

fore, the children forget about the "sexy side" of a Barbie Doll, if any.

Sooner or later, girls must learn about boys. With Ken, they will learn that boys are sweet and kind. When the time comes to learn about boys, in detail, they will learn from their mother, or another great source, like experience (sic). You said, "With Barbie, girls learn to expect to be valued by an ever-increasing wardrobe and their ability to manipulate their fathers and, later their husbands into buying clothes, and more clothes." This is not true in many cases. If it is not true in one case, this statement is false. A lot of people can not afford (sic) to spend the money on all the clothes and friends of Barbie. But, mostly every girl has a Barbie Doll. Therefore parents think differently about Barbie Dolls than you do. If they thought a Barbie Doll was a sex symbol, and a bad influence on their children, their children wouldn't have one. A baby doll is no different than a Barbie in some cases. First of all, it needs a bottle and maybe other clothes. There are cribs, swings, strollers (sic), etc. and the children might get those things. They manipulate their fathers, and later husbands, for clothes and accessories (sic). It might give a child the urge to go out and have a baby, when they are under age. Some of this too is caused by the parents letting their child go quicker than others.

As any other doll, Barbie has its good qualities as well as its bad. It must have good qualities, or else it would have been out of business long ago. "Barbie and her friends," were put out to make money, just like any other doll, toy, etc. As you can see it made a lot of success (sic).

Eloise Marion (age 12)
Los Angeles, California

Sirs:

I think that the article on Barbie in your April **Ramparts** was unfair. Girls don't have all those Barbie clothes as Donovan Bess implied. Women have lots of clothes to look at, yet they don't buy them all.

Also, Barbie isn't a person. She is what the person who owns her wants her to be — from princess to witches, almost never "glamor girls."

Debbie Lawton (Age 11)
Riverside, California

Sirs:

Hurrah for your article on the Barbie dolls! Incidentally, for what it's worth, Ken and Barbie are physiologically incapable of kneeling.

The Rev. Albert J. Colton
San Francisco, California



...manipulate
their fathers...



THE COVER: *Ho Chi Minh Crossing The Delaware*

It was, at first, of course, only a wild flight of fancy. "How do you see Ho Chi Minh?" we asked **RAMPARTS** ace cover artist Justin Murray.

"As Washington crossing the Delaware, of course," Murray replied. **Of course.** And we all laughed.

Upon sufficient reflection, however, we realized that Murray had come up with a grain of wisdom from the chicken-growing country of Petaluma, California, where he resides.

The history of Vietnam is a history of a people struggling against the troops of outside nations. First, for centuries, the Chinese. Then the French. Then the Japanese. Then the French again. Now, a majority of the population is fighting the Americans.

Murray's cover brings home a primary point that most Americans do not realize: Ho Chi Minh, our enemy, is the great revolutionary hero of modern Vietnam. He fought the Japanese. He defeated the French. Now he is the symbol of the fight against the Americans, whose degree of popularity in Vietnam is only rivaled by the Gallup rating of the British just before the Boston Tea Party.

The coke bottles in the river are, of course, a modern touch. Everywhere, one encounters the effects of massive American Aid.

N EDITORIAL ANNOUNCEMENT

RAMPARTS takes great pleasure in announcing the establishment of its new Editorial Board comprised of Arthur A. Cohen, William Stringfellow and Edward M. Keating.

This Board was formed in order to more fully reflect the editorial policy of RAMPARTS, stemming from the Judeo-Christian perspective of man and the world. There is an ever increasing need for mutual participation by the three major religious faiths in the cultural and social issues of contemporary society. Too long Catholics, Protestants and Jews have spoken to each other over the picket fences that traditionally circumscribe each religious community.

With the convergence of these three religious perspectives in RAMPARTS, there will be discussions from time to time among the three Board members. There is no intention to reduce everything to common consensus since a deeply committed Protestant, a deeply committed Jew and a deeply committed Catholic comprise the Board—united by a mutuality of respect for each other's convictions.

Moreover, the members of the Board are bound together by their deep concern and love for America. At this stage of world and American history it is crucial that the essential character of America and Americans be reaffirmed. Such reaffirmation is fundamentally *moral and revolutionary*; moral, having everything to do with human conduct and revolutionary as continuing to improve our master over the use of change. If America and Americans lose their ability for moral indignation and if they become afraid of change, there is no future for us for freedom and for democracy. To be revolutionary (that is, to change) is necessary for it helps to prevent the moral approach from becoming doctrinaire. On the other hand, moral concern is the lifeblood of human relations as they change throughout history.

Thus, RAMPARTS' new Board represents an effort to combine that which is greatest in all of us: love of God and love of fellowman. We range in all directions in RAMPARTS, but always we return to that fundamental starting point: God and man.

The Editors

EDITORIAL ANNOUNCEMENT



Arthur A. Cohen is Editor-in-Chief of the Trade Department of Holt Rinehart and Winston Inc. He was President of Meridian Books which he founded in 1955 and 1960 he became Vice President of World Publishing Company upon its acquisition of Meridian Books. In 1961 he was appointed Director of the Religious Department of Holt Rinehart and Winston Inc. Mr. Cohen received his B.A. from the University of Chicago in 1946 and his M.A. from the University of Chicago in 1949 and was a Fellow in Medieval Jewish Philosophy at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, New York, from 1951 to 1953. His books include *Martin Buber* (1958), *The Natural And The Supernatural Jew: An Historical And Theological Introduction* (1963) and he has a novel in progress. He is a frequent contributor to many journals, including *Worldview*, *The Commonweal*, *Harper's Magazine*, *Partisan Review* and *Cross Currents*. In addition, Mr. Cohen is a member of the Advisory Council of the Institute for Advanced Judaic Studies at Brandeis University, the Editorial Board of Judaism, and the Board of Institute of Church and State at Villanova University.



William Stringfellow, a practicing attorney in New York, is also an established author and lecturer. He is best known for his book *My People Is The Enemy*, published in 1964, but his writings also include *Free in Obedience*, *Instead of Death* and *A Private And Public Faith*. He is a graduate of the Harvard Law School (1956), Bates College (1949) and was a Rotary Fellow at the London School of Economics (1950). After graduation from law school he lived and practiced law in the East Harlem section of New York City. His law firm still devotes a large part of its work to the underprivileged in this and other parts of the city. In 1962 he was one of six "young American theologians," and the only layman, to participate in a public dialogue with Karl Barth at the University of Chicago. Active in the ecumenical movement since his days as a leader of the World's Student Christian Federation, he has traveled in thirty-six countries of Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America and he now represents the Episcopal Church in the United States on the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches. He is a member of the Board of the Church Society for College Work of the Episcopal Church, and has been a Special Deputy Attorney General of New York, consultant to the New York State Commission Against Discrimination and a witness before the President's Committee on Narcotics. His military service with the Second Armored Division won him three commendations.



Edward M. Keating, founder and Editor-in-Chief of RAMPARTS, is a graduate of Stanford University (A.B. 1948) and the Stanford Law School (L.L.B. 1950). He has been an active participant in the Negro Civil Rights Movement in the United States, in the role of private citizen and as Editor-in-Chief of RAMPARTS. During the past several years Mr. Keating has demonstrated a keen interest in the growing ecumenical spirit of America's three major religions, and has responded with intensity to the demands of "renewal and reform" in his own Catholic Church. Last year he received the Brotherhood Award from a chapter of B'nai B'rith. His book, *The Scandal of Silence — "A layman's powerful critique of the Catholic Church in America"* — was published recently by Random House. Mr. Keating resides with his wife and five children in Atherton, California.



SOUTHEAST ASIA A SPECIAL REPORT

The Unreasonable Question

The virgin issue in our Vietnam policy is the moral one. The Lilliputian measures of public dissent have been couched in supremely practical terms: How are we going about the war? Should we be escalating or negotiating? Are our policies efficient? Are we winning?

These are reasonable questions, asked by reasonable men. The *unreasonable* question—the seemingly unutterable question is—*why*?

But this is the essential query. It is what must be asked before any rational discussion of policy alternatives is possible. It is the question RAMPARTS asks in this special issue on the moral disaster of our Southeast Asia policy.

Why is the public told America was *asked* to step into Vietnam, when our initial involvement was actually installing, financing and arming a despotic and unpopular premier as a “democratic alternative” to the overwhelming grass-roots popularity of the Communist guerillas? (P. 16)

Why do people still believe that Southeast Asia is ready to fall, country-by-country, like dominos into the Communist axis, when Asian nations are in reality complex, perverse and independent—like Cambodia where a King can feel comfortable as a Socialist and an anti-Communist at the same time? (PP. 25 and 34)

Why do serious, concrete, non-Establishment proposals for peace (P. 41) stand so little chance of being heard and understood by American policy makers?

Why—and this is the most disturbing question of all—why is there no significant number of Americans asking these questions? Is the age of consensus that complete? Or have we lost all capacity for moral outrage?

The Cold War and its hot complexes are no longer as simple-minded as they appeared in the late 1940s. This is a post-Vandenberg era: foreign policy should be *debatable*. Indeed, it *must* be debated if this country is to rid itself of the clumsy, generous, para-missionary, quasi-gangbusters crazyquilt of little reality that has covered our bipartisan foreign policy through four administrations.

There can be no better place to begin such a debate than over our Southeast Asia policy. We *know* it doesn't work. Let us ask *why*.

—The Editors.