

Kipple, a remarkably frequent journal of opinion and comment, is edited and published by Ted Pauls, 1448 Meridene Dr., Baltimore, Maryland, 21212. Copies are available for letters of comment, contributions (articles, verse, etc.), exchange with other periodicals (by pre-arrangement), or the cash sum of 20¢ per issue. This magazine is sponsored by the Stuart Hughes for Vice-President Committee, Inc.

JOTTINGS...

THE CONTROVERSY WHICH CULMINATED in a Supreme Court decision to the effect that prayer recitation and Bible-reading ceremonies in public schools were unconstitutional originated three years ago in Baltimore. There was negligible public concern and comparatively little publicity accompanying the initial stages of what was later to be recognized as a momentous court battle; indeed, the entire issue seems to have been largely ignored outside the boundaries of Maryland, until it was recognized that any court decision prohibiting religious observances in the public schools of Baltimore would, by implication, banish prayer and Bible-reading exercises from the public schools of every state in the Union. When the Supreme Court ruled in favor of Madalyn Murray, an atheist challenging the right of tax-supported schools to conduct nominally voluntary sectarian religious ceremonies, there was a brief flurry of national attention, almost invariably accompanied by outrage--but the landmark decision almost immediately ceased to be front-page news over much of the nation. The remarkably short duration of outspoken and zealous opposition in other sections of the country has probably convinced many Kipple readers that the judgment of the court has been accepted gracefully by all segments of the American public, and consequently they may (despite frequent editorials in this periodical) be unaware of the extent to which the ruling is being resisted in this area. In Baltimore, the outcry of public indignation was significantly more vehement, and it has not as yet abated, although in recent weeks the intensity of the opposition has decreased somewhat. Since the controversy had its origin in this otherwise unexceptional city, it is appropriate that Baltimore has become both the physical and spiritual center for the forces which have rallied to the defense of tradition and orthodoxy, blind dogma and useless ritual. Any attempts to circumvent or set aside the just decisions of the highest judicial council in the nation should be of pressing concern to readers of this journal, so a few words dealing with recent developments may be in order.

The polarization of public opinion has resulted in two sharply divided factions among those who have bothered to voice any opinion at all, with an indeterminate number of moderates carefully straddling the fence. On the one side, the beleaguered warriors of Madalyn Murray, lawyer Leonard J. Kerpelman, the American Civil Liberties Union, and an aggregation of independent thinkers whose numbers are difficult to esti-

...FROM THE EDITOR'S DESK

mate, are defending the brilliant decision of the Supreme Court and attempting to obstruct efforts to nullify or evade it in some fashion. In the opposing camp, one finds a diversified company of sanctimonious drivelers: a fairly imposing though by no means unexpected number of clergymen, displaying covertly a narrow-mindedness and concern for ostentatious ritual which would have appalled that remarkable carpenter from whom they allegedly derive inspiration; Francis B. Burch, the political appointee who, as City Solicitor of Baltimore, represented the city in the litigation and now steadfastly refuses to surrender his holy cause, a man who brings to the leadership of this ignoble crusade all of the cunning and unprincipled tenacity of a professional politician; the local representatives of the Hearst newspaper organization, pernicious varlets whose slanted reporting, emotionalistic sermonizing, and blatantly inflammatory editorializing have contributed mightily to the atmosphere of disrespect for the liberties of dissenters which has permeated this community in recent months; Mrs. Elizabeth Allen, a housewife-turned-crusader with a Joan of Arc complex, who single-handedly spearheads the "Freedom of Prayer" organization, and whose most notable activities to date consist of semi-articulate television appearances and the distribution of platitudinous petitions admonishing Congress to return Jesus to the children; an insidious coalition of politicians and businessmen whose drive to return superficial piety to the schools is not as open and above-board as that of their spiritual brethren, but who, under the leadership of Burch, attempt to exert influence clandestinely; and the several hundred authors of derogatory letters which have appeared in local newspapers since Mrs. Murray first became newsworthy, preposterous simpletons with ossified mentalities and ludicrous harpies eager to exert the corrosive influence of their collective stupidity on one of the most honorable documents of mankind, proudly zealous to the last man and capable of issuing the most puerile prattle in support of their ignominious campaign.

At the moment, the legions of pretentious godliness are, like the barbarians of old, overwhelming the courageous forces of liberty by sheer weight of numbers, although the continued appearance of occasional rational comments is encouraging. Fortunately, the glorious crusade of these obtuse regiments is doomed to failure in any event, for the furor is far too localized to generate the support required to reverse an edict of the Supreme Court. (This situation is subject to revision, of course, as lower courts apply to other areas of the nation the restrictions of Murray vs. Curlett. This will occur gradually throughout the country, however, and in the intervening period--provided that the amateur demagogues allow the passions of the zealous to evaporate--this latest ruling may come to be accepted, as was Engel vs. Vitale.)

Prior to the actual rendering of the decision by the Supreme Court, there was general acceptance in Baltimore of the probability that Madalyn Murray would be victorious, and so methods of evading or subverting the anticipated restrictions were openly sought as early as last Spring. Since the objectionable ceremonies were already technically "voluntary", it was recognized that further stressing this aspect would probably not be fruitful; nevertheless, the possibilities were explored, and several Maryland schools actually adopted such a specious solution. Essentially, this consisted of allowing students to pray if they wished at some specified time during the regular school-day, on school property and under the benevolent and watchful eye of an instructor--all the while claiming that the tax-supported institution had nothing to do with the religious exercise! For rather obvious reasons, this crude attempt to evade the restrictions inherent in the court ruling was not widely emulated: the religious ceremonies, under this procedure, were no less a portion of official school policy, even granting that the

initiative originated with the children, since permission from the school to conduct such ceremonies was obviously required. Variations of this proposal have constantly been suggested, however, although it is virtually impossible to escape the stigma of official sanction or participation in exercises which take place on school property during the regular school day and in the presence of teachers. Despite their dubious legality, similarly evasive procedures have been instituted at various Maryland schools, over the loud and justifiable protests of the American Civil Liberties Union.

The possibility of allowing a minute or two of silent meditation prior to the opening of classes was also considered, and may actually have been initiated in some school districts. This seemed to me a reasonable solution, since while it allows children to pray silently if they so desire, it cannot possibly result in coercion against those who may not wish to pray. Many of the most violent proponents of religion in public schools actively opposed this method of resolving the controversy, on the thinly concealed ground that their progeny, if granted absolutely free choice in this matter, would not choose to pray--which, in my opinion, discloses a great deal about the mentality of such pious souls.

The principal concern of the self-righteous legions undertaking to reinstate prayer in the schools has been with the possibility of an amendment to the Constitution, modifying the First Amendment in such a manner as to legalize state-sanctioned sectarian religious ceremonies. No less a personage than Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg recently mentioned this course of action as a possible solution to what the zealous look upon as an intolerable infringement upon their inalienable rights. Mr. Justice Goldberg did not go on record as specifically endorsing this alternative, but neither did he explicitly oppose the concept of such an amendment. That he failed to do this indicates to me that the eminent jurist's concept of the purpose of law in this area is inadequate. If the Bill of Rights is looked upon in the same manner as state codes governing petty crime or city trespass ordinances (i.e., as merely a set of decrees which can be juggled at the convenience of fifty-percent-plus-one of the population), then the vaunted American liberty is a tenuous thing indeed. And if an honored member of the nation's highest judicial body believes that at least one tenet of that venerable document is deserving of obedience only because it is part of the law and not because of intrinsic merit, that its abridgement or repeal should be a matter of little or no concern--then perhaps this liberal will seek a seat aboard the conservative bandwagon of criticism of this branch of the judiciary. Of course, it is specifically the function of the Supreme Court to interpret the Constitution and its members are predisposed to be concerned principally with the rather narrow question of legality--but Mr. Justice Goldberg's statement quoted above appears to indicate a belief on his part that the establishment clause of the First Amendment is important only because it is a tenet of the law and that repeal of the specific legal injunction would erase the underlying principle.

It seems obvious to me that this is simply not true. A law, in itself, even when that law comprises a part of our Constitution, is nothing but words on a scrap of paper. What is law is determined by whim, with the only significant difference between law in a democracy and law in any other sort of society being that the number of individuals whose whim determines the law is generally greater in a democracy. There must be more compelling reasons for respecting and obeying a law than the mere fact that it happens to be a law, and--granting this--the wisdom of repealing any given law is highly questionable unless there is general agreement that the particular law no longer serves a useful purpose.

Now, presumably Supreme Court Justice Goldberg would agree that the establishment clause of the First Amendment serves a purpose, and consequently he would appear derelict in his duty by remaining neutral when the possibility of drastically revising the clause was broached.

The First Amendment is primarily a principle, only secondarily a constitutional provision, and the repeal of a section of the legal provision would not render the principle any less valid. Legalizing religious observances in tax-supported schools is easily accomplished, just as legalizing murder or any other act is comparatively simple. But legalizing something is not synonymous with making it right or just. Religious exercises in public schools are objectionable in principle, because they are unjust; they are also, at the moment, illegal. Erasing the legal restrictions on such exercises by adopting a constitutional amendment will not erase the ethical objection--it will simply foster an unjust law, in an era which has so far prided itself on its efficiency in striking down unjust laws.

Anyone who favored the original decision--even including a Justice of the Supreme Court--should attempt to prevent the circumvention of that decision by means of a constitutional amendment. For that matter, anyone interested in preserving our liberty--perhaps especially a Justice of the Supreme Court--should oppose in principle any amendment which seeks to modify any part of the Bill of Rights. These liberties were not intended to be subjected to the vicissitudes of partisan politics or public debate.

THE INTERREGNUM IN FOREIGN DIPLOMACY, which coincided roughly with the period of national mourning declared in memory of John F. Kennedy, was marked by nothing more significant than the breaking of diplomatic relations with Cambodia and the continuing inability of South Vietnam's loyal government forces to take the initiative in their guerilla war with the Communist insurgents. But the period of grace has now concluded, and President Johnson may be expected to devote considerably more attention to external matters in the future. Indeed, he will probably be forced to do so: the Russians have been prevented from instigating any major or minor crises only because they were too uncertain of Mr. Johnson's temperament to be able to predict accurately the American response. This situation cannot endure indefinitely. Eventually, Soviet foreign policy experts will arrive at a consensus regarding possible revisions or subtle shiftings of emphasis in the defense posture of the United States, and, having formulated an opinion, they must necessarily attempt to test this thesis by experimenting--probably in Germany or the Middle East.

It is unfortunate that President Johnson must anticipate dealing with new problems, since the inherited ones are sufficiently serious to cause strong men to weep. Novice Presidents have traditionally encountered dilemmas which their predecessors, unable to resolve, have bequeathed to them, but in recent years a new dimension has been added. Incumbent administrations have not been content to attempt partial or total solutions to outstanding problems, or, failing that, to complicate them by maladroit handling (which, at least, would have indicated concern); instead, persistent problems have been accepted as part of the status quo and consigned to some diplomatic limbo, in the fond hope that God, in His infinite wisdom, would erase them from the physical universe. Despite the fact that ignoring irksome situations rarely if ever contributes to their equitable adjustment, this course has been accepted quite casually by Democrats and Republicans alike. Rather than risk politically dangerous consequences by exploring the possibility of compromise, previous administrations have simply perpetuated intransigent positions which may have originated as early as the first Truman Admin-

istration. (It is axiomatic to point out that this apotheosis of the status quo also characterized certain domestic issues in many previous administrations--e.g., civil rights.)

There was some indication that this sort of thinking, limited and unimaginative, was being gradually abandoned by the Kennedy Administration. Certainly the achievement of a ban on atmospheric nuclear testing, about which prior administrations had piously sermonized while simultaneously adopting a position which they knew in advance to be unacceptable to the Soviet Union, stands as the most brilliant accomplishment of John F. Kennedy. And there is some indication that Mr. Kennedy's attitude toward Fidel Castro's Cuba had been revised drastically between the time of the Bay of Pigs fiasco, when he had honored the ill-advised commitment of a former administration of expert bunglers, and the crisis of October, 1962, after which it seemed that at least a tacit agreement existed precluding United States military intervention in the internal affairs of Cuba. (I am aware that Mr. Kennedy repeatedly denied the existence of such a formal understanding between himself and Chairman Khrushchev, but it is difficult to escape the conclusion that an unspoken accommodation existed between the two heads of state. In any case, the attitude of the executive branch of this government with respect to Cuba underwent a not inconsiderable revision after the successful conclusion of the missile crisis, with allusions to military invasion of the island ceasing and overt assistance to the various Cuban exile groups in this country being minimized.)

On the other hand, the Kennedy Administration appeared less inclined to fruitful discussion and compromise with respect to other outstanding issues, although it is of course impossible to predict what course events might have pursued if Mr. Kennedy had been allowed to complete his constitutional two terms. Free from considerations of political expediency and the necessity of winning another election, President Kennedy, in his second term, might conceivably have dealt reasonably with the problem of partitioned Germany and Berlin, among others.

The burden of these problems has now devolved upon Lyndon Johnson. He inherits from the abruptly curtailed Kennedy Administration (which, however, acquired them in the same manner) a number of outstanding and unsettled issues, among which three are of particular significance: Castro's Cuba and what path future relations should pursue, the divided Germany, and the inevitable necessity of recognizing Communist China as a world power. No one seriously expects Lyndon Johnson to solve these problems with a wave of his hand, and perhaps intransigent Communist positions on one or all render them insoluble; but one hopes that the Johnson Administration will make an honest and sincere attempt to resolve these difficulties, rather than abdicating responsibility and simply mouthing variations on the inflexible proposals of past administrations.

In considering the Cuban situation, it ought to be recognized at the outset that the present state of affairs serves no one's interests, and least of all that of the Cuban people. The lack of diplomatic relations with Cuba renders it more difficult for this country to acquire accurate information about the internal affairs of the island (a statement which is similarly true of China) and, so far as I can determine, does not harm the Communist government in any significant material respect. The partial boycott, which is intended to serve the dual purpose of burdening Russia with the economic support of her satellite and increasing internal dissatisfaction, is of questionable value. The reasoning behind this tactic depends upon two assumptions which do not appear justified when subjected to any but the most superficial examination: (1) that the Soviet Union will eventually abandon Cuba as a direct result of the expense entailed in supporting the economy of a nation

largely isolated from world trade; and (2) that economic deprivation will contribute to internal turmoil and eventually result in the collapse of the government in a mass uprising. Both of these assumptions are untenable. The Soviet Union is committed to the task of assuring the economic viability of Cuba as a matter of prestige, and withdrawal until such time as the island is economically independent would be unthinkable for the Russians. Every day that Cuba remains economically sound in spite of the exertions of Western governments immensely increases the prestige of Russia as the leader of the Communist world; withdrawing would be tantamount to an admission that the Soviet Union and its Communist allies are impotent against the economic power of the capitalist nations. As for the second aim of the boycott, history--from the ancient Jews in Egypt to the people of London during the Blitz--indicates that a population responds to the application of prolonged external pressure by tightening its collective belt, grimly carrying on with routine tasks, and redoubling its efforts in support of its leaders. To pretend to ourselves that the people of Cuba will react to our economic strangulation of their nation by revolting against Fidel Castro and then gratefully turn to the United States for its benign guidance is to engage in a patently absurd flight of fancy. The actual effects of the economic boycott will be to increase and continually stress the dependency of Cuba on Russia, while simultaneously lending substance to Castro's violent tirades against the United States.

A little thought should suffice to show that neither of these results is particularly satisfactory. Certainly we should endeavor to decrease Cuba's dependence on and consequent affection for the Soviet Union, and I completely fail to comprehend the value of increasing anti-Yankee feeling among the masses of Cuba. Cuba--that is, the Communist-oriented, revolutionary society of Fidel Castro--is a reality to be faced, not something to be shunted off into a convenient corner and thereafter ignored. Perhaps there are cogent reasons for opposing any attempt to resume more or less amicable relations with the island--and perhaps the Cubans would reject such advances, were they to be made--but I can discover no reasonable justification for the current policy. Decreasing the extent to which Cuba is dependent upon the Soviet Union might result in the metamorphosis of that island into the sort of "liberal" socialist society represented by Yugoslavia or Algeria. Less pleasant prospects are equally possible, of course, but this is certain: no improvement whatsoever can be anticipated so long as we refuse to explore the possibilities.

For similar reasons, polite--if not friendly--relations with Communist China would appear useful. China, too, is a reality--we may abhor its political ideology and pragmatic policies, but we cannot ignore its existence. Continuing to refuse to recognize the Peking government as the "legitimate" representatives of the Chinese people does not affect the obvious fact that the Communists do govern China and that they must be dealt with. The eventual recognition of the Communist regime is inevitable, and our emphatic and stubborn refusal to act before we are forced by circumstances to do so is nearly childish in the short-sightedness it displays. The pragmatists who rear their ugly heads in every Democratic Administration should realize the wisdom of attempting to establish contact with the Chinese government, even if no one else does. It is quite conceivable, of course, in view of the fiery fulminations of Mao Tze-Tung and his cohorts, that China would refuse any fruitful contact with the United States. But how are we to know that this is the case if we refuse to make the attempt? We have dealt freely in the past with governments and ideologies of which we did not approve, and for less reason. Communist China will become a nuclear power within the next decade, and eventually it will possess the weapons necessary to carry

out its constant threats of warfare against the forces of "capitalist imperialism". It seems perfectly apparent that China, if it continues to be ignored by the majority of the Western nations and excluded from the world community, will become increasingly more belligerent and more likely to initiate a war when it possesses the means. There is no guarantee that this attitude can be softened or reversed--perhaps no effort on our part can evaporate the fervor of China's militant brand of communism--but with the stakes so very high, can we possibly afford not making the attempt?

I am acquainted with the arguments in favor of our present position, particularly those with respect to admitting Communist China to the United Nations, but they are for the most part specious. It is undesirable from one point of view to increase the Communist representation on the Security Council, so opposing arguments, even when specious, appeal to a traditionally powerful national motive (viz., self-interest). Spokesmen for this nation have rarely stated the motive so openly, however, since obviously other nations are somewhat less concerned with promoting the interests of the United States. Consequently, the grounds on which we have so far successfully prevented the admission of Communist China to the United Nations are designed to appeal to the more general interests of member nations: (1) the Communist regime is not the legitimate government of China, since it attained political dominance by the unacceptable expedient of military might and maintains its position only by force of arms; and (2) China blatantly disregards the requirements of the United Nations Charter, which dictate that member nations must actively labor for a peaceful world. These are not unreasonable grounds on which to exclude a nation from the sort of world organization which the United Nations strives to become, except that they are deliberately utilized to discriminate against Communist China. If a criterion for membership in the assemblage is to be the pursuit of peace at all times, then the membership may henceforth conduct meetings in the closet of the Secretary General's inner office. It is a rare nation indeed which pursues the course of peace when its private interests dictate otherwise. Does Nationalist China, whose leaders have been enthusiastically preparing for the reconquest of the mainland for fourteen years, qualify as a "peace-loving" nation? Similarly, the matter of "legitimacy" would be an eminently rational basis on which to deny membership in the world organization, provided it were applied in a non-discriminatory fashion. But this is not the case. A number of nations hold seats in the UN with United States blessing and support whose governments are no more "legitimate", by the criteria established above, than the Communist Chinese regime. The highly appropriate example, once again, is Nationalist China, where General Chiang Kai-shek rules by a mandate from heaven and the power of his armed forces.

Ultimately, then, the controversy reduces to this relatively simple question: Are the interests of the United States and the world best served by accepting the existence of Communist China and the necessity of admitting it to the world community and attempting to establish useful contact, or by a continued exclusion of the nation from the mainstream of current political developments which can only lead to an increase in the militancy and belligerency of its spokesmen? To such a question there appears only one rational answer.

Finally, there is the thoroughly absurd situation which exists between East and West Germany. Since it envisions the eventual reunification of Germany on a Western pattern as the ultimate goal of foreign policy in that sphere, the United States refuses to recognize the legitimacy of Walter Ulbricht's East German People's Republic; at the same time, this country expects the Soviet Union and its allies to recognize and respect the sovereignty of Ludwig Erhard's Westernized democracy.

This policy was championed so consistently and vigorously by Konrad Adenauer and other spokesmen for the NATO alliance that it has now become a fixture, although recently there have been encouraging indications that Chancellor Erhard wishes to pursue a more flexible working policy. He may find himself unable to convince his allies of the usefulness of a revised outlook, however, for the device of non-recognition is entrenched in our overall European policy far deeper than would be suggested by an examination of the original justification for the stance, and, in fact, is now pursued largely as a matter of prestige. Having stated time and time again that we considered formal recognition of the East German government absolutely unacceptable, the policy itself--as distinguished from the original circumstances under which it was instituted--has become inextricably a part of our entire European posture. There is no more certain indication that a policy is in need of revision than when specific procedures survive the erosion of the circumstances with which they were originally created to deal.

The Western powers have gone to fantastic lengths to avoid admitting that East Germany is governed by local forces and not directly from the Kremlin. But such an inflexible policy imposes burdensome limitations on those who utilize it as well as on those against whom it is used. No better proof of this statement exists than the repeated rejection by the United States of the concept of a non-aggression pact between the nations of the NATO and Warsaw Treaty alliances. The United States (with the support of other NATO powers) has thus far refused to even discuss the possibility, since any such agreement would imply tacit recognition of the East German regime in its capacity as a signatory of the Warsaw Pact. This is not to say that a non-aggression pact with the Communist alliance is necessarily worthwhile; on the contrary, the usefulness of such an agreement, under terms which would be acceptable to the Soviet Union, is extremely dubious. But the reason for which exploratory discussions in regard to such a treaty have been rejected by this country has nothing to do with the value of such a pact, per se, but rather is concerned with the totally irrelevant problem of implied recognition of East Germany as a political unit.

The Grand Design with which such procedures are consonant calls for the reunification of Germany along Western lines. This is purely an academic question, and probably has been all along, for under no circumstances could the Soviet Union accept Western proposals for reunification. The Russians, for their part, are in favor of a united Germany only to the extent that this entails the absorption of West Germany by East Germany, a contingency which is justifiably abhorrent to the West and to which we could never consent. The result is an impasse, and one not likely to be improved so long as neither side is willing to compromise. No one would seriously suggest that the United States capitulate to the Communists and unite Germany in accord with their current wishes; this is obviously unthinkable. But our refusal to recognize the existing (and, short of nuclear warfare, irrevocable) partition surely serves no useful purpose. Recognizing the East German republic and negotiating with its leaders on outstanding problems in that area (e.g., the Berlin Wall) would surely be a minor sacrifice to the spirit of East-West détente to which the year 1963 gave birth.

On a less imposing scale, precisely the same problem exists with respect to the divided city of Berlin. The Western powers will consider reunification of that enclave only if a political advantage may be thereby gained, and the Russians will accept no such turn of events. There does, however, exist the distinct possibility that the Soviet Union would be willing to accept a compromise solution, for they have broached the idea of creating a neutral city by combining the Eastern and Western sectors of Berlin under the administration of the United Na-

tions. Perhaps the specific proposals aimed at achieving this end would be unsatisfactory to the West for significant reasons, and perhaps Mr. Khrushchev would withdraw the offer altogether if there appeared any possibility of NATO acceptance of such a compromise. But we shall never know if we continue to refuse to even discuss the proposal. The Soviet Union has, of course, often been stubborn and uncompromising in their negotiations, but on the matter of Germany's future, the Russians possess no monopoly on these qualities. The position of the NATO powers has not altered appreciably since 1945; even when the Russians appear willing to sit down at the conference table, rationally discuss the alternatives, and achieve a compromise, the Western powers refuse to deviate from their inflexible, predetermined policies. (The recent willingness of West Berlin Mayor Willy Brandt and Chancellor Ludwig Erhard to negotiate with the East Germans when absolutely necessary is encouraging, but the importance of such moves is easily over-rated.)

In the meantime, all of the interested factions engage in elaborate rituals of maneuvering at checkpoints, quibbling over minor regulations and procedures of no possible consequence to anyone, and making verbose speeches at the base of the infamous wall--sophomoric gestures which would be ludicrous if not for the uncomfortable fact that they could trigger a nuclear war. Perhaps the German dilemma is insoluble, but then again perhaps it isn't--the only way to find out is to sit down and discuss the possibilities without having decided beforehand that under no circumstances will we alter our position.

One hopes that President Johnson will deal rationally with these problems and not allow preconceived, dogmatic opinions to destroy the possibility of equitable solution. If he can resolve any one of these three outstanding difficulties, he shall be recognized by that deed alone as one of the great American Presidents.

THE TOP SHELF: One of the comments most frequently encountered when book reviews were a regular feature in Kipple concerned the dearth of fiction in my literary diet. One particularly suspicious reader even accused me of deliberately publishing pretentious lists of scientific and philosophical tomes while ignoring the Mickey Spillane thrillers and others which this individual was certain I eagerly devoured each night before retiring. The truth of the matter is less colorful. Most works of fiction appeared to be designed to provide the reader with a pleasant method of wasting a couple of hours, and since I have never been able to convince myself that such purposeless reading was worthwhile, serious non-fiction constitutes the vast bulk of my reading matter. My taste for the ephemeral is adequately satisfied by viewing the Steve Allen Show on television whenever possible; when I pick up a book, I expect something more substantial.

But as the above would tend to indicate, fiction which has a message to convey appeals to me, though only to the extent that the message is successfully conveyed. More orthodox standards of literary judgement (style, characterization, etc.) occupy a secondary position in my evaluation of those comparatively rare works of fiction which I do read. But "Fail-Safe", by Eugene Burdick and Harvey Wheeler (Dell Book #2459), must be accounted a success by any standard, orthodox or otherwise. The message is conveyed clearly and superbly, the style is austere but remarkably effective, and the characterization is for the most part exceptional. What is perhaps more remarkable is that characterization and background are developed at some length in the midst of what is essentially a suspense novel, without dissipating the aura of tension which pervades the book after the first few pages. "Fail-Safe" concerns a failure in the overly-automated nuclear retaliatory system which has been evolved to protect against the possibility of human error--a fail-

ure that sends a flight of nuclear-armed bombers winging toward Moscow, virtually immune to Soviet defenses and unresponsive to recall even by the President of the United States. As the tension mounts and American and Soviet leaders attempt to prevent the nuclear holocaust which the destruction of Moscow will surely unleash, the reader is allowed to witness the effects of this hideous incident on a diverse and highly interesting group of individuals. Most of these characters represent certain well-defined types of human beings, and at least one, the militarist philosopher, Walter Groteschele, suggests to the reader a single contemporary counterpart (Herman Kahn). "Fail-Safe", in all particulars, is a remarkably fine piece of fiction.

"The Greek Way", by Edith Hamilton (Mentor Book #MD32), is the classic popular treatise on the Golden Age of Greek civilization, and although the neophyte scholar will find it the perfect introduction to that magnificent period, the volume is not directed solely at the beginner. Those who, like your obedient servant, have been fortunate enough to read a great deal by and about the Greeks of the fifth century B.C., will nevertheless thoroughly enjoy this fascinating tome. One has the impression while reading "The Greek Way" of being privileged to view a living, moving summary of Greek history and character, narrated by the principals, for the author makes extensive use of quotations in which the giants of Greek literature and philosophy describe themselves to the reader. This impression is heightened considerably by Edith Hamilton's style, itself classic in a sense and as foreign to contemporary English literature as the style of Herodotus was to ancient Greek literature. The author's manner of writing, as much as the words she uses, pays tribute to the beauty and grace of an era that is still recognized as the finest hour of mankind.

"Asia in the Modern World" (Mentor Book #MT542) is a compilation of articles, edited by Helen G. Matthew, dealing briefly with the history, geography, religion, art, mores, character and contemporary importance of the nations of Asia. Since a comprehensive analysis of even a single nation in three hundred pages would be a formidable task indeed, this volume predictably leaves much to be desired from the standpoint of thoroughness. Yet the individual articles are remarkably well-chosen, apparently with the intention of painting a general outline and not becoming hopelessly lost in the infinite detail possible to this sort of reference work. "Asia in the Modern World" fulfills this purpose admirably. The various learned contributors are principally interested in providing the reader with a description of the national character of the nations under discussion, and although specific historical facts are abundant, they are utilized primarily in order to illustrate a particular facet of the national personality being scrutinized. This sort of treatment is difficult to master (Vera Micheles Dean's "The Nature of the Non-Western World" is recommended as an especially successful application of this technique), and the fact that this collection of originally unrelated articles succeeds so well is attributable to the talent of the editor.

--Ted Pauls

"The act of going to war is an admission that reason has failed; hence war is a demonstration of infantilism in man. It is a reduction of all his efforts, schemes, ideals, aims, hopes, faiths, purposes, plots, and possessions to the nursery level. It is an abandonment of sanity, a falling back to barbarism, and employment of national fist-cuffing to settle dispute or to defend itself." --Philip Wylie, in "Generation of Vipers".

"I'm living in a stacked deck!" --Linus, in "Peanuts".

LETTERS

TOM SEIDMAN :: C/O BOEING SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH LAB-
ORATORIES :: P.O. BOX 3981 :: SEATTLE 24, WASH.

No one is trying to "legislate morality" in the sense of passing a law that forbids particular attitudes or their verbal expression. The attempt is to prohibit the establishment of discriminatory attitudes in law or in the machinery of government. Were I to wish to marry a non-white (see my ethnocentrism?) there is no reason why State law should be permitted to prevent me; or why it should prevent me from living where I please or eating or urinating where I choose; or why it should reduce or remove my voice in public affairs by disfranchisement (and that goes for the redistricting situation as well); or why it should interfere with any action I might wish to take which concerns no one except, perhaps, other consenting adults (and that takes in a hell of a lot of other laws to which I object). The raison d'être for the State, in my view, is the maximization of the range of effective choice (personal, economic, etc.) of every individual--which, in today's overwhelmingly interdependent world, means that the State will inevitably have its fingers in many pies, must have considerable power, and will be inevitably subject to the abuses and inefficiencies (as well as the capabilities and efficiencies) which go with great size and complexity--but this remains the single principal on the basis of which its activities may be justified. In the present case it seems that, by and large, the actions of the Federal government do (and those of the southern States do not) consort with this principle. Certainly, without considering any modifications of segregationist attitudes, it is possible to annul laws and governmental forms and actions which, because of their discriminatory nature or their support of discriminatory imbalance, fail to accord with our constitutionally established standards of justice. Further, it should be noted that such legal changes do have psychological effects--if nothing else, they mean that the segregationist can no longer appeal confidently to the support of the Law and is, therefore, deprived of a psychologically important justification for his attitudes. Most people will avoid disobeying 'the law', if for no other reason, because it is too much trouble to do so (and that emphatically includes the economic effects of "racial disturbances"). To the extent that non-governmental actions may be essentially public (i.e., part of the para-governmental economic structure of the society) it also becomes justifiable to subject them to similar, though perhaps less rigorous, tests (just as unlimited freedom of contract is now abridged--e.g., in juvenile, labor, and marriage law--to avoid exploitation of the 'weak' and to conform to societal norms). The at-

the great
debate

tempts to introduce reverse "compensatory" discrimination seem less justifiable. I would hardly suggest supporting such efforts in law, though, of course, they remain 'legitimate' potential goals for the Negroes as an eventual lobbying "power-bloc" looking out for their own interests.

Let me amplify that last point a bit. I would say that the government (presumably the Federal government, in this case) should do the following: (1) guarantee the effective rights of individuals to register and vote and to take such political action as party organization, getting qualified candidates on the ballot, and campaigning; (2) ensure non-discriminatory administration of justice in all courts and non-discriminatory use of police and licensing powers; (3) invalidate legislation which is a priori discriminatory (this does not, of course, refer to relevant discrimination, as, e.g., between men and women in labor legislation--with respect to maternity leaves, etc.--or "segregated" schooling for retarded children, or separate toilets, segregated by sexes) or which serves principally to maintain de facto discrimination (this last requires judgement as to whether such legislation serves genuine social ends and whether these might be served in alternate ways); (4) deter the discriminatory use of non-governmental public power (principally stores, restaurants, public transportation, transient hotels, waiting rooms and public halls, but not clubs, boarding houses, churches--which have their own moral problems--and whorehouses); (5) pass a Federal FEPC law, on the ground that the corporations (over, say, 20 employees) which do most of the hiring in the United States are, despite the courts' interpretation of the Fourteenth Amendment, not persons but para-governmental autonomous public units and their regulation in no sense contravenes the principle of maximizing personal freedom--in fact, just as it is now held that State laws are subject to the provisions of the Federal Constitution, I should like to see it recognized that corporate policy should be subject to similar limitations, that the major corporations are, in effect, "governments" whose "constituency" consists of their suppliers, dealers, employees, and customers, as well as their stockholders.

On the other hand, the use of governmental power to discriminate in favor of anyone or any group sets a dangerous precedent--it is as bad as the present use of State power to discriminate against. Similarly, interference by government in private relations (whether a Mississippi anti-miscegenation law or a University regulation against discrimination by fraternities) seems unjustifiable and sets a dangerous precedent. For example, I would like to see laws to the effect that no (licensed) real-estate broker (serving a public function) may be discriminatory in selling or leasing property and that no discriminatory contract (i.e., "restrictive covenant") is enforceable, but that anyone selling or renting his house privately can exercise whatever prejudices he may have in deciding with whom he wishes to deal.

"...the secret of rulership is to combine a belief in one's own infallibility with the power to learn from past mistakes." --George Orwell, in "1984".

CARL LAZARUS :: 50 KENILWORTH PLACE :: BROOKLYN, N.Y., 11210

It seems to be generally agreed that television fare is usually directed toward the average moron, but suggestions for improvement are rare. I hope that pay-TV will eventually become a reality, because it is about the only thing that can make it commercially feasible to produce programs intended for more discriminating viewers. And, of course,

the absence or near-absence of commercials would be a welcome relief. But James MacLean's TV utopia leaves much to be desired. Telecasting congressional committee meetings would only lead to sensationalism: the McCarthy hearings or the recent McClellan Committee hearings with Joe Valachi are good examples of this. As for government controlled or government sponsored networks, I don't relish a combination of the government and the news media; it isn't safe.

Says Tom Seidman, "...it is no more relevant to ask if God 'really' exists than to ask a theoretical physicist whether electrons 'really' exist." There is quite a difference between these two questions. I am no expert on physics, but I had always thought that the concept of the electron is not one that was taken out of a hat and then championed as the final Truth; it is the theory which best explains the observed data and which is consistent with the rest of the body of physics. I am aware of no overwhelming body of observation which is best explained by the existence of a supreme deity. The physicist builds his ideas from a foundation which is firmly rooted in observation and experimentation; the theist builds his ideas on a foundation of emotion. There is quite a difference here.

I see that A. G. Smith (in #49) has taken the cudgel of John Boardman. I really can't see the necessity or usefulness of a violent revolution to improve the lot of the Negro. If integrationists begin murdering segregationists (as well as everybody who is within a thousand miles of them on the political spectrum), the resultant bloodshed will make the present loss of life seem puny by comparison. Segregation is slowly dying out and the coming generation of Negroes can look forward to a date when segregation and race violence will not exist--within ten years, every store and eating place in the country will be integrated. A Boardman-style war would reverse this and cause a new wave of race hatred; it isn't only wrong--it's foolish.

While on the topic of hate, I suppose I should mention the lack of astuteness of our news and political commentators in the period following the assassination of President Kennedy. Nearly all of them spoke of the "climate of hate" which supposedly caused the assassination. However, assassinations in the United States have traditionally been the work of individual lunatics motivated by their own troubles and not by political events, and all the evidence made public so far seems to indicate that this was no exception. Much as I dislike such men as Robert Welch or Edwin Walker, I don't believe in pointing the finger of guilt at certain groups without a shred of evidence, as was done repeatedly. It sounds very nice to talk about the need for ending hate (let us also end death while we're at it), but this matter is irrelevant here.

The problem of the morality of abortion has plagued Kipple for quite awhile, and the reason why it is so difficult to reach any sort of agreement on the questions: "When does a foetus become human?" and "Is it right or wrong to kill a foetus?", is that these questions are meaningless. You cannot answer a question unless you know the meaning of its terms, so no answer can be reached until the words "human" and "right" are properly defined. Human according to whose definition? Right according to whose code of morality? All reasoning must begin from certain unprovable but assumed premises. If a group of people agree on certain premises, then they can meaningfully debate an issue by applying basic principles of logic; if they cannot agree on a foundation, they might as well give up, because each can only come to the conclusion that the others are ignorant of the true light as he sees it. (To digress into a broader area of discussion momentarily: I will not quarrel with your specific example, but it is certainly not true that "all" reasoning is based upon unproven (and unprovable) premises. Remember Descartes' classic premise of a priori reasoning, cogito ergo sum, an indisputably valid

statement. In another sense, only the first word, cogito, is a premise (again indisputable, because anyone who believes he is thinking is obviously doing so); the remainder of the statement is a logically concrete conclusion based on that diminutive premise. In any case, it is clear that some premises of reasoning are provable.))

If I may loosely summarize some of your recent comments on this topic, Ted, they boil down to: Humans consist of critters like ourselves and those who have passed stage X in the process of becoming critters like ourselves; any critter like ourselves who has passed stage X is human; it is wrong to kill humans except in certain cases (i.e., a foetus when the mother's life is in danger). Note that each of these statements is an unprovable assumption. I am not arguing about the particular stage X that you recognize; that's pretty minor. (The particular stage X (i.e., the point at which a foetus deserves to be considered a human being in ethical controversies) which I recognize is conception, for reasons outlined in previous issues. I arrived at this conclusion after having found indefensible several earlier alternatives. But you need not agree with this premise in order to concur with my judgement: Granting that it is presently impossible to prove at which point a foetus may be considered (for our purposes) a human being, are we not obligated to assume that the foetus at any given stage is human until it is proven otherwise?))

I feel that the morals we adopt should be ones that will create the most good and harmony for society and the most happiness for individuals. I have adopted the premise that it is wrong to kill other humans after they have been born (note that the use of the word "other" exempts suicide and voluntary euthanasia from this injunction). My reasons for this attitude are that murders tend to disrupt society, and that a society in which murder was permitted would soon lose certain desirable individuals--such as those of us who are a bit stronger in brain than in brawn (e.g., me). However, in the case of the foetus, there are mitigating circumstances. When a child is born who is not wanted by its parents, it will begin a life which will hold much unnecessary unhappiness both for itself and for its parents. You are saying that a certain moral assumption which you are making should be forced on parents, even though it will create unhappiness. I am countering by saying that since this is not a problem of prime importance to society, we might as well let the closest conscious people involved decide. You might charge me with possessing a double standard of morality, but I can counter by defining "human" in such a way as to exclude the foetus. (There were a number of attempts in the initial stages of this debate to define "human" in such a way as to exclude the foetus, all of them unsuccessful. I eagerly await your contribution...))

"We do not trust educated people and rarely, alas, produce them, for we do not trust the independence of mind which alone makes a genuine education possible." --James Baldwin, in "Nobody Knows My Name".

PHIL KOHN :: MAIN ROAD :: YOKNEAM :: ISRAEL

"Eventually," you state, "society will be forced to...engage in a genuine effort to solve the problem /of juvenile delinquency/--beginning with the revamping of the basic values imparted (by example, not command) to the youth of this nation." I didn't think it was possible, but you are actually a shade more fatuous than the people who want to see all of the pornographic books (for why else would they apply for posts as censors?). Who is to formulate the values, and who shall apply them to youth?

Juvenile delinquents are created, first, by the absence of useful, gainful employment. "The devil finds work for idle hands" and always will (whether or not there really is a devil or God). A society in which human productive time is not a value but a surplus to be disposed of will solve none of its absurd and ridiculous human problems. The answer is not necessarily socialism, but simply a managed currency in which the issuing of money, taxing and spending are managed together--mainly through the market--in such a way that there is employment for all who want it and prices remain steady.

Juvenile delinquency will also continue to exist until America decides whether sex is good or bad, and sticks to that decision. If sex is agreed to be good, then Wilhelm Reich's ideas should be put into practice: free contraceptives for everyone, contraceptive instruction for pre-teenagers, no discouraging of masturbation in the cradle or at any time, and the availability of rooms where young unmarried couples can get cheaply together. This was Reich's advice to the Communist Party of Germany in the years before Hitler's rise to power, so that they could attract to their cause real proletarian youth, but it applies to you Americans today--the biology has not changed. If these proposals don't appeal to you, then return to the moral codes of 1910; stability in either extreme would be preferable to the current situation. Today's sex morals, so called, are about as stable as a fellow on a log floating in the river, trying to scratch his backside with one leg. Even a correct pretense is too complicated nowadays. You can acquire a bad name either as a virgin or as a loose person, a puritan or a deviate, by admitting to the same acts in different places or to different people. So how can you impart values when you don't know what they are?

Charles Crispin comments, "It does seem true that in many cases the victims of oppression become oppressors in their own right once they find themselves in the majority, although this has not happened in the case of Jews." Thanks for the flattery, but read your Bible again: We had hardly escaped from Egypt when we turned on the Amalekites and others, and became oppressors in this country. The same thing is occurring today. In no case will our--or anyone's--interest be served by the fiction of the gentle, harmless Jew. Philip Wylie, in "The Innocent Ambassadors", wonders why anti-Semites have never taken up the cause of the Arab refugees. The answer is that an anti-Semite is not a person who, for some reason, dislikes Jews; an anti-Semite, like a white supremacist, is an inferior kind of sadist out for helpless victims. The last thing he wants to realize is that it may actually be dangerous to tangle with some Jews. This is why I am confident that the Arab refugee case, for all it is worth, will never recruit many anti-Semites. ({Crispin probably had specifically in mind the pattern of American race relations: members of one-time scapegoat groups (Irish, Italian, etc.) which are now accepted as part of the "American majority" often possess violently anti-Negro, anti-Fuerto Rican opinions. Jewish bigots, on the other hand, are encountered remarkably seldom in this country (and presumably in others as well).})

An irresistible force and an immovable object may co-exist if the force is of such a nature that it cannot be turned against that particular obstruction, or if they are the same object. And energy, particularly in the form of heat, is the universal solvent; it is kept in a diluted state. All of which is to say that such maunderings are an abuse of philosophy. Philosophy should be to science what a wooden scaffold is to a building; it is there to ease the scientist's work by providing a temporary structure on which to hold. People who try to preserve such structures after the building is completed belong in the boobyhatch.

The debate in re Catholic parochial schools reminds me of a man who is caught without enough money and so tries to convince himself that

his four nickles make a quarter. Obviously, on "general grounds" the Catholic case is unanswerable; what, then, remains to be said?

Suppose an Electrical Workers Union, led by a communist cell, established a system of schools with the avowed purpose of bringing up children in the Marxist-Leninist faith. Suppose, furthermore, that no one had interfered with this program, a large supposition indeed. What would happen if they now spoke up and requested their share of the school tax money? Since their doctrine is not officially recognized as a religion, there would not even be a constitutional impediment in this case--but can you imagine America subsidizing subversion?

But I can hear the protests: "Catholicism isn't subversive!" Let us take a close look at what they are teaching. First, a comparison. Joseph Stalin was, of course, one of history's most prominent mass murderers, but he was not dead two years when Khrushchev stood up and accused him. Now, Khrushchev certainly knew how much he himself was implicated in the eyes of the world, he knew how much the party was implicated in Stalin's gross acts, and he realized that this could be used by his rivals--but Khrushchev happens to believe in his Communism. He believes that the goal sanctifies all means, but not that it may be used to cover up private iniquity and crime by any leader of the moment. Other Communist leaders--Tito, Gomulka, Kadar, etc.--risked all on similar protests, when they were in weaker positions than Khrushchev.

On the other hand, Catholic history--from Constantine to Diem, Franco, and Salazar--is a succession of Stalins, each one meaner, uglier and dirtier than the other. Some, like Pizarro, probably succeeded in murdering more people by themselves, and in almost any generation Catholic tyrants considered as a whole have exceeded Stalin's total. Yet not one of them has been condemned outright by any Pope, neither during their reign nor after. Even Hitler--Catholic only by parentage--was not actively opposed.

In regard to the latter case, the Church has recently given conclusive proof that it does not believe in God, in a way to make a mere agnostic like myself shudder: Attend: Rolph Hochhut, in "The Representative", merely accused one Pope of being weak in not protesting the mass executions of the Nazis. The Church replied that he could not, since he had to take into account the fate of Catholics living in countries occupied by Hitler. But if the Pope is God's representative, he is Right and Might at once. His style then must be Theodore Roosevelt's "Karamanlis alive, or Raisuli dead", for that is how Right and Might, united, speak. If the Pope was personally weak, that's one thing; but if he had to behave as he did, that is saying no less than, "Don't be childish, there is of course no God--that's for the peasants!" Remember that in the name of God, millions were tortured, millions were (and are) persuaded to abandon procreation, sexual joy is ruined for billions, books are burned, parties banned, science resisted--and now we are told it is all a joke: there isn't really a God to back up moral protests against armed might...

Let us examine the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church. They teach us that sex is a sin (natural history teaches us that the sexually limited are manageable, the sexually healthy and mature never so); they teach obedience and subordination as an ethical value in itself (whereas even the Communists teach it only as a useful political tool); they teach that a man or a council can find eternal binding truths, and of course that these are necessarily the same as Catholic dogma. The law does not require you to believe that even stealing or murder is eternally damned. It tells you that since we must deal, in fact, with thieves and murderers, the law will not tolerate them--but you may hold and spread your own opinions on these matters. Not so in the Catholic Church. The mere claim to any final dogma is enough to condemn the

church. Science is based on the ability not to know and to acknowledge your ignorance, and the church has always fought science--just as it has always fought freedom--as hard as it dared in any particular circumstance.

Orthodox Jews also have schools of their own and are double-taxed, so they might be expected--by the naive--to support the Catholic position. But they know better than to ask financing for tomorrow's pogromists; they prefer to pay twice and keep America decent.

"For nineteen hundred years the West has been undergoing a process of education in the particular versus the general. We have been in school to the foremost individualist of all time who declared that the very hairs of each man's head were numbered. That intense individualization has molded our spirit, and it has brought to us problems new in the history of mankind, together with trouble of mind and bitter disagreement where once there was ease and unanimity. It is not men's greed, nor their ambition, nor yet their machines, it is not even the removal of their ancient landmarks, that is filling our present world with turmoil and dissension, but our new vision of the individual's claim against the majority's claim." --Edith Hamilton, in "The Greek Way".

MARTY HELGESEN :: 11 LAWRENCE AVE. :: MALVERNE, N.Y., 11565

The fact of God's existence is relevant and, in fact, essential to any realistic view of the world because it is a fact. He is. (On what evidence is this conclusion based? Did you at any time in the past doubt the existence of a Supreme Being; and, if so, in what manner did you arrive at your present state of absolute certainty? I am not demanding proof of your contention, nor am I engaging in sarcasm--I am simply interested in the reasons for which you, personally, believe in God.) To borrow an example, denying the existence of God is like denying the existence of the sun. You may, with luck, get through life with no seeming disadvantages, but there is a hole in your view of reality and, therefore, your view of everything else is distorted. There is also, of course, the danger of sunstroke. Furthermore, if you attempt a profession such as navigation, this unrealistic view of the world may lead to the loss of your ship and its passengers. The fact that God does not directly intervene in specific problems, the way we might like, does not mean that he does not exist or that he can be disregarded. (You have no doubt anticipated and are prepared to deal with the observation, but I shall nevertheless point out the obvious fact that the existence of the sun can be demonstrated by various reliable methods; the existence of a deity cannot.)

You say that it is not necessary to explain the wonders of the earth by the existence of God because science (Science?) can explain them in other terms. All right, but then you have the other terms to explain. You can explain an acorn lying in the forest in terms of the oak from which it fell and you can explain the oak from which it fell in terms of the acorn from which it grew, but how far back do you want to repeat this cycle? Eventually, you must come to a first acorn or first oak which needs explaining. When you finish explaining things in terms of other things you must still come back to God as the ultimate explanation. (In tracing the ancestry of a particular acorn, one would not eventually encounter something recognizable as "the first acorn" or "the first oak" (unless you accept the view of Archbishop Ussher that everything was spontaneously generated in 4004 B. C. or thereabouts). The acorn in question is traceable (by an admittedly tiring series of complicated steps) to a few chains of protein molecules floating in a warm,

nutrient-rich pre-Cambrian ocean; the process by which these chains of protein molecules were formed from non-living chemical substances is no longer as mysterious and unfathomable as it once was, and various steps in the process have been duplicated in laboratories; and beyond this, the means by which the ocean itself and the underlying crust came into being are well known to science. It is true that ultimately a question (viz., how did the universe come into existence) must be encountered for which science provides at this time no generally accepted answer, but this does not necessarily establish the theological interpretation as the only reasonable hypothesis. For theology does not, in fact, answer the question; it simply attempts to arbitrarily postulate a beginning point (i.e., God) which is accepted "on faith". But in the same spirit that you question the validity of "explaining things in terms of other things", an irreverent soul might question your assumption of God as a beginning by saying: "Okay, God created the universe out of thin air; now, who created God?" Your answer would probably be that God had been there all along--that God, being infinite and eternal, needed no prior condition for existence. This is excellent reasoning, and I find nothing in it with which to disagree--save the conclusion. For if it is granted that something may exist independent of any cause and eternally, it would seem logical to me that the universe (or the material out of which it was created) could occupy that position with as much justification as your "God". So I reiterate my earlier observation: the existence of a God, while possible, is not essential in order to explain the material universe.))

No, Ted, divine law is not equated with what is right in childhood training to justify faith in divine decree by showing that God is clever enough to agree with us as to what is right. Rather it is done because, while children cannot follow a subtle ethical argument, they can understand, in a simple, basic manner, that they ought to love and obey God. It is done to justify the teaching that certain things are right and others wrong.

The drawing of qualitative distinctions between totalitarian governments of the left and right was introduced into Kipple not by a politician, but by Ted Pauls in the passage in #46 to which I referred. I question, though, whether the dissatisfaction of the populace was quite as significant a factor as you think. The reports seem to indicate that the dissatisfaction was not primarily in the countryside, where, we are told, any guerilla war is won or lost, but rather in the cities, such as Hue and Saigon. ((But most of the manpower for the Viet Cong forces comes from the countryside, which would certainly indicate to me that the peasants were not satisfied with their government.)) The Diem regime was negligent in prosecuting the war. Commanders who were too successful were kicked upstairs to desk jobs where they could be watched because they were considered dangerous. Commanders were discouraged from aggressive action which included a risk of higher than normal casualty rates because heavy casualties were looked upon with disfavor. Furthermore, there was too much central control. Local commanders could not use their own initiative against the enemy but had to clear their plans through higher authorities. The time lost in getting clearance was often decisive.

You claim in #50 that the question of whether or not Communists had infiltrated the Bosch government in the Dominican Republic is irrelevant. On the contrary, it is very relevant. Sufficient infiltration could lead to a Communist takeover and a dictatorship at least as bad as the Trujillo rule from which the people were recently liberated. ((Certainly "sufficient infiltration" (by the Communists or by the SPCA) could lead to a takeover in any government, but the solution to this is hardly a military takeover by rightists. This is a classic instance of

the cure being, if not worse, then at least no better than the disease. The military coup may have weakened the position of Dominican Communists, although there is an equal chance that the takeover strengthened the position of socialist-Marxist elements (by increasing their popular support, for example)--but in either case, the one fact which emerges as indisputable is that the Dominican Republic's first popularly chosen government in nearly four decades was destroyed at the whim of a few military officers. This seizure of power was justified on the ground that President Bosch's government had been "infiltrated", by Communists, and I'd like to examine that charge. The word "infiltration" implies that Communists were exerting influence covertly. This is a favorite accusation of rightists, of course, including the especially virulent United States variety, which sees every institution of this government controlled to one degree or another by Communists. But it is only a "charge", nothing more; I have seen no information that would elevate it to the level of a statement of fact. Of course, Communists were allowed to participate in the Dominican election and to freely operate as a legitimate political party; some professed Communists may have held elective or appointive offices in the Bosch government--but this is an accepted practice of democratic governments over much of the planet (India, France, Italy, etc.), and surely this sort of innocuous "infiltration" does not justify stabbing democracy in the back. It is possible, of course, that the Bosch government was on the verge of leaving the Western camp, declaring its everlasting loyalty to the principles of Marxism, and requesting military assistance from Peking--and that consequently the military takeover was dictated by necessity. But it appears a great deal more likely to me that a couple of corpulent Generals decided that a return to the Good Old Days of Trujillo, when the populace was without voice in the government and the military reigned supreme, was desirable, and seized upon the red herring of "Communist infiltration" as an excuse to implement their deplorable preference.))

Walt Willis: I can't speak for any other groups, religious or otherwise, but the Catholic Church teaches that in the event of a terminated pregnancy the foetus should be baptized and given a proper burial, however early in pregnancy the termination occurs.

It is unfortunate that Larry McCombs again illustrates his arguments with teachings of the Catholic Church, because he misunderstands the points he uses. Prevention of the union of sperm and egg cannot be murder because until the sperm and egg have united there is no person to be murdered. His other point is, at best, an over-simplification. However, the basic error is your statement that the Church wishes to impose its teaching on everyone. As I pointed out in some detail in Kipple #38, the Church teaches that it is function of the law to enforce public order and the common good, not private morality. ((The distinction here is one of little importance, since most Catholics (like most non-Catholics) equate their private morality with "the common good" in most cases. Restricting the discussion to the original specific controversy (viz., contraception), it seems to me that this qualifies as a matter of private morality. But the Catholic opposition extends beyond the point of private morality to the extent that Catholics attempt to restrict the use of contraceptives among non-Catholics. It is undeniable that many Catholics do just that, and that they use the mechanism of the law wherever possible; claiming on some pretext that the public good is being enhanced in this way does not alter the fact that one faction is attempting to impose its private morality on the population as a whole.))

In #48, Charles Crispin says that the Catholic Church teaches that it is bad to eat meat on Friday. That is incorrect. If eating meat were wrong on Friday, then logically it would be wrong on every other

day. The truth is that the Church does not teach anything about the eating of meat. Rather, using the legislative authority which God gave it ({!}), it commands that Catholics abstain from meat on Fridays. Since this is a law made by the Church, not by God, the Church can and does grant dispensations to classes and individuals where there is sufficient reason. The Church speaks to all men only when teaching the truths of divine revelation. It would be as wrong for you to commit an axe murder or to practice contraception as it would for me. (Both of these actions are violations of the moral law. Only one should be a violation of the civil law.) ({If the majority of Catholics believed that contraception should not be a violation of civil law, then one would find Catholics in the forefront of the campaign to repeal the relevant statutes in Connecticut--but I have seen no evidence that this is the case.})

"While we stand for freedom with leadership and democracy under centralized guidance, in no sense do we mean that coercive measures should be taken to settle ideological matters and questions involving the distinction between right and wrong among the people. Any attempt to deal with ideological matters or questions involving the right and wrong by administrative orders or coercive measures will not only be ineffective but harmful. We cannot abolish religion by administrative orders; nor can we force people not to believe in it. We cannot compel people to give up idealism, any more than we can force them to believe in Marxism." --Mao Tze-Tung, in "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People".

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

While I found the account of your experiences as a gang-member interesting and appreciate the insight and maturity it took to evaluate Ted Pauls/circa-1953, I agree with Harry Warner that you are probably over-estimating the implications of your behavior. Boys around that age do tend to go through a "gang" stage, and the underlying attitude of that gang is almost always asocial. Even non-gang boys of ten or over seem to go through a period where stealing represents the epitome of exciting and prestigious activities. (For that matter, some girls go through this too. I even know a couple of cases of arrested development in college who engage in shoplifting, stealing textbooks and the like.) Of course, to say that this is "typical" does not condone it, but I think it can be partially explained. You mention that your activities took place "in a moral vacuum". You are probably right, but you are overlooking the fact that we were born in a moral vacuum. Far from being shocking, amorality is a "natural" occurrence in infants. Yet, to maintain order in a highly complex social structure, the child must be socialized or assimilated into that society; thus, he is taught morality. Your group was probably experiencing a conflict. At ten to fourteen, you had certainly been exposed to this society's concepts of right and wrong. But you were young enough to resent these concepts as unreasonable attempts to inhibit your freedom. For that matter, mature people often resent these impositions--and often with good reason. The difference is that, at ages ten to fourteen, you expressed your resentment in childish and blatantly anti-social behavior--attacking the very things you had been taught to respect, in a non-subtle, aggressive manner. Of course, the values held by a given gang do vary with the neighborhood; yours may have been more anti-social than some, but surely not as far-out as many. The important thing is that you at least grew mature enough to abandon this particular form of aggression; as I've indicated in the case of the college students, many people do not.

Well, I've got to admit that the "crackpot manifesto" of Heinlein's was indeed crackpot. (Enid, Mark Owings and I recently amused ourselves by reading aloud various portions of the document, replete with the appropriate emotion.) My opinion of Robert Heinlein is changing as I read more of him. Funny; he can come on so liberal on some subjects, in some situations. Take the question of absolute values. In several fairly recent works ("Stranger in a Strange Land", "Glory Road", even "Podkayne") he states or implies that social values, conventions, mores, etc., are primarily relative, changing from society to society. This is not a profound observation (de Sade is reputed to have made it, back in an 18th century prison), but it is at least a fairly reasonable one (to me, anyway). On the subject of power, force, authority, et al., however, he throws all his views of cultural relativity out the window; obviously, he considers them only applicable to "social", not "political" values (if you can draw a line between them). Even "Podkayne", a juvenile or teenage or whatever-it-is novel, has examples of the social darwinist, might-makes-right theory that you mention. Related to this might be Heinlein's emphasis on the authoritarian father. This penchant became apparent to me after reading only a very little Heinlein. The father is always Right because he is the father and, more important, because he has the authority and force to impose his will on the child. Heinlein not only fails to indicate that a family can be other than a power structure, he does not seem to consider it any other way. (Excoriating Robert Heinlein seems to have become remarkably popular of late. Dave Jenrette dissects "Glory Road" in Yandro #129, and Alexei Panshin expounds the thesis that Heinlein is sexually naive ("a 56-year-old adolescent") in Shangri-L'Affaires #67. When I reprinted Walt Willis' initial attack on Heinleinism, it was done principally as a result of my admiration for the stylistic excellence of the essay. Heinlein's social and political views had previously been dissected and left for dead in the pages of Warhoon, so I expected no major discussion to develop on that topic. But I underestimated the tenacity of his defenders.)

Perhaps a suggested solution to the illegitimate-child, to abort or not to abort syndrome, as discussed by Pat MacLean (and this is just a thought--I'm not gung-ho over it or fanatically dedicated to it) would be to accept the fact that a certain number of illegitimate children are going to occur each year, and prepare for them. This, along with the wide distribution of contraceptives, as Deckinger suggests, might decrease the furtive hackwork that is the average abortion in this country. Specifically, a better program of caring for the illegitimate children is needed. In too many cases, the "real" mother is not able--or, more important, not competent--to raise a child. Better facilities (probably state-supported--after all, the state does provide for such things right now, after a fashion) are needed for the children while still infants (homes, competent staffs, etc.), but sooner or later adoptive parents are going to come into the picture. The foster parents program, in my opinion, could well be junked--at least for children whose mothers definitely have no intention of providing for them. The adoptive program as it now stands also has several faults, the gravest of which I feel is the unrealistic attitude toward adoptive parents. To hope to adopt a child, the potential parents must live up to certain standards which I feel are unfair--they must be youngish, "wholesome", well-liked, respectably religious, et al. This means that even if I were married and able to provide for a child, I probably could not adopt one because of my religion--Ethical Culture. More serious perhaps are the implied standards a prospective couple must live up to: they must not be too offbeat, nor intellectual, they cannot be careless housekeepers, etc. The social workers check with all the neighbors, "drop in" at odd

times, and often take years to decide if a couple is truly qualified. Although the desire to give the children a good home is admirable, this quasi-pre-set standard of what a good home should be is limiting--and unrealistic. A substantial reservoir of potential parents is being overlooked or dismissed.

"Conscience makes cowards of us all, and having cast the first bomb we live in fear of the fear we have evoked, forever watching the skies for what we were the first to throw. Western man proclaimed the rights and the brotherhood of man, but their voices were silent or unheard in discussion of military expediency. More recently even lack of enthusiasm for extending the scope of atomic death to unlimited dimensions has been branded a social sin under certain circumstances. And Government, it was said, has the right to search the soul of a man. It has not! It may have the power, but it has not the right, and only a self-righteous complacency or a cold cynicism could claim it." --N.J. Berrill, in "Man's Emerging Mind".

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

"Memoirs of a Young Punk": So you were a neglected child whose parents did not care what you did. They must have known the significance of the gangster outfit you lads wore, so why did they buy it for you? And why did they let you out of the house at nights without knowing exactly where you were going, who you were going with, and what time you would be back? Raising a boy or girl is a full-time job, with no vacations or week ends off. One way of keeping kids out of trouble is to remember the old saying, "An idle mind is the Devil's workshop, and idle hands are the tools." You are fortunate to have escaped unharmed. (The problem was not one of parental neglect, but rather of parental helplessness and ignorance. Few parents are capable of seeing their offspring as others see them, and I am certain that the parents of the Black Hawks would have reacted angrily and indignantly to any inference that their children were delinquents. And even when it was recognized that a problem existed, our parents were not able to take the proper measures necessary to solve it. The ordinary forms of punishment (including sound thrashings) were not effective, since accepting such punishment stoically was simply another method of achieving stature in the eyes of the Gang.)

Now I am old, but I have not forgotten my younger days and I still have two teenage boys to finish raising. Neither one was ever allowed to leave the house without telling me where and with whom he was going, neither one was ever allowed to run loose after dark. If either of them had ever stolen anything, they would have been thrashed unmercifully and then made to take it back to the owner and confess that they were a thief. Kids who get spanked for taking cookies without permission when they are four years old seldom shoplift at fourteen.

You say that I am extreme in proposing that parents go to jail along with their criminal children. Why do you say that? A man or woman is jailed for some act detrimental to society, and what can be more detrimental than to raise a child without teaching him the difference between right and wrong and the necessity of observing the rules and laws of society. There are no innocent parents of criminal children; they failed to do their proper job, and should be punished for that nonfeasance. (I object to your proposal on these grounds: (1) parents are not invariably to blame for the misdeeds of their progeny; (2) in cases where the parents are responsible for the anti-social behavior of youngsters, this is most often due to ignorance rather than lack of concern,

a problem to be solved by education rather than punitive measures; (3) removing one or the other parent from the house would be detrimental to their other children, if any; and (4) the consequences to parents in the event of juvenile crime would be so great that children would be reared in an atmosphere of repression totally inadequate to prepare them for responsible adult positions in a free society.))

The murder of John Kennedy was the greatest tragedy since the murder of Lincoln. I had little use for the man and less for his ideas--he typified the Irish politician, glib, charming, but believing that his first duty was to see that all his relatives had fine fat jobs at high salaries--but I don't believe in murder as a political weapon. He might have made a middling great President in time. His best monument is the statement, "Ask not what our country can do for us, ask what we can do for our country." Those words should be carved on his tombstone. (It probably shouldn't be surprising that what you appear to have admired most in Mr. Kennedy's many speeches was precisely what I admired least. Of course, in the original context of the inaugural address, the statement you quote was a plea to all citizens to apply the principles and ideals which America represents, to bring these ideals to fruition. But in the intervening three years, it has been bandied about out of context in a manner more appropriate to a totalitarian society, where the interests of the State take precedence over the rights of the individual.))

The worst thing (politically) about his murder is that it may have destroyed the last foreseeable chance for the American people to regain control of foreign policy from the custardheads and fellow-travelers in the State Department and their stooges in the Congress. If Kennedy had lived to run again, the Republicans would have been forced to back Goldwater. But the Democrats have no one in Kennedy's class to put up next year, and so the Eastern bosses of the Republican Party will run some pipsqueak like Romney or Scranton whom they can handle.

I don't approve of Goldwater 100%. I regard spouting about "States' Rights" as akin to treason: the tail does not wag the dog, and properly a State is just an administrative district of the nation, as a county is of a State. I believe in one Nation, one Flag, one Law. Yet the election of Goldwater would be a great defeat for the "liberals". Once a liberal was a man who believed in more freedom for the citizen; today, a liberal is one who believes that the people should be ruled, for their own good of course, by he and his clique. A "liberal" believes in more and more government control of every facet of our public and private affairs. The liberals and custardheads have been passing out the United States Treasury to all applicants for a handout, provided that they were genuine foreigners; now that they are running out of Treasury, they have started giving away bits of United States territory without asking the inhabitants thereof whether or not they wanted to be given away. Oh well, they are only American citizens, so who cares...

You say that you challenge Goldwater's "America first" philosophy. But what other nation should a candidate put first? Answer me that! People who do not believe in the doctrine of "America first" should move to the nation that they prefer. What this nation needs is an executive branch and a State Department whose policy is the aggrandizement of the American people, officials who try to see how much they can get out of the foreigner, not how much we can give them. (The first duty of any human being is to the human race, a fact which practitioners of "America first" (or "Nyasaland first") philosophies fail to recognize. The second duty of an American is to the principles of this nation--but I stress that this duty is to the principles of the United States, not to the government, which is, after all, only a diverse group of highly fallible human beings who exercise power on a temporary basis.))

You seem to disapprove of my personal philosophy. I will admit that it is primitive, but then both life and death are primitive. My philosophy is the result of observing the world as it really is, not as some nice old Aunt Nellie thinks it ought to be. It kept me alive back in the days when I was earning my living in places where my white skin was a standing invitation to be murdered. I learned that only a complete fool ever forgives a man who has tried to kill him, or even threatened to kill him. Forgiveness is a form of suicide. Did you ever stop to consider that Survival of the Fittest means "non-survival of the unfit"? This is nature's way of improving a race. If the unfit are allowed to live and breed (as they are in the U.S.), they will soon overcome the fit by sheer weight of numbers.

I most probably won't see it, but you are young and you will see the worst race wars of history right here in our country. The fighting will begin in the big cities, and the first stories of atrocities will fire the whites into real atrocities. It is the white men who have the weight of numbers, the military organization, and the manufacturing capacity for making arms. Of course, if a race war does break out, we will find the United Nations helping the Negroes with men and arms, if they can get them across the ocean into our territory. That bunch of Communists, Arabs, and Negroes hate us because we are rich, and because they want our wealth. They are showing their teeth already by denouncing Portugal and Suid Afrika; we will be next.

There were good small towns in Portugese Africa when the Indians saved the Pilgrims from starvation by giving them food. The Dutch were in Cape Colony before the Bantu Negroes--the whites, moving North, met the Bantu, moving South, along the Tugela in 1650. In other words, the whites have as much right to the land as the blacks. I despise the Boers, being a Roinek myself, but after all, they are white and if educated can be assimilated into Western society; educate a Bantu and you still have a Bantu, who cannot be assimilated.

FROM

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



SEND TO

printed matter only

may be opened for inspection

return requested

uhuru!

Dave Hulan & Co.
17417 Vanowen St., Apt. #21
Van Nuys, California, 91406

The number in this space 52 is the number of the last issue you will receive; a mark here x indicates that we exchange periodicals; an esoteric symbol in this space _____ means that this is a sample copy; an "X" in this area x informs you that you are receiving this issue because of your connection with the Young Socialists for Goldwater Movement; and a mark here _____ means you are not receiving this issue.