



VIPER #9, June 1965
is published for OMPA
by Bill Donaho, P.O. Box 1284,
Berkeley, Calif. 94701

ANTI-GERMANISM & It's a very Good Thing that
 ANTI-AMERICANISM the British fans and the
 German fans are getting
 together and finding things in common. But
 I gather there is still a lot of anti-German
 feeling in Britain. Someone or other said

that this was in part based on the suffering of the British civilians during WWII. (One imagines that the Germans might well be anti-British and anti-American for the same reason.)

Well, I just came across an interesting statement: "During WWII in Britain more civilians were killed by American military vehicles than were killed by enemy action." Fascinating, if true. It sounds just a wee bit doubtful though. And if it is true, you British have even more reason to be anti-American than you knew about!

But I've come across another statement that is even more incredible and one which I find it more difficult to swallow each time I think about it: "Each year more Americans are killed by automobiles than the total of our military personnel killed by enemy action during WWII." It just doesn't seem reasonable....

THE ANGLO-SAXONS Oddly enough there was little or no anti-German feeling in the U.S.
 AND THE GERMANS before, during or after WWII. There was plenty of anti-Japanese feeling though. In fact one theory has it that we would never have dropped the atom bomb on Germany. I think we would have--look at some of the fire-bomb raids--but at least we'd have had some hesitation about it. And might very well have arranged a demonstration in a deserted area...

American liberals were very anti-Nazi of course, but being liberals they stopped at being against the political ideology and didn't carry it over to the German people. And the American people in general just didn't get into a sweat about the whole business.

American soldiers liked the German soldiers. During lulls in the fighting there were friendly interchanges across the lines--as there were during our Civil War. Several such interchanges were reported in the papers at the time. I remember one in particular. It was just after Italy had been invaded and had switched sides. A German soldier called across tauntingly, "What do you think of your new allies?"

"You can have 'em back."

"No thanks. You keep 'em!"

Some psychologist said that most Americans and British were quite amused by the German "Master Race" type attitudes and propaganda. He explained that the Anglo-Saxons were so convinced that they were a master race that they didn't even need to talk about it, or convince themselves, and that anyone else's "pretensions" along that line amused rather than annoyed them. It sounds plausible. Anyhow good-natured arrogance seemed to typify the world-view of the American soldier during WWII.

Nevertheless, almost all American soldiers who fought against the Germans admit that by and large the Germans were better soldiers than they were. The American soldiers assumed that this superiority was due to better training and this didn't bother their egos. And since the Germans respected the Americans too, to some extent it was a love feast all around.

Also, most American soldiers seem to think that the German equipment was better than theirs. I've talked to Technical Types who have disputed this and have made individual comparisons, but the point is that whether it was true or not, American soldiers thought it was. The general opinion of the American soldier seems to have been that the Germans were defeated because we had so much more equipment than they did that we swamped them.

And American soldiers who were in Germany after both WWI and WWII like the German people very much. The general sentiment was "They're more like us than anyone else in Europe." Probably the educated Americans tended to prefer the British, but those who hadn't read English literature nor studied English history--by far the great majority--tended to favor the Germans, in spite of the language barrier. Most likely the famous British reserve had something to do with this; it puts American backs up.

I don't think I ever heard an American soldier of either WWI or WWII say a good word for the French. (France, yes; the French, no.) They didn't like the French at all. Liberals would try to maintain that it was just the French peasants who were dreadful, not all the French, but they didn't like them either. On the other hand, while generally contemptuous of the Italians, most American soldiers seemed to like them.

Perhaps along these lines... Paris still has a very good press here--"All good Americans go to Paris when they die" and all that jazz. Yet since WWII I've noticed a common phenomenon. Both middle-class and bohemian Americans I know who have been to both almost invariably prefer Rome to Paris.

During WWI of course the U.S. eventually settled down into being quite anti-German. In fact it was rather hysterical about it for awhile. No German music: no Beethoven, no Bach, no Brahms, no Mozart, no Wagner was played publicly. And one didn't talk about Germans, but rather dirtyhuns. But all this disappeared in a year or two after the war.

During WWII no one even thought of not playing German music, but "Madam Butterfly" was not performed. And all the Japanese-Americans on the west coast were put in ~~concentration~~ ~~camp~~ relocation centers. (This of course was in flagrant violation of both the U. S. and the California constitutions. And our great bulwark of Civil Rights, Chief Justice Earl Warren, was then governor of California and deeply involved with it all.)

Actually WWI brought a crisis to American public opinion and for awhile we even vacillated between being pro-British or pro-German. It's rather instructive to read pre-WWI jingoistic American literature. It's sort of taken for granted that the Anglo-Saxons and Germans are going to take over the entire world and give order to the lesser breeds. As the old British saying has it, "The Wogs begin at Calais." The Anglo-Saxons and the Germans were thought of as essentially one breed and that There is no need for us to fight, boys: there's plenty of loot for all.

And if the Kaiser hadn't been such a fool, something like that might very well have happened. It certainly fitted in with British attitudes and policies of the time. And Bismark was tending that way. But the Kaiser threw him out and started anti-British policies. Even so it took him some twenty years of these policies and of public insults to make the British public anti-German. And it seems mostly jealousy and wounded vanity on his part. These policies were not only contrary to German's interests but the Kaiser himself doesn't seem to have been all that anti-British. And there is evidence that WWI came about because of not only these policies but also a serious miscalculation on his part: he just didn't believe that when it came right down to it, that Britain would back up France against Germany.

RACE & ALL THAT Things are looking up in Alabama and it looks as if the negroes are going to get voting rights. Mostly. Probably it's not too apparent over there, but the amazing thing is that things have gone as peacefully as they have. White southerners really take segregation seriously. Trying to get equal rights for negroes is sort of like changing the religion of a country by government fiat--back in the days when people took religion seriously. But the segregationists are yielding to massive pressure and things are looking pretty good. And while there is a long way to go yet, there has been much progress since WWII. Up until then the negroes were exploited and treated like dirt and nobody was protesting at all. Or at least no protests were heard.

I was raised in east Texas which is culturally a part of the south. I was brought up with the idea that I should be good and kind to negroes, but that wasn't because they had rights, but because I had obligations. And after all, a good man is always kind to his domestic animals and looks after their welfare...

When I was 13 I went North for the first time. I still recall how upset I was when a white man shined my shoes. The idea that a man would so demean himself as to shine another's shoes was very repulsive to me. It was three or four years before the idea sank in that black men were men too.

Some years later I read a book in which a white South African girl visits London and is violently upset when she is waited on by a white maid. I knew exactly how she felt.

But from the age of 17 I realized intellectually that negroes were people and were entitled to be treated as such. But it took much longer for this to sink in emotionally--and undoubtedly there are traces of my earlier attitude buried deep within me. But at least from the age of 17 I've been able to act towards negroes the same as I act towards other people.

I have a few negro friends. In each and every case I've known the guy for years before I stopped feeling uncomfortably aware of his race and just related to him simply and naturally as a human being. And I still have to repeat this process with each negro I get to know. But in no case have these negro friends ever stopped being aware of race. And this is very natural: it continually slaps them in the face.

But at least the question is on the way to being solved on a national level.

RACE IN NEW ZEALAND Perhaps Bruce Burn can correct me but I've heard a couple of things that indicate that New Zealand is one place where the Anglo-Saxon conquerors treated the native race fairly and get along with it today. I've heard that if a visiting white man tries to treat a Maori like a "nigger" or even call him that, he's most likely going to get his block knocked off. And by a fellow white man too.

The other side of the coin is the Maoris' attitude towards the British. I've heard that the Dutch were the first Europeans to try to exploit New Zealand and that for a long time they had the advantage. But the Maoris liked the British and didn't like the Dutch. When they were fighting the Maoris the British would knock off for tea and they more or less treated war as a sport. The Dutch were dreadfully solemn and efficient and never, never knocked off for tea. So the Maoris massacred the Dutch and the British eventually took over.

YANKS, AUSSIES
& RUSSIANS

During WWII naturally there were lots of American soldiers in Australia. And there was a large amount of friction between the Yanks and the Aussies. Almost all of it was because American soldiers got far higher pay and therefore had much more money to spend, and because of this, and because they were new and different, were making out much better with the Aussie girls than the Aussies themselves were. Anyhow there were numerous individual fights and quite often pitched battles with thirty and forty Yanks and Aussies to a side. And many time people got killed. But when the fight was over the Yanks and Aussies would bind up each other's wounds and cooperate in concealing the evidence from both Australian and American authorities. But when they weren't quarling or fighting they got along famously. As one Aussie said, "You Yanks are bloody sons-of-bitches, but then you're our kind of sons-of-bitches."

And by all odds the Australians are an American's favorite "foreigners." (We don't consider Canadians foreigners.) Although oddly enough it appears that the Russians may very well be the same kind of "sons-of-bitches" as we and the Aussies. (You British-isles British are obviously a totally different kind of "sons-of-bitches.") But of course there is the language barrier with the Russians. Not to mention the political one.

Our similarity to the Russians is a point Heinlein often emphasizes. He says that we should never forget that communism is a Great Evil, but that this should not make us anti-Russian, only anti-communist, and that the Russians are amazingly like us.

Some years back Heinlein made an extended tour through Russia. One of his stories from it was that on one occasion when he was discussing languages with a group of Russians he said, "We are very interested in languages these days in the U.S. The optimists are studying Russian and the pessimists are studying Chinese." He said that first there was a double take, then a dead silence, and then a great belly laugh. And that this story spread like wildfire and from then on the standard toast he got in Russia was "To the optimists!"

THE PRESIDENTIAL RACE Probably the best comment on this year's campaign was made by columnist Art Hoppe. "Well, they've convinced me. The Republicans have convinced me that Johnson is a crook, and the Democrats have convinced me that Goldwater is a madman." I suspect that a very large number of Americans would agree with this diagnosis, although they would probably soften the terms a little.

Whether or not Johnson is a crook depends upon one's point of view. It also involves the old Tammany distinction between honest graft and dishonest graft. Dishonest graft is illegally looting the public treasury. Honest graft is using your inside knowledge and political connections and influence to accumulate money. Quite obviously Johnson's personal fortune of \$11,000,000.00 comes from honest graft. But most Americans are quite tolerant of this sort of thing.

Actually we probably tend to be somewhat relieved if we are convinced that a politician practices only honest graft. Poll after poll has shown that most Americans think all politicians are corrupt. Possibly that's why rich men have been so successful in politics in the last few years; the voters probably figure that he's already got his money; he doesn't "need" to steal any more. Also, it's a well-accepted fact that the sons and grandsons of rich men are never as greedy as the self-made man.

Perhaps it's well at this point to recall Lincoln Steffens. He was a well-known muck-racker towards the turn of the century. For some years he went from city to city exposing the corruption of the city government, helping to turn the rascals out and to elect a reform administration. In his autobiography he says that it took some time for the lesson to sink in, but it eventually did: in every case the reform administration gave the city worse government than the previous corrupt administration had. In most cases the Reformers were just naive incompetents who got nothing done and messed everything up, but in some cases they turned out to be thieves themselves; only they stole so much that things collapsed completely.

Things aren't that bad any more; dishonest graft has dwindled down, but honest graft is still ever present. And most police departments seem to be pretty corrupt. A small town or city may have a clean police force, but for a large city to have one seems to be a definite exception. And probably a temporary one.

As is well known Americans don't have the same attitude towards the police that the British do. When you know that the police can be fixed--at least in small things--it doesn't much incline you to rely on them. And there is a further good point recently brought up by Gordon Eklund, "If the majority of negroes were ignorant bullies, I'd be prejudiced against them. And since the majority of police I've come in contact with are ignorant bullies, I'm prejudiced against them." And Gordon is obviously clean-cut, middle class, white and non-Latin. He also speaks politely when they approach him. He's not going to get much deliberate hassle from the police; they're just being their natural charming selves. But people not fitting into all those categories frequently do get deliberate hassle.

6

But back to the presidential campaign. I was fascinated by the campaign pamphlet "A Texan looks at Lyndon". It was in general a fine example of right-wing paranoia. I particularly liked the delicate way it hinted that Kennedy's assassination might have been arranged by some notorious Johnson backers. But there were a few facts scattered hither and yon. The account of Johnson's election to senator back in 1948 was substantially the same as carried in the Texas papers at the time.

Johnson was running in the Democratic primary as a liberal against the then Governor of Texas, Coke Stevenson, who was an extreme conservative. I was at the University of Chicago but I voted for Johnson myself by absentee ballot. Stevenson came in ahead on the first ballot and Johnson was second. And there was a field of some 10 others. Stevenson didn't have a majority so there was a run-off between Stevenson and Johnson. There was around 1,000,000 votes cast. At first it looked as if Stevenson had won again, but all of a sudden one of the state's rotten burrough polling places announced a change in its tally. It put Johnson some 87 votes ahead of Stevenson. (Landslide Lyndon they called him for many years thereafter.) Naturally Outraged Shrieks rent the air. After all, it was Sort of Obvious. (One of the most beautiful things about the whole deal was that the "boss" of the rotten burrough polling place was a former Stevenson supporter who double-crossed him.)

Stevenson tried to get a recount, but the election authorities turned a deaf ear. (Such a request is usually automatically granted when the vote is so close.) And he was governor of the state! He finally got a U.S. District Court to impound the records and start an investigator. Actually this would seem to be out of its jurisdiction since it wasn't a national election but a sort of public caucus of a state party. In any case staunch liberal Supreme Court Justice Hugo Black stopped the District Court cold with an injunction. And Stevenson never got anywhere further. Johnson went to the Senate, mended his fences, and was overwhelming re-elected in 1954.

I was also much interested in further details of the career of an old acquaintance, Mac Wallace. Mac, an ex-marine, was the president of the student body when I was at the University of Texas in 1944. And though I was a callow 17 and a lowly freshman I got to know him since he was going with the cousin of my roommate. Mac instigated and lead student demonstrations--not too dissimilar from the current hassles at Berkeley--in support of the liberal president of the university who had just been fired by the conservative Board of Regents. He stayed fired.

Being a bright boy and an economics major Mac went on to Washington. And became a Johnson man. Then in the early fifties he killed a man while back in Texas. (The pamphlet insists it was a political murder but I rather imagine that's open to doubt.) Anyhow Mac was convicted of First Degree Murder. And the sentence? A 5--year's suspended sentence--with his times of reporting to his parole officer arranged so that it wouldn't interfere with his job at the Department of Agriculture in Washington. That's going some--even for Texas.

NAME DROPPING A couple of weeks ago I read two news items which for a few brief moments made me feel almost close to the Establishment. Or something. First cousin Glynn R. Donaho is now a Vice Admiral and a Big Noise in the Navel Department and Ex-roommate Mike Nichols is now more important than ever as a Broadway director and is squiring Jacqueline Kennedy around. Of course I haven't seen Mike for 10 years or so and I barely know Glynn (in fact I'm not at all sure the paper didn't make a mistake and it shouldn't be "Glen") so I had no trouble controlling my transports.

ANTI--JAPANESEISM There seems little or no anti-Japanese feeling in the U.S. now, but we were intensely anti-Japanese for some time prior to WWII. In his memoirs Churchill, speaking about Britain's breaking her alliance with Japan in the twenties, said something to the effect: Japan was a loyal and valuable ally during WWI and it seemed to the best interests of both Britain and Japan to continue the alliance, but it soon became

obvious that it would be impossible to continue the alliance and also maintain friendship with the United States, so of course there was no choice.

Australia was even more anti-Japanese than the U.S., but evidently that didn't influence British calculations. (The U.S. thought that Japanese Imperial Ambitions threatened its Imperial Ambitions, but the Australians thought that Japanese Imperial Ambitions threatened ~~THEM~~.) For that matter, much as we like the Aussies, I can't see their opinions having much effect on U.S. policies either.

But it was not only immoral and illegal for the U.S. to put the Japanese-Americans into concentration camps, it was pretty stupid. Most of the Japanese who immigrated to the U.S. didn't like Japan and had few if any emotional ties to it. The Japanese government slipped in some agents with them of course, but I have been told there is not one instance established of a 2nd or 3rd generation Japanese-American's being involved with disloyal activities. (Tokyo Rose?) And for some odd reason being put in concentration camps didn't damage their loyalty to the U.S. (Of course there were no gas chambers attached.) I don't know why; it sure as hell would have damaged mine.

THE BRITISH & THE JAPANESE But perhaps the British-isles British and the Japanese are the same sort of "sons-of-bitches". I once read an article that claimed they were. Both Britain and Japan were densely populated Island Empires with an orientation towards navel power. (And both lost their empires at about the same time too.) Both had the most heavily masculine-oriented societies among civilized nations. Other nations might keep females in equal or more subjection, but in Japan and Britain society was almost completely geared to the male. In France and Italy, not to mention the U.S. and Germany, this was never the case. (And both Britain and Japan are loosening up there a trifle now.)

And, the article went on, both the British and the Japanese tend to be reserved and formal, but they'll be polite and friendly to a stranger appearing in their islands with the proper credentials and all. But get them off their tight little islands and their strict codes of behavior don't seem to apply any more. They become complete and utter "sons-of-bitches". The article went on to compare British and Japanese colonialism which it Did Not Approve Of.

COLONIALISM The article didn't approve of American colonialism either, but it pointed out that American colonialism used a considerably gentler hand, was not nearly so ruthless. This seems to be true.

But British colonialism was not as repressive as Japanese. For that matter I've heard that Britain could have held onto India indefinitely--India really doesn't seem to have much nationalist spirit--except for two typical Anglo-Saxon stupidities: race prejudice and anti-intellectualism.

Speaking cynically, no subjugated people has ever revolted without intellectuals to point the way and lead them. People just don't revolt without leaders. And leaders need education. An occasional exceptional man may lack education and still be an effective leader, but he is a definite exception. And a successful revolt needs a lot of leaders.

So, a successful colonial power carefully controls the education of its subjected populations. It needs some native intellectuals in the lower echelons, but it makes damn sure that any native who gets educated fits into its scheme of things and is properly awarded with status and money. And unfortunately history has demonstrated that intellectuals bribe very easily.

But the Anglo-Saxons have never done this. They are so full of prejudice that the educated native is never, never accepted and has very little status. And the Anglo-Saxons are so anti-intellectual that they are contemptuous of ideas and abstractions, even of

thinking. They don't care how many natives get how much intellectual training. So in India they had the whites monopolize the practical things like engineering, but let the natives fool around with ideas as much as they liked. It makes one to laugh.

If British colonialism looks bad when compared with American colonialism, it sure looks lily-white when compared with Dutch colonialism or Belgium colonialism, and with German colonialism too--unless one is misled by WWI-type propaganda. (I don't really think one can call the activities of Hitler's Germany "colonialism.") And Spanish colonialism was perfectly dreadful. Its treatment of American Indians in the 16th, 17th and 18th Centuries can only be compared with the 19th Century Belgium treatment of the natives in the Belgian Congo.

But France seems to come out rather better than any of us. At least it did when it still had power. It doesn't seem to pull out of its colonies very well. At least the British and the Americans withdraw gracefully when we've Had It. (Viet Nam seems to be thought of as a military base and matter of prestige rather than a colony or whatnot.)

While the British have dispossessed a few people here and there the U.S. (and Canadian) record with the American Indians is rather worse than most of Britain's record. Except Ireland.

But dispossessing the natives is not colonialism. It's worse. However this type behavior is characteristic not only of the Anglo-Saxons, but of all patriarchal people. Throughout history if a patriarchal people have wanted somebody else's land and had the power to take it, they took it. Matriarchal or matrilineal people are peaceful types who respect other people's right. This just doesn't seem to be a characteristic of any patriarchal society. It can be of individuals within the society, but it never seems to be of the society as a whole. But it is of matriarchal societies.

The subjection of women and the invention of Private Property (in more than clothing, tools, etc.) and of Warfare all took place about 6,000 years ago. Many authorities do not think that these are coincidences, but that they are all bound up together. In other words women were the first Private Property.

But back to colonialism. Quite obviously the U.S. is still indulging in it. I'm against American colonialism. Most American fans are against American colonialism. Most British fans are against American colonialism. And I'm sure that if Britain were still indulging in colonialism, most British fans would be against British colonialism.

But it seems equally obvious that there is no British colonialism because Britain no longer has the power to interfere with other countries, not because British politicians have suddenly become virtuous.

THE SLAVE TRADE But come to think of it the slave trade could be considered both an example of British colonialism and as something worse than the American treatment of the Indians. In Black Cargoes Daniel P. Mannix gives a fascinating picture of it. It is estimated some 15,000,000 negroes were torn out of Africa and sold in the Western Hemisphere. (As a comparison it is estimated there were 4,000,000 Indians in all the Americas when Columbus got here.) Up through the 18th Century all the reigning British monarch and numerous private individuals were financially involved in it. Liverpool was built up primarily through it. Also, British treatment of slaves in the sugar islands of the West Indies in some respects shames Belgian operations in the Belgian Congo. In the U.S. at least slaves were regarded as valuable domestic animals and treated accordingly. In the sugar islands the planters decided it was uneconomic to breed slaves; it was cheaper to buy new ones. So they worked them to death as a matter of economic policy. And although most of those 15,000,000 slaves were brought over in British ships the British government finally developed a conscience about it and tried to stamp it out--assisted by the U. S. government. Cynically speaking this was just about the time most of the profit went out of the slave trade. For that matter the U.S. developed a conscience about the Indians as soon as we had stolen just about everything from them worth stealing.

Vituperations

THE MEADOWS OF FANTASY - Mercer: This was a delight, Archie, the high point of the mailing. I thought it was extremely good. And funny. The This-bury fans really came alive. I'm looking forward to Part Two.

POOKA - Ford: I can hardly believe yet that Don is dead. It was so sudden and shocking; my first reaction to the news was that it must be a hoax. Unfortunately not. Ompa--and fandom--will miss him.

HAGGIS - Peters: Note that not all Americans consider that it is our right to interfere in the internal affairs of another country. But South American countries in general raise a peculiar emotional problem for most Americans. Up until Roosevelt's administration the U.S. more or less frankly treated the Latin American countries as its own possessions, countries that it owned and controlled, but didn't have to go through the formal bother of governing. And there are many traces of this emotional attitude to be still found throughout the U.S. Add to that the standard American reaction that communism is evil in and of itself even though objectively a communist government may actually be better than some of our gallant allies like Franco. But the not-trading with Cuba bit also has a lot to do with the fact that Castro expropriated American property in Cuba and the corporations are howling.

Actually it's sort of ironic that Roosevelt started the Good Neighbor policy with South America. Back in 1920 when he was the Democratic nominee for Vice President and was busy plumping for the U.S. to join the League of Nations, he pointed out that the U.S. didn't have any need to be afraid of adverse votes and all, pointing out all the South American votes it would control. At one point in his speech he said, "As for Nicaragua it has a good constitution. I ought to know--I wrote it myself." (He was Assistant Secretary of the Navy under Wilson.)

For that matter Right Now the U.S. is busily interfering with Canadian affairs. As you have probably heard, there is a very strong separatist movement in the Canadian province of Quebec which is largely French. They want to secede and it is all the Canadian government can do to pacify them. And naturally there is a strong Quebec underground using all the apparatus of violence. The U.S. Establishment is busy supporting the separatist movement and helping the underground. As far as is known the U.S. government isn't involved, but on the other hand it isn't restraining "individual American citizens" who are.

You see it is generally admitted that the Canadian union just isn't viable without Quebec and that if Quebec goes, Canada will fall apart, right into the arms of the U.S. (Most observers also think that Quebec is being pretty stupid because the U.S. will eventually get it too.) In fact the premier of one of the western provinces, Saskatchewan I think, has made a public statement to the effect that if Quebec secedes, Saskatchewan will have no choice but to seek admittance to the U.S. as a state.

You see most of Canadian industry, etc. is owned by U.S. investors. This makes many Canadians and the Canadian government pretty unhappy. Every now and then Canada will adopt policies to restrict further American investment, etc. And this makes the American Establishment pretty unhappy. And naturally they don't trust the Canadian government not to go further and all that. So the Quebec separatist movement has been hailed with joy in "certain quarters". However, as of now the Canadian government seems to have everything under control. And naturally enough very little of this ever gets into the news. Most Americans probably don't know anything about it.

Ken Cheslin's correspondent who referred to "The Bluebells of Scotland" as an "English" folk song was most probably an American. Somewhere in his memoirs Churchill says that on the continent Britain is still called England. It is in the U.S. too. England and English are terms that Americans use much more easily and naturally than Britain or British. And even if Americans say "British", the tendency is that an American will (subconsciously) think of English and British as equivalent words, and to quite naturally refer to anything in the British isles as "English". And it takes quite a while, usually, for an American to be aware of what the hell you're objecting about if someone protests. And I'll bet that 9 out of 10 Americans never get out of the notion that you're nit-picking even after they learn what it's all about.

Perhaps along the same lines many Canadians get furious at being called Americans. But I think they have less excuse. After all English-speaking Canada has the same culture as the U.S. and Canada is in America. And the South Americans get upset for the opposite reason. We don't call them Americans and they insist they should be since their countries are in America too....

QUARTERING - Fitch: But that's why we send 50 copies--four more than are needed--to the A.E., to allow for a member's miscounting his zines by providing a margin for error. And if you're anxious about it, you can always count your zines twice.

As a nurseryman maybe you can confirm or deny a Vicious Rumour I just ran across. Someone said that if people think that flowers don't have the fragrant smells they used to, it's not because they are growing old and losing their Sense of Wonder or whatnot, but because the nurseries are deliberately breeding scents out of flowers, since most people erroneously associated the flowers' smell--not the pollen--with hay fever.

BINARY - Patrizio: While I applaud heartily your thesis that capital punishment should be abolished I wonder somewhat at your statement "Murders are committed predominantly by the insane...." Is this the case in Britain? You have an extremely low murder rate so I can well believe it. But, as has been pointed out on several occasions, Britain and the U.S. have vastly different ideas about violence and all that. We have a far higher murder rate. For that matter we have a goodly number of homicides that don't get classed as murder.

And I'd say that most homicides in the U.S. are committed by angry people. But they aren't insane--at least no psychologist would say that they are. At least the great majority of them aren't.

. Leave me cite Texas. Someone recently said, "Texas prides itself as being peculiarly American; it exaggerates the best and the worst in American character." That's more or less true. And Texas takes homicide pretty lightly.

There's an old Texas story about a man who killed another man and stole a horse in an area where it wasn't clear whether he was in the State of Texas or the State of Arkansas. First they tried him in Arkansas and sentenced him to hang for killing the man and fined him \$10.00 for stealing the horse. He escaped and was later caught by the Texas authorities who tried him over again. They fined him \$10.00 for killing the man and hung him for stealing the horse.

And the laws about self defense: of course in any state you're entitled to kill someone else to protect your own self, but it's generally necessary to establish that you had no alternative to killing him. Not in Texas. The law specifically states that a man is the best judge of what is necessary for his own defense. This doesn't give carte blanche of course, but it sure as hell loosens things up. A Texas lawyer assured me that in almost any fight between two males either can kill the other with complete immunity from legal consequences. And U.S. lower-class males fight fairly frequently.

I have a cousin that got involved in a bar-room brawl in which the other guy got him down and tried to stomp him to death. He didn't quite make it but did manage to break both my cousin's legs and most of his ribs. It didn't even occur to anyone to send for the police, and if the police had stumbled on it it is extremely unlikely that any charges would have been filed. And the attitude of my cousin's family and friends was that he was damn lucky the other guy was too drunk to do an efficient job, that it served my cousin right for going to such a low dive, and that anyhow he was a belligerent type who undoubtedly asked for it.

I was born and brought up in Texas you know and am really quite a peaceable type. But up until my late twenties about every two or three years I'd get mad enough to want to kill somebody. The feeling only lasted about five minutes though and I had no difficulty whatever controlling it--I haven't even hit anybody since I was sixteen.

In one case though the feeling lasted considerably longer: my officers in basic training. Every time I thought about them for about two years the anger would be right there. I didn't think about them too often, but every time I did, the feeling was right there. But again, I didn't have the slightest difficulty controlling it.

And somehow I don't think it is a coincidence that American soldiers are never, never sent to the Front with the officers who trained them. Even then it's one of those army truisms that at the Front officers act considerably more human and less chicken than they do behind the lines. Nevertheless it's one of the most persistent of army rumours that the very high mortality rate amongst American officers at the front is not because enemy snipers concentrate on them and pick them off, but because they are killed by their own men. And even if these rumors are completely untrue or grossly exaggerated, they still show the general attitude.

Speaking of chicken officers and all reminds me. Shortly after WWII I read something to the effect that the German army was considerably more "democratic" than either the American army or the British army, that the officers had far fewer privileges and that they associated with their men on terms of equality, even far behind the lines. This is contrary to everything else I've heard about "Prussian officers" though... Unlikely. And not too long ago I was reading some sociologist who said that the same-type ideas and attitudes that now exist in the U.S. are developing and spreading in Britain, and that if present trends continue in a generation or two they will be identical. You have so much to look forward to.

INTERLUDE - Gray: I have heard that one of Einstein's favorite forms of relaxation was to listen to "crackpots" expound their theories so that he could go over them in his own mind and pick out the fallacies. He was always very polite though and kept his conclusions to himself. Perhaps that's what he had in mind with astrology.

I once discussed astrology with Katherine MacLean. We agreed that obviously there is something there, but that it seemed far from an exact science. One difficulty I have in accepting it is that I've known some practitioners of it--who seemed to be to be sincere--who seemed to contradict each other on specific points. However, I've never had my horoscope drawn or anything. By the way I was born at Houston, Texas on December 23, 1926 about 12:20 noon.

Did you know that Hannes Bok was a devotee of astrology?

THE SCARR - Charters: A very funny zine; you yourself were in good form; your collective letter from Irish fandom was hilarious and the Berry piece is one of the best things he's done I think.

HEX - Wells: Yes, modern critics and even more-so modern English Departments read all sorts of way-out things into the words of an author. I once went with a

girl whose brother was majoring in English at the University of Florida. He was a good friend of Tennessee Williams and the day his class in Modern American Drama discussed "Streetcar" he brought a visitor to class: Tennessee Williams. And he didn't introduce him until the discussion was over. Tennessee Williams was highly entertained and the instructor was furious.

MEIN OMP-F - Freeman: Americans also get most upset by various examples of British reserve. In fact sometimes they get downright insulted. In fact the American stereotype of the typical Britisher includes two prominent elements: (1) The British have no sense of humor. (2) The British never, never speak to anyone unless they have been "properly introduced" and won't really talk to you until they've known you for years. There is also a fairly prevalent opinion that the British are really some species of polar bear and that ordinary mortals turn blue in their houses in the winter.

NEXUS - Weston: I disagree with you about Krishna series. DeCamp is one of my favorite s-f writers, but I never could stand that series. When I read adventure stories I want to identify with the hero. And I find all the main characters in that series to be absolute jerks. I couldn't care less what happens to them. And much of the time I find the action a little too realistic too. Even if I liked the characters I wouldn't dig the series too much; instead of action DeCamp plays up the humdrumness of what's going on. At least it seems so to me. And while this may be realistic, it's not fun.

I'm very fond of H. Beam Piper too. My favorite story of his is his first-published one "Time and Time Again." I'm also extremely fond of his paratime series which is by far my favorite series of the last ten years or so. I liked "Space Viking" but not as much as you seem to.

Joe Patrizio is wrong about the Pilgrims. They were neither Quakers nor peace-loving. They were one of the most intolerant of intolerant protestant sects and persecuted the hell out of all sects disagreeing with them including the Quakers. Also, although they were very peaceful and friendly with the Indians as long as they were heavily outnumbered, they started breaking treaties and stealing the Indians' land as soon as they were strong enough. And when the Indians tried to stop them, they killed them. But that was the common pattern for the settlement of the continent. Sometimes it is true the original settlers would observe the treaties. But after all they had their land. It was always the desire for more and more land that did it. And the old settlers would always observe white solidarity and fight alongside the treaty breakers. But the Indians never started fighting until the whites violated the treaties by occupying more land.

I'm afraid that E. F. James was wrong about Thomas Paine's "The Rights of Man". It was written in England after the American Revolution was over and Paine had conditions in England in mind. I believe however that James is right when he says that Paine knew very little about conditions in France.

I seem to have a disagreement with Chris Priest too. He says, "You see, I don't believe egoboo is the actual receipt of acclaim; but the expectation of it. I get more egoboo out of typing CON stencils than I do out of reading reviews of it--even good ones." I think Chris is confusing egoboo with satisfaction. He gets satisfaction out of putting out a good fanzine and that is more important to him than the egoboo he gets from others. As it should be.

COGNATE - Hickey: Your description made me most thankful that I no longer have to experience a Chicago winter.

MORPH - Roles: I have heard some women say that although they would naturally prefer a civilization where they had equal rights, that as things are now they'd rather live in the Latin countries where, although the woman is kept firmly in her place, things are clear-cut and definite, that to live in our present mixed-up situation where

as far as women are concerned things are betwixt and between is far worse.

ZENITH - Weston: A beautiful zine. Your layout is excellent. You have some good material too of course. I agree with Terry Jeeves about Cordwainer Smith. I liked his first couple of stories, but soon got heartily sick of them. Mood and atmosphere are fine when they are placed on top of a good plot, but I don't think they are adequate substitutes for a plot.

WHATSIS - Cheslin: I'm sorry that Ken won't be with us any more. He was fun to have around.

OZ - Henley: Rum is my tippie too. Boy, do I love the taste of it. Unfortunately however it gives me a vile hangover if I get drunk on it. Perfectly vile. I don't like the taste of scotch, but I drink it fairly often as it is the only thing I can get rousing drunk on and not have a hangover. I don't dislike scotch, mind; it just doesn't send me.

The trouble with books like "Fads and Fallacies in the Name of Science" is that obviously the writers can't be experts in all the fields they cover. So, essentially they write about what Authoritative Opinion in a given field says. And of course Authoritative Opinion isn't always right. Quite frequently some of the fads and fallacies turn out to be not so fallacious as all that. Nevertheless Gardner et al seem to be useful correctives.....

TOM CHATS IN THE DARK -- Schlueck: I've always greatly enjoyed "Kind Hearts and Coronets" myself. I also like "Fanfan, the Tulip", but not nearly as much. Many of my friends consider "The Blue Angel" to be one of the greatest of all films, if not the greatest, but I never could work up much enthusiasm for it. I can quite see that it is a study in degradation, that from the old school teacher's point of view the change from "Professor Unrat" to a crying clown is degradation and that in the process he has become degraded. But according to my standards he's a pretty miserable specimen of humanity to start out with and besides I don't see all that much difference between a professor and a circus clown. I just can't empathize.

VIPER - Me: The underground cinema guy who died was named Ron Rice, not Ben Rice. You see the brand of rice I use is called "Uncle Ben's Rice" and the familiar name sort of overpowered me when I was stenciling.

AMBLE - Mercer: Glad you and others took up Hulan's quiry about British kings. I've taken quite a lot of English and British history myself. And I was rather surprised to see him list Edward II as one of the three great kings. My instructors sort of leaned towards William the Conqueror, Henry II and Elizabeth. I was also fascinated by you British-types' picture of Richard the Lion-hearted and his wicked brother King John.

I was taught that Richard, although a folk hero, was one of the worst kings to sit on the throne; and that he almost ruined the country. He was a lousy administrator and cared nothing for the country. He was interested almost exclusively in his possessions in France and in his crusades, that he stripped the country twice: once to finance the crusade and again to pay his ransome.

But that John while wily, treacherous and all that--personally a washout--was on the whole a very good king. He did two extremely good things by inadvertance: he lost the French possessions of the crown which tended to the best development of the country and he provoked the barons into making him sign the Magna Charta. But even apart from these he did more to develop trade and commerce and develop the country than any other king for some time. One theory has it that he was so unpopular that he was sort of forced into all this to curry as much favor as he could and so retain the crown.

The Mr. Higginbottom bit was lovely. * I've just discovered the "Sanders of the River" books and to date have managed to read nine of them, counting "The River of Stars." I like them far better than any other Edgar Wallace I've ever read. And the stories typify for me the best qualities of the pulp adventure stories I read in the late thirties and early forties. (Of course the Sanders stories appeared much earlier.) I can even remember a sort of imitation of Sanders in SHORT STORIES, some character who the natives called Haiji--or something like that--in stories by, I believe, H. Bedford Jones. I liked them too.

While I don't remember hearing of Sanders before, the minute somebody mentioned Sanders, the phrase "of the River" popped into my head and seemed very familiar, so I have at least heard of him before. I am told that in the middle thirties there was a movie "Sanders of the River" starring Paul Robeson as Bonsalmo. Tony Boucher has a recording of the score. But somehow or other this is one old picture that never got on the TV circuit and no one seems to have seen it or heard of it for years. Rumor hath it that when Robeson became rich and famous he bought up all copies of the film and had them destroyed.

NADIR - Winstone: I sort of get the impression that although this is an OMPazine and contains many familiar names that still basically it is a New Wave zine. About these I really know from nothing. I've been all too much occupied--as far as my fanatic is concerned--these past couple of years with conventions. So, although I've seen references to the phenomena of the New Wave and all from Willis et al, I haven't actually encountered it. And frankly I'm baffled. I gather that ZENITH is a New Wave zine too, but at least it is devoted to science fiction and all.

And the reason for my bafflement is that your zine is obviously good in many, many respects, but I suddenly get the feeling I've wandered into the wrong tea garden and everyone is using words I know, but they are still talking a different language. And I feel I'm missing something because obviously there is more to it than appears.

Just in passing I'd like to say I'm very pleased with your layout. The layout in ZENITH is better, but yours is still good. And if this type layout is characteristic of the New Wave, then in my opinion this is one place that the New Wave has older British fandom licked hands down. Up until now British fanzines have been characterized--at least in American eyes--as betraying an utter indifference to good layout, the general operating principle seeming to be to cram as many words as possible onto a given page, without actually intruding on an illo. (There are a few exceptions of course. But I can't think of any British fans, even fan artists, who have devoted much attention to layout. Terry Jeeves does occasionally and some fanzine editors will devote attention to "showing off" good art, but that isn't precisely layout. Even ZENITH & NADIR are somewhat too crowded for the best possible layout, but by god they do show imagination and an interest in the concept. ((I certainly wouldn't claim that the last couple of VIPERS had good layout.))

But back to the contents. It's quite obviously considerably more than adequately written as far as putting together of words goes. But I feel like I'm missing all sorts of in-group jokes. Or something. Sort of the other side of the coin of Willis's statements in his review of THE SCARR #4 in ZENITH.

PHENOTYPE - Eney: It's extremely hard to find any competent political types who take picketing at all--seriously these days--except the type picketing where people don't cross the picket lines. But as a gesture of protest or for publicity, it's nowhere. If competent political types picket at all in such circumstances it's usually to show solidarity with other groups who may be picketing for the same reason.....

I must confess that all those Demographic Charts brought a glazed expression to my eyes. But otherwise I found the article highly interesting.....

Through Darkest Psyche

with Gun and Camera:

The BOONDOGGLE in Retrospect

"
In Bob Lowndes' column, "Aufgenknopft", in WARHOON 21 he makes a very good point. Psychology is a very popularized subject these days and the catchwords and terms are floating all around, being used and abused by all and sundry. And one can carry this even further. There seems to be a natural tendency for fans to consider themselves Experts on any and every subject they are vaguely familiar with, but this tendency becomes accentuated beyond all reason when it comes to psychology. And become confused with each fan's individual views.

And of course Lowndes is not free from this himself. Obviously he has done wide reading in psychology. But it seems to me he has read psychology the same way I read philosophy. I read philosophy because I'm interested in individual philosophic concepts or insights. Some of these I may integrate with my personal philosophy. But I'm just not interested in the over-all philosophical system or how it's put together. So, although I've done a lot of reading in philosophy—including the complete works of some philosophers—I think it would be only accurate to say that I know very little about it.

I was also somewhat amused that although Lowndes was discussing the Breen scene in the light of psychology he never got around to discussing child molestation; instead he psychoanalyzed the people against it—which is a rather different thing. However, it's an interesting topic so I think I'll follow his example.

First though I want to take care of a legal point Lowndes brought up. He seemed to feel that the Pacificon committee was obviously acting out of malice and that we could be convicted of libel because "Truth is a defense against libel, providing you can prove it beyond reasonable doubt; however, you must also prove that there is no malice involved in stating this truth."

Up until now there has not been the slightest shred of proof that the committee even felt malice towards Breen, much less that malice influenced them. Several accusations have been made to the effect that we expelled Breen, etc. because we dislike him, but no one has even offered the flimsiest reason for that statement, much less any proof of it.

In any case there are several things wrong with Lowndes' statement. We would not have to prove the statements about Breen beyond any reasonable doubt, only by a fair preponderance of the evidence. And in most states malice is irrelevant if the defamation is true; and in states where it is relevant, the burden of proving actual malice is on the plaintiff, not the defendant.

I have some argument with almost all of the points Lowndes makes, but it would make this article far too long if I attempted to go into them, so I'll only pick a few high spots. He seems to share the typical layman's misunderstanding of and emotional reaction to the term psychopath. It's really a technical term and not all that dreadful, but it seems to conjure up visions of axe murderers or Bloch's "Psycho". Probably the simplest definition is "A psychopath is someone without a moral sense." This doesn't mean he's violent or dangerous or can't behave acceptably socially—out of sheer self-interest.

And Prentiss Choate gave a very good description—in describing Walter Breen in POST-MORTEM—of what makes a psychopath: "a part of his psyche got left behind in the growing-up process." But when I pointed this out to Prentiss he screamed that I was twisting his words. Evidently the term is a very loaded one indeed.

But the thing that puzzled the hell out of me was Lowndes' statement "the person who is compelled to seek out ('unnatural') impulses in himself and others and try to punish all wicked people who have such 'unnatural' impulses.... is just as much of a 'sex criminal,' clinically speaking, as the opposite extremist who rapes, tortures, seduces and assaults children; the important difference in our society is that in most instances, the law is on the side of the negative sex extremist..." This sounds like it might be good theology. But it's not good psychology. The accepted psychological theory is along the slightly more reasonable lines that, say, a person who is violently anti-homosexual may well be so because he is afraid of homosexual impulses in himself.

But even if Lowndes' statement were 100% true, I don't see the relevance of it. Some anti-Breeners--including me--got pretty extreme. But nobody ever said anything about punishing him. Even those who wanted to run him out of fandom on a rail only wanted to get rid of him. And far from seeking Breen out we would have been most grateful had he not thrust himself upon our attention. I would also add that if anyone is seeking out "wicked people" who have "unnatural impulses" he is doing a damn poor job of looking.

It might be relevant to point out that Wetzel was driven out of fandom by essentially BOONDOGGLE-type tactics and on far less evidence than we have on Breen. But everyone was convinced that Wetzel was guilty and that he was dangerous. Most fans just don't think that Breen is all that dangerous.

To oversimplify a trifle, nearly everybody in fandom agrees that seducing children is wrong, but the opinions about the degree of wrongness vary. In general the anti-Breeners seem to feel that seducing children is in the same class with acid throwing; it's something that is utterly beyond the pale. And the pro-Breeners seem to feel that while it's wrong and sick, it's something permissible in human behavior; it's nothing to ostracize anyone for.

Actually our mores seem to be in a state of flux. Forty or fifty years ago the almost universal attitude would have been "Thumbs Down on Breen." Forty or fifty years hence we may be as permissive as the South Seas. At the present time in fandom we have examples of both of these attitudes and all shades in between. I think though that the attitude of most fans would fall in the middle ground. Most fans would say that seducing children is a Bad Thing, and they are going to protect theirs from it, but they feel little or no social responsibility about it. And someone who seduces children is sick and more to be pitied than censured. But on the other hand, since seducing children is bad, there isn't going to be too much condemnation of someone who does do something about it. The BOONDOGGLE was condemned quite heavily, but it's made little change in my social relationships, even with those who have condemned it most strongly.

But in any case there has been no sign or indication that the committee or anyone else in fandom wants to "try to punish all wicked people who have such 'unnatural' impulses." In fact we have been accused of hypocrisy by some on the grounds that we know about and/or let attend the convention other child molesters and homosexuals.

Well, there were several active homosexuals at the convention. So what? If anyone's really interested I had homosexual experiences myself when I was a boy. I don't see that they hurt me. I have homosexual friends now. And I'm not a homosexual because I think ---ing is more fun, not because I think there's anything wrong with being a homosexual.

But as far as I know there were no child molesters at the convention. And while I do know of three other fans who are reputed to be such, none of them were at the convention nor expected to appear. And of these other three, in one of the cases I know the guy fairly well and don't believe it; the other two are to the best of my knowledge reformed and in any case one of them has been gafia for years and the other is well known to old-time fans.

Well, so much for Lowndes. However, since I do know the subject fairly well--and that's a pun, son--let's see what I can figure out about my motives and all--using a minimum of psychological gobble-de-gook. And a minimum of rationalization. Which is more difficult.

Let's look at the BOONDOGGLE. It is an extraordinary document. And to me, rereading it now, the most extraordinary thing about it is the honesty of it. There isn't a quibble in it. It's an exact statement of what I did, thought and felt re the question of Walter Breen. This article may approach it's honesty because I'm trying, but I was highly emotional at the time--I'm not now--and in portraying those emotions accurately, a hell of a lot of other things came across. Also, I rewrote the BOONDOGGLE seven or eight times and I'm not about to do so to this.

And when writing the BOONDOGGLE I seem to have been in pretty full contact with my emotions too. I was repressing some guilt, but that showed up. Obviously I wouldn't have spent so much time trying to get down exactly how I felt--as if complete honesty could make up for everything--if I had been completely happy about it. Also, while I find Breen hilarious on occasion, I don't find him nearly as funny as I portrayed him. That was a pure defensive reaction. And evidently a fairly successful one. A couple of people with robust senses of humor have told me that the BOONDOGGLE is the funniest thing they have ever read, and I still--in spite of everything--find it funny myself.

Oddly enough I tried to be fair to Breen. Of course in one sense it wasn't fair to write and publish any of these details, but I tried to be fair in the sense of not exaggerating or shading. I also clearly separated what Breen did and what I thought about it. With each of the children involved I did use the worse known incident, but I strove to portray these accurately. And to date only one valid correction has been received for these: one child was followed into the bedroom, not into the bathroom. And even though in the BOONDOGGLE I said this incident was evidence only of an unhealthy interest in children, I have since been persuaded that even this was exaggerated. I took my account from his mother's story and reactions as she described them to me at the time. It later developed that her reaction was due to her knowledge of Breen's reputation, not anything overt that he did at the time. However, all the other incidents were at least as bad as described.

And naturally I discarded all incidents that I wasn't sure of, retaining only those that I had seen myself or had been described to me by a direct eyewitness or things substantiated by Breen's own admissions.

So, the BOONDOGGLE is a sincere, intensely felt, highly charged emotional document. Reactions to it were equally as intense. And each reader seemed to colloborate in writing his own BOONDOGGLE as it were. Most of the violent objectors to it have each had their own individual reasons for objecting. In many cases you'd hardly think they were talking about the same document.

Several people complained about "purple language" and "slanted prose" or whatnot. In most cases they turned out to be talking about a different passage and hadn't even noticed one someone else was talking about. Actually a dispassionate analysis will reveal that most of the language used is rather clinical and/or direct quotes. And any slanting is my unconscious bit about making it funny, not in intensifying the incidents. Obviously it would have been more effective if I hadn't done this.

I was also honest in giving my opinions about it all. Readers may recall that among other things I said (1) I wasn't all that convinced that sex with child was that dreadful. (2) I didn't really see the necessity for barring Breen from the convention.

I also said that I would like to perform a surgical operation separating Breen from fandom. I still think that fandom would be better off without him; however, various people have pointed out that it's no one's business or right to make a decesion for someone else

about who he is going to associate with. This is a perfectly valid point. But as I keep pointing out in return, there's really no way to keep people from associating with someone either. No one can be surgically removed from fandom as long as fans are individually willing to associate with him.

Well it's pretty obvious that even apart from the ethics of it, publishing the BOONDOGGLE was a pretty stupid thing to do. And it's an obviously stupid thing to do, fugg-headed in fact. I'm not that dumb I assure you. The BOONDOGGLE seems designed to bring the wrath of fandom down on my head. And I think it was.

Why? To punish myself of course.

I think this may be the point to enter a disclaimer. In spite of the way this seems to be tending, I didn't take out after Walter Breen because I don't like him. No. I think I know myself reasonably well and would not be able to hide that at this point. Obviously I don't like Walter Breen. But there are a lot of people around who rile me more, but I'm still content to live and let live.

Nevertheless I think that personal animosity played a part in my motivation. Gordon Eklund put it rather well in his letter in MINAC. He said in effect that I wasn't doing this to Walter Breen because I disliked him, but I wouldn't be doing it if I liked him. That struck me with blinding effect even through all the rationalizing I was doing at the time. And it's not very nice either. But it's sure true.

But leave us return to the BOONDOGGLE. And remember it is an honest document and an accurate portrayal of my emotions and opinions. And remember I said that I wasn't all that convinced that sex with children was all that dreadful and that I didn't see the necessity for barring Breen from the convention.

However it's unfortunately only too obvious that to publish the BOONDOGGLE to even such a limited circulation as was originally planned for it, only makes sense if I had already decided--on some level anyhow--that Walter Breen was going to be barred and that fandom was going to be told Why.

It's probably relevant to say here that I was only one member of a committee. I'm only talking about my own reasons and motives. The other members have their own ethical convictions and ideas. Even if I had decided against it, it would not have stopped the exclusion. But things would have been done differently.

So, while I wasn't convinced of the necessity of barring Breen, I was convinced of its desirability. Why? Leave us return to the BOONDOGGLE wherein all my attitudes are found. There is one common thread running through my attitudes, one underlying reaction to Walter Breen. It isn't moral disapproval. It isn't even dislike. It's distaste. I'm afraid I objected more to the flagrant display and boasting of his quirks than I did to the quirks themselves. I found them and him embarrassing and distasteful.

Also mentioned in the BOONDOGGLE was the whole question of Responsibility that had been agitating me most severely the previous months. I had changed my views on a number of things and decided that one did owe responsibility to larger units than individuals. I still think that. But I think that somebody who had always had conservative ideas about responsibility would have goofed less badly than I did. Responsibility was a New Scene for me and I didn't quite know how to handle it. And while I didn't think seducing children was Evil, I did think it was Bad and that I had the responsibility to protect the convention members, etc. Whether they wanted to be protected or not.

And this mixed with my distaste to produce the attitude "There will be none of these Goings On at our convention." Or in other words I let power go to my head. And oddly enough this is one thing nobody seems to have accused me of.

I must admit that I never gave a damn about our legal liability and didn't even care very much whether Breen did anything at the convention. I knew he had made contacts at other conventions and assumed he would do the same at this one. And I felt responsible for that too. This is extending one's Moral Responsibility pretty far, but I really felt that way.

However, if it had been a question of the now-gafia child molester I would have done my damnedest to do this all without publicity. I liked him. Apart from his sexual sickness he was a nice guy.

And why the publicity about Breen? Let's return to the BOONDOGGLE. I said that I didn't see any reason for barring him from the convention if he were still able to continue his activities in fandom. Therefore, the publicity was not to explain our barring him, but to Warn Fandom about the Monster.

Obviously an Attack of Responsibility coming on fairly late in life is a pretty serious disease. One should get inoculations or something.

But being felled by an Attack of Responsibility and all didn't mean that I had suddenly become a different person. I still had my old standards and attitudes also. So naturally I had Guilt Feelings like all bloody hell. And equally naturally I repressed them. But they still operated. I arranged to punish myself as well as to Take Care of Walter Breen.

Obviously if the only idea were to Take Care of Walter Breen the smart thing to have done would have been to quietly expel him. Naturally he would have told his friends. And they would have screamed with outrage. When the screams reached the deafening level we could have presented our side of the case. And if it hadn't been for the BOONDOGGLE, that is most probably what would have happened.

Obviously I think my Telling All about Breen was unethical. But it's unethical only because I personally don't think seducing children is all that bad. If I did think so, I believe that revealing the facts about Breen would be a highly moral act. If someone is engaged in activities harmful to others, you warn others about him. At least I think so. But since I don't think Walter is all that dangerous I should have kept my mouth shut.

Of course once the BOONDOGGLE was published and we had expelled Breen and the attacks began to come I started rationalizing like mad. Even more so. It'd be an extremely peculiar person who wouldn't under those circumstances. And such odd rationalizations. Not only was excluding Walter Breen the True, the Good, the Beautiful, but it was also the politically-wise thing to do. I kept insisting so at Great Length. This was sort of asinine because if excluding Breen had ever had any political value at all, insisting that it did would destroy it.

Much praise has recently been devoted to the philosophy "Live and let live." And it must be admitted that it does have a great deal to say for it. It's a quite necessary approach to civilized living.

On the other hand that's exactly what all those people in Queens were doing when the girl was stabbed to death. They were minding their own business and living and let living. You have to draw the line somewhere. You can't just lie back and say "Anything Goes." If someone is damaging others--especially children--in your presence or with your knowledge I think it's highly ethical to do something about it or to warn others who can do something about it.

Acid throwing is nice and simple and clear cut. Everyone agrees that's bad. But seducing children is more complex. And I think that each individual has to make up his own mind what's ethical for him, whether to "Live and let live" or to do everything he can to stop it or to protect the person others are trying to stop. Obviously there's going to

be no consensus about it. Equally obviously what is ethical behavior for one person is going to be unethical for another. And my behavior was unethical for me: once my rationalizations are stripped away I don't think seducing children is all that bad.

However, I'm only one member of a committee. The other members of the committee-- along with many other fans--think it is pretty bad. And they have massive support from psychologists for their attitude. Also, the other committee members were worried about their financial liability. So in any event I would most probably have been overruled and Breen would have been expelled.

But everything would have gone So Much Smoother if I hadn't had that Attack of Responsibility and all. And oddly enough the anti-Breeners have much more reason for a beef with me than the pro-Breeners whom I delivered plenty of ammunition to. Not to mention that the anti-Breeners have been put in the position of going along with something they don't approve of. (They don't like the BOONDOGGLE either.) I seemed to have ----ed up all around and messed everybody up.

But humility doesn't really become me so I'll close with this quote from Theodor Reik's "The Need to be Loved" which I'll try to live up to:

"One can feel sorry about something without feeling guilty. Feeling guilty is as useless as crying over spilled milk. One may regret having done something wrong without being emotionally crushed by it. Too deep grief would dishearten and humiliate the individual. A clear understanding of the significance of our misdeeds or wrong-doings is emotionally healthier than hopeless misery afterward. 'I have done this; it was wrong; it is done with,' is perhaps the better attitude."

Bill Donaho
April 1965