

"Traditional Anglo-Saxon intolerance is a local and temporal culture-trait like any other. Even people as nearly of the same blood and culture as the Spanish have not had it, and race prejudice in the Spanish-settled countries is a thoroughly different thing from that in countries dominated by England and the United States. In this country it is obviously not an intolerance directed against the mixture of blood of biologically far-separated races, for upon occasion excitement mounts as high against the Irish Catholic in Boston, or the Italian in New England mill towns, as against the Oriental in California. It is the old distinction of the in-group and the out-group, and if we carry on the primitive tradition in this matter, we have far less excuse than savage tribes. We have travelled, we pride ourselves on our sophistication. But we have failed to understand the relativity of cultural habits, and we remain debarred from much profit and enjoyment in our human relations with peoples of different standards, and untrustworthy in our dealings with them."

--Ruth Benedict

Kipple is published and edited by Ted Pauls, 1448 Meridene Drive, Baltimore, Maryland, 21212. Copies of this irregular but frequent journal of opinion and commentary are available in exchange for letters of comment, contributions, similar periodicals 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 publications; and the letter "S" means this is a sample copy.

This magazine is the official organ of the North Baltimore Democrats for Javits-Fong, Inc. -WOKLpress-

CHAY BORSELLA :: 311 EAST 29th STREET :: BALTIMORE,
MARYLAND, 21218

The close correlation between voting results and the forecasts of pre-election opinion polls reminded me of the question as to whether polls will ever replace voting. Bayles, an educator, defined democracy as: "Equality of opportunity to participate in making group decisions and equality of obligation to abide by them once they are made and until they are rescinded." He noted that polling, properly done, would be just as democratic as voting. So long as everyone has an equal chance to be polled, the requirements of democracy (by Bayles' definition) would be met.

Of course, I think a change like this would be a helluva note because (1) polling techniques are not yet perfect and some elections are decided by small margins, and (2) people are apathetic enough already, and few persons would both to investigate the issues in a campaign if they knew that their chances of being queried were slim. Also, how honest are professional polling firms? At the moment, they are 99% honest, since their results will be proved by the voting itself and future jobs depend on their accuracy. But I would not guarantee that this would be the case if no verification of their findings were possible.

When applying for a teaching job in Baltimore, a person has to swear in writing that he belongs to none of the approximately 300 organizations on a "subversive" list prepared by the Attorney General. Some of the organizations on the list have colorful names: National Blue Star Mothers of America, People's Drama Inc., Massachusetts Minute Women for Peace, Photo League, Yugoslav Seaman's League and the Croation Benevolent Fraternity.

Paul Zimmer gives some good reasons for the existence of pressure groups. I know people who look upon these groups as sinister and extraneous cancers. The word "pressure" is perhaps an unfortunate term, conjuring up images of congressmen being squeezed to surrender by individuals representing narrow special interests. But the modern lobbyist is almost always a high caliber individual, intelligent and well-informed in his field. As Zimmer says, people can't be represented as individuals because there are too many of them. Too, representatives of various groups serve the purpose of keeping congressmen informed as to what is going on. As long as all interests can afford to lobby, no one gets a raw deal. (It isn't as simple as that. The resources at the disposal of pressure groups vary radically. Are we to suppose that the interests which can afford the best-financed lobbies are necessarily the most worthwhile?)

Most boys and girls would be terribly disappointed if they didn't receive a tidy letter-grade on the report card. If grades are going to gauge intelligence, there is no reason to give tests at all.

DISSENTING
OPINIONS

Rather, one would give no tests except a battery of IQ-tests and promote the children on that basis... Why on earth should tests measure intelligence? Intelligence isn't the only criterion for success. If a slow child studies for ten hours, memorizing everything in sight, and gets a better mark than a bright child who studied for only one hour, the slow child is entitled to the grade. This sounds elementary, but some teachers in the Baltimore system won't give a dull child any more than an overall mark of "C", or "fair". Memorizing is a type of talent, and it deserves to be recognized as such. In school or in life, lots of questions call for answers of simple, straight facts rather than brilliant flashes of logic.

Assume that two students go through school together, getting approximately the same grades. One memorizes the work with no great understanding, and the other, a "smart" student, uses logic, deduction and induction. Finally the pair go to college. The memorizer realizes that the work is too hard and drops out early; the other student goes on. In this case, water will have risen to its own level--sooner or later it will--but the duller student is still entitled to his former good grades.

"Many people fear that these rapid changes in the most advanced countries may lead to permanent decay. Sound judgment as to the future, however, must be based on the long past. The changes of thousands of years are far more significant than those of a century. Reasoning in this way, we may expect that for thousands of years civilization will continue to advance rapidly in some parts of the earth, less rapidly in others, and very slowly in still others. Thus the general contrast between one region and another will increase. We may also expect that in the most advanced countries civilization will ultimately involve an almost incredible control over nature and an improvement of economic, political, and social methods until they function as perfectly as the best motor car. We may reasonably hope that there will be less human suffering, more beauty and joy, and greater cooperation among nations as well as among men. Such a view is by no means blind optimism. It merely assumes that in the long run the evolution of civilization will follow the main trends of the past rather than the minor fluctuations of the present." --Ellsworth Huntington, in "Mainsprings of Civilization".

ANDY ZERBE :: P. O. BOX 6206 :: MONTGOMERY, ALABAMA, 36106

Re "De Gustibus", perhaps the reason that the James Bond stories are so popular is because we are told what his likes and dislikes are--so that even though his adventures seem to come straight out of a pulp magazine, he seems more real to us than any of the other detectives currently sleuthing their way through the books and magazines. This same idea might also explain the long popularity of Sherlock Holmes.

I like good music of any kind and am usually willing to put up with a few inconveniences to get it. The radio station here in Montgomery which broadcasts the best music is also the one which broadcasts the most commercials; I've counted as many as eight in between two pieces of music. And in order to listen to "The Shadow" and "The Green Hornet", I have to put up with the fact that the car might not start the next morning--because I can only pick up the St. Louis station which broadcasts them on the car radio and not on the one in the house.

The election was quite a surprise here in Alabama. Everyone knew that Goldwater was going to carry the state, even Johnson's supporters, but no one expected him to carry along with him as many Republican can-

didates as he did. Almost every Republican who ran for office was elected, in spite of all the ads the Democrats put out explaining how to split your ballot. A friend said that if he had accepted an offer to run for judge on the Republican ticket, he probably would have been elected. The voters just stepped into the booths, pulled the GOP levers, and stepped out. The next day, even the persons usually well-informed on the local political scene were asking just who were these people they had elected? Even after it happened many people found it hard to believe, although, as the editor of the Montgomery Advertiser pointed out, what happened could have been foreseen in view of the results of the election of two years ago.

Just a few months ago, the GOP expected to elect one--possibly two--congressmen. Then the state legislature, eager to please the threatened Democrats, redistricted the state. They did this in such a way that each Republican was placed in the district in which it was believed that he would run the poorest race. The redistricting wasn't expected to hold up in court; all that was necessary was that it hold up until after the election. Naturally, everyone thought that this was the end of the Republicans, but the election showed them how wrong they were.

One good result of the Supreme Court's order for the reapportionment of the legislature is that now the state government is taking more of an interest in the cities. They have always taken some interest in us city folks before, but only because they had to provide us with some services that we wouldn't provide ourselves with, such as schools. Now they're actually going out and offering the cities services. One such example is that the state has agreed that the highway fund could be used to pay for the paving of city streets. As a result, Montgomery has gone on a paving spree; every street is getting paved, whether it needs it or not. Every street that belongs to the city, that is. Due to the peculiarities of local politics, several of our major thoroughfares belong to the county. Naturally, these are the streets most in need of paving; naturally, they aren't getting it.

We haven't gotten to teaching machines yet, but education is certainly a big thing here in Alabama. Just a few years ago the voters passed a big bond issue and now schools are going up all over the state: junior colleges, vocational schools, and even a new college--the first such state-financed institution of higher learning founded in seventy years. The only thing bothering most folks is where is the money going to come from to pay the teachers who will teach in these fine new buildings.

"Whatever the world thinks, he who hath not much meditated upon God, the human mind, and the summum bonum, may possibly make a thriving earthworm, but will most indubitably make a sorry patriot and a sorry statesman." --Bishop Berkeley, in "Siris".

WALT BREEN :: BOX 1032 :: BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA, 94701

Thanks for the dedication, but we fear that young Patrick arrived a little too late to get his application in to Harvard for the spring term. Besides, we're thinking of waiting for offers from Princeton, Yale, Cambridge, the Sorbonne and my old alma mater Johns Hopkins.

I would have been far happier about Double Bill's survey of the musical tastes of science fiction fans had there been some attempt to work up the results in some useful sociological manner. If, for instance, we could ascertain that individuals of a certain type overwhelmingly preferred Gilbert & Sullivan, or folk-music of a certain type, or coun-

try and western, or classics of a certain type, that might be a good sociological discovery; "preference" might be established by what said individuals actually buy in records (proving that they want to listen to the same pieces or performances again and again), or what artists they actually plank down money to go and hear live. Are so-called "Insurgent" types really so traditional-jazz-oriented as their public image suggests? Do the few extreme opera buffs in science fiction fandom (Warner, Evans, Marion, Lowndes, Blish, Prosser, Silverberg, etc.) actually have anything else in common? Does anyone else besides yours truly really dig the work of Pro Musica Antiqua, or the music of such worthies as Janacek, Monteverdi, Lili Boulanger, Besard, etc.? And is there anything else held in common among the fanciers of such musical esoterica?

But what do you do with music? Do you listen to it very intently, comparing one performer's rendition with another of the same item, or is it a stimulus to revery, or mere accompaniment to stenciling, or what? (Well, of course, it depends upon the music. Usually, I listen very intently to music; I have difficulty understanding the apparently widely-held notion that one ought to do something while listening to music. On the other hand, I generally have the car radio on, listening with half an ear to the mediocre mush that characteristically issues from the speaker. I occasionally compare renditions, especially of jazz pieces. I even use music on occasion to get rid of a headache, since it is a more pleasant remedy than aspirin.)

"Authenticity" in traditional jazz may be legitimately spoken of if the performances you have in mind are dubbings from ancient 78's by the people who created the stuff on the spot in the 1920's and 1930's,

e e #
w #
=

"I am a very fortunate woman. For Christmas this year
I received two dresses..."

"...a transistor radio..."

e e #
w #
=

e e #
w #
=

"...a set of luggage..."

"...three pair of shoes..."

e e #
w #
=

e e #
w #
=

"...and a four-pound can of birth control pills."

but hardly if they are instead modern performances by people who have memorized the old Jimmie Noone and Sidney Bechet and Bunk Johnson solos. I also wonder by just what criteria one defines "folk" music if one can include in it such items as "They Laid Medgar Evers In His Grave", or the latest Bob Dylan creation. I have quite serious reasons for bringing this up: I have been, for the last few years, preparing a book-length thesis (for my degree at the University of California) on the sociology of music, and there is a very grave difficulty attending every attempt yet made to define folk-music. The definition I adopted, for the thesis, derives from some professionals in that field--"Folk-music is music of a particular culture group sung by and for members of that group in the group's distinctive idiom"--but this begs the question of whether, say, rock & roll isn't in some way the folk-music of a certain stratum of urban society in the United States. Particularly as we know that many tunes now accepted as "folk-music" are transmutations of older popular commercial tunes of known origin. A folk-music specialist friend of Lee Hoffman's cited to me having heard, in the Southwest, a version of "I'm Looking Over a Four-Leaf Clover" (British pop crud of the late 1940's, I believe) sung in folk-music contexts by native singers in a hillbilly idiom quite unlike the original. And so the Kitsch of one generation becomes the "authentic folk" stuff of the next--and where do you draw the line? (One thing puzzles me about the definition of folk-music which you suggest. If folk-music is "the music of a particular culture group sung by and for members of that group in the group's distinctive idiom" (*italics mine*), then Negro blues is presumably folk-music when it is sung by Josh White to a Negro audience but something else when it is sung by Theodore Bikel to an audience of Jewish students. That would appear to me, at first glance, a rather odd means of classifying music. And by what criteria could one define folk-music which would not include "such items as 'They Laid Medgar Evers In His Grave', or the latest Bob Dylan creation"? Some folk-music buffs apparently suffer from a tendency to consider age a valid criterion for authenticity. Listen, for example, to Dylan's "Ballad of Hattie Carroll", which deals with the Negro domestic, Mrs. Carroll, who was caned to death in Baltimore by "gentleman farmer" William Zantzinger, a crime for which the latter was sentenced to six months in prison. Now, if the incident had occurred in 1823 and the ballad originated by an illiterate slave and passed on by word-of-mouth, no one would have denied that it constituted "folk-music", but because Dylan wrote it in 1962, shortly after the incident occurred, purists refuse to accept it as valid folk-music. Oh, well, quite a bit of folk-music has not been considered such at the time it was written; I suppose Dylan's recognition as a creator of folk-music will have to wait until the musicologists of future centuries examine this quaint era.))

Marty Helgesen: Why does your first uncaused cause have to be different from, or outside, the universe itself? How could you possibly devise a non-circular proof that this first cause was identical with Jahweh? Not even Aquinas attempted that; he knew better. Adducing the Bible as proof begs the question of its reliability, which in turn hinges on its divine inspiration, which in turn begs the question of Jahweh once again--which is what one was trying to prove to start with. Saying that the nature of this uncaused cause is to exist is assuming the Anselmian ontological argument, which even Aquinas rejected as unconvincing. Go read Walter Kaufmann's "Critique of Religion and Philosophy", where this identical question is dealt with about as definitively as one could wish. Kaufmann, incidentally, is a deist. Incidentally, the weight of evidence is with Harry Warner's contention that Jesus believed in an imminent end of the world/Second Coming. The great expert Albert Schweitzer marshaled the evidence in his "The Quest of the His-

torical Jesus". This evidence is found not only in the canonical gospels but also elsewhere in the New Testament and in the apocryphal books of the same period. The Roman church does not seem to have altogether given up the belief prior to the Council of Nicaea or Nikaia, 4th century A.D., and various groups were again and again infected with it at various times. A.D. 1000, 1212, and 1844 were favorite dates. Doubtless the modern Jehovahs Witnesses will be glad to tell you in detail.

George W. Price is curiously uninformed about the real effect (as against the alleged intent) of loyalty oaths. Of course communist spies will lie; there needs no ghost come from the grave, Horatio, to tell us this. But objection to signing such oaths is not limited to communists and communist sympathizers. There are plenty who recognize that signing the oath will be held against them should it be found in the future that some close relative of theirs was in any way connected with communism; or that they themselves had toyed with marxism in any form during the 1930's. There is also the very real problem that loyalty is as curiously undefined a term as is pornography; its definition in use changes from one generation to the next, or even more rapidly. Does Mr. Price recall when Russia was called "our gallant Soviet ally"? Does he think that this is forever again impossible, e.g., if they and the U.S. find themselves on the same side in a war (cold or lukewarm or --God forbid--hot) against Communist China? Might not opposition to some State Department or CIA policy, perhaps relevant to Latin American dictators or the like, count in some future administration as "disloyalty"? When the term has not been clearly defined until now, how does one know where any future administration will draw the line between loyal and disloyal behavior, or that the line will not be erased and moved over a few miles to the right? This is the principle behind the refusal of many professors to sign any such blanket oath, even though when entering the armed forces each man swears to uphold and defend the Constitution, and even though the Smith Act already makes it illegal to teach and advocate the overthrow of the U.S. government by force and violence.

"Public opinion is the expression of the moral judgment of a group. In the nonliterate groups moral judgment in action constitutes public opinion. The exhibition of an attitude, the inflection of a word, or a gesture may suffice to exert the proper effect. A similar function is achieved in our own society by the great organs of public opinion such as the journals, periodicals, and also by newspapers, newscasters and commentators." --Ashley Montagu, in "Man: His First Million Years".

FRED LERNER :: 926 FURNALD HALL, COLUMBIA COLLEGE :: NEW YORK 27, N. Y.

I agree with George Price that the Republican defeat was more a rejection of Goldwater and his campaign than a rejection of Republicanism and Conservatism. I'm a Republican first, and a "Conservative" (if I am a Conservative) second, so I won't go completely to pieces if Goldwater does not retain control of the party. As far as I'm concerned, Goldwater had his chance (and I'd been hoping for five years that he would get that chance) and he bungled it. I would like to see Goldwater return to the Senate, or--and this is more probable--run for Governor of Arizona in 1966. Yes, I think that would be a job admirably suited to Goldwater's talents and interests.

But what about 1968? Javits and Fong, anyone? Jim Sanders and I have founded a Javits-Fong club here at Columbia. Yes, as I said, I'm a Republican first... (Somehow, Fred, I don't think the liberalizing trend in this country has progressed far enough to give a national tick-

et headed by a Jew and "balanced" by an Oriental much of a chance. On the other hand, of course, no conceivable slate of candidates could fare worse than Goldwater and Miller did this time around.))

Is anybody out there (except John Boardman, from whom it is to be expected) opposed to American intervention in the Congo? It seems to me that such intervention can be opposed only by a complete isolationist, or a person who believes that Moscow and Peking are always right. ((The term "intervention" covers a lot of territory, and it is quite possible to oppose some forms of American intervention in the Congo without falling into either of the categories you mention. The rescue mission, which I suppose is the specific incident you are referring to, was probably justified, but should have been handled differently. The use of Belgian soldiery was incredibly stupid, under the circumstances; from all reports, these paratroopers indiscriminately fired upon any African who happened to be so unfortunate as to be caught in the streets and summarily executed captives who were suspected of having participated in the rebellion. Then they flew back to Brussels for a fascist-style parade and hero's welcome. British or American troops could have accomplished the rescue just as effectively, while at the same time acting more responsibly. I wonder how the conservatives who lavish praise on this "mission of mercy" would react to a Nigerian regiment dropping into Neshoba County, Mississippi, to rescue the oppressed Negroes of that region?))

Your discussion of the Giles-Johnson case reveals a major example of the abuses created by the extension of the protection of well-intended laws to people who do not deserve such protection. I believe that the juvenile offender should be dealt with severely; that juvenile delinquency is more subject to the deterrence effects of harsh laws than any other form of crime. But the real root of juvenile crime is the attitude of society in general toward youth. Perhaps our society needs to think out the problem of just what it expects from its younger members, and what it plans to give them.

"The course of my life can be divided into innumerable parts, none of which is in any way dependent on the others. Accordingly it does not follow that because I was in existence a short time ago I must be in existence now, unless there be some cause which produces me, creates me as it were anew at this very instant, that is to say, conserves me. To all those who consider with attention the nature of time it is indeed evident that a thing in order to be conserved at each of the moments in which it endures has need of the same power and action as would be required to produce and create it anew, if it did not yet exist. That the difference between creation and conservation is a difference solely in our way of thinking is one of the many things which the natural light manifests to us." --Rene Descartes.

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

The whole business of the Supreme Court's "usurpation" of power has been going on almost since the country was founded. The basic difference of opinion is over whether the Constitution is to be viewed as a shell or a skeleton. One side wants to view the Constitution as a rock-ribbed set of definite and specific laws, frozen forever; the other views it as a living document, consisting of very general principles to be interpreted in the light of the special circumstances of different cases. The former holds that the Constitution is not to be interpreted at all, but taken at face value. As you pointed out several issues ago, however, the Constitution is of such a nature that to hold to

its letter would render it practically inoperative.

"Since the universe exists," says Marty Helgesen, "there necessarily has to be a First Uncaused Cause, whose nature it is to exist." Leaving aside the smokescreen of "First Uncaused Cause", I will readily concede that there necessarily has to be something that was the first thing to exist, whose nature is to exist. Why could this not be the material universe? Why must there have been a First Something before the universe? I find it just as logical to assume that the universe came first and that its nature is to exist.

George Price neglects to mention that if the United States followed some of the policies of the Soviet Union, it would stand to lose in prestige and respect more than it would gain in anything else. For instance, if we attempted to put ICBM bases in Japan--if the Japanese would sit still for it, which they wouldn't--there would be immediate screams of "Yankee Imperialism!", whereas the Russian attempt to arm Cuba lost it nothing but the small amount of prestige involved in having to back down. (As long as we portray ourselves as the "good guys", the nonaligned nations will expect us to act in some way different than the Communists.)

"This is a Christian Nation, where Sabbath is a holiday, the property of churches is not assessed, untaxed donations to God (up to ten per cent of income) are permitted by the revenue collector, money bears the name of the Lord, the witness to crime is sworn on the Bible, most violations of the Ten Commandments are punishable by law, and statesmen say grace. Yet there are enough different kinds of Christian churches here to convince any Buddhist or any worshipper of Baal or any Martian that the Christians themselves have no idea what Christianity means or what it intends that they should do." --Philip Wylie, in "An Essay on Morals".

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

Your description of various likes and dislikes is interesting, but even more interesting is the reason you give for going through it: that such a description gives a Clue to You, as it might be phrased were such goings-on made into a television program. I am simply not convinced that it does shed insight into your inner workings. The motivations for a person's likes and dislikes are complex and connected with all sorts of experiences the person has had from the time he was an infant. The fact that you think Capucine beautiful could be tied in with a skinny little girl that lived next door when you were age nine, your relationship with your mother, and the decisions the hairdresser makes when he prepares her for a scene about to be shot, and things even more obscure than that--not to mention the fact that Capucine is beautiful. (I'm not being entirely flippant when I say that--one must leave room for aesthetic objectivism.) How could anyone possibly learn anything important about you from your likes and dislikes?

Well, I suppose they could guess at whether you went to college or not, whether your parents were lower, middle, or upper class, and so on. But not guess very accurately: Some college, lower-middle-class parents? (No college, middle-middle-class parents.) But if that's the sort of thing you are trying to communicate you can get it across better by simply saying it.

It is true that we as Americans share a great amount of common experience and it is true that if we allow ourselves to soak up, so to speak, a picture of you in an intuitive way rather than trying to analyze your likes in some explicit way, we might be able to draw on some

sort of inner, unexpressed knowledge of how people behave. That could happen. Indeed, I am half convinced that most people have at least some intuitive, unanalyzed knowledge of other people. But it is awfully easy to fool yourself into thinking you know more than you do.

Anyhow, the reason you gave for your likes-list is the first halfway decent attempt at a reason I have ever seen. Perhaps it will provide sufficient excuse for me to do the same...

"The procreative task of an Arapesh father is not finished with impregnation. The Arapesh /of the Central New Guinea highlands/ have no idea that after the initial act which establishes physiological paternity, the father can go away and return nine months later to find his wife safely delivered of a child. Such a form of parenthood they would consider impossible, and furthermore, repellent. For the child is not the product of a moment's passion, but is made by both father and mother, carefully, over time. The Arapesh distinguish two kinds of sex-activity, play, which is all sex-activity that is not known to have induced the growth of a child, and work, purposive sex-activity directed towards making a particular child, towards feeding it and shaping it during the first weeks in the mother's womb. Here the father's task is equal with the mother's; the child is product of father's semen and mother's blood, combined in equal amounts at the start, to form a new human being." --Margaret Mead, in "Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies".

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

Was the Goldwater campaign allowed to pre-empt "That Was The Week That Was" so often because "someone in the hierarchy of the network decided that this would be an excellent means of further demolishing the popularity of the program"? There is a simpler explanation. Probably the network chieftains--good Liberals all--felt that Goldwater was even funnier than TW3.

On the Giles-Johnson case, in which the defense claimed that the white girl had willingly submitted to the Negroes, you remark that "It is simply not conceivable to the average Caucasian that a white girl would desire sexual relations with a Negro." You are doubtless right that such a defense only further prejudiced the jury against the Negro defendants. However, I think that a great many Caucasians--and most especially the segregationists--really do believe, though perhaps only subconsciously, that white women can desire Negroes.

Consider the famous question, "Would you want your sister to marry a n-----?" Note well the question is "marry", not "be raped by". The obvious implication is that your sister would be willing to marry a Negro, if only it were permitted. This shows, I suggest, that no matter what they claim to the contrary, the racists are aware that racial feeling is not inborn. It must be carefully inculcated. Alternatively, or perhaps additionally, we would have to assume that when white women get the hots they will ignore their "natural" racial feelings. So if the human race is to be preserved from the horrors of mongrelism, barriers of law and custom must be raised to guard against the lewdness of white women.

I am reminded of the old Moslem legal doctrine of Presumption of Intercourse, which held that if a man and a woman were alone together for as long as five minutes, intercourse would be presumed to have occurred. No further proof was needed; it was assumed that coition occurred.

CONTINUED AFTER "JOTTINGS"

BY TED PAULS

Jottings from the editor's desk

THE YELLOW PERIL: According to author-philosopher Gerald Johnson, writing in The New Republic, "The first requisite for a successful President of the United States is the mental capacity to see what is necessary for the welfare of the country, and the second requisite is the guts and the skill to do it." Now that he is President in his own right, elected by the most substantial majority in the history of this republic, Lyndon Baines Johnson will have ample opportunity to demonstrate the existence of these qualities. This writer does not for a moment doubt that President Johnson possesses "the guts and the skill" to accomplish any legislative or diplomatic goal which he decides to pursue; what requires demonstration is whether he possesses in addition the mental capacity to see what is necessary.

The most meaningful test of Lyndon Johnson's competence to exercise the awesome responsibilities of the most powerful office on earth will not, I think, be the success or failure of his domestic programs, or the future of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, or even his handling of the increasingly depressing situation in South Vietnam, but rather the manner in which he conducts United States policy vis-à-vis Communist China. Washington's present policy with respect to the People's Republic of China originated during the Truman Administration, and it has not been altered perceptibly in the intervening years despite its demonstrable inadequacy. The recent emergence of Red China as the world's fifth nuclear power has not noticeably aggravated the inadequacies of this policy; it has merely rendered the penalty for failing to correct them more severe. The long-postponed "agonizing reappraisal" of this aspect of United States foreign policy has now become an immediate necessity. The standing policy inherited by President Johnson consists in large part of the short-sighted assumption that mainland China can be most effectively dealt with by isolating it from the world community, imposing a cordon sanitaire, and, in a very real sense, studiously ignoring its existence. This is, of course, precisely the policy once pursued in relation to the Soviet Union, until Franklin D. Roosevelt, who possessed the mental capacity to see what was necessary and the political courage to do it, abandoned this negative and fruitless course. Perhaps we can take encouragement from the fact that the man now residing in the White House was for a number of years FDR's political protégé.

Whenever this subject is broached in conversation, those who vehemently oppose the establishment of normal diplomatic relations with Communist China enumerate their objections, which have, over a period of fifteen years, codified into a litany of ignorance. We are informed by them that the leaders of the People's Republic of China are bellicose fanatics, eager to enslave the world, a charge which, however accurate,

does not happen to be relevant to the matter at hand. The operative fallacy underlying this objection is the belief that extending diplomatic recognition is somehow equivalent to expressing approval or at least acceptance of policies and actions. The British, in particular, are amazed by this remarkable attitude, which apparently envisions diplomatic recognition by the United States as some substantial reward which is bestowed upon only the most deserving peoples. The United Kingdom, whether governed at a given moment by the Conservative or Labour elements, routinely extends diplomatic recognition to any regime which in fact controls a nation, regardless of its political acceptability or moral rectitude. They understandably consider this a quite reasonable approach to the matter, for after all the purpose of diplomatic relations is merely to enable countries to communicate with each other, a process equally necessary with friend or foe. As Harold Wilson remarked during an interview, prior to becoming Prime Minister, "The fact that we recognize Communist China does not imply that we approve of what they do; it means merely that we accept their existence and recognize the necessity of dealing with them."

Whether diplomatic contact with Communist China would initially accomplish much of significance is debatable, to be sure, but it would at least constitute a beginning in establishing mutual respect and a meaningful dialogue. It is argued by opponents of this course of action that diplomatic contact with a belligerent and uncompromising power such as Red China could never be particularly fruitful, but this is a highly questionable premise at best ("never" is a long time); and, in any event, it is manifest that the effort must be made, for to continue to treat Communist China as an "outlaw" nation, a renegade not worthy of the minimum respect normally granted to other nations, can only increase the belligerence of its leaders. Perhaps the People's Republic of China would spurn any effort on the part of the United States to normalize relations, treating any such gesture merely as a political victory, but we cannot be certain of this until the attempt is made--and we cannot afford not to make the attempt. To adopt the close-minded attitude that it is pointless to open broad diplomatic channels because the Chinese will never be willing to engage in any genuinely useful discussion is a ridiculous position which serves the interests of neither side.

Another argument frequently raised by those speaking in opposition to the establishment of normal diplomatic contact with Peking is that the Chinese Communists are not the "legitimate" rulers of China, that they achieved power "illegally" and manage to maintain themselves in a position of authority only by virtue of superior military resources. All of the specific accusations contained in this argument are in some respects justified (albeit exaggerated--it is probable that the present government of China is popular to a degree unimagined by those who base their opinions solely on Nationalist Chinese propaganda and State Department press releases), but the argument is nevertheless irrelevant. For diplomatic purposes--remembering, once again, that diplomatic recognition is not a reward for meritorious conduct but a necessary means of establishing channels of communication--the "legitimate" government of any nation is the one which does, in fact, exercise power. If we are to accomplish anything with respect to China and its position in the world, it is necessary to deal with the regime which formulates Chinese policy and controls the Chinese mainland--even if it is morally abhorrent. Diplomacy must deal with reality, not abstract moral judgments. The central fact in this situation is that a small group of Communists, headed by Mao Tze-tung and Chou En-lai, do in fact control the destiny of the Chinese nation; it does not matter, from the viewpoint of this country's foreign policy and diplomacy, that they achieved power

by undemocratic means and that they do not permit free elections.

Even if this were a legitimate consideration in diplomacy, one could question the obvious hypocrisy of applying it to certain cases but not to others. After all, there are a great many governments which achieved power illegally (i.e., by revolution), including that of the United States, and many which have never permitted free elections. If legitimacy in this sense is to be considered a qualification for admittance into the diplomatic community, then the Soviet Union, Spain, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, all of Eastern Europe and most of Latin America should be expelled. Nor is there any sense in which "our" China, Nationalist China, is "legitimate" by this standard. The regime of Chiang Kai-shek was never especially popular, it maintained itself solely by military force until deposed by the Communists, and it is not even the "legitimate" government of Taiwan: the Taiwanese are not racially Chinese, they did not invite Chiang and his army to settle on their island, and they have never been permitted a free election.

All of these same points are equally germane to the question of Communist China's admission to the United Nations. It is true that the United Nations Charter establishes certain qualifications for membership in the world organization which the People's Republic of China does not meet, but this is not a particularly powerful argument against their admission for the simple reason that many of the nations which are members in good standing are equally vulnerable on this point. If every nation faithfully obeyed the idealistic demands of the Charter, there would be no need for the United Nations. The position of those outside the Communist world who advocate the admission of Red China, viz., that it would be possible for more reasonable nations to exert greater influence on the Chinese if they were members, remains valid irregardless of the degree of belligerence displayed by the Chinese Communists. Certainly no one claims that admission to the United Nations would make the Chinese less receptive to the pressure of world opinion; and if there is even the slightest chance that membership in the world organization would make the People's Republic of China more inclined to lis-

(:::)) "My name is Kassem X, founder and director of the Black
(= =) Parsis, a militant religious order dedicated to freeing
(U) the so-called 'Negro' from his present enslavement by
((-)) the white man."

"For too long have we suffered oppression and countless
indignities. The so-called 'Negro' will no longer accept
the leadership of white stooges like James Farmer, Roy
Wilkins and Martin Luther King."

(:))
(= =)
(U)
((-))

(:))
(= =) "We will no longer accept gradualism and tokenism, no
(U) longer listen to the counsel of 'Patience.' We must have
((-)) freedom now or the streets will run red with blood."

"Our white oppressors claim that we are not fit to live a
civilized existence. I say riot, murder, rape, burn, de-
stroy! That ought to show the bastards!"

(:))
(= =)
(U)
((-))

ten to the voices of sanity, it is worth the risk involved. (There is, from the viewpoint of United States foreign policy, one further advantage to be gained from the admission of Red China to the United Nations. Almost certainly Communist China, when it is admitted, will receive a seat on the Security Council, and although this would enable them to block actions sponsored by the United States, it would also bring them into frequent conflict with the Soviet Union, thus aggravating the Sino-Soviet split.)

If the Chinese leaders ever succeed in solving the eternal problem of feeding their immense population and complete the process of industrialization which has only just begun, China will once again become one of the most powerful nations on earth. It is essential that we establish fruitful communication before that day arrives, or else there may actually be a war to end all war--because it will end all life. It is true that the prospects for "fruitful communication" appear distressingly slim at the moment, but a beginning must somehow be made. I would like to see a Communist Chinese delegation sitting at the United Nations; whether we end up calmly discussing issues with them, ignoring them, or hitting them over the head with their own chairs, they would at least be there, available for discussion and subject to pressure from other member states.

Another factor which Washington should consider in examining its policy with respect to admitting Communist China to the United Nations is that the question will eventually be removed from our power to control (short of destroying the United Nations itself). It is inevitable that Communist China will receive a seat in the world body; if it does not occur this year, then it is almost certain to occur next year. We are therefore placed in the unenviable position of attempting to implement a policy which is not only extremely unwise but also doomed to eventual failure. Unfortunately, the situation has now progressed to the point where there is no graceful way for the United States to capitulate on this issue. Our policy has always been tactically absurd, in that it incorporated a position so extreme and untenable that even our staunchest allies could accept it only with difficulty and under pressure. The United States consistently rejected the concept of "two Chinas", insisting that the Nationalist regime of Chiang Kai-shek was the only representative of the Chinese people; as a consequence of this, Washington is deprived of recourse to a compromise position which might now prove extremely useful. The Chinese Communists have also refused to accept the notion that there are two legitimate Chinese governments, asserting that only their regime represented China. Had our policy been more flexible on this point, the present difficulties might have been avoided and the coming debacle prevented. If the United States had accepted in principle the proposition that the Communists represented mainland China and the Nationalists represented Formosa, which a vast majority of United Nations members would have considered an eminently fair and completely reasonable view, Red China would still have been excluded from the UN by its own refusal to join under these conditions, but its exclusion would then have been attributable to the intransigence of the Communists in turning down a fair compromise. This would have resulted in a tactical victory for the United States, since admission would then have been conditional upon a Communist Chinese concession, resulting in a loss of prestige for them rather than for the United States.

But there is purpose to be served by examining might-have-beens; as matters now stand, there seems no possibility of abandoning our position. Due more to Washington's lack of foresight than to any cleverness on the part of the Chinese, they have the United States trapped in an extremely unpromising position: if we continue to pursue our present

policy, we will eventually lose the diplomatic struggle outright (i.e., the United Nations will vote to accept Red China over our objections); but if we retreat, then Peking will make us appear fools by emphasizing before the world our uncomfortable reversal. We are in a situation, in other words, where we cannot win anything, but have the option of choosing where and how we must lose. Such a situation offers no opportunity for political gains, and cannot be very attractive to Lyndon Johnson; the course of action which the nation pursues in the next four years will not require a great deal of skill on the part of the Chief Executive, but it will depend heavily on his "guts".

MARTIN LUTHER KING: More than any other individual, Dr. Martin Luther King symbolizes the struggle of the American Negro for freedom and equality. Honored in his own lifetime by an impressive array of awards and testimonials, culminating with the coveted Nobel Peace Prize, he will be recognized by future generations as one of the truly great Americans of this century. Few other leaders of men have so successfully emulated the courage, devotion and perseverance of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, whose spirit guided Dr. King through the dangerous and frustrating months of effort, failure and redoubled effort. It would be appropriate, I feel, if the ultimate honor of the Nobel Medal were to mark Dr. King's retirement from the front line of the civil rights movement. He has achieved a pinnacle of attainment and personal prestige; and, like a professional boxer who has finally won the championship, has only one direction in which to go if he insists on remaining active. In a sense, the Rev. Dr. King's crusade began in the Spring of 1960, with the first large scale civil disobedience campaigns, and ended in 1964, with the enactment of the omnibus civil rights bill. There are still crucial battles to be fought, but Martin Luther King is not the man to fight them. The struggle for equality has changed, qualitatively, with the passage of the Civil Rights Act, and the philosophy and methods of its former leaders are no longer suited to the task at hand. In the South, the battle now is between the forces of law and decency, and those of chaos and anarchy, between the Federal Government, its courts, law officers and, eventually perhaps, its troops, and the hooded raiders of the Ku Klux Klan and the local governments which they control. There will be no more mass sit-in demonstrations or freedom rides; that phase of the struggle has passed into history. In the North, where ultimately the most important battles must be fought, the tactics of Dr. King's dedicated band of non-violent resisters have no relevance. The campaigns of non-violent resistance have never succeeded in achieving the goal set by Martin Luther King or Mahatma Gandhi, viz., converting the enemy through the power of love. The quiet courage of those Birmingham school-children could never touch the hearts of the Ross Barnetts or the George Wallaces, for such as they are insensitive to all but the basest emotions. What the demonstrations did accomplish was to focus public attention on the conspicuous aspects of the oppression, the brutality, the morally debilitating atmosphere, and thus force to take some sort of action those who were already nominally allies. The sit-in campaigns awakened the consciences of the hundreds of thousands of basically good people who had previously blinded themselves to the situation which existed. This is no small thing; its importance is indicated by the comparatively rapid progress of the civil rights movement in the past few years. But such tactics cannot be effective in the North, for there are few specific grievances on which to focus. The segregation of the ghetto is covert; there are no slayings of civil rights leaders, no signs saying "White Only", no ludicrous governors standing in the school-house door, no systematic discrimination in the voting registrar's office. The very subtlety of the oppression makes

the battle against it more difficult. And for this struggle, Martin Luther King's philosophy and his strategy are equally useless. The struggle will be won, of course; it is only a matter of time. But the old leaders cannot adapt to the new situations, and their continued presence, as useless ornaments, can only tarnish the prestige which they have at last acquired. Martin Luther King is America's Gandhi, but what the civil rights movement needs now are Nehrus, practical political leaders and organizers, not mystics and gurus. The awards and accolades which Martin Luther King has received are in recognition of the fact that, for four years, he marched in the van of history. The time has now arrived for him to pass the sword to others.

"BETTER RED THAN DEAD": Several years ago, a heated controversy arose regarding the relative validity of two admitted catch-phrases, "Better Red Than Dead" and its opposite, "Better Dead Than Red". It is difficult to recall now exactly how the controversy began or which slogan was coined first, but the debate continued for some time, occasionally even leading to physical violence--as when a picket carrying a sign with one or the other phrase emblazoned on it was attacked by bystanders who happened to be partisans of the other viewpoint. Implicit in this argument regarding the worth of two rather sophomoric slogans was this question: Given a clear-cut alternative, in which all other possibilities are excluded, is it preferable to engage in a thermonuclear exchange which may eradicate all life in the Northern Hemisphere and will at least destroy the United States as a nation, or surrender to the Communists and permit this country to become part of the Soviet empire? Although rather less fashionable of late, the question remains an interesting topic for dinner-table conversation--especially if one enjoys excitement with one's meal--because when it is posed, the assemblage immediately polarizes into two mutually hostile factions, the first believing that the second is composed of cowards, the second assuming that the first is composed of maniacs. (I exclude from this hypothetical example those who reject both alternatives and rally to the slogan "Neither Red Nor Dead", since they are guilty merely of misunderstanding the nature of the original question, which does not admit of any third alternative.)

In attempting to rationally examine the opposing positions in this controversy, it is necessary to establish at the outset a few conditions which, though in practice they might not be fulfilled, greatly facilitate what is an almost wholly academic argument. The argument is academic because, first, it is extremely unlikely that a situation would arise which would offer an absolutely clear choice between only the two alternatives under consideration; and, second, even if it were granted that, given the situation, surrender would be the most reasonable response, this could never become a matter of national policy--for to make such an admission publicly would simply encourage our external enemies to arrange a situation in which the dreaded choice were offered. Another difficulty which tends to complicate this question is that not all of those who address themselves to it sufficiently comprehend the difference between its personal and its national application. As the question is posed in this context, it implies that the alternatives are an immensely destructive nuclear war or capitulation to the enemy (presumably the Soviet Union). However, it is also possible to interpret the question in a purely personal sense--as, e.g., a choice between passively accepting a Communist dictatorship in this country or being executed for non-cooperation or "subversive" activities. It is not difficult to perceive that the position taken by many individuals with respect to this controversy might vary radically depending upon the circumstances in which the question was interpreted. There would be many

persons who, like Patrick Henry, would be willing to die rather than surrender their liberty; but it does not necessarily follow that each and every one of these individuals would be willing to accept the slaughter of 160,000,000 Americans in order to defend the same principle.

Despite all of these qualifying and obscuring factors, it is nevertheless of some value--however academic--to pose the question, because reactions to this question can be expected to provide an insight into the character of the individuals responding. Since it is a purely hypothetical situation, we have the advantage of being able to neatly ignore the mitigating factors and complex aspects which might otherwise interfere with a logical, unemotional evaluation of the controversy. In its most comprehensible and unequivocal terms, the choice may be stated thus: If the United States were offered the choice between engaging in a thermonuclear exchange, which would utterly destroy the nation and kill the vast majority of its inhabitants, or surrendering to the Soviet Union, which would lead to the forced communization of our country, which alternative should we choose? Those who immediately reply "War!" are generally considered by their opponents to be raving maniacs; some are, of course, but the greater number are simply in ignorance as to the true nature of the alternatives offered. And those who unhesitatingly reply "Surrender!" are in turn dismissed by the other faction as cowards, although, as I hope to demonstrate, theirs is by no stretch of the imagination a cowardly choice.

Of course, I cannot assay this issue in a disinterested manner, for obviously I have a preference as between the two alternatives: if a situation ever arose where we were offered a choice between these unpalatable alternatives, I should--most regretfully, to be sure--choose to surrender. I have been thinking seriously about this question for a number of years, and can state honestly that I have never encountered a genuinely reasonable argument in favor of engaging in a suicidal nuclear war in order to avoid falling under the domination of Communism. Communism is, of course, the principal bogeyman of the American people (most of whom know considerably less about it than they believe themselves to know), but all of the evidence which has accumulated to date provides little indication that the millions of people who actually do exist under Communist regimes would prefer to be dead. Occasionally, it is true, groups of them stage a riot or defect to the West or attempt to revolt, but all of these symptoms of dissatisfaction appear to occur just about as frequently in the non-Communist world. However much most Americans would dislike living under a regime which is anti-democratic, oppressive (less so, currently, but still oppressive), and not constrained to respect any basic liberties of its citizens, it is simply ridiculous to assert that Communism is that legendary fate-worse-than-death constantly referred to in "The Perils of Pauline". People in Communist countries, from all indications, appear to eat, drink, work, make love, get fired, walk through the park on Sunday, go to night-clubs, get beaten up by hoodlums, raise flowers, and sometimes suffer from malnutrition, exactly like most of the people outside the sphere of Communism. At times, when the dictatorship becomes particularly oppressive, they suffer terribly, but throughout history human beings have endured greater misery and brutality. Many individuals have struggled against oppression and have been murdered in the attempt, to be sure, but this is the first time that allegedly intelligent members of society have advocated national suicide as a reasonable answer to such a problem.

At various times in the history of the Western world, Protestants have thought it intolerable to live in countries dominated by Catholics, and vice versa; Jews and skeptics have been systematically and continuously persecuted by both of these groups. Many leaders have counseled

violent resistance, even when this meant certain death, but mass suicide has never been seriously considered as an alternative to existence under such conditions. I very much doubt that a modern American would find life under Communism as difficult as the Jews of the Middle Ages found life in Christian Europe; it appears unlikely, too, that a Communist society in this country would be any more oppressive than the conditions endured by the Negro in America for three hundred years. There is a Negro spiritual which contains the line, "And before I'll be a slave, I'll be buried in my grave." This admirable sentiment has little connection with "Better Dead Than Red" as that slogan is generally understood; the distinction is subtle, but profound. For although the Negro has struggled mightily against the bonds of slavery, and many have indeed gone to their graves prematurely as a result of the struggle, Negroes as a group have never contemplated suicide as a valid means of escaping oppression. Life under Communism, then, is no more unsatisfactory than many ways of life which men have been forced to endure throughout history; but never before has it been suggested that we avoid the discomfort by killing ourselves, our children and our children's children to the nth generation.

However, since there are many sincere people who do in fact ad-

(" " " " ")
 (7 7) "My name is D. Ellsworth Carter, district coordinator of
 (o) the Office of Economic Opportunity. It is our bureau, as
 ((=)) you know, which is responsible for putting into operation President Johnson's anti-poverty program."

"My position in the agency is especially important, because of the location of the district over which my office has authority."

(" " " " ")
 (7 7)
 (o)
 ((=))

(" " " " ")
 (7 7) "My office has the responsibility for conducting the war
 (o) on poverty in Beverly Hills, California."
 ((=))

"I should like to stress that the Office of Economic Opportunity is not simply a welfare unit, dedicated to perpetuating the dole. For example, job retraining programs are a most important aspect of our work."

(" " " " ")
 (7 7)
 (o)
 ((=))

(" " " " ")
 (7 7) "In Beverly Hills, we are particularly anxious to reach
 (o) as many prep-school drop-outs as possible, and train them
 ((=)) for useful lives. We also have a program of vocational retraining for corporate executives whose jobs have been absorbed by advancing technology."

"Our slogan is: 'A family with only one swimming pool is not fully free.'"

(" " " " ")
 (7 7)
 (o)
 ((=))

vocate this course of action, notwithstanding its palpable absurdity, it is necessary to formulate some rather more specific arguments against it. There are two which come immediately to mind. The first is that, if the nation chooses surrender rather than destruction, individual citizens would nevertheless retain the option of deciding differently. That is to say, if the United States, confronted with the sort of dilemma we have been considering, were to choose the alternative of capitulation, any citizen who believed that life under Communism was so distasteful as to require the ultimate sacrifice in its avoidance would be free to commit suicide or, if he found that completely negative course of action unpalatable, join an underground organization and fight clandestinely against the government until he was captured or killed. But if, on the other hand, the nation were under the circumstances to choose destruction rather than surrender, dissenters would be deprived of any alternative; a thermonuclear holocaust is not selective, i.e., it would not kill only those who preferred death to life under Communism. The second major objection to the "Better Dead Than Red" thesis concerns the matter of permanence. Subjection, by Communism or any other odious system, is not a permanent situation. History is full of vast empires and oppressive social systems; some have lasted only a short time, others have endured for centuries, but none has been permanent. Even at its worst, Communist domination is a state which holds out the promise of future improvement, whether by revolution or evolution. But death is permanent and irrevocable (ignoring, for purposes of this discussion, theological questions); if you choose to die, and at the same time kill your children and prevent the birth of future generations, then you have abolished hope. If necessary, I would prefer to see 100 generations of Americans live under Communism, that the 101st should be free, rather than accepting a course of action which insures that those generations shall never be born.

One of the most interesting aspects of this dispute is that proponents of the thesis that it is better to be dead than Red seem determined to brand their opponents as cowards. A little thought should suffice to demonstrate that this charge is wholly unwarranted. Traditionally, it is suicide which has been considered the cowardly alternative, not the desire to live in spite of all the misery of life. Proponents of the "Better Red Than Dead" thesis are saying that they would continue to live if a Communist regime were somehow brought to power in this country, that they would even surrender and bring about such a thing in order to avoid nuclear destruction, and that they would then attempt to improve the situation (for their descendants, if not for themselves) by struggling against the imposed tyranny. They realize that such action would probably cost their lives, but they are willing to make that sacrifice if there is even the faintest hope for the rekindling of liberty in future generations. This is not a cowardly position. Rather, it is those who say that living under Communism is such a fearsome prospect that they would prefer the easy solution of ending it all in a burst of flame who are guilty of cowardice.

--Ted Pauls

"The criminal law has, from the point of view of thwarted virtue, the merit of allowing an outlet for those impulses of aggression which cowardice, disguised as morality, restrains in their more spontaneous forms. War has the same merit. You must not kill your neighbor, whom perhaps you genuinely hate, but by a little propaganda this hate can be transferred to some foreign nation, against whom all your murderous impulses become patriotic heroism." --Lord Bertrand Russell, in "New Hopes for a Changing World".

red whenever there was opportunity. The gallant Southern Gentlemen seem to feel the same way about their women. History is repeating itself: our Southern Chivalry look upon their women in much the same way as women were regarded in the medieval Age of Chivalry, when female virtue was both extravagantly praised and held in deepest suspicion. A sharp entrepreneur might make a fortune selling chastity belts in Dixie.

My personal suspicion is that the Southern whites' preoccupation with inter-racial intercourse is largely rooted in the fear that if Negroes are not kept subjugated, they will take revenge in kind for the countless thousands of black women whom white men have possessed as their seigneurial right. Nor would I consider this fear to be entirely unfounded. After all, the Southern Negroes have associated so closely with the Southern whites that it would not be at all surprising to find that the Negroes are just as insane as the whites. Of course, the possibility of rape by Negroes would not explain the whites' presumption that intermarriage would be desired by white women; but then we are not dealing with reason and logic. And if Southern white men believe that their womenfolk are wantons and trollops, who should know better?

The racist attitude is shot through with these contradictions. In a way, the Negroes should feel complimented that the white racists feel the need of such rigorous institutions to keep them suppressed. It is an admission that Negroes are not really inferior in their abilities. For if they were really inferior, there would be no need to hold them down; their own incompetence would keep them down.

It is an article of faith with many "progressives" that Tshombe should be abhorred for his use of white mercenaries. Many of these "progressives" were around in 1941; I wonder why they did not scorn that other famous gang of white mercenaries: the Flying Tigers. Hmmmm... When America entered the war against Japan, the Flying Tigers were absorbed into the U.S. 14th Air Force. Let us hope that history does not repeat in the Congo.

Chay Borsella thinks of a "conservative" as one who is "concerned with progress just as much as a liberal is, but...is moving at a slower pace." A reactionary, on the other hand, is moving "in the other direction...(and) would want to repeal all the laws of progress that have been passed in, say, the last 25 or 50 years." By these definitions, I am more a reactionary than a conservative.

To wish to undo our "progress" is not wrong ipso facto; it depends on the direction of that progress. Consider a driver on a road leading to the brink of a cliff. If he is a liberal, he says "Progress must continue!", steps on the gas, and hurtles over the edge. A conservative, by the Borsellian definition, also drives over the edge, but slowly. A stand-patter just sits there until he starves. And a reactionary turns around, goes back to the last fork, and takes a different road.

Like most reactionaries, I believe that we took the wrong road about one or two generations ago. The election of FDR is often used as a convenient landmark, but the causes reach back much farther. Roosevelt's accession only proved that the various collectivist influences had grown to political potency. The basic conflict has always been with us: whether government should be limited to the negative role of protecting people against coercion by others, or whether government should also take positive action to achieve "social goals". I take the former position, in the belief that coercion is rarely creative and that liberty provides the best environment for solving most problems. Given my

choice, I would rather be called "libertarian" in preference to either "reactionary" or "conservative".

To decide what are the morally proper functions of government, it is helpful to remember that government is by definition "the social apparatus of coercion". When someone proposes that a law be passed to achieve "so-and-so", we should understand that he is actually saying "If people do not do so-and-so voluntarily, then men with guns should force them to do it." As a corollary, if so-and-so is not vital enough to justify the use of force, then it is not properly a government function.

Liberals have a lot of fun describing rightists as people who want to sell the Post Office to private enterprise, as though this were proof of our idiocy. Yet, I have never seen any argument even attempting to show why the mails should be a government monopoly. If Railway Express and Bell Telephone can function effectively as private companies, why not the Post Office? Let it pay taxes instead of eating them. Can any reader of Kipple give me any reason why the Post Office should not be sold to private ownership, as a regulated public utility? Or if that's too drastic, can anyone say why it should be illegal for anyone but the P.O. to carry first class mail for pay?

The Bobby Baker scandal suggests one reason why the functions of government should be strictly limited. It is not enough to say that Baker was a crook; we must recognize that big government automatically breeds crooks en masse. As a consequence of the government's ubiquitous regulation of the economy, it has so many favors to bestow that the grafters and sharpers naturally flock to it. The buzzards go where the carrion is. In the long run, the only way to fumigate the government is to prune away the superfluous regulations (about 80% of them, at a rough guess).

For obvious example, it is now ridiculous to subject the railroads to the minute regulation that was devised when they had a monopoly of long distance transportation. Or again, in the late campaign it was suggested that the FCC was unduly favorable to Johnson's television station, and prevented competitors from setting up in Austin. Whether the charge is true or not, the government should not have the power to decide who can establish a station. It would be fairer to sell the channels to the highest bidder, and let the money go into the Treasury instead of into the pockets of influence peddlers. For a third example, the voters of California, in their august wisdom (and November folly), forbade the establishment of Pay-TV. This is what I call "legal corruption"; the networks and theatre owners quite legally sponsored a law destroying a competitor.

As long as government possesses vast and frequently capricious power over the conduct of businesses, the businessmen will be tempted to mollify that power with liberal applications of money. And the more widespread the regulation is, the less is the chance that anyone will try to seriously reform the system. That is, no one will dare to rock the boat, lest his own little vested interest might fall overboard.

Incidentally, although I have not had the pleasure of seeing Western Destiny, when you said "In it, you will find no grotesque full-page illustrations comparing the anatomy of a Negro with that of a gorilla..." you reminded me of an article which amused me mightily. Alas, I don't remember the name of the author or where it appeared. It pointed out that (1) apes have thin lips with little eversion. Apes are long in the upper lip, where a mustache would be on a man, but that's not part of the lip proper. (2) Under all that hair, apes have mostly unpigmented skin. (3) Among human races, Negroes have the least body hair, Orientals are intermediate, and whites are hairiest. Apes are hairy all over, and (4) ape hair is straight, not curly or kinky. Now then, which

variety of human is the most ape-like? Tarzan was right at home!

"Inasmuch as the active application of language is speech, it is upon speech that writing, essentially a secondary means of communication, is dependent. The pedants, it is true, have long fostered the misconception that everyday speech is to be regarded as inferior to the written word, that the one constitutes a base and corrupt form of the other. As to this, there is no doubt that writing is much more conservative than speech, upon which it exercises a powerful and restraining influence. But the fact, nevertheless, remains that mankind has been possessed of language since time immemorial, whereas even in these days of universal progress and enlightenment, some two-thirds of the population of the world are still unable either to read or to write. Very evidently, language is what is spoken, rather than what is written."
--P. E. Cleator, in "Lost Languages".

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

Your "Season's Greetings", which arrived the other day [written December 7th], was enjoyed but presents something of a problem: How can I respond without offending your scruples? I trust it will be all right to wish you a happy new year. (Aw, gee, Marty, you have me confused with Madalyn Murray. Being wished "Merry Christmas" doesn't offend my scruples; only dogmatism and obscurantism do that.)

Your musical tastes are rather similar to my own. There are a few exceptions, but in the spirit of the season and for the sake of novelty, I'm not going to mention my disagreements. I will say, though, that my favorite folk-music is Israeli and my favorite performers are Geula Gill and the Oranim.

When I referred to constitutional amendments with regard to bicameral legislatures with a real difference between the houses, I was not talking about any plans to restore to the people of the several states the control over their legislatures which the Supreme Court has usurped, although I strongly favor such an idea. Rather I was referring to the fact that the people could have made this change, if they wanted it, without the Court. Since you will probably rephrase the same objection to say that rural dominated legislatures would reject such a proposed amendment out of self-interest, let me point out that the same device could have been employed as was used to ratify Repeal. Congress specified that ratification was to be by conventions rather than by legislatures in order to bypass the rural dominated dry voting legislatures and get more urban wet votes.

You say that you object not so much to the idea of an Uncaused Cause but rather to the various theologies built on this premise. But why should I stop thinking after I have shown the necessity of this Uncaused Cause? The same reasoning process which tells us that God must exist can tell us some of his attributes. As I've mentioned before, you, yourself, engaged in this kind of reasoning in Kipple #46 and #48, when you demonstrated that there could be only one omnipotent and infinite God.

The reason that I accept the statement that St. Matthew received divine revelation but reject the idea that Charles J. Guiteau did is not merely because I have been taught so, as you claim. Rather it is because there is ample evidence to support the one statement and none whatsoever to support the other. In Kipple #57, I quoted from Msgr. Ronald Knox's "The Belief of Catholics" a list of "certain leading doctrines which no Catholic, upon a moment's reflection, could accept on the authority of the Church and on that ground alone." Obviously, if we

do not accept them on the authority of the Church we must have other grounds. The other grounds are a consideration of the available evidence. If you look back at those doctrines you will see that they culminate in the statements that God founded the Catholic Church and promised that through his divine power it would be protected from teaching error. For this reason, after one has satisfied himself intellectually that these doctrines are true, he has the intellectual duty of believing what the Church teaches. You will notice that only after the authority of the Church has been established by reason is there any mention of religious faith. As I pointed out to John Boston, it would require an apologetics book, such as Msgr. Knox's, even to outline completely the evidence used to prove these points. Therefore I am not going to attempt it in a letter and will restrict myself to answering specific questions and objections.

"The reactionary conservative is found in all the pages of history. Nowhere does he look good. Not once has he been correct in his attitude. Always, history and events have moved on, leaving him behind to make bitter, self-pitying entries in diaries, or to commit himself to some folly of public policy which will remain as a footnote in history." --Ralph McGill.

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

Re education: I wish more people would read A. S. Neill's book, "Summerhill: A Radical Approach to Child-Rearing". I won't go into extended commentary, but I think Neill has a very good point. He makes the case for progressive schools quite well. The whole basis for Skinner's concept is to substitute something for a textbook, but there shouldn't be a substitute for textbooks, which are supposed to be a supplement, an aid to make teaching easier. This view has been largely ignored in recent times. I am still openly croggled at our second year algebra class. Each day we get a heavy homework assignment, usually taking from one to two hours, and with material to read and study besides. Then, the next day in class, we spend the whole period simply checking the homework assignment. This goes on day after day, and as far as I can see the teacher has pretty well evaded doing any work at all. This is very frustrating, and it makes the course pure drudgery. The topper to all of this is the attitude of students and teachers toward tests. There is one reason and one reason only for the students learning the material: so they will score well on the tests, and thus get a good grade. This results in "cramming", which is learning material at such a hyper-fast rate that it usually only stays with one for a week.

This "average student" thing amuses me, too. The teachers grade by the average and teach to the average, but usually there are only one or two "average" students in a class. The system of grading known as "grading by the curve" means that you work it out so that you make the students fit into the average whether they do or not. This leads to ludicrous results; such as giving students who get 37 out of 100 possible on a test "A's", while giving students who get 87 out of 100 "D's" or lower. The system operates by deciding on the "average" and fitting everyone to it.

Another thing: the schools do not teach students how to think. I haven't yet learned how from schools and if I left it up to them, I never would. You hear some teachers say, "This assignment will make you think", but the results are idiotic. This year, English is taught by one of those make-you-think types. She keeps insisting that we must think, that in writing essays we should express our opinions and thus

At the high school I attend, Columbia High, there is quite a bit of basic grouping. I take a French class dominated by juniors (I am a sophomore) but including several seniors. I have other classes with equal types of grouping. On the whole, however, there are quite a few classes in which "lower" students get in with "higher" ones.

In my opinion, learning went out with the Greeks and their form of "school". Today we have not "learning institutions", but "memorization institutions". You accumulate facts, yet learn nothing. Right along with the rest, I grotched like hell about returning to school. You are also right, though--I do want to learn. And that is exactly why I didn't want to return to school. I learned a lot this last summer. I spent tremendous amounts of time thinking about myself, about my position in life, my future, and where I would go from here. Now, since returning to school, I am so pressed for time that I haven't thought much about anything, but must trust largely to intuition. I am undecided on many things that are more important to me, yet homework gets in my way. I have done little reading since school began, having to drop many books to read the "classics" (such as that thought-provoking "satire", "Pride and Prejudice"), which are required reading. Yes, I am bitter. I hate school because it took away from me the most rewarding times of my life so far.

[illegible]

FROM:

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



BALTIM

MD:

printed matter only
return requested
may be opened for inspection
third class mail
no commercial value

W E T P A I N T

SEND TO

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

How about writing an article for Kipple?