

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.

JOTTINGS from the editors desk

"I can imagine that the fishing village of Phat Diem, connected to the sea by small canals, is considered a naval station, even if it does lie about 12 miles inland: it was bombed 57 times, including on a Sunday, during which raid the church of Saint Francis Xavier was destroyed, killing 72 worshippers (Phat Diem is 80 percent Catholic; 5 of its 15 churches have been ruined). I cannot understand the bombing of Vinh Yen, an agricultural center of 10,000 some 65 miles northwest of Hanoi. There, a couple of weeks before I arrived, US planes had dropped ten mother bombs carrying 300 fragmentation 'guava' bombs, each with some 300 tiny pellets. Such pellets destroy no houses, dent no steel. They only break glass, puncture pots and pierce skin. I covered that town inside out. I rode in each direction for at least two kilometers; there was absolutely nothing that could be misinterpreted as a military target--just mud huts, a few trees, paddies and water buffaloes. The railroad to Yunan is far off and the nearest railroad yard is a little over 18 miles away (which, well defended by anti-aircraft batteries, had never been hit). Why was Vinh Yen struck? The raid was disastrous. I saw pellets everywhere (and brought home one unexploded 'guava'). There were pellets embedded in walls, in trees, in telegraph poles--and in hundreds of kids. One had been hit by a pellet in one temple; it exited through the other, blowing out both his eyeballs. Because the pellets come in on a spin and keep right on boring, many get lost inside the body." --John Gerassi (former editor of Time and Newsweek), in New Republic, March 4, 1967.

I am a war criminal. Citizens of Germany after World War II could, unless they had directly participated in the Nazi atrocities, claim innocence, but we who live under a democratically elected government have no such excuse: Each American citizen, regardless of his political views, is 1/200,000,000th responsible for every Vietnamese child who has his eyeballs blown out by an American bomb. Moreover, I, as a supporter of President Johnson in 1964, am 1/42,000,000th responsible for

every action of this Administration. Oh, I try to cop out by believing that Goldwater would have been worse, but that doesn't change the fundamental truth: the man in the White House ordering the murder is Lyndon Johnson, and I helped to put him there. So I am a war criminal. My war crime consists in having believed the campaign statements of Lyndon Baines Johnson. There is some consolation--but not much--in the knowledge that, in the unlikely event that I should have to face trial for this war crime, I will at least have a lot of company in the prisoner's dock. Those few who have fled to Canada or gone willingly to prison rather than cooperate with the war machine will be spared, and certainly the spirit of Norman Morrison will be excluded from the roster of criminals (though there remains the lingering suspicion that his was more than anything else an act of escape); but practically everybody else in this country will be there. Somehow, though, there isn't much comfort in that realization.

"WHAT IS A CONSTITUTIONAL CONSERVATIVE?" Nchoklhk had asked me, his antennae vibrating in anticipation of the reply. I should explain that Nchoklhk (or "Joe", as I call him, being unable to pronounce his name) is a graduate student from the second planet of the star Aldebaran, here on a four-month study of Ter-ran political institutions with particular attention to the government of the United States. His presence as my house guest has, as you might imagine, caused considerable concern, polarizing the neighborhood into two opposing camps. The conservatives send me anonymous letters asking "Would you want your sister to marry an alien?" (which is vastly amusing to Joe, who considers all earth people sickeningly ugly and has not succeeded in two months in distinguishing males from females); the liberals go blocks out of their way to drop by, shake Joe's tentacle and assure him that some of their best friends have five eyes. Anyway, as I started to say, this visiting scholar had asked me what a "constitutional conservative" was, and I was attempting to explain it to him.

"Yes, yes, I think I understand now, Teddy. At first, I thought they were something like the religious fundamentalists of my world--you know, people who would consider automobiles infernal machines because they weren't mentioned in your Constitution."

"No, they're nothing like that," I assured him. "Constitutional conservatives are people who believe that the Constitution is the very foundation of our society and must be preserved and upheld in every detail."

"A commendable view, to be sure. This George Price person you've told me about--he's one of them, isn't he?"

"Yes. George, for example, is opposed to religious ceremonies in public schools, but is equally opposed to the Supreme Court decision which eliminated the ceremonies."

"I have difficulty grasping that," Joe admitted. "My people, you see, are thoroughly pragmatic. If I felt a certain practice at home was wrong, I'd be happy to see any government institution abolish it. I can't imagine objecting to the elimination of a practice I opposed because it was accomplished by a court order rather than a legislative decree."

"George, you see, is a man of principle rather than a pragmatist like you. The principle--that everything must be accomplished in accordance with the strictest interpretation of the Constitution--is more important to him than his personal opinion concerning prayer in schools."

Joe nodded what passed for his head thoughtfully. "Yes, a man of principle indeed. Remarkable. Truly remarkable. This George Price person, then, must be one of those courageous young men you've told me about who have gone to prison in protest against military conscription,

since your Constitution explicitly forbids 'involuntary servitude'."

"Well, no," I admitted, "actually he isn't. I don't recall George ever advocating abolition of conscription. And I'm sure he never went to prison protesting it; in fact, he served in the armed forces during the Korean conflict."

"But how can this be?" Joe asked in astonishment. He stroked his anterior pseudopod reflectively, then said, doubtfully, "Perhaps in my ignorance of your world I chose the wrong example. But this Price person must certainly be one of those protesting your nation's involvement in Vietnam, since your Constitution quite plainly requires a Congressional declaration before war may be levied."

"No, he isn't," I muttered, my embarrassment for a fellow human becoming more acute. "As a matter of fact, George is an outspoken Hawk, advocating expansion of the war. Oh, he's mentioned on several occasions that it might be a good idea to secure a Congressional declaration to make the war legitimate, but he seems to consider this a minor detail."

Joe's antennae drooped abjectly, and he stared in bewilderment. "Let me see if I understand this. When a practice which he opposes anyway is banned by a court interpreting the law differently than courts have in the past instead of by amending the Constitution, he looks upon this as a serious breach of legality; yet he considers it a minor detail when the nation expends twenty-two billion dollars and thousands of lives every year in prosecuting a war halfway around the world without bothering to declare war as the Constitution prescribes. Is that what you're telling me?"

I cast my eyes down to the floor, unable to meet his piercing gaze. "Yes, Joe, that's right..."

He shook what passed for his head in exasperation, mumbling profanity in his native language. Then, after a long pause, his face perceptibly brightened. "Ah, I think I see," he began hopefully. "This Price person is an escapee from one of your mental asylums, and you're using him as an example just to try to confuse me and test my knowledge of your people. Right?"

"Wrong," I replied. "Constitutional conservatives don't have a monopoly on inconsistency. I'm afraid we're all like that, Joe."

The momentary brightness faded from his countenance. "By the public hairs of the Seven Great Deities," he exclaimed vehemently, "you're impossible! If my thesis succeeds in making any sense out of your race, I'll be awarded the Glunph Prize three years in succession."

GEORGE ROMNEY AND THE 1968 ELECTION: Polls taken among rank-and-file Republicans during the past couple of months have generally placed Michigan Governor George Romney at the top of the list of favored nominees to carry the GOP banner against President Johnson in 1968. Other opinion polls which show Romney presently capable of defeating the President may provide additional impetus to his (unofficial but vigorous) campaign for the nomination. Of course, the rank-and-file party members do not always have the decisive voice in selecting the nominee, as was demonstrated in 1964 (when practically every sampling of opinion showed that most Republican voters preferred another candidate--almost any other candidate--to Barry Goldwater). The party delegates and local committeemen, who do have the decisive voice, generally tend to be more conservative than the average Republican-on-the-street, and probably lean more toward Richard Nixon as their favored nominee. However, these party professionals, except during years (like 1964) when they are seized by suicidal tendencies, do give some consideration to popular feelings, and good showings in a few primaries would probably swing many of them into the Romney camp. Certainly George Romney must be considered the leading contender at this time.

Although of course it is always possible for an individual to rise to the demands and challenges of the office after he moves into the White House, it is my belief, tentatively at least, that George Romney would not be a particularly good President. He appears to be a capable administrator, but one who lacks both the extensive knowledge and the flair for new concepts necessary to formulate effective policy at the Presidential level. Moreover, his humorless self-righteousness is already virtually a political trademark, inspiring witty remarks by political opponents and defensive protests on the part of Romney acolytes. One Michigan Democrat was quoted as saying, "George hasn't decided whether or not to seek the Presidency; he's awaiting word from God." Another favorite barb is: "Romney intends to use the Presidency as a stepping stone..." But Governor Romney is, in any case, a candidate of the Establishment or what C. Wright Mills calls the Power Elite--as Barry Goldwater was not--so his election would not threaten any fundamental departures in either foreign or domestic policy. He might, as I suspect, be a second-rate Chief Executive, but at least he wouldn't be likely to incinerate the Northern Hemisphere in a moment of pique. Because he is a representative of the Establishment, I would applaud his nomination; it would signal the return of the Republican Party to the control of the so-called "Eastern Liberal Establishment". Depending upon the positions he develops on specific issues, I might even vote for him in preference to pulling a lever for four more years of Uncle Cornpone.

Supposing he is nominated, what kind of chance would Governor Romney have to defeat President Johnson? Specific predictions are out of the question at this early date, of course, but it is at least reasonable to envision a fairly close contest (it would have to be closer than 1964, in any event), and one waged on minor domestic and major foreign policy issues. The domestic issues would tend to be minor (in real importance, if not perhaps in the emphasis placed upon them during political speeches) because Romney is a more or less "liberal" Republican whose record in office and stated philosophy indicate no fundamental disagreement with the Administration on such matters as civil rights, health and welfare legislation, economic policy, urban problems and so on, ad infinitum. No doubt the Governor could find dozens of nits to pick on questions of detail, but on basic principles he and Lyndon Johnson are Tweedledee and Tweedledum as regards domestic policy.

The assumption that there would be major foreign policy issues debated in any Johnson/Romney struggle is predicated in part upon this very closeness with respect to domestic matters. A successful campaign against an incumbent President must raise large and important issues. The Republicans could successfully conduct a mid-term congressional campaign by concentrating on predominantly local issues and depending upon the discontent with respect to national issues to bring them votes without necessitating their taking definite positions on those national questions, but that strategy will not be sufficient to win in 1968. Presidential candidates are expected to discuss national issues. Where there is no outstanding divergence between the candidates on matters of domestic policy, then the non-incumbent must strike hard on issues of foreign policy. This course should be particularly inviting in the present circumstances, since foreign affairs is President Johnson's chief area of ignorance and hence his principal weakness. (Of course, foreign affairs is also Governor Romney's chief area of ignorance, but presumably his hard-working and dedicated staff will correct this deficiency by prefabricating a couple of dozen viable and consistent "positions" for their candidate to offer the voters.)

There are numerous areas of foreign policy that could be exploited by the Republican nominee, but the dominant foreign policy issue,

barring some unforeseen miracle, will be the war in Vietnam. I doubt that Governor Romney will commit himself to any particular stance with respect to the conflict, at least until the end of the year, but eventually he will be compelled to choose between three main alternatives: general support of the present policy with minor variations, pursuit of a hard line, or advocacy of a soft line.

The first would not appear to be especially promising. Assuming that the war is as important an issue in November, 1968, as it is at the present time, it is likely that some millions of voters will be swayed by the candidates' respective positions on this issue alone. If there is no substantive distinction between those positions, the people to whom it is of prime importance will either vote along party lines or stay home altogether--neither of which offers much encouragement to the minority Republicans. Besides, while the GOP candidate is grinning and bearing the accusations of "me-tooism" as regards domestic affairs, I don't believe that he can afford to be susceptible to similar criticism with respect to the overriding foreign policy issue of the campaign.

Pursuing the path of Hawkishness, replete with demagogic appeals to chauvinism, ultimatums and old-fashioned missile-rattling, might appeal to any Republican candidate, and certainly Romney is not above attempting to ride into office on the crest of a jingoistic reaction. There are, however, a couple of disadvantages which a GOP candidate would confront in advocating further escalation. First of all, as I have observed before, the President always retains the option of escalating the conflict during the campaign if his opponent's demands appear to be finding substantial support with the general public. Suppose, for example, that Governor Romney should travel about the country during the campaign calling for the bombing of Hanoi. Then, in October, the President could undercut his opposition by actually doing the deed, and compound the Republicans' dilemma by having his Secretary of State and other officials explain that the bombing operation had been in the planning stages for months and was nearly jeopardized by the opposition candidate's loud advocacy of the move. The GOP candidate would look pretty silly; and Johnson is precisely the cunning, accomplished politician who would deliberately invite his opponent to stumble into such a booby trap and afterward exploit the situation to the fullest. But there is an even more important reason why Romney (or, for that matter, any reasonably "moderate" Republican candidate) might eschew the temptation of pursuing a harder line on Vietnam than the Administration. That reason is the probable third party candidacy of George Wallace. Wallace, in addition to promoting racial segregation, will also emerge as a spokesman for a jingoistic foreign policy. While he is not a serious threat to become President, this "outside agitator" from Alabama will certainly hurt the Republican candidate by siphoning off conservative votes. He may receive as many as four million votes outside the South, and in the nature of things most of these voters would tend to be extreme Hawks.

Thus, with the ultra-escalationist vote going to Wallace and the middle-of-the-road largely monopolized by Johnson, Governor Romney might find it worthwhile to take a position on Vietnam somewhat to the left of the Administration, and thereby attract the anti-war vote. One reason that this idea would be appealing to him is that he wouldn't have to alter his "moderate" image to receive most of the Dove vote; these voters have no place else to go. Should he decide to stake out a Dove-like position, he would not go so far as to advocate unilateral withdrawal or anything of the sort. The very best that could be expected is that he would hint at an unconditional stoppage of the bombing of North Vietnam, and even in this he would be cautious. But there are "safe" positions that Romney could embrace to place himself in moderate opposition to the Administration's Southeast Asia policies. He could, for ex-

ample, suggest that President Johnson's wholesale commitment of combat forces, which represented a qualitative change from the Eisenhower and Kennedy policies, was an unfortunate move--a good many Americans would agree with that--without actually advocating de-escalation of that commitment now. He could stress the fact that Johnson's actions after the 1964 election betrayed his campaign promises, a charge for which there exists plenty of documentation. He could urge that the US not stumble blindly into another similar conflict in Thailand, as the country does indeed appear to be doing. He might even advocate direct negotiations with the National Front for Liberation. These relatively minor public positions would probably draw millions of liberal independents and Democrats into the Romney camp. Personally, I believe this is exactly what George Romney (or any other moderate Republican) will do, and all other things being equal it just might put him in the White House in 1969.

THE NEW ERA BOOK STORE on Park Avenue was the politically-oriented book store to which I referred in Kipple #119, noting Chay Borsella's letter-to-the-editor protesting an attack on the store by hoodlums identifying themselves as Knights of the Ku Klux Klan. As it developed, the incident commented on by Chay was only the beginning of the shop's difficulties. Subsequently, red paint was splattered on the owner's automobile and at least one attempt made to burn down the New Era Book Store. Then, to add insult to injury, owner Robert Lee was ordered by his landlord to vacate the premises by the ides of April. It seems that the fire had frightened fellow tenants in the building, who were understandably uneasy about sleeping nights upstairs from a book store which had suddenly become a fire hazard. Those tenants had complained to the owner of the building, and he took firm and prompt action to safeguard their lives (the fact that his insurance company threatened to cancel the policy on his building may have contributed to the firmness and promptness of his action, too).

The Baltimore Sun commented on this unfortunate affair in one of the articulate, pithy editorials for which it is justly famous. The Sun, I should perhaps explain, is an old-style liberal newspaper like the New York Times, whose liberalism is not so much a matter of left-wing orientation as of intelligent, informed, sophisticated journalism. The Sun views bookburners, bigots and political banshees with a magnificent aristocratic contempt. For example, during the 1966 gubernatorial campaign, the paper's attitude toward "backlash" candidate George P. Mahoney resembled that of a wealthy matron who discovers a dog turd on her carpet. Anyway, here is the Sun's commentary on the difficulties of the New Era Book Store:

"The bookstore in the 400 block of Park Ave. is reputed to carry left-wing and civil-rights literature. The persons who have attacked the store on successive occasions with a brick, red paint and lighted gasoline are presumed to be right-wing racists. But the political tags are of no matter. The situation would be an odious one if the bookstore were right-wing and the attackers left-wing. What matters is that a bookstore in Baltimore has been subjected repeatedly to hoolumesque harassment and has lost its insurance and received an eviction notice."

"Despite appearances, surely it is not a matter of public indifference in Baltimore that a bookstore may be hounded out of existence. A city can claim for itself a world's championship in baseball and have a shiny new

set of downtown towers and have expressways coiled in concrete symbols of technical progress, but if it is a place where a bookstore can be driven out by terror tactics, it is not a big-league city or a cosmopolitan city or a progressive center of culture and enlightenment. A city in which a bookstore is forced to yield to know-nothing book burners is a mean place, a frightened and frightening place, and it easily could happen to Baltimore while good citizens are busily looking the other way."

THE BASEBALL SEASON is upon us once again, and barring crippling injuries to key players the Baltimore Orioles appear likely (extremely likely, I'd say) to win their second consecutive American League pennant. The team has basically the same personnel it had in 1966 (you can't knock a winning combination), with several promising additions. The outfield is probably the best in the league, with Frank Robinson in right, Paul Blair and Russ Snyder platooning in center, and Curt Blefary (possibly backed up by the International League's "Super Jew", Mike Epstein) in left. Blefary is the only name on that list likely to bat under .300 for the year. Then there's the infield, certainly the finest in the major leagues and conceivably one of the greatest in modern baseball history. Brooks Robinson, at third, is merely the greatest third baseman since Pie Traynor (you young whippersnappers ask your grandfathers who he was). Louie Aparicio, at 33, is still the best defensive shortstop I've ever seen, and second year man Davey Johnson has the potential to become one of the great second basemen ever to have played the game. Then there's John "Boog" Powell, the hulking first baseman, who can hit a baseball as hard as any man alive. In addition, he is, despite his excessive bulk, a damn fine defensive ballplayer. Catching chores will be shared by Andy Etchebarren, the "Battling Basque", who hits for a low average but has a positive genius for getting the key hit in a ball game, and Larry Haney, possibly an even better defensive catcher than Etchebarren. (Left-fielder Blefary can also catch.) Pitching? Well, yes, we have some, though Oriole pitching is something of a running joke locally. The Birds are supposed to have poor pitching this year (they were supposed to have poor pitching last year, too, as a matter of fact), and local fans are given to tongue-in-cheek lamentations on this point. Actually, we have got pitching like Kellogg's has got cornflakes: five regular starters (Dave McNally, Jim Palmer, Wally Bunker, Steve Barber and Tom Phoebus), four spot starters to fill-in in the event of arm trouble among the regulars (John Miller, Frank Bertaina, Gene Brabender and Eddie Watt), three relief specialists (Moe Drabowski, Stu Miller and Eddie Fisher), plus minor league phenoms available for emergencies (Tom Fisher, Paul Guilford, Ed Barnowski and others). That's depth, baby. If those arms remain reasonably healthy, the Orioles should win the pennant even more handily than they did last year.

ON "ACCIDENTAL" KILLING OF CIVILIANS: Bob Vardeman's indignant denial that the United States is "willfully and knowingly murdering South Vietnamese" villagers deserves a more detailed response than I was able to provide in the letter section of Kipple #118. The degree to which the murder of civilians is "willful" and "knowing" largely depends, as I pointed out, on semantic interpretation. It is doubtful if any American officer plans an operation with the idea in mind of consciously and deliberately killing non-combatants. But having said this, it remains true that a great many civilians are killed or wounded during the course of US military operations in South

Vietnam, and in many cases it is difficult to avoid labelling these murders willful. The best that can be said is that the murder of civilians is not the direct intent of the planners. Of course, much the same could be said of the slaughter which would doubtless ensue if a metropolitan police force were to initiate air strikes in slum areas in order to reduce crime and violence. If they cannot be accused of attempting to kill non-combatants, at least they cannot be accused of trying very hard not to.

There are three different categories of incidents in which the "accidental" deaths of civilians occur. First of all, there are the instances in which US planes crash in inhabited areas. Several times entire villages have been obliterated in this fashion. It is true, of course, that these accidents would not be occurring were it not for the United States military presence in South Vietnam (the same planes might then be crashing into inhabited areas like El Segundo, California, or Passaic, New Jersey). But these incidents, I think, may be classified as "accidents" in the truest sense of the word; in them, there is no intent to do any damage whatever.

It is another matter entirely, however, when villages are "accidentally" destroyed by artillery barrages or air strikes. A good example of this was the recent incident in which the Montagnard village of Lang Vei was fifty-percent destroyed by two US Phantom jets. This was an "accident" in the sense that the pilots were not specifically ordered and, I am willing to believe, not specifically attempting to obliterate Lang Vei (a pro-government village, after all). But clearly this sort of thing is not quite the same as a plane crash; the village was hit repeatedly by rockets and machinegun fire. These miscalculations (Lang Vei was far from the first and won't be the last) occur because the jets are so fast that pilots, far from achieving pinpoint accuracy, usually have very little idea what they're actually hitting. The F⁴ and F⁴C Phantoms are particularly prone to this sort of thing, since they are uniquely unsuitable for attacking ground targets. (The F⁴ was designed to be--and is--this country's finest operational fighter, and flies at such speeds that the pilot can't even see a ground target. Even over North Vietnam, the Phantoms are not employed to bomb stationary targets; rather, they fly escort for slower fighter-bombers and deal with any hostile aircraft. It was a couple of F⁴C's that shot down seven MIGs in the Great Air Battle of January 5, 1967.) The real significance of Lang Vei was ignored by most people commenting on the tragedy. The real tragedy is not that the wrong target was hit, but rather that these futuristic planes, with their incredible armament, sophisticated instruments and capacity for indiscriminate destruction, are being used against an enemy which even troops on the ground cannot readily distinguish from the rest of the peasants. If, instead of a pro-government village, Lang Vei had been a settlement outside the control of the government, the bombing would not have been considered a tragedy; the hundred-odd men, women and children who were killed in the raid would merely have been added to the weekly "body count" and called "Viet Cong casualties".

And this, of course, brings us to the third type of "accidental" killing of civilians. If an army patrol or a spotter plane is fired on by snipers hiding in a village, the usual response is to call in air support. The village is "softened" by bombing, strafing and napalming until it is safe for ground troops to move in and finish the job (like by burning whatever houses are left standing). Again, it is not the specific intent of the action to kill civilians; the officers who request the air strikes would certainly tell you--and, heaven help us, they would be sincere--that their purpose is to kill the Viet Cong snipers and even, in doing so, to "protect" the people of the village. But it would require some fancy footwork to evade the conclusion that drop-

ping napalm and fragmentation bombs on such a village is anything less than willful murder.

As to the air attacks on North Vietnam, here there is no doubt whatever that civilians are being "willfully and knowingly murdered". I direct your attention to the passage by John Gerassi quoted earlier. "Guavas" don't damage factories or oil storage areas or bridges or missile sites or anti-aircraft batteries or railroad tracks; they tear only soft things, like human flesh. The only purpose for dropping them on villages is to kill the villagers. This is barbaric; it exceeds for brutality anything the US did during World War II. In destroying such cities as Dresden and Nagasaki, there was at least the argument that military and industrial targets were being put out of commission, and that the civilians killed were incidental. But here we are employing sophisticated weapons which specifically do not damage military or industrial facilities, but concentrate solely on people. Think about that, Mr. Vardeman, as you lay in bed tonight.

THE CASE OF THE CARLYSLE CAPER: (Synopsis: Renwood Falquon III, World's Greatest Jewel Thief, has been enlisted in a daring plan to steal the crown jewels of Upper Volta. With his accomplices--Lord Leslie Trenchfoot, Linda Luscious, Freddy Nkakamwakam, Dr. Bertram Bedsore, Sister Mary Theresa and former Captain Niles Needleman of the USAF--Falquon has boarded a ship for the first leg of the trip to Ougadougou. An unfortunate accident--the seasick former Captain Needleman leaning over the rail of the first class deck and throwing up on several sunbathers on the second class deck--has resulted in an attractive young woman inviting Falquon to her cabin at 10:00 that evening, an invitation which he, of course, is eager to accept.)

Promptly at 10:00, Renwood Falquon III, World's Greatest Jewel Thief, rapped jauntily on the door of cabin number 203, and just as promptly a charming and musical female voice asked, "Who is it?"

"It is I," Renwood announced, "your dashing young Prince Charming with the pith helmet." She opened the door, a stunning brunette in an evening dress cut to the navel, grasped Falquon's hand warmly and drew him into the cabin. He clicked his heels smartly and bowed from the waist (it being very difficult to bow from the armpits). "I am Count Stanislaus Polanski, eighteenth in line to the throne of the Kingdom of Bohemia." He kissed her hand urbanely, only slightly lacerating his lip on the diamond ring she wore.

"My name is Connie Lingus," she said graciously. "May I offer you something to drink, Count Polanski?"

"Call me Slaus; all my friends do." Falquon moved across the cabin to the portable bar. "Allow me to fix us drinks, my dear. I prepare a specialty called the Brighton Strangler: lime juice, skotch, rye, a little vodka, a dash of pepper and a raw duck egg."

"Sounds fine," Connie said. "The raw duck eggs are over there." She pointed to a portable ice box in the corner.

The drinks were downed to the company of pleasant chatter, in the course of which Renwood's eagle eye inspected the cabin and made some typically brilliant deductions about its occupant. At the precise moment when he had concluded that Connie Lingus was nothing more than a sex-starved tourist who had been dazzled by his masculine charm, she said, with an undertone of hardness in her voice, "All right, Mr. Falquon, we've had our fun. Now suppose you tell me what you and your companions are going to Africa for."

Although surprised by this turn of events, Renwood Falquon III's superb composure did not desert him for a moment. He smiled broadly and advanced toward the girl in a calm but nonetheless menacing manner. "You are in no position to ask questions, particularly not when you end

your sentences with prepositions. Who are you and how did you know my name?"

She stepped back lightly and uttered a single word: "Mound!" At first, Falquon thought she was offering him a candy bar, but then the door to the adjoining cabin opened and a giant trudged ponderously into the room. There was no doubt about it, Renwood mused as his lightning mind began to weigh alternatives; this was Mound. The name was appropriate. He was nearly seven feet tall and must have weighed over three hundred pounds. His arms swung menacingly at his sides as he approached the greatest jewel thief. On his left arm was a tattooed heart and the words, "Cory Seidman--Sweetheart of MITSFS".

Falquon was galvanized into action. He immediately crouched into Karate Position Number Nine. "Yaaaaaaagh!" He gave his famous karate yell, stepping gracefully toward the hulking monster and smashing the side of his hand into the huge man's chest. "Eeeeyaaagh!" he screamed again, this time in agony, as the pain paralyzed his hand and shot up his arm. As he cradled his damaged hand in the other and attempted to massage some feeling back into it, Mound casually grabbed him under the armpits, lifted him off the floor and began knocking his head against the ceiling. Renwood Falquon III, World's Greatest Jewel Thief, passed out.

When he regained consciousness, Renwood was lying on the bed in his own cabin, and the faces of Lord Trenchfoot, Linda Luscious and Freddy Nkakamwakam were hovering concernedly over him. Dr. Bedsore was visible in the background, removing implements from his medical bag and laying them on a card table. "What happened?" Falquon inquired, still somewhat groggy.

Freddy, cradling his teddybear tenderly in his arms, explained. "Linda and I were walking around the deck, and we happened to be passing the girl's cabin when we heard your famous karate yell and knew there was a fight going on. Then we heard your opponent's scream of pain--"

"That was my scream of pain," Falquon corrected glumly.

"Yes. Well, we thought it was the other fellow's, so we assumed that you had things well in hand and we were waiting for you to come out. But then we heard what sounded like somebody's head being banged against the ceiling, followed by strange voices, so we decided we'd better come on in. The door was unlocked. When we burst in, the two of them had you on the bed, searching you. The girl ran out the other door and told her large friend to take care of us, and he started toward us. Linda had trouble getting her automatic out of her brassiere holster, as usual, but the big slob was so fascinated watching her fish for it that I managed to get behind him and clobber him with an ashtray. Then we brought you here."

As Freddy spoke, Falquon was watching Dr. Bedsore curiously. The doctor had ignored their conversation and was busily lining up surgical instruments on the table, whistling happily as he worked. "What are you going to do, Doc?" Renwood asked.

Dr. Bedsore chortled contentedly. "I'm going to operate. There may be brain damage."

"Like hell you are!" Falquon screamed, leaping out of bed. "I'm all right. Really." To prove it, he went into a vigorous Irish jig, keeping the rhythm by clacking his teeth. There was a tear in Bedsore's eye. "Blast it! And it was going to be such fun to operate again..." He threw the implements back into his bag and departed in a huff.

"Gee," Falquon commented as the door slammed. "I'm sorry I disappointed him, but I'm really all right..."

"Forget it," Lord Trenchfoot advised. "He'll brood a while, but he'll get over it by morning." The portly lord turned to face Falquon. "Now then, Freddy and Linda burst into the cabin when your young lady

and her oversized companion were searching you. Did they take anything from you?"

Renwood Falquon III began to check his pockets, taking inventory. "Let's see... Cigarettes, matches, lewd pinochle cards, lockpicks, address book, skeleton keys, money clip, laundry ticket, kazoo, packet of watermelon seeds, Imperial Japanese Navy discharge, asfetida bag... No, I've got everything. Wait a minute!" he gasped, staring in disbelief at his left hand. "The bastards! The dirty bastards! They stole my Little Orphan Annie Code Ring!"

"Is that serious?" Linda asked dubiously.

"Serious? Why, do you know what was in the secret compartment?"

Linda shook her head slowly, impressed by Falquon's sudden display of emotion. "No, what was it?" The others crowded around to hear the answer.

(To Be Continued)

THE PUBLIC OPINION SURVEY taken in South Vietnam to which CBS news devoted thirty minutes on March 21st probably requires some sort of comment, even though it is improbable that a group of people as intelligent as the readership of Kipple would even for a moment take it seriously. The results given and conclusions offered are invalid in the first place because the poll was conducted by an agency of the Saigon government--hardly a disinterested party. No independent observers were present to monitor the honesty of the 1500 interviews, or for that matter to vouch for the assertion that interviews actually took place (the "results", down to the minutest percentage point, could as easily have been created in Saigon). The sole "evidence" for the honesty of the survey is internal: some of the results are mildly critical of the US and the Saigon government. But of course it is an old trick of propagandists to "salt the mine", as it were, with accurate and/or slightly self-critical ideas so as to make the main points more credible. The fact that the results on some of the minor questions displayed something less than unanimous enthusiasm for the US and the Ky government lent the "ring of authenticity" to the survey--even to an experienced newsman like Charles Collingwood--and hence made more acceptable some remarkable results on major questions.

It is possible, of course, that the interviews were scrupulously honest and the tabulations exact; the poll remains of dubious value. The people interviewed came from the five largest cities in South Vietnam (where most of the pro-government Vietnamese reside) and the 55 most "secure" of the thousands of hamlets in the country. Obviously, the results of such a survey, even if honest, are not representative. One could, I suspect, uncover some very interesting results in the United States by taking a political poll in the five largest Eastern cities and the 55 most liberal legislative districts in the nation, but the findings would hardly represent "US opinion". Although sufficient in itself to invalidate the survey, this was not the only selective factor operating to slant the results. Having selected the most pro-government areas, there would necessarily be a further selection of people within these areas. I suspect that, in Vietnam as in the United States, not everybody would be willing to answer the pollster's questions. This would be especially true in South Vietnam, where voicing the "wrong" opinion is likely to lead to imprisonment. So the people most likely to cooperate with the survey would be precisely those who are most enthusiastically pro-government. In addition, there is yet another selective factor to consider: the willingness of the interviewee to answer truthfully. I mean, after all, who's going to be crazy enough to admit to being pro-Viet Cong to a government agent?

Perhaps these factors, rather than any actual dishonesty in the tabulation of results, account for some of the extraordinary responses. For example, of the 1500 Vietnamese interviewed, not one said that he or she would be better off under the Liberation Front than under the Saigon government. (Extrapolating from this sampling to form a national picture, as pollsters do, we find: nobody supports the Viet Cong; therefore, there is no Viet Cong; therefore, 50,000+ US casualties in the past five years are an hallucination.) George Price may accept this result, if nobody else does, but I'll bet that even George would choke on this one: only 13% of the interviewees said that they thought the Saigon government should change anything it's doing. To appreciate the extraordinary nature of this result, I recommend going out on the nearest corner and polling your fellow Americans on this question. It will be a cold day in August before you find an individual who doesn't believe the government should do anything differently. Practically everybody--American, Swedish, Congolese, Brazilian, Chinese, French, Russian, you name it--wants their government to change something. Yet we are invited to believe that 87% of the Vietnamese believe the Ky regime is perfect and shouldn't do anything differently.

SHORT NOTES ON LONG SUBJECTS: A lot of Kipple's younger readers seem to have gotten into trouble in their schools lately. Sutton Breiding got suspended for letting his hair grow, Nick Allen got his magazine censored, and now Tom Draheim is in hot water. It is cheering to learn that Tom is not quite as conservative, wholesome and temperate as his letter elsewhere in this issue might indicate. Tom has left the school paper since the "hair controversy" at Roosevelt High, and he is now in a bit of trouble with the authorities for posting flyers (including a reprint of Sutton's Speaking Unabashedly #3) on the walls. +++ Speaking before the Tennessee legislature on March 15th, President Johnson asserted: "We have never deliberately bombed cities nor attacked any target with the purpose of inflicting civilian casualties." What was particularly saddening was not the statement, but the fact that of all the people on the floor and in the gallery--who certainly knew better--not one had the courage to stand up and say, "Mr. President, you are a liar." +++ In the first couple of months after El Supremo took power, I began to really appreciate (alas!, too late) the Presidency of John F. Kennedy. Then after while I began to appreciate Eisenhower's two terms. Right now I'm in the process of appreciating Calvin Coolidge, and no doubt if Johnson wins a second term I'll eventually find something good to say about George V. +++ For Harry Warner, who doesn't believe she exists, and others who have wondered What Chay Borsella Is Really Like, I offer the following thumbnail sketch: She is a sexy, statuesque blond, somewhat resembling Jane Fonda, rather aloof and extremely sophisticated, and a trifle less of a political conservative than she sounds in print. Chay may have something to add to this description, but I think it tells you enough to compare with your mental picture of Chay-the-letter-writer. +++ "Washington, Sept. 26 (AP)--The State Department denied today that last night's nuclear bombing of sixteen Chinese cities represented a change in American policy or an escalation of the war." +++ As John Boardman noted in his column this issue, although anti-Communists miss no opportunity to identify Communists with sexual "immorality", the fact is that Communists are basically puritans and run their countries in a manner which Anthony Comstock would have approved. Of course, the degree to which the official puritanism effectively governs the society seems to depend upon the people. The Russians, who have always been stuffy and prudish, and the Chinese, who have never been accused of being a people dedicated to carnality, accept the puritanical ideas of the party theorists fairly easily. (Some

wit once remarked that the worst criticism of Mao Tse-tung's government is that it totally wiped out sin in China...) On the other hand, the Cubans, at least, if my information is accurate, have remained pretty much the same people they were before the Revolution, as far as sex is concerned. +++ In #118, I erroneously stated that a two-thirds majority was required to pass bills in the House of Representatives. Red of face and wearing an idiotic (if endearing) grin, I hastily corrected the error in the next issue. Meanwhile, letters and cards were coming in on #118, and amazingly nobody caught the slight (!) error. That makes me feel better; stupidity, no less than misery, loves company. +++ The Old Testament, Book of Joel, comments on American forces in Vietnam: "A fire devoureth before them, and behind them a flame burneth: the land is the Garden of Eden before them, and behind them a desolate wilderness; yea, and nothing shall escape them." +++ The latest issue of Graffiti (\$2/6 issues, 88 Bleecker St., New York, N.Y., 10012) contains Martin Wank's article on the post-Kennedy era, a guide to witch-hunting by Sam Elkin, Dan Haber's commentary on the Defense Department's "Pocket Guide to Vietnam", and thirty pages of other interesting material. But the best thing about Graffiti is still its interlineations. Like: "God is alive--he just doesn't want to get involved", "Chastity is its own punishment", "Use contraceptives--take the worry out of being close", and "Where's Lee Harvey Oswald now that we need him?" +++ I'm a failure insofar as music appreciation is concerned. I can't listen to the William Tell Overture without thinking of the Lone Ranger and I can't watch Charlotte Moorman without thinking of sex. +++ The Seattle Group Bulletins #34, 35 & 36 (1815 18th Ave., Seattle, Wash., 98122--free, but it wouldn't hurt to send some money to cover postage) are at hand. #34 consists of a long and extremely interesting essay on the origins of the female's subordination in human society. #35 discusses immigration to Canada to avoid the draft and a book by Joel Carmichael which portrays Jesus of Nazareth as sort of the Eugene V. Debs of the Roman Empire. #36 presents some radical thoughts on that gloomy science, economics. +++ The classified section of the Berkeley Barb is a place "of wonders many and spectacles rare"; as somebody once said. In addition to the usual ads for sex partners, etc., the March 10th issue contains a few inserts in various ancient languages apparently designed to give philologists something to do on a rainy afternoon. There are three lines of Egyptian hieroglyphs which would probably turn out to be a dirty joke about Ronald Reagan if I could decipher them; three cartouches of Indus Valley hieroglyphs which are untranslatable (not merely untranslatable by me, but untranslatable period; the Mohenjo Daro writing has never been deciphered); a set of three Egyptian hieroglyphs which even I recognize as the name of Pharaoh Tutmosis; and a pair of Mayan glyphs. You won't see many ads like those in the New York Times. +++ Speaking of the Barb, incidentally, a correspondent named Ward Fulcher, writing in the New Republic, notes that he found Barbara Garson (author of "MacBird") "as subtle and mature as a journalistic member of the underground--the Berkeley Barb". He didn't intend it as a compliment, and it would probably blow his mind to learn that both the Barb and Mrs. Garson would probably interpret it as a compliment. +++ Hey, Dr. Boardman, would you believe that our favorite Nixon Republican, Betty Kujawa, is one of us peaceniks? Too burdened by personal difficulties (like, deaths in the family) to write at length, she nevertheless takes time to note: "Like so many I too would like to see us pack up and leave Vietnam. The only thing we seem to be doing there now is helping to knock off a lot of human lives--which is not exactly my idea of a way to whittle down the over-population of our earth..." +++ Smokey the Bear has an anxiety complex!

--Ted Pauls

MATTER

IN

Just as the CIA is digging out from under the accusations that it helped finance and direct the activities of the National Student Association, various related youth groups and several unions (including the Newspaper Guild!), yet another charge is being piled on it. If current disclosures coming out of New Orleans are supported by the evidence, the CIA can be charged with indirect complicity in the assassination of President Kennedy.

This is not to endorse the far-fetched conspiracy theories put forward by some people that the CIA plotted the assassination. This spy agency had quite another plot in mind. It seems that, after the failure of its Bay of Pigs invasion, the CIA decided to work against Cuba in a less open manner, by assassinating Fidel Castro. Or so James Garrison, the district attorney of New Orleans, believes.

This plot illustrates the naive and fumbling approach which we have come to recognize as characteristic of CIA operations. Governments and their policies are not the deeds of one man, or a handful of men; they are expressions of social forces operating in their countries. Had Adolf Hitler been assassinated in 1930, minor details about the Nazi movement would have changed, but the future course of German and world history would not have been fundamentally altered. Only a wave of resistance from the democratic left could have kept Hitler out of power, and owing to basic contradictions within the Social Democratic Party this resistance never materialized.

Similarly, the assassination of Fidel Castro might have made small changes in the course of Cuban history, but it could not have reversed it. It will take more than the death of one man to restore Batista, or an equally pliable man, to the Cuban leadership.

Still, the plot was set in motion. And, inevitably, the Cuban government became aware of it. Instead of openly publishing his proofs, Castro seems to have fallen to the same delusion as the CIA, and arranged for an assassination plot against President Kennedy. It seems that the FBI became aware of this plot through interrogation of a Cuban assassination team in New York, and warned President Kennedy and the Secret Service. But one team, purportedly composed of Oswald and the people whom Garrison has been investigating in New Orleans, escaped their notice.

-oOo-

The other activities of the CIA could bear investigation, too. A couple of years ago, three Cuban emigres in New York City fired a bazooka shell across the East River into the United Nations. Had their aim been better, several deaths would have resulted, with serious international consequences for the United States. When the case was investigated, police found that one of the Cubans was a CIA agent.

-oOo-

What is the value of human life? This ethical question has troubled men for centuries, and is still with us, as the loud debate over liberalization of the New York abortion laws shows. But the German Federal Republic has the answer. Recently three Germans who had been in charge of administering Nazi racial laws in the occupied Netherlands were sentenced for deporting thousands of Dutch Jews and other "unde-

motion

—BY JOHN BOARDMAN

sirables" to extermination camps. The ringleader got a sentence which worked out to one hour and thirty-five minutes for each of his victims.

-oOo-

Thanks to Bertram Wolfe, author of "Strange Communists I Have Known"; the curious career of Grigori Bessedovsky has at last been made public, in the last chapter of that book. Bessedovsky held a minor position in the Soviet diplomatic service during the 1920's, but then defected and wrote "Revelations of a Soviet Diplomat" in 1931.

What Bessedovsky did in the next twenty years is obscure, or at least not commented on by Wolfe. But in 1952, the year after the death of former Foreign Minister Maxim Litvinov, Bessedovsky was hawking in Paris a manuscript purporting to be Litvinov's secret diary. This work, he said, had been given by Litvinov to the remarkable Aleksandra Kollontai, then Soviet ambassador to Sweden. Mme. Kollontai allegedly passed it on to a Stockholm resident whom Bessedovsky refused to name, who gave it to a Russian businessman in Paris. This Russian, also anonymous, passed it on to Bessedovsky.

In fact, this elaborate transmission belt is a total lie. Wolfe shows convincingly that Bessedovsky wrote the "Litvinov diary" himself, and cites parallel passages between it and Bessedovsky's own "revelations" of 1931. The style and content of the "diary", to an old Soviet hand like Wolfe, immediately show themselves as completely alien to Litvinov.

Mme. Kollontai's name was probably worked into this fabrication because she has always exerted a fascination on anti-Communists of a sensationalist turn of mind. An early associate of Lenin's, she was a remarkably uninhibited woman sexually. And she was no hypocrite. To her we owe the "drink of water" theory of sex, that sex is a bodily need just as is water, and that sexual intercourse should be subject to no more restrictions than a drink of water, as satisfying a mere physical need.

It is a pet belief of anti-Communists that Communism is a complete negation of all human standards of moral conduct, and that therefore Communists engage freely in wild sex orgies. This was being bruited about during the Russian Revolution, usually in the guise that Russian women were held "in common". And it cropped up in the "Congressional Record" as recently as 1965, when after the Selma-to-Montgomery march an Alabama Republican told lurid tales about sexual promiscuity and Communist involvement during the march. In fact, both the Soviet Union and China have installed very puritanical moral standards by American criteria.

Mme. Kollontai still looms large in the forebodings of American anti-Communists. Just a few months ago, the conservative fortnightly The Councilor gave a brief, lurid review of her career and intimated that she is actually still alive. Naturally; if it were admitted that Mme. Kollontai is dead and her sex theories completely alien to modern Soviet belief and practice, there would be less conservative opportunity for high moral indignation about "Soviet immorality".

Bessedovsky, it seems, did quite a business in anti-Soviet forgeries. At about the same time as he manufactured Litvinov's diary, he invented Budu Svanidze. Svanidze was allegedly a nephew of Josef Stalin. His memoirs, giving intimate personal glimpses of Stalin, were accepted

as genuine by Henry Luce, who serialized them in Life.

The Bessedovsky forgeries had the same goal as such earlier forgeries as the "Zinoviev letter" of 1924 and a series of Hearst revelations about Soviet conspiracies in Mexico from the same period. The aim of all these documents is to portray the Soviet Union as a ravening wolf at the door of Christian civilization, fomenting revolution while it speaks hypocritically of peace. In fact, the "Litvinov diaries" went further; they purported to show that Litvinov, born a Jew, used his influence to ease religious persecution against fellow Jews. Of such Jewish Communists as Litvinov, Yoffe and Soltz, Wolfe writes:

"Their Jewish origin tended to make them more rather than less hostile toward religious and anti-communist Jews. But such passages, in which all Jews in the communist camp are portrayed as holding with each other and with non- and anti-communist Jews against the party, are scattered through the diary."

Another famous anti-Communist forgery is a speech allegedly made by Dmitri Manuilsky at a training school for spies in Moscow in 1930. According to Manuilsky, proper Soviet policy will be to lull the West into complacency with a peace drive, then to smash them with an iron fist after their guard is down. This quotation, which appears frequently in Soviet literature whenever a détente with the Soviet Union appears imminent, has no credentials of legitimacy whatsoever. Since Manuilsky is of Jewish ancestry, and was for a while connected with the Soviet mission to the United Nations, it affords an opportunity of tying together Communism, the UN and Jews in one vast conspiratorial network.

This history of shameless forgery naturally raises questions about "The Penkovskiy Papers", which have recently been given wide circulation in the West. These papers purport to be the intimate diary of one Oleg Penkovsky, a high Soviet official executed a few years ago as an alleged American agent. Thus, like Litvinov, the source of this diary is dead; also like Litvinov, he ended his days in disgrace and thus his alleged words are given an air of authenticity in the West.

Lacking any direct corroboration of the authenticity of "The Penkovskiy Papers", we have to examine their internal evidence, as Wolfe has done with the "Litvinov diary". The result is not encouraging. "Penkovsky" tells a tale of international conspiracy which would do credit to the pages of American Opinion. Gullible or treacherous westerners feed information to Soviet agents who set fantastic plots in motion. This should definitely be taken with a grain of salt--or a dose of salts.

Finally, we come to the preposterous Col. Goleniewski. A couple of years ago, this alleged Polish intelligence officer defected to the United States and told a Congressional committee a long tale about the usual sinister international Communist conspiracy. Finding himself eagerly believed, he developed another act for his repertory. Now, he claims, he is actually Aleksei Nikolayevich Romanov, rightful Tsar of All the Russias! He has come forth with a fantastic story, "documented" in ads paid for by himself (or his anonymous backers) in the N.Y. Times. He claims that the whole imperial family was smuggled out of Siberia by a secretly loyal officer, and that his parents and sisters lived and died in widely scattered parts of the world. Lately, his ads have taken the form of querulous pleas to Senator Kennedy, claiming that someone in the Senator's office is intercepting his (Goleniewski's) letters and that, if Kennedy knew the facts, he would back his claims.

Perhaps it's just as well that Mao Tse-tung is keeping the last heir of the Chinese imperial family firmly under his thumb. One such claimant on the loose is quite enough.

--John Boardman

dissenting | LETTERS *opinions* | OF COMMENT

TOM DRAHEIM :: 2122 SECOND STREET :: WYANDOTTE, MICHIGAN, 48192

Give me a break, will ya? I'm a "minor", as John D. Berry put it; or, more aptly, "just a kid". I should be given freedom to roam the political and economic ideologies without undue criticism; you might stifle my learning processes.

My problem is selfishness--I put my own interests before those of others. But is that so bad? I'd like the government, both state and federal, to cut spending, especially welfare programs, because I'll be paying for them. If I were old, or a Negro, or poor (don't get the wrong idea--my dad is a factory worker and I don't know how we're going to pay for my higher education, but we will) then I'd fight for legislation that would benefit me, and I'm glad everyone does just that. But I think people can get out of trouble, and provide for themselves (somewhere in the past my ancestors did), without putting extra strain on me in the form of a "lifetime of taxes". If these people are to get an even start, as you suggested, the government could do better than to hand out money in such programs as the War (the one against poverty, not Vietnam). They are attempting to cover up the problem instead of eliminating it. Education of the young seems to be the only solution which could end our social problems in the foreseeable future. I am not opposed to paying my share to support programs which have the capability of benefitting everyone in the end, but I am against the present wholesale handouts.

Living within the same county as Dearborn, Michigan, I can assure you that, while the city may be "average", it certainly isn't conservative. Detroit is called the auto capital of the world, but that honor may really belong to Dearborn, for Dearborn is where the auto companies have their major factories and mills. Most of the labor for these plants comes from Dearborn. You can't call auto and steel workers "conservative".

While I'm being authoritative, I'll comment on the issue of long hair on school boys. In my high school (Theodore Roosevelt), a boy was suspended because he wouldn't get his hair cut. He claimed he needed it long to be a success in a local band, and his mother didn't want him to cut it (though he eventually did). The mother, with backing by the ACLU, took the school to court. The mother lost, he got his hair cut, and is now back in school.

An interesting sidelight to this is that the controversy came to involve freedom of the press. As a columnist for the school paper, I wrote an article giving my feelings on the case (this was prior to the court action). I originally took a liberal view. I defended his right to long hair with the ideas of relative freedom (do whatever you want as long as you don't interfere with the rights of others), private property rights, and common sense (persecution because of hair length is

ridiculous). Not a word of it could be printed, said the Administration. I wrote another, more "moderate" article: he had the right to long hair, but the Administration had the right to kick him out if it was in the interests of getting him an education (the idea that anyone has the right to go nude, but not down Main Street, is also involved). And, I said, people who believed that the educational standards might be lowered (the scaring away of teachers and whatnot) by the bad publicity had only themselves to blame for causing the uproar. I ended with: "Look at yourself before you judge others." (The principal of Theodore Roosevelt has a drinking problem...) The word came down from the Administration: none of it could be printed. I wasn't being "constructive", they said.

The case is over now and I side with the Administration, but not for their reasons. You expressed the idea of giving everybody an even start, a fair shake; I like that idea, too. But the boy with long hair isn't getting one: he is branded a trouble-maker (though unfairly), and given special treatment. If the school acts fairly, let them have power over students, let them give the child the best possible start and then, when the student has been given his education, give him his choice. After society has tried to give everyone a good start, then is the time to give kids (like me) their own way, and responsibilities.

"Track became something different for me in college. In high school I was fighting being broke and on relief, and each Saturday I'd go out and recharge my batteries, be a hero for another week. But in college I was fighting being Negro. That's not a temporary condition. It was a hell of a thing for me to be running good track in college and walk past a downtown restaurant and see a teammate in their eating a sandwich and drinking a malt with his girl. He'd look up and smile and wave at me through the plate-glass window. I'd wave back and I'd say to myself: 'Eat up good, 'cause tomorrow I'm going to crush you on the track.' But by the time tomorrow rolled around, I'd have swallowed the hurt down and I'd go out and show that guy how to shift his weight when he took the turn." --Dick Gregory, in "Nigger".

JOHN BOARDMAN :: 592 16th STREET :: BROOKLYN, NEW YORK, 11218

In criticizing Keynesian economics, George Price has made strong objections to accepting the gradual inflation to which he feels we are condemned by Keynes. This inflation is caused, he feels--and in this he is at least partly correct--, by the granting of demands for higher salaries by workingmen.

This is "the gloomy science" with a vengeance. Economics got this name a couple of centuries ago as the result of the efforts of various classical capitalist economists, who came to the conclusion that a class living in poverty was a built-in necessity of an economic system, required so that a free market could flourish. If this class were able to demand successfully that its living standards be raised, the argument went, productive capacity would go into satisfying their consumer demands instead of into capital formation; thus the growth of industry would be impossible or at best severely retarded. And the rise in their wages would inflate merely prices, not their living standard. This argument is still with us every time a major union wins a wage increase for its members. It is claimed that this increase will not improve the living standard of the people who get it, because an inevitable price increase will occur which will eat up the wage increase, leaving people with higher incomes no better off and those with fixed incomes worse off.

Price suggests that the way to meet this problem is simply to refuse to capitulate to the demands for a wage increase. This way, the

whole "wage-price spiral" need never be embarked upon, and the purchasing power of money will not diminish.

If you admit the "gloomy" view of economics, this argument is probably correct. But economics is not just a matter of balance sheets. The important thing is not whether laborers' wages are too low, but whether laborers believe them to be too low.

What happens if the full power of the state is invoked to back up a refusal to meet demands for higher wages? Eventually, as their living standards continue to remain below what they think desirable, the wage-earners will react against force with force. The result will be either a revolution or a rightist dictatorship whose purpose is to suppress a revolution. (For the latter situation, compare Austria in 1934-1938, or Spain today.) Inevitably, this development is accompanied by an inflation--sometimes a scrap-paper inflation such as took place in Russia after 1917. So, in practice, the choice is not between inflation and a stable value of money. It is between a moderate, regulable inflation, and the wild inflation which follows upon war and revolution. Price's horse may be a nice-looking animal, but he's just not in the running.

Your analogy between Washington's National Liberation Front and Ho's is a good one and one which I have heard used before by peace workers. You might go further and compare Pitt with Kennedy. Both men, while not straight-out supporters of the NLF, and more interested in their own political careers, took positions which questioned the actions of the colonial power. And both men had such oratorical talents and such popularity as to make the government extremely uneasy about having them in opposition. (And Pitt, like Kennedy, sprung from a family with politically dynastic characteristics.)

The odd behavior of liquid Helium-4 (Helium-3 acts more decently) is quite an involved topic in low-temperature physics. I'll do a "Matter in Motion" column on it someday in the near future. It'll require a little research, as it is quite far removed from my own field of interest.

Derek Nelson quotes Lincoln out of context when he asserts that Lincoln was trying to save the Union without regard to the slavery question. This was certainly true in 1861, when Lincoln sacked General Fremont because Fremont made his Missouri campaign an Abolitionist crusade. But three years later Lincoln was doing the same thing, having finally realized just what the rebellion was being fought about. ((Whenever I hear someone praising Lincoln as a conservative, I ask him if he is familiar with Lincoln's second inaugural speech, a remarkably subversive address which, in addition to blessing the "revolutionary right" of the people to overthrow the government, contains some thoughts on the right of a laborer to enjoy the product of his labor which are positively communistic. Then, of course, there was Congressman Lincoln's opposition to the Mexican War, which caused him to be reviled by the jingos of his day as Senator Morse and others are reviled today.))

I find one point on which I can agree with Derek, that "revolutionary forces...are committed to opposing the status quo, which is obviously the United States". And the United States--or at least its present leadership--reciprocates by supporting the status quo, for the purpose of which it has allied itself with governments ranging from democratic and socialist Norway all the way around the perimeter of the Communist bloc to the military dictatorship in South Korea. The only requisite a government needs for US support is that a living, breathing plenipotentiary be able to sign his name to an anti-Russian alliance.

By what tortuous arguments is Derek Nelson willing to accept Hungary as being in the Soviet orbit, and Guatemala in the US orbit, and yet try to keep Vietnam by force out of the Chinese orbit? If we are

fighting to keep China from having as much influence in Vietnam as the United States has in Guatemala, we are fighting against geography, history and the natural laws of power politics. It is costing the USSR a great deal to maintain a pro-Soviet Cuba on the doorstep of the United States, and if the present Cuban government had come to power as the result of a Soviet invasion rather than an indigenous revolution, it would have fallen years ago under the natural pressures of power politics. Apparently Derek's ideas of natural spheres of influence operate only when they suit the policies of the USA or the USSR--Chinese are not eligible.

Your reply to Derek reminds me of a story told about the US in Vietnam, the French in Algeria, and for all I know the British here 200 years ago. A field officer of the occupying army is asked, "Is the country around here loyal or rebel?" He replies, "Do you mean daytime or nighttime?"

Scott Duncan is apparently a traditionalist conservative like Eric Blake rather than a libertarian conservative like George Price. (As for Derek Nelson, what kind of conservative can he be called except "Tory"? Just to satisfy my curiosity, Derek, could your forefathers write "U.E." after their names?) A libertarian conservative would say that a sale is strictly a transfer of property between the two parties involved, and that the state has no business in the affair except maybe to collect any relevant taxes. For a libertarian conservative, the government is as wrong when it requires housing segregation as it is when it requires housing integration. But the overwhelming majority of conservatives in this country are traditionalist rather than libertarian, as I pointed out in my columns in #116 and #119. "I still want to uphold the quality of the home through the person to whom I sell it." This is a traditionalist conservative argument, which overrides the right to transfer property with what is regarded as a higher right, the right to preserve some valuable tradition. It represents a difference of opinion between an 18th Century Tory and an 18th Century Whig; in the 20th Century, the whole discussion has a sort of period charm to it.

This whole controversy between traditionalists and libertarians within the conservative movement can be turned to the amusement of non-conservatives. If you are ever in a discussion with a group of conservatives, raise one or more of the following questions: (1) Are zoning laws an infringement on property rights? (2) Should car owners be required by law to get periodic safety checks on their cars? (3) Should military conscription be abolished? (4) Should religion be taught in the public schools? (5) Should a white man be permitted to sell to a Negro a home in a white neighborhood? The libertarian conservative will, if consistent, answer these questions so as to indicate support of individual rights; he will not grant the existence of "community interest" with which these individual rights might conflict. Thus, he will answer these five questions: Yes, No, Yes, No, Yes. A traditionalist conservative regards himself as being situated in a continuous and continuing society, based on certain fundamentals which must be maintained. Therefore he will give the opposite answers, in general, so that these fundamentals may be passed along unimpaired. New Individualist Review and National Review are the principal representatives of these two schools of conservative thought.

In practice, however, American conservatism--and, in fact, almost every conservatism that has ever existed as a serious political movement--is traditionalist. The raw individualist, the William Rickenbacker or the Vivian Kellems, may excite admiration in the conservative ranks for resisting unwarranted encroachments of the government on individual freedom, but such a person never achieves a position of leadership in the conservative movement.

The list beneath the oak tree in Unterampfrach reminds me of the

"White Lists" turned up in Germany after the war. It seems that the Nazis maintained "Black Lists" and "White Lists" of every country they planned to invade. Men on the Black List were to be rounded up in a stated order of priority and imprisoned, to be disposed of later. Men on the White List were local collaborators who could be trusted to aid the invading forces.

The Black Lists were made public; I've seen a fascimile of the page of the British Black List which has Churchill's name on it. However, as I've heard the story, there were so many prominent names on the British and American White Lists that they were suppressed when discovered. Senator Gerald Nye was among the names on the American White List, I have been told.

Scott Duncan's letter in #117 is perilously close to voluntarism and antinomianism. Voluntarism is the most extreme form of subjective idealism; it deliberately downgrades reason and logic, and claims that there are no clear guides to action. It accuses analytic approaches to problems of "ignoring human nature" or "oversimplification". Antinomianism, originally a form of Christian thought, rejects "law" as a guiding force in human relations (or in the relationship of Man with God) in place of "grace"; the more emotional Protestant sects have always had an affinity with this sort of thing.

"I realize that under Johnson we may have to move back to the idea that politics is a lot of crap. And when it's played that way, it is a lot of crap. But Kennedy and Johnson have taught us all that politics is the only place it's at. All the rest is a game of impotent unimportance. Whether we like it or not, men in great positions--whether young or old--will determine the merest basics of our lives. And this is not to speak of the ultimate decision they can make--whether or not we live at all." --Martin Wank, in Graffiti.

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

I have never understood the great fuss over the presence of Vikings in the New World. Well, on second thought, I can understand it in the light of national pride on the part of the Italians and the stubbornness of the "no contact before Columbus" branch of historians and archaeologists. Colorado schools were teaching as fact some thirty years ago the visitations of the Norse to the New World about 1000 AD. Further recent studies and translations indicate that the existence of the Western Continent was known to most of the peoples of Northern Europe--the Scandinavians, Icelanders and even Eskimos. (Eskimo wanderings in the Arctic included the whole circumpolar area.)

The existence of America was not known--or suspected--by those Western Europeans from whom we derive our history: England, France, Germany, Spain and Italy were so concerned with their own petty struggles that they were in almost complete ignorance of everything outside their own sphere. It is completely reasonable to assume that Columbus became aware of the existence of the western continent during his visit to Iceland as a trader. Our conventional historical view, with its roots in Western Europe, is exceedingly narrow and omits much that was known in other parts of the world. (In addition to Leif Ericson and Columbus, there appears to be a third claimant for the honor of having discovered America. According to British historian Richard Deacon, a Welsh explorer named Madoc Ad Owain Gwynedd (pronounced Goo-in-eth, if my recollection of Welsh pronunciation is correct) entered Mobile Bay in 1170 AD. The Welsh legend about Madoc's wanderings appears to be confirmed by the fact that Indians in the region were using Welsh words and sentence

construction when first encountered by the post-Columbian arrivals.))

You state in #115 that, in a democracy, the government always presumably acts for the majority of the citizenry, which gives it the right to inconvenience some individuals, etc. Do you mean that the government acts on what it thinks will be of benefit to the majority or that it acts in accordance with the wishes of the majority? (Neither; I mean that in a democratic society the people are always presumed to approve of what the government does until proven otherwise.)) The government of the United States is acting on what it thinks is best for the majority of the people of the country, but I question that the government's actions are in accordance with the wishes of the majority. I certainly agree that nothing would ever get done if the consent of each individual was required before action was taken, but I do think that on major issues the people should be consulted--i.e., the decisions should be made on the basis of a popular referendum. Such items as the war in Vietnam, the draft, open housing, school imbalance, Grand Canyon dams, etc., should be submitted to the people for decision rather than to 535 members of Congress who cannot, by any means, be considered representatives of the people. While it can be argued that this would be an exceedingly cumbersome procedure, it seems that in this highly technological society of ours it should not be difficult to work out the details of it.

Such a procedure, however, will always be declared as too cumbersome and impractical inasmuch as direct referral to the people would have an upsetting effect on the nation's power structure.

Derek Nelson can believe that the Red Guards are akin to the Boy Scouts if he wants to, but if so there must be some peculiar Boy Scouts north of the border. I have yet to see any of our Boy Scouts march into a factory and throw out the general manager for being a deviationist.

I do not share your admiration of Robert Strange McNamara. I concede his brilliance and his tremendous administrative capacity. Considered strictly in the light of a man doing his job, McNamara is doing a magnificent job in his directing of the Department of Defense. But I thoroughly detest him. No personal animosity, of course; it's just that I thoroughly detest his entire class and everything it stands for. Also, as is to be expected, he speaks--as the Injun in the western movies says--with a forked tongue. Consider his statement on our objectives in the Indo-China war: "Our objective is limited to preserving for the South Vietnamese the right to shape their own destiny and choose general and political and economic institutions as an independent sovereign power." Uh-huh. In which case why not turn the mess over to the UN for a supervised general election in South Vietnam and abide by the results. Once the election has been held--or even before--and a government duly constituted (regardless of what kind of government it is), then get the hell out of the country. (I wish you'd clarify your reasons for disliking McNamara. When you refer to his "entire class and everything it stands for", do you mean the "class" of pragmatic administrators oriented toward systems analysis, operations research and cost accounting as opposed to moral, political or ideological considerations? It is true, of course, that Secretary McNamara speaks with a forked tongue, but it is hardly fair to single him out for criticism on this point; the entire Administration displays an almost pathological inability to be honest even about minor details (like whether or not Henry Cabot Lodge intended to resign as US ~~PROTECTOR~~ of Ambassador to South Vietnam).))

Mr. Charles Crispin comes along putting his words in my mouth--a deplorable practice, inasmuch as his mouth seems to have more than enough capacity to contain his own utterances; he doesn't need any help from me. I would suggest that he go back to #116 and go over my statement on the Warren Report word for word. Slowly.

There are, as Charles Crispin points out, dozens of rumors of con-

spiracy to kill Kennedy. Add to those he listed that the suspects include the Mafia, the "unions", Cubans (both pro- and anti-Castro), the Black Muslims, white racists--the list is endless. But it is now more than three years since the event, and nobody has yet come forward with any proof of a conspiracy. (Don't point to Jim Garrison, Ted, because he has yet to exhibit that he has anything other than a propensity for making public statements. He promises arrests in months or perhaps years. He has hauled one man in--all the others seem to be conveniently dead--and charged this man with conspiracy. When Garrison goes before a grand jury and gets an indictment, then I'll begin to take notice. When he goes to court and proves his case--well, in the event that occurs it could start off a whole course of events. And again, it might not. If Garrison proves conspiracy, the federal government could either disprove the charges or admit that it was known all along but classified in the cause of national security.) ((It never seriously occurred to me that Garrison might be nothing more than a man with a propensity for making public statements. It is well known that he has political ambitions. In his public statements about the Kennedy assassination, he has shinnied so far out on a limb that if he doesn't produce his political career is finished. He could have played it differently, hedging his bet, but he didn't; so I feel he must have the evidence. (As to Garrison's political ambitions, some commentators have said that his investigation is chiefly aimed at making him governor of Louisiana. I think they underestimate Garrison. In my opinion, he is looking beyond the statehouse to the 1972 national elections, aiming to become Robert Kennedy's running mate. He is a southerner, to balance the ticket; his name will be a household word if he secures convictions; and what more appropriate running mate for Bobby than the man who brought to justice the murderers of his brother?))

I think I would go even a step beyond Charles Crispin and say that an organized plot to cover the facts in the Kennedy killing is not to be dismissed.

And that is unbelievable. Sure it is...

"A greed for collective guilt is characteristic of leftwing intellectuals. They will grab a share in Belsen, Apartheid, the Moors Murders, anything for which they are obviously not in the least to blame; but reproach them for the minor offense they have in fact committed, the failure to return a book, the ignoring of an important letter, and they are immediately up in arms." --Honor Tracy, in New Republic, March 25, 1967.

SCOTT DUNCAN :: 2508 HIGHLAND AVE. :: BROOMALL, PENNSYLVANIA, 19008

There is quite a bit in Kipple #119 which seems to belie the radical-liberal point of view (if there is any definite point of view for radical-liberals as a unit). Personally, I consider myself a plain liberal (conservative to those left of ordinary liberals) and I don't have the unwavering faith in Socialism and legal liberties that radical-liberals do. For instance, I have been having an argument with John Reiner in The Broken Line regarding the coming of Socialism, which I claim is anti-human nature because it assumes people are willing to take it at face value. My claim is that it will take a radical change in human nature before Socialism is a reality (and your comments at the end of "Some Thoughts on Collectivism" seem to agree). My feeling is that people create the socio-political system, not vice versa; I also feel that it will take a "substantial majority of the population (to) desire a cooperative society if one is to exist and prosper". I am, therefore,

anti-economic determinism and pro-voluntarism (meaning that people will be allowed the kind of economic and social system that they wish rather than be forced against their will to take one on). This assumes that people will take the time to consider such things, of course; passivity in these matters will eliminate any individual from the considerations. So I see a need to work on people before working on the economy and social system; improvements in the latter two areas will follow automatically if improvements are made in the former. I put a great deal of trust in proper education, since this is the only way people are going to develop a sense of what is better.

Your comments on Dick Gregory's experience at the restaurant seem to indicate this social concern above human concern. In the case of civil rights, and in many other questions where emotions are involved, I put very little faith in the power of law. Naturally, I appreciate the law because it can sometimes prevent individuals (through punitive measures) from repeating what I feel is a wrong action; and it can also provide a mild deterrent. But, as I have said before, no law is going to keep me from murdering anyone I wish as long as my desire to do it is stronger than my concern for myself. I do not see how any Negro family can possibly be comfortable in the thought that a law may guarantee them the right to live where they please when they know that no law can possibly prevent the "silent stares, raised eyebrows, social discrimination" which will accompany anyone's trying to exercise the rights under the law. I would not live in a neighborhood where I was hated for all the tea in China, law or no law! Getting and testing a law may be a theoretical and ideal end for some, but I am more concerned in what borders this law which has been tested and upheld. Although, because I am a mere liberal, I am often classified in the same breath with "racists", I can assure you that I would never approve of any form of discrimination; but I would no more go on a march through a hostile neighborhood and try to set up a family there for the mere sake of testing a law than I would march through a Bessemer Furnace when it's going full tilt. Perhaps some will regard this as a cowardly admission, but I see no advantage in such things other than psychological comfort to a few individuals who haven't been swayed one way or the other. When "sides" are determined, the demonstrations will cease; campaigning stops when election day is over and the "sides" have been counted.

=====

FROM:

TED PAULS

1448 MERIDENE DRIVE

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND, 21212

U. S. A.

DELIVER TO

printed matter only

may be opened for inspection

return requested

LOVE, BABY, LOVE

re