

SEPTEMBER 23, 1964

Kipple 66

Kipple, an irregular but frequent journal of opinion and commentary, is published by Ted Pauls, 1448 Meridene Drive, Baltimore, Maryland, 21212. Copies are available in exchange for letters of comment, contributions (articles, verse, etc.), other interesting periodicals, or the cash sum of 20¢ per issue. If a number appears in the address box, it is the number of the last issue you will receive; the letter "T" indicates that we exchange publications; the letter "S" means this is a sample copy; and the letter "P" is highly suspicious. This issue is dedicated to Paul Ehrlich, discoverer of sodiumdiaminodihydroxyarsenobenzenemethanalsulfoxylate, without which most chemistry textbooks would be considerably shorter. WOKL

$\text{Au} + \text{H}_2\text{O} = \text{H}_2\text{S}$ $\text{Au} + \text{H}_2\text{O} = \text{H}_2\text{S}$ $\text{Au} + \text{H}_2\text{O} = \text{H}_2\text{S}$

"We have seen that Marxism as an ideology is dead, yet Mao Tse-Tung, though freely adapting Marx to suit his needs (and patterning his adaptations after Lenin), still holds dear one key ideological thesis of Marx: that communism is inevitable and that we must be agents of history and bring it about. While the Soviet Communists also feel this to be the case, they do not expound such an activist interpretation. The messianic flavoring that Marx gave his teachings can prove to be the most pernicious of his thoughts, as it implants in its adherents a sense of divine destiny and thus has rulers concerning themselves directly with the ends-in-view, rather than with the morality of the means in action; in setting up a system of absolutes, Marx invites his agents to dispense with an ethical rationale, giving them the opportunity to perform bloody deeds with a righteous attitude, chalking up the cruelest purges as necessary evils. This attitude accounts for the guiltless manner in which Lenin executed his enemies, and is also prevalent in the ways of Mao Tse-Tung. This is not the only way in which Mao picks up the Marxist-Leninist thread; being the most orthodox of contemporary communist rulers, Mao is the most simplistic in defining his goals--and the most aggressive in reaching them."

--Donald E. Gastwirth

DEREK NELSON :: 18 GRANARD BLVD. :: SCAR-
BOROUGH, ONTARIO :: CANADA

In the field of foreign policy, I am in agreement with George Price almost 100%. You, Ted, note that "given time", the Communists will accept the de facto political division of the world in much the same way that Christians now accept the Protestant-Roman Catholic division. This is precisely what I, and probably Price and Anderson and Pournelle, are after. But we don't believe you can do it without fighting; and it took two centuries to convince the Catholics in Europe that they weren't wanted in many regions, two centuries of some of the bloodiest warfare the world has ever seen. You can't stop an aggressor by flexibility of the Fulbright brand (i.e., "surrender"), but rather by flexibility of response to his aggressions. (Senator Fulbright advocates flexibility of response to a changing world situation; this includes flexibility of response to blatant aggression, but extends beyond this into areas less comprehensible to the intellect of a Burkean conservative. Flexibility of response must include, for example, recognition of realities (e.g., the enduring nature of German partition, the presence of Communism in Cuba, etc.), however unpalatable. It must also include the realization that every Communist nation is, like every non-Communist nation, in a category of its own, an individual case which must be dealt with individually. Finally, the Fulbright foreign policy, as I understand it, demands attention to what is termed "the long view". This latter is particularly important. Conservatives cry "Victory over Communism!" while advocating policies which are more likely to lead to the universal annihilation of thermonuclear war, and when Senator Fulbright points the way to the only kind of victory over Communism which is possible to us, he is condemned as an appeaser. This victory consists in the culmination of the evolutionary trend toward liberalization of Communist society which is presently in its primitive stages, as indicated by the ideological disagreements within the Communist camp and the mild degree of independence being asserted by the Soviet satellite states in Eastern Europe. We can encourage this trend by continuing efforts to relax world tensions, entering into extensive trade and cultural agreements with the most "progressive" of the Communist regimes (Yugoslavia, Hungary and Poland), deliberately undercutting the position of the Chinese purists, and encouraging

DISSENTING

letters

OPINIONS

Communist governments (such as the present Cuban regime) to become less dependent on the Soviet Union. (Our current policy with regard to Cuba, whatever its aim, has exactly the opposite effect.))

President Kennedy built America's armed forces in such a way as to make this flexibility of response possible. But will this policy be followed? I think Johnson, as a pragmatist of the first order, will carry it out, while Kennedy's liberal principles of self-determination and such gunk got in his way. In response to further Castro-type rebellions, we will have the Bay of Pigs all over again--only we'll use enough force to win these future battles. If necessary in order to win in South Vietnam we'll carry the war to the rest of Indochina, but not beyond. We will fight for our friends like Malaysia, by forgetting the co-existence principle of passive containment, under which the enemy have privileged sanctuaries. For the guerillas that Sukarno sends into Borneo, we send an equal number back across the border; this is limited response. We fight on their terms of area and conduct, but we hit back rather than just waiting for assaults and we hit back in the same manner as the attacker. If he uses guerillas, we use guerillas, and if his regular army moves, so does ours. (Such a policy is useful in certain areas and at certain times, but it must be viewed only as a relatively minor facet of a much broader general policy. The military aspect of the present conflict garners most of the headlines, but we should not permit this to foster the delusion that it is the most important or decisive aspect.)

We are in Southeast Asia (to use but one example) because of its strategic importance to the Western Alliance, and we must be there to win. I have no use for leftist neutralization proposals which inevitably the Communists use to grab an area without fighting for it. But equally I detest the isolationist (A. G. Smith) cry of "Wait till they reach us." It is easier to stop an aggressor when he is weaker than when he is stronger. And as for Goldwater's idiotic suggestions about nukes on supply lines and victory by bombing China, I have only contempt. I have no desire for victory over Communism, however evil it is, but I want their expansion stopped--and the West can do it if it fights rather than surrenders or appeases. The Communist advance is halted in Europe, so let's not stir things up there as Goldwater wants but instead concentrate our efforts to secure the Asian periphery and the vast rear areas not tied to Communism (even if not allied with us).

And while we are on the subject of defense and war, I would like to comment on Newman's review of the Kahn book, and preface it with the suggestion that the reviewer is an idiot in the "lacking comprehension" sense. He does not review; he digests "On Thermonuclear War" and actually makes quite a good case for the book while doing so. Kahn exists--an acquaintance of mine does and has worked with him--which demolishes to an absurdity Newman's attack on the man rather than his writings. And that the book is a moral tract on mass murder is about as sensible as saying that writings of Clausewitz are the same on a smaller scale.

The arguments against Kahn aren't in this pamphlet, though they do exist. Horowitz has one of the best, but, on the whole, Kahn still offers the first general theory of nuclear warfare since the atom bomb that operates (to my mind, rather successfully) on something other than emotion.

If nuclear war ever comes, and if Kahn's suggestions are followed, we have a far better chance of survival than at present. And a chance is better than certain death, which most of us in the cities face.

But we will never have to face this challenge if Communism is stopped on its periphery without an attempt to "roll them back". Then neither Russia nor ourselves will be forced, in desperation, to use the ultimate weapons. Let us stop reacting to Communist aggression when it

is too late; let us meet them and their allies at the moment of assault and stop them on the spot. When the Berlin Wall was built we watched it grow in horror but without doing anything other than talking. Yet we now know that the Communist border guards who built it did not have ammunition in case the Western forces in Berlin decided to knock it over, and thus blood would not be spilt and the crisis deepened. The lost opportunities of the past gaze down on us.

To my mind, the most dangerous and ill-considered decision of the Supreme Court is that dealing with reapportionment, which levels every state legislative office in the United States to the appealing dictatorship (in the original sense) of majoritarian democracy. Leaving aside the argument as to whether the court is outside its jurisdiction in setting the conditions for elections, the size of ridings, etc., I would like to concentrate on another aspect of the decision. As a conservative, I am repelled by the concept of direct democracy, and even of indirect democracy that works on the basis of numerical superiority alone. The checks and balances system is a necessity in any state, and changing government to a pawn of the mobocracy by ruling that both state houses must be based on numerical equality alone is extremely dangerous. I have enough faith in the people to believe that this power will not be used damagingly, at least for the present, but the rootless city mass of a modern, discontented, rootless America with its revolutionary and atomistic traditions could easily fall prey to a radicalism--e.g., of the Goldwater school, or its successors. The concept of "one man/one vote" is not under attack, but rather the belief that one million plus one will be right while one million will be wrong. The theory of concurrent majority, to which I subscribe, restricts the tyranny of mere numerical superiority. One house based on population exists in a bicameral legislature along with a house devoted to regional interests, a check on the radical house devoted to the mob, as it were. (The question is not whether a numerical majority is necessarily right (it obviously is not) but rather whether it should be permitted to prevail in day-to-day political decisions. The alternative to majority rule is minority rule, which may be blatant (as in fascist or communist dictatorships or the system of restricted franchise advocated by George Price) or covert (e.g., the present situation in malapportioned legislatures, which you favor, giving a minority a veto on the decisions of the majority). Apart from the ethical objections to such an anti-democratic system, which I doubt would impress you and therefore will not trouble to outline, there is one outstanding pragmatic objection which you would do well to bear in mind: if the principle of minority rule is accepted, then you cannot reasonably object if the composition of the minority changes so as to effect a movement toward the Left. Thus, if radicalism once again becomes popular amongst rural folk (as it was during the era of the Populist Party) and screaming liberals come to dominate the geographically constituted houses of state legislatures, conservatives, having previously conceded the right of these upper houses to wield decisive power, will be unable to reasonably argue against the resultant radical legislation. I am reminded of those conservatives who, during the 1930's, lavishly praised an independent Supreme Court for resisting the liberalism of the New Deal, and now find themselves in the position of attempting to curb that very independence. If you accept the principle of the accumulation of power in the hands of a minority, then you must accept it even when the minority is no longer on your side.))

In #61, you affirm that liberals have principles but you seem to deny that conservatives do, rather denouncing what you call "a hideous conglomeration of moral precepts, religious tenets, etc." to which con-

CONTINUED AFTER "JOTTINGS"

jottings from the editor's desk

THE MFDP IN ATLANTIC CITY: If liberals in general have consistently displayed any particular shortcoming it is that they tend to be insufficiently skilled in the procedures of practical politics. Whereas modern liberals are frequently accused of sacrificing principle to the demands of expediency, the actual fact is that an excessive degree of idealism and a consequent tendency to fail in the achievement of practical goals is more often the dominant liberal characteristic. Do not misunderstand: idealism is not a regrettable attribute, and devotion to principle is always a highly admirable trait. But the political structure of the democracy in which we move and function is such that, no matter what the moral brilliance of one's position, it is necessary to win elections in order to achieve a degree of influence over the outcome of events. Adlai Stevenson may be the greatest liberal spokesman of our generation; but John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson, the superb politicians, managed to secure the power without which laudable political ideals are virtually impotent.

The game of politics is frequently distasteful to liberals, because it entails entering into association with a variety of individuals one would not necessarily want one's sister to marry (political bosses, union leaders, financial barons, etc.), mollifying pressure groups of one persuasion or another, and frequently compromising immediate goals in order to remain in a position to wield authority. But while the liberal in politics may regret the existence of the peculiar political structure in which such activity is necessary, there is very little he can do to avoid it without abandoning all hope of victory in the election which is always imminent. Too many liberals have adopted, in anger and frustration, the latter course, thus sinking into political oblivion. Of course, it is not suggested that any true liberal consent to the compromise of his principles in order to win an election; this course is wholly unacceptable. What is necessary, however, in playing the game of politics is to recognize that there is more than one way to skin a cat, and that one must render one's philosophy acceptable to the majority of the electorate. For every political, social or economic objective there are many possible paths by means of which it may be reached. The liberal idealist selects the most direct path, the politician the most popular; without considering which most faithfully obeys the moral imperative, it is at least clear that the politician's course is more likely to result in the adoption of the program. (Consider, for an example, Governor Carl Sanders of Georgia, who could not have been elected on a platform of civil rights for Negroes, but who could--and did--gain a victory on a platform of moderation and respect for law and order. The effective implementation of such a policy in the state of Georgia will lead to the enjoyment of full civil rights by its Negro citizens, of course.)

Most liberals seem to have recently decided to scrupulously heed

the dictates of practical politics, having no doubt realized the necessity of emerging victorious from the forthcoming elections. As November 3rd draws ever closer, criticism of the Johnson Administration from the left decreases both in frequency and in vehemence. This indicates a measure of political wisdom which liberals have in the past failed to display. The Johnson Administration is certainly susceptible to criticism from this quarter; I personally remain, as I have since his elevation to supreme power, frankly underwhelmed by Lyndon Johnson's "liberalism". But this is not the proper time to expose such attitudes to the public eye. The prospect of a Goldwater victory in November is so terrifying that liberals cannot afford to foster quarrels within the Democratic Party. Perhaps this view leaves politically sophisticated liberals open to charges of hypocrisy, but I seriously doubt that such criticism is warranted. After all, a man may find much to criticize in the characteristics of his wife, but he generally refrains from voicing these opinions in the presence of a third party who is viciously attacking the woman he loves on the basis of what he considers her admirable qualities.

Not all liberals, however, are content to hold in abeyance their demands and objections until a dangerous adversary has been vanquished. Among the diverse segments of the liberal-radical coalition are to be found those whose devotion and zeal are so all-consuming that moderation and political wisdom are casually cast aside. These are individuals whose dedication to principle would, under almost any other conditions, entitle them to the highest praise. Unfortunately, the uncompromising devotion which permits valiant young Americans to non-violently endure the systematic brutality brought to bear upon them by the corrupt white power structure of Alabama and Mississippi is strikingly inappropriate in the context of a national political convention. As Dr. Martin Luther King pointed out, when a movement shifts its emphasis from street demonstrations to meaningful political activity, its adherents must be prepared to adjust not only their tactics but also their attitude. The delegation of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party which attended the Democratic National Convention in Atlantic City failed conspicuously to undergo the necessary transformation. These individuals brought to Atlantic City unflagging dedication and nothing else; one had the impression that James Farmer, Bayard Rustin, Dr. King and Joseph L. Rauh were embarrassed by their unsophisticated backwoods colleagues but were trying terribly hard not to show it.

To one deeply in sympathy with the moral position of the Freedom Democrats, the spectacle of these unknowledgeable amateurs fumbling around amid a gathering of professional politicians was especially saddening. It is unlikely that the activities of this particular assemblage of militant integrationists resulted in the same degree of damage to the movement as have the recent riots in Northern cities, but it will be a long time before many members of the television audience forget Dr. Aaron Henry's repeated rudeness to representatives of the press, the disturbances caused by the attempts of the MFDP to gain entry to the convention hall, the ridiculous public statements of comedian Dick Gregory, and other indications of the MFDP's notable lack of political acumen. What to me represented the final demonstration of their amateur status, however, was the failure of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party to accept the seating compromise framed by former Governor Lawrence's Credentials Committee. It was obvious from the first that most of the regular Mississippi delegation, acting under orders from Governor Paul Johnson, would reject any proposition which would require them to pledge loyalty to the nominee of the party. Had the MFDP quickly announced their acceptance of the compromise, they would have scored a tactical victory by placing the regular Democrats in the position of

being forced to unilaterally reject a proposal supported by a majority of the convention. Robert Moses and the Freedom Democrats, however, rejected this proposal out of hand, thus insuring that the regular Democrats could likewise turn down the suggested compromise with minimum embarrassment. The gravity of this political faux pas is demonstrated by the fact that, after this move had been announced, the professionals at the convention who had previously supported the MFDP position abandoned it in droves, so that finally it was impossible to find the eleven signatures necessary in the Credentials Committee to issue a Minority Report.

Like the radicals of the 1930's, some outspoken liberal groups today allow their dedication to blind them to the fact that, in order to achieve influence and authority in this society, a position must be broad enough and flexible enough to impress and attract people of many different interests, and that all political progress is accomplished by mutual compromise. Whenever an organization or pressure group proceeds to ignore this fundamental principle, whether they be the Mississippi Freedom Democrats or the loose association of unilateralists captained by H. Stuart Hughes, they assure their continued political impotence.

THE CONFLICT BETWEEN INDONESIA AND MALAYSIA which periodically disrupts the already uncertain peace of Southeast Asia would appear at a superficial glance to stem from the territorial claims of the Republic of Indonesia against the Malaysian Federation. Ever since the federation of the Malayan states into a single political unit was first proposed, Indonesia has contested the inclusion of Sarawak and Sabah (North Borneo) in this league. Conceiving of the conflict solely in these terms, however, is extremely unwise, for the issue is in reality much broader. Two divergent philosophies are in opposition in this region, one a virulent, almost xenophobic nationalism, the other a Malayan modification of the Gandhian doctrine of "creative interdependence". The outcome of this struggle is bound to have far-reaching significance throughout the underdeveloped world, and its immediate as well as ultimate consequences are of great importance to the West.

In order to fully comprehend the precise nature of this ideological conflict, it is necessary to understand Achmed Sukarno, the volatile President for Life of the Republic of Indonesia. His background is in many respects similar to that of most of the leaders of the emerging nations of Africa and Asia, whose attitudes were forged in the struggle for independence from colonial domination. Sukarno became active in the Indonesia merdeka (freedom) movement in 1926, and was one of his country's leading anti-colonialist agitators until 1942, when the Dutch were expelled from Indonesia by the conquering hordes of Imperial Japan. During this sixteen year period, Achmed Sukarno spent an aggregate of thirteen years in one prison or another. The Japanese occupation of the Indonesian islands lasted three years, and during this period Sukarno collaborated with his country's new lords, apparently on the premise that, if one's homeland is to be dominated by foreigners, it is at least better that they be Asians than Europeans. Although the Japanese were driven from Indonesia by the British in 1945, their presence had demonstrated that Asians could successfully challenge the supremacy of Europeans, and the effect of the Japanese occupation (as in other nations) was therefore to increase the striving for Indonesian independence. The British returned the liberated territory to the Dutch, but Indonesia had no intention of submitting to a return to colonial status. Sukarno and his fellow revolutionaries declared it an independent nation, and after four years of guerilla warfare and negotiation (alternately or, sometimes, simultaneously), the Dutch recognized the existence of the

Republic of Indonesia and withdrew.

Achmed Sukarno has been its maximum leader since the creation of the republic. He remains in power by walking a tightrope, in the tradition of dictators of unstable countries throughout history. In Indonesia today there are two consistently potent and stable elements, the armed forces, commanded by General Abdul H. Nasution, and the powerful Communist Party (PKI) of Mr. D. N. Aidit, and Sukarno maintains a delicate balance of power by playing one off against the other. When the army becomes too ambitious, President Sukarno aligns himself with the Communists and brings his military establishment under control; and when the Communists increase their influence dangerously, Sukarno uses the armed forces to cut them down to size. His position is not therefore one conducive to relaxation and complacency, and the fact that he has so long remained in a position of power suggests that he is a very talented demagogue indeed. It is probable, however, that this balance of power will eventually collapse. Continuing economic deterioration and a persistent decline in the standard of living throughout the republic favor the eventual rise to dominance of the Communists, whose influence is always greatest where conditions are poorest. General Nasution makes no secret of the fact that he is determined to seize power at any time should the influence of the PKI grow beyond manageable proportions. The situation, then, is one in which Sukarno's position becomes less secure with the passage of time; if he cannot reverse the trend of the Indonesian economy, it is extremely doubtful that he can survive as President for more than another year or two.

It is ironic that this background, so similar to that which has produced such great leaders as Gandhi, Nehru and Kenyatta, could have also resulted in an arrogant demagogue of Sukarno's calibre. But in struggling for independence from European colonialism, Sukarno permitted himself a delusion which is so easily created and nourished in such a situation: viz., that all of the problems of life in the underdeveloped world are the direct result of oppressive colonialism and therefore independence will automatically result in the arrival of the millenium. This misconception is the key to "Bung" (brother) Sukarno's personality, and explains why he pursues and exterminates the vestiges of "colonialism" with all the fervor of a religious zealot rooting out heresy. He is at once devoted, narrow-minded, visionary, dogmatic, idealistic, gentle and ruthless. Sukarno's dream is a monolithic Southeast Asian state, incorporating present-day Indonesia and what is now the Malaysian Federation, governed in accordance with Sukarno's policies and capable of balancing the expansionist tendencies of Communist China. He pictures himself as the Indonesian Messiah, deliverer of oppressed peoples, and every couple of weeks he awards himself another pompous title to that effect. The immense egotism which makes possible such an attitude explains why a direct confrontation with the Federation of Malaysia (and hence with the power of Great Britain) may be unavoidable in the very near future.

Malaysia represents a threat to Achmed Sukarno, not only because it refuses to accept him as its savior and thus challenges his leadership of the neutralists in the area, but also because its prosperity contrasts so sharply with Indonesia's economic chaos. This contrast is embarrassing to Sukarno as a national leader; moreover, it strikes at the very heart of his social, political and economic philosophy. The cardinal tenet of Achmed Sukarno's philosophy is the doctrine of complete independence from colonial powers, i.e., in his terms, the refusal to tolerate any form of Western influence in the former colonies. Because Malaysia has prospered while retaining close ties with its former British overlords, while Indonesia, having expelled the Dutch and rejected any sort of alliance with them, stagnates despite massive econom-

ic aid from the United States and the Soviet Union, the very existence of the Malaysian Federation must be painful to Sukarno. He must destroy Malaysia, because so long as it prospers his next-door neighbor provides a convincing demonstration that Sukarno's social revolution is an abysmal failure and his rabidly nationalist philosophy a means of national suicide.

Moreover, Indonesia's pogrom against the "neo-colonialist plot" of Malaysia provides an excellent means of diverting the attention of Achmed Sukarno's people from their own plight. Dictators have often used grandiose national ventures (or the threat of them--e.g., Chang Kai-Shek's long-promised return to the mainland) to consolidate their power and focus any aggressive tendencies of their vassals on something external. In Sukarno's case, some sort of national venture is even more

(' ' ' ')
(̄ ̄) "My name is Leonard V. Backlash. I am a lifelong conserv-
(V) ative, presently serving as a regional director of the
((=)) 'Goldwater for President' organization."

"Unprincipled political adversaries have insinuated that (' ' ' ')
our campaign intends to play upon the regrettable racial (̄ ̄)
antipathies existing in our society in order to derive a (V)
political advantage." ((=))

(' ' ' ') "I wish to state unequivocally that this accusation is a
(̄ ̄) gross and pernicious slander, circulated by the liberal
(V) establishment for the basest of reasons. The philosophy
((=)) of conservatism has never tolerated racial prejudice."

"The fundamental tenet of conservatism is individual re- (' ' ' ')
sponsibility, a principle which implies, in the political (̄ ̄)
context, strong local government and a minimum of federal (V)
interference." ((=))

(' ' ' ') "It seems perfectly evident to the conservative that any
(̄ ̄) attempt to resolve at the federal level questions which
(V) are properly left to the hearts of men must necessarily
((=)) result in disaster."

"Of course, not all citizens are sufficiently sophisticated (' ' ' ')
to comprehend this philosophy as it applies to their (̄ ̄)
everyday lives, so we have created a statement which re- (V)
duces conservatism to its essence and is at the same time ((=))
completely clear to the voter at whom it is directed."

(' ' ' ')
(̄ ̄) "We intend to let every state handle its goddamn n-----
(V) any way it wants."
((=))

imperative. Indonesia possesses an army of 350,000 men which, if it is not going to become a breeding ground for discontent, must be kept occupied at some task. (One is reminded of the member of the French Assembly who, explaining why the French Revolution was being exported to other countries by force of arms, remarked: "We have two hundred thousand men under arms. We must make them march long and hard, else they will return and cut our throats.")

At the moment, this conflict occupies a secondary role in the general turmoil of Southeast Asia. Small forces of Indonesian volunteers engage in minor forays across the border separating Indonesian Borneo from Sabah and saboteurs are being smuggled into all parts of Malaysia. These efforts constitute, at worst, an annoyance. The real danger lies in the future, when Achmed Sukarno is compelled--either by his obsession against "colonialism" or the pressure of domestic politics--to launch an all-out military operation against Malaysia, thus plunging the entire region into a bitter and protracted war.

CONFESSIONS OF A SOMETIMES WRITER: To me, it is invariably fascinating to discover how another individual writes, and especially so if that individual happens to be a professional writer of some standing and experience. For this reason, one of my personal favorites among the many articles published in this magazine since its inception was Marion Zimmer Bradley's "I'd Rather Drive a Truck", in Kipple #10. Although I do not presume to consider myself a "writer" in any but the most literal sense (i.e., I am, undeniably, a person who writes), it occurs to me that some readers of this periodical might be interested in the manner in which the many editorial essays come into being. As a matter of fact, I wrote such an article many issues ago, but the situation has changed somewhat in the intervening period--the result, I should hope, of some slight improvement in my ability to construct an acceptable article.

There are actually three categories of essays which appear in this column, in the sense that they are conceived and written in one of three different ways. The first of these is what we may term the "article from inspiration", usually the result of encountering in newspapers, books, magazines or personal intercourse an opinion with which I strongly disagree. The second type of article is one which takes shape slowly and gradually within my mind and finally, when I feel that it is sufficiently coherent, is transferred onto paper. And the third distinct variety of editorial discourse is one where, having encountered a broad topic which seems to provide the opportunity for a reasonably interesting article, I proceed to unearth background material and laboriously construct a brief essay.

In creating an article of the first classification, I generally experience the sort of feeling which, in a slightly different form, is characteristic of successful professional authors. After encountering an opinion which causes a strongly divergent view to be generated in my mind, I feel that I must set down on paper my opinion. Writing in this situation is therefore compulsive. When a typewriter is not available, I often jot down preliminary notes on whatever scrap paper is at hand, covering it with semi-legible scrawls until writer's cramp forces me to stop. If I retire for a night without writing down some sort of an outline for such an article, it will be gone in the morning, erased from my mind as though it had never existed. The idea may still exist, but the desire and the means to construct an article around it will have vanished. The first draft of such an article is usually composed rather hurriedly, in an effort to capture on paper the major ideas while they remain clear in my mind, but--except for grammar and spelling--the completed draft represents essentially the final form of the article. Such

corrections as are necessary can be added as it is stencilled. Only rarely in this draft so rough as to necessitate another one preliminary to the stencilling of the essay.

The second type of article is the easiest and most enjoyable to construct; it is the one which takes shape gradually and over a long period of time, and is not transferred to paper until I am absolutely certain that I know exactly what I wish to say. "The New Battleground" is an excellent example of such an article. The basic ideas for this essay, which appeared in Kipple #61, developed while I was writing a letter to Tom Seidman (which was later published in Anthrohedron), commenting on an article of Tom's devoted to the special problems of education in urban slums. Not until several months afterward did I bother to write down these thoughts. The mechanics of typing a draft of this sort of article are somewhat different: I know that I am under no compulsion to hurry, because the article is perfectly clear in my mind and is likely to remain so; and I therefore type very slowly, checking grammar, spelling, etc., thus making the first draft also the final draft. Only very minor corrections are necessary as this type of article is transferred onto stencil.

These types of article share in common the fact that they are not particularly difficult to write: one flows smoothly and easily because it has been in my mind for some time, the other spills out like water through a burst dam because I am aware of the necessity of putting it down on paper quickly. But the third variety of article is different. In constructing this sort of an essay, I am given perhaps a taste of the painstaking effort which one must be prepared to endure in choosing writing as a career. This type of article is rather like a high-school homework assignment or, if you prefer, an article which has been commissioned by some technical journal. I begin with a topic--one which I consider interesting enough to devote a portion of this column to but one which, on the other hand, is of little immediate interest to me because I do not know in advance what the article is going to say. The first two types of article are easy to write because they revolve around my personal opinions; the third is excruciatingly difficult to construct because it originates with merely a sterile word or phrase to indicate subject matter: "Nebraska's Unicameral Legislature", "Congressional Reform", "The Brazilian Revolt", etc.

The first step in constructing this sort of essay is to acquaint myself with some background material. For this necessary research, I occasionally utilize books or magazines; but because of the very nature of the majority of material in this column, most of the research involves my Files. For those who have never visited 1448 Meridene, I should explain that the Files-with-a-capital-F consist of nine or ten shelf-feet of manila file folders, crammed full of newspaper clippings. Some idea of the content of this fire hazard may be gathered by randomly scanning the titles on the folders, which range from "Africa" to "Zoology" and include: "The American Nazis", "Pesticides", "Education", "Engel vs. Vitale", "Civil Liberties", "Mississippi (Race Relations)", "Censorship" and "The Congo/Katanga". The temperament of a packrat and my natural desire for orderliness have here combined to provide a valuable tool for researching articles about any topic important enough to be granted space in the newspapers.

Having disinterred all of the relevant background material, the physical work of constructing an article begins. The first draft consists of preliminary notes--in the most primitive sense--outlining names, dates, facts and circumstances which may later be useful in writing a reasonably coherent article. The second draft is the difficult one. The essay is constructed sentence by sentence, with frequent consultation with "Webster's New Practical Dictionary" and "Roget's Thesaurus". A

sentence is typed out, examined from all possible angles, juggled, rearranged, then typed again in its new form. Words, phrases, sentences are blotted out, paragraphs shifted, additions and corrections interpolated between lines--until this draft has the appearance of the work of an unbalanced orangutan. The third draft is, supposedly, the finished product, but I frequently become dissatisfied with the construction of the essay, tear out the page, and begin again from a different angle. When the work is going particularly badly, I pace about with a cigarette in my mouth; sometimes I even light it.

There is undoubtedly a stylistic difference between the sections of any given installment of "Jottings", according to the manner in which they were written. I suspect that the articles written "from inspiration", as it were, read more smoothly, but that material constructed in either of the other fashions is better written by any other criterion. However, these conclusions are extremely tentative since, like most individuals, I cannot view my own writing with sufficient objectivity to make such a judgement.

DONAHO'S APOLOGY: Presumably, most of the readers of this periodical have received copies of the mimeographed document recently circulated over the name of William L. Donaho. Labelled "Apologia", this sheet purports to be Donaho's personal apology for the distress caused to Walter Breen and his friends by the actions of Mr. Donaho and the Pacificon Committee. The more perceptive of Kipple's readers will doubtless agree that, as an apology, the leaflet leaves much to be desired. Let me assure you that no one would be more gratified than your obedient servant if Donaho and his cohorts were to issue a genuine apology to Walt and Marion Breen; perhaps it would then be possible to lay to rest this sordid controversy and restore to science fiction fandom the convivial atmosphere which previously characterized the microcosm. Unfortunately, Mr. Donaho's ill-titled "Apologia" does not by some considerable margin constitute a genuine apology, and its appearance at this time is, I strongly suspect, motivated by something utterly alien to the good fellowship which seems at a superficial glance to permeate the document.

In essence, this alleged apology merely reiterates, by indirection, the original accusations, but expresses regret over the manner in which action was taken against Walter Breen. Mr. Donaho claims that he is sorry and wishes to drop the entire matter; however, his desire to put an end to the conflict is conditional: he wants the matter dropped on his terms only, in such a fashion as to imply that Walt and his many friends recognize the justice of the original attack and contest neither the charges nor the right of a self-appointed council of moral guardians to act on them. (It may be worthwhile to note, parenthetically, that previous statements in this journal referring to "self-appointed" censors have been objected to on the ground that the Pacificon Committee was elected. In fact, however, there was no election in any meaningful sense, since the Committee's bid for a convention was not opposed by any other city or group.) With all due respect to those over-anxious pacifists whose desire for a peaceful settlement impairs their otherwise formidable intelligences and may blind them to the subtleties of this ingenious proposal, I wish to state categorically that such an arrangement is completely unacceptable to me. Of course, I cannot speak for Walter or Marion. If, after all they have endured, they should decide to accept these terms for the sake of a little peace and quiet, I am certain that no one of us will blame them. But as for me--I am not satisfied with Donaho's dubious concession, delivered in the fashion of a bone tossed to a starving dog.

The "Apologia" is interesting for, among other diverse reasons,

the statement that "The Boondoggle was essentially true of course." Is this what it seems to be, i.e., an admission that (unspecified) portions of the publication were not true? If not, then why the qualifying term, "essentially"?

We are also treated, in the body of this statement, to an illustration of William L. Donaho's magnanimity:

"Walter's close friends say he now has a chance for rehabilitation. Let's give him that chance. After all, from the practical point of view, he's not dangerous any more. From now on he's going to be watched like a hawk and pounced upon at the least sign of deviation. But again, let's be fair. Let's make this surveillance as unobtrusive as possible.

"He can't be watched closely enough at large affairs like the worldcon, but he can be at small gatherings. And it seems to me that if--after a couple of years or so--there are no complaints against him, he should be welcome at worldcons again."

At this point, the temptation to throw up is compelling, but I shall stoically resist it in order to further comment on this most remarkable passage. Mr. Donaho proudly claims credit for placing Walt Breen in a position where he will be "watched like a hawk and pounced upon at the least sign of deviation"; and, I believe--I honestly do believe--that he expects to be congratulated for a job well done. Perhaps he even expects Walter Breen to thank him; the tone of the passage suggests that Donaho believes he has done some fine thing which should earn for him the respect and gratitude of all parties concerned. This is an almost frightening indication of Donaho's state of mind.

The second quoted paragraph is unbelievably arrogant. It appears to Donaho that Walt should be welcome at world conventions again, if there are no complaints against him in the next couple of years. This man's boundless charity is positively overwhelming. His pronouncement carries the tone of an ecclesiastical dispensation; there stands Patriarch Donaho, resplendent in robes of purple, waving his bejeweled hand casually and returning Walter Breen to a state of grace--on a probationary basis, of course. There is implicit in this statement the same appalling attitude evident in Donaho's original order of excommunication (wherein he stated his avowed intention to "perform a surgical operation, separating Walter" from his associates). Can Mr. Donaho actually believe that he possesses the authority to hand down such decrees?

Fortunately, I am able to report that the matter has been removed from the hands of William L. Donaho and his co-conspirators. The Pacificon is part of the past now, and the situation within the Cleveland organization (which is bidding for a convention in 1966) remains confused. But the following year will witness the restoration of the traditional policy of open conventions; Mr. Donaho's permission is neither required nor solicited. The city of New York intends to bid for the 1967 World Science Fiction Convention, and has announced a policy of specifically inviting Walt and Marion to attend. At the moment, nominal opposition is provided by Baltimore, which has no such policy, and there seems little doubt that the New York bid will be successful. (I wish to take this opportunity to point out that I have no connection whatsoever with the organization which is promoting Baltimore's convention bid, and intend to support New York.)

If a bit of speculation is not out of order, we might attempt to perceive the motive underlying the issuance of "Apologia". I suspect

that the purpose of this questionable apology is to throw into disarray what Donaho is pleased to term "the other side". Many individuals have found themselves protesting the action against Walter not because they disputed the accuracy of the charges or denied the right of the convention committee to act upon them, but on the sole ground that the manner in which this situation was handled was objectionably clumsy. This is what Donaho is now apologizing for. It is as if a man were to apologize for committing murder with a hatchet when he could as easily have accomplished the same purpose with a knife; but I have no doubt that the apology will serve its purpose. Such an apology will win over or at least effectively neutralize those whose opposition is not to murder, per se, but to messy murder which excites public attention. Donaho's present strategem, then, will have the effect of subtracting from the anti-Donaho faction those individuals of doubtful moral consciousness whose principal objection has been that the assassination was not accomplished covertly. Those of us whose protest against the crucifixion, actual or verbal, of "eccentrics" rests on more fundamental grounds will not be satisfied with an apology for method; we demand as well an apology for intent.

WE ALL MAKE MISTAKES, BUT... In the second segment of this installment of "Jottings" I managed to surpass all previous records for abject dimwittedness by misspelling, in the space of three paragraphs, the names of two renowned world leaders. I was so certain that Jomo Kenyatta's surname was properly spelled with but a single "t" that I didn't even bother to check before duplicating those pages. The second error was made the hard way: I checked the proper spelling of Chiang Kai-shek's name but still managed to render it as "Chang Kai-Shek". What will I do for an encore?

--Ted Puals

"In the early days of the Restoration a great discussion was held by the learned men in the presence of the king on why, if a live fish were put into a brimming pail, the water would not overflow, while if the fish were dead, it would. Many elevating reasons that had to do with the inner significance of life and death were adduced for this spiritually suggestive property of water--or fish, until the king asked that two such pails be brought in and the fish added to them before his eyes. When it turned out that the water reacted the same way to the fish alive or dead, the scientists received a lesson that had far-reaching results on the advisability of the mind's not going the way of the spirit and withdrawing into itself to exercise the pure reason free and unhampered, but of remaining strictly within the limits of the outside world. Abide by the facts, is the dictum of the mind; a sense for fact is its salient characteristic." --Edith Hamilton, in "The Greek Way".

"The greatest guilt today is that of people who accept collectivism by moral default; the people who seek protection from the necessity of taking a stand, by refusing to admit to themselves the nature of that which they are accepting; the people who support plans specifically designed to achieve serfdom, but hide behind the empty assertion that they are lovers of freedom, with no concrete meaning attached to the word; the people who believe that the content of ideas need not be examined, that principles need not be defined, and that facts can be eliminated by keeping one's eyes shut. They expect, when they find themselves in a world of bloody ruins and concentration camps, to escape moral responsibility by wailing: 'But I didn't mean this!' " --Ayn Rand, in "Anthem".

servatives subscribe. This is a rather useless attitude, since a reading of conservative thought (and I don't mean Goldwater) would soon dispel it: try, for example, our fear of rootlessness that is our justification for tradition and slow evolutionary change, our belief that society is a partnership "between the living, the dead, and the yet unborn", while the liberal of the Rousseau school sees only the living and the future while ignoring the past. (Perhaps, in view of your fear of "rootlessness", the conservative symbol ought to be a giant sequoia: an organism possessing myriad roots and enduring through the ages, while accomplishing nothing.)

"That any man should think fit to cause another man--whose salvation he heartily desires--to expire in torments, and that even in an unconverted state, would, I confess, seem very strange to me, and I think, to any other also. But nobody, surely, will ever believe that such a carriage can proceed from charity, love, or good will. If anyone maintain that men ought to be compelled by fire and sword to profess certain doctrines, and conform to this or that exterior worship, without any regard had unto their morals; if anyone endeavor to convert those that are erroneous unto the faith, by forcing them to profess things that they do not believe, and allowing them to practice things that the Gospel does not permit, it cannot be doubted indeed but such a one is desirous to have a numerous assembly joined in the same profession with himself; but that he principally intends by those means to compose a truly Christian Church, is altogether incredible." --John Locke, in "A Letter Concerning Toleration".

CHARLES WELLS :: APT. M-1, 815 DEMERIUS ST. :: DURHAM, N. C., 27701

Since your article on the Gulf of Tonkin affair was written, some columnist has pointed out that Johnson fell into a sort of trap in that encounter. He limited his response to the North Vietnamese, not bothering the Chinese. Now, if the Communists begin a major offensive, Johnson will be forced to stay within this limitation by his own precedent. I'm not quite sure I understand the reasoning here--that's the trouble with a good deal of the foreign policy reasoning that goes on: it has huge logical gaps in it. Every once in a while some pundit starts this we-do-this-then-Khrushchev-does-that-then-Mao-does-that sort of connected reasoning, and it almost never hangs together. The pundits' usual trouble is that they assume an action by one party can force an action by another. This almost never happens in reality. Even assuming all the protagonists are reasonable men (as they seem to be here) this difficulty arises, for in most circumstances, at least most of those that arise in international diplomacy, there are several actions a reasonable man could take; which one he chooses depends upon his estimate of various factors (Johnson's ego, the number of North Vietnamese PT boats, or whatever) about which he almost never has complete information. It is simply not true that in most international crises there is only one reasonable way for a given leader to act.

Your remark on the variety of Christian Democrats applies to Europe, too. The Italian Christian Democratic Party seems to be dominated by a big-business-and-aristocracy clique which makes it very hard going for any real reform (more desperately needed in Italy than in most

places) to take place. That's the reason for the popularity of Communism there. On the other hand, the French party, which is known as the Popular Republican Movement, has in the past two or three years been a true reforming party with several similarities to the Chilean party. (Before De Gaulle it had a right-wing element which has since left the party.) And of course everybody knows about the West German party.

I haven't the space to comment on all of George Price's letter, but I would like to point out that the book he cites as "the best layman's discussion" of the working conditions under nineteenth century capitalism is by a notorious right-winger who can hardly be trusted to give an unbiased account (this is F. A. Hayek). I read a portion of another book by him, the name of which I have happily forgotten, and was astonished at his distortions. This is not to accuse all right-wing historians of massive distortion, mind you; just F. A. Hayek.

"Once, changing my shirt, I saw myself in the mirror and suddenly caught a striking resemblance to my father. In reality there is no such resemblance. I remembered: my parents' bedroom, and I, a boy, am watching my father as he changes his shirt. I feel sorry for him. It's already too late for him to be handsome, famous, he is already cooked, finished, already not famous for anything, he can't be anything except what he is. That's how I was thinking, pitying him and feeling quietly proud of my own superiority. And now I recognized my father in myself. No formal resemblance--no, something else, I would say--a sexual resemblance, as if I suddenly perceived in me, in my very substance, my father's seed. It was like being told: you're cooked, finished, there's nothing more for you. Produce a son." --Yurii Olesha, in "Envy".

JOHN BOARDMAN :: 592 16th ST. :: BROOKLYN, NEW YORK, 11218

Gretchen Schwenn: Have George Price and his fellow conservative intellectuals heard about the Enlightenment? Sure, and they're against it! Some of the franker twentieth century conservative intellectuals, such as T. E. Hulme and T. S. Idiot, have openly proclaimed their intent to repeal not only the Enlightenment but also the Renaissance. Their goal, as frequent National Review articles proclaim, is a structured society in which everyone is sure of his place in this world and the next. The fundamentals of Western Christian civilization are to be erected as an orthodoxy, and institutions of higher education will have the primary purpose of inculcating and defending this orthodoxy. (See articles by William F. Buckley, Richard Weaver, Russell Kirk, and other members of the conservative brain-trust. Then see Newman's conclusive refutation in his book "The Futilitarian Society".)

Notions of class, whether conservative or Marxist, are sometimes a little difficult to apply to particular cases. For example: my grandfathers were, respectively, a farmer and a gandy-dancer (who later became a bull--and the railroads are an integral enough part of our cultural history that I'm not going to bother to translate); my father is a salesman; I'm a physicist; one of my brothers is a sailor and the other is a chiropractor; my wife is a miner's daughter. Now tell me to what class I belong.

George Price: If we are to accept a class interpretation of history, it might be interesting to examine how the remnants of the feudal class have cooperated with the proletariat in attacking the bourgeoisie. There is a sort of alliance of interests, since the feudalists were expropriated in the past, and the proletariat is being expropriated in the present, by the bourgeoisie. As for this Hayek whom you cite as an authority on how woefully the capitalists have been misunderstood by the

historians, he is a devotee of the conspiracy theory of history. The man who wrote, in "The Road to Serfdom", that Franklin D. Roosevelt was part of a conspiracy to impose a dictatorship in this country, might also be expected to believe that historians and other intellectuals have conspired over several decades to discredit capitalism. It's like Fritz Leiber says, "You can explain anything with a large enough conspiracy."

Of course, another explanation than Hayek's occurs: that the facts ran against the capitalists, and that most historians have been reporting the facts accurately. Betcha never thought of that one!

A jury is "twelve good men and true, acquainted with the defendant"? How long could a petit juror last on a panel today if he acknowledged being acquainted with the defendant before him?

"The vast proportion of all individuals who are born into any society always and whatever the idiosyncrasies of its institutions, assume, as we have seen, the behavior dictated by that society. This fact is always interpreted by the carriers of that culture as being due to the fact that their particular institutions reflect an ultimate and universal sanity. The actual reason is quite different. Most people are shaped to the form of their culture because of the enormous malleability of their original endowment. They are plastic to the molding force of the society into which they are born. It does not matter whether, with the Northwest Coast, it requires delusions of self-reference, or with our own civilization the amassing of possessions. In any case the great mass of individuals take quite readily the form that is presented to them." --Ruth Benedict, in "Patterns of Culture".

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

It was extremely good of you to arrange to have the latest issue of Kipple waiting for us when Kumari and I returned from our "honeymoon", even though the remarks by George Price and Derek Nelson pretty conclusively killed off what was left of my honeymoon spirit. Ordinarily, of course, comments in Kipple's letter column don't have an especially profound impact on my life--but Nelson's jibes at my radicalism did bother me, because of something that happened last week.

My wife and I did not have an actual "honeymoon", as neither of us are exactly the type for maudlin vacations at Niagara Falls, but we did drive down to New Orleans and visit my favorite Aunt & Uncle for a couple days. Unfortunately, we had to pass through that state of abject depression otherwise known as Mississippi, an experience of indescribable glumness. The state is, first of all, unbearably depressing, quite apart from the things that keep happening there--anyone would get this impression from a brief visit, even if he knew nothing of the racism and so forth. The heat and humidity were oppressive, the roads incredibly bad, and the small towns through which we passed (sporting names like Higgins, Improve, Jayess, Enon, etc.) were drab and ugly places. The knowledge that most white Mississippians aren't yet reconciled to the abandonment of their "peculiar institution" is an added burden. You have no idea how dampening to the honeymoon spirit this combination of physical and moral ugliness can be.

There was also the element of physical danger, never far from our minds while in the state of Mississippi. My wife is an Indian (of the L. B. Shastri rather than Sitting Bull variety) and this, combined with the New York license plates on the car, made us conspicuous. In Mississippi, it's dangerous to be conspicuous. (We're conspicuous in New York, too, but mostly because Kumari is attractive; it's a pleasant kind of con-

spicuous there, though.) Maybe some of your readers--the ones who don't know much about Mississippi--will be amused that we feared for our personal safety, but I can assure you that this is a reasonable fear under the circumstances. In that state, any non-Caucasian is automatically considered a "n-----" and it's always open season on any "n-----" who associates with, much less marries, a white. Our desire to get out of the state as fast as possible was restrained only by the knowledge that speeding, under certain circumstances, is a capital offense in Mississippi (that's what the local sheriff picks you up for before he hands you over to the Klan). Getting back to New York after that trip was quite a relief, believe me. (To be fair, I should note that the situation was quite different in New Orleans, where we were treated with the utmost kindness; but Mississippi left a bad taste in the mouth which didn't permit us to fully enjoy the rest of the trip.)

Derek Nelson is right, of course, in saying that I'm a radical. I do believe in evolutionary rather than revolutionary means, but I am impatient with the slowness of the process. Things aren't evolving fast enough to suit me. I want Mississippi to be free, I want the U. S. to really be "one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all", I want a genuine "peace offensive" and an attempt to bring China

(+++++) "I am a self-made man. I was the oldest of twelve kids in
(= =) a poor family, and never knew what it was not to be hun-
(v) gry until I was seventeen. I dropped out of high school
((---)) to get a job and help support my parents."

"I worked as a chauffer for the richest family in town, and (+++++)
got their daughter pregnant so of course I had to marry (= =)
her. Her family gave us all the money we wanted to move to (v)
another city and forget to leave a forwarding address." ((---))

(+++++) "With my wife's money I bought a half-interest in an e-
(= =) lectronics firm. My partner was an electrical genius but
(v) with no business sense, so it wasn't hard to squeeze him
((---)) out. He later committed suicide in San Diego."

"I don't know beans about electronics or anything like (+++++)
that, but I've got two dozen brash young punks with col- (= =)
lege degrees on my payroll and today the company grosses (v)
a cool six million a year." ((---))

(+++++) "Last week my wife's old man and old lady got scrambled
(= =) in a plane crash, so now I own a steel mill and 30,000
(v) acres of grassland in Oklahoma."
((---))

"Pretty soon my kid'll be old enough to start thinking a- (+++++)
bout his future. My wife wants to coddle him, but I told (= =)
her I wouldn't stand for none of that. I'm going to make (v)
him come up the hard way, like I did." ((---))

into the world community, I want a program of public education geared to present needs so that we can stop wasting our most valuable resource --and I want these things in my lifetime, not in the dim future. That makes me a radical.

George Price's assertion that both communism and fascism are leftist creeds is understandable as an attempt to palm off Hitler on the Left, but his argument leaves something to be desired. It is certainly true that the policies, tactics, and practical effects of communism and fascism are similar. For that matter, all dictatorships, be they communist, Nazi, theocratic, or personal--all dictatorships are basically similar in their day-to-day operations. One can't tie fascism to communism by commenting that they advocate some of the same things and treat their subjects in the same way, though; one must examine the theories of the respective doctrines. Doing so demonstrates that they evolve from opposite ends of the political spectrum.

Pay attention now, George. Communism is anti-democratic in theory because it sees democracy as a means of sugar-coating exploitation and thus postponing the revolution, and because political democracy is unnecessary in a pure state of communism, because absolute justice and cooperation already exists. More simply, communists don't believe in democracy because, in Marxist theory, the state gradually withers away as communism is achieved; without a state, political democracy becomes redundant. Fascism, on the other hand, is anti-democratic in the far different sense that it postulates a permanent ruling class holding sway over the masses, who have no real voice in affairs. Communism is also egalitarian, while fascism is inherently anti-egalitarian, postulating the permanent division of society into an elite minority of rulers and a great mass of slaves. Finally, communism is theoretically internationalistic, whereas fascism incorporates vicious nationalism and chauvinism. These are pretty significant differences, even though they tend to become blurred in practice.

In the United States, the distinction between the two doctrines is still more precise, because the political spectrum in this country is composed of fairly clear-cut categories. The communist in the United States (i.e., the doctrinaire Marxist--not necessarily a Communist-with-a-capital-C) is on the outer fringe of the radical/socialist element, mostly consisting of liberals who have come to the realization that their program is insufficiently radical to deal with the problems. Whatever else they may be, these individuals are generally internationalist-minded egalitarians. American fascism, on the other hand, stands in relation to conservatism as communism does to liberalism. Fascists are on the outer fringe of the reactionary/nationalist camp, which in turn is composed of conservatives who have come to believe that simple conservatism is not enough. Whatever else they may be, it is reasonably certain that they will be chauvinists and anti-egalitarians--exactly the opposite of the communists, in other words. In America, they will probably be racists as well. (Although, as Boardman notes, racism is not necessarily a part of fascism, the two are rather closely identified in practice because, once one has accepted, as the fascist has, the inherent superiority of his nation, it is but a short step to the inherent superiority of the race.)

To put it more simply still, communism is egalitarianism reduced to the point of absurdity, whereas fascism is patriotism reduced to the point of absurdity.

According to my desk dictionary, incidentally, a "fascist movement" is "The movement toward nationalism and conservatism as opposed to internationalism and radicalism..." (my underlining). Mr. Price is free to continue to argue the point, of course, but now he can argue it with two knowledgeable gentlemen named Merriam and Webster, neither of

whom may be legitimately accused of left-wing tendencies.

Citing the fact that ex-Nazis find employment within the government of the German Democratic Republic does not indicate an ideological similarity between fascism and communism. There are a large number of former Nazis occupying positions in the government of the Federal Republic; so what? Does this demonstrate an ideological kinship between German Nazism and the democratic doctrine of the Bundesrepublik?

John Boston: Your remarks in re the exploitative nature of laissez faire capitalism show a commendable wisdom, but you may as well save your breath; Price won't be convinced. George Price is a Goldwater intellectual, and as such is committed to the belief that unfettered capitalism is good. It's virtually a religious tenet. Trying to convince him otherwise is like trying to convince a Catholic that there's no God or a communist that government in a bourgeois state is something other than the repressive instrument of a single class.

"The complete independence of the courts of justice is peculiarly essential in a limited Constitution. By a limited Constitution, I understand one which contains certain specified exceptions to the legislative authority; such, for instance, as that it shall pass no bills of attainder, no ex post facto laws, and the like. Limitations of this kind can be preserved in practice no other way than through the medium of courts of justice, whose duty it must be to declare all acts contrary to the manifest tenor of the Constitution void. Without this, all the reservations of particular rights or privileges would amount to nothing." --Alexander Hamilton, in "The Federalist" (No. 78).

VIC RYAN :: BOX 403, 2309 SHERIDAN RD. :: EVANSTON, ILLINOIS

I am familiar with the sociological study that Enid Osten is speaking of in Kipple #63, but I'm afraid she is twisting the results just a little. Senator Goldwater would object to the validity of such a study on the grounds that one can't "legislate morality", while the armed forces are noted for their ex-officio legislation (i.e., orders), but I think there is a more valid objection than this. Such integrated contacts are useful in reducing racial tensions if they are what sociologists call "equal-status contacts"; that is, the people or groups in contact are assigned status only on the basis of performance, in this instance promotions. Under these circumstances attitudes toward integrative practices seem to improve, but there is real reason to believe that even under these ideal, seldom achieved conditions what is present is not a mitigation of bad feelings, but rather a sort of attitudinal apathy. That is, the feelings are the same, but it simply isn't as important to express them or act upon them. ((I have often been puzzled by conservative assertions that we cannot (or should not) "legislate morality", in view of the fact that a great many of our laws are designed to accomplish precisely that. What are the laws governing marriage, divorce, fornication and adultery, if not attempts to legislate morality? What about laws governing "indecent exposure", cruelty to animals, birth control, the closing of business establishments on religious holidays, ad infinitum?))

The "militant atheist" cartoon reminds me of something Bernard Shaw once said: "Christianity is a great idea. Too bad no one has ever tried it."

When you, in your article on Herman Kahn, make a small concession and say "Let us, for the moment, be as hard-nosed and unemotional as Mr. Kahn..." you have touched upon what might be the fringes of something important, without batting an eye simply because you were the per-

son involved in the transgression. The kind of language Kahn uses isn't that uncommon to the social sciences, particularly political science; it simply never struck you, I suspect, because you agreed with the hard-headed sociologists who speak so callously of population explosions, famine in Red China, or birth control (a terrible thought to some people). This "hard-nosed" approach is simply a matter of convenience, one into which you yourself fell, even if you did admit it in an offhand way.

A. G. Smith may be quite a character, but somehow he strikes me as being incapable, in even his better moments, of writing a letter so fantastically pompous as Gretchen Schwenn's.

"It never seems to occur to people that, so far in history, the common men of every nation that has arisen on the face of the earth have, somehow, run it into the ground. It is not lack of leadership that creates ruin where there was once a city, but a failure, at last, of common men to heed their leaders or, at the least, to elect to follow wise ones. Apparently, as soon as a society, or a state, or a city, achieves sufficient organization to make its existence profitable in money to large numbers of its people a process of deterioration sets in among them. They turn from the hard idealism of the founders to the golden pursuits of the incumbents and, presently, there is not enough discipline, or integrity, or asceticism, in the whole entity to maintain the positive forces and prohibitions essential for collective life." --Philip Wylie, in "Generation of Vipers".

DAVID JENSEN :: 401 CATSKILL :: RICHLAND, WASHINGTON, 99352

I want to seriously disagree with George Price's views on a limited franchise being desirable. This is a shocking attitude and possibly a very dangerous one. He says that, under such a system, a man would have a chance to advance himself, but this does not vindicate Price. Tell me, George, who would decide the standards? Who, in the first place, would decide how to set this system up and, once it was set up, who would see that it would work out correctly? I say that it could not work. The persons first put in power would almost certainly encase themselves in a hierarchy of power and thereby be in the position of "benevolent dictators", deciding who should or should not be granted the franchise. They would, of course, be maintaining a guise of democratic government, but there would in truth be no difference between this system and any other dictatorship--except that this would be a rightist set-up (just as bad as any other dictatorship, maybe worse). (It is often difficult for those of us reared in the American tradition to understand that conservatives like William F. Buckley and George Price consider democracy, which constitutes the central theme of our entire lives, a mere convenience which may be dispensed with at any time. Conservative intellectuals tend to establish standards according to which the "individual freedom" they cherish so highly is restricted to those who deserve it--i.e., themselves, and their less intellectual but highly zealous comrades. This is why conservatives of the more extreme sort are, unlike radicals of most other persuasions, completely outside the mainstream of American thought.)

Enid Osten: I disagree that churches will become "nice, sterile recreation centers". I, for one, share James Wright's fears that too many people can be fooled too much of the time. If they are told that "this" or "that" is done by "decent people", then they will go out and do it. Look at the "good" Christian churches down South: the dominant doctrine taught is that of hate and the people follow it with glee. Is

this harmless? (Although there are certainly rabidly segregationist clergymen in the South, I doubt that they are sufficiently numerous to render "hate" the dominant doctrine of Southern churches. Most of the clergymen in the Deep South, it seems to me, have attempted to remain "neutral" on the issue. This in itself is a moral crime of considerable repugnance, but it is not quite as bad as actively preaching hatred and bigotry.)

Re Tonkin Gulf: I, for one, fully support President Johnson's actions in this situation. I do not believe that his retaliation was of a political nature or that it put this nation in any danger whatsoever. As for the reasons for the attack, I believe that it was a power-play by Mao Tse-Tung in the Sino-Soviet feud. I think that he figured that the U.S. would not retaliate against such a puny effort for fear of incurring unfavorable world opinion; then Mao could claim that we were indeed a "paper Tiger" and would have put one over on the Soviets.

As for topless bathing suits, I agree that it really is a sad indication of the intellectual fiber of our society when we react so vigorously to such a farce--especially when its designer said it was all a joke, anyway. As for the suit itself, I think that it is ugly; but I'm not against toplessness, per se. I also agree that too many women just don't have the breasts to bare in public. One thing really upset me, though, and has bugged me for a week now. I refer to your calling teenage girls "scrawny and sexless". I just can't take it. I guess you live in a "depressed" area and should get the President to declare it a national disaster area. When I think of the girls I know I certainly don't see scrawny sexless objects. (I did not say that teenage girls, in general, were scrawny and sexless, just as I did not say that housewives, in general, were middle-aged and fat. What I did say was that revealing garments are most likely to be worn by those in both categories who have nothing particularly exciting to reveal...)

"One curious intellectual cult in our own midst insistently portrays the American people as 'conformist'. This view has, in fact, become so orthodox in certain circles that the person who sees the mass as made up of all kinds and varieties is looked upon with some disapproval: he is nonconformist, is not putting the social scene in order by imposing upon it the proper classifications. Variousness in human society, however, is a product not only of what people are but also of how they are regarded. Nothing makes two men in grey flannel suits look so much alike as looking at the suits instead of the men." --Harry and Bonaro Overstreet, in "What We Must Know About Communism".

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

George Price quite flatly states that Communism is economically impossible. This could very well be so, but that can't be decided until we see a Communist government actually in existence. I think that Communism could work, if put into practice. Unfortunately, the fault lies not with the system itself, but with the difficulty of creating such a government. It is quite a bit like the situation, "You can't get there from here"; it will work, but you have to put it into practice first and that is the hard part. It can't really work without full cooperation from everybody, and that is no easy thing to get. Price also says that humanity is fundamentally flawed. Well, this can't be proven, and at this stage it is only a matter of opinion; I prefer to think that humanity is essentially good, and perfect, but I really am not sure. If we were all bad at heart, wouldn't the best course be for us to commit suicide, so as to "become perfect in the hereafter"?

Marty Helgesen admits that "there are certain minor discrepancies in the Gospel narratives". I know personally of one open-minded person who forsaked Christianity for another religion because of those "minor discrepancies". He goes on to say that "time can be thought of as the ticking of the universe". Which time are you referring to? Time is relative, and for all parts there are different times. There may be a universal time-scale, but I doubt it. The universe ticks differently in different places.

Enid Osten is partly right: anything that is in any way bad for the U.S. is automatically a Communist plot in the eyes of some people. My mother tried to convince me the other day that the Harlem riots were Communist inspired, citing as "proof" that several of the rioters were admitted Communists. In the novel, "Candy" (by Southern and Hoffenberg), Candy's father finds her in bed with a Mexican boy. After searching for words, he comes up with the "worst" one he can think of, and calls Emmanuel a Communist. This is so typical and so true that it really isn't funny at all.

Enid, the churches are the apathy, credulity, and emotionalism of humanity. That is their base, their life; in a sense, they are composed of the above-mentioned neuroses.

Chay Borsella is right. I, as a liberal, have elevated a cause to the position of a religion. I believe that I have the right to live my life as I feel it should be lived as long as it does not affect others seriously, and that I--and only I--have the right to live my life. That is the cause I have "elevated to the status of a religion". More simply, it could be phrased: Look out for number one. I don't know about other liberals, but to me that is a more glorious and holy "religion" than Christianity.

I had an interesting and valuable experience today. A friend, Christopher Lih, and I walked into the Republican headquarters so I could get a sticker (for some reason) and so he could get some more literature (for some reason). Unfortunately, Christopher was wearing his Johnson button. This proved to be our downfall--but also our enlightenment. As soon as we walked in, two characters jumped on us and told us in no uncertain terms to get out. We hemmed and hawed, but after discovering that they were serious, we left. This, I think, was more than infuriating, and a true pointer to the attitude of Goldwater Republicans. This somewhat shocking hostility is only a forerunner of what will come if Goldwater is elected. "I may not believe what you say, but I defend to the death your right to say it" has probably never entered their freedom-loving minds. Christopher and I were quite peeved, and found out later that the Democrats held that attitude not at all. I can't imagine what they thought we were going to do--maybe blow up the joint, or throw powder in their faces. All teenagers are hoods, you know, to people who think in stereotypes.

Despite the many reassurances I have had from such people as Enid Osten, I continue to believe that Christianity is a potent force and will be for quite a few years to come. The masses follow like sheep the directions of the few who control the churches; these people literally control minds and thoughts. That is why I am afraid. As long as there are people like Clyde Kuhn, this world will not be safe.

Censorship is becoming more and more popular. It has become almost a status symbol to say, "I had a hand in the censoring of this smut." Take the example of "Fanny Hill". It was banned in Boston, and the judge had to "read it four times" before he could ascertain that it was obscene. Bah! He probably read it ten times. Perverts such as that are very much interested in this sort of thing. I don't know if "Fanny Hill" is obscene, as I haven't read it, but I think I should be the one to judge, not someone else. Everyone has their own standards of decency,

and everyone should decide for himself. Don't tell me someone will become a prostitute just from reading about it.

I heartily back President Johnson's decision to retaliate for the attacks in the Gulf of Tonkin. There is a point at which someone cannot be driven any further, and I think that Johnson has reached that point. I realize that a liberal is supposed to be pacifistic, but look man, if somebody smashes me, I'm going to smash back--as hard and fast as I can. I have human motives of revenge and such, presumably like everyone else. The thing is, just how far are you going to carry your action? This is the factor which determines a good politician. Johnson gambled and won, just as Kennedy gambled and won in the Cuban crisis. Although I do not agree that blockading Cuba was desirable, you must admit that the end results were beneficial, considering the position there anyway.

As for the topless bathing suit, in my opinion anyone may wear one who desires to do so. It certainly wouldn't be exciting to see a middle-aged housewife in one, but that is a matter of taste--like wearing low-cut evening gowns. And I don't think we will be seeing very many housewife-types in them, because women have a better eye for taste than that. On a well-shaped woman, such a suit would be fairly delightful, so why worry? I resent, though, the implications of the remarks about "scrawny, sexless teenagers". Quite a number of girls from ages 16 through 19 are hardly scrawny and sexless; and that covers half of the teenage set. Girls of these ages wear tight shorts whenever possible (thank God). I agree that when the younger set wears them it looks awful, but I can stand for that as long as the older girls wear them too.

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



SEND TO:

printed matter only

may be opened for inspection

return requested

third class mail

myob!

T66

Dick Bergeron
333 East 69th Street
New York 21, New York

(1 1 1 1)
(8 8)
(W)
((V))