

Death in the Alps

"~~those who the~~ Climbers are seen by ~~born climber~~
those who don't climb lots of two kinds.—
those who climb knowing that they may be
closer to die, & those who climb in ignorance
of this fact. And the former are the more
foolish". Such is the text of many a well-meaning
homily; and the homily like others of its kind
suffers both because it is ~~meant~~ delivered in good part
& because it is delivered ^{too} frequently. It is well
that climbers should appreciate the attitude
^{of} the world outside them. We are regarded like
men of some strange religion. ~~We are not by the~~
the ignorant with the proclaim us heretics the intellectual
tolerate us because one must tolerate everyone and
those who are neither particularly stupid nor
particularly clever meet us with the common
smile of the self-styled European for an oriental
god. By all alike we are regarded as hamblers,
~~and that is where~~ ^{it is here that} the wit creeps in: ~~the~~ if we
were damned as heretics as we ought to be damned
we might take some trouble with our own defense.
But the vegetation to spot in this country is so unceasing and so thick
and ~~but~~ the attack against us ^{so} ~~is~~ ^{so} thickly got
natural and so freely delivered, that we almost seem

almost to have ceased to regard them as serious
attacks at all - That at least is ~~the~~^{an} explanation
of the many ~~of~~ incomplete & apparently ~~without~~^{without}
statements that are often spoken & written on one
side of the controversy & that is the reason for
the present attempt to arrive at a clear
point.

Let us turn once again to the text: our
sympathy of course is with the former the
more foolish, those who are aware that
it may be their destiny to meet ~~the~~^{death} on
the mountains. But the existence of those others,
the ignorant & the more wise deserves some
few words.

How many climbers do ~~certainly~~ realise the nature
of the risks? At ^{my} ~~least~~ there are ^{a small number} ~~some~~ who ~~never~~
~~attempt~~ to do so. Or why should they ^{sometimes} deny
~~continually~~ the folly of those who are overwhelmed
& accident? There are many deaths we know
in the Alps of those who cannot claim any
serious acquaintance with the mountain or any
knowledge of the requirements - the technical
skill of no Art. but accidents are by no means

confined to this class of mount. Now, despite
the fact that men of the highest reputation
for caution & restraint have been the
victim of accident. It is undeniable that
a climber may possess the great mountain-
climbing qualities, ^{may possess them} & ~~not~~ even in ~~the~~
~~the highest degree~~, yet suffer. There is
~~is~~ ~~can be no~~ certain immunity from the
mountain perils. Who would have suggested
that Emile Ray might one day miss his footing,
~~up a winter mountain of difficult~~ ~~as a sheep does~~ or that a man of
such tried fortitude as another famous guide
Alexander Buerger, should have been
induced to ~~the~~ face the risks of avalanche when
his life was in no peril from other circumstances.
And yet there are still some climbers, still talk
of these sad events as though the fate of other climbers
~~had not~~ was no particular concern of theirs. There
is a simple argument thought: 'X was killed, therefore
X was a fool'. That is the gist of the first step. Of
course ~~one~~ in some cases one wouldn't have expected
it of X, the conclusion can't be expressed so clearly
'X's mistake is clear' the argument continues: 'I shall
not make that mistake, certainly not; I'm not a fool'

Copied to this class of tourists. None will
disputes the fact that men of the highest reputation
for strict ~~control~~ ^{and} ~~constraint~~ which is ~~concerned~~
~~to the highest standard of manufacturing~~
have met with accidents. And yet there are
some who still talk of these sad events as
the deserved fate of fools ^{who have been} unexpected in particular cases but
indicating a condemnation more than certain for that,
~~and appeal~~ they appeal to the canons of our
faith ~~as the title of devotees of some strange~~
fetish worship prostrating themselves before
~~on it a worthless idol, & a~~ ^{Xian before the dogs of}
~~sign of alarm & supremacy, grasping with terror supercilious the~~
~~sooty scat of a dung or monkey.~~ ^{unique among}
~~so & & & &~~ ^{in ever} which ~~of these~~ ^{united} ~~hence~~
are ~~and~~ at his opening ^{been violated} ~~in~~ and so many
are they to fulfil the ritual of their creed
& determine where in regard those ~~unfortunate~~ ^{impudent} have fallen short
that they neglect the more simple human
confidence that thy themselves are liable to
the same error ; while it is not improbable that
this very mistake false step or negligent omission,
whatever it be,
has been made ^{mistake} ~~them~~ already many times
but without the same fateful consequences. They
fail to realise perhaps how easily these ^{mistake} ~~accidents~~ are
met, some of us may remember W. Banks
without the last two years having had many

I shall not be killed' It seems impossible that anyone
should be simple; and all those who reason in this
manner would of course deny the fact categorically.
But it would not require a lengthy conversation
to ~~discover~~ find them out. ~~Within the first~~ The
most certain sign by which you know them is a manner
of referring to the "rules of maintaining" these or
~~as they simple folk of the Middle Ages regarded the King & went~~
~~regarded~~ ~~as~~ with superstition reverence and
~~and~~ ~~and~~ the devotee will bombard you ~~with~~ ^{with rules} as such
a strict Puritan might bombard you with fragments
& the Old Testament.

