

kipple

60

JUNE 9, 1964

"Justice is the recognition of the fact that you cannot fake the character of men as you cannot fake the character of nature, that you must judge all men as conscientiously as you judge inanimate objects, with the same respect for truth, with the same incorruptible vision, by as pure and as rational a process of identification--that every man must be judged for what he is and treated accordingly, that just as you do not pay a higher price for a rusty chunk of scrap than for a piece of shining metal, so you do not value a rotter above a hero--that your moral appraisal is the coin paying men for their virtues or vices, and this payment demands of you as scrupulous an honor as you bring to financial transactions--that you withhold your contempt from men's vices is an act of moral counterfeiting, and to withhold your admiration from their virtues is an act of moral embezzlement--that to place any other concern higher than justice is to devalue your moral currency and defraud the good in favor of the evil, since only the good can lose by a default of justice and only the evil can profit--and that the bottom of the pit at the end of that road, the act of moral bankruptcy, is to punish men for their virtues and reward them for their vices, that that is the collapse to full depravity, the Black Mass of the worship of death, the dedication of your consciousness to the destruction of existence."

--Ayn Rand

This stuffy journal of opinion and commentary is edited and published by Ted Pauls, 1448 Meridene Dr., Baltimore, Maryland, 21212. Copies are available for letters of comment, exchange with other periodicals, contributions (articles, verse, etc.), or the cash sum of 20¢ per issue. This issue is dedicated to the voters of California, who on June 2nd demonstrated conclusively the truth of the axiom crediting that state with a high incidence of lunacy. The number in the address box is the number of the last issue you will receive; the letter "T" indicates that we exchange publications. -WOKLpress-

JEAN ROSE :: 221 STADIUM PARK :: IOWA CITY, IOWA, 52241

Re your excellent presentation of the principles and mechanisms of evolution, in response to Charles Crispin's letter: I should like to add that we do indeed see evolution in progress today. It is, as you point out, a slow process, and we see only a small part of the whole process in any particular group of organisms at any particular time; but we have most certainly artificially created new sub-species--that's what selective breeding is about. It is, in fact, an exact counterpart of natural selection: artificial selection. It is a directive but mechanical process, just as natural selection is, working on a pre-existing variation in the population. The variation is random, and its main components, as you point out, are genetic reshuffling (recombination) and mutation. Do not forget that some 75% of mutations are lethal, about 24% neutral, and 1% favorable at the time of occurrence; but that neutral and even lethal genes can be carried as recessives in a population, and be selected at some later time when conditions have so changed that these are now favorable characters. (Experience has taught me that opponents of the modern theory of evolution generally fail to grasp the obvious parallels between natural and artificial selection or else draw unwarranted conclusions from the use of the latter to illustrate the former (viz., that since human beings consciously direct artificial selection, some higher being must therefore consciously direct natural selection). Since the space available for my replies to letters is severely limited, I decided not to further complicate the discussion by illustrating natural selection with examples of artificial selection. For the same reason, I have ignored other rather subtle aspects of evolutionary theory (e.g., the distinction between characteristics which are adaptive in terms of intra-species competition and those which are adaptive in terms of inter-species competition--a point raised implicitly if not directly in your next paragraph, referring to antlers and their development). This topic is such a fascinating one that even a basically lazy writer such as myself would not find it difficult to write a book on the subject. In making circumscribed comments such as those to Crispin #58 and Warner in #59, therefore, I have found it necessary to completely ignore details which, to you, appeared essential, but which would simply have added to Harry's or Chuck's confusion.))

I should also like to emphasize the importance of reproduction in evolution. It is not important what other effects a particular character has: if it gives an individual an edge in reproduction, and is heritable (i.e., gives his offspring an edge in reproduction), then it will automatically be selected. Such a character does not, for instance, have to help him to live longer, if it increases (a) his chances of finding a mate, (b) his fertile time, whether total number of years or (in the case of a female) percentage of the year in heat, or (c) his offspring's chances or surviving to reproductive age. This accounts for some of the more "bizarre" characteristics (which really only means great complexity or great specialization) displayed by some groups (antlers, etc.), although it is probably not the whole story.

I'd also like to point out that reproductive isolation--or non-isolation--is not always the result of genetic isolation. For instance, two animals may not successfully interbreed

because (a) they come into heat at different times, (b) there is a physical (anatomical) incompatibility (to put it grossly, they don't fit), or (c) there is a behavioral barrier--e.g., the female does not recognize the male's courting behavior for what it is. In all these cases, it is conceivable that reproduction could occur by use of artificial insemination; but barring that, interbreeding is quite effectively prohibited. Reproductive isolation also occurs when the offspring are non-viable from any stage from penetration (or lack of it) of egg by sperm to reproductive age of offspring. (The most common examples of structural isolation (i.e., inability to interbreed because of anatomical incompatibility) occur within the species Canis familiaris. The sperm of a fox terrier, for example, may be quite compatible with the egg of a great dane, but the immense difference in size successfully prevents interbreeding in most cases. A more amusing example of structural isolation occurs in a fish of the genus Anableps. The intromittent organ of the male may be either on the left or the right side, and there is a corresponding variation in the position of genitals in the female. A "left-handed" male can mate only with a "right-handed" female, and "right-handed" males must seek out "left-handed" females. Presumably, interbreeding would be possible through artificial insemination, but under normal conditions the two varieties are completely isolated from each other insofar as reproduction is concerned.)

Perhaps you might also note, against the more religious of your correspondents, that while variation is random, and occurs largely because of the extreme complexity and consequent moderate instability of the large protein molecules (DNA, RNA, etc.) that transmit genetic information, natural selection is a directive process; it is not random. But this does not imply any External Being or Force, any will or drive on the part of organisms, doing the directing; it is a purely mechanical directing which has a component which may or may not be purely random (I tend to think not)--that is, changing physical conditions. (When I say this component is non-random, I mean that I think I can detect repeating patterns--e.g., of geosynclinal development, spread and retreat of seas, mountain-building at the margins of continents, etc.)

Perhaps a brief statement of opinion with respect to religion is in order: I think I've seen far more harm done by religion (almost any religion) than good. I don't feel any great emotional need for a First Cause or Causeless Cause. It suits my uniformitarian viewpoint better to consider that there is no beginning and no end. But I am also aware that such phrases as "Causeless Cause" and many other paradoxical expressions arise because we have all these damn words, and insist on playing with them, and assume that there is some sort of 1:1 relation between them and things out there that we can see, feel, touch, etc. The "reason" that we are here and are as we are is just exactly that we are here, and that had we been grossly different, we probably wouldn't be.

I don't have the reference at the moment for an exact quote, but I most certainly disagree with Publicola's statement concerning the "base" and "evil" animalistic nature of man, which must be suppressed and over-ridden by his mighty shining bloody spirit. It's his damn "spirit" that has gotten him into most of his trouble. So what's wrong with animals? Of course we're animals; we are what we are, and it's a whole thing, not a split thing.

To say that contraception is equivalent to abortion is patently ridiculous. To use the argument that to prevent the sperm from reaching, or penetrating, the egg is the same thing as killing the embryo at some stage is almost as wild as claiming that not mating at all is the same as killing the embryo.

Surely there is no real difference in the ways that a sperm is

prevented from reaching the egg: chastity, by this argument, becomes a sin; sterility is an unforgiveable sin, a tragic flaw about which nothing can be done. (Even if the "sinfulness" consisted in sex without reproduction, it would then be sinful for a man to have intercourse with his wife if she were sterile.)

I think this misconception also stems from too strong a reliance on the so-called logic of words, and a gross ignorance of biological fact. A sperm or an egg is not a potential individual; it is only a bunch of genetic information with a tail or an extra food supply. It is, at best, only one-half a potential individual; and there are, per individual, many, many more of them than any individual could conceivably use in a lifetime--what is it, $3:10^9$ sperm per male human, or more? A much smaller number of eggs can be produced, but this number is still far greater than the number of children any woman can bear in a lifetime.

Of course, a great deal of this feeling stems also from the notion that sex itself is wicked, unless justified by reproduction--and production of "souls" at that, not just continuance of the species. I'm not enough of a psychologist, sociologist, anthropologist or historian to track down the origin of that notion. But it is clear that many biological processes and functions, and types of behavior, have developed other functions--I might say "purposes" if I didn't know the word would be misinterpreted--besides their original one.

Sure, the main and original function of sex is reproduction; sure, reproduction is necessary to the continuance of the species, so that any group that does not reproduce will die out. But over-reproduction can be lethal, too, and may well have been a factor in the extinction of certain groups--and may well be a factor in the extinction of ours.

One is on much trickier ground when dealing with an already formed embryo. Please note, however, that it is standard biological and medical usage to differentiate the zygote, the cell formed by union of the sperm and egg, through its various cleavage and differentiation stages (which last some three to four months in humans), from the embryo. Effectively, this says that the zygote is only a potential human (or other) organism; the embryo is the human being, at an undeveloped stage. Don't misunderstand me; I am well aware that this is very tricky ground, full of semantic pitfalls. I mention this difference as a notion to think about, and to emphasize that there is a real (if perhaps small) difference between the non-differentiated and differentiated stage of development. I think there is some relation here to the fact that an abortion is both physically and psychologically easier and safer for the mother if performed early--before five months development, preferably before three months.

"It is error alone which needs the support of government. Truth can stand by itself." --Thomas Jefferson.

JOHN BOSTON :: 816 S. FIRST ST. :: MAYFIELD, KENTUCKY, 42066

Your comments on foreign policy are for the most part, I believe, quite sound. The question on which the survival-or-suicide choice rests is the oft-expressed one, "Would you rather be red than dead?" I'm not exactly sure what my stand would be if the United States were forced into such a position that the only alternative to Russo-Communitic domination would be war, nuclear or "limited"; however, I do know that I wouldn't last long in a communistic society. This being a democracy, or a constitutional republic, or whatever those better versed in political

terminology than I have decided the United States is, it would be immoral, unethical, un-American and so forth, for any small group, whether it be the John Birch Society, the American Civil Liberties Union, or the mailing list of Kipple, to knowingly precipitate the whole nation--or in this case, the whole planet--into a disastrous war. To be an act of the people, a plebiscite would have to be held before a war was initiated--a rather impractical scheme. But under present circumstances, a war would have to be started by a small group of higher-ups--and therefore could in no sense be considered a manifestation of the will of the people.

For a number of months, I have consistently refused to recite the Pledge of Allegiance in dear old Mayfield High School. As yet I have attracted the attention only of some of my more patriotic and less intelligent (no slur on patriotism per se intended) fellow students. My reasoning is that I won't pledge allegiance to either a plot of ground or a piece of cloth, to which no one has yet come up with a satisfactory rebuttal. (Although you hastened to parenthetically deny a direct association, you must surely recognize that patriotism and lack of intelligence go hand-in-hand with depressing frequency. Patriotism, as defined by popular usage, is a manifestation of pride, itself the most destructive of emotions. To be patriotic with respect to the ideals of the United States automatically precludes patriotism of the more common variety--i.e., pride with respect to the alabaster cities, spacious skies, and amber waves of grain, the belief that institutions are worthy of veneration because they are American rather than because they are inherently worthwhile, "America-first-and-to-hell-with-the-foreigners" chauvinism, and so on. "The patriotic bias," quoth William Graham Sumner, "is a recognized perversion of thought and judgment against which our education should guard us.")

As far as I am concerned, I am going to studiously ignore the Breen affair, and urge anyone else who is not personally committed to one faction or another to do likewise.

"Have you heard that President Goldwater, the week after taking office, was told that the Russians had launched a missile attack? With cool presence of mind he ordered, 'Put the women in the center and draw up the wagons in a circle!'" --T.R.B., in The New Republic, May 30, 1964.

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

So Crispin thinks it is not an acceptable tactic in a discussion to ask your opponent what he actually knows about the subject under discussion. Now if I were to argue with his friend Leonard Kohler on evolution and he came out with such weird statements, I would certainly ask him how much he had studied biology or related disciplines. By the same token, a man arguing about militarism or similar subjects should expect to be asked how much he knows about it personally.

Now I am going to astound Mr. Crispin. I am glad to read that he is honest enough to volunteer the information that if he were physically fit for military service, he would go to jail rather than serve. Nor do I think that he is necessarily either a traitor or a coward. A traitor would join and then try to damage us--e.g., by passing information to our enemies. Of course, a real rabid militarist might argue that by being a worthless soldier he was aiding the enemy; but that is too extreme for anyone but a Marxist dialectician or a pacifist to use.

Nor would he necessarily be a coward. Some of the bravest men I have ever met have been conscientious objectors. There are two classes of these social misfits. One class refuses to carry arms and to kill, on

moral grounds, and the extreme among them would prefer to be killed rather than kill. But these conscientious objectors will go into the Medical Corps and help to save lives. (I remember one in World War I who refused to carry the medical bolo because it could be used as a weapon. I was given the job of converting him and I did, pointing out that he might need a chopping tool to make splints or an emergency litter in the field. He got my point that anything heavy and harder than human flesh can be used as a weapon.) I recall a British draft board whose chairman used to ask conscientious objectors if they had any objection to saving human life. Naturally, they said no. They got assigned to front-line trenches as stretcher-bearers, the most dangerous job in the line--without relief, or until they asked for combat duty. It doesn't take much being shot at before the normal man wants to shoot back. The ones who did not want to shoot back in self-defense had courage in inverse proportion to their brains.

The second class of objectors refuse to perform any manner of military service; they are liable to the death penalty in time of war. I would not call them cowards either, just fools who are so conceited that they think they are precious enough that other men should risk their lives to protect them from the enemy. Other men, in their conceited opinion, should bear the agony of wounds and death so that these twerps can sleep safe at home.

I can respect the man who risks his life unarmed for his ideals, but for the second variety I have nothing but contempt. (Some of these draft-dodgers marry to avoid conscription. They expect a woman to risk her life to give them sons, but they are not man enough to risk their own life to protect her and her children. Think that over, Charley.)

As for Evers, his is a common viewpoint, and that is why I am against a peace-time draft. Every nation since Sparta and including T'chaka's Zulu Empire that has depended on conscription to fill the ranks of its armies has been defeated and destroyed by some nation that used volunteers. But I do not understand how Evers figures that the draft is slavery. Does he believe that compulsory school attendance is slavery? Every man should know how to use weapons, and how to act as a member of the team in defense of his way of life, just as much as he should know how to read, write and figure. It is part of his education for life as a man.

As long as other nations are willing to use armed force to make us conform to their will, then we have to be willing, ready and able to use more efficient force to teach them the error of their ways.

"A socialist state may be defined as one in which public ownership is the rule rather than the exception and private enterprise is restricted to certain well-defined areas and regulated by extensive controls. The distinguishing characteristic of a socialistic state is therefore a paternalistic attitude toward its citizens." --K. N. Varenkov, in "Marxist Principles in the Modern World".

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

I have at hand two heavily documented pamphlets defending Pope Pius XII from the charges made in "The Deputy", one written by a Catholic and one by a Jew. However, I do not propose to deal with the subject at any length. Your main criticism seems to be that Pius remained silent out of culpable expediency, to protect himself and other Catholics. I deny this. His "silence" was to protect everyone, including the Jews, from greater harm. (Without in the least doubting your estimate of the motive underlying Pius' failure to speak out, one might wonder

what "greater harm" could possibly have befallen the Jews...)) He wrote in 1943: "Every word that We addressed to the responsible authorities and every one of Our public declarations had to be seriously weighed and considered in the interest of the persecuted themselves in order not to make their situation unwittingly even more difficult and unbearable." That this was not just his idea is shown from the statement of a Berlin Jew who escaped from Nazi imprisonment to Rome and was hidden there until he could reach safety in Spain: "None of us wanted the Pope to take an open stand..." It is possible that, with the advantage of twenty years hindsight and the greater advantage of not being responsible for the consequences of a decision one might say, perhaps correctly, that Pius should have spoken out more directly. However, the evidence clearly shows that his "failure" to do so was motivated not by self-seeking expediency or cowardice but by a sincere conviction that the course of action selected was for the greatest possible good for all concerned.

I would like to thank Derek Nelson for his kind words. Unfortunately, his description of papal infallibility is not quite accurate. The definition in 1870 was not an initial claim, but, like all definitions of dogma, a formal statement of something that has always been believed. Also, no advice or consent is required. He may seek it if he chooses because, unlike inspiration, infallibility is a purely negative thing. It means that if the Pope doesn't know the right thing to say, he won't say it. Ex cathedra means that infallibility applies only when the Pope is acting in his formal capacity as pastor and teacher of the universal Church. His private opinions are not infallible.

Judging from the brief passage you quote, if Thomas Paine wrote as well on politics as he did on religion we'd still be singing "God Save the Queen". The doctrine of the Immaculate Conception refers to the state of Mary's soul when she was conceived in the normal manner, by sexual intercourse. The doctrine of the Virgin Birth, which, in spite of what he says, Paine is so ineptly criticizing, deals with the fact that Christ was conceived in Mary's womb not by sexual intercourse, but by a miracle. It is understandable that the ordinary unbeliever not be aware of this distinction, but it would seem that if one is going to write a book attacking these doctrines he should at least find out what he is talking about. Further, Matthew and Luke do not contain contradictory reports of the same event but reports of two separate events. (In examining the New Testament, one discovers frequent discrepancies in what purport to be eyewitness accounts. For example, regarding the resurrection, Matthew 28:16-17 records that the eleven disciples went "away into Galilee, into a mountain where Jesus had appointed them" and "when they saw him, they worshipped him". Luke, however, claims (24:13, 15, 33) that Jesus first appeared at a village about "threescore furlongs from Jerusalem" and then again in the presence of the eleven at a house in Jerusalem. Both Matthew and Luke claim to have been present at this happy reunion, and both (by referring to "the eleven") claim the presence of the other at their respective versions, but they are in disagreement as to the location and circumstances. Surely resurrections are not so commonplace that two eyewitnesses to a rather important one would disagree as to the city and manner of place in which the event occurred, if these accounts were genuine? Needless to say, this is only one of many examples which could be produced of contradictory accounts of the same event by supposed eyewitnesses.)) Finally, as the quote from Msgr. Knox indicates, this whole doctrine is not a cause but a consequence of belief.

You say that if God were to reveal to you that the Catholic Church is infallible you would accept this as true. But if you accept the Church as infallible, you thereby accept her infallible teachings. Yet the infallible teachings of the Church are those statements which Msgr. Knox

said "cannot be proved by reason alone". (Admittedly, this appears to compromise my avowed reluctance to accept statements which cannot be proven to my satisfaction by reason, but a personal divine revelation would be a rather special circumstance.) Like you, I have not been nor do I expect to be favored by direct personal divine revelation. However, in spite of this lack, I have sufficient reason to accept the Church as infallible. I, therefore, accept her "unprovable" infallible teachings and assert them dogmatically, for which you tell me I am wrong. (Whether you actually have "sufficient reason" to accept the Church as infallible would depend, I suppose, upon the definition of "sufficient reason" used. Your religious philosophy would impress me a great deal more if you were a convert to Catholicism, rather than the product of a Catholic environment, for conversion must be influenced at least partially by a reasoned evaluation of doctrine and central beliefs. It is apparent that you have devoted considerably more thought to your religious beliefs than the vast majority of Americans, but no evaluation can be truly objective where a prior commitment to one of the choices offered is present. William Murray's atheism fails to impress me for the same reason.)

I am afraid that you are intermingling the argument and the freight train analogy I used to explain it. In the analogy the question is not how either the box cars or the locomotive came into existence but why they move along the tracks. The box cars move because the locomotive pulls them. The locomotive moves because it contains within itself the reason for its motion. It is a self-mover. The box cars could not move without the locomotive. To leave the analogy and return to the universe, God does not interrupt the chain of cause-and-effect; he completes it. Nothing other than God could occupy this position. The material universe is not enough. It is composed of various parts, each of which is caused by something other than itself. Any part of the universe will produce its own effects, but it would not exist as a cause if it had not itself been caused. If you do not go outside of the universe to an uncaused cause, which we call God, you are left with nothing but a chain of effects, which is absurd. (Note that while this Uncaused Cause is identical with the God of Christianity, I have not yet attempted to prove that this is so.) (Let me repeat an observation which I have made several times during the course of this discussion: if you are going to postulate something which exists without having been caused, then why could not the material universe occupy that position? It seems, in any case, highly unlikely that something could be the cause of its own existence; but if we accept this paradox, then an "uncaused" material universe appears to me no less plausible than an "uncaused" deity.)

Since I lack both Mr. Sheed's learning and his talents I am afraid that I can do little more than paraphrase him. Endlessness in time means time (which is related to change) open at both ends, time stretching away back into the past with no beginning, stretching away forward into the future with no ending. Eternity, on the other hand, is outside of time and is a constant now. You cannot say that eternity had been going on for some time before God created the world and, with it, time. That is meaningless because it brings time into eternity. I am fairly sure you will find this explanation unsatisfactory. If so, please specify your objections and I will try to answer them. Also, please remember that it is not easy for an amateur to condense several necessarily difficult chapters written by an expert into one accurate, easily-understood paragraph. Mr. Sheed is not equating "reason" with "justification" rather than "cause"; the whole point of the note I quoted is precisely that a quantity lacking a beginning still needs a cause. (The "beginning" of any quantity is its creation; to "cause" means, in this context, to "bring into being". To speak of the "cause" of any quantity (be

it the universe or a wheelbarrow) assumes that there was a time prior to which it did not exist. If a quantity has no beginning--if, i.e., there was no point in time prior to which it did not exist--then it could not have been caused by any other quantity. The theological distinction between "eternity" and "endlessness in time" appears specious, because it rests on the assumption that "time" is the sort of concrete quantity which, like a rock, could be "created" by God..I cannot conceive of "time" in this manner; my concept of "time" is, unfortunately, impossible to articulate, but it rejects utterly the idea that "time" is something which needed to be created. More to the point, this argument assumes the existence of God, which is precisely the question being discussed; you are attempting to prove the existence of God by the use of arguments which presuppose the existence of God.))

In #58, Kevin Langdon assumes that the universe does not need a reason for its existence. If the box cars are rolling downhill, how did they get to the top of the hill? (As you observed above, in the analogy the question is not how the box cars came into existence (and it is no more relevant how they came to be at the top of the hill) but why they move along the tracks.)) If they are obeying a natural, physical law, who passed the law and who enforces it?

"In the space of one hundred and seventy-six years the lower Mississippi has shortened itself two hundred and forty-two miles. That is an average of a trifle over one mile and a third per year. Therefore, any calm person, who is not blind or idiotic, can see that in the Old Oolitic Silurian Period, just a million years ago next November, the lower Mississippi River was upward of one million, three hundred thousand miles long, and stuck out over the Gulf of Mexico like a fishing rod. And by the same token any person can see that seven hundred and forty-two years from now the lower Mississippi will be only a mile and three quarters long, and Cairo and New Orleans will have joined their streets together, and be plodding comfortably along under a single mayor and a mutual board of aldermen. There is something fascinating about science. One gets such wholesale returns of conjecture out of such a trifling investment of fact." --Mark Twain, in "The Mississippi".

JOHN BOSTON :: 816 S. FIRST ST. :: MAYFIELD, KENTUCKY, 42066

I am thoroughly in accord with your stand in relation to Putting God Back in Our Schools. I have first-hand experience with this sort of thing, having attended a school in which prayer recitation was customary until this year. This put me in the rather uncomfortable if not indefensible position of continuing to read my book or work my algebra problems when the class was requested to put its little worldly pursuits aside and harken unto the Holy Writ. My home-room teacher, fortunately, never called my bluff on that score, being a comparatively intelligent person.

However, that is beside the point, for the most part. As I implied above, I am now attending high school. I am also compelled to attend the Sunday school of my parents' choice every Sunday morning. From the many observations I have been able to make of my fellow students' behavior in relation to the school exercises and their statements and general behavior in Sunday school, it is quite obvious that there are few Christians to be found in this younger generation. I would say that 90% of the attendees of my Sunday school are Christians because they have been told to be Christians. In the entire student body of Mayfield High School, which numbers about 800, I know of exactly one intelligent Christian--that is, one individual who is intelligent as a Christian, in

that his attitude toward his beliefs and the beliefs of others is sane and reasonable. The rest of those who profess Christianity are afflicted because of rigid parental training with a sort of hysterical blindness which will not allow them to consider objections either to their beliefs or to their attitudes concerning those beliefs. Then we come to the Yahoos, numbering about 50%, who just don't give a damn. Actually, I suppose the reference to them as Yahoos is rather ill-advised, in a large number of cases; most of these people probably live in homes where no emphasis is placed on either religion or intellectual values.

You may ask, just what has this to do with school prayer, Bible-reading, and so forth? Just that, aside from objections to these exercises based on constitutional principles, they are susceptible to criticism because they will do no good whatsoever. The teaching of moral and ethical principles in the schools does not work. State-supported religion will do no good. "You've got to be taught, before it's too late, before you are six, or seven, or eight"--to care about morals, ethics, religion, philosophy, etc., in the home, or else these interests and concerns will either not develop at all or (at best) must wait until near-adulthood to be awakened. My mother died when I was eleven, and was quite ill for two or three years prior to her death, so there was no religious influence on me at all until my father remarried and decided to resume churchgoing--partially to please my stepmother, partially for the sake of appearances. Up to that time I had no thought whatsoever for anything not immediate and material. It took a dose of Sunday school and an excellent history teacher's lessons on early philosophy to interest me in philosophy, religion, and other matters not concerned directly with the filling of one's belly. Religious exercises had been conducted to some extent in every school I had attended up until that time--but without meaning to me.

Might I ask what good the boycott of the Pacificon will do? If the current committee were the permanent proprietors of the World Science Fiction Convention, I could see the point. But the boycott, in this case, will serve only to let the Committee know that a number of people disapprove of their actions, rather than causing any great and sweeping reforms. This type of tomfoolery is not a normal occurrence, and it is not exactly reasonable to fear that it will become a regular practice in the future. (If the action taken against Walt Breen is allowed to stand without a direct and unmistakable expression of protest by a significant number of individuals, a nasty precedent could be established. Most of us, as I pointed out, could be excluded from a convention on some pretext, since the criteria for exclusion set down by this incident are by no means narrowly limited. A strong enough protest might also abort the campaign undertaken by Donaho, which--as he has made plain--does not propose to rest with Walter's mere exclusion from the forthcoming convention. Finally, the threat of mass action may force the Pacificon Committee to capitulate and restore Walt's membership. I suspect that Walt would politely decline such a gesture, but it would be no less a capitulation for that fact, demonstrating effectively that we have no intention of countenancing such misuse of authority by any convention committee.)

I am glad the world is not as full of A. G. Smiths as it could be. I shudder to think of a world full of people who would prefer risking the lives of any number of strangers to insure his personal safety. A good example of this is the jolly practice the Germans had of flooding one of their "showers" with gas very slowly, thus precipitating a mad rush by the victims to climb on top of everybody else in order to "escape" momentarily. In the process, the prisoners were pretty well re-

CONTINUED AFTER "JOTTINGS"

VIETNAM MUON NAM: Nearly seven months have passed since elements of the South Vietnamese military overthrew the dictator, Ngo Dinh Diem, and the situation in that strife-torn nation remains unpromising and potentially disastrous. Apologists for the authoritarian methods of Diem, who constitute a significant faction among American conservatives, point out with considerable satisfaction that no substantial progress has been recorded in the intervening period in the war against the Viet Cong guerillas. They conclude, therefore, that the coup d'état which deposed the rapacious Diem family and which the United States whole-heartedly supported was neither necessary nor desirable. This would seem to me to be a hasty judgement, founded on insufficient evidence and prompted by an overt enthusiasm for making political capital at the expense of intelligent evaluation. Like any truly important historical event, the full significance of Ngo Dinh Diem's fall from power can be accurately assessed only in retrospect. Certainly the situation appears to have deteriorated further since the military establishment undertook to rule South Vietnam, but conservative circles in this country, always inclined to grossly over-simplify foreign crises, have studiously overlooked the fact that the South Vietnamese guerilla war is neither wholly nor basically a military problem. In a guerilla war of this type, true progress is not measured in terms of military victories achieved or territory controlled; rather, the essential criterion of progress toward ultimate victory in such a conflict is the degree of popular support attained by the respective contenders (viz., the legitimate government and the in-

JOTTINGS FROM THE EDITOR'S DESK

surgents). There are indications, however tentative and shadowy, that the replacement of the Diem police state by a military government which pays at least lip-service to the desirability of popular support represents a degree of progress. Whether the coup of November, 1963, was therefore a significant landmark on the horizon of history will be determined in the years and decades to come.

An inexact but nonetheless worthwhile parallel may be drawn between the South Vietnam guerilla conflict and the insurrection which erupted some years ago in Malaya. Forces loyal to Western principles succeeded in defeating Communist-sponsored guerillas in Malaya, and though many of the circumstances which existed in Malaya have no counterpart in South Vietnam (and vice versa), several lessons may be learned from the earlier conflict. The most important single factor bearing on the Malayan rebellion was the support of the population, which generally rested with the central government--tainted though it may have been by colonialistic and paternalistic attitudes--in preference to the terrorists. It is essential that any legitimate government, if it is to wage a successful war against guerilla forces, firmly possess the sympathy and active support of the majority of its citizens or subjects; victory becomes otherwise an unattainable goal. This does not mean that widespread popular support is the panacea which will terminate the conflict in Southeast Asia. The circumstances surrounding the Malayan insurrection tended to favor the ultimate victory of the forces supported by the West--for one thing, the indigenous Communist guerillas were isolated

from direct assistance, since Malaya had no common boundary with any country sympathetic to the goals of the terrorists. In South Vietnam, the Communist forces possess the inherent advantage of easy accessibility to privileged sanctuaries in several other nations and a corridor through which supplies and reinforcements can safely pass. Consequently, the American-supported central government cannot end the hostilities and achieve a lasting victory merely by gaining widespread popular support, as they could if the Viet Cong were completely dependent upon the dissatisfaction of the peasantry. Communist North Vietnam (and, in the background, China) could sustain a civil war in South Vietnam indefinitely, and there is no valid reason to assume that their aims will be revised in the near future: the present conflict offers the Communists potentially vast gains in Southeast Asia with a minimum of effort. But while achieving popular support cannot insure a permanent victory for the South Vietnamese and their American allies, it will prevent the defeat which is otherwise inevitable.

The ideal solution to the problems generated by Southeast Asia's competing ideologies would be the neutralization of North and South Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia and Thailand, guaranteed by the United Nations and respected by the aligned nations of that area. This is rather like stating, however, that the ideal solution to the problem of famine would be for sustaining rations to miraculously issue forth from fissures in the earth at frequent intervals. This is an inarguable thesis, but also a highly academic one. Effective neutralization (as opposed to neutralization-as-a-prelude-to-communization) will be possible only when the government of Communist China has evolved to the point of sophistication attained by the Soviet Union--i.e., to the point where it recognizes the desirability and necessity of peaceful coexistence. It is impossible to predict how many years this process of evolution will take, but that it will occur is beyond question. Certain elements in this country view Communist China with an emotionalistic aversion better suited to the days of the "yellow horde" thesis, and many sincere Americans feel that China under Communist domination can never gain (or deserve) acceptance into the community of nations. Of course, similar doubts were voiced thirty years ago with respect to the Soviet Union, but it is central to the philosophy of conservatism that it does not profit from experience. The arrival of Communist China at the threshold of responsibility (an event which can only be further delayed by continuance of the present United States policy toward the People's Republic of China) may occur in ten, twenty, or perhaps even thirty years. Only when this point is reached will the neutralization of the Indo-Chinese states be an acceptable and fruitful alternative, because only then will "neutralization" mean anything other than the surrender of Western-oriented forces. The aim of American policy in South Vietnam must be to stave off defeat for that considerable period of time; in other words, we must maintain a negotiating position until such time as Communist China is prepared to sit down and calmly discuss the security of Southeast Asia. If the forces enjoying our support are decisively defeated in the meantime, all will have gone for naught. (Military defeat in South Vietnam is one of two equally distasteful alternatives, the other being extension of the war into North Vietnam and--ultimately--conflict with Communist Chinese forces, as in Korea. Extension of the war should be considered only as a last-ditch alternative to surrender, and then only if the state of international relations indicates that the chance of such a war escalating into a nuclear conflict with the U.S.S.R. is negligible. Broadening the war short of this type of conflict might in any case be no more than a temporary barricade against humiliating withdrawal, since it is by no means certain that the United States could achieve a clear victory in an Asian land-war.)

To maintain a negotiating position until such time as negotiations appear likely to be fruitful means that further deterioration of the situation in South Vietnam and Laos must be avoided, an aim which may be furthered only in small part by increasing the military assistance to our allies in those countries. It cannot be stressed too heavily that the problem is not essentially a military one; if it were, the American-equipped South Vietnamese Army would have destroyed the numerically-inferior Viet Cong activists long ago. But the problem is basically one of human beings--specifically, the peasants of South Vietnam, who have not adequately supported the central government. Merely to maintain the status quo (which is the best that can be hoped for in the near future), it will be necessary for the present government of South Vietnam and its leader, General Nguyen Khanh, to gain the confidence and active support of a vast majority of the Vietnamese people. This is a task which, if it can be accomplished at all at this late date, will entail a great deal of effort. The government in Saigon must above all display concern for the well-being of the populace, especially the peasantry in far-flung areas of the country; some villagers in the less accessible regions of South Vietnam have no contact whatever with representatives of the central government for months or even years. Second, the government must endeavor to dramatically improve the lot of the country's predominantly rural population, by providing medical attention, education, training in modern techniques of agriculture, food where shortages exist, and other services which peoples in more advanced countries have come to take for granted. And third, the central government must undertake to protect those who do give it their allegiance, for the Viet Cong ruthlessly exterminate government supporters wherever they manage to gain control. Possibly there are also military measures (such as increasing the number of aircraft in use against Viet Cong strongholds) which could be adopted to retard the discouraging process by which the Communist guerillas are improving their position in South Vietnam, but the principal battleground of this war will continue to be the minds of the populace.

If the anti-Communist forces of South Vietnam are to succeed in gaining the confidence and support of the people, this must be accomplished, I should say, within two or three years--after which time, if the present trends continue to develop, the situation will be altogether hopeless. Perhaps even less time is available. And perhaps such an effort, even if it is undertaken on an immense scale, is foredoomed to failure by the antipathy toward the Saigon government which was generated during the period of Ngo Dinh Diem's rule. Even if General Khanh successfully carries out such a program, however, this will not miraculously terminate the conflict. It will increase the burden on the external enemies of South Vietnam's legitimate government, and ease somewhat the task of the South Vietnamese in containing the guerillas. But the guerilla effort will not collapse (as it did in Malaya), because the Communist North Vietnamese and the Chinese will not be influenced by any shift in the sympathies of the South Vietnamese people. There is no reason to assume that the expenditure of men and materiel necessary to continue the civil war is anything more than an annoyance to Hanoi and Peking, and their efforts could be maintained indefinitely. But the chances of victory for these Communist forces would be drastically reduced should the South Vietnamese government succeed in transforming itself into a popular regime, and unless North Vietnam or China decided to extend the war by an outright invasion of the southern sector (a rash step, indeed, but one which cannot be entirely disregarded), both sides would at least tacitly accept the stalemated status quo and settle down to several decades of locally violent but indecisive conflict.

This is the most attractive alternative, as I say, from the view-

point of the United States, and would retain for us a bargaining position for the time when Communist China ceases fulminating and becomes a responsible member of the world community. It will be an expensive course of action, but ultimately far less costly than any of the alternative courses of action which have been suggested. It may save Southeast Asia, if that area is still capable of being saved. But only time will tell...

THE MARYLAND PRIMARY: The day following any election is given over to jubilant celebration by the victors and agonizing self-criticism by the vanquished. It is usually also the day on which those with pretensions to political punditry analyze the official returns, either lauding their own perceptive judgement (if they have correctly predicted the outcome) or formulating complex alibis (if they misinterpreted the omens). My already dubious reputation as a prophet was very neatly demolished during the New Hampshire primary earlier this year, but an examination of the Maryland results, which I anticipated with even less finesse, would seem to be in order.

As most Kipple readers are undoubtedly aware, Alabama Governor George C. Wallace, running against a favorite son candidate hand-picked by the incumbent Democratic organization, polled an impressive 42% of the total vote in Maryland's May 19th primary election, thereby precisely doubling the figure I had predicted as the maximum percentage of the vote likely to be accumulated by the segregationist. The reader may be astonished at my audacity in maintaining, despite this considerable miscalculation, that the assumptions on which this prediction was based were fundamentally sound. In originally discussing with Bill Plott the possibility that Governor Wallace might enter the Maryland Democratic primary (see Kipple #46, September 20, 1963), I observed that this state displays political characteristics which have become identified with states dominated by a single populous metropolitan area. In specific regard to Governor Wallace's chances of achieving a victory, I admitted that the segregationist spokesman would probably amass a considerable number of votes in the outlying counties; but I further commented that this margin would be swamped by the predominantly "liberal" districts which comprise the Baltimore metropolitan area. Had the issue in this election remained uncomplicated by extraneous considerations, I am convinced that the result would have conformed rather closely to this pattern. However, the campaign was not based on a clear-cut choice between integration and segregation, and though Baltimore City predictably provided Wallace's opponent, Senator Daniel Brewster, with a margin of approximately 43,000 votes, the two counties which adjoin this unexceptional industrial city and constitute the remainder of the metropolitan area conspicuously shirked their responsibility to sanity: Governor Wallace was supported in Anne Arundel County, lying to the south, by a margin of nearly two-to-one, and Senator Brewster managed to salvage Baltimore County, bordering the city on the north, by a pathetic margin of 106 votes (with approximately 93,000 ballots being cast). At the same time, Governor Wallace carried fifteen of the remaining twenty-one counties, although Senator Brewster, winning heavily in the suburbs of the District of Columbia (Montgomery County and Prince Georges County) edged the Alabamian outside of Baltimore City by approximately 9,000 votes. The final results, as reported by the Baltimore Sun (May 20th), were therefore rather appalling:

Brewster.....	265,713
Wallace.....	214,123
Easter (Andrew J.).....	8,513
Uninstructed Delegation.....	12,427

One should not conclude merely from the unfortunately large percentage of the total vote received by Governor Wallace that nearly 43% of Maryland's voters are bigots. There were several significant contributing factors which may help to explain the comparatively massive support which Wallace received in this border state. One of these contributing factors was undoubtedly the present unpopularity of Maryland's Governor, J. Millard Tawes, and his uninspiring administration. As one news commentator pointed out, Governor Wallace was extremely clever in choosing primary elections in which to test the appeal of his sordid philosophy. In Wisconsin and Indiana, recently increased taxes caused a reaction against the incumbent administrations and thus inspired protest votes against the personalities chosen as "favorite son" candidates, and precisely the same advantage operated in Wallace's favor in Maryland. The usually torpid Millard Tawes had recently compelled the legislature to adopt an unnecessary increase in the state income tax, and opposition to this measure was both widespread and vigorous. Some of the resentment generated by this politically explosive imposition undoubtedly focused on Senator Brewster, a loyal servant of the Tawes machine. Brewster himself invited this sort of guilt-by-association by jointly campaigning with Louis L. Goldstein, the incumbent Comptroller and the machine candidate for the United States Senate. Their campaign slogan, "Pave the Way for LBJ--vote for Daniel Brewster and Louis L. Goldstein", was familiar throughout the campaign, even though Goldstein's attempt to achieve election to the Senate had nothing whatever to do with the Brewster-Wallace struggle. Presumably, Comptroller Goldstein realized that he was highly vulnerable and attempted to increase his support by standing, as it were, in Brewster's shadow, but this device had--to an extent--the opposite effect. The Tawes machine had experienced no previous difficulty in securing the election of its various puppets, and it is illustrative of the unpopularity of that administration that Mr. Goldstein was soundly trounced by an independent Democrat, Joseph Tydings. Mr. Tydings' impressive victory startled even his most optimistic supporters:

Tydings.....	277,511
Goldstein.....	152,785
Harbaugh.....	22,460
Amaimo.....	15,756

The Governor of Alabama was greatly assisted, in addition, by the manner in which his opponents conducted their campaign. At first, as Morning Sun political columnist Brad Jacobs remarked, Wallace was not treated as a serious threat; he was contemptuously dismissed by the leaders of the Democratic Party in Maryland as some sort of irritating insect which could be stepped on at the convenience of Senator Brewster and his supporters. When the party leadership belatedly realized that some serious campaigning might actually be necessary in order to defeat Governor Wallace by a comfortable margin, Brewster campaigned in an unbelievably clumsy manner. It might actually have been better had Senator Brewster followed the political formula of Henry Cabot Lodge and not campaigned at all.

The principles for which Wallace stands should have been perfectly clear even to the least sophisticated resident of Maryland, but there is a long-standing and highly astute political axiom to the effect that the memories of voters are phenomenally short. Governor Wallace did not campaign as a racist or a segregationist, but rather as an advocate of state's rights; he repeatedly attacked the civil rights bill, but studiously refrained from making any statement which could be construed as an attack upon a specific minority group; he was almost stereotypically

courteous, the very epitome of the southern gentleman, and stressed throughout the campaign the fact that he had not referred unkindly to any Maryland political figure; he spoke of the "great state of Maryland" as if he were running for governor, and carefully acknowledged the right of a state to enact civil rights legislation (as Maryland has done). In response to this surprisingly dignified campaign, Senator Brewster, generally urbane and witty, seemed to lose his poise as well as his political acumen. His attempts to counteract the support which Wallace's new image was obviously gaining for him constituted nothing more than name-calling; his only apparent defense against Wallace's almost theatrical courtesy was rudeness. Thus, the conduct of the respective campaigns presented a most remarkable and discouraging contrast: Brewster, who stood for moderation and decency, conducted himself like a saloon brawler, while Wallace, representing one of the great evils of this nation, appeared by comparison the epitome of courtesy and gentleness. This contrast obviously had an effect on the outcome of the election. Had the Democrats of this state managed to put forward a more intelligent and resourceful candidate--one, that is, who could have lifted Governor Wallace's veil of respectability and exposed the ridiculous bigot underneath--analyzing these returns would be a much more pleasant task.

Of course, the Presidential Preference poll could have been an even greater disaster; in the closing days of the campaign, a number of Marylanders entertained serious fears that Governor Wallace might actually win the primary. (Mrs. Gloria Richardson, the Joan of Arc of Cambridge, translated her extraordinarily low opinion of Maryland's white majority into the prediction that Wallace would receive 65% of the total vote.) And other races, at least, had happier outcomes. The decisive defeat of Louis L. Goldstein by Joseph Tydings, who is now in excellent position to unseat the incumbent Republican, Senator J. Glenn Beall, represents a long-awaited flowering of excellence amid the professional mediocrity of Maryland politics. Affable but incompetent, Goldstein, had he been elected to the Senate, would have devoted himself almost exclusively to advocating various domestic policies which promised a quick dividend in consolidating his popularity in his home state. Mr. Tydings is a young liberal who will carry to the Senate an intelligence and scope of vision the equal of which Maryland has not contributed to that legislative body in many years. There was also balm for liberals, bitter over the Wallace coup, in the results of the Republican primary. In the Republican Presidential Preference race, Maryland's small but vocal Republican minority voted to send an uninstructed delegation to San Francisco, rejecting John Steffey, a Goldwater partisan. And Rep. Charles Mathias handily defeated the last faint hope of the lunatic fringe in this election, L. Brent Bozell.

So all things considered, the primary was not a total loss; but as Eric Sevareid observed, this has been a bad year for political pundits.

THE SILENCE OF GOOD MEN: After an initial burst of indignation and condemnation, the loose-knit organization of science fiction devotees appears to have more or less accepted the foul treatment accorded Walter Breen and Marion Bradley by the Pacificon Committee. Walt's arbitrary exclusion from the forthcoming convention is, along with the subsequent calculated attacks against his character and that of his fiancée, apparently now accepted as a fait accompli--deplorable, to be sure, but not really worth prolonged discussion or concrete action. In Kipple #59, Harry Warner decried "endless diatribes" on the subject, and in the letter column of this issue, John Boston remarks that he is "going to studiously ignore the Breen affair, and urge any-

quote, Boggs, Bok, Bowdler, Bowles, Bradley, Bzontz

one else who is not personally committed to one faction or another to do likewise." John's statement, in particular, causes me to realize at long last precisely why certain Americans are so infuriated by the Indian policy of "nonalignment".

In dealing with a fundamental moral issue, neutrality is invariably a self-deceptive illusion. As I pointed out when commenting on "Der Stellvertreter" in Kipple #57, one may be responsible for an evil not only if one has actually committed it but also if, through inaction, one has tacitly accepted its existence. One may claim to be adhering to a policy of neutrality if, after a lynching has occurred, one fails to condemn it, but this is a self-deluding semantic shield, a convenient method of obscuring an insufficient commitment to principle. The silent bystander is never neutral; he is, at best, a reluctant accomplice to the perpetrator of the evil.

The action taken against Walt Breen and Marion Bradley raises a fundamental moral issue: viz., does society or any segment thereof possess the right to exclude from intercourse and take what are, in effect, punitive measures against an "undesirable" individual, except as prescribed by just laws? This is what is at issue when a Communist is denied the civil liberties enjoyed by the majority because of his political heterodoxy, when a Negro is refused service in a restaurant, when an atheist is refused a job for which he is qualified, when an ex-convict is ostracized upon moving into a "respectable" neighborhood, when a woman is condemned for pregnancy out of wedlock, when a man is fired from his job because he has grown a beard, ad infinitum; essentially the same issue is encountered in assessing the actions of the Pacificon Committee vis-à-vis Walt Breen and Marion Bradley. In every case, it is, upon reflection, impossible to objectively justify the action of the majority. Any society must obviously have laws to protect its members against certain particularly harmful types of individuals. In specific cases, the law may go too far; more rarely, it may not go sufficiently far toward dealing with "undesirables". But it is in any case clear that where the law adequately protects the majority (as, e.g., where the offense of child molestation is involved--a criminal activity dealt with quite severely by most states), self-appointed inquisitors have neither the right nor the authority to impose extra-legal sanctions.

Perhaps those readers of Kipple who prefer to remain silent do not sufficiently realize what is at stake in this controversy. I shall address myself now exclusively to the "liberals" among the recipients of this periodical. For years we have been condemning the abuses of individual liberty which occur in society as a whole with appalling frequency; most of us have taken part in civil rights demonstrations or, failing that, at least contribute to civil rights and civil liberties movements and attempt to convince others of the basic justice of these causes. But suddenly it becomes apparent that within science fiction fandom, of which we are all nominally members, similar abuses are occurring. A suspected deviate is ostracized and reported to the local police authorities, the woman he loves is vilified merely because of her association with him, and these pernicious deeds are perpetrated--most infuriating of all--by individuals who superciliously boast of their "liberalism"! Can there be anyone who believes that he can remain neutral in the ensuing controversy and do anything thereby other than aid and abet the scoundrels?

The Breen affair represents, in miniature, the worst aspects of the majoritarian tyranny of present-day society. And those of us who are opposed to such oppression of the individual now have the opportunity to prove that our "liberalism" is something more than clever words on a piece of paper. Perhaps a disinclination to sacrifice much for the sake of a principle is forgiveable in society today, where the abuses

are so frequent and the voices of protestors so pitifully few. But in the fraternity of science fiction fans, where five voices represent a significant minority, fifty a veritable legion, one hundred an irresistible juggernaut of public opinion--how, under those circumstances, does one justify a refusal to become involved? What excuses an inclination to "studiously ignore" the bush league despotism of the Pacificon Committee, when a minimum of sacrifice can produce a maximum effect in righting an obvious and indefensible injury to a fellow human being? What pardons the silence of good men in the face of evil?

ONE NATION, UNDER GOD: Baltimore's renowned atheist, Mrs. Madalyn Murray, recently initiated the second phase of her continuing campaign against religious influences in the public schools by demanding that the phrase "under God" be stricken from the pledge of allegiance to the flag. Similar attempts to banish irrelevant piety from tax-supported institutions of learning are underway in other cities, but Mrs. Murray's action, because it is merely the most recent tactical maneuver in an unrelenting offensive (one might almost call it a holy war) against organized religion, attracted an inordinate degree of attention. Whatever one's personal opinion of Madalyn Murray (and her personality is such as to make her remarkably easy to dislike), it cannot be denied that once again reason and justice firmly support her position; and since she has nimbly appropriated those qualities and enlisted them in her cause, the sanctimonious opponents of secular education must rely for their defense upon emotion and injustice. Their position is weakened still further by the fact that Madalyn Murray's most vehement opponents fail to observe even the pretense of considering the issue on its merits. Since the Supreme Court decided that religious observances and Bible-reading ceremonies in public schools were unconstitutional, opposition to Madalyn Murray has become, for a certain segment of the population, a religious obligation and a patriotic duty. It is no longer important to her hard-core detractors what, specifically, the atheist supports or denounces; what is important is that they zealously oppose her. If Mrs. Murray announced that she favored eating breakfast, 50,000 Maryland Christians would immediately condemn the morning meal as a communistic institution.

In an effort to discover the feelings of the man-in-the-street with regard to the (no doubt) critical issue of once again rewriting the pledge of allegiance, the Baltimore News American (formerly the News-Post) dispatched its inquiring reporter to a suburban shopping center, the modern equivalent to the Athenian marketplace. This industrious journalist interviewed half-a-dozen casual passersby, a remarkable contingent of fatuous claghorns the like of which has not been assembled in many years, even in this notably intelligence-free city. To the question, "Should the words 'under God' be taken out of the Pledge of Allegiance in Baltimore schools?" six typical residents of Baltimore replied:

"That's foolishness. It has been like this for years and years. I see no reason to change now because one person is in favor of such an act. The majority should not be forced into doing what one person may favor."

"Never. It is our way of life to include God in all our actions. It is for this reason that I wouldn't approve of taking these words out of the Pledge--especially for the school children. We should never let a few dictate to the majority."

"Everybody should have a faith. We must believe in someone that is far superior to ourselves. Without this the world would be lost. I'd say we are on the way to this theory when you talk about taking God out of the minds of school children."

"Well, I guess I feel the same as everyone else. If you take God out of the country, you just don't have a country. The idea of taking the words 'under God' from the Pledge of Allegiance is shameful."

"No. It is my opinion that God is just as important a part of the school childrens' life as their education. They go hand in hand in our schools and I'd never approve of taking either away. Good Americans believe in God--why discourage it?"

"The whole idea is really pretty bad. First they restrict the children from praying in school and now this. They shouldn't take the last thing that school kids have left. The words 'under God' should remain in the Pledge of Allegiance."

No indeed, we should never let a few dictate to the majority; after all, good Americans believe in God--why discourage it?

A WORD OF EXPLANATION: In "Dissenting Opinions", L. Sprague de Camp, in a letter reprinted from Warhoon #19, outlines several fundamental objections to the hallowed "free enterprise" system. These remarks serve as an introduction to the letter from George Price which immediately follows them. The Price letter was sent directly to Sprague de Camp, and a copy forwarded to Dick Bergeron for possible publication in Warhoon. Dick's new format, however, apparently precludes the publication of extremely lengthy letters, so an attempt is being made to uproot the entire controversy and transplant it into Kipple. Watch this space, gang; I may get three of Warhoon's columns next issue.

--Ted Pauls

"To the extent that abolishing the differences in the approved personalities of men and women means abolishing any expression of the type of personality once called exclusively feminine, or once called exclusively masculine, such a course involves a social loss. Just as a festive occasion is the gayer and more charming if the two sexes are dressed differently, so it is in less material matters. If the clothing is in itself a symbol, and a woman's shawl corresponds to a recognized softness in her character, the whole plot of personal relations is made more elaborate, and in many ways more rewarding. The poet of such a society will praise virtues, albeit feminine virtues, which might never have any part in a social Utopia that allowed no differences between the personalities of men and women." --Margaret Mead, in "Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies".

"The Americans feel that Cuba has fallen into extremely dangerous hands--those of the people who live there." --David Frost, on TW3

"Better to remain silent and be thought a fool than to speak out and remove all doubt." --Abraham Lincoln.

duced to the status of animals.

Smith has also earned a new award--the Boston Trophy for the Standing Broad Jump to Conclusions. I said nothing about limiting his or anyone else's freedom of speech; I merely remarked that I did not find his racial theories to be particularly pleasant. And, of course, I am neither a Communist nor a Nazi.

I see that our difference lies--or lay, since you have effectively proved your point--in my ignorance of the biology of pre-natal development. I still maintain, however, that a human personality is not indispensable because it is unique. There are just too many possible combinations of the factors which make up a personality for any one to be indispensable. Or is this what you are dismissing as having been projected just for the sake of argument? (Theoretically, I suppose, any biologically irreplaceable individual is indispensable. However, as you point out, there are practical limitations on the extent to which this theoretical indispensability can be respected. The continued survival of mankind is the over-riding consideration in the population-control controversy.)

"You might regard Mother Nature in general as your enemy, and envisage human life as a struggle to get the better of Mother Nature. If men viewed life in this way, cooperation of the whole human race would become easy. And men could easily be brought to view life in this way if schools, newspapers, and politicians devoted themselves to this end. But schools are out to teach patriotism; newspapers are out to stir up excitement; and politicians are out to get re-elected. None of the three, therefore, can do anything toward saving the human race from reciprocal suicide." --Bertrand Russell, in "Human Society in Ethics and Politics".

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

George Price's arguments in favor of an unfettered capitalism (and let's not use question-begging terms like "free-enterprise system" or "free market economic system") are beguiling. But, before we hand him the marbles, let's ask him what he would do to cure certain faults of capitalism. And let's not fall for claims that these faults are temporary and adventitious; that they are all the fault of the First World War or of governmental interference or something. There have always been wars, so an economic system had better be constructed on the theory that war from time to time is a normal state if it is to be any good. And these faults obtained through the nineteenth century, when the governments of leading industrial nations in general gave their capitalists almost complete freedom from regulation. The faults are:

(1) Inequality of opportunity. Despite the great rise in working-class living standards in the last quarter-century, the child of upper-class parents still has a far better chance of getting through college than one of working-class parents, given absolute equality of ability.

(2) Temporal instability; that is, boom-or-bust. Apologists for capitalism take the line that the boom is "normal" but the subsequent bust is "abnormal" and can therefore be cured by some gimmick. Keynes thought governments ought to save in boom times and spend beyond their incomes in bad; a neat theory that ignores the political reality: that political pressures always make it impossible for governments to save in

boom times, so the spending program is strictly a one-way street. As far as the evidence of the last two centuries goes, alternations of booms and depressions are as natural as the alternation of birth and death. When we can cure death, maybe we shall also be able to cure depressions.

(3) Chronic unemployment. This, too, seems to be "normal" even in "normal" times; "full employment", as in the Second World War, is decidedly unusual. I'm not talking about frictional unemployment or the hard core of unemployables, either, but about a situation like the present and comparatively prosperous 1960s. If the Communists are wrong in prophesying that unemployment will increase indefinitely, the pro-Capitalists seem likewise wrong in assuming that it will automatically go away. In part, chronic unemployment seems an inevitable consequence of technological progress; but without the technological progress we should still be living as the Sumerians did. So what to do?

These questions are not asked in any hostile spirit; after all, I can't complain much about the treatment that capitalism has accorded me personally. For that matter, I should like not only Price's formula for curing these faults without governmental action, but also those of some of his Liberal opponents on how to cure them with governmental action. All the methods proposed so far, when analyzed, basically come down to a progressive depreciation of the currency by ever-expanding debt; in other words, infinite inflation. This has been resorted to by many governments, ever since paper money came into existence in China under the Sung Dynasty, as a means of coping with desperate situations, and the cure has usually turned out to be worse than the disease.

And while he's about it, suppose George tells us what he proposes to do with all the millions of strong backs and weak minds who will be made unemployable by the ever-increasing mechanization and automation of industry?

"Socrates, like Thucydides, was 'in love with' Athens. Like him he was thoroughly well acquainted with the 'new learning'. He too had seen and known Athens at her greatest and at her lowest. He too was concerned with the moral problem of the time. It was a problem which bears some resemblance to that of our own days. The optimism, the belief in 'progress', the faith in the value of a 'scientific' approach to life seemed somehow to have let down the believers. The tremendous achievements of the intellect, the triumph of democracy, the wide spreading of education had not, as it appeared, made men better; indeed it could be claimed that they had made men worse. Socrates, unlike some of our modern prophets, concluded that what was required was not less but more education, not a retreat from the intellect but a more thorough and, in a sense, impassioned use of it." --Rex Warner, in "The Greek Philosophers".

GEORGE W. PRICE :: 873 CORNELIA AVE. :: CHICAGO 57, ILLINOIS

Sprague asks what I would do to cure "certain faults of capitalism", namely (1) inequality of opportunity--"the child of upper-class still has a far better chance of getting through college than one of working-class parents, given absolute equality of ability", (2) temporal instability, i.e., the boom-and-bust cycle, and (3) chronic unemployment, even in "normal times". And he also asks what I propose "to do with all the millions of strong backs and weak minds who will be made unemployable by the ever-increasing mechanization and automation of industry?"

First, Sprague, we need to settle a point of semantics. I am puzzled that you should think "free market economic system" to be a ques-

tion-begging term. I use the term because it has a precise meaning in economics, unlike "capitalism", which has become encrusted with emotion. Had I spoken kindly of "capitalism", too many readers would have assumed that I was offering a blanket defense of everything about our society, whereas I was trying only to defend market freedom as a means of coordinating economic activity.

My aim was to suggest that our economic ills can best be alleviated by extending market freedom rather than by contracting it. The United States is far from having a really free market, although we remain closer to it than any other nation. Of course, I am aware that the perfectly free market is an ideal to be sought and approached, but only in the certainty that, the human condition being what it is, the ideal will never be fully achieved.

I define the theoretical free market as an economy in which exchange of goods and services proceeds without coercion, so that all decisions represent the free will of the individuals concerned. The role of the government, so far as concerns the economy, is to see that the market remains free. Thus, the breaking-up of monopolies--which usually exist only through coercion--is a necessary and legitimate government function, while wage and price controls are not.

I contend--without attempting to prove it here--that such an economy is, other things being equal, the most efficient possible in giving people what they want, and in ameliorating and eliminating poverty (LBJ take notice). To be sure, the free market has the defect of its virtue: giving people what they want may not always be wise.

The competing economic systems--principally socialism and communism--also undertake to give people what they want and to raise the level of the poor, but by coercive means. The relative failure of those systems may be explained by the inherent inefficiency of systems operating by coercion rather than cooperation. I observe that the one area in which the Soviet Union comes close to matching the West--science--is also the one area in which there is extensive freedom. In the economic competition with the Soviets, our greatest allies are the Marxist ideologues.

Now let's get on to the specific points you raised.

(1) A market economy assuredly produces inequality in the sense that it allows the more competent and energetic to surpass those of lesser ability. For this I have no apology; it is a very large point in favor of the market economy. What we wish to learn is whether a market economy is necessarily so structured that children of low income parents are restricted in their opportunities. I say that, other things being equal, they are not.

The trouble is that other things usually are not equal. For an obvious example, consider the problem of Negro poverty. The mass of Negroes are not denied opportunity because they are poor; rather they are poor because they have been denied opportunity. They have not been held down by the operation of the market; rather they have been excluded from the market. The imperatives of the market have been overridden by the imperatives of prejudice. The ethic of the market--production for profit--implies that employers should hire those workers, of whatever color, who can help make them the greatest profit; the opposing ethic of racism requires that employers should accept a lower profit rather than hire Negroes.

As you suggest, "the child of upper-class parents still has a far better chance of getting through college than one of working-class parents, given absolute equality of ability." But if you mean that lack of money is the major barrier, I must disagree. Consider myself as a handy example. My college education cost my parents nothing; I earned my tuition and board by working part-time and summers. True, I went to a state

university, so the taxpayers paid a good part of it. Otherwise, I would have had to work full-time a year or two after high school, before entering college. My family was quite poor, but my parents had great respect for learning, took it for granted that I would go to college, and that money should be saved for that purpose. (What they saved was not used, since I supported myself in school; their savings will cushion their old age.) They believed in all those old-fashioned puritan virtues of frugality and thrift and sobriety. I need not describe the opposite kind of family, in which beer today is far more important than education for the children ten years from now. I suggest that most lower-class children don't get through college, not for lack of money, but because their home life has left them unprepared or unmotivated, or both. I have a strong suspicion that very often the characteristic lower-class attributes--lack of thought for the future, instant gratification of appetites, and contempt for intellect--are not the result of poverty, but the cause of it.

It is worth remembering that education is already heavily socialized, so its faults cannot be blamed entirely on capitalism. What would a really free-market education be like? Perhaps all schools would be private, and students too poor to pay would borrow from banks, to be repaid from future earnings. This is already done to a small extent, and I see no reason why it could not become universal.

To sum up, most of the inequality of opportunity in our society is not a result of the market economy, but rather reflects the extent to which the market is hampered by such non-economic factors as racial prejudice and anti-intellectual home environment. (Your "strong suspicion that very often the characteristic lower-class attributes--lack of thought for the future, instant gratification of appetites, and contempt for intellect--are not the result of poverty, but the cause of it" is a rather more articulate but only slightly more generous restatement of Senator Goldwater's offhand observation that lower-class individuals are generally poor because they are lazy. But it still begs the question, which is: how did the poor come to possess these attributes? Unless you accept the belief popular among would-be aristocrats and modern-day fascists that these traits are hereditary (with all that implies), then you must place the responsibility for this state of affairs, at some point in history, with the environment of the lower-class citizens and thus with the economic system. Of course, even admitting a certain prevalence of anti-intellectualism and a scarcity of foresight among the lower classes, your assertion that, "other things being equal," the "children of low income parents are (not) restricted in their opportunities" is absurd. If the free market economy produced inequality merely in the sense that "the more competent and energetic" were allowed to surpass those of lesser ability, it would be from that viewpoint an eminently desirable social structure. This is not the case. The inequality of opportunity to which Sprague referred is such a widespread and blatant aspect of "unfettered" capitalism that I am frankly amazed that even the most ardent proponent of laissez faire could completely dismiss it as non-existent. Surely you can't believe that, during the heyday of unrestrained capitalism, the son of a mill-owner and the son of his janitor, given equal ability and ambition, had precisely equal opportunity? Even today, under a central government which endeavors to ensure equal opportunity for all citizens, the very structure of our society tends to promote inequality of opportunity. I am pleased to know that you were fortunate enough to acquire a college education in spite of your humble background, but your case is hardly typical. Inequality of opportunity is a central fact of life for most children born of lower-class parents. Examine, if you will, the educational prospects of a child born and reared in an urban slum area or a rural "poverty pocket".

As a rule, the schools he attends from kindergarten through high school will be sub-standard in every particular, from the buildings in which classes are held (especially in metropolitan areas, construction of new school facilities is confined largely or wholly to middle-class suburban areas) to the textbooks and laboratory facilities available. Moreover, the level of competence of his instructors is likely to be well below that of teachers in other districts (in most school systems, instructors are allowed a certain degree of choice as to where they shall teach, with the result that slum schools are staffed chiefly by the least experienced and least competent teachers). All of this is largely attributable to the fact that community interest in improving school facilities is greater in upper-class areas; unlike her moderately well-to-do counterpart, the lower-class mother does not ordinarily attend PTA and school board meetings to demand higher standards in Johnny's school. This is not because she is anti-intellectual; more likely, it is because she slings hash from eight o'clock at night until three o'clock in the morning, then arises at seven o'clock to prepare breakfast for her unemployed husband and six children. Even assuming that a child from such a background manages to graduate from high school, the prospect of his entering and completing college remains gloomy. Many youngsters in such circumstances are simply unable to afford it; others, who might be able to support themselves (as you did) while in college, find it impossible to escape family obligations (i.e., they are forced to get a job digging ditches for Uncle Angelo's construction company in order to contribute to the support of their brothers and sisters). It is probably true that a certain fraction, comprising the very intelligent and very ambitious, will somehow manage to surmount these formidable obstacles and complete their formal education. But the fact remains that society subjects the entire lower class to a vicious process of elimination (or natural selection, if you wish) that a child on the opposite end of the financial spectrum needn't experience. The child of fairly wealthy parents will have no difficulty remaining in school if he possesses even a modicum of intelligence. He will probably attend a private school, but even if he is sent to a public school, it will be one of the new suburban schools, providing the best available instruction, newest textbooks, most modern lab facilities, and so on. And college will be no serious problem for him. Neither extremely high intelligence nor great ambition will be demanded of him; all that is necessary is that he manage a passing grade on examinations. You would probably be amazed how little actual intelligence and ambition is required to remain in college, if your father owns a few square miles of Manhattan Island. Or maybe you wouldn't be amazed; I can't quite believe that you are as naive about the free enterprise system as these remarks on equality of opportunity would at first glance indicate.))

(2) I flatly deny that the boom-and-bust cycle is an inherent part of a market economy. You say that "Apologists for capitalism take the line that the boom is 'normal', but the subsequent bus is 'abnormal' and can therefore be cured by some gimmick." Centurion, kindly take that cross off my shoulders; I say the boom is abnormal too.

You observe that through the centuries the usual government cure-all for economic troubles has been "progressive depreciation of the currency by ever-expanding debt; in other words, infinite inflation." Precisely so. And it is this same cure-all, practiced in comparative moderation, which produces the boom-and-bust cycle.

Let's follow the cycle for one painful turn. We usually start with various pressure groups demanding "easy money", or promulgating schemes for making us all rich by "increasing purchasing power", etc., which all boils down to the government increasing the money supply by deficit financing. (In the more backward countries, they just turn on

the printing presses. We are more subtle: we have constructed the complicated Federal Reserve structure to promote monetization of the debt.) Our latest venture into inflation is the recent tax cut, not matched by a cut in government spending. I won't go into details about how government debt is transformed into an increase in the supply of money; consult a text on the operation of the Federal Reserve.

The obvious effect of the inflationary process is a general rise in prices and wages, as the value of money is diluted. As is often pointed out, this works hardship on pensioners and others on fixed incomes. But this is the least of the mischief. The long-term effect of inflation is to distort the operation of the price system, causing mal-investment. That is, the injection of new money causes investment opportunities to appear better than they actually are. The general effect is a shift from consumer goods to capital goods. To quote the New Republic (Feb. 15, 1964, p. 3), enlarging on the beneficence of the tax cut: "As consumer spending rises [due to the tax cut], business firms feel encouraged to produce more goods. In order to do this they install more machinery or enlarge their operations in other ways. If consumer demand gets strong enough, business activity approaches a 'flash point' at which a kind of investment explosion occurs." A most accurate description. The difficulty is that the increase in demand is unreal, because the consumers do not actually have more purchasing power, but only a greater number of cheaper dollars. This is obvious when we consider that since the government has not decreased its spending, it must be taking as great a fraction of the national product as before, and therefore private consumers can have no greater share.

When the inflation stops, or even slows, the mal-investments become apparent and the superfluous capital structure must be liquidated before the economy can return to producing what the consumers really want. The process of liquidation is the recession or depression, and it is necessary to restore the economic balance.

As soon as the recession begins, the government is subjected to almost irresistible pressure to "do something!" And what it usually does is to begin a new cycle of inflation, making the next boom and bust inevitable. This is the supreme irony of economics: that the principle cause of recession is the very measure taken to prevent recession.

Once we are in a recession, it will be prolonged in a measure as our customs and institutions hinder the necessary readjustments, which may be quite painful. An obvious example is wages. It is apparent that wages should fall in those industries which over-expanded in response to that unreal increase in demand, in order to encourage workers to leave those industries and go into others producing what is really wanted. If those particular wages are prevented from falling--by union pressure, minimum wage laws, or the kindness of the employer--the recession is to that extent prolonged. I remember reading a proud boast by a labor leader that during the Great Depression his union had successfully maintained wages at very near the pre-depression level, despite widespread unemployment of the membership. It never occurred to him that maintenance of unrealistically high wage rates may well have been the major cause of that widespread unemployment. When the price of a commodity is too high, some part of it goes unsold, and that applies to labor as well as any other commodity.

To sum up, indulging in an inflationary boom and then trying to prevent the recession is like swallowing poison and then preventing vomiting.

(3) I know of no reason to suppose that chronic unemployment is an inherent part of the market economy. In a theoretical free market, chronic unemployment could not exist, because the competition of unemployed workers would drive down wages until everyone who wanted to work

could find a job, though perhaps at a low wage. It is obvious that in our present system this does not happen. Why not? I say, because our institutions are so organized that wages cannot fall to the necessary extent (note: I am talking about lowering particular wage rates, not necessarily lowering wages in general). When we raise the minimum wage to \$1.25/hour, then everyone whose productivity is less than \$1.25/hour must necessarily become unemployed. Unemployment compensation also sets a floor; few people are either high principled enough or stupid enough to work for \$40 a week if they can get \$35 on compensation. The same applies to public relief or any other form of dole. I do not say that all these institutions should be abolished. There may be good social reasons for keeping them. I do say that if our ideas of social justice preclude letting people work for less than a certain amount, then all those whose productivity is below that amount will have to be unemployed. (I am by no means completely convinced that, "in a theoretical free market...the competition of unemployed workers would drive down wages until everyone who wanted to work could find a job" (how does reducing wages create new jobs?), but the remedy is, in any case, worse than the malady. The supply of labor is increasing faster than the demand, due largely to automation (which allows fewer workers to produce more goods than ever before). As the population continues to increase and technology becomes more efficient, this situation will intensify: an increase in population means an increase in both supply of labor and demand for labor (to produce goods for the additional people), but automation prevents the added demand from being great enough to absorb the additional supply. Thus, if your theoretical free market abolished unemployment by continually absorbing the "surplus" labor, this would entail not a single readjustment of wages but a progressive decline of wage rates. Obviously, there is a limit beyond which wages cannot decline and still provide sustenance, especially since prices are not likely to decline accordingly. (They should, in a theoretical free market, because of heated competition between manufacturers, but in industries where a few large corporations control the market, this would not be expected to occur. Capitalists have a nasty habit of fixing prices rather than competing and thus driving down prices--a practice which, like the inequality of opportunity of the poor, doubtless does not exist in your dream world.) When the glutted market caused by the inability of much of the labor force to purchase goods resulted in a decrease in productivity by the manufacturers, workers would become unemployed in wholesale lots; your free market economy, still striving valiantly to maintain full employment, would absorb this additional surplus by driving wages still lower, thus aggravating the situation which created the surplus to begin with. Eventually, the whole bloody structure would collapse like a house of cards, the government would step in and socialize critical industries to prevent utter chaos, and you and your conservative friends would probably leave on the next plane to Brazil, anguished screams of "Communism!" and "Centralized Control!" echoing behind you.)

You ask how I would take care of those made unemployable by automation. I would like to point out a very odd circumstance. Automation has been proceeding apace for the last ten years, and at a somewhat lesser rate for the past two centuries, since automation is a difference in degree, not kind, from the preceding phases of the industrial revolution. If automation is truly rendering unemployable those of strong back and weak mind, then the number of unemployed should be increasing in direct ratio to the onset of automation. In fact, it is not. Unemployment has remained substantially constant over the decade. This suggests to me that those displaced by automation are finding other jobs, but that some factor causes the provision of new jobs to lag a constant distance behind the need. What is this factor? I refer you to

my remarks above, on the reasons why wages are not permitted to fall, to the extent necessary to provide everyone with a job. I suggest that the extent of our chronic unemployment is a measure of the extent to which our institutions prevent the operation of a free market in labor.

It would appear that the excessive wages enforced by some unions in some lines of work are a major cause of automation. If wages were set at a somewhat lower level, automation would be less profitable and would therefore be introduced more slowly, giving workers more chance to retrain and shift into other fields.

There is also pride as a cause of unemployment. It is obvious that as machines take over the repetitive production work, people must shift into forms of personal service which cannot be automated. For many of the strong backs and weak minds to whom you advert, this means becoming personal servants. But our mores hold that such jobs are degrading, so to many the dole is better than becoming a valet or housemaid. We need not decide if this pride is justifiable, to see that it cannot be blamed on the market economy. (The fact that unemployment has remained fairly constant over the last decade, despite the exertions of unions and government agencies to reduce it, indicates to me that, in an unrestricted free market economy, it would have increased in direct ratio to the onset of automation. We are presently, like the Red Queen in "Alice", running as fast as we can just to stand still.)

You say, quite rightly, that the faults of capitalism should not be blamed on war, because a good economic system should be able to withstand an occasional war. The trouble is that while there is no reason why a free market system should not work well in wartime, the advent of war is invariably used as an excuse for imposing all sorts of anti-free-market controls, and for indulging in inflation.

Let's speculate on how a wartime economy should work if a rigorously free market were maintained, i.e., if there were no rationing and "allocation", no price, wage or rent controls, and no deficit financing. We must first assume that the war has popular support, and so the people will submit to a vastly increased tax load. Because the government's income has increased so much, it becomes far and away the biggest customer, and so production shifts to the war materials that the government bids for. At the same time, because taxes are high, private individuals are less able to buy, and so production in civilian consumption goods is discouraged. The market economy gives the people what they want; if they want to fight a war, then the greatest profits will lie in producing the best and most armaments. The principal objection to such a system is that it would collide with the widespread prejudice that it is immoral to profit from war. That prejudice may be defensible,

A COMMENT ON PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

And when thou prayest, thou shalt not be as the hypocrites are: for they love to pray standing in the synagogues and in the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward.

But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly.

--Matthew, 6:5-6:6

but it is obviously contrary to the capitalist ethic that profit is the rightful reward for producing what the consumers want.

As the length of this letter proves, it bugs me to have the market economy blamed for conditions that are really due to failure to obey the rules of the free market.

"Sissy Jaimison was pregnant. She had known, of course, before the results of the tests were available, but the methodical, coldly objective verdict pronounced by the doctor seemed to finalize her predicament. Trembling, she picked up the phone and hastily dialed Ronny's number, praying that he would answer the phone, not knowing what to say if his wife answered.

"Hello?"

"She breathed a sigh of relief; it was Ronny. 'Ronny...Ronny, I'm going to have a baby...your baby, Ronny.'

"Silence. Seconds, ticking by. Then the strangled gasp, 'My God, I didn't know it was loaded!'" --George Allen Bond, in "A Kind of Folly".

CHAY BORSELLA :: BOX 443, TOWSON STATE COLLEGE :: TOWSON 4, MARYLAND

Mr. A. G. Smith's insistence on prime loyalty to that part of the human race genetically closest to himself is insensible. He thinks of himself first of all as a member of a specific "genetic strain", then reluctantly concedes that he is also a member of the race of man.

I have always been more aware of being a member of the human race than I have of being a member of a specific in-group. In this feeling, I don't think that I am unique. Mr. Smith has the same machinery inside his body that a lower-class, uneducated, mentally defective member of a minority group has in his. Both eat, sleep, breath air, etc.; and both are born to die. Their anxieties and fears will not be the same, but both will encounter anxieties and fears. But to Mr. Smith, these similarities apparently warrant no empathy.

Mr. Smith feels that the Church has murdered more human beings (figuratively, I trust) with its attempts to rule than have all the "warlords". The Church, perhaps, does not present the "torch of truth"; but it does provide balm--in the form of hope and realization of human worth--to the countless millions who will never understand that $E=mc^2$ and who wouldn't recognize a "torch of truth" if they stumbled over one in the dark. Mr. Smith, conversely, offers nothing but loss of dignity and aloneness. He would have us so alone from one another that we could only consider ourselves members of the race of man after we had weighed our merits as members of our blood group, our in-group, our out-group, our out-out-group, and our out-out-out-group, in that descending order of importance. He would murder man irrevocably; for if there was nothing bigger in life than each man's own ego, there would be little sense in living at all. We wouldn't seek approval, for we would know that we were best.

As a Marylander, I feel ashamed of the strong showing that Governor Wallace received in my state.

When I was much younger, I had assumed that Negro children thought no more about their race than I did about mine. Recently, I've been working at a largely integrated school, and I was shocked to learn just how "color conscious" some of these children are. When asked to supply a word describing "us" as part of a grammar exercise, several of the eighth grade students replied: "Black us." So did the children become excited when they were asked to describe several pictures, one of a small Negro child. Later, when asked to write a sentence using a proper noun, one Negro boy wrote: "Governor Wallace is the governor of Ala-

bama." (It should not be surprising that, in such a race-conscious society as ours, children of oppressed minorities are acutely aware of and highly sensitive to the differences which distinguish them from the supercilious majority. Discrimination as it is practiced in our country appears to give rise to two distinct attitudes among Negro youths; the attitude which becomes dominant in a particular case no doubt depends upon the personality of the individual. The first attitude is that of anger and resentment toward the white majority (the writings of James Baldwin epitomize this reaction to second-class citizenship), and although this anger may find violent release and result in actions which are to be regretted by all responsible elements in society, it is generally a healthy reaction. On the other hand, the same discrimination may result in a decidedly less healthy attitude: depression, apathy, a sort of acceptance of "inferiority". You have probably encountered at least occasionally the Negro child who, having been told in so many ways and for so long that he or she is "inferior", comes to believe it. It is from this group that the "Uncle Toms" come, Negroes whose subconscious acceptance of their "inferiority" leads them to reject identification with the Negro Revolution and seek security in imitating the customs and attitudes of the white majority.)

"Except at rare intervals of intellectual ferment, education in the past has been radically infected with inert ideas. That is the reason why uneducated clever women, who have seen much of the world, are in middle life so much the most cultured part of the community. They have been saved from this horrible burden of inert ideas. Every intellectual revolution which has ever stirred humanity into greatness has been a passionate protest against inert ideas. Then, alas, with pathetic ignorance of human psychology, it has proceeded by some educational scheme to bind humanity afresh with inert ideas of its own fashioning."
--Alfred North Whitehead, in "The Aims of Education".

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

Again I must take issue with our outspoken friend A. G. Smith. In Kipple #59, Smith uses phrases like: "Every man...owes allegiance" to some government; the U.N. "has no legal right to wage war"; and "the government of Cyprus would be justified...", implying that governments have rights in their relationships with each other and with foreigners. This I deny. Governments have no rights vis-à-vis foreigners, only power. A right, selon the dictionary, is a claim that can be legally enforced. But, to enforce a legal claim, one must have a law, passed by a competent legislative authority and enforced by a competent executive authority, with police, courts, and jails or other instruments of correction. As Smith himself says: "the U.N. is not a sovereign nation" and therefore lacks these attributes. The so-called "international laws" are not laws at all, but customs of intercourse that nations have agreed upon as convenient or expedient, but which any of them feels free to violate when it feels threatened, as in the recent American airplane flights over unfriendly countries.

International relationships are comparable on a larger scale to social relationships in a primitive hunting band, a frontier mining camp, or a big-city criminal gang: anarchy tempered by custom and by the fear that the stronger inspire in the weaker. Even in such a group, people are not fighting all the time. When some member of the group becomes too obnoxious, the rest may gang up on him and lynch him. This may be better than letting him live, but to call the process "law" is an abuse of the language.

The fact that there is no authority superior to that of national governments is precisely the reason why all such governments are always treacherous, perfidious, and ungrateful by nature. A nation may be defined as a more or less arbitrary collection of human beings who have the misfortune to be ruled and exploited by the same gang of political adventurers. Rulers use foreigners and foreign nations without scruple precisely because they know they will not be called to account, unless by some remote chance they involve their nation on the losing side of a war.

The record of the United States is no worse than most in this regard, but not much better, either. This government began its career of perfidy in 1783, when it reneged on its promise in the Treaty of Paris to compensate the American Tories whose property it had confiscated. This career has continued down to the present, as witness the case of the Seneca Indians and the Kinzua Dam. Apparently Smith is angry because the U.S. Government has not adopted a policy of even more brutal, ruthless, Machiavellian Machtpolitik than it has. Of course, he takes the chance that a government that treated foreigners in this manner might decide to deal in the same way with him.

As for the foreign "friends" and "enemies" of the United States to which Smith alludes: Having lived, if not quite so long as Smith, at least through two complete cycles in which yesterday's staunch ally became today's implacable foe and contrarywise, I cannot take these so-called national friendships and enmities too seriously. Friendship can change to enmity and vice versa in an amazingly short time when rulers find such a change to their advantage.

As for Smith's sneers at "dogooders", one might remember that even if the people he refers to sometimes embrace foolish ideas, with so many do-badders in the world a certain number of do-gooders are needed to balance and counteract them.

"There are again two methods of removing the causes of faction: the one, by destroying the liberty which is essential to its existence; the other, by giving to every citizen the same opinions, the same passions, and the same interests.

"It could never be more truly said than of the first remedy that it was worse than the disease. Liberty is to faction what air is to fire, an aliment without which it instantly expires. But it could not be a less folly to abolish liberty, which is essential to political life, because it nourishes faction than it would be to wish the annihilation of air, because it imparts to fire its destructive agency.

"The second expedient is as impracticable as the first would be unwise. As long as the reason of man continues fallible, and he is at liberty to exercise it, different opinions will be formed." --James Madison, in "The Federalist" (No. 10).

FRED LERNER :: 152-B DONOR AVE. :: EAST PATTERSON, N. J., 07407

I agree with E. E. Evers in his opposition to the draft; I, too, am a conscientious objector to conscription, but not to fighting. And I, too, chickened out and registered--though probably because there was something in it for me (the right to drink in New York State). I agree that the state has no right to require that its citizens defend it--if the state is worth defending, then its citizens will volunteer to serve. (N.B.--see "Starship Troopers", p. 88 and p. 146, and "Beyond This Horizon", p. 97, "An armed citizenry, willing to fight, is the foundation of civil freedom...If the rebellion is successful, notwithstanding an armed citizenry, then it has justified itself--biologically," for evidence

that the Noted Militarist, Robert Heinlein, agrees with this view. Page references are from paperback editions.)

I note with amusement the fuss being raised about the Hassidic Vigilante group in Brooklyn. Tell me, O Great Shining Liberals, since when is a group of unarmed citizens patrolling the streets to report to the police suspicious behavior considered a vigilante group? If the police and the courts do not provide protection to decent citizens, then the citizens must do it themselves. I'm also amused to note that Negro leaders have attacked the formation of this group. Why? Surely they can't claim that it is directed against Negroes--and even if it were, just what could they do to said Negroes? Apparently it is a common reaction on the part of so-called Liberals to react to proposals to improve law enforcement with charges of racial discrimination. I don't agree with all the legislation which has been proposed to help the police catch criminals, but this opposition is on grounds of civil liberties, not so-called "civil rights". What kind of civil right is it to be excused from prosecution or punishment because one is a Negro or Puerto Rican? The only reason I can see for the Negro leaders' opposition to the Hassidic Volunteer Patrol is a fear that Negroes will be punished for crimes which they commit. And, pray tell, why shouldn't they be? I shall be grateful to anyone who can suggest another reason for this hostility to the Patrol. (The concept of vigilante action to supplement the efforts of legitimate law enforcement agencies is one which most liberals oppose out of respect for a principle of political liberty and a tenet of the United States Constitution which guarantees all citizens protection from punishment except by due process of law. Historically, vigilante action, however well-intentioned in the beginning, has degenerated into indiscriminate mob violence. Please recall that even the Ku Klux Klan was ostensibly formed to "provide protection to decent citizens". Having stated this position, however, I should add that I find nothing whatsoever objectionable about the aims and methods of the Hassidic Volunteers. A problem obviously exists, and though I should prefer that it be solved by increasing the efficiency of the legitimate police force, the Volunteer Patrols seem perfectly justified as an interim measure.)

"The alliance with Pakistan has from the outset been a useless and counterproductive instrument of American foreign policy; it could truly be called a diplomatic act against nature. For the military forces of Pakistan, built up with our massive support, have as their prime target not the Soviet Union or China, but India. Yet we have an obvious vital interest in the political and economic success of India, an interest far transcending any other we have in Asia. Our military support of Pakistan has forced India to divert a proportionate fraction of its scarce resources to military purposes and we, anxious to prevent India's collapse, have been compelled to replace at least a part of those diverted resources with foreign aid." --Hans J. Morgenthau, in Commentary, May, 1964.

MIKE DECKINGER :: APT. 10-K, 25 MANOR DR. :: NEWARK, N. J., 07106

A. G. Smith's ludicrous defense and attempted enlightenment on his "prejudices" is hopelessly confused. Comparing aggressive prejudicial behavior to self-defense and self-preservation is hardly the proper method to convey one's attitudes. I daresay that were I immersed in a situation similar to the one Smith postulates, in which I found myself in the midst of a battlefield about to be skewered by an enemy soldier rushing at me with an out-thrust bayonet, I'd do everything in my power

to prevent this. If it meant that I had to retaliate with my own weapon and maim, injure, or possibly kill my adversary, I would not hesitate to do so--regardless of the color of his skin or his background. I don't think this can be construed as an admission of prejudice, either for myself or against the charging soldier; it's merely a demonstration of the very strong instinct for survival and self-preservation which goes beyond the bounds of petty prejudicial dislikes.

"Winning" or "losing" are ambiguous terms as applied to a war and demand a more precise definition before they can be properly debated. We won the Second World War to the extent that we vanquished the threat of the enemy, destroyed much of their population capable of waging war, and left a great deal of their territory in rubble and shambles. We were not invaded or conquered by them, so by this yardstick we were the victors. But our side still suffered tremendous losses, in both lives and industry, our civilians experienced heartbreak, pain and sorrow, our fighters learned what it was like to face vast and complex machines specifically designed to annihilate human lives, and our commanding generals gave the orders to increase the slaughter. If some future war pitted "our" side against the Soviets, with every nation in the world taking sides, and a cataclysmic new bomb was dropped on the enemy which totally obliterated them while our forces had been reduced to a mere dozen men through numerous skirmishes, mathematically we would be the victors. But numbers are cold and inhuman and they can in no way represent the terrible misery and suffering that has taken place, the irredeemable losses that both sides have incurred. A war is a devastating behemoth with an intellect as large as that of the small handful controlling it.

I agree with you that it is heartening to see the number of responsible, sensible individuals--both in and out of the clergy--who have rallied to the defense of the Supreme Court decision banning school prayer. The prime significance of this controversy now seems to rest upon its usefulness as a political issue. Politicians who denounce the decision are fully cognizant of the fact that this will endear them to the majority of the voters. Most experts predict the failure of the Becker Amendment or any other that would alter the First Amendment, despite the (usually hysterical) public sentiment. It is difficult to believe how insecure some people are until you read some of the testimony given in favor of the amendment. The blunt emotional appeal ("The Supreme Court has driven God out of the schools!") has been discarded for a more personal attack ("The Supreme Court won't allow your child to pray in school") and most of those favoring reinstatement of prayer tend to fasten with admirable tenacity on one or the other appeal.

Recently, Senator Goldwater held a rally in Madison Square Garden (directly following an engagement of the circus--appropriate timing), and tomorrow is the California primary. I have decided that I would be delighted if Senator Goldwater not only won the party nomination but went on to win the Presidency. I am still firmly opposed to the overriding irrationality and stupidity of his cockeyed conservative policies, but I can't conceive of a more fitting irony than to have a man like Barry Goldwater as President. I can picture some scholarly historian, one hundred years hence, conducting a close scrutiny of twentieth century politics and laughing himself silly over the inescapable fact that even though Barry Goldwater was given every opportunity to speak out for his policies (and usually made an ass of himself when he did), the popular vote still awarded him the Presidency. The irony of this is, as I said, awesome. (Not possessing your fine sense of humor, I am more genuinely concerned about the possibility of Senator Goldwater gaining the Presidency. Although, as you say, there is a certain degree of ironic humor involved in the prospect of such an irresponsible and unknow-

ledgeable reactionary gaining election to the Presidency, I am afraid that, unlike your hypothetical future historian, we would be in no position to appreciate the joke.))

It is unfortunate that Nehru's sudden death destroys much of the charm of Louis R. Rukeyser's article, since it covers many purely hypothetical suppositions concerning Nehru which will now remain unproven and unprovable. I hardly think it likely that India will insidiously be swallowed up by communism with Nehru's demise, as one pessimistic sort predicted; indeed, I feel the internal governmental shift may benefit the Indian economy and welfare in the long run.

Most responsible civil rights leaders in New York refused to support the proposed stall-in that Joe Pilati writes about (the central chapter of CORE suspended the Brooklyn chapter for making the proposal). Stall-ins as token demonstrations of civil disobedience are perfectly valid but there must be a dividing line between acceptable civil disobedience, on the one hand, and, on the other, actions that can be a nuisance and even jeopardize lives. In the latter instance, I can cite a hypothetical example of some errant CORE chapter staging a stall-in at a large hospital. By blocking all entrances and refusing anyone admittance or departure, they would be most effectively publicizing their cause and insuring themselves large and meaty write-ups in all the newspapers. On the other hand, such action would seriously threaten the lives of some injured persons who may require emergency treatment but are prevented by the pickets from entering. Actions such as this go beyond normal tolerance and could not possibly do the civil rights movement any good. The animosity and hostility generated by such action would not dissipate for a long, long time. (Malcolm X, who advocates even more irresponsible and direct action, reasons that you lose nothing by generating animosity and hostility among those who hate you to begin with.))

-oOo-

"Newton showed that gods did not control the movements of the planets: Laplace in a famous aphorism affirmed that astronomy had no need of the god hypothesis: Darwin and Pasteur between them did the same for biology: and in our own century the rise of scientific psychology and the extension of historical knowledge have removed gods to a position where they are no longer of value in interpreting human behavior and cannot be supposed to control human history or interfere with human affairs. Today, God can no longer be considered as the controller of the universe in any but a Pickwickian sense. The god hypothesis is no longer of any pragmatic value for the interpretation or comprehension of nature, and indeed often stands in the way of better and truer interpretation. Operationally, God is beginning to resemble not a ruler, but the last fading smile of a cosmic Chesire Cat." --Julian Huxley, in "Religion Without Revelation".

"The cold war has put a high premium on avoiding innovation at home because new programs involve controversy as well as expense and it is felt that we cannot afford domestic divisions at a time when external challenges require us to maintain the highest possible degree of national unity. Far more pervasively than the United Nations or the 'Atlantic community' could ever do, the cold war has encroached upon our sovereignty; it has given the Russians the major voice in determining what proportion of our Federal budget must be allocated to the military and what proportion, therefore, cannot be made available for domestic social and economic projects." --Senator J. William Fulbright, in The Progressive, June, 1964.

PUBLICOLA:

For the conservative of reflection, the cross is not a crutch for the weak, nor is the altar a refuge for the timid. Christian ethics and the Christian religion are considered the earthly manifestation of the logos and, however much man may err in understanding its meaning, it is the true guide for worship and conduct. To the charge that he does not suffer from delusions about the "greatness" of man, or that he does not glorify "reason" or a "progress" that is lamentably synonymous with a neurotic desire for change, the conservative pleads guilty--unhesitatingly guilty, proudly guilty, forever guilty. The conservative feels that modern man brings on himself by his hubris many of the manifold burdens under which he staggers, but that instead of recognizing that the cause is in man's fallibility and his worship of reason, he prefers to blame it on unthinking persons, quite unlike himself. "Civilized man no longer works the magic with medicine bags, amulets and animal sacrifices, but with nerve remedies, neuroses, 'progress' !,"

essays in conservatism

the cult of will power, and so forth." (C. G. Jung.)

Because the fading institutions created by the collective wisdom of our forefathers were not created for mankind in general, but rather for a very specific kind of man--the Christian--the conservative views with trepidation the attempts by the oracles of "progress" to clepe faith superstition and a stigma which blemishes the glorious future which they perceive for mankind. It is well known by those who understand democracy that a general consensus on basic values must exist, or the body politic will be rent apart by internecine squabbles; and because Christianity provides us with this unity, we enjoy an ordered, stable and free government. Democracy, as a system which appeals to men's minds and reason, will be made functional by another intangible, and not by all the material goods that could ever be mass-produced.

In the days when religion formed the center of social life, it was in the parish that a man secured and kept his reputation, for it was the local groups which knew him best and could best judge his worth; and it was the parish which provided fellowship, charity and solace. A man is small, but a nation is large and anonymous, and it is difficult for a man to esteem the opinion of a large and amorphous body of mass men who will never know--or care to know--him. These days are gone forever, but it is not for us to glory in their disappearance and try to eradicate all traces of them which are still extant. Rather, we must realize that it is in the ethos of Christianity that we find the roots of our whole civilization and culture, and thus try to reinvigorate in new form the basic traditions which are at their nadir. We cannot separate religious ideas from our institutions and expect to taste the ambrosia of freedom and the nectar of order. To deprive a thing of its essence is to deprive it of its existence, and to destroy the end of our institutions is to destroy their meaning, their use and their

value. The History of the Western world has been the History of Christianity, though the History of paradise, never to be regained on this earth.

The errors into which liberals and socialists fall are two-fold, each pernicious and unrealistic. Some preach abstract doctrines of Christian love and charity, exhorting all and sundry to shake off the "mark of Cain" and to realize what they feel is the natural goodness in humanity. These predicants and energumens disassociate the doctrines from mankind, and live by themselves in a world of abstract metaphysical and political speculation. If mankind could have been saved by moral exhortations and lofty ideals, this would be paradise. However, if men were perfect, there would be no need for the Christian-socialist, but there would also have been no need for Christ. Does the man who conjures his visions of Utopia realize what treasure he is trying to plunder from mankind? It is occasional grief and suffering that teaches man to be strong, that tests him to see if he has well learned the difficult path to nobility of character, that allows him to experience the humility that is necessary for the inner peace of the true Christian.

Other defecated intellectuals try to perpetrate a truly insidious scheme, for ours is an age in which the planner and the philosopher have joined together in low intrigue to convince the multitude that Moloch is the true god, and that they are his ordained priests. Because we have allowed modern juke-box culture to ignore all that was truly great in our History, because we have permitted pseudo-scientific scepticism to challenge blatantly our most cherished beliefs, because we have countenanced the destruction by the "other-directed" of the man of genuine nobility of spirit, we must beg History to

Remember us--if at all--not as lost
Violent souls, but only
As the hollow men
The stuffed men.

What does the liberal and the socialist offer us in place of moral absolutism. As a man who considers the morals of one epoch as valuable and as legitimate as those of another, the moral relativist does not presume to judge the value of the new morality as the morals of his society shift and change, nor does he have the courage or the means to arrest the change. He is a man with shifting principles, and can we not properly term such a man unprincipled?

Perhaps it is fitting for those who profess a belief in the materialistic faiths to despoil the rich, but on what grounds do they justify the depletion of the common reservoir of solace and peace from which rich and poor alike could draw? They "know" that the prejudices of the people stand in the way of their material improvement and must be removed; but conservatives suspect that the private stock of reason which each man possesses is small indeed when compared with the wealth of knowledge inherited from the past, and therefore suspects those who wish to substitute a more rational or humane order, as they see it.

By glorifying the same scientific method which has immeasurably and unquestionably improved the material condition of mankind to a point where man can live a life of adequate leisure and con-

templation, the modern philosophers, the logical positivists, drag mankind with them into the mire of their relativism: The eternal moral truths of Christianity are thrown into disrepute, or merely passively accepted, because we are led to believe that these too may be disproved by the shallow, destroying scepticism of science.

We are desperately in need of a Renaissance. This rebirth does not need to discover new foundations for its base, for we have a firm rock upon which to build, and in spite of human weaknesses, mankind has loyal allies in the struggle against the excesses of human nature. With Faith joined to wisdom, with a respect for the enduring values of the past, with a love for the institutions which give the security needed for law and order, we can tread the treacherous path through our earthly existence until we reach the summit, not of a mound of material goods, but of the mountain which Dante ascended.

--Publicola

FROM

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

SEND TO

Dick Bergeron
333 East 69th St.
New York 21, N.Y.



60

Printed Matter Only

Return Requested

May be Opened for Inspection

"Hence tyrants are always fond of bad men, because they love to be flattered, but no man having the spirit of a freeman will degrade himself by flattery. Good men love others, but do not flatter anybody. Moreover, bad men are useful for bad purposes. 'Nail knocks out nail', as the proverb says. It is characteristic of a tyrant to dislike everyone who has dignity or independence. He wants to be alone in his glory, and anyone who claims a like dignity or asserts his independence encroaches on his prerogative, and is hated by him as an enemy to his power. Another mark of a tyrant is that he likes foreigners better than citizens, and lives with them and invites them to his table; for the citizens are enemies, but the foreigners enter into no rivalry with him. Such are the marks of a tyrant and the arts by which he preserves his power. There is no wickedness too great for him." --Aristotle, in "Politics".

"Those who knew Benjamin Franklin will recollect that his mind was ever young, his temper ever serene; science, that never grows gray, was always his mistress. He was never without an object, for when we cease to have an object, we become like an invalid in a hospital waiting for death." --Thomas Paine, in "The Age of Reason".