

x x x x x x x x x x x x x x  
x Still got together by Dennis Tucker at  
x "DELIRIUM TREMENS", x "Wicklow", 87 Oakridge Road, HIGH  
x WYCOMBE, Bucks., and still duplicated  
x Number 8. Feb. 1943, x by JMR, who still receives our thanks.  
x x x x x x x x x x x x x x

ROY ROWLAND JOHNSON, "Isn't it about time some-one defined such  
answering Julian Parr: words as "intelligence", "intellect", "mind-  
power", etc.? The Oxford Dictionary treats the  
first two as synonyms -- "faculty of knowing and reasoning; quickness of  
understanding; sagacity". However, in fandom, "intelligence" seems to  
mean, more or less, "knowledge and standard of education". I'm sure Mr.  
Parr will deny that; but his words certainly indicate that such is his  
meaning. In which case, the average "intelligence" of a Britisher or a  
German is greater than that of an average homo sapien -- low though that  
standard of education is, by absolute measurements.

But if we take "intelligence" to mean "power of  
acquiring and using knowledge; wisdom; and quickness of understanding",  
then the average Britisher lies very low in the scale of Intelligence.  
He is, as I have repeatedly stated, "uneducated, unimaginative, apathetic  
.....etc., etc." Fans, on the other hand, are the opposite. Obviously,  
or they wouldn't be fans. Their standard of intelligence -- or intel-  
lect -- is very high; most of them, that is.

Intelligence might not be the only quality to be  
sought, but it is the most important. Much more important than social  
responsibility -- though, as a matter of fact, most fans do seem to take  
a great interest in politics, sociology and economics, and have a much  
higher sense of social responsibility than the apathetic "average" people.

YES; we are entitled to ignore the commonplace  
and mundane as unimportant, inasmuch as we are able. They are unimport-  
ant, to us. The mass of mundane things, and people themselves in the  
main, just aren't worth bothering about. Intellectual snobbery, that is,  
I'm told; but I'm sticking to it.

Does Mr. Parr know what he is talking about ?  
"Philosophies.....based on a deep-founded moral laziness". I've been  
trying to point out, that:- A) There is no reason why fans should be soc-  
ially responsible, to help the mass of People, who aren't worth helping,  
and:- B) Despite this, they actually are far more responsible, and take  
much more interest in politics, etc., than most people do. I deny that  
they should help; but insist that they do.

Well, Mr. Parr, so what ? Are you, then, a Fan ?

EDWIN MACDONALD, "Julian is quite right, of course. I was thin-  
also answering JEP: king of ascending from the British Isles to the  
world, and not of descending from one plane of  
intelligence to another, when I said "or of the world". I have no des-  
ire or intention to read "Love on the Dole", but I shall get around to  
Huxley some day. I disagree with Julian's statement that fans are lazy  
with regard to social obligations. I should think the case is quite the  
reverse. [My, my. - Another one !! Ed.] The much maligned "man in the  
street", it is obvious, had -- and perhaps still has -- little or no re-  
gard for his social obligations. But the thoughtful fan, fed on that  
uplifting literature, "science-fiction", takes a much more serious view  
of things, and realises the importance of fulfilling the obligations in  
question. And I don't think it's necessary for every-one to study pol-  
itical history and party politics to get a decent Government. These sub-

jects should, of course, be taught in schools to some extent. Certainly the "man in the street" has less knowledge of these things than the fan, and where is a fan going to find time to study politics seriously ?

JULIAN F. PARR,  
on "Time".

"Time travel of the kind described by Robert Silburn would have far-reaching effects upon methods and conventions of

thought. Nowadays it is accepted that historical events must have been effects of certain causes operative in the Universe during the time preceding those events: as an alternative to this method whereby historians seek to explain these occurrences, once time travel is popularly accepted, no one could be certain that the future may not have interfered with the "natural" succession of events....

....CAUSE: EFFECT - FURTHER CAUSE: EFFECT - FURTHER CAUSE: EFFECT....

...by introducing an effect which had no preceding cause, almost a First Cause.

Any conclusions drawn from historical phenomena would first need to produce evidence to suggest that those phenomena were in fact "natural" i.e. were not by-products of interference by future (or even past) time-travellers.

This idea of bodily transition from one year to another in a few seconds is much less plausible than the other time-travel theory wherein there is perfect mental transition. One's mind -- ego -- would not introduce matter or energy in the accepted sense, into the Universe, so no interference would be possible -- just as it is impossible for a person watching a newsreel to alter the course of effects, or to draw the attention of the moving figures on the screen to his "presence".

This "time-travel" would resemble modern newsreel screening except that no receiving (registering) apparatus would be needed; and no restrictions of time or space would arise, giving the traveller perfectly comfortable, safe, and perhaps communal visits to the past or perhaps even the future !

A FEW WORDS,  
by Ye. Ed.:

I am now at liberty to reveal to the deluded eyes of those queer specimens known as science-fiction fans (don't take offence -- I'm one, y'know!) the true identity of one, David Radcliffe, who caused quite a furor in this sheet some little while ago.

The name was a pseudonym used by J.E.RENNISON of Blackburn, better known in fandom, perhaps, as "Renny". As he is now retiring absolutely from fandom, he writes:- "...as regards Radcliffe. Now that it makes no more difference, you can tell the fans who Radcliffe was. I've told them myself in an open letter, which should appear with the next FIDO. I could write a reply easily enough now, but for various reasons this will never be done..... I mean this sincerely, when I say that I meant all I said as David Radcliffe, that I'm sick of s-f, and couldn't stomach reading another sfn. magazine. That is why I quit the BFS, -- I am no longer a fan !"

Well, Renny, I for one, am sorry to see the last of you in fandom, and I'm certain that many others will be, too. Personally, I get sick of science-fiction now and again, and drop it for weeks, but the mood passes. Though perhaps it won't pass, one of these days ! Incidentally, I apologise for any lies I have told when referring to Radcliffe but the truth had to be kept deadly secret !! S'Long.... DT.