

This periodical is edited and published by Ted Pauls, 1448 Meridene Drive, Baltimore 12, Maryland (21212). Copies of this irregular but frequent journal are available for letters of comment, exchange with other periodicals, contributions (articles, verse, etc.), or-- as a last resort--the cash sum of 20¢ per issue. This issue is dedicated to that valiant anti-Communist Ngo Dinh Diem, who, encouraged by his rapacious sister-in-law, has succeeded in making pikers of Chiang Kai-shek, Perez Jiménez and other staunch defenders of democracy...

JOTTINGS FROM THE EDITOR'S DESK

THE PARTIAL TEST BAN TREATY recently concluded between the United States, Russia and the United Kingdom (with the active blessings of many concerned spectators of the spiraling nuclear armaments race) has evoked a multiplicity of varying reactions from all points of the political compass. On the Right, there is widespread dissatisfaction that the agreement was undertaken to begin with, coupled with skepticism with respect to the good intentions of the Russians. In its most virulent form, this right-wing resistance to the concept of an agreement curtailing nuclear testing hurls accusations of ignoble surrender or active collaboration at the Kennedy Administration. On the Left, certain dedicated and starry-eyed pacifists are jubilantly dancing in the streets, eagerly proclaiming the millennium. This diversity of feeling affected President Kennedy's recent address to the nation, which could otherwise have been a clear-cut statement committing the United States to the future active pursuit of nuclear control and (eventually) disarmament. In attempting to accommodate the inharmonious cries of the multitudes who voiced their divergent opinions in the hours immediately following the successful conclusion of the treaty, the President's message was a mosaic of vague optimism for the future overlaid with hard-nosed pessimism, a patchwork of contradictory attitudes. The entire affair pointed out once again Mr. Kennedy's very considerable skill as a professional politician: each listener, no matter what his ideological affiliation, was able to perceive in the President's speech exactly that attitude which he was predisposed to prefer.

Not surprisingly, my own attitude markedly favors the jubilation of the American and British left-wing--without, however, losing sight of certain political realities which must be considered within the context of any appraisal of the value of this treaty. I feel, in short, that neither the human race nor the American people (whose interests I, as an American, am obliged to consider--albeit secondarily) can lose anything as a result of this venture; the only question is whether we shall gain a little or a great deal.

Obviously, any value to be derived from this partial test ban treaty is contingent upon the adherence to the provisions of the agreement by its signatories. One of the loudest and most persistent criticisms levelled at our acceptance of the treaty contends that the Rus-

sians have a reputation for failing to honor such agreements, and might very well prepare to conduct nuclear tests in secret under the protective aegis of the treaty. The conservative military clique of the Soviet Union no doubt entertains similar suspicions with respect to the United States. (That there is less justification for these suspicions is irrelevant; the fact is that their distrust is no less real than our own, and this attitude must be considered in any discussion of East-West relations.) The possibility that the Soviet Union will adhere to the treaty only until it can secretly prepare a series of tests does, of course, exist, but I feel that it is a calculated risk which can and must be taken in order to reap greater benefits.

This suspicious distrust of Russia is to an extent based upon past performance, but it is more firmly based on the right-wing dogma that Russia is frantically increasing its armed might with the intention of mounting an attack against the "free" world whenever a suitable opportunity presents itself. The mental pictures conjured up by this belief may be suitably horrid for the purposes of the neo-Nazis and John Birchers who utilize the resultant mass hysteria to line both their pockets and their ego, but it does not happen to be true. The responsible leaders of Russia realize what many of our own bureaucrats are in the process of discovering: that thermonuclear warfare cannot possibly be advantageous to either protagonist, that, in fact, neither camp can hope to survive a nuclear holocaust, and consequently nuclear war is an insane course of action. The Soviets are tough, ruthless, opportunistic diplomats who will pursue every conceivable method of advancing their position; they will lie without compunction when it suits their purposes. But they will not commit suicide. They will refrain from engaging in the mass annihilation of a nuclear holocaust not because they are great humanitarians, but because they realize full well that any thermonuclear exchange would exterminate their society as well as ours.

Furthermore, since both major nuclear powers now possess sufficient stockpiles of fission weapons to eradicate each other and the rest of the world several times over, further development is redundant. The armaments race is a self-perpetuating demon, draining more and more resources from the participating nations. This is particularly irritating from the viewpoint of the Russians, whose pyramiding defense expenditures divert funds from other areas in which they are sorely needed: agricultural improvements, development of uncivilized areas of the nation, and the improvement in the standard of living which is progressing with such painful slowness. The Western powers, although better able to sustain such a drain on resources, could surely apply the funds more constructively in other areas. So there is no doubt that both camps are eager to reduce their "defensive" preparations, which not only increase the possibility of war but are also tremendously expensive. While both sides are far too suspicious of each other to undertake unilateral reduction of armaments, agreements such as this test ban will allow at least partial multilateral reductions in this area.

Finally, public opinion must be considered. The major area of competition in this era between the East and the West centers about the contest for the loyalty of the non-aligned nations. The competition in this arena is vigorous; the weapons are propaganda and foreign aid (for which cynics may read: "lying" and "bribery"). Since these neutral nations are the prime advocates of the abolition of nuclear arsenals, they are unlikely to look with favor upon the country which blatantly and without provocation disregards an agreement which may be the initial step toward this goal. The United States realizes this, and so must Russia.

Assuming the compliance of all the signatories, there are two general areas in which the treaty may be viewed and judged: (1) as pre-

vention against the more or less incidental effects of nuclear weapons testing (i.e., fallout); and (2) as the foundation for future extensive agreements in all areas of political strife.

The value of the partial test ban treaty in the first area is obvious. The entire race--but particularly those nations in the Northern Hemisphere--will benefit from a cessation of nuclear tests. Advocates of bigger and better bombs who claim that the increase in the radiation level caused by such tests is still "safe" are on exceedingly shaky ground: we know far too little about the effects of radiation to assign any level of safety. The information that we do possess is not encouraging. Recent findings would appear to indicate, for example, that there is no "safety limit" with regard to the effect of radiation on leukemia; that is, any dose of radiation will increase the incidence of this disease. There is also no general agreement on a safety level for genetic damage attributable to radiation. Consequently, the effects of the nuclear tests of the past decade may never be fully known. No responsible scientist denies, however, that there will be some damage attributable to this cause. This damage may not be numerically significant, but neither it is negligible, for no increase in human misery and suffering may properly be considered "negligible".

The second area in which the agreement may be valuable is more tentative. It will be for future historians to determine whether or not this agreement represented a lasting relaxation of tension in the relationship between the two great power blocs of this latter portion of the Twentieth Century. I am neither a political pundit nor a scholar of international affairs, but certainly no one denies that the atmosphere is a good deal more cordial than has ever before been the case. Whether or not this hopeful cordiality continues is dependent upon certain variable factors, not the least of which is the possibility of a change in leadership in the government of either major power. Mr. Khrushchev is no longer a young man, and may be expected to succumb to the ravages of age in the foreseeable future. His successor could conceivably spring from the ranks of the war-oriented conservative military clique, whose policies are a good deal closer to those of the Chinese. Similarly, there is no guarantee that the more-or-less "liberal" Democrats need always persevere in national elections against the highly vocal reactionaries. If such missile-rattling panic vendors should come to power in either Russia or the United States, the international situation would once again slide toward the brink of disaster. The acquisition of significant nuclear armaments by the Chinese would also severely damage the cause of co-existence. (In this connection, a few words about Charles de Gaulle are probably appropriate. Despite the similarity in attitude between the eloquent autocrat from France and the Chinese Communists, I am not overly concerned with regard to a French upsetting of the disarmament applecart. President de Gaulle will no doubt explode a thermonuclear device in the North African desert in the next few weeks by way of thumbing his nose at the rest of the world, but France will probably thereupon return to its previous state of atomic inactivity.) Finally, the "atmosphere of Moscow" may be dissipated by a sudden crisis in Europe in which both sides remained adamant to the point of military threats, but the recent increased cordiality and rediness to negotiate which has been shown by the Soviet Union makes this eventuality less likely that it has been in the past.

Unless one or several of the above contingencies should materialize, there seems an excellent chance that the foundation of cooperation which has been established by this treaty may eventually lead to a lasting peace.

I conclude, then, that the optimists of the Left may, at worst, be accused of a certain degree of short-sightedness; whereas the oppo-

sition on the Right, ironically aligned with the Chinese Communist Party on this issue, must, at best, stand accused of insanity.

REFLECTIONS ON THE VALUE OF "ART": While there may be more pressing philosophical questions than "Wherein consists the value of art?" there is hardly a more interesting one. Plato posed this question, and his answer was that the value of art was its beauty; i.e., that the one quality common to all works of art was beauty. The fact that individuals very rarely agreed as to which objects possessed beauty and which did not does not affect his thesis, for Plato conceived of beauty as a Form and consequently a quality which possessed objective existence quite apart from the divergent tastes of mortals. If men disagreed as to what constituted beauty, Plato reasoned, this merely indicated that some of them were right and others wrong --or, more precisely, that the opinion of some individuals was more accurate than that of others.

In considering this question at length, I have rejected any form of aesthetic objectivism. In Plato's simple society, of course, there were relatively few objects d'art, and even while individuals disagreed as to which were truly beautiful, it is likely that any given art object would have a significant number of admirers. One might not particularly care for certain temple mosaics while still admitting that they possessed a certain beauty. But in this complicated technological society, it is no longer possible to believe that artistic value is anything more than a reaction in the eye (mind) of the beholder. Hobbyists of various sorts (a phenomenon with which Plato was not familiar) eagerly collect postage stamps, old coins, furniture, matchbook covers, buttons, and hundreds of other classes of odds and ends; each considers his particular accumulation of trivia to be "art objects"; yet, most would admit that the objects are not particularly beautiful. Certain postage stamps, certain pieces of antique furniture, may properly be said to possess something which society recognizes as beauty; but other postage stamps and pieces of furniture, even more eagerly sought after, are not considered "beautiful" at all. They are obviously desired and valued by collectors on another basis, by a criterion of which Plato was apparently unaware.

If this criterion is not beauty, then what is it? There is obviously no objective standard, and no reason why one should exist: the matchbook cover which you and I toss into the gutter may be highly prized by certain hobbyists, but the piece of cardboard possesses no intrinsic value. The same statement may be applied to a rare stamp, although this particular example is complicated by the fact that philately is such a widespread and renowned hobby that nearly everyone realizes that certain old postage stamps are worth a great deal of money. Nevertheless, their value is attributable to the same quality as is the value of a matchbook cover or a fancy button: a stamp is valuable because there are certain people who desire it and will pay a certain sum of money in order to acquire it. If these individuals suddenly abandoned their hobby and no others took their place, rare stamps would shortly become worthless.

Here, then, is the criterion of value for objects of "artistic" (as opposed to utilitarian) nature: consensus. Any object possesses a value so long as it is desired by some or many individuals; the value of an object is determined by the relation between the number of existing objects of that type and the number of individuals desiring to acquire them. (An interesting corollary of this concept is that, just as the value of a unique object increases proportionate to the number of individuals desiring to acquire it, so, too, does the value of this unique object decrease as the number of individuals desiring to acquire

it decreases. Consequently, a unique object which is desired by only one individual is worthless.)

The same standard applies to objects which are generally conceded to be "works of art". The Mona Lisa is a fantastically valuable painting because individuals assign it such value and wish to possess it. Any given individual, in addition, may consider the Mona Lisa to possess beauty, but its value is not dependent upon this subjective assessment, for even those who do not consider the painting beautiful may still desire to possess it. It is desired, in short, not because of any intrinsic worth, but merely because it is unique and others also desire it. (It is axiomatic to point out that if the masterpiece were somehow lost in the New Guinea highlands, it would be used for some appallingly functional purpose such as carrying dead fish. It might be requisitioned by the headman to add to his wealth, but this possibility would depend upon the whim of the chief to possess this unique object rather than our arbitrary concept of the value of the painting. A bent coat-hanger or a handmirror might likewise enhance the headman's possessions, by virtue of being equally unique in the village.)

The value said to be possessed by any given art object, therefore, consists simply of a significant number of individuals attributing a value to it. Any object is valuable when it is desired and ceases to be valuable when it is no longer desired, irregardless of any "beauty" it may be said to possess.

"THE CROWNING EXPERIENCE": In the days immediately preceding the television premiere of the motion picture in Baltimore on August 19th, previews of certain scenes from "The Crowning Experience" had been shown in order to whet the appetite of the viewing public. One of these was particularly impressive: As hundreds of people from all over the world attired in their native dress paraded past the camera, the beautifully vibrant voice of Muriel Smith intoned, "We must remake the world--the task is nothing less than that!" As the concept revealed by this scene was apparently to be the central theme of the motion picture, I anticipated the arrival of August 19th with some elation, convinced that this film must be viewed by every believer in the brotherhood of man.

As the amateurish production unfolded step by pious step, my elation was systematically demolished, until at length my morose personality began to react in its customary manner to the unabashed proselytizing. Only the gleeful contemplation of the exquisite pleasure to be derived from authoring these comments prevented me from succumbing to the urge to end this farce with a flick of my wrist, and view instead the trained seals performing on another channel. Ordinarily, film reviews are not within the province of this periodical. However, since viewing this motion picture is an experience which I would not wish upon the proverbial dog, I feel that a word of warning is in order in the event that this sanctimonious saga is presented for viewing in other cities.

It is, first and foremost, ineptly produced. The allegedly inspiring story is incoherent, the continuity non-existent. Narration was obviously called for in order to supplement the dialogue and explain the background, but none was forthcoming. Muriel Smith was uniquely out of place in the cast by virtue of her acting ability; indeed, the supporting players may not have been professional actors at all, but simply people dragged in off the street and handed scripts. Worse, the motion picture was a semi-musical, a term reserved for those appalling mavericks of the motion picture world wherein impassioned speeches are suddenly interrupted by makeshift songs. Music can, of course, contribute to the setting of a mood, but in "The Crowning Experience" its purpose was to assist in telling the story. The result was reminiscent of most

second-rate Broadway shows, where the songs are intended simply to replace segments of dialogue and are consequently tuneless and meaningless atrocities. Also, as the perceptive reader may have surmised, the supporting players were hopelessly incompetent singers; only Muriel Smith's immense talent partially salvaged the musical interludes. Finally, characterization was completely inadequate, though fully in keeping with the banal dialogue which the protagonists were forced to mouth. The stereotyped characters were so utterly unbelievable (e.g., Charlie, the Negro rebel-turned-Communist, who, in the end, is converted to the Holy Cause of the Moral Re-Armament Crusade) that I had to pinch myself to be certain that I wasn't dreaming.

A motion picture of this type cannot be judged solely or even largely on the basis of such technical qualities, however. If the message contained in the production is valid and if it is dramatized meaningfully, all of these faults in presentation become tolerable. Unfortunately, "The Crowning Experience" is a dismal failure in this area as well; it is philosophically bankrupt. The black-or-white conception of world affairs, the either-or dogma which permeates the minds of the devout is the predominant Idea of the motion picture. It is not only implied but stated outright that the world must embrace God and live according to His rules, or succumb to tyrants (i.e., Communists) and exist in misery and degradation. The film accepts no middle ground, announcing: Either you are with us (and hence a pure-hearted, pious disciple of God) or against us (and hence an atheistic Communist). As an individual who has rejected both of these unattractive alternatives, I naturally resent the implication that I do not exist.

The high point in the film occurs when Muriel Smith, portraying Emma Tremaine, is in the process of being converted to the Crusade. A lady newspaper reporter is eagerly proselytizing, during the course of which she observes that one's life must be judged by four absolute standards: honesty, purity, charity and love. Mrs. Tremaine, who still retains a portion of her earlier sanity and level-headedness, cocks an eyebrow questioningly at the glib use of the term "absolute". The reporter, herself newly converted, smiles wisely and sweetly replies, "Of course. What good would they be if they weren't absolute?" While this smug statement merely caused your obedient servant to strangle vigorously on a kumquat pit, it must have resulted in some whirlwind revolutions in the graves of Socrates, Aristotle and other advocates of intellectual honesty. It apparently satisfied Mrs. Tremaine, in any event, for she immediately joined the flock and began predicting the imminent collapse of civilization unless everyone went out and joined the Moral Re-Armament Crusade.

Unless you possess the warped sense of humor which can derive pleasure from watching persons with saintly expressions spout ridiculous platitudes, I suggest that you take to heart this warning and avoid "The Crowning Experience" with the same enthusiasm with which you customarily avoid Billy Graham.

WITH TONGUE IN CHEEK DEPARTMENT: Much of the criticism of American education which has appeared in these pages has, in the Kipple tradition, partaken of pedantry. In keeping with my often-voiced (though less often practiced) desire to entertain as well as interest the reader, I'll take this opportunity to pass along the following "book review". Entitled "Why Nobody Writes Good", the essay originally appeared in the Newsletter of the Institute of Early American Culture and History:

"It seems like there is something wrong concerning the manner in which students in college courses are being

instructed about how to write good English. One man has undertaken to recently write down in a book called 'Themes, Theories, and Therapy: The Teaching of Writing in College,' just exactly what is bad about the way freshmen students are being taught by their college teachers to write well.

"The man who wrote this about freshman English courses is named Albert R. Kitzhaber, and his book is all right but it appears that it is pretty biased. This is because he says that the English teachers in college are not doing an awfully good job at teaching to their college students, which is probably right, but the more important thing about what he says is that other professors who teach different subjects than English should make their students write well in addition.

"It would seem that this is a point which is not very well taken and is probably due to the author's aforementioned bias which is obvious. In fact it is unbelievably incredible for someone to write that other professors than in English courses should teach students, which it is not their job to do.

"In American history, to show a specific example, the professors in actuality should stick to the subject. In fact, English hasn't got anything to do with history which proves that his whole book is irrelevant."

THE EARLY AMERICANS: Recent discussions have served to convince me that even reasonably intelligent individuals display a surprising lack of knowledge with respect to the early Indian civilizations of South and Central America. History, in general, appears to be victimized by the apathy of the modern American, but even those who take considerable pride in the diversity of their intellectual pursuits display a limited interest in the native cultures of the Americas. Ancient Rome and the glory that was Greece are currently popular among the intelligentsia and among the pretentious, of course, and the civilizations of the Tigris-Euphrates valley and the Egyptian delta are extensively studied in most institutes of higher learning. But for a variety of reasons, the Aztecs, Incas, Mayas and Toltecs remain of little interest to modern man, with the exception of a relative handful of specialized scholars.

One important reason for this disinterest is that modern man is inclined to ignore the history of any culture which does not have a direct bearing on his own society. Ancient Chinese history, for example, may be no less interesting in its own right than the history of Britain, but the former has little or no connection with the emergence of what we are pleased to call the greatness of Western civilization and is consequently relegated to a position of lesser importance. A similar fate appears to have befallen the native cultures of the Americas. Too, it is axiomatic that history as we know it tends to center largely around wars and conquests, and the history of the American civilizations is singularly unexciting in this particular--until the arrival of the Spaniards. Warfare among the inhabitants of South and Central America was both furious and constant, but it resulted only infrequently in the sort of protracted encounters which mark the epochs of European and Asian history. Wars were conducted by the Aztecs, et al., primarily in order to acquire slaves rather than for territorial aggrandizement, and

took the form of periodic raids rather than large-scale military movements. (The conquest of the Yucatan Maya by the Toltecs under Quetzalcoatl in 1191 A.D. is a notable exception, and may constitute the only military engagement in the history of either civilization which would merit the term "war" by Western standards.)

Finally, I believe that the ignorance on the part of the modern American with respect to these native cultures is also partially explained by the fact that any study of their history must eventually encounter and deal with the grim details of their unpleasant demise. Presumably, this also explains the gross apathy which is displayed by the majority of Americans when confronted with the plight of the American Indian. I am not well acquainted with the psychological process by which an individual feels discomfort, perhaps even guilt as a result of incidents which occurred many years prior to his birth, but it does seem true that most of us would prefer to ignore some of the atrocities which represent historical examples of man's inhumanity to man. This factor may largely account for the distorted version of the Spanish Conquests, which, fostered by banal and inaccurate textbooks, has firmly entrenched itself in the patchwork quilt that is called "common knowledge". As is the case with all brutality, this inglorious chapter in the expansion of European civilization becomes acceptable to the sensitive mind of contemporary man only through the process of envisioning it as a struggle of unalterably "good" guys against unredeemably "bad" ones. Thus, the Spaniards are deified in the public eye as courageous knights in shining armor, engaging in a struggle against bloodthirsty aborigines intent on their destruction. (It is a grim testament to the narrowness of the mind which at one time inhabited this body that not only did I assimilate this stereotype without flinching in school, but even occasionally sat in class and, via my daydreams, imagined myself one of the noble conquistadors, striking down bloodthirsty heathens with lightning strokes of my gleaming sword.)

Gradually, as the years passed and I began using my meagre intellectual talents in exploring for myself the history of this subjugation, the final justification for these ghoulish thoughts crumbled. It is impossible to sustain such a stereotyped concept in the face of the true facts, which are largely unknown to the majority of Americans today. Man seems capable of tolerating almost any excess of beastliness and cruelty if he remains convinced that it is being perpetrated against a somehow inferior group of human beings. History provides innumerable examples of this attitude, the most vivid of which is the acceptance of the Nazi "final solution to the Jewish problem" by the majority of Germans. For this reason, the entire justification for the Spanish Conquests rests on the premise that the Indians were barbarians who had to be forcibly "civilized". In reality, as the objective student soon discovers, the civilizations of South and Central America were in many respects superior to the society of the Spaniards who conquered and annihilated them--and, indeed, to the whole of European civilization. The Aztecs, Toltecs, Mayas and Incas were not merely ignorant savages who built a lot of stone temples, as they are pictured by the average American today. They were highly civilized societies who possessed scientific techniques, laws, and systems of government which, for a great many years rendered them the equal of any society on the face of the earth. The Aztecs and the Mayas were highly literate (although unfortunately for modern science the vast majority of their literature was ordered destroyed by bigoted Catholic functionaries who hoped, in this way, to "glorify God"); their hospitals, medical knowledge, and sanitary systems impressed even the Spaniards, who realized that these "barbarians" possessed far better facilities in this area than those which they had left behind in Spain; the Inca system of government (basically a decen-

tralized welfare state) was one of the most sophisticated which has ever existed; their agricultural methods were such that everyone possessed an abundance of food, on land where thousands are now starving despite the marvels of modern technology; the Mayas were not merely the creators of temple gargoyles, but also of intricate gem-carvings (for which they must have possessed some sort of jeweler's glass, although it has not yet been discovered by archaeologists), feather mosaics, frescoes, and exquisite pottery; they performed plays (including comedies) for the entertainment of the populace, and the Spaniards were impressed by the talent of their actors; the Inca laws were sufficiently sophisticated to distinguish between stealing out of malice and out of want--for the latter there was no punishment dealt the culprit--and to prescribe more severe punishment for members of the higher classes who transgressed against ethical and moral injunctions, on the theory that their greater privileges carried with them the concomitant responsibility to act with greater dignity and thus set an example; the Mayas discovered the zero, that indispensable symbol of mathematics, several centuries prior to its discovery by the Hindus (from whom Europe derives it); the Incas possessed a system of highways which was second only to the famous Roman road system.

It is true that the Aztecs (but not the Incas or Mayas) practiced human sacrifice, but even this is falsely represented in the minds of most Americans. As in most societies in which the custom of blood sacrifice is found, it was not cruel in intent. The victims were a privileged minority, willingly offering themselves to the gods. Each young man and maiden eagerly looked forward to being chosen for sacrifice, for it was a great honor. It is difficult to believe that the Spaniards, who, at the time, practiced the most appalling torture on religious heretics and common criminals, looked upon this custom with any great horror. More likely, the existence of the custom furnished an excuse for the slaughter which would have been undertaken in order to acquire wealth even if the Aztecs had not engaged in their pagan rites.

It becomes quite apparent, given these facts, there there is a serious distortion in the version of the Spanish Conquests which exists in the minds of most Americans. The Spaniards were not honorable crusaders, glorifying their king and bringing under control a few thousand savage barbarians; they were self-seeking murderers, whose fanatical devotion to the militant dogma of their religion was overshadowed only by their avarice, who conducted an ignominious slaughter at the expense of millions of superstitious (though civilized) human beings. It is unfortunate that textbooks and popular renditions of history so thoroughly misrepresent this merciless massacre. Perhaps if these textbooks or popularized renditions included such facts as the story of Pizarro's first encounter with the Incas at Cajamarca, the popular conception of the Spanish Conquests would tend to be less biased. (Atahualpa, the emperor of the Incas, intended to welcome the foreigners to his land, and sent word that they should meet him at the public square at Cajamarca. In order that the visitors not be offended, Atahualpa ordered his warriors to come unarmed. Francisco Pizarro arrived at the square first, and stationed two divisions of cavalry and all of his artillery in the buildings surrounding the square. When Atahualpa was carried into the square on a litter, Father Valverde, a priest who accompanied Pizarro, approached the bewildered Indian and attempted to convert him on the spot to Catholicism. When this failed, Valverde accused Atahualpa of having insulted the Bible and the Pope, and ordered Pizarro to attack. A single Spaniard was wounded in the ensuing melee; 10,000 unarmed Incas were murdered.)

As in so many other areas of knowledge, people believe what they wish to believe and don't care to have their smug, well-ordered concep-

tions shattered by brutal truths. It's a pity, since the South and Central American Indian cultures are fascinating areas of study, once an individual has disposed of the misinformation encountered from most common sources.

THE ULTIMATE IDIOT, I have always believed, would of necessity combine the most repugnant qualities of the foaming-at-the-mouth religious fanatic, the anti-Communist monomaniac, and the wild-eyed white supremacist. After years of extensive search, I have stumbled upon a specimen of this fabled breed. Writing in the Baltimore News-Post, Mel Johnson makes the following observations:

"We have eyes, but we do not see. We have ears, but we do not hear. This is America today. We are like an ostrich with its head stuck in the ground, or a child with blankets pulled over his head.

"It's bad enough that the inspiration of God's word has been taken from our school children, but now they are left wide open to Communism and all other Godless doctrines.

"The Communists admit that the Christian is the hardest person to convert. Destroy Christianity in America and the battle is won. Mongrelize the white and colored races and the battle becomes a rout.

"It beats me how any red-blooded American can watch a minority group disrupt our whole school system, defy all forms of law, threaten us with bloody revolt, and then say: 'Well, what are we going to do?'"

Yessir, we really have to watch out for those Godless Communist mongrelizers...

--Ted Pauls

"Since thought gives expression to the reality of life beneath the surface, it is considered as important to permit its adequate functioning as it is to encourage it. The right to freedom of thought is extended also to children, and one of the most striking facts reported by anthropologists is the respect that is almost everywhere offered children as personalities in their own right in nonliterate societies. Radin recounts how on one occasion, among the Winnebago Indians, desiring to purchase a pair of child's moccasins, he approached the father of the child on the matter. He was told that the moccasins were, of course, the child's. Upon being pressed, the father agreed to consult the child, who was about five years old, as to whether he cared to part with them. 'The whole transaction took place in a perfectly serious manner. There was not the slightest flippancy about it. The child refused and that ended the matter.'" --Ashley Montagu, in "Man: His First Million Years".

"But, above all, every state should be so administered and so regulated by law that its magistrates cannot possibly make money. In oligarchies, special precautions should be used against this evil. For the people do not take any great offense at being kept out of the government. Indeed, they are rather pleased than otherwise at having leisure for their private business. But what angers them is to think that their rulers are stealing the public money. Then they are doubly enraged, for they are deprived of both honor and profit." --Aristotle, in "Politics".

DAVE HULAN :: C/O ELLIK :: 1825 GREENFIELD AVE. :: LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

In reply to Dave Mason in Kipple #42, no, none of my best friends are Negroes. When I was in grade school (in Illinois) there were a couple of Negro boys who were among my better friends, but at the time I wasn't particularly conscious of the fact that they were Negroes. That was fifteen years ago, anyway. Since I moved back South in 1949 I have not had any very close Negro friends. For one thing, it's practically impossible. Most Southern Negroes distrust any Southern white--an attitude I can't blame them for at all, but one that's hardly conducive to the formation of close friendships. I'm not the sort of person who forms close friendships easily anyhow; with an obstacle of this magnitude in the way I don't even bother to try. So I wish he'd stop trying to put words into my mouth.

Secondly, I don't recall saying anything about going slowly. I said the timing was bad, and I still think it was. If the Birmingham demonstrations had started a year ago I would have had no objection to them. (I would still have objected to the violence, on principle, but not to the timing.) But as it was, the timing looked very suspicious to me. It's not as if they were spontaneous demonstrations. Rev. King came into town and announced

THE GREAT DEBATE

ahead of time that he was going to lead demonstrations and then did. They got a bit out of hand, he admits. If they had been spontaneous then it wouldn't have been a question of timing--you don't "time" spontaneous demonstrations, they just happen when a situation reaches the boiling point. But this one was timed--and it looks as if it was timed to cause the maximum publicity rather than the maximum results in terms of what Rev. King claimed to want.

I didn't in any way intend to imply that, as Mason puts it, "the Negroes began by attacking police." I don't think that implication could be read into my comments. I more or less assumed that everyone knew pretty much what had happened and didn't see any point in belaboring the obvious. They didn't begin by attacking police, but they did end up doing that--which meant that it was no longer a "non-violent" protest. It was an insurrection. An insurrection in which my sympathies were on the side of the rebels, it's true; but that doesn't make it any less of an insurrection. The pertinent point is whether there was anything to be gained by it.

My personal opinion is that there wasn't. I could be wrong. If I am, then it was right for the Negroes to resort to violence; if I'm not, then it wasn't. Since what I think about it is not going to make any difference except to furnish topics for discussion in Kipple--since I'm not in a position of sitting in formal judgement on the case--I am not unduly worried about whether I'm right or wrong.

As for my remark about the Birmingham demonstrators not seeking legal rights, it was perhaps too open to misinterpretation--I intended it as a simple statement of a fact which I thought everyone would acknowledge, but evidently it wasn't taken that way. I was referring to the four points which Rev. King and others said were their motivation for demonstrating. They were: desegregation of eating facilities, rest rooms, water fountains, fitting rooms, etc. in places of business; better jobs for Negroes; release of those arrested for demonstrating; and something else which I forget at the moment. Anyhow, with the exception

Letters

of the release of arrested demonstrators--which question arose only after demonstrations started, obviously--the things they were seeking were things which were the responsibility of private individuals, not of the government. That's what I meant by their not seeking legal rights; if the meaning was fuzzy, I apologize. But what I meant was that their protest was not directed at the city government but at practices of the local businessmen, and that therefore they were more or less dependent on gaining the good will of the businessmen rather than in forcing a situation where the law (Federal, of course) would step in on their side. They weren't asking for anything which the Federal government had the power to give them.

Re your comments on my letter in Kipple #43--I'm not so fantastically literal-minded; I was just needling you a little. You have used the same tactics on more than one occasion yourself, you know.

Anyhow, further thought has caused me to change my mind about the principle of a public-accommodations bill--I'll now agree with you that such a thing would be desirable. Now all you have to do is convince me that it would be enforceable without prejudice. I'll agree that a proprietor should not be permitted to discriminate in his business on the basis of irrelevant qualities in his patrons, of which race is certainly one. Now you tell me how a bill can be phrased to make sure that if he wants to discriminate on the basis of relevant qualities--like cleanliness, for an offhand example--he can be sure he won't be hauled into court if he denies service to a member of a minority group, even if this person does not meet his other, relevant standards. The trouble with this kind of law is that in ruling out discrimination on certain bases, it tends to have the effect of eliminating the possibility of discrimination of any kind (which is sometimes desirable and even necessary) against any person who could be discriminated against on the grounds outlawed by the bill. It's a sticky question, I still say. ((Since all laws are imperfect, injustices occur in every area covered by law. The very nature of a public accommodations statute will probably increase the number of regrettable cases in which persons are falsely accused and even falsely convicted. Our law is structured, however, in order to grant the accused every possible courtesy. While a significant number of proprietors may be taken to court and falsely accused (an admitted annoyance), the very nature of our legal system will prevent the majority of these innocent victims from being convicted. The possibility of false conviction continues to exist, of course, but I believe it is outweighed by the benefits to be derived from such a bill.))

A fairly good example of this kind of thing is evident in Civil Service Regulations. There is a new directive out from Washington which stipulates that if a promotion is available, and a member of a minority racial group is one of the top three candidates for it, then failure to give him the promotion must be justified in writing to Washington. This essentially gives a Negro a tremendous advantage in competition for Federal jobs: no supervisor likes to have to justify something in writing to Washington, so the result will be that in most cases the Negro will get promotions at the expense of equally qualified, perhaps better qualified, whites. Maybe this is a good thing--a sort of compensation to the Negroes for past discrimination in the other direction--but I know that I'm just as happy that I'm not going to be working for Civil Service much longer. I don't like the thought of being discriminated against just because I'm white, any more than the Negro does because he's black.

Some of your comments against my earlier position (which I have renounced) are not true, though, or irrelevant. In the first place, I haven't seen a hardware store even in Mississippi that refused to sell

to Negroes. Businesses affected by the public accommodations law fall into a very few categories. Essentially they are housing (hotels, motels, and the like), eating (restaurants, lunch counters, etc.), and recreation (amusement parks, swimming pools, etc.). Most other businesses are willing to serve anyone who has the money to buy--at least I've heard of very few that wouldn't. Biracial patronization of other businesses doesn't require anything resembling social contact, as these do. And it is relevant that patronization of all these types of businesses is pretty much a voluntary thing. True, the most ardent segregationist wouldn't stop eating because all the grocery stores sold to Negroes--but then all the grocery stores do that anyhow. But I know a lot of people who would rather give up eating at restaurants than eat at one that served Negroes. I know a lot of people who would build their own swimming pool or give up swimming rather than swim in a pool used by Negroes. It would hurt a business financially if it had to integrate--I am still convinced of that. But you and others have convinced me that it is the lesser of evils, so I'm not arguing that point with you.

Incidentally, my father's church has called a congregational meeting for the purpose of taking a vote on whether or not to ask him to resign. He is pretty sure that the vote will go against him, though the furor has turned up an unexpected amount of support for him. He has been under a lot of pressure to resign out of hand, but has so far refused, in order to force the congregation to go on record as being opposed to his preaching Christianity.

In your comment to Charles Wells you gave two premises that you said were the basis of your personal philosophy. The second is reasonably straightforward ["human life possesses intrinsic value and ought not to be willfully destroyed"] and I agree with it, but the first ["justice is a desirable state"] is like saying you're against sin. What is justice? Until that term is defined, it is practically a meaningless statement, unless you intend it to be a definition--in which case what is a "desirable state"? I realize that you have discoursed on justice at great length in earlier issues of Kipple, but I still don't know what you mean by it except that "Justice is what Ted Pauls says it is." This is all right in its own way, but rather unsatisfactory as a basis for argument. Of course, Plato spent most of the "Republic" attempting to define justice, and didn't ever succeed in convincing me that he was right--you would probably have an equally difficult time in convincing me that your definition was right. In fact, I'm not so sure that I could ever be convinced of a definition of justice, because I'm not sure that such a thing exist. Justice is more of a catchword than a meaningful concept. It means many things to many people--and practically everybody would agree with you that it is a desirable state, by their definition of justice. Hitler thought it was just to incinerate Jews to protect the purity of the Noble Aryan Race--so he'd agree with you. Other examples come to mind easily. No, you will have to define what you mean by justice in unambiguous terms (if this is possible--something of which I am by no means sure) before I know whether or not I agree with you that it is a desirable state. (There can be no hard and fast definition of "justice", because justice is not an object like a barbeque pit or a desk. But perhaps the same effect may be achieved if I briefly describe what I envision as the just society: All ideas, actions and individuals are judged on the basis of their merits, not on the basis of irrelevant qualities such as skin color and affluency (in individuals) or--in the case of ideas--association with other ideas; no person or ideology is discriminated against by law or consensus; no individual or group may force their view on another individual or group, except for the absolute necessity of self-protection (e.g., the suppression of crime). These criteria may seem limited, but they abolish

nearly every fault of our society. Admittedly, this just society is a highly improbable utopia, but the standards set forth above might at least help you to understand my conception of "justice".)

What do you have against geography? Were you bitten by a geography book at a young age or something? Seriously, it depends on what you mean by the term, but I believe it to be of considerable importance and becoming steadily more important to have some idea of the nature of the rest of the world as regards its physical and human resources. I consider this to fall within the province of geography. If you want to say that that's something else, then what do you mean by geography? Maybe what you mean by geography would be a waste of time--but I'd have to know what you meant before I'd be willing to agree. (The effect of climate and environment on human society is certainly worthwhile knowledge, but it cannot be studied in isolation. The ways in which a population is molded by its environment should be examined within the realm of history and politics, in which context these matters are highly relevant. This is what constitutes "geography" in most schools, with a smattering of geology and a few lectures about the difference between a plateau and an escarpment added. There simply seems no justification for dealing with these matters as a separate classification.)

"The only possible justification of our continued reliance upon weapons of total extermination would be that they do no present harm and would never be used by either side under any extremity of provocation. Can any mature mind comfort itself with either hope? Even our experimental explosion of nuclear bombs, at a rate of more than two for Russia's one, has poisoned our babies' milk, upset the delicate ecological balance of nature, and, still worse, defiled our genetic heritage. As for the possibility that nuclear weapons will never be used, our children in school know better than this every time they are put through the sadistic mummery of an air-raid drill and learn to 'play disaster'. Such baths of fear and hostility are gratuitous assaults against the young, whose psychological damage is already incalculable; their only service is to bar more tightly the exits that would permit a real escape." --Lewis Mumford, in The Atlantic Monthly.

MIKE DECKINGER :: 14 SALEM COURT :: METUCHEN, NEW JERSEY

I submit that courage is so tenuous and indistinct a quality that no definition can accurately pinpoint it, so that no definition may be used in precisely determining whether or not a specific action constitutes an act of courage or not. I further submit that your analogy of the swimmers needs modification. Courage is always a relative concept; it cannot be applied to an action along (i.e., Mr. S- raced up the hill during a wartime skirmish, risked his life, and destroyed a large number of the enemy encamped there). Mr. S- may have been a neurotic who was completely incapable of crouching in a foxhole for hour upon hour, waiting for the ultimate breakthrough. Mr. S-'s neurotic compulsion drove him up the hill, not a non-existent sense of bravery or courage. By the deed alone Mr. S- may have been a brave and courageous man, but examining it from the standpoint of motivation we can see that Mr. S-, on the contrary, was exactly the opposite--a weak-willed man unable to control his emotions. It would have taken courage for him to remain where he was. His reckless charge was not an act of courage but an incident that a stronger-willed man might have subdued, and he would have been the courageous one.

What I'm driving at is that an act of courage should not be examined out of context. Don't just look at the incident and from that a-

lone determine whether or not the individual in question is displaying courage. Look at the facts surrounding it. Suppose that I was suffering from a disease that made every movement a curtain of agony for me. Typing a letter while seated at my desk would then be a thoroughly and unshakeably painful experience for me. Yet, would I not be displaying courage if that was the case and I just felt I had to send a letter to you, irregardless of my condition?

While I am not acquainted with the content of the sermon that Dave Hulan's father delivered, the ensuing remarks imply that it was at least mildly slanted towards the integrationist viewpoint. For that, I respect the elder Mr. Hulan for his convictions and the method by which he carries them out. But this in no way exonerates the majority of the Southern clergymen who operate segregated churches, in complete opposition to the spiritual teachings of the Bible--with which they, as members of the clergy, should be especially familiar--as well as being the more encompassing moral wrong. There is no excuse for the incidents in which Negroes are turned away from the churches by ushers, with the full knowledge of the presiding minister, for trying to enter an all-white service. He may not agree with this action--but if he doesn't, it is his duty, at whatever the cost, to show his opposition. A clergyman who calmly accepts the majority's desire for segregated facilities, including churches, and does nothing to voice opposition is a poor excuse for an alleged man of God. The clergyman must sermonise, argue, wangle, and even demonstrate for the rights of the Negro--or he is no more of a clergyman than you or I.

And I seriously question if a minister who preaches a strong integrationist theme is really in danger from the white trash in his congregation. A few rabble-rousers may find his remarks repulsive, but I don't believe anything like hordes of Ku Klux Klansmen will descend on him, masked in sheets and little pointy hats to fit their little pointy heads. The Southern racist has some intelligence (infinitesimal though it may be) and he realizes full well that the ministry would be in a position to oppose his campaign. And I'm sure he also realizes the ineffectual position in which the hypothetical clergyman finds himself, possessing very little power to accomplish anything outside of exhorting his congregation to abandon their ways, and perhaps marching in a few picket lines. Nearly all ministers, priests, etc., prefer to adopt the passive stand, in the smug assumption that heavenly intervention will clear the air.

"Half of the nation has little or nothing to do with churches and assumes that 'religious freedom' implies freedom of their irreligiousness. It does not. America tolerates all churches. But no church tolerates unchurchliness; because of that, the free mind of the nation is disenfranchised without knowing it. We are enslaved by religions even when we will have none of them. They are one when one of them is criticized. Indeed, the pressure of sanity against them today is driving their sects toward physical reunion." --Philip Wylie, in "An Essay on Morals".

FRANK WILIMCZYK :: 447 10th AVE. :: NEW YORK 1, NEW YORK

For what should be obvious reasons, Paul Wyszowski's letter interested me--and additionally for a few not so obvious reasons. From time to time over a period of approximately fifteen years, I have tried to read Dante and have been unable to do so. In fact, I generally bog down after a page or so. The only translation I've run across that seems at least halfway readable is Dorothy L. Sayers', which is a prose trans-

lation, and is just about as uninteresting as the verse translations--including Ciardi's, which is supposed to be one of the best. But recently I discovered the Oxford set, which has the Italian on one side and a literal English translation on the other. My Italian leaves something to be desired, but I've found it pretty easy reading, since when I run across a word I don't know I just glance across the page for a definition instead of having to pull out a dictionary. The translation is just about the worst I've seen, but it's practically a word-for-word one, which makes it convenient. As Paul mentions, poetry, even in a language as "close" to English as Italian, is practically impossible to translate, although this is not just because of the difference in meanings of words. There's no comparison, for example, between "Nel mezzo del' cammin' di nostra vita" and "In this, the midway point of our journey through life".

I think Paul could have chosen a better example to illustrate the divergence of languages than a single word, which at least has a rough equivalent (aside note: I wonder how you can translate "I love ice cream"). There is a wider area of most foreign languages which is impossible to translate into English: conversation. All conversation. And I don't think that any American who learns a foreign language can quite grasp this concept, no matter how accurately he assimilates grammar, etc. It's an over-all emotional feeling. Take, for example, a couple of illustrations from my own experience. You see, in Polish there are three forms of direct address: very informal, then a sort of intermediate (second person plural), and very formal (third person). Now, back home (and perhaps Paul's background is different than mine) we used the informal, but when I meet someone for the first time I use the middle area, just to be safe. Fairly recently, I met a Polish girl who'd only been here for a couple of years. We talked for a while--intermediately--and somewhere along the line I called her Andzio, which is what we would have called her back home. She gave me a pretty surprised look, and told me I should call her Anna, not Andzio. On the other hand, some years ago a girl I had met at the Art Students League turned out to be Polish, though I hadn't known this when I first met her. One day I heard her chatting with some fellow in Polish, so I went over and joined the conversation--but when she talked to me, it was so formal that I immediately realized that she didn't consider me too close a friend. Since I hadn't spoken Polish for years except at home, I was kind of surprised at my reaction--I just froze up.

Regarding Polish poetry, one of the things that I imagine would be pretty hard to get across (aside from the rather odd construction of the Polish language) would be the spirit of nationalism that runs through it--particularly the 19th century material. It seems that exiled Poles were always writing love poems to women who were not really after all but symbols of the lost homeland, and it gets rather frustrating after a while.

Bill Malthouse's letter evokes a couple of memories of high school teachers and courses. I was kind of a maverick in my teens, and when I ran into something which I considered particularly fuggheaded, I just wouldn't cooperate. For example, in my freshman year of high school one of the compulsory subjects was geography. The subject didn't interest me in the first place, and I gave up completely on it after the first test which we were given. One of the questions was, "What kind of agriculture is carried on in Central Europe?" Only half-thinking, I remembered a phrase in the textbook to the effect that "Intensive agriculture is carried on in Central Europe," and sort of automatically wrote that in as the answer. But when I looked at it, I thought, "That's not a kind of agriculture," and crossed out the answer. It turned out that "intensive" was the right answer, and I never cracked the geography

textbook again. On the other hand, I had some good math teachers, even though one of them couldn't maintain discipline in the classroom. There were only a half dozen of us in class who listened to what she said, but her explanations were so clear that I never had any trouble understanding what was going on, and was able to float through the course without ever having to take the textbook home. Unlike Bill's teachers, though, she just ignored the pupils who weren't interested in keeping up, and the course progressed without obstruction. I didn't feel much sympathy for anyone who didn't try, just as I didn't mind just scraping by in the geography class which did not interest me.

"Concerning outward worship, I say, in the first place, that the magistrate has no power to enforce by law, either in his own Church, or much less in another, the use of any rites or ceremonies whatsoever in the worship of God. And this, not only because these Churches are free societies, but because whatsoever is practiced in the worship of God is only so far justifiable as it is believed by those who practice it to be acceptable unto Him. Whatsoever is not done with that assurance of faith is neither well in itself, nor can it be acceptable to God. To impose such things, therefore, upon any people, contrary to their own judgment, is in effect to command them to offend God, which, considering that the end of all religion is to please Him, and that liberty is essentially necessary to that end, appears to be absurd beyond expression." --John Locke, in "A Letter Concerning Toleration".

ENID JACOBS :: 3914 BROOKHILL RD. :: BALTIMORE 15, MARYLAND, 21215

Actually, I was surprised at the lack of fuss and furor over the good Madalyn Murray's ousting of the prayer from Baltimore (and the nation's) schools. True, the lunatic fringe screamed "Heresy!" and "Communism!", thus waving the red flag and the bull, but this was to be expected. Still, there have not been as many wild-eyed protests as I had expected--perhaps because of the recent racial issue, which has been erupting in various places all around Baltimore, or perhaps because of the decision last June, which might have prepared the minds of the multitude for the Supreme Court's decision in this case. And I understand that in other parts of the country, Mrs. Murray's name would hardly, if ever, be recognized.

"The Harp That Once or Twice" seemed to be one passage in an entire symphony concerning Heinlein and his philosophy as revealed in his novels. Not having heard the whole symphony, I do not feel qualified to say much. Yet, I disagree on general principles that Heinlein himself advocates a philosophy discussed in one of his novels. After all, Heinlein is a science fiction writer and as such as got to constantly invent new ideas, technological advances, philosophies and political systems, and psychological effects of these--to make his living. Possibly he may feel that the world might come to thus-and-so a plight, but I seriously doubt if he solemnly advocates the fictional system, and is, in fact, using the novel form for propaganda. More likely, he is rather cynical (meaning no criticism of Heinlein) about the situations in his works, choosing to write about what is original and will sell. As for the "recurrence of sadism and violence" in his work--I do not think one can single out Heinlein for brutal scenes. So many books are crammed with them today that they are more boring than horrifying. Again, Heinlein could be accused of cynically following a trend to sell his material--but not of personally advocating violence. It's true that Heinlein never seems to pass judgement on his characters or their way of life (I thought the hero of "Gory Road" was a stupid, limited clod, yet the au-

thor never gave any indication of recognizing the stupidity of the main character), but that is no proof that he actively approves of what they do. ((Your defense of Heinlein would be a good deal more applicable if it were not based on a false premise--viz., that Heinlein was being criticized for a philosophy advocated in "one" of his novels. No author can be held accountable for the philosophy underlying a single work, but Heinlein has preached substantially the same doctrine in all of his major works. In "Beyond This Horizon", for example, Mordan, one of the central characters, is questioned as to why a subversive underground organization was allowed to plot a revolution unhindered by a government which was fully aware of its intentions. He answers, first, that they were allowed to proceed so that they could be exterminated when the attempted coup materialized, rather than bothering with the troublesome formalities of trying them for subversive activity. But suppose the revolution succeeds? he is asked. "If the rebellion is successful, notwithstanding an armed citizenry, then it has justified itself--biologically." This is the evolutionary ethic, the "survival-of-the-fittest" credo with which Willis dealt. Translated into less subtle terms, it means "Might makes right!" For a few years after Darwin published his theory of evolution--when the intelligentsia still labored under the misapprehension that natural selection meant tooth-and-nail struggles--this philosophy was popular. It still is popular in some quarters, including, as Willis observed, the Chinese Communist Party and the extreme right-wingers of this country. Also, Willis mentioned Heinlein's campaigning for bigger and better hydrogen bombs--a facet of this discussion with which your defense made no attempt to deal.))

Bill Malthouse: I appreciate your "horror stories", and your points are well taken. The main criticism I have of the "masses are asses" philosophy is that it could lead to a segregation of educational facilities by socio-economic groups. Since brighter children usually come from a middle- or upper-class environment (partly because of more emphasis on learning in these classes), education, as usual, might get the bass-ackward idea that children of these classes are invariably bright, and children of the lower groups are invariably and incorrigibly stupid. Thus, much brain-potential would be lost as intelligent children from the lower classes stunt their mental growth in inadequate schools--and a superior education is wasted on the dull-average children from "good" homes. Of course, Bill, you did not advocate such a system; I'm just stating what I fear might happen if so-called educators were to get ahold of the don't-educate-the-masses doctrine. Specialization? Homogeneous grouping? Yes! But on the basis of abilities (which is what you intended), not home-environment (which is what would result).

And, of course, something must be done about teachers. It is wasteful and pathetic to expect a bright young thing with an IQ of 120, a fear of thinking too deeply, and a promise to teach for the state for two years to encourage and stimulate--or even to understand--a gifted child with an IQ of 140--much less that occasional rare genius of over 160 IQ points. And I speak as a denizen of a state teachers college.

Good God! Not that old white-is-right hogwash...! It amazes me that people--from intelligent men like Dr. Carrel to the veriest clod--actually believe that it is somehow "better" to have less pigmentation in one's skin. One stalwart white supremacist recently told me that "God made them black--for a reason." The reason, she went on, was that "they" are not "as good as us." It never occurred to her that this artistic deity might have given "them" darker skin because, let's say, he preferred the richer, more exotic color and decided that the Negroid race was more worthy of it than the Caucasian, who only rate a peaked, wishy-washy whitish skin. Why not? The ways of "God" are supposed to be

incomprehensible to man--yet he constantly acts as interpreter for his deity.

"I am also sure that my ancestral skin was brown, but not too dark and not too light. White skin is a defective skin and why white man should be so proud of his pink and white complexion is hard to say. Perhaps at heart we are not too pleased, for no other race seems so anxious to hide its skin from the gaze of others or look so nude when stripped of clothes. White skin and prudery seem to go together. Certainly a light brown skin is more becoming and generally more efficient. As it is, when white-skinned beauties and other shapes step from the shade into the sun they must be covered with clothing, lotion, wide-brimmed hats and sunglasses. The ten-gallon hat of the Texan is a sign of weakness and his predecessor got along well with only a band to keep his hair out of his eyes." --N. J. Berrill, in "Man's Emerging Mind".

VIC RYAN :: 2160 SYLVAN ROAD :: SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS, 62704

I admire the idealism behind your hypothetical restaurant proprietor's choosing his clientele on the basis of "relevant qualities", but it would seem, in practice, that this would virtually guarantee discrimination. To you a "relevant quality" might be simple good behavior, but since that's practiced by a vast majority of restaurant-goers, and since its opposite is punishable by law, it hardly seems that "relevant". Skin color will be relevant to a bigot, and no high-minded appeal is ever going to change that. ((I am hardly concerned with what qualities are relevant to a bigot; if we allow bigots to set our standards, lynchings will become a popular American passtime once again. Race is simply not a relevant quality in most situations, and therefore public establishments should not be permitted to discriminate on that basis. Good behavior, amount of money, and state of dress are qualities which are relevant in this context, and the proprietor of any public establishment is obviously entitled to discriminate on these bases.)) Somewhat more applicable would seem to be the ability to pay one's bill --and here, again, the Negro is out in the cold: his financial state might be the result of discrimination in hiring, promotion and wage-scales; but the fact is that the assumption that he'll buy less and be less likely to pay is probably a good deal more correct than it would be were it applied to an anonymous white. Sad, but true.

I wonder if Bobby and Jack Kennedy have come to some sort of agreement anent the civil rights march that's due in Washington this month? It's just idle curiosity, I know, but the only public statements on the part of these gentlemen have indicated that Jack is eager to see it, provided that it's orderly, and that Bobby thinks it's unlikely to do any good and will probably be of harm. Surely there'll be a reconciliation--that is, perhaps the Negro men will be able to cross into the Capital, while the women and children must wait just across the line, or some such thing.

"The attitudes compatible with the urge to conform are established at a very early age; the competition which exists to enter college comes too late to be of any assistance." I won't grant this as long as our society continues to reward achievement as it does; but even if it were true, wouldn't this knock a rather large gap in the liberal's "brotherhood" concept? For surely the attitudes which are compatible with racial hatred, prejudice and bigotry are formed quite young, and no amount of cooperation or education can alter them? ((Most bigots cannot be swayed by logic or reason, true--but how does this affect what you call the liberal's brotherhood concept?))

As far as I'm concerned, you simply haven't supported your allegations that today's educational system encourages conformity at the expense of excellence and individuality. I certainly didn't find this the case in grade school or high school, where there were awards, "gold stars" and such for almost any sort of academic achievement. The real awards are fewer in college, but more meaningful; and in no instance have I found the urge to conformity that you seem so dead-set on announcing. Perhaps I've overlooked the ratings for "group adjustment" simply because I've gotten along well enough with my peers never to have had to worry. Perhaps what I thought before was simply necessary discipline and moderate emphasis on cooperation is the dreaded "molding" of which you seem so terribly apprehensive. But that or any other mis-emphasis on my part still doesn't cloud the fact that I was given every opportunity to be better than the crowd; most of the crowd--though not all--had the same opportunity. A few took advantage of it, and were rewarded.

That the genius may aid himself physically where the moron is more hopeless is, of course, true in a sense; but it still begs the question, by assuming the genius need aid himself thusly, or that the moron has any conceivable reason to better his mental status. (Intelligence has greater value as a survival characteristic than brute strength. If a genius and a moron were marooned in different areas of a hypothetical jungle, the genius, even if his strength and endurance were vastly inferior to that of the moron, would stand a better chance of surviving. The physically powerful clod would have only his strength on which to depend to keep him alive; the genius, while he would probably be incapable of the feats of strength performed by his fellow human being, would be able to build a fire, fashion weapons, devise ways of determining which plants were edible, determine direction (and hence insure against wandering in circles), and in general improvise until rescued. Of course, in any given case, the moron might survive while the genius died; but on the average, the intelligent man would have a better chance.) "Abstract qualities?" They may make your life more meaningful, but a double-play is fully as aesthetic to the laborer, sitting in his hammock, watching his kid mow the lawn while he ogles the television set.

"The common run of Americans object to any pretention to a higher standard of intelligence, or any assertion of an original point of view as a direct denial of American democracy." --Beatrice Webb.

EARLE STEVENS :: P.O. BOX 662 :: DeRIDDER, LOUISIANA

Honest, Ted Pauls, you can be a liberal. The polemic in question was in response to a current rash of denials of the existence of the conservative view on campus. I stated nowhere that the current crop of college students cannot be liberal; the contention being that the conditions of their servitude in this veil of tears is highly inconducive to it. I do maintain that there are more intelligent liberals than conservatists (as John states, they claim the name for themselves)--the shock troops of the far right aren't made up of professors, or, for that matter, of college students. Radio-stimulated imagination, I am told, helps in education, but certain qualities and experiences in our early environment and upbringing are not absolutely essential to the formulation of a liberal philosophy, although they do help. Old Tom Paine and James Madison weren't spoon-fed escape from birth; they studied dead languages, not Cooking 1B; they achieved discipline in the arts of learning and reasoning. I do not contend that young students

today cannot achieve the same, but I do state that the atmosphere in past generations was more conducive to this. Also, I concluded by stating that with an easier row to hoe, we didn't do so well; so how can we expect you to do better? The liberals who say that there is no resurgence of conservatism on campus, I am afraid, are projecting. (They see things through horn-rimmed glasses, darkly?)

Be fair, now--you printed an essay by Mr. Willis, told your readers how great it was (and I enjoyed it thoroughly), but cautioned them to be lenient because it was loosely woven. Those few lines of mine in the Pointing Vector were just the presentation of an idea, in outline form. You may or may not agree, but where was the logic so clumsy, and why shouldn't I tell you I'm a liberal?--I'm not proud. (I did not object to your calling yourself a liberal, but rather to the tacit implication that I wasn't. "We know who Taft senior and Fighting Bob are--does he? How could he be a liberal?" This line is representative of the entire tone of the article, and struck me as fairly clumsy logic. "He doesn't know who F.D.R. was, not really," you said of the current college generation. "...he may have read a few pages about the Second World War in a history book and some crud written for the he-man set in the men's magazines." These statements and others are given as reasons why the contemporary college student would tend to be a conservative rather than a liberal. But such reasoning is not justifiable. It is true that I know relatively little about "Fighting Bob" LaFollette--just as I suspect college students of the early 1980's will know little about Medgar Evers or Stephen Young--but this has no bearing on political concepts and ideals.) Point: anti-intellectualism hadn't taken as firm a hold upon our school systems prior to 1954, at least not where I went to school; nobody took a tape recorder to my school to trap a teacher.

The point of the article was simply to demonstrate, glibly, that we shouldn't be too surprised by an outgrowth of Rightism in our higher institutions of football.

I don't know how you and John Boardman differ on the politics of survival, but I feel safe in assuming that it is in part due to his stand on militant liberalism. For many years I believed John to be more than a little extreme, but I have come to see that his views may not be sufficiently extreme. I have spent the last two years (involuntarily) in the Deep South, the home of the great American traditions of greasy fried food and racism, conservatism, states' rights-ism, ad infinitum. I have lived with grass-roots conservatives, and, to tell you the truth, they scare the s--t out of me...

"The ancient theory of the just war breaks down when victory is impossible, when the weapons are so indiscriminating as to destroy both sides. What objective justifies the extermination of a whole nation or of the human race to attain it? How is it possible to practice restraint or selectivity with a weapon which wipes out cities with one blow and which creates fallout destroying all life within hundreds of miles? What is right about preparing for a nuclear war which could poison the atmosphere and make the earth uninhabitable?" --Harold Fey, in "God and the H-Bomb".

TOM PERRY :: P.O. BOX 1284 :: OMAHA, NEBRASKA

Possibly part of the reason for the varying concepts of liberalism is that "liberal" and "conservative" actually refer to the attitude taken toward the world and philosophy more than they do to the beliefs themselves. Thus, Jefferson was a liberal who held some of the same

concepts some conservatives defend today.

This may also help explain why a person who regards himself as a liberal can value human life so little as to advocate that one person be killed in order to alleviate the emotional problems of another. To be fair to you, this is not, of course, the light in which you consider it. It takes imagination to regard a foetus as human--it is red, and uglier than most babies are by the time most men see them; and the condition of the woman carrying one reminds one not of the natural state it is, but of a huge tumorous growth. Possibly one of the most convincing premises in Willis' article was the clear implication that adults have no right to slaughter infants to settle their problems, but the fact that a foetus or embryo is not so cute as a baby keeps you from applying this principle to abortions. (The physical unattractiveness of the foetus is not relevant; there are many unattractive human beings (myself included), but no rational person advocates wiping them out because of this trait. But I contend that a foetus is not "a person". The embryo is alive, biologically speaking, but it is an extension of the mother, possessing no individuality and unable to exist independently. It bears the same relation to the mother as does my arm to the rest of my body: a living organism, capable of movement, receiving nourishment from the parent body, but possessing no consciousness and incapable of independent existence. It takes, as you say, "imagination"--an overabundance of it--to consider the morula (the cluster of cells which attaches itself to the lining of the womb after the first week) "a person". Is the embryo "a person" after the first month? After the second? Where do you draw the line? Unless you fall back on the Catholic dogma of assuming that the "soul" enters the body at conception, it seems that your arbitrary classification of the foetus as "a person" is ill-advised. No reasonable definition of an individual could overlook qualities which the foetus does not possess: consciousness, personality, biological independence.)

I share with you an admiration for Willis' clear logic concerning the lack of necessity for war, and I have to admire also his fine sarcasm. But I wonder if his target--Robert Heinlein--really deserves it. Violence has cropped up in Heinlein books, but it hasn't been prevalent. Willis can point to "Gulf" and to "Starship Troopers", but what about all the material in between? Books like "Double Star" and "The Star Beast" show two very different races getting along together, albeit with problems. As for torture, I think "Between Planets" shows quite well that this evil can be undertaken by people "just doing their jobs", and furthermore portrays it as an evil. No matter what I thought of "Starship Troopers", I don't think all of Heinlein's work can be condemned because of it. What about "Tunnel in the Sky", in which the very principles of cooperation Willis lauds are enunciated?

It's worth pointing out that Walt Willis' favorite science fiction author, A. E. van Vogt, has written a number of stories in which alien life-forms are evil and cannot be dealt with except by violence. I'm thinking chiefly of the tales incorporated into "The Voyage of the Space Beagle". Some of the beasties therein were definitely intelligent but quite individualistic. And if I recall correctly, the hero, Grosvenor, stated some principles that ran counter to democracy and cooperation, which were applicable at least on the interstellar ship where the story took place. (Not having read the story in question, I cannot judge van Vogt's motive, but the obvious should be mentioned at the risk of seeming redundant: democracy doesn't work on board a ship, and presumably this would apply to an interstellar spaceship as well as to an ocean-going vessel.)

The point is, of course, that van Vogt did all this without being attacked from all quarters as a warmonger. A matter of timing, I

suppose: perhaps if "The Voyage of the Space Beagle" had been newly published in our present atmosphere of concern about nuclear war, that book too would be interpreted as a cosmic allegory whose lesson was that we should wipe out the Reds even at the cost of so-many-odd mega-deaths.

In any event, I think that the notion that man will go into space and meet something he can't get along with on any terms is a fair one to take in a science fiction story. Under such conditions, the military leaders might well develop a philosophy and a view of history like the one Heinlein portrayed.

As for the "crackpot manifesto signed by (Heinlein) and circulated by G. M. Carr," Mr. Heinlein has disclaimed knowledge of Mrs. Carr's publication of anything over his signature. He does so in a personal letter to me. I wrote him, asking about the "manifesto" after Willis mentioned it to me. He replied most graciously that he knew nothing about it. At the time--some two years ago--I had no way of publishing it, but I mentioned it to Willis in a letter and got no response. I think possibly Willis might disagree with Heinlein's views on H-bomb testing--and I might, too--but I consider Mr. Heinlein much more credible than Mrs. Carr.

"Perhaps the most important fact concerning the life of man today is this fact of interdependence. No nation, community or individual can gain any lasting measure of security without taking that fact into consideration. The resources that man must utilize, if he wishes to escape the fate of his less intelligent relatives now known only by their fossil remains, are unevenly distributed and locally concentrated. The techniques of discovering and utilizing them are now fairly well known, but satisfactory procedures for making them and their products available to all members of the human family are not close at hand." --Kirtly Mather, in "The Crust of the Earth".

STEVE STILES :: 1809 SECOND AVE. :: NEW YORK 28, NEW YORK

At last I can think of one good reason why Nixon should have won the presidential election in 1960: it would've kept Goldwater from any possibility of getting into the White House in 1964.

In regard to some of the reprinted letters re the Murray case: It is remarkable how many people can be against communism only because it supports atheism. If the Communists forsook their totalitarian outlooks, their imperialistic tendencies, their unworkable economic doctrines (and there are some indications that certain Communist bloc nations are moving in this direction, perhaps including Russia, as illuminated by recent events: viz., the test ban, the split with China, the growing number of artistic freethinkers within Russia, etc.) and only retained an official atheistic outlook (though not trying to force it on people), I for one would have little reason to oppose them. It would seem that to some of these religious fanatics, the question of civil liberties is a very minor one.

You do, however, do that 15-year-old an injustice in labelling him a nincompoop. He was merely unhappy that the Lord's Prayer had been removed from his school; presumably he liked it. So? This makes him a nincompoop? (I was objecting not so much to what he said, but to how he said it. He didn't know how to write good English well...)

Paul Wyszkowski asserts that morons are gaining control of human events, but I must say that this is not my impression. The evidence of the activity the next generation is taking in regard to social reform, intellectual and artistic pursuits, etc. (to a greater extent, some

say, than has been reached in the past among the youth of this country), and the efforts that have been made in that direction by today's present generation, would seem to point to a different conclusion. Sure, we still have our "wars and rumors of wars"; but in this century we have something new--the United Nations, and the frantic strides towards banning armaments since World War I.

You say, in reply and agreement to a valid statement by Marty Helgesen, that flag saluting should be removed from public schools because it smacks of social coercion. True, a child refusing to engage in the ritual would probably be punched in the nose--but probably not because of abstract patriotism, which the average child cares and knows little about, but rather because such an action would be non-conformist and most children by their natures follow strong herd instincts (which they can disregard later if they are psychologically or intellectually oriented to do so). One can be glad that children usually act as a group; I shudder to think of the mischief and chaos which would be wrought if they all became individualists. But a thing like flag saluting is not social coercion, but a social agreement. As a child, I was happy to salute the flag; I was proud of it (and still am, in certain areas). I was not proud because I agreed with the foreign policy or the actions of the political party in power, but because the flag represented to my child's mind the people around me, the songs I enjoyed, the block I lived on, etc. The flag was and is a representation of the environment in which we live, not of a current political school of thought.

CLOSING NOTES:

If there is a number in the upper-right of the address box, it refers to the number of the last issue you will receive; the letter "T" means that we exchange periodicals; "S" indicates that this is a sample copy; and the absence of any symbol whatever means that you are receiving this publication for a more esoteric reason--viz., I owe you a letter, your name is mentioned herein, I like the way you spell your name, ad infinitum.

There are also letters and cards on hand from: John Boardman, Larry McCombs, Mark Owings, E.E. Evers, Rosemary Hickey, Louis Rodde-wig, Kena Rhanagas, Joe Pilati, Bill Plott, Harry Warner, Nathan Bucklin, and Tom Seidman. Some will appear next issue.

FROM
Ted Pauls
1448 Meridene Drive
Baltimore 12, Maryland (21212)
U. S. A.

printed matter only

return requested

may be opened for inspection

SEND TO

Len Moffatt
10202 Belcher
Downy, Calif.

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



SENT

404

9-16-62