

Kipple

47

OCTOBER 2, 1963

Kipple is edited and published at irregular but frequent intervals by Ted Pauls, 1448 Meridene Drive, Baltimore, Maryland, 21212. This periodical is available for letters of comment, exchange with other publications, contributions (articles, verse, etc.), or the cash sum of 20¢ per issue. This magazine is published by the Greater Baltimore Committee to Repeal the Sex Act. -WOKLpress-

JOTTINGS FROM THE EDITOR'S DESK

THE TRIALS AND TRIBULATIONS of an amateur magazine are legendary, but Kipple #46 experienced a difficulty which may be unique in the annals of amateur journalism. Exactly one-half of the pages in that issue had been duplicated when the A.B. Dick Company very inconsiderately switched paper mills without troubling to notify the editorial offices of this august publication. Consequently, it was discovered that the paper on which twelve pages of #46 had been printed was no longer possible to obtain. The A.B. Dick Company subsequently sent a brace of its most comely secretaries to apologize profusely to the enraged editorial staff, but the damage--alas--had already been done. One hopes that the loyal Kipple readers will accept the word of the editorial staff as to the sincerity of the company's apology, and accordingly continue to patronize the repentent organization.

A CUBAN ODYSSEY: The wisdom of a group of American students whose political sympathies lie predominantly left-of-center engaging in an illegal jaunt to a particularly obnoxious Communist nation is seriously open to question, even assuming the sincerity of the travelers. The host country, having undertaken to finance the tour at considerable expense, is likely to bombard the senses of the curious visitors with deliberately contrived facts and scenes in the hope of deriving some propaganda value from their reports of the situation. Such a government is also likely to encourage the selection of prejudiced travelers in order to secure an additional advantage. Moreover, what is observed and reported, even granting these limitations, is unlikely to be credited as accurate by the stay-at-home majority who should presumably display an intense interest in such first-hand reporting, since the reporters themselves can be so easily discredited by unscrupulous political opponents. For these reasons, the illegal visit of 58 American students to Cuba seems particularly ill-advised at this time. In the final analysis, the only justification for the pilgrimage is the probability that it will ultimately result in a legal test of the constitutionality of the original travel restrictions.

The amount of abuse and vitriol heaped upon the rebellious individuals is grossly out of proportion to the offense, however. Granted, they are guilty of a transgression against the law, but their expressed purpose for this disobedience is not without merit. Indeed, I myself would be interested in discovering exactly what is occurring in a number of countries (including Cuba) with greater accuracy than can be obtained from the pages of American newspapers, although admittedly I have

no immediate intention of traveling abroad in order to satisfy this curiosity. Granted, too, that the Americans were unlikely to have been shown facts and situations which would result in publicity detrimental to the Castro government; but their tour was by no means narrowly restricted, and consequently their general impressions as to the attitude and morale of the Cuban people were probably accurate to some degree. And granted, finally, that the ideological inclination of the visitors is one which would suggest insufficient objectivity in their judgements, it is not enough to discredit their statements by accusing them of being predisposed to prefer a socialistic government. It is only in the minds of their political opponents, the reactionaries, that socialists are equated a priori with Communists.

Once again, it is the ubiquitous monomania of American anti-Communists which is responsible for the treatment accorded these voyagers at the hands of the press and certain segments of the government. No one can reasonably object to their prosecution under law for having committed an infraction of the regulations in traveling to Cuba; the students knowingly broke the law, and must be prepared to suffer the consequences prescribed by that law. Perhaps the anti-conservative monomaniacs of the Left will object to this punishment with the same vigor with which their right-wing counterparts objected originally to the jaunt, but their objections will be purely political with no constitutional justification. However, the extra-legal persecution which is simultaneously taking place should be protested by every advocate of liberty. The students have been crucified in the press and subjected to the venom of that ignominious council of character assassins, the House Un-American Activities Committee. Not since the infamous events of "Operation Abolition" has the Committee stumbled upon such perfect targets for its vengeful wrath: since the great majority of Americans are predisposed to be suspicious of the travelers, HUAC can carry out a campaign of pernicious character assassination which is unusually vicious and thorough. Witness the principal accusations levelled against defendants before the Committee, as recorded verbatim by the ever-accommodating press: "Philip Luce...associate editor of Rights magazine, a publication of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, which has been described by congressional committees as the 'legal arm' of the Communist Party." I do not contend that Mr. Luce is not a communist or other subversive; but I do submit that the Committee has not succeeded in proving it. The "evidence" cited in this brief summary is merely that Luce is associated with a magazine which is published by an organization which "has been described" as a Communist affiliate. Behold another indictment: "Wendie Nakashima...who attended the Communist-organized Helsinki World Youth Festival, was arrested for disobeying civil defense instructions during a drill and worked in Castro Cuba in 1960. She said she was married to a Jacob Rosen. Committee counsel said it 'has information to believe Rosen is a Communist'." This nasty little dossier does not even have the dubious distinction of connecting the victim to a supposedly subversive group; it merely points out that she dislikes civil defense, attended--along with thousands of others--a Youth Festival, worked in Cuba in 1960, and may be married to a man whom we are to believe to be a Communist on the basis of undisclosed but implied information. Unfortunately, too many Americans will read the indictments of Miss Nakashima and Mr. Luce, and mistakenly believe that something or other has been proven.

Some of these travelers may be Marxists; most are certainly hopelessly naive political infants. But this does not justify the blatantly unfair tactics with which HUAC and the newspapers have sought to discredit their observations and besmirch their reputations. A truly free society should not tolerate such abusive practices, even--or perhaps es-

pecially--in the name of opposition to Communist tyranny.

THE RELUCTANT CANDIDATE REVISITED: With the realization of his covert desire to acquire the Republican presidential nomination nearly within sight, Barry Goldwater faces an imposing dilemma. In those halcyon days when he was merely an outspoken Senator with no apparent higher political ambitions, it was very easy indeed to glibly refer to an overwhelming conservative groundswell, a mass movement dedicated to the tried and true principles of yesteryear. There were millions of Americans, boasted Barry, who eagerly awaited the opportunity to cast their ballot in the cause of true conservatism. But Barry Goldwater is nothing if not a clever and accomplished politician, and he is well aware that the political strength of contemporary conservatism is largely illusory, despite their impressively loud voices--that the bark of the right-wing zealots, to borrow a venerable metaphor, is often worse than their bite. Hence a new figure has in past weeks dominated the political horizon: Barry Goldwater, Moderate Republican. His recent efforts to broaden his appeal in order to capture votes outside the narrow confines of the vocal Right have resulted in some odd examples of oratory, to say the least. The Senator has even unbent so far as to admit in a recent interview that the use of Federal troops to enforce desegregation is sometimes justified, surely a heresy in ardently pro-Goldwater circles. And although his final judgement with respect to the partial nuclear test-ban treaty was the anticipated one, he claimed at one time to be undecided and open-minded as to whether or not he would support the treaty. Consequently, his final decision to oppose the treaty appeared superficially to be the result of considerable thought and soul-searching, rather than a snap judgement. (In actual fact, his opposition to the treaty was almost automatic: Even while it was being negotiated, Senator Goldwater had violently opposed the concept of such a treaty, demanding that American negotiators be recalled and the entire project scrapped. His subsequent avowal of open-mindedness and indecisiveness with respect to the end product of these negotiations was therefore a political maneuver, nothing more.)

One difficulty aggravated by Goldwater's new-found moderation is his identification with right-wing extremists. He must now successfully disavow the support of such individuals and groups (or make it appear to the voters as if he had done this, which will produce the same effect) while simultaneously managing to retain their backing. Actually, I have no doubt that he would prefer to forget the entire issue, if the Democrats would allow him to do so. His initial effort to reconcile his lunatic-fringe support with his self-designated moderation and "libertarian conservatism" consisted of a simple denial that neo-fascist organizations such as the John Birch Society could, in fact, be considered extremist groups. Of late, when asked about the radicals of the far Right, Senator Goldwater has taken to replying with a question of his own: Who are these radicals of the Right, anyway? Then, before the perplexed chap has an opportunity to reply, Barry proceeds to expound on the radical Left--which, of course, he considers the truly dangerous area of political thought. Goldwater's radical Left includes not only the Communist Party and various Marxist and Socialist splinter groups, but also the Americans for Democratic Action and the American Civil Liberties Union. (The fact that conservatives generally tend to consider concern with civil liberties largely or wholly a left-wing concept is, to me, the finest illustration of the qualitative difference that exists between the two policies.) The eminent law-maker then explores in some depth the dangerous activities of this deadly combine of organizations--having successfully evaded the original line of thought.

But this entire discussion is purely academic, for a brief peru-

sal of the Senator's recent public statements easily belies the assertion that he is in any way moderate. If Barry Goldwater hopes to be believable as a "libertarian conservative", he must do more than soften a few opinions; his entire political philosophy must be revamped. Otherwise, Democratic orators will continually destroy his pretensions to moderation by quoting his less equivocal public statements--those which were committed to the public record prior to Barry's realization that to be elected, one must please the majority of voters. One can almost imagine Senator Goldwater's rosy cheeks become ashen when, at a rally for the Republican ticket, an A.D.A. agent in the audience raises the question, "Are you still in favor of General Edwin Walker's position with respect to troop indoctrination?" And the furor is only barely imaginable when, before an audience of young mothers, some inconsiderate political opponent quotes one of Goldwater's many demands for increased nuclear testing.

It should be an interesting campaign...

DEPARTMENT OF SPECTACULAR NINCOMPOOPS: To some individuals, appalling asininity is a congenital character trait; to others, it is a portion of their personality requiring a good deal of conscious effort and conscientious toil. This periodical is not certain into which classification he properly belongs, but Harry J. Hudlin, author of the following splendid epistle, is certainly entitled to consideration as a master craftsman in the field covered by the title of this section of "Jottings". His contribution to public hilarity enlivens the otherwise commonplace and non-controversial subject of American officials traveling abroad:

"The Baltimore News-Post stated in a news item that Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, was entertained by Premier Khrushchev at his plush Black Sea summer estate. This information was contained in a space in your paper of approximately 1-3/4 by 2-1/2 inches and would escape the eye of a majority of readers.

"Due to the recent Supreme Court decisions favoring the Communist philosophy, this meeting could be interpreted by many readers (including myself) as having a certain significance, namely that they both believe in the same ideologies. Further, this meeting may flatter and tend to influence Mr. Warren in further anti-American decisions. I am of the opinion a person in this high judicial office cannot enjoy the contacts of an ordinary citizen, politician or statesman, but should always be alert and conduct themselves in a free and pro-American manner as to avoid such contacts mentioned in this article."

RECENT DISCUSSIONS WITH VIC RYAN involving the question of whether or not intellectual ability can be said to be in any manner qualitatively superior to physical ability have degenerated into unproductive head-butting contests. In each letter column in which the discussion is prominent, Vic restates his contention in slightly different phraseology than had been used in the past, and I observe a similar process in reiterating my rebuttal. Neither one of us, apparently, has been able to discover the bridge of communication which would enable us to reconcile our divergent views. However, the discussion has not been a total loss from my point of view, for it has in-

spired my return to a perennially interesting topic: the nature of intelligence. Despite my fascination for this subject, it has been introduced in the pages of Kipple only where it has been relevant to another subject already under scrutiny. This tradition will continue to be observed: the principal reason for this brief inquiry into the nature of intelligence is to determine the characteristics of those individuals not fortunate enough to possess the quality in sufficient abundance, which should be of assistance in arguing my thesis with Vic Ryan.

This article is not going to be the sort of pseudo-scholarly treatise which occasionally appears in these pages due to the influence of classical philosophy on this minor thinker. There will be no discussion involving classical concepts of "intelligence"; I am not particularly concerned at this time with the definition of intelligence favored by Kant or Hegel, but rather with the possible value of my own contemporary observations. Strictly speaking, it is not possible to consider this subject in complete isolation from philosophical views and observations, if only because such classical thought has influenced to some degree my opinions. But insofar as it is feasible, the present inquiry into the nature of intelligence is intended as a reasonably concise, uncomplicated piece of commentary, based upon personal observation and thought. I do not even intend to bore the reader with a tedious recounting of the path by which I approached some of the conclusions to be set forth below; instead, such conclusions will be introduced and justified as succinctly as possible.

To begin with, it is advisable to distinguish between "intelligence" and "knowledge". Knowledge, generally speaking, is a conglomeration of facts and assumptions, sometimes rigidly systematized, more often disorganized. Such knowledge is obviously indispensable to intelligence, but does not itself constitute intelligence. Intelligence is something more than the sum total of an individual's knowledge, in the same sense that (to introduce an inaccurate but useful analogy) a cake is something more than the sum total of its ingredients. In the latter case, of course, it is easily determined that two things are necessary in order to create a cake from the separate ingredients: blending and baking. Discovering the missing quality (or qualities) in the first equation (" $kn + ? = I$ ") is considerably more difficult, however.

According to a venerable bromide, "Knowledge is facts; wisdom is the capacity to use them." As with all generalizations, this statement is not entirely accurate, but like the analogy of the cake, it may be useful in illustrating my view as to the nature of intelligence. I do not equate intelligence and wisdom--first, because it would be logically useless to do so, since an undefined term ("wisdom") would simply be substituted for another undefined term ("intelligence"); and secondly, because such a definition would neatly disqualify the vast majority of human beings (including your obedient servant) from any pretensions to intelligence. The proverb, therefore, is presented only as an analogy. My immediate premise is that "intelligence" may be substituted therein for "wisdom", thusly: "Knowledge is facts; intelligence is the capacity to use them." This does not define intelligence, but it accurately represents my view that intelligence is not knowledge, although dependent upon it. (All that is necessary in order to possess great knowledge is a comprehensive memory. While memory is certainly one of the factors involved in intelligence, it is not the sole factor. Quite a number of individuals engage in impressive feats of memorizing data who would not otherwise be considered particularly intelligent--e.g., the banal ignoramus who commits to memory the major-league batting averages for nineteen consecutive seasons.)

If intelligence is knowledge-plus, then what is that unknown ingredient without which knowledge is something less than intelligence?

There exists the strong temptation to use such a commonplace term as "detachment" or "perspective" or "objectivity", but all of these terms are in a sense narrowly restricted, by usage if not by definition. The terms "narrow-minded" and "broad-minded" are even more narrowly limited in application, and certainly bear no true relevancy in their usual context to the matters covered by this article. However, if the narrow boundaries of their ordinary definitions are set aside, these words may be used to describe as accurately as any I can call to mind the distinction between intelligent and non-intelligent individuals. I do not mean to say, of course, that I have decided that the distinction lies in the fact that intelligent individuals are invariably broad-minded, whereas less intelligent persons are inevitably narrow-minded. This bald statement summons up a picture of a dramatic comparison between an enlightened moral relativist, on the one hand, and an over-zealous, dogmatic prude, on the other. This distinction could conceivably manifest itself in such a stark comparison, but prudery versus enlightenment is only one insignificant area in which the cleavage between "narrow-mindedness" (expanded definition) and "broad-mindedness" (expanded definition) is noticeable.

The broad application of these terms may be best illustrated by considering a less controversial area, e.g., musical tastes. The maxim "De gustibus non est disputandum" to the contrary, there occurs a great deal of dispute with respect to difference in personal preferences. The narrow-minded individual (again using the expanded definition of that term) may be distinguished from his more fortunate brother by the fact that his own taste preferences are asserted as objective judgements of relative value. Instead of admitting, "I don't generally care for folk-music," this individual renders the unequivocal ex cathedra pronouncement, "Folk music is no good." He compulsively thinks in terms of his private tastes as being the "right" and "normal" ones; therefore, anyone who fails to agree with those tastes with the proper enthusiasm is obviously "wrong" and "abnormal". The intelligent individual may hold this attitude as well; ignorance possesses no monopoly on short-sightedness. But the intelligent individual is far less likely to subscribe to this particular fault and dogmatically assert that his personal preferences are objectively superior.

This does not truly succeed in defining what I consider to be the distinguishing feature of intelligence, however. Perhaps, all things considered, "perspective" is an accurate designation: the intelligent individual possesses a perspective on himself and his society which is unavailable to the average member of that society. He is capable of abstracting himself from any situation and examining it as an unconcerned bystander, of viewing his personal preferences and attitudes from a detached viewpoint and consequently being able, within certain reasonable limits, to render an objective verdict as to their actual value. He realizes, as a result, that his culture, his religion, his favorite music or political party, are but one among many, and not necessarily intrinsically superior to any other.

But if I cannot successfully define this quality, I can at least better characterize those in whom it is not present--a category which, unfortunately, includes the greater majority of human beings. Judging everything and everyone from his own subjective viewpoint, this individual lives in a curious world of black and white, good and evil. He is more susceptible to racial or religious bigotry, since the judgement that his race or religious sect are superior to all others is a natural one for him to make. He possesses, of course, a rigid standard of morality (which, however, he does not necessarily obey when it would inconvenience him to do so--although he expects unflinching obedience from other practitioners of the same code), and would enjoy seeing the

entire world adopt it. To this end, he is quite willing to engage in emergency measures such as book-burning in order to stamp out heretical ideas. His attitude toward all foreign customs is either outrage (when they conflict with his ideal of morality) or amused tolerance. He is occasionally willing to concede a certain degree of beauty to non-native art and ritual, but he never lays aside his air of contemptuous superiority. Since he is not always a truly ignorant individual, he may be well-read in the fields of history and anthropology, but the singular lesson of these studies eludes him. He is generally amused by anthropology, and its recounting of what he condescendingly terms "quaint" customs and mores.

He is, in short, appallingly narrow-minded. The entire world is, for him, a conveniently labelled assortment of absolutes, with every element neatly categorized as "good" or "evil" in relation to its divergence from his personal preference. Such an individual may possess considerable knowledge and be uncommonly clever; but he remains, like the William Jennings Bryan of "Inherit the Wind", a fool with the mental horizons of a dung beetle.

To reiterate, then, I conclude that the quality which we term "intelligence" is a combination of knowledge, memory, and a difficult-to-define "perspective" possibly connected to imagination. I am not completely convinced that these conclusions are accurate, but I have tentatively accepted the premises put forth in this article until such time as they should be proven false.

--Ted Pauls

"How you, O Athenians, have been affected by my accusers, I cannot tell; but I know that they almost made me forget who I was--so persuasively did they speak; and yet they have hardly uttered a word of truth. But of the many falsehoods told by them, there was one which quite amazed me--I mean when they said that you should be upon your guard and not allow yourselves to be deceived by the force of my eloquence. To say this, when they were certain to be detected as soon as I opened my lips and proved myself to be anything but a great speaker, did indeed appear to me most shameless--unless by the force of eloquence they mean the force of truth; for if such is their meaning, I admit that I am eloquent. But in how different a way from theirs!" --Plato, in "Apology" (Socrates speaking).

"We love those who hate our enemies, and if we had no enemies there would be very few people whom we should love." --Bertrand Russell, in "Human Society in Ethics and Politics".

"In best-selling books, magazines, movies, television programs, and some popular preaching, religion is offered as a practical aid to the prior needs both of the self and of the society. For the self, there is the familiar blend of psychology and religion that offers practical steps to make life longer, higher, fuller, and possibly wider by the use of religion. The link between religion and America's tradition of self-help literature appears to be strong and continuing. 'Success' is one of the main goals which religion of this sort is supposed to serve. More recently, along with the 'success' theme, the self-help religion has been directed toward allaying inner anxieties and difficulties: peace of mind, peace of soul, peace with God. In any case the pattern is to take either perennial or current goals for granted, as the prior and determining aims of life, and to advocate religion as a useful means for attaining them." --William Lee Miller, in "Religion and the Free Society".

THE GREAT

BILL CHRISTIAN :: 112 BIRCH CLIFF AVE. :: SCARBOROUGH, ONT. :: CANADA

As the course of American history marches along to the tune of President Kennedy's pious but hollow rhetoric, a great disaster is shaping up in the South, a disaster which could rend your nation apart as surely as the Civil War. And while, at the time of the Civil War, you were protected by the benign hand of "perfidious Albion", you would now be in the position of the great Hector in "Troilus and Cressida". You would have laid down your shield, but you would be found and destroyed by a vicious enemy without honor and without scruple. America needs all of its nation, North and South, Negro and white, to fight for its very survival.

The murder of Negro children by fanatic racists in the South points out the fact that there are desperate men who would stop at nothing short of an all-out terrorist campaign to achieve their goal, to foster their ideology, their belief. And all of President Kennedy's flowing phrases will not convince them by reason or emotion that the Negro is their brother, that he belongs in their schools, in their churches, or in their homes as a guest. And do not forget that the Negro, even in the South, is a minority in most communities. Even where he is not a numerical minority, he is most certainly in the educational/economical minority. Well, cry the liberals, surely you have just confessed that the Negro is oppressed, and unless you are a perverted white supremacist, you too must agitate so that Congress will legislate him into equality with the whites. However, this is precisely what I maintain Congress cannot do. No governmental body can, by fiat--presidential or otherwise--give to the Negro the education he needs to run a city council or a state legislature. And no number of resolutions can educate the Negro to take over the higher paying executive positions.

Liberals, as usual when they have hit upon a social wrong, are attempting to exploit it to the limit of its emotional and propaganda appeal. But beware, my friends, that you do not unleash another Macbeth. There are three ways in which the Negro and the northern liberal can hope to win: educational superiority, economic superiority, or "military" superiority. It will be readily granted, I hope, that the southern Negro is inferior from an educational point of view, and that he does not control the wealth of the South. He cannot attain a superiority in these factors until he has first attained de facto equality. But he does not wish de facto equality; he insists that he has a right to and will obtain de jure equality. He has, then, but one weapon, one force. Martin Luther King's program of passive resistance is bound to fail in this instance, simply because the southern whites know that they are right--they "know" that they have virtue and morality on their side, and "know" that they are waging a version of the Civil War against the damn Yankees like that black Democrat from Massachusetts. The main reason that Ghandi's policy of passive resistance worked so well against the British was the fact that the government of Great Britain, aside from being socialist in nature at the time, felt that India had the right of self-determination, and that Britain could not morally crush the revolution with fervor. But the southern white has no such gnawing doubt, no moral hesitation. And just like any human being who sees himself and his family and his way of life being pushed closer and closer towards the brink of disaster, the southerner will react--and he will

DEBATE

letters

react violently, especially against a violent or apparently violent revolution. It matters little whether or not from an objective point of view the southerner will suffer the fate he fears; the fact that he subjectively fears such a fate makes the fate as real to him as a madmen pointing a gun at his head and threatening to kill him. The field of psychology points out quite lucidly--and has been doing so for the last eighty years--that the fears and anxious apprehensions of the mind are just as real as those of actual physical danger.

The Negro has now been oppressed for one hundred years. Surely he does not wish to throw away all those things for which he has sacrificed in this time. If only he would wait--if only he could have the patience to wait perhaps another twenty or thirty years--he would be able to gain all that he wants without plunging his nation into a blood-bath in which the innocent and the young would suffer as much as the guilty and the old. As Edmund Burke wrote, "Rage and phrenzy can tear down more in half an hour than prudence, deliberation and foresight can build up in a hundred years."

"In Augustine's view the world was created for man's benefit: bees give honey for man's use; for the same reason, a cow gives milk. It sounds pleasantly plausible, but such a homocentric view raises the 'problem of evil': Why does the rattlesnake have fangs. (Or, as William Blake asked, 'Did God make the Tyger?') One can explain the evil created by the Augustinian mode of thought only through the use of a most dubious device--by saying that evil really exists for our own good, in some mysterious sense known only to God. Such an explanation may be true or it may be false, but it is logically objectionable because it is too good. Literally anything, true or false, may be explained by it. 'The infinitely mysterious ways of the Lord' is a panchreston, an 'explain-all'. No puzzle disturbs the thoughts of those who embrace a panchreston: neither do they discover new truths." --Garrett Hardin, in "Nature and Man's Fate".

FRED LERNER :: 926 FURNALD HALL :: COLUMBIA COLLEGE :: N.Y.C., 10027

I agree with your remarks anent the lack of knowledge and the deliberate slanting of history concerning the aboriginal inhabitants of our hemisphere. What especially annoys me is the glorification of General Custer which many textbooks and history teachers impart to students in American schools. To my mind, Custer is well qualified for the title of "first American Nazi". In Dr. Max Rafferty's much publicized speech, "The Passing of the Patriot", the California educator complains that "the sterile culture of the Pueblo bulks too large in our curricula", and advocates devoting that attention to the Greek heroes such as Ajax ("beef-witted Ajax") and Achilles (who spent all his time queering around with Patroclus). Whether the Greek heroes are a better influence on schoolchildren than the Indians is open to debate, but only a nitwit could categorize Pueblo culture (or indeed, any American Indian culture) as "sterile". (I possess only limited information on General Custer, but I suspect that his personal philosophy generally mirrored that of another "hero", General William T. Sherman, who said that "The only good

Indian is a dead Indian." This sentiment is, of course, similar to the Nazi attitude towards Jews. But it is not surprising that these men are revered today as heroes: Any society which is capable of venerating Jesse James, Billy the Kid and John Ringold as "folk-heroes" is capable of any similar idiocy.))

The American Indians are not the only ones who get a tough break in our history books--pick up any high school history textbook and read about the Crusades. "The Catholic Church preserved Western culture" indeed! It was the Moslems who saved most of Greek philosophy, and who brought science from the theoretical to the experimental stage. It was the Jews who had the only decent literacy rate in all of Europe. The Christians are claiming a lot of credit for other people's accomplishments.

"Another way in which even a national fallout shelter program could increase the chances of war is by lulling the nation into a false sense of security. We are even now being led to believe the claims of Life magazine or Doctor Edward Teller, that with some fallout protection most people could survive a thermonuclear war, while the probable fate of our cities is hardly publicized. To support this illusion of safety, all the tricks of modern advertising are being drawn upon: gay pictures of teenagers chatting in shelters, survival statistics based on minimal attacks against military installations, claims of overwhelming military superiority on our side, and even appeals to individuality and the spirit of the old frontier, as though winning a thermonuclear war were a matter of showing manly courage. Thus Kahn says that 'We are in a position much like the pioneer. He had to carry a gun because the Indians might attack him.' (This analogy makes sense only if one substitutes 'neighbors' for 'Indians'.) Under the spell of this false sense of security the American people may become more willing to support an adventurist military policy rather than more fervent in demanding disarmament negotiations, just as our leaders may become less hesitant about pushing their terrible buttons." --Erich Fromm & Michael Maccoby, in Commentary.

WALTER BREEN :: 2402 GROVE ST. :: BERKELEY 1, CALIFORNIA

Has Bill Christian ever heard of Paleolithic Europeans, Camaiura Indians of Brazil, Eskimos, or any number of Australian and South Pacific tribes, whose known (or, in the first case, archeologically-reconstructed) histories indicate no evidence of war or oppression? Is he aware that many tribes exist even to the present day without even a word for "war" or "sin" or "hell" in their vocabularies, tribes which have no particular difficulty in surviving in harmony with their natural environment? Despite his assumption, related in an earlier Kipple, that man is basically strongly inclined towards evil-doing, the evidence appears to indicate that oppression and enslavement and other evils are pretty much restricted to peoples of what G. Rattray Taylor calls the "patrist" persuasion, tribes whose attitude to other tribes is not "live and let live" but "convert them to the one true path". Freud's doctrine of the "id" is irrelevant. A person's id is not a repository for hatreds and sadistic drives and Will to Power from birth; if it gets that way, it is for the very good reason that the person has been twisted in early childhood. Were the id necessarily twisted, e.g., by the hypothetical "original sin" to which (true to his family name) Bill Christian seems to be appealing, psychoanalytic or other methods would never untwist it.

Re education: My own much-criticized utopian ideas on education actually fit in surprisingly well with Marion Bradley's analysis of the

of the situation. As some readers may remember, I advocated maximally homogeneous grouping, together with sets of semi-annual examinations, non-competitive, but increasingly difficult; students failing in any of them may repeat them indefinitely if they wish to get ahead, but after all concerned are satisfied that the student has reached his limits, every effort is then made to shunt him off to a vocationally-oriented kind of school where he would not be expected to progress intellectually--rather, to get the kind of job-training, etc., which Marion correctly says that the kids basically want. I wanted to make college and graduate school something attainable only by the small minority who can actually get along in it. A kid who enters college and drops out after the first year has wasted several hundred hours of instruction, hundreds or even thousands of dollars of parental money (or state money if he was in a state university), together with a lot of effort or even misery, to no discernable purpose. Tom Seidman showed me a quotation from Edgar Z. Friedenberg in the May 1963 issue of Commentary which fingers the real issue: kids are in high school, for the most part, largely to keep them out from underfoot, off the streets, out of other trouble (if possible) and--most importantly--off the labor market for a few more years.

Anita Simon observes, "Every child should have the chance to get a full education." What is a "full" education? How much chance? Is the same effort to be expended on the dull-normal to push him through college (via fraternity files of exam papers, ghostwritten theses, etc.) as on the brighter boy who really wants to learn something there? Where do you get the idea that Marion Bradley is "creating failures by her own standards of excellence"? Would you have no standards at all other than the Average? And when you say, "only by being a failure under the subject matter curriculum can a boy be a nonconformist", you ignore the extra-curricular areas in which nonconformity is possible (though, to be sure, subjected to adverse pressure). In citing Jim, you're loading your case by taking as an example someone who presumably has some kind of vocational aptitude and who wants to work; what, then, can be said for the school inmate with no discernable aptitudes whatever (other than perhaps seducing girls)? Tom Seidman was clearer than you are on the matter of social adjustment; insofar as you align yourself with adjustment proponents, you slur over the fact that one's group (e.g., in high school) is not automatically of one's own choosing. A group into which one fits by conscious choice is not one in which one has to make the sacrifice of individuality (with certain obvious exceptions, e.g., monasteries); either the rest of the group accepts you as you are, or else you've made the sacrifice and do not consider it such. Accept me as an individual or not at all; love me as I am or not at all. There is no contradiction between this challenge and a mutual commitment to another individual. I don't expect the one I love to give up her individuality; I accept her as she is, and vice versa.

Ted, what is justice? How can you be sure that the term has any meaning at all? (Not wishing to continue the apparently limitless debate by repeating comments which I have previously made, let me say simply this: Our system of jurisprudence recognizes (in theory, if not always in practice) that all persons are equal before the law. In deciding legal issues, the courts administer "justice" by resolving controversies objectively, regardless of extraneous details and emotionalistic side-issues; cases are resolved, in other words, on the basis of their intrinsic merits. It is my feeling that this conduct should be extended to all aspects of societal contact, to all dealings of one individual or group with another, and I chose to term this "justice"; if you consider the term meaningless, suggest a better one. What we decide to name this state of society is not particularly important; what is im-

portant is that we agree with respect to its desirability.)) And if human life possesses intrinsic value, can you conclude (as in fact some do) that the more lives, the more value? (The answer to this query would be far too involved for the limited space at my disposal in this letter column, particularly since I am uncertain as to your precise meaning. Are you bringing up the matter of a "better-that-one-should-perish-than-five" criterion, or is your question (as I suspect) concerned with over-population?))

I have been, for some time, trying to formulate my own reasons for regarding intellectual pursuits as intrinsically of greater long-run importance than sports. To many it may seem a self-evident proposition that intellectual pursuits are more important; to others, it is equally self-evident that sports are more worthwhile (they are their own reward, they are harmless, they do not contribute to the arms race or other dangerous enterprises, etc.). Perhaps it is significant that the proponents of each side are usually the participants, rationalizing their own prior commitment. Right now the question is anything but settled in my own mind. I have two related lines of approach: (1) orientation in time, (2) evolution. The first is, in effect, to say that by and large sports are ephemeral; the mere record of activity cannot give later non-participants anything like the immediate excitement experienced by the original participants. Further, so far as I can tell, they are unrelated to anything outside themselves save in the very narrow respect that competence in one form of athletics sometimes tends to correlate with competence in other forms of athletics, and that sometimes there is an aesthetic pleasure to be found in performing or watching the performance. Whereas intellectual endeavors often--though not always--have indefinitely vast ramifications outside themselves; they are sometimes their own reward, as in the discovery of some new mathematical relationship; the excitement is not ephemeral at all but communicable even at a distance of centuries or tens of centuries, contributing to what can ideally be a continuously self-correcting picture of the universe, enabling increasing control over environmental features which would otherwise be handicaps, or producing an unending aesthetic delight as new symmetries and natural laws are discovered. The evolutionary argument is that while a rudimentary kind of sport is possible to a number of different kinds of subhuman animals, intellectual pursuits are (along with creative arts) so far as we know limited to human beings. Therefore, why waste time on less than the best one can do? Of course, there never should have been the question of a choice between these things, to start with...

Since you reprinted Walt Willis' column from Warhoon #10, allow me to reiterate my reply to it from Sapterranean #4:

Leaning over backwards to show your opposition to one unacceptable position, you fall into another. I am as anti-war and anti-H-bomb as are you, but I cannot see that you have proved your case; you have set up a straw man. Being set to argue against a certain set of attitudes, you ascribed them to Calkins whether or not he actually expressed them. I've read through his "Summer Soldier" with some care and do not find them in that form or to that degree. Calkins argues that Heinlein (in "Starship Troopers") has been misunderstood and that civilized man cannot turn back the clock. You are arguing against the tory notion that the U.S.A. can in some real sense "win" an atomic war with the Soviet world, thus in some way demonstrating "survival of the fittest". Because social darwinism--the sociological interpretation of that slogan--has been in bad odor since the robber barons and Hitler, you jump on it once again and plump for the Ashley Montagu cooperation propaganda, probably unaware that it is propaganda...

You bring up the examples of Greek (it wasn't just Spartan) in-

fanticide and Eskimo exposure of the sickly aged. The latter is irrelevant (it is economic rather than eugenic, as these aged had already reproduced: see Ruesch's "Top of the World" for a sympathetic account of Eskimo society) and the former is a straw man. The Greek practice went on for many centuries, and until the plague of 430/429 B.C. (probably some mutant virus, like the 1918-1919 influenza pandemic) hit them really hard, the various Greek tribes were doing quite well. For their size, they had a tremendous number of first-rate artists, poets and musicians... A more recent instance of what natural selection can do is the American colonies. The period of 1750-1850 included a whole galaxy of statesmen and versatile, highly competent creative figures. (Jefferson was great, but many others had nearly his range of interests.) And that century was preceded by two centuries of rigorous natural selection. "Survival" types raised large families and did their best to give their kids a respect for learning. Non-survival types didn't stay around long enough to do so in such numbers; they died enroute, or died over here more quickly than the survival types, or couldn't take it any more and returned to England. This is one answer to your claim (doubtless quoted from Ashley Montagu) that "animal evolution...ceased to apply to the human race a long time ago". Nobody claims anymore that business competition or war contribute to evolution; even the Nazis disdained after awhile to flay that dead horse. In the above skeletal outline, which could be expanded to book-length (and has been, e.g., in Pendell's "Population on the Loose"), I did not mention the "unfit". But let me dispose of that issue too, since you bring it up. A realistic definition of the "unfit" would be: those who by reason of insufficient intelligence are incapable of independent existence, i.e., are permanently dependent on relatives or social agencies. (Those afflicted by certain rare hereditary diseases also fall into this category.) Now insofar as these "unfit" types can and do reproduce their kind in quantity, they are doing harm. Instead of advocating killing them (as you suggest that some do advocate), the obvious answer is to discourage in some way their reproduction, while allowing them their normal (?) sex lives. Oral contraceptives may be the answer. However, if the world population increases much longer, more stringent means may be necessary.

You perpetrate another piece of soft-brained Ashley Montagu propaganda when you say, "Mankind owes its pre-eminence to...the strong helping the weak so that their less obvious gifts benefit all: to revert to the animal laws of evolution means to become animals again." Gifted people are by and large physically superior types, not weaklings. (They are not necessarily athletes, but comparatively healthy, long-lived, disease-resistant.) Exceptions exist, but they are rare. Evidence has been accumulating on this point for at least forty years, ever since psychologists began to study the gifted. Havelock Ellis, Hollingworth, Terman, Witty and Gesell are only a few of the better known scientists who have contributed here, and their researches all bear out this conclusion. In referring to the "less obvious gifts" of the weak, you seem to be appealing to some supposed law of compensation which says in effect that the weak and the ordinary and the stupid have, somehow, special gifts which make up for their obvious deficiencies. Go visit any home for the feebleminded and talk to some of the inmates--then ask the custodians about this law of compensation. As for reverting to animal laws of evolution--hell, one reason why the army is so full of stupid types is that Homo sapiens has in fact reversed the evolutionary process. Human beings are animals, and the Roman church's systematic attempt to make them forget this has accomplished nothing but 2000 years of misery and progressive degeneration.

Nor have you sufficient basis for concluding that the Antareans (or whoever) have a peaceful and cooperative outlook because their

technology is more advanced than ours. They may, indeed--or they may not. To Ashley Montagu is now joined Gerald Heard...how deplorable.

The reliable data you seek, Ted, to prove that the relative number of stupid humans has increased, can be found in the Pendell book earlier cited--among many other sources. Possibly the ignorant have outvoted the intelligent in other eras, too, but not by quite so huge a majority.

I suggest that before you blast Heinlein for "campaigning for bigger and better H-bombs" you go find the exact text of the Heinlein advertisement in the Colorado Springs newspaper which G.M. Carr circulated through the Fantasy Amateur Press Association. It isn't what you think, or what Willis thought. I don't have it handy to quote here, but as I recall it, Heinlein was contrasting the risk of a nuclear war with what he considered the certainty of enslavement to communism, and he ended it with: "These are the risks. We accept them." As Tom Perry correctly says, G.M. Carr published the thing without Heinlein's knowledge or consent. (Walt Willis' formidable reputation for integrity has, it seems, placed me in the position of judging Robert Heinlein's views without first-hand knowledge. In view of my continual statements to the effect that one ought not accept any statement without subjecting it to thorough investigation, my embarrassment is particularly vivid. Since there seems to be no general agreement as to the existence or content of what Willis calls "Heinlein's crackpot manifesto", I will refrain from further comment on the matter until I have seen a copy of the document in question.))

Proprietors of many restaurants practice discrimination on an altogether different basis from a merely racial one: they assume that a would-be customer without necktie is de facto unsuitable. They consider it a "relevant quality"; I do not. Who is to say who is right in this instance? I know that in general a restaurant whose admission policy is as stuffy as that is not one I would want to eat in anyway--though perhaps I might find myself a suitable ethnic costume and claim to be a U.N. diplomat from some outoftheway Indian state, if it were really that important for me to eat there.

"Since some of the things men take for granted are likely to be wrong and some right, it is highly desirable that every society encourage the inquiring mind. If we are ever to distinguish between the right and the wrong, we shall most efficiently be able to do so through unimpassioned inquiry. Happily man is the most inquiring creature in creation, so we needn't worry. We should begin to worry only when obstacles are created to prevent men from pursuing their inquiries in freedom and without restraint." --Ashley Montagu, in "Man: His First Million Years".

JOHN BOARDMAN :: BOX 22 :: NEW YORK 33, NEW YORK

Your criticism of my assumption that Floyd Simpson murdered William Moore shows a gross ignorance of the methods by which legal processes operate in the South. However, although I disagree with you here, I am certainly liberal enough to enable you to make contact with other people who share your doubts of Simpson's guilt. I am enclosing a newsletter from a committee which also challenges the widespread belief that Simpson is Moore's murderer. (The leaflet in question asserts, among other things, that "Simpson...is being persecuted to satisfy the blood thirst of leftist race-mixers." Thus, to the advocacy of a guilty-until-proven-innocent ethic, John has added the use of guilt-by-association. I have, of course, no desire to contact the sordid council of

racists who sponsored the manifesto in question. I do assert that, in accordance with the finest principles of American jurisprudence, Floyd Simpson cannot be assumed guilty until convicted by a jury of his peers. To deny this basic premise--and then to imply that its advocates should enter into comradeship with the venomous racists who applaud William Moore's murder--is not only appallingly illiberal, but also personally insulting.))

I have just made some chilling speculations about the nuclear test-ban treaty. Barry Goldwater, as the most outspoken opponent of the treaty, has established himself in the public mind as the Man Who Warned America. Now what should happen if the treaty should fail, or can be made to look as if it has failed? Goldwater, having established himself as against the treaty from the first, would be swept into the presidency by a disillusioned and indignant public.

What would a Goldwater presidency mean from the Kremlin's perspective? It would mean a decrease in American commitment around the globe, to be followed by a corresponding increase in Soviet influence as the U.S.S.R. flows into the vacuum. In a speech in New York on December 8, 1960, Goldwater urged that Congress abolish foreign economic aid. In Phoenix, on December 20, 1961, he urged that the United States leave the United Nations. By leaving the problem of desegregation to the states, he would remove the power of the federal government from this sphere and drive Negroes to more and more desperate expedients as they realized that they could not count on Washington to support them. The resulting turmoil would feed the Communist propaganda mill and perhaps even give Communism stature among American Negroes. By breaking diplomat relations with the U.S.S.R. and other Communist countries, Goldwater would leave us in as much ignorance about the internal situations in those countries as we are today with respect to China and Cuba. In short, the U.S.S.R. would find a number of advantages in the presidency of Barry Goldwater.

So what has happened? By ratifying the treaty, the Senate has made it possible for Nikita Khrushchev to put Barry Goldwater into the White House! All he need do is to denounce the treaty in language as cynical as possible, and then blow some Arctic glacier into steam with a fifty-megaton bomb.

This is not to say that the treaty shouldn't have been ratified; but no one seems to have noticed this angle of it. (One unusually astute letter writer raised this possibility recently in the pages of the Baltimore Sun, but he was not certain that Premier Khrushchev would desire a Goldwater victory in the 1964 national election. I tend to agree. The advantages you cite are overshadowed by two obvious disadvantages which the U.S.S.R. would face: (1) the unprovoked suspension of the test-ban treaty would be difficult to justify, and the reaction of India and the African bloc, whose efforts in favor of disarmament and the cessation of nuclear testing have been prodigious, would hardly be friendly; and (2) the risk of nuclear war, with Goldwater directing the policy of the United States, would be sharply increased, an eventuality which Mr. Khrushchev should certainly be eager to avoid. Of course, the test-ban treaty is not an isolated political powderkeg; the collapse of any Kennedy proposal against which Senator Goldwater was aligned would have the same effect, as would an economic recession in the early autumn of 1964. To one degree or another, any such situation would be quite helpful to Barry Goldwater's candidacy.))

Dennis Lien's idea that all the gods of the various religions exist is an intriguing one, but the Mormons go him one better. A little-known tenet of the Mormon religion is, "As we are now, so God once was; as God is now, so we shall one day be." This means that someday each faithful Mormon will be able to create and rule absolutely a universe

of his (His?) own! I think that Philip José Farmer knew of this doctrine when he wrote his novels "The Lovers" and "A Woman a Day". One of the tenets of the puritanical religion preached by Isaac Sigmen also is that each faithful Sigmenite will one day rule a universe of his own. (The Sigmenites should emulate the Rosicrucians in appealing to the public through magazine advertisements, if only to amuse us by the sheer novelty of encountering a garish two-page spread captioned: "Yes, you too can rule a universe...!")

"The contrast between reform and revolution does not consist in the application of force in one case and not in the other. Every juridical and political measure is a force measure which is carried through by the force of the State. Neither do any particular forms of the application of force, as, for example, street fights, or executions, constitute the essentials of revolution in contrast to reform. These arise from particular circumstances, are not necessarily connected with revolutions, and may easily accompany reform movements. The constitution of the delegates of the third Estate at the National Assembly of France, on June 17, 1789, was an eminently revolutionary act with no apparent use of force. This same France had, on the contrary, in 1774 and 1775, great insurrections for the single and in no way revolutionary purpose of changing the bread tax in order to stop the rise in the price of bread." --Karl Kautsky, in "The Social Revolution".

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

It's rather pointless to argue with an editor, since he always gets the last word. However, I'm afraid I do regard as a human being anything that, left to nature, will grow into one. This is not because I accept the Catholic dogma but because I don't know when the "soul enters" or when it "becomes a person". Nor do I know that a foetus lacks consciousness, despite your assurance; I only know that it has very little of which to be conscious. I don't assume it can't feel pain, though, just because it cannot cry out. And are you quite sure things without consciousness or personality are not persons? Does that include people in deep comas, or those we usually think of as being devoid of personality? (Individuals in deep comas are obviously "persons"; they were perfectly ordinary people prior to lapsing into unconsciousness, and we may assume that in most cases their minds are intact beneath the surface of their condition. And I don't think that anyone lacks a personality, though there are individuals who are spoken of as lacking one. Generally, this means that they possess a terribly dull personality, not that their personalities do not exist. You may be correct in your other observations, and perhaps my position should be reconsidered. But consider the two women whose tragic deaths originally inspired this discussion (all of the anti-abortion participants in this discussion have been eager to discuss the foetus, but terribly reticent with respect to the adults). Both were forced by stringent laws to apply for the services of a medical quack, and both died as a result of the butchery. The embryos perished as well, of course. Does it not seem reasonable to you that the lives of these women should have been saved, if possible? The foetus in each case was doomed in any event; but a liberalized legal code would have prevented the death of the parent.))

I've just had a letter from Gertrude M. Carr concerning the "crackpot manifesto" of Heinlein's she is supposed to have published. I mentioned in the last Kipple that Heinlein disclaimed knowledge of it. Since both Heinlein and Willis are honorable men, as far as I'm concerned, this left the onus on Mrs. Carr. I hope you will be able to publish

the gist of her letter. She writes, in part:

"I have never published anything over Mr. Heinlein's signature--in F.A.P.A. [Fantasy Amateur Press Association] or anywhere else. However, I suspect what you are referring to is the Petition which was printed professionally about seven or eight years ago. These were for distribution to citizens who wished to protest then-President Eisenhower's proposed disarmament plans and contained a clip-out to be signed and forwarded to Washington D.C. I purchased a hundred or so of these petitions from Mr. Heinlein and distributed them with my Gemzine. (...) As I recall, it was a full-page advertisement on regular newsprint and carried Mr. Heinlein's name and address together with information for obtaining additional copies. (...) I don't recall how I came across it--probably in the mail."

It should be clear from this that she misunderstands the meaning of the word "publish" and if the petition went out with her magazine in 1955 or 1956 it probably went through the Fantasy Amateur Press Association, since she was a member then and her magazine was a regular part of the mailings.

I have been warned (aptly enough, by Harry Warner) not to quote directly from the letter I have from Heinlein. Paraphrased, though, he says he has not (as of March 1961) addressed anything to science fiction fans as such and does not know what F.A.P.A. is. He does mention a newspaper ad he ran in 1958 concerning nuclear testing and says a few tear sheets went to people who may or may not be science fiction fans. He indicates that fewer than five such tear sheets would be involved.

I suspect that the shortcomings of human memory can be blamed for the discrepancies in time and number, and that Mr. Heinlein and Mrs. Carr are talking about the same thing. The only thing that remains in question, I think, is whether a petition against disarmament can rightly be termed a "crackpot manifesto". By dictionary definition a manifesto is simply a public pronouncement, but it seems to me that the connotations of the word are somewhat stronger. However, a petition might well contain a manifesto.

As for Mr. Willis' use of the word "crackpot"--ordinarily I have the deepest respect for Walt's judgment, and if I knew nothing else about the persons involved would be inclined to accept it. However, I also admire Mr. Heinlein. Without having seen the petition--neither Mr. Heinlein nor Mrs. Carr could supply me with a copy--I wonder if Walt's use of the word might not come from a lack of an intimate acquaintance of American politics. Distrust of disarmament and desire for continued nuclear testing is a legitimate political viewpoint in the United States, held by many people who are not crackpots, though they may be wrong. I've received recently a letter from a Republican Senator from my state which explains why he did not give his vote to the limited nuclear test-ban treaty. He says his committee heard testimony from military and scientific experts who said the treaty would be dangerous to the United States. Since your editorial admitted that there might be an element of risk in the treaty, perhaps you would agree with me that these people are not crackpots.

"An optimist may see a light where there is none, but why must a pessimist always run to blow it out?" --Michel de Saint-Pierre, in "Les Nouvelles Littéraires".

MARTY HELGESEN :: 11 LAWRENCE AVE. :: MALVERNE, NEW YORK, 11565

I generally agree with Enid Jacobs' views of the ethics of religious debate. If there is disagreement, which, as she points out, is

obvious in the fact of belonging to different groups, it is not only proper but necessary to discuss the disagreement in an effort to find out who is right.

In your discussion of civil disobedience, you asked what would happen if divine law commanded evil rather than good. This is a meaningless question. Since God is the source of good, it would be impossible for his law to require evil. ((The point I was making was simply that divine law was not obeyed on the strength of its holy origin, but rather because it is believed to be right. The tenets of Islam which decree Jihad (holy war) against infidels are not obeyed merely because of their esteemed origin, but because the practitioners happen to believe that holy war is an honorable venture. If Islam banned Jihad , but it was nevertheless esteemed by the practitioners of the religion, it would continue to be undertaken; conversely, if the individual Moslems detested the idea of a holy crusade, then the fact that their religion advocated it would probably not sway them. What this means, translated into general terms, is that persons generally tend to obey laws and moral dicta only to the extent that they agree with them or fear the consequences of disobedience.))

In #44 you say that the philosophy of racial superiority is the philosophy which stoked the ovens at Dachau. This is correct, but incomplete. Another philosophy which contributed to Dachau is the one which says that for a "good reason" it is permitted to murder innocent people. This is the philosophy of abortion. ((This is not the philosophy of abortion so long as there is reasonable basis for the assumption that a foetus isn't a "person".)) In your reply to Tom Perry you attempt to avoid this by denying that an unborn child is a human being. You claim that the embryo bears the same relation to the mother that your arm does to the rest of your body. Please let me know when you intend to have your arm separated from your body so that it may grow into another human being. ((If my arm is through some unfortunate accident separated from the rest of my body, it will cease to extract nourishment from the "parent" body and mortify; significantly, precisely the same thing will occur in the case of an aborted foetus at the stage at which such operations are generally performed.))

Your main point seems to be the question, "Where do you draw the line?" I would like to ask you that question. I believe we would agree that a new born baby is a human being, ethically safe from being killed for the convenience of another (even though the qualities you mention are present more in potentiality than actuality, as in the case of a foetus). Yet what of the baby which has cleared the mother's body but is still connected by the umbilical cord? Is it a human being? If not, I would like to know what strange power a pair of scissors has to create human life. ((Since the connection between mother and baby may be severed without any harm to the welfare of the baby, there is no parallel between this case and the dependency of the foetus.)) Also, what of Siamese twins who are connected by more than an umbilical cord. Are they not human? ((There is, again, no direct parallel. Siamese twins do not bear the same relation to one another that a foetus bears toward the woman carrying it. The question of whether or not Siamese twins should be encouraged to live is a separate one, and I shall not digress from the immediate subject at this time.)) If, on the other hand, the baby-connected-by-cord is human, we must go further back; back, in fact, to the foetus which, before, you claimed was not human. Or do you feel that the movement through the vagina is some sort of mystical "rite of passage" which somehow creates a man? ((I would tentatively suggest that a foetus is fully human when it is able to survive outside the body of the mother, i.e., as a premature baby. Of course, as I admitted to Tom Perry, you may be correct in believing that a foetus is a "per-

son" much earlier than that. This is debatable. What is not debatable is that mothers are human beings, and that the pair whose specific cases inspired this discussion are dead because of laws created to accommodate essentially the same attitude you have espoused.))

Aid to education on the basis of need (by number of schools or number of students) would not be preferential. It is true that on a nationwide basis the largest block of beneficiaries would be Catholic parents. However, their need--not their religion--would be the deciding factor. If changing circumstances led to another religious group sponsoring a greater number of schools, then parents of that faith would be the prime beneficiaries. This is not being preferential to any religion. Perhaps a parallel example will make my point clear. An FEPC law today would primarily benefit Negroes. In the Know-Nothing era, when the signs read "No Irish Need Apply", the Irish would have received the chief benefits. However, such a law is not designed to help Negroes or the Irish, but to provide justice and equal treatment for all citizens. The same is true of fair aid to education. ((If a law aids one religious or ethnic group over another, it is irrelevant to claim that the intent of the law is ostensibly altogether different. No one denies that the FEPC benefits Negroes; that this is not its explicit purpose does not affect the reality. Federal assistance to parochial schools will likewise benefit the Catholic Church a great deal more than any other sect; the claims of apologists for parochial school-aid that the intent of the law is non-preferential does not change the situation. If another sect should displace the Catholics as the prime beneficiaries, my objections would remain the same.))

"Democracy, which reached its most advanced and most active form in Athens, arose from a series of extensions of power to a bigger and bigger class, until in the end this included all free male citizens. It soon developed a marked character which distinguishes it from modern democracies in more than one way. It had, at least in its early days, an undeniably aristocratic tone. A tradition of taste and elegance was maintained by noble families like the Alcmaeonids, who, despite their wealth and lineage, welcomed the new system and took a leading part in establishing it. From them a sense of style spread to a wider circle and was enriched with a new strength and scope. Artists and writers, conscious that their public was no longer a few select families but a whole people, gave a new meaning to traditional forms and spared no effort to be worthy of their wider horizons. So too in civil and domestic life, as we see it painted on the vases, there is nothing vulgar or mean. Style and taste are always dominant and have an aristocratic distinction, as if they belonged to men who knew instinctively how to infuse any occasion with charm and dignity." --C.M. Bowra, in "The Greek Experience".

HARRY WARNER :: 423 SUMMIT AVE. :: HAGERSTOWN, MARYLAND, 21740

That new system of teaching a child to read might justify a try. For one thing, it is not too different from the customary method of teaching children French: don't let them see the written language at all for a while, then introduce them to its wild spelling only after they've become acquainted with the words by rote. The adjustment is made in this case. I can also testify from my own experience with Russian. This was a tough language for me to get even a nodding acquaintance with, but I got along much better when I spent some time with transliterations into English of the Russian prose. In theory it should have been hard to relate these phonetically spelled English-letter words

to the special forms given letters in the Russian alphabet and to adjust to the fact that Russian has some letters that have no existence at all in the English alphabet. But it worked out. Maybe the difficult thing for a child to do is to understand how these written marks relate to audible sounds and that when this knowledge is acquired, the child will have less difficulty translating the inconsistencies of normal English spelling. There's no way to be sure if the experiment isn't tried.

I'm not at all certain that you can dismiss contradictory religious doctrines by this method: that someone must be wrong if two persons have conflicting beliefs. There is the possibility that neither is wrong because God doesn't give a ~~damn~~ blessing about such tenets of faith. (If the specific matter is irrelevant to a deity, then both individuals are in error, because one claims (explicitly or implicitly) that God sanctions the action, the other that He prohibits it.) There is an even greater possibility that God functions in a manner as unthinkable to us as the processes of human thought would be to an amoeba, or even better, to a block and tackle. If you ascribe to God the Ted Pauls type of reasoning and thought, you can find all sorts of things wrong with conventional religious doctrines and activities. But if you admit that the human forms of reasoning may be as completely inadequate from the standpoint of God as a wheel on an axle would be inadequate as a mechanism for constructing a city, you begin to feel a trifle more humble and you can still feel superior to the fundamentalists and the superstition-worshipping Catholics and Baptists. (The aphorism that "God reasons in strange and mysterious ways" is no less a panchreston than "God works in strange and mysterious ways." Its use neatly resolves all outstanding doctrinal inconsistencies, but it is logically unacceptable precisely because of that fact.)

I'm quite gloomy about the Goldwater outlook. His cause has been championed by a number of Hagerstown men who are normally above the average in intelligence and common sense. It isn't hard to imagine a future in which a couple of accidental occurrences like the death of an astronaut during a space shot or a manipulated stock market crash could cause a decisive revulsion on the part of the undecided in favor of Goldwater next year. If it should happen that way, I would be satisfied in only one respect: it would end once and for all my hesitation about whether I want to try to spend the last part of my life in some other part of the world, preferably Europe.

Don't be too sure that your hypothetical weight-lifter wouldn't figure out a way to accomplish his purpose as promptly as you would. You would use a machine to lift the block of wood. He might purchase the "Republic" in talking book form or pay someone to read it into a tape recorder (these lower-than-average mentalities usually are quite successful in a financial sense, you know) and he could accomplish his end by means of a machine just as you did. I hope you don't claim that a person with an IQ of 80 couldn't understand the Plato work. He might have trouble holding up his share of the load in an intelligent discussion of the work. But its basic ideas are not too difficult for an individual in this intelligence area. (If, as you say, these lower-than-average mentalities are usually financially successful, why does the problem of a gradually increasing minority of permanently unemployable individuals exist in this society? As for "Republic" and its likelihood of being comprehended by an illiterate with an IQ of 80, you badly miss the point when you introduce the possibility of the work being translated into spoken form. Such a hypothetical individual as we have been discussing would be incapable of comprehending a tape-recording of "Republic" for the simple reason that he would be familiar with far too few of the words utilized in that tome.)

I wonder if John Boardman also feels that it's necessary to be violent with any New York men who date unmarried girls who live in apartments, now that the authorities have failed to track down the individual who killed those two career girls in such a bloody and lengthy manner a month ago?

"That the number of the wealthy increases and does not diminish is not an invention of bourgeois 'harmony economists', but a fact established by the boards of assessment for taxes, often to the chagrin of those concerned, a fact which can no longer be disputed. But what is the significance of this fact as regards the victory of socialism? Why should the realization of socialism depend on its refutation? Well, simply for this reason: because the dialectical scheme seems so to prescribe it; because a post threatens to fall out of the scaffolding if one admits that the social surplus product is appropriated by an increasing instead of a decreasing number of possessors. But it is only the speculative theory that is affected by this matter; it does not at all affect the actual movement. Neither the struggle of the workers for democracy in politics nor their struggle for democracy in industry is touched by it. The prospects of this struggle do not depend on the theory of concentration of capital in the hands of a diminishing number of magnates, nor on the whole dialectical scaffolding of which this is a plank, but on the growth of social wealth and of the social productive forces, in conjunction with general social progress, and, particularly, in conjunction with the intellectual and moral advance of the working classes themselves." --Eduard Bernstein, in "Evolutionary Socialism".

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

The application of a phonetic alphabet may be useless in teaching a child the complex intricacies of the English language, but its blatant presence is not totally unfathomable. Most learned educators will freely admit that the English language is one of the most haphazard and inconsistent languages that a child can learn. Letter combinations that should be pronounced the same way aren't, plurals are created out of a seeming galaxy of methods, contractions don't always conform to grammatical rules, ad infinitum. Perhaps the very reason that so many Johnnies can't read is because they can't absorb so flexible a system in a curriculum that normally relies on logic and order in its other courses. I don't say that phonetics is the final answer, but perhaps it's a paving stone on the path.

The fanatical regard that some have shown for the nuclear test-ban treaty reminds me a little of the proverbial drowning man frantically clutching the proverbial straw. Any treaty is only as good as its least reliable signatory, in this case the Soviet Union. The U.S.S.R. has shown no zeal in maintaining treaties before, and there is no reason to expect that in this instance they will forsake their prior actions and rigidly adhere to what may be the means of loosening some of their domination in the atomic field. (Critics of the treaty have complained loudly and often that the agreement will enable Russia to gain ground on the United States; you are, to my knowledge, the first to maintain that the opposite will occur, excepting the government officials who are forced to publicly adopt such an attitude.) I would greatly love to see the nuclear hazard reduced and I think that this treaty accomplishes the purpose, but only in the sense that it tangibly eases the cold war situation, and creates a somewhat more amiable picture of the Russians. Unfortunately, I doubt if they would agree to such a treaty, unless they were certain that they could conduct unde-

tectable tests--which could very well be the case. I don't believe the treaty represents quite the vicious appeasement some of its critics claim, nor do I believe it to be the ultimate life-saver. It's somewhere in between these two conflicting views, and I wish I had some idea where.

I too find Bill Plott's rationalizations for Goldwater more than a trifle eyebrow-raising. In a presidential contest between John F. Kennedy and Barry Goldwater it's clearly a choice of the lesser of two evils, and I would unflinchingly vote for Kennedy. I also find it surprising that Bill would resurrect that tired southern argument that the North is just as bad as the South. This point is used whenever a white southerner is accused of discrimination and outright prejudice. The accepted retort is to nod approvingly, neither confirming nor denying the charge, and then level a fiery volley alleging that much more pronounced racial hatred exists in the North. Unfortunately, there is racial prejudice in the North. It's even likely that there is racial prejudice in some form or another wherever two or more different races are grouped. This is not arguable or surprising; it is one of the axioms of human beings to behave in this manner. But the North is not an indoctrination ground for a loathsome hate-thy-neighbor policy, as is the South. The North is conscious of the problem and in many cases attempting to correct the injustice. The South is equally conscious of the problem, but steadfastly refuses to accede to the reasonable demands of the colored population. Most of the South continues to exist--mentally and emotionally--in the slave-holding era, when Negroes were property and not human beings. It is this poisonous doctrine which is being nurtured and taught to younger generations, while the older ones proudly adhere to it as the "southern way of life". We northerners may be hypocrites and we may practice some of the injustices, but how many of us believe so urgently in discrimination that it overshadows all other aspects of life, until strict obedience to this belief demands law-breaking and brutality?

There is also a curious distinction between white and colored justice in the South. The alleged bombers of the Negro church in which four young girls died have been captured, according to reports. It makes not one bit of difference whether these are the actual guilty persons or not; they will not be prosecuted outside of perhaps some formality, they will not be treated as criminals, and they will most assuredly not lose their lives, despite their having so violently removed the lives of four others. On the other hand, a Negro boy who blew up a grocery store owned by a white man in Birmingham was captured within a few hours. Despite the fact that he is under 21 years of age, he is having the book thrown at him--every heinous crime that can be pinned on him will be. He has no chance for a reprieve--he is in a pit of sadistic vipers who will ruthlessly toy with their prey before striking. How can you possibly contrast one instance of "justice" with the other? Of course, the young Negro boy was lucky in one respect: he wasn't shot "while trying to escape" or some such subterfuge, as is normally the case when colored lawbreakers are apprehended.

This is just a facet of the moral relativity about which Bill Malthouse speaks. It is so prevalent, existing in so many shapes and forms, that its actual abolition is totally impossible. It is born of greed and lust and desire and everything else that helps to shape man into what he is and what he remains. This is man in his basic form, stripped of the refinements in which society has clothed him. The preachers can continue to yammer about hell and the teachers can talk of heaven, but their not-so-subtle bribery remains as ineffective as it was three thousand years ago. We are changeless and unchangeable, neither desiring nor seeking an alteration in personality. Why toil when

theft is so much easier? Why study when cheating brings the same results with less effort? Why grant your fellow human being the same rights that you demand, when to do so would subject you to inconvenience? Why do anything in the name of goodness, when more favorable results may be achieved with deceit, treachery and dishonesty? I, too, am pessimistic that the situation will ever improve.

"I would say that we are a 'religious people' only in the sense that we are a 'reverential' people who have escaped the dogmatic anti-religion which has infected large portions of European society. But the 'religion' that is accepted as a part of our public life is largely a matter of good fellowship and good works; it is certainly distrustful of particular theological dogmas. Above all, it is distrustful of ecclesiastical authority. Rather than providing a basis for unity in our society, therefore, efforts to introduce any specific, dogmatically grounded religion into public life usually lead to frustration and ill-will." --William Clancy, in "Religion and the Free Society".

BOB UNDERWOOD :: BOX 1073 :: CHAPEL HILL, NORTH CAROLINA

I would very much like to join your legion of letter writers, but my time has recently been taken up in battling the North Carolina State Legislature, who in a recent stunning tribute to God, Country, Mother and Apple Pie outlawed Communist speakers at my state-sponsored university. I've written the Greensboro Daily News a few letters about it, generally shedding a little more heat than light. I won't bother to put forth my arguments, for I assume you must realize exactly how I feel, being liberal--though not communist--yourself. In any event, I hope we are making some progress toward the repeal of this compromise of the Bill of Rights. The major newspapers in the state are against it, as are many teachers, students, etc.

"I can foresee a time when we shall abolish our Latin-style alphabet and go back to something like Egyptian hieroglyphics in order to cater to a generation of readers who cannot visualize an idea without a picture." --Rev. E. Garfield Evans, in Look.

SI STRICKLEN :: ROUTE 2, BOX 1030 :: AUGUSTA, GEORGIA, 30904

I am a little disturbed by the way practically everyone who writes to your magazine freely and easily, with no apparent opposition, characterizes anyone who favors segregation as some kind of weird and horrible beast called a bigot. Everyone agrees, of course, that such people as the ones who bombed the Birmingham church or burned the bus in Anniston, Alabama, are some sort of warped criminals. But certainly it isn't fair to say that anyone who holds the same general beliefs is indirectly responsible for the crimes. This is sort of like throwing people in jail because they agree with the Communists in some respect. Reading your magazine makes me feel like arming myself and going into the swamp bigot hunting.

You seem to feel that it is impossible for an intelligent, well-informed person to honestly and intellectually believe in segregation. John Boardman apparently feels that it would even be difficult for an intelligent animal to believe in segregation. I assume from the tone of his letter that he automatically equates segregationists with murderers.

Now, we all know that a belief in segregation is irrational. That is, there are no observable facts from which it logically follows

that segregation is a "natural" kind of way in which to organize society. I presume that the anti-segregation arguments are based on the belief that all men are inherently entitled to fair treatment in life and that it is evil to allow oppression to exist. Is this a rational belief? It certainly doesn't follow from any observable facts. If you say that it's a founding principle of this country, then you really wouldn't have any argument against apartheid. If you are so bold as to suggest that it is a truth applicable to all mankind, then I must wonder at its source. Certainly not religion, because I know of a great many devout Christians who favor segregation.

Or suppose we approach the question from a different angle. I think it is clear that there will eventually be a merging of the races if the country is really integrated. Isn't it possible for a person to believe that this would be a bad thing? Perhaps the question of the relative abilities of Negroes and whites isn't yet settled. Notice that it is an objective question that could be settled eventually by the scientific method. Certainly it isn't clear that complete racial intermixture won't cause a significant lowering of the average intellectual abilities.

Or suppose a person took a practical view. It has been established, I think, that Negroes have a notably higher crime rate, significantly more illegitimate children, and are distinctly poorer in education. Might not one feel that integration would tend to spread these qualities? Might not one perhaps feel that, while segregation should eventually be abolished, it would be better to take plenty of time in the abolition because there are, after all, idiots who will blow up churches and burn buses and so forth if the thing is pushed?

It seems to me that a reasonably intelligent, reasonably well-educated person could believe any of these things honestly and intellectually--that it need not be an intense, completely emotional belief. Perhaps he could hold several of these attitudes. And I doubt if such a person would really and truly deserve the title, "bigot".

=====

FROM:

Ted Pauls
1448 Meridene Drive
Baltimore, Maryland, 21212
U. S. A.



SEND TO:

Len Moffatt
10202 Belcher
Downy, California, 90242

printed matter only

return requested

may be opened for inspection

SENT 8/100
10-26-63
47

If a number appears to the left of this paragraph, it will be the number of the last issue you will receive. The letter "T" indicates that we exchange magazines, "S" means that this is a sample copy, and the letter "K" informs you that you are not receiving this issue. The absence of any symbol indicates a rather more complicated reason for your good fortune in receiving the issue.