

Kipple, a journal of opinion and comment published and edited by Ted Pauls, 1448 Meridene Drive, Baltimore, Maryland, 21212, is available in exchange for letters of comment, contributions (verse, articles, etc.), other periodicals, or the cash sum of 20¢ per issue. This publication is the official organ of the Council to Preserve the Inherent Superiority of the Caucasian Race, Ltd. -wokl-

JOTTINGS

FROM THE EDITOR'S DESK

R. BOWEN HARDESTY, A DEPRECIATION: In Kipple #38, an editorial appeared deploring restrictions on academic freedom at Frostburg State College, a small and thoroughly insignificant institute of higher learning in Western Maryland. Originally, the controversy concerned the abrupt dismissal of four English instructors after they had vigorously protested censorship carried out by the administrative directors of the college. The professors had requested certain controversial volumes for use in their English classes, including "Lady Chatterly's Lover" and "Lolita". The administrators at first delayed by all possible means ordering the books in question, then finally flatly refused to allow the tomes to be used at Frostburg. The professors protested this sanctimonious attitude, and were shortly thereafter dismissed from the academic staff of the institution. Three other professors resigned in protest over this harsh manner of dealing with criticism, and many students began questioning the competence and good faith of R. Bowen Hardesty, president of the college. The administrators at first refused to release any statement to the press, but finally, in response to repeated objections from both faculty and student body representatives, offered an extremely ambiguous statement on the controversial discharges. The academic qualifications of the four instructors who had lost their positions were not mentioned; instead, they were charged with being "immature" and not amenable to proper authority. "Young professors," it was pointed out, "should listen to reason and mature judgement and wise counseling." To compound the controversy, another administrative official of Frostburg State College, Ivan C. Diehl, consented to be interviewed by the press and made some remarkably fatuous observations with respect to the books which had been originally requested. Among other things, he said of "Lady Chatterly's Lover" that it was "not fit for college teaching" and was "altogether too exciting for a young person".

Despite the silence of this periodical in the intervening months, the controversy has not noticeably faded. Indeed, the high-handed and autocratic methods of R. Bowen Hardesty have become even more outrageous since the initial phase of this controversy exploded into the public eye. The four professors appealed to various bureaus and agencies concerned with education in Maryland, but to no avail. They finally utilized the courts in an effort to gain an impartial hearing for their charges of unjust restrictions on academic freedom, but when President

Hardesty issued a statement explicitly noting that the academic qualifications of the four were never in question, thus clearing the way for them to find positions with other schools, the court action was halted. On the campus, however, the situation rapidly deteriorated. Having been exposed in the newspapers as an arrogant and inflexible autocrat, President Hardesty apparently decided to stifle once and for all any opposition or criticism which might develop on campus against his authoritarian methods. To this end, Hardesty composed a letter which was mailed to all students and reproduced in the student handbook which is customarily given to freshmen. In this document, Frostburg's uncompromising ruler attempted to equate criticism of college regulations with subversion and warned that no further demonstrations of any sort would be tolerated. If any such demonstrations occurred, Hardesty vowed, the leaders would be summarily expelled from the institution. This ruling established a situation in which criticism of the college administration could lead to the arbitrary expulsion of a student without benefit of a hearing of any sort.

Not content with even this harsh measure, Hardesty initiated what may be considered with little exaggeration a pseudo-dictatorship at Frostburg. Jerry Howie, the president of the student government and a critic of R. Bowen Hardesty's policies, resigned from his position as a result of pressure exerted on him by the college president. Hardesty, he stated, had threatened to attempt to discredit Howie by "exposing" the fact that the student leader had once stolen a five-cent package of ice cream from the college. In commenting on Howie's resignation, President Hardesty did not deny having threatened such action, but simply reiterated his earlier pronouncements and made this reference to the ice cream incident:

"Reference was made to Howie's attempt...to take from the State of Maryland more than one cup of ice cream. The incident was discovered and witnessed by a finance officer of the college's business office. The volume of ice cream is not significant. The principle of the then-vice president of the student government attempting the act is significant."

Other students critical of Hardesty's repressive policies have been dealt with in more orthodox fashion. Some have been placed on probation as a result of what the college administration arbitrarily terms their "radical" attitudes. One of these students, who must report to Mr. Hardesty each month on evidences of a change in his attitude, informed newspaper reporters that he has still not succeeded in discovering what "radical" attitudes he is supposedly guilty of displaying. Another student, it was reported, was threatened with expulsion after a campus policeman had overheard him criticizing President Hardesty in a private conversation and promptly reported the information to the administrative office.

Far from having been resolved, then, the controversy grows hotter with the passing of each day. President Hardesty has been hanged in effigy on several occasions, and the student body of Frostburg recently adopted a resolution condemning the authoritarian practices of the administration by the rather remarkable vote of 1045-to-6. Finally, the State College Board of Trustees, acceding to the demands of the American Association of University Professors, conducted a formal investigation of the entire situation. The probe was brief and conducted in large part in private sessions, and the report of the three-man commission appointed to make a detailed study of Frostburg College's internal problems has not yet been made public. No particular genius is necessary,

however, to predict that the formal report will display the greatest concern with glossing over R. Bowen Hardesty's conspicuous abuses and almost no concern at all with the welfare of the students at Frostburg. This is not likely to solve the problem, of course, but it will prevent an embarrassing display of dirty linen being washed in public. And so long as the basic situation fails to materially improve, Frostburg State College will recede further and further into insignificance. Eventually, the intellectual level of the faculty will drop to that of the administration, with the result that Western Maryland's grand dream of another liberal arts college will become a nightmare.

MEMOIRS OF A YOUNG PUNK: To the average citizen of this nation, the concept of juvenile delinquency is equated with the flourishing adolescent crime of New York City (and, by extension, every other large metropolitan area in the United States). The vast bulk of literature on this subject has been guilty of an overt concentration on this particular aspect of the problem, exploring in tedious detail the exploits and motivations of street gangs and their members. Most of this literature is remarkably homogeneous, repeatedly covering the same ground in its fascination for those youthful criminals who are responsible for the majority of automobile thefts, muggings, and other lesser crimes in this post-World War Two society. The danger of this approach is that it promotes a tendency to conceive of juvenile delinquency only in such terms, and by channeling productive thought exclusively toward the most hopeless and blatantly criminal manifestations of the problem, renders more difficult the formulation of any lasting solution. I do not pretend to possess any comprehensive solution to the problem of juvenile delinquency, but I do believe that such a solution may be more readily discovered if the attitude which contributes to the creation of a juvenile criminal is understood in its less complicated early stages. To this end, I may one day author a lengthy tome which will bear the same title as does this segment of "Jottings".

My qualifications for the creation of such a study of juvenile delinquency in its less harmful foetal stage should be briefly summarized. The first thirteen years of my life were spent in a neighborhood of this city which was precariously poised on the brink of becoming a slum (and has since tumbled into the abyss). Apart from certain limited academic talents, I was a distressingly normal product of such a lower-class environment. What a psychologist would term rebellion against the mores of genteel society had caused me to conform with a vengeance to the pattern of social behavior prevalent among the youngsters of my neighborhood. Conserving detailed descriptions until later, it suffices to say that I unhesitatingly adopted the attitudes and activities of my youthful companions, and became a member in good standing of an in-group possessing what at best may be considered grossly distorted values and goals. At the same time, I retained a certain sense of objectivity toward the entire situation, which, coupled with my reasonably high intelligence and ability to discern both my own and others' motives, allowed me to learn a great deal about the situations in which I was enmeshed.

The in-group of which I was a member may most appropriately be categorized as a borderline street gang. By this I mean that the members were too young to indulge in full-fledged criminal activities such as muggings or automobile thefts (one boy was only ten years old, and no one was older than fourteen), while at the same time the various activities of the group often progressed beyond the stage of mere childish mischief. Every member of the group was apprehended by the police at one time or another for illegal gambling, shoplifting, or disorderly

conduct. Had this group existed within the environment which the popular literature on the subject appears to consider normal under such circumstances, I suppose that the older members would have been inducted into a genuine street gang. Fortunately, this neighborhood possessed no such organization, and so my in-group was allowed to remain at this relatively moderate level of delinquency. It is because, at this level of organization, the criminal aspects of such a gang are overshadowed by the social aspects, that a study of this sort of group might prove valuable to those interested in this problem.

Space does not permit a comprehensive analysis of the attitudes responsible for sustaining such a group; indeed, a rather long book would be necessary in order to present a reasonably complete exploration of this topic. What I shall attempt in this article is to outline several aspects of life in such a situation, with particular attention to psychological motivation but with no real effort toward unity or completeness.

One ironic aspect of such an existence which suggests itself as significant is the degree of conformity encountered within such a supposedly rebellious clique. The raison d'être for the gang (known as the Black Hawks, in honor of the comic book characters of the same name) was a rejection of the idea of conformity to the stereotype of the "nice" boy which our parents eagerly thrust before our eyes at every opportunity. I felt (and I am certain that this feeling was shared by the other members of the group) that the ideal of the obedient, clean-cut Christian youngster who invariably does his homework and possesses an attitude of quiet reverence toward parents, teachers and other symbols of authority, was intolerably restrictive. Of course, the motivation was not stated in such articulate terms; indeed, it was probably never stated consciously at all. But in escaping from this narrow--and, we thought, unreasonable--channel of existence, we literally created an even more restrictive set of conventions. Far from becoming non-conformists in our rebellion, we systematically conformed to a mode of living which was more rigid and less tolerable to an individualistic personality than anything which had previously been experienced. Within the sub-culture known as the Black Hawks, behavior was rigidly prescribed within certain channels (which might differ in many respects from those imposed by law or custom, but were no less restrictive); modes of dress, speech, and even thought to some extent were dictated with less leniency than had been encountered in the adult-ruled society against which we had rebelled. And punishment for transgressions consisted not merely of a harsh word from a father or the imposition of additional homework by a teacher; it did not even consist of simple physical retaliation, which we would have accepted without flinching. Punishment consisted of the worst possible fate, from the point of view of a member of the gang: temporary or permanent exclusion from the group.

It may seem strange that any group would reject conformity to a relatively innocuous--and even desirable--stereotype, then welcome a more rigid conformity incorporating a greater penalty for infractions. The distinction that rendered acceptable this otherwise unfortunate situation was, of course, the fact that the regulations and customs of the Black Hawks were our own rules, self-imposed. They might be harsh and restrictive conventions, but they were imposed by consensus rather than being rules imposed from outside the group by authority images.

The modes of dress, speech and behavior which were adhered to were diametrically opposite those advocated by the responsible adults in our environment. Black leather jackets and motorcycle caps were de rigueur; no one was instructed to dress in this manner, but one did so without conscious consideration because otherwise one would not be a part of the group. Much the same may be observed with respect to the

other conventions to which we adhered. Smoking and violent profanity were obligatory, particularly in the presence of scandalized adults. The attitude illustrated by this custom was, of course, "What's the point of being a rebel if nobody sees you?" Appearing "tough" was the order of the day, and this was accomplished by the use of various mannerisms and external trappings: speaking in a crude imitation of English while a cigarette dangled from one's lips, affecting a uniquely devised strut accompanied by a nasty facial expression, wearing cleats on one's shoes (the sound of which striking the pavement would announce your arrival three blocks away on a quiet night), and cultivating a disconcerting bluntness when addressing adults in general and police officers in particular.

Much of the time, of course, we were reasonably normal youngsters beneath these superficial manifestations of our distorted sense of values. For recreation we would indulge in most of the normal activities of adolescents everywhere, such as fishing at a nearby reservoir, attending a motion picture at the local theatre, playing baseball and football in the appropriate seasons, climbing trees, ad infinitum. Mingled with these healthy activities were a few which were decidedly frowned upon by our elders: playing serious poker or shooting craps, breaking windows at a nearby junior high school, using firecrackers in defiance of a city ordinance prohibiting their possession, trespassing, and occasionally shoplifting. The latter activity has a particular significance to the avowed scope of this brief article. None of the members of the Black Hawks were underprivileged youngsters, no family in the neighborhood could properly be considered impoverished. But shoplifting was a potent status symbol in our group. Anyone could buy a desired object, either by requesting the necessary cash from their parents or working for it in some manner. But stealing it, we believed, was a mark of courage. The question of ethics or morals did not intrude into the problem in any way--remember that the only ethics we knew at the time were the injunctions of our parents, who possessed a remarkable double standard in judging the faults of their progeny as opposed to their own. I am now appalled by many of my own actions during this period, but there was nothing within me at the time capable of making moral judgements, a deficiency I shared with the other members of the clique. The only reason to abstain from stealing which occurred to us was provided by the remnants of parental indoctrination, and having rejected a great deal of this code, it was not at all difficult to reject all of it.

Stealing, then, was not accounted "wrong", but it was acknowledged as a dangerous pursuit, with the result that successful shoplifting was accorded high standing in the gang. Managing to pocket even such common items as candy bars or Tastykake cupcakes not only provided the pleasure inherent in a situation which incorporates a certain degree of danger (i.e., of being apprehended), but also resulted in ego-gratification due to the compliments and back-slapping of fellow gang members. I stress again that such activities took place in a moral vacuum, and in other circumstances it is just such an amoral attitude which may eventually lead to the more daring (and deplorable) exploits of a genuine street gang: assault, rape, murder, robbery on a large scale, etc.

Among other commonly recognized manifestations of "juvenile delinquency" in which the Black Hawks did not engage was gang warfare. There were never more than a dozen or so members of our group, and we knew of no official "gangs" in adjacent neighborhoods, so the phenomenon of a "rumble" was unknown to us except through the channels of the various mass media. Occasionally, small groups of young toughs from adjoining neighborhoods would enter the few square blocks which comprised

our neighborhood, but real trouble was rare. If such a visiting party discovered any lone Black Hawk, they might terrorize him with harsh words and a few punches (a favor which we would thereupon return by visiting their district a few days later), but so long as three or more members stayed together, serious fighting was unlikely. Exchanges would consist of verbal fencing and at the most a little shoving; on only one occasion did I participate in an actual fight between two opposing groups. This may seem unusual because of another erroneous impression fostered by the popular literature on the subject. According to most accounts, fights generally occur because no gang member may retreat from any challenge unless he is willing to risk disgrace in the eyes of his fellow young hoodlums. I am willing to accept the word of the authors concerned that this is what occurs in the standardized gangs on which their works are based. But, like most generalities, this concept cannot be applied in cases where the similarity in other respects is only partial. Unlike the members of a large criminal gang, who are at best only comrades in poverty and partners in crime, the Black Hawks were in addition friends. There was no particular disgrace in running from superior odds or strength rather than fighting; flight was, indeed, the prescribed last ditch alternative, if bluffing and intimidation failed. We were a normal group of youngsters to the extent that no one particularly looked forward to the prospect of being knifed or badly beaten. The acquisition of status and the display of courage took other forms, as I have pointed out, such as shoplifting or impertinence to a police officer, and consequently physical combat as a means of displaying courage was unnecessary.

On Sunday, the ordinary mode of dress was abandoned in favor of more respectable clothing--white shirts, ties, suits or sportcoats, newly-shined shoes sans cleats, etc. I later learned that my parents (and I have no reason to doubt that this applies to the parents of all the members) were encouraged by this apparent touch of what they idealized as normalcy. We had always been encouraged to "dress up" on Sundays by our respective families, but assented only partially and very grudgingly to do so. After a few rousing Sunday afternoon football games, our dear parents wisely abandoned such ideas. Now, suddenly, they discovered us taking an interest in such matters without their prodding, and falsely concluded that this was a symptom of maturity. Actually, our concern with our appearance was not of the normal variety, and, contrary to the beliefs and wishes of our families, it represented an even deeper psychological commitment to our ludicrous rebellion. In dressing up on Sundays, the emphasis was not on "looking nice" (by the standards of adult society), but rather on appearing "cool". As with nearly everything else we did, the underlying purpose was to impress people with the fact that we were (supposedly) hardened, supremely confident young paladins, against whom it would be unwise to become pugnacious. Exchanging motorcycle boots and leather jackets for flashy sportcoats and garish ties was not then a sign of maturity; it was simply the use of different symbols for the same basic and unchanging purpose. It was also, to a lesser extent, part of an effort to impress the neighborhood girls, in whom we were beginning to take an interest. Finally, it is conceivable that a subconscious reason for the metamorphosis may have been a continuing desire to strive for the idealized goal which we had consciously rejected.

It does not seem reasonable to claim that any of us were ashamed of our actions at the time, but I don't know how else to explain the interesting fact that the leather jackets and assorted accessories were discarded in favor of more mundane clothing whenever we attended a party at which girls were present. The civilizing influence of the female on a male does not suffice to explain this change of heart, when you con-

sider that we were barely adolescents, young toughs whose newly-awakened interest in girls was nearly cancelled out by the increased hostility which its strangeness evoked. The only reason which seems tenable to me for our disinclination to sport our "tough" garments at a party is that, subconsciously, we were somewhat ashamed of what the clothes symbolized. I should like to believe this, for it would provide some bond of sympathy between Ted Pauls/1963 and the vicious little bastard who inhabited this body ten years earlier. But I cannot honestly state with any certainty that I regretted, at the time, my activities and attitudes. (My lack of individualism and my dishonesty were not the only character traits which I find appalling in my former self; in addition, I was, as I have mentioned previously in this periodical, a narrow-minded bigot, who had not yet been able to break loose from parentally-inculcated anti-Semitism and anti-Negro sentiments.)

In these few pages, I have barely scratched the surface of a subject about which I have often thought in the past few years. Although I normally experience difficulty in writing about myself (even when it is a thoroughly contemptible former self), in this case I could have written much more. But such reminiscences are painful to an extent, even though I think I have achieved a certain degree of detachment, and exploring my former character (or lack thereof) in order to gain an insight into the mind of the juvenile delinquent is a distasteful chore, rather like dredging a cesspool in search of a lost jewel. Shortly after my thirteenth birthday, my family moved to a suburban community and I gained a new set of friends. This uprooting corresponded to what may be termed, with utmost ostentation, an intellectual awakening, when I developed an insatiable appetite for knowledge of all sorts. To an already existing interest in zoology and astronomy, I added an interest in every other field of science, in philosophy, in politics, history, ethics, you-name-it; an interest, in short, in the world, bounded only by the limits of available books. One by one, the prejudices, the attitudes, the distorted values crumbled. My faults may now be just as numerous (including a pedantic and pompous manner), but they are at least different from those of Ted Pauls/1953.

The preceding paragraph has been not only an attempt to bring up to date what has gone before, but also a disclaimer of responsibility. I realize, of course, that it is impossible to escape the responsibility for being the sort of disreputable character I have attempted to describe in this article. But I do not feel as if I were the same child who used to steal candy bars at a neighborhood confectionary store, and certainly the Ted Pauls who was a segregationist and an anti-Semite is totally alien to the present writer of this treatise. If this could happen to me, then I suspect that it could happen to most of the young delinquents of today--not to mention the young bigots and the young chauvinists. But to affect such a transition would require a key of some sort. And I cannot claim to possess a solution for the problems of any other young hoodlum, when I am only vaguely cognizant of the "key" in my own experience.

Whatever the solution may be, it had better be discovered quickly. Nightsticks and long prison terms do not solve the problem, they merely compound it.

THE OVERTHROW OF THE DIEM REGIME occurred at what for John F. Kennedy must have been an extremely inopportune moment. Only a few days prior to the military coup d'état in South Vietnam, the President had made known his dissatisfaction with the current situation in Latin America, where military takeovers occur at an astonishing rate. Commenting in particular on the sudden and unexpected downfall of President Juan Bosch's democratic government in the Domini-

can Republic, Mr. Kennedy decried the subversion of legitimate governments by ambitious military cliques. It is axiomatic that the United States, often through no fault of its own, has a remarkable capacity for making itself appear foolish in the eyes of the rest of the world, so it did not come as a total surprise that the Vietnamese military leaders chose this moment to conduct their smoothly implemented revolution. The Kennedy Administration fully and publicly supported the coup, since there was no possible alternative, and consequently opened the way for charges of hypocrisy and duplicity in evaluating the wisdom of military uprisings in different areas of the globe.

Senator Goldwater will no doubt utilize to the fullest extent this apparent assumption of a double standard, and cause it to become an issue in his enthusiastic non-campaign. To some extent, the problem posed by this situation confronts your obedient servant as well, although I suspect that my own thinking on this matter does not parallel that of the present Administration. In my most recent dissection of Barry Goldwater's more fatuous public statements, I disputed his contention that the two most recent military coups in Latin America were justified by the violently anti-Communist attitude of the insurgents, and voiced sorrow that power had been usurped from the Dominican democracy. Having gone on record as being in opposition to the Dominican Republic coup, however, I must admit that I was in favor of the inevitable revolution in South Vietnam, and I am pleased so far with the results. Derek Nelson and other members of the political right-wing among Kipple's readers are unlikely to let pass this apparent contradiction, and so, in anticipation of their objections, a few remarks are probably in order.

When the President is called upon to defend his apparent double standard, it is conceivable that he will choose to establish this criterion: that the South Vietnam coup was in the best interests of the United States, and hence desirable, whereas the Dominican Republic revolution was injurious to the interests of this nation, and therefore undesirable. Although he would not agree with this specific application, Senator Goldwater would no doubt accept this standard in principle. As Americans, we are, of course, compelled to consider the interests of our nation in evaluating any situation, and it is certainly true that the South Vietnam takeover favors the interests of the United States while the revolution against Juan Bosch's government will probably be ultimately disadvantageous to this country. This is not, however, a basis on which I would care to defend my support of the Vietnam coup and opposition to the Dominican rebellion.

In a recent discussion, I pointed out--while challenging Goldwater's "America first" philosophy--that anti-Communism cannot be the sole criterion by which to judge a foreign government. By the same token, the value of another government cannot be considered solely or largely in terms of the comfort and convenience of the United States. In the final analysis, the qualities on which a government may properly be judged are concerned with internal stability and popular support, not the usefulness of that government to a foreign power. On this basis, I believe that the United States should, in accordance with its avowed principles, support those governments which best benefit their people. By this criterion--and it is the only logically valid one--a qualitative distinction may be perceived between the two specific regimes in question--viz., Bosch's Dominican government and Diem's Vietnam regime. Military councils are necessarily less palatable than democratic civilian governments, but this does not affect the obvious fact that in certain cases even military rule may be an improvement over the previous situation. This is obviously the case in South Vietnam, where one of the most brutal dictatorships in the Eastern Hemisphere was deposed, and

it is just as obviously not the case in the Dominican Republic.

This distinction is not dependent upon the degree of anti-Communism manifested by the various regimes, nor by their friendliness toward the United States, but rather by their ordering of domestic affairs. President Bosch's constitutional government was hardly a paragon of Western freedom. But it was, considering the unique circumstances of an educationally and financially deprived country, a remarkable attempt to adapt democratic processes to the needs of a fairly typical Latin American republic. That it was a popular government is attested to by the fact that the new regime found it necessary to close all schools in order to stifle daily anti-government demonstrations. There seems no doubt that after several decades under the authoritarian rule of the Trujillo family, the people of the Dominican Republic were by and large pleased with Bosch, and the pretext on which power was usurped by the military--i.e., that Communists had infiltrated the government--is not relevant to this question.

The Ngo Dinh Diem regime in South Vietnam, on the other hand, was most assuredly unpopular, and could not have been accused by any stretch of the imagination of striving toward democracy. In many ways, it was a classic example of a dictatorship in an underdeveloped and beleaguered nation. President Diem and the lesser lights of his sordid clan utilized the guerilla war against the Communist Viet Cong to increase their personal power, freely imposing arbitrary rules by fiat on the grounds that such measures were necessary to preserve public safety and treating all opposition as treason, punishable by death or torture. That the Diem regime was unpopular is indisputable; the most obvious proof of this is that anti-government guerillas cannot exist for long except where the majority of the populace is sympathetic toward them. The new regime, headed by a triumvirate of generals (Lieutenant General Duong Van Minh, Lieutenant General Tran Van Don, and Major General Ton That Dinh), is certainly not to be considered an ideal government, and the principle of a military government is objectionable on several grounds in itself. But the regime, which asserts itself to be an interim governing body, reflects more closely the temperament of the majority of South Vietnam's inhabitants, and it should certainly be able to rule with more wisdom than Diem's corrupt dictatorship. The popularity of the revolution is shown by the immediate reaction of the residents of Saigon, who happily greeted the troops and demonstrated in favor of Diem's successors. Also of significance is the repatriation of several bands of guerilla fighters who, due to Diem's predilection for considering all opposition to his authority a sign of Communist domination, had been mistakenly believed by United States representatives in Vietnam to be part of the Viet Cong movement.

Of course, the maxim that absolute power corrupts absolutely is no less true of Vietnamese military men than it was of Diem and his family, and the distinct possibility exists that one or another officer may gain control of the military council and utilize it as a vehicle for personal power. If that were to happen, the populace would probably be no better off than before. But despite continuing danger of such a turn of events, the revolution would appear to have justified itself. The quick relaxation of censorship by the new regime, the extraordinary tenderness with which troops treated civilian crowds when finally they were ordered to disperse riotous mobs, and the lack of immediate retaliation against the Catholic minority by the long-suffering Buddhist majority all bode well for the future.

Therefore, I conclude that the differing sentiments with respect to recent military coups are not an exercise in hypocrisy, but simply the application of a reasonable premise to divergent situations. One can neither favor nor oppose revolutions in general, since to hold such

an inflexible view would be to fail to take account of the distinctive facets of differing situations. Whatever defense other liberals may offer, I do not consider it inconsistent with my own principles to oppose the subversion of Juan Bosch's government while at the same time applauding the ouster of Ngo Dinh Diem and his cohorts.

Since the above article was prepared for duplication prior to November 22nd, it has been allowed to stand as written, despite the fact that its references to President John F. Kennedy's policies are likely to evoke poignant memories. The catastrophic events of November 22, 1963, are now a part of history, and mere words are not sufficient to express the grief of the American people. On that day, a nation which had stood against the awesome power of some of the mightiest military forces on earth, a nation which survived rending by a hideous civil war and rose to take its place as one of the great nations of history--that nation was beheaded by a single lunatic. As horrifying, possibly, as the loss of the President is the terrible realization that despite its fantastic military power, this nation was unable to shield its leader from an onslaught by one individual. My reactions to the assassination were in no way atypical: disbelief, at first, followed by incomparable shock, and finally a dull sense of loss. Eulogies have been written in abundance, praising the memory of this man who stood at the helm of his nation, guiding it through troubled waters the like of which had not been encountered by any past President. But the eloquence is forgotten easily in the light of continuing events, and only one observation, almost rude in its stark simplicity, is worthy of remembering: John F. Kennedy was a good President, who could have become a great one but was robbed of the opportunity.

--Ted Pauls

"The decisions we make now, as human beings, and as human beings who are members of groups with power to act, may bind the future as no men's decisions have ever bound it before. We are laying the foundations of a way of life that may become so world-wide that it will have no rivals, and men's imaginations will be both sheltered and imprisoned within the limits of the way we build. For in order to think creatively men need the stimulus of contrast. We know by sad experience how difficult it is for those who have been reared within one civilization ever to get outside its categories, to imagine, for instance, what a language could be like that had thirteen genders. Oh yes, one says, masculine, feminine, and neuter--and what in the world are the other ten? For those who have grown up to believe that blue and green are different colors it is hard even to think how any one would look at the two colors as if they were not differentiated, or how it would be to think of colors only in terms of intensity and not of hue. Most American and European women simply cannot imagine what it would be like to be a happy wife in a polygamous family and share a husband's favors with two other women. We can no longer think of the absence of medical care as anything but a yawning gap to be filled at once. Inevitably, the culture within which we live shapes and limits our imaginations, and by permitting us to do and think and feel in certain ways makes it increasingly unlikely or impossible that we should do or think or feel in ways that are contradictory or tangential to it." --Margaret Mead, in "Male and Female".

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

The local civil defense chief has an odd theory that might interest you. His belief, apparently with some backing from his observations, is that there are many more fallout shelters than most persons now believe in existence in this nation. He wants to try to make some sort of survey in which anonymity and secrecy would be guaranteed. His reasoning is that there has been so much discussion over the question of what to do if your neighbors ask to get into the shelter just large enough for your own family that families have been keeping secret their fallout

arrangements. It would be disconcerting, come to think of it, if the bombs began to fall and I began running around Hagerstown looking for a place to escape, and I beheld in every block scores of families rushing into fallout shelters that the husbands and fathers had dug in the middle of the night when everyone else assumed that they weren't in the house be-

THE GREAT DEBATE

cause they were chasing after other women. (I should think that even in outlying districts of Hagerstown it would be virtually impossible for a family to conceal from their immediate neighbors such an imposing venture as the construction of a shelter. In Baltimore--and particularly in the pseudo-suburban sort of community in which I reside--it is impossible to dig without detection even a grave for one's pet canary.)

You are echoing the Madison Avenue cliches about the importance of television in a most alarming manner. I've never understood why people think television has such supreme importance as an educating and enlightening medium. It is greatly inferior to the radio and the motion picture in most respects. It doesn't reach nearly as far across the land as the former with its sound and it has only a small fraction of the pictorial qualities of the latter--did you ever try to read any fine print from a book projected onto a television screen? Moreover, I think that the informational and news telecasts are the very poorest features of its programming. I can understand the less discriminating person enjoying the soap operas, variety shows, westerns, and other pure entertainment telecasts, but I can't imagine either the less discriminating or more discriminating element getting anything out of the allegedly intellectual and informative fare.

LETTERS

I've never seen any documentary, "exploration in depth", or other televised informational program that contained as much information on the topic involved as you can find in a young people's encyclopedia like the World Book or get in a feature story in a metropolitan newspaper. I don't see the slightest hope for improvement. Educational television stations cost infinitely more to operate than it would cost to run film-lending and tape-lending services to persons interested in improving their minds and commercial television will never appeal to anything better than the lowest common denominator; pay television will be even worse if it comes, because of the direct revenue factor. (The visually-oriented mind of Homo sapiens is served better by television or motion pictures than by radio. Radio, particularly during the period of its golden age, provided some remarkably fine enter-

tainment, but on the whole the medium suffered from the restrictions caused by the necessity of translating visual images into narrative or dialogue. The medium is generally comparable to silent movies, which occasionally managed to achieve extraordinary heights but were always limited by the lack of sound. With the advent of sound films, the best qualities of silent movies and radio were combined into a medium which has gradually become an art form. Television is potentially an instrument of far greater value, which combines with the virtues of motion pictures the added convenience of easy accessibility. The fact that this potential remains largely unrealized should not obscure the fact that it exists. As for the quality of educational and informational telecasts, what has been done should not, again, be confused with what can be done. Nevertheless, some impressive informational programs have been presented in the past couple of years. A recent telecast entitled "Greece: the Golden Age" furnishes one example of the value of the medium in this field. The material covered is unlikely to be discovered in even an exceptional young people's encyclopedia, and newspaper features rarely attain sufficient length or scope of coverage to incorporate this information; in addition, radio obviously would have been totally inadequate for this task, since the production consisted of commentary on Greek sculpture and architecture with the appropriate illustrations. A motion picture could easily have covered the same material, but far fewer people would have watched it at a far higher price. For another example of the superiority of television's informative programs over those of other media, consider historical documentaries covering aspects of World War Two, the Korean War, etc. Such productions could be adapted to radio, but the effect would probably be disastrous: the best efforts of radio could only create a narrative incorporating odd background noises (explosions, screams, et al.) which are associated with armed combat. Newspaper features would face the same dilemma of translating visual images into words, but their solution would be different: viz., tremendous verbiage. Even a few frames of film depicting a battle would necessitate pages of detailed description in a written account. Consequently, a newspaper feature, although possible, would be intolerably lengthy if it adequately covered the same ground as a one-hour television documentary. Motion pictures, of course, can (and have) portrayed such events with remarkable skill, but they sacrifice in the process television's relatively vast audience and its inexpensiveness. As for regular newscasts, those of television stand above radio newscasts by virtue of their pictorial qualities, and are more immediate than motion picture newsreels and even newspapers (can the Daily Mail inform its readers of an event within three or four minutes of its occurrence?).)

I've assumed, without taking the trouble to check up, that the government's dislike of unauthorized trips to Cuba derives from the danger that there will be a war-provoking incident growing out of such visits. Cuba is close enough to anarchy to create a real international incident if a couple of dozen Americans were gunned down on the main street of Havana without cause or if a plane full of Americans sabotaged some vital Cuban feature. Russia is a different matter. It's close enough to being a civilized nation (i.e., about as close as the United States) to handle any troublemakers through recognized channels and it keeps a close enough control over weapons and bombs to make it unlikely that any grave tourist problems could arise. (The official explanation of the State Department for its travel restrictions is that, since we have no diplomatic relations with Cuba, the United States is unable to protect any of its nationals who visit the island. Hence, they are not allowed to visit Cuba.)

It sounds to me as if you and Tom Perry and perhaps some others

could save yourself a lot of philosophizing if you realized that people normally start to think of an embryo as a human when it reaches the stage in its growth that would permit it to have a good chance of survival if born prematurely. ((The obvious objection to this criterion was voiced by Marty Helgesen in #49: the death or survival of a premature infant often depends upon the sophistication of the medical apparatus at hand.))

You appear not quite sure of the function of a grand jury. The grand jury doesn't have anything to do with determining if an individual is guilty or innocent. All that it does is to listen to the evidence that the state brings before it to support the state's charges against the individual, and on the basis of that, the grand jury decides whether the individual should stand trial. They can't convict, as you seem to think. ((I understand the function of a grand jury, though the phraseology of my replies to Boardman may have been open to easy misinterpretation.)) As for the old adage that law here says that the man is considered innocent until proven guilty, it suffers from the same handicap that afflicts any other short adage in a complicated world: things aren't simple enough to be summarized fully in such a few words. There's an element of truth in it but it isn't literally true, or nobody would be required to post bond or wait in jail until his case came up for a hearing or trial. The words really mean, I imagine, that under American law, the individual who is accused does not suffer the penalty of guilt until his guilt has been ascertained and that he must undergo only as much inconvenience until the verdict is established as is necessary to prevent the guilty ones from making a complete mockery of the law. And even this more complicated way of stating the matter is subject to all manner of provisos and exceptions. For instance, the jury in a civil case has different standards than the jury in a criminal case for determining if the defendant is to blame.

"Even when laws have been written down, they ought not to remain always unaltered. As in other sciences, so in politics, it is impossible that all things should be precisely set down in writing; for rules must be universal, but actions are concerned with particulars. Hence we infer that sometimes and in certain cases laws should be changed. But when we look at the matter from another point of view, great caution would seem to be required. For the habit of lightly changing the laws is an evil, and, when the advantage is small, some errors both of law-givers and rulers had better be left; the citizen will not gain so much by the change as he will lose by the habit of disobedience." --Aristotle, in "Politics".

DAVE HULAN :: APT. #21, 17417 VANOWEN ST. :: VAN NUYS, CALIF., 91406

Deckinger and Boardman are overgeneralizing again--damnit, there are plenty of people in the South who deplore the murders of Evers and Moore as much as they do. In some areas (like Huntsville) they even form a considerable majority. Elsewhere, as in Gadsden or Jackson, they are a considerable minority. Birmingham is a questionable case; despite all the violence there, the majority of the people seem to be moderate and probably would convict anyone who had a really good case made out against him. But that will have to await the test of time. "To Kill a Mockingbird" was written about the 1930's; I have known of at least two instances while I was in Huntsville of Negroes being acquitted on rape charges. And they weren't lynched later, either. Times do change; not as fast as one would like, perhaps, but they change.

Incidentally, I recall that Mike, in an earlier issue, said that

my father wasn't in any real physical danger in preaching against segregation. Perhaps not--but it did succeed in costing him his job. This is not a trivial thing; the Jackson church pays in the upper bracket of ministers' pay, and few churches in that category want to hire a man who is over fifty. As it has turned out, he has ended up with a small church in Kentucky at less than 2/3 what he was making in Jackson. And he was pretty sure what would happen when he preached that sermon in the first place. I consider that this takes courage, whatever Mike Deckinger may think.

As you can probably deduce from my earlier letter, my position regarding abortion pretty well parallels Tom Perry's. How do you answer his question--would you require a court order, or would you permit abortions to be performed on request, like an appendectomy? If a court order is required, the effect of the law would be infinitesimal; I venture to say that 95% of all illegal abortions are performed to conceal the fact that the woman was pregnant, and requiring a court order would leave the quacks' business practically untouched. (The conditions under which I would now consider abortion justifiable were outlined in #49. I do not think it unreasonable to allow qualified physicians to be the judge of whether or not such conditions exist, and hence I would not require a court order permitting an abortion to be performed.)

As for when a foetus becomes a person--surely the logical time to choose is the point of conception. This is the point at which, in the absence of outside influences, the fertilized ovum will develop into a human being. Ability to survive independently is no criterion; a newborn baby is no more capable of survival if abandoned than a two-month foetus. And science, through the use of incubators, etc., is gradually pushing back the time at which a foetus can become viable outside the mother--does this mean that foetuses are becoming persons at an earlier age? This seems philosophically absurd to me, if not to you. (Yes, the logic of considering conception the point at which a human being comes into existence is inescapable. The random combination of genes which results from the joining of the egg and sperm determines the heredity of the individual, and the various characteristics which render each person different are established at that time. All subsequent improvement and increased complexity of the organism is simply the inevitable result of the pattern established at conception. Since most of the qualities by means of which we define a human being are more potential than actual in this stage of development, I feel that abortion is justified when it enhances the well-being of the mother to a significant extent, for in her the potential is largely realized. Nevertheless, we are agreed as to the undesirability of abortion in principle, and further disagreements are likely to concern only the relatively minor matter of when conditions do warrant sacrificing the foetus in favor of the mother's well-being. It would seem that your pessimism with respect to the possibility of converting me to your position was erroneously based on either an over-estimation of my tenacity or an under-estimation of your talent as a debator.)

Abortion is not, you will agree, natural. Therefore, the results of an abortion cannot be considered in deciding a natural question--i.e., "When is a foetus a person?" True, an aborted foetus is not viable--but it is viable in its natural environment, the uterus. An adult can't live underwater, either, but that doesn't make him less of a person.

In short, I can't understand your reasoning at all. I have a great deal of sympathy for that schoolteacher--but my reactions are: (1) The code of morals that condemns premarital sex is the primary culprit; (2) Men who engage in sexual intercourse with women that they aren't married to without using contraceptives are among the lowest types in the world, in my opinion--there is little excuse for undesired pregnancy

in this day and age; (3) Why didn't she quit her job on some pretext and disappear for a while? This isn't hard to do--and there are all sorts of homes for unwed mothers where she could stay until the baby came. Almost any clergyman of any of the major denominations could and would gladly advise and help her in any way possible. My father has done this sort of thing on many, many occasions--it's simple, effective, and far safer than abortion, as well as being less questionable morally.

Contrary to popular opinion, few ministers--at least of those groups who require that their ministers be educated; I except Baptists and most fundamentalist and pentecostal sects--are in the front lines of the Legion of Decency types. The great majority realize that one of the essential parts of the Christian message is "Judge not, lest ye be judged," and "Let him who is without sin among you cast the first stone." While they will preach against those practices which they deem contrary to scripture (and there is some disagreement as to whether or not pre-marital sex falls into that category), they leave the punishment or lack thereof to God, considering Him amply capable of deciding what He wants and punishing those who transgress. And when someone is in trouble, they will help without condemning.

In defense of Si Stricklen--he didn't say that it was the Negroes' fault that they were culturally inferior. He said that they were, and that this made a lot of people reluctant to integrate with them. Who is at fault in this situation is another question--with the obvious answer that it's the fault of the white majority. But this doesn't eliminate the problem. A person sufficiently concerned about the plight of those less fortunate will say, "Then integrate, associate; they will never rise to our level until someone makes a start." Which is all very true, but which generally draws the comment, North and South alike: "But I, as an individual, have never done anything to oppress and degrade the Negro. Why, then, should I subject myself to association with these unpleasant people? Let them become as I am, and I will accept them." This is a reasonable, albeit selfish, attitude. Most people, even in the South, have never done anything to Negroes. Most people just want to be left alone to go their own way. And they resent being compelled to do something they don't want to do. It's sad, but true--most people are selfish. I don't consider this bigotry; I do consider it selfishness.

"In North and South America, government among non-literates was mostly democratic. A good example is the League of the Iroquois, the federation known as 'The Five Nations'. The tribes forming the League were the Mohawk, Oneida, Onondaga, Cayuga, and Seneca. Each tribe maintained independence in its own affairs, but in matters affecting the League, a council of fifty, drawn unequally from each tribe, acted for all. Public opinion was always given the fullest scope for expression before the council, whose decisions were arrived at by majority vote. Women named the members of the council, though no woman served on it. Women could also remove any member of the council at will." --Ashley Montagu, in "Man: His First Million Years".

WALT WILLIS :: 170 UPPER NEWTOWNARDS RD. :: BELFAST 4, NORTHERN IRELAND

By now you will have seen the Heinlein-signed document I mentioned, and I think you will agree that my reference to it was almost pedantically accurate. I admit of course that "crackpot" is a subjective term, but I'm not impressed by the fact that the opinions so described are more common than I realized at that time. No matter how many pots are cracked, they don't hold water any better.

As I said before, I haven't seen any other criticisms about my

essay that weren't in my opinion either irrelevant or already implicitly answered. This applies even to those from Walter Breen, though of course in his case I was overawed by his perspicacity in detecting that I was influenced by a writer I never heard of. I shall have to watch that. Seriously, I have the greatest respect for Walter and I am ready to concede that there may be much in what he says. It seems to me, however, that he is to a large extent attacking the illustrations rather than the arguments, and as long as he concedes what I was trying to illustrate--viz., that as evolution progresses, intelligence tends to become more important than physical strength--I am willing to accept any amount of artistic criticism of the diagrams, as it were, that accompanied my text. On the only other outstanding point: It is, of course, impossible to prove my assumption that any civilization complex enough to achieve inter-stellar flight must be founded on voluntary cooperation, just as it is impossible to prove that there is not a life-size statue of Barry Goldwater on the other side of the moon, but until we get there we must order our lives on the more reasonable assumption. It seems to me that any civilization must be either corporate or individualistic: that is, the component parts must be autonomous or integrated into a corporate entity. I would be prepared to argue that a corporate, or ant-like community is inherently incapable of progress; and that any individualistic civilization must pass through a Doomsday Machine crisis like our own, to which the only answer is planet-wide cooperation.

If an undeveloped fetus is a human being, why is it not baptized and given Christian burial, instead of being consigned (prior to the seventh month) to the incinerator in hospitals like an appendix? Your view, that a human being cannot be said to exist until he has independent existence, is the only logical one and is already recognized by law and medical practice. The fact is that the human soul, in the sense of a recognizably unique collection of memories and characteristics, comes into existence only gradually.

You were most uncharacteristically chauvinistic in your statement that the United States pioneered the development of television. Television was invented and pioneered in Great Britain, where regular daily programs were being broadcast in the 1930's, being stopped by the outbreak of war in September of 1939. (Lapsus mens.)

"For the modern man patriotism has become one of the first of duties and one of the noblest of sentiments. It is what he owes to the state for what the state does for him, and the state is, for the modern man, a cluster of civic institutions from which he draws security and conditions of welfare. The masses are always patriotic. For them the old ethnocentric jealousy, vanity, truculency, and ambition are the strongest elements in patriotism. Such sentiments are easily awakened in a crowd. They are sure to be popular. Wider knowledge always proves that they are not based on facts. That we are good and others are bad is never true." --William Graham Sumner, in "Folkways".

LARRY McCOMBS :: 238 N. PINE AVE., APT. 407 :: CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, 60644

The reaction to Kennedy's death here, as apparently around the country, was one of complete shock and disbelief. During one of our four lunch periods, the rock-and-roll music in the student cafeteria was interrupted for the first bulletin of Kennedy's shooting, and a stunned silence fell over the whole room. The news spread quickly around the school by word of mouth--most people thinking they were being spoofed and not really believing until they got to a radio and heard the word for themselves. I went to my physical science class where everyone sat

clustered around a transistor radio, mysteriously obtained from somewhere. The only news was that Kennedy was in critical condition, but no one knew exactly how bad it was. So I had them turn off the radio and went on with the class, though I found it most difficult to concentrate on balancing chemical reactions. At the end of the period, we turned the radio back on and heard the news that the President was dead. Everyone gasped as if they'd been struck physically, and several people burst into tears. I myself was so shook up by the news that I couldn't teach any more classes, but just wanted to get away by myself somewhere and try to grasp the reality of what had happened. In fact, that seemed to be the general reaction--people sat and listened to their radios for hours, not so much in search of further details, but with the subconscious hope that the man would somehow assure them that it was all right and that Kennedy wasn't really dead. It came as a shock to many of us to realize how completely the Kennedy family had become a part of our image of the country. It was impossible to visualize Kennedy as dead--"He was so young; so vigorous; so alive!" was the unanimous reaction, even of the radio announcers.

When Kennedy delivered that tremendous inaugural address (it seems strange not to refer to it as "his first inaugural address") most college- and highschool-age Americans were deeply moved by his words: "Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans, born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage, and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this nation has always been committed..." Sure, they were the words of a battery of speech writers, a more polished version of the political rhetoric to which we have become inured. But we had high hopes that Kennedy meant what he said. After eight years during which we blamed all our troubles on the elderly caution of a respectable Father in the White House, we felt that a young man of our generation was taking over. (Yes, he was of our fathers' generation, not ours--and yet we identified with him and claimed him as our own.) Now action and youthful idealism would sweep out the accumulated trash and get the country moving again. Kennedy would not sit by idly--he would go to work to solve the crises that faced us. And for the first few months, our hopes were realized. He brought to Washington the finest array of intellectual expert opinion that we had seen in years. He called for a variety of actions which seemed to be just the sort we had hoped for.

But then, as the first year of his administration (and I almost want to say "reign", for it is only after his death that I realize how completely the government of the past three years has been dominated by his vital presence at the White House) became history, we grew discontented with his actions. Kennedy was a politician first and foremost--he believed in achieving results through the slow and devious channels of political influence. We recognized grudgingly the wisdom of his choice--we knew that he was planning to build his power slowly for the latter part of his eight-year stay in the White House--but we mourned for the impetuous youthful idealism which we had anticipated. And this last summer, as the Congress tread water while economic and racial crises grew, we became very bitter about the man in the White House, who refused to step out and publicly lash the Congress into action. Our bitterness was not so much directed at the man Kennedy, but at the whole American system of government. If this vigorous young man couldn't get the system off its collective ass, nobody could. During the fifties we blamed this country's lethargy on the lack of leadership from Ike's caretaker government. Now there was no place to put the blame but on the nation as a whole. And so today's youth began to lose interest in world

and national affairs. The Cuban crisis of last fall brought the lesson home with sickening finality--for a few days we waited to be blown up at any minute, and we all knew that we could do absolutely nothing about it. Kennedy got us through without catastrophe, but we all felt at least a nagging doubt that perhaps it was Khrushchev's greater flexibility and willingness to back down that saved us. The reaction of most of us has been a muddled one--we lost ourselves for a while in the civil rights struggle, but quickly realized that the economic crisis is inextricably intertwined with the racial one, and that our sit-ins and picketings were really feeble slashes at the very surface of the problem. We joked about it, but we confined our joking to the Boston accent and family solidarity of the Kennedys, not touching the deeper problems that distressed us.

In the past few months we have realized that Goldwater may well be a candidate for election in 1964, and that he could even be elected. We have simply sat back in stunned disbelief--if the American people would elect such a man, then our worst fears are justified. We might as well eat, drink and be merry while we may.

We have become immune to shock. In our name, the government has infiltrated and overthrown governments in countries we disliked. It has thrown most of the population of Vietnam into concentration camps to prevent them from aiding the Viet Cong forces. It has invaded and attempted to starve into submission a tiny country which dared to attempt to defend itself against our rule of the Western Hemisphere. It has stood by idly while Southern bigots jailed and harassed those who tried to help Negroes register to vote, one leader of the Negro movement was shot in the back and four children were bombed in a Sunday school. Last summer, in a last gasp of belief in the American system, thousands of us marched to Washington to assemble peacefully to petition Congress for action. Congress watched warily, expressed brief disappointment when predicted violence failed to occur, and then returned to its business of stifling every needed bill in a maze of committees headed by Southern congressmen. We were just plain disgusted, without much of a plan or direction to turn. We don't want the Communists to take over, and yet we don't see that this government is enough better to justify carrying a rifle in its defense, much less killing humanity in a nuclear war. And so we've moiled about in confusion and inaction.

And now suddenly Kennedy is gone, and we are startled by our own tears. We must have cared more than we realized; we must have built our hopes on the possibility that Kennedy would eventually bring about the changes he had promised. And somehow a man whom we only saw at a great distance has become a personal friend, whose death is in every sense a tragedy.

And even as we stop all our activities for a few days of mourning, we begin to wonder: what next? Who will be the democratic candidate now? What will this do to Goldwater's chances? What will Johnson do? Will he be able to get Congress moving at last? We wonder and we wait.

My own reaction, after the first shock wore off, was mostly one of anger. The conservatives say that things must be done through the proper legal channels, that direct action and civil disobedience are evil and un-American, that reforms must be won in the courts and not on the streets. Kennedy tried to play the game their way, and now he's dead. If a Negro had come up to me with a rifle yesterday and asked me to join in a revolution to get things done now and to hell with the consequences, I think I would have joined him. Today I'm a bit calmer--I can see that that isn't going to solve anything either. And yet, I don't see any direction to go now. Just wait, I suppose.

Re Goldwater: What can be said? This man represents the defeat

of just about everything that the liberals have accomplished in this century. If he is elected, it would be, for me at least, the final sign that the American empire has passed its peak and is in its decline, frantically seeking after the superficial characteristics of those "good old days" when we were on top of the world.

As for your comments on religion, I have a few disagreements, though I consider myself also an atheistically-tending agnostic. First of all, I find your argument of the existence of an absolute Truth (or Veritas, if you will) to be almost as unpalatable to me as is the concept of a deity. I don't think you can justify it any more than the deist can justify his belief in God. You say that you feel a deep conviction of the existence of this truth--the deist says the same of his belief in God. You can produce the arguments of numerous great men who felt as you do--so can the deist.

I tend to be more of a relativist. There is my own particular way of looking at the world--that is my truth. But my neighbor's truth is at least a little bit different from my own--often a lot different. That is fine. If we can agree on a language, we can communicate. If we can agree on certain definitions and ways of looking at things, we can understand each other and reach agreements as to the best ways to live and let live. If communication and agreement become impossible, we must reach whatever sort of working agreement is possible. It seems to me pointless to argue over whose Truth is the Real Truth. Isn't this rather a Platonic approach--imagining an ideal Truth to which various people's individual truths are more or less accurate approaches? From your own use of Occam's Razor, ought you not to question the existence of the ideal until it is shown to exist? (It is impossible for me to question the concept of absolute truth because I cannot accept the alternative; admittedly, this may reflect a deficiency in my intellect. I am always willing to concede that I may be in error in judging what is the truth, but it appears entirely unreasonable to me that there should be no correct judgement possible. Consider the matter of sense perception, often exploited by the relativist: I believe that flowers possess many different colors, and consequently feel that "color-blind" individuals are cursed with defective vision. Nevertheless, it is conceivable that those who are considered color-blind are actually perceiving accurate details, and that I--and the vast majority of the human race--possess defective vision which imparts bright colors to objects which do not in fact possess them. But that there should be no accurate statement pertaining to the coloration of a specific flower (or, conversely, that all statements should be equally correct) seems to me utterly impossible. Or consider the classic situation of three individuals entering a room and attempting to estimate the temperature. Most likely, their estimations will differ within moderate limits. All that this proves is that the opinions of three people as to the temperature of a room differ; it does not affect the temperature itself, and an accurate measurement by the proper instruments will resolve the disagreement. (That the number assigned to this temperature is arbitrarily fixed by consent and differs depending upon which of several scales is utilized does not affect the existence of a single, absolute temperature.) The same concept should be applicable to ethical disagreements, although in this case there is no mechanical device capable of measuring ethical desirability and hence settling the argument. Lacking such an infallible guide, my ethical judgements always admit of the possibility that I am wrong. But it is inconceivable that no accurate ethical judgement is possible.)

Secondly, I question your opposition to religion infringing on others' rights. You cite the Catholic opposition to birth control as an example. Catholics believe that prevention of the union of sperm and egg

is a form of murder--that copulation without intent to fertilize is a form of perversion. I think they can make rather reasonable arguments in support of both of these statements (I don't agree with them, but their arguments are rational and strong). From their point of view (with regard to their truth), it is their duty to prevent others from murdering these defenseless children-to-be, and to prevent others from engaging in perversion. How does this differ from your feeling that we have a right to pass laws to prevent white bigots from persecuting Negroes? From our point of view, from our truth, it is wrong for Negroes to be treated in this fashion, and it is our duty to protect the defenseless Negro. From the bigot's point of view, from his truth, we are limiting his personal freedom without justification--Negroes are not people, and he can treat them as he likes. (The Catholic hierarchy, for the best of motives, seeks to compel those outside its spiritual influence to abide by the moral code of those within the Church, whereas I maintain that the Church should by rights possess no power over those persons who do not freely accept its authority. This is not a case in which the relativist is justified in claiming that neither position is ethically superior. Reason dictates that a qualitative distinction exists. If the Catholic Church were attempting to force me to restrain from the use of contraceptives and I, in return, was advocating that Catholics be compelled to use birth control devices, there would be little to choose between our respective positions. But this is not the case. I have no desire to impose upon Catholics my moral values and compel them to use contraceptive devices; I seek only to protect my right--and the right of all non-Catholics--to procure and use contraceptives. No religious sect is entitled to seize the mechanism of the law to impose its own moral code on the civic community. Catholics may preach and argue against the devices, and members of the Catholic faith have the right to consider them immoral and refuse to use them. The qualitative distinction, therefore, is that I advocate free choice for Catholics and non-Catholics alike, whereas the Catholic hierarchy respects only the choice of their own adherents. Your analogy between this controversy and the racial difficulties of this nation is invalid because the former is a moral or theological dispute which concerns abstract notions of sexual morality, while the latter is a social and legal problem concerning injury to individual human beings. The bigot's racial ideas are hardly equivalent to a sincere philosophical position, and in a society supposedly governed by law, suppression of one group by another cannot be tolerated.)

Really, I think it simply becomes a question of power. If we have the power to enforce our views on civil rights, while preventing the enforcement of the Catholic views on birth control, we will be happy. If not, we simply have to put up with the situation or find a way to get around it. To theorize about the Rightness of our Truth and the wrongness of their Truth seems to me to be a waste of time and a juvenile self-justification, rather on the level of the jingoistic defenses of our right to overthrow the Cuban government.

And finally, I'd like to comment a little about de facto school segregation, since as you know I've been somewhat involved in the local conflicts.

I agree with you that the basic problem is fair employment and equal housing opportunity. And yet, how are people to be convinced that Negroes make decent neighbors unless they've known them in schools as they grew up? How are Negroes to learn the basic decencies of middle-class living unless they can associate with non-slum-dwellers during their youth? The problem really must be tackled on all levels; schooling changes should be made wherever possible, along with employment and housing changes.

The Chicago school system contains 550 schools, which serve 536,000 students. Of these, about 260,000 are white and about 240,000 are Negro. The rest of them make up a mysterious group called "Other", presumably chiefly Oriental.

Of the 550 schools, 168 contain 95% or more Negro students, while 247 contain 95% or more whites. Thus, by the most conservative definition of a segregated school, 75% of Chicago's schools are segregated. Notice also that the predominately white schools far outnumber the predominantly Negro schools, though the total number of pupils are about the same. In fact, a survey made by the United States Commission on Civil Rights several years ago showed that the average class size in all-Negro schools was 40, in mixed schools 35, and in all-white schools only 30.

Now, the conditions that create this situation are important. Negroes tend to be crowded into slum districts, where there is no room to build new schools. Whites tend to be scattered in the more open suburban areas where there is need of many small neighborhood schools to avoid long walks for the pupils. Nonetheless, there is general agreement that Negro students in Chicago are receiving a drastically inferior education. Should they not have the right to travel to outlying schools where they could get a better education, if they feel the extra-long trip is worth it? And should not some white parents be forced to send their children to the slum schools, so that some parents in positions of power in the city will have a personal interest in improving these schools? ((Your father is, I believe, a real estate broker in Wasco, California. Would you consider it justifiable for the government to relocate your family in a Harlem tenement for a year or so, in order that your father develop a personal interest in improving slum conditions?))

Negro schools here are not only over-crowded--they are inferior. Teachers in the Chicago system are allowed to transfer to other schools if vacancies are open. When a vacancy appears in Austin High School, for example, it is filled by the teacher with the most seniority who has applied for transfer to Austin. Teachers in the slum schools have the same salary as those in the upper-class white schools. For the same amount of money, they have to deal with over-crowded classes, discipline problems, students brought up in homes with little emphasis on education, students who know they won't get into college ("Please submit a photograph with your application") or won't get a good job if they do get a college degree, and must teach with inadequate equipment (most Negro schools are short on textbooks, have old delapidated buildings and of course have little of the advanced equipment that goes to schools with many honor students). So the better teachers move to the white schools where their teaching will be more enjoyable, and the Negro schools are staffed by young teachers, substitutes and incompetents. It is not in the least unusual for an elementary student in a Negro school to get all the way to the eighth grade without ever having the same teacher for more than two months! In these conditions there is little continuity of instruction. Teachers tend to take the easy way out and give minimal assistance or challenge. Slum conditions naturally encourage reading problems (how many of these students' parents have a strong interest in good reading?), but the teachers here have no special training in remedial reading. The results are horrifying. In most Negro high schools, over half of each year's graduating class have less than an eighth grade reading level!

What I'm trying to point out is this: the problem is not only one of "separate but equal facilities"--that would be bearable, if not very pleasant. The problem is that the school system is run by well-to-do white parents who do little to alleviate the special problems of slum schools, resulting in a definitely inferior education for the Negro.

Until this fall, the Chicago school board has consistently denied that any such problem exists. They have refused to conduct surveys on classroom use in various schools, on racial makeup of schools, or on the educational level of the graduates of various schools. Their refusal to admit that a problem exists has been the main complaint of local integration groups. It wasn't until half the students of the system stayed home for a day last month that the board finally admitted that something was wrong and began to actively seek solutions.

In October, a coordinating council of local integration groups organized a boycott of city schools which was far more effective than anyone had dared hope. Some 225,000 students were out of school, and 8,000 people joined in a protest meeting at the Board of Education offices in the evening. The council presented thirteen demands, which are currently being considered by the school board. (I wonder how many of those 225,000 students were sincerely concerned over the unfortunate state of affairs which exists in Chicago, and how many were motivated to join the protest in order to remain out of school for one day and thus enjoy the bonus of an extra "holiday"?)

The demands were: (1) The resignation of superintendent Ben Willis, who has become a symbol of de facto segregation, and the establishment of a nationwide search for a competent successor; (2) Publication of a school-by-school survey of student bodies by race, use of empty and unoccupied classrooms, and the racial composition of teaching staffs (the first of these surveys has been made--I mentioned its results above); (3) Adoption of a basic policy of integrated student bodies and staffs; (4) Removal of two pro-Willis members from the school board's segregation-problems committee; (5) Appointment of nationally-known authorities on desegregation to fill these vacancies; (6) Immediate publication of student achievement levels, grade by grade and school by school; (7) Put Dr. Havighurst, University of Chicago professor of education, in charge of the school survey committee which was set up to inquire into Willis' administration of the school system (Willis appointed himself as a member of this three-man committee to investigate his own competence, and one other member threatened to resign if Willis' resignation was accepted last month--a good indication of the impartiality of the committee); (8) Mayor Daley should ask for federal funds to finance remedial programs at any schools found to be substandard in achievement; (9) A change in board policy to permit employment of social workers, counselors and nurses without teaching certificates (this requirement has kept these areas constantly underfilled); (10) Abolition of high school branches now being held in parts of elementary schools; (11) Opening of trade and vocational training to all students under qualified instructors; (12) Full utilization of available space in permanent schools before using mobile classrooms--and the mobile classrooms not to be used to avoid having to send Negro students to white schools or vice versa (this issue was the heart of this summer's demonstrations here); and (13) Reconstruction of the school board by appointment of new members publicly on record against de facto school segregation.

These demands seem to me to be quite reasonable, particularly the sixth and eighth. Notice that there is no demand for wholesale re-locating of pupils--shipping whites or Negroes far across town to integrate schools. It was this reasonableness which caused me to support the boycott by working in the offices of the movement and marching in the demonstration. (I did not stay out of school that day, since Oak Park High School is not a part of the Chicago system. Like most suburbs, Oak Park has practically no Negroes, and there are no Negro students in the school. But since it is financed by an entirely white district, it is a different problem from the city schools which serve dis-

tricts containing both whites and Negroes. Sometime when I have more time, I'd like to discuss the suburban problem too--it has many interesting facets, particularly as reflected in the changing character of the high school.)

"Of course, a written constitution carries with it the danger of a cramping rigidity. What body of men, however far-sighted, can lay down precepts in advance for settling the problems of future generations? The delegates at Philadelphia were well aware of this. They made provisions for amendment, and the document drawn up by them was adaptable enough in practice to permit changes in the Constitution. But it had to be proved in argument and debate and generally accepted throughout the land that any changes proposed would follow the guiding ideas of the Founding Fathers. A prime object of the Constitution was to be conservative; it was to guard the principles and machinery of State from capricious and ill-considered alteration. In its fundamental doctrine the American people acquired an institution which was to command the same respect and loyalty as in England are given to Parliament and Crown." --Winston Churchill, in "A History of the English-Speaking Peoples", Volume III.

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

I found your comments regarding television, the vast wasteland rather interesting. It brings to mind a speech by Morris Ernst, the well-known lawyer who has played a major role in fighting censorship of books in this country. Ernst lectured here a few weeks ago and the following are some of his comments:

"The cruelest kind of censorship is the decline in the number of daily newspapers in the United States. In the marketplace of ideas, truth has a good chance of winning if there is a conflict of ideas." Out of context, these words don't mean much, so I'd better elaborate on them a little. In the preceding sentence, Ernst was speaking of the frightening number of cities (Baltimore may be one of them, though I'm not sure) where there is only one newspaper published, or where, in many cases, the evening, morning and Sunday newspapers are all published by the same company. And quite often the newspaper will own the local television and radio station. According to Ernst, a situation like this represents the worst kind of censorship. ((Baltimore has six newspapers published by three companies--the morning, evening and Sunday Sun, published by the A.S. Abel Company; the Afro-American; and two Hearst papers, the News-Post and the Baltimore American--and two of its three television stations are affiliated with newspapers. The idea that competition in this area is desirable is no doubt impeccable as a general rule, but in at least one case in Baltimore competition has exerted an unhealthy influence on quality. The Evening Sun, though published by the same company, is noticeably inferior to the Morning Sun, for the simple reason that while the morning paper possesses a monopoly, the evening edition must compete for its readership with the mass-appeal of the Hearst newspaper. In order to remain in existence, the Evening Sun must lower to some extent its standards and concentrate on attracting an audience. The Morning Sun, secure in its position as the sole morning newspaper, can appeal to an articulate minority without courting financial disaster.))

He also protested the fact that three networks (ABC, NBC and CBS) control everything we see on television. He advocated some sort of trust-busting so that more networks could be established. That's well and good, I suppose, but I find it equally chilling to envision a situ-

ation like that of the 1890's where sensationalism is the journalistic byword. And that could very well be the result of such a competitive system.

He went on to say that in the future (just how far in the future, he neglected to mention) we can probably expect to see what he calls a "facsimile newspaper". This would be a newspaper produced by a wire service. The entire national and international news and features would be printed and distributed by wire from the network. Each individual small town publisher would simply add one or two pages of local news as he saw fit and send the paper out to the public.

And Ernst touched on all facets of censorship in the United States, including that of books. He said that any book openly published and sold over the counter today was in very little danger of being successfully banned in this country.

"The 'wall' of separation between Church and State, as it is conceived by most 'absolute separationists' in America, is not really a constitutional concept. It is rather a private doctrine (of militant secularism in some cases, of one version of Christian theology in others) which a minority of Americans seems intent on imposing on all. Many of the battles that now rage over 'Church-State' issues tell more about the growth of dogmatic secularism in our society than they do about the Constitution. They may be argued in juridical language but are firmly rooted in the dogmatism of a sect of one kind or another. To the extent that they 'absolute wall' theory is supported in the courts, to that same extent a doctrine about which the Constitution itself knows nothing has been imposed on American life." --William Clancy, in "Religion and the Free Society".

TOM SEIDMAN :: 1720 15th AVE. :: SEATTLE 22, WASHINGTON

The real difficulties in the concept of (God's) omnipotence have nothing to do with such verbal quibbles as irresistible forces and immovable objects; rather, they are connected with the problem of the existence of evil (in a world created by a good, by definition, omnipotent God). The main resolutions which have been advanced have been (1) Manichaeism--the existence of a powerful opposing force or Devil--and (2) that the existence of evil is concomitant to the existence of free will which conduces to the Greater Glory of God. (Cf., also, Walter Kaufmann, "The Faith of a Heretic", page 225.) Another resolution, however, would be a view of God as an ultimate Oriental potentate who could reward or punish whomever he chooses, can investigate and find out whatever he wishes to learn, can do whatever he wants done--but is, of course, restricted in his omnipotence by being forced to act in time and so being able to be aware of and act in respect to only a limited number of situations at once. (The question of irresistible forces and immovable objects was introduced only as a convenient analogy. It has nothing to do with the question of omnipotence, per se, but was intended to illustrate the argument that more than one omnipotent deity was impossible. This point was made in reference to the contention that contradictory religious beliefs need not be mutually exclusive, if all of the various gods existed.))

To the best of my knowledge, Catholicism has always made the partial fast on Friday an observance for Catholics but not a moral responsibility for all men (as refraining for the use of contraceptive devices is, for example). (True, the devout Catholic believes that the partial fast applies only to Catholics; but he also believes that Catholicism is the only true religion. Does not this have the effect of

maintaining that all people ought to embrace the dogmas and abide by the rituals of the Catholic Church?)) Parenthetically: I was fascinated to learn the Church's position on the damnation of non-Catholics--one is damned unless one receives salvation by the grace of God; one can achieve salvation only through the Church; if one "truly desires" salvation and sincerely wishes "to do that which is necessary to assure salvation", then one has "in one's heart" become a member of the Church (even if, consciously, one is opposed to 'Popery'...) and can then be saved.

Last Sunday I gave the sermon at the Edmunds Unitarian Fellowship (a return invitation after having spoken there once before, last Spring) under the title, "Experiment and Encounter", the idea being a parallel between certain aspects of the philosophy of science and of the theory of values (and religion). Just as a scientific theory will usually contain various "constructs" which cannot, in general, be directly verified but serve to formulate the regularities of nature in a way more intuitively apprehensible than might otherwise be possible, so religious "myths" serve to formulate complexes of attitudes and value-judgements more conveniently, more concisely, and (above all) with far more impact ("moral force") than a mere listing of ethical rules. In this sense, it is no more relevant to ask if God "really" exists than to ask a theoretical physicist whether electrons "really" exist. To say, "I believe in God," is thus to say that one is committed to formulating one's principles in terms of the "God-concept", to acting in one's encounters with the world (to use Vaihinger's term) as if God exists, just as the scientist acts as if his theories were deduced from, e.g., the existence of the electron--in each case the meaning of the belief is defined by the behavior deducible from it in concrete situations (wherefor the title of the sermon).

"The 'establishment of religion' clause of the First Amendment means at least this: Neither a state nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. Neither can force nor influence a person to go or to remain away from church against his will or force him to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. No person can be punished for entertaining or professing religious beliefs or disbeliefs, for church attendance or non-attendance. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. Neither a state nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups and vice versa." --Justice Hugo L. Black, in the majority opinion, case of Everson vs. Board of Education.

JAMES F. MacLEAN :: P.O. BOX 401 :: ANACORTES, WASHINGTON

The Cambridge situation is interesting, but Gloria Richardson's action seems more admirable than otherwise. "Inherent rights" throughout history have proven inalienable only to the extent that the population seeking to exercise them is willing and able to assert them vigorously and defend them against all comers. Allowing oneself to acquiesce in placing them before a tribunal of whatever sort which may grant or deny them--however likely the former action--is a serious step towards the apathetic relativism which considers all rights conditional and negotiable and subject to the practical considerations of the moment.

On TV: The situation is nearly hopeless, ridiculous, and a typi-

cally American one. Insignificant, low-quality television is found in other countries, but America is its true home. Some Utopian suggestions: A government-operated, nationwide network devoted to telecasting all sessions of the Senate and the House and all non-secret meetings of Congressional committees, live, unedited, and without comment. Video amplification techniques in the process of development and now in specialized use will soon make possible excellent pictures without special lighting, and existing microphones can do the job without stands, booms, or other intrusive paraphernalia. Let the bulk of the citizenry know what it's government is doing, at the flick of a switch. Another network, government sponsored, managed by a board of top-flight artists and critics--which could be selected in several different ways--and functioning on the pay-TV system, could telecast operas, plays and symphonies live, fill in with other worthwhile material, and broadcast the sound component of the program in hi-fi FM, perhaps stereo as well. The smaller right-thinking countries which would think such a set-up excellent don't have the material to draw on that we do and would find it difficult to program high-quality material steadily; we have some potential advantages in living in a country that occupies the best part of a continent; pity so few of them can be realized.

Re abortion: I think the Catholic theological and the current legal definition of when the developing organism is to be considered human, i.e., the ovum immediately after fertilization, is quite as reasonable as any other and has the significant advantage for a definition that it "carves nature at the joints", as Bacon suggested we should, by drawing the line at the only qualitative and clear-cut difference between one stage and another to be found in the organism's development. Birth is definitely a poor second when looking for a clear-cut demarcation line; the change that takes place then in the methods of food and oxygen uptake and waste removal is a minor one compared to other changes since fertilization, and the new-born baby is very nearly as far from being a significant social organism as the nearly-born foetus. The baby is as strikingly different from the child as the early foetus is from the baby; if the one is granted humanity (and in some cultures it is not) no very convincing argument can be presented for denying it to the other.

What, after all, constitutes a human being, or humanity? Historically, intelligence of a degree associated with a cranial capacity of 900 c.c. or better and the typically 'human' degree of forebrain development and cerebral convolution, the ability to use tools, and, most crucial of all, the ability to use speech of a certain degree of complexity and abstraction. Since humanity has lived in clear-cut tribal groups, apparently since before it could be called humanity, one could consider that usefulness to the group might be a factor in adjudicating full humanity; specifically, the point at which an individual ceases to become a drain on the community and becomes an asset. A baby, if it were to retain its mental capacity and manifold inabilities throughout its life and were a member of some true-breeding species of which it was typical, could not possibly be considered human. The breaking point, at which an equivalent adult member of a newly-discovered race would likely be considered 'human' for ethical purposes if not strict taxonomy, is somewhere around three to five years of age; before that the individual is not valued for its actual humanity but for its human potential, for the fact that it will, barring untoward events, become a fully functioning member of the race. And a fertilized ovum has quite as much potential as a new-born baby--though a somewhat greater susceptibility to untoward events--without having a whole lot less realized humanity; none at all isn't so very different from almost completely none!

Tom Perry's 'modest proposal' and his contention that if you

can't accept it you're embroiled in semantics and semantics only are perfectly logical and very difficult to argue. Where I would seem to differ from both of you is in seeing no ethical objection to his proposition. One of the great disservices the missionaries have done the Polynesians is the suppression of infanticide, which over a couple of millenia had served the dual purpose of keeping the population down to the very limited capacity of their islands and weeding out all inheritable physical defects visible at birth. Under these circumstances--no effective contraceptive measures, only the roughest knowledge of eugenics, sharply limited land area--infanticide is clearly the most ethical course of action. Our objection to it is a matter of cultural conditioning, like our objection to overt approval of pre-marital sex.

Without pushing that point, being aware of the probable strength of objection, consider the advantages of abortion. The comfortable notion that the population explosion is a problem of the underdeveloped countries alone holds no water whatsoever. America is in for it just like any other country and for precisely the same reason: more births than deaths, all the time; a lot more. Exponential. Worse and worse faster and faster. The country already has too many people--the few remaining "wilderness recreation areas" are littered with beer cans and picnic leavings, suburbs are exploding over farmland and countryside, the point at which we'll have a farm deficit rather than a farm surplus is only a few decades away and at that time there will be literally no place from which export of food will be possible--or at very least is abundantly supplied. Legalized abortion has effectively solved the Japanese problem, assuming it continues to be taken advantage of at the current rate; so far no nation has balanced its population budget through contraception alone, and it appears obvious that the combination of easy abortion laws with vigorously promoted contraception education would be much more effective in any country than the latter alone. Perry fails to take into account the fact that the "better chance for educational and economic fulfillment" and "five times as much income as families over the world subsist on" will very rapidly, historically speaking, cease to be the lot of the unborn candidate for abortion if the present irresponsible birth rate continues. The point at which we, like so many other countries, will begin to lose rather than gain ground in the race between economic and population growth, is not far distant however much one tries to fudge with the calculations. Having so great a head start, we can hold out for a very long time, living conditions becoming steadily more cramped and meagre, food more synthetic, life more regimented for the great bulk of the population; we have enough sense as a nation to institute some sort of birth controls before large numbers begin actually starving to death daily, as they used to in China, but not enough to run the wheels backward to a more comfortable level. Obviously, the time to start is now, while population and food resources are in so favorable a balance as to allow even the lower income groups to taste meat fairly frequently. Perry's fear that "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" sounds like a darned good recommendation to me--the sort of personality which would obtain abortions for such reasons would, by and large, be a poor one for child-rearing, and would help no little in cutting back on population growth.

As for the phonics-vs.-progressive argument, you, Ted, don't seem to know much about either the modern phonics system of teaching reading and spelling, as used in England and as gradually regaining some influence here, or English spelling as a general thing. The spelling of English seems a completely reasonless mess at first or even nth glance; only some careful study will show that there are in fact reasonably

simple rules accounting for all but a very small number of English words. To be sure, many rules have large numbers of exceptions which must be learned and many words could go under more than one rule and the one which in fact applies must be learned. Despite their complexity and the very large amount of memory work required compared to that for many of the continental languages, learning to read via the spelling rules of the language is still more efficient than the method Perry so aptly describes as "as if it were written in Chinese ideographs". My wife, for instance, is a product of California grade schools and the "recognition" method of teaching reading and spelling, while I had a "phonics" upbringing; her memory is better than mine and her "on the curve" school grades were excellent (and she reads as much as I do), yet the pronunciation of an unfamiliar word is more often a dictionary problem for her than for me, and her spelling must fairly be described as atrocious. The tremendous extent of this sort of problem in matured and now-maturing "recognition"-schooled Americans as compared to its near-nonexistence in England, where phonics was never abandoned, is almost irrefutable evidence in favor of the latter system. High speed in reading can only be achieved by recognition methods, it's true, but the child first learning to read is going to be comparatively slow for at least a few years no matter what system he learns under, and what he greatly needs at that stage is a technique for transposing his relatively massive spoken and aurally-understood vocabulary directly into a reading and writing vocabulary. Phonics teaching provides that technique, while recognition teaching effectively gives him an entirely new vocabulary associated with only graphic communication, which must be laboriously built up in much the same manner as was his spoken vocabulary. Work on speed is appropriate to later stages, when phonics techniques have been mastered and the entire speaking vocabulary is available for graphic communication and has had some exercise in that application. Your example of "criticism" betrays, as I say, considerable unfamiliarity with the "accepted phonics method" you mention. Rules learned in the second grade assure that no pupil, completely unfamiliar with the word, would make the mistake of trying to sound any of the "i's" long.

The insert from "Nature and Man's Fate" preceding John Boardman's letter is a painful exception to the very high standard set by your quotes in this issue. This is the first time I've seen this radically anti-scientific view in print, overtly stated, and it's even more objectionable than its implicit manifestations in scientific and other controversies when thus blatantly approved. Theory, however apparently well-established, becomes a trap preventing optimum progress when the scientific community begins to believe in it rather than regarding it as a tentative way-station along the long road to final comprehension of the edifice of universal law, the end of which is still far distant despite the fact that enough glimpses have been obtained to make a large number, perhaps a majority, of physical scientists confident that the goal does in fact exist. The "confidence in our theory that is not easily shaken by apparently contradictory facts" is the very frame of mind which ensures the failure to develop and advance a new and more basic, inevitably more useful, theory accounting adequately for the contradictory data as well as those accounted for by the old theory. All theoretical progress in science has been made by persons who, far from saying, "The facts are wrong, not the theory," were able to free their minds of the strong hold of the current theory and scrutinize those incompatible facts in detail. The use of a theory to discover new facts predictable from it, far from requiring the kind of confidence Hardin extolls, requires merely the proposal of a self-consistent, mathematically coherent theory to the scientific community; research scientists go begging

for new basic theories to test, and the essence of science is that the theory must stand or fall on the results of those tests, not on the degree of "confidence...that is not easily shaken" it arouses due to its elegance and aesthetic qualities.

On gods: I don't believe any coherent polytheism maintains that all the deities believed in are omnipotent. Usually, none are; a few more deeply intuitive ones like Hinduism and the Polynesian theology hold that one is omnipotent, although aloof, while lesser deities are merely possessed of much greater ability and freedom of will than the human spirit. So your logically airtight reasoning on polytheism actually is quite irrelevant to real cases. (My use of the term "polytheism" was unfortunate; what was meant was that the major gods (i.e., the distinctly different Gods of each Christian sect, plus Allah) could not all exist as separate entities, since each was considered omnipotent and since (as you admit) multiple omnipotent deities are logically impossible. This discussion, which began about ten issues ago, originally concerned my contention that when differing religious beliefs are contradictory, only one of them could possibly be true. That is, if one sect claims that God decrees polygamy and another sect believes that it is a sin, one must be in error. In answer to this, the proposition was put forth that all of the beliefs would be equally valid, provided all of the gods in question existed. And my argument against multiple omnipotent deities was in reply to this--not, strictly speaking, a polytheistic concept, but rather the idea that each religion had a god who possessed actual existence, so that all of the major beliefs about the qualities and decrees of "God" were correct. Two obvious alternatives exist, of course: (1) There is no god at all, a premise to which I am admittedly somewhat partial; (2) There is but one God who is called by different names, and the contradictions of dogma and ritual are the result of human error in the interpretation of divine law.)

Mike Deckinger's letter: "...it still tarnishes the image I had of them." Hoo-ee! Generally I find myself in substantial agreement with Mike's way of looking at things on the rare occasions I run across him in an amateur magazine; this is a bit of an exception. How deliciously smug and self-righteously certain of the omniscience of his own third-hand beliefs about Cuba! It's great and noble for a group of students to travel to Cuba in defiance of State Department legislation-by-edict, not to discover anything about the situation in Cuba but as an act of civil disobedience protesting restriction of the right to travel; when they come back saying they've learned something and it's something that disagrees with Mike's preconceptions, that's a horse of another color. Presumably that makes them propagandists, the trip a propaganda stunt; much less noble indeed, particularly when it's propaganda for something which Mike is apparently against on principle regardless of its effects in the physical universe. Now, what Mike is implying, rather directly, is that the students involved are not reporting accurately due to a predilection towards Communism which led them to (1) deliberately falsify their accounts to make better propaganda of them, (2) uncritically follow official guidance in their observations, giving them a highly inaccurate picture but one corresponding to what they wanted to believe and allowing their later "propaganda" accounts to be literally accurate but naively one-sided, or (3) approach the experience critically but with a willingness to accept a favorable impression which allowed the skilled and well-prepared Castro propagandists to manouver them into repeated "show-case" situations and to avoid situations which would give an unfavorable impression, without arousing the proper amount of suspicion. Why are these the only feasible alternatives? Because Mike is living in a country in which the consensus of opinion, molded by a small number of very prejudiced accounts, holds that the internal situation in Cuba is

thus-and-so, quite otherwise than that reported by the returning students. And Mike, bluntly, has been suckered into accepting this consensus as valid simply because it has such complete currency, and cannot take an impartial view of accounts differing greatly from it. A fourth possibility exists, that at least a fair number of the students are reasonably unbiased, alert, and intelligent, and that their account of the Cuban situation is a closer approach to the complex reality than the one which the American people so uncritically accept. I haven't the hard data to come to a decision myself, but I definitely do not think it reasonable to rule out that fourth possibility at the present juncture.

"The young, strong body, now helpless in sleep, awoke in him a pitying, protecting feeling. But the mindless tenderness that he had felt under the hazel tree, while the thrush was singing, had not quite come back. He pulled the overalls aside and studied her smooth white flank. In the old days, he thought, a man looked at a girl's body and saw that it was desirable, and that was the end of the story. But you could not have pure love or pure lust nowadays. No emotion was pure, because everything was mixed up with fear and hatred. Their embrace had been a battle, the climax a victory. It was a blow struck against the Party. It was a political act." --George Orwell, in "1984".

A. G. SMITH :: 65 N. FOSTER ST. :: NORWALK, OHIO

The basic cause of juvenile delinquency is that there is now no outlet for the aggressive tendencies of the young human male. I believe that the only way we will ever overcome this problem is to hold the parent of the same sex responsible for the acts of their children. If Dad knew he would go to jail or the penitentiary when little Willie was caught shoplifting or stealing automobiles, and if Mom knew that she would go to jail as a prostitute if little Suzy started giving it away to the boys, the children would be watched a helluva lot closer. Also, I believe that the practice of not publishing the names of juvenile criminals is wrong. They should publish names, and addresses, and names of parents--for it is the parents' lack of interest in their children that causes juvenile delinquency. Working mothers are just a phase of this--Mom wants a Buick instead of a Chevy, so she works and the kids run wild. (Perhaps a greater share of the responsibility for juvenile crime should be borne by parents, but your proposals of imposing the appropriate punishment on the parent of the offender is a trifle extreme. Carried to its logical conclusion, such a program would mean that if a boy killed another in a gang fight, his father would be hustled off to the electric chair--which solves nothing, is absurdly unjust, and leaves the actual criminal unpunished. Similarly, consigning the father to a penal institution in retaliation for a car theft on the part of his son might cause some parents to more carefully supervise their progeny, but in the process a good many innocent people would be incarcerated.)

Re television: They say that radio scripts are aimed at the 12-year-old mentality; if this is so, then television seems to aim at the seven year old mind. Most TV fare could be presented just as well over the radio, and doing so would reduce advertising expenses. After all, you don't have to look at a news commentator, or at an orchestra to enjoy good music. I believe that instead of reducing standards to those of the least intelligent of the people, television should make an effort to raise its standards and make the morons exercise what brains they have.

On religion: I have noticed that whatever the religion, the more devout any nation or group, the lower its standards of living, educa-

tion and morals. This is natural, as the more of the wealth of the people is siphoned off by their clergy, the less remains for the people. And a church must keep its people in ignorance of truth, so that they will be unable to see the fallacies in the teaching of the clergy. The third condition follows from the previous two: morals are always lower among the poor and ignorant.

The fundamentalist religious fanatics that you mention are the most dangerous group in our population. They would destroy civilization in order to foster their puerile superstitions. Their minds are back in the early Bronze Age and it is a shame that their bodies are not also-- then at least they would be of some use as training material by budding archaeologists learning excavation techniques...

Mike Deckinger makes a good point when he says that the Negro should return blow for blow if he wants his rights (though one might wonder what rights are possessed by a dead "n-----" lynched for striking a white man). I have said for many years that if the Negro fought back, he would win respect. When a Negro is found murdered by the Ku Klux Klan, a few Klansmen found on the road with buckshot in their backs or a few Klansmen's houses set on fire in the night, and those brave knights would hightail it North to safety. No man has any rights that he is not willing, able and ready to defend by killing those who would deprive him of those rights. It is a "do-it-yourself" job.

It would take a wiser man than you or I to solve the race problem. First, in a fight between races for survival, there is no such thing as right or wrong; the survivors are right, always. (Your personal philosophy appears to consist of a primeval value judgement which makes even social darwinism appear idealistic by comparison.) So far, the demands for more jobs and better housing for Negroes boil down to "fire a white man and hire a Negro" or "make a white man move to the slums so that a Negro can live in the white man's house". At any given time, they are only so many jobs and only so many houses available.

As for parochial schools, Romanists do not send their children to the parochial school as a sign of their religious freedom, but because the Roman Catholic priests have persuaded them that if they don't, they will go to Hell. There is only one reason for the existence of a parochial school--viz., to brainwash the next generation into believing that church law is above the law of the state, and that priests of all degrees have an authority over the laity and possess supernatural powers which are denied to other men. The Protestant ministers are also guilty of filling the minds of children with lies. They did it to me, but even as a child I could think for myself and see through the sacred lies.

I am unalterably opposed to being taxed to support in any degree any organization that claims to be above the people and to have a God-given right to rule over them. I believe that all churches should pay taxes on their property, and income tax on the income they receive from that property. Free-will offerings could be exempt, but legally collectable pledges ought to be taxable.

"When a man calls an animal 'vicious', he generally means that it will defend itself when he tries to kill it." --Joseph Wood Krutch.

L. SPRAGUE DE CAMP :: 278 HOTHORPE LANE :: VILLANOVA, PA., 19085

In your first reply to my arguments in Kipple #49 ("It is impossible to discuss..." and so forth) you advocate negotiation with the Soviet Union and defend the U.S.S.R. against the charge of wishing nuclear war. But, if you will refer to the passage of my letter in ques-

tion, you will see that I did not mention the Soviet Union or Khrushchev at all. I alluded to Communism only in quoting and paraphrasing Mao Tze-Tung. My reference was not to Communist governments in particular but to governments in general. I asserted that a paranoid may gain power in a government of any kind--monarchical or republican, libertarian or authoritarian, democratic or autocratic, capitalistic or socialistic. Stalin was such a character. If Khrushchev is not, that's our luck. There's no guarantee that a paranoid will not be running the Soviet Union twenty years from now--or our own country for that matter. And such a person wouldn't mind pushing the button. ((Interestingly enough, Joseph Stalin, paranoid though he may have been, did not "push the button". Stalin was a good deal more vehement than Khrushchev, and generally promoted a crude brand of diplomacy, but twenty years of history does not support the contention that he was particularly anxious to engage in a large-scale war. He spoke of it often and loudly, to be sure, but in the classic confrontation of the pre-Khrushchev era--viz., Korea--both camps took precautions to insure that the war remained a limited engagement fought for limited objectives. Remember that the tacit agreement prohibiting air strikes against bases outside Korea, against which MacArthur so vigorously protested, was a double-edged sword: the Communists were extremely careful to honor the inviolability of American bases outside the immediate battle zone. In Berlin in 1948, where a war-eager paranoid would have completely sealed off the city, the Russians carefully left open the air corridor--the intention of course being to engage in a battle of nerves with the West, without actually provoking a situation in which we possessed no alternative to war. Even under the rabid Joseph Stalin, Soviet foreign policy has never deviated from this basic premise laid down by Lenin: "Stick out a bayonet. If it encounters soft flesh, stick it out further; if it encounters armor, pull it back." As for Mao, it seems likely that his casual attitude toward nuclear war is more political than military in nature, and when China achieves the industrial capacity necessary to make itself into a nuclear power, I shall expect a surprising shift toward moderation in that quarter. In any event, it is clear that the elements of the shelter program to which I am opposed--i.e., those which promote the delusion of security without actually providing security--will be of no use to the population should a nuclear war erupt.))

As to whether Mao's speaking so blithely about blowing up half the world's population is just electioneering talk--maybe, but I shouldn't care to bet my life on that possibility. A lot of people thought Hitler was kidding when he spoke of exterminating the Jews and enslaving the Slavs, but it turned out that he meant it. (Parenthetically, it strikes me that the Mao statement is practically a mirror image of the Heinlein statement quoted earlier. How come you didn't condone the Heinlein statement on the ground that it was merely "empty talk characteristic in those in no position to carry out their threats"?)) ((Robert Heinlein is no more capable of starting a nuclear war than I am of initiating immediate disarmament, but Heinlein is a member of a faction which could conceivably gain supreme political power in this nation, and would then have at their disposal a formidable nuclear arsenal. Mao, on the other hand, is prohibited from initiating a nuclear war by the technological inferiority of China, a presently insurmountable obstacle. For the time being, at least, I am a good deal more concerned about Heinlein (read: the school of thought symbolized by Heinlein) than by Mao Tze-Tung; Mao, to perpetuate an over-used figure of speech, speaks loudly but has only a very small stick, whereas the Heinleinians not only speak loudly but also have nearly within their reach a big stick.))

About shelters: I'm glad to see that your objection is not to shelters, per se, but to shortcomings in the present program. Of course,

any program has to be carried out by human beings; and, since most human beings are more or less stupid or corrupt, or both, any program is bound to be executed more or less stupidly or corruptly or both. One can only keep struggling.

As for the choice of areas to be protected, I think you're confused in condemning the stocking of shelters in such obvious target areas as New York and Baltimore. Sure, it makes little sense to stock New York if New York is going to be hit. But suppose Philadelphia is hit, while New York is not? Then stocking New York makes excellent sense, since New York is down-wind from Philadelphia much of the time. It certainly stands to save more people than stocking a shelter in the middle of Nevada, where there are hardly any people and to which it would be impossible to transport large numbers in time to matter. As to which cities may be plastered--well, if people knew the exact course of war in advance, there would be hardly any wars. (Until such time as we manage to devise a method of defense against guided missiles, so that we possess at least a reasonable chance of preventing Soviet missiles from reaching their targets, it is absurd to base any program on the assumption that the largest cities in the nation will escape unscathed in the event of a nuclear war. Under what circumstances would New York be spared? Is it reasonable to act on the smug assumption that Baltimore is not going to receive one or more missiles? There is, of course, the barest possibility that one or another of our large cities will, as a result of some mechanical failure or human miscalculation, be spared. But this remote possibility does not justify the ridiculous assumption of local civil defense agencies that their particular area will escape direct involvement, while neighboring cities are destroyed (an assumption which those neighboring cities also apply, with themselves in the fortunate position of lone survivor).)

I don't know just what the CD people have been saying; but I haven't seen anybody claiming that shelters will prevent all casualties or make nuclear war a picnic. If they have, they are doing wrong. Perhaps I don't read the right newspapers, but it seems to me that outside a small lunatic fringe everybody who thinks about the subject at all agrees that, win, lose or draw, a nuclear war would be a hell of a thing, and that a civil defense program could at best slightly reduce the number of megabodies. As long as there are plenty of people like you, I don't think there's much danger of America's thinking itself invulnerable, shelters or no shelters. (Despite the best efforts of people like myself--who are commonly dismissed as subversives by the pro-shelter faction--most Americans do not seem to me to have any clear idea of what a nuclear war would entail. Perhaps Villanova is a comparatively rational community, but most of my acquaintances in Baltimore cannot conceive of a nuclear attack as being much worse than the London Blitz. Many of them sincerely believe that the fallout shelters in downtown buildings are capable of protecting against a direct hit by a thermonuclear device. Perhaps the antiquated emergency plans of the Baltimore Fire Department best illustrate the attitude prevalent in this community. The fire department is scheduled to absorb Baltimore's civil defense organization in the near future, and so it would be reasonable to conclude that the fire department itself possessed a fairly clear picture of what a nuclear exchange would mean. In fact, this is not the case. The emergency plan of the Baltimore Fire Department was devised over ten years ago and has not been materially altered since. The scheme calls for all fire-fighting equipment to be evacuated to a pre-arranged location in the event of an attack, so that immediately after the explosion fire apparatus will be able to return to the disaster-stricken center of the city and attempt to control the various conflagrations which can be expected to occur as a result of the bomb. This is a weak

plan by any standard, since even a very excellent fire department is helpless when faced with dozens of major fires burning simultaneously, but it is rendered completely ludicrous by the fact that the entire plan was devised with a Hiroshima-sized weapon in mind. The pre-determined location to which apparatus is evacuated lies within the zone of total destruction for a ten-megaton device, and consequently the net effect of the entire scheme is to collect all of the city's apparatus into one convenient lump and thus insure its total destruction. This is not atypical of Baltimore's preparations for nuclear catastrophe.))

Nor have I seen any "frantic" shelter-building. The feeling of most of the public and of most branches of government towards civil defense could better be described as heedless, indifferent, euphoric, lethargic, fatalistic, bored, or ostrich-like. As for the Soviet Union's interpreting such a program as a signal for attack, either side could easily have convinced itself any time in the last decade that the other was mounting such an attack; yet both preferred to hold off rather than convert the possibility of devastation into certainty. Certainly the preparation of bigger bombs and better rockets to deliver them, which both sides have been doing, is a more ominous gesture than digging holes in the ground; but it hasn't yet brought Ragnarök.

"There is no Reason visible today in a whole world implemented by reason. Frightful predicament! A world wherein the best brains are no longer capable of turning back to the old gods. A world of physicists unmovable by Christian charity. A world four-fifths inhabited by the blindest bigots, born into credulity, worshiping snakes and ghosts and holy virgins. A world which at last has unlocked the secret of objects, whose strength is as the strength of suns because of the pure part of a few minds. A world of muscle, carnivorous, with very little brain. A new dinosaur--man, destroying, huge--who dimly blinks at the shape of extinction, sees the coming of hunger in a planet his own strength has scourged. A stupid character who has sought violence as the means of his arrogant perfection and hypocritically to protect himself; who now sits in the gloom of an unradiant mind, waiting for radiation to consume his tissues. The one animal who ever feared himself--as well he might!" --Philip Wylie, in "An Essay on Morals".

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

The beneficial aspects of fallout shelters are twofold. Consider, on the one hand, the tangible (though limited) protection they will afford in the event of a nuclear attack. It has been proven that radiation can be effectively screened out by a good, sturdy shelter. This can well mean the difference between survival and demise, and in the improbable event that a full-scale atomic war were to be waged which lasted only a short while and with the radiation dissipating after not more than two weeks, fallout shelters could be more meaningful than their detractors would have us believe. However, I do not rely on this view through rose-colored glasses; I don't believe that our enemies would be benevolent enough to plan their attack in such a way as to deliberately shorten the radiation exposure. Once the supplies of food, water and air in the shelter are exhausted, it is a question of remaining and dying or returning to the surface and dying, in either case slowly and unbearably. Thus, while there can be worthwhile results from a mass fallout shelter program, I consider it unlikely. The use of fallout shelters cannot be entirely dismissed as superfluous, but they are useful only to a limited degree.

But what of the mental brightening of those individuals who know

they have shelters and have been deluded into believing that they will survive a nuclear holocaust? Pro-shelter propaganda constantly emphasizes this fact. Isn't it likely that such a family will be more confident and sure in a nuclear attack, and less likely to panic and provoke trouble? (Isn't it also likely that such a family will display a marked preference for brink-of-war foreign policy, a desire to invade Cuba and overthrow Castro, and a tendency to favor Goldwater's isolationism?) They know they will be spared the miseries. Never mind whether or not it's true; it's what they know, and knowing it, they may be inclined to handle matters better, insuring their survival and the survival of others. I don't believe they'd be overcome by grief or fear at the prospect of war. Undoubtedly, there would be some measure of apprehension, but anything more frantic would be banished by the tangible reality of the shelter. And people who believe steadfastly that they will survive are likely to do so--at least, their chance is greater than that of the crazed fool who blindly runs around in a frenzy, trying to reach protection. He lacks the confidence and determination that the shelter owners possess. He knows beyond a shadow of a doubt that he will perish. He feels that there is no need to plan or prepare for a future he will never see. The real planners and builders will be the shelter owners. So in this respect I think that shelters do some good, though not enough to justify the exorbitant sums spent and the fearful propaganda unleashed, generally by construction agencies who realize a large profit from each shelter (but sometimes by uninformed government sources). As for the problem of refusing admittance to others when the shelter is overcrowded, I think there's only one answer. You don't overload a lifeboat in the middle of the ocean with so many survivors that it sinks and all are lost. You save as many as you can cram into the boat adequately, and once that point is reached, sheer necessity dictates that you ignore the others.

The basic fault of television is its direction. Ninety percent of the programs on the screens today are directed toward the hypothetical average viewer. This average viewer, one would assume from the quality of the shows, rarely drinks or smokes and has no other vices, has a chronological age of twenty and a mental age of ten, derives uncommon delight from incoherent scripts, unbelievably infantile jokes, and banal panel shows. In addition, our average viewer is too meek to protest the barrage of commercials flung at him, which he endures with a measure of delight equal to his obsession with the programs. He doesn't use polysyllables, rarely converses on controversial subjects, and has a pathological fear of females wearing abbreviated costumes. It's this mass media (or "ass media") which dictates the programs. These people are the majority and it is to them that the sponsors wish to sell their products.

Sponsors are not philanthropists. They care little about enriching the cultural horizons of the viewers. As you point out, the commercial sales are the raison d'être for nearly every show. Programs are indiscriminately switched around and yanked off the air according to ratings and sales of the product. The former criterion is determined by some of the most absurd and unworkable methods, which are intended to determine what percentage of the viewing public watches each show. It is a proud thought to consider that 40% of the nation are fanatical fans of the Beverly Hillbillies. It does something to me deep down inside to picture such a massive horde of persons, numbering in the millions, sitting down in front of an idiot box each Tuesday night and devoting all their attention to the inane antics of the Clampetts.

There has been one recent exception, though, and it inspired me to even writing a letter to TV-Guide praising the show. This was the American version of Britain's "That Was the Week That Was", a merrily

irreverent and thoroughly hilarious commentary on the recent affairs in the world. There was no indiscriminate blue-pencilling and no frantic hiding of facts so as not to risk offending. This was satire and deep satire, employing a creativity rarely shown on the screen. It was done with merry humor and gusto and was surely one of the finest things ever presented on a traditionally taboo-bound network.

The best yardstick to employ as to whether or not you will enjoy a television show you may consider watching is to examine its origin. If it was made especially for television, as are the noxious comedies and blaring westerns, then it must conform to the rules and formulae, and consequently it will be on the same level as most of the tripe. If it is from another source, say, a Hollywood film shown uncut (though necessarily riddled with commercials), you have a better chance. Of course, the small screen has a diminishing effect, and the constant commercial interruptions demolish the continuity, but it was at least not made solely with television viewing in mind. And lately there have been some astoundingly good full-length films shown on TV (e.g., "The Diary of Anne Frank", "Sayonara", "Attack", etc.).

FROM

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



printed matter only

return requested

may be opened for inspection

kilroy was here

SEND TO:

Dave & Katherine Hulan
17417 Vanowen St., Apt. #21
Van Nuys, Calif., 91406

51 The number to the left is the number of the last issue you will receive under present circumstances; a mark here X indicates that we exchange periodicals, a mark in this space means that this is a sample copy, and a mark here means that you are not receiving this issue.