kipple 62

JULY 21, 1964

"Power, for the sake of lording it over fellow-creatures or adding to personal pomp, is rightly judged base. But power in a national crisis, when a man believes he knows what orders should be given, is a blessing. In any sphere of action there can be no comparison between the positions of number one and number two, three, or four. The duties and the problems of all persons other than number one are quite different and in many ways more difficult. It is always a misfortune when number two or three has to initiate a dominant plan or policy. He has to consider not only the merits of the policy, but the mind of his chief; not only what to advise, but what it is proper for him in his station to advise; not only what to do, but how to get it agreed, and how to get it done. Moreover, number two or three will have to reckon with numbers four, five, or six, or maybe some bright outsider, number twenty. Ambition, not so much for vulgar ends, but for fame, glints in every mind. There are always several points of view which may be right, and many which are plausible. I was ruined for the time being in 1915 over the Dardanelles, and a supreme enterprise was cast away, through my trying to carry out a major and cardinal operation of war from a subordinate position. Men are ill-advised to try such ventures. This lesson had sunk into my nature.

"At the top there are great simplifications. An accepted leader has only to be sure of what it is best to do, or at least to have made up his mind about it. The loyalties which center upon number one are enormous. If he trips, he must be sustained. If he makes mistakes, they must be covered. If he sleeps, he must not be wantonly disturbed. If he is no good, he must be pole-axed. But this last extreme process cannot be carried out every day, and certainly not in the days just after he has been chosen."

--Sir Winston Churchill

Kipple is edited and published by Ted Pauls, 1448 Meridene Drive, Baltimore, Maryland, 21212. Copies are available in exchange for letters of comment, other periodicals, contributions (articles, verse, etc.), or the cash sum of 20¢ per issue. The number in the address box is the number of the last issue you will receive; the letter "T" indicates that we exchange magazines; the letter "S" means that this is a sample copy. This journal is affiliated with the Foundation to Promote Virginity, Christian Morality, and Topless Bathing Suits. -wokl

$Au + H_2O = H_2S$ $Au + H_2O = H_2S$ $Au + H_2O = H_2S$

MARX AND CAPITALISM: The name of Karl Marx elicits from the majority of Americans not so much an intellectual response as an emotional reaction. To the average citizen of this nation, Marx was evil personified, the ruthless, narrow-minded fanatic who is responsible for the present enslavement of hundreds of millions of human beings. This rather extreme reaction is made possible both by ignorance (i.e., of the laissez faire capitalism which Marx knew and deplored) and by an altogether unwarranted identification of the man with the movement. As with all such stereotypes, there is at least a grain of truth in this characterization of Karl Marx; he was narrow-minded and fanatical on the subject of capitalism, his personal bête noire, and the philosophy he espoused may fairly be described as ruthless in attaining the objectives it envisions as desirable. But it is certainly unfair to condemn Marx on the basis of actions undertaken and policies pursued in the name of "Communism" and "Marxism". Karl Marx, who desired above all to free the working class from the dreadful oppression to which it was subject, would have been appalled and outraged by the gross and dictatorial actions of Stalin, just as Jesus of Nazareth would have been appalled and outraged by the Inquisition and the Protestant witch-burnings. Great historical figures have no control over the actions undertaken in their names after they are dead.

Karl Marx was a very fine sociologist, but his work in that sphere has had surprisingly little influence on following generations of social scientists because it lacks the detachment necessary for a truly scientific exploration of any topic. Marx had no patience with the slow and methodical instrument which is the scientific method, nor was he interested in the search for truth for its own sake. His goal was in sight from the first, and he wasted no time or energy with the niceties of objectivity or logical process. His was not a search for truth through historical process, but rather an endeavor to demonstrate to the world the truths which he believed he had perceived at the outset; consequently, Marx's entire body of work lacks the tentative and discursive attitude of other explorations into comparatively new fields. He knew what he was after from the beginning and desired only to prove his points to others. Too often, he abandoned inquiry in favor of rhetoric; "Das Kapital" is not so much a quest as it is a relentless polemic. Lacking this scientific detachment, Marx was never able to gain the respect as a sociologist to which he might otherwise have been entitled.

As a social commentator and political polemicist, Karl Marx found his true calling; as a prophet, he was somewhat less successful. To understand Marx, it is necessary to understand the society in which he lived, the capitalism which he so unwaveringly excoriated. In the middle of the nineteenth century, the industrial revolution had attained a peak and the economy of Western Europe boomed to a degree which seemed at the time positively fantastic. National prosperity reached a summit which only the United States, having begun its industrial revolution somewhat later, was eventually to surpass. But the prosperity was restricted to a small minority of the population, and Marx saw an economic structure which, though immensely impressive from the outside, was slowly rotting from within. Wealth and power were obtained by one class at the expense of another, and the victims of this system were distinctly in the majority. Marx as a rhetorician was always unrelenting, often e-

motional, and rarely gave even the pretense of being fair. Also, as an economic determinist, he was inclined to make the capitalist economic structure a scapegoat for a variety of social and political problems (notably war) which, although influenced by it, were in no sense directly attributable to the economy. Having said this, however, it remains undeniable that unfettered capitalism, circa-1850, was responsible for a tremendous amount of human misery, and, in its most extreme forms, created an oppressive social structure much as Marx described.

Most of the national governments of the period were dominated, overtly or covertly, by financial interests. Even the government of Great Britain, where Marx lived when he authored his most memorable indictments of capitalism and which was, by any reasonable standard, one of the best of the period, was to a startling extent controlled by a small class of immensely wealthy and powerful industrialists. Their principal aim, obeying what has since become known as the "capitalist ethic", was profit; and in pursuit of this goal, their ruthlessness at least equalled that of Marx in his proposals for dealing with them. Minimum wages, child labor laws, fringe benefits, employment security, strong unions, standards of safety in mines and mills enforced by the state, and other modern conveniences for workers were unknown and undreamt of by Marx. The proletarians, to use Marxian language, were exploited by the small minority of financial barons, and the latter exerted sufficient control over the civil government to maintain their dominance. Marx was always prone to carefully choose his examples in order to provide the greatest possible emotional impact, but it would be difficult to exaggerate the state of abject poverty and oppression in which a majority of workers were compelled to live.

It is one of those tremendously important coincidences of human history that Karl Marx lived during this period. Had he been born three-quarters of a century earlier, Marx, as an obscure contemporary of Francis Noel Babeuf, would have lacked a clear-cut object for his wrath; had he been born three-quarters of a century later, when most of the conspicuous abuses of capitalism were being remedied by popular governments no longer overwhelmingly dominated by the capitalist exploiters, he would have been a mild and uninfluential socialist. But the intellectual abilities and highly emotional sense of purpose of Karl Marx reached their peak just at the same time that <u>laissez faire</u> capitalism was at its most oppressive.

Many of Marx's specific predictions concerning the future of capitalist society have proven to be erroneous, and it is therefore often asserted that he underestimated capitalism. This is not, strictly speaking, the case. Karl Marx predicted that the process by which capital accumulated in fewer and fewer hands would continue unchecked until the entire financial structure of capitalist society was controlled by a few immeasurably powerful industrialists, and the despotism with which they managed their financial empire would make revolution inevitable; he predicted that the polarization of all society into two classes, the wealthy few and the impoverished many, would be complete in a few decades, with the consequent disappearance of the middle class, the <u>petit bourgeoisie</u>; and he predicted what is inherent in the first two assumptions, that the material deprivation of the proletariat would increase until survival compelled them to rise and violently overthrow the exist-

ing order. All of these predictions appeared perfectly reasonable when Marx first stated them, and it was not his underestimation of capitalism which caused him to be so strikingly mistaken; rather, it was his underestimation of the legitimate political power of a growing class. Karl Marx himself hypothesized that the functional indispensability of a class in the economic system results in its political supremacy in the nation as a whole, but he failed to realize that this functional indispensability was not an asset which could be held in reserve, unsuspected, until the final upheaval, but rather a lever which would become progressively more significant in political affairs and hence arrest the process by which capitalism was moving toward its inevitable destruction.

England provides the most impressive illustration of this process in action because it possessed the most perfect democracy in Western Europe. The growing political power of the proletariat gradually became a factor which had to be taken into consideration by the constitutional government, and this loosened the grip of the capitalist elite class on the political affairs of nations. It seemed inconceivable to Marx in the 1860's that anything of importance could be achieved by reform, but the political power of the working class, once it began to manifest itself, increased very rapidly, becoming first significant, then dominant. The rise of unions, which was concurrent with this acquisition of political power, provided the proletariat with still another lever, one which ultimately exercised profound influence in nearly every aspect of economic existence in the West.

Had capitalism remained "unfettered" by the national governments and unrestrained by organized labor movements, there is no sufficient reason to doubt that Marx's predictions for its future would have been accurate. Certainly the misery of the workers would have continued to increase had they not discovered and utilized the political and organizational power necessary to offset the immense power of the capitalist leaders--the latter were not likely to voluntarily take the measures which simple humanity dictated. And the accumulation of capital in the hands of fewer and fewer people is the obvious outcome of a completely unrestricted and competitive economy, so it seems likely that this prediction, too, would have been vindicated in time had capitalism remained "unfettered". Marx's belief that the middle class would be diminished in size until it ceased to exist altogether foundered on another unexpected development, though one surely influenced by the conditions which invalidated his other predictions. To Marx, the petit bourgeoisie consisted almost solely of small businessmen, and it seemed only a matter of time before this class disappeared through the pressure of competition, as small producers were absorbed by the huge cartels and monopolies. But Marx failed to anticipate the progress of technology and the vastly greater importance of consumer goods and services in the economy as a whole. What has actually occurred, of course, is that the "middle class" (now consisting largely of administrative and service personnel--i.e., "white-collar" workers) has, contrary to Marx's assumptions, become the dominant class in modern society.

Karl Marx, then, did not in any sense underestimate capitalism; rather, he failed to recognize the capacity of democracy to modify the capitalist economic system. In retrospect, this seems an astonishing oversight; after all, it seems perfectly obvious that any state which permits the majority of its citizens to direct the government of the nation cannot long maintain the status quo of an exploitative economic system. But it is always easier to be perceptive with the aid of hindsight. In the middle of the nineteenth century, the condition of the working class was sufficiently grave to be considered "hopeless"; there was nothing a few industrial serfs could do to influence a remote and

impersonal government, which claimed to be "democratic" but was in fact ruled by an oligarchy. At that particular point in history, few men possessing Marx's knowledge of contemporary affairs would have disputed his predictions for the future.

THE REVOLUTIONARY COURT: Prior to 1954, the Supreme Court of the United States had, with only brief interruptions, maintained an essentially conservative composition. Indeed, the Court, at critical junctures in the history of this republic, traditionally aligned itself with the forces of reaction. The truth of this observation is amply demonstrated by a casual perusal of the most notable decisions of the Supreme Court during the period 1850-1940. Early in this singularly depressing era of American judicial activity, the Supreme Court, then headed by Chief Justice Roger Taney, issued what must stand as the most ignominious and contemptible decision in the annals of American jurisprudence: the Dred Scott decision. The Court next emerges as a significant political force some years later, when it summarily struck down as unconstitutional all of the important civil rights legislation of the Reconstruction Era. A dozen years later the Court handed down a series of decisions dealing with the free exercise of religion, in which this constitutional privilege was explicitly denied to certain minor sects; the language of a typical majority opinion, e.g., in Latter-Day Saints v. United States (1890), is reminiscent of the ravings of a bigoted fundamentalist preacher. And as late as the 1930's, a reactionary Supreme Court voided piece after piece of New Deal legislation. Occasional admirable decisions departed from this established pattern, it is true, but, in general, the record of the Supreme Court through this period of nearly a century is deplorable.

In the relatively brief span of ten years, the present Supreme Court--the Warren Court--has justified the existence of that institution by a series of brilliant and far-reaching decisions. The term "liberal" is inadequate when applied to this tribunal, and I believe that I am fully justified in terming the Warren Court, as in the title of this article, a revolutionary court. The Warren Court has made the Constitution and, most particularly, the Bill of Rights, a living document. In the process, it has been subjected to unprecedented vilification from whichever segment of society is displeased, at any given moment, by the most recent rulings. Beyond these temporary enmities, the Court has incurred the lasting animosity of those who, with Kipple's own Publicola, firmly believe that the judicial establishment should never be an innovatory body. But future historians will, I think, conclude that the Warren Court has been the single greatest institution for the protection of individual liberty in the history of this nation. Its accomplishments to date have included numerous rulings which seem destined to exert a tremendous and lasting influence on the very fabric of American society: Brown v. Topeka Board of Education, which, although it will not be fully enforced for a number of years to come, in effect marked the end of the most pernicious aspect of racial prejudice in this country; Wesberry v. Sanders and all of the subsequent reapportionment decisions, which eventually will have the effect of liberalizing the entire political structure of the United States; Engel v. Vitale and Murray v. Curlett, landmark decisions which reinforced the venerable "wall of separation" between church and state; Gideon v. Wainwright, which once and for all established the doctrine that a defendant in a criminal case must be represented by legal counsel; et al.

Very few of the significant decisions rendered by the Warren Court have escaped protracted and violent controversy, and rather large segments of the population have, at various times, been outspokenly opposed to the Supreme Court. Much of this resentment lingers even after

the decisions responsible for it have passed into history--thus, Southern racists are still condemning the Court as a result of the 1954 decision outlawing discrimination in public schools, religious zealots have an axe to grind as a result of a series of decisions curtailing religious ceremonies in public schools, right-wing extremists are particularly vehement in opposition to the Warren Court because it has propounded what to them is the heretical doctrine that the Bill of Rights applies equally to all citizens, including Communists, and so forth. Strangely enough, the recent reapportionment decisions have generated a considerably milder response--despite the fact that the effect of this series of rulings will, in the long run, be more profound than that of any previous Supreme Court decisions. Perhaps the reason is that the justice of these rulings is inescapable, and the concept of "one person, one vote" can be disputed only by those whose motive is plainly dishonorable.

One of the most brilliant defenses of the Warren Court that I have seen was authored by a Baltimore gentleman named Henry Nordin, who appears with astonishing frequency in the letter sections of the metropolitan newspapers. His intelligent and concise epistle will probably not convert any of the clamorous cavilers whose attacks customarily fill the letters-to-the-editor columns of the local newspapers, but the occasional interjection of sanity into this dispute is encouraging to me and Mr. Nordin's remarks warrant reprinting:

> "The constant cry of many letter writers is that the present Supreme Court has taken to itself the business of making laws. If these people would stop to think, they would realize that this just isn't so.
>
> "The Constitution was ratified in 1789. As it stood at the time, it offered very little to the people, except to give them protection from foreign invaders. It was an unpopular document until James Madison, Thomas Jefferson and probably George Mason convinced the Congress that a Bill of Rights ought to be adopted by the new Government. This bill was modeled on the Virginia Bill of Rights, which that state had adopted several years earlier. It was ratified and added to the Federal Constitution in 1791 and it has been there ever since.
>
> "For a long time it was ignored. During the Civil War, during the westward expansion and the great industrial growth of the Nineteenth Century and into this century, the Bill of Rights was there--and that was all.
>
> "I am old enough to remember Supreme Court decisions that were almost unanimous with 'Justice Brandeis dissenting' and then decisions with 'Justices Black and Douglas dissenting,' always with the Bill of Rights in the background.
>
> "When Dwight Eisenhower became President and had to appoint a Chief Justice, he appointed Earl Warren, who is a Republican and was governor of California. This is only my opinion--it may never be borne out by the historians--but I think that Earl Warren will be remembered as one of the really great judges.
>
> "The Warren Court (if you like) is the court that has

decided to use the Bill of Rights for what it was originally intended, the protection of the rights of the minority, whether that minority be a racial or ethnic group, or a minority of one, i.e., Mrs. Murray, or Clarence Gideon.

"The majority is in no danger of losing its rights. Its rights are maintained by sheer numbers. It is the lone non-conformist who needs protection--yes, and even the hapless thief. These people are now getting that protection. May they always have it."

Unfortunately, Mr. Nordin and your obedient servant are distinctly in the minority. There is a very real danger, should the Warren Court continue to antagonize significant segments of the American public, of a situation in which the proposals of the right-wing extremists to abolish or drastically curtail the authority of the Court will become attractive to a majority of citizens, each desiring for his own petty reasons to strike back at this revolutionary court. It seems abundantly clear that such action, should it be carried forth to fruition, would represent a mortal blow to liberty in this nation.

THE REPUBLICAN CONVENTION is but a week away at this writing, and the task of the moderates who desire to prevent Senator Barry Goldwater from capturing the nomination appears virtually hopeless. Several times during this Presidential campaign, the Goldwater surge appeared on the verge of collapsing (after the New Hampshire primary, for example, and just prior to the California election), but each time the procrastination and indecision of the moderates permitted the Goldwater forces to regain their lost momentum. This has been one of the unusual characteristics of the campaign to date: that the front-runner stood out not so much because of his greater brilliance but merely as a result of his lesser ineptitude. Goldwater conducted what one witty journalist termed the first kamikaze campaign on record, alienating every important voting bloc in the country and rattling missiles with gay abandon at every opportunity, but such was the character of his disorganized opposition that the moderates within the Republican Party consistently failed to capitalize on his propensity for shooting from the hip. Men stood proudly erect and women swooned when, in a desperate final attempt, William Scranton came galloping over the ridge astride a white charger and threw down the gauntlet, only to discover that the battle had already been fought and no one really appreciated his grand gesture. The speech made by Scranton in Baltimore when he declared his candidacy is one of the most brilliant political speeches I have ever encountered, and it is truly a pity that the eloquent Governor of Pennsylvania hesitated so long. It would now be nothing short of a miracle were he to succeed in stopping Goldwater at San Francisco, much less gain the nomination for himself. But his candidacy does serve the purpose--for which I suspect it was intended all along--of bringing his name before the public as a courageous battler for party principles, and I wouldn't be surprised if, even while excoriating the extreme positions of Goldwater circa-1964, Scranton's eyes were actually on 1968.

As it gradually became apparent over the last couple of months that Senator Goldwater, although unsuccessful in mustering popular support, was effectively corraling hordes of delegates, many liberals have been applauding the Republican Party's slide to the Right and rubbing their hands together in eager anticipation of a Democratic landslide in November. They reason that President Johnson will be victorious in any event, and if someone as ridiculous as Barry Goldwater is the opposition

candidate, the Republican minorities in the Senate and the House of Representatives will be whittled away still further. Consequently, these individuals are overjoyed at the prospect of Goldwater's nomination. But such people are, I should say, those to whom politics is basically a game, an interesting diversion, a fascinating topic for conversation over cold beers--but, in any case, without relevance to the real world. This is an infantile attitude, for no one who devotes serious thought to the matter can lightly dismiss the consequences of Barry Goldwater's nomination.

True, the "Johnson phenomenon" is rather awesome at present. President Johnson seems sincerely to desire to be a non-partisan leader, President of all the people, and the man has a positive genius for making himself acceptable and even attractive to groups with highly divergent interests: at the moment, there does not seem to be even one significant bloc of voters which would give Senator Goldwater a majority over Lyndon Johnson. Under these circumstances, it may be adjudged unimportant what manner of fanatic represents the sole alternative to President Johnson on election day, but a little thought should suffice to demonstrate that this belief is the result of conspicuous short-sightedness. No matter what the venerable polls may predict, victory celebrations are premature before the victory has taken place, and jubilant Democrats should bear in mind "Dewey's Axiom" ("No election is over until the votes are counted")--an absurdly obvious principle of political science which nevertheless tends to be overlooked on occasion. Lyndon Johnson's popularity, although remarkably stable so far in this election year, is not invulnerable: a sudden Chinese thrust into Southeast Asia, unparried, for one reason for another, by the United States, or a mid-October stock market crash, could result in a reversal of public opinion virtually overnight. And the possibility of Lyndon Johnson's health declining so as to prohibit his heading the Democratic ticket should not be completely ignored.

Admittedly, Senator Goldwater's prospects are encouragingly dim, and even the occurrence of such a disaster as mentioned above would not necessarily result in his election. But Goldwater's accession to the Presidency would be such an unparalleled calamity for the nation and the world that even the slightest chance of such a thing occurring is enough to fill one with horror.

Moreover, Senator Goldwater's mere nomination, regardless of the outcome of the election, will have certain unpleasant consequences. It will immensely damage the prestige of the United States in the eyes of the world. Conservatives scoff at such considerations; when European newspapers commented with horror on Goldwater's victory in the California primary, William F. Buckley, conservatism's most articulate spokesman in this country, rudely observed that foreigners had no business expressing opinions on American politics. It is nevertheless clear that Senator Goldwater's nomination by a major political party will have certain highly undesirable results in the area of world opinion, and can ultimately benefit only Communist propagandists. The United States is already viewed in many of the underdeveloped countries as a reactionary and somewhat callous advocate of pseudo-colonialism, and the spectacle of one of our major political parties giving its nomination to such an irresponsible chauvinist as Goldwater is hardly likely to correct this regrettable misapprehension.

It seems likely that, with Goldwater at the head of the ticket, the Republican Party will go down to defeat in every area, and only the very short-sighted members of the Democratic Party are vigorously applauding this possibility. Any further weakening of a party which is already clearly a minority in the United States Congress and in most state governments can only damage the two-party system as a whole. An over-

whelming majority of one party in a government such as ours is always an unhealthy situation. The welfare of the citizens of a democratic nation is safest when the governing party and its opposition are evenly matched, since under those conditions the incumbent government can never operate without concern about the effect of its action or lack of action in any given area; the reverse situation, in which one party is completely dominant, begets sloth and despotism, and leads to that confidence in power and immunity which corrupts. Thus, the entire nation will ultimately suffer as a result of the Democratic landslide which seems inevitable with Senator Goldwater heading the Republican ticket.

THE MARYLAND POLITICAL SCENE has been thrown into utter confusion as a result of the latest and most far-reaching Supreme Court decision on the apportionment of state legislatures. Representatives from sparsely populated districts of the state periodically glance nervously over their shoulders as if expecting the Grim Reaper himself to be lurking in the shadows. Politicians from the more densely populated areas, whose constituents will benefit from the Supreme Court's reaffirmation of the principle "one person, one vote", are anxious to carry out the necessary reforms, but seem uncertain where to begin. The very nature of the Court decision suggests a workable--though radical--means of conforming to the ruling, and I am confident that this proposal, which may be termed the Nebraska Plan, will eventually be entertained by the conservative political leaders of Maryland. The Supreme Court, by ruling that both houses of bicameral state legislatures must be apportioned on a strict population basis, has effectively abolished the Maryland State Senate as a separate entity. The only significant reason for the independent existence of this body was that it, like the upper houses of all bicameral state legislatures, represented the areas of the state in a manner substantially different from the lower house. Geographical alignment of either house in a state legislature is now unconstitutional. In with the Supreme Court decision, the states will realign their legislatures in such a fashion as to render the composition of both houses essentially the same. This being the case, the separation appears superfluous.

Nebraska is the only state in the Union possessing a unicameral legislature. This radical innovation was approved decisively (286,086 to 193,152) by a referendum in 1934, as the result of prolonged dissatisfaction with the previously bicameral body. A great deal of controversy accompanied the change, of course, and the professional politicians, organized groups, and newspapers opposed the proposal to adopt a unicameral system. The only argument advanced by this faction which needs to be considered (apart from the plaint, dear to the hearts of conservatives, that traditional forms must be retained) viewed the bicameral legislature as an indispensable component of the checks-and-balances system. Briefly summarized, this position argues that a split legislature prevents the passage of grossly unwise legislation, first because more time is required for the enactment of a law, thus assuring plenty of opportunity for deliberation and second thoughts, and second because each house serves as a check on the actions of the other. But critics of the bicameral legislature replied that requiring the approval of two separate houses merely made it more difficult to enact any legislation, made it easier for a small, willful minority to impede the legislative process, rendered it possible to conduct business in more or less secret fashion and hide procrastination and corruption from the public view, and provided a convenient means by which politicians might evade responsibility for their failures and excesses.

Whatever the validity of these charges, it is clear that the faults here outlined are not confined to bicameral legislatures or ne-

cessarily inherent in them; rather, they are faults primarily of legislators. No system of government is so perfect that it cannot be thwarted by sufficiently ambitious individuals. Still, it is difficult to deny that Nebraska's unicameral legislature has been a successful experiment. There is an openness in the transaction of public business that is seldom equalled in bicameral legislatures. The public tends generally to be more interested in what its elected representatives are doing, and as a result the politicians find themselves more directly responsible to the electorate. The unicameral legislature is a fishbowl, and the legislators are acutely aware that the eye of the public is constantly on them, which--quite naturally--causes them to discharge their duties with greater vigor and integrity.

The concept of unicameral legislatures will now be debated once again as it was in the 1930's, because the Supreme Court reapportionment decisions have created a situation where no significant difference will exist between the two houses of bicameral legislatures--and therefore their combination into single units is the next logical step. The advantages of such a system, apart from those purely political ones already mentioned, include substantial reduction of the amount of time and money consumed during a legislative session. (The cost of Nebraska's unicameral legislature the first year was one-third the annual expense of the old bicameral one.) Any move to adapt the Nebraska concept to other states will be staunchly resisted by conservatives, of course, but I would not be surprised if the unicameral legislature became the norm in this country within a generation or two.

--Ted Pauls

"Ideas of God have unquestionably inspired men to noble deed and filled some few with conscience. Perchance these would have been generous and responsible, anyway. But it is certain that up until this very day, God has been man's main excuse for failure. God is his moral alibi. And whether he is born a blank tablet or whether his impulses are stronger than all the wisdom he may get on earth, he cannot even discover, while he serves in piety, his own imagination. For, to the extent a man believes, he cannot seek; and so long as he prays, he is not trying his own best." --Philip Wylie, in "An Essay on Morals".

"There is perhaps no surer way of infecting ourselves with virulent hatred toward a person than by doing him a grave injustice. That others have a just grievance against us is a more potent reason for hating them than that we have a just grievance against them. We do not make people humble and meek when we show them their guilt and cause them to be ashamed of themselves. We are more likely to stir their arrogance and rouse in them a reckless aggressiveness. Self-righteousness is a loud din raised to drown the voice of guilt within us.

"There is a guilty conscience behind every brazen word and act and behind every manifestation of self-righteousness." --Eric Hoffer, in "The True Believer".

"The diplomatic initiatives of General de Gaulle in Southeast Asia ought not to be dismissed lightly. They are designed to preserve a measure of peace, stability, and national sovereignty in Southeast Asia, where all three are on the brink of collapse in the gathering chaos. In my judgement, these initiatives now, as in the past, are consistent in every respect with the interests of the United States in that part of the world." --Senator Mike Mansfield, quoted in The Progressive.

-oOo- -oOo- -oOo-

LETTERS:

dissenting opinions

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

It may be further observed in relation to man's "base and evil animal nature" that without it man wouldn't have lasted very long. John Campbell points this out much better than I could in "Evolution", the editorial in the July, 1951, Astounding Science Fiction. His argument is that man's "base, etc., nature", otherwise known as instinct, is "good, in the highest ethical sense, because /it/ had to be in order to permit the race to survive." He says that instinctive behavior, by the very nature of instinct, is sane, because an unsane instinct would be weeded out by natural selection. And acts which are usually attributed to vile, uncouth, animal instinct are usually highly unsane.

In my letter, I was not using "patriotism" to necessarily mean loyalty to the United States itself rather than its ideals. I didn't have any particularly clear idea of the definition of the word; either idea can be classed as "patriotism", and I was denying any disparagement of the latter connotation. However, a certain amount of "America-first"-ism is not necessarily "a recognized perversion of thought", but a bit of rational self-interest. I would feel no qualms about defending the U.S. against another power based on exactly the same principles.

A. G. Smith's remarks on pacifism make quite a bit of sense. His point that learning the use of weapons is a part of a man's education is a telling one; I had never thought of it in that light. And it is advisable to be willing, ready and able to use force if necessary on the individual level, considering the conspicuous absence of perfection within the human race. How many hold-ups could be prevented in New York City if a shopkeeper could legally keep a gun under the cash register?

An intelligent Christian friend of mine (a minister's wife, in fact) claims that your two "contradictory" Bible quotations may not be descriptions of the same event. According to her, Jesus went gadding about over the countryside and appeared in some quite different places. (It is conceivable, of course, that Matthew and Luke were describing separate events, but I do not consider this probable. Both Matthew and Luke refer to "the eleven", and thus each implicitly claims the attendance of the other at their respective versions of the meeting. If both incidents occurred, why does Luke not mention being present at the mountain in Galilee (as Matthew says he was), and why does Matthew not record the later meeting at a village near Jerusalem (which, according to Luke, he attended)? Of course, in seeking contradictions between the books of the New Testament, it is not really necessary to become enmeshed in the ambiguities of such "eyewitness" accounts; Matthew and Luke fail completely to agree with respect to something so important as the genealogy of Jesus. According to Matthew (1:6-16), Jesus is a descendant of the twenty-eighth generation from David, but Luke (3:23-31) says that Jesus is of the forty-third generation following David; moreover, only two names (those of David and Joseph, husband of Mary) are alike

in both accounts.})

I see I am being taken to task for my avowed policy of "studiously ignoring" the Breen affair. My comments here will probably belie that statement, but after all, arguing is such fun.

My reasons for this policy are, I believe, quite sufficient. Despite all of the material on the subject that I have read, I am operating in a near-vacuum of facts. After stripping away the layers of propaganda surrounding all the factual material, I am left with the knowledge that two people named Donaho and Breen are engaged in a nasty feud. Not knowing any of the people involved, and not knowing any more about the subject, I think it wise to keep out of the matter. ({The term "feud" implies a bitter exchange between two factions or two individuals. In view of the fact that Walter has refrained from directly replying to the attacks upon his character, it seems strange to refer to a "nasty feud" existing between "two people named Donaho and Breen".})

George Price says that, other things being equal, a child of poor parents has equal opportunities to those of a millionaire's child. The trouble with that idea is that other things are not equal. He admits this, then proceeds to ignore it. This may be all very well when such things as racial prejudice have been shed and left behind. However, that happy day has not arrived yet, and current circumstances invalidate his thesis. An idea is not justified by its workability, but an unworkable idea should be discarded.

Publicola's latest "Essay in Conservatism" is quite as flowerily fuggheaded as the first one. The equation of a political philosophy as general as conservatism to a specific religious belief is a self-evident fallacy, but quite representative of American conservatives--who quite often start out any crusade by invoking God, presumably on the theory that if they get Him on their side, they have it made. (Unfortunately, it is often a package deal, and the side which claims God often winds up with a gaggle of half-baked and zealous Crusaders for the Right which does the cause more harm than good by alienating intelligent people in droves.) He claims, also, that the History of the Western World is the History of Christianity. I'll mention the Crusades and the Spanish Inquisition and let it go at that. And the remark about the "shallow, destroying scepticism of science" is slightly ridiculous also. Science is not sceptical any more than a tidal wave is malevolent. If your beliefs or your house gets swept away, you can't blame an intelligent entity, or a personification such as Publicola's concept of science.

"An educated man ought to be beyond the reach of suggestions from advertisements, newspapers, speeches, and stories. If he is wise, just when a crowd is filled with enthusiasm and emotion, he will leave it and will go off by himself to form his judgement." --William Graham Sumner, in "Folkways".

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

How do you reconcile your remark about the high incidence of lunacy in California with the cold hard fact that a majority of voters were so sane that they voted for Barry Goldwater, instead of some internationalist-minded twerp? Now, Barry Goldwater may not be perfect, but he is the best candidate this bedeviled republic has had a chance to choose since Teddy Roosevelt. He is a man who believes that America comes first and the rest of the world a poor second. He is going to be lied about even worse than Hoover, by the "Liberals" who believe that Americans exist to pay taxes to support the rest of the world, and that the end justifies the means. The other candidates yawp about how much

they have done, but Goldwater actually forced through integration of the National Guard in Arizona. The others, being "Liberals", talk, but Barry did something. ({Barry did something last week, too--he voted against the civil rights bill. The others, being liberals, merely disappear in Mississippi or get arrested in Saint Augustine...})

You write about Vietnam. Well, the whole of Southeast Asia is not worth the life of one American soldier. We should pull out and leave it to China, who will get it anyway in the long run. Every American has the duty to defend his country, but he certainly has no duty to defend one lot of flat-faced heathen against another variety of the same. "Mind your own business" is 90% of wisdom and it is time that we began to do just that. Let the Vietnamese defend themselves, and they are not interested in doing it. Save our men and our money to use when China attacks us or our possessions in the Pacific. China is four times our size, and "the odds are on the cheaper man".

John Boston is trying to weasel out of what he said. "The trouble with free speech is that it allows men like Smith to have his say" is what he said. He doesn't agree with my views; that is natural, as he has not seen enough of the world to know what it is all about. Twenty years from now his ideas will have changed and he won't be so cocksure that he is right. "A ham weighs most when half cured."

George Price reads as though he had been through the mill and had those iridescent ideals rubbed off. He is right--in this country, any man who is willing to practice the old-time virtues of hard work, frugality, and sobriety need not be poor. Laziness, shiftlessness and drink are the three roots of poverty. Smart men live on the interest fools pay on their installment-buying debts, and grow rich while the interest-payer stays poor. It is the modern equivalent of chattel slavery, without the disadvantage of having to keep the slave even if not profit-producing at the time.

I see you quote the Highest Authority on prayer. The newspapers up here won't print this passage--it ruins all the arguments of the pious poops. ({I wrote a letter to the Baltimore Sun pointing out that the lines in question from the Bible were an excellent commentary on the school prayer controversy, but it was not printed. Of course, not all of my letters to the editor are published, but I thought it rather odd that this particular epistle was ignored; no one else had referred to this passage, and it seemed to me a rather effective rebuttal to the proponents of religion-by-rote.})

Chay Borsella thinks that because I am built with the same interior arrangements as some useless semi-moron I should show a fellow feeling for him! Someone should tell her that back in the Middle Ages the anatomy of the abdomen was taught by opening a pig, whose interior is arranged in the same manner as those of Borsella and Smith. Does that fact stop her from eating pork chops and bacon? She is an odd character, feeling closer to some painted Congolese cannibal than her own cousins. She says I offer nothing but loneliness. Well, we are born alone, suffer alone, and die alone, and I feel it more dignified to stand erect on my own two feet than to be propped up by others because I'm too weak to stand alone.

Here you make some disparaging remarks about "Uncle Toms". Nowadays, it is used by troublemakers, black and white, as an epithet. But the term actually denotes a Negro who, caught in a white society, has the sense to adapt himself to conditions as they exist. He knows that he can never become a white man, but he knows also that he can adopt the virtues of the white man, instead of his vices, and so gain the respect of all thinking whites. Uncle Tom would live when Malcolm X and his followers would be lynched, so it is a survival trait.

De Camp forgets that all rights depend on force; the force can be

that of the individual claiming the right, or that of his fellow citizens channeled through laws and the courts. As long as the force is superior, the claim is valid. Nations, like men, have rights *if* they can enforce them; otherwise, they have no rights at all. De Camp seems to have the idea that a government is distinct from the people. The people, if not sheep, can always bring any government to heel fast. The most conspicuous feature of any "do-gooder" is the fact that he can't mind his own affairs and so gets his nation involved in nasty messes; and then practical men have to straighten things out, *if they can*. Vietnam is a case in point.

I see that Mike Deckinger finally admits that he is just as prejudiced as I am, but attempts to explain away prejudice as animal instinct of self-preservation.

Vote for Goldwater and die in peace in your own bed at home. Every war in seventy years has been started by a Democratic administration, and "Drink while driving" Johnson is already getting us ready for a war with China. This is the same old trick of all politicians: if there is trouble at home, start a war abroad.

"In order to brush away the veil of mystery that too often surrounds science, we need to have all these fundamental ideas and principles stated in familiar terms. We need to have explained to us, in words from our own vocabulary, that science is merely the statement of the orderly relations between facts, many of which each of us knows or can readily know from common-sense observations of the everyday things about us. Once this explanation is made, we are able to understand causes and effects, so that things begin to appear to us in delightfully simple and orderly relations and not as an appalling number of independent facts each of which must be separately mastered." --William O. Hotchkiss, in "The Story of a Billion Years".

VIC RYAN :: P. O. BOX 674 :: MANTENO, ILLINOIS, 60950

I'm a little curious to see if "Jottings" will touch upon the recent Supreme Court ruling expanding "one man, one vote" so that it suddenly has direct relevance to the legislative makeup of a great majority of the states. The decision seems to have farther-reaching consequences than even something as fundamental as religion in public schools; for, if the territorial alignment that determines representation in one house of most states' bicameral legislatures is unconstitutional, there can be a strong argument made that even a major pillar of the Constitution itself--the United States Senate--is, paradoxically, unconstitutional. (*The term "unconstitutional" has a very restricted definition, which has nothing to do with justice or fairness. The composition of the Senate may be unjust, but as that body's territorial alignment is provided for within the Constitution, it can in no sense be considered "unconstitutional".*)

You wrote one too many diatribes on the Breen Affair, I'm afraid, since this last was undirected and, at the end, downright dribbly. Some time ago you seem to have lost track of the fact that the majority of convention attendees--at least, those in Washington--chose not only a site in California for a convention but a committee as well; and that committee, despite certain restrictions, may be said to have represented the majority. (*But didn't Los Angeles withdraw from the contest, leaving the bid of the Bay Area unopposed?*) It is the right of the majority to enjoy the world science fiction convention, and the committee presumably safeguards that right. This doesn't mean a minority isn't perfectly justified in boycotting the convention and urging others to

do likewise; or that a majority should simply accept the committee's edicts uncritically. It does mean, though, that some thought should be given to the other side of the issue, the one which you seem to have progressively disenfranchised. The committee may not have acted in all the haste and with all the foam-at-the-mouth that you hypothesize; it may have seriously weighed the alternatives: on the one hand, depriving certain individuals of such rights as attendance; on the other, causing substantial worry--and perhaps inattendance--on the part of other people who, rightly or wrongly, fear for themselves or their charges.

I don't object to your coming to your own conclusions, since I have myself; but both are somewhat irrelevant. What I object to is the a priori assumption that presumably responsible people have acted in another fashion altogether. I think that the convention committee was completely aware of the consequences of both possible alternatives of action.

"Without realizing how it had come about, the combat men in the squadron discovered themselves dominated by the administrators appointed to serve them. They were bullied, insulted, harassed and shoved about all day long by one after the other. When they voiced objection, Captain Black replied that people who were loyal would not mind signing all the loyalty oaths they had to. To anyone who questioned the effectiveness of the loyalty oaths, he replied that people who really did owe allegiance to their country would be proud to pledge it as often as he forced them to. And to anyone who questioned the morality, he replied that 'The Star-Spangled Banner' was the greatest piece of music ever composed. The more loyalty oaths a person signed, the more loyal he was; to Captain Black it was as simple as that, and he had Corporal Kolodny sign hundreds with his name each day so that he could always prove he was more loyal than anyone else." --Joseph Heller, in "Catch-22".

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

You give an interesting dissection of the social factors that prevent most poor people from breaking out of their prison of poverty. You appear to agree with me that what keeps poor people poor is not the mere lack of money; it is their upbringing and their entire social environment, which cause them to behave in ways that ensure their continued poverty. You add that unless I think these traits are hereditary (I don't), then I "must place the responsibility...at some point in history, with the environment of the lower-class citizens and thus with the economic system." Now we are getting to it. To equate "environment" with the economic system is a rather large non-sequitur. Surely environment must also include such factors as government, religion, education, family and racial traditions, etc., as well as economics. To refute my argument, you must show that the problems of poverty are caused by, or at least made worse by, the action of a laissez faire economy, out of all the myriad cultural strands which constitute the total environment. I do not think you have done so.

You say, "...society subjects the entire lower class to a vicious process of elimination..." True enough, in we bear in mind that the "society" in question is that comprised by the lower class itself (which I don't think you meant). The upper and middle classes don't push the lower class down; the lower class holds itself down by refusing to adopt the customs that would enable them to move to the middle class.

You very accurately describe schools in lower-class neighborhoods as generally substandard. Why? "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." In the first sentence above, you have effectively conceded my point, and the second sentence is very far from a convincing rebuttal.

Question: How come Pop (unemployed) can't find time to go to the PTA meetings? Does he job-hunt so constantly that he can't spare one evening every week or two? But assuming that both parents are unable to go to the PTA, why don't they demand better schools from their precinct captain when he calls to solicit their votes? City Hall would get the message! No, I am afraid the fact is that the typical poor man does not really care much about education, or else--again because of the culture in which he lives--he completely misunderstands what is needed to get better schools. (I might suggest that many politicians are not greatly interested in rectifying the situation, because masses of poor and ignorant people are easier for the machine to control.) (Effective political action on an individual level becomes progressively more difficult as one travels down the scale of affluence. The demand of a poor family that their neighborhood school be improved is likely to be shelved and forgotten, alongside their request that the city enforce its building code against their landlord. Mass protest will probably goose the politicians into taking action, of course, but the prospect of united action faces formidable obstacles amid people who generally have less free time, more problems, and the ingrained belief (reinforced by experience) that their voices will never be heard or heeded by those in authority.)

When our slum kid brings home a bad report card, does Pop chew him out for it--or does he go storming down to the school to make them stop picking on his boy? (You've been watching too many second-rate motion pictures, George. Most of the children in my grammar school were from poor families--some were on relief--and we all dreaded bringing home bad report cards, because we would be bawled out and/or punished for poor marks.) As a corollary, does Pop demand a <u>real</u> report card, not two paragraphs of hogwash about Johnny's "integration with his peer group"? (Does <u>anyone</u>? I haven't noticed any large-scale opposition to the "adjustment" theory of education from <u>any</u> class.)

How many unemployed slum fathers will volunteer to patrol the schools to put down violence? (Donating, say, half the time he would otherwise spend in a tavern.) Let's face it: most slum people have no civic spirit, and some even have a negative spirit, i.e., they blame society at large for their own shortcomings.

The responsibility of the lower class for their predicament may be further illustrated by a little Chicago history. During World War II many thousands of Japanese-Americans were tyranically uprooted from their homes on the West Coast, and some few thousand of them were settled in Chicago. They arrived as the poorest of the poor. Many landed in a neighborhood adjacent to where I lived at the time. This neighborhood was white, very rundown, and about to go colored because few whites were willing to live there any longer. Instead, it went Japanese. It <u>improved</u>

The Japanese were poor, but they had pride, thrift, and a solid determination to better themselves. And they did. Their clothing was cheap, but it was kept clean and mended. Their homes were rundown? They repaired them. Their children were well-behaved--disciplined without be-

ing cowed--and were encouraged to do well in school. There was some racial feeling against the Japanese, but it soon dwindled as they demonstrated that they were far better citizens than the white trash (mostly Southern migrants) they replaced. A drunken Nisei was a rarity, and I never heard of a Japanese going on relief or ADC. There were no Japanese juvenile gangs, as there were--and are--white and Negro gangs. The police considered assignment to that neighborhood a sinecure.

Now, twenty years later, there are no more Japanese neighborhoods; they have been absorbed into the white areas. My neighborhood has rather more than most: perhaps one family in twenty. My building has one Japanese family, out of thirty-six. I have never heard any white Chicagoan say he'd move if a Jap moved in next door.

Now then: What made the difference? The Japanese started dog-ass poor, and of a despised race with whose homeland we were at war; yet within two years they were respected and within a generation they were fully integrated. The answer is simple: their purses were lower-class, but their thinking was middle-class.

Conclusion: The "system" which holds down the lower-class is almost entirely of their own making. They are not to be condemned on that account; they certainly don't plan it that way. The problem is how to help them break out of the pattern. I see no quick and easy way, although it would be helpful to preserve and extend the free market, thus raising the income of the poor to the maximum their productivity permits.

Come to think of it, the situation <u>is</u> the fault of the middle and upper classes, to this extent: that we do not compel the improvement (intellectual and disciplinary) of lower-class schools even beyond what the lower classes themselves want. Of course, if we did thus try to impose our mores on the lower classes, the politicos and bleeding hearts would explode with protests against "tyranny" and "Hitlerism", and I won't say that they would be entirely wrong. Maybe just for a start, we could abolish the system of promoting children whether their school work is satisfactory or not. Just try it, and note from what quarters the loudest protests come.

You ask, "How does reducing wages create new jobs?" Remember that I carefully specified that I am speaking of wage reductions <u>in some lines only</u>, not a general reduction. The purpose is to reduce the prices of the goods produced by the workers in question. In the simplest case, the price reduction brings increased sales, and therefore more workers are needed to produce the goods. It is more likely that a reduction in the price of A will leave the consumer more money to spend on B, C, and D, thereby increasing employment in those industries. If you say that automation will provide increased production without increased employment, I need only point out that B, C, and D also include all the services which cannot be automated in the foreseeable future.

Wage reductions can create new jobs in another way. When the employer need spend less on wages, he then has more to invest in new tools, to provide new jobs.

It may well prove that factories employing a large labor force are only a passing phase. Time was when almost the only people who worked as employees were soldiers and personal servants. Most production workers--i.e., farmers and artisans--were self-employed. There is no reason why the time cannot come when all mass production is done by machines supervised by a few skilled technicians, and everyone else is employed in services. I can't predict what such a society would be like, any more than our forebears at the start of the Industrial Revolution could envision our society, but I see no reason to fear the prospect.

Speaking of the Industrial Revolution, it occurs to me that your argument on the progressive decline of wage rates could as easily have

been offered at the start of the Industrial Revolution. You might ask yourself why the horrors you depict did not in fact happen during the heyday (such as it was) of laissez faire capitalism? In point of historical fact, real wage rates have risen steadily as "automation" (i.e., machine production) increased.

You say: "The supply of labor is increasing faster than the demand, due largely to automation (which allows fewer workers to produce more goods...). 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."

Your fundamental fallacy is the implicit assumption that "labor" is synonymous with "workers engaged in mass production of goods". You are assuming that factory work is the only kind of work, so if the factories are automated, people must necessarily be unemployed. But what about services? Are you taking no account of service occupations expanding to absorb those no longer needed in factories? (¿Will the expansion of service occupations occur at a faster rate than the expansion of the population as a whole?¿)

I need not directly answer your thesis of a "progressive decline of wage rates", because it is based on the fallacy discussed above, that assumes that only factory labor enters the equation.

"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...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..." This also is founded on the fallacious assumption that workers cannot shift out of automated production industries into non-automated service industries.

I also seem to see, entangled somewhere in the depths of the above quotation, an overpowering ignorance of Say's Law. This is: "Production creates its own purchasing power." That is, the goods and services you buy are traded for the goods and services you produce. Enormous confusion has arisen because of the use of money as an intermediate step in the transaction.

Where there is free competition and sensible monetary policy (e.g., no inflation), there will arise neither chronic surpluses nor shortages. Since each man's purchasing power is identically equal to his production (Say's Law), it follows that the sum total of all purchasing power is identically equal to all production. Surpluses and shortages arise only very temporarily, when the producers misjudge what the consumers want. These have always been corrected very quickly except where there was interference with the competitive price system, as by rationing and price controls. Do I hear a voice out there saying, "What about farm surpluses?" Well, here we have a textbook example of supply and demand working as it should in a free market. The fact is that there are no farm surpluses, in the sense of goods produced in excess of demand. The Government provides the demand, by being willing to pay for the stuff, and the farmers supply it. The Government's reasons for wanting to buy un-needed farm products are irrational, but that is not an economic problem.

The old-time Socialist war-cry "The workers should be able to buy back what they produce" sounds like a complaint that Say's Law doesn't work; actually, it is based on a fallacious understanding of what goes into production. Can any reader spot the fallacy? Hint: In a mar-

ket economy, the workers can buy back what they produce; the problem is to understand why the Socialists did not see this. (¢To a sloppy thinker (a category in which most of the Socialists of my acquaintance belong), a man working on the assembly line of, say, the Chevrolet plant, might seem to be "producing" automobiles, whereas actually he is taking part in one minor step of automobile production. He can't buy back the automobiles he's "producing", because he isn't producing any. The same thing applies to any other modern industry. Is this the fallacy you meant?¢)

Your final comment is, "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..." Well, of course I think that the efforts of unions and government have actually exacerbated the problem. The trouble is, their economic beliefs are rather much like yours.

As a mental exercise, try thinking of all the ways in which price-fixing can harm the economy. Okay? Having done this, ask yourself which if any of these injuries would not occur if the commodity in question is labor, and the price-fixer is a union? When the government cracks down on union wage-fixing as joyfully and efficiently as it does on industrial price-fixing, then I will admit that the government is seriously doing something about unemployment.

I strongly disapprove of the Supreme Court decision against public school prayers. At the same time, I do not favor the proposed constitutional amendment to restore prayers to the schools.

The root of my reaction is that I have a very strong regard for the principle of "a government of laws, not men", and I interpret the principle rigidly. To me, the law is what is written in black and white in the statute books. It means exactly what the authors intended it to mean, and judicial interpretation should be limited to those cases (numerous enough!) where the law as written is vague. It is absolutely impermissible for a judge to alter the law "by interpretation" to make it accord with his ideas of desirability, however wise and humane his interpretation might be. Because as soon as this is tolerated, you no longer have the rule of law; you have the rule of capricious men. If a law is bad, the proper recourse is to repeal or amend it, not to pretend that it means something other than what it plainly does mean.

There's an old story about a codger who lived in a shack near Main Street, in a small town. He kept a goat, which frequently got loose and butted passersby, to the vast irritation of the town fathers. But they were helpless, for there was no law prohibiting goat-keeping. At last the Assessor had a brilliant idea: if they couldn't prohibit the goat, perhaps they could make it too expensive to keep. So the old man got a tax bill on the goat, for twenty dollars. When he stormed into the Assessor's office, they showed it to him in plain English: "All property abutting on Main Street shall be assessed ten dollars per front foot."

Now the current Supreme Court doesn't even have the excuse of having misread a pun. It just ignores the written law and the precedents and hands down decisions embodying what the Court majority thinks the law ought to be, without serious regard to what the legislators actually intended.

To come to the prayer decision, it is obvious--and the Court never denied it--that most of the Founding Fathers were Christian believers, who certainly did not intend that prayers should be banned in public schools. A knowledge of the times shows that the constitutional prohibition against "an establishment of religion" meant that there was to be no official ("established") state church, as the Anglican Church

is Established in England. And it did not mean anything else.

Personally, I have no desire to maintain prayers in school. I am agnostic, verging on atheist. But common honesty requires me to state that the Constitution, when it was written, was not intended to prohibit prayers in school. Since it has not been amended on that subject, prayers are still constitutional (though perhaps undesirable or even, if you wish, wickedly immoral), and the decision of the Supreme Court is bad law. If someone wishes to propose a constitutional amendment forbidding prayers in public schools, I will sign the petition. But let us please stick to amending the Constitution in the statutory manner, not by pretending to find in it what is quite plainly not there.

The proposals for an amendment to permit school prayers are pointless, because as long as the Court is of its present temper, it will simply misinterpret that amendment to suit itself. There are only two real cures: As vacancies occur in the Court, fill them with justices having a proper respect for the Constitution; or else restrict the Court's appellate jurisdiction so that it can no longer pass on these cases (see Article III, Section 2, Paragraph 2 of the Constitution). The first course seems more sensible. After all, the Court is not operating in a vacuum. It would not make such outrageous decisions if it were not evident that most people are really not concerned about constitutionalism and the rule of law. I notice that most of the controversy on school prayers centers on whether prayers are desirable, and not on the constitutional grounds which are important to me. When--and if--the people desire a return to constitutionalism, better justices will be appointed, and bad decisions will be over-turned. Attempts to thwart the Court are useless, because in the long run the Court gives us the kind of law we want. (Granted that the Supreme Court is not necessarily correct in its rulings, it seems the height of presumption for a layman to offhandedly dismiss Court decisions as erroneous. On what grounds are you better qualified that the Supreme Court to decide what is or is not constitutional?)

"Our ignorance of the world outside our borders, and our assumption that an anti-Communist stance is all that a chief of state needs to qualify for our support, are errors which compound quickly and work well for our enemies. What has happened already in Cuba, Korea, Turkey, Iraq, and North Vietnam should have taught us bitter lessons. Yet our government--with the tacit approval of the press--seems content to blame all foreign revolutions on Communists; and after one debacle has passed, we proceed as before to help create the climate in which revolution becomes almost inevitable." --William J. Lederer, in "A Nation of Sheep".

DAN DEVERE :: 59 LAKESIDE AVE. :: HASKELL, NEW JERSEY, 07420

Pertaining to Marty Helgesen's letter in Kipple #60, I have a question about one of your interjections. There is no necessary discrepancy between the accounts of Matthew and Luke of the actions of Jesus after the resurrection. All that I see in reading the two selections is that the Matthew account is of one thing and the Luke account is of another. They both tell something of the risen Jesus, but not the same thing. (See my remarks to John Boston above.)

I am glad to see you caught that verse from Matthew which speaks against prayer in public places. But even more pertinent, I think, is the verse immediately following (Matthew 6:7). "And in praying do not heap up empty phrases as the Gentiles do; for they think that they will be heard for their many words." Even though the Lord's Prayer is not many words, too often, I think, it is repeated by rote in the schools.

Little children say it because they have memorized it; the older ones just mumble it. The prayer is all too rarely coming from the heart (as Jesus would have wanted it).

The prayer ban by no means hinders Christian practice. The Christian should pray because he wants to pray; and the Christian can pray sincerely and silently all day long if he so wishes.

Everything is based on belief. No discussion can be held without the participants believing in at least some things in common. Reason, of course, is a wonderfully useful tool; reason must be used to find belief and vice versa. The believer, the unbeliever, the agnostic, and the indifferent all have their own unproved beliefs. (What is proof? Is it not just something that causes you to believe?)

"Character is a Greek word, but it did not mean to the Greeks what it means to us. To them it stood first for the mark stamped upon the coin, and then for the impress of this or that quality upon a man, as Euripides speaks of the stamp--character--of valor upon Hercules, man the coin, valor the mark imprinted on him. To us a man's character is that which is peculiarly his own; it distinguishes each one from the rest. To the Greeks it was a man's share in qualities all men partake of; it united each one to the rest. We are interested in people's special characteristics, the things in this or that person which are different from the general. The Greeks, on the contrary, thought what was important in a man were precisely the qualities he shared with all mankind." --Edith Hamilton, in "The Greek Way".

CHARLES CRISPIN :: C/O ORLOVE :: 845 E. 14th ST. :: BROOKLYN, N. Y.

Publicola's third essay on conservatism is certainly the most scholarly and best written in the series to date, but the ideas presented therein are no more palatable to me than those in the first two articles. I suspect a full rebuttal would fill a magazine the size of Kipple #61, so I'll confine myself to brief comments on a few specific points. His apparent inability to see any difference between the "atrocities of...Auschwitz, Buchenwald and Budapest" (if by the latter he refers to the suppression of the Hungarian Uprising) is typical of most conservatives. I support the ideals of the Budapest Revolt and would have been pleased had it succeeded, but when the Russians crushed the revolt with tanks and trained soldiers they did nothing that any other nation would not have done under similar circumstances. This is in no way comparable to the appalling situation at Auschwitz, where unarmed, unresisting prisoners were slaughtered by the thousands merely because of their ethnic background. The defeat of the Hungarian patriots was unfortunate, but they were in open revolt and realized the probable outcome of their rebellion from the first; they chose to fight--and die--for their freedom. The Jews murdered at Auschwitz made no such choice. Here we have Publicola condemning the "bread and circuses" attitude of Rome, a favorite target of conservatives over the years. The Romans believed that the first duty of the state was to see to it that the people did not starve; just what is wrong with this? I note that Pub devotes a couple of paragraphs to the apotheosis of habit. He is right in saying that habit can be relied upon to perform the vast majority of those routine actions which confront us daily, but this statement at the same time exposes the limitations of habit. Habit cannot react appropriately to new situations. It is my habit to leap briskly out of bed in the morning in order to become instantly alert, and this habit has served me well for years; but if I should for some reason go to sleep on a mountain ledge, the habit may well kill me. So with tradition. A society

ruled by tradition will operate splendidly, so long as it encounters no new situations. This can best be understood by examining the difference between reason and instinct. Instinct is the biological equivalent of tradition, and animals function quite well using instinct, so long as it encounters only a few common situations and no radically new element. Man, having little instinct (i.e., few set responses) but possessing the capacity to learn, is superior to all previous earthly life-forms by virtue of this distinction; the (liberal) society of reason is superior to the (conservative) society of tradition for exactly the same reason.

Publicola ought to be incensed by this installment of "Jottings". Your analysis of conservative attitudes in the first couple of paragraphs hits the mark solidly, though I'm sorry you didn't continue with a general evaluation of the conservative's personality. Generally speaking, the conservative seeks security in rigid rules and societal forms, and in religious and political dogma. As a basically insecure individual, the conservative desires certainty, and thus advocates a society in which order and stability are maintained whatever the price. This underlying attitude immediately explains most of the similarities in views among all those who call themselves "conservatives". Most conservatives are religious believers (modern religion, of course, promotes security and certainty); generally, conservatives show little practical concern with principles of civil liberties, look askance at controversy, and stifle dissent when in a position to do so (order is best preserved by silencing those who question accepted values); conservative ideas with regard to foreign policy share the common fault of seeing everything in terms of black and white (certainty demands an over-simplified picture of the world as a struggle between good and evil--to admit a complex world of shades and degrees, in which every problem has many constantly changing aspects, makes one insecure as hell); et al. All this is by way of a foreword to the comment I wished to make on your latest defense of flexibility in foreign policy: no conservative will ever accept your ideas, clearly tenable though they are to me, because the conservative view of the world looks upon flexibility-of-response (to, e.g., Soviet proposals) in much the same manner as a man suffering from claustrophobia views a small elevator--and for the same subconscious reasons.

Having unleashed my anti-conservative philippic for this issue, however, I should mention that the topic broached in the second essay of your column (computerized courtrooms) finds me solidly in the conservative camp. Replacing judges and juries with computers is not only unconstitutional but, in my opinion, an unusually bad idea in general. It's true that juries sometimes convict or acquit as a result of some irrational prejudice or the dramatics of a cheesy shyster, but our jury system is amazingly efficient, all things considered. Except under very special circumstances (e.g., the Deep South, when the crime involves a Negro and a white), twelve people are unlikely all to be prejudiced at the same time in the same way, and at least one out of every twelve jurors is probably perceptive enough to see through legal tricks and extraneous displays calculated to have an emotional impact. Computers might eliminate such prejudice as exists (though they might not--maybe a machine "human" enough to act as judge and jury would also be human enough to be prejudiced...), but any highly complicated computer will malfunction fairly frequently due to mechanical breakdowns. How would this effect its efficiency as a courtroom arbiter? Also, as you pointed out, unscrupulous defendants could devise some way of tampering with the machine, even though "bribery" in the normal sense would no longer suffice to rig the "jury".

You'll be able to congratulate me on the occasion of my marriage in a few months. The only minor (!) hang-up being that I haven't asked

the girl yet. (A. G. Smith wouldn't like her; she belongs to one of the "lower races" he's always railing against.)

Vic Ryan's criticism of your article on the Maryland primary election is somewhat puzzling. He wishes you had handled it "a little more open-handedly" and remarks that "you presume that the staggering vote accorded a bigot like Wallace speaks for itself". Actually, your analysis did explore the many subtle reasons that Wallace garnered so many votes and you explicitly denied that the Wallace vote was an accurate index to Maryland's feelings in re integration. Maybe Vic didn't read your comments very carefully.

Is the bit of verse separating the Ryan and Fitch letters genuine or (as I suspect) a collection of nonsense syllables designed to puzzle curious readers? ({The verse in question is an Icelandic rimur, an esoteric form of poetry the stanzas of which may be read either forward or backward. The excerpt published in Kipple #61 is particularly ingenious, in that its meaning when recited backward is diametrically opposite that when read forward. Read normally, it means: "His judgements are well grounded, he never leans unfairly to one side in an issue, he cultivates honor, he never shares in deception and evil." The same letters, read backward, are translated as: "He leans toward vile deception, he never considers honor, he twists what is right to make it wrong, his judgements are ill-grounded." This sort of thing is easier to construct in Icelandic than in English, but it still represents an immense effort.})

"There are no revolutions which do not shake existing belief, enervate authority, and throw doubts over commonly received ideas. The effect of all revolution is, therefore, more or less, to surrender men to their own guidance, and to open to the mind of every man a void and almost unlimited range of speculation. When equality of conditions succeeds a protracted conflict between the different classes of which the elder society was composed, envy, hatred, and uncharitableness, pride and exaggerated self-confidence, seize upon the human heart, and plant their sway in it for a time. This, independently of equality itself, tends powerfully to divide men,--to lead them to mistrust the judgement of each other, and to seek the light of truth nowhere but in themselves. Everyone then attempts to be his own sufficient guide, and makes it his boast to form his own opinions on all subjects. Men are no longer bound together by ideas, but by interests; and it would seem as if human opinions were reduced to a sort of intellectual dust, scattered on every side, unable to collect, unable to cohere." --Alexis de Tocqueville, in "Democracy in America".

JAMES WRIGHT :: 1605 THAYER :: RICHLAND, WASHINGTON, 99352

Bravo for Jean Rose! Religions are the greatest menace facing humanity today. The phrase "a contingent of fatuous claghorns" pops into my mind as one of the best descriptions of religions and their perpetrators. Religions have, for ages, been passing off the idea that sex is shameful, that man is born evil, and that the best way to end up "good" is to devote your life to "God". "God", as I like to say, is a non-existent (but really there) person, in a non-existent (but really there) place, with a non-existent (but really there) filing cabinet, and the power to send people after they die to non-existent (but really there) places. This is the whole basis for religion--it's non-existent (so you cannot prove that it is a lie) but really there. Sex is not shameful. If I went out and slept with a girl, and she wanted it, and I wanted it, I would feel no moral "twinge of conscience". The act in it-

self, if we both wanted it and received pleasure from it, would be moral and innocent. If we thought we had the right to do this (and we do), it would be innocent and moral. Man is not born evil, man is born innocent. Evil is taught by the churches. I wonder what would happen if all children were raised without the "benefit" of parental and community prejudices? Probably we would have a completely moral and innocent group on our hands. Sort of like Heinlein's Valentine Michael Smith.

Also a bravo for John Boston. If I had any guts, I would refuse to take the pledge of allegiance--but not for his reasons. I would not say it because of the words "under God". "What!" the teacher would exclaim. "You don't believe in God? You're sure to grow up to be an evil person." And down to the principal's office I would go, to receive a repeat (lengthened) performance of the same lecture. However, the fun of watching "dignified" people make idiots of themselves would not outweigh the pressures from ostracization, both publicly and at home. I can hit back in other ways, though.

Walter Breen has been wronged by a passel of blockheads, as far as I'm concerned. But I dislike boycotts. I've seen too many become nothing more than failures, usually slightly amusing. I'm not saying you shouldn't boycott--go ahead if you want, but I'm not going to. You're on the right side, anyway.

Although I won't refuse to recite the pledge of allegiance, if anybody tries to make me pray, that will be the limit. The Supreme Court has made the right decision. And I think Madalyn Murray is on the correct path and I wish her success. I hope she succeeds especially in revoking the law under which churches are tax exempt. Why should the churches get away with it? (I note, incidentally, that Mrs. Murray was offered refuge by the Unitarian Church. I always was of the opinion that the Unitarians were the only sane church.)

What irritates me are the people who ignore Goldwater "because he doesn't have a chance". That type makes me almost wish Goldwater would get elected, so they could suffer for the rest of their lives.

"As soon as a nation has attained a position where the rights of the propertied minority have ceased to be a serious obstacle to social progress, where the negative tasks of political action are less pressing than the positive, then the appeal to a revolution by force becomes a meaningless phrase. One can overturn a government or a privileged minority, but not a nation." --Eduard Bernstein, in "Evolutionary Socialism".

NED BROOKS :: 911 BRIARFIELD RD. :: NEWPORT NEWS, VIRGINIA, 23605

In my opinion, Publicola's whole argument collapses about halfway down page five, where he says: "As with the individual, so also with society..." This anthropocentric analogy of the nature of societies with the natures of individuals is an ancient and pernicious fallacy. The most obvious flaw in it is exhibited in Publicola's equation of "habit", an external relation of the individual, with "custom", an internal relation of the society.

Who originated the phrase "justice tempered by mercy"? Shakespeare, perhaps? While "tempered" may mean "soften", "dilute" or "mollify", it also means "strengthen and make more flexible". What the original meaning in the quotation was I am not sure. In any case, it seems rather far-fetched that a computer could grasp the intangible factors involved in the human concept of "justice". I think a better system would be to let the computer decide all the questions of law and fact, but leave the sentencing to a human agency.

I agree with Fitch about the fundamental nature of the questions raised by the Breen affair. Most of the questions he lists could not be answered in a general sense, and I wouldn't even attempt to consider them in this specific case unless I had been on the scene of the various alleged incidents.

I cannot help but admire Madalyn Murray, although I don't agree with her atheism, being myself a Christian. If this were a Christian nation in the sense that most of the people acted towards one another in a truly Christian manner, she could never have been persecuted so for her beliefs.

"The right of the Executive Government to imprison a man, high or low, for reasons of State was denied; and that denial, made good in painful struggles, constitutes the charter of every self-respecting man at any time in any land. Trial by jury of equals, only for offenses known to the law, if maintained, makes the difference between bond and free. But the King felt this would hamper him, and no doubt a plausible case can be advanced that in times of emergency dangerous persons must be confined. The terms 'protective arrest' and 'shot while trying to escape' had not yet occurred to the mind of authority. We owe them to the genius of a later age." --Winston Churchill, in "A History of the English-Speaking Peoples".

KEVIN LANGDON :: 823 IDYLBERRY RD. :: SAN RAFAEL, CALIFORNIA

I see that E. E. Evers wants to kick Donaho out of future conventions, missing the entire point of responsible opposition to the actions of the Pacificon Committee. I don't object to Walter's exclusion from the convention because I think that Walter is an angel; many of those who are most disgusted with Donaho and the committee dislike Walter. The question, rather, is of the ethics of using the coercive power of the state against another individual. Every time the police exercise their power against someone, that power is strengthened. As I disagree with the basis of that power and am familiar with the fascist tyranny which it can, and often does, lead to, I conclude that it is an evil act to use the police against Walter. This doesn't justify using the power of the state against Donaho, though; the two acts don't cancel each other out. Rather, the oppressive force of the police is increased still more. Let no one think, incidentally, that the convention committee acted out of a high-minded concern for the welfare of the youth of science fiction fandom. When Donaho asked me to testify at his "hearing", I asked him, "Why persecute Walter?" Donaho replied that he felt it was his duty to protect the rest of us. "Come off it," I said. "You know that Walter is completely harmless." Donaho chuckled and said, "Well, the convention will get a lot of publicity out of it."

A. G. Smith: In a kill-or-be-killed situation, knowing my own worth, I would have no hesitation in judging it superior to that of the sort of maniac who would create such a situation by attacking me; therefore, I'd kill him. This isn't prejudice; it's rational behavior. Don't misunderstand me; intuition is an integral part of the process of forming hypotheses, but they cannot be accepted as fact until they are tested by reason and experiment. Prejudice is accepting one's irrational impulses uncritically.

Charlie Artman is weak on theory, but his letter affords a practical description of a highly rewarding way of living, one which is practiced by a good many people, though it is seldom spoken of. Charlie is a good friend of mine, and I know from many months of contact with him that his letter is not high-blown theorizing, but the way he lives.

I don't mean that Charlie is a raving sex maniac; he doesn't drag everyone he sees off to bed, but he does accept sex as a natural part of a relationship, without trying to force it one way or another, and this, I think, is good. I try to live this way, too.

Jean Rose: I agree that it is difficult to draw a line between "human" and "non-human", but I don't see why it has to be drawn at all. Whether the embryo is human or not is really irrelevant. If you had a cat and decided you didn't want it, would you drown it? I am in favor of abortion because I oppose over-population and needless suffering. I don't think that human life is sacred. Sacred people are as bad as sacred cows. The real evil is not killing but using the coercive power of the state to do so. In any case, abortions do take place, and legalizing them would make them safer.

There's a third type of conscientious objector which A. G. Smith neglected to mention: me. I object to (1) nuclear war (the end of the world isn't going to do anybody any good) and (2) getting mixed up with the silly, inefficient U. S. Army. As long as there is an adequate supply of guys who like to fight and join up, why should I risk my neck Sure, I'll fight if I'm really threatened, but that's not the case at present.

Marty Helgesen: There is no top of my hill; it is infinite, just as time is. A law of physics isn't an edict which makes the universe behave as it does; rather, it is a description of the abstract mathematical principles which have been observed to correspond to the universe in the past.

Chay Borsella forces me to side with A. G. Smith. Thinking of the human race as a coherent whole, different in kind from all other animals, is provincialism on a grand scale--but provincialism, nonetheless. Of course, I'm not narrowly for those closest to me genetically, either. I'm in favor of evolution, i.e., selective reproduction and survival, and against anything (like nuclear war) that works against it. The Church has probably been no worse than any other fascist outfit, but it's been no better either. There was the inquisition, you know. The Church makes people feel secure by not feeling at all; this sort of vegetablism sickens me. I'm for living life lustily, accepting both the pleasure and the pain, on aesthetic grounds. But the masses have never had much taste. Everyone is imprisoned within himself; pretending not to be is more vegetablism. A. G. Smith does tend to be a bit narrow, but there's nothing wrong with being self-centered as long as one's radius is wide enough.

"If everything must have a cause, then God must have a cause. If there can be anything without a cause, it may just as well be the world as God, so that there cannot be any validity in that argument. It is exactly of the same nature as the Indian's view, that the world rested upon an elephant and the elephant rested upon a tortoise; and when they said, 'How about the tortoise?' the Indian said, 'Suppose we change the subject.' The argument is really no better than that." --Bertrand Russell, in "Why I Am Not a Christian".

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

Charles Crispin's remarks (in #59) on conservatism exhibit the sort of illogical clotheadedness which is characteristic of the medium-left wing and renders suspect many of their other judgements. So conservatives have always been wrong? The implication is clearly that every change, indeed every proposed change, is for the better. Patently this is absurd. Yet it is implicit in his statement and cannot be evad-

ed. Were the conservative Girondists who didn't want to execute Louis XVI wrong and the Jacobins right? Were the conservative Russian Mensheviks wrong and the Bolsheviks right? Were the conservatives after the U.S. Civil War who wanted to carry out Lincoln's program wrong, and the radical Reconstructionists (who must be blamed for most of the anti-Negro feeling in the South ever since) right? I question these instances, off the top of my head. I could raise even more serious questions if I went back and collected some radical proposals that didn't make it past conservative opposition. (Obviously, change does not necessarily constitute improvement, and I am certain that Charles would make no such claim. But your specific examples might have been better chosen. I doubt that the Girondins, who differed from the Jacobins only in degree, could properly be considered "conservative". The conservatives of the period were those who supported an absolute monarch ruling by Divine Right and a weak parliament dominated by the nobility; both of the factions you name were devoted to republican ideals, the Jacobins advocating the abolition of the monarchy, the Girondins favoring the retention of the monarchy as a figurehead with all effective power being wielded by the Assembly. Similarly, the Mensheviks were "conservative" only by comparison with the Bolsheviks. True conservative opinion of the time supported the Tsar and the feudal system, which both the Mensheviks and Bolsheviks were pledged to destroy. The latter groups disagreed chiefly as to how society should be ordered after the revolution: the Mensheviks, oriented toward the needs of the serfs and small landowners, favored democratic socialism, while the Bolsheviks, who drew their support principally from the urban factory workers and disenchanted intellectuals, were committed to a communist utopia. There is about as much justification for terming the Mensheviks "conservatives" as there is for calling Norman Thomas a conservative.)

At the risk of sounding Hegelian, I will say that for true progress both radicals and conservatives are needed. Without radicals, a society would stagnate; without conservatives, it would run wild and tear itself apart, as French society did under the Jacobins. Conservatives serve a very useful function as a filter for new ideas; those with real merit will be adopted sooner or later, while half-baked ones will be exposed for what they are.

Please note that I am using "conservative" in the sense of "defender of the status quo"--most "conservatives" of the present day are really radicals; the only difference between them and left-wing radicals are their ideas. Don't you think the change from Johnson to Goldwater would be greater than that from Eisenhower to Kennedy? That proves to me that Goldwater isn't a real conservative.

I would say that John Boston shows more judgement than you do about the Breen business. He is taking nobody's word for what the real situation is; and unless you were in Berkeley recently (which I'll bet you weren't), you are. And gathered together in the Breen camp is a choice collection of the most notorious liars in science fiction fandom, which is not much recommendation for their veracity. (Since you imply that taking someone's word "for what the real situation is" is inadvisable, I trust you will forgive me for reacting sceptically to this accusation until you have named these individuals and demonstrated with something more concrete than your mere assertion that their word is not to be trusted.) They may be telling the truth in some instances (all things are possible), although it has been conclusively proved in several instances that they weren't. But certainly this case isn't open-and-shut, even if the word of Breen's local supporters is taken in all cases. For instance, I have had confirmed to me by an eyewitness who is taking Breen's side in the matter (specifically, Bob Lichtman) the accuracy of the incident described in Boondoggle concerning the Ellington

child. To me, that is enough in itself to justify excluding Walter from social contact with any juveniles that I am responsible for. I do not consider it necessary, in the name of "liberalism", to associate socially with anyone who is not a convicted criminal. Neither do I consider it necessary for any social organization--which is what a convention is--to admit anyone to membership who is not a convicted criminal. It is my contention that it is quite possible for a person to be proven undesirable beyond a reasonable doubt without convicting him of a crime, and so far as I can see the only argument advanced by Breen's supporters is that if he hasn't been convicted, there is no right to exclude him. I disagree. If those who feel that a man must be convicted before a "liberal" can consider him undesirable want to boycott the Pacificon, I don't care. In the first place, I suspect they are very few in number; in the second place, I will be going to the convention to have a good time and I don't want to spend it arguing about Walter Breen.

Just one incidental point. What have you heard against Marion Breen? I've been all around and nobody has heard anything against her; only that Donaho is circulating a "vicious rumor" about her. Damn funny, I say, that nobody knows what this rumor is. Permit me to think it might be an invention of the pro-Breen side looking for sympathy. Donaho has flatly denied circulating any such rumor, incidentally--he says he knows nothing against Marion (other than questioning, as I do, her judgement in marrying Walter). (In The Loyal Opposition, Marion writes: "(Donaho) has circulated, in letters, a slander about me which--in addition to being provably false--is so unbelievably foul that I cannot repeat it here. When apprised of this slander, our lawyer warned us not even to send a copy of it through the U.S. mails but to have it delivered in person to her office!" Admittedly, I have not personally seen any slanderous letters bearing Donaho's signature, but I have no reason whatsoever to question Marion's veracity. Redd Boggs once wrote of Marion in a letter to me, "If I have learned anything about her in 15 years of close friendship, I've learned to rely completely on her good intentions and high integrity." This has always been my view as well.)

I'll agree with George Price that inequality of opportunity is not the fault of the free market economy. It is the fault of two things: the family system and the profit motive. Both of these are pretty fundamental parts of the human society, and ending either would necessitate practically starting over from scratch. I don't care what your economic system is; unless you can think of some alternative to the profit motive, the more competent will accumulate more of this world's goods than the less competent. And as long as there are families, the children of the competent will thereby have a head start over the children of the less competent. The only way in which the economic system would affect this would be to determine the amount of inequality and the bottom level. There is no inherent reason why the free market economy should be worse in this respect than a planned economy. A free market economy is not, as I see it, necessarily incompatible with a considerable degree of welfarism; most advocates of the free market economy are opposed to welfarism, but that's not the same thing.

Also, I think you wax a good deal too emotional on the point--in modern American society, I doubt if over 20% of the population is in a position where financial difficulty prevents them from going to college. The median income the last time I looked was over $5000, and on a salary of $5000 a year my father put me and my brother through college without our doing anything of great significance--and this wasn't a state college, either. If the student is willing to work part-time or co-op (which can be done at many schools, especially in engineering or scientific work), even less money is required.

How, I might ask, would any economic system get past the road-

block of parental indifference to education rubbing off on the children? The problems of laziness, etc., you refer to may not be hereditary, but unless you advocate removing the children from the home they will still be passed on by whatever mechanism.

"To the extent that a society insists upon different kinds of personality so that one age-group or class or sex-group may follow purposes disallowed or neglected in another, each individual participant in that society is the richer. The arbitrary assignment of set clothing, set manners, set social responses, to individuals born in a certain class, of a certain sex, or of a certain color, to those born on a certain day of the week, to those born with a certain complexion, does violence to the individual endowment of individuals, but permits the building of a rich culture. The most extreme development of a society that has attained great complexity at the expense of the individual is historical India, based, as it was, upon the uncompromising association of a thousand attributes of behavior, attitude, and occupation with an accident of birth. To each individual there was given the security, although it might be the security of despair, of a set role, and the reward of being born into a highly complex society." --Margaret Mead, in "Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies".

ENID OSTEN :: 2712 CALVERT ST. :: BALTIMORE, MARYLAND, 21218

A. G. Smith reminds me of the speaker in cumming's poem, "next to of course god america i", except that, unlike the platitudinous speaker, he doesn't think too much of god, but sincerely believes in the mystical goodness of the "american" way of life. The windbag in the poem goes on to celebrate the "happy heroic dead/who rushed like lions into the roaring slaughter/and did not stop to think they died instead". Smith goes on to praise the military as a fine and necessary institution for defending this way of life from intruders and desecraters. His viewpoint is understandable, issuing as it does from his basic premise of "America over everything" (i.e., "one's native country over everything"), but shows little empathy for the conscientious objector who places an ethical or moral abstraction (such as "War is evil," "Life is precious," etc.) over defense of his native country. The most frightening thing about Smith's viewpoint is his bland assumption that everyone except a few "social misfits" feels that his country is always mystically "right" and that other nations are in "error". Patriotism is not, as Mr. Smith assumes, a self-evident truth. Too much of it is injected calculatedly by brainwashing--emotional sins of commission and ommission; too little of it is the result of maturity and reasoning. I personally believe that I am not in a position to say which country is nearest to my "ideal", having direct experience with only one. But then I doubt if Mr. Smith would approve of my Utopia.

Incidentally, one facet of this country's philosophy that I admire and appreciate is the relative tolerance for nonconforming or minority views, but this tolerance (except in the related and possibly more crucial area of Negro-Caucasian relations) is fast being sucked down the drain. Victorian England, which boasted a Jewish Prime Minister, a determined atheist Member of Parliament (who made no secret of his atheism; quite the contrary) and innumerable Socialist meetings in Trafalgar Square, had it all over us in this field; we seem to be terrified of rocking the boat. Which boat appears to be at a standstill.

Your analysis of the Maryland primary was excellent. I've heard that the Wallace near-victory is an indication of the upsurge to conservatism that is occurring in our suburbs. It seems that the middle

class people of the Depression era with their Protestant ethic and professional-proletarianism are getting older without making an appreciable impression on their children--who are growing up, buying on credit while adopting safe conservative views politically, and descending on the shopping centers and voting-booths of the suburbs in ever-increasing numbers. The old "working class" is dying or dissolving into the socially volatile "middle-middle" class, with hopes of one day making the "upper-middle" bracket--and the relative liberalism of the one is being replaced by the conservative ideals and catch-phrases of the other.

As to the Breen affair, Ted, you are forgetting that many people are frankly unfamiliar with the participants in this admittedly sordid affair and thus unable to judge what is taking place--indeed, many seem rather bewildered by it, myself included. True, the ideals you mention are good ones and ones which I think few would hesitate to defend if it were not for the confusion which surrounds this issue and the magnitude of the various charges. Does society have the right to exclude an "undesirable" individual? I feel most of us would agree that the very thought of this is repugnant. Science fiction fandom has always been haven for persons who may have trouble being accepted by "normal" society, and I'll admit that the Committee's action sets a nasty precedent. Too, accepting for the sake of argument the validity of the charges, the manner of dealing with the situation was reprehensible. Yet there are several factors that have kept many from speaking out; I feel this is not so much fear of voicing a liberal opinion as lack of knowledge of the true facts. The variou accounts are vague and contradictory. Several presumably reliable individuals believe that Donaho "did Breen dirty" as the result of a personal grudge, and Donaho's going to the police and publishing Boondoggle seems to support this. Yet other equally reliable persons, including so-called "friends" of Walter, have stated that the "deviation" charge has some basis in fact. Respectable-seeming members of the Committee have stated that the exclusion of Breen was not instigated by Donaho but by the Committee acting as a gestalt--and not out of a wish to do in Breen, but out of a desire to protect their own necks. If the charges are in the least true, the Committee has a right to exclude Walter from the convention, not on moral grounds, but on the fear of being held responsible for anything that might occur. Even the Marquis de Sade said something to the effect that the societal deviate is more or less at the mercy of the society from which he deviates and should expect the worst if his deviation becomes known. The fact that the Committee could well have been "enlightened" of Walter's deviation by a personal enemy of his, that the tactics used were of the worst and most bastardly, that the charges were probably exaggerated and/or had little bearing on the convention--these factors are unfortunately offset by the fact that "society" would back up the Committee's action, and punish the Committee in the event that anything it frowned on would arise at the convention.

"The rights of neutrality will only be respected when they are defended by an adequate power. A nation, despicable by its weakness, forfeits even the privilege of being neutral." --Alexander Hamilton, in "The Federalist" (No. 11).

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

You are either writing or rewriting Publicola's essays. First of all, I would recommend your instituting the proper procedure to copyright that word or to register it as a trademark or something, because that way, you can just sit back a few years and then cash in when some

soft drink manufacturer unwittingly infringes your rights by naming the newest soft drink sensation for leftists with that word. (⟨"Publicola--the drink populists enjoy!"⟩) It's hard to tell if you are presenting ideas you genuinely believe in, or are keeping your entire tongue in cheek. You could hardly have overlooked the important little fact about present-day law: that its principal function and almost sole reason for recourse is involved in its help in the matter of maintaining the status quo in the distribution of wealth and property. (⟨I suppose it is pointless to deny authorship of the essays on conservatism, since I have in the past occasionally invented contributors to this periodical, but I am utterly horrified that you should even consider the possibility that Publicola's remarks represent ideas in which I genuinely believe.⟩)

I don't quite understand your reasoning in the first article in "Jottings". You charge that the United States policy about recognizing new governments is "inflexible". Immediately you cite instances in which the government did not adhere to the policy that you ascribe to it. Then you charge hypocritic foreign policy. I think that you are bound to get them, either coming or going, if you fuss at both flexibility and inflexibility. (⟨This comment neatly illustrates the validity of my major criticism of the conservative view of foreign policy. You are equating flexibility with hypocrisy, an association which I took pains to discredit in the original article. Hypocrisy in foreign policy is not the opposite of inflexibility of foreign policy; rather, it is the inevitable result of an inflexible policy. A flexible policy is one which permits a nation to cope realistically with any contingency without engaging in hypocrisy (i.e., acting contrary to a previously stated position). To comment once again on the specific matter of recognition of governments which come to power by non-democratic means, let me say that my preferred "policy" on this matter is one of judging each case as it occurs and not committing oneself in advance to a position of either recognition or non-recognition. Obviously, it is at times necessary to recognize and even aid governments which achieved power by non-democratic means (South Vietnam, Brazil, etc.). We have, at various times in the past, been committed--on paper, as it were--to refuse recognition to such governments, but this committment has been ignored whenever expediency demanded. The policy is clearly inflexible, and therefore promotes hypocritical action in this area. The policy which I would substitute does not commit the nation to any particular action, but permits the proper authority to take what action appears proper at the time. This is a realistic policy, which allows great latitude in its execution but eliminates the possibility of hypocrisy.⟩)

Use of computers in the courts would not exactly be an innovation. Law books are similar in function to the proposed use of computers and I'm sure that the introduction of written materials to replace verbally transmitted and mentally retained laws and precedents was criticized in much the same way as computers are now called threats to removal of the human judgement from justice. I don't see how computers could take over completely. It's hard to imagine such skillful interpretation of computer findings as a jury can now obtain simply by hearing a slight change in a witness's way of speaking, betraying the fact that he has just begun to perjure himself. I don't think that computers could read expressions as well as humans can read them, and I'm convinced that a human can frequently make a shrewd guess about a defendant's guilt by his expression. There is no criminal look in the sense that a person with a certain facial configuration is destined to crime. But the guys who really did it frequently look frightened, worried, and six other things before a judge and jury, and I believe that this betraying emotion has caused the legend of the criminal look.

We think pretty much alike on the matter of civil rights demon-

strations. But you can't say that unequal job opportunities are wholly to be ascribed to poor education. Matter of fact, you didn't say it, but you failed to take into account the large quantities of jobs which Negroes can't get even though the vocations require little or no education or special training. Hagerstown has no Negroes as waitresses at most of its lunch counters, custodians in most of its schools, mail carriers, and so on: these aren't high-paying jobs but they're a step above caring for lawns or pimping.

I wish people wouldn't keep claiming that drugs provide "illumination" and let the individual "transcend himself" and so on. Mescaline and the like do a much poorer job at creating special sensations than the fever of a serious illness or a severe case of schizophrenia. If I take a dose of something that causes me to think that there is some supernal significance in a cigarette butt in a toilet bowl, I must either tell what this significance is or admit that I've been deluded by whatever upset my ability to make value judgements and to perceive reality. If a cockroach begins to glow alternatingly green and blue and to trace an important message by running about the floor in front of a drug addict, I expect him to reveal to me the message and how he recognized the language and to prove that his sudden ability to perceive the fluorescing from black light caused these results, or I'll think that he was suffering from inability to perceive reality, not increased ability to perceive it.

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

CHAY BORSELLA :: 311 E. 29th ST. :: BALTIMORE, MARYLAND, 21218

The Stuart Chase article, "Will Communism Conquer the World?", contains some apt observations so far as trouble from Russia and China are concerned. But this essay has not said one word about the dangers of a slow, steady drifting toward Communism from within. The result of this ommission was that the essay seemed to be blithely dismissing these dangers.

Of course, there is no single thing which will send the country toppling downhill overnight, but the constant accumulation of smaller things can be, in the long run, much more dangerous. I cannot think of nine men in this country who are trying harder to accelerate this leftist drift than the baseball team of Earl Warren. For truly the Supreme Court, in its highly arbitrary interpretations of the United States Constitution, has been throwing around more power than it was ever meant to accumulate. The latest outrage is the reapportionment order, a job that will not be able to be carried out without much disruption of the

state systems that are involved. (⟨It takes a remarkable degree of imagination--a quality much esteemed among science fiction readers--to interpret a court decision which materially increases the extent to which this nation is a democracy as part of a "slow, steady drifting toward Communism". Surely the chief requisite for true democracy is equality of representation; to the extent that the vote of one citizen carries less weight than the vote of another, the political system is undemocratic. As for your assertion that the nine members of the Supreme Court are deliberately attempting to accelerate a drift toward Communism, I suppose it was inserted to incite me to riot and might have had it been offered by almost anyone else; but--confident that the Chay Borsella I know believes no such thing--I will ignore the remark.⟩)

I can not think of one thing the Supreme Court has done to facilitate the government process in recent years. I wonder if its sole purpose is not to cater to the likes of such citizens as Madalyn Murray and various others of her ilk. Take, for instance, its decision that Communists can now obtain passports and journey in and out of the country at will. In this decision, the Court has removed one more safety-valve and has slung it to the winds. I would <u>not</u> term this passport decision "open-mindedness". There is a point when what you, Ted, consider "open-mindedness" deteriorates into sheer foolhardy <u>risk</u>. (⟨A free society may not impose legal restrictions upon any individual on the basis of his political beliefs. A discriminatory law (i.e., one which applies to some citizens and not to others) violates the basic concept of civil liberties. Even if the risk were grave, the principle involved would justify the Court's decision. Since, as it happens, the actual risk is negligible (it shows a distressing lack of confidence in the American system to fear a few thousand anachronistic malcontents who are already the most despised group in the nation), the case of those who opposed the Supreme Court ruling is even weaker.⟩)

Nor can I agree with you that the average liberal is more tolerant than the average moderate or even conservative. In fact, I can think of no group more stubborn, unyielding, and unwilling to reason than the majority of the declared liberals that I know. Usually, they are completely <u>intolerant</u> of any view except their own. (⟨Perhaps we use the word "tolerant" in a different sense. I suppose that I am representative of the declared liberals with whom you are acquainted, and I consider myself reasonably tolerant of the opinions of others. This does not mean that I receive such opinions without responding or even that I am invariably courteous to political opponents; but it does mean that I defend the right of others to voice their opinions. The absolute freedom to hold and express any opinion whatsoever is central to my ethical and political system; but this implies equally my right to be "stubborn (and) unyielding" in condemning an opinion, so long as I make no effort to prevent its expression. Most conservatives pay lip-service to this principle, but ignore it in practice (when Gus Hall is invited to speak at the local college, for example, or when junior brings home a textbook from school which implies that Communism might not be an absolutely evil system). This sort of tolerance, best expressed in Voltaire's famous statement, is not restricted only to liberals, but is nevertheless primarily identified with liberalism. In a society ruled completely by my philosophy, George Lincoln Rockwell would be absolutely free to express his views; would I be equally at liberty to express my opinions in a society ruled by Rockwell's philosophy?⟩)

I <u>do</u> agree with you that a socialist could hardly be a moral relativist, since socialists place much confidence in the capabilities of man. This philosophy would shape the socialist into a type of humanist. Even in this, though, there is an ambivalence; for socialism, in my opinion, by taking from one man and giving to another, reduces the

integrity and self-respect of man while purporting to upgrade it.

You say: "The principles of a liberal, in the final analysis, are few, highly generalized, and very inclusive..." This philosophy still seems to me more "unprincipled" than "flexible". You want justice. Let us assume that you are trying to form some kind of an opinion on (for instance) the Breen-Donaho business. The first thing you would want to do would be to get as many objective facts about the case as you could. Then you would try to relate the facts to your principles. But if all you had for principles were "highly generalized" vague constructs, and "few" of these, even, it seems you would be at a standstill, unable to make a decision at all! This philosophy would seemingly lead to a perpetual agnosticism; it would be impossible to render any answer but "I do not know." But no one can act on "I do not know"; decisions are a must, as we all do know.

"Though Greek history abounds in political failures and disasters, and though its courageous experiments were to close in the absolute monarchies of the Hellenistic kings, yet it has its own grandeur. Greek politics were at least founded on the conviction that men have a right to live for their own sake and not for the sake of some exalted individual or supernatural system. It was indeed difficult to decide whether this should be applied to a whole people or to a privileged section, but the mere fact that it existed is a tribute to the Greek respect for human personality. Even more impressive is the way in which this ideal was translated into fact through the rule of law. Law guaranteed liberty, and even if it imposed limitations on what the individual could do, these were not irksome in view of the assurance which it gave to him that he could pursue his own life in his own way. The Greeks saw that liberty cannot exist without law, and that only in their combination can a man realize himself among other men." --C. M. Bowra, in "The Greek Experience".

DEREK NELSON :: 18 GRANARD BLVD. :: SCARBOROUGH, ONTARIO :: CANADA

In #59, Charles Crispin contributes to "Dissenting Opinions" the type of statements that infuriate me, partly because of their assininity and partly because you made no attempt to refute them. Crispin is the classic example of the radical making idiotic statements about conservatism (or anything else he doesn't understand). In particular, by the use of a broad and warped generalization, he states that "obstructing progress demands the use of violence and the suppression of freedom".

I will concede that conservatives oppose progress (though it is not necessarily true in all circumstances and at all times) as the liberal wing defines it. He sees this as our weakness; I see it as our strength. We are here to conserve what is; the radical is out to change society. Life is tolerable, we say, so leave it alone!--err we destroy everything in a rampage of "progress" and enlightenment. And the thought of the French Revolution, with its liberalism and progress run riot to savagery and despotism--this still makes us shudder.

And Crispin talks about "suppressing freedom"--the only way we can slow or stop progress. He is either very stupid, very ignorant, or has let his radical emotions destroy his reasoning powers.

It was the father of modern conservatism, Edmund Burke, who stood in that greatest and most venerable of political institutions, the House of Commons, and fought long and hard for the rights of free men. Against the tyranny of his king he supported the American colonials who rebelled to keep their long-established rights as free Englishmen. But conserva-

tive that he was, he repudiated the radical rantings of Paine and his clique who supported the Conservation for entirely different reasons. For example: Paine was against the monarchy, but Burke was against a king. Only the radical sees no difference.

And it was Burke who, on the one hand, bitterly opposed the progress inherent (from the democratic point of view) in the Reform Acts, while, on the other, he was the longest and fiercist campaigner for the abolition of repressive and discriminatory legislation aimed at Roman Catholics and Protestant dissenters.

Again: it was Burke, the supporter of the American Revolution, who spent years fighting from the gut against the French Revolution. The conservative sickened at the thought of the triumph of progress in the form of the guillotine at home and the bayonet abroad.

But facts and historical examples won't convince Crispin. I doubt that the passage of the Civil Rights Act in the Senate has come to his attention, especially the fact that the majority of conservatives voted in favor of it.

Crispin also accuses conservatives of once having enforced their desire for stability with torture and royal absolutism. I plead guilty to this--but God be my witness, far better the absolutism of Metternich than the liberal paradise of France/1797; far better the Congress of Vienna than Napoleon's legions gutting the young of Europe in bloody combat; better Bismark's Germany than Hitler's Germany; Manchu China than Mao's China; ad infinitum. This is not to say that all change in government systems is bad. The Japan of today, for instance, is incomparably superior to the Japan of the warlords.

However, Crispin does make one good point: that there have always been conservatives, no matter what the age or the name they went under. From Aristotle to the barons at Runnymede, and many more, some have given correct analyses of the future course of their society while others have failed in their interpretation of events. But let me ask Crispin, would he have sided with the conservatives in the Roman Senate such as Cicero and Cato, or with the radicals--militarists like Marius or populists like the Grachhi?

But that is history. I get the impression that Crispin wouldn't really mind if conservatives didn't exist; he apparently believes that there is no place for them in politics. How do you judge a conservative's usefulness? Has conservatism failed because change takes place? Of course not, for what the conservative wants is to channel and retard it, so that there occur no basic, abrupt upheavals in the social fabric (since this produces disaster as often as not).

To my mind, the stereotyped perfect governmental system for Western style free democracies is a two-party system, with one party based on a conservative philosophy and the other based on liberalism. The latter, when in power, reforms, tinkers and changes society at random so it progresses. Then the conservative party assumes the mantle of leadership to consolidate or, if necessary, to reform the liberal's changes in the structure of society, to root these alterations in the cultural organism. This, of course, is the optimum, so it can never be.

But the liberal and conservative both should admit they need each other, plus a few radicals and reactionaries hanging on the wings, to insure a political dialogue and an actual choice for the populace.

And to finish with Crispin in #59: I note he must equate conservatism and reaction in the typical idiocy of the non-discriminating American liberal.

In the previous issue, the same Mr. Crispin, as the anti-religious are wont to do, sneers at Publicola's mentions of God and the general conservative tendency to support God (as if He wasn't big enough to take care of Himself). As an agnostic who usually doesn't give a damn about

religion one way or another--and as a conservative--I feel I should comment. I defend Christianity, the Bible in school and all the rest of the rigamarole not because I believe in it, but mainly because religion roots the masses in the culture (it is their opium, as Marx said). The potential radical is chained, secure by being chained to his God. Also, it's an unnecessary change and I object to that in principle. Lastly, I haven't been convinced that the constitutional phrasing "freedom of religion" does actually mean "freedom from religion".

As a parting comment for Charles Crispin, I might remind him that Patton's number one hate were the British, and secondly anyone else who wasn't an American. I doubt very much he was a racist in the sense that skin color determined his outlook.

In #60, John Boston brings up the old bogey of nuclear war that "I don't mind dying, but I can't condemn everyone else." Goddamn it! Last I heard this was a democracy and we elect the people who sit with the fingers on the button. That's what your parliamentary representative is for--to make decisions. And if you don't like the thought that the guy you elect is pledged to go to war if the Reds grab Berlin, then vote for the Peace Party or the NDP, but don't go around saying we didn't have a choice and moaning all the time. (Well, the trouble is, of course, we don't have a peace party in this country; the choice often lies between varying degrees of bellicosity.)

FROM:
TED PAULS
1448 MERIDENE DRIVE
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND, 21212
U. S. A.

SEND TO:

printed matter only

may be opened for inspection

return requested

this side up

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

NEWS FLASH:
Senator Goldwater has announced that, if he is elected President, a new secret weapon will be employed in the war in South Vietnam. It is called a catapult...