then, again, his chronological age is immaterial to the fact.))

"We never should should have forced our ideas on Hitler, that great humanitarian. We have been bad. Hang our heads. Shame on us." (1526 Winford Road, Baltimore 12, Maryland.)

MIKE DECKINGER COMMENTS ON #38

"Your denunciation of the various stupidities supported by SINA is precisely the sort of reaction I'd expect from anyone with enough intelligence to realize what the absurd claims of SINA amount to. Much of the material you comment on in Kipple is prefaced by views and observations that do not necessarily conform to the norm of mass thinking today--and thus Kipple is a refreshing diversion because of the different, and occasionally inverted, observation it advances. I've not seen

one person actively supporting SINA, except for the stooges who paraded in front of the white house. Incidentally, SINA is a hoax, in case you didn't see the Newsweek story on it about a month ago. It seems one of the Newsweek staff decided to check up on SINA. First he delved into the background of Clifford Prout, the alleged millionaire who is post-humously sponsoring the group, with his money and his son's direction. It was discovered that no man by this name had ever existed. Further checking revealed that SINA was being handled by a West Coast comedy writer who had organized it for fun and sustained it for reasons of his own. He was not the least bit serious and fully expected ridicule and criticism. I think it's non-existence was apparent through some of the unbelievably inane statements issued by one of the 'directors'. Among other things, the newspapers quoted him as proudly saying he had a dog and a cat who were permitted to run around naked when alone at home, but were conspicuously dressed in pants whenever visitors arrived.

"There have been several verbal free-for-alls in the local press concerning the Jersey City school official who threatened to expel any steady daters from the parochial school of which he was the head. A lot of mothers, most apparently non-Catholic, who have willingly professed that they have teenage offspring, have agreed with him. In this case, they're unconcerned with the religious aspect or the severity of the penalty the man, Mr. Carey, can levy; they are simply opposed to going steady among teenagers, no matter what the conditions, and thus look upon Mr. Carey as someone who publicly advocates what they've long maintained. The question, however, is not one of debate among the factions who oppose and favor steady dating among teenagers--but rather the more insubstantial factor of whether or not a totalitarian attitude can be maintained in such an unreasonable manner. The Catholic Church is notorious for inflicting its opinion on others, no matter how illogical, stupid or senseless that opinion may be. I don't believe there is any definite rule that can be applied to the problem of steady dating. Some teenagers possess enough maturity to treat it sensibly, others don't. It's unfair to say that everyone shouldn't--or that everyone should--with no exceptions. When I was in school, I knew an eighteen-year-old girl who was married, and was far wiser, in intellect and determination, than many adults I know.

"Mrs. Murray's vigorous and aggressive attitude against religion may well be distasteful to even atheists, but I still admire her courage and determination in doing what she's doing. She is apparently one of the few people who has discovered what she doesn't like and disagrees with, and is actively seeking to correct the disharmony. I wonder how many others feel precisely as she does in opposing public school prayer, and yet are afraid, unwilling or unable to publicize their opinion.

"It's unfortunate that 'O'Neill's 'Long Days Journey into Night' (his greatest work, beyond a doubt) was cancelled at Baylor because of the presence of profanity, but even this misdeed is partially reconcilable when compared with the crime perpetrated by Embassy pictures, distributor of the film version of the story. Its original running length was close to three hours and it received well deserved praise for the story and stars when it began its limited engagement some time ago. However, Embassy, ever mindful of the quick buck, has booked it on a saturation run, under the deceptively pure motive of giving more people an opportunity to enjoy it. What they've also done is to chop nearly 40 minutes from its original length, in order to accomodate some cheap second feature. I've seen both versions of the picture: uncut it's a masterpiece, cut it's an emasculated version of itself. The public is deliberately not told about the mutilation.

"The thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth amendments freed the Negroes, as Jerome McCann says--on paper. But you don't wipe away many

years of ignorance, injustice and fear by signing an amendment to the Constitution. It makes no difference how many amendments are added to the Constitution providing the Negro with more rights--it's up to us, specifically the ignorant and opinionated southern masses, to change. Prejudice derives chiefly from ignorance and misunderstanding. I can think of no better example of unashamed, gullible, twentieth century ignorance than the drawling southerner who declares that he'll do all in his power to keep the white race from mingling with the 'goddamn n ---- s'. The situation might not be so pathetic if this hypothetical southerner wasn't so unequivocally convinced of the wisdom and right in his convictions.

"Vic Ryan's proposal for alleviating the population problem by reducing the population is not only workable, but it's been in force for over three thousand years. To break the monotony and reduce the number of individuals, sporadic wars are waged irregularly, usually commanded by flat-bottomed generals safely perched in their chairs, directing innocent young men to sacrifice themselves in a vain attempt to prolong civilization by not using up all the available living space so soon. Wars are excellent means of disrupting families, sterilizing individuals, and causing noticeable unemployment and added territory. Eyeing the law of diminishing returns, however, makes me wonder if eventually the cemetery space won't intrude on what's being used as living space. Then, foreseeably, wars will be cut down until a proper balance can be restored." (31 Carr Place, Fords, New Jersey.)

"The mutability of the past is the central tenet of Ingsoc. Past events, it is argued, have no objective existence, but survive only in written records and in human memories. The past is whatever the records and the memories agree upon. And since the Party is in full control of all records, and in equally full control of the minds of its members, it follows that the past is whatever the Party chooses to make it. It also follows that though the past is alterable, it never has been altered in any specific instance. For when it has been recreated in whatever shape is needed at the moment, then this new version is the past, and no different past can ever have existed. This holds good even when, as often happens, the same event has to be altered out of recognition several times in the course of a year. At all times the Party is in possession of absolute truth, and clearly the absolute truth can never have been different from what it is now. It will be seen that the control of the past depends above all on the training of memory. To make sure that all written records agree with the orthodoxy of the moment is merely a mechanical act. But it is also necessary to remember that events happened in the desired manner. And if it is necessary to rearrange one's memories or to tamper with written records, then it is necessary to forget that one has done so. The trick of doing this can be learned like any other mental technique. It is learned by the majority of Party members, and certainly by all who are intelligent as well as orthodox." --George Orwell, in "1984".

SHORT NOTES ON LONG SUBJECTS

On May 7, 1963, municipal elections were held in the city of Baltimore. Theodore R. McKeldin, the Republican candidate, shocked the professional political prophets by winning the election against the impressive opposition of a gaggle of organizations. Mr. McKeldin's plurality was uncomfortably small (108,365-103,741), but even this is a striking victory considering the fact that Democratic registration in the city outnumbers Republican registration 4½-to-1. Mr. McKeldin will

head what is without doubt the most unusual administration in the history of the city. His City Council President is Thomas D'Alesandro III, son of a political kingpin and an Organization Democrat. (The Republican candidate for that office was so badly beaten that no one remembers his name...) The third member of the trinity is Hyman Pressman, who was beaten in the Democratic primary but ended up becoming Comptroller in the general election by running on the Republican slate. It should be an interesting four years...

I don't know how many readers of this periodical share my fascination for knowing what other people read, but this seems an opportune moment to indulge this idiosyncrasy of mine. I am going to list, in no particular order, what I consider to be the ten most interesting books I've ever read. By "interesting" I refer to a number of qualities: well-written, stimulating, enjoyable, thought-provoking, etc. I would be most interested in similar lists from any reader. My particular favorites are:

- "The Meaning of Evolution", by George Gaylord Simpson
- "Generation of Vipers", by Philip Wylie
- "Male and Female", by Margaret Mead
- "Human Society in Ethics and Politics", by Bertrand Russell
- "Republic", by Plato
- "Philosophy", by C. E. M. Joad
- "The Nature of Living Things", by C. Brooke Worth & Robert Enders
- "The Greek Experience", by C. M. Bowra
- "Folkways", by William Graham Sumner
- "After the Seventh Day", by Ritchie Calder

Needless to say, this list is not submitted for criticism, since there is nothing so pointless as an argument over subjective preferences of this sort. You may have read ten (or 10,000) books which you consider vastly more interesting than these, and perhaps three or four years hence this list will be amusing even to me. However, the fact remains that at this time, these are the most interesting books I have ever read. (Interestingly enough, at least two of the books in the list were unfavorably reviewed in this magazine several years ago, when first I read them; but I have since re-read both several times, and they are more enjoyable each time.)

The following entomological information ought to be of especial interest to readers of Kipple:

"The Typographical Error (Lapsus calami), commonly known as a 'typo', is an animalcule commonly found in masses of printed matter. Although lacking mandibles, this creature is capable of inflicting vicious wounds on syntax and grammar. Of particular interest is its fantastic ability to conceal itself. Lapsus has developed the art of camouflage to an even greater degree than the so-called 'mimics' of the insect kingdom. In mimeographed matter, the creature is capable of concealing its presence from even the most studious proofreading, due to an ability to encyst itself in an invisible chrysalis. Metamorphosis occurs immediately after mimeographing, whereupon Lapsus, now grown to tremendous dimensions, eagerly displays itself to even the casual reader. Typographical Errors are a heterogeneous race, occurring in a vast number of different sizes and shapes. Science has as yet discovered no defense against these pests." --Prof. Fyodor von Pauls, in "American Arthropoda", Volume Six.

Right-wing extremists often utilize unfair methods to gain their political ends. John Boardman, who criticizes both the means and the ends of these extremists, advocates unfair methods in dealing with them. And F.M. Busby, who criticizes John for this, uses a method which is unfair by virtue of the fact that he doesn't bother sending John a copy of his attack. I have decided not to bother sending Buz a copy of

this paragraph, so that I may undergo the confusing experience of being accused of using unfair methods in criticizing the unfair methods used in attacking the unfair methods utilized in dealing with the unfair methods of the extreme right...!

Regular readers may now twiddle their thumbs or stare off into space while I explain the tic-marks in the address box to new initiates to our little circle. If a number appears in the upper-right of the address box, it is the number of the last issue you will receive under present circumstances. The letter "C" indicates the presence of a contribution or letter of yours in this issue. A "T" means that we exchange magazines, while "P" indicates your place on my permanent mailing list. The absence of any symbol whatever means that you are receiving this issue for reasons best known to you.

AND I ALSO HEARD FROM:

Ben Orlove, Betty Kujawa, Samuel D. Russell, Madalyn Murray, James Den Boer, Rosemary Hickey, John Boardman, Ron Sverdløve, and Fred Galvin. Appearing next issue in all probability will be such stellar names as Chay Borsella, Vic Ryan, Joe Pilati, and Bill Christian. Can you hardly wait?

May and June are known as the best months for a game called "Musical Apartments", similar in design to the well-known Musical Chairs. As the colleges empty for the summer, Kipple's readers joyfully return to home and hearth. So far, only two have announced the change of address, but I expect a veritable landslide next month. Vic Ryan, as of June 10th or so, returns to the hollow tree he calls home at 2160 Sylvan Road, Springfield, Illinois. And Bernie Morris, who formerly prowled the MIT campus, moves to 22 Hilliard St. (Apt. #1), Cambridge 38, Mass., effective from June to September.

FROM:

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

printed matter only

return requested

may be opened for inspection

handle with abandon

SEND TO

Len Moffatt
10202 Belcher
Downy, Calif.



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