

The
Timebinder

The



Timebinder

The Time-Binder

VOLUME II

SUMMER, 1946

Number 3

These Adventures
Into Thinking are
for you to enjoy,
which we believe
you can do best
by participating
in them regularly.

THE TIME-BINDER IS PUBLISHED BY TH' OL' FOO OF FANDOM, EEEVANS,
628 South Bixel Street, Los Angeles 14, California. Please re-
member to keep those fine letters coming -- they mean so much.

INTRODUCTION.

Boy, am I in the dog-house -- but good! That article "The Road" in last issue, that I had forgotten who sent it to me -- well, it was my own son, Carl B Evans, who authored it, and you can imagine how I feel that I couldn't remember THAT fact. But I can claim a little bit of excuse -- it was typed, and Carl so seldom sends me anything typed, being a long-hander, that there is not so much wonder. Anyway, the credit is his, belated tho it be. So solly, Son.

I am planning to run off an extra 50 copies this issue, to be handed to any attendees at the PACIFICON who may wish them, so that they can begin to get a little idea of what sort of mag we are attempting to turn out. There are a few second-run copies of the first issue left, for such as may wish them. All the other issues are gone, which is a shame, what with the calls we get for them from people who have been introduced to it lately. I can only say that I am very happy about the reception my little effort is receiving. My 200-copy issues seem too small but that is about all I can handle just now.

Again I am using some of the special letters as articles, since they are not merely reviews of preceding discussions as much as complete analyses of certain subjects, themselves. Hope this method of presentation meets reader and writer approval.

I am overjoyed with the response to each issue in the way of letters. I would mention that I am getting more than I can use, if I were not afraid some of you might think I didn't want all the letters I can get, which is not true. Even though I am not able to publish all that come in, and I haven't been, yet I do want all of you to write, and give me your ideas and philosophies, to add to my own. I am still studying and groping; my own philosophy of life is still fluid and open to new ideas and counter-ideas, from which I pick those that seem to me to be a worthy addition to my beliefs, or of such calibre as to make me change previously-held beliefs. When I get so "sot" that I can no longer make changes in my beliefs, I will be ready to cease living -- for I will, actually, have already ceased "living".

So keep those splendid letters coming, and I will continue printing as many of them as space permits, as well as all those articles received.

WHO'S YELLOW NOW?

The many letters we have received concerning The Case of The Conscientious Objector, have been about evenly divided between those who look upon them with either agreement or tolerance, and those who, with vituperation and sarcasm, seek to say that these "so-called Conchies", as many like to term them, are "yellow"; are "sissies"; are "gut-less".

Very well, then, for the sake of discussion let us assume a hypothetical future in which the vast majority of the people are conscientiously against any kind of warfare.

Into this peaceful world of the future, YOU -- the fellow who is so positive that people should be fighters, rather than pacifists -- YOU come into this peaceful world still with your beliefs in the value of fighting.

Remember, there are a small minority of you -- all the remaining people of the world either do, or say that they do, believe that war and fighting are altogether wrong; that anyone's highest duty is to be peaceful and work for peace; that people are ENLISTED or DRAFTED for peace, as they now are for war.

Now, consider this carefully, and HONESTLY. Ask yourself this question: Would I, in that case, have the GUTS to proclaim to the world that I believe in fighting, and spend my life in working toward that end? Would I be "brave" enough to go to a concentration camp or to prison willingly for those ideals of mine, rather than conform to the general public opinion? Would I be a "sissy" and take the easy road of fighting, rather than the brave road of keeping the peace, as the rest are doing?

If you can honestly answer those questions with a "YES", then you have a right NOW to rail at the Conchies. If you can NOT, in all honesty and truthfulness to yourself, answer "Yes", then, in this observer's opinion, a tight shutting of your face is indicated, when it comes to discussions of the men and women of today who have and are answering THRIE question with an emphatic "YES!", and are suffering the sneers and slurs of those who have opposite beliefs; who are willing to, and do go to, a concentration camp or prison or both for their ideals; who continue steadfast in the way they believe no matter what contumelies are heaped upon them.

Conscientious Objectors spend hours on end for months and years studying and praying about their beliefs, and how they should act before God and Man about them. You who sneer at and belittle them -- how much -- honestly, now! -- how much actual thought and prayer have you given in arriving at your opposing beliefs? Or have you merely taken "the easier road"?

MUST WE ALWAYS BE "SCARED"?

I have become increasingly angry through the years at the persistent course set by some unknown groups, who seem determined that mankind shall look at all things from the "Fear" angle all their lives.

Our newspaper and magazines use the "Fear" method in their presentation of the news and happenings of the times. The headlines scream at us of things gone wrong; of people doing unjust and criminal things; of the end of the hopes of peace; of evil plottings by men in high places; of still greater evils to come.

All our advertising seems to be based on this "Fear" technique -- fear of B.O.", of "Bad Breath", of "Five O'Clock Shadow", etc., etc., without end.

It is perfectly true that we have not yet reached a state of Utopianism. It is absolutely true that the world is in many ways in a mess. It is true that class fights against class; nation arrayed against nation; creed against creed; color against color, and so forth.

There is poverty, crime, starvation, race and class hatred and a lot of other things wrong with the world and its peoples. I do NOT blind myself to these myriad wrong things.

NEITHER DO I ALLOW MYSELF TO BE RULED BY FEAR OF THEM!

I try to take care of myself; to keep myself clean and not too smelly -- not because I am afraid, (nor yet because I expect to win the beautiful damsel if I do), but because I feel better that way. I shave fairly often, (perhaps not as often as might seem necessary, since I am somewhat lazy), not because of fear of what others may think if I don't, but because I feel better after a clean shave, and bath, and mouth-washing.

I try to examine all the facts regarding the great and the small affairs of the days, that I can get and have time to read and study, and I find far more reason to be hopeful than I do to be afraid.

Certainly man has now reached the stage of educational and mechanical advance where it was expected he would release atomic power. We all knew he would sooner or later (all we fans, I mean), and most of us expected it to come within our lifetimes. We have seen the signs for the past decade, that it would soon appear. And it was a natural consequence that it's first uses should have been destructive, rather than for constructive purposes, or for interplanetary flight, as our stories all had it.

But that is no reason to expect it always to be so used; nor to feel that the end of the world or of civilization, is in sight. There will undoubtedly be more atom bombs dropped on our cities and manufacturing plants in destructive war. There will also be terrible accidents and blow-ups in taming this tremendous power to industrial usages.

But need we spend our lives, then, in perpetual fear? Do we quit using fire, because millions of dollars worth of property and thousands of lives are lost each year by fire? Do we quit using dynamite, or nitro-glycerine, industrially, because it has been used in wars, or has cost millions of dollars and lives? Do we quit eating because many have been poisoned by corrupt or other-wise poisonous foods?

Every new discovery and invention has carried along in the wake of its development, a tremendous price in lost lives or in property. Do we stop inventing or discovering because of that fear possibility?

Men who have been absolutely clean-shaven, freshly bathed, and with mouth as antiseptic and clean as medical science knew how to make it, have lost The Girl; and I doubt seriously that many have gained one merely by using those highly-advertised, "fear"-touted products.

Certainly, nations have gone to war in the past, and will undoubtedly do so in the future. But -- and this is the important fact, to me, that so many seem to overlook, in their pessimistic outlook on Tomorrow -- in every generation recently, an ever greater percentage of the men and women of every nation are working for ways to peace and harmony among men and nations.

If you will but stop to consider seriously the fact that each nation has such a different (an extremely different) background of history, heredity and way of looking at life principles, you can see that the wonder is NOT that they occasionally misunderstand each other, and each other's motives -- but that they ever do agree at all!

The terrible habit of the newspapers of screaming that the United Nations is being wrecked, each time some national delegate says the least little thing against one of our own statements of belief, is but the supreme example of this "Fear Technique" of which I am speaking.

THEY DON'T SHOUT IT LOUDLY TO THE WORLD WHEN THE NATIONS COME TO AN AGREEMENT AFTER ALL THESE FIRST-DISCUSSED POINTS ARE THRESHED OUT, AND ONE OR ANOTHER HAS GIVEN IN A BIT. WHY? ASK YOURSELF THAT, SERIOUSLY -- WHY DON'T THEY?

They yell to High Heaven every time the Russian delegates say the least little thing disagreeing with our view, as though our delegates have all-vision, all-wisdom, and are eternally in the right, and the others eternally in the wrong. Yet they almost never mention the fact that Russia has given in from her original beliefs a dozen times for each once that we have done so, that there might be peace in the world. In fact, when we do give in a little bit, it is hailed as a "major defeat". BAH!! (No, I am not pro-Russian -- I just believe in fair play!)

My voice is small; my influence microscopic. But, By Heavens, as long as I am able to do so, I shall keep on battling defeatism, pessimism, fear, and all the factors that seek to keep men from getting as much pleasure, peace and happiness out of life as possible!

And if that be "Pollyannaism", make the most of it, you carping, pessimistic scaredy-cats!

*

I believe in the brotherhood of man; not merely the brotherhood of white men, but the brotherhood of all men before law. I believe in the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence. In giving to the Negroes the rights that are theirs, we are only acting in accord with our ideal of a true democracy.

-- President Harry Truman

"HEAVENLY DISCOURSES"

Gus Willmorth

FOREWORD.

This article is the result of an early morning session of bull-fest in Lou Goldstone's room, between Los himself, Everett Evans, and myself, in which we talked of many things, but which finally settled down to the recent discussions of religious matters which have been appearing of late in THE TIME-BINDER. Lou spent much time trying to give us his ideas of the "religious feeling", whereas Everett gave us his views on the Infinite Will as presented in THE TIME-BINDER, and I, in my evasive way, tried to remain rather neutral. Everett made a good deal of compliant about the attitude of the atheists among us in not writing in to give their reason for being atheists.

While I explained to Everett that actually I am not qualified to be writing a defense of atheism, I feel that something should be done to explain the stand of those who have no need for a personal God. As I told Everett, as science-fiction fan, and an advocate of inductive reasoning and non-aristotelian logic, I am an atheist because as yet I have not seen any factual positive proof of a supreme creator, nor even for ghosts. However, as a fantasy fan and a student of mythology, folklore, et al, I am duty bound to at least believe "--there are no ghosts and ghouls, or things that go bump in the night -- MAYBE!" So from this incompatible and paradoxical situation, I write.

ARGUMENT.

Since atheism is a negative assertion that states that since there is no factual evidence for there being a god, there is none; the burden for proof of an aetherial world lies with religion. However, since atheism is a positive force in so strenuously opposing religion, there should be some justification for this attitude. Most religions and philosophic theory concerning supernatural forces are either dogmatic or deductive so the opposition must show religious factors wrong by endeavoring to disprove this reasoning. Dogmatism lies in faith and unquestioning acceptance of prior statements that are held to be right because of the source. Deductive reasoning rests in presenting a theory and then trying by various means, mostly by mental reasoning, to discover facts to support the theory and oftentimes discounting or not considering all the facts in the case, that might detract from the original theory. Since, as stated, atheism is the result of the deductive method of reasoning, it considers all the facts available before formulating any hypothesis, and in doing so is less fallacious than the

methods used to support religion.

HISTORY

In the beginning, as the saying goes, man was rather a rude sort, a savage, if you will, who had neither culture nor religion, but there were a lot of things around that this lad did not entirely understand. It seemed to the primitive that the elements of nature, from solid rock to the restless wind, had some innate directive cogency or ability for harm or good. As such, these primitive superstitions were developed into well regulated totemisms. However, as the years fled and man's knowledge increased, the man began to realize that plants and animals did not have individual power over spiritual things and some philosopher divorced the demon from the particular and placed it in general power over a sect. Thus animism came into being. Instead of every object having supernatural power, there was a controlling spirit or spirits for each specie of animal, plant or natural phenomena.

From an animal or plant god it is but a logical step for the egoistic human mind to produce an anthropomorphic god. This of course, was the cause of the development of most of the classic mythologies of the many countries that have been registered today. There was now a group of humanoid gods guiding or confusing the efforts of the people and the world, mischievous and helpful by turns, and always to be pacified with gifts and sacrifices. Some of them were kindly in aspect, but the greater number of them were malevolent and terrible. Inscrutable they may have been but quite willing to listen to the supplications of the human race.

From a generality to a particularity in rationalism, it is not very far. When the gods did not lend an attentive enough ear to the supplications of the people, they lost face and favor. Since the thinkers of those days must have been thinking a good deal of the half world and death -- death at all times was a close companion in those rugged days -- several prophets, so-called, sprang the supreme judge idea on the populace and apparently these aesthetic gentlemen have succeeded wondrously in their teaching though most of them died young. Once the trend was started, philosophers developed the idea in various ways.

Thus philosophical deliberation has turned the initial idea of a single god into a Supreme Creator, an Infinite Will in the face of man's increasing insignificance in the material world. As the universe grows around us in all its magnitude and the populace grows less in comparison, the conception of an anthropomorphic god became less probable so that in the end there is a something that is neither a personage nor a single entity.

*(Evans made clear that he did not believe in an anthropomorphic god.-- GW)

but merely an all-pervading force macrocosmic in character and application.

CONCLUSIONS

In a developing system of conceptions as described above there is very little scientific method, but the whole is primarily a mental process that might include some deduction, but this deduction takes for facts the teachings, declarations and writings of various people, and the unexplained mysteries of the world which they contribute, since there is no rational explanation for them, to a supernatural agency. In scientific experimentation there is no place for personal prejudice, faith, unquestioning belief in prior assertions, nor any other manner of fallacious reasoning. Factual, measurable evidence must be considered only. From all correlation of such factual evidence in the objective sense there has never arisen proof of the existence of a god. For all mysteries scientific experimentation and advances will eventually find an answer; if there is a god, science will bring him out where his potentialities can be tested and measured. Until such time as this is done, it is our duty as open-minded and progressive science-fiction fans to retain a suitable scientific scepticism.

*

Ambition is a grand thing. Fresh-startitis is a grand thing, too. But neither gets anywhere unless guided by reason and aided by hard work. Ambition to make money isn't worth a darn unless the money is spent for things worth while.

-- Leo Shippey
L. A. Times

A CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTOR SPEAKS.

By Charles D Hornig

I read all the issues of THE TIME-BINDER you gave me, and find the publication among the most stimulating I have ever read. I could not possibly comment on all the ideas presented therein, as I would like to, but there is one item in particular I would like to tackle.

It is the letter in one of last year's issues from Thomas S Gardner. He is an old friend of mine, having written for my "Wonder Stories" in the old days. He showed me a good time, around the campus of the University of Tennessee, in the old days before he got his Ph D. I am sending this as an open letter to him.

Though I cannot appreciate some of his philosophy, as expressed in his letter and herein present some contending views, I hold his ideas in respect and himself with the kindest personal regards.

Two things in his letter stand out to me: his lack of information concerning the conscientious objector; and his amazing failure to use the Semantics he so highly respects.

I cannot claim to be an authority on pacifism, although I have been a pacifist in fact for many years, and in practice, all my life. I have lived with and come to know hundreds of C. O.s during the war and since. I am interested in just who the dozen C.O.s were that Gardner had met, all of whom he says were atheists or agnostics. The gap between the two is tremendous. How many were actually atheists, or claimed to be? I say who "claimed to be" because it has been my experience that those people (none of whom were C.O.s) who claim to be atheists are actually very religious, and show a high moral sense that can have no claim to atheism.

Semantics shows us how easily words can be misused, frees us from the blinding slavery of platitudes and cliches. A "C. O." "Pacifist" or "Socialist" cannot be regarded in any general sense. It is always dangerous to generalize. Freedom can be variously interpreted, as well as "Democracy" and all our other favorite terms. C.O.s vary in belief as widely as non-C. O.s. I have found that the majority base their belief on the sacredness of human life, on the preachings of Jesus, on the tenets of their church (Quakers, Mennonites, and Brethren) or on some other religious credo. Most of the others, who claim to be pacifists for purely social reasons, are also acting on principles laid down by Jesus, though they may not admit it.

Every man with a conscience may, must, rather, draw his own line. Among the C.O.s they range from those who act superficially -- supporting the military system and the government that sponsors it all the way up to actually killing, and draw their line there. They are in the army as non-combatants, usually in the Medical Corps. At the other extreme are those who are determined to support nothing or no one, to the limit of their ability, that makes war in any way -- they cannot cooperate at all with the military or a government at war, they can not pay taxes that go into war, and when they go to prison, they cannot accept orders given them. In other words, they reject compulsion as undemocratic and unchristian.

Most of the conscientious objectors I have known fall in between these two extremes -- the majority, whom I feel have any claim to the term, were either in Civilian Public Service camps or in prison.

Dr. Gardner states that either he or the C.O. (Mrs. Newton) must be insane. I do not think that either is insane, although one of the contending philosophies may be. Dr. Gardner, I ask you: if the philosophy that permits violence has led, as must be admitted, to the mass murder of millions -- to such incomparable atrocities as the unwarned atom bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki -- can anything be more insane? Anything else must be better than the war philosophy, which led us to the lowest moral depths imaginable.

We risked the lives of millions of Americans when we swallowed the propaganda that the Japanese were set on destroying us -- or the Nazis of enslaving us. We have no proof that either intention was correct. We do know that no form of government, including our own, will hesitate to stoop to the lowest form of deceit to win a war, against its own people or that of the "enemy" countries. Witness the phony "bombardment" of Los Angeles shortly after Pearl Harbor, in order to incite the populace (I saw it all myself, with the phony reports of Jap planes shot down in the city, etc.)

Before we start trying to free the world from foreign fascism, we should get rid of it in our own country, or at least make a trial of it. I claim that there has been no atrocity in any part of the world that has not been exemplified on our own soil, if in a lesser or less glamorous degree. Let us take a few pet words and define them -- not as we find them in the dictionary, but as a Semantist would find them in actuality. Aside Dr. Gardner, I find that a large percentage of pacifists are ardent Semantists and followers of Korcybski. His "Science and Sanity" was the most popular book among them in some CPS camps and rpsions. Some of my best pacifist friends attended his seminars.

Freedom -- In Europe, the elimination of the Nazi government and the retention of Nazi officials in high office by the Allied Government, together with strict dictatorial rulings for the freed people to obey without question. This is the way we teach Europeans how to govern themselves.

In America, the suppression of free thought and action -- throwing thousands of men into concentration camps and prisons for placing God above politics -- over a hundred thousand others into concentration camps -- all without trial, for having certain blood in their veins, in good old Nazi fashion.

Liberation -- invading a country to throw out the previous invaders, leaving the populace just as hungry as they were under the original tyrants -- preventing them from organizing themselves into democratic unions.

Democracy -- offering equality to those liberated. Preventing millions in our own country from voting because they can't afford a poll tax. Denying equal opportunities to Negroes and other minority groups -- supporting all kinds of discriminatory ordinances against them and fostering prejudices to our fellow man may be less spectacular, but that is usually due to our hypocrisy. As long as we smile when we do it, everything's all right.

Dr. Gardner says there are practically no pacifists among the great men of the world. I cannot give his definition of great. I can cite a few men who might be classified as such and who were or are staunch pacifists: Aldous Huxley, Ramsey MacDonald, Mahatma Ghandi, Tolstoy, Thoreau, Garrison -- and, of yes, Jesus Christ, although that's going back a ways. Unfortunately, to be great usually demands conformity to the world's standards.

A Pacifist can accept slavery if he has faith in his belief that the love he has for Mankind and the power of non-violence can eventually overcome his conqueror to the betterment of both, as has been done in numerous individual cases and to some extent in mass movements -- the "satyagraha" of India, for one. A Pacifist can accept extinction if he believes it is better to die than to do evil.

Going back to the C. O. and Semantists. Gardner brings up this as a challenge to the C. O.'s power to think. As I mentioned, a large number of C. O.s are general semantists and the civilian public service camps had a very generous sprinkling of Ph. D.s. I have no figures handy, but I have seen some showing the high percentage of C.O.s with college degrees. A great many were teachers in private life. Many others were in college, but not yet graduated.

It is hard to answer Dr. Gardner's question about the place for a C.O. in America after a war that he did not help win. For that all depends on whether America believes a man should act on his conscience despite political trends. If America demands a philosophy of violence in all its subjects, then there is no real place for the practicing Christian. Leaving the country is no solution. That is just running away from the problem. We are told that the democratic thing to do is to propagandize your ideas until the majority sees the truth in them and accepts them. That is what the Pacifist must do.

Pacifism has already been proven in small groups throughout the world. There is no use for American Pacifists to isolate themselves and form another group. All those with constructive aims must work with and for the entire race of man -- placing love of God for all mankind above that of any political subdivision; must work for the elimination of all those things that are the fundamental causes of war -- racial, religious and national segregation and discrimination -- all the economical, social and cultural inequalities wherein lie the roots of hatred.

The acceptance of war is leading to the destruction of the human race; even the military admit this. Nothing can be worse than what we have and what we are heading for in our present world of national pride and economic greed. Wouldn't anything be better, Dr. Gardner -- even Pacifism?

Those who do not insist on blinding themselves to the real truths behind Pacifism can get lots of free literature from the American Friends Service Committee, 20 S. 12th St., Philadelphia; Fellowship of Reconciliation, 2929 Broadway, New York City; and the War Resisters League, 7 Beckman Str., New York City. I have neither the information nor the talent to give a complete argument for Pacifism, ^{here} and I'm sure Evans hasn't the space, but I challenge Dr. Gardner, and all others who are not willing to try out the "Pacifist scheme" to communicate with these organizations.

P.S. For those who might be interested, I spent over a year in an American concentration camp, called Civilian Public Service, and nearly a year in the McNeil Island Penitentiary as a conscientious objector. I am still on parole.

*

THE TIME-BINDER

By D. B. Thompson

1

I stand on a high peak,
A mighty mountain of light.
To right and left, there is . . . nothing.
Or, if there be something,
It is forever hidden from my sight.

2

Behind me,
Lesser peaks and valleys
Stretch far and far away.
Into the valleys I cannot see,
And only the nearer peaks clearly,
Save only those other mighty ones
As high, perhaps, as this
Upon which I stand;
And even these are distorted,
As though seen obliquely
Through imperfect glass.

3

Ahead,
I see but a little way
Into a shifting kaleidoscope
Illumined
Only by the light
Shining from the peak upon which I stand,
And fitfully,
By random gleams reflected
From the distant peaks behind me.

4

Who am I?
I am Man.
I stand upon a mighty peak
In The Stream of Time . . .
The Present.
To right and left, all is Darkness;
I can not see the Island Worlds .
Which float in other Streams of Time.

5

Behind me,
I see the Past,
Uncertainly, through other eyes
Of those who dwelt in gaes past.
Before me,
I see the Future:
A kaleidoscope
Of towering, shining peaks,
Fitfully illumined
By the ever-changing Light of History;
And dark, abysmal valleys
Into which I cannot see.

6

It is for me to choose that Future . .
Whether it be
The peaks of high achievement
Or the valleys of disillusion.
Which shall it be?
Which shall it be?

*
*
*
*

COMMENTS-- and CRITICISMS

EXCERPTS FROM THE MAIL-BAG.

DONALD B. THOMPSON

The Winter issue of THE TIME-BINDER is very fine indeed. The cover is wonderful. Frankly, though, I prefer to remain a while longer with the puzzled head-scratcher; I'm not sure that I like what the Utopian Heights have to offer.

Most of my ideas along the lines discussed in the last two issues are expressed fairly well in the letters by Carlson and Chauvenet, and in Ashley's comments in EN GARDE, although there are points of disagreement with all of them. I can't quite imagine a personal diety; certainly not one of which man is the image, and still, one capable of taking a personal interest in every living thing. And, like Russ, I certainly couldn't worship one of the conventional type, any more than I can imagine that a truly supreme being, if one existed, could possibly desire worship.

I agree with you on the matter which you characterize as "Tallwood talking", although I doubt if that is the correct explanation of Russ' attitude. I don't consider his "anthropoidal man" concept of much importance. Neither do I have, or do I have any need for, Russ' Tower.

I was very much astonished by your statement that, if you believed as Carlson does, you would see no point in continuing to live. With millions of things needing to be done -- things which you yourself regarded as worthwhile and important, your statement seems strangely inconsistent.

Personally, I don't quite understand why anyone should go to any great lengths in setting up hypotheses which are (1) incapable of either proof or disproof by currently-available methods, and (2) which are, at the same time, contrary to the apparent trend indicated by the few facts which have been established up to now.

I understand well enough the place of gods and devils in a primitive culture; the people needed some "explanation" of the bewildering array of natural phenomena which affected their lives so strongly, and they had not yet developed anything resembling the scientific method of approach to a problem. And, while we may know no more than they about some things, we do have the scientific method to serve as a sign-post along the way.

Trying to mix the heterogeneous results obtained by a pri-
ori reasoning with those gained through rigorous application of
the scientific method, serves merely to confuse the issue, even
in the case of matters where scientific thought has yet barely
scratched the surface.

And in the meantime, keep THE TIME-BINDER coming; it real-
ly is developing into a very fine forum of opinion.

WESLEY H. PORTER

On my first time through the Spring, 1946, THE TIME-BINDER
I was a bit disturbed about your leading article, "The Almost
Man," because I felt that someone who knew you should answer
that article.

I've put off the labor, but I do want at least to give you
my viewson some of the observations you made.

First off, you cover the subject of writing. I'll make the
observation that I think you write extremely well. I will make
the further comment that you may not realize that writing is a
craft -- a formula, if you please -- that must be followed. You
may be a top-notch writer along certain lines -- but if you sell
for cash you must follow the formula. So you may be an even 100
per cent as a writer and still not "sell" for cash.

You say you were an "almost" musician. Did your music give
you a sense of inner satisfaction? Did it please a majority of
the people who heard you play? That's success.

Jobs are funny things. You walk down a certain street at
a certain time, meet a certain party who gets you a certain job.
If you do that job well -- and I know that you always do your
jobs extremely well -- you are a success.

Marriage is a metter of chemistry. Nobody can have every-
one like or love them. Sometimes in this world people mate who
simply cannot "jell" -- as the expression has it. If you tried
sincerely, that doesn't prove that you are wrong. You might be
but personal chemistry is a funny thing.

People who are friendly usually have friends. One doesn't
argue with friends -- one discusses. Ever put out a smile to a
perfect stranger, and get a good healthy smile back? That's be-
ing friendly. You are not alone, by a long shot, in believ-
ing that your friends don't understand you. On the other hand, a
wise bird once said that a friend is a person who knows all a-

bout you and still loves you. That's just about right. There is a limit and a breaking point to friendships, and that point is usually reached when a person passes beyond that inner line where dwells the other fellow -- you and me.

I think I am a friendly person. I like people, but darn it all I'm sometimes utterly amazed at the things they will do to me -- at the gall of some of them for trying to break down that inner barrier that protects the real me from those most disturbing problems that my friends are experiencing.

In climax, Everett, I can readily see that all through your analysis -- self examination -- torture or soul-bating -- you have the dollar mark in most empty spaces.

Now I fully realize that money is a very necessary evil in our present day scheme of things. But remember that money is only an evidence of what you were able to get from the other fellow.

I recall having a friend call upon me during the dark days of the depression. He had been a big man -- a man who had made scads of money -- who had traveled in spending circles. He came into my office one morning all smiles. I wasn't doing so well, myself.

"How are things, Wesley?" he asked. "You look swell."

Then he told me a story that I will never forget. It may have a direct bearing on your questions.

"As you probably know," he started, "my business is in bad shape. In fact, when I got to the plant this morning there was not a single job ticket that needed attention.

"My first impulse was that I had no work to do today. I went into my private office and sat there for a long time, just thinking.

"Then the answer seemed to flood over me. If I had no private work to do today I had plenty of time to go about doing the Lord's work.

"So I started out.

"I've made about half a dozen calls. I haven't tried to sell a job. I had made up my mind that I would simply call upon my friends and wish them well. I can assure you that I had no thought of profit.

"Well, the amazing thing is that I have accumulated enough jobs to keep my plant running for a week. Knowing you as I do, I am going to tell you that I have learned a lesson today. I started out to give -- and I have been paid back. All I could give was good cheer and friendship. What I needed most was work to keep my plant running, so that others would not suffer thru my lack of business getting."

When George "R" left -- and that's a splendid cue as to who this man of goodliness was -- I sat thinking about him. The strange part of it is that I gave him an order, too!

He was a MAN -- not an almost man! He GAVE!

The transcript of your crimes -- call them errors if you wish -- leaves me cold. Secretly, I think you are a huge success. Before I ever met you I had someone tell me what a great guy you were -- and how he treasured your friendship.

So that "almost" has just disappeared from my thoughts about you.

JOSEPH J FORTIER

I was sincerely happy to receive the latest issue of your magazine, THE TIME-BINDER. I've enjoyed the magazine up to now and with the latest issue I find it almost a must-get. Let hopes be high for ever increasing quality in the submitted letters and articles.

After Chauvenet's letter I didn't think it was at all sensible to try to add anything further to discussion inasmuch as he expressed my ideas to the nearest "T" with but a few exceptions. Tom Wright was over this week-end, and he revised his opinions of LRC quite completely, stating that he could now place him the equal of Stanley in the brain-trust. The views therein revealed aligned perfectly with Tom's, discounting a few remarks on the value of life.

I want to submit a few of my own ideas before I lose every spark of interest in the fan field, although no matter what, I shall endeavor to follow THE TIME-BINDER so long as it maintains its open-minded policy of now.

I agree completely with Russ Whitman as regards principle of the argument, that the military services need a thorough and well-nigh more than complete over-hauling. BUT:

(1) All peacetime standing services should be abolished

the necessary patrol functions being shared alike by the train-
ess (maximum two years) and government police;

(2) Teaching that sexual gratification is not conventional would be one of the greatest furtherances to the present frustration problem facing us. Denial of drink in any form, lecture or prohibition, is a rather ridiculous measure if the cause is not removed;

(3) The type of training suggested, the moral regimentation, smacks of national youth movements. Any honest psychologist would turn thumbs down on the whole proposal.

Let it be understood, furthermore, that I see no sense in warfare; think nothing is solved; actually believe our latest was at its best a 90% waste. What happened can be avoided in the future so that the recognized purpose cannot be considered a failure. So to speak, it can but can it? I hate any form of military service but am not a conchie for the simple reason the old urge of self-preservation still motivates me for no particularly good reason.

Until I read the bit by Martin Carlson I knew him only as a name and considered him for even less. But whether or not I agree he certainly reasons things out and shows more initiative than most of the stupid lot; at least he's trying. Self-preservation, so natural but also so seemingly ridiculous, is a perfectly valid ground. It's proven that the natural way to live is the knowledge of the nature of one's own nature put into practice as the actual law of nature.

I'm sure that Carlson with his belief and Evans, you without yours, would find sufficient reason to live (or at least a strong compulsion to continue at any odds) and do so now in the EEE commentary of "we can only keep seeking!"

The dilettante philosophy is somewhat as I see things and is a perfectly grand individual philosophy so long as the author can stick to his guns. It solves nothing but the individual apparently does not care, nor in my weaker moments can I blame him. Apparently I have some disapproval which you may or may not discover in my main section.

Ron Lane I cannot speak with because of our differing bases of life. But I will advance one point that while war solves nothing, that the line about the meek inheriting the earth is pure hokum, and one of the greatest hunks of propaganda ever handed out by the original tyrannical church and now continued in use for the benefit of cutthroat leaders. Yes, war must go on, the war against the stupid things of life rather than the battle against ourselves and among our own.

Mari Beth Wheeler? A self-admitted example of complete pre-conviction.

If Jay Chidsey will make a slight revision of his statements to "I respect their belief (those who believe in a god), but I do not feel sorry that I cannot emulate them," then he should develop into an admirable person after he has gained a scientific insight.

I shall keep scanning Chauvenet's article as I try to hit on a few points in my own personal philosophy.

A. Mr. Cram's thesis is mine almost completely. I ran across the same sort of idea about a year ago and came to conclusions nearly identical in the course of conversations with friends Phillips, Hellman and Wright. My idea is that Cro-Magnon man (and here I tread on ground of which I've received but the briefest training) never disappeared but interbred with the human mutant; not only did he survive, he dominated. Perhaps the next mutation will handle itself far better, although the sub-human may be too clever, (my personal feelings being that the human has the least chance because of reasons too numerous to dwell on other than in a long article.) Who are the true humans? None, I should guess, there being a little Cro-Magnon in all of us. Heh, a little of the beast in all of us, they say. Where do we draw the line between hopefuls and non? A touchy problem, a very touchy one.

You're rather reluctant to be specific in your arguments for psychical progress, Everett. Is it progress that we're now catching up with Aristotle who is one of the causes for the less mental operation is in today? Come again; you may convince someone next time.

Noek? His book is already on my must list.

I still believe as before, that the mass cannot be educated and brought up to a normal level above today's standard. But now I realize he does not wish it, this mass man, and the only one worth working on, by both modern education and improvement by psychiatric methods, is the one who desires it, the near-human. Still, that not only leaves hope as before, it perhaps leaves even greater promise.

B. Religion I shall not discuss at length because I have come close to giving up trying to break open the blocks of human minds. Perhaps when I have learned a bit more, when I have learned the possibilities of clearing out pre-convictions, I'll try again. Anyway, I've noted that one lessens his attempts to buck churches and convictions, as a general rule, in accordance

with his gain in belief that he is completely right, religion completely wrong.

First, I'm an agnostic in that I confess complete ignorance on the beginning of things; that there may have been some sort of force I can well imagine; that we are pawns at times, that we were created, almost anything, I find conceivable. Otherwise, so far as any sort of god or heaven or hell or personal afterlife as the result of a soul may be concerned, I am a blackblack ATHEIST with the whitewhite conscience of a saint, and a redredred f l a m e like the beatbeatbeat of a tomtom.

Churches and bars, eventually even religion and liquor, will disappear with the psychical awakening of mankind. That's how I feel about the entire farce facing us today. Otherwise, refer to Philip Wylie; the feeling is mutual.

C. Today's basic problem is mentioned in Russ' final paragraph. The world is of the opinion that it is the solution to atomic power, in particular the threat of the atomic bomb. Pure balderdash! That is merely the means to force the hand of mankind to devote some time to solving the real pressing cause of trouble, the function of society which just doesn't. Choices of systems are fruitless, as Russ points out, although I too would choose capitalism as it is practiced in the U. S.

The only answer is a psychic awakening, of which most of our crowd is aware, the control of the throttle button by the humans functioning as humans, the utilization of every possible advance in the psychological channels. Why make a discourse? Nothing short of a complete treatise would be of any value, and would that?

So you see I agree with LRC immensely. Below I shall outline a few of my tenets but they are not permanent building blocks: they are smatterings of a few of my philosophic grounds as I happen to think of them on the moment's spur, and since I don't expect to have my basis complete for several years, never expecting to have it unalterably finished, you're not to criticize incomplete portions, although I do want suggestions in subsequent issues.

1. Most important to me is the maxim that one should be true to his own self. All my actions are based upon that law, and while I subsequently end up obeying most laws I do not follow the letter of modern society because of any desire to be a law-abiding citizen. The contrary, indeed!

This leads me to wonder who has the audacity to tell another person what is right or wrong in his actions. Arbitration

over certain actions injurious to an object individual is only natural, but only in the case of self-injury has anyone the right to censure. To criticize or suggest, yes, but to say what is correct or incorrect, never!

It is only natural for me to fall into the wide classification covering individuals who believe in free enterprise and who have an instinctive dislike of anything smacking of communism or socialism or dictatorship or whatyoumaycallit. If all of us were on the borderline side of humans, then I might advocate a form of anarchy, but until we are able to practice a golden rule I am happy to be sure the threat doesn't exist.

2. This and following sections are secondary to the first statement. Love of life or a life of love, that is important. This is the sublime outgrowth of the self-preservation factor; this is the "F" factor which gives us reason when there is no reason; this is the height of emotion when properly expressed and accurately directed.

This demands self-love, too. It is my belief that our egoist is a necessary individual. It is my belief also that the meek are a worthless lot.

Above all this is the hot white flame running all through life. Sometimes we haven't any, or cannot find it at any rate, and sometimes when we do have it we lose it for a moment or so. Like fools we turn to god, or we look for a stimulating dope to make life worth while, or like other fools we turn to drink, we look for a salve that pulls a glittering veil before our mind's eye. Like fools we seldom realize that the spark in our minds is all that can light the precious life fluid and bring a burning passion for existence.

3. Curiosity is a great thing. When we are disgusted with the hopelessness of life as it seems sometimes it is this pilot light which keeps us flickering until we can turn on the jet for the burn of full living once again. This is what keeps the near-human going on when he has not found himself; the mass-man who cannot appreciate curiosity hasn't sense enough to know the appreciation of values.

4. I think that we can straighten ourselves out in time, as ridiculous a conjecture as this may be in the face of things as they exist. I believe such a faith, which is wholly emotional and almost without any logical bedrock, is necessary for happiness. It may be a mild dope for a dupe, but it is something I have to believe to achieve complete happiness. For some reason I can't help but believe it is true. A case of pre-con-vict on which I haven't licked? Possible. It is this for which

I shall fight; this is the game I shall play; this is my entertainment value in the plan of being.

Even did I not believe this, did I succumb to my conclusions worked out from the basic facts of today, I would continue to go about my business, and be almost as happy because of my belief in myself as the most important thing in my world.

((There is quite a bit more all extremely interesting, but too lengthy to print -- for which I beg Joe's pardon. -- EEE)).

RUSSELL WOOD

I enjoyed the issues of THE TIME-BINDER very much. At last I find something connected with fans that has to do with what I expected to find when I joined the LASFS, back in 1941. Thinking, no less. After two meetings, in that long-departed past, I nearly dropped out, because I learned that many fans not only do not read science fiction; but there is a dearth of intelligent thinking about anything. That was then. Your fanzine, which is not really a fanpublication in the strictest sense, as you say, proves that there is an awakening of some fans to an awareness of the world we live in, the only possible world upon which the world of the future can be built.

As I have told you, I disagree in some respects with every contributor to THE TIME-BINDER, as well as with its editor -- which means mainly that it stirs to life some of my own long-dormant thinking cells.

((Sorry, Russ, but I haven't room this time for that fine contribution by Dan Lyons that you sent. Later, maybe. -- EEE))

GERALD W MAHSMANN

A couple of days ago I received issue #6 of THE TIME-BINDER. As it was the first one I ever had the pleasure of reading I did not know exactly what to expect. So I was in for a surprise, a pleasant surprise, yes, indeed, very pleasant. Many of the articles and letters made me feel as though I should put in my say.

Everyone speaks of the sex problem in the army, except the guys that just don't give a darn, but what about the young fellows in civilian life? Many of them are just as bad as the sex-crazy soldier. The social diseases are more apparent in the

Armed Forces because of the fact that the uniform holds a certain amount of allure as far as women are concerned, hence the soldier takes the punishment for someone else's blunder.

I am in favor of military conscription even in peace time, for I am completely convinced in my mind that there is no such thing as a lasting peace, nor will there ever be. As long as the inhabitants of this earth are human beings, there will be enmity and strife amongst the peoples. Only one thing can join all the nations of the Earth together, and that is actual invasion from somewhere Outside! Lasting peace is only a beautiful dream, just wishful thinking on the part of certain people. As much as I hate to admit it, I honestly believe that the UN will prove to be a complete failure. But still I will give them my whole-hearted support, or anyone else who tries to prevent conflict. But then again, we cannot prevent the inevitable.

Widner's little poem brought to mind the following one. I hope you can print it:

"He travels fastest who travels alone,"
Is an adage hoary with years;
But what does the swift one do when the cliff
Of trouble and sorrow appears?

It is better to travel more slowly and walk
With one's hand in the hand of a friend;
The level land's lovelier shared with another
Hills easier, far, to ascend.

And we all come at last, traveling slowly or fast,
To the Gate of the Unknown Land,
Whose latch lifts more gently for those who have had--
And have given -- a helping hand.

(Author's name not given.)

ETTA HITT

Your THE TIME-BINDER has given me a good deal of pleasure. Also, of course, a good deal of material for thought. I have enjoyed the differing opinions, finding in each one much with which I agreed, and some ideas with which I disagreed.

I may as well put in my oar on the difference between pessimism and optimism. The Pessimist is the backward looker, the Optimist looks forward. The Pessimist remarks on the disagreeable weather. The Optimist remarks that it looks as though it were clearing off. The Pessimist groans under his huge load of

troubles. The Optimist, with the same load, thinks tomorrow will be better, and, anyway, it could be worse.

My motto has always been: to enjoy the minute to the full. No matter what my task, or what the surroundings, I am responsible for myself, for my mental state, and I can find something in each minute which is enjoyable, or instructive, or which can give me reason to hope. Not that I have always managed to live up to this, but it has been of immense help to me in learning to live.

Another maxim which I have tried to put into effect in my life is: True tolerance is that which is tolerant of intolerance. I put a rather wide interpretation upon this, including overlooking other's faults and disagreeable traits. This forbearance on my part I call tolerance, and learned to live with my older brother, hitherto almost impossible.

Overlook, will you please, my youth, and let me state my views on religion, garnered through rather extensive reading, including the New Testament. (Overlook, too, the mistakes, and blame them on two very active sons, and my position as mediator between them.)

I believe in the Creator, of course, since creation cannot exist without cause. And since the only reason for creation that "holds water" is love, I believe in the loving supervision of that Creator. This entails a belief in the long climb upward from the slime to perfection. Sin is not absolute, rather a deviation from the upward climb. Thus what would be sin for one would not be for another, less learned, or placed in differing circumstances.

When we make anything, whether it be a picture, a book, a poem, a machine or what, during the process of making the creation is rough, unfinished, with imperfections and faults. But we do not condemn it for the flaws and senselessly destroy our creation, rather we work with patience, revising, smoothing, adding until the creation shines with its finished perfection. Is the Creator less of an Artist than one of His creatures or one of his creations?

Jesus, I admire and respect, even revere, as the chosen of God who accomplished his special mission. That he is God is quite another matter. He spoke of the saints of old as being called gods because of their works.

Jesus is not God because: When we say God we mean the Creator and One does not create himself. Do you? Jesus is not thought of as God by his contemporaries and apostles, but as a

high priest. This is clearly stated in the fifth chapter of Hebrews. Paul, explaining the priesthood of Jesus, goes into detail, saying: So also Christ glorified not himself to be an high priest; but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, today have I begotten thee. This intimates that he was not the Son until he was ordained by the Baptism of John. Again, his ancestry is traced thru Joseph, not Mary, who was also of David's line. This indicates that those who knew him had no doubt he was the son of Joseph.

Another thing I might mention is the revision of the early writings of the general council called by Constantine. It seems that Constantine, although not a Christian, supported the Trinitarian group, and that, to please him, the revisions supported that idea, not present in the original writings.

The idea of a Triune is not new. It is in many of the ancient religions, especially that of Egypt where several triunes were worshipped. Much of the Roman Catholic Church ritual was taken directly from the Egyptian ritual. Even the worship of the Mother and Babe was present in Egypt.

As to the nature of God: He is All. Javeh means I Am The I Am. The ancient Pharaohs had papyrus manuscripts buried beside them with the legend "I Am the I Am." Since all matter is composed of electrical pulsations, and since all of us give off electrical pulsations capable of being recorded on instruments, is that so hard to understand? What perhaps surprised me as much as anything is that this idea of "God as All" is supported by semantics and Noah Webster. O, or Om, was an ancient symbol for God. Go on from there. I discovered that one evening in an idle moment and was very surprised that our language reflected the fact it had taken me twenty-three years to learn.

It follows logically that love is the object of our lives. Love our fellow men, we are then loving God. Since our fellow men are part of God, we cannot love Him without loving Them. Open our hearts to our fellow men and we open them to God. What state could be better than one in which each loved the other? That, of course, was what Christ taught.

I could say much more, but will only mention that it seems provable by Irish History and other sources, that the people of the U. S. and Great Britain are the "Lost Tribes" of Israel. I hope that will interest you enough so that you will go into the subject thoroughly.

Once again I thank you for the privilege of enjoying your inspired publication.

POSTSCRIPTUS.

Thus endeth the Seventh of THE TIME-BINDERS. I hope that all of you continue to find it as interesting and stimulating to thought, as your editor. I consider it truly one of the most important phases of my life to date.

To all of you PACIFICON attendees who may chance to read a copy of this periodical for the first time, I wish to welcome you to our group, and to assure you that you have only to make your desire known, and you will be gladly furnished with copies of the future issues, as well as one each of any remaining copies of former issues which are, alas, all too few. Our regular run is 200 copies, and I actually believe I could dispose of at least 250 without trouble. However, there is a slight element of expense connected with the publication of this journal, and it is very much against my desire to make any charge for it. I want everyone who really desires to receive these discussions to have them, and would not wish financial considerations to be a bar to anyone's receiving them.

The splendid response that I am getting in the way of your fine letters and articles is more than pleasing, and I am only sorry that I cannot print all of them, and that I have occasionally to cut out a portion of some of the longer letters. It is NOT because I want to omit any of your arguments or statements, you may be sure.

The ONLY thing that gets the editorial blue-pencil is on the rare occasions where some correspondent starts to indulge in vituperation, bombast, or sarcasm to make a point. If it be "intolerance" to cut out such passages which I do not deem to show the "tolerance" I wish this magazine to show, then I am to blame for my conception of tolerance.

As I have said so many times, I will print either side of any question, no matter how controversial, as long as your letter or article is written in a sane, logical and decent manner. I have even left off making personal comments, as I did in the first few issues, feeling that this is not quite the thing, as it gives me an unfair advantage. Rather, if there is something brought up with which I disagree to the extent that I want to put in my own ideas, I shall put them into a special article on that subject. Those of you who have been with me since the beginning of THE TIME-BINDER should know my views well enough so that you will have no difficulty in telling which letters or articles would meet my approval. The rest of you will soon begin to learn, I hope. To put it briefly, though, I believe that there is "a glory that is Man; that while Men may make a mess of things from time to time, Man goes ever onward and upward."

AND THUS IS MANKIND BORN

If you have thought that man has reached his goal;
Has climbed the stairs of learning and of fame;
If you have dreamed that man has played his role
And drawn the curtains round his shining name:
Alas, and why was mankind born:

If you have only seen the haze of pain
That hovers over man who eyes look down,
Have not looked up and watched the True Light gain
And grow through all the fetid life of man;
Ah, me, and so is mankind born.

If you have only watched the fight for fame,
Have gazed around and seen no selfless man,
Have only seen the struggle and the blame,
Why then of course you think the world is dead.
Ah me, and thus was mankind born!

Why then you will have failed the world, indeed;
Have misconstrued the gold and seen her dross,
Have stepped on her in hour of deepest need.
You must look up and see the golden blaze,
Oh, me! And thus is mankind born!

You must look up and feel the light of day;
You must look up and see the shining of our goal;
Must understand that man grows all the way,
And shining is the Way that we shall fo.
Oh, me, and thus is Mankind born!

• Ollie Vane