

Kipple

NO 34

FEBRUARY 4, 1963

Kipple is published whenever the urge strikes by Ted Pauls, 1448 Meridene Dr., Baltimore 12, Maryland. Copies are available for letters of comment, contributions, trades, or the cash sum of 20¢ per issue. Subscriptions will be spent in perpetuating my life of sin.

"Not all of my enemies are fools; but all fools are my enemies." --Anon

DEPARTMENT OF FORMAT CHANGES

If you are a victim of habit--or what Larry McCombs refers to as "reinforced conditioning"--you've no doubt removed the wrong staples from this issue and find yourself grasping twelve loose sheets. Staid, stereotyped Kipple may have seemed the least likely amateur magazine in existence to make sudden, radical changes in format, but it has indeed done so. The reason is simply boredom. Naturally, I could never become bored with the content, since every tan page mirrors my own personality, but the format is a different matter. I do not wish to consume a great deal of valuable space enlarging on this premise, but briefly, it is a loss of enthusiasm with the more mechanical aspects of Kipple which has led to the revamping of the format. The January issue, #33, is a particularly unfortunate example of this. That issue contained what I quite honestly believe to be some of the best writing I have ever done, but the effect, if I may be allowed an immodest parable, was equivalent to drinking imported beer from a rusty tin can. Kipple was quite frankly in a rut.

There is no particular reason why an amateur magazine should imitate the format of professional magazines, but Kipple, along with many others, was ruefully guilty of this. Fancy layouts, contents page, page numbers, occasional "covers", "binding" on the left side...all of this is unnecessary in a small-circulation personal journal of opinion. A rigid schedule is equally useless. But perhaps you marvel at my lack of intelligence in discovering this after nearly three years. I cannot sufficiently explain this myself. But with the January issue, the true uselessness of all the above-mentioned traits made itself known to me. After thirty-two issues and hundreds of layouts, I could not devise any reasonably new ones: all four internal layouts in that issue are copied from previous issues, hardly an interesting process since it entails little creation. The page numbers and the contents page appeared to me, for the first time, to be ludicrous. And the full impact of the stupidity of rigidly maintaining a schedule struck me as a result of two excellent letters which arrived January ninth and were consequently deleted from the issue. These letters would have added tremendously to the interest of the letter column, but because of my stubborn concern with adhering to a precise schedule, they could not be included.

Here, then, is the new Kipple, an amateur journal in newsletter format. The material will no doubt retain its stodgy, pompous tone, and the letter-writers and I shall still make a practice of conspicuous hair-splitting. But other things have changed. Some of the additions and deletions are immediately obvious to the casual glance, others perhaps less so. Letters, for example, will be printed at different points in the issue, each letter headed by an underlined introduction in much the same fashion as my material. My replies will continue to appear in double parentheses identified by hyphens. Articles will be published in much the same fashion, unless the writer should demand a lettered head-

ing, in which case I shall give him one out of courtesy.

On the other hand, much remains the same. All of the minor items of format--paragraphing, indenting quoted material in the body of an article, etc.--are unchanged, and the methods by which you may acquire this journal (for which see the colophon) are likewise unchanged. The subscription remains the same despite the reduction in size largely to discourage subscriptions.

The only other significant change is that of schedule, which is now simply this: no schedule. Kipple will continue to be reasonably frequent, as my magazines have always been, but no longer will I be subject to the rigid schedule of the past. All in all, the new Kipple promises more enjoyment for me--and, I hope, for you as well.

"WHY, SUH, SOME OF MY BEST FRIENDS..."

The sentiments expressed by the motto adorning the top of the first page are particularly relevant to the first section of what in another day would have been an installment of Quotes & Notes. Racists of various types have always been among the most singular fools, but among all racists one particular type is outstandingly moronic. Surpassing for sheer idiocy even George Lincoln Rockwell and friends are the bigots who sprinkle throughout their tirades against a specific racial type the plaint that they are really very broadminded, it's just that these people are taking over and diluting our fine old American stock and... Most of us have had acquaintance with at least one representative of this particular breed. They are probably not consciously lying when they claim to be broadminded, I should point out; they are usually quite convinced of their lack of prejudice. It is this genuine sincerity which catches one off guard for a moment, and under these circumstances it is possible to listen for a few seconds to a racist tirade without realizing its identity.

Recently, an example of just such a bigot made himself known to our homey little microcosm, challenging once again the not always facetious proposal that science fiction fans have broad mental horizons. The name of this personage is Bill Mallardi, co-editor with Bill Bowers of Double Bill, a cleverly titled and competently assembled magazine. Mr. Mallardi exposes his peculiar attitude in an article entitled "Some Defeats For: Integration". He begins the jeremiad by noting that he is angry ("so mad, inwardly, that I don't know whether or not I can get it across to you in words..."), surely an unfortunate state in which to author an article. Even making allowances for such anger, however, does not render palatable the subsequent tirade. By way of qualification before beginning the treatise itself, Mr. Mallardi whines the following in a manner calculated to irritate (punctuation, grammar and spelling are, of course, strictly in context):

"Now don't get me wrong, I'm going to tell you now and I want you to remember this all the way thru this article: I DO believe in integration, and am violently opposed to the views held by the segregationists. (At least, I believe in integration of the schools down South, and other things of that nature, tho more drastic measures such as inter-racial marriages I'm not too keen on). But at any rate I want you to understand that I'm about as broadminded as I or anyone else could possibly be concerning the rights of the Negro."

Now, despite the qualification about inter-marriage, this entire paragraph appears reasonable. Unfortunately, Mr. Mallardi's subsequent

comments do not bear out his avowal of broadmindedness, except insofar as that term refers to having a hole in the head. The material which he presents as "defeats for integration" is simply a rehash of two news stories concerning illegal acts committed by Negroes, plus a few of Mr. Mallardi's irrelevant and emotional personal interjections. The first concerns a Negro mortician who accepted money for burials but failed to bury the bodies, thus realizing a tidy profit. A number of bodies of children were found in the basement of his establishment. This is, of course, illegal; in addition, it isn't very nice. But Mr. Mallardi deplores it all out of proportion to the seriousness of the crime: "Now if that isn't the lowest thing for a human being to do, just for a few extra bucks, and especially to his own people, then.....hell, I don't know, I'm speechless..." Perhaps it will shock Mr. Mallardi that I am not properly outraged by this dastardly act, but I suppose that has something to do with my lack of concern for my own corpse. When this enfeebled body at last expires sometime in 2033 A.D., I don't particularly care what happens to my body. The proper authorities can use it for a railroad tie, if they wish (with apologies to Henry David Thoreau).

The second incident quoted in Double Bill concerns a 19-year-old Negro babysitter who was caught by the parents of her charge allowing her boyfriend to stay overnight, and in retaliation for being fired, she strangled the baby at the first opportunity. This is a considerably more serious matter, and the girl in question is obviously mentally unbalanced. But perhaps you don't see what this has to do with integration, defeated or otherwise. Mr. Mallardi explains:

"SO, now you see. Thats the reason I'm so mad; that the negros scream for their civil rights and better treatment, while all along stupid individuals FROM THEIR OWN RACE pull down all their attempts of being respected and getting results integration-wise, by sick and sometimes violent actions like the two mentioned above. Of course, I am also personally angry at the two individuals involved, but that doesn't help matters one way or another, even though the acts were deplorable. I mean, there isn't anything I can do, the law will take care of them; even though when I first heard the news (incidentally, both had happened within 7 days or so of each other) I could almost agree to getting a lynch mob together and taking care of them personally. Which, I realize, would just bring me down to their level of lowness."

Apparently, the implication is that no race which deserves equality should have any criminals among it, which neatly destroys the claims of every race on the face of the earth. If I possessed Terry Carr's fine talent for satire, I would probably write a few paragraphs from the viewpoint of the white supremacist, deploring the actions of a Charles Starkweather or a William Heirens every time "we" begin to show progress in proving our "superiority". But, regrettably, I have no talent for that form of writing, and so in my normal stodgy, pedantic fashion I must observe that Mr. Mallardi's bigotry is only partially masked in this diatribe. He attacks, it is true, two criminals, but he takes special pains at the outset to identify them with the integration movement. The implication is obvious.

The previous quotations, however, would hardly stand comparison for sheer stupidity with this next brief paragraph. Up until now, his comments have contained merely implications. But now Mr. Mallardi de-

cides to lodge an actual charge:

"As an aside, personally I wouldn't doubt but that at least two or three of those nine babies were illegitimate, though the papers never mentioned it, and that's one of the reasons why he could get away with it as long as he did. It is also my personal belief that negro girls, generally speaking, have just about the lowest morals (in the U.S.) than the white girls would ever have..."

This paragraph implies an attitude with which John Howard Griffin deals in his excellent book, "Black Like Me". It is a situation in which a man vicariously indulges himself by identifying with a girl's partner in immoral acts which he attributes to her (and of which she is very likely innocent). If one's imagination is fertile, it is considerably cheaper than feeble peectures... Griffin found the attitude quite commonly held in the South, where he travelled as a Negro thanks to a medical treatment by which his skin was darkened. Most white men were not inclined to speak to him at length, but those who did strike up a conversation were only interested in one thing: sex. Apparently, it is a commonly held premise among the white southerners that Negroes habitually indulge in all sorts of exotic forms of sexual pleasure. The men who asked Griffin to describe these acts began with an air of superiority or indignation, but this quickly turned to rabid interest and even pleading.

The distorted picture of Negro activities held by these people is not too surprising, but surprising indeed is their frantic desire to experience, even vicariously, such erotic pleasure. The white supremacists evidently see no contradiction here between their superiority delusions, on the one hand, and their envious imaginings, on the other.

I am not prepared to state that Mr. Mallardi is motivated by similar interests to attribute low morals to Negro girls, and I shall resist the temptation to base an analysis of his psyche on other phrases and statements in his article. (I am, for one reason, completely unqualified to author such an analysis, although their are assumptions about the emotional being behind such paragraphs as I have quoted that even a layman of my meagre learning might reasonably make.) It is, at any rate, a safe assumption that Mr. Mallardi speaks from second- or third-hand information, and I suggest that if he wishes to make further similar statements he first read a reputable sociological study. He will find that while a larger--although by no means overwhelming--percentage of Negro girls are more likely to be "morally lax" than white girls, this is simply a result of another finding: morals are looser in lower income groups. Since most Negroes are forced to remain in these lower income groups, they naturally reflect the morality of such groups. Any statement which can be made about the "average" laborer is going to be equally true of the "average" Negro, since the percentage of Negro laborers is so high. So there are no statements of this sort which apply to Negroes per se, but only to the economic groups to which they belong--usually through no fault of their own. (It should be noted, parenthetically, that "loose morals" in this context usually refers to an acceptance of pre-marital intercourse and promiscuity. This is a moral code which long ago outlived its usefulness, a restriction which no longer serves a purpose. Pre-marital relations and promiscuity are found in all social strata; the only difference is that the "lower" classes admit it, while the "upper" classes give lip service to chastity. Eventually, no doubt, this healthy attitude will penetrate upward; meanwhile, the Bill Mallardis of the world can be simultaneously out-

raged and jealous of the "lower" classes.)

Another example of the same unfortunate situation is in intelligence and education: more Negroes are uneducated or educated poorly, at least in many areas of our country. From this fact, the white supremacist draws the totally erroneous conclusion that Negroes are stupid. The result is this circular rat-race: Negroes belong to lower income groups because they are less well educated on the average; they are less well educated because they belong to lower income groups. Where this reasoning finally leads is beyond me.

The authorship of that article assures Bill Mallardi a place in the legion of fuggheads of our little microcosm, a reputation equal to or surpassing that of the other immortals of that company: G.M. Carr, George Wetzel, Bill Conner, D. Bruce Berry, Claude Degler, et al. I trust he will be happy in such suitable company.

BILL PLOTT REPORTS FROM ALABAMA

"I suppose you know by now that the University of Alabama closed registration a few weeks ago, thus ending all possibilities of integration here for the spring semester which begins in about two or three weeks. The reason for this move has never been publicly given, but rumors managed to trickle down through the grapevine. The atmosphere on campus, as I pointed out in my last letter, was about as good as one could hope for in view of the circumstances. Civic and faculty groups had passed resolutions; the student legislature passed one the day after the closing of registration was announced, but the resolution had been prepared a week or so before that happened. Most students were willing to go ahead and 'get it over with'. And most important of all, the Mississippi crisis was still a dark cloud hanging over the campus, the community and the entire state.

"Therefore, this seemed like a ripe opportunity to send a Negro in to crack the color barrier permanently (you will recall the Autherine Lucy aborted attempt in 1956; since that time the University has been under court order to admit qualified Negroes). One of the rumors regarding the closing of registration seems to stem from the fact that Governor Wallace and the rest of the state officials are not in complete agreement on how to handle the race issue. Wallace, in his inaugural oration earlier this week, defiantly proclaimed, 'Segregation now...Segregation tomorrow...Segregation forever!' In the speeches that followed, almost every one of his elected subordinates seemed to repudiate Wallace's proclamation and in turn advocated law and order at all costs. Also there is some belief that the state legislature is not totally behind Wallace. From this stems the rumor that the University hopes that there will be a wide breach between Wallace and the legislature next September; in the event of such a miracle, integration could be effected without as much danger of his interference if the legislature refuses to pass laws granting him further powers.

"Wallace is in a rather precarious position. He commands a great deal of power, but he also has some serious limitations. The President of the United States can hire and fire, almost at will, his cabinet members (with Congressional approval on the appointment, of course). Wallace, however, cannot do this, because all of his 'cabinet' members are popularly elected. Therefore they are free agents to take what steps seem right to them individually. This could handcuff Wallace considerably. Lt. Governor James Allen has already come out openly advocating law and order. And it is rumored that he and Wallace will not appear as speakers on the same program anywhere unless it is completely unavoidable. Allen might very well be the saving grace of this state in the future.

"I don't think Wallace is quite as popular as he was when he was

2

elected, but on the other hand he may be even more popular with the backwoods farmers and diehard white supremacists. Here on campus, many students are laughing at him openly. On a bulletin board in one of the buildings here, somebody tacked up a picture of him delivering his inaugural address. It was a bust shot which caught him with his mouth open in the middle of a word and his arm raised up in a clenched fist to emphasize his point. Whoever tacked up the picture had quite effectively added with an ink pen a moustache and a patch of hair dangling above his right eyebrow. Combine this picture with the fiery oration he delivered and one is reminded of the newsreel movies of a man called Schicklgruber in Germany. As a matter of fact, a friend of mine was talking with a local white street sweeper, and the sweeper pointed out that Wallace reminded him of Hitler.

"Apparently we will have no trouble here this semester, but I definitely feel that integration will be attempted in September. And it might possibly be attempted in June, when the summer semester begins.

"Now that Clemson College in South Carolina has been ordered to admit Negro Harvey Gant, Alabama will be the only segregated state left by the first of summer. That, too, might help to alleviate some of the strife and resentment that could come if there were others standing by to support Alabama. I noticed that the new governor of South Carolina held a public barbecue after his inauguration. Everyone, black and white, was invited and several hundred Negroes attended without incident. If only Alabama could follow her measure!

"Mike Deckinger: Mike, you apparently don't realize the deep-rooted hatred and bigotry that so many Alabamians hold for the Negro. Anyone who hints at supporting civil rights and integration is abhorred with equal fervor. These people are so moved by their bias that they reach a peak of complete disregard for law and order. Homes have been bombed, people have been flogged, and jobs have been lost when people spoke out against the 'Southern way of life'. These people don't realize that they are the ones who are communistic, rather than the NAACP, CORE, and all who labor for equality and the rights of the individual. Ted reiterated my opinion: defending oneself is fine, but retaliatory measures only tend to increase the chaos, mistrust, and fear that already exist." (P.O. Box 5598, University, Alabama.)

A CONNECTICUT YANKEE IN KOLWEZI

We turn now to a matter of no less importance, although of considerably less urgency, namely the Congo situation. As of this date (Jan. 26), the suppression of the secessionist province of Katanga by United Nations troops is a fait accompli, so any philosophical and ethical discussion at this late date is of purely academic interest. I refrained from commenting on this latest invasion until now because the constantly shifting situation and contradicting reports from the "front", as it were, endangered the conclusions of any possible article. Now that the long-stand crisis has apparently ended, a few words from your obedient servant are in order.

For some as yet obscure reason, the political situation finds conservatives as a whole greatly deploring the use of force by the United Nations to settle the internal affairs of the Congo, while my fellow liberals blandly lend their support to this invasion. I use the word "obscure" advisedly, for while I have heard all of the reasons presented by liberals for their support of the invasion, considerable thought leaves me with the inescapable conclusion that they are one and all irrelevant. Perhaps John Boardman will coggle at this further indication of my occasional alliance with the political right-wing; perhaps he will be able to offer something constructive, such as reasons for the invasion which are more tenable than those with which I propose

to deal. Until such time as he does, however, I will have to assume that the reasons with which I am familiar are the very best which the vaunted liberal intelligentsia can muster. All of them revolve around this situation: Katanga's president, Moise Tshombe, is a dictator under the control of European mining interests who does not speak for his people in choosing to remain independent of the Congo Republic. Most or all of this may be--and probably is--true, but I fail to see how it justifies the United Nations actions in Katanga (which have included advancing contrary to orders and murdering Belgian women, among other unfortunate "mistakes"). The arch-conservatives scream that the United Nations action robs the Katangese of their right of self-determination, and the liberals sneeringly reply that under Tshombe they are already being deprived of that right. Both, in fact, are probably correct.

Naive idealist though I may be, I am quite aware that Moise Tshombe owes a considerable debt to various European mining concerns, without whom his province would likely be bankrupt. He is no doubt willing to go a long way toward pleasing these aforementioned mining interests. I am equally aware that no referendum on secession was ever held in Katanga, and that many Katangese favor reunification. They are thus being deprived of their right of self-determination. Equally obviously, however, many Katangese oppose reunification. The exact percentages are unknown, since no one has bothered to consult the Katangese. So if some inhabitants are being robbed of their self-determination by Tshombe, it must at least be said that some others are being robbed of their self-determination by the United Nations. At this point, I feel it wise to trundle in an old proverb: Two wrongs don't make a right. Motheaten though it may be, this cliché is quite appropriate to the situation. If Mr. Tshombe is wrong to form a new country without the express consent of the populace, how less wrong is it for the United Nations to retaliate by destroying that new country without the express consent of the populace?

Moreover, I am ashamed to say that a good deal of the liberal support for this United Nations venture appears to have evolved more out of a dislike for Mr. Tshombe, his ideals, and his friends, than out of any reasoned consideration of the situation. The reasoning apparently runs thusly: Tshombe is a conservative, aided by "colonial" interests; conservatives and colonialists are evil; ergo, Tshombe is evil, and deserves no consideration. To these "liberals", the fact that Tshombe is not a liberal is apparently more important than whether or not his cause is just.

When the invasion of Cuba was proposed, a resounding cry of "No!" arose from liberal ranks (including your beloved editor). A portion of this opposition was caused by the fact that such an invasion might trigger a nuclear holocaust, but I thought that at least a portion of it was based on a principle, namely that the United States does not go around conquering countries it doesn't like. The parallel between Castro and Tshombe is obvious. Dr. Castro could not be accused of being under the control of European mining interests, but he is certainly under the control of Russian political interests. He probably no longer has the approval of a majority of his people. Yet some of my fellow liberals support, with customary gusto, the fall of Mr. Tshombe's state, while simultaneously lapsing into apoplexy at the mere suggestion of invading Cuba. I would not like to believe that this difference in reactions is caused merely by the fact that Dr. Castro and Mr. Tshombe belong to different political wings. That isn't how I practice liberalism, and I would not like to believe that I am particularly unique among liberals.

My preference for a Congo policy is what I believe to have been the only fair one. It would probably also have been a workable one, as-

suming the rulers of the Congo Republic proper could be pacified. The United Nations, having now virtually full control of the province of Katanga, should initiate a referendum in which every citizen of Katanga would have the right to vote on secession. And the United Nations should insure that the decision, whatever it is, was carried out. This is hardly the best of all possible solutions, inasmuch as it does admit the acceptance of enforcing policy by force of arms, but the situation has deteriorated so far that it is probably the best that could be accomplished now. Its chances of being carried out are about as good as George Lincoln Rockwell's chances of being elected to the Presidency...

FORCED CONFORMITY: A FEW WORDS

Discussions of rules governing "proper" attire in schools appear to be a regular feature of this magazine, periodically cropping up and dying out as various cities hit the front pages of the nation's press with news of their edicts. The general trend of these discussions appears to be towards large-scale shoulder-shrugging and chiding of your obedient servant for introducing so insignificant a topic. Speaking merely from memory, I would say that in the previous thirty-three issues of this magazine, at least half a dozen of which have featured this discussion in its various forms, not one reader commented on the principle involved in these situations. The participants in these discussions displayed a singular devotion to specifics, and to attempts to convince me that the fads being banned are unattractive. This I have never denied. I nevertheless submit that school authorities have absolutely no right to impose any such "code" of attire on the pupils; nor do the majority of the pupils have the right to impose such a code on the minority. This issue, insignificant in itself, is tremendous in the principle it encompasses.

Recently, Philadelphia's school authorities drafted a "code of proper attire" governing the appearance of some 96,000 students, ostensibly with the approval of the majority of those students. The code bans dungarees, "clanking hobnails", flamboyant shirts, sideburns and ducktail haircuts for boys, and beehive hairdos, short skirts, sloppy sox, tight slacks, jangling jewelry and "messy makeup" for girls. No penalty for infraction is encompassed within the code itself; enforcement is the prerogative of individual principals and student governments. The avowed purpose of the code is "to bring greater dignity into the classroom and to eliminate anti-social behavior..." I am willing to stipulate that it will accomplish the first objective, although whether or not this has any particular importance is a moot point. It will certainly not accomplish the second objective; behavior affects attire, but it is hardly likely that the reverse is equally true. But nit-picking aside, I do not hesitate to admit that strict enforcement of the code will improve the general appearance of the students.

This, however, is no proper function of the schools. However desirable may be the objective, there remains the fact that strict laws are not the means, nor schools the body, to accomplish it. Despite the fact that the majority of students who bothered to vocalize their opinion supported the poll, it is an unjust one. By my reasoning last issue (see "The Just Society Revisited, Kipple #33), the just solution to a given situation is the one which assures freedom of choice to the largest number of people. There are three alternatives here: (1) force all students to wear so-called "improper" attire, (2) force all students to wear so-called "proper" attire, (3) allow all students to dress as they please within the limits of the law. It is obvious that of these, only the third is a just alternative. We may use Aristotle's reasoning equally well in this situation and say that alternative number three is a virtuous mean between two evil extremes. Enforcing no

code of dress whatever, those students who wish to wear dress shirts and a suit, or long dresses, pigtails and high-necked sweaters, may dress in this manner. They may of course argue with the other students, attempting to convince them that dungarees and ducktail haircuts (or "sloppy sox" and mascara) are unattractive. But under no circumstances have they the right to enforce their standards on any other group. This strikes at something basic in our society, the right to choose.

The law dictates that a person have certain portions of his body covered when appearing in public. Beyond this, neither law nor justice presume to impose standards. This is not accidental; the gentlemen who devised our laws and formulated our system of justice realized that justice prohibited enforced conformity save in a very general fashion. It is reasonable to decree by law that a person appearing in public must be wearing something; but it is not reasonable to rule what that "something" may or may not be.

The specifics in this case are indeed insignificant. But the ramifications are far-reaching. If a vaguely delineated "majority" can govern the dress of a minority, then they can do likewise with the actions of that group (in areas not already covered by law). If conformity of attire can be enforced, then conformity of action can likewise be enforced. It is eventually going to occur to someone that conformism cannot be implemented merely by enforcing conformity of attire, and then rules will be formulated forcing the minority to act like the majority. From this it is a relatively easy step to a rule insuring that the minority think like the majority. If it isn't acceptable that there be obvious external differences, then it certainly isn't acceptable (from the viewpoint of the majority) that the minority have different ideas and opinions.

This very possibly sounds absurd, and I will doubtless be accused of going overboard in my condemnation of this insignificant situation. Be that as it may, I happen to believe that conformity is an unhealthy goal for humanity. And I intend to scream like a wounded banshee every time I notice the cause of conformity gaining a foothold.

BERNIE MORRIS DISCUSSES MY RELIGION

"Your list of logical reasons for doubting the truth of Revealed Religion is as fine a one as I could ever hope to produce. I personally favor the 'look-at-the-horrible-deeds-of-men-in-the-power-of-a-Just-and-All-Powerful-God' approach, not just the ones inspired by religious zeal like the Inquisition, the Thirty Years War, or St. Bartholomew's night, but the organized murder of the past few thousand years which we are pleased to call history.

"But all these arguments and proofs crumble into dust in the face of a True Believer.

"The only article that I ever read that treated the problem realistically was by George von Hilsheimer in The Realist. He is a Unitarian minister who admits to being a Boy Preacher in his earlier days. Revival meetings and all; Hallelujah, praise the Lord, and pass the plate. His attitude to your excellent list is 'all that flip isn't worth a damn'. For you see, or more likely you do not see, Truth is based on Divine Revelation and doesn't give a damn for logic. All Believers know that they are Right.

"To drive this point home, I think I'll attack your religion (the fact that it is also my religion will be ignored for the duration by this Jolly Insurgent).

"'But I'm a good, God-fearing Agnostic,' you say.

"'You're a devout Believer,' says I.

"'In what?'

"'In Toleration, Liberalism; what is generally known as the "mo-

dem world viewpoint". Founded in Athens and Runnymede, and San Francisco, your Faith tells you it is Right "To reaffirm faith in fundamental rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small." You accept these ideas as the only sane way to run a family, a nation, a world. Now comes the \$64 question: Can you prove it?'

"What do you mean prove it? Isn't it obvious? Are you some sort of Right-Wing-John-Birch-Reactionary?'

"Calm down, Ted, all I asked for was a little logical or experimental proof. While you're thinking about it I'll give some proof that Democracy and Human Rights are a lot of drivel.

"What's happened to repressed people who suddenly become free and in possession of all the Rights mentioned in the UN Charter? Well, in the Congo they're still killing each other; in your own words, 'the UN, whose Congo soldiers have taken to machine-gunning Belgian women (are no better than their opponents)'. In Ghana they have a flesh and blood ~~God~~ leader who has wiped out all democratic opposition.

"Of course, there's the opinion held by many conservatives that it takes time to ready oneself for self-government. Well, the good people of Mississippi have been at it for a while (or at least half of them have). Do the events of the recent past help your Faith?

"But then many Europeans think that Americans are savages anyway, that it takes centuries for a stable government to form. Unfortunately, the actions of Germany in 1934 or France in 1958 prove that a truly representative government is doomed to go down in confusion, whereupon a Leader (i.e., Dictator) will arise to 'lead' the ~~not~~ noble citizens to greater glory.

"Going from the specific to the general, the same 'look-at-the-horrible-deeds-etc.' reasoning that can be used to cast serious doubt on (note that it does not disprove) the existence of a Benevolent God can be used to cast the same doubt on the existence of the 'Dignity of Man' which the Charter is so anxious to protect. But even worse, if you don't believe in a Supreme Being, you have no choice but to attribute all of man's terrible actions to his basic nature. Thus the judgement of History (boy, aren't we getting Hegelian) not only 'casts serious doubts on' but disproves that man is basically Good. For here the theist's ploy that 'man cannot know the reasons for God's actions' doesn't work. We can and do know the reasons, actions, and consequences of our fellows. His deeds are rotten, ergo he is rotten.

"By now, you probably have some proof that Liberalism is Right. Well, don't bother with it. As science has shown, if something is objectively right, there can never be any proof to the contrary. I have shown said proof. QED, you are not Right. Neither am I. (Your attempt to interdict beforehand any reply I might care to make is interesting. It is not, however, going to be successful, largely because your arguments are based on a premise which, though it might be identified with liberal ideology, I simply do not hold. Your entire argument is calculated to show that man is not basically Good. I quite agree. Therefore, what follows from that premise cannot properly be a relevant refutation to anything I believe. Man is not "basically" good, "basically" evil, or "basically" anything else pertaining to a mental state. As a libertarian, I am naturally inclined to disbelieve anything which might tend towards a determinist philosophy. If free will exists (and I believe that it does), then Man, from birth, cannot be "basically" good or evil. Harry Warner recently attempted a similar argument, and I make to you much the same reply as I made to Harry. His point was that a man is either born with or without ethics--morals, if you will. I submit that the thinking portions of the mind (which replace, in my philosophy, the theist's concept of "soul") are a blank slate from birth. It is the na-

tural tendency of the infant to develop a selfish, egotistical personality (all infants, I think you will agree, are selfish), if only because the only impressions likely to intrude on its still-dormant mind are a few overwhelming needs (food, mostly). This tendency is soon subverted to one degree or another as ethics are taught, selflessness is taught, etc. The success of this teaching, or lack of it, determines a man's personality, his mental (read: spiritual) state, etc. What I am saying, in other words, is that the degree to which an individual will be good or evil is not inherent, but determined by education. From this reasoning naturally proceeds the supposition that our faults are a result of a faulty education (environment), either by teachers or, more likely, by family. This psychological theory is unpopular in some quarters at the moment, since many look upon it as passing the buck. (If I appear to be disregarding the effect of nature and concentrating too heavily upon nurture, let me say that this is quite intentional. Just as nature forms the stomach but has little effect on the type of food introduced into it and consequently the amount of nourishment achieved, so nature forms the brain but has little effect on the material fed into it or the affect achieved by this material. Except in cases of congenital brain defects, then, nature has no control over the use to which education/information is put.) It has often been accused that liberals tend to believe that man is perfect or, at least, perfectable. This is also not a part of my philosophy. Man is obviously not perfect, (that is the safest statement of the year), and I doubt that he is perfectable. This would not be desirable, even if possible, since it would result in a state of absolute conformity, the cause against which I screamed a few pages ago. But I do believe that man can be improved; nothing more, nothing less. The answer to this is education--not the vapid teaching of today, but the sort of education envisioned by Plato and Aristotle, in principle if not in content. To reiterate, man is not basically good, and he probably cannot be perfected; but man can be improved and made, if not "good", at least "better".)

"The faith that let the Christian martyrs face death in ancient Rome is still with us. Today it's shown by the Freedom Riders and the Peace Corp workers who face injury, abuse, and plain hard work in a manner totally out of place in a materialistic society. These people can't prove they are Right. They Know it. They Believe.

"And you Believe. And for that matter so do I, in the face of all the arguments previously brought up." (420 Memorial Drive, Cambridge 38, Mass.)

DON FITCH ON POLITICS

"There seem to be several major dangers facing the country today; the most evident is the threat of foreign aggression, from Russia. There doesn't seem to be much that I, as an individual, can do about this, so it lies outside my scope of immediate interest. The two most obvious ones which I can do something about (if only talk) are that of Communist subversion and that of increasing right-wing Fascism. Actually, I don't feel that I need be too concerned about these. The John Birch Society, et al., together with the FBI and the congressional investigating committees, will keep the limelight on the Commie Menace. The liberals will continue to point out the dangers facing us from the radical right.

"However, I see, as exceedingly dangerous, a fourth factor, and this is what makes me call myself a conservative. I find myself in agreement with Lord Acton; I do not trust Men, when they have Power. I see Power being centralized in the United States in the Federal Government (and in the regional branches of government as well), and I consider that there is a strong possibility that this power, when it be-

comes great enough, will fall into the hands of unscrupulous men who will use it to prevent themselves from being held responsible for its use (or misuse) by the people. There appears to be a clear danger, in other words, that the U.S. is moving towards a Totalitarian Government, and I am opposed to this.

"I recognize that the government must do for the people what they cannot do for themselves, but the growing tendency seems to be for the government to do for the people what they will not do for themselves. Man, in my observation, is basically lazy; he isn't going to work if he thinks he sees a chance of getting something for nothing--from the government, in this case. Man may or may not be stupid, but he's a little bit slow--slow to realize that when he resigns to the government some function which he previously carried out for himself, he's going to have to pay for it somehow. Maybe with increased taxes, maybe with the resignation of some small amount of the individual freedom of choice which he previously enjoyed, probably with both.

"One thing which rather turns me off the liberals is their habit of frequently repeating such catch-phrases as 'The Goldwater conservatives want to turn the world back a century,' and 'They want to build a mile-high wall around the U.S.' My only acquaintance with Sen. Goldwater is through reading, once in a while, his occasional column in the Los Angeles Times, because it appears on the same page as the Interlandi cartoon and I turn to that while I'm eating breakfast. But from this, I get a strong impression that the senator is a rather intelligent man, and I can't believe that he actually considers it possible to turn back time in its course, or that it's possible for the U.S. to avoid taking its place as one of the three or four major world powers. Nor do I think it probable that he considers it possible to halt or reverse the tendency, prevalent in the U.S. as in the rest of the world, towards a greater centralization of power in National Government. I do believe that he, like many other conservatives, and like myself, is attempting to slow down this accretion of Authority to the State, in order to give the people an opportunity to reconsider, and perhaps to back down gracefully, before it is too late--before that power is so entrenched that it can be removed only by revolution.

"I sometimes think that Sen. Goldwater is overly optimistic; I think that bread (or increased Social Security, socialized medicine, urban renewal, federal aid to education, farm subsidies which make it more profitable not to work, and much etc.) and circuses (did you watch the astronaut parade down Fifth Ave.?) may easily be more appealing to the people than an existence which makes them responsible for their own success or failure. (I presume that you are opposed to all of those items listed as "bread". No doubt we would get along well enough without them, but at least two of them--urban renewal and federal aid to education--strike me as being fine ideas, progressive steps worth taking. As for Social Security, this too I favor, although I would prefer it to be voluntary rather than mandatory.)

"Like John Boardman, I remember the times before WWII; I remember when someone who had served in the army was unusual, and college students didn't have to expect to spend a year or two in the service. A time when people were known by names, not by numbers. But that was in my childhood; I managed to adapt to the fact that for two years I was U.S. 56 069 509, and I'm even managing to adapt now to the fact that I'm #572-54-0646--the Social Security number under which I pay my income tax and under which the government will eventually enter and compute all my major financial transactions. I'm putting those numbers here as sort of a Grand Gesture, like that of the signer of the Declaration of Independence who added his address under his name in order that there be no mistake about his identity. There is a strong possi-

bility that within 20 years a number of people will be called upon to answer under oath the question, 'Did you ever write a letter which appeared in the pages of Kipple?' and I only hope that I will have the courage to say 'yes'--or that there will still be some countries which offer political asylum, and which retain some of the freedoms which the American people are rapidly resigning. (I've been overstating here--a little.)

"Because I'm attempting to conserve things in our tradition which I consider to be of value, because I believe in the greatest possible degree of individual freedom, because I believe that Power, in any hands, is liable to misuse as it grows greater, I seem to be a conservative. I wonder if John Boardman can ever realize that I look aghast at many of the actions of some people who also call themselves conservatives, and that I am bitterly opposed to violence, to censorship, to the abuse of invested power wherever it is displayed--regardless of the label pasted on the person who perpetrates it." (3908 Frijo, Covina, California.)

JOHN BOARDMAN THROWS KEROSENE ON THE FIRE

"Have you noticed that the same readers who reject the idea that liberals should defend themselves against future conservative violence are most vehement in approving the President's plan to defend in advance against what he considers to be potential aggression from Cuba? I'll grant that I'm partisan; will they admit the same?" (The analogy, I think, is rather strained. The Cuban quarantine was not "defense in advance" (though the planned invasion would have been if it had been carried through), but rather a preventive measure analogous to removing your opponent's weapon from his hands before he has chance to use it on you. Perhaps this is splitting hairs, but to me there appears to be a difference between disarming a man to prevent him from attacking you and killing a man to prevent him from attacking you. And I note that you once again claim that we, your opponents, are opposed to liberals defending themselves. You have made this statement, I believe, in every one of your letters, and I have refuted it each and every time. Once is an error; twice a misconception; three times a bad habit. I'll now try again to cure you of that bad habit. Behold: If attacked, whether by a conservative, a Nazi, or a Socialist, I will defend myself to the best of my abilities. I will grant that any liberal attacked by a conservative (and, of course, vice versa) has the same right to defend himself. If this entails cracking the fellow's head, well, too bad, but he would have done the same to you. But I will not go out and beat up/kill conservatives because they might someday do the same to me, and I will not retaliate against innocent bystanders for an attack merely because my attacker and the bystanders happen to share political beliefs in common. I don't believe that anyone who would do either of these things is very much of a liberal. A leftist, yes, but not a liberal.) (Box 22, New York 33, New York.)

BEN ORLOVE OFFERS A FEW COMMENTS

"On religion: I am an agnostic with atheistic leanings. The world can be traced fairly well from the creation through the formation of the sun, the solar system and life, to the universe today. The problem, then, is the origin. There are several theories about the origin of the universe: the 'Big Bang' theory, which states that everything can be traced back to one big explosion, eons ago, the steady state theory, which says that the universe is infinite in size and age, and the oscillating theory, which says that the universe changes from minimum density to maximum density and then back again. The 'Big Bang' theory doesn't help much, for it doesn't say where the stuff that banged

came from. The steady state theory has many advantages. There are many theories in the steady state hypothesis. One that I find interesting, though I don't know enough astrophysics to be able to determine much about it, is the continuous creation and destruction hypothesis of Kapp. He wrote a book about it, 'Towards a Unified Cosmology', which I strongly recommend. It ties in a great deal, too much to mention here. Another good book on the subject is 'The Universe', a Scientific American book. The oscillating theory is a sub-theory of both, with the problems of both and the advantages of neither.

"Shelters, I agree, aren't worthwhile. The city will be demolished, either by the bomb and its side-effects, or by the survivors looking for food and shelter. In the country, the damage will be due mostly to fallout. However, not that many people live in the country, and the livestock would be killed unless they had shelter. The suburbanites would most likely be away from their homes and shelters. In other words, no war is the best solution.

"On 'The Just Society Revisited': All definitions must eventually lead to concrete objects and actions, otherwise all definitions would be circular. Your definition of 'just', by that criterion, is a good one. There are some things that I think should be controlled (i.e., censored), however, such as narcotics. Drugs of many sorts tend to remove free choice. The same thing applies to food inspection--if you take botulin, for example, you surely won't have free choice. (My definition of narcotic is something which, in the vast majority of cases, produces addiction. One can get addicted to alcohol, airplane glue, or practically anything, assuming psychological addiction; the National Enquirer says nutmeg is addictive. These should not be outlawed. Things like heroin, however, should.) Top secret documents are another exception; they, too, should be censored. On the whole, though I agree with you." (845 E. 14th Street, Brooklyn 30, New York.)

THE DEVIL MEETS HIS MASTER

Censorship, a particularly virulent form of lunacy, has garnered a few headlines recently. Certain books appear to be banned at least a couple of times per year in one city or another, chief among these being "Brave New World", by Aldous Huxley. J.D. Salinger's "The Catcher in the Rye" is also a potential candidate for the "Most Likely to be Burned" award. Recently, in Edgerton, Wisconsin, a faded flyspeck on most maps, the guardians of the public morality struck a potent blow for God and the American Way by undertaking to ban from the town high school this veritable catalogue of filth: "The Catcher in the Rye", "Brave New World", Orwell's "1984", "Of Mice and Men", by John Steinbeck, Fyodor Dostoevsky's "Crime and Punishment", and "The Ugly American", by William Lederer and Eugene Burdick. One of the crusaders astutely pointed out that the books in question "are demoralizing literature inspired by the Communists." But the good people of Edgerton do not intend to sit still for this treatment, and I have no doubt that their heaven-inspired campaign will succeed. This splendid accomplishment will assure Edgerton's undying fame, already partially insured by Goswell Noseblow, a resident of Edgerton and the horseshoe champion of Duckdung County.

But friends, this crusade has shamed me, indeed it has. I have actually read most of these tomes (horrors!) without being aware of the danger, probably because my sinful big-city existence has blunted my moral sensitivities. I tell you I was shocked, absolutely shocked. Until reading of these wonderful Edgerton people, I had not realized how potent was the lure of sin. That I, once a righteous, courageous, and honorable Baptist should have been so misled by what I mistakenly assumed to be good literature, is sufficient to shake the faith of even

the strongest among us. Fortunately, the strong faith of Dr. Billy Graham was able to fortify me in my hour of need, and I have at last seen the Light. Yesterday, I burned all those obscene devil's tools, and today I'm searching for an even better method of reclaiming my soul.

Today I went out and got roaring drunk...

Seriously, and despite my attempt to chide Edgerton in the Boggs manner, I am appalled by these acts. According to the newspaper clipping, dated January 23rd, three parents originally discovered the existence of these books, and they each began calling friends. The friends, who became in their own right properly indignant, were instructed to telephone acquaintances of their own and explain the situation. And thus, not unlike a chain-letter, this abominable crusade was perpetuated. Even the original instigators have no idea how many self-righteous, pompous, overbearing nincompoops have enlisted in the crusade (and admittedly they don't refer to each other in quite that manner), but I suspect the objectors will be numerous enough to cause the removal of the books in question when the school board convenes. Censorship of many of these volumes has been discussed previously in this magazine, but the mere fact of repetition does little to improve my tolerance of the situation. Salinger's novel, in particular, is harmless enough for high school students. True, it contains a certain four-letter word for which polite individuals generally substitute "intercourse" or "sleep", but even Salinger's central character, Holden Caulfield, is properly outraged by its use in these circumstances. Otherwise, the book is totally without "objectionable" material--although, as Gregg Calkins once pointed out, the right kind of mind can find objection to anything. It is also, in my humble opinion, one of the finest books of the century, a quality which should certainly speak favorably for its inclusion in a high school course.

Huxley's "Brave New World" is objectionable (and I use the term strictly in context) largely because it advocates premarital sexual relations. Presumably this precludes its use in high school. "1984" could probably be objected to on the same grounds, but then, so could Kipple, and there is at least one high school in Brooklyn where the latter periodical is read and (presumably) enjoyed. Do you suppose that it will corrupt the morals of those poor innocents? Do you suppose they will engage in premarital relations because I happen to advocate a society in which they will be acceptable? Well, I don't think the students in question (Ben Orlove, Dorothy Braunstein, Carl Lazarus, et al.) are stupid enough to do something merely because I write about it, and I don't think the high school students of Edgerton are stupid enough to do something merely because Aldous Huxley or George Orwell write about it. (Any of these individuals may, I hasten to add, indulge their appetite in this field, but it won't be because Orwell, Huxley or I told them to; it will be because it is what they wish to do. The censors seem to feel that whatever group they are currently attempting to protect--in this case, high school students--possess only the mentality of a monkey, and are inclined to imitate what they see and hear. My opinion of the American public is higher than that.)

Now I suppose after this essay on the intelligence of the high school student, Ben Orlove will immediately go out and get pregnant on my recommendation... It certainly is a wonderful thing.

THAT CRAZY BUCK ROGERS STUFF

Although I personally prefer to think of it as an amateur political journal, Kipple is at least technically an amateur science fiction journal, and with an eye to that distinction, it occurs to me that I ought to mention science fiction or fantasy at least once every six or seven months. On this particular occasion, it is my intention to re-

view a book, although one hardly likely to be unknown to fellow enthusiasts of science fiction and fantasy. August Derleth's anthology, "Strange Ports of Call", was originally published in 1948 and is only likely to be available through used book dealers nowadays. But it is well worth an exhaustive search, if you are one of the relatively few science fiction or fantasy readers who has not read the anthology in one form or another in the fifteen years since its publication. When I recently re-read "Strange Ports of Call", I was pleased to discover that my enjoyment of the anthology is as great now as it had originally been, and I am certain that this tome qualifies as one of the finest anthologies of the genera. There are twenty stories in all, including two classics, several near-classics, and no really poor stories. This is in no sense intended as a full and complete review, but I would like to mention a few of the more notable tales. My review and recommendation of this anthology is intended to serve a double purpose: it is, first of all, to bring this book to the attention of science fiction and fantasy enthusiasts who, for one reason or another, have never read "Strange Ports of Call"; but also--and, perhaps, primarily--it is to recommend the anthology to those readers of Kipple who are not normally science fiction and fantasy buffs, since "Strange Ports of Call" would serve as an excellent introduction to those fields.

In commenting on Nelson Bond's "The Cunning of the Beast", I am at first tempted to note that the plot is an unoriginal one, although it is superbly handled. However, since this story was written in 1942, it may very well have originated this particular plot. Briefly, it is a defense of a scientist, the Yawa Eloem, a member of an alien race, who created in a chemical laboratory the prototype of a race of servants--mankind. The aliens are unable to exist in their environment without artificial aids, and the scientist desires to create a reasonably intelligent animal for such physical labor as is necessary. The human being, a male, eventually asks for and receives a female companion, and together, through a combination of greed and stupidity, they wreak havoc. As a result of this they are banished from the planet, set adrift in a spaceship, and the narrator of the of the tale--a friend of the former Yawa Eloem--ends his defense by hoping that they will eventually find a world on which to live. Their names, naturally, are Adam and Eve. My rendition of the plot leaves much to be desired, and I trust that it will not prevent anyone from reading the story. Nelson handles this simple plot with surprising skill.

David H. Keller's "The Worm" presents another absurdly simple plot: the worm in question is a gigantic one which is attracted by the grinding of a mill (apparently mistaking it for another giant worm), and the story concerns the discovery of the creature by the miller, his subsequent fight against it, and his final defeat. This is definitely a low-key story; while it could undoubtedly have been handled in a superior fashion by a more skillful writer, I have the impression that an attempt to inject anything more into this story would have been superfluous. "The Worm" grinds along as steadily and calmly as the creature of the same name, and the addition of urgency into this story would probably have been disastrous. An attempt at deep characterization, on the other hand, would have made the story top-heavy, since the plot is incapable of supporting a more detailed development. But Keller aimed low and hit his target, creating a perfect--albeit unambitious--little tale.

"The Thing From Outside", by George Allan England, although a longer and more ambitious tale, presents a similar mood. Although the story is largely concerned with the flight of an expedition from an unknown creature in the Hudson Bay area, the narrative is oddly unhurried. Even in headlong flight, an aura of casual futility prevails, as

if a commentary on the uselessness of fleeing from death itself. The identity of the creature which hunts and haunts the expedition is never fully revealed, and England's mastery of words serves him well in this tale.

"John Jones' Dollar", by Harry Stephen Keeler, is an excellent story in all respects. John Jones is a socialist, a bitter enemy of all private ownership of wealth, who invests the sum of one dollar in the name of his fortieth descendant. Anyone familiar with mathematical puzzles may anticipate the approximate result of this act, namely that eventually the holdings of John Jones the fortieth surpassed the available wealth of civilization (which by that time included several other planets of the solar system). John Jones' dollar had increased in value over the centuries due to investments and interest, and during the lifetime of his thirty-ninth descendant the trustees of this wealth own the entire solar system, plus additional paper wealth (it being impossible to produce tangible interest on holdings which already equalled all human wealth). John Jones the thirty-ninth never marries, and since the benefactor of John Jones' dollar was not born, the government stepped in and took over--thereby finally achieving Jones' original goal, the socialistic state. Keeler tells the story via a history lesson (given over two-way pseudo-television), and his instructor includes among this a running commentary on 1000 years' history, with references to John Jones' dollar and its current value being given on random, historically-important dates during this period. The story is extremely well-written, and while the coincidental circumstances leading to the final solution are a bit strained, this does not detract greatly from the story.

"Call Him Demon" is one of Henry Kuttner's most memorable tales, a story which alone may be sufficient reason to consider Kuttner one of the great modern fantasy writers. "Call Him Demon" is a story of children, and Kuttner's characterization of the child mind is brilliant. To be able to recall the emotional and intellectual feeling of being a child, to create believable characters of children in a literary work, is a gift not given to many. Many excellent stories are written from

Francis Walter's Band

Composed by Joe Pilati

(an all-purpose song for Congressional investigating committees)

O, my name is Francis Walter,
I'm the leader of HUAC,
Although we're few in number
We can stab you in the back.
We root out all subversives
Like the Spanish In-quis-ish,
But we work best when cutting
Operation Ab-oh-lish.
O, are you now or have you ever
Been, or will you be?
There's nothing we enjoy more
Than the good old third degree,
McCarthy pumped the witnesses
And God but he was grand!
A credit to America
Is Francis Walter's band!

the viewpoint of the teenager; most of us can vividly remember at least segments of our attitudes and feelings at that age. But it is by no means as easy to recall being a child, with the result that most stories written from that viewpoint fall flat. But Kuttner knows children. Not from the dreary and redundant perspective of the psychologist, but from the uniquely wise perspective of the fellow child. The story itself concerns The Wrong Uncle, an extension of a beast which apparently lives in another dimension. One day this Wrong Uncle appears in the household, and because of its evident powers of mind-control, the adult members of the family don't notice anything out of the ordinary. The children know, however, because, as Kuttner says, the creature couldn't control their minds, "for those minds were neither quite human nor quite sane, from the adult standpoint." The part of the creature living in another dimension is called by the children Ruggedo, and the children buy and steal raw meat with which to feed it until they can no longer acquire it. Then one of them feeds Grandmother to its extension, The Wrong Uncle... A thoroughly fascinating tale.

The finest story in the anthology is, appropriately enough, written by a gentleman whom I consider to be the finest science fiction and fantasy writer alive: Theodore Sturgeon. The story is his much-discussed gem, "Thunder and Roses". I doubt that there is an admirer of science fiction who has not read this story at least once, so I will not recount the plot. The writing is in all respects superb--as is usual with Sturgeon--and in addition a question in ethics is posed: namely, the United States having been struck by a massive nuclear blow from which we cannot recover, do we retaliate and thereby kill more millions in our losing cause, or do we sit back and let The Other Side have what is left of the world? The second alternative is obviously the proper one, but I am very afraid that the military minds who would be in command of the situation would sacrifice ethics to their lust for revenge.

All in all, a very fine anthology of science fiction and fantasy, well worth a search through the mouldy stacks of a second-hand book store.

VIC RYAN COMMENTS ON #32 AND #33

"I'll have to disagree with your statement that the insane sometimes fail to search for pleasure; your idea of 'pleasure' may be entirely different than that of the masochist, but pleasure, in the strictest sense, is merely the removal of drive tension--and all organisms seek to relieve all but the mildest forms of tension. They damn well have different ways of going about it, of course.

"The dispersal of a potential mob is an abridgement of the right of assembly? Perhaps so, but then, equally so, stopping a person from yelling 'Fire!' in a crowded theatre is a serious abridgement of the right of free speech. (What is a "potential" mob, anyway? Any group or organization has the potential for becoming a mob, given the proper incentive. Should all large groups of people be dispersed because they constitute a "potential" mob? And if we are to use that reasoning, why then obviously anyone can be kept out a public establishment because they are "potential" trouble-makers, anyone can be arrested as a "potential" criminal, and we can each and all be incarcerated in a mental institution as "potential" lunatics. Zeus save us from this kind of world!>)

"Compulsory prostitution for adolescents is a pretty far-fetched idea, but, except in the case of a large percentage of our female population, which probably wouldn't benefit in the least, it's about as logical a situation as that which exists today. I'd be a little less radical and suggest that sex education be made compulsory, but I'm not sure that'd be as effective as simply finding some magical way to make

sure that all people who planned to get married were in love with each other, not with themselves. Problems seem a lot less difficult under those circumstances.

"I thought 'Confessions of an Altar Boy' excellent, but I have my doubts that the variety of religious practices constitutes a real argument against the validity of religion. Proper food may be variously defined by different groups, but food may simply be a decidedly non-integral phase of religion as seen by a Supreme Being. Simply, he may not give a damn, and he may not give a damn about the way in which he's defined or conceived. He may just not give a damn, and I don't blame him.

"Of course, social evolution doesn't necessarily result in a religion like ours--many religions have developed longer than the ones to which we're accustomed, undergone more change and revision, and still fit the popular conception of 'primitive'.

"True, compulsory home fallout shelters would be a serious abridgement of personal freedom--as would be the actions of a neighbor who tried to break into my shelter. I know there's no point in discussing the morality of shooting one's neighbor under these circumstances, since we're doubtlessly poles apart, but please remember that this personal freedom bit is a two-edged sword. (How do you know there is no point in discussing our respective opinions until they have been set down side by side and compared? I personally doubt that we are "poles apart"--and I make this statement without benefit of having heard your opinion on the matter, but merely from what I am able to deduce from other of your statements. My view is simply that, given no other alternative, I would defend my life by taking another. Theoretically, then, I would shoot a neighbor who attempted to break into my fallout shelter (albeit not without qualms). However, in practice, my actions would be quite different: since I do not feel that a shelter would do more than extend my life two or three weeks, I simply wouldn't care if a neighbor battered down the door. He or she would be welcome to the crypt; I'd rather die outdoors, anyway. To state this is merely to beg the question, however, since it is not a specific action, but rather a general attitude, which is under discussion. So I shall reiterate by saying that if I believed that a shelter could provide protection for me, and if there was no alternative, then I would shoot an interloper to prevent him from breaking in and evicting me from my sanctuary.)

"Of course, the presence of shelters may make nuclear attack more likely--but the Russians supposedly have extensive civil defense preparation, and does that make us any more likely to attack? I know there's little or no point in equating our policy with that of the communist bloc, but I think this parallel, under these circumstances, is valid, since it seems to concern human nature and little else.

"I've long considered the distinction that a woman of eighteen is capable of choosing sexual companions while her seventeen-year-old sister is not to be ridiculous, but Fred Hunter's suggestion that the penalties for rapists be similarly divided is even worse. Talk about your artificiality--I'll take the 21-year-old vote franchise any day! (Not that I intend to rape anyone, of course.)

"Of course, the real fault with the castration idea is that it simply doesn't do much good. An adult rapist doesn't rape for the orgasm involved; there's some deeper behavior abnormality at fault, and removal of the genitals after sexual maturity will merely result in some substitution--say some vicious tool. The castration of potential sex perverts--before puberty--would probably be of some value, but not only does this present almost insurmountable difficulties in personal assessment, there's the very distinct possibility that some 'potential' rapists may be so acted upon by their environment that their worst expectations will never be realized. In any event, it's something that I

wouldn't want to touch with that proverbial ten foot pole. (Pardon me for helping you to refute your own arguments, but might I point out that "potential" rapists are only a little more difficult to deal with than "potential" mobs...?)

"Preventing people from copulating in public may be a personal abridgement of freedom, but even those children who don't comprehend pornography are likely to grasp this physical relationship--and for some of the more sensitive ones, the scene is likely to be as damaging as a meeting with an exhibitionist." (Box 308, 2309 Sheridan Road, Evanston, Illinois.)

DEPARTMENT OF ABJECT APOLOGIES

Earlier in this issue, I commented on the crusade to ban certain books from the high school of Edgerton, Wisconsin. Recent developments are of a sort which force me to offer my profound apologies to that fair city. A glance at my comments indicates that I was certain beyond doubt that this campaign would succeed. While there is certainly a precedent for this assumption--small town censorship campaigns directed against schools are in most cases spectacularly successful--this is nevertheless no excuse for jumping to that unwarranted conclusion. I forgot that a handful of lunatics do not an asylum make. Not only did the Edgerton School Board refuse to ban the books, but it refused in no uncertain terms. Board President Thomas Houfe announced that the board was "one-hundred percent behind the teachers and staff of the high school." John Rothe, apparently another board member, stated, "We are no longer living in the age of Longfellow. We can't keep a fence around our children." So, even though this august journal is unlikely to be read by the Edgerton City Fathers, I should like to take this opportunity to express my heartfelt apologies for underestimating their intelligence. Incidents of this nature, however insignificant they may be, reinforce my faith in the intelligence of 20th Century Man.

THE JUST SOCIETY REVISITED FOR THE NTH TIME

There have been several philosophical discussions in these pages in the last six or seven months, but there is one which I have wished several times to introduce. Each time, however, I was unable to do so, largely because there is little I could say about it without resorting to padding. Since the new format allows inordinately brief articles, perhaps this is a good time to comment on it. In Chapter Five of the "Nicomachean Ethics", Aristotle comments parenthetically, "...what is unfair being always unlawful but what is unlawful not being always unfair..." This was to form the basis of an article on three separate occasions, but each time I discovered that there was really little to say about the premise. It is certainly erroneous now; it probably always was. Slavery existed in Greece during Aristotle's time. This subjugation of certain peoples was obviously unfair, but it was not unlawful. Of course, the difficulty may be that Aristotle was theorizing rather than making a statement about current conditions (although the construction of the sentence would appear to indicate otherwise). And theoretically, of course, the premise is quite correct: in theory, law mirrors justice and administers fairness. But in practice, something quite different occurs, since legality is such a vacillating concept. In practice, anything may be lawful, but this has little bearing on its objective fairness and value to the just society. If a majority of residents in Crimson Corners, Kentucky get together and pass a resolution prohibiting breathing, then breathing is henceforth unlawful in that city. But fairness is a more stable term, with an absolute meaning.

To my mind, that which is just is (1) fair, and (2) lawful--in

that order. If a proposition is fair but not lawful, it is nevertheless just; if it is lawful but unfair, it is no less unjust. In fact, the second criterion may be dispensed with altogether: that which is fair is just, that which is unfair is unjust. Fairness, not legality, causes a particular act to warrant the term "just". (If anyone is interested in my definitions of these terms, the information may be found in several recent issues of Kipple; there is no room here for such a venture.)

There may come a time, of course, when what is fair and what is lawful are precisely equivalent. But from what I know of Athenian law, we have made uncomfortably little progress in that direction since Aristotle first wrote his "Ethics".

GORDON EKLUND ON BOARDMAN AND NELSON AND VANDEPUT

"John Boardman seems to be more than usually fuggheaded these days, and I suppose a person such as Boardman is helpful in forcing me to continue to realize that all liberals aren't 'good guys' and intelligent, thinking individuals. Boardman may be intelligent, but he obviously isn't thinking. For instance, at one point he implies that whatever one wishes to call oneself, one is. Therefore, I say that I am a Communist, and I belong to the Communist Party of the United States, and I advocate the total overthrow of the government by force. Before anyone rushes to the phone to sic the FBI (and HUAC?) on me, let me assure you that this is not true. But because I said it, according to Boardman's reasoning, this is my label from now on. Boardman somehow fails to realize that his enemies, his 'conservatives', might stoop to lying. Lying, I say, to save face. Lying, in order to hide under the respectable label of conservatism, while immensely harming those who are truly conservatives, not radical reactionaries or just plain psychopathic.

"Boardman's paragraph supposedly devoted to proving something (that Barry Goldwater is a Nazi, I think, though I'm far from sure) is a classic example of guilt-by-association. If my stomach weren't as weak as it is, I'd use this as an example to show some of my pro-HUAC friends why that little monster is a bad thing. Boardman again proves that he feels it is correct to adopt the methods of those whom he is supposedly fighting. To me, this removes Mr. Boardman from any consideration as a thinking person. As Buck Coulson pointed out in #32, his opinions are emotional, not intellectual, and arguing with him is apparently useless.

"Derek Nelson is perhaps correct when he says that such a thing as the Mississippi incident harms U.S. prestige abroad, but I think that in many ways the image of the United States might be advanced by the thought that this country is at least doing something. Desegregation may split the country and open old wounds, but I feel that this is a far more desirable alternative than allowing one minority group to be subjugated to the will of the southern whites. I think also that Derek Nelson fails to realize that right or wrong really doesn't enter into something like the Mississippi situation. A federal court decided that it was unconstitutional to refuse the entrance of a man to a state-supported university solely on the grounds of race. Actually, the federal government had little choice in debating whether or not this would do more harm than good--I personally think it will do much more good than harm, but this is a moot point. The only choice of the government was whether to install Meredith in Ole Miss--that is, obey the court order --or refuse to implement the court order. To refuse would have seriously injured the American system of law, would actually have given precedence for executive veto of judicial decisions, and would doubtless have done much greater harm than the tragic incidents on the campus.

Derek, when he praises Kennedy's decree outlawing discrimination in federal housing, seems to fail to realize that mere words mean nothing. While the use of federal troops to enforce housing integration is rather improbable, some form of enforcement may be necessary.

"As for Nelson's comments on the school prayer, he still shows an apparent lack of knowledge of the United States Constitution. Supposedly, this document guarantees that, while the majority shall rule, the majority does not have the right to subjugate the minority in certain fields. These fields are mostly those dealing with civil rights. Therefore, the government does not have the right to enforce an opinion of the majority--or, in this case, a belief of the majority--on the minority. Nor can the government by its actions display something close to approval or support of a single religious philosophy, as it was doing in New York. As long as there is one person in this country who doesn't accept the majority's religious philosophy, the state should not have the right to force said majority belief on him. Even if there were no men who disagreed with this majority philosophy, I still might have my doubts, since it is always possible that some man will appear who does disagree. Separation of church and state are essential in this country, and just as essential are the rights of the minority.

"I note that you share my feelings of indecisiveness when confronted with the Belgian case regarding the woman who murdered her deformed baby out of sheer pity. The mercy killing is undoubtedly the most difficult crime to judge. While this is indeed a nation of laws, I think it would be best if these laws would, in some way, be just. I believe as you do that the motives of the crime should determine punishment, not guilt or innocence. However, I find it difficult to bring myself to believe that Mrs. Vandeput was indeed guilty of murder. She did kill a human being; the killing was premeditated; but somehow, despite all this, I think the correct thing was done when she was declared innocent. The mercy killing is an enigma to justice and to law. A man who kills out of pity or even by request of a dying man is judged as having committed the same crime as a man who kills for revenge. The only possible solution to this problem, unless we continue gaily on our way freeing some mercy killers (such as Mrs. Vandeput) and putting others behind bars, would be to set up mercy killing as a different crime entirely, and place some necessary--but just--punishment on it. Even now, I suppose most mercy killers are charged with second-degree murder, or even manslaughter, but somehow even this doesn't impress me as the right solution." (Unfortunately, the difficulty involved when we set aside mercy killing from ordinary murder is qualitative: where is the line to be drawn between murder and mercy killing? As inefficient as our present system may be, it at least serves to prevent a few borderline cases by forcing all alleged mercy killers to face trial for murder. Oddly enough, this is one of the few kinds of murder which it is possible to deter by threat of punishment. (Since it is not normally a crime of passion or insanity, the potential murderer may consider in advance the consequences of his action. The threat of facing trial for first- or second-degree murder may very well change the mind of the person involved.) By removing or reducing drastically this threat of punishment, the advantages may in many cases come to outweigh the consequences. A minor example of this was reported in a newspaper clipping dated November 20th, and datelined Liege, Belgium. A week after Mrs. Vandeput had been freed for her part in the mercy-slaying of her deformed child, a Mrs. Paulette Martle killed her three-year-old mentally retarded daughter by "hitting and kicking her and plunging her into icy water." Remembering that the child had been alive for three years, the obvious conclusion is that Mrs. Martle's decision to kill her was at least partially influenced by the fact that Mrs. Vandeput had recently

been adjudged innocent in a similar case. If we remove mercy killing from the category of murder and publicly avow a lighter punishment, this might influence other Paulette Martles.) (14612 18th Ave., S.W., Seattle 66, Washington.)

RONALD SVERDLOVE COMMENTS ON #33

"In 'Confessions of an Altar Boy', you state that you are an agnostic. You then go on to give four strong arguments against the truth of religion. If you are an agnostic, however, you must also have some reasons for believing that religion might be true. (Religion--or anything else within reason--might be true because I can produce no positive proof that it isn't.) In connection with your first argument, if you consider that there are ten religions, and that the beliefs of each are mutually exclusive, then each religion is thought to be wrong by 90% of all the people, not including the atheists and agnostics. This in itself is a good argument against religion. I am an atheist, and yet I think that religion, to a certain extent, is a good thing. You pointed out that the first men were looking for explanations for things that they could not understand, so they naturally invented the supernatural. I think it is good that religion provides so many people with something to turn to when they have serious problems. Personally, I would have more faith in a psychiatrist, but for many people religion is the best solution.

"On Civil Defense, I think all the basic arguments you state plus a number of others generally support my conclusion that little, if any, life of any kind will be left upon the earth after a nuclear war. Therefore, the subject should not even be discussed. Any talk about civil defense means that we consider war a possibility. The possibility of a war which will literally destroy life should not even be thought about.

"I agree with you in regard to capital punishment. I think it is the duty of society to try to reform (or cure) criminals, and by executing murderers the people are avoiding their responsibilities and taking the easy way out." (1354 E. 15th St., Brooklyn 30, New York.)

CHAY BORSELLA ON RELIGION

"What does Miss Braunstein mean, infanticide is sometimes right? I concede that people with serious hereditary defects should not reproduce, but once such a person is born, no one but no one has the right to say whether or not that person should live. Dogs and cats, though inferior, are sometimes very affectionate and make good, loyal pets. Why can't an occasional idiot, imbecile or otherwise imperfect person serve in the same role? As for Miss Braunstein's Christmas with everyone getting drunk to celebrate Christ's birthday--if I really viewed December 25th as the birthday of such a critter, I think I would be justified in getting totally, unequivocally stoned!

"Enid Jacobs' letter, typical of an indecisive agnostic, is nonetheless very logical. But to be logical does not mean to be 'right'. What is more logical, for example, than the Christian Scientist syllogism re sickness:

Major Premise: Sickness is evil.

Minor Premise: God would not create evil.

Conclusion: God did not create sickness.

Therefore, there is none. (Sixteen out of the twenty-five children in my brother's class were absent the other day. Of course, kids will play hookey, you know...)

"Re 'Confessions of an Altar Boy', agnostics are not necessarily

closer to atheism than they are to theism. Ingersoll, Darrow and Thomas Huxley were very nearly atheists. But there is another type of agnostic, the kind that leans toward Christianity or Judaism, or whatever. All agnostics say, 'One cannot know if there is a god.' Some agnostics add, 'But I sincerely hope there is one.' This particular species frequently go to church. Many are loathe to admit that the stigmatized word 'agnostic' describes them. 'I don't know if there is a god,' they assert, 'but I'm not an agnostic!' This leads me to think that this language needs a few new words. What about 'microchristian'? And another one: 'anti-theist', which would be far more formidable than the merely a-theist. I would personally be just as happy to junk the word agnostic from the vocabulary, and thus make some of the indecisive souls take a stand, one way or the other. (But even if we agreed that discarding the concept was worthwhile, discarding the term would not accomplish this.) Many agnostics are wishy-washy organisms who simply refuse to go out on a limb. Like Eliot's pal J. Alfred Prufrock, they are afraid to 'disturb the universe' with a firm, reasonable stand." (Box 443, Towson State College, Towson 4, Maryland.)

AND I ALSO HEARD FROM

Larry McCombs reports that his school-teaching duties leave him so little free time that he carries Kipple in his briefcase and reads it during study halls, home rooms, and free periods. Bob Underwood's school-learning prevents him from joining our little discussion group, so he submits as a poor substitute for a letter of comment two rumbled, dusty dollar bills. Calvin Demmon writes a typical Demmon letter, with every third word capitalized to denote emphasis, cliches, and where the author has his tongue rammed into his cheek. The letter is extremely complimentary, but Mr. Demmon's writing style leads to the conclusion-- and I trust you will forgive me if I'm wrong--that it isn't entirely sincere. Terakitamu Johnson is a hoax, apparently perpetrated by Ben Orlove, Dorothy Braunstein, and (maybe) Carl Lazarus. The hoax is executed well, except for one minor detail: the sheer coincidence of receiving, on the same day, letters from part-Maori Mr. Johnson (sent through friends in Manhattan, supposedly) and Miss Braunstein, on precisely the same lined notebook paper (even to the watermark). Thanks also to: Joe Pilati, Misha McQuown, Jerome McCann, Dorothy Braunstein, Seth Johnson, L.C. Corona, Tom McKinnon, Bon Ellick, Rosemary Hickey, Dave Katz, John Boardman, Vic Ryan, Dave Keil, and Bill Sommers, some of whose letters will appear next issue.

FROM

Ted Pauls
1448 Meridene Dr.
Baltimore 12, Md.
U.S.A.

printed matter only
return requested
may be opened for inspection

SEND TO

Len Moffatt
10202 Belcher
Downy, California



The number to the left is the number of your last issue. If the letter "T" appears, it means we trade; the letter "C" indicates that you have a contribution in this issue; "P" means that you are on my permanent mailing list; and "S" means this is a sample copy.