

YHOS

#5



ἄνθρωπος τελεολόγος

Der zukünftischer Mensch

NOMOFUTURUS

by Chandler Davis

ГЛАГОЛО

A Brass Tacker once said, in praise of A E van Vogt's "Repitition", that the characters had the superhuman qualities that were "bound to appear". Well, Campbell's recent article in Astounding gives all the evidence necessary to show that they are bound to appear, but leaves the door open to speculation on what superhuman qualities will show up, and when - an interesting question to which too little attention has been given. Leaving eugenics out of the discussion, MacDonald having done such a swell job in "Beyond This Horizon", I'm going to give those questions the best answers I can in the following speculation.

I'll start with the statement, with which you are welcome to disagree, that within ten thousand years, and in as little as a thousand, man will be decidedly different in heritable traits from man of today. Considering genus Hemo's low birth rate, that is fast evolution, to put it mildly. But fast evolution is in order, for this reason: The characters of an organism which are most freely variable are those on which the survival of the individual depends least; on the other hand, a character whose variation from normal hurts the individual's chances is "soon" stabilized by natural selection. Now civilized man does not rely for survival on exactly the same qualities which kept his progenitors alive. Physical endurance, facility in grasping with the while hand, speed of reflexes and automatic reactions, intensity of emotions, and so forth, we may assume, were for many thousands of years more essential than facility in using the fingers separately, inventiveness musical ability, etc. As the race approached civilization, however, it is just this latter group that began to count in the struggle for life - these characters which were never so important before, hence are now much more variable. And the more a species varies in the characters which can be acted on by natural selection, the more quickly it may develop.

If my conclusion as to the speed with which we are evolving is correct, it should be possible to point out some character in which the race has changed markedly since, say, 3000 BC; and I think I can. I refer to social adaptability. Whether or not you admit that this is heritable (as is the corresponding trait in the lower animals), it is hard to deny that we have it in greater degree than our barbarian ancestors. And it seems to me that not only is this (partly) an evolutionary change, but it has been speeded up more and more within the last five thousand years by sexual selection. With the great amount of travel in a civilized community, everyone comes in contact with more people, and sexual selection becomes more severe. Certainly social adaptability is a trait which would

tend to be preserved in this selection. What about it, historians?

This, then, is my answer to the "when" of the question: 3 1000-10,000 years. Now the "what"; what will be the difference?

That, as the teacher says when she is stumped, is a good question. Let's see if we're stumped.

We would be if we were asked to predict the evolutionary future of a "wild animal": its environment would in almost every case be so complex and itself so subject to change that we would not even want to make a guess. But we may say that to the extent that "man makes his own environment" he makes his own evolutionary future - with the following reservations: 1) which characters will vary, in what direction, and how far, is not predictable, except in a rough way by the reasoning I used above, and from a small volume of direct evidence; 2) we do not know whether many traits, observed to differ from one person to another, do so by spontaneous variation or because of differing environment; and 3) new species may be produced by "major" mutations at any time. Having stated these reservations, I shall henceforth ignore them.

Now we have to guess what environment man will create for himself. Science-fiction writers have been trying to decide for quite a while and have come to no agreement, so I shall take up several of the guesses commonly offered.

Number one. Many authors portray the world at any given time in the future as merely a larger edition of the world of today. Hmm. I suppose they think (if they think at all) that capital's excess of manpower, which under the present system unavoidably accumulates, will continue for all time to destroy itself at irregular intervals by cataclysmic wars. No, I'm afraid things will have to change a good deal in the next few centuries, I don't think I will discuss number one after all.

Number two. A possibility for the future, which is without precedent but which some idealists, including myself, support as likely, is the following. A world-wide government is set up giving the people equal representation, free school and university education, birth control, and planned economy. I won't take up here the probability, or even the method, of this state's formation. What I want to point out is that if it were set up it would probably continue for a much longer time than any previous. I don't mean that Stasis would be achieved - a lot of changes could be made without endangering the bases of the state. What I do mean is that so very few would be dissatisfied with these institutions that they would probably endure, even long enough to themselves effect an evolutionary change. What change? Well, with everyone putting to use his best abilities for constructive work, humanity might branch into several varieties, say one with ready intelligence and quick reactions, one specially fitted for scientific work (having a subvariety capable of lightning calculation), etc., etc. This effect might be slow in appearing, but once social barriers were erected between the classes divergence would be comparatively rapid. Subject for a story: the extinction of the Artists.

Number three: achievement of interplanetary travel within a few hundred years. It would seem that none but the soundest and best-ordered society could survive this without restoring, if it did not already include them, private property, inheritance, and free competition. So, whatever the superficial structure of government (which, judging by past experience, would be subject to change without notice), the individual motivations would, in the main, be much the same as in the last five hundred (plus) years.

Result, of course, continuation of today's evolutionary trends, for a time. There are many subsequent possibilities, but if I brought everything into this article that I would like to it would be of quite a dismal length.

Number four: eventual achievement of interstellar travel. I'm including this, even though its effects cover an immensely longer period of time than those of the others, because so many authors - Asimov in particular - have what I think is quite a serious mistake; as follows. They reason, like VanVogt's historian in "Discord in Scarlet", that a life-form superior to all others in the galaxy would, given interstellar travel, replace or dominate them. And, with some logic to back up their egotism, the pretty generally assume that we are it. No objection to that; or to postulating a large number of planets habitable by us. But they do not even consider the evolutionary changes which would be certain to take place in the long process of exploring, and colonizing the whole galaxy - about a hundred million stars, I believe, and Type G one of the commonest of the ten types.

I am unafraid to tackle this remoter future (I was never noted for conservatism) because the direct effects of interstellar travel would be so profound as to be independent of any developments in the interim. Likely effects are:

I. Complete acclimation of colonizers to other planets. This would not take place within the Solar System; it is simply wishful thinking to imagine men ever living on the other Planets without elaborate protective devices. But given worlds somewhat more similar to this, subspecies at least as divergent as the present races but of course much better differentiated would arise, how quickly I won't try to guess.

II. More original, I hope, but admittedly less certain; The exploration, even the preliminary exploration, of the nearer star systems will take many generations. The explorers will be carefully selected for certain mental attributes and certain very special physical qualifications. When once one of the "nearby" worlds has been pretty well conquered, there will be a natural tendency for its conquerors to leave for another star - again those best fitted for the job being selected. As this goes on, the permanent settlers will come to follow more closely behind the Explorers, so that fewer Explorers will remain in the colonies, and their job will be confined to taking the first and greatest chances, solving the problems that may arise quite unpredictably, and digging in. Of course what I am leading up to is Kemo explorer.

One last wild flight of imagination. The Explorers will finally run out of worlds to explore, but not until after they have become a well-defined species. Ill-fitted for most occupations beside their own, unable to make a living in competition with others, desperately overcrowded, if I may use the word, they must do their inadequate best to survive on the remotest, least hospitable planets. There, eons before the race as a whole has any incentive for intergalactic travel, is a small minority with the strongest incentive.

Tableau: the intrepid band, who believe themselves the first to reach Messier 33, land a tender on a likely-looking satellite - to find it was colonized in prehistoric times by men - the long-forgotten Explorers - from their own galaxy!

That's all. Comments?

YHOS PERUSETH YE MAILYNGE

First, I wish to apologize for the technical appearance of Yhos lastime. It was very little better than the work of Joe Fortier's which I criticized with such gusto in the same issue. I think this number will be easier on the eyes in spite of the fact that it again comes on yellow second sheets, and that I have even less time to do it than I had lastime.

LET'S LOOK AT THE RECORD

Hodgkins says the VT&M attack on Technocracy was composed mostly of gross misstatements etc, but he does not quote, or directly refute any of them. Instead, he quotes from the Technocrat, which might reasonably be expected to be as prejudiced in favor of Technocracy as VT&M are prejudiced against it. Not that I am taking VT&M's part in this squabble -- they have been so completely wrong and so often, that as a general rule, I would automatically guess that anything they opposed was probably okay. However, I would expect something a little clearer from Hodgkins.

Total conscription isn't a bad idea, but I think the average person would look on it as taking advantage of the situation to create a dictatorship, which many people think Roosevelt is doing anyway, what with the registration of most of the population thru one sort of bureau or another, plus the omnipotent questionnaire. Besides, it would take some time to get organized on a Total Conscription basis, during which period not much of anything would be accomplished. We have already passed thru one of these periods in converting industry to war production, and another might be disastrous at this stage of the game - just when we have a chance to clean it up in a year or so by pushing our present advantages. At least it would delay victory another year or so. The pamphlet should have been printed in December 41 instead of May 42.

S-f Goo

The last sentence of the first paragraph can pertain to fanzines as well. In fact, it could pertain to a great many things in general. "Mental laziness and falling-off of imaginative vigor" (to quote SDR) is no doubt 90% at the root of the recent criticisms of ASF & UNK; and also the same anent the late-lamented Spaceways.

I'm also tired of hearing how much better the Tremaine era was. I started reading stf "steady" on the rise of the Tremaine dynasty, & found it good. But I found it better when JWC took over - and while he has not greatly improved the mag in the last year or so (which may be the root of the trouble, after all) it has not slacked off any on the average.

It's just the way everybody speaks respectfully of the dead and lambaste the living, merely because that is the thing to do. They remember "Colossus", "Rebirth", & "Skylark of Valeron" & forget the numerous stinkeroos. "Human" vs "intellectual" also holds about as much water as a sieve. "Old Faithful" was the only Tremaine story that ever appealed to my emotions as much as "Helen O'Loy", "Rust", "Lifeline", "Jay Score", etc, especially those by Del Rey, stfdom's first and foremost "tear-jerker". And if you could call "Blinding Shadows", "Star Ship Invincible", "Inflexure" or "Brain of Light" -- "warm and human" -- you could get a kick out of kissing a snowman.

If somebody has the time and the inclination to make a fair comparison of the Campbell and Tremaine Astoundings let himer (who has read most of the stories) rate same and add up the averages. I think the difference will be decisive in favor of JWC.

Hey Sam, put me first in line for an autographed copy of your book as soon as it rolls off the press. I sincerely hope this is not just another of those great, heroic pipe-dreams in which fans are so wont to indulge. . . .

HORIZONS Harry's remark that he'd pay a dollar to find out what nine poems out of ten that he read meant, is highly encouraging to yhos. He thot he was merely stupid, or lacking in appreciation of some of the finer things in life. But to read such a statement from one who is a good poet, and understands poetry far better than he, gives him at last the full courage of his convictions - that most poets (or perhaps I should say verse-writers, since Eastman thinks there is a subtle but sharp distinction there) don't know what they're babbling about.

Sorry to disillusion Harry on my artistic ability once more-- if someone has not already beaten me to it - but the "better-than-Disney" cover is nobddy else but Disney. They are all creations of his, traced directly from my FANTASIA program. Who else could dream up that fetching centaurette, the slap-happy unicorn, and the deadendkiddish little satyrs?

Incidentally, I should think all fan collectors would like to have one of these programs as an essential item, especially if they haven't seen the opus. I expected it to come around to the smaller theaters so I could view it a 3rd and 4th and maybe more times, but no luck. The program is a big (approx 10x13) affair of around 20 pages with comments on all the selections, numerous fotos, sketches, drawings, and sidelites on production difficulties, oddities, etc. They sold for a quarter at the original Fanta-sound version, and I imagine anyone interested could obtain one from the Disney studios for the same price.

Rest easy, Harry, it was I who made such an hilarious muddle of that quote in FF you mention. I don't regret it, because Heck & I, if nobody else, got a whale of a big laugh out of it.

From a reliable source, together with hints given out by JWC himself, I have found that the Campbell search for stf reader-technicians is for an actual naval war research project. Heinlein, Jameson, Asimov, and other stf authors &or readers are trying to develop a spacesuit! If allied planes can fly higher than those of the axis, we will naturally enjoy a decided advantage, perhaps enuf to bring the war to a swift conclusion.

This is not giving away a military secret, as both sides know the other has been working on it for some time, in fact, there was something quite similar in the Camel cigarette ads of not long ago about how wonderful it was to climb out of an 82°-below, near-vacuum test chamber, and light up one of their weeds.

Tsk! I wouldn't give it a second thot in a magazine by Ludowitz or Schmarje, but to find a Warner pub with "Irregardless" is mildly shocking, to say the least!

I can't say that I care for fantasy-music any more than plain music (classical that is) except for stuff that is definitely on the weird side. Most of the fantasy music story plots are pretty corny, and I prefer to enjoy the music as is. Liszt's Piano Concerto in A Major goes over better with me than, say, the slow movements from some of Wagner's fantasies. In short, I like heavy

music better than light (as a rule; there are many exceptions) and so if the stuff is good and solid, I like it, and I don't care what kind of a story is in back of it. And a piece like the above Liszt opus can have any kind of a story you think fits the music and I daresay I could think of an interpretation that would please me better than the one Liszt might have thought of, if he had bothered, which I am glad he didn't. All of which explains why Harry's discussion of fantamusical interested me very little.

SUSPRO The cover is good altho I wouldn't have appreciated it without the explanation, passing it off as merely another amusing bit of Foo-lishness.

The puns on Herman's nodding were grade-A ckerman. And when he is good, he is very, very good . . .

Quote: "I am determined not to run this department to four pages this time." Warner also says much the same, and so do others. WHY?????

Second quote from the Autocrat brot me up short. My opinions have been, and to a large extent still are, "at the mercy of every superior mind that holds a different one." This results in a lot of confusion, especially where there are two superior minds with opposing opinions. But what can I do about it? The only apparent refuge is in Inflation of the Ego, and that is not attractive. My mind is somewhat like my desk. Full of numerous pigeonholes with things in them that I intend to settle some time or other but which I mostly never do.

On 3rd quote you could carry the analogy of the rifle and the hose a little further and support the opposite side. Viz: If you have time enuf with a rifle you also have a good chance to hit the mark. And when you hit it - it stays hit. With the hose, there's too much chance to dodge around, or even if hit, for the mark to bob up again and thumb its highly abstract beezee at the marksman.

Shafer's quote: The first sentence, in fact, the whole works has more semantic blanks in it, than the average Hitlerian utterance. Over my head.

Guess I'll have to get "The Red Badge of Courage" one of these days and read it. The few quotes I've seen of Crane have caused me to admire the way he says things.

I weep over "S-F's Spoon River" becoz it was so good. 'Why'n heck, Juffus, when Harry rejected it, didn't you send it to me for Fanfare? I'd've tossed out most anything I had to put it in. Ten times better than that Consolidation thing you sent me. Incidentally, I didn't really reject the latter - it was just uh sorta you know - squeeze out. . .

Well, how do you like the present trend of Alley Oop? I think it's a stroke of genius on Hamlin's part. Really an excellent piece of propaganda. The kids, and kid-minds can really get stratoned out on the fundamental issues involved. Besides, Alley Oop can fight the war on our side without the embarrassment of being in the present, where sudden victories, defeats, or an armistice might leave him high and dry. One of my favorite cartoons, this one. Much better than Buck Rogers at his height.

Guess I'll list my favorite "comic" strips. I think Juffus at least will be interested, and that's all the incentive I need. These are not in order of pref; I haven't time for that. Alley Oop, Li'l Abner, Donald Duck, Mutt 'n' Jeff, Capt Easy, Knerr's Katzenjammer Kids (Dirks' are lousy) Blondie & Dagwood, Out Our Way Prince Valiant (for the beautiful pictures mostly). Buck Rogers

I don't see any more, so can't say. All I can think of at the moment. Eek! Most forgot Smoky Stover & Spooky.

All I can make of the interlineations on p 10 is that Jack is very drunk on account of something.

I proceeded rather slowly with the back cover until I got to the part where I found out I was intelligent, after which things went much more smoothly. Neatricks, J.

I have worked out a fonetic alfabet of my own which can be written on a typewriter and intended to present it in this issue but there are a lot of odd symbols in it and I decided to adopt Jack's suggestion of eliminating capitals for beginning sentences, and using them in place of the unfamiliar finger-reachings I had. But there is no time for that, so it will have to wait until after the duration, I guess.

A TOUR OF THE EVAN'S The borders look very nice. I once intended to do that with Fanfare, but Old Man Laziness just got the best of me, as usual.

I like to read about trips as much as I like to write of them and Ze's was as interesting as any.

The cartoon I didn't like. I prefer my off-color humor on the Esquire, rather than the Capt Billy's Whiz Bang style. Awk! Awk! Watch out for the captain's log!

EN GARDE Evidently in that w-k \$90 there's been so much harping about, you Ashleys included, the cost of the mimeo, lino-block press, wasted paper, etc. At that rate the first mimeod ish of Fanfare cost me \$45-50, and it was just another avg issue at that, while the 1st Nova was definitely good.

That seems to be that. Sure, we're friends. I never get really mad at anybody in fandom, anyway.

One other thing, tho. Since you say Nova is a subscription mag only becoz you want to make sure that those who get it are interested, how about distributing it in the FAPA? It'd probably cost you less than a dollar per issue in lost subs to do this, and it would benefit the FAPA enormously.

"Perspective" and "Air Raid Instructions" were completely hilarious, and rank with the best of fan wit.

And all these honeyed words aren't just becoz I'm trying to soft-soap you after the sand-blast. They are on the level. I'll sand-blast you again just as quick & just as vigorously as I think I have reason to. Or anyone else.

If I am a member of the Laureate Committee judging 1942, I'll not have the trouble deciding the Artist Award that I did for '41. It'll go to Wiedenbeck hands down for his En Garde covers.

NUCLEUS I could say a thing or three about the first page - but something tells me I'll be better off if I keep my big mouth shut.

The only worthwhile piece in the issue was the dig at the NFFF, which, sad to state, is only too well merited. Spencer's reviews only serve only to heighten the frenzied indifference with which I regard G&S. (I mean Gilbert & Sullivan not Gertrude & Spencer).

Concentrated Comments: Ze's "Merie Night" was the best thing in Ceres, the rest being mediocre. I'm looking forward to Aagh!, however, and a bigger "Bull" dept by the ed-

itor. ""In Walt's Wramblings, I don't get the remark about Jekyll & Hyde in reverse. Sure, two were one, but one was also two. It's like turning an "H" upside down. I could've done a blueprint paper like Bobliquep in the lab where I work, but it was too much bother to hunt up a source of sensitized paper, and I was afraid it would cost too much, & fifty sheets would be too easily missed from the lab's supply. . .

ommanipadmcfooommanipadmcfooommanipadmcfooomannipadmcfooommanifooo

Whatnot -

In yesterday's Christian Science Monitor's magazine section - Nov 28th - appeared an article on the future rather unusual for that conservative paper. I haven't had chance to read it yet, but 'twas entitled "Is the Castle Coming Back?" and had pretty pictures of the English countryside of a decade or two hence, with graceful, curving super-highways, ultra-streamlined cars on them - and amidst beautifully landscaped countryside, massive, futuristic architecture; one-building "towns". These are proposed in place of merely building again the same type of affairs which are now bomb-flattened.

I don't know whether they propose these as merely "business & industrial centers" or whether they expect everybody to live there - but the latter is not for me. I expect to have a streamlined cottage "out in the bresh" somewhat, and to commute in gyro-auto. If it's the former, then they have my permission, yea even my blessing, to go ahead and build them.

I wish Sardonyx would ease up on the poetry for a while, and instead, harangue us on biology, upon which the editor is also an undoubted expert.

For instance I think LRC could lead us into something by explaining the differences between microbes, bacteria, bacilli, viri and what have you. Or perhaps he could tell us if there are any omnivorous animals besides homo and bruin, and if so, are they as biologically successful as these two, and how do they compare with animals of more specialized eating habits?

Aah yeh, heheheh - more workers for de salt mines! 6. Abbott & Costello. 7. Burns & Allen. 8. A whole army of stupes who whistle on radio programs. 9. The guy who butchered Fantasia - for the "hoi-polloi". 10. The guy who invented double features. 11. The guy who invented triple features is to be dipped in honey staked out in the sun, and eaten alive by little red ants. Buzzards also cordially invited to attend.

Quotes from Korzybski's Science & Sanity: (I got the Quincy library to buy it for me and promptly moved - they persuaded Weymouth to borrow it from Quincy, and when I finally got it I was so awed by its size that I didn't tackly it for a week, and by the time I had hacked my way halfway thru the preface, they wanted it back. Reckon I'll have to buy the thing. I honestly think, if a guy could read this book and really digest it, and apply its theories, it would actually do for him what the Rosicrucians and half

a dozen other supposedly high-powered sects claim their books will do.) #1. "It should be noticed that the average child is born extentional, & then are his evaluations distorted as the result of intensional training by parents, teachers, itc, who are unaware of the heavy neurological consequences."

#2. The stock in trade of the magician to fool the public, consists of methods of misdirection, mis-evaluation, half-truths, etc - used to play on the ordinary associations & implications, habits of hasty generalization, etc, of the audience, thus leading to misinterpretations, indentifications, lack of predictability, etc. . . .

#3. The man in the street, our education, medicine, and even sciences, are still in the clutches of the system of Aristotle, a system inadequate for 1941, yet perhaps satisfactory 2300 years ago, when conditions of life relatively so simple, when orientations were on the macroscopic level only, and knowledge of scientific facts was practically nil.

#4. Personally, the author is always shocked profoundly that parents . . . can tolerate educators, physicians, scientists, etc, who train their children in such pernicious & hopelessly antiquated methods.

""""""""""

Yhos will no doubt be in the armed services by the time of next mailing, but he hopes to continue with at least a one-sheeter as long as he remains in the US, which his wife has graciously consented to stencil and mimeo for him. (Useful people, these wives!) Apologies for no Fanfare this time. Just couldn't make it. Hope somebody else will continue the Fighting Fan. Here's another contributor. Fanfare subs will be returned as soon as plssible after Christmas, which is using up all my ready cash. Okay?

With the above in mind, he launches some discussions that ot to keep the FAPA crackling merrily for several mailings yet, and with the fervent hope that he may be able to participate in them.

#1. It is my opinion that hate is our mental appendix, and like that organ is absolutely useless, and a good part of the time - dangerous.

#2. Baseball is a much more interesting game than football either for watching or playing. That is, football is for a strong back and a weak mind, while baseball calls for all around ability.

#3. What present occupational groups would stand the best chance of surviving in a barbaric world? (Supposing civilization suddenly went smash, like in "3,000 Years!")

""""""""""

It was just too much for us to get Fighting Fan into ye mailing, so we will send it out a little later at our own expense.

""""""""""

This has been the fifth issue of "Yhos", ground out at 87 Colonial Road, North Weymouth, Mass, by the Widners, Art, Ruth, and Pete, for the Winter 42 FAPA mailing. Cover by Virginia Anderson.

""""""""""

Victory IN Forty three!