
THE TIME SCANNER
Published and edited by

Free
To

BCB STUDLEY
210 W. 109th St.
New York, N.Y.

Free
To

F

F

P

A

P

A

Vol. 1

No. 2

Members

Members

OUR IMPARTIAL REPORTER

We set out to visit and query several Fapo members on their choice for Vice President. The first one we came to was an uncouth looking, unshaven tough individual, whom we stopped as he was climbing out of a back window with silverware sticking out of his pocket. After we had convinced him of our good intentions, he laid aside his jimmy and revolver and agreed to answer our questions.

Q. - "Who are you going to vote for for Vice President?"

A. - "I'm gonna vote for Rothman. His ideas worked okay in Germany and they suit me fine."

Next we came upon a little old lady who was sitting on the porch of her well-kept little home, knitting. She smiled sweetly, and, setting aside her needles and thread, agreed to answer our question: -

Q. - "Who are you going to vote for for Vice President?"

A. - "Why I'm going to vote for Wellheim, of course. I've always believed in law and order, and we must preserve our homes."

At this point, we concluded our impartial survey for the day.

ATTENTION MR. KOENIG (Notes by Doc Lowndes)

For a long time, BCK, I have thoroughly enjoyed your Reader & Collector, a thing which some people might find difficult to believe inasmuch as you've slammed Futurians quite steadily, and torn into me at times, too. But you've always done it in such a manner as to make me see the amusing side of the situation, and I must admit that, upon re-reading some of the good Futurians have written in the past, you were quite justified.

However, now and then, BCK, other things come up. You take an item out of some publication and comment upon it without taking the trouble to find out if the item in question was accurate or not. I am referring particularly to your quotations from "Fantasy News" in regard to Stirring Science Stories and your remarks, comments which would have been perfectly in order had those reports been correct -- but you didn't bother to find out about that. In fact, Mr. Koenig, despite the fact that Fantasy News has often been found to have been unreliable in the past, and despite, further, that the subject was one upon which its editor could be expected to show personal prejudice, seizing upon an opportunity to slander a personal enemy, you chose to take these reports as absolutely sound, proven beyond shadow of doubt.

The Time Scanner

As a matter of fact, HCK, those reports in Fantasy News were entirely conjecture, based upon questionable rumors and not in accord with facts. The editor of Fantasy News was too glad to rush into print with them. The matter of \$15 covers and ~~to~~ offer for stories had to do with something else entirely, and never came up in the preliminary plans for the Albing Publications.

Not being acquainted with Mr. Sykora and his associates, or with Fantasy News, Mr. Albert had quite sound reasons for stating the fact: "Frankly I cannot understand the unfavorable comment you say ... has evoked."

The second matter I wish to take exception with you on is that of Jack Robins' factual account of the 1939 World Science Fiction Convention which you found so horribly objectionable. From your attitude one would take it that there would not be any ill-feeling about that affair if only the nasty Futurians would refrain from mentioning what actually happened and permit utterly false impressions to circulate unchallenged. It is only incidental, oh, HCK, that those false reports are slanderous to our group. That's okay, what? So long as we don't go around stirring up ill-feeling by telling the facts in the case, why fans who have not had much experience will place their confidence in the managers of that 1939 Convention, who saved fandom from the ghastly conspiracies of the PSNY; then, maybe, they can really get away with more similar raw deals.

I'm sure, HCK, a great many people are in favor of this attitude. Perhaps we should make it a legal procedure. Let's say, now that Joe Schultz (name hypothetical; any resemblance etc) is on the carpet on a charge of assault and battery. Now it seems that Joe has a nice long record of misdemeanors behind him, and the prosecutor starts to set them before the magistrate as an indication of Joe's character. However (saved!) this would tend to dig matters out of the grave, arouse ill-feeling. Therefore, it cannot be considered. And we don't want to arouse ill feeling do we? Of course not. A thousand times no. Sooner, for sooner Joe should be released on lack of evidence, there being nothing in his past to indicate that he might be a questionable character, even if a few dozen honest citizens are beaten up and robbed later.

Yes, HCK, you are quite right. Things like Robins' account will arouse ill-feeling in the hearts of those who had hoped it had all been forgotten and that they had gotten away with it. And other people who, for various reasons would like to suppress the facts in the case, won't like it either. It's tough when someone you don't like turns out to have been in the right, isn't it? (Not referring to you, HCK.)

Having brought these matters to your attention, Mr. Koenig, I close with a repetition. Aside from such cases as these, I think Reader & Collector has been a swell little publication, and I like to imagine that it has helped me see a few of the errors of some of my ways. And further, I hope you won't skip any mailings with future issues.

sincerely, Doc Lourdes

A note of interest: the impartial reporter item, while nothing more than a joke here, is not our invention. This type of thing was actually used in one of the dirtiest political campaigns in our history. It took place when Upton Sinclair was running for governor of California. News-reels were made up, showing reporters questioning various people on the subject of whom they were voting for. They got sweet-looking old ladies, neat-looking business men, etc, to state that they were pledged for one candidate, while the dirtiest, meanest looking bums they could find were held up to give their pep talks for Sinclair.

Incidentally, apropos of nothing, we hear that Dr. Smith walked out during the discussion of a certain question disagreeable to him at the Chicon. The doctor apparently knows his politics, too. That's an often-used parliamentary trick, and it nearly always works. Hm, maybe we'll be celebrities some day ...