

Kipple is published and edited for the raznochintsy by Ted Pauls, 1448 Meridene Drive, Baltimore, Maryland, 21212. Copies are available in exchange for letters of comment, contributions (articles, verse, etc.), other amateur journals, or the cash sum of 20¢ per issue. This periodical is affiliated with the United Chapters of the Federation for the Preservation and Protection of Plasmodium.

JOTTINGS from the editor's desk

DESPITE THE CONTINUED PRESENCE OF TROOPS, Maryland's Eastern Shore community of Cambridge had succeeded until recently in retreating from the spotlight of national prominence. Earlier this year, periodic rioting had erupted among residents of this rural community as the result of an intense and protracted anti-segregation campaign. Full-scale occupation of the area by units of the National Guard, the imposition of modified martial law, and a settlement negotiated by Attorney General Robert Kennedy appeared superficially to have stemmed the rapidly increasing tide of anger which enveloped segments of the population. The settlement was greeted with optimism nationally as well as locally, and Cambridge was quickly replaced in the national eye by other areas of racial unrest. In Kipple #44, I wrote, "It is perhaps wise at this early stage to avoid undue optimism, but at least this much is clear: provided that the representatives of the white community were sincere in their negotiations to the extent that they will abide by the terms of the agreement, it seems unlikely that the city would experience further strife." Unfortunately, it would have been wise to eschew even this minimal optimism, for I did not anticipate the erratic actions of Mrs. Gloria Richardson.

The keystone of the negotiated settlement agreed upon by representatives of the white and Negro citizens of Cambridge was an amendment to the city charter providing for desegregation of all places of public accommodation. The mayor and city commissioners agreed to adopt such a statute, but the mechanics of amending a city charter demand that final ratification of any amendment be subject to a popular referendum. This should not have presented any grave difficulty. Although many white residents of Cambridge possess an attitude which is strikingly typical of the Deep South, the racial unrest of the summer of 1963 was looked upon with some disgust by the leaders of the white community. Cambridge had up until that time been considered a city with a future, in the grand American tradition of growing, prosperous, but homey communities. However, the notoriety resulting from the strife had severely damaged Cambridge's appeal to outside industries, and the prognosis for the future soon became gloomy. Basing their appeal on the practical necessity of counteracting the "image" which the city had acquired during the weeks when full-scale race riots appeared imminent, the white business, industrial and political leaders overwhelmingly supported the adoption of the charter amendment. They were hopeful that the white citizens of Cambridge, recognizing the obvious pragmatic merits of this appeal if not their moral obligation to the Negroes, would support the equal accommodations amendment--indeed, on the eve of the referendum,

one city official confidently assured a Baltimore television audience that sufficient votes were pledged to ratify the amendment. Finally, it was believed that even if the white citizens did not support the charter amendment by a majority vote, the votes of the Negro population of the town would more than compensate for the deficit.

This reasoning appeared sound, but the predicted result did not materialize. The charter amendment was rejected by the white population of Cambridge, and the margin of defeat was not offset by Negro votes. A large number of Negro voters simply failed to register their preference, in response to a demand by Gloria Richardson, nominal leader of the integration movement, that the referendum be boycotted. Mrs. Richardson, a very remarkable woman who possesses the bearing and mannerisms of a grand duchess, asserted that constitutional privileges could not properly be subjected to a majority vote. Why, she demanded to know, should we be forced to vote in order to obtain inherent rights? Although Mrs. Richardson's firm refusal to compromise principle is admirable and her reasoning unassailable, the boycott was both ill-advised and irresponsible. That an organization which is willing to subject its members to every manner of indignity and to endanger their physical well-being in order to achieve integration be, at the same time, unwilling to vote for it, appears ludicrous. The existence of the boycott in no way affected the basic fact that constitutional privileges were being subjected to the arbitrary whim of whichever position could muster the greatest number of advocates; the sole effect of the boycott was to insure the defeat of the amendment, an egregious error by any standard. Obstinacy is occasionally an admirable trait, but in this instance it must be charged that the Negroes of Cambridge deliberately sabotaged their best opportunity to bring peace to the community.

Cambridge is now desperately trapped in a neat little cul-de-sac, with the possibility of violence once again dominating the horizon. There were a number of provisions in the original inter-racial agreement, but the equal accommodations pledge was the principal clause; the failure of this provision to be implemented seriously calls into question the value of the entire settlement. Mrs. Richardson has announced that, at the moment, her concern lies in areas other than public accommodations, but no one is truly certain when sit-in demonstrations may again resume. The National Guard is preparing to continue the military occupation of Cambridge throughout the winter, but morale is deteriorating and the soldiers, anxious to return to wives and families, are openly suggesting that federal troops assume responsibility for policing the area. The sole remaining hope for the city of Cambridge lies in the voluntary desegregation of hotels, motels, restaurants, etc. Despite hopeful rumors, it seems unlikely that the restaurateurs and hotel proprietors of Cambridge would agree to liberalize their racial policies even out of self-interest.

Future bloodshed may no longer be attributed solely to the white oppressor; the responsibility for future violence must be shared by Mrs. Gloria Richardson, who could so easily have prevented it.

THE OSTRICH REBELLION: Virtually since its inception, this magazine has periodically been dominated by a debate concerning the advantages and disadvantages of civil defense programs in this nuclear age. As the predominantly liberal temperament of the readership probably suggests, opinion has tended to favor the abolition of civil defense agencies and the abandonment of the government policies sympathetic to their existence. This series of discussions culminated in my reasonably comprehensive summary in Kipple #33, entitled "Civil Defense: The Home Mausoleum Plan". The reaction to this eight-page précis was overwhelmingly favorable, but with this important reservation: many

readers firmly believed that it was useless to oppose the concept of civil defense, since the government had managed to marshal behind its program the imposing force of public ignorance. As Joe Pilati rather dejectedly pointed out (forgetting, momentarily, the maxim about the silence of good men), "Who are you convincing? Civil Defense goes marching on..." Since mathematical probability generally favors any proposition which is based upon the premise of public apathy, Joe's cynicism appeared entirely reasonable.

Fortunately, the pessimistic concept of civil defense as an irresistible juggernaut proved to be premature, and my own highly atypical optimism with respect to the intelligence of the American people appears in the process of being at least partially vindicated. The enlightened community of Portland, Oregon, recently dispensed with its entire civil defense program on the grounds that defense against the weapons of modern warfare was futile, the expense intolerable, and the regimentation of such community measures clearly dangerous to the liberty of the individual. The ostrich mentality has been further humiliated by the megapolis of Los Angeles, which recently sliced its civil defense budget nearly to the point of non-existence: the entire sprawling community is now "protected" by three full-time civil defense workers operating with the ludicrous yearly appropriation of \$30,000. Even Baltimore, traditionally hesitant to adopt the progressive policies of more enlightened areas, has drastically reduced the current civil defense budget.

More significant is the increased public consciousness of the fact that civil defense is a debatable issue, and that one may question its value without being labelled subversive in conventional quarters. The debate currently raging in Baltimore is unique in at least one important respect: intelligent and perceptive observations vastly outnumber the contributions of the anti-survival lunatic fringe, perhaps because the latter group of people are presently concentrating their rage in the direction of the nuclear test-ban agreement. The controversy was initiated by City Council member Henry J. Parks, who requested that the regional civil defense organization be disbanded in order to divert funds to educational and renewal projects. His proposal was immediately supported by Hyman Pressman, the fiery and outspoken City Comptroller, and Caroline B. Ramsay, an occasional Republican candidate for various offices. Clarence Long, the oleaginous solon who immortalized the fatuous campaign slogan "Keep Your Country Strong--Vote For Long", rushed to the immediate defense of shelters, and thus began the debate. As regular readers are aware, it is the policy of this periodical to reprint selections from the most outstandingly puerile epistles whenever a significant topic is disputed in the pages of the local newspapers. In this instance, however, it would be unfair to pursue this course, for to do so would misrepresent the entire discussion. Departing, therefore, from glorious tradition, here are a few of the surprisingly penetrating comments which have recently assailed the bastions of ostrichism:

"Concerning the current civil defense harangue, one wonders how a city which is impotent in overcoming the paralysis caused by a heavy snowfall can aspire to defend its citizens against the effects of a nuclear holocaust." (Signed: Frederick W. Becker.)

"We must emphasize measures that will allow our people to grow in confidence. There must be lessons in what the individual really may do to get a world free of nuclear war and a society that will not bow down before authoritarian power." (Signed: Allan Brick.)

"In our present age of thermonuclear weapons I feel that a civil defense program mocks the intelligence of the American public. Our only defense, our only hope, is peace. Public leaders should refrain from perpetuating the hoax of underground survival. People must be aroused to the realities, not pacified by false hopes." (Signed: Helen Hollingsworth.)

"I feel that it is a waste of the taxpayer's money, that there is no real defense for the civilian population against atomic warfare, and that it gives us a false sense of security and thus detracts from our efforts to seek peaceful solutions to all our conflicts." (Signed: Rabbi Uri Miller.)

"Let us honestly face the awful fact that the only defense against the nuclear attack is the absolute non-use of the bomb." (Signed: Edgar Daniel Kramer.)

"How much do fallout shelters cost? What if we contributed that amount, not to getting ready for war, but to removing the causes of war; ignorance, suspicion, greed and armed nations in a lawless world? How much effort is required to build or maintain shelters? What if we expended the same energy in a continuing effort to be well-informed and vigorous advocates of a just and realistic peace?" (Signed: David Andrews.)

"Now, what is this Civil Defense Program? It is an effort to lull the citizens into a false sense of security, is it not, so that they will be content to think that our tremendous supply of horror weapons will deter any war-like action on the part of our enemies? This, in turn, will make it unnecessary to face the facts in this generation, which facts call for a realistic effort to find a way and means of living together on the face of the earth..." (Signed: Don Frank Fenn.)

The opposition viewpoint, for the most part, was presented with equal restraint, and the furious denunciations of dissenters as Communist pawns which would ordinarily be plentiful in such a discussion were notably absent. Perhaps this unusual relative sanity bodes well for the future.

WHY JOHNNY CAN'T READ INDECENT LITERATURE: Juvenile delinquency is a problem which rightly concerns all thinking persons. Unfortunately, it is also of the utmost concern to many individuals who could not under any circumstances be accused of thinking. From this latter assemblage of obtuse crusaders issue forth the ready-made panaceas, the uncomplicated, inflexible dicta which are intended to eradicate juvenile crime virtually overnight. Various warring factions within this company of zealots adhere to separate and mutually antagonistic doctrines, running the gamut of ineptitude from the censoring of diverse segments of the mass media through the remarkably callous program of mandatory punishment by physical brutality. Proponents of each of these alleged "solutions" share one outstanding characteristic, however: an uncomfortable single-mindedness which admits no doubt with respect to the desirability of their particular proposal. When, as occasionally happens, one such proposal gains sufficient pub-

lic support to be initiated on a large scale, its failure to adequately combat the ailment does not deter advocates of differing--but equally fatuous--proposals from attempting to implement their programs. The classic example of such a failure was the ill-advised campaign against gruesome comic books. Spearheaded by Dr. Fred Wertham, the finest argument to date for the contention that psychology is no proper part of science, this crusade managed to extinguish forever any entertainment value which "horror" comics may have possessed. It would seem rational that the conspicuous failure of this literary emasculation to stem the tide of juvenile crime would have resulted in a massive re-examination of other similar schemes, but this was not the case. Instead, veterans of Dr. Wertham's ignoble legion became converts to one or another of the remaining programs, and embarrassment for the failure was circumvented by the simple expedient of ignoring it.

Many of these individuals have now joined their spiritual brethren of a later generation in a strikingly similar venture. The alleged culprit has now become indecent literature; but although the vehicle of the evil has changed, the spiel of the zealots possesses a depressingly familiar ring. If only these lewd and obscene magazines and motion pictures can be eliminated, runs the fervent chant, juvenile crime will largely cease to exist; remove the seductive influence of "smut", and our children will remain innocent, reverent, honorable, clean-cut youngsters, a credit to their church and nation. No particular genius is necessary to perceive the inevitable failure of this course of action to achieve the desired result, of course, nor can it be doubted that the fruits of such a venture will be ultimately harmful to our liberty. In the process of conducting the campaign, the self-righteous harridans who spearhead the impromptu vigilance committees of decency may actually accomplish something worthwhile by arousing public interest in the problem of hard-core pornography. But it is certain that the injury sustained by our freedom at the hands of this squad of censors will grossly outweigh any valuable by-products of their vengeful crusade.

The cause of this conspicuous concentration on matters which are at best merely symptoms of the malady lies in the essential inability of parents from a middle-class environment to comprehend the culpability of their progeny--and hence their own initial responsibility. These unperceptive individuals are quite willing to concede that the unfortunate products of a lower-class environment whose exploits enliven the pages of tabloids are conscious criminals. But this, they insist, does not apply to their offspring, who are merely mischievous youngsters momentarily led astray by the overt temptation of whatever commodity their particular clique happens to oppose. Ten years ago comic books were the culprit, the principal target is now lurid periodicals, and perhaps within another few years emphasis will shift primarily toward television. And thus the vast majority of concerned parents vigorously attack barely relevant manifestations of the problem, completely oblivious to the fact that they are treating symptoms of the disease rather than the disease itself.

They find it more convenient to direct their collective fury against such tangible scapegoats, of course, since it releases them from the necessity of exploring the problem in depth. But it is appalling that otherwise intelligent individuals can sustain the belief that such a widespread and pervasive problem as juvenile delinquency is the responsibility of such transitory phenomenon as cheesecake magazines, violent television programs, terrifying comic books, or the Cold War.

But misdirecting the blame solves no problems, and juvenile delinquency continues to increase despite the the enthusiastic efforts of censors and advocates of harsher punitive measures. Eventually, our society will be forced to cease concentrating on non-essentials and engage

in a genuine effort to solve the problem--beginning with the revamping of the basic values imparted (by example, not command) to the youth of this nation. Let us hope that this realization will not occur only after it is too late to salvage the situation.

THE VAST WASTELAND: Television is potentially the greatest instrument for universal enlightenment since the invention of the printing press. Virtually unknown in many areas of the world and barely emerging from its infancy in even the most civilized nations, the vast potential of this medium has not even begun to be realized. In the United States, which pioneered the development of the instrument and possesses the greatest resources for its continued refinement, commercial television represents what Newton Minow so aptly termed a vast wasteland. It is freely conceded in nearly every quarter that American television is most appropriately characterized as mass-produced mediocrity; disagreement is encountered only in attempting to pinpoint the guilt for this deplorable state of affairs. The viewing public, in general, tends to blame the television industry--that is, the aggregate of writers, directors, producers, actors, etc.--for the inferior quality of their product. This host of self-proclaimed artists denies the guilt with equal vigor, pleading that their ideals and preferences are subverted to the wishes of the almighty sponsor. And the sponsors, brandishing their ubiquitous ratings, smile suavely and complete the diabolical triangle by tracing the dereliction to an uncritical public.

There is no doubt that the responsibility must rest to a certain extent on each of the three factions. The industry cannot absolve itself from blame for its insipid productions by futilely gesturing in the direction of a malevolent beast known as a Sponsor. In the final analysis, the artists are the least dispensable element of the medium, and if they constantly bow to the authority of sponsor representatives, it is largely because any alternate course of action is considered too troublesome. On those exceedingly rare occasions when the writers, actors, and producers present a united front in defense of a specific point of view, the sponsor generally retreats. It could not be otherwise, of course; if the artists resolve to resign or otherwise fail to cooperate, they stand to lose only a job (and jobs are plentiful in the medium as the result of a paucity of talent), whereas the sponsors may forfeit a considerable and irretrievable financial investment. In many cases, of course, it is the writer or producer who, by putting forth only the minimum effort for which he will receive payment, is more directly responsible for the lack of quality in a television program.

The sponsors, too, must certainly carry a burden of responsibility for the absurdly low standards of the medium in general. In endeavoring principally to sell their products and only secondarily to provide entertainment to the viewing public, they have reversed the established pattern of every other entertainment medium and have often rendered the actual program superfluous. The entire raison d'être for an hour of television programming may be the six minutes of commercial announcements which it will allow. It is not surprising, in view of this conspicuous instance of the tail wagging the dog, that emphasis has dramatically shifted in a manner which is not generally conducive to quality programming. The goal of many television presentations is no longer to entertain or educate the viewers, but rather to hold their attention in between commercials and prevent them from changing the station. These goals are often not synonymous. Of course, the finest possible method of holding the attention of an audience is to present a worthwhile, interesting program, but this is expensive. There exist many less expensive methods of capturing and holding a television audience, and these are eagerly exploited by sponsors and their representatives.

A second area in which commercial interests contribute to the excessive banality of most television fare lies in the imposition of taboos. All mass media are restricted in some sense with respect to program content and emphasis, but such censorship is rampant throughout the entire television spectrum, from news broadcasts to soap operas. Not only are the normal taboos of radio and motion pictures with respect to sex, religion, profanity, et al., broadened to an incredible extent where they apply to television, but an entirely unique set of restrictions has been introduced at the instigation of the sponsors. The principal tenet of any sponsor's philosophy is that no group of human beings large enough to affect the sale of his product to any degree whatsoever should be offended. On the surface, this appears reasonable and proper. But since the average advertising representative can be frightened into near hysteria by four or five protesting letters stressing the same point, this area of "offensive" material is unbelievably vast: productions which criticize--or seem to criticize--any occupation group, from judges through ditch-diggers, are prohibited unless sufficient reason for the apparent criticism can be provided within the context of the program, or unless compensatory praise is delivered elsewhere in the script; anything which might tend to irritate or insult a particular nationality group is strictly verboten--and, of course, the use of Jewish or Negro characters is a matter of the utmost delicacy; manufacturers of consumer goods must not be offended by anything which could be construed as a criticism of their product; and so on, ad infinitum. On a more general level, sponsors usually avoid taking a definite position (or giving the appearance of doing so) with respect to any controversial issue. And, of course, the advertising representatives are particularly sensitive to anything which could in any way prove detrimental to the interests of their client--e.g., when a filter tip cigarette manufacturer sponsored a western series last season, smoking was strictly forbidden to any of the cast, including the myriad extras in each installment; filter tip cigarettes did not exist in the American West, of course, and the sponsor decided that any other use of tobacco would in effect constitute an advertisement against his own product. This excessive limitation of program content is so prevalent that often a situation arises where the sponsor must literally observe a razor-edge line in attempting to accommodate groups of differing attitudes: e.g., the presence of social drinking in a dramatic presentation is vigorously protested by temperance organizations, and its unrealistic absence is just as heartily condemned by distilleries and their representatives.

Finally, the television audience must be held partially responsible for the reprehensible quality of most programs. The difficulty is not that a great many viewers are actively opposed to worthwhile television programs; but rather that they passively accept nearly any piece of puerile trash that is offered, thus leading the sponsor to mistakenly assume that his pet potboiler is what "most people" prefer. This negative reaction assists the perpetuation of a low standard in another important respect: the occasional superior programs are not adequately supported by the largely indifferent audience. If expensive, high quality programming arouses no more public interest and support than low-budget dross, it is obvious which category of program the sponsor will choose to produce. Most persons consider themselves isolated and insignificant dissenters, incapable of affecting the policies of monolithic television networks and gargantuan sponsoring corporations. Consequently, they are generally willing to accept (albeit grudgingly) any program foisted off on them. Their guilt is less because the actions and attitudes by means of which they contribute to television's lack of quality are passive, rather than active--as in the case of the sponsor and often of the industry.

There is, however, cause for optimism. Considered as a whole, television today displays a depressing lack of vitality, combined with an appalling standard of--to use the most appropriate term--"non-excellence". But there is no doubt that the past five years have produced a steady improvement, possibly as a result of the fact that television, having reached the abysmal level of 1958, found itself with only one direction in which to proceed--upward. While still falling far short of its tremendous potential, several specific areas have shown a dramatic improvement in that half-decade. There now exist several dramatic programs which have managed to pull television drama out of the cliché-ridden morass of westerns and private-eye epics. The much pilloried trend towards medical background for a continuing series has, despite well-founded criticisms, resulted in dramatic presentations which pursue a high standard of technical excellence (i.e., better than average acting, directing, etc.). Genuinely talented actors and actresses are utilized in one-shot "guest" appearances, rather than fading Big Names whose principal contribution is one of prestige rather than talent. The content of dramatic programs has also undergone an improvement in recent years. CBS's "The Defenders" and "The Nurses", whatever their faults, manage to deal with heretofore forbidden subjects such as abortion, euthanasia, narcotics addiction and racial prejudice, and to deal with them intelligently.

The increased emphasis on news broadcasts is another healthy portent; perhaps the time is near when the family room will no longer resound to the thud of hooves or the crack of revolvers, but will instead serve as a theatre from which to constructively view world affairs. Any reasonably significant occurrence is adequately reported not only by the regular newscasts, but also usually by two or three special news programs, examining in depth the issues and background. On some evenings, indeed, the informative or documentary programming consumes as much time as all other categories combined. Perhaps a situation is arising where television-oriented children will adopt as their hero Chet Huntley rather than Davey Crockett, which is an improvement from almost any point of view...

And then, of course, there are the genuinely brilliant productions, the occasional gems which, however rare, suffice to offset the hours of stereotyped stable-sweepings. "The Invincible Mr. Disraeli" on the Hallmark program was one such classic, and the recent broadcast of the Broadway play, "The Advocate", was another. (Unfortunately, this extraordinarily fine play by Robert Noah appeared in only five cities, via the diminutive Westinghouse Network.) On these exceptionally rare occasions when television achieves a monumental height by the realization of its full potential, we are granted, I believe, an insight into the future importance of the medium.

But the vast bulk of television fare remains unimpressive, and it is incumbent upon the viewing public to correct this situation further--if they are sufficiently concerned. Neither the industry nor the sponsors will engage in any concentrated effort to raise standards, so long as they are certain that low standards will continue to be profitable. And low standards will continue to be profitable unless the viewing public decides to cease tolerating bilge on their screens.

THE SUPREME COURT DECISION in the case of Murray versus Curlett, which prohibits prayer recitation or Bible reading as part of a formal ceremony in public schools, continues to elicit vituperative condemnations from the devout. No useful purpose would be served by quoting a half-dozen of the most outrageous epistles, as is my customary practice, for every category of nincompoop has already been adequately represented in these pages. I cannot resist, however,

reprinting one particular communication on the subject, an absurd letter to Representative Joel Broyhill by a spokesman for the Culmore Methodist Church, in Falls Church, Virginia. The letter, authored by Frank W. Sencindiver, achieved immortality a few weeks ago when Congressman Broyhill accommodately entered it into the Congressional Record. This gem of ignorance reaches the editorial offices of Kipple through the kind assistance of Joe Pilati:

"We are deeply distressed by recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court which downgrade and tend to destroy religious faith as a vital part of our national life. This Nation was founded upon the belief that human liberties are endowed by God, not by man.

"Aside from legal technicalities, the Supreme Court decisions reflect a view by the Court's majority that references to Almighty God in historic documents and ceremonies of our Nation are merely matters of form, and have no meaning.

"Acknowledgement of a power greater than man is the decisive difference between the United States and those pagan and atheistic forces which threaten to engulf the world. Unless we, as a nation, pay homage to and draw strength from Almighty God, this Nation will surely fail in its responsibility to its own citizens, to mankind everywhere, and to our Creator.

"The antireligious views of those who deny the existence of a Supreme Being have no standing in our courts or other official bodies. Citizens are entitled to protection of their lives and property but not of philosophies which contradict the very nature of ideals upon which this Nation is based."

If there is any single ideal to which this nation is particularly pledged, it is that in the United States all doctrines are entitled to freely coexist, and that an individual has the right to freely espouse any philosophy he chooses. The "antireligious views of those who deny the existence of a Supreme Being" are entitled to precisely the same standing in our courts as is Mr. Sencindiver's Methodism; to deny this freedom is to subvert our ideals to the ignominy of majoritarian dictatorship.

--Ted Pauls

"Since 1945, the American government has devoted the better part of our national energies to preparations for wholesale human extermination. This curious enterprise has been disguised as a scientifically sound method of ensuring world peace and national security, but it has obviously failed at every point on both counts. Our reckless experimental explosion of nuclear weapons is only a persuasive salesman's sample of what a nuclear war would produce, but even this has already done significant damage to the human race. With poetic justice, the earliest victims of our experiments toward genocide--sharing honors with the South Pacific islanders and the Japanese fishermen--have been our own children, and even more, our children's prospective children." --Lewis Mumford, in The Atlantic Monthly.

THE GREAT DEBATE

LETTERS OF COMMENT

VIC RYAN :: BOX 406 :: 2309 SHERIDAN RD. :: EVANSTON, ILL.

Thanks for Kipple, of course, but it isn't the same magazine. Not only are the major league standings missing --surely you could have made the transition to NFL standings or college football ratings?--but the editor has mellowed beyond belief. The old Ted Pauls has been replaced by a convivial fellow who assumes his old friends are obstinate rather than stupid, an assumption that even his old friends aren't perfectly willing to make. But this new magazine is enjoyable, too, so if it really pleases you, keep up the good work.

"Variations on a Theme" fits in nicely with what I considered the only interesting problem presented in a social psychology course I took last winter: scapegoating. It sounds as if you've been reading Adorno's "Authoritarian Personality" without making all the ridiculous cause-and-effect associations that the unsophisticated are heir to, and the effect, translated into "fiction", is a worthwhile one. To a certain extent man is a generous creature and rarely confines his bigotry to one ethnic or social group--ergo, anti-semitism and vehement segregation can and do exist comfortably side-by-side in some people's minds--but it's a good general principle that the most readily apparent physical deviate group is the one which will bear the brunt of public animosity.

I wonder whose Gallop Poll you've been reading lately? The one I saw indicated a popularity increase of about one per cent for Kennedy as a result of his summer civil rights activities. That's misleading, of course, because the Poll is supposedly one of political significance; therefore, it should reflect the electoral system. Under these circumstances, President Kennedy could reasonably assume to be weakened electorally in the South while his northern gains might be of little significance, and in this sense his courage--if, indeed, it's that--might have been politically costly. (The poll to which I referred (and conceivably attributed to the wrong source) appeared in Time several months ago. Since I am unfortunately not able to unearth that particular issue, I would greatly appreciate information as to the original source and precise figures of the survey from any reader whose file of Time is preserved in a somewhat more orderly fashion than my own. A recently published survey conducted at the request of Newsweek also indicates a loss of support due to Mr. Kennedy's stand on the racial issue, although his overall prestige has increased. According to Newsweek, approximately 1.0 million new Negro supporters have entered the Kennedy camp as a direct result of the President's stand on the civil rights issue, whereas 4.5 million white voters have switched their allegiance to other candidates.)

Appropos of nothing, I was just thinking how my political ideas can change radically. At one time I would have thought it beyond consideration that I might vote for Otto Kerner--Illinois' "inept but subservient" (to quote Time) Democratic governor and puppet of Chicago's Mayor Daley--since he represented, to me, everything weak and ineffectual in Illinois politics, and a very real reason why Goldwaterian states' rights would never work--simply because there aren't enough qualified state administrators.

But now I'm not too sure--and the change in attitude is the result of two isolated, molecular actions on Kerner's part which impressed me very much.

The first was his veto of House Bill #1073, a measure for censorship which would have made it a criminal act for a newsdealer to sell to a "child" under eighteen any magazine or book which any court might term "obscene". Presumably this would include scattered issues of Life and Saturday Evening Post, necessitating a dealer's examination of everything he might sell, placing the question of display squarely in the hands of basically frightened and unqualified men; the thing wouldn't have held up in higher courts, particularly in the context that such cases must be examined as a whole rather than as a section of "obscenity" in an otherwise inoffensive publication. But, despite overwhelming public approval and legislative endorsement, Kerner vetoed the bill, properly labelling it vague, unenforceable and duplicatory of other, better obscenity laws. Similarly, Kerner struck down a similarly popular motion that would have made mandatory public school recitation of the "Under God" lines of the Pledge of Allegiance not as a daily pledge but rather intended as a daily prayer. The two actions, though minor, were courageous, and their perpetration was enough to make me take a close second look at the man.

"It is a matter of indifference to the democratic society if each and every religious doctrine affirms, not only absoluteness, but superiority to its competitors. Each religion may claim to possess not only truths, but The Truth. Such claims are irrelevant to the functioning of the free society. All such assertions are of significance only to those who believe them. It is unfair, therefore, to argue that any one religion is a danger to the democratic society merely because its claim to truth is more encompassing, comprehensive, or dogmatic than [that of] its competitors.

"The issue of religious absoluteness and superiority becomes a matter of grave concern to the free society only when the professing religion departs from intellectual assertion and enters the sphere of practical action. It is one thing for the Catholic, Protestant, or Jew to believe his truth is absolutely binding upon himself or even upon all mankind; it is quite another to seek the cooperation of the law to ensure that the supposed obligation of others to believe and obey is practically advanced. It may be the belief of one's religion, for example, that divine law precludes divorce and that this law binds all mankind. The problem for the free society arises when individuals or groups attempt to translate this conviction into civil law." --Arthur Cohen, in "Religion and the Free Society".

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

I am partially sympathetic with the students who participated in the "illegal" trip to Cuba, up until the point that they begin giving speeches declaring what a benevolent and beneficial ruler Fidel Castro is, and how fortunate they had been to see such a splendid example of the workings of socialism. I do feel that they were justified in ignoring the State Department ban against visiting Cuba, for the simple reason that I can envision no rational motive for enacting such a ban. We have no restrictions against travel to Russia, and it seems foolish to allow visitation to a communistic area like the U.S.S.R. while restraining travel to Cuba where Communism hasn't advanced to the level it has reached in Russia. I had at first assumed their motives for making the trip to be primarily an act of civil disobedience against the restric-

tions on travel, but their subsequent remarks glorifying Castro have somewhat altered my opinion of them. They have, of course, every right to say whatever they choose, but it still tarnishes the image I had of them.

The sudden HUAC inquiry into the trip smacks of clear election-year propagandizing. That such an insignificant traveling body is capable of sparking a full committee hearing, with the appropriate charges and counter-charges hurled back and forth, seems a bit ludicrous. But the congressmen affiliated with HUAC have had their names recorded so that the voters may observe their perseverance in ferreting out communists, and this will surely be beneficial to them in the long run. It's frightening to see how many of these costly and time consuming committees are activated purely to enlist public sympathy and insure the reelection of their members.

The white southerner has already reacted--and is reacting--to what he considers the unlawful encroachments of the Negro populace. If his resistance remains as steadfast and determined as it currently is, it must be met with force. Passive resistance is successful up to a point. When bombs and guns are used to combat picket lines and sit-ins, then the odds fall way out of proportion. There is such a thing as self-defense, and no matter how out of character it may seem, I don't believe that the Negro should placidly accept anything dished out by turning the other cheek. This may have been all right for Christ (who still wound up on a cross) but it constitutes avoidism, evasion, and cowardice when used today. A Negro endowed with the conviction that his freedom and equality must be attained should react accordingly to white violence. A Negro hit in the mouth should return the blow.

Pickets and passive resistance are basically token moves, designed to exploit and derive propaganda value from the situation rather than to combat it. A string of pickets parading across the parking lot of a White Castle diner will receive good newspaper coverage, but not otherwise tangibly affect the discrimination policies of the establishment. Some people will stop patronizing the diner, of course, but not enough to really affect the situation. How many people actually shun business establishments that practice discrimination in hiring?

I don't think that a student who drops out of college after a year has totally wasted his time and money, as Walt Breen claims. There remains some knowledge, some insight that the courses have given him, despite his inability to absorb the knowledge capably. His losses exceed his assets, but I think he has gained something--though in some instances of drop-out it can be quite infinitesimal. Anyway, colleges are for the most part status symbols with the accent on sports and social activities, and a minimum of learning combined with all that. Contrast the popularity of the colleges boasting well-known football teams with those concerned with more academic pursuits. A student who attends college in order to participate in the athletic activities will probably not be a genius at trigonometry, and vice versa. And I happen to think that training a student's intelligence and mentality is far more important than helping him develop bloated biceps.

As in the case of the bombers of the Negro church, it is unimportant whether or not Floyd Simpson murdered William Moore. If he didn't, the jury will immediately ferret out this point; if he did, he will be a southern hero on a par with the man who shot Medgar Evers or the aforementioned church bombers. As I mentioned in my last letter, justice in the South does not have the same meaning it has here. I don't think that a man like Simpson could possibly receive a fair trial, when no doubt every judge and juror would secretly admire him for his action. It has happened before and will continue to happen until an unbiased jury can be found. In "To Kill a Mockingbird" (both film and book),

this attitude was evident. Tom Robinson was conclusively proven to be innocent and the guilty parties were clearly illuminated. Yet it would have been impossible for the jury to acquit a Negro on a charge of rape brought by a young white girl, and then declare her charges to be false. It would have gone against every southern tenet these men knew to enact justice and decency to a Negro who had been proven innocent. The trial was a sham and a mockery; he was guilty from the start, just as Simpson was innocent. (It is true that southern justice leaves a good deal to be desired, but this does not justify the "liberal" trend to adopt the opposite extreme and assume that the segregationist is always guilty and the Negro always innocent.)

"The state is a machine for maintaining the rule of one class over another. When there were no classes in society, when, before the epoch of slavery, people labored in primitive conditions of greater equality, in conditions where productivity of labor was still at its lowest, and when primitive man could barely procure the wherewithal for the crudest and most primitive existence, a special group of people especially separated off to rule and dominate over the rest of society had not yet arisen, and could not have arisen. Only when the first form of the division of society into classes appeared, only when slavery appeared, when a certain class of people, by concentrating on the crudest forms of agricultural labor, could produce a certain surplus, when this surplus labor was not absolutely essential for the most wretched existence of the slave and passed into the hands of the slaveowner, when in this way the existence of this class of slaveowners took firm root-- then in order that it might take firm root it was essential a state should appear." --Nikolai Lenin, in "The State".

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

About these abortions, now. When a schoolteacher gives birth to an illegitimate child she is likely to lose her status, her job, and her friends, as you say. This is such a part of our society that so liberal-minded a person as yourself, Ted, thinks first of destroying the developing baby as a solution.

But whether the abortion is legal or not, it does not solve the woman's problem--unless, as happened in the case you mentioned, she dies because of the operation. (And I agree that this is an unsatisfactory solution.) If she has a successful abortion, she goes back into the world a woman unfulfilled, with the capacity to love a man and a child but possessing neither. Society won't let her rear a child without a man, or at least a man's name. I suggest that society needs liberalizing, rather than the law that limits abortions. (Certainly the narrow and irrational standard imposed by society is faulty, but the fact that the standard is unreasonable does not affect the practical matter of its existence and potency. Pending the liberalization of society's attitude towards pre-marital sexual relations, what measures can best prevent a woman guilty of nothing more than a lack of foresight from becoming a social outcast and bearing the formidable burden of public indignation? Legalized abortion is one possible solution to this problem (and to others), and I will continue to think of it as such so long as I remain unconvinced that a foetus and an infant are comparable organisms. Wider distribution and promotion of contraceptives is another solution, of course, and probably a superior one. I doubt that you would have any objections to this (though your comrade-in-arms in this particular argument, Marty Helgesen, probably would). You may succeed in converting me to your position as re considering the foetus a human be-

ing, as I admitted last issue, but in order to do so you must present valid reasons for drawing the line where you do. We would both agree that a foetus is a human being two weeks prior to birth. But is it a human being two months after conception? Two hours after conception? Are the sperm and ovum to be considered a human being two minutes prior to conception? Perhaps your answer to these questions will introduce a criterion for determining the existence of human life which I will find agreeable.))

And even if such a law were passed, it would not help her. I can't conceive of a law being passed in America that would legalize abortions with less than a court order--and obtaining one would reveal her pregnancy and be just as disastrous to status, friendships and that schoolteaching job. (And if you allowed abortions without court approval, you'd have women getting them for all sorts of shallow selfish reasons, such as preserving the figure.)

I think the other case you mentioned was a widow with several children and another on the way. It's true that her position is not enviable, but a child born in the United States has a better chance for educational and economic fulfillment than one born most places on the globe. I cannot see destroying it on the basis that its parents could provide only, say, five times as much income as families over the world subsist on.

If you are looking for an immediate solution to a woman's problem (hypothetical, of course), allow me to make a modest proposal. Since abortions are dangerous, as you say, when performed by the butchers who make their living that way, let's allow the child to have a normal birth in some secluded place. (After all, births are a natural occurrence; it takes a real dub to mess them up.) As soon as the woman has been delivered of the child, it can be destroyed. This solves the economic or emotional problem and leaves the mother relatively safe. Except for the safety factor, the result is the same as a successful abortion.

If you cannot accept that, Ted Pauls, then I say to you that the only difference is semantic: one you call an abortion; the other is a foul murder. Yet the only difference lies in the syllables you use to describe them. The real reason abortioners can ply their trade is hypocrisy, you see.

And speaking of hypocrisy, I suspect one reason you got so much comment on that short article in Kipple #44 was that you felt free to label everyone who disagreed with you as callous hypocrites. "I trust that those to whom abortion is synonymous with murder can reconcile their hypocritical concern with the existence of a foetus with their callous disregard for the lives of those unfortunate enough to fall victim to the charlatans who exist as a result of the unrealistic statute." It's this kind of argument that upsets me; and I notice that ad hominem grits in your own teeth when you get it from John Boardman. (Nothing in the original article was directed at the readers of Kipple, since none had voiced their opinion on the subject at the time it was written. My comments, which were characteristically caustic, were directed toward the individuals who had voiced remarkably callous opinions during the original controversy stirred up by the newspaper coverage of the schoolteacher's death. Typical of these comments was the thoughtless observation of one woman that the teacher's death had been just retribution for her "immoral" actions.))

I intended to disagree with your apparent belief that since some English words are spelled by variant rules, the whole language should be taught children as if it were written in Chinese ideographs--actually only some fifteen percent of English words are spelled unphonetically, according to Rudolph Flesch--and I hope I won't be accused of wanting to make children spend school hours in useless study for some dark mo-

tive if I do. ({Since I haven't counted them lately, I am not prepared to disprove the statement that only fifteen percent of the words in the English language are spelled unphonetically, but it does seem an understatement. The "through-bough-rough-cough-though" series is most often cited as a dilemma for non-native students attempting to learn English, but more subtle difficulties exist in great abundance. Wherever there are two possible sounds for the same letter (and excepting those relatively rare cases coming under the jurisdiction of an uncomplicated rule), the phonics system cannot be used unless combined with word recognition. This category includes nearly every use of the letters "g" and "c", not to mention an incredible number of vowel sounds. As examples, note this brief list of common words which are impossible to read using a straight phonics system because what appear to be the same sounds (i.e., combination of letters) are pronounced differently, or vice versa: gin/gun, loll/poll, birch/perch/lurch/search, cent/cant, cute/butte, fuzz/does, curd/gird/herd/heard, beau/foe/flow, coat/coati, pap/paper, now/know, ad infinitum. Or consider the even more elementary matter of vowel sounds in a word such as "criticism". Each letter "i" is pronounced with a "short" sound; but if we were unacquainted with the word and attempted to "sound it out" by the accepted phonics method, we might well substitute the "long" sound for the letter "i" in one or more places.})

Though I think Boardman is sometimes overemotional, I think he has the best of your current argument with him. The assumption that the accused is innocent until proven guilty is strictly a forensic one, demanded of the judge and veniremen. I don't think anything in this constitutional principle prevents John Boardman from holding an opinion and expressing it. If there were such a provision, the judge would have to interrupt the prosecuting attorney's closing speech: "Here now, counsellor, you can't tell the jury this man deserves the chair; you must consider him innocent until he is found guilty." Of course, I think you've a right to your opinion, too. ({No private citizen is legally compelled to adhere to the belief that a person is innocent until proven guilty, of course, but I nevertheless believe that it is an ideal worthy of wider application than the jury box. Technically speaking, I was not objecting to John's refusal to consider Floyd Simpson innocent, but rather to his willingness to assume Simpson's guilt; there is a subtle distinction here, you see. I myself am not willing to defend Simpson's innocence, but neither do I share Boardman's confidence in his guilt. Simpson may or may not have murdered William Moore, but John's smug certainty that the man is guilty because he and Moore were on different sides of the race issue is unbecoming a liberal.})

Whatever the nature of the newspaper ad of Heinlein's that G.M. Carr distributed, I don't think Walt Willis' integrity suspect, and I didn't mean to suggest so. I think Europeans regard both American and Russian experimentation with atomic weapons in a far different light from either Russians or Americans--understandably so. I meant to imply in my last letter that this could well account for his calling a "crackpot manifesto" what some of us apparently consider a legitimate petition.

 "The only government that I recognize--it matters not how few are at the head of it, or how small its army--is that power that establishes justice in the land." --Henry David Thoreau, in "A Plea for John Brown".

BILL MALTHOUSE :: 216 S. MACOMB :: TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA

Charles Wells: It is not yet time for the complete socialistic

welfare state that you propose in attempted retribution of the injustice done to the Negroes. The problem is not one of paying the poorly educated more in order to repay them for the loss of a good education; rather, it is to see to it that they receive a good education in the first place. What you propose is as idiotic as giving a large bonus to the survivors of a man who died through medical malpractice and doing nothing about the quack who was responsible. In addition, your analogy with the veteran's benefits is faulty since some men must be discriminated against by being made soldiers, while there is no reason why any person should be discriminated against on the basis of his color or religion. As to the proprietor's "right" to refuse service, that is merely a case of the written law versus the unwritten moral code of values. Any sociologist will emphatically state that in such a case it is the mores that are "right", irregardless of the "laws". Thus, few would object to a restaurant owner refusing to serve a leper, since such action is in agreement with the mores, but it would seem that refusing service to a Negro solely on the basis of his color is against the mores; and rightly so, since only the racist would equate a Negro with a leper.

"Theory in science plays various roles. It summarizes voluminous data succinctly. It presents a picture that is easy to remember. It injects rationality into the world. And, not the least important, it leads us to discover new facts. It is hardly possible for a theory to fulfill the last-named function unless we have a confidence in our theory that is not easily shaken by apparently contradictory facts. Faced with incompatible facts our first impulse must be to say, 'The facts are wrong; not the theory.' Saying this, we put ourselves in a dangerous position, of course; but only those theories that are capable of achieving so strong a hold on our minds will reach the highest degree of usefulness." --Garrett Hardin, in "Nature and Man's Fate".

JOHN BOARDMAN :: 592 16th ST. :: BROOKLYN 18, NEW YORK

I'm sorry that it seemed to you that I was being personally insulting in sending you that flyer from the "Committee to Defend Floyd Simpson". I merely wished to point out that the legal machinery of southern states is being used to protect segregationist murderers, and that such a state of affairs is being applauded by racists all over the country.

To encourage segregationists to continue the murder of Negroes, the legal authorities in the South refuse to regard such acts as crimes. A Grand Jury refused to indict Simpson for Moore's murder. No one has been arrested for any of the dozens of bombings that have taken place in Birmingham. Beckwith is not going to be indicted for Evers' murder, or, if indicted, he will not be convicted by a local petit jury. No one will ever serve a day in jail for killing those six Negro children in Birmingham last month. Your assertion that failure to bring an indictment against the responsible criminals means that the accused persons are not guilty, is at sharp contrast with the realities of life in the South today. (Failure of a Grand Jury to indict an accused murderer does not, of course, constitute conclusive evidence of his innocence; but neither can it be construed to represent proof of his guilt, regardless of whether or not the jury is composed of bigots. I am quite willing to admit that the average southern jury does not particularly care whether or not the defendant is guilty as charged in a case with racial overtones; they would generally be expected to free the accused in either case. But their refusal to indict or convict the defendant does not constitute proof of his guilt, since mathematical probability alone

would indicate that some of the individuals freed by southern courts are actually innocent.))

Such realities are ignored by conservative theorists outside the South. Bill Christian, for example, urges Negroes to "wait" in blithe ignorance of the fact that Negroes will not wait. This is a fixed point with which he and other opponents of integration must deal. To paraphrase his Burke quotation (isn't it wonderful how you can quote Burke whenever you want to justify an evil of long-standing?), the "rage and phrenzy" of people who don't want to stand still and be murdered will "tear down more in half an hour than prudence, deliberation and foresight can build up in a thousand years". A great deal of deliberation and foresight (they didn't feel the need for prudence) was put by white southerners into the system of segregation and white supremacy--and it will be torn down. The segregationists' only choice is whether they wish to stand by this system and be physically torn down with it. (A great many of those who have had no direct experience with the racial situation in the United States (Bill Christian, for example) appear to have a rather unrealistic conception of the problem. I have previously encountered comments similar to Bill's counselling patience and prudence from other non-residents of this county. Aside from Bill's innate conservatism, another factor bearing on this naive concept may be the context in which segregation is viewed outside this nation. The predominant attitude of non-citizens appears to be that segregation is the remnant of an earlier injustice, an unfortunate state of affairs, to be sure, but not one for which contemporary society can rightly be held responsible. What Bill apparently fails to recognize is that segregation is not a remnant which everyone is anxious to dispose of, but an actively promoted tool of contemporary white supremacists.))

"Suggestion is a legitimate device, if it is honestly used, for inculcating knowledge or principles of conduct; that is, for education in the broadest sense of the word. Criticism is the operation by which suggestion is limited and corrected. It is by criticism that the person is protected against credulity, emotion, and fallacy. The power of criticism is the one which education should chiefly train. It is difficult to resist the suggestion that one who is accused of crime is guilty. Lynchers generally succumb to this suggestion, especially if the crime was a heinous one which has strongly excited their emotions against the unknown somebody who perpetrated it. It requires criticism to resist this suggestion. Our judicial institutions are devised to hold this suggestion aloof until the evidence is examined." --William Graham Sumner, in "Folkways".

CHARLES CRISPIN :: c/o ORLOVE :: 845 E. 14th ST. :: BROOKLYN 30, N.Y.

"The Outsiders" was an interesting story, but I'm not so sure I'd agree with your major premise, which seems to be that Negroes would be eager to take part in mob actions against other minority groups after finally achieving their own freedom. It does seem true that in many cases the victims of oppression become oppressors in their own right once they find themselves in the majority. This has not happened in the case of Jews, however, and I don't think it will happen in the case of American Negroes. Having been persecuted themselves for so many years, members of the Jewish community rarely take part in persecuting other minorities. I tend to think that the Negro, having suffered so conspicuously at the hands of the white man, would be more sympathetic to the plight of blue-skinned scapegoats. (Also, your story appears to take place in the reasonably foreseeable future, when--it would seem to me--

the memory of his own unfortunate past would prevent the Negro from persecuting another minority.)

Your metaphysical observations in reply to Dennis Lien are unintelligible for better reasons than the poorly corrected typographical errors which mar that particular page. Your objections to polytheism appear to be based on a semantic quibble, and you introduce an entirely irrelevant question (irresistable forces versus immovable objects) as well. This is all right, of course--the question is a fascinating one--but your offhand dismissal of the question's validity only manages to confuse the discussion still more. It may be true that neither irresistible forces nor immovable objects can exist within the currently accepted limits imposed by the laws of physics, but this is hardly a valid objection to a philosophical (i.e., theoretical) statement. (My arguments were deliberately very brief, and this has conceivably been responsible for the confusion. My point was not that irresistible forces and immovable objects were physically impossible (for this is, as you say, irrelevant), but rather that they were logically impossible. This objection does happen to be relevant to a theoretical discussion. Given an irresistible force, there can logically be no immovable object, since by definition any object will be found to be "movable" in the presence of an irresistible force. The opposite is also true: granted an immovable object, what force can possibly be irresistible?--since the immovable object will, by definition, be able to resist it. This principle is applicable to the question of omnipotent deities. If God A is absolutely omnipotent, then there can be no other omnipotent deity; the fact of God A's omnipotence logically limits the power of any other hypothetical deity.)

Apart from disliking your philosophical "proof", however, I agree with the point you were attempting to make. The contradictory beliefs of the major religions do indicate that only one can be right in any given case, though this does not of course prove that one must be right in a specific instance. Hinduism, e.g., may be correct in the matter of beef-eating taboos, but only if Judaism is wrong with respect to its allowance of beef devouring; and vice versa. It could be argued, of course, that eating beef is wrong for Hindus but right for Jews, but this does not seem to be compatible with the attitude of the religions. Note that Hinduism does not bar beef-eating for Hindus so much as to consider beef-eating inherently wrong; there's a distinction here, you see. Catholicism does not hold that eating meat on Friday is something that Catholics ought not to do; rather, it cites meat-eating on Friday as something bad, which only devout Catholics are enlightened enough to avoid (but which, it is inferred, all persons should avoid).

On #47: Your expressed fears as to Goldwater's possible election are not shared by me. I suspect that we both agree on the terrifying aspects of Barry entering the White House, and I am anxious to avoid the possibility. But you seem to feel that he has some significant chance of actually being elected; I don't. I don't have any illusions as to the political discrimination of the American people (any that I had crumbled when Nixon was nearly elected), but I do have faith in Jack Kennedy's skill as a practical politician. Mr. Kennedy has announced that he is anxious to begin campaigning, and I can see why: prior to seriously considering his candidacy, Goldwater made so many half-assed statements that the Democrats will only have to quote his own words at him in order to completely alienate the voting public from the Republican Party. Despite his current binge of reneging on earlier statements, Goldwater's words on nuclear testing, union shops, farm subsidies, etc., will haunt him like the ghost of Marley. Of course, a really important

--Continued After Next Article--

F. ERNEST JOHNSON:

PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS IN A PLURALIST SOCIETY

Is it not true that American pluralism has been rather superficially conceived? We tend to exalt it as a "good", as something to be cultivated for its own sake. Yet at the same time most of us contend so vigorously for our own political and religious beliefs and way of life as to leave no doubt that we should be happier--and more hopeful for the world--if other people were more like us. Perhaps an element of persuasion enters into all serious communication. Are we not all inveterate "persuaders", bent on spreading our opinions and preferences--and even our prejudices? In any case, it would seem much more realistic to regard our plural culture as a given to be accepted and to forego speculation as to whether a culture less heterogeneous might be more desirable. For it is clear that many individuals and groups in America are utterly convinced of the superiority of their particular heritage. This is notably true of religious groups--conspicuously so of Protestants vis-à-vis Catholics, and vice versa. Cultural plurality is a fact, not a preference.

The point to be stressed here is that for a substantial part of the religious population in America an educational program that is not closely and expressly articulated with religious faith and practice is woefully truncated. For many this is an article of faith. For others it is a matter of strong individual conviction. If we who defend the secular school are indifferent to such attitudes, are we not accepting cultural pluralism in name, but refusing to recognize its plain implications? By implications I do not mean specific policies that should be adopted; I mean, in particular, the fact that parents who feel duty-bound to send their children to a religious school, while continuing to bear their share of the cost of public education, are burdened in a unique way. A common response of non-Catholics to such a grievance is that all parents have free choice in the matter -- just as they have between public and independent schools. But this overlooks entirely the fact that in the former case full religious freedom in the all-important matter of education has to be purchased at a price. This is why I call the resultant situation uniquely burdensome.

It seems to me necessary to make a distinction here that many people may regard as artificial, namely, between religious liberty, in the sense of absence of restraint or constraint, and personal religious freedom. As I see it, in our American system the law and the courts can take account of religious liberty only

as it is assimilated to the category of civil liberty in general. The context of the "establishment" clause in the First Amendment supports this view: religious liberty is linked to that of speech and assembly. In this sense religious liberty is a particular aspect of the right not to be coerced in respect to what are held to be normal and wholesome human activities. But religious freedom as understood by a religious community has to do with more than free speech or assembly. It has to do with the spiritual life and with every burden placed upon it by external pressures. It has to be achieved by persons living in community.

The comment of a noted Jesuit scholar once made in my presence is illuminating and instructive. He said that a Protestant living in a Catholic country could not expect to have the full measure of freedom--of participation, for example, in social and cultural activities--where the determining factor is the voluntary choice by individuals of the persons with whom they will associate, or to whom they will entrust authority to represent them in a given capacity. However, a Protestant in such a situation, he said, has a right to insist that the state shall not underwrite such preferences by giving them the force of law. But beyond this, social freedom must be granted by society rather than by the state. And, as I see it, a major duty of a democratic state is to establish and maintain a high degree of autonomy on the part of the people, acting through their own institutions.

I am fully mindful of what may seem an inconsistency between this reasoning and approval of the Supreme Court's historic decision in the school segregation cases. As an educator I was among those who rejoiced over that decision, which, as I understand it, meant that the Constitution demands equal treatment by the state for all citizens and that enforced segregation is not equal treatment. Thus the Court performed a major judicial function; it spelled out the meaning of the "American consensus" in a grievously controversial area involving public policy. But the process of implementation--its tempo and even the limits of its enforceability in a given instance--had to be determined by experience, in accord with the late Justice Holmes' famous maxim.

With respect to educational policy and procedure in the field of religion we have, so to speak, the segregation issue in reverse. Whereas in the latter case the Supreme Court extended a long arm into the area of cultural tradition and regional patterns of life to stigmatize a common practice that was palpably repugnant to the American system of government, on the religious issue the Court--in its sweeping prescription of "separation" in the McCullum case--reached far into customs and ideas that were deeply entrenched in the nation as a whole, to set up novel judicial sanctions. Segregation was something to be repudiated as contrary to the American idea. In contrast, a friendly disposition toward religion on the part of the government had everywhere been taken for granted. Here, too, in an effort to promote liberty, the Court came up against strong barriers.

It should be noted that the Supreme Court in the subsequent Zorach case formulated a quite different doctrine. For the absolutistic definition of separation of church and state set forth in the former case, the Court substituted--not explicitly, but in effect--the principle of cooperation between church and state, within limits which apparently must be determined in the light of particular circumstances. At least for the time being, this decision settled the nation-wide controversy over "released time" for religious education. The continued use

Note: "Parochial Schools in a Pluralist Society" is excerpted from "Religion and the Schools", a pamphlet available from the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Santa Barbara, California. Single copies are available free of charge.

of the school-attendance laws to facilitate enrolling pupils in these classes presents a real issue, but the Court's decision was, on the whole, much more realistic than the one which it modified.

What I want to stress here is that for all citizens to enjoy the privileges a free society should provide, sanctions must be invoked that are broader--and higher--than those which legislatures and courts can be expected to implement. To repeat: I am contending that tax-paying parents who for conscience' sake, and in accord with the dictates of their religion, incur burdensome expense by sending their children to religious schools suffer a burdensome disadvantage which should disturb the conscience of the community.

But to recognize this disparity--"double taxation" is an inexact and provocative way of putting it--is not to prescribe a remedy. It is not even to assert that a remedy is presently available. Indeed, this situation is an impressive illustration of the fact that separation of church and state, as defined by our courts, is not a formula for eliminating religious tension; at best, it is a way--only partly effective--of negotiating the tension inherent in our pluralistic culture. When Protestants--and other non-Catholics--are ready to view the school problem with sympathy for the economic predicament of a Catholic family of slender means, Protestant concern for religious freedom will be more convincing.

On the other hand, there is widespread fear on the part of non-Catholics that any strengthening of the Catholic position in our society must impair the status of other groups, religious and secular. When this fear is removed, Catholics may expect a more sympathetic and reasonable attitude toward the situation in which they find themselves.

The crux of the matter, of course, is the question of whether it is consistent with our governmental system for public funds to be used for the support of schools which not only provide the prescribed program of general education but integrate it with sectarian religious instruction and worship. The argument for such support--which seems to furnish the rationale for British policy in this matter--is that if the state allows the prescribed educational requirements to be met by attendance at church-related schools and makes available to them the machinery of compulsory school-attendance laws, it is only fair that a financial quid pro quo be provided out of public funds in return for the share thus borne by Catholics of the cost of the general education program. In principle, this seems comparable to the reimbursement out of public funds of a church-related institution for the care of children who are wards of the state, a policy which apparently goes unchallenged because a relatively small amount is involved.

The case against the proposal rests in part on the unmistakable and very substantial "aid to religion" involved, which, the Supreme Court has flatly declared, neither a state nor the federal government may pass laws to provide. In view of the innumerable instances of aid, of an indirect or incidental sort, which government is permitted to afford to church bodies or agencies, it seems clear that the controlling factor is quantitative rather than qualitative. The public as a whole, with the backing of state constitutions and the state and federal judiciary, is opposed to the proposal, which is taken to mean a government subsidy to the Roman Catholic Church. Again, as long as the interfaith situation is characterized by fear and suspicion, such a proposition will presumably remain virtually undiscussible in this country.

On the other hand, transportation to and from school for children attending non-public schools has been clearly affirmed by the Supreme Court, and the provision of secular textbooks has been likewise upheld. I regard the opposition to these "fringe-benefit" provisions as unreasonable and unfair. It is a conspicuous example of the fact that

Americans seem readier to accept the idea of cultural pluralism than to accept its consequences. Only warped thinking, it seems to me, can justify denying families of children attending religious schools those facilities freely accorded to others which are unrelated to religious instruction.

The issue goes deeper than legal and constitutional provisions or court decisions can penetrate. It is rooted in the philosophy of education as a public function--that is to say, as a function prescribed, maintained, and supervised by public authority. (To argue about what is public and what is not seems to me to play hide-and-seek among definitions.) Public education as a major function of the state needs no defense in America. But there is a deep cleavage between the philosophy of those who hold that a secular state is competent to provide an education that is adequate at all levels of experience embodying a total way of life, and the philosophy of those who hold that a fully adequate and ideally integrated educational program must include an element of spiritual commitment which public education should not attempt to encompass.

American policy with respect to general education exhibits the tension characteristic of a pluralist culture in that parochial and other religious schools are authenticated by the state as fulfilling the requirements of a compulsory educational program; yet, they are in effect disapproved by majority opinion--religious as well as secular--on the ground that they tend to weaken the public schools which, with their admitted limitations in the sphere of religion, are held to be of paramount importance. This ambivalence, as I see it, is nothing to be surprised at. It is one manifestation of our pluralism. Yet it would be more mature on the part of all of us to recognize and acknowledge the ambivalence instead of endeavoring to construct and defend a rationale for the status quo.

--F. Ernest Johnson

—THE GREAT DEBATE—

CONTINUED

reversal for the New Frontier, such as the collapse of the nuclear test-ban agreement or a protracted recession, could change the picture between now and next November.

I have one objection to your otherwise reasonable comments on Goldwater. Having noted his low opinion of the American Civil Liberties Union, you use this as a take-off point for the observation that conservatism is wrong by virtue of considering civil liberties a left-wing concern. Barry didn't say that civil liberties were a left-wing concern; he pointed that the ACLU was a left-wing group. Surely it's possible to criticize the ACLU without being accused of being against civil liberties...? In fact, I recall reading several months ago that various conservatives had formed their own civil liberties group, which indicates some degree of concern. (Attacking a specific organization is not equivalent to an attack on the purpose of the organization, but the right-wing opposition to the ACLU, as a whole, would certainly indicate something less than scrupulous concern with the principles involved. Such attacks ignore the obvious fact that the ACLU is not a left-wing group (except, as I said, insofar as civil liberties can be considered a left-wing concern). The American Civil Liberties Union is a non-partisan group devoted to protecting the rights of individuals whenever they are challenged. The beneficiaries of their services are most often members of the American Left, but only because the Left is most often in need of such protection. The ACLU has defended Madalyn Murray

and members of the Communist Party; but it has also been concerned with protecting the civil liberties of members of minority religious sects and George Rockwell's American Nazi Party. (The recent activities of the local branch of the ACLU are probably representative: in recent weeks it has emerged as the watchdog of the courts, attempting to prevent schools in this area from circumventing the ban on religious ceremonies; in addition, the organization has promised its assistance in the case of a chaplain at the University of Maryland who has come under fire for criticizing college fraternities; and it is currently defending a segregationist who was arrested in Baltimore for making an anti-Negro speech during a racial demonstration.) The right-wing civil liberties group which you cite is indicative of the general attitude I criticized. This committee was organized expressly to protect the civil liberties of members of the American Right, which only serves to reinforce my original criticism: I am quite willing to believe that conservatives are concerned with protecting their own rights, but the creation of a civil liberties committee to assist right-wing victims does not convince me that conservatives show any particular concern with my civil liberties.))

Your three-page dissertation on narrow-mindedness could have been condensed to five words: "Most people suffer from ethnocentrism".

I'll resist the temptation to call Si Stricklen a bigot, and assume that he's one of the "reasonably intelligent, reasonably well-educated" individuals who happens to believe that segregation is justifiable. Most of his arguments are ambiguous--they blur into innocuous statements which don't mean what I thought they meant whenever I try to sink my teeth into them--but his time-worn observations on the cultural inferiority of the Negro is deserving of a few words. It is true, of course, that Negroes as a whole have "a notably higher crime rate, significantly more illegitimate children, and are distinctly poorer in education." But whose fault is this? Mr. Stricklen might claim that the fault lies with the Negroes, but these conditions are not restricted to a single race or nationality group. In New York, an unfortunately large number of Negroes exist in a situation which breeds the sort of problems Mr. Stricklen fears will "tend to spread" if integration is successful. These problems are inherent in the environment, however--not its inhabitants.

Living in New York provides one with a perspective on this situation which a citizen of Augusta, Georgia, couldn't possibly understand. I have seen some of the most depressing slums in existence recently--dwellings with two or three families to a room, one bathroom per floor, appallingly unsanitary living conditions, garbage piled in the hallways of "apartment buildings" (once single-family homes). Senator Eastland would gleefully use this situation as an argument against integration, except for one thing: these tenements were not inhabited by Negroes, but by Italians. Thousands of Negro families live in equal squalor throughout this city, but that isn't the point: the conditions I have described (and the resultant problems of lack of education, illegitimacy, and galloping crime-rate which Mr. Stricklen mentioned) are the result of poverty, not race. The conditions Mr. Stricklen deplores were not caused by Negroes (or by Italians or by Poles or etc.); Negroes are the victims of the conditions. The lack of education, high crime-rate, and excessive illegitimacy is not the reason for the discrimination; quite the reverse--all of these problems are the direct result of the discrimination. This is what Mr. Stricklen and those who believe as he does cannot comprehend. Eighty years ago, when few Negroes lived in northern cities, these ghettos were inhabited by Irish, Italian, and Eastern European families. No one seriously claims today that these nationality groups are inherently inferior to anyone else. We realize that

these people lived in such ghettos because of the prejudice on the part of the dominant majority. Some of us (but not, apparently, Si Stricklen) also realize that much the same thing applies to Negroes--they live in slums because they are forced by the dominant white majority to do so.

"...it is fit the ruler should have a power in many cases to mitigate the severity of the law, and pardon some offenders, since the end of government being the preservation of all as much as may be, even the guilty are to be spared when it can prove no prejudice to the innocent." --John Locke, in "The Second Treatise on Civil Government".

BILL PLOTT :: P.O. BOX 5598 :: UNIVERSITY, ALABAMA

Your arguments against my letter (#46) are generally quite valid as usual. However, my stand remains identical to what was expressed in that letter. My feelings there are not unique--they are quite prevalent around here and throughout the South. I certainly don't think Goldwater will do anything to stem the tide of the civil rights movement--a lot of people do and that explains much of his support in the South. I believe that if Goldwater wins, we will still have a Congress controlled by Democrats. That would create a stalemate that would give people a chance to catch their breaths after the unbelievable tempo of the past year.

FROM:

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



SEND TO:

printed matter only

may be opened for inspection

return requested

Au + H₂O = wet gold

52 The number to the left of this paragraph is the number of the last issue you will receive under present circumstances; the letter "T" indicates that we exchange periodicals; "K" means that you should have been stricken from the list but are receiving this issue out of the goodness of my heart; and "S" indicates that this is a sample copy.