

"Despite the protestations of many that they value religious ideas most highly, mankind really hold the bulk of religious activity in utter contempt. To be sure each man has reverence for his own theological opinions and for those of people who think as he does, but often there is an almost direct ratio between that reverence and the disdain a man feels for religious views that differ from his own. Since each religious individual is only a member of one minority or another, it follows that most men completely respect only a minority of religious ideas and are prepared to laugh off the majority as unthinkable.

"To enforce theory with example, the Buddhist smiles at the Jew's belief that he is one of God's chosen people; the Lutheran reacts to the doctrines of Christian Science with intellectual horror; the Methodist is privately convinced that the Mormon is theologically deranged; the Jew is aghast at the Christian heresy in general; the Catholic regards the Protestant as a deluded soul; and Protestants look upon Catholicism either as some sort of a world-wide conspiracy or as a well-intentioned but potentially dangerous dogmatic philosophy. It is safe to say, therefore, that the bulk of religious thought is regarded lightly by the religious as well as the irreligious."

--Steve Allen

Kipple is published and edited by Ted Pauls, 1448 Meridene Drive, Baltimore, Maryland, 21212. Copies of this irregular but frequent journal of opinion and commentary are available in exchange for letters of comment, contributions, similar periodicals, or the cash sum of 20¢ per issue. The number in the address box is the number of the last issue you will receive; the letter "T" indicates that we exchange publications; and the letter "S" means this is a sample copy.

COMMUNISM AND THE TECHNOLOGICAL SOCIETY: According to Karl Marx, the true communist society which will evolve from socialism under the direction of the dictatorship of the proletariat will be founded upon the premise "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs." This development is to be accompanied by a progressive "withering away" of the State, which; in the Marxian view, is an instrument of class oppression, and, although it may serve temporarily the purpose of realigning the society into a communist pattern, cannot continue to exist once the transition to a classless, communist society has been accomplished. The ultimate result of this process, in theory, will be a utopian community of the sort envisaged by the radical philosophers of previous gen-

JOTTINGS
FROM THE EDITOR'S DESK

erations. Every previous utopian design, however, from Plato's Republic (which incorporated a rigid class structure but compensated for this defect by assuming absolute equality of opportunity) to the free-thinking communities of Owen and Noyes in the Nineteenth Century, was intended to apply to comparatively small, self-sufficient agricultural communities in which life was, of necessity, primitive. The principal claim to fame of Marx and his followers (apart, that is, from having devised a new form of totalitarianism) consists in attempting to create a utopia on the foundation of a complex industrial-technological society spanning an entire nation. Now, Karl Marx's communism, reduced to its fundamentals as in the opening two sentences of this essay, is not an unattractive philosophical concept, but I believe that intensive examination reveals that it is impossible to attain.

Communist societies have existed throughout history, although their members have generally not chosen to refer to them by that term. The word "communist" derives from the same root as the word "community", which even the John Birch Society does not customarily condemn as a subversive term. Communism, in the classical sense, implies a community in which individuals subordinate personal interests to the needs of the society as a whole (which is the case to some extent in any community); in its simplest form, the fruits of individual labor are contributed to the community storehouse, from which every citizen draws according to his needs. This, in essence, is communism; the purges and pogroms, repressive legal sanctions against dissidents, arbitrary administrative procedures, parades of military hardware, barbed wire fences and all of the other trappings of the modern Communist state were grafted on to this concept by Marxists whose humanity and judgment were both dwarfed by their zeal. The original concept is extremely ancient, and many primitive peoples (including the Plains Indians) adhered to the communist pattern with regard to the all-important matter of food. During the most impressive period of Christianity's dominance in Europe, there existed a large number of monasteries which were functioning communist societies in which the principle "From each according to

his ability, to each according to his needs" was faithfully obeyed. In the United States today, the communist ideal is most closely approached in Amish communities, where no one goes hungry while others eat and no one lies on the cold ground while others sleep in warm beds; the community, functioning as a whole, attends to the welfare of the individual families.

Throughout recorded history, the distinguishing characteristic of human communities which function according to some variety of communism has been simplicity, i.e., primitiveness. Such a society provides for its members the bare necessities of life (food, clothing and shelter), with few or none of the luxuries. Industry, in such a community, is restricted to handicrafts. There are also severe limitations on the number of individuals residing in such a community. I believe it is reasonable to state that classic communism can function only under such comparatively primitive conditions. Increases in technological complexity or increases in population (or, as is likely to occur in practice, any combination of the two) invariably produce the polarization of society into classes and the proliferation of regulations. The former is the communist's bête noire, the latter the libertarian conservative's bane of existence. Between them, they cause a qualitative change in the nature and structure of the society, and render impossible the sort of agrarian utopia which communist philosophers have traditionally advocated.

There is one apparent exception to the rule that communist societies must, by definition, be primitive societies. The Israeli kibbutz has frequently been cited as an example of a completely workable communist society which utilizes modern technological achievements in maintaining a classic utopian community. Superficially, the kibbutzim are indeed communities of the sort described above, but they are not especially primitive, considering the environment and circumstances in which they are found. A kibbutz is a communal farm situated in the wilderness and attached to a small town or village which may, eventually, develop some light industry and produce some of its own modern consumer products. Unlike the communist societies which we have been discussing, these collectives are able to supply not only the necessities but also not a few of the luxuries of modern living. Certainly the kibbutzim are communist in philosophy. Isaac Livneh, of Kibbutz Yotvata, described life in the kibbutz to a National Geographic interviewer by paraphrasing Marx's famous statement thusly: "Every man gives what he can and gets what he needs." The sense of community which has always been the most admirable quality of such a settlement is present in the kibbutz, though this is probably as much attributable to the fact that the inhabitants are Jews in the familiar situation of being surrounded by enemies as it is to the economic and social structure of the commune. The kibbutzim are a special case, however, as the result of their unique economic position. Unlike the classic communist societies, they are not economically self-sufficient: a kibbutz is able to rely for heavy machinery, medical equipment, and so forth on a larger society structured in a more conventional manner (in this case, a mild form of socialism). In effect, the citizens of this communist society are able to acquire modern equipment and luxury consumer goods from a non-communist society (which happens to be under the control of the same government--a confusing situation, indeed). The kibbutzim are therefore benefitting from the best of both worlds, and cannot legitimately be considered the sort of communities envisioned by the utopians. These collectives are extremely interesting experiments, but their existence does not alter the accuracy of the statement that genuine communism can function only under comparatively primitive conditions; for the kibbutzim are, in effect, aspects of a mixed economy system.

What is to be said, then, about the efforts of Marx and his followers to adapt communism to an industrialized or industrializing nation? There can be no doubt that the economic system known as Communism to the modern generation of Marxists is functioning, albeit imperfectly, throughout the Communist bloc, and has produced, in some instances, remarkable material progress. According to the present leaders of the Soviet Union and the other Communist countries, their nations have achieved socialism and are currently "building communism", but this "communism", even after it has been fully established at some indeterminate future date, would be difficult for Marx and impossible for the earlier communist theoreticians to recognize. Actually, the present collectivist system of the Soviet Union and the other Communist bloc countries more closely resembles what the Marxists themselves characterize as "state-monopoly capitalism", in which the state owns all of the means of production. This is not the same as communism, in which the people own and control the means of production, although in a Communist country which happened to be a complete political democracy this distinction would not be especially significant. To be sure, the present system of (to use a term less complicated than "state-monopoly capitalism" and more distinctive than "Communism-with-a-capital-C") Marxism-Leninism is not supposed to endure indefinitely; the Communists envision its eventual replacement by true communism, a happy occurrence which will be accompanied by the "withering away of the state". But there is no indication that the state is preparing to wither away in any of the Communist countries: As a matter of fact, in Communist (i.e., Marxist-Leninist) countries, as in "capitalist" countries, the state is perceptibly growing. (In the non-Communist countries, the state is increasing both in

(' ' ' ') "My name is Ogawahalpeeneekawawe, which means 'Small-
 (̄ ̄) Turtle-Who-Urinates-In-Rushing-Stream'. I am a full-
 (V) blooded Kweichi Indian. For many years my people have
 ((⊖)) lived in peace with the white man."

"We have a treaty with the Great White Father in Washing- (' ' ' ')
 ton, promising to honor until the end of time our right (̄ ̄)
 to the woodlands and lakes of our ancestors. But now, the (V)
 government tells us we must move and lose our land." ((⊖))

(' ' ' ')
 (̄ ̄) "White man speak with forked tongue. Him stinkin' Indian
 (V) giver! The Kweichi are proud people, and we will not
 ((⊖)) permit the white man to drive us from our land."

"We have decided to secede. When the new nation of (' ' ' ')
 Kweichiland is proclaimed, we will seek admission to the (̄ ̄)
 United Nations. Already we are receiving military assist- (V)
 ance from Algeria, the U.A.R., Cuba and Communist China." ((⊖))

(' ' ' ')
 (̄ ̄)
 (V) "How you like them apples, Paleface?"
 ((⊖))

size and authority, whereas in Communist countries it is increasing only in size, i.e., number of bureaucrats employed, because in the Communist countries the state controlled virtually everything to begin with.)

Marxism-Leninism, then, is not "communism" in the classic sense, and, despite the frequent contrary assertions of the Communist leaders, there is little likelihood that it will ever become so. It is, at best, a radical modification of communism, intended to apply the principles of collectivization to huge populations and highly developed industrial communities. To an extent, it is a successful modification. What is commonly termed Communism is one means (though certainly not the only conceivable means) of rapidly industrializing a country, and, at its most efficient, it can be responsible for an economic miracle such as the Soviet Union's rapid industrial development. It is no small thing for a nation to transform itself from a large, backward feudal society into one of the two great powers of the world in less than fifty years, especially when you consider that this process was interrupted by an unbelievably destructive war. Of course, the price was high in terms of human suffering, but that is always the case during the evolution of a society. The so-called "capitalist" nations built their prosperity on a foundation of suffering, too, though in their case the human suffering was spread out over a longer period of time.

Even on its own terms, however, Marxism-Leninism is a severely limited socio-economic system. It is inflexible, so that efficiency is achieved invariably only at the cost of comfort and, conversely, human needs can be met only at the cost of some efficiency. Theoretically, Communism is concerned primarily with the welfare and comfort of the people, but in practice the immediate welfare of the populace always seems to be subordinated to some other consideration which the Leaders arbitrarily decide is of greater importance. This defect is probably inherent in the system itself, which invariably defines "the needs of the people" in terms of what the Central Committee of the Party considers those needs to be. Another aspect of the same difficulty insures that the orthodox Communist system is incapable of satisfying consumer needs. Complete centralized planning works reasonably well for heavy industry, but leaves much to be desired in the manufacture and distribution of consumer goods. No matter how expert they may be, the administrators who draw up the plans can never be completely adequate judges of precisely what goods the people will want to buy next year. Then, too, centralized planning encourages standardization of goods, which is perfectly reasonable in the case of steel girders but leaves much to be desired in the field of consumer products.

The present leaders of the Soviet Union and the Eastern European countries are beginning to recognize the structural defects of their system, and are modifying it by adopting certain "capitalist" marketing techniques. These modifications have not as yet achieved truly significant proportions, but their importance, in principle, should not be underestimated. Should the present trend of experimenting with "capitalist" methods continue, it should eventually require a re-examination of the Marxist "labor theory of value", according to which the value of a commodity is determined by the expenditure of labor required to produce it. Karl Marx, writing in "Theorien über den Mehrwert", explained: "Even when exchange-value has disappeared, labour-time will always remain the creative essence of wealth and the standard of the cost required to produce it." Thus, this cost in labor-time required to produce a commodity is the true index of its value, according to the Marxists, contrary to the capitalist and, I think, more sensible notion that the value of a commodity is determined by consumer demand in relation to available supply. In the Communist countries at present, relative scarcity theoretically has no effect on the price of a commodity (except in the black-

market), but now that "profit" is no longer a dirty word in the more advanced Communist nations, it is inevitable that manufacturers and retail outlets will eventually begin to experiment with adjusting prices according to consumer demand. And if the Soviet Communists continue to experiment with supply-and-demand marketing, the labor theory of value will eventually have to be scuttled. Since this concept is central to Marxian economics, its abandonment will have far-reaching consequences.

Such experimentation and modification is inevitable, and I expect that it will increase dramatically in the immediate future. The Marxist-Leninist system was extremely useful in allowing the Soviet Union to pull itself up by its own bootstraps, as it were, but now the U.S.S.R. is a well developed, industrially advanced nation, and the limitations of that system are becoming increasingly apparent. It appears to me that Communism may be an excellent means of recording rapid economic progress up to a certain point, but that beyond that point the structure of the system begins to become a burden to the economy. Perhaps the reason is that the initial steps of developing a complex technological society are concerned with creating an industrial base, which entails, in a society ruled by socialist planning, juggling resources and regimenting huge numbers of people, whereas the later stages are more concerned with satisfying the needs of individuals, an endeavor which requires the sort of pragmatic approach impossible within the framework of a dogmatic doctrine. Loyal Communists are neither by temperament nor experience capable of a "Let's run it up the flagpole and see if anybody salutes" outlook.

Communism, then, appears to be quite efficient in transforming an essentially underdeveloped country into an industrialized country, but unadulterated Communism cannot, so far as I can see, transform an industrialized country into an affluent one. The perceptible slowing down of the Soviet economy in recent years as increasing attention is being devoted to light industry and consumer products may indicate that Communism in the U.S.S.R. has reached its point of maximum efficiency and is, with the shifting economic emphasis, beginning to feel the strain. If this is the case, then it is probable that the Soviet economy will continue to grow less efficient, confronting the Communist leaders with the agonizing choice of either abandoning efforts to satisfy consumer needs or else abandoning their sacred cows and continuing, pragmatically, to seek efficiency through innovation and the adoption of "Western" methods. It is difficult to see how they could avoid choosing the second alternative. Whatever innovations may be accepted, the Soviets will continue to refer to their system as "Communism", but by the time the U.S.S.R. succeeds in raising its living standard to the level currently enjoyed by the United States, I suspect that the name will be the only thing left of Communism.

REMEMBRANCE OF THINGS PAST: Several years ago, I happened to purchase a paperback book of childhood reminiscences by Robert Paul Smith entitled "'Where Did You Go?' 'Out.' 'What Did You Do?' 'Nothing.'" To readers of Mr. Smith's generation, this volume was no doubt a fascinating reintroduction to the joys and sorrows of innocent childhood, but as a member of a succeeding generation I must admit that I found the little book unrelentingly dull. Most of the experiences chronicled by the author had no parallel in my own early experience, with the result that I reacted with complete indifference to most of the presumably fascinating adventures and misadventures which Mr. Smith described in exhaustive detail. Nevertheless, the concept of such a book impressed me as being extremely worthwhile; my principal regret was that such a volume had not been authored by someone whose youthful experiences more closely resembled my own. Probably the majority of Kipple's readers

are less interested in necessarily abbreviated accounts of childhood activities than in the political commentary which usually comprises the bulk of this column, but this article should at least please Harry Warner and the other amiable fogies who assert that too great a percentage of this periodical is devoted to politics. Previously in these pages I have discussed my rather depressing early adolescence (see "Memoirs of a Young Punk", Kipple #50); these jottings will endeavor to provide a picture of my earlier childhood.

My background is fairly typical of children of middle-class parents during the period directly after World War II and prior to the mass exodus to the suburbs. The neighborhood in which I spent the first thirteen years of my life (the area bounded by Harford Road, North Avenue, Chester Street and Clifton Park, for the benefit of readers acquainted with this city) was constantly in the process of "changing", i.e., changing from a predominantly white to a predominantly Negro section, and from a reasonably neat neighborhood to a slum section. It was my good fortune (or misfortune, as you will) to reside in an area which at any moment might become an outright slum but never quite seemed to wholly cross the line. The vague sense of impending disaster inspired by this circumstance lent an air of excitement to life in what otherwise would certainly have been an unusually drab setting. We lived in a huge brick house which today probably accommodates four or five families as a slum tenement. My grandparents had purchased this home during or immediately after World War I, when it was surrounded by vacant lots. Later, row-houses were constructed on the adjacent property--which proceeded to deteriorate with alarming rapidity. By the time I was born, the neighborhood was sinking into comfortable squalor.

People of my generation who spent their childhood in prosperous small towns or suburban developments often experience difficulty in imagining the sort of childhood endured and, on the whole, enjoyed by the youngsters of my neighborhood. Indeed, there is a stronger bond of common experience between myself and the previous generation of urbanites than between myself and individuals of my own generation who happen to have grown up in a different environment. Life in the center of our great metropolitan areas has undergone no essential alteration since World War I; the economic and (especially) racial character of its inhabitants has undergone numerous subtle changes, and technological advances have radically altered specific aspects of urban life through the years, but the essential nature of city life remains unchanged. On the most fundamental level, basic attitudes differ as between the central city and the suburbs. In the suburban areas, roads and streets are exclusively or at least primarily traffic arteries; in the city, streets are playgrounds. In the suburbs, the policeman is a symbol of order and protective authority; in the central city, the cop is a uniformed stereotype in whose presence one feels acutely uncomfortable and whose appearance invariably means trouble for someone on the block.

These basic differences of attitude, combined with the radical differences of specifics caused by the economic and social level of the average family in the central city, eliminate even the possibility of meaningful communication regarding childhood experiences between myself and individuals of my age born and raised in more prosperous areas. In conversation with such acquaintances, I have discovered that certain aspects of their early life were so important to them that they have difficulty imagining that others, such as myself, were influenced by totally different experiences; and, of course, the same is true vice versa. Most of my contemporaries, for example, spent at least their later childhood in the benevolent glow of a television tube. In our neighborhood, however, television was still an experimental gadget which one marvelled at in store windows. For entertainment, we gathered around the mas-

sive radio console and listened to "The Shadow" or "I Love An Adventure" or even "Stella Dallas". (The radio at our house, an early Philco combination radio and record player, was probably about three feet high and half as wide, but that appeared frightfully huge when I was a child. Once, when I attempted to open the record player section, the entire contraption tipped over, pinning me beneath it. Although I wasn't seriously injured, I lay there emitting blood-curdling shrieks until my parents freed me and returned the Philco to its customary standing position against the wall.) Supermarkets were another convenience which existed in our world only as a vague impression. Occasionally, one would glimpse a supermarket while passing through a more prosperous neighborhood, but no such thing existed in our area. I doubt if many families would have patronized it even if one had been established close enough to make this feasible, because frequent journeys to the little stores on the corner of nearly every block were too much a part of the social pattern of the neighborhood.

Our neighborhood, which I suppose was reasonably typical of neighborhoods in the central city, was remarkably self-sufficient and self-contained. There were a variety of small food markets and other stores scattered throughout the area which provided virtually every necessity of life and such luxuries as were enjoyed by the residents. The elementary school (PS #99) was directly across the street from our house, a junior high school was located a few blocks away in the park, and there was a branch of the public library on the next street from where I lived. A number of neighborhood motion picture theatres were located within easy walking distance, as were fire stations, an ice house, and other useful facilities. (It should be explained, parenthetically, that the usefulness of the ice house derived from the fact that refrigerators were a virtually unheard of and probably sinful convenience. Food was preserved in ice boxes, extremely primitive cold storage units which required semi-weekly deliveries of ice in order to function.) Apart from occasional shopping trips "downtown" and the minor commuting of those people who were employed outside the neighborhood, there was very little reason to travel beyond the confines of that few-square-block area.

Most of Robert Paul Smith's book, of course, is devoted to detailed accounts of the various activities in which he and his youthful companions engaged for recreation, and I should like to pursue a similar course in this essay. Unfortunately, it is difficult, utilizing the limited medium of the printed word, to adequately describe and define the vague and apparently pointless activities in which we engaged. As Mr. Smith intimates in his title and elsewhere in the book--and this is one aspect of childhood which the intervening decades have been unable to alter--children spend a great deal of time doing, essentially, nothing. Occasionally, for example, a group of kids from our neighborhood would journey to the Belair Market, a sprawling wooden structure containing hundreds of food stalls, and spend the entire afternoon absorbing the sights and sounds and smells of the market. It would have been difficult to explain exactly what it was that we did for four or five hours, but none of the participants ever doubted that it was enjoyable. Sometimes we would observe chickens being cleaned and dressed, as grisly a spectator sport as can be imagined. On other occasions, we would take up positions at a strategic location and spend an hour or so smelling spices imported from exotic places like Keokuk, Iowa. Always there were plenty of free samples of various foods, common and exotic, and interesting people with whom to converse. A modern shopper, accustomed to the suburban supermarket with its neatness and antiseptic cleanliness, would have been appalled at the number of flies and other insects to be found in the market stalls, and the rats were large enough and

bold enough to flaunt themselves openly even at mid-day, but no one appeared to mind sharing the building and the food with various vermin.

Another enjoyable passtime consisted of watching a delivery of coal being made to one of the houses in the neighborhood. For the benefit of Kipple's younger readers, I should explain that coal, with which you are doubtless familiar as having something to do with geology and the Carboniferous period, was once the primary source of fuel in our society. Periodically, a large dumptruck would deliver quantities of this substance to every house in the neighborhood, dumping it into the basement by means of a chute. If your family was particularly fortunate, there was a coal bin situated in the basement; otherwise, the coal simply collected into a pile on the cellar floor. When the thermometer dropped below a certain optimum point, a husky member of the family was dispatched to the basement, and he proceeded to shovel quantities of this coal into an imposing and unbelievably grimy furnace--which, by the groans that it uttered, appeared to be threatening to explode at any instant. Whenever a coal delivery was to be made in our neighborhood, word would circulate via that remarkable grapevine children have managed to perfect and a small knot of youngsters would gather on the sidewalk to critically observe the entire operation, from the initial insertion of the chute into the basement window to the final sweeping of the pavement.

In the summer, on especially hot and humid afternoons, a group of us would pool our financial resources and purchase an enormous watermelon at a local produce market. One of the kids would borrow a few kitchen knives and some old newspapers from his mother, and we would lounge on the curbstone for hours, eating watermelon and spitting the seeds into the gutter. One of the smaller children in the neighborhood would, in return for occasional succulent slices of watermelon, keep the melon relatively free of insects by shooing them away with a fly-swatter. Oddly enough, although in later years it occurred to me that this was a noble task indeed (rather like plugging a dike with one's finger, in a way), we invariably selected the least likeable kid in the neighborhood to guard the watermelon.

Of course, we also engaged in the more pedestrian boyhood pursuits, such as playing baseball, hurling stones through windows and attending movies in order to drop popcorn and spitballs from the balcony onto the bald pates of middle-aged gentlemen in the audience. Our baseball games (usually involving a ball that had the appearance of having been used as a cannon ball during the Boer War) were nearly always played in the middle of the street, although there was a public park equipped with facilities for the game only two blocks away. We were more comfortable in the street than in the park, and the unconventional location of our games at least provided some fascinating discussion concerning ground rules ("Anything this side of the Buick is foul, and any ball that goes over the Packard on the fly is a homer") and disputed plays ("Whaddaya mean, you couldn't catch it because it took a bad bounce?" "Well, goddamnit, it ricocheted off the lamppost and went through Mrs. Balanski's window!"). One characteristic of our baseball games which appears to typify unorganized baseball games involving young children today as well was that any relation between what we did and the game of

(: : : : :)
(0 0)
(w)
((~))

"Happiness is finding twenty-five stencils in a quire."

baseball was purely accidental. Our usual equipment consisted of one ball (when it rolled down the sewer, one of the skinnier kids--usually me--was detailed to go down and retrieve it, since its permanent loss would have postponed the game indefinitely), two or perhaps three gloves (I was eleven before I discovered that certain players on a baseball team have special types of gloves), and a couple of bats in various sad states of disrepair. We never, except under extraordinary circumstances, had enough players to form two regulation teams, and the concept of substitutions was a fanciful dream: when one of the fielders sustained an injury or, more likely, was called home to supper, the remaining fielders were expected to cover a little more territory.

Despite the fact that many of the families in the neighborhood perpetually balanced on the brink of poverty, most of the youngsters somehow managed to acquire sufficient money so that excursions to motion picture theatres were one of the more common diversions of our young lives. On Saturday, of course, there was the matinee at the neighborhood theatre, presenting two full-length features, a serial and usually a couple of animated cartoons. Admission price was 20¢, and such a bargain was not to be lightly bypassed. Unfortunately, every kid in the world attended those matinees, and the result was a hellish bedlam of screaming children, salty popcorn and sticky bubblegum. It was considerably more enjoyable to travel to one of the plush uptown theatres, much larger edifices with thick carpet, velvet draperies and dignified ushers. Of course, the admission price was steeper, but the resultant drain on our finances could be offset in a number of ways. Usually, we would walk uptown instead of spending good money to ride on a streetcar. This was an adventure in itself, and usually consumed three or more hours each way. The distance was such that a company of Marines, carrying full battle gear, could probably make the hike in under an hour. The fact that the journey took us three or four times as long to complete is not attributable to our being unusually sedentary children, but rather because we paused frequently during the hike in order to engage in such fascinating pastimes as spitting off of bridges and playing a game ("Hits or Cracks") with empty cigarette packages discovered in the gutter. Actually, we probably enjoyed the unhurried trip more than the motion picture. One indication of this is that it never occurred to any of us to determine what features were playing at the uptown movies by looking in the appropriate section of the newspaper; instead, we made the time-consuming trip first, and only then bothered to find out if any motion picture worth seeing was playing.

Having decided upon a feature of limited artistic merit, we then shaved expenses still further by the relatively simple (albeit dishonest) stratagem of sneaking into the theatre through the rear exit. One motion picture theatre was especially favorable for this purpose, because the emergency exits were located in the restrooms. One member of the group would purchase a ticket, then immediately proceed to the men's room and, when the coast was clear, admit his co-conspirators. I vividly recall one memorable afternoon on which I was selected to play the central role in this plot to defraud the motion picture theatre chain. When I reached the men's room, having proceeded there immediately after gaining admission in the conventional manner, there was a middle-aged gentleman leaning against the wall smoking an extremely long cigar. As I waited for him to leave, I began to perspire freely and, having nothing else to do, washed my hands three times (a sight which would have sent my parents into immediate shock). As the seemingly endless minutes ticked by, there came a gentle but persistent tapping at the emergency door; the gentleman masticating the cigar glanced first at the door and then at me, and I nearly fainted on the spot. While I stood trembling and peering surreptitiously at the intruder, wishing that he would

strangle to death on his cigar or something equally dramatic, the knocking at the door came again, louder and more insistent. Finally, my companion in the restroom removed the cigar from between his lips, grinned at me, and said, "Go ahead and let 'em in, kid; I used to do the same thing." With a great sigh of relief, I casually pushed open the door and executed a low bow as my comrades illegally entered the theatre. As we left the men's room, I winked conspiratorily at my new-found friend with the cigar.

On another occasion, a group of us chipped in to pay the admission price for one youth, and it developed that his idea of a practical joke was to simply sit down and enjoy the movie, completely ignoring those of us who waited impatiently in the alley. As it became apparent that more than a temporary delay was involved, we concluded that the little bastard had no intention of opening the rear exit for us, so another member of the group was chosen to carry out the plan. Eventually, we succeeded in gaining admission to the theatre, but instead of settling back to enjoy the feature we concentrated on locating the traitor and devising delicious little schemes for revenge. The method decided upon was positively fiendish: we intercepted him on the way to the lobby to purchase popcorn, muffled his shrieks for assistance, and removed his trousers. We then proceeded to the little room marked "Ladies" and, when one of us kicked open the door, another hurled the trousers toward the far wall. As we hastily retreated from the premises, the victim was visible staring uncertainly at the restroom, while ushers with flashlights converged on the scene of the turmoil.

There is more, much more, that could be added to these recollections, possibly even enough to write that book I spoke of in the opening paragraph. Such a book would have to include at least one full chapter about Robert "Crud" Shaw, a neighborhood fixture who might be characterized, impolitely, as a wino. Crud (no one ever, to my knowledge, called him anything else) was one of the persons whom every child in the neighborhood was instructed to avoid--with precisely the opposite result. No one knew anything about his family background or point of origin; he was a middle-aged bum (in the factual rather than derogatory sense) who had been hanging around the neighborhood for as long as any of the children could remember. Sometimes he caddied at the local golf course in order to support himself, but usually he simply loitered on the corner or in Joe Hampshire's confectionary store. Most of the kids liked him because he treated us like people instead of like children, and he possessed one outstanding talent: he could touch the tip of his nose with his tongue. Then there would have to be a chapter on Sol Cohen, the proprietor of the grocery store next to my house. Sol Cohen was a noteworthy figure (as far as the neighborhood children were concerned) as the result of two possessions. First, there was the revolver which he invariably wore holstered on his hip while in the store in order to forestall robberies (and which tragically failed him when, several years ago, several young thugs surprised in the process of robbing his store murdered him with a claw hammer). Second, there was his magic light-changer, which to the uninitiated had the appearance of an ordinary flashlight but was capable of making traffic lights change from red to green. (I was embarrassingly old before I realized that the secret of this magic was that Sol could see the reflection from the orange light warning traffic on the intersecting street, and thus knew precisely the right moment to point the flashlight into the air.) No doubt there would also be a chapter on the arbitrary tendency of memory to retain insignificant recollections and discard important facts. I cannot now recall, for example, the details of my early schooling, which might be useful in assisting me to formulate my own views with respect to education, but my brain is positively cluttered with an amazing va-

riety of utterly worthless facts and incidents from the same approximate period. I can remember exactly what I was wearing the first time I fell out of a tree, but I cannot recall precisely what it was that caused my second year in elementary school to be infinitely more pleasant than my first. I can recall my thoughts the first time I saw the Glenn L. Martin Aircraft Corporation buildings, depressing even in the spring sun with their covering of camouflage nets (the value of which hindsight permits us to question): how thrilling would it be, I thought, to climb all over the buildings on that mesh, just like climbing in the rigging of a ship. I also wanted, as a youngster, to experience climbing over the side of a troop transport on a net into a landing craft, but then I learned that a lack of expertise could result in a broken leg, even if you didn't fall. And then there's... But no more of this. This article is far too long already; five pages of this sort of thing ought to be enough to convince even crotchety old Harry Warner that Kipple's political commentary is infinitely preferable to the sort of material that would replace it.

SHORT NOTES ON LONG SUBJECTS: It was ironic that the "Short Notes" column in Kipple #84 discussed the more noteworthy errors which the lovable editor has committed over the years. In that very issue, the letter column was incorrectly assembled, resulting in the letters from Walker Lane and George Price being thoroughly mixed up. First time that's ever happened... +++ L. Sprague de Camp (278 Hawthorne Lane, Villanova, Pa., 19085) is currently writing a book on the famous "Monkey Trial" in Dayton, Tennessee. The book will be concerned primarily with the Scopes trial itself, but the final chapter will contain a brief account of the anti-evolution movement from the time of the trial until the present time. Kipple readers are requested to forward any relevant clippings to Sprague with all proper speed. He is especially interested in material concerning attempts to repeal the "monkey laws" of Tennessee, Arkansas and Mississippi. +++ I was gratified to note recently while reading the evening paper that the branch of the family which remained in the Old Country when my ancestors migrated to the United States has at last produced a noteworthy figure. Dr. Rolf Pauls has the singular distinction of having been appointed the first ambassador from the Federal Republic of Germany to Israel. +++ I have been requested to announce that Redd Boggs and Gretchen Schwenn have moved. Redd's new address is P.O. Box 1111, Berkeley, Calif., 94701. Gretchen's new address, oddly enough, is also P.O. Box 1111, Berkeley, Calif., 94701. Sending a letter or magazine jointly to Redd and Gretchen at that address is, however, frowned upon most emphatically by Gretchen, who is Fine, Upstanding and a Little Peculiar.

--Ted Pauls

"Perpetual self-inspection leads to spiritual hypochondria. If a man insists on counting his pulse 20 times a day, on looking at his tongue every hour or two, on taking his temperature morning and evening, he will soon find himself in a doubtful state of bodily health. It is just so with those who are perpetually counting their spiritual pulse, taking the temperature of their feelings, weighing their human and necessarily imperfect characters against the infinite perfections placed in the other side of the balance." --Oliver Wendell Holmes.

"On the whole, I think we shall survive. The outlook is as bad as it has ever been, but thinking people realize that--and therein lies the hope of its getting better." --Jawaharlal Nehru.

KEEPING PEACE

BY STEPHEN BARR

The complex and critical problems disturbing the Atlantic Alliance must cause serious concern to all who regard it as an essential bastion of peace and freedom in Europe. There can be no doubt that the Alliance has become, in the words of Henry Kissinger's title, the troubled partnership. ("The Troubled Partnership: A Reappraisal of the Western Alliance", McGraw-Hill, 266 pages, \$5.95). The fact is that fundamental differences of opinion have developed concerning its whole future.

The Atlantic Alliance is perhaps the most powerful collective defense association ever known in peacetime. It grew out of and expanded the concept of a defense alliance within the framework of the United Nations Charter which the late Ernest Bevin, then British Foreign Secretary, put forth in 1948, when he proposed a formula for Western union embracing not only defense but also technical, cultural and social cooperation. The Communist coup in Czechoslovakia and the Berlin blockade, as Dr. Kissinger points out, caused a turning point in Western policy, and it served to produce the decisive participation of the United States in what emerged in 1949 as NATO. Thus the United States became directly involved in maintaining the security of free Europe against any further Soviet expansion. That was a development of momentous significance.

NATO prevented war in Europe throughout the subsequent years, contributed to the development of the policy of peaceful co-existence, and enabled practical steps to be taken in the direction of European unity. But, as Dr. Kissinger makes abundantly clear, there have been adverse results as well. There have been "increasingly sharp disputes among the Allies." Unity within the Atlantic Alliance has been seriously strained. Problems that may be structural in origin have emerged as policy issues. "Thus...within the Atlantic Alliance disagreements about the future organization of NATO and the relative roles of its members have multiplied. The chief protagonists have been the United States and France." The author summarizes the divergent American and French attitudes in concise terms:

"Now debating the wisdom of negotiating with the Soviets, now contesting the role of nuclear weapons, always disputing the future organization of Europe and the structure of the Alliance, the two countries have sometimes acted as if each has a psychological need to use the other as a foil. Each side has developed elaborate theories concerning the evil designs of its opponent."

The reader will discover that in discussing these disagreements the author presents the French position as fully and fairly as the American. What is disquieting is that there should be such

deep policy divisions within the Alliance, and that on some issues United States and French views diverge so as to hold out little hope for harmony. To take only one important point: Both the United States and France support the idea of European unity. But while the United States urges an "integrated" Europe in which the role of nation states would diminish, President De Gaulle argues that unity depends on "the vitality of the traditional European states". He envisages a confederation of states rather than a supra-national institution.

It is clear that the conflicting attitudes of the United States and France on this and other issues lie at the heart of many of the tensions that impair the present well-being and the future prospects of the Atlantic Alliance.

The author shows that Britain has not escaped General De Gaulle's displeasure. He resented the Nassau Agreement, and he dislikes the "special relationship" that Britain is supposed to enjoy with the United States. The term was first used by the late Sir Winston Churchill in the House of Commons on November 7, 1945, when he referred to "...our special relationship with the United States and Canada about the atomic bomb." The connotation of this term has been misconstrued to imply that there is some kind of preferential relationship between Britain and the United States. Such is not the case. If "special relationship" is intended to mean that we speak the same language and have the same cultural antecedents, it is of course true; but it is a myth that Britain enjoys a "preferential relationship" with the U.S. at the expense of other NATO partners.

Two informative chapters deal with "The Nature of the Strategic Debate" and "The Issue of Nuclear Control", on which agreement has not

(" " " " ")
(̄ ̄) "Today, students, we will study Twentieth Century American history. As you recall, 'America' is short for 'The
(W) United States of America', which was one of the most powerful
((=)) countries of that era."

"On the bulletin board you will find a picture of Lyndon Baines Johnson, the 36th President of that country. In November, 1964, Johnson was elected President by 43,000,000 votes to 27,000,000 votes over his opponent."
(" " " " ")
(̄ ̄)
(W)
((=))

(" " " " ")
(̄ ̄) "From its inception, the Johnson Administration pursued enlightened domestic policies, but its true claim to historical notoriety derives from its vigorous prosecution
(W) of a so-called 'limited' war in Asia."
((=))

"In November, 1968, Mr. Johnson was re-elected President in an election which was the most extraordinary in the history of the country, because every living citizen of the United States voted in it."
(" " " " ")
(̄ ̄)
(W)
((=))

(" " " " ")
(̄ ̄) "Lyndon Baines Johnson was re-elected by a margin of 453
(W) votes to 279 votes..."
((=))

yet been found possible. Here it is vital that there should be unity of viewpoints and political aims. The alternative to real and effective interdependence is, obviously, the proliferation of nuclear weapons; and the "road towards nuclear proliferation has no logical ending." It is relevant to mention here the view expressed by the British Prime Minister at the NATO ministerial meeting in London in May, 1965:

"The sheer facts of thermonuclear weapons, to say nothing of the hard lessons of economics, mean that outside the two major nations, the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., there cannot be a genuinely independent nuclear power capable of sustaining thermonuclear war or of providing a globally credible nuclear deterrent.

"The effects of modern nuclear warfare, no less than the realization that isolation is impossible even for the most powerful, mean that no nation, however great, can think in terms of going it alone, without allies and without regard to world opinion."

It is, of course, a fact that the U.S. is the leader of the partnership. But if there is to be a real interdependent Alliance, then it is surely right that the non-nuclear countries should have their say in the formulation and control of policies which will affect all the nations in the Alliance.

In a chapter dealing with East-West relations, the author puts forward an interesting suggestion regarding the problem of the reunification of Germany, about which there are differing views within the Alliance. In brief, it is that for a period of fifteen years "the territory now called the German Democratic Republic /i.e., East Germany/ would have a status similar to that of present-day Austria." This proposal would mean that "a loose confederation could be established between the two German States, but East Germany would be independent, neutral and demilitarized." Kissinger elaborates on this idea, but is cautious about its practical value, for his conclusion is that "it is improbable that any negotiating formula will advance German unity. Even the most reasonable program is likely to be rejected by the East. The long-term hope for German unity therefore resides in the unity of Europe." This conclusion seems to be sound, if by "the unity of Europe" the author means the solution of some of the political and security problems in Europe dividing East and West.

Dr. Kissinger's book makes a timely appearance. During the coming weeks and months, some of the disagreements and problems he discusses will have to be solved by the NATO governments if new life and strength are to be injected into the partnership.

--Stephen Barr

"If you work at that which is before you, following right reason seriously; vigorously, calmly, without allowing anything else to distract you, but keeping your divine part pure, as if you were bound to give it back immediately; if you hold to this, expecting nothing, but satisfied to live now according to nature, speaking heroic truth in every word which you utter, you will live happy. And there is no man able to prevent this." --Marcus Aurelius, in "Meditations".

"The Vice Presidency is sort of like the last cookie on the plate. Everybody insists he won't take it, but somebody always does."
--Bill Vaughan.

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

Your comment on the inevitability of monopoly in a "pure" free enterprise economy is of some merit, but is exaggerated and also misleading in implication. "Monopoly...occurs through an evolutionary process in which competitors gobble each other up until only the strongest remains." Here you neglect the continual entrance of new firms into the field, a process which is stimulated by the fat profits attained by a monopoly. Liberals ought to give more study to the methods used by monopolists to prevent the rise of competition; you would find that with startling regularity these involve getting government support for the monopoly. Some free market economists go so far as to say that an effective monopoly is practically impossible without governmental connivance. When not supported by government, monopoly is almost invariably an unstable situation. For obvious example, the rise of economic liberalism brought about the Industrial Revolution by clearing away the mercantilist system of legally enforced monopolies, franchises, and detailed regulations which stifled competition.

You speak of how all the companies in a field tend to agree upon rates and prices. True to some extent, but you should also mention how, once the agreement is made, there is a strong tendency for each conspirator to secretly underbid the others in the hope of increasing his own share of the market. This is why Fair Trade laws get passed--they are the would-be monopolist's attempt to get the government to enforce the price-fixing which he can't enforce on his own. The profit motive does indeed lead to attempts at monopoly, but it also stimulates erosion of monopolies. You say that when price-fixing agreements occur "in a critical field...the consumers cannot participate in a buyers' strike unless they are willing and able to be deprived of the commodity or service in question." This would be true if the price-fixing could be made to stick, which is very rarely the case. You apparently assume that the price-fixers are dishonest and greedy enough to enter into a price-fixing agreement, but not dishonest and greedy enough to violate it to their own advantage by underselling the other conspirators. Honor among thieves? (←No, greed. It is assumed that a manufacturer would be unlikely to conspire to fix prices unless he was dissatisfied with his percentage of profit in a competitive market. It is hardly probable, therefore, that such an individual would jeopardize the arrangement by stabbing his co-conspirators in the back. This would merely force them to lower their own prices, thereby restoring the competitive market and minimizing profits for all those involved. There probably have been instances where price-fixing agreements were sabotaged by one participant acting in this manner, but most businessmen aren't that stupid.→)

Your commentary is misleading in that it implies that a "free market" means an economy in which there is no legal regulation, so that any sort of sharp practice is perfectly permissible. This "law of the jungle" version of the free market is a straw man much beloved of the "planned economy" advocates, and bears scant resemblance to the actual position of most classical economists. As I have said before--and will probably have to say again--the concept of the free market assumes that the role of government is to keep the market free. "Laissez faire" does not mean that the government lets businessmen do any damned thing they please; it means that the government limits itself to providing a climate of law and order, and does not try to dictate the course of busi-

DISSENTING OPINIONS

ness. And of course, the concept of law and order must include the suppression of monopolies, or at the very least, the prevention of coercion by monopolists against would-be competitors.

I am perfectly willing to concede that the worst, or at least, most effective, enemies of the free market are not the socialists or communists, but the businessmen and unionists who refuse to abide by the rules of the market. Let the government limit itself to enforcing those rules, and the natural forces of competition will do the rest. The collectivists suffer from the strange delusion that the way to eliminate the evils of monopoly is to gather all business into one gigantic monopoly--the national government.

I recommend to all Kipplers a paperback, "The Economics of the Colour Bar", by W. H. Hutt (5 shillings, Andre Deutsch Ltd., 105 Great Russell Street, London W.C.1). Professor Hutt discusses the various economic controls employed by the South African government to suppress the blacks. He shows how these controls hurt not only the blacks but also the whites, and also how the most effective action to ameliorate the condition of the blacks has been taken by white industrialists--not out of altruism or liberalism, but strictly in the hope of profit. It is ironically amusing that the South African government agrees with many of the independent black African governments that foreign investment in the black areas should be discouraged. The black governments do this to protect their people from being "exploited"; the white apartheid government does it to keep the blacks in poverty and political apathy. To be sure, the South African government pays lip-service to anti-colonialism and anti-exploitation, echoing the black governments; but it is plain enough that the real motive is to prevent the blacks from breaking out of tribalism and gaining civilized skills and technical knowledge. There might be a lesson for the independent black governments in this: if keeping foreign capital out of South Africa's "Bantustans" will keep the South African blacks in poverty and servitude, might it not do exactly the same in, say, Ghana?

Derek Nelson and Chay Borsella have got themselves tangled up in definitions of "conservatism" and "prejudice". It appears to me that each of those words has two different definitions which are constantly confused. First, "conservatism" can mean "defense of the status quo", which is how Miss Borsella seems to take it, and as she says, this is more of a mental state than a philosophy. The other definition, which I think is more applicable to current politics, is that "conservatism" entails belief in certain principles; such as the free market, limited government, constitutionalism, etc., without regard to whether or not these principles are embodied in the status quo. A conservative in this sense is also a radical, because what he wants is greatly different from what exists.

"Prejudice" usually refers to having an utterly closed mind on a given subject. It can also mean the habit of assuming certain things to be true unless there is very strong evidence to the contrary, such as assumptions being usually based on what has been found by experience to be most often the case (the Burkean meaning). Like, the Patent Office has a "prejudice" against perpetual motion machines, but that doesn't mean the examiners are bigots. The usefulness of the Burkean type of prejudice is that it enables us to make most of our routine decisions automatically, without having to debate every little thing de novo. The

second type of prejudice degenerates into the first when one becomes unable to accept evidence showing that the prejudice is erroneous or no longer applicable.

I quite agree with you on the hypocrisy of the U.S. Government's declared policy in Vietnam. While I am wholly in favor of destroying Communist power in Vietnam--both North and South--the only valid reason is that such power is a prospective danger to us. The preservation of a non-existent "democracy" in Vietnam is a ridiculous irrelevance. Of course it would be nice if, in the process of breaking the Communists, we could help the Vietnamese establish a workable liberal government; but that should not be our principal aim. We should fight in Vietnam only because if we don't, we'll have to fight in the Philippines, or Thailand, or etc., etc.

It is notable that the sort of moralizing hypocrisy which the Administration employs is also used by much of the Liberal opposition to the war. Mr. Johnson's cant about "defending democracy" in Vietnam is matched by the opposition's equally spurious and irrelevant claims that the Viet Cong are a "people's movement" who should be allowed to prevail because they have popular support. In both cases, the arguments take for granted that the central question is, what do the people of Vietnam want? I say that, for us, the central question should be, what promotes the security of the United States and the West? The only arguments against the war that I would consider relevant would be those aimed at showing (1) that we don't have the power to win, and/or (2) that in the long run a wholly Communist Vietnam would not be harmful to America and the West. And that will take a lot of showing. What the people of Vietnam want should be a consideration insofar as it affects the strategy we must use to get rid of the Communists. But their desires--or what propagandists say are their desires--should not be allowed to deflect us from the hard requirements of our security. For analogy, if someone tries to set fire to the house next door to you, you stop him in order to save your own house; and you don't care a damn whether he can produce a valid deed to the property. (Here is an excellent illustration of my frequent assertion that conservatives possess, on the whole, little respect for the concept of democracy. You have placed yourself on record as stating that, in order to promote the security of the United States, we have the right to intervene in Vietnam (and, by implication, any other country), regardless of the wishes of its populace. This attitude is the foundation for a number of nasty little precepts, including the view, much beloved of rightists such as the Junkers, that "might makes right". It perpetuates the rule of brute force at the expense of the rule of law, and betrays every ideal for which this nation has historically stood. Moreover, since, as Alexander the Great and Napoleon discovered, true security is unattainable as long as there remain nations independent of the empire, it necessarily requires the subjugation, in one way or another, of the entire world. Finally, since the belief that "the people" do not necessarily possess the right to choose their own government if it interferes with our security cannot be applied selectively, it therefore follows, according to your view, that rightists are completely justified in attempting to overthrow the government in Washington when it appears to them to be fail-

(; ; ; ;)
(= =)
(M)
(())

"Happiness is a cloudburst, when your team is eight runs behind in the third inning."

ing to promote the security of the United States. You see, as I pointed out to Derek Nelson in Kipple #85, once you establish the principle that the desires of the populace as to the nature of their government can be thwarted by some outside agency or dissident minority, you have opened a Pandora's Box:~)

You know, if we really want to take the 1954 Geneva agreement seriously, we could claim with some justice that it was automatically abrogated when the Communists started violating it in Laos, which they did practically before the ink was dry.

L. Sprague de Camp is in fine form of capital punishment. I shall be extremely careful not to trespass on his property... It has been pointed out that it is certainly of punishment, not severity, which is the best deterrent to crime. A 95% probability of ten years in quod is much more effective than a 1% probability of being drawn and quartered. Mr. De Camp is especially right in noting that we have no effective means of rehabilitation. Thus, to argue that rehabilitating criminals is preferable to executing them is to indulge in mere rhetoric having no application to the real world.

If I were a judge, and sentenced a man to death, I would certainly feel deep regret over the cutting off of a life that might have produced something of value. And on the other hand, if I were a judge, and did not execute a criminal when I had the opportunity, and he afterward murdered someone, that someone's death would be deeply on my conscience. There is no easy answer.

To me, the primary argument against the death penalty is that we might kill the wrong man. But of course this does not apply when the criminal is caught red-handed, like Mr. De Camp's burglar. I would have no hesitation or qualms about shooting a burglar caught in my home. I would try to take him alive only if I could do so without significant danger to myself; certainly I would not feel honor bound to give him a sporting chance.

By the way, a local newspaper reported a farmer's land posted with this sign: "NO HUNTING. TRESPASSERS WILL BE VIOLATED." That is going Sprague one better!

"It is a small thing to accept people for what they are: if we really love them we must want them to be what they are." --Alain.

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

In relation to your comments on the demonstrations in Berkeley, you may be interested in a somewhat similar occurrence some time back at the University of Tennessee. Although there were no instances of civil disobedience or demonstrations at UT, the muddle seems to have been at least partly inspired by Berkeley. Primarily, the trouble was led by two students in the College of Liberal Arts who started out demanding that the curfews on the girls' dormitories be lifted, a not unreasonable idea. From there on they picked some maybe-political overtones to the tempest in a teapot.

Now, what caught my eye about all this was that one of the leaders of the Free Speech type thing was from Milan. Phil Smith always seemed to be a very intelligent kid, and managed to enter UT a year earlier than the usual student. However, from what I've picked up about him, he also seems to be a chronic misfit. Like the time he was attending Band Camp and attempted to convert some grade-schoolers to atheism. That escapade came to an abrupt end when the good religious kids dragged him off into the corner and beat him to a pulp... He didn't much fit into small-town life, and after he went to college he organized a

"Damn Milan" club, which would meet on an empty lot and make signs saying "Damn Milan". It must have been a fun club, since a lot of kids who had never even heard of Milan joined up. Eventually, I imagine he got tired of just damning Milan and decided to damn the University.

I wouldn't want to be accused of arguing the particular to fit the general, but Smith's personality seems to be apparent in some of the California types, too. Whether or not there is something legitimate to protest, this sort of personality seems to get its kicks out of just being generally perverse and antagonizing people in authority.

But to keep things in perspective, I should mention that the President of the University of Tennessee is a dunderhead character by the name of Dr. Andrew Holt, who by all means deserves having some of his feathers ruffled.

"We no longer have heroes in American life: instead to have invented celebrities. The essence of the celebrity condition is that there, but for the breaks, go I. We don't worship celebrities; we consider them equals (or even inferiors) who have been favored by special advantages. They--the starlets, the ballplayers, the comedians--are ourselves, with one talent (or a bosom) writ large. They are not aristocrats with a whole set of values we could not learn in a lifetime; they are not scientists whose brainy triumphs would make our heads ache, but someone like us, who enters the night club and spends freely, indifferent to the check, or builds a garish home with swimming pool as we might like to. And since he is us--plus the artificial life of riches and notoriety thrust suddenly upon him--he will probably make a mess of his marriage or of his life and provide us with an interesting morality play to read about as well. A certain kind of gossip-journalism has mastered the art of smacking over sin, so that it can be enjoyed vicariously and disapproved in the same breath." --Thomas Griffith, in "The Waist-High Culture".

DUNCAN McFARLAND :: 1242 GRACE AVE. :: CINCINNATI, OHIO, 45208

I wish some people would get one thing through their heads: Communists are people. Their complexities are as bewildering as ours; they have many of the same hopes, ambitions, desires and fears that we do. They laugh and they love as we do, and have as many illusions about the nature of the West as we have of the nature of the East.

I'm sick and tired of having all Communists characterized as ogres. President Johnson described the Peking variety as those who "hate and destroy". And so we embark on another crusade. This crusade against Communism is characterized by the same ignorance and prejudice that has accompanied attempts in the past to wipe out Jews, Christians, Jacobins, the bourgeoisie, socialists and various sorts of heretics, to name a few. I hope that someday time-travel will exist, so we can send the crusaders back to the Thirteenth Century where they'll be appreciated. (Incidentally, John H. Kautsky has an excellent article entitled "Myth, Self-Fulfilling Prophecy, and Symbolic Reassurance in the East-West Conflict" in the March, 1965, issue of The Journal of Conflict Resolution.)

The inspiration and doctrines for the series of revolutions, violent and peaceful, that have swept the world in the Twentieth Century have been provided by men of the industrialized nations. Hence the ideologies of the advanced nations--liberalism, socialism, communism, social democracy, etc.--have never been relevant to the needs of the underdeveloped countries.

The Russian Bolshevik Revolution was not a Communist one. Russia, according to Marxist ideology, was not ripe for a proletarian re-

volution. The socialists of the period realized this. This is why they tolerated the Kerensky regime, and refused to seize power before Lenin arrived from Switzerland and began organizing an insurrection. Before a Communist state could be established, Russia had to go through the capitalist stage and develop a large, oppressed working class.

Trotsky rationalized the Bolshevik insurrection by arguing that the Russian bourgeoisie was too weak to overthrow the monarchy and establish the capitalist state. Hence, the proletariat had to make both the bourgeois and the proletarian revolutions because of the peculiar nature of Russian society. That this deviated from Marxist doctrine is unquestionable. But Lenin fully expected a wave of revolutions to sweep through the industrialized countries of Europe after the war, and so save the Russian revolution. Both Lenin and the West thought that the Russian revolution was a proletarian one. Lenin, expecting a wave of similar revolutions in the advanced countries, hoped to help them along by propaganda and agitation. The Western bourgeoisie, fearing for its existence, adopted a strong anti-Soviet policy. Hence, unparalleled fear and distrust arose between the camps, stemming from a misunderstanding of the nature of the Bolshevik Revolution.

The Bolsheviks remained in power through the civil war only because of peasant support. And this example did help spread revolution throughout the world, but only in the underdeveloped, unindustrialized countries where it was relevant.

It is interesting to speculate what would have happened if a non-Marxist group of socialists, say the Social Revolutionaries, had seized power instead of the Bolsheviks. Even if, for instance, Kerensky had pursued the same policies as did Stalin, he would have been regarded in the West in somewhat the same manner as Sun Yat Sen or Achmed Sukarno; i.e., as one whose policies were geared to the modernizing of a backward state. One might say that even a non-Marxist socialist revolution in a country as big and with the proximity of Russia would be dangerous to the West. But historical fact demonstrates that not one proletarian revolution was inspired by the Russians.

The myths and symbols of Marxism are a useful weapon of foreign policy, especially when a country is weak. Hence, strife-torn, weak revolutionary Russia relied on them heavily, just as, today, the Chinese Communists issue the call to arms to establish the world communist state. Modern-day Russia, however, utilizes its wealth and political power (as well as Marxist symbols) to try to gain influence throughout the world.

To be successful, a government's policies must jibe with reality, not with outdated myths. Marxist dogmas have ceased to dominate Soviet policy; this policy had its beginning with the demise of Lenin, and especially since the banishment of Trotsky in 1927. So the Russians denounce the Chinese Communists, allow most peasants private plots of land, begin to decentralize planning in the economy, forget about the Communist parties in the underdeveloped nations in an effort to spread Soviet influence in the third world, etc.

This is not to say that much of the conflict between East and West does not stem from realities not connected with Marxist symbols and myths--i.e., Russian imperialism in postwar Europe, the race for nuclear arms, and the development of alliances such as NATO and the Warsaw Pact. However, these factors do not account for the regarding of the Soviets as ogres, as some sort of aliens to the planet Earth, as people who want to hate and destroy. Toynbee throws in the suggestion that much of the suspicion of Communism--to the extent of McCarthyism--arises from an economic fear of the West for Communism rather than for, say, fascism.

The conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union is one between two great national powers, for which there exists plenty of historical precedent. Self-righteous Ogreism is a bar to the establishment of understanding and cooperation in the world, and it ought to be stopped.

"Theft, of course, was antisocial. Since all the clans within the tribe were of one blood, it was considered distinctly unethical to take something not of one's own. Maya houses had no doors, no locks, only a drapery or a string of bells to inform the owner that someone had entered. For theft the punishment was slavery. The thief had to 'work off' the theft; or should his immediate relations feel the social defilement brought on by it, they paid off the debt. Second offenses could bring death. Theft perpetrated by any member of the directing classes brought disgrace; his face was scarred by deep tattooing and carried notice of his crime throughout life. There was no social atonement for theft. The thief did not pay 'society', the Maya having no form of imprisonment except for sacrificial victims. The culprit paid the victim." --Victor W. von Hagen, in "World of the Maya".

BOB VARDEMAN :: 3705 GEN. STILWELL, N.E. :: ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO

Mr. Helgesen states: "Adam was created perfect, with the perfections proper to man." When Adam chose to reject God he apparently, from this statement at least, made a perfect choice. Either Adam was not created perfect (which indicates that God is not perfect--for how could a perfect being create anything non-perfect?) or evil is a more potent force than God. Take your choice.

What Mr. Helgesen says about the Hell's Angels, etc., may be true, but it seems recent news at least shows the Negroes "think bigger" than penny-ante groups like these. At last report, twenty-eight were dead in Los Angeles and property damage was in excess of \$175 million. All this in just five days, and more to come. This is a pretty good record for a minority group wanting equal rights, if those rights are to kill, burn, loot and discriminate. (Of course, the recent violence in Los Angeles had nothing directly to do with the struggle for equal rights. What occurred was an explosion, a regrettable but entirely natural result of the condition which was permitted to develop. Such an explosion cannot, of course, contribute to the progress of the civil rights movement, and I doubt if any of the participants believed that their actions would serve a useful purpose. A spontaneous riot is by definition an irrational response to a frustrating situation; it is analogous to pounding one's fist on the table during a run of especially bad luck in a card game.)

To take issue with Mr. Blake, gambling should be legalized. To prohibit any activity is to leave it wide open to full criminal control. Prohibition created the biggest bootlegging industry in the world. When sanity finally returned to the law-makers, the criminals were given two choices: become legal, licensed businessmen regulated by the government, or continue illegal activities and try to undersell legal outlets. Criminal activities are no doubt costly in bribes, pay-offs, protection and so on, and underselling would be difficult in competition with legal liquor dealers. So the criminals ceased their bootlegging activities. The same thing would happen to gambling. The gangland syndicates would have to be subjected to government control. Hence, in this one area, at least, they would become legitimate businessmen. I suspect that the state treasuries would love to see revenue from the taxes on gambling activities pour in. Nevada derives fantastic amounts from this source.

In this way, the non-gamblers would benefit also (assuming, that is, that such people do not oppose highways in favor of dirt roads and public parks instead of weed-overrun lots).

I agree with you, Mr. Pauls, when you state that Negroes should not be discriminated against on public transports, public recreations and other public services. However, I contend that if your "bigots" want to prevent Negroes from eating in their restaurants, this is their right. If these people are so narrow-minded that it sends them into convulsions at the mere thought of a Negro eating in their establishments, fine; it is their property and they should have the right to manage it in any way they choose. In effect what the integration laws do is to force a person not inclined to be tolerant into a completely alien pattern of thought. I believe that the Negro, as an American citizen and taxpayer, should have the unconditional right to vote, sit anywhere on the bus he wants, and not be discriminated against by public services and/or servants. But the individual property owner has lost the right to manage his property as he chooses if he must serve a Negro--or anyone else, for that matter--when he does not wish to. (This argument was answered adequately in my original remarks to Eric Blake in Kipple #84. In a free society, every individual possesses the right (except under extraordinary circumstances such as are found in prisons) to associate or not associate with other individuals or types of people, provided that he exercises this right by controlling his own actions. Perhaps an example will serve to illustrate the principle involved. It is my heartfelt desire to avoid any contact whatsoever with Governor Wallace; I intend to pursue this desire by studiously controlling my own actions in an effort to insure that our paths do not cross. Admittedly, this method of avoidance becomes more difficulty as the number of people one wishes to avoid increases, but it seems to me that an individual who experiences "convulsions" at the prospect of personal contact with any Negro should be willing to go to great lengths to avoid the situation arising. My aversion to Governor Wallace does not entitle me to restrict his freedom; since the choice to avoid contact was made by me, I am obliged to carry it out by limiting my own actions. Probably it is true that "integration laws...force a person not inclined to be tolerant into a completely alien pattern of thought"; so what? Laws intended to interdict arson force a person not inclined to be respectful of the property of others into a completely alien pattern of thought, or in any event attempt to do so. Shall we repeal these laws in order

(#####)
(5 5) "We interrupt this program to bring you a special bulletin. Rioting has erupted again in the Los Angeles area.
(w) National Guard troops are moving into the area, and are
((=)) expected to have the situation under control soon."

"Meanwhile, in an extraordinary news conference this afternoon, Mayor Yorty charged that the latest violence was attributable to trained infiltrators from Northern California. He said that an appropriate response will follow."
(#####)
(5 5)
(w)
((=))

(#####)
(5 5) "The nature of this response was revealed early this evening, when a flight of planes based in Orange County dropped 75 tons of bombs on what were officially described as 'military targets' ten miles north of Oakland."
(w)
((=))

to avoid curtailing the rights of arsonists? Of course not, for it is recognized that the arsonist possesses only those rights enjoyed by the entire community and enjoys no special privilege to burn down buildings. Similarly, the rights of the bigot do not include the right to commit acts of bigotry which have the effect of limiting the freedom of the victim. Incidentally, why put parenthesis around the word "bigot" in the context of people who "want to prevent Negroes from eating in their restaurants"? Do you know a more suitable term to describe them?))

Capital punishment is not deterring crime in any significant amount. In fact, only fifteen executions took place last year. I oppose capital punishment not because I consider it immoral, but because there is always the possibility that an innocent person will be executed. Instead of execution, why not employ the relatively simple pre-frontal lobotomy? Maybe the thought of ending up like a vegetable would deter some criminals. Also, an innocent person would not be dead--perhaps in an equivalent state, but still not dead. (Do you actually believe that this is an important distinction?) The state gives free room and board to convicts now, therefore it shouldn't be too much of a strain to add a few harmless "vegetables" to this. I further contend that such a fate should be meted out to all those pleading (temporary or other) insanity in any crime. To free a criminal because he temporarily lost control of his actions is foolhardy. If freed, the criminal could "temporarily" lose sanity again and again and go scot-free. After such an operation, these people would not be left with enough initiative to rob or murder, and would not be putting an intolerable strain on the state's budget for their maintenance.

The quotation of George Price's from Kipple #82 used by Walker Lane seems quite acceptable to me. Indeed, it could be extended to include Mario Savio and his followers. They, just as much as the Communists, are trying to force their own "socio-economic religion" down the throats of others (in this case, the college administrators). Also, I wish Mr. Lane would remember that the Boston Tea Party was not done for democratic ideals. The colonists at this time would have been willing to substitute an American king for the British one; George Washington was offered the throne but declined in favor of a convention to decide the issue. From this convention came the Constitution and democratic ideals.

FROM:

TED PAULS
1448 MERIDENE DR. 841
BALTIMORE, MD. 21212
U. S. A.

BALTIMORE, MD.

BALTIMORE, MD.

SEND TO:



Walt & Marion Breen
Box 1032
Berkeley, Calif., 94701

printed matter only

may be opened for inspection

return requested

third class mail

late to bed, early to rise, makes it hard to hold open your eyes...anon