

During the spring and summer of 1958, and again in 1959, I was engaged in collecting and observing various specimens of insect life. I was not in any strict sense a "collector" of insects, since the mounted specimens which generally characterize that activity held no interest for me; instead, I spent my time in the observation of living specimens, which I confined in a screen enclosure in the backyard. During this period I accumulated several notebooks full of laboriously handwritten notes, later editing them into reasonably literate comments. What follows represent more-or-less random excerpts from those comments.

EXCERPTS FROM AN ENTOMOLOGIST'S NOTEBOOKS

"On August 24, the larva of the Monarch butterfly decided to end its carefree infancy and progress to the next stage of its development, and so it set about forming its chrysalis. This milkweed-devouring insect had heretofore been notable primarily for its garish coloration. It is, to my knowledge, the only insect in this area whose protective coloration consists of a series of colors which vividly contrast to the (milkweed) background. A milkweed plant has green leaves and stem, with red and white flowers (occasionally merging as pink or orange). The Monarch larva could be colored in such a way as to blend with these surroundings, but it will have none of this: it has yellow, black and white stripes around the whole of its body, thereby resembling the arthropod equivalent of a tiger. This contrast has quite a utilitarian purpose: feeding entirely on milkweed, the caterpillar (and consequently the mature insect) acquires the bitter, unpleasant taste of that plant. A bird will not often attempt to devour this insect, whose taste is repulsive to them. If the caterpillar had subtler colors, birds might continually kill them without first identifying the creature with its taste. However, their coloration is so uniquely noticeable that even dull-witted birds will recognize it after a few unsuccessful attempts to digest a member of the species, and so give it wide berth. The same holds true for the brightly-colored mature insect.

"Thus, while most caterpillars depend to some extent on blending shades as protective coloration, Monarch's protective coloration is one which makes it considerably easier to spot. The very existence of this creature is of considerable assistance to the camouflage technique of another species: the Viceroy butterfly. In the larval stage, Viceroy is a white caterpillar of unexceptional size which feeds on poplar and willow. It resembles no other caterpillar to any great degree, and it certainly has nothing in common with the Monarch larva. In its adult stage, however, Viceroy is a slightly smaller edition of Monarch, with only minor differences in coloration and pattern. Although any student of entomology can easily differentiate between the two species, birds are not quite so observant; those which have learned from bitter experience that Monarch is not palatable will also avoid Viceroy, although it apparently does not share the former's unpleasant taste.

kipple 41

JUNE 17, 1963

This magazine of comment and opinion is published by Ted Pauls, 1448 Meridene Drive, Baltimore 12, Maryland, for the enjoyment and edification of friends, acquaintances, correspondents and amiable strangers. Copies are available for letters, exchanges with other periodicals, or the cash sum of 20¢ per copy. This august publication is produced by the Greater Baltimore Committee to Draft Barry Goldwater (Into the Congolese Army). WOKL-

"Monarch constructs its small, green chrysalis hanging from the underside of a milkweed leaf by a stem of silk. This stem is constructed first, and the caterpillar hangs from this perch by its hindmost set of false gripping-legs while it binds its body into place with strands of silk. Once this is done the ornate skin is shed and drops to the ground. The larger moths and butterflies also shed their skins in this manner as they prepare to pupate, but in many cases this is done within the privacy of a cocoon or furled leaf. Monarch is not so secretive about this transition, and the entire process is easily observed. Unfortunately, observing and describing are two unrelated acts: the former is not only simpler but also unparalleled for its instructive qualities. Describing these events is extremely difficult, and it is a poor substitute for actually observing the process even if done by a skilled writer. When the skin is shed, Monarch is already covered entirely by the rapidly hardening chitinous covering which will protect it as it engages in the metamorphosis which will eventually bring it to the adult stage. This does not take long in comparison with the majority of moths and butterflies, which spend the winter within these protective shells, since two or three generations of Monarch live and die in one summer and since they do not spend the winter within the chrysalis, but instead migrate southward in the adult form during the fall months.

"The chrysalis is also protectively colored, but in this instance Monarch precisely reverses its previous technique, since the chrysalis is light green and blends perfectly with the milkweed leaf from which it dangles.

"The emergence of the adult insect was observed on September 21, less than one month after the caterpillar had made the transformation from larva to pupa. If it is difficult to describe the process when a caterpillar begins to retire to its cocoon or chrysalis, then it is practically impossible to describe the beauty and fascination of the emergence from this shell of the mature insect. The chrysalis splits down its vertical center, and the creature which emerges hardly resembles a butterfly at all. The wings are folded and crushed close to its sides, and they are as yet very wet. The creature must now obtain a grasp on a solid object and expand the wings, for they will harden as they dry and be irrevocably fixed in whatever shape they are in at that moment. Thus, if the wings are not expanded quickly enough, they will stiffen into useless and deformed appendages. In this case, the Monarch climbed the split chrysalis and the leaf above, finally coming to rest on the stem of the long-dead milkweed plant. The shapeless wings began to move in an exaggerated slow-motion caricature of flight, while gradually they extended as fluid was pumped into the veins running through them. This slow fanning process continued for half an hour as the wings gradually expanded and took shape. They were still damp and the creature could not yet fly, but now the wings stretched to their full span of four inches. They were brilliantly colored orange, with black borders dotted with white and yellow spots. The body of the Monarch was torpedo-shaped, with long, gracefully curved antennae which terminated in knobs. In another fifteen minutes the creature began to flutter impatiently within the cage, so I opened the top and released it. Its initial flight in the freedom of the outside world was weak and hesitant, but after a brief rest on a convenient fence-post, it took off again, more confidently this time, and, gaining strength, it fluttered out of sight."

+++

+++++

+++

"My four specimens of Cecropia moth larva, which had never before left the various twigs and branches which I daily placed in their compartment, suddenly ceased eating on August 27 and began to explore their

cell. I discovered all four crawling over the sides and top of the cage and suspected that the time had come for them to undergo the transition between larvae and pupae. Cecropia normally spins its rather large cocoon on a branch of a wild cherry tree, firmly anchored in place by a great many silken threads. These specimens had no desire to carry on that tradition, however, deciding instead to construct their winter homes in the convenient corners caused by the juncture of wire mesh walls and the top of the cage. This presented a problem. Since the cocoons were being constructed in such a way that they were anchored firmly to both the walls and hinged top of the cage, they would be torn apart whenever the need arose to open the cage. There was no particular reason for me to enter this compartment, but the same hinged top covered four other compartments, some of which contained live insects which must be cleaned and fed. Thinking quickly, I ran into the house and grabbed a staple gun and a handful of cardboard file-cards. Opening the top of the cage, I stapled these cards to the wooden frame, thus forming a 'lip' and creating the sort of corner the caterpillars had been using, but of a somewhat more permanent nature than that caused by the mobile cage top. When I lowered the top, my Cecropia could go about the task of building their winter homes without interfering with the maintenance of the other inhabitants of my little zoo.

"One of the specimens chose to construct its cocoon in a location suitable for close observation, and thus I was given the opportunity to minutely observe the process by which the cocoons were constructed. The insect first anchored itself firmly to the screen side of the cage by its false gripping-legs, detached the six proper legs, and began to swing its head and thorax in a rhythmic arc. A strand of silk so fine as to be invisible except when rays of sunlight reflected from it issued from the mouth of the larva like fishing line being cast from a reel, and this attached itself to the sides and top of the cage (the latter now formed by a row of cardboard cards). Even at close range, it was difficult to observe the manner in which the swaying head spun the cocoon in a circle about itself, first laying the line of silk against the wire mesh and then flinging it above and behind its body. This process continued for an hour and a half before the caterpillar was invisible behind its wall of silk. I briefly debated slitting the cocoon slightly in order to observe the next stages of the creature's metamorphosis, but decided against it, since I didn't wish to do anything which might injure the specimen."

+++

+++++

+++

"The first in a series of notable events during 1959 came not from the fields and woods, but rather from the confines of my cage. On June 3, the only living specimen of Cecropia in my collection emerged from its cocoon. It was a matter of luck that it occurred while I was on hand, and after having witnessed from beginning to end this incredible emergence, I have thanked kind providence time and again for that fortunate stroke. The emergence of Monarch the previous year had hardly been a fitting prelude to this scene, despite that creature's beauty, for an adult Cecropia moth must surely be one of nature's greatest beauties. The moth succeeded in chewing through the bottom of its cocoon, which was spun in the upper left-hand corner of this particular compartment, and laboriously crawled diagonally along the mesh wall. A long-dead branch happened to contact the screen at one point, and Cecropia pulled itself onto this. There was little indication of its beauty in these first moments, for its wings were still crushed against its body and it seemed to be having extreme difficulty obtaining purchase on the limb. Finally, anchoring itself firmly to the branch, it began the truly

tremendous effort necessary to open its huge wings. The moth was evidently using for the first time the newly-created muscles which would control the movements of those leviathan wings, and the effect at first was negligible. Tremors ran through the abdomen of the creature, but gradually a section of wing moved slightly away from the body. Both body and wings were still damp, and the wings were in a highly compact, collapsed state. Gathering its strength for the formidable task, Cecropia began to pump blood into the virgin veins of the wings, expanding them little by little, and eventually the erratic tremors resolved into a rhythmic fanning motion.

"The entire process lasted over an hour, and as more and more of the wing surface was exposed to my eyes, the color pattern began to take shape. It is absolutely impossible to adequately describe the Cecropia, and even detailed paintings or photographs do not fully represent its beauty. I can say that the presence of a great number of scales gives the wings a velvet texture; I can say that the body of this insect is plump, furry and reddish-brown in color, and the head, with large, easily noticeable compound eyes, is complemented by a pair of long, fragile, feathery antennae; I can say that the basic coloration of the wings is chocolate brown, but there are bands and spots of lighter browns, white, red, yellow, black and tan. Even if you have the rare sort of visually-oriented mind which can successfully form a picture of the creature I am describing, you have only the slightest concept of Cecropia's incredible beauty. The colors are richer, more vibrant than any which flow from the artist's brush, and the realization that this creature is alive is beauty of another kind.

"Everyone should view the emergence of such a creature at least once in his life; it is a sight not soon forgotten."

"There are in America from fifteen to twenty million religious fundamentalists who are dedicated to doctrines incompatible with democracy in that they insist upon their prerogatives as first principles. An even larger group feebly follows the trail of fire breathed by these fundamentalists. They are the most dangerous minority we have because they categorically eschew the reasoned judgments of the majority. Democracy properly allows them the right to worship as they choose. It should never have conceded them the right to establish schools. Education is not a function of any church--or even of a city--or a state; it is the function of all mankind." --Philip Wylie, in "Generation of Vipers".

DEREK NELSON COMMENTS ON SCHOOL PRAYER AND LIBERALISM

"In keeping with Kipple's discussion of religion-in-schools, let us take a look at the problem as it presents itself in Ontario. In the public schools (both primary and secondary) there is religion present in one form or another. Up to and including Grade 6, there is religious instruction (I believe half an hour per week) given by the teacher in a manner prescribed by the local school boards and within general guidelines set by the provincial government. In Grades 7 and 8, this policy is continued with the difference that the instruction is given by a minister from one or the other of the major Protestant sects. In high school, the Lord's Prayer and a short Bible reading are the only religion present in the course, and these readings are incorporated in the opening exercises when the national anthems are sung and announcements are given.

"In public school (i.e., Grade 8 and below) attendance is not compulsory, and any parents can have their child leave the room if they wish. Now, many say that there is moral compulsion on the child to at-

tend and this may be true. ({This compulsion, which I would term "social" rather than "moral", very definitely exists and it is a factor in such cases. Most human beings feel embarrassment to varying degrees when they do something frowned upon implicitly or explicitly by a psychologically important group (family, co-workers, bowling team, etc.). To the child, his schoolmates are a very important group, and thus their displeasure, tacit or expressed, is extremely unpleasant to him. This attitude occurs in nearly all men, as I say, but it is particularly pronounced in children and adolescents.}) However, I cannot understand the opposition to the child's attendance from atheists or agnostics, since it is their 'dogma' that the child must decide for himself. This may help him; it certainly won't hinder him, witness the increasing number of non-religious persons in all the Western countries. ({It is my personal view that a child ought to be taught to be an agnostic; that is, to retain an open-minded attitude towards both sides of the question. But even if we grant that most agnostics and atheists want their children to decide for themselves, surely you will agree that this ought to take place only after the child is mature enough to make a reasonable decision. Indoctrinating students in favor of religion from the first grade is not compatible with this alleged aim of "free choice".}) Secondly, Jews, Hindus, etc., can, I feel, remove their children without this vaguely-defined ({see above}) moral pressure acting on them. The only person I remember leaving during religious education in public school was in Grade 5. We thought it was strange, naturally, but that was it. ({Pardon me if I remark that you must have a truly exceptional memory, to be able to recall your feelings toward a fellow student in the fifth grade.}) I remember wishing I could leave too, for religious education bored most of us to tears. We didn't beat him up after school or brand crosses on his forehead or anything similar; in fact, if I remember correctly, it soon became weekly routine and we forgot all about it. ({As I hope I succeeded in showing above, the social compulsion is not necessarily directed deliberately from the group to the dissenter, but rather exists independently within the dissenter as a result of the group.})

"As for the Lord's Prayer in high school, it doesn't worry me in the least. I didn't say it--that would be hypocritical--but I didn't support the band of LRYers who walked out because they refused to stand during the recitation. I told them it was a ridiculous matter, which put me (as usual) in an almost non-existent minority, who, for example, opposed an LRY resolution which wanted to abolish religious education in the schools. I don't think the religious liberals were being very liberal. And, on the other hand, the general reaction of the Christians I know to the LRY action was 'Who cares?' or simple laughter. As I mentioned a few issues ago, they didn't have to attend during the opening exercises, which solved the problem.

"The only really sensible objection I have heard to religious education, etc., was voiced by Enid Jacobs, who said that 'acceptance... implies a tacit approval on the part of the school, the community and the government for the concept of theism.' I mulled over this for quite a time until it suddenly struck me that the so obvious answer to this is that 'the school, the community and the government' already think this way and attacking them just reinforces their belief. (Note that I am not saying, by implication, that there should be no opposition to school prayers because it will make theists mad.) ({"It is hard to escape the suggestion," says Pierre Berton, "that religious education in Ontario proceeds from the smug assumption that what's good for the large Protestant churches is good for everybody."})

"And to correct a few mistaken impressions which people have acquired about my views: First, I have no argument against the original

Supreme Court decision banning state-written prayers as unconstitutional, because they probably are. I doubt that the Lord's Prayer can be classified as an establishment of religion, but I'll wait and see what the Court says. Second, I oppose legal compulsion to attend religious education.

"In Canada there is no law against establishment of religion or anything else, so there can be no opposition on legal grounds. The only way to stop it is by applying pressure to the provincial government, and I doubt that will work. And you know something, I really don't care.

"Re #39: You say you're astonished by my comments; that's extremely interesting, as your 'answers' astonished me as much, if not more.

"I was under the impression that the topic under discussion was the Welfare State, and all my comments were directed toward that particular form and portion of society and no other part. I said nothing about racial equality, freedom of speech for Hall or Rockwell, or any of the other things you mention in your retort. Therefore, I consider them irrelevant within the context of my remarks. I accused you of nothing; in particular, I did not accuse you of stifling the right to dissent, especially the right of free speech or the rights of other dissenters. I repeat: I was dealing with the loss of freedom to dissent in regard to the Welfare State. (Despite the fact that your letter was concerned entirely with the Welfare State, the final paragraph nevertheless appeared to me to be a blanket accusation: "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." (Underlining mine.) Even in the context of a previous discussion of Welfare Statism, this paragraph appears to be a general conclusion, and thus my misinterpretation ought to be at least partially understandable.)) 'Most liberals and socialists seem to have the idea that equality by compulsion is a desirable end in itself.' Let me emphasize: 'Most liberals...seem...' I purposely phrased it this way since I know that not all leftists agree on 'equality by compulsion'; you, for one, seem in opposition to compulsory social security. Compulsion is an integral part of the majority of liberal and socialist social security welfare schemes (by saying social security I'm excluding here such things as free food to the unemployed, winter works programs, etc.), and by forcing everyone to be members of these plans, what else can this be but a denial of the right to dissent? My observation has been that equality (economic? social? neither one by itself, but perhaps a mishmash of elements of both) is to be the end product of such compulsion. If you know another reason for restricting freedom in such a way, please let me know. If I agree with you I'll gladly withdraw the phrase. (The "end product" of social security, medical care, and other programs appears from where I sit to be the levying of a minimum standard. If individual A reaches the age of 65 with ten million dollars in the bank, fine; but individual B, less successful in business ventures, will at least be assured of a small monthly income. If individual A retains three dozen specialists during a bout with influenza, fine; but individual B must at least have access to minimum medical attention. Neither of these specific programs, typical of the Welfare State measures you condemn, seek to equalize the populace, economically or socially; their purpose is simply to insure a minimum standard in their respective fields, a goal no less necessary than a minimum wage.)) (The argument that not everyone will subscribe to social security but that many of the same people will expect such social security anyway cuts no ice with me. Support of parasites and those who can't pay is better than the loss of a little freedom.)

"To bring this whole question into the realm of party politics, let's examine what in all probability will be the big issue in Ontario's next provincial election: a pre-paid medical health insurance plan, i.e., Medicare. The Progressive Conservative Party (conservative), which forms the government, is going to bring in a comprehensive medical health scheme, voluntary for both patient and doctor, and in conjunction with private- and doctor-operated plans now existing. The Liberal Party (liberal), on the other hand, while leaving the doctors the right to choose whether or not to be a member, advocates a plan that is both compulsory and universal for the potential patients (i.e., me). The New Democratic Party (socialist) agrees with the latter point in the Liberal plan, but wants to conscript the doctor as well (as they tried to do in Saskatchewan), as an added insult.

"Now, I'll be damned if I can see why I should be forced to join the government plan of the Liberal or New Democratic parties, when the same result can be brought about just as effectively on a voluntary basis. The Conservative plan is workable, less costly, and equally as efficient (at least...), not to mention a damn sight less restrictive of freedom, than either of the other plans. Of all the liberals and socialists I know, only a few of the former are out of sympathy with the compulsion aspect of their Party's programs. This--plus the fact that liberals instigated and maintained compulsory social security in the United States--led me to the conclusion that equality is the reason for compulsion.

"My point in suggesting that you will support Medicare was just an example (I said 'for instance') of how the liberal or socialist continually comes up with a new welfare scheme to 'help' people. (Proof of this, if any is needed, lies in the progression of 'duties' that leftists advocate the government must perform, and as expressed through the campaign literature of the CCF-NDP and Liberal Party for the last quarter century. For as soon as one plan is accepted, another pops up to take its place. As Mackenzie King said, 'Socialists are just liberals in a hurry.') The whole point of my mentioning this is to oppose your contention that it is an absurdity to believe that the Welfare State will lead to socialism.

"I personally can see no destination or end for the Welfare State but 'cradle-to-grave' security. And this is certainly socialism. Granted, it is Bernsteinian 'democratic' socialism, and not Marxist Communism, but the socialist state has a far greater potential of easily controlling its members and dictating to them than has the capitalist or welfare state society. (The solution to this "potential", of course, is to see that it doesn't materialize, not to halt all social progress out of fear as to what may possibly occur. I suppose there must have been at least one Derek Nelson in the group of cave-dwellers who first learned to make and use fire. "Leave it alone," he must have warned; "it is potentially dangerous, and, anyway, we can get along just fine without it." This is an inexact parable, but the target is clearly enough the overly cautious attitude which dictates, "It might be dangerous, so let's not try it." This is a useful attitude in many ways, but, if I may perpetuate a cliché, not one compatible with progress.)

"It was sloppy phrasing on my part that produced a refutation of something you never said. However, I thought it was an obvious conclusion that the welfare state (liberal variety) does lead to government controls which could lead to a dictatorial society.

"Concerning federal aid to education: No, I was not aware that you proposed that 'no one force the states to take money they don't want', even taking into account your one difference of opinion. You said: 'If the states or cities shirk the responsibility of providing

for the education of their own children, then it is obvious that some other agency must usurp that function. The federal government is the logical agency for this purpose...' (underlining mine). My dictionary defines 'usurp' as 'to take possession of by force without right; to oust, supplant'.

"I may be reading your signals wrong, but this and the whole tone of your last few paragraphs suggests that even if the states will not give aid to education, then you'll have the federal government do it regardless of state wishes. I think the states should accept the money, but once again--and of supreme importance--I'll be damned if I'll force it down their throats; because I resent having the government compel me to join their social security plans; and particularly because 'the petty politicians and fulminating advocates of State's Rights' are elected by the people of the state themselves, the electors being the ones with the children to be educated.

"Besides, would you refrain from pushing federal aid to education on an unwilling state if the people voted against it in a referendum (hypothetical, since I do not support direct democracy)? I note the lines, 'but the voters who turn down appropriations for education are apparently incapable of this foresight. But because it is the future adult generation, not the present voting generation which is harmed, it is not only unfortunate, but grossly criminal, to allow this situation to continue.' Am I wrong in deducing from this that you would not allow the situation to continue if you had any power over it? (The pitfalls of writing a rebuttal off the top of my head, combined with my natural aversion to advocacy of compulsion, produced what you perceptively attack as a disorganized evasion, rather than the straightforward reply your argument deserved. This is inexcusable, and I apologize most sincerely. Basically, I advocate federal aid to education in order to alleviate conditions in which individual states are unable to provide sufficient funds. However, as you correctly surmised from my earlier comments, I am prepared as a last resort to compell states to accept the aid of the federal government, even over the protests of the voters. This is, you will note, rather more drastic than my proposals on other facets of the "socialistic" program advocated by the majority of liberals. I oppose mandatory social security, as you know, and, to give another example, I believe that any extensive medical care program should be strictly voluntary. But in the field of education, another dimension is added which is lacking in most Welfare State proposals: those persons directly concerned (viz., the children) are both legally and intellectually incapable of asserting their preference. Since it appears obvious that it is desirable that these children be educated to the best of our ability, I believe that the federal government (as the logical agency for the purpose) should provide the funds for this venture if local governments refuse to do so. As a last resort, this should be done over the protests of the local populace. I dislike this concept, but I dislike even more the idea that the voting populace of an area has the right to decide that politically-helpless children can or should be deprived of the best education which we can provide. I do not believe that this step would be necessary, however, since I feel that, given the facts, the local voters would request federal aid rather than deprive their own children of an adequate education. But if, in extreme cases, they refused to do this, I regretfully maintain that the federal government has a right--or, rather, a duty--to step in and perform the necessary function. You will no doubt consider this entire argument an example of Creeping Socialism, but at least I won't need to apologize again for equivocating and conspicuously evading the issue.) To give a specific example, take Quebec. They have taken federal aid for universities, I believe, but refuse it for all other branches of

education. Should they be forced to accept it, remembering that Quebec is one of the poorest of the provinces from an educational point of view? I say no." (If Quebec is sufficiently "poor" in educational facilities that a large number of its children suffer second-rate educations, the province should be legally compelled to accept aid from the national government in order to alleviate this situation. All other possible solutions to the problem should be examined first, but if no workable alternative is found, I would certainly favor intervention by national authorities.) (18 Granard Blvd., Scarborough, Ontario, Canada.)

"The ex-Jacobin became the prompter of the anti-Jacobin reaction in England. Directly or indirectly, his influence was behind the Bills Against Seditious Writings and Traitorous Correspondence, the Treasonable Practices Bill, and the Seditious Meetings Bill (1792-1794), the defeats of parliamentary reform, the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, and the postponement of the emancipation of England's religious minorities for the lifetime of a generation. Since the conflict with revolutionary France was 'not a time to make hazardous experiments', the slave trade, too, obtained a lease on life--in the name of liberty.

"In quite the same way our ex-Communist, for the best of reasons, does the most vicious things. He advances bravely in the front rank of every witch hunt. His blind hatred of his former ideal is leaven to contemporary conservatism. Not rarely he denounces even the mildest brand of the 'welfare State' as 'legislative Bolshevism'. He contributes heavily to the moral climate in which a modern counterpart to the English anti-Jacobin reaction is hatched. His grotesque performance reflects the impasse in which he finds himself. The impasse is not merely his--it is part of a blind alley in which an entire generation leads an incoherent and absent-minded life." --Isaac Deutscher, in "Russia in Transition".

TOM SEIDMAN HAS A FEW THOUGHTS ON PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION

"Perhaps the first step in looking at the educational process should be to decide (1) what we might hope to accomplish by it, and (2) what are the restrictions within which we must work. In order to answer (1) satisfactorily would require some consideration as to what sort of society we want in general--which starts to take us a bit far afield. Let us begin, however arbitrarily, with some assumptions:--

"I) Individuals come to the school system with innate differences in ability (not just 'IQ', but a considerable variety of physical and mental characteristics) and temperament.

"II) They start out with a variety of backgrounds--due to differences in their parents' attitudes, abilities, jobs, religions (or lack thereof), socio-economic status, race, culture (e.g., national origin), etc.

"III) For each individual there will be a considerable range (combination) of jobs, interests, skills for which he or she is potentially suited (in the sense of providing him with both a livelihood and a 'full' life as well as making whatever contribution to society may be possible).

"IV) Given a rapidly developing world, changing technology, etc., even if we had all possible information about the child (and this can only be estimated by tests and observation over a considerable period) it would still be impossible to predict with certainty what jobs, for example, will be available. For instance, it is estimated that the 'half-life' of an engineering (specialty) education is about ten years--

that's about how long it takes for half the things (facts and techniques) he's learned to become obsolete; math teachers are now having considerable problems with the introduction of the so-called 'new mathematics'; even home cooking has been transformed by the availability of all sorts of frozen foods, etc.

"V) We assume a set-up not radically different from the present one--no taking kids away at birth to be brought up in crèches, for instance.

"VI) We must work with severely limited resources--limited funds, limited tools (there is a big shortage of good textbooks in various fields--'good' by any standard), limited supply of personnel. There is, heaven help us, almost an absence of good teachers--which, for me, means that (a) they know something, (b) they can present it so students can understand it, and (c) they have enough enthusiasm to get the kids to appreciate the material and want to learn it. This, I think, is a function of the teacher and depends little on his nominal 'philosophy of education'--an understanding and enthusiastic teacher can teach anything, anything he knows, whether by 'traditional' or 'progressive' methods, while an incompetent or bored 'teacher' will get nothing across, again regardless of method.

"VII) Parents generally get the school systems they deserve--if parents won't let a school introduce 'homogeneous grouping' (i.e., separation of 'faster' and 'slower' students) to permit variation in teaching, then you're going to have teachers restricting their attention to the average (who make up maybe 35 out of the 40 in the class with two or three bright and two or three idiots) and encysting in dullness the student who might otherwise disrupt the class. But then, given a choice (and the choice is often just that) between giving one's attention to the bright child, while 90% of the class is 'snowed' or ignored, or vice versa, what should one do? (Not that homogeneous grouping solves all problems either--it's generally impractical except for rather large school systems and there is always the problem of who decides--and how--on the groups.)

"Enough 'assumptions'--there are actually two comments on which I'd like to concentrate:

"A) Most of the abuses of 'progressive education' (like most of the abuses of 'traditional education') are just that--abuses, rather than fundamental weaknesses implicit in the philosophy. For example, from the very reasonable proposition that 'An individual must learn to function in a world of other people and the school situation will, inevitably, affect his development of techniques for handling group situations', one can go (by a natural, albeit incorrect chain of plausible 'reasoning') to the dubious proposition that 'It is part of the function of the school to "teach" students how to "get along with people"; and from this (equating 'handling group situations' or 'making oneself effective in interpersonal relations' with 'getting along with people' and, thence, with 'avoiding friction') the pernicious doctrine which you assumed an intrinsic part of progressive education: that 'The student must learn to avoid conflict, to conform to the dominant values of his society, to avoid even the appearance of "being different" (e.g., in attitudes or intelligence or interests), to immerse himself in the "large whole" of the group; and, furthermore, that it is the (major-most important) function of the schools to "socialize" students in this way.' This damnably insidious chain of plausible 'reasoning' receives added 'confirmation' from another leitmotif of the 'American philosophy'--we believe that part of democracy is the concept of egalitarianism. The proposition that 'All men are created equal' was originally an expression of a belief in equal rights, not equal abilities. We may believe that one unborn baby is the equal (in potentiality) of any other

and therefore resent an established inequality based on irrelevancies (this is the key word--we would object to the establishment of the red-headed as an elite just as surely as to an establishment based on descent; the liberal does object to inequalities based on 'race, color, creed, or national origin') and yet feel that we must admit the relevancy of such qualities as intelligence. (It is, of course, a matter of our set of values which makes us see these differences as significant while denying the significance of, e.g., skin color--this is a value which is no longer universally accepted even among the intelligentsia--though it would take us too far afield to go into the present 'Cult of the Irrational' in the arts and even in philosophy and historical theory. The resentment of the intellectual and of 'reason', the deification of that variety of 'horse-sense' which is systematic short-sightedness, the xenophobic persecution of the un-understood has long been prevalent in our society and should not surprise us when it appears in the educational establishment, however much we may disapprove.) (Cf. the comment above in (VII) re 'homogeneous grouping', parents' reaction to.)

"B) Having impressed myself with the argument of proposition (IV) above, I'd like to argue that the 'Rickover Proposal' (to re-introduce an emphasis on 'facts' in the schools) is a mistake. While the idea of 'teaching the child, not geography (or arithmetic or history or grammar or...)' lends itself far too easily to abuse, it would seem that the important things to teach are (a) a few elementary techniques--the standard '3 R's' of reading (how to extract information from print), writing (how to communicate effectively--which includes organization and logic as well as grammar and spelling) and arithmetic (enough, say, to handle money--which can get pretty tricky with instalment-buying, etc.), (b) a generalized approach to problem-solving (recognizing and formulating a problem, knowing how to learn whatever special techniques or information may be required), (c) a recognition that all techniques are provisional, all propositions tentative, almost all systems complex and only-too-easily over-simplified (but recognizing the value of the 'engineering approximation'), and all decisions, judgments, commitments are made in the face of a possibility that they may be wrong and can only be justified as 'in terms of what we now know this is the most likely course of action to achieve our goals', and (d) some appreciation of our 'roots'--our history and culture." (1720 15th Ave., Seattle 22, Washington.)

"Man is always ready to die for an idea, provided that idea is not quite clear to him." --Paul Eldridge.

JOHN TRIMBLE DISCUSSES EDUCATION IN CALIFORNIA

"Re Progressive Education, Dr. Max Rafferty, and the California Public Schools: Dr. Rafferty's election was fought by strong liberal forces all the way, as he'd been tagged as being ultra-right wing (just to the left of the John Birch Society). No matter what his personal politics, however, Dr. Rafferty is proving to be a very able and capable administrator, engaged in fulfilling his promise of more emphasis on fundamental educational standards at the expense of the social adjustment hogwash. A number of liberals of my acquaintance--the rational thinkers among them--who opposed Dr. Rafferty vehemently in November are beginning to regard his election as a lucky fluke.

"Not directly connected to Dr. Rafferty's election, but springing from similar feelings, is the recent action of the state legislature which redefined the basis for obtaining a teachers credential in this state. They have trimmed back the 'how-to-teach' courses (three units

of audio-visual, three units of elementary basic weaving techniques, etc.--I'm being facetious, to some extent) which an elementary teaching major would have to have from 45! to a mere 12, for instance. This is largely the result of lobbying on the part of the American Federation of Teachers.

"However, the AFT is opposed by the older, progressive education oriented California Teachers Association. The CTA is run by a bunch of 'how-to-teach' course enthusiasts--many of whom are school administrators; Dr. Rafferty has his work cut out for him!--and they managed to reach a sort of impasse in the legislature with the AFT forces. And as a result of the solids pushed into the program by the AFT lobbyists, opposed by the education courses backed by the CTA people, it now takes five years to gain a full teaching credential (i.e., permanent), where it formerly took only four. This is somewhat discouraging to someone at my level of education who's aiming for a teaching credential. One ray of light, however; a recent ruling has made it possible to get a provisional credential after four years, with the fifth year having to be picked up within five years after the person commences teaching. This impresses me as a potentially good idea: get the new teacher in the habit of going to school still further after he's begun to teach, and you stand a good chance of having a much higher percentage of teachers in your schools with MAs and/or PhDs. You also have a lower percentage of the kind of teacher who completes his basic education, begins to teach, and stops learning at precisely that moment. I can still vividly remember the ones of the latter type which it was my unpleasant fate to endure." (5734 Parapet St., Long Beach 8, California.)

"Democracy is wrong in many of its current aspects and under some current definitions, but democracy is the only political ideology which can be made to embrace an ethically good society by the standards of ethics here maintained. Laissez faire capitalism, or any other societal activity that promotes or permits selfish or unfair utilization of some individuals by others, is obviously wrong by these standards. Capitalism, not further restricted, is perfectly consistent with authoritarianism or totalitarianism and is of course wrong if involved in either of those morally wrong systems. In a socialized democracy, controlled capitalism without improper exploitation may be ethically good. Majority rule is wrong if it involves suppression or oppression of any minority, but decision of problems by all those affected by them, accompanied by free expression of all opinions and full preservall of minority rights is, so far as has yet been demonstrated, the only possible ethically good means of reaching collective action." --George Gaylord Simpson, in "The Meaning of Evolution".

RACE RELATIONS: THE LOCAL PICTURE

Maryland, an otherwise prosaic territory, is an anomaly in the sphere of race relations. Long categorized in the convenient pigeon-hole as a "border state", Maryland, in its general attitude toward the cause of racial brotherhood, combines features commonly identified with the Deep South with those more easily associated with the liberal North. Thus, in many parts of the state the pendulum swings to and fro, often resulting in unusual mixtures of ignorance and enlightenment brought together in the same incident. Cambridge, a small community on this state's Eastern Shore peninsula, has been the scene of ardent demonstrations by integrationists for several years, occasionally erupting in violent encounters between demonstrators, police officers, and citizens of the rural area. These drawling aborigines are, at their worst, com-

parable to the rednecks of Alabama or Mississippi. Amidst this atmosphere of Southern fried bigotry, an occasional gleaming light shines. Recently, a group of young demonstrators acting under the auspices of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee were arrested after staging a sit-in demonstration and charged with offenses ranging from mere disorderly conduct to attempting to incite riot and assaulting police officers. But Judge W. Laird Henry, of the Dorchester County Circuit Court, refused to allow the the more serious charges, and fifty-four integrationists were therefore tried on charges of disorderly conduct. Judge Henry found them guilty, but showed himself to be atypical of Dorchester County authorities by imposing (suspended) fines of one-cent per individual.

Unfortunately, most racial incidents in this sovereign state do not likewise present cause for optimism. On the less pleasant side, there have been three shooting incidents of a definite racial flavor in rural areas of Maryland in the last month. In the first, two Negro men were wounded, one seriously, by a shotgun blast fired from a passing automobile as they walked along a road leading to their homes. Both are residents of Denton, another Eastern Shore community noted for its preponderance of "plain, simple country folk". Two white men, who had earlier been noticed cruising through the Negro neighborhood in their automobile, were apprehended, and a shotgun was found in the car. They have not, to my knowledge, been formally charged, and no further news of this incident has appeared in the local press. According to the original newspaper accounts, State Police "tended to discount the incident" as having any particular racial significance."

Two weeks later, the home of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph McCready, several miles southwest of Cambridge, was riddled with shotgun pellets apparently fired from a passing automobile. The incident occurred at 10:30 PM, several hours after Timothy McReady, age 14, had answered the telephone only to have an anonymous male caller contemptuously accuse him of being a "black n----" and then hang up. There has been no indication that the police are making any progress in apprehending the culprit(s) in this case.

More recently, a Negro family in Linthicum, Maryland, has been terrorized by spiritual brethren of Ross Barnett and his ilk. The children of Mr. and Mrs. John Chesley were playing in their front yard when an automobile bearing three young white men rolled to a stop in front of the house. The occupants of the vehicle observed the children silently for a few moments, then began to make vulgar comments alluding to the race of the Chesley youngsters. These innocent children were given a harsh initiation into the realities of a social order which penalizes certain individuals as a result of an irrelevant biological characteristic. Finally Costello Jackson, a resident in the Chesley household, chased the interlopers. The automobile returned half an hour later, drove slowly past the house, but did not stop. However, at 5:00 AM the next morning, the calm of a spring morning was suddenly shattered by the sound of firearms discharging; five bullets were fired at the home, penetrating a window and a rear door and damaging two automobiles parked in the driveway. This contemptible action was compounded by what must at the very least be described as conspicuous procrastination on the part of the local constabulary. These authorities were notified of the incident early Sunday morning, at which time the Chesleys furnished them with the license number of the automobile which had earlier parked in front of their home. No action whatever was taken until Tuesday afternoon, more than 48 hours after the incident occurred; the County Detective Bureau was not notified by local authorities until Tuesday, and no attempt was made to locate the owner of the automobile until then. When that gentleman, a resident of the neighborhood in which the Chesleys

• reside, was finally apprehended, he was briefly interrogated and then released. Local authorities are still attempting to locate his two companions.

A ludicrous note was added when Police Chief Edward King tendered what must be the standard comment in incidents of this sort: "I do not believe the shooting to have been of any special racial significance."

No partial report of Maryland's racial situation could be given without devoting at least a few words to the equal public accommodations law which has been in the offing for some time. On the credit side, it may be said that this measure, when it becomes law, will represent the first such bill enacted south of the Mason-Dixon line. However, Maryland may never taste the heady wine of pride in leading the South toward a new era of enlightenment, for the bill is in grave danger of being delayed an additional $1\frac{1}{2}$ years. Since it was proposed several years ago, the concept of an equal accommodations law has been viciously attacked by segregationist elements in Maryland. Although they have not succeeded in killing it altogether, the measure has been wounded, maimed, castrated and muzzled in the legislative houses of the state for the past year. What has emerged from this meat grinder is a pitiful measure indeed, covering a few essential businesses, failing to prohibit segregation in others, and applying to less than half of the state (due to a provision in the State Constitution which allows counties to exempt themselves from any measure they happen to dislike...). Poor though it may be, however, it is preferable to the existing state of public accommodations in Maryland. But even this emasculated ordinance is in danger of further delay, a fate little better than death considering the tenseness of the racial situation in many areas. It seems that a rabidly segregationist group, the Maryland Petition Committee, accompanied by a gaggle of lesser groups (including an organization affiliated with the White Citizens Councils), decided to collect petitions demanding that the law be repealed pending a referendum. The structure of Maryland law is such that only 23,000 signatures are necessary to force this measure to referendum. This in itself is not damaging, since I am certain that the voting populace will support this minimum public accommodations bill, but unfortunately the issue will not come to a vote until November, 1964; until then, Maryland has no public accommodations law. The legality of the petitions is in some doubt, and Hyman Pressman, Baltimore's fiery comptroller, has been retained by several civic organizations to fight the delaying tactic. Mr. Pressman has announced his intention to take the issue to court. Pending further developments, however, Maryland's considerable body of segregationists has succeeded in prolonging an intolerable situation months or even years.

Maryland, proclaimed by its motto "The Free State". Yeah...

"Superstition...is usually a slipshod term to describe someone else's religion." --Raymond Firth, in "Human Types"

MARTY HELGESEN COMMENTS ON RELIGION

"I question whether Denver Farley's statement that atheism takes away the basis for morality is meant to imply that an atheist is necessarily less moral than a theist in his personal life. Theistic morality basically judges something to be immoral if it is contrary to the will of God. ({This is necessarily an inept premise, even assuming the existence of God, since there is no objective standard for determining God's will. During the Crusades, remember, "God's will" inspired and justified both sides...}) If this is ignored there is not much left.

This is shown in your quotation from Bertrand Russell in which the only moral objection to genocide he offers is the feeling that objecting to it is qualitatively different from objecting to oysters. (The quotation from Lord Russell is excerpted from a discussion of the specific place of subjectivism in ethics, and is not to be taken as an indication that genocide can be opposed on no other grounds. My philosophy opposes genocide on two basic premises: (1) that all human life possesses intrinsic value, and therefore the destruction of one individual or group by another individual or group is immoral; (2) that it is unjust (and hence immoral) for an individual or group to be penalized in any manner by another individual or group on the irrelevant basis of race, religion, nationality, ad infinitum. Neither of these premises (and they are separate and distinct--the first applying to genocide, the second to the segregation, deportation, internment in concentration camps, and general deprivation of civil liberties which, in Nazi Germany, was the prelude to genocide) needs to be justified by recourse to "the will of God".)

"You jump to several conclusions in the case of the Jersey City parochial school which banned steady dating, a particularly unwise practice in view of the apparently garbled press coverage. I doubt very much that the four students were 'requested' to leave merely for disagreeing with the edict. No mention was made of the words or actions used to express their objections, although this information is essential in judging who was right. To push your strained analogy even further, a person who expressed his objections to capital punishment by murdering judges who imposed it would probably himself be executed, but not for daring to dissent. (Since, as you say, no mention was made of the words or actions by which the students expressed their opposition, I am probably not justified in assuming their protest to have been mild. But why do you swing to the opposite position of apparently believing that their protest was couched in terms or actions analogous to "protesting capital punishment by murdering judges who impose it"?)

"I say that the press coverage seems garbled because of the quotation attributed to Father Carey. He allegedly said that some kids are 'committing sins without knowing it'. This is impossible. According to Catholic theology it is impossible to be guilty of a sin unless the act in question is done deliberately or knowingly; one cannot sin accidentally or through ignorance.

"No, Ted, pregnancy out of wedlock is not in itself sinful. The sin is in the pre-marital intercourse which produced the pregnancy. It would have been just as sinful if, through chance, no pregnancy had occurred. Subsequent marriage does not affect this fact; it will legitimize the baby but not the act which produced him. (Needless to say, this moral code is totally alien to my way of thinking. I am opposed to children born out of wedlock, on the grounds that it is improper to subject children to the social ostracization and/or persecution which will, in some circles, be their lot. This is a fault of society, however, and not of the "illegitimate" individual. To me, the marital state of an individual's biological parents at the time of his conception is of no greater relevance than his religion or skin color. If the tendency of society to penalize individuals for these irrelevant factors were to disappear, I would have no further objection to "illegitimacy". My view of pre-marital intercourse is comparable. Aside from two practical objections (the possibility of venereal diseases or pregnancy) which modern medical technology is presently wiping out, I can see no reasonable objection--and certainly no moral objection--to pre-marital sex relations. So long as no third party is injured, two individuals ought to be allowed to enjoy themselves in whatever way they wish.)

"I do not think that religion would be 'established', as the word

has traditionally been used and as Madison used it, if government funds were made available to church related schools. When Madison was a member of the First Congress, which approved the First Amendment, he was on the joint committee which set up the chaplain's system in Congress. Furthermore, during his presidency he used federal funds to pay chaplains for Congress and for the armed services and to support missionaries to the Indians. From this it appears that he would not agree with your interpretation of his amendment.

"I see no reason why support should not be made available to schools operated by the minority religions you mention and to such groups as the Ethical Culture Society, which already operates its own schools. ((The only possible equitable program for such government assistance would be one which granted equal financial aid to each and every group that wished to operate a school (including, of course, atheists). While certainly fair, I do not believe this program to be desirable; it would merely tend to codify by government intervention the institution by which the mind of the child is channelled toward the specific doctrine dictated by his immediate environment (i.e., the beliefs of his parents). I would prefer a social system in which a child is allowed to decide for himself his religion or lack thereof, and not bombarded with propaganda for the sect of his parents' choice. This possibility lies somewhere in the rarified upper-reaches of utopia, given the quite understandable position of parents who wish to rear their offspring in their own religion. But under current conditions, the pattern is loose enough to allow many children to throw off the effects of this parental conditioning. Under the program of aid-to-private-education that you propose, the pattern of what may metaphorically be termed "religious inheritance" would tend to tighten and become rigidly systematized. This is only one disadvantage to such a program, but it is one which has not previously been discussed in these pages.)) It is possible that the voters would not agree with me, but I thought that discussions in Kipple generally emphasized what ought to be done in the interest of justice rather than what can be done considering politics and prejudices. ((Excepting a few pseudo-scholarly articles on philosophy, the majority of the discussions in this magazine relate to what ought to be done to resolve realistic situations in a just manner. Justice is always paramount, with practical politics a poor second, as you say, but it is always wise to bear in mind what is possible, as well as what is proper. Your program is a just one (inasmuch as any system which decides the religion of intellectually-helpless children is just), but at the same time we must bear in mind that due to the structure of our form of government it must be approved by "representatives of the people" before it can pass into law. This I account improbable. Therefore, even if we were agreed as to its desirability, the discussion would be academic, at best. (Similarly, the immediate solution to Asia's over-population problem is to have copious quantities of nutritious food drop from the sky at six-hour intervals. You will forgive me if I do not devote space to the discussion of this phenomenon, however, on the grounds that fantasy does not concern this periodical.))

"I agree that persecution is wrong whatever the number of people being persecuted. However, we are not talking about persecution, but merely government recognition of religion. You do not like government recognition of religion as opposed to irreligion, but the only alternative is government recognition of irreligion as opposed to religion. Establishing irreligion (as a general term for related theological views such as atheism, agnosticism, secularism, etc.) would be as unconstitutional as establishing religion. ((I do not enjoy seeing agnosticism categorized with atheism even under the very general heading of "irreligion". It is my view that a government, to be just, must assume the

philosophy of agnosticism, as against either theism or atheism. If the civic community recognizes the validity of one above the other, the stage is set for the sort of social and economic discrimination which usually characterizes communities firmly committed to the tenets of a single theological philosophy--and I would certainly describe this as "persecution", however mild. Innumerable examples of this could be put forth, drawn from the entire history of civilization, and I'm certain that you are well acquainted with these abuses. Placing the prestige of the government behind theism does not itself constitute persecution, just as placing the prestige of the government behind the beliefs of a specific sect does not itself constitute persecution; but in both cases government recognition (and the concomitant implication, preference) constitutes the initial step in an inevitable process which leads to persecution (of non-believers, in the first instance, and of "infidels"--that is, persons whose theistic beliefs differ from those of the dominant sect--in the second).) As several recent correspondents have pointed out, a religion does not have to acknowledge a God. There is a difference between respecting the rights of a minority and letting the minority rule. It is proper to excuse a Jehovah's Witness from saluting the flag; but it would be wrong to ban the flag salute so that a Jehovah's Witness would not feel uncomfortable. Or perhaps you do not agree. Perhaps, seeing a parallel to the school prayer controversy, you feel that it should be banned to prevent 'persecution'. If so, how far will you take this? Should the Supreme Court ban meat on Fridays so that Catholics do not feel persecuted? Or meat every day so that Vegetarians feel free? (There is no real parallel here. The issue at stake in the school prayer controversy is whether or not the government has a right to legislate theism, an issue which is conspicuously absent from the three examples you give. To deal with them briefly: I do not object to the existence of the flag salute (although my personal opinion is that it is fairly pointless), but I would very definitely object if the federal government issued a proclamation implying that anyone who failed to salute the flag was un-American. I do not think that the existence of meat on Fridays is a threat to Catholic theology, but I would most certainly protest a campaign by the government to promote the eating of meat on that day (with the necessary assumption that there was something a bit "odd" about people who refused to eat meat on Friday--the assumption now applied to students who refuse to recite prayers in the classroom). And, of course, I would object to official recognition of meat-eating as something praiseworthy and patriotic, with the obvious implication that vegetarians were neither. By this time you probably understand my basic thesis: people differ in many respects, and whenever the government commits its formidable power and prestige to a specific position in the arena of opinion, the non-believers of that particular opinion are necessarily injured.)

"Steve Stiles: People have been gleefully predicting the death of Christianity ever since a small group of Jewish leaders thought they could end the problem by crucifying a rabble rousing ex-carpenter. Their perennial disappointment is explained by a statement he made to his followers several weeks after his execution, 'Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.' (To a non-believer, the phrase "...a statement he made...several weeks after his execution..." is uproariously funny. I'm not saying he couldn't have, mind you, only that the statement is humorous when casually dropped in the context of this discussion.)

"I'm skeptical of the news clipping from Minneapolis quoted in #39. If Father Schneider has ordered his people not to return copies of the book, why is he returning the copy in his possession instead of destroying it? And how many hundreds of copies of the book did the library

buy that he thought it necessary to order all his parishoners not to return it? What are they all doing with copies out, anyway? If it were reported that he ordered them not to take it out of the library I would be less skeptical. As it is, the story is inconsistent with itself, and, especially in that the priest allegedly advocates theft, inconsistent with Catholic teaching." (11 Lawrence Ave., Malverne, New York.)

"I happen to disbelieve the doctrines of Marx; I happen to believe that there is power and strength in the democratic system of free enterprise, far beyond what its enemies imagine. I think that, in the arena of world opinion, we can win the cold war--if only we are willing to fight it. To date, we have done very little. We have continued to place our faith in arms and guns and bombs and rocket bases, while the Soviet Union has placed its faith in propaganda and people. Nation after uncommitted nation has moved from a pro-Western position to a neutralist one, to a position in which they are at least friendly to the Soviet power. And we, with all our talk of anticommunism have allowed them to do it. For example, as each new African nation came into being, months and months elapsed before we sent a full diplomatic corps; the Russians were right in there from the first day. And the people we have sent generally have not been able to speak the language of the people; the Soviet emissaries do. Further, the news of the world is filled with egregious instances of segregation against our own citizens who are non-white--when, unfortunately for us in this connection, the citizens of these other nations are also nonwhite. Equally hurtful has been our own support of tyranny everywhere. Space will not permit listing all instances, but one reason Castro is in power today is because we supported the tyrant Batista. We have, with almost unerring accuracy, supported the wrong regimes and the forces that stand against social change."
--Bishop James A. Pike, in "God and the H-Bomb".

BILL CHRISTIAN DISCUSSES MAN, SOCIETY AND REASON

"I was profoundly shocked when I read your comments to Derek Nelson. The subject matter with which he was concerned is of little interest to me presently. What is of immediate interest is that you seem to have made a rather serious contradiction which I would like you to acknowledge or clear up, for I am at a loss to see how a liberal, who probably claims, as do most liberals, to rely on reason, can maintain the position which you do.

"You will grant, I am certain, that any doctrine which contains in itself a contradiction is a doctrine not worthy of support. First, then, I would like to see if your conclusion does follow from your assumption; I hold that it does not. Secondly, I would like to question the validity of the assumption which Derek assures me you profess: That human beings are born with a clean slate (tabula rasa) at birth, and not with any inborn tendency towards good or evil. The main point of my attack is a section of a paragraph which you wrote and which I will quote for easy reference: '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.'

"Since you claim that man is born with a clean slate at birth, you quite rightly deduce from this that his society will affect his attitude to the world and to his fellows. Thus, if we build a society based on Reason as the goddess who will guide our destiny, man will be influenced by this right, just and ideal society and will be improved accordingly. The evil in man can be driven out, or at least suppressed

in this way. (Your phraseology would cause even a radical of the 1930's to blush. Let us say, less ambitiously, that I, as a liberal, believe that proper education could improve most individuals, provided it was initiated early in life.) Am I confusing this with communism? I do not think so, for I think that liberals wish to accomplish this end through reason, not force, and through freedom, not slavery. For can a man be said to be good if he cannot choose between right and wrong? It is man's society which imposes these views of life on him, this Weltanschauung. It is his society which teaches him what is right and wrong, and then allows him to choose. Now, if I may return to the subject at hand, I would like to point out that you claim that if arson were legalized, you would not have the right to commit it. But if arson is made legal by a conscious effort of society as a whole, and if there is no punishment for committing arson, the community will, in due time, come to regard that there is nothing wrong with arson. (Subjectively, then, each member of the community will possess the right (read: legal privilege) to commit arson. But what, aside from the attitude of the populace, has changed? Apart from the strictly pragmatic factor that the community is now inclined to disregard the action, what excuses me from guilt in setting your house afire after arson is legalized? If your belief is to be that whatever is sanctioned by the community is necessarily right, then such sordid affairs as the Inquisition, slavery in the South prior to 1865, Hitler's extermination of the Jews, ad infinitum, become not only justified, but--far worse--morally proper.) Unless you regard that rights are immutable, and are granted by God (as is written in your Declaration of Independence), you must maintain that the source of rights is society. (Perhaps our disagreement here is primarily semantic. You appear to define "rights" only as "legal privileges", whereas I recognize moral rights as standing superior to these legal liberties (which are erected and sustained by whim, and likely to topple at the flick of a pen, even if a "free" society). Similarly, moral obligations are, in my philosophy, more valid than legal obligations. These moral dictates (both "rights" and "responsibilities" or "prohibitions") are immutable, growing, as they do, out of self-evident premises. Ideally, laws should be patterned after these moral premises, but this ideal state of society is not soon likely to come into existence. To translate this abstract discussion into the context of your specific argument: my moral code prohibits deliberately injuring another individual unless provoked, and, arson being clearly injurious, I am prohibited from the malicious firing of your property. That this is in addition illegal is irrelevant.) If the source of such rights is historical tradition, then admit to this facet of conservatism and read Edmund Burke to see if, perhaps, you are not a conservative in his tradition. But if the source of such rights is the goddess Reason, then, in true liberal tradition, if Reason declares that there is no longer a penalty for arson, then it is assumed that you are permitted to commit arson (for it is your right in a democracy to do what is not forbidden); or it is assumed that there is no need for such a law, for humanity will no longer commit arson. (If "Reason declares that there is no longer a penalty for arson", the obvious cause of this must be that arson is no longer injurious; if that is proven, my moral code will no longer prohibit arson. But it must be recognized that what is decreed by reason and what is decreed by society are not necessarily synonymous; society decreed Prohibition in this country, surely an unreasonable measure. Your statement that "...it is your right in a democracy to do what is not forbidden..." is another apparent example of your narrow definition of "right" (and its reverse, "prohibition") as being a quality legally determined. If I were a restaurant owner, I would possess the legal right to refuse service to Negroes for no other reason than that they were Negroes. I feel that

this practice is basically immoral, however, and thus I would certainly not feel that I possessed the right to engage in discrimination, although it is true that I would be legally entitled to do so. Again, the disagreement is probably caused by the fact that we conceive of the word "right" as meaning two separate and distinct things.)) If the latter is correct, then your assertion is meaningless, for we agreed above that a man can be said to be good only if he has a choice between good and evil, and chooses good. However, if the former is true, then each child who is born will know nothing about the previous dictum against arson. If he reads of it, he will consider it no more than a prejudice of an ignorant age; and, since he has a clean slate, no instincts from the womb, if he comes across a chance to commit arson for his benefit, knowing no reason to abstain, he will possess the right to commit arson. (Under these circumstances, an individual will feel that he has the right to commit arson; this is not quite the same thing.)) As I have said before, I believe the essence of democracy to be that what is not forbidden is permitted. Witness our cliché: It's not against the law, is it? (This disreputable sentiment is a refuge of the wicked, the hoary old cliché by means of which they justify their transgressions against good taste and ethical conduct.))

"The second task which I set myself was to challenge your assumption proper: that men are born with a clean slate, and that they are neither good nor evil at birth. It is with a two-edged sword that I would like to attack this doctrine, with historical example and with psychological theory.

"Has there ever been a period in the history of our troubled planet in which there has been a 'golden age'? Have we ever been free from affliction, from misery, from vice? Have we ever been spared the calamities of war or the threat of oppression? And if we have, has it not been only for a brief period, because of circumstances and not because of humanity? I would go so far as to maintain that humanity has not progressed basically from the city-states at Sumer to the sprawling industrial giants of today. Our intellect, our knowledge, our techniques have improved; but human nature has not! It is still rooted in the sordid depths of our primeval urges, in our own minds--in our id. Since space does not permit me to give a complete explanation of the id, I would suggest that the id is, basically, the section of our personality which is devoted to satisfying our baser, animal needs. For although we have a 'soul' and an intellect which separate us from the lower forms of life, our body is mortal and as dependent on rest, food and procreation as that of the wolf, the bear or the lion. The id wishes to satisfy these needs. It is the duty of the ego to control the id, to prevent it from acting in such a way as to incur punishment. But we see constantly examples of people acting against their best interests, acting on impulse, under the control of their id. And just as we do not expect animals to attain a millenium, to live in a 'golden era', we should not expect mankind to do so either. Instead of being born with a clean slate, man is born with urges which were inherent in the cave man, and which are inherent in all animals. To live, man must satisfy his needs. To live, man must be potentially evil!" (If man is inherently neither good nor evil, then it would certainly follow that he is "potentially" both. If your only claim is that man is potentially evil, then we do not disagree.)) (112 Birch Cliff Ave., Scarborough, Ontario, Canada.)

BETTY KUJAWA HAS A FEW CHOICE WORDS FOR LES NIRENBERG

"I thank you very much for sending Kipple #40, as in three weeks I would have entered Hyatt House (for a convention) and faced friends and acquaintances, completely ignorant of what they might have read about me in Panic Button. I feel that it is revealing of Les' character

and ethics that I was not sent a copy of his attack on me, an attack that went out not only to our little group but to many others as well. Unfortunately, the majority of his readers will never know this illuminating fact.

"The 'wounded nun' joke was given me by Roman Catholic friends whose Roman Catholic children heard it while attending a Roman Catholic private school. There was no intention on their part nor on mine to attack Catholics, I'm sure you realize. But, Ted, I am honestly fearful of protesting even mildly about this to Les. I suspect that if he is capable of misinterpreting my original comments, he is equally capable perhaps of taking any defense from Bigoted Betty as an anti-semitic attack. I am a White Anglo-Saxon Protestant and therefore suspect of even the mildest form of reproach.

"As to your trusting that Les will acknowledge his errors, for your sake I hope he will. But perhaps you too should step warily, being, as I recall, of Teutonic ancestry and, I think, a Protestant as well. (Les notified me via postcard that his comments on my article will appear in the next issue of The Panic Button.)

"The logic of the statement 'I know I'm right because there are plenty of other people who feel the same way I do about this subject' is the logic of Bull Connor and his followers or a Nazi group, and not worthy at all of comment.

"In sending me Kipple you practiced the courteous custom of sending an issue to the person in point. I would have thought of Mr. Nirenberg as ethical; that he did not respect this elementary custom of good manners says a great deal to me, and makes me appreciate John Boardman very much indeed. I prefer a man who says it to my face and who admits an error when he makes one. John and I really didn't know each other at that time (see Kipple #30-32), but Les I took to be a friend of many years standing. What this proves, I don't know.

"If Les considers me a bigot, what am I to consider a person who attacks me but hasn't the courage/decency to face me while doing so? Do you know a term that would cover that?" (2819 Caroline St., South Bend 14, Indiana.)

"The democracy of universal suffrage is not a bad form of government; it is simply not necessarily nor inevitably a good form of government. Democracy must be justified by its works, not doctrinaire affirmations of an intrinsic goodness that no mere method can legitimately lay claim to." --William F. Buckley, in "Up From Liberalism".

JOHN BOARDMAN DEFENDS HIS POLICIES

"I consider that the viewpoint I have been arguing in recent issues of Kipple has been vindicated by current developments in the South. More facilities have been integrated, in the South and elsewhere, since the beginning of the Birmingham demonstrations than in the previous nine years since the Supreme Court's decision against school segregation. For the first time the federal government is stirring towards an expression of moral commitment to integration. (These prophetic words were written three days prior to President Kennedy's eloquent speech of June 11, 1963, which very definitely represents just such a commitment.) Schools, unions, businesses, and local and state governments are being hard pressed by integrationists, and are beginning to respond by taking concrete steps towards ending segregation.

"These recent events mark the end of a period when token concessions would satisfy integrationists. This dissatisfaction has expressed itself, not in remonstrances to Congress or the President that will be

• filed and forgotten, nor in legal cases that must be financed by private individuals and fought upwards for years through hostile state and federal district courts, but in the hard language of demonstrations, boycotts, and violent self-defense against violent attack.

"Perhaps the most concrete demonstration of the change in tactics occurred last week in Lexington, North Carolina. A lynch mob of 2000 whites marched on the town's Negro quarter. In past years in the South such a beginning has led to dozens of deaths and hundreds of injuries among a town's Negro population, with subsequent clucks of regret from northern liberal newspapers. In June, 1963, the lynch mob was routed with one dead and one wounded. A thing done has an end.

"For the first time the President and the Attorney-General have been convinced that firm immediate action is necessary to assure the end of segregation. The Attorney-General's eye-opening session with a group of militant Negro intellectuals has convinced him of this. But it is necessary to keep in mind that only militancy has been able to persuade the government that now is the time for action. Governmental sweet-talk about 'timing', 'bad publicity', 'negotiation', won't work any more. The Negroes of the South, and of the whole country, want these wrongs ended now, and if the government won't help them they are perfectly capable of helping themselves. It is simply a case of the government finding out which way the people are going, and getting out in front of them so it can still maintain the posture of leadership.

"I'm afraid that Joe Pilati has slightly misunderstood my analogy between Mike Newberry and Andrzej Trautman. Newberry is an American journalist and Trautman is a Polish physicist; both are Communists. In reading an article by either I would not accept or reject any of the arguments or conclusions simply because the author is a member of the Communist Party. (The question fundamental to this argument is this: Granted that a Communist physicist can discuss physics objectively, can a Communist journalist be equally objective discussing politics? I say he cannot, as does Joe Pilati; but you apparently believe there to be no difference in the two cases.) Each point and the article as a whole would have to be judged from its contents, just as would any other article. The reputation of Picasso as an artist, or of Shostakovitch as a musician, or of Oparin as a biologist, or of Neruda as a poet, will not depend upon the membership of these individuals in the CP. Of course, Oparin's rejection of Lysenko's theories, or the subject matter of Neruda's poems, will have to be considered in the context of their party membership, just as Pound the poet cannot be completely separated from Pound the apologist for Mussolini. But their work in their own callings should not be judged solely on the basis of their party memberships.

"The same thing is of course true of Nazis. Four of Germany's greatest physicists, including two Nobel laureates, were Nazis (Stark, Lenard, von Weiszäcker and Jordan). But their contributions to physics have lasted. Jewish physicists who lost kinsmen to the Nazis still maintain cordial relations with Pascual Jordan, and judge his views solely on the basis of their physical merits." (Box 22, New York 33, New York.)

WALT BREEN COMMENTS ON #39

"John Trimble: I am of two minds on this matter of living on unemployment checks. I can see where one would consider himself entirely justified in doing so. Take for instance the composer or artist who correctly regards mundane work as unjustified interference with his proper creative vocation. He works for long enough to build up a tiny backlog of savings and to become eligible for unemployment checks--or, perhaps, long enough so that he feels he would be a candidate for the local squirrel-cage if he were to continue. Then he either gets fired or quits and returns to his art, maybe sells a few paintings or gets a

one-man show or a public performance of his works. But even this degree of success is unusual and not always predictable--and when it does come, it does not allow one to live off one's creative activity. And so he goes on collecting unemployment checks, irritating you, causing others to yell 'Beatnik!', but remaining serene in the knowledge that he is contributing something of value in his artistic creations. On the other hand, I dislike being taxed to support irresponsible mothers who go on producing bastards secure in the knowledge that they'll continue getting checks. And yet who is going to decide whether the artist is really producing anything worthwhile or merely trying to fool people into thinking he is doing so? And who is going to decide whether the mother is just irresponsible, or the victim of rape, or actually feeble-minded?

"If you, Ted Pauls, define 'equality' as the demand that a man be judged solely on the basis of his attributes, talents, etc., relevant to the situation, and not on the basis of irrelevant qualities such as ethnic origin, etc., then please get rid of the word 'equality': almost nobody else who uses it restricts it to that meaning. The word has been too much contaminated with other meanings, all of them unacceptable to other than their users.

"As much as I disagree with Derek Nelson in general, I don't find his final statement nearly so incredible as you do, in context. There are all too many self-styled liberals who do operate on the principle 'if you aren't with us, you're against us'. I've known them. Applying this principle remorselessly in any and every context leads to a rigidity just as bad as one finds in extremists of other types.

"Martin Helgesen: You may call it a matter of faith, if you wish, but I call it a piece of nonsense when you claim that people born 2000 years or more after the Crucifixion are responsible for it. As I see it, the people directly responsible for it were those who could have chosen to take part or not to take part. I am responsible for things in which my choice has some effect; I am not responsible for things which took place before I was born and in which I would most likely have had no wish to take part had I been around at the time. The kind of thought you have presented to us is of the 'In Adam's fall, we sinned all' variety, for which there is no rational justification. Calling it a matter of faith, a matter beyond human understanding, is merely evading the question--no matter who says so.

"John Boardman: If this 24th Amendment passes, the government will have to raise funds somehow, most likely via assessing per-capita taxes on the states. Result: For Sale--State of Mississippi; the top bidder will doubtless be Elijah Muhammad. Of course, even funnier--but more dire--consequences will ensue: no mail at all because it competes with the old Ma Bell and telegraph company; no pure food laws enforceable because of competition with the AMA; no laws enforceable against medical quackery for similar reasons; and worse and worse." (2402 Grove Street, Berkeley 1, California.)

SHORT NOTES ON LONG SUBJECTS

It is with extreme sadness that I note that my skill as a prophet has recently been vindicated. In Kipple #40, I concluded an article on the militant anti-segregation demonstrations in Birmingham, Alabama, on this dire note: "Unless the Negro is truly freed (...) Birmingham is going to be merely the first in a long succession of racial disasters, some of which could make the riot in that city look peaceful by comparison." Within three weeks of having written those words, I find myself appalled (but not surprised) by riots and near riots erupting in Philadelphia, in Danville, Virginia, in Lexington, North Carolina, and in Cambridge, Maryland. After 100 years of alleged "freedom", the Negro is at last becoming tired of waiting for first-class citizenship. Racial

disturbances which have occurred in the past month and those which will surely occur in coming months are rendered even more distasteful by the knowledge that, were it not for the studied short-sightedness of the American white, this situation need never have come into being.

Happier news indeed is the fact that Maryland's equal accommodations law has recently gone into effect, as a result of numerous illegal signatures which invalidated the petitions demanding a referendum on the issue (see above). Maryland now becomes the first state south of the Mason-Dixon line to enact such an ordinance. The law is weak, and barely represents a stopgap measure, but it is at least a beginning.

The esoteric symbols above and to the right of the address refer to the status of the individual reader on my mailing list. A number refers to the number of the last issue you will receive unless you respond in some manner; the letter "T" indicates that you receive this periodical in exchange for a publication of your own; "S" means that this is a sample copy; and the absence of any symbol whatever indicates that you are receiving this publication for reasons best known to yourself.

In an open and thorough quest for a political philosophy, it seems to me inevitable that Marxism will sooner or later be embraced. Provided the quest remains open and thorough, it appears inevitable that the doctrine, having been examined in depth, will consequently be discarded.

Anita Simon and Marion Bradley wrote extremely interesting letters on American education which will certainly appear in #42. Len Moffatt, John Boardman, Jerome McCann, Bob Underwood, David Ettlin, Chay Borsella (new address: 26 Cedar Ave., Towson 4, Md.), Maurice Guiteau, Les Nirenberg, Dick Schultz, Bill Haramy, Dave Locke, Rosemary Hickey and Bob Brown also wrote.

FROM:

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



printed matter only

return requested

may be opened for
postal inspection

SEND TO

45

Len Moffatt
10202 Belcher
Downy, Calif.

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