

SPACE DEVOTED TO MISCELLANEOUS REPLIES TO MILTY

We can say amen to most of the conclusions of Rothman's article in the current Milt's Mag re the Pro-Scientists, but there are some details on which we want to take exception.

In the first place, the reference to labor unionizers being beaten up by Ford's rowdies is a bit one-sided, in view of the fact that organized labor has contributed well over half of the violence that has been connected with unionization. And we have never been sympathetic to organized labor. Like Westbrook Pegler, we feel that they have set themselves up as a government coexisting with our own, an "invisible empire", but one not run on the republican lines that are designed to serve the wishes of the majority of the whole citizenry. Moreover, rejecting as we do communism with a small c, we deny the need for labor unions to exist, feeling that on the whole they have militated against the general economic well-being, that such benefits as they have brot could have been gained much more easily and securely and with less blood and tears had half the devotion shown in organizing labor been turned into the legitimate sphere of political activity. If this be treason, make the most of it.

We do not see that his remarks anent our quoteworthy quote from W J Cameron are to the point. In the first place, it is obvious that Cameron no more wrote that speech than Joe Louis writes the articles in Liberty on Why I Am a Champion. The speech was written by some unknown person who had very good insight into the question of science' relation to present and future events, and the fact that someone known as America's Number Two Fascist spoke the words doesn't make them unacceptable. Indeed, the speech would still be a good one even if Cameron himself had written it. Why, we'd even quote from Gentle Joe or Karlemagne if one of 'em said something we agreed with and thot worth repeating.

Incidentally, we wonder if Milt has any evidence to back up his assumption that the dear pee-pul are taken in by those speeches over the Ford Sunday Evening Hours. It is easy to think that something said publicly by someone, something that you disagree with 100%, is being lapped up like milk by the great unthinking herd of people, and to become very perturbed over it. But talk to the people and see whether they actually have fallen hook, line, and sinker. It's a hard thing for an intellectual to realize that intellectuals do not stand alone; but it has been our observation that virtually all Caucasians have minds capable of quite deep thinking at times, and that those times are much more frequent than we, who see them only when they're not alone, realize. Apparently the present round, i e, intervention in the European War, is going to go to the rabble-rousers, but I am not prepared to consider that as conclusive evidence that the last syllable should forever be dropped from Homo sapiens' name.

To return to Gregor's article on the Pro-Scientists, which we swung away from a couple of paragraphs back, we'd like to question an unspoken assumption that seems to have been accepted by both Rothman and Van Houten. Both seem to take it for granted that there is a great and threatening body of anti-scientific sentiment among the American people; indeed, that the majority of them are very suspicious of scientific progress and will tend to oppose it. I don't think this is so. The really sickening amount of pro-scientific propaganda that appears in all the history books in the form of "We push a button and light floods the room", etc, coupled with the undeniable evidence on every hand that we are better off than our forefathers, sees to it, I think, that people appreciate the material advantages that science has brot them; and articles like the New Republic's Shape of Everyday Things to Come reprinted in the Reader's Digest, the world fairs, and commercial advertising and so on, hold constantly before them the idea that the future will be yet

better thru science. Such anti-scientific sentiment as exists, we believe, is largely in old-fashioned people who dislike the loss of the beloved social activities and traditions of the past, the quilting bees, the sleigh rides, the grandparents in the home, the church socials, and so on. Some fundamentalists among the religious dislike the conclusions science is teaching in the public schools (monkey laws are almost disregarded in the states where they exist), and some philosophers don't like science' materialism. Yes, and some blame is put on science for the destructiveness of modern warfare. But none of these blobs of public opinion seem to me to be threateningly large, and indeed they are on the wane. You will find almost no one who will admit that he opposes science per se, but you may find many who think scientists might well change the direction of their work somewhat.

Finally, a word of explanation on something in my *Über die Schönheit* which Milt doesn't seem to have understood. It is quite true that we must leave it to books to remember for us the melting point of iron and the freezing point of mercury and so on. That is a fact, but a fact whose existence I protest. My main point, however, rested on the distinction of two different kinds of facts. The one kind, the general rules which hold in all situations to which they can be applied (such as "The melting point of iron is blank degrees Centigrade" or "The elasticity of this kind of celluloid is blank"), are interrelated in a way that strongly suggests that they can be reduced to a very few broad principles, perhaps to one principle. This idea I have discussed at length in "Will Science Ever Turn the Corner?", which was published in a couple of Comet publications some years back. But with just the principles we are in a vacuum, a lawn mower without a lawn to mow. The world to which the principles must be applied consists of another kind of facts, which I called factual details. The principles of gunnery are put into practice on an individual terrain, whose configurations are a determining factor in an artillery duel and whose configurations can only be learned by going to the terrain itself or to a map made from the terrain itself. In figuring how to fire the gun, you can tell what the shell's inertia is going to be from a knowledge of its mass and the velocity at which it will be traveling. You cannot tell from this valley what the next valley looks like. You cannot tell from Roosevelt's being president now that Hoover beat Smith in 1928, or that Williams will defeat Johnston in 1944. These are factual details, occurring at only one point in time or space, and do not necessarily follow from the other factual details around them, whereas the density of ice at 50 degrees below zero does necessarily follow from other known characteristics of ice. The universal principles science may someday reduce to simple things that can be carried around in our heads; the physical details of the universe to which they must be applied never can be. And that, I think, is a great pity.

////////////////////
 TO WHOM IT DOTH CONCERN: /
 Don't mention my name in /
 pro mags of nationwide /
 circulation, guys. I ap- /
 preciate the plug, but /
 see that mimeoed sheet /
 we put out re the Chicon /
 bal masque for our reason /
 //////////////////////

Elmer is not sublimated

Rothman is fond of remarking how wonderful it is that the average IQ of the population as a whole should always be 100. We hate to spoil his little joke, but seem to remember from our one semester of psychology that IQ is based upon mental age and physical age, and that after about the seventeenth year the concept of mental age ceases to be useful, and is not applied to persons developed therebeyond.

Idle thot: Wouldn't it be nice if Joe Louis would enlist in the Navy?

We had planned to have in this issue an account of an incident which involved suicide, with political implications. In view of the Cambridge occurrence we have put that off, and, in the hope of soon despatching the enfant terrible, instead include in this number an extra long section of the

LIST OF LIES, MISSTATEMENTS, AND HALF-TRUTHS APPEARING IN LE VOMBITEUR
IN ITS NONE TOO BRIEF EXISTENCE —further continued

26. "...the impossibility and contradictions of the present regime," $\frac{1}{2}$ T. It's not impossible, Doc; it's just devilishly difficult.

27. "...has no clear conception of economic forces..." $\frac{1}{2}$ T. Who has? Or, rather, who can be certain that he has?

28. "...the necessity of ...alignment with the masses as the only true revolutionaries..." L. Union Now is a revolution, and it certainly is not drawing its greatest support from the "masses".

29. "'fascist unconscious'" L. The term is taken from John Strachey, and "for brevity's sake" is frequently shortened in usage to "fascist". It's a beautiful rationalization of the practice of calling everybody that disagrees with you a fascist.

30. "... including two most charming ladies,..." Ms. He's talking about the attendance at the Futurian meeting now, boys. We chivalrously refrain from speaking further on this head.

31. "Sykora disrupts Scientificinema Club, with his customary tactics then tries to palm off all blame on Michelists;" L. That ain't the way I heered it.

32. "Michelism advances at Newark Convention despite attempts at censorship by Sykorites;" L.

33. "Wollheim withdrawing, rather than resort to Sykora method of disruption;" L. Big-hearted Donald just failed to gain any support because of his do-nothingness while he was acknowledged head of the arrangements for the Convention.

34. "Wollheim, Michel, Lowndes, and Pohl withdraw from active fandom, resign FAPA offices rather than allow continual viciousness on part of reactionaries to destroy organization;" L. They got out because things were getting too hot for them.

35. "Progressive Party in FAPA formed, supported by Michelists;" $\frac{1}{2}$ T. I've skipped over several highly questionable ones of the "Highlights of 1938", which have already been dealt with. The Progressive Party didn't want the Michelists' support and dissolved and reformed in order to be free of them.

36. "Jack Speer, Stf's lone Fascist," L. Even if I were a Fascist, I wouldn't be alone, if all the people the Michelists called Fascists really were. And there were other supporters of the have-not Powers in fandom and a-jay, such as Edgar A Hirdler of the OCSFL and Francis W Miller of the AAFP.

37. "CPASF program completed in full;" L. Haw! You mean "finished", don't you, Doc?

38. "...he now manages to find excuses to defend the stealing of a person's pseudonym by another, in order that the appropriator may use it to accuse the originator of lying and make scurrilous attacks upon the originator's person." L. I think that ~~this quotation is pretty well answered in the item it attacks~~, and in connection with the latter part of it refer you to the original article in the SFFan.

39. "at times we think he is going senile before even becoming mature." Ms. Thank Foo we don't all mature like the Wollheimists did.

40. "Incidentally, this little brat has never dared to show his face in New York, although he has passed through a couple of times." $\frac{1}{2}$ T. The statement is transparent, and probably meant to be funny, but for the benefit of those who don't know the details, the two passages thru NY were going and coming on the same trip, ^{to Connecticut} on which I had intended to stop off and see

everybody on the way back; but one is not likely to stop off the train for the purpose of showing one's face when a trip undertaken entirely on one's own responsibility and against the advise of the owner of the car ends in a wreck and one is heading for Prime Base with all possible haste.

41. "(Or should we say 'New Fan-Dump', which would be far more descriptive of the worth-of-content of this tres-in-the-hole journal.)" L. New Fandom was a right good mag right at that time.

42. "... the most outstanding and provocative fan-magazine of the day, the 'Science Fiction Advance'" L.

43. "Member Kravitz then showed his honour and integrity as a sincere fan by immediately resigning membership and leaving the club." L. This is in reference to the resolution introduced by new member Kravitz that the PSFS have no dealings whatsoever with people who retain or express fascist sympathies. The thing has a 1941 ring in it, doesn't it? Except that it is being extended to everybody who disagrees with the majority. Incidentally, if it was the honorable thing for Kravitz to do, how come the Michelists never adopted such a policy?

44. "...the element of prudery and puerile 'niceness' which is trying the gain the upper hand..." Ms. Granted that many "prudes" have the reformer complex, so that they want to impose their ideas on everyone by force, inclusion of erotica and pornography (Doc insists on distinguishing the two) in fanmags is not justified. If my theory is correct, that your intellectual side is in the saddle when you're sitting at a typewriter or scratching a stencil with a stylus, inclusion of this sort of material in fanzines is a concession to the animal side that need not be made, and it is improper to impose such gratification of your animal side upon others by publishing it.

45. "... it would still be entirely unnecessary for us, as Communists, to distort or suppress facts." L. There was the question of how big a crowd attended a certain Communist rally in Chicago. The Commies claimed a crowd several times as big as the various estimates of Chicago newspapers, and the Police Department estimate was even lower. And there is the matter of Mendelian heredity, which is suppressed in Russia because it doesn't jibe with St Marx' assumptions. And why have the dictators of Red Russia never allowed reporters, diplomats, and other foreigners to go out and dig up the real state of affairs? Not Germany nor Italy have ever been so restrictive. Perhaps the above quotation should be classed simply as a misstatement, since the Communists for the most part believed that they were letting the truth be known. But oh, how they suppress and rage against certain "falsehoods". Naturally they must deny the truth of things unfavorable to Communism; otherwise they would not be Communists. ...We have just discovered the note we made on the Chicago matter. It was on March 6, 1930. The Tribune stated 1,200 were present. The Daily News estimated 1,800. The Daily Worker said 50,000 demonstrators had been on the scene. Police records indicated that 550 persons were in attendance. Our source is noted as "Lasswell & Blumenstock". I don't remember now what it was published in.

With which terminal preposition we bid you Aufwidersehen for the moment.

This thing is published by Jack F Speer, of 3416 Northampton NW, Wn/DC, whose official signature for fandom appears below.

Jack F Speer