



# A CITY STREET

## The sights of a city street:

Grimy children playing stick-ball,  
Bloated flies hovering over vegetable stalls,  
Pot-bellied men washing second-hand cars,  
Pitiful painted girls in tight skirts,  
Aimless groups of teenagers loitering on corners,  
Broken, tattered old men sprawled in gutters,  
Cracked windows in sordid tenements,  
Ravished women in housecoats fanning themselves on stoops,  
Empty beer bottles in the gutter,  
Cadaverous dogs rooting in overturned garbage cans.

## The sounds of a city street:

Raucous horns blaring in frustrated anger,  
Mothers yelling at their children from third-storey windows,  
The shuffle of aimless feet on concrete,  
Huckster wagons going clickety-clack down the alley,  
An untended infant crying in vain,  
The discordant twang of steel guitars issuing from a jukebox,  
The squeal of brakes,  
Junkies moaning in secluded hallways,  
A rubber ball thrumping against a stone curb,  
Children screaming in delight at their secret games.

## The smells of a city street:

Puddles of cloudy water in a defective gutter,  
The poisonous breath of whining drunks,  
Stew burning in an iron pot,  
The cheap perfume of pathetic whores,  
Bedraggled children with bubble-gum breath,  
The rotting carcass of a long-dead cat,  
A newly waxed car baking in the relentless sun,  
Sweating crowds of disturbed human cattle,  
Exhaust fumes from a hundred thousand metal monsters,  
The cheap hair oil of the neighborhood rakes.

A city street--

Inevitable product of our superior civilization.

.....by ted pauls.....

THE "THEORY" OF EVOLUTION: Virtually every significant theoretical discovery in the history of science and philosophy has originated as an unorthodox hypothesis developed by one outstanding thinker (or, comparatively rarely, a small group of outstanding intellects). The hypothesis will then be criticized, violently assaulted or even ridiculed by the more orthodox members of the scientific community. This period of intensive controversy is usually an invaluable aid to the development of the hypothesis, because during the controversy the inadequacies and errors of the original theory are exposed. Vigorous criticism tends to strengthen a basically sound hypothesis by stripping it of any superfluous aspects and compelling its advocates to undertake adjustments and corrections where appropriate. But once a concept has become es-

## jottings from the editor's desk

tablished beyond a reasonable doubt within the scientific community, it ordinarily ceases to be considered "controversial". It occasionally happens, however, that a particular scientific concept becomes the focus for a public controversy which persists long after scientific criticisms have been successfully countered. This is especially likely to occur when the hypothesis possesses or appears to possess significance as a challenge to political or theological orthodoxy. The political or religious interests affronted by the offending hypothesis will endeavor to suppress or discredit it, an effort which often results in a prolonged and bitter public controversy. The character of this public controversy is radically different from that of the scientific controversy which usually precedes the establishment of a theorem, because the majority of its participants are laymen who are not competent to pass judgment with regard to the scientific merits of the theory.

During the past one hundred years, the work of Charles Robert Darwin has inspired a public controversy of enormous dimensions. Immediately after the publication, in 1859, of "The Origin of Species", religious zealots, viewing with alarm the collapse of a minor but integral tenet of their system of belief, launched an energetic and vituperative campaign to discredit the eminent naturalist's views. Many, realizing that their petty cause was manifestly ludicrous in an age of reason and scientific inquiry, enhanced their stature in the eyes of the public by means of a device familiar to us today: they asserted that advocacy of Darwin's evolutionary theory was tantamount to a direct denial of Christianity. (Recently, enterprising American opponents of evolution added a new degree of

sophistry to the case against Charles Darwin's contribution to scientific thought by asserting that advocacy of evolution is equivalent to advocacy of communism. This assumption is founded upon two equally ridiculous premises: first, that Darwinian evolution is necessarily an atheistic, materialistic concept incompatible with religious belief; and, second, that atheism is invariably found in alliance with communism.) The obscurantist struggle was directed by the English High Church and certain fundamentalist sects; but, while not actively hostile toward it, neither the Catholic Church nor the other Protestant denominations could be accused of being enthusiastic about evolution.

The historical facts of this struggle, from the Oxford debate to the trial of John Scopes, are well known to the majority of the readers of this periodical, of course, but it is sometimes difficult for reasonably enlightened individuals to comprehend the extent to which the issue remains controversial today. There is no longer any scientific controversy--Charles Darwin's original ideas have been substantially modified by his successors, but the underlying concept of biological evolution is no longer seriously questioned by reputable scientists--but the acrimonious public controversy has never entirely ceased. Although we tend to look upon the vigorous if not always rational debate of the Nineteenth Century and the depressing series of events which transpired in the quaint little community of Dayton, Tennessee, in 1925 as irrevocably a part of the distant past, the fact remains that the tattered banner of anti-evolutionism continues to be borne aloft by a dedicated and highly vocal band of fanatics.

Several years ago, Tennessee State Senator Carter Patten introduced a bill in the legislature intended to repeal the law prohibiting the teaching of Darwinian evolution in that state's public schools. Astonishingly, this measure was handily defeated. When, six years ago, an Arkansas legislator, Mrs. Willie Oates, introduced legislation aimed at repealing the anti-evolution statutes of her state, the outcry from rural lawmakers was so intense that she was compelled to withdraw the bill. In Texas, a group of concerned citizens led by evangelist Reuel Lemmons is attempting to procure legislative action to prohibit the teaching of evolution in that state. Lemmons' objections to Darwinian evolution are impressively inclusive: it is, he asserts, anti-God, anti-Bible, unscientific, anti-religious and anti-moral. In Arizona, the Rev. Aubrey Moore of Phoenix organized a campaign directed at bringing to referendum the question of whether or not evolution should be taught

```
( " " " " " )
(  •  •  )   This is Johnny. Oh, see Johnny. Johnny is a boy. See
(   v   )   Johnny the boy. See Johnny play. Johnny plays.
((  =  ))
```

Johnny makes snowballs. Oh, see Johnny make snowballs.  
Johnny likes to make snowballs. Oh, see him play.

```
( " " " " " )
(  •  •  )
(   v   )
((  =  ))
```

```
#####
#  •  •  #   This is Snowballs.
#   W   #
#   =   #
```

as scientific fact in the public schools of that state. One of his associates, Dr. David C. Hass, pastor of the North Phoenix Baptist Church, observed that their organization does not object to Darwinian evolution being taught as a theory; but they strongly protest having it taught as "a fact contradictory to the Bible." The request that Darwinian evolution be presented in institutions of learning merely as a tentative theory is not so much objectionable as absurd, for the principles of evolution are no more tentative today than is the view that the Earth is roughly spherical in shape. Nevertheless, a number of states have compromised the integrity of their school systems by acceding to this request in order to avoid becoming embroiled in controversy with various right-wing groups. According to Dr. Richard A. Gibboney of the Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction, evolution in his state "is taught as part of the life sciences and this is carefully done without a point of view expressed." It is at least as reasonable, in this presumably enlightened era, to teach Isaac Newton's "theories" about motion and gravity without expressing a point of view as to their validity.

The profound and, even among intelligent laymen, widespread ignorance which exists in this country with respect to the processes of biological evolution is at least partially attributable to the efforts of the various pressure groups active in this sphere. This numerically insignificant but highly vocal minority has succeeded in convincing educators that Darwinian evolution remains a "controversial" scientific theory, with the result that many school systems have avoided exploring it in depth. And widespread public ignorance has, of course, contributed to the effectiveness of the anti-evolution forces, thus closing the vicious circle. Fortunately, the ultimate failure of any obscurantist effort is assured by the dynamic nature of human societal evolution, and it is probable that the current notable increase of anti-evolution sentiment represents the final agonizing convulsions of a moribund cause. Still, the amount of distortion and misinformation which currently masquerades as knowledge of Darwinian evolution offers grim testament to the effectiveness of the obscurantist campaign. This particular aspect of scientific thought is so poorly understood by the public at large that occasional efforts to educate the American people with regard to evolution are as refreshing as a spring breeze in a musty corridor.

One educational project which has so far escaped notice in intellectual circles is a series of volumes published by Time, Inc., entitled the "Life Nature Library". These volumes are intended to explore the beauty and scientific wonder of life on this planet in a way that is both informative and completely comprehensible to the general reader. Each book in the series is devoted to a different branch of the life sciences or a different order of living creatures. This series is significant because it is intended to reach a mass audience. Each volume is comprehensive, beautifully illustrated with photographs and drawings, and written in an intelligent and interesting manner. In the volume devoted to "The Mammals", the author, Richard Carrington, stated the case for evolution unequivocally:

"Little more than a century ago, few people realized that the diverse array of mammals we have just described were not only related to one another but to all other living things. Religion taught that each individual type of animal had been created by God to fulfill a special role in the world. The idea that the mighty elephant, the tiny shrew, the lithe and graceful panther, the monkeys, apes and even man were in a very real sense cousins would have been regarded at best as a mad delusion and at worst as blasphemy. Yet we now

know beyond a doubt that all these creatures can trace their ancestry back to a common stock.

"The revelation of this fact is, of course, due to the discovery of the principles of organic evolution. The idea of the evolution of all life was discussed by the ancient Greeks, but after them it was forgotten for more than 2,000 years and men's minds were preoccupied with more magical interpretations of nature. It was not until the middle of the 18th Century that the idea was reborn, this time with new vitality. A century later, in 1859, Charles Darwin's 'On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection' was published. This classic book presented the story of evolution so clearly that it could no longer be rationally denied, and later work has served only to confirm its basic truth."

Although the "Life Nature Library" series could serve splendidly as natural history textbooks in junior high and high school, these two paragraphs would probably inspire heated objections were this volume to be utilized by any school system in the country; there is no question that in the so-called "Bible Belt" its mere presence on a library shelf would evoke outraged protests. It is incredible that a nation which is in many respects the most enlightened on the face of the earth should tolerate narrowness and bigotry of this sort.

**THE GUNS OF AUGUST:** Despite the confident assurances of Administration spokesmen that United States air strikes against selected targets in North Vietnam are significantly weakening the Communist insurgents in the south, there appears to be general recognition at all levels of government that the war must ultimately be won on the ground and within South Vietnam. The failure of the South Vietnamese Army to record any discernible progress in its operations against the guerilla forces, in spite of massive American assistance in the form of materiel and advisors, has compelled Washington to dispatch sizable contingents of combat troops to the area, and it now appears that the United States is irrevocably committed to the Asian ground war which Walter Lippmann and other perceptive observers have long dreaded. Originally, our combat role in Vietnam was supposed to be confined to the maintenance of security in the vicinity of American installations, and even "search and destroy" operations in these regions were essentially defensive in nature. However, a more active policy was firmly established in early July when a United States paratroop unit participated in a joint offensive operation in "Zone D", north of Saigon, and it is only a matter of time before the United States armed forces stationed at various coastal bases in South Vietnam will be conducted massive and continuous combat operations against the insurgents. Inevitably, greater United States participation will lead to increasing U.S. control of all aspects of the prosecution of the conflict, and it is to be expected that eventually the war will become primarily an American effort. In view of this, it might be useful to examine the probable course of development of the struggle in the months to come, the difficulties which will confront United States forces involved in a type of warfare in which they have no previous experience, and the psychological effect on the citizens of this country of our deepening involvement in the war.

At first glance, conflicts of this sort usually appear to be ludicrously uneven contests, with the government forces possessing overwhelming advantages. This is especially true in the present instance, because the South Vietnamese Army has at its disposal the resources of

the greatest industrial and military power in the world. The combined South Vietnamese-United States forces not only possess numerical superiority and ample supplies of the most sophisticated equipment, unchallenged domination of the air and surrounding seas, but also virtually unlimited economic resources. Yet the less apparent advantages enjoyed by the insurgents have proven to be adequate to compensate. I have discovered in conversations with individuals who are unacquainted with the devices of guerilla warfare that it is extremely difficult to enumerate the advantages possessed by the insurgents, many of which are extremely subtle. Certainly mobility is one of the principal military advantages enjoyed by the Communist guerillas, but this is largely dependent upon another quality inherent in clandestine military organizations, viz., anonymity. Operating usually in small units, the guerillas are frequently able to conceal their whereabouts and avoid contact with large formations of enemy troops. If necessary, the guerilla band will disperse into the surrounding countryside, and since individual members of the Viet Cong are not readily identifiable as insurgents, they may escape detection simply by discarding their weapons. In the larger cities, cadres trained for sabotage or assassination are able to operate quite freely, because the average Communist guerilla is indistinguishable from the average Vietnamese. This anonymity also enables the insurgents to develop extremely capable intelligence and espionage networks. Finally, the insurgents are not to any significant extent dependent upon unwieldy supply lines or cumbersome logistical support facilities. Operating as self-contained units, guerilla bands are frequently able to subsist on food available in the immediate environment and military equipment captured from government units.

There are also psychological advantages possessed by the insurgents, and their significance should not be underestimated. Since the very nature of guerilla warfare prevents the government forces from achieving genuine security even in their most highly fortified and conscientiously guarded installations, soldiers involved in counter-insurgency warfare are compelled to remain constantly alert and prepared for action. A professional soldier always anticipates being called upon to fight at a moment's notice, but the state of mind produced in troops stationed in guerilla-infested areas is of a different character altogether. He functions in an environment where instant death is a ubiquitous possibility. The distinction between the "front" and comparatively secure occupied areas does not exist in such a conflict. To relax, even for a moment, is to invite disaster. The enemy is as likely to strike in a Saigon bar as on a jungle path, so the individual soldier must be constantly prepared to defend himself. The tension which this situation produces in human minds is frightening, and probably this explains why otherwise capable battlefield commanders fail to make the proper decisions or permit their units to blunder into ambushes while conducting operations against the elusive enemy.

Since the war in Vietnam is as much a political as a military conflict, it follows that victory cannot be achieved solely by military means. As long as substantial numbers of South Vietnamese continue to support (either actively or passively) the Communist guerillas, the complete elimination of the clandestine National Front for Liberation is impossible. It should, however, be possible, by military means, to inflict punishment on the insurgents in such a way as to severely circumscribe their activities, while simultaneously providing at least partial security to substantial areas of the country. This reason that this objective has not so far been achieved is that the loyalist troops do not outnumber the Viet Cong by a sufficient ratio. There is presently some question regarding precisely what ratio should be considered "sufficient" in this context. Regular armies lacking widespread popular sup-

port have usually contained guerilla uprisings with great difficulty even at favorable odds of twenty-to-one. Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara estimates that in order to achieve victory over the Communists in Vietnam the Saigon government should possess a numerical superiority of ten- and preferably fifteen-to-one. Accepting the lower figure as the minimum necessary preponderance of military personnel, it is clear that achieving this level of superiority will require considerable exertion. The combat forces presently available to the Saigon government (including regular South Vietnamese troops, local militias and the United States personnel in South Vietnam as of July 20, 1965) outnumber the Viet Cong by slightly more than four-to-one. If the government of Premier Nguyen Cao Ky succeeds in its current program of armed forces expansion and the United States expeditionary force is increased to 150,000 combat troops (admittedly a conservative estimate), this margin may be increased to nearly six-to-one. This number will still not even approach the required ratio, and ultimately hundreds of thousands of additional troops must be thrown into the conflict. South Vietnam is a small and not very prosperous country whose resources are already being strained to the utmost, so these additional troops must be supplied by the United States and its allies. Ultimately, therefore, our commitment in Vietnam is likely to be as costly as the "police action" in Korea.

This depressing fact is not recognized by a great many of the Americans who constantly clamor for more decisive action in Vietnam. The impression appears to be fairly widespread in this country that the entrance of substantial bodies of United States combat troops into the struggle will cause the insurrection to collapse. This incredibly overconfident appraisal of the situation is, fortunately, avoided by the majority of government spokesmen and responsible citizens, but I suspect that it is held by a majority of ordinary Americans. During the past two years, I have been confronted literally dozens of times by some posturing cretin declaring that the conflict in Vietnam should be brought to a successful conclusion by "sending in a few thousand Marines to clean the place up". This remarkably naive outlook is primarily the result of the fact that, for years, the press in this country has permitted its readers to conceive of the struggle as one in which the successes of the Communists are chiefly attributable to the incompetence of the Saigon government and its armed forces. Newspaper accounts of ambushes in which detachments of South Vietnamese troops are wiped out have the effect, not of convincing American readers that the Viet Cong are extraordinarily capable guerilla fighters, but rather of convincing them that the government troops are hopelessly inept. Since the American people are accustomed to considering their own soldiers the finest in the world, there is naturally a tendency to believe that a relatively small number of U.S. troops, given a free hand, could subdue the insurgents. Actually, the South Vietnamese Army, although poorly motivated as a whole, is one of the best trained and most competent fighting bodies in Asia. Its officers, it is true, do not appear to excel in good judgment, but even the United States "advisors" admire and respect the individual fighting capacity of the troops themselves. This reason that they have fared so poorly is simply that the enemy is a group of expert guerilla fighters taking advantage of a situation and a form of warfare which no regular army staff has ever succeeded in reducing to military equations. This tendency to underrate the South Vietnamese Army and therefore believe that United States troops must necessarily achieve greater success is potentially a horribly dangerous attitude.

In limited combat operations to date, the United States forces in South Vietnam have not suffered a major defeat, but nothing is more certain than the eventual occurrence of such a disaster, involving hundreds of American casualties. The psychological effect of such an inci-

dent (or a series of such incidents) will be enormous. We Americans are, as a people, conditioned to accept only victory. For decades we have been taught that our armed forces, and especially the United States Marine Corps, were the finest soldiers in the world, irresistible, unflagging and invulnerable. It is utterly inconceivable to the majority of Americans that these crack troops could suffer significantly at the hands of a band of irregulars. There is a rather frightening parallel between most Americans and most Germans after World War I, and I should expect that continuous heavy losses of American personnel in a war which continues without any apparent progress would have approximately the same psychological effect on the American people as defeat in World War I had on the Germans.

This is indeed a frightening prospect, but I do not believe that it is an unreasonable prediction, considering the circumstances. Should a significant number of American troops be ambushed and destroyed, there will be howls of anguish from the press and from politicians all over the country. Republican support for President Johnson's policy in Vietnam will, predictably, begin to wither. There may be calls for an investigation and demands for the immediate bombing of Hanoi in reprisal; some pathetic company commander may even be court-martialed. Certainly there will be an immediate search for convenient scapegoats. As a matter of fact, this tendency is already noticeable. Whenever a terrorist bomb or a mortar attack does substantial damage to a U.S. installation, the newspapers take great pains to inform their readers repeatedly that South Vietnamese troops were responsible for security precautions at some point around the perimeter of the base; the implication is that the incompetent South Vietnamese were responsible for the setback.

This is an unquestionably irrational reaction, but it is nevertheless probable that an imposing number of Americans will succumb to it as United States losses in Vietnam mount. And there is every likelihood that these losses will increase dramatically as American troops come to play an ever more active combat role. It should be remembered that the insurgents, who have been participating in this struggle for twenty years, are seasoned guerilla fighters with an intimate knowledge of the countryside. The vast majority of the American soldiers, on the other hand, are young recruits and conscripts who have never seen battle or fired a shot in anger prior to their arrival in Vietnam. They possess virtually no first-hand knowledge of the countryside in the area in which they are stationed, and everything that they know about guerilla warfare was taught to them out of a book at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, by an instructor in khaki shorts and a brass hat who himself had never journeyed to within two thousand miles of a guerilla conflict. This is not an encouraging comparison. An even more depressing indication of what we may expect is a short squib which recently appeared in the newspapers containing an account of an interview with an Australian

A simple line drawing of a smiling face. The face has two dots for eyes, a 'W' shape for a mouth, and a series of vertical lines above the head representing hair or a crown. The entire face is enclosed in a large, irregular, hand-drawn outline.

"My name is Maxwell Taylor. I drew the long straw."

"My name is Henry Cabot Lodge. I drew the short one..."

( : : : : )  
( ē ē )  
( V )  
( ( ) )

infantryman, assigned to the South Vietnamese Army as an advisor, who discussed the American soldiers with whom he had become acquainted. He remarked that going on patrol with them was "a bit too bloody dangerous", because they "talk and smoke and generally set themselves up as pretty good targets." "Americans are good blokes," he concluded, "but not when they're on patrol."

No one questions the courage and competence of the American soldiers in Vietnam, and I expect that they will acquit themselves admirably in this struggle; but it is a foregone conclusion that they will not live up to the totally unrealistic expectations of their more vocal boosters among the citizenry. The South Vietnamese Army is already doing as well as could reasonably be expected under the circumstances, and the introduction of moderate numbers of United States troops into the conflict probably cannot dramatically alter its present course. It is merely naive to expect anything resembling military victory in Vietnam, even in limited local campaigns. Ironically, it will be discovered, as the casualty lists grow, that those Americans who most loudly clamor for "Victory!" will be precisely those least willing to pay the price of victory--especially since "victory", in this context, is defined as maintaining a situation of stalemate and avoiding defeat, and does not actually entail "winning" anything.

COMMUNISM COMES TO CATONSVILLE: The majority of the readers of this periodical probably have never heard of Catonsville, Maryland, or the community college which bears its name. Situated in a burgeoning area of Baltimore County, Catonsville Community College is a small, unostentatious institution of higher learning which has never experienced conflict between students and administrators, civil strife or even panty raids. Nevertheless, this diminutive educational institution has recently become the focus for a controversy which raises issues so fundamental to the maintenance of a free society that its national prominence should, by any rational standard, exceed that of the University of California at Berkeley. The difficulties began on March 24, 1965, when the college presented the final program of the semester in its Lecture Series, featuring Carey McWilliams, editor of The Nation. Mr. McWilliams' appearance on the campus was the occasion for a sustained shriek of outrage on the part of local conservative organizations, spearheaded by the John Birch Society. Fifteen pickets appeared at the community college as the scheduled lecture began, carrying signs accusing McWilliams of being a "Communist agent", intent on subversion. Unsigned leaflets were distributed throughout the community, accusing the college of sponsoring "subversive" speakers, and when 300 students (over 40% of the total enrollment) signed a petition condemning these efforts to "smear" their college, other leaflets were distributed characterizing the students as "left-wing radicals" acting as agents for the Communist Party. The indignant students then held a rally to protest these vicious tactics, and this rally enjoyed the tacit support of both the faculty and the administration.

Subsequently, when David R. Matteson, the state coordinator of the John Birch Society, spoke at the Social-Political Forum at Catonsville College, he was questioned about these events. Mr. Matteson carefully denied that the pickets and leaflet distributors had been acting at the behest of the Society leadership; he did not deny that they were members of the John Birch Society, but he suggested that they had been acting on their own initiative. In response to a direct question with respect to Mr. McWilliams' controversial appearance, Mr. Matteson claimed to be in possession of evidence showing that McWilliams was associated with various Communist front organizations, but he insisted that the John Birch Society did not make a practice of picketing or other-

wise disrupting lectures. However, he dismissed a query concerning freedom of inquiry by asserting, "We don't believe that Communists have any business talking in public."

In commenting on this depressing affair, the Baltimore Sun had earlier observed that:

"A welcome to the ranks of higher educational maturity is due Catonsville Community College, which in its relatively young life already has drawn the fire of the sick element in the American rightist movement. The college could have seen to it that its students were never exposed to any speakers not guaranteed to be entirely safe, noncontroversial, bland and dull. Instead, the college has followed the stimulating college tradition of encouraging its students to discuss the great issues of the day (which necessarily are controversial or they would not be great issues) and to hear speakers of divergent, even unconventional viewpoints (which necessarily make them controversial speakers).

"The experience for the students so far has proved most enlightening. If they have not solved any great issues, they at least have seen how the militant extremists of the politically far right will, under the guise of defenders of freedom, invade a campus with inflammatory signs and nameless leaflets in an attempt to intimidate freedom of expression. The maturity of the college itself has been demonstrated in the confidence it has placed in its students to hear both or many sides of an issue with open minds and in its determination to stand fast against the outside attacks. The maturity of the students will be tested today when their speaker will be a representative of the John Birch Society. If, despite the right-wing charges made against them, the students give their guest speaker their quiet, courteous attention, the place of Catonsville Community College in Maryland higher education will be a bright one."

In the event, the student body behaved admirably. Mr. Matteson was treated with the utmost courtesy, although most of the students could hardly have been accused of being sympathetic toward the principles espoused by his organization.

Unfortunately, the controversy was not permitted to perish of natural causes at this point. Onto the scene there now galloped a knight astride a white stallion (although there are those to whom the intruder more closely resembled a nincompoop perched awkwardly on a grey jack-ass). Baltimore County Councilman Wallace A. Williams, his indignation aroused by a handful of protests from moronic constituents, determined to put an end to the sad state of affairs which permitted naive young college students to come under the mesmeric influence of diabolical Communist agents like Carey McWilliams. Councilman Williams, whose previous record of public service is distinguished solely by a recommendation to replace the doorknobs on the county courthouse lavatories, introduced legislation aimed at curbing the massive and malignant influence of subversives in county educational institutions. Under the provisions of his proposed statute, any individual desiring to utilize the facilities of any tax-supported school, library, hall or auditorium must submit a list of his organizational affiliations to the proper authorities. The bill would prohibit the use of such facilities to per-

sons connected with any organization declared to be "subversive" by any branch of the Federal Government or any official agency of a state government. The only saving grace possessed by this bill is that it is so blatantly unconstitutional that no court in the country would uphold it, so there was never any significant danger of any convictions and fines resulting from a refusal to comply.

The controversy stirred up by Councilman Williams' ill-advised effort to protect the impressionable young minds of Maryland's college students was so intense that the proposal perished in a burst of flame while still in committee. However, the irrepressible zealot has announced his intention to periodically reintroduce the measure, and if my estimate of the intellectual capacity of the average Baltimore County politician is accurate, it stands an excellent chance of eventually becoming law. Should this occur, it will constitute another catastrophe for local government, because the citizens of this country will once again be compelled to turn to the courts to guarantee their rights under the Constitution.

SHORT NOTES ON LONG SUBJECTS: George Murphy, erstwhile song-and-dance man, may not have realized what he was starting when he ran (successfully) for the Senate last November. There is every likelihood that Ronald Reagan will run for Governor of California in 1966, and if that happens it can only be a matter of time before other Hollywood personalities leap into the political arena. John Wayne, of course, will attempt to replace Tommy Kuchel in the Senate, Buster Keaton will oust Mayor Yorty, Andy Devine will make a strong bid for Jesse Unruh's position as speaker of California's lower house, and, with Walt Disney as her campaign manager, Annette Funicello will run for the legislature on a platform of two pizza pies in every oven. +++ Typographical errors are creatures that have mastered the art of camouflage to a degree not achieved by even the most cunning animals. Each stencil is carefully proof-read before duplication, yet jolting typographical errors are an inevitable feature of every issue of Kipple. The previous issue of this periodical appears to have achieved altogether new heights in this respect. On the cover, the date "June 12, 1965" appears in letters fully half an inch tall. Notwithstanding this conspicuous announcement of the date, however, that eighty-third issue was actually published on July 12, 1965. +++ The last time something of that sort occurred, incidentally, was in the summer of 1962. The magazine was then appearing (with considerably thicker issues) on a formal monthly schedule, but due to an error in lettering the dates the July issue (#27) is followed by two September issues (#28 & #29), the former of which was supposed to be labelled "August". +++ Then there was Kipple #10, which was labelled "Februrary, 1961". So far, I haven't managed to misspell the name of the magazine itself, but it's only a matter of time... +++ From a recent issue of TV-Guide: "(11) Battle Line--Documentary. The 1944 Battle of the Bulge, Hitler's last attempt to stop the Allied advance, is described by Jim Bishop, a former Allied sergeant and a former Nazi panzer soldier." Mr. Bishop must have led an extremely hectic life during the war years...

--Ted Pauls

"The study of theology, as it stands in Christian churches, is the study of nothing; it is founded on nothing; it rests on no principles; it proceeds by no authorities; it has no data; it can demonstrate nothing; and it admits of no conclusion. Not any thing can be studied as a science, without our being in possession of the principles upon which it is founded; and as this is not the case with Christian theology, it is therefore the study of nothing." --Thomas Paine, in "The Age of Reason".

## DISSENTING OPINIONS

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

As I indicated in my last letter, a discussion of evil will involve questions for which no one has satisfactory answers. All I can do is present hopefully useful observations. You wonder about a definition of evil. One common definition is that it is the absence of a good which ought to be present. It is evil that a man be born without legs, but not that he be born without wings, because legs belong to man by his nature but wings do not. However, an eagle born without wings is an example of evil. Evil can be divided into physical and moral evil. Evil which is in the thing itself is physical evil, as in the above examples. Moral evil (or sin) involves a free act contrary to that which ought to be done (including the omission of a morally obligatory act).

Genesis tells us--in allegorical form--how evil came into the world. Adam was created perfect, with the perfections proper to man. He was fully and completely what God wanted him to be. His perfections included total integrity. That is, his body accepted the rule of his soul and his soul was ruled by reason. Therefore his choices were free and were not affected by any of the factors, such as those mentioned by Miss Borsella, which in us can serve to diminish or even eliminate moral responsibility for our acts. Furthermore, he had certain freely given gifts from God which went beyond his nature. One of these was what the theologians call impassibility: the universe, made for the service of man, literally could not harm him. Another gift was immortality. Man was meant to pass from earth to heaven without the temporary separation of body and soul which constitutes death. (He also had the gift of supernatural life, which was the most important gift, but any discussion of it would take me too far afield.)

When Adam, the representative first man, freely chose to reject God, he forfeited these gifts for himself and his descendants. The body rebelled against the soul and even within the soul the harmony of its various powers was lost. This caused the difficulties Chay mentioned. As for the effects of natural disasters on generally good people which you noted, theologians teach that in addition to the personal effects of this first sin, including the loss of impassibility and immortality, there was damage done to the order of the material universe. Considering the state of the world during the centuries before man even existed, it is difficult to say what this damage was, and they don't claim to know, but it would seem to be a relevant factor. (As a matter of personal speculation, I wonder if it might not be partly related to what some people, such as science fiction writers who use it as a gimmick, refer to as "the perversity of things".)

These statements do not mean that we are being punished for the sin of our first parents. Rather, certain freely given gifts, to which we had no right, have been withdrawn because they were misused. Discus-

sing this subject, Msgr. Knox once wrote:

"To give a very crude parallel; it is not as if a schoolmaster said, 'You will all write 200 lines every day this term, to punish the insolence of last term's sixth form (who have now left) in writing their names on the seats in my garden.' It is rather as if he said, 'I am not going to let you wander about in my garden, because when I gave that privilege to your predecessors they misused it.'"

As I indicated above, various factors such as ignorance, habit, etc., can diminish or even eliminate moral responsibility for an act, and a person in such a case will not deserve and will not receive punishment for such acts. However, my statement that evil results from men making the wrong choice included more than the punishment for our own sins and more than the above mentioned loss of various gifts once given to mankind. There is a way in which a man can suffer evil for making the wrong choice in good faith, believing it to be the right one; even if God rewards him for his good intentions. This is because the moral laws given by God are not arbitrary commands. They are statements of the best way to act in accordance with the real world. These guides to spiritual reality are analogous to statements of physical reality such as that if I touch a live power line I will be electrocuted, whether or not I know it is live or even whether or not I know of the existence of electricity. The British sailors who suffered from scurvy before they were given limes did not know of the existence of vitamin C and did not even have control over their diet. They suffered because the body must have certain substances, including vitamin C, and cannot have others. Similarly, there are some actions or omissions which nourish or debilitate the soul. These effects are not always easy to see, but sometimes it is possible. I think that many would agree that the effects of racism, which is immoral, on the person doing the hating can be severe, even if, due to his upbringing, etc., he is not morally responsible for his prejudice. It has been said that Martin Luther King is doing as much to free the white man as he is to free the Negro.

I agree that too often the United States has unconditionally supported undesirable governments because they opposed our enemies. You only mentioned the support given to anti-Communist regimes since World War II, but we should not forget the aid we gave to the Soviet govern-

(\*\*\*\*\*)  
( o o )  
( w )  
(( o ))

"Hey, Dad, do you know what we did at college last week? There was a teach-in on Vietnam, and later a bunch of us got together and burned President Johnson in effigy."

"Now, really, Ronald, burning an effigy; don't you think that was rather childish?"

( ' ' ' ' )  
( = = )  
( V )  
(( — ))

(\*\*\*\*\*)  
( o o )  
( w )  
(( — ))

"Well, I suppose it was, but the President refused our invitation to attend, so we settled for the effigy."

ment when Hitler was the enemy of the moment. The correct course of action is not to withdraw all aid and back rebels, except, perhaps, when all other alternatives have failed, but to demand reforms in exchange for our aid programs. This idea has been tried already, but not resolutely enough. We first must convince the rulers that we mean what we say about withdrawing aid and applying whatever other pressure seems appropriate to the individual situation. This may require letting one or two small countries, carefully selected for minimum strategic importance, collapse due to lack of aid. The second important thing we must do is to be realistic in our demands for reform. Especially, we must be more concerned with the substance of a reform than with its form or appearance. Land reform, elimination of corruption, and similar measures which directly affect the well-being of the man in the street are of more immediate importance than the inauguration of the externals of political democracy as we have it in the United States. Furthermore, the rulers would be more inclined to risk the loss of aid if the reforms demanded would endanger their jobs. After the other reforms have been well established, it will be time to press for these political reforms. Gradualism can be perverted into do-nothingism, but if it is conducted under constant pressure and forced to make constant progress it is the best kind of reform. Revolution should be the last resort of the oppressed. (When you speak of the "externals of political democracy", I assume you are referring to free elections, freedom of press, speech and assembly, and universal adult suffrage. I flatly deny that other specific reforms are of more immediate importance. Free, regular elections, in which every adult citizen is qualified to cast an equal ballot, represent the only guarantee of the integrity of reforms. In a nation ruled by a dictator or an elite minority, reforms may be withdrawn as suddenly and as capriciously as they are instituted. Once a situation has been established where the officials are directly responsible to the citizenry, however, reforms which benefit the populace are almost impossible to abolish.)

In spite of my agreement that unconditional support of right-wing regimes is undesirable, I am glad we went into the Dominican Republic. Most of the rebels may have been non-Communist, but many of Castro's troops were also non-Communist. I think the danger of another Cuba was great enough to justify our actions. This, of course, does not mean that we need support the junta. It seems that we may be approaching the best possible solution under the circumstances; not the dominance of either faction and not a coalition of the leaders of both factions, but a center government which will explicitly exclude the leaders of both factions.

The summary of the current world conflict which you offered to George Price is, at best, incomplete. The conflict is between a group of nations which wish to subjugate the rest of the world and impose their ideology on it and another coalition of nations which do not want to be subjugated. (That is essentially accurate, but, merely as a description of the countries involved, my "summary" is considerably more accurate than George's group of "democratic and civilized" nations.)

Columnist Sydney J. Harris once observed that with all of the do-badders in the world we need a few do-gooders to offset them.

Eric Blake: I'm all in favor of restricting the franchise to those of any race who are capable of making an intelligent choice. Think of all the white Southerners we will disenfranchise. In fact, I suspect a pretty good case could be made that membership in the Ku Klux Klan, the White Citizens Council, or any similar organization should be considered prima facie evidence that the individual has not achieved the required "level of culture". (When you begin to limit the franchise to individuals capable of making an intelligent choice, it is difficult to

know where to stop. To paraphrase somebody whose name I suspect I ought to remember, "The only people with the knowledge and wisdom to make an intelligent choice are you and me, and I'm not so sure about you."))

Speaking of what Negroes are really like, have you seen the newspaper and television coverage of the Hell's Angels motorcycle club, the motorcycle rioters at Laconia, and the Fourth of July rioters across the country? Judging from the pictures of individuals and groups, these hoodlums are predominantly, if not entirely, white.

-----  
"The entire life of socialist society is based on the principle of broad democracy. Working people take an active part, through the Soviets, trade unions, and other mass organizations, in managing the affairs of the state and in solving problems of economic and cultural advancement. Socialist democracy includes both political freedoms--freedom of speech, of the press and of assembly, the right to elect and to be elected, and also social rights--the right to work, to rest and leisure, to free education and free medical services, to material security in old age and in case of illness and disability; equality of citizens of all races and nationalities; equal rights for women and men in all spheres of political, economic and cultural activity. Socialist democracy, unlike bourgeois democracy, does not merely proclaim the rights of the people, but guarantees that they are really implemented. Soviet society ensures the real liberty of the individual. The highest manifestation of this liberty is man's emancipation from exploitation, which is what primarily constitutes genuine social justice." --Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.  
-----

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

I find much with which to disagree in Kipple, but the cover of the 81st issue is quite enjoyable. The "beatnik" element is quite as conformist as the people they criticize as "conformists". They have chosen to conform to a different viewpoint, but they conform to it with even more vigor.

Your Mr. Pressman seems to approach his work with a vigor worthy of a better cause than legalized gambling. A poet whose works I read out of curiosity because he bears the same family name as myself, and came to like for their own sake, once wrote to the effect that,

"The whore and gambler by  
the state  
Licensed, weave that nation's  
fate."

I decidedly cannot agree with your statement that "Communism prospers in the underdeveloped nations to the extent that the Communists manage to identify themselves with the legitimate aspirations of the masses of the people." Leaving aside for the moment the question of what the "legitimate aspirations of the masses of the people" ought to be, I think that this remark indicates a misunderstanding of the true nature of Communism. If it were true, one would expect to find thriving communist movements in the poorer districts of the large cities and no communists in wealthy families. Quite the contrary seems to be the case. The South, the poorest part of this country, is also the most strongly anti-communistic. Communism flourishes in America, not in the slums and share-croppers' cabins, but on the campuses of our wealthiest universities, attended by young men and women of good family. Communism is not a consequence of poverty, but a subversive movement spread by commu-

nists. (It is difficult to believe that even the most zealous follower of Barry Goldwater could possess such an awesome talent for over-simplification, so I prefer to believe that you are engaging in the venerable debating trick of deliberately misinterpreting my statements in order to distract attention from the main issues. The fact that "Communism prospers in the underdeveloped nations to the extent that the Communists manage to identify themselves with the legitimate aspirations of the masses of the people" does not, of course, mean that there are "no communists in wealthy families"; it merely means that, under conditions of extreme poverty and social injustice, the philosophy of communism can appeal to large numbers of people because its spokesmen appear to stand for what every individual desires: freedom, dignity and a full belly. None of this applies to industrialized and politically sophisticated nations such as the United States, so your observation on the anti-Communist sentiments of the relatively impoverished South does not constitute a refutation of my assertion. It might be worthwhile to point out, however, in this context, that Communism as a political force reached its high-water mark in this country during an economic depression. Then there is your rather strange assertion that "Communism flourishes in America...on the campuses of our wealthiest universities," which indicates to me that your definition of "Communism" is considerably more inclusive than the conventional one. If Communism is really "flourishing" anywhere in this country, it should come as a pleasant surprise to Gus Hall and other leaders of the CPUSA. Finally, your statement that "Communism is not a consequence of poverty, but a subversive movement spread by communists" is a truly remarkable over-simplification. One might assert with equal justification that typhoid is not a consequence of polluted water, but a debilitating disease spread by carriers. The latter statement is not actually untrue; it is merely insufficient.)

The "Left Democrats" whom you claim are the best defense against communism are in fact heavily infiltrated by communists. President Betancourt of Venezuela is a Moscow-trained communist, and as President Johnson announced lately, the "Left Democrats" among the Dominican rebels include over fifty communists.

Alma Hill has introduced an element of sanity into the "civil rights" agitation by pointing out that people prefer to congregate with others of the same cultural background. Why doesn't the federal government consider this right to be worth protecting? (Something ought to be said, I think, about the concept of "freedom of association", touched upon in this paragraph. Certainly the freedom to associate or not to associate is a legitimate right, but the concept has been grossly perverted by champions of the segregationist viewpoint. It would be intolerable in a free society (except in such extraordinary circumstances as are found within the armed forces or in prisons) for individuals to be compelled by law to associate with other individuals whom they considered "objectionable" in some manner; as a matter of fact, no such state or Federal legislation exists, nor is any proposed. When the racist protests that his "freedom of association" is being curtailed, he is actually objecting to the fact that civil rights legislation compels him to limit his associations with Negroes in exactly the same manner as he limits his associations with whites. This is the essence of "equality under the law". It is a situation designed for those of us who prefer to choose our associates on an individual basis, but it does not preclude bigotry; it merely cancels the special privileges which the bigot had been accorded on account of his racist sentiments. Prior to the passage of comprehensive "open accommodations" legislation, Negroes had labored under a special disadvantage; the law removed that disadvantage. The law did not, however, attempt to compel prejudiced whites to associate with Negroes. There is no statute, for example, decreeing that Eric Blake

must eat in a restaurant with a Negro. The law states that you cannot avoid this by excluding him from the restaurant. It does not prevent you from leaving the premises, if the presence of a black face in the crowd spoils your dinner. You may ask, why should you be forced to suffer this inconvenience? Actually, you suffer such inconvenience constantly in choosing your associates, but you probably don't notice it unless the person you are attempting to avoid is a Negro. When you ride on a bus, you carefully select a seat, avoiding, if possible, those persons on the vehicle who are obviously inebriated, ill or unwashed; you may also, depending upon your temperament, endeavor to avoid teenagers, matronly ladies; women chewing gum, children or senior citizens. In every case, however, you assert your right to associate as you please by controlling your own actions, not by passing a law prohibiting certain types of people from riding on the busses or confining them to a certain section of the vehicle. Precisely the same thing applies to every other aspect of life, including housing. If a Negro family moves into your block, it is your privilege, as a bigot, to move elsewhere; it is not your privilege to compel them to move.))

I would dispute with Derek Nelson Senator Dirksen's right to be called a "conservative". The Senator is a man of generally sound economic views, and I applaud his fight to retain some of the states' rights to run their own affairs, but his support of the "civil rights" law seriously impairs his title to the name "conservative". Senators Goldwater and Tower fought the good fight to the end against this arrogation of federal power, and will certainly be vindicated in time as the reaction against forced integration grows. ((I agree with you perfectly in regard to Senator Dirksen's questionable right to be considered a "conservative". Derek Nelson and George Price may quibble and split hairs until doomsday in an effort to reconcile their high principles with their political philosophy, but we know what true conservatives stand for, don't we, Eric?))

-----  
"Egypt, as one of the world's first civilizations, provides an illustration for all civilizations. Rich in some things, poor in others, its economy and social order labored to stay in balance. Civilization was and is a hot coal that needed to be juggled to keep a people's hands from burning." --Walter A. Fairservis, Jr., in "The Ancient Kingdoms of the Nile".  
-----

WALKER LANE :: 511 AVENUE "A" :: DENTON, TEXAS, 76201

George Price, in opposing the liberal standpoint in Kipple #82, says: "The basic crime of the Communists is that they seek to forcibly impose their socio-economic religion upon others; this would be scarcely less evil if only the traditional methods of military conquest were employed." Presumably, it would also be reprehensible even if traditional methods of military conquest were not employed. I would like to remind Mr. Price that most liberals, and certainly the so-called New Left, censure and sometimes excoriate our own government for just that sort of activity: Our socio-economic religion, that of the old-time rampant capitalists, who are best able to express themselves of time-honored maxims of undoubted integrity and careless application, is forcibly imposed upon "underdeveloped" countries by industrial zealots seeking big profits; and they are sometimes aided by the CIA or even a few Marines. Mr. Price can, of course, read careful expositions of such positions elsewhere; my only purpose is to suggest that, in the context of the discussion, such a statement does not contribute to a clarification of issues, but muddies the water still more.

do more harm to segregation than all the civil rights laws Congress could pass in a decade. MacDougall would have been fascinated by the mind of Murphy... Some of my more Liberal friends ask me why, since I profess to be in favor of integration, I don't take part in civil rights activities. Well; it's cowardice of a sort. Confronted with an animal like Matt Murphy, I don't think I could resist shooting him, and I don't want to go to the chair, most especially not for such a worthless scut.

Roy Tackett finds it hard to believe that I am serious in my admittedly radical economic proposals. It is testimony to how far gone we are into neo-mercantilist balderdash that proposals based on classical economics should appear radical. This is, as Mr. Tackett reminds us, 1965, not 1765. Why, then, does he defend the sort of government interventionism which was rampant in 1765, under the name of Mercantilism, and whose destruction opened the way to the Industrial Revolution?

Mr. Tackett says I have apparently "never talked to anyone who did any farming during the first third of this century...(when) farmers were mortgaged up to the eyeballs and the return on a crop seldom met the cost of raising it and getting it to market." This being the case, it is obvious that most of the farmers went broke and we all starved to death. Seriously, during the first third of this century my grandparents on both sides were farming successfully (as were the great majority of their neighbors); their opinions on farm subsidies cannot be repeated in a family publication like Kipple.

Granted that a minority of farmers could not make a go of it, one wonders why they persisted in farming instead of moving to the cities where the jobs were. We seem to have this sentimental notion that

(; ; ; ; ;)  
( ¯ ¯ )  
( U )  
(( = )) "Recently, when I was in Nigeria, I visited the world-famous National Zoological Gardens, which possesses many rare specimens, including the Tiparillo, a ferocious carnivorae. While observing this creature pace about its enclosure, I had a most unsettling experience."

"A well-dressed native couple were standing a few paces from me. Suddenly, to my horror, the man calmly picked up the woman and threw her into the animal pit. As I watched, the Tiparillo devoured her, clothes and all." ( ; ; ; ; ; )  
( ¯ ¯ )  
( U )  
(( = ))

(; ; ; ; ;)  
( ¯ ¯ )  
( U )  
(( = )) "The man, meanwhile, leaned against the railing and observed these grisly proceedings in a totally disinterested manner. Naturally, after recovering from the shock, I began to scream for the police to arrest him."

"He was quite calm as they led him away, seeming not to realize that he had done anything objectionable, and I later learned that his case became the focus for a complex constitutional controversy. He may escape punishment." ( ; ; ; ; ; )  
( ¯ ¯ )  
( U )  
(( = ))

(; ; ; ; ;)  
( ¯ ¯ )  
( U )  
(( = )) "The Nigerian courts will now decide the intriguing legal question: Should a gentleman offer a Tiparillo a lady?"

farmers are a special breed, the backbone of the nation, etc., and they must be maintained on their farms whether it is economic or not. I say farming is a business like any other, and there is no reason on earth why the submarginal producers should be encouraged to stay in business. If the subsidies were removed and a free market restored in agriculture (gradually, of course), we would expect that the number of farmers would decline and so would crop production. Prices would rise until a balance was reached where the remaining farmers could make a sufficient profit on the amount of food actually demanded by the consumers.

Mr. Tackett wonders what would keep businesses going without subsidies. Specifically, he says that the transportation industry could not keep going without subsidies. Well, it is a dead certainty that it would be radically changed. There might, at a guess, be more railroads and fewer airlines. Would this be bad?

Let us remember that subsidies do not create any business. They merely re-arrange the total production, by taking from one industry and giving to another. Since the pattern of production in a free market economy represents what the consumers most want, as evidenced by their willingness to pay, it follows that the re-arrangement by subsidy cannot but form a less desired pattern. In fact, subsidies not only re-arrange production into a less than optimum pattern, they actually reduce the total production by the expense of administering the subsidy. Government subsidies and controls are essentially undemocratic: the verdict of the consumer is rejected, and in its place is substituted the supposedly superior wisdom of the planners and controllers.

The supposed need for subsidies in the shipping industry is at partly the result of other stupid government policies. For example, the maritime unions are allowed to hamper the introduction of automated equipment which would allow American builders and operators to compete with foreign concerns. E.g., the "Savannah" strike. And of course it is possible that in an unhampered market all commercial shipping would gravitate into the hands of, say, Japan. Apart from considerations of national pride, would this be a bad thing? It is said that we have to maintain a sizable American merchant marine in case of war. Very well then, to be honest we should pay for these ships out of the military budget and let them be formally part of the Navy, leasing them to commercial operators in peacetime.

Mr. Tackett's comments on my proposal to restore the Gold Standard only show that he doesn't know what the Gold Standard is. He elegantly demonstrates that the total of gold in the world is only a small fraction of the value of currency outstanding. This is perfectly true, and was also true during the Victorian era when the Gold Standard flourished. Has anyone said that the Gold Standard means that paper money would be abolished? The Gold Standard means (1) that everyone can buy, own and sell gold to the limit of his desire and his purse, and (2) that the Government will redeem its paper money in gold for anyone who demands it. Since paper is far more convenient than gold for most transactions, the Government will not have to redeem any large proportion of its paper, and therefore the Government's stock of gold need be only a fraction of its outstanding paper, in the normal course of things. In the abnormal course of things, it is possible to have a "run", when a great many citizens demand gold for their paper. But this doesn't happen unless the government has been pursuing policies which cause the people to fear for the value of their paper money. The most common such policy is inflation, i.e., the expansion of the supply of paper money (and credit), with a consequent dilution of its purchasing power. The principal value of the Gold Standard is that it discourages governments from inflating their paper. And of course, this is precisely why demagogic politicians hate the Gold Standard: it hinders them from robbing

The same sort of remark can be made of the next paragraph of Mr. Price's letter, from which I quote: "If we, in our zeal to defend ourselves against Communism, should ever reach the point of denying other societies the right to exist, simply because they are different, then we too should be done away with." I suspect that the New Lifter would agree with this, fearing that our national demise would be so justified today. They feel that this is what we have done often, through both economic and military means. Most of them do not view "Communism" as a uniform world conspiracy, but merely, taken as a socialistic form of management, as one possible and legitimate alternative to capitalism. It seems quite conceivable to these liberals that nationalization of resources is a handy way for other peoples to regain control of their economy (which in many cases has slipped into U.S. hands in the process of being "developed"), whereas continued endorsement of capitalism by these peoples might require honoring the contracts with U.S. firms which were foully negotiated when the other country was in a poor bargaining position, or else very naive.

Mr. Price's remarks on the FSM are similarly distressing. He insists that the "punks" (who hardly fit the traditional description, being well-educated, industrious and civic-minded "punks") had no legitimate business in Sproul Hall "once the authorities told them to leave". My question is: Were not the "authorities" really supposed to be public servants, and were they not wishing to ignore and deny the petitions of the segment of the public most immediately affected by their service? Further, can it be supposed that the "authorities" (on what?) were required to use violence? What damage to property or persons were they preventing by their violence? Again, you say that the "authorities" were required "to use violence in order to exercise their legitimate rights". I submit that public service consists of fulfilling responsibility more than it does of exercising rights. Finally, you say that it is "of the essence of democracy that when democratic methods won't get us what we want, we should subside and accept the fact, not resort to riotous behavior." That notion precludes the acceptance of change, does it not? It suggests that demonstrations (remember the vandalism of the Boston Tea Party) are not democratic; it suggests that demonstrations are riotous one and all, regardless of how well-behaved the participants may be; and it suggests that if there is not majority approval right at the start, it's a bad idea and should be dropped. That latter is a nice idea to sell to the opposition, no matter what side you're on! The single word, "subside"; is particularly frightening: if one chooses to "subside" or submit, one surrenders his individual being, doesn't he? That is a rare enough interpretation of democracy.

-----  
"My interest is in the future because I am going to spend the rest of my life there." --Charles Franklin Kettering.  
-----

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

You say my hostility toward Mario Savio and the FSM is "remarkable". "One would think," you comment, "from your vehement denunciation and name-calling...that they were guilty of murder, rape and mayhem." You are coming close to the mark, because if the methods of the FSM become accepted, we will be well on the way to anarchy and a general breakdown of the social structure, and you will get murder, rape and mayhem in vast plenty. The dangerous essence of these demonstrations is that they are a refusal to accept the limitations of the democratic process. If you can't get what you want by the normal modes of peaceful persuasion, they seem to be saying, why then you raise unholy hell un-

til the majority gives in just to have peace. There is no place in an orderly and democratic society for these infantile temper tantrums. Ironically; if Savio and his epigones do break down the structure of law and order, they themselves are likely to be among the first to suffer. The "New Left" is numerically small; if anarchy and mob action become commonplace, they are rather more likely to be on the receiving end. (Whenever an interest group, in order to publicize grievances, undertakes the sort of direct action which tends to disturb public order, an inevitable reaction develops: conservatives begin to shriek about a collapse of law and order, a "general breakdown of the social structure". This is such an impressively serious accusation that its very gravity tends to obscure the fact that nothing of the sort is occurring. But it is an extremely effective argument to utilize when it is no longer advisable to candidly oppose the specific goals of whatever group happens to be under attack. Pro-slavery interests condemned the abolitionists for contributing to a breakdown of law and order after it was no longer respectable to condemn them for opposing slavery; the suffragettes were excoriated for "lawlessness" after the justice of their cause became so widely acknowledged that it was unpopular to dispute it; after opposition to union activity, as such, became unfashionable, business interests began to prattle about "law and order"; today, when it is no longer respectable to oppose integration, conservatives rant against "violence in the streets"--a neatly respectable phrase, the meaning of which is perfectly clear to every redneck. The argument which you are using against the New Left is, in short, historically the last recourse of scoundrels. Incidentally, it might be worthwhile to repeat something mentioned above by Walker Lane. The Boston Tea Party, a dramatic act of vandalism recognized today as one of the proudest moments in American history, was a considerably more extreme protest action than the sit-in at Sproul Hall. Would you have argued against it if you had been a member of the Sons of Liberty at the time?)

"The same individuals who so roundly condemn Mario Savio," you say, "...place themselves on record as advocating that we 'forgive and forget' in the case of the Nazi war criminals." What individuals are these? (William F. Buckley, Jr., is the principal offender.) For myself, I feel only regret that West Germany has abandoned the death penalty--a course urged upon them by our Liberals--and has a statute of limitations on the Nazi atrocities. Just out of curiosity, how many of you who vehemently oppose the death penalty are willing to extend your mercy to include the Nazi murderers and torturers? To be sure, I do not believe that we should treat West Germany as a pariah nation, but that is not forgiveness, it is only a recognition that guilt can apply only to individuals. And I disapprove of the Nuernberg War Crimes Trials because they prostituted the principles of the law in order to take revenge upon the losers. Most of the guilty Nazi officials could and should have been tried and executed under the civil laws of Germany and the other countries where they committed their crimes. (My opposition to capital punishment is unqualified (I opposed the execution of Eichmann), and certainly it is true that guilt can apply only to individuals. What I object to is the tendency of many conservatives to take the position that "Hitler wasn't so bad; he just went overboard." In this context, I recall Senator Goldwater's fantastic statement to the German press during the campaign to the effect that Germany had invented the modern concept of "peace through strength". Nazi Germany was compelled to surrender in such a way as to deprive it of dignity; let us not, at this late date, restore dignity to the Nazis by treating them as honorable opponents whom we defeated and can now embrace in friendship.)

The obscene diatribe of Matt Murphy (at the Liuzzo murder trial) deserves the widest possible distribution across the nation. That would

the people by an inflationary dilution of the money supply.

Gold has a number of advantages as a medium of exchange. It is durable, easily recognizable and hard to counterfeit, and most important, its value is not dependent on government fiat. An excellent discussion of the Gold Standard, for laymen, can be found in "What You Should Know About Inflation", by Henry Hazlitt.

Now, just for the sake of argument, let me accept Mr. Tackett's assumption that there isn't enough gold in the world to serve as money. Very well, I won't insist that paper money be redeemable in gold. Now can you, Roy (or anybody else), tell me why it should be a crime for me to own gold? Why shouldn't I be allowed to buy it on the open market the same as I can buy iron, lead or tin?

-----  
"There is less risk in being discredited when trying the impossible than when trying the possible." --Eric Hoffer, in "The True Believer".  
-----

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

In an hour or two I hope to see the first pictures of Mars taken from the Mariner. Reason, science and commentators have made it clear that these pictures won't show more than the sketchiest geographical features. It is inconceivable that even features that looked artificial would be accepted by science as the work of intelligent life. And yet this is a delicious moment of suspense. I really think that the space program gives something more to live for. It seems so final somehow to think of dying without knowledge of just what is on the nearest planets in the solar system, and it is increasingly apparent that I have a chance to find out such things about Mars and Venus, at least, if I'm fortunate enough to escape an incurable disease and take care of myself for the next couple of decades. So I look forward to more nights like this, in the belief that each future night of suspense will bring something more specific to our knowledge, and in the hope that one of these nights will produce undoubted evidence that we aren't alone in the solar system.

You show more concern for the criminal than that gentleman justifies, in your notes on L. Sprague de Camp's letter. While it is true that every individual is unique in a sense, there are so terribly many of these unique individuals that mortal men must make decisions about which of them deserve priority in their attention. I believe that the person who commits crimes forfeits some of the dignity and respect to which he would normally be entitled. The cost of keeping a man in prison has become enormous. Wouldn't it be better to force convicts to live a more primitive, duller sort of life, and spend the money saved in this manner on college scholarships for kids from the lower classes who have not turned to crime? I believe that the best punishment for crime would consist of hard work on the dullest type of projects. Lots of crime that isn't the result of impulse comes from the criminal's desire to get things the easy way, without working for them, and if this sort of life backfired on him, we might have less crime. I am definitely on Sprague's side, when it comes to chopping off the heads of burglars caught in the house. Unfortunately, I have nothing at 423 Summit Avenue suitable for this procedure, and if I should run across a burglar in the house, I'd have to do the next best thing: throw things at him in the hope that I'd smash in his skull.

I have never sampled a glass of water in Gary, Indiana. But I know the history of the private companies that have supplied water to various small communities in this part of Maryland and adjoining Penn-

sylvania. Their fate almost always consists of forced taking-over by municipal authorities after they fail to maintain purity standards that satisfy the health authorities. I also know that the will of the public is not to be trusted in matters involving water and sanitary facilities. If referenda were to govern matters, it would be almost impossible to have first-rate water and sewerage systems anywhere. This county is having a dreadful time overcoming the legal barriers thrown up by various citizens' groups to public water and sewerage systems in rapidly growing suburban areas. The people scream that it is bureaucracy, invasion of private rights, and much worse things, when it is simple recognition on the part of authorities that it isn't safe to have people drinking well water that is known to contain coliform bacteria and to use private sewage disposal measures where six or eight thousand people live within a few square miles.

You don't make it clear in your jeremiad on the Vietnam war if you think the government hypocrisy is typical or special. That is, do you believe that the United States is adopting attitudes that are strikingly more two-faced than this nation or any major nation pursues in any time of international tension? (Well, no, I suppose not...)

Maybe I'm becoming more of an old fogey than the most conservative of your correspondents. But I don't feel that college campuses--and high school campuses, yet!--are the most appropriate places for exhibiting political consciousness. College students are bumming off someone, either parents or society as a whole, and they might be wiser to put off until after graduation their demonstrations about how they feel about the world. Attitudes toward politics, life, authority and similar topics can change quite rapidly after the person in question gets out of the artificial world of the school and becomes responsible for his own livelihood and perhaps has other people dependent on him. Most of us go through one period of rebellion against authority at the age of three or four, when we do exactly the opposite of what our elders tell us. We get out of that rut within a year or two. Some of us fall back into it again during the final years of school and snap out of it for the second time when we get into the working and marrying world. It might be instructive to note that the rebellion periods normally arrive during the final stages of a certain type of dependency combined with freedom, as if we resented the changes that are just ahead and were trying to show in advance that we won't conform.

FROM:

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

printed matter only

return requested

may be opened for inspection

made in japan



DELIVER TO:

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