

urth-urth.net Digest, Vol 5, Issue 15

The Urth list — 10 messages, 6 voices, 11 Jan 2005

<https://urth.darkrealm.vip/thread/urth/4297>

Exported from an unofficial mirror of a public mailing list. Copyright in each message remains with the person who wrote it. Email addresses are obscured as `user at host`, the form the original archive published. This file was rebuilt from parsed fields rather than retained headers, so it is faithful in content but not byte-exact.

Jeffrey Lefstin — 11 Jan 2005, 11:33

I wouldn't go so far as to endorse this point of view whole-heartedly, but I was struck by how jarring the paeans to supply-side economics and universal gun ownership were in Exodus from the Long Sun. At the time they seemed so clumsily inserted that I wasn't sure if they were satire or GW's views.... Now I assume the latter?

JL

On Jan 11, 2005, at 11:16 AM, urth-urth.net-request at lists.urth.net wrote:

I don't think Orwell crossed any kind of critical line in what he wrote about Chesterton here; he seems to attack him more on political than religious grounds anyway. But it was clearly posted in the group as an insult to certain members, though I can't claim to understand why. I mean, the religious views of most active members on this list are well known, as are Gene Wolfe's. Is the poster implying that Wolfe's novels have become increasingly stale and polemical as his religious and/or political beliefs have found a more overt expression in his writing?

aqala at yahoo.com — 11 Jan 2005, 11:38 · follows Jeffrey Lefstin

--- urth-urth.net-request at lists.urth.net wrote:

Message: 6

Date: Tue, 11 Jan 2005 10:57:56 -0800

From: Dan'l Danehy-Oakes <danl do at gmail.com>

Subject: Re: (urth) Orwell on Chesterton

To: The Urth Mailing List <urth-urth.net at lists.urth.net>

Message-ID: <1f76173705011110571de36a2f at mail.gmail.com>

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=UTF-8

Aqala:

I am a great admirer of both Orwell and Chesterton, and a man who is converting to Catholicism in his 40s, after a great deal (more than ten years) of thought. May I ask why you feel it necessary to post something so inflammatorially insulting?

--Dan'l

What is exactly insulting Orwell's opinion or my own?

To whom is it insulting? Chesterton has been dead many for a long time. Why is it insulting?

People has been denouncing religion and the church for a long time now, nothing new there, like Robert Burns said: Proud Priests and Bishops we'll translate And canonise as Martyrs; If not

with swords than with words. If you find Orwell's opinion (or mine) insulting to YOU than that, sir, is your problem.

James Wynn — 11 Jan 2005, 11:44 · in reply to aqala at yahoo.com

What is exactly insulting Orwell's opinion or my own?
To whom is it insulting? Chesterton has been dead many for a long time.
Why is it insulting? People has been denouncing religion and the church
for a long time now, nothing new there, like Robert Burns said:
Proud Priests and Bishops we'll translate
And canonise as Martyrs;
If not with swords than with words. If you find Orwell's opinion (or mine)
insulting to YOU than that, sir, is your problem.

Errr...I think the insulting part was not Orwell's opinion which was directed a Chesterton, but it was rather your own which was directed at the intellect of anyone considering converting to Catholicism. That's rather personal and not directed at some dead for nigh on a century.

In short, it was inflammitory.

~ Crush

aqala at yahoo.com — 11 Jan 2005, 11:46 · follows James Wynn

Message: 8
Date: Tue, 11 Jan 2005 11:16:12 -0800 (PST)
From: stilskin <acronus at yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: (urth) Orwell on Chesterton
To: The Urth Mailing List <urth-urth.net at lists.urth.net>
Message-ID: <20050111191612.83372.qmail at web20021.mail.yahoo.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

--- Andy Robertson <andywrobertson at clara.co.uk> wrote:

I don't think Orwell crossed any kind of critical line
in what he wrote about Chesterton here; he seems to
attack him more on political than religious grounds

You can find the text of Orwell's essay here:
<http://gutenberg.net.au/ebooks03/0300011.txt>

anyway. But it was clearly posted in the group as an
insult to certain members, though I can't claim to
understand why. I mean, the religious views of most

So anyone who expresses a view that does not confirm to your own (or certain members) views than he is bent on insulting? That must make it easy (very easy) to just dismiss anyone with a different view rather than engage them!

active members on this list are well known, as are
Gene Wolfe's. Is the poster implying that Wolfe's
novels have become increasingly stale and polemical as
his religious and/or political beliefs have found a
more overt expression in his writing?

You read all that in a post that didn't even mention Wolfe? No your interpretation is completely wrong.

James Wynn — 11 Jan 2005, 11:52 · in reply to Jeffrey Lefstin

I wouldn't go so far as to endorse this point of view whole-heartedly, but I was struck by how jarring the paeans to supply-side economics and universal gun ownership were in Exodus from the Long Sun. At the time they seemed so clumsily inserted that I wasn't sure if they were satire or GW's views.... Now I assume the latter?

I didn't think they were clumsily inserted. I think they were jarring because the plurality of SciFi writers are politically liberal.

Thus, placing favorable views to gun-ownership and supply-side economics in the mouth of a very simpathic and (presented as) wise character might have caught you unaware if you did not previously know of Wolfe's conservative politics.

~ Crush

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes — 11 Jan 2005, 12:55 · in reply to aqala at yahoo.com

What is exactly insulting Orwell's opinion or my own?

Yours.

Specifically:

"A man so lacking in thought and intellect he converted to Catholicism when in his 40's."

While stated as a remark on Chesterton, it is in fact a general remark on the intellegence of anyone who converts to Catholicism, and especially in their 40s. (Which - by the way - does not take an apostrophe.)

To whom is it insulting?

To me and anyone else who voluntarily embraces Catholicism after a great deal of thought.

Why is it insulting?

I refuse to insult you by assuming that you are too dim to figure it out yourself from teh clues given.

People has been denouncing religion and the church
for a long time now,

There is also a lengthy tradition of denouncing blacks as half-animals, jews as greedy Christ-killers, atheists as closed-minded bigots, etc. An insult repeated for a long time does not become less insulting thereby.

--Dan'l

www.livejournal.com/users/sturgeonslawyer

Freedom has no barcode.

--J.G. Ballard

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes — 11 Jan 2005, 12:56 · in reply to James Wynn

On Tue, 11 Jan 2005 14:52:10 -0500, James Wynn <thewynns at earthlink.net> wrote:
I didn't think they were clumsily inserted. I think they were jarring
because the plurality of SciFi writers are politically liberal.

Thus, placing favorable views to gun-ownership and supply-side economics in

the mouth of a very simpathic and (presented as) wise character might have caught you unaware if you did not previously know of Wolfe's conservative politics.

We must not be reading the same SF: Heinlein, Weber, Niven and/or Pournelle - well, I gave up on those two years ago... There is a long and rich tradition of conservatism in SF.

Which doesn't make it right, of course. 8*)

--Dan'l

www.livejournal.com/users/sturgeonslawyer
Freedom has no barcode.
--J.G. Ballard

James Wynn — 11 Jan 2005, 13:25 · in reply to Dan'l Danehy-Oakes

We must not be reading the same SF: Heinlein, Weber, Niven and/or Pournelle - well, I gave up on those two years ago... There is a long and rich tradition of conservatism in SF.

That's why I said "the plurality of Sci-Fi writers" -- not even a majority. I have no way of ascertaining whether political liberals are in the majority, but having gone to my share of gatherings of SF writers and aspiring writers, I feel comfortable in saying that there were far more liberals than conservatives there. Or perhaps the liberals and conservatives only *thought* the liberals held an overwhelming majority there, and so were more vocal.

However, it was, I didn't find Silk's opinions on gun-ownership any more or less jarring than the omnipresent villainous corporate heads in SF literature, or the benign and efficient socialist societies.

~ Crush

Alexander, Bryan — 11 Jan 2005, 13:37 · follows James Wynn

Bruce Franklin's collection of Vietnam war writing has a reprint from a 1968 issue of Galaxy, which includes two petitions on that war. One is a group of writers urging the United States to withdraw, while the other recommends the nation remain in the fighting. It's fascinating to read the two lists (which are roughly equal in size) - in fact, it would make a great teaching tool for science fiction history!

-----Original Message-----

From: urth-urth.net-bounces at lists.urth.net [mailto:urth-urth.net-bounces at lists.urth.net] On Behalf Of James Wynn Sent: Tuesday, January 11, 2005 4:25 PM To: The Urth Mailing List

Subject: Re: (urth) SciFi politics

We must not be reading the same SF: Heinlein, Weber, Niven and/or Pournelle - well, I gave up on those two years ago... There is a long and rich tradition of conservatism in SF.

That's why I said "the plurality of Sci-Fi writers" -- not even a majority. I have no way of ascertaining whether political liberals are in the majority, but having gone to my share of gatherings of SF writers and aspiring writers, I feel comfortable in saying that there were far more liberals than conservatives there. Or perhaps the liberals and conservatives only *thought* the liberals held an overwhelming majority there, and so were more vocal.

However, it was, I didn't find Silk's opinions on gun-ownership any more or less jarring than the omnipresent villainous corporate heads in SF literature, or the benign and efficient socialist societies.

~ Crush

Chris — 11 Jan 2005, 15:25 · in reply to James Wynn

I am undecided on the supply-side economics bit, but I did not think that the gun-ownership bit was clumsily inserted either; it's quite to the point and a real concern in the particular political situation Silk found himself in. And ultimately it seemed to me like Silk's position on guns, at that point, was largely a matter of political pragmatism rather than universal principle. To me, the issue there wasn't "gun control" but rather the distribution of power to individuals in an unstable, revolutionary atmosphere.

I am not sure that Wolfe could even have realistically avoided the subject.

I wouldn't go so far as to endorse this point of view whole-heartedly, but I was struck by how jarring the paeans to supply-side economics and universal gun ownership were in Exodus from the Long Sun. At the time they seemed so clumsily inserted that I wasn't sure if they were satire or GW's views.... Now I assume the latter?

I didn't think they were clumsily inserted. I think they were jarring because the plurality of SciFi writers are politically liberal.

Thus, placing favorable views to gun-ownership and supply-side economics in the mouth of a very simpathic and (presented as) wise character might have caught you unaware if you did not previously know of Wolfe's conservative politics.

~ Crush
