

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 Greater Baltimore Committee to elect George Wallace President (of the Congo). -wokl-

# LETTERS

LETTERS & MORE LETTERS

GEORGE W. PRICE :: 873 CORNELIA AVE. :: CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, 60657

I trust that I am not the kind of nationalist "who believes the great nation-states of the Nineteenth and Twentieth centuries to be the glorious culmination of this trend (toward ever-larger social-governmental units)..." I hope and expect that eventually there will be a world government that can maintain civilized standards of law and order. But I do not expect this to materialize any time soon, and in the meantime the rights and duties of national governments will continue to be as I described them. That is, national governments have the right and the duty to use all necessary force to protect the legitimate rights of their citizens, including specifically the right to life, liberty and honestly-acquired property.

You say that I "may continue to support National Sovereignty and the sort of world in which every nation has the absolute right to kick any other nation in the teeth...but your philosophy is rapidly becoming an anachronistic curiosity." As I pointed out, when governments restrict themselves to defending the legitimate rights of their nationals, which is all that national sovereignty requires, there need be no conflict between governments. The conflicts arise when one government presumes to interfere with the legitimate rights of the nationals of another government. If all peaceful remonstrance fails, then, since there is no higher authority who can enforce justice, the aggressor has to get kicked in the teeth. It would be wonderful if this were an "anachronistic curiosity", but it is unlikely to become so while there exist so many governments with no respect for the rights of others.

The anarchic condition of the world is not caused by lack of a world government. The causation is the other way around. To form a decent world government--not just a world-wide tyranny imposed by one powerful nation--requires that the subsidiary units share a certain minimum community of beliefs and standards. Since no such community now exists or is likely to appear in the foreseeable future, world government is out of the question for the time being. For example, we cannot expect that there could be established a world government which would then



peacefully settle the disputes between communist and liberal nations, precisely because the existence of communist powers (assuming they continue their present behavior) is thoroughly incompatible with the development of the requisite community of beliefs and standards. So there will be no world government until the communist powers have been rendered impotent, or until the whole world has become communist. It would be possible to have a world government under which the various nations had widely varying forms of national government, so long as they agreed on the basic principle that they were not to interfere with each others' internal customs. But this is precisely the rule that the communists cannot abide by; their religion requires them to interfere with other nations in order to establish communism. So if you want to see world government established, bend your efforts to eliminating communist power. ((It would be possible to have a world government under which the various nations had widely varying forms of national government provided we could eliminate the notion that the existence of other systems of government is incompatible with the best interests of the world. This is a vicious and narrow outlook which is currently closely identified with doctrinaire communists and American "conservatives". Your advocacy of this viewpoint is somewhat more sophisticated than Mao Tse-tung's, of course, in that it asserts that the major reason "communist power" must be eliminated is that the communists are interested in "eliminating" us. But then, I suspect that a Communist theoretician could make a good case for the view that the "imperialist" nations should be eliminated as a matter of "self-defense", so in practice your position is extremely similar to that of a Marxist fanatic. It will be interesting to see how the continuing evolution of Communism will affect your viewpoint. The Soviet Union already recognizes the necessity of co-existence to the extent that it implies avoidance of a major war, and within the next decade or two the major Communist powers will abandon in practice (though not, for some time after, in theory) the idea that the existence of non-Communist nations is a temporary aberration which must be rectified. At what point will you admit that the preservation of Western liberal democracy no longer demands the elimination of communist power? And, incidentally, if you believe that the present distressing state of the world is caused by the existence of a great number of governments which fail to respect the rights of others, may I suggest that urging your own government to adhere to the same policy is no solution. An individual who goes on record as advocating that his government nullify by force the results of elections in other countries can hardly object to other governments failing to respect the rights of smaller nations. (Well, you can object to it, of course, but you can't expect to be taken seriously. One of the advantages of morality as opposed to expediency, you see, is that morality permits an individual or a nation to stand for something beyond its own self-interest and to criticize the methods of opponents.))

I asserted that morality is long-term expediency, whose ultimate end is the survival and well-being of the human race. You say that morality is something more than expediency: "Morality assumes the existence and validity (intuitively perceived, in the final analysis) of certain basic premises, and regulates conduct in such a way as to respect these premises even when it is clearly expedient to act contrary to them."

First let me say that I am highly suspicious of any "basic premises" which must be "intuitively perceived" without being backed up by either reason or experience. I just don't have all that much faith in intuition. The history books are crammed with the hideous consequences of countless "intuitively perceived" madnesses. Second, you seem to misunderstand what I meant by "long-term" expediency. I meant--as I thought



I made clear by referring to "the survival and well-being of the human race as ultimate ends--that what is expedient is to be judged in terms of the full experience of the race, not just over a few years or even over one lifetime. "Morality" is the codification of this experience, though possibly wrongly interpreted in many aspects. (My parenthetical reference to the "intuitively perceived" validity of basic premises was the result of my recollection of a philosophical argument in these pages several years ago, which ended up demonstrating only that all philosophical systems are founded on one or more assumptions which cannot be conclusively proved. In practice, this is usually not very important, because the assumptions are so obvious that no one seriously questions them, but in an abstract argument it can be extremely embarrassing to discover that your ethical code is based upon ideas which you have always taken for granted but cannot prove. Your own concept of morality as long-term expediency is not free from this defect, you know. If the ultimate ends of morality are the survival and well-being of the human race, as you say, then you have assumed that the survival of the human race is desirable. But can you prove this? Anyone who wished to play the devil's advocate could make a good case for the viewpoint that the most notable accomplishments of the human race have been the extermination of other life forms, the pollution of the air and water, and the causing of great misery to its own members. Of course, I do not dispute the assumption that the survival of the human race is desirable, but I do contend that the validity of the assumption cannot be conclusively demonstrated and is therefore intuitively perceived. As to your second point, I understand perfectly what you meant by long-term expediency, but viewing this innocent-seeming abstraction in the context of some of

(:::~::~)  
 ( ~ ~ ) "My name is Nguyen Don Vuong. I was, until recently, a  
 ( u ) Deputy Foreign Minister of the Democratic Republic of  
 (( = )) Vietnam."

"A disagreement about foreign policy with President Ho Chi (::::~::)  
 Minh resulted in my dismissal from that office, and I was ( ~ ~ )  
 compelled to flee the country in order to avoid being shot ( u )  
 for treason." (( = ))

(:::~::~) "It was my belief that, instead of pursuing the present  
 ( ~ ~ ) policy with respect to the United States, the Democratic  
 ( u ) Republic of Vietnam should declare war on the imperial-  
 (( = )) ist U.S.A. and then immediately capitulate."

"President Ho was inclined to look upon this as a treason- (::::~::)  
 ous suggestion, but I maintain, on the contrary, that it ( ~ ~ )  
 actually demonstrates great patriotism and a sincere con- ( u )  
 cern for the welfare of my country." (( = ))

(:::~::~)  
 ( ~ ~ ) "After all, Germany and Japan have become prosperous by  
 ( u ) losing wars to the United States; why shouldn't we?"  
 (( = ))



your more remarkable practical suggestions rather dims its altruistic luster. Convince me, please, that the survival and well-being of the human race requires the United States to bomb North Vietnam, support anti-popular regimes, overthrow governments which Washington disapproves of, and invade the territory of nations with whom we are not at war.))

You cite Churchill's refusal to seize Irish ports, even though this would have greatly aided the campaign against the U-boats. Churchill said, "No! That is the very thing we are fighting against!" Does this show the difference between morality and expediency? It was moral to thus respect the rights of a neutral, and it was certainly not expedient in the short run. But I equated morality with long-term expediency. As Churchill realized, to invade Ireland would have negated the purpose of the war, by making England no different from Nazi Germany. Surely it is inexpedient to adopt the very kind of government you are fighting a war to avoid having imposed on you. However, I wonder how Churchill would have decided if it had seemed to him that British failure to seize bases in Ireland would have meant certain victory for the Nazis, instead of merely making Allied victory more costly. I suspect--indeed, I am mighty damn certain--that he would have concluded that invading the rights of a neutral would be a lesser immorality than permitting the Nazis to win. ((I thought it was clear that in the closing months of 1940 the situation was so desperate that a few ships one way or the other might have meant the difference between victory and defeat for Great Britain. Exercising the advantages of our twenty-five-year perspective, we may doubt that the situation was this serious, but this doesn't alter the fact that Churchill believed that the Irish ports were vitally important to Great Britain's ability to continue to resist Nazi Germany but refused to seize them in violation of Irish neutrality. Your assertion that it is "inexpedient to adopt the very kind of government you are fighting a war to avoid having imposed on you" puzzles me. You reason that adopting the methods of Nazi Germany would have "negated the purpose of the war" and would have been "inexpedient" (immoral). Very well; let us accept this line of thought and see where it leads us. If adopting the tactics of your opponent is equivalent to adopting "the very kind of government you are fighting a war to avoid having imposed on you" and thus negates the purpose of the war by making Nation A "no different from" Nation B, would you please explain why you have consistently advocated that the United States utilize the tactics of the Communists? Do you realize that your argument that a nation, by adopting the methods of its enemy, negates the purpose of the struggle against that enemy, is precisely the argument I have been attempting (unsuccessfully) to make you accept?))

If, as your argument implies, morality is not based on long-term expediency, how does one choose when two moral rules conflict, such as when respecting the rights of a neutral might mean letting immoral monsters like the Nazis prevail? If moral rules are absolutes, it is impossible to establish an order of precedence among them. But if they are considered as long-term expedients, it becomes possible to try to establish which is the more expedient over the longer term. ((An order of precedence among moral laws is established by the idea that we should endeavor to minimize human injury and suffering, which is itself a moral rule. When two (or more) moral rules are in conflict, we should follow the course which causes the least suffering.))

To my contention that we should teach "the virtues of economic freedom" to underdeveloped countries, you suggest that a "socialist from an underdeveloped country would reply that 'economic freedom' generally refers to the freedom of a small minority to grow fat off the labor of the masses, and as such is a 'freedom' which can be readily dispensed with in this day and age." Yes, that's probably just what he would say,



and it is in large part because he and many of his countrymen believe such taradiddle that his country is and will continue to be "underdeveloped". To be sure, they equate "economic freedom" not with the free market, but with the various monopolistic systems imposed in the past by imperialist powers. Such systems were usually quite incompatible with a true free market, which may be briefly (and by no means exhaustively) defined as a system in which all buying and selling, of both goods and services, is done by the uncoerced agreement of both buyer and seller, and the role of government is to maintain this freedom. The "underdeveloped" nations will begin to enjoy rapid development when they adopt something approaching a free market, and stop behaving as if profitable private businesses were either insults to the working class or cows to be milked by the politicians.

At this writing it is too soon to see what the effects will be of the recent American escalation of the Vietnam war. To me, the critical and so far unanswerable question is to what extent the Government of North Vietnam can control the Viet Cong. If it lies in the power of Papa Ho to call off the VC, then it is right for us to persuade him to do so, by forcibly demonstrating that continued support of the VC will mean the wrecking of North Vietnam. On presently available evidence, such as enumerated in the recent White Paper, and from a general knowledge of Communist methods and discipline, I think it is worth a good try. At the very least, it is ludicrous for North Vietnam to claim any of the rights of neutrals.

The American strikes against targets in North Vietnam are no longer being explained as tit for tat "retaliation" for VC attacks on U.S. installations. That is at least an advance in honesty, since it was absurd to claim that U.S. bases in South Vietnam should be respected by the Viet Cong. The fact is that we are making war upon the Communists in Vietnam (both North and South), and we can hardly expect them to grant our bases "privileged sanctuary". Only we indulge in that kind of idiocy.

-----  
"Cremation and urn burial was sanitary and neat and much less barbarian than our present practice. For myself, when I am dead, I would prefer to be a skeleton than the most nicely embalmed cadaver and I would sooner be ashes than either. Early man believed in the continuation of life in association with the buried body, as primitive people do yet, but he progressed from binding spirit and body together to burning the flesh to set the spirit free. We who say we believe in immortal souls should stand by our conviction and give wings to the spirit instead of making shrouds of lead and canopies of granite. We are more earth-bound in some ways than our ancestors." --N. J. Berrill, in "Man's Emerging Mind".  
-----

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

Re "The Problem of Power": If I fall into either of your categories of Conservative, it is the first. I have a vested interest in seeing that power accumulates in the hands of the individual. I realize that I live in a society where many of my views and enjoyments are not approved of by most people, and I want to see that "most people" cannot tell me, and cannot force me, to stop believing and doing these things. To be more specific: I want to be able to buy a Polish ham, sell furniture on Sunday, drink beer, be an atheist, refuse to sell property to Negroes, make my own provisions for insurance, educate my children (who, I hope, are hypothetical) as I see fit, and read "extremist" magazines like Kipple. I want to be free not to segregate my customers by race or



sex, pay tax money to support religious displays, tell a stranger where I live, answer questions about my politics, and wear pants. And there is somewhere in this country, in each of these cases, where some governmental official has the legal right to stick a gun in my back if I do or don't do one of these things against someone else's wishes.

I agree with you that the Federal Government--or more properly, the National Government--is generally more honest, more efficient, and just plain better than the state and local governments. But perhaps this is largely due to the preeminence of the National Government, drawing attention away from the other levels of government. After all, when almost all the big decisions are made in Washington, who is going to watch Albany, or Trenton, or Annapolis, or Pierre or Podunk? Besides, who can take New Jersey (or any other state so conceived, so dedicated, and so geographically/economically situated) seriously? If states' rights are obsolete, it is because the states are obsolete! Let us reform the states, and make inter-state cooperation on regional affairs easier, and we will have better state governments, because we will have more meaningful state governments.

-----  
"Communism is a classless social system with one form of public ownership of the means of production and full social equality of all members of society; under it, the all-round development of people will be accompanied by the growth of the productive forces through continuous progress in science and technology; all the springs of cooperative wealth will flow more abundantly, and the great principle "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs" will be implemented. Communism is a highly organized society of free, socially conscious working people in which public self-government will be established, a society in which labor for the good of society will become the prime vital requirement of everyone, a necessity recognized by one and all, and the ability of each person will be employed to the greatest benefit of the people." --Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.  
-----

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

In the wake of recent events in Alabama and recent proclamations by Dr. Martin Luther King, I hark back to your editorial on Dr. King in Kipple #72. You were so right. Current tactics in Alabama smack of doing brain surgery with an axe; the bombings and attempted bombings bear witness to that. King is still using the tactics he used to get legislation in the field of civil rights; he's got the legislation and he's getting more of it, yet he unveils a masterpiece of idiocy such as his "economic boycott" of Alabama. There will be enough hate stirred up in the South no matter how circumspectly the civil rights workers go about their business; this is entirely unnecessary and will do more damage to his cause than good. In the first place, if it fails, as apparently it will, King--and by association, the whole movement--will lose face to a great extent. If it succeeds, the results will be worse. The hatred and resentment caused by such a thing would be a more effective block to the cause of Negro equality than all the fulminations of Governor Wallace and all the dynamite of the Ku Klux Klan. The southern people are having a tough row to hoe as it is; they are having to give up a way of life which has been drilled into them since birth. (I know; I lived there for over four years.) Radical reconstruction didn't work a century ago; similar tactics will not work now. The "economic boycott" seems designed to punish everyone who lives within the arbitrary bounds of a geographical-political institution known as Alabama; this includes



Governor Wallace, the Alabama Klansmen, Sheriff Clark, and the white moderates and Negroes of Alabama. It will not succeed in breaking the mental and emotional habits of a hundred years; if anything, it will aggravate them. As I remarked above, the southern people are having to make a tremendous transition; the fact that their original position is so completely indefensible doesn't ease the transition one bit. The cause of civil rights will proceed with much greater speed and much less bloodshed and bitterness if southerners are at least given the impression that they are cooperating rather than having something thrust down their throats with a ramrod. Dr. King would do well to consider a statement which he, as a Protestant minister, has no doubt encountered: "Forgive them, Lord, for they know not what they do." The southern bigot has been guilty of forgetting or ignoring individual human worth; Dr. King and his followers have no reason to follow suit. They have a just cause, and should go about achieving it in a just fashion. The integrationists have the laws and they have the support of the federal government and an increasing number of intelligent southerners; Attorney General Katzenbach had the right idea when he said, "Let's get this thing off the streets and into the courts where it belongs." (The editorial to which John refers suggested that Dr. King retire from active leadership of the civil rights movement. This was not one of my more brilliant suggestions. However, I agree that the proposed economic boycott of Alabama is an extremely unintelligent move. A boycott of Alabama is objectionable for the same reasons that a boycott of Cuba is objectionable: (1) it is not selective, in that it injures the innocent along with the guilty; (2) it will not be effective; and (3) it will have the effect of increasing the hostility of the intended targets.)

Is there a Christian in the house? Eric Blake? Marty Helgesen? The idea of free will is that it would be a greater evil for God to interfere in the material world and try to alleviate man's suffering, thus turning him into a will-less puppet, than to allow man to go ahead and blow himself to hell by the exercise of his free will. Right?

-----  
"I do not believe that a decay of dogmatic belief can do anything but good. I admit at once that new systems of dogma, such as those of the Nazis and the Communists, are even worse than the old systems, but they could never have acquired a hold over men's minds if orthodox dogmatic habits had not been instilled in youth. Stalin's language is full of reminiscences of the theological seminary in which he received his training. What the world needs is not dogma, but an attitude of scientific inquiry, combined with a belief that the torture of millions is not desirable, whether inflicted by Stalin or by a Deity imagined in the likeness of the believer." --Lord Bertrand Russell, in "Human Society in Ethics and Politics".  
-----

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

Re "The Chaplain's Bombshell": What amazes me about the Rev. Wood's speech is his adding the tag "fun" to the sexual experience. Not because it's an inaccurate one, but simply because clergy in general, and in particular when speaking to a youthful group, emphasize the beauty, not the hedonism. (There's a whole generation of Americans being raised, not only as Mort Sahl said, believing that women have staples in their navels, but also feeling sex, while esthetic, is something of a duty, like introduction to art and creative writing courses in college.)

A similar sermon has led to dismissal, of course; viz., Professor Koch's letter in the University of Illinois daily newspaper. At



Northwestern, a popular philosophy instructor named Arthur Lessing has been asked to leave, partly for these reasons. The nominal excuse is that he is unable to properly instruct graduate students, which is true to the extent that most graduate students would find it difficult to follow what anyone had to say about anything sexual. Mostly, though, Lessing talks about love and sexual expression; he is a standard liberal in most aspects of this, but he has some new, revelatory things to say about the privacy of love affairs and the charming idiocy of pillow talk.

-----  
"There is undoubtedly an important element in China today, both in the communes and in the urban areas, which is opposed to the present regime. The government admits this and talks constantly about the necessity of continuing its struggle against the "reactionary bourgeois elements". I am strongly of the opinion, however, that the younger generation and many of the older people are enthusiastic supporters of the present regime, just as in the case of the U.S.S.R. I should not be surprised if a majority of the young adults, who know nothing of the benefits which are enjoyed by those living under a different system, would, if a free election took place--an impossibility under Communism--vote preponderantly for a continuation of their present system of government. As I see it, China's government today is one of the most durable and stable in the world, and I do not foresee any circumstances, either external or internal, in the next ten years or so which are likely to cause its overthrow." --James S. Duncan, in The Progressive, April 1965.  
-----

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

I agree that capital punishment has no place in modern society, but I think that its abolition must be part of a major revision of our whole penal system which will make a better effort to rehabilitate all criminals and which will protect society from them until this rehabilitation has been accomplished.

In relation to this, I would like to pick out an incidental remark you made to Harry Warner. I believe that prisons should have cottages or other facilities where married prisoners may have private visits with wives. This would not only aid in rehabilitation, but, by relieving sexual tensions, would aid in maintaining discipline and order within the prisons. To anyone who would claim that depriving a prisoner of the opportunity of exercising his sexual rights is part of the punishment of imprisonment, I will point out that you are also unjustly depriving the innocent wife of the sexual companionship of her husband.

Eric Blake: You compare integration to water flowing uphill, implying thereby that integration is impossible without force. The analogy is faulty because water will not flow uphill without force anywhere in the world, while multi-racial societies do exist in other parts of the world. There are, of course, other countries with racial problems, but I believe that the only country in the world beside the United States with the absurd stigma of anti-miscegenation laws is the Union of South Africa. (Offhand, I would guess that Angola, Mozambique and Southern Rhodesia have similar prohibitions against inter-racial marriage.)

I think the reason Les Sample was misunderstood is that usually the "problem of evil" is stated by itself, without being introduced by reference to the fact that God created man in his image and likeness. The basic problem is how can we reconcile the existence of evil in the world with the existence of an all good, all powerful God. I can't answer that question; neither can anyone else. I can, though, make a few observations which might prove useful.



Whenever anyone makes this objection, he is saying in effect that if he had the infinite power of a creator god he would run the universe differently. Well, maybe he would. However, if he had God's infinite power, he would be God, with God's infinite knowledge and infinite wisdom. (You can't break the set.) With this knowledge and wisdom he could see and understand all of his creation, all of the universe and all of its significance, in a way which is impossible to our finite human intellects. Under these circumstances, the whole question might look a little different. Related to this is the fact that our life on earth is not an end in itself. It is preliminary to an everlasting life after death. This provides ample opportunity for apparent inequities to be evened out. Another point is that God created us with free will. Why he did so, or even why he created us at all, I don't know, but he did. This freedom includes the fundamental freedom to choose or reject him. In order for freedom of choice to be real and not just a two-headed coin which only seems honest, the consequences of each choice must be permitted to follow from it. Since God is completely good, the natural consequence of choosing anything other than God is evil, and all evil in the world is the result of people making the wrong choice when faced with this basic decision. (Perhaps these observations explain the existence of evil attributable to human sin ("people making the wrong choice"), but what about evil not caused by human beings, such as destructive floods and earthquakes? It is possible to argue, of course, that these upheavals are the result of the laws of nature, and are consequently morally neutral rather than "evil" in the accepted sense, but the fact remains that, according to your philosophy, God decreed these laws of nature which produce great misery in a non-selective manner--i.e., affecting not only those who have rejected God but also those who are devoutly religious. Also, by propounding the thesis that natural calamities are properly considered neutral rather than "evil", you have established a rather special definition of "evil", according to which the term applies only to humanly directed acts. But if this is so, then it appears that an act can be considered evil only if the perpetrator recognizes that he has made the wrong choice. An act committed by an individual who is unaware of its nature is in the same category as a violent thunderstorm, no matter how much suffering it causes.)

In reference to Alma Hill's quest for a name for modern Dylan-style "folk music", I wonder if some of it might not be termed apocalyptic music.

-----  
"Man is a gregarious animal, and much more so in his mind than in his body. He may like to go alone for a walk, but he hates to stand alone in his opinions." --George Santayana.  
-----

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

I am enclosing a newspaper clipping explaining what was supposed to have happened on the Sunday in Selma when the state troopers waded in with clubs and broke up the attempted march to Montgomery. Bob Ingram, who wrote it, is the regular exposé columnist with the paper. His job is to expose something wrong with the state government every Sunday.

Unfortunately, I missed most of Governor Wallace's appearance on "Face the Nation". From what I did hear, I saw that he was doing his usual good job. Even when I disagree with most of what he says, I must admit that he does it convincingly. (Mr. Ingram, in the column in question, acts in the capacity of an apologist for Governor Wallace and nominates Al Lingo, commander of the state troopers, as a scapegoat. I imagine that the attempt to blame a disobedient subordinate for the vi-



olence is an integral part of Governor Wallace's vigorous efforts to improve his "image", in order to further his political aspirations (it has been suggested that he may run for President in 1968). Another aspect of this effort was visible when Mr. Wallace cancelled a trip in order to visit the site of a bombing in Birmingham, during which he offered the fantastic observation that, while other states might be accustomed to this sort of thing, the people of Alabama were not (fantastic because Alabama has recorded more and solved fewer bombings than any other state). I am appalled at the willingness of otherwise sensible individuals to accept Governor Wallace's assertion that he is opposed to violence and profess admiration for the man. This vicious hypocrite has done more than any other living man to foster the atmosphere of violence which persists in many areas of the South. He is, to be sure, personally charming and as convincing as a snake oil peddler, but these qualities do not at all mitigate his heinous moral crimes. Yet he is embraced by even moderate southerners as a symbol of southern character and spirit. If the South is ever to truly rejoin the Union, the good people of the region (a majority, I am certain) will have to drive such demagogues from power and give their admiration and allegiance to politicians who deserve it--e.g., Governor Carl Sanders of Georgia, who may someday be considered a great man in the South.)

Are you sure that Churchill made that statement about seizing the ports in Eire? How come he didn't go ahead and invade Eire like he did Iceland? He probably realized that the Irish, unlike the people of Iceland, would put up a fight which would tie up too many troops needed elsewhere to fight the Germans.

I'm surprised that with all the charges of imperialism floating around in the United Nations that no one has really gotten after the United States on that charge. How about returning the southwestern United States to Mexico? The Mexican War was an out and out case of imperialism. Or why not return their territory to the Creek Nation? It seems to me that one of the treaties that gave us our independence required us to recognize them as an independent nation. Even the Supreme Court upheld this when the case came before it. These are two of the most obvious examples of imperialism in our history, yet we haven't been gotten after for it that I know of in the UN. You would think that instead of all those charges that our interfering in foreign affairs was imperialism someone would get after us about these incidents.

Just what were we fighting for in the first place in World War One? It seems to me to have been just another attempt to retain a bal-

(\*\*\*\*\*  
( ̄ ̄ )  
( U )  
( ( - ) )

"My name is Nikolai Boryachev. I am a Russian Cosmonaut. At the moment, I am training for the Soviet Union's next spectacular space achievement."

"Our scientists have perfected a landing system which will permit the space capsule to be guided manually throughout the re-entry phase and come to earth on dry land."

(\*\*\*\*\*  
( ̄ ̄ )  
( U )  
( ( - ) )

(\*\*\*\*\*  
( ̄ ̄ )  
( U )  
( ( ) )

"This development is especially satisfying to me, because I intend to bring the craft to earth in an unexpected location: New York's Central Park."



ance of power in Europe by preventing one nation from becoming too powerful. Everyone doublecrossed everyone else and broke treaties and promises; Wilson even agreed to violations of his fourteen points. The only one he stuck by in the end was the formation of a league of nations, not seeing that a league composed of countries that broke every one of the promises they were supposed to uphold wouldn't be successful. If Wilson had stuck to his fourteen points there would have been a purpose to the war. As it was, it was just another balance of power affair.

We in Alabama have been fortunate in recent years in that there is no statewide political boss here. Where one man does control politics, it is usually on the city or county level. One or two reasons are usually advanced for this state of affairs. The main one is that the governor is not allowed to succeed himself, which usually prevents him from building up a strong machine. Another is the primaries. I don't know how it is in other states, but here the person who wins may be the one who is usually given the least chance of doing so. What can the state party chairman do when most of the important offices are kept out of his control by this method. (Please elucidate--are your primary elections structured in such a way as to favor candidates whose chances of victory are considered slim?)

Corruption on the state level is held to a minimum by the vigilance of our two local newspapers. They always give any that they find plenty of play on the editorial pages and they have at least one writer who does nothing but hunt for corruption. Not many people are willing to engage in something illegal when they know that everyone will probably be reading all about their little deal in the paper the next day.

George Wallace may be the first exception to this lack of rule by one man at the state level that we've had in a long time. He is so popular that he may be able to get the legislature to pass a law enabling him to succeed himself. If this happens, he will be able to build a practically unbeatable machine.

My personal opinion about all this is that we have just been lucky. (Well, of course, the situation in several southern states is such that a little corruption might be an improvement....)

In the Republican Party, the state chairman exerts a great deal of influence because they select their candidates at a closed convention. This method does make it easier for one man to control the party.

If, as you say, the Federal Government is so free from corruption, how come senators refuse to disclose their outside sources of income? I think they might be afraid of what the taxpayers would find out. A lot of people probably still remember the Harding Administration. And what about the years under Theodore Roosevelt when the Senate was selling out the country to big business? (My claim was not that the Federal Government was particularly "free from corruption", but merely that there was less corruption at the federal level than at the state or local level.)

The present controversy over the Supreme Court in regards to reapportionment has reminded me that I never could understand the objections to FDR's plans for the Court. They were all legal and they were all good proposals as evidenced by the fact that they were all accepted in the end except the one to add another justice to the Court for each one over 70 years of age. And even this would have been a good one, considering the behavior of some of the older judges on the bench. Anyway, what is so important about the number nine? This merely happens to be the number of judges on the Court at the present time. This number has varied throughout our history and there is no reason why it can't be changed again. (Our system of government requires an independent judiciary to review the acts of the executive and legislative branches. The



independence of the judicial branch is, however, extremely difficult to preserve, because, although in theory it is the strongest, in practice it is the weakest branch of government. (Controlling neither the finances nor the armed forces, its power is totally dependent upon the respect for law of the other two branches.) Obviously, this independence is jeopardized if the President or Congress are permitted to increase the number of jurists on the Supreme Court by arbitrarily adding a number of hand-picked cronies whenever the decisions of the Court are unsatisfactory to them. Were such a precedent to be established, the situation would be equivalent to that which prevailed for several centuries with respect to the British House of Lords, where the King could exercise control over all legislation which passed that body by virtue of his prerogative of creating new peers. The judiciary would, under these circumstances, become merely a creature of the incumbent administration.))

If the statistics from Vietnam showing that we are killing two Viet Cong for every one of us they are killing are correct, we will eventually win the war there through simple attrition, provided we are willing to stay there long enough to do the job and are willing to put up with the instability of the Vietnamese government.

-----  
"Free enterprise is to be distinguished from merely private enterprise which is the necessary but not sufficient condition for the former. Private enterprise requires that ownership and control be vested in private individuals rather than in the community (communism) or the Government (socialism). Free enterprise refers to the institutional framework within which decisions are made by the individuals--a framework which provides effective limitations on the scope of individual discretion and which guarantees that those decisions will be in the general interest. Free enterprise may be subverted either because of government regulations, as in the transportation industry, or because of concentrations of private economic power." --Laurence H. Meyer, in Yale Political.  
-----

ROY TACKETT :: 915 GREEN VALLEY RD., N.W. :: ALBUQUERQUE, N.M., 87107

Your rope and hemp item on page four of Kipple #77 calls to mind the observation that while the "conservatives" are most vocal in their demands that the Federal Government stop meddling in private affairs and halt "the growing trend towards socialism", they always seem to want to start somewhere else. Take the traditional Little Old Lady in Tennis Shoes, for example; she will tell you that we've got to stop the march towards socialism, and when you say "Right, Little Old Lady in Tennis Shoes, and we'll make a big start by cutting out your Social Security," she will tell you that's not what she had in mind. Or the states' rights advocate who is a farmer down South--now there's a cat who really wants the government to stop meddling in private enterprise. So you tell him, "Right, and we'll start by knocking off all these price supports and subsidies on your tobacco and cotton," and he'll tell you that's not what he had in mind at all. Or let's take the big business tycoon and tell him that the place to start is by cutting back his government contracts and, again, that's not what he had in mind at all. Amusing. (Recently, conservatives have been asserting that any risks which we may run in Vietnam are justified in order to fulfill our moral obligation to the several hundred thousand refugees from the North now living in South Vietnam who would probably be liquidated if the Communists gained control of that country. It is fascinating to watch an expression of pompous self-righteousness turn to something very like disgust when you



counter this with the suggestion that these people could be most effectively protected by immediately being granted United States citizenship and having free transportation provided to bring them here. I have yet to encounter a conservative who is sufficiently concerned about these refugees to want a couple of them living on his block.))

What do you suppose makes John Boardman think that Falangism is going to be overthrown in Spain and a new government established? Franco and the Falange are sitting tall in the saddle in Spain and the government there isn't about to change--no more than the Nazi government in Germany would have been changed without the war. Boardman should have enough political acumen to realize that once a totalitarian government is established and stable, it can only be changed from outside. (This is going to come as surprising and pleasant news to Fulgencio Batista, Rafael Trujillo, Juan Peron, Louis XVI and Chiang Kai-shek, among others.))

Helgesen's comment, in regard to a referenced Bible verse, that "The problem is to interpret its meaning" brings to mind something I picked up about the Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter Day Saints while in Utah. The Mormons, you know, say they believe in the Bible "insofar as it is correctly interpreted". And doesn't everybody who believes in the Bible? All have their own interpretation of the Bible, which is, as any fool can plainly see, the correct one.

Considering that this state is rapidly being buried under an ever-increasing pile of empty beer bottles and cans which the state/county government seems unable to see, I'm rapidly coming around to the view (cold-blooded as it is) that habitual litterbugs should be removed from society by execution. (On second thought, I'm beginning to believe that maybe we should just execute the state/county officials by gathering up enough beer bottles to bury their office buildings.)

-----  
"It cannot fail to be seen how appropriate is the teaching of 'laissez faire' by the professors and scholars produced by institutions supported and upheld by the very opposite practice, a system of Capitalism dependent wholly upon laws established and maintained to thwart equal opportunity and to prevent freedom." --J. K. Ingalls.  
-----

GEORGE W. PRICE :: 873 CORNELIA AVE. :: CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, 60657

As one of the "minority of fools and malcontents", as you term us, who voted for Goldwater, I have one small consolation. My candidate didn't win, but, at least, one of his principles did. Lyndon Johnson is now unabashedly doing in North Vietnam what Goldwater advocated. Since it has been generally accepted that it was Goldwater's "belligerence", more than any other one thing, which cost him the election, one wonders how the vote would have gone if Johnson had proposed to bomb North Vietnam with vigor and enthusiasm. True, LBJ never actually said that he would not escalate the war, but he certainly implied it by letting the "warmonger" tag be hung on Goldwater. This implied campaign promise is one which I am very glad to see broken. (Perhaps it would be more appropriate to term the bombing of North Vietnam a policy rather than a principle; had President Johnson accepted the principle underlying Mr. Goldwater's advocacy of carrying the war across the 17th Parallel, similar tactics would have been applied elsewhere--e.g., shooting down Soviet planes during the recent conflict in Berlin. I notice also that we haven't been "defoliating" the jungles of Southeast Asia with nuclear weapons. And I can't quite imagine Barry Goldwater offering economic assistance to North Vietnam, either.))

By the way, Liberals who voted for Johnson in order to avoid



Goldwater's "belligerence" can now understand how conservatives felt after we voted for Eisenhower in hopes that he would start dismantling the welfare state, and instead he allowed it to be extended.

The silly uproar over the use of non-lethal gas in Vietnam is one more proof of human irrationality. Can anyone seriously believe that being dosed with tear gas or nauseagenics is less humane than being shot or bayoneted? If those who protest the use of gas were to be gathered together and given their choice of being flooded with tear gas or sprayed with machine gun fire, is there any doubt which they would choose? I would like to see the use of non-lethal chemicals considerably extended. For example, there is a gas which causes exuberant diarrhea; it might have had a salutary effect in the Sproul Hall sit-in at Berkeley. Although, I must admit, it would have been a dirty deal for the janitors. (Each time I discover a small area of agreement between us, it appears, you immediately ruin the effect by making some fantastic remark to which I am compelled to take violent exception. As it happens, I agree that there can be no valid objection to our using non-lethal chemicals against the Viet Cong. But I am appalled that you would consider using such substances against peacefully protesting Americans.)

Some commentators have said that we should not have allowed gas to be used in Vietnam, not because gas is immoral, but because it gives the Communists a fine talking point. This is not a valid reason. First, the Communists will create an uproar over anything we do, and the more so if it is successful. To avoid feeding their propaganda mill, we would have to do nothing at all. Second, even if we avoid giving the Communists any talking points, we will be spared nothing, because the Communists will then invent complaints, as they did with the "germ warfare" big lie in Korea.

I am very dubious about the value of attempting to tailor our policies to please "world public opinion". Most of what passes for world opinion is in fact the creation of a few highly publicized loudmouths with axes to grind, and bears little relation to what the masses of people really think. We have nothing to lose by ignoring these hypercritical pundits; the Communists completely ignore "world opinion" when it is critical of them, and "world opinion" isn't able to do a damn thing about it. So if we find good and sufficient military reasons for using gas in our war in Vietnam, let's go right ahead and use it, and answer the complaints of "world opinion" with a hearty, "T.S., Mac."

The proposed voting rights bill is a real puzzler. It's almost as if the authors went out of their way to make it unconstitutional. And the oddest part is that the unconstitutionality is quite unnecessary to the purpose of the bill.

The bill takes as its base the voting pattern of a time already past, which gives a certain ex post facto flavor. Technically, the bill is not a "punishment" of the states involved, so it is not quite a bill of attainder. But these are only violations of the spirit of the Constitution; let's stick to violations of the letter.

The bill will apply only to certain states, known in advance. This effectively sets up different qualifications for voters in those states, as against the exempted states. This is unconstitutional because it denies to citizens "equal protection of the laws".

The central unconstitutionality is that the Federal registrars are authorized to disregard the states' literacy requirements. It should not be necessary to point out that the Constitution specifically grants to the states the right to set voting qualifications, so long as race, sex, etc., are not considered. The Federal Government has no constitutional right to force the abandonment of literacy tests, no matter how much they have been abused.

While it is probably not unconstitutional, it is certainly an a-



buse of the spirit of democracy for the bill to provide that a person registered by the Federal authorities must vote "at least once during three consecutive years while listed." As the Wall Street Journal put it, "You have to vote, or you can't." It sounds to me like Big Daddy saying to the li'l ducky, "Now see here. I'm giving you the privilege of voting, and if you are so ungrateful as to not take full advantage of it, I'll withdraw the privilege."

I said that the unconstitutional parts of the bill are unnecessary to its purpose. Then what could be done strictly within the limits of the Constitution?

The obvious first step is to pass legislation enforcing Section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment, reducing the congressional representation of states which practice disfranchisement.

The second step is to recognize that literacy tests are not bad, per se, it is their abuse that is bad. It seems to me that the proper course would be to file suits of mandamus against southern registrars, to require them to enforce their states' literacy tests. It is an established principle of law that courts may, and in fact should, take cognizance of the real facts rather than the verbal description of them. So the Federal courts (especially the higher ones) would presumably find that since the "literacy" tests as now administered are in fact race tests, the registrars are violating the laws which require them to administer literacy tests. We don't need to strike down the southern voting laws, we just need to require their impartial and rigorous enforcement.

To deny qualified Negroes the right to vote is grossly unconstitutional, and it is the too-long-neglected duty of the Federal Government to rectify the abuse; but I don't see the point in doing it by further violations of the Constitution. (The Fifteenth Amendment forbids any state to deny a citizen the right to vote on account of race, and empowers Congress to enforce the article by appropriate legislation. "Literacy" tests which are in fact race tests are therefore unconstitutional and may be abolished by act of Congress.)

####  
( ̄ ̄ )  
( V )  
(( ◯ ))

"My name is Frank Plunke. I was an airline pilot. I used to work for Cosmo Airlines, but I had a little accident."

####  
( ̄ ̄ )  
( V )  
(( ◯ ))

"I forgot to fuel before taking off on the Boston-to-Paris hop one time. There were eighty-four people aboard. I was the only survivor."

####  
( ̄ ̄ )  
( V )  
(( ◯ ))

"The bastards fired me! I offered to let them dock my salary ten bucks a week for the plane, but they wanted my scalp."

####  
( ̄ ̄ )  
( V )  
(( ◯ ))

"It ain't fair. One little booboo shouldn't be allowed to ruin a fella's whole career."



I am amused by the Liberal reaction to HUAC's proposed investigation of the Ku Klux Klan. For instance, in the April 10th New Republic, both columnist TRB and the editors are dithering about it. They want the Klan to get a painful comeuppance, but they also quite obviously don't want HUAC to get credit for anything good. They seem to be settling on the line that HUAC probably wants to investigate the Klan merely as a preliminary to smearing the civil rights movement with the Red brush. By the way, I wonder just how many of those who detest HUAC have ever bothered to read any of its scholarly studies, such as those by Dallin or Niemeyer? (The reason that many liberals are opposed to an investigation of the Klan by the House Un-American Activities Committee is that we find the methods of the Committee reprehensible. I also object to lynchings, even when the victims are people I don't happen to like.)

-----  
"It has been calculated on the basis of probability that even with an absolutely unfettered means of travel from one star system to another we might still spend the totality of our tens of millions of years of racial existence searching for another intelligent race and never find one during the period of its existence on its planet. This would be particularly true if stars and solar systems were constantly being formed, if there were stars and planets of all ages distributed throughout the Universe and if the tenure of a race on a planet is limited to a tiny fraction of the total life of the planet, as is the case on Earth. Conceivably we might land on thousands of planets where the conditions for life existed but where life had just not started yet. We might land on other planets where the last flicker of intelligent life had already burned out. If the life history of a planet were a long straight line composed of thousands of tiny segments, perhaps one of those segments might represent the time during which life was in existence there. The probability of our striking precisely the right segment on that line at any given time would be exceedingly small." --Alan E. Nourse, in "Nine Planets".  
-----

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

The bigots of Baltimore have another incident about which they can boast. Mrs. Elnora Walker, a Negro, rented a house in a white neighborhood. After a mob of neighbors surrounded the house and bombarded it with rocks, however, she decided it would be advisable not to stay. One might hope that some of the younger of her five children are not old enough to grasp the reality or the significance of this act; one might wish, too, that no one will relate the incident to them until they are mature enough to understand the narrowness of a human mind. Of course, I'm well into my twenties but I suppose that I'm not yet mature enough to understand such narrowness, for incidents such as the above-mentioned never fail to repulse me. In rejecting people in this manner, the offenders are shaping the minds of their victims in an unhealthy direction. If the larger society saw you as an inferior and undesirable person, you would necessarily see yourself in much the same manner. It seems to me that no one has the right to interfere with another person's mental processes like this. I can't understand why anyone would want to mess up another individual's life deliberately. We are all going to mess up our own lives plenty before we die (death being the final mess), so why can't we, out of humanity and pity, at least respect each other? Of a more trivial nature was an act by a Baltimore school principal who last week sent a fourteen-year-old boy home and strongly suggested that the student get a hair-cut. From the picture that appeared



in the newspaper, the hair looked quite decent, bangs well above the eyebrows. The question that immediately rose in my mind was, "By what right?" I don't want to get trite, but this is America, not Russia. Freedom, to me, is the right to make one's own choices regarding the little things (like how to wear one's hair). If we have no say over such triflings as this, then we are not free. Dressing and hair-wearing are means of self-expression; again, this is a personal thing, and no one should interfere.

Baltimore's school system (and most public school systems in this country) has an ear which is particularly attuned to the mundane. Hair incidents usually occur several times a year. Of equal absurdity was the dismissal of a teacher who wore a striped sports jacket. I'm scheduled to work for this school system in September, but I don't know how long I'll last. During the eight weeks of my practice-teaching, I wore my hair boy-short, with bangs long enough to obscure the vision. My supervising teacher tactfully suggested that I change the style, because she found a resemblance between myself and a Beatle. I merely laughed, explained that my hair was hard to manage, and asked her what a Beatle was. I never did change the hair. On the other hand, one young woman was reprimanded for wearing skirts and blouses while practice-teaching. These outfits of hers were completely modest, but they were termed "childish". As a result, she switched to her more formal (and considerably less modest) dresses. This girl was ordered to wear high heels, too. I was rather encouraged not to, because my supervising teacher couldn't abide them!

This type of restriction probably encourages conformists to go into the teaching business--an unhappy situation which, in my opinion, short-changes the children.

-----  
"By any reckoning...the human mind is very young, and it is not to be expected that it should, as yet, understand very much of the world in which it finds itself. Indeed, there is a sense in which the more we know, the more we become aware of the extent of our ignorance. Suppose, for example, that we think of knowledge as a little lighted patch, the area of the known, set in a sea of environing darkness, the limitless area of the unknown. Then, the more we enlarge the area of the lighted patch, the area of the known, the more also we enlarge the area of contact with the environing darkness of the unknown. In philosophy, then, as in daily life, cocksureness is a function of ignorance and dunces step in where sages fear to tread. The wise man is he who realizes his limitations..." --C.E.M. Joad, in "Philosophy".  
-----

ERIC BLAKE :: P. O. BOX 26 :: JAMAICA 31, NEW YORK

I think that George Price, whose views I support in most things, has become unnecessarily optimistic in excluding Yugoslavia from the Communist regimes striving for world conquest. The Yugoslav exile, Dr. Draskovitch, has pointed out that the alleged split between Tito and other Communists is a fraud designed to confuse us about the nature of Communism, and an attempt to get aid for the "good Communist" Tito so he can pass it on to his "comrades". (Are you claiming that the schism between Yugoslavia and the orthodox Marxist countries has been constructed as part of an elaborate conspiracy to attract American aid? I hesitate to ask what you consider the nature of the Sino-Soviet quarrel....)

Also, I think that Mr. Price's establishment of two kinds of morality establishes a separation where none exists. He contrasts the notion of "a set of rules handed down by the Almighty" with "a set of



rules which we have found by experience and reason have been best for the survival and well-being of the human race". Aren't these two codes of conduct one and the same? Certainly the moral law ordained by God is best fit for the human race on a practical basis. (But that assumes (1) that God exists and (2) that the moral law said to be ordained by God actually derives from that source. The existence or non-existence of a deity has, of course, been debated for thousands of years, and no doubt your opinion on this matter is too well entrenched to be shaken by my puny efforts. But as to the second point, I'm afraid that you cannot demonstrate the validity of the "moral law ordained by God" until there is some agreement as to what that code constitutes. Every sect interprets divine law differently and these interpretations frequently contradict one another; obviously, God could not have ordained all of these diverse and contradictory codes. So precisely what do you consider "the moral law ordained by God", and why is your interpretation superior to all of the others?)

When I said that a free election which the Communists win is a contradiction in terms, I meant that such an election would end freedom in that country. Certainly this is obvious? And the Communists certainly aren't going to win an election in which they aren't on the ballot, so denying them the right to run candidates is one way to insure the continuation of a free country (though not the only way, of course). (I do not believe that a Communist victory in an election would necessarily "end freedom" in that country, although it probably would end free elections (notice the distinction). You appear to be defining "freedom" as an absolute quality, which exists outside of Communist countries and is completely absent within them. But there are degrees of freedom. Most Communist countries enjoy less freedom than most non-Communist countries, but beyond that there is no generalization which may reasonably be applied to this area. It is simply not true to claim that there is "no freedom" under a Communist regime. And, incidentally, I do not believe that preventing certain parties from running candidates is a very good way to preserve the freedom of a country...)

I am not surprised that Bertrand Russell rejects the concept of punishment, since he also rejects the concept of sin. To the man who doesn't believe in sin or punishment, there is nothing wrong in crime. We shouldn't be surprised, then, that Russell has allied himself with the greatest criminals of all. (Your statement that "to a man who doesn't believe in sin or punishment, there is nothing wrong in crime" betrays a fundamental moral deficiency. What you are actually saying is that only the threat of (civil and divine) punishment prevents you from committing crimes. Agnostics and atheists usually have a rather highly developed ethical code, to which they are considerably more faithful than is the average theist to his particular "God-given" code.)

Personally, I regard the principal reason for punishment as neither revenge nor deterrence. Many criminals are just too stupid or too unthinking to connect their acts with their possible consequences. Protection of society against the criminal should be the chief duty of the courts--rather than the protection of the criminal against society, as now seems to be the case.

The experiences of the Breens with their son must be multiplied by those of thousands of other white parents and their children. It is the reason why New Yorkers are beginning to demonstrate against integrated schools: White liberals, who had never been acquainted with the problem before, are now beginning to understand what Negroes are like. This, I think, marks the beginning of the end for the "civil rights" movement. Whites in the North are now understanding why whites in the South do not want to send their children to school with Negroes. (As there are still many of us unlearned in these matters, I would appreci-



ate it if you would explain "what Negroes are like". I am certain that we would find it fascinating.))

To clarify the "rootlessness of liberalism", I would like to contrast liberalism and its more outspoken socialist and communist versions to the historical tradition variously called Christendom, western civilization or simply The West. This tradition is grounded upon the Christian religion and upon the secular ideas of law and government which we inherited from the Greeks and Romans. It protected our western heritage across the centuries from attacks by barbarians from outside Europe, and from rebellion within. It carried our civilization, the highest in man's history, to all the continents of the world. It has given us a standard of living beyond the wildest dreams of our ancestors. This is not a time to abandon it, but a time to support and strengthen it against its foes without and within.

What do liberals have to offer by contrast? Compromise with communism, the removal of religion from our institutions, and placing western civilization on a state of moral equality with Communist butchers and African savages.

You have characterized the French Revolution as a "temporary and minor" exception as far as liberals are concerned. This may have been so at the time, but now the blood baths which were a brief feature of the French Revolution have become standard operating procedure for several decades by the Communist powers.

George Price's question in Kipple #74, asking us to consider the two alternatives of a Communist government and a nuclear war, leaves aside another and increasingly more frightening possibility. Naturally, if we fail to win a nuclear war against the Communists, we will be compelled to live under a Communist government. But it could also happen that Communism might come to power in America without a nuclear war, through a gradual communization of our government. Under these circumstances, there would be no point in time which could be marked as the date America become communistic, but a transition so gradual that no one would realize it had happened until it was too late.

This sounds fantastic, but look what has already happened. The United States of America has become the first country outside the Communist bloc to make atheism its state religion. Increasing restrictions are being placed upon economic freedom. The late President Kennedy's arrogant order to the steel companies to decrease their prices cannot be reconciled with the free enterprise system. Socialized medicine has just been voted, and federal control over education seems about to follow. And "civil rights" is being used as an excuse to make inroads on many phases of life.

The picture is not without hope, however. The instigators of this process are beginning to over-reach themselves, and public objections are increasing in volume. Winning our country back is not going to be easy, but I have increasing faith that it is possible. (And if worse comes to worse, you can always emigrate to South Africa or Spain, where your principles are dominant.))

-----  
"The wise man recognizes that life's most important truths are often trite. The clever man sees only the triteness." --Eli Schleifer.  
-----

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

George Price's statement that people of underdeveloped areas want "wealth, security, and their own crack at being masters" is partially true, but too sweeping a generalization to be applicable as a general rule. Suppression of any sort, whether by government, parental authori-



ty, church, et al., is resented and frequently disliked, but it is not always met with resistance. In some instances, the conquered welcome the advent of an overseer, who may be cruel and unjust but nevertheless provides for the welfare of the people over whom he rules. Those who yearn for the opportunity to become top dog, to usurp their master and replace him with themselves, are not looking forward far enough. They are expressing a primitive form of revenge, a share-and-share-alike intent, bringing the same misfortune to the one who so eagerly doles it out. Most conquered people are incapable of governing themselves, not because they are unfit or genetically incapable, but because centuries of suppression have rendered them more docile and willing to accept order, bowing at first to the Pavlovian command of the order with the whip, until the whip is withdrawn and the order becomes associated with the pain of the whip and is obeyed instantly. Look at the condition after the Civil War, when former slaves roamed about in a state bordering on anarchy, or conditions today in the Congo, which have been further complicated by the intrusion of diverse outside elements.

A race of people will eventually adjust themselves to self-government, given the opportunity and enough time for this adjustment to take place. But why list "wealth, security, and their own crack at being masters" as if the desire for this were something distasteful, as George Price seems to imply. Essentially these conditions are what we all seek to attain. If some "primitive" race is held in enslavement for centuries and is suddenly given free rein, I think we can expect some confusion, some misunderstanding, and some violence. What is the solution to this? Shall we keep them enslaved until all sense of spirit and identity has been wiped out, or free them and immediately try to teach them and guide these misguided efforts into something profitable and worthwhile? You may wind up with a spear in your back, but in the long run the latter alternative is more profitable and, to use a much misused term, morally right.

Re "Better Red Than Dead": The Birchers, of course, refuse to recognize the possibility of remaining alive after a theoretical nuclear attack and enslavement by the Soviets or Red Chinese. Rightist thinking always assumes that once we have been defeated our presence would only be of a beneficial nature to the captors. Thus, hope is abandoned and the human race may be given up for lost, while "Godless Communism" rules the once-prosperous country. The likelihood of having the entire population annihilated by the war is extremely remote. The survivors will be in a bad enough mental state as it is, without the echoes of fiery pronouncements of self-sacrifice ringing in their ears. It would, in fact, be impossible for a loyal, dedicated American to be "Red" as an alternative to being dead. Remaining alive under Communist tyranny does not imply that the individual's allegiance switches to the other side; on the contrary, I imagine he would become more fiercely opposed than ever, and would resist all the more.

John Boston has merely reiterated what has been said so many, many times before. You may argue about religion as much as you choose, but in narrowing the bone of contention to personal beliefs, gnawing at this bone can be done for as long as the participants wish. A matter of faith demands no explanation, and usually can present none. A believer

#####

# @ @ #

# v #

# o #

This is Bubbles Latour. Bubbles is a prostitute. She found freedom under Clark Kerr.



in God, who profoundly accepts all of the beliefs his faith teaches and can justify these tenets with modern society, cannot be swayed in an argument, since you can't tell him in effect that he does not believe in what he says he believes in. You can argue the meaning of certain rituals or some beliefs that religions foster with a bit more clarity, but it is hardly possible to resolve such a debate. (One of your observations on religion recalls to mind arguments I have had with individuals who consider themselves philosophical determinists. It is impossible to conclusively disprove the central thesis of determinism, of course, but it is relatively easy--given an intellectually honest opponent--to demonstrate that he does not genuinely believe what he says he believes.)

I don't think censors actually seek to eliminate sexual behavior or misbehavior. Most would probably state that they want such and such a book or magazine removed from the newsstands so that children will not be able to see it. That is where the the biggest justification for censorship lies, in the oft-stated desire to remove certain evil literature from the possession of youngsters. Evidently, having a teenager see a badly photographed pin-up will have the same damaging effect on his mind that reading "Lady Chatterly's Lover" will. The censor seems to feel that merely claiming the material is to be kept out of the reach of children is sufficient support for his campaign. They are attempting to rid society of an uncommon obsession with sex, without realizing that only a neurotic could be so obsessed with the subject that he would go to great lengths to deprive others of the opportunity to read about it, smugly believing that his intellect has been spared the traumatic shock which could have been transmitted to a prospective viewer. The teenager or adult who occasionally buys a copy of Playboy to glance through the pictures or read the other material is no sex fiend or potential manic. But an individual who scrupulously inspects each copy of a magazine on a newsstand to determine whether or not the contents are acceptable for the eyes of others is certainly not normal.

-----  
"When we think of this desert it is easy to blame human greed; but it is well to remember that this answer is too simple. Greed no doubt played its part. So did imagination, initiative, hard work, the willingness to risk life and savings to gain independence. These are some of the things that we regard as among the higher attributes of man. They were vitiated by ignorance, by lack of established responsibility, and by the pressure of competition which led to the crowding of the range beyond its carrying capacity, until today in many places that carrying capacity has practically gone." --John H. Storer, in "The Web of Life".  
-----

JOE STATON :: 469 ENNIS ST. :: MILAN, TENNESSEE, 38358

Re John Boston's remarks on religion: It should be fairly obvious that religion of almost any sort cannot be justified rationally. Its very nature precludes this. After all, by Dewey's definition, religion is "a deep emotional identification with an object which is considered to be sacrosanct or inviolable". If you accept this definition (as I do), then you must realize that any rationalistic approach to questions of religion would tend to destroy the basis of that religion. As long as the object of identification, whether it be Christ, Buddha or a broken alarm-clock, is consider sacrosanct, no amount of logical argument will undermine it. You may point out, e.g., that it is historically impossible for Moses to have written the Pentateuch, but as long as either (Moses or the Pentateuch) is considered to be supernatural and



above questioning, your logic will be useless. I should point out that, by this definition, the object of the identification need not be a person or even an idol; it may be, as in the case of Emerson's bastard pantheism, "whim".

I think maybe you blame the "neutrals" in the Breen case just a little too harshly. I never took any sort of position myself (nor do I intend to do so now) simply because the evidence was never really made clearly conclusive for either side. And not knowing the participants personally, I stayed clear. Maybe there were a couple of other neutrals around like that. (Your sincere appraisal of the evidence as inconclusive should have been sufficient to compel you to exert the greatest effort in behalf of Walt and Marion Breen. It is not necessary for the defense to present conclusive evidence in support of its position, for the burden of proof rests with the accusers, and this is equally valid within and without the courtroom. Were some mutual acquaintance to assure me that you habitually murdered old women, and if, after an extended argument in which many points of view were expressed, it appeared to me that the evidence was inconclusive, I should certainly publicly state that as far as I was concerned you were innocent of wrongdoing and our mutual acquaintance was a vicious rumor-monger.)

I mentioned a while back the move to abolish the death penalty in Tennessee. You will probably be interested to know that the legislature killed it. And after it had gone down to defeat, the newspapers all chimed in to say that they had done right and that Tennessee would keep the "deterrent" to crime. Of course, our beloved legislators in Nashville did do some things: e.g., they passed a bill to ban nudist colonies in the state. A nudist club is preparing to fight this in the courts and it promises to be another "Monkey Trial" to shame the state. Tennessee wouldn't be a universal joke if we had some legislators worth ten cents.

And on the liberal versus conservative debate in #76, I still think some people make too much out of labels. Some of your people think they are conservatives and that therefore they must be conservatives in everything they do, and others think the same thing about being liberals. However, it strikes me that the really sane way to look at things would be to be neither liberal nor conservative, but rather to judge each issue on its merits, perhaps within a general framework of ideas which could be considered either conservative or liberal; but when your considered evaluation of an issue comes into conflict with your frame of reference, then to ignore labels. (Well, of course, most people do not tailor their opinions to conform to the label they have adopted, but rather choose whatever convenient label happens to cover the opinions they have already formed.)

-----  
"It makes no difference if I burn my bridges behind me--I never retreat." --Fiorello La Guardia.  
-----

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

A few remarks on Kipple #78: As regards that list of murders per 100,000 population, it is not just the top ten states, as you pointed out, but eighteen of the top twenty states in murder rates which are "southern" states or have southern affinities. In these parts, it is very obvious that Oklahoma and Missouri are "southern" states; so is southern Illinois (the "Delta" country), and so, I almost feel at times, is Iowa--though this is kind of an unfair exaggeration. Our department is heavily populated by "southern" types--Texas, Oklahoma, Missouri, Arkansas and Kansas folk. I am, incidentally, rather astonished at Io-



wa's low murder rate. My explanation: Iowans are so blamed dull they can't even motivate themselves to spectacular crimes. They make up for it, though, by slaughter on the highways. Speed is the grand passion of the bored farm-boy and the small-town punk.

I'm so sick of an all-WASP community I could scream. I have half a notion to claim that I am part Negro or oriental just to see what would happen. The head of my department told me that I would enjoy my teaching assistanceship here because there were practically no minority groups. I find it stifling! Coming from Cambridge, where all but a handful of my friends were non-WASP (mostly Jewish, a few Negroes, orientals, whathaveyou), these people are a deadly bore. They sit in class with their blank, inattentive faces; they never ask questions; they don't want to think, or read a book; they just want to be told, and get it over with.

This, of course, also reflects strongly on the abominable excuse for education we foist on them. The course I assist in is so bad I really can hardly stomach it. Initiative and creativity on the part of the undergraduate and graduate assistant alike are stifled. And paperwork! Meaningless, meaningless; the kids hate it, we hate it--and most of them are a dull lot anyway. But the ones who aren't dull--we make them hate geology. It breaks my heart; I love my subject, and I want others to see what is interesting and exciting about it. We kill the few live ones we have, instead of waking them up. It's horrible. I have to face two more years in this place (Ph.D, you know), and Bob thinks I'll go psycho. I've aged ten years in the nearly two years I've been here.

-----  
"Social revolution in the sense here meant is peculiar to the stage of social development of capitalist society and the capitalist state. It does not exist previous to capitalism, because the political boundaries were too narrow and social consciousness too undeveloped. It will disappear with capitalism because this can only be overthrown by the proletariat, which as the lowest of all social classes can use its domination only to abolish all class domination and classes and therewith also the essential conditions of social revolution." --Karl Kautsky, in "The Social Revolution".  
-----

ALMA HILL :: 463 PARK DRIVE :: BOSTON 15, MASSACHUSETTS

Your handling of definitions reminds me of Humpty Dumpty, who said that he could make a word mean anything he wanted to. Of course, he added, when you do that, you have to pay extra. You sure do; and Humpty Dumpty had a great fall.

What is "classical" that you feel able to say that a piece of music (or, presumably, painting or sculpture or literature) either is or is not classical? As this term is ordinarily used, it is simply a loose floppy coverall thing--all covered over with sweet violets--that means, more or less, "I think this is great and that a lot of other people know about it and feel the same way about it." On one piece, you would find that at the very most you might get 80% agreement, with the disagreement ready to make enough noise to sound like a majority. Surely you can't think of any composer or composition that everybody praises? In short, the term "classical" reduces to personal opinion; and there can be no is-or-isn't about a matter of personal opinion; that is one of the nine meanings of the classical expression, De gustibus non disputandum. (All nine are true in my book, but there is a tenth which I consider nonsense--viz., the claim that all people with good case will naturally concur with one another, and with the speaker.)

In short, the term "classical" is more like the term "folk" than



it is different from it. Both are appeals to public acceptance; but whereas "classical" is an appeal to current and recent critical opinion, "folk" is perhaps more an is-or-isn't thing. If it can be shown that it fits the dictionary definition by being the product of a place and time, a region, a people, rather than any one person, then it can be shown to be folk-music (or -painting or -sculpture or -ceramics or whatever). A Roman tear vase is folk art; Steuben glass is the product of a particular artist. Some Swedish modern glass is folk art, but if it is signed it is not. Every artist is to some extent influenced by his medium and milieu, so the individual or local styles are not to the point. The term "folk" art is a claim to folk-ownership, collective property rights--nobody wrote it, nobody knows it (there are usually several versions) and everybody sings it.

It doesn't seem reasonable to me to be such an individualist that one can't get along with the dictionary. If a new word is needed, okay, make your own. I hear tell that there are lots of possible combinations that have never been used in this language so far.

Try some specific instances? Is a Gregorian chant folk, classical or just a Gregorian chant by, say, Palestrina? Is "My Old Kentucky Home" classical, folk or just a popular song? How about "Tiger Rag"--and I mean "Tiger Rag" whether performed by Louis Armstrong or Lawrence Welk. The test of a definition--or any term--is its applicability, isn't it? (May I be struck by lightning the next time I attempt to define folk-music...)

v-oOo-v

FROM

Ted Pauls

1448 Meridene Drive

Baltimore, Maryland, 21212

U. S. A.



DELIVER TO:

printed matter only

may be opened for inspection

return requested

third class mail

no commercial value

this side up

use no hooks

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



"Happiness is learning that Mary Poppins was arrested  
for drunken disorderly conduct in a cathouse..."