

The
Timebinder

The



Timebinder

The Time-Binder CBBB

Volume II

1946

Number 1

So many fine letters and articles have been sent to Ye Editor, that he has decided to make this issue an All-Letter one, in order that he may give the largest possible number of the fine ideas, comments and criticisms of others. A very minimum of comment from Ye Editor will appear, which does not, however, mean that he agrees fully with all the things our good correspondents have said. But it is the policy of THE TIME-BINDER to present also the ideas of others. I think most of our readers know Ye Ed's ideas well enough to tell which ones agree with his, and the ones that do not. We were so very glad to have all these letters --

Please keep them coming.

THE TIME-BINDER is published by Th' Ol' Foo of Fandom, E. Everett Evans, from 628 South Bixel Street, Los Angeles, 14, Calif. Serious, thought-provoking and logically-written letters and articles are still wanted for future publication. These, or your comments, are all the pay asked.

The Sword sang on the barren heath,
The Sickle in the fruitful field;
The Sword it sang a song of Death
But could not make the Sickle yield.

— William Blake.

PSYCHOLOGICAL DANGERS OF CONSCRIPTION

by Russ Whitman, U. S. Army.

National leaders have concluded that exclusive ownership of the atomic bomb will be our most effective means for maintaining peace in the future. No longer will the size of the army and navy determine the strength of our nation, not when a dozen or even fewer men in a B-29 are able to destroy several entire cities in a few hours.

Experienced military authorities report that American boys have made the best fighters. They put their whole heart and soul into the winning of the war because they knew that victory meant return to their homes and normal living.

German and Jap soldiers were well seasoned and highly skilled in modern warfare, but they lacked the impetus and spontaneity born of the assurance that when the war was over the yoke of military authority would be taken from their necks.

The freedom-loving American boy, with six months' to one year's training, was more than a match for men born and raised under militarism. America has never lost a war and never will as long as men proud of liberty rally to her defense in time of a crisis.

If we put peace-time conscription into effect, the psychological effect will be the same as in other countries, that of producing professional soldiers who plan no future but war.

The Majority of people who endorse military conscription during peace time are unaware of the low moral conditions in the camps and of the dangerous pitfalls awaiting the American youth. Returned soldiers who agree to conscription may do so because they believe it only fair that all should render the same service which they have given.

Consideration must be given to the psychological dangers of camp life for boys in the 'teen age. Separation of a boy from his parents has a profound influence. Home environment tends to foster inhibitions regarding sex. When removed far from those who care for his spiritual welfare, and thrown in the company of worldly wise and sex experienced men, a boy's standards may drop surprisingly fast. The army sponsors sex lectures, and warnings are given on the dangers of venereal diseases. A boy is informed that he is more manly if he abstains, and in the same breath given instructions regarding precautions. Many camps furnish soldiers with such "precautions" as they pass out the gate.

For men who live that type of life it is wise to guard against disease in this manner, but to indiscriminately distribute them among young, inexperienced lads, is to use the same princi-

ple as the woman who, on leaving her children for a time, puts a pan of beans before them and cautions them not to put them in their noses. When she returns home the children all have beans lodged in their noses, and it is necessary to obtain medical aid to remove them.

The psychological power of suggestion produced by the very act of providing boys with such equipment is so strong that it often results in the ultimate downfall of an heretofore clean young man.

Older men talk freely of their experience with women before these boys, and often taunt them for their lack of knowledge. Young boys are shocked and amazed to discover that sex gratification is deemed almost conventional. Respect for womanhood and clean living are considered old-maidish.

It may seem a harsh statement, but if a boy doesn't drink or run around with women, he has a difficult time finding friends in the army. As Mark Twain said, "Be good, and you'll be lonely." The soldier has no choice of his associates. He sleeps in barracks with many other men. He may be a total misfit for the group, but no consideration is given such matters in the army. If moral conditions of army and navy camps were realized by parents of lads being drafted, they would rise up in arms and demand legislation that would clean up and remedy them.

Instead of forcing 18 to 20 year old youths into military service, which is un-American and unconstitutional, why not make the army and navy attractive enough and fine enough to make such service a privilege? We have spent billions during the war for training and equipment. If we wish to maintain a strong peacetime army and navy, this nation should be willing to give their youth the finest training, and commensurate rates of pay. A year or two of college or vocational training should be offered under good instructors, where young men entering could have psychologists aid them in choosing their life occupations according to their talents and abilities. Expert military training could be given in conjunction with professional and technical education. At the termination of training, the government should aid such men in obtaining employment and allow them to return to civilian life until such time as need for mobilization would arise.

These camps or schools should be managed by Christian men equipped to aid in the spiritual welfare and moral uplift of our boys. Sex training of the right kind is vital. Boys should be taught to respect womanhood; how to choose a life-partner; the role a father should take in child-training, and how to make themselves worthy to be the head of a home.

You can readily see a new generation springing up from such training as this. Volunteers would be plentiful and over a period of a few years a powerful army of skilled men could be call-

ed to arms almost instantly. Men equipped to follow the profession for which they are most qualified are happy men. Men kept clean in mind and body will choose women like them, and their children will build a strong, peaceful nation and world.

Let's keep America American, where the pursuit of happiness is the inalienable right of every man, with liberty and justice for all.

LEE comments: This expose of camp-life is worth a lot of study. My own experience bears out all that the author says — and more too, as there are many other vices he has not mentioned that the young chap newly in camp is almost forced to learn about, if not actually to try.

"If our feelings and emotions are the only realities which we know at first hand in very essence, and of the most stirring of all emotions is what the world calls love, then is it not true that the nearest we ever get to reality or to God is when great love is in our hearts?"

— "Zero To Eighty"
by E. F. Northrup.

RELIGION, AS I BELIEVE IT.

by K. Martin Carlson.

I believe that if we follow nature, we will come closer to the true religion. On every side we see religion in practice. Every other form is but a sham. The main idea seems to be survival. (Isn't the "hereafter" legend, but a desire to live again after death?)

We all concede that there was a superior force or (?), no one will ever know what, that started the universe rolling as it were. We do know that we live, and that there is more to this spacedom, than the earth and planets. The stars seem to hold part of the secret. But we will never know it.

I can't seem to believe all the stories in the Bible, and therefore, I couldn't be called a true Christian. To be a true follower, I should maintain that the savages in Africa are all wrong praying to their gods; that the Asiatics are wrong in following their idols.

It seems to me that THE ALL-POWERFUL GOD should have enough power to at least hold his chosen people together. Or are we just a higher form of animal, as Darwin said? The best he is able to do, is to keep things going.

Our heaven and hell exist only here on earth. Our wrong doing generally catches up with us in some form or other. Our good deeds endear us to others and promote a better life. We are continually striving for better things, simply the survival idea again. By bettering ourselves we have an easier time to survive (or live).

If we try to do right in all things we are apt to get along better with our fellow men. This earth was placed here for our use. WHY should we worry so much about the future? We can surmise that THAT will also be taken care of at the proper time. No, our small efforts will not change things. Our world-conceived religions will have little bearing on the future in store for what is left of us at death. Perhaps it is a good idea that we cannot look into the future. It saves us a lot of worrying. I believe that worry is our biggest enemy here on earth, as they say. And it can be connected up to that survival idea again. Worry or fear spoiled many a caveman's sleep.

I may or may not have the wrong slant at things, and would certainly appreciate it if some one can prove to me that religion is necessary in this world of ours. They are doing a poor job of it now, even with Hell to hold over our heads.

Many of our scientists and professors can find no real value in it. Many are not Christians, themselves.

Buddha, Jesus, Mohammed and others, were just leaders in their times, seeking a better life for their followers.

So, if we live right and follow close to nature, we will have our religion, so to speak.

EEE comments: I have the greatest respect for Martin and know he is an earnest and deep thinker. But I cannot follow him in his religious beliefs. Were I to believe wholly as he does, there would be no point and reason in life, and I would not care a bit about continuing to live. I do admit that there is much in Nature that will show us the Truths of God, when we have learned to evaluate them properly, and understand their message.

But then, perhaps Martin is right, and I am wrong. We can only keep seeking, conscientiously and earnestly, and follow the thing that seems right to us.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE DILETTANTE.

by Art Widner.

Perhaps the readers of this article have been prejudiced irretrievably by the use of the word "dilettante" in the title. The ordinary impression that comes to mind upon sight or sound of the symbol, is one of a fop; a bored idler who yawns his way through a life consisting of golf, concerts, cocktail parties, and other such esthetic pretensions in monotonous succession.

But he will be considered here in a larger, and kinder, sense. Consider him for the nonce, as a person with the ambitions and sensitivity of an artist, but perhaps without the drive or talent. A person who appreciates leisure and uses it to best advantage for his own happiness. One who is fascinated and curious about everything outside the range of dull normal human experience, regarding most of what lies within that range with mild amusement and disdain.

Now the teeming warrens and clanking beehives of our "modern civilization" have produced another type. This one takes life quite seriously indeed. He "learns something well", "gets ahead", "makes something of himself", and "becomes a success". Verily, says our culture, he is one to be emulated. This fellow will be labelled a "specialist".

Not to be confused with the specialists are the few who enjoy doing one thing to the exclusion of all else. They are happy. Selah. Also, many of them are artists or scientists whose labors help to alleviate our existence, although ours seldom help to alleviate theirs.

In a purely utilitarian fashion, the specialist fits into our competitive culture rather nicely. But there is a serious doubt as to whether competition is the best method of attaining our goal. Our goal, presumably, as Poffenberger puts it, is to "attain the maximum of social productivity and the minimum of personal satisfaction". But hark to Robert Sherwood: "...where this country went wrong was when it began the deification of the doctrine of every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost".

It is difficult for the dilettante to discern a valid reason behind all the frantic activity of the specialists. On the surface, it seems to indicate considerable forethought. If one concentrates on a particular activity, pursuing it diligently for many years (says the specialist), in the end he can sit back and enjoy what remains of his existence. This would be a capital idea (pun intended), except that in the main, it is a huge swindle and a tricky mirage of the first order.

It is a mirage because by the time dividend day has rolled

around, one is too worn out (with a sour stomach and a disposition to match) to put the benefits received to any good use. This is making an unwarranted assumption that the benefits are received! Often the nose is so firmly attached to the grindstone that it cannot be removed. One putters around dismally, and finally succumbs from sheer boredom (or the grind itself!) or goes back to work -- not because it seems attractive still, but because the old groove is more comfortable than the agoraphobia resulting from the unfolding picture of vast quantities of empty time. Frequently the dividend is not as large as anticipated, in which case it's back to work, jerk, or turn in your air castles for a bowl of soup. Sometimes, due to unforeseen calamities, there is no dividend at all. Sad.

Mankind struggles and sweats for a streamlined, chromium-plated Utopia, where it can relax and let machines do all the work. The dilettante looks upon this prefabricated ideal with justifiable cynicism. He is already relaxed, occupied with his innumerable interests, performing such tasks for society as are necessary for his comfort and convenience, and watching nonplussed as the lemmings go squeaking, pushing, and crowding across the sands of time to drown themselves in the sea of neurotic discontent. He knows his destiny will wait for him....

RON LANE,
22 Beresford Road, Longsight, Manchester, 13, England.

Dear Everett,

What does one call you? EEE? Edward? Surely not Th' Ol' Foo. Anyhow, I like Everett. ((Yes, that's the name by which I am usually called, it being the one my parents used in addressing me, although I am at times called by all of the others, and others not usually printable.—EEE.))

Being now eligible for FAPA, Watson has sent me some stuff along, among the same is an unusually pleasant mag called THE TIME-BINDER. I say pleasant, as the first thing that strikes me is the sane attitude of the editor; far removed from the bombast and supercilious sneers of several "top" fans, whose attitude is, after all, mere snobbery, even if unconsciously so. There are many who consider that to be serious one must be profound, but truth is not involved, but simple, if the way to it is hard.

I've only skimmed through THE TIME-BINDER, but am as I say very pleased with it. No show of culture, no sophisticated language, but a sincerity which is greatly to your credit — I refer to your own stuff in chief.

To comment more fully. You need not attempt to justify TTB, it doesn't need it. Whether you make "converts" or not, it is good to see one echoing with such evident sincerity one's own views; a further support for a faith momentarily shaken by the atomic bomb. You are not a little man; if you believe as you write in TTB, then I do not believe you yourself believe this. No one who does as he can to help his fellows is little and many who consider themselves above the common man are less; the meek shall inherit the earth.

The problem of the C.O. is not easy. Over here there is a turmoil in pacifist circles seeking not for a faith but for a way to apply faith. From a narrow point of view the problem will in time be solved; the atom bomb does not need a million men behind it. But the pacifist cannot even here ignore war. Faced with war, and the might of a modern state, all he can do is register his protest, and by his example assert a faith which lies deep in man. There is no questioning the courage of the true pacifist; it is of a higher order than the soldier's, for the herd instinct is strong, and to buck it is harder than to follow it.

In reply to Mrs. Wesson. The soldier seldom goes to war because of his ideals. Would his ideals prevent him leaving the army when he has the chance? He joins because his friends have joined, because he has been inflamed to believe the enemy is vile. He takes the path of the herd. War solves nothing.

Now there is every reason to believe that the atomic bomb has sown bloody hate of the Americans in Japan; and they will

rise again. As to the bestiality of the Japs, in the first place you must remember that the Japs think little of death, and they naturally apply their standards to the enemy, as we do. And the Allies have no monopoly of virtues. Jap prisoners have been shot out of hand, and the dropping of the atomic bomb on an unwarned town with full knowledge of the fact that there were to be quarter of a million casualties is the most barbarous act of this war.

The CO does not assert that he is independent of the group. He asserts that his first allegiance is to mankind. The American or British pacifist is one with the Japanese pacifist — and many such exist. At the moment we have reached the stage of national communities — and why did you stop there? "All the way up the fundamentals of naked survival force men to unite..." Obviously the next step is to go beyond the national stage. "There must be a group code for the common good". You are right; you would not apply the code that allows of war between nations to families; nor can it be applied to the society of nations toward which we must proceed. The pacifist only carries your argument a step further; you preach support of the nation; he support of man. And by your own argument you cannot accuse the Japanese; for they just act as the patriotic American.

The pacifist does not sit down with his arms crossed, and say "I don't believe". Such a statement reveals your emotional and irrational state. You invoke Christ. Would he have murdered Japs because some of them commit atrocities? Would he, as alas many church leaders have done, preach a holy war on the Japs?

Truly, happiness lies in creation, and in part in all the little things which one can do to help others. Yet one has a duty to one'sself, for to live fully in this life one must develop to a goal, the search for truth, or God, as some call it. I believe that spiritual evolution is the only criterion of progress and I believe that such progress lies in the search for unity — I believe ultimately man must transcend his individuality, but only when he has developed to the utmost, when the individuals joyfully renounce the "I" for a "We"; when such a community of beings attains a new individuality, as high above the ego of the state as this is above the individual member. For I believe that a nation is much more than a collection of individuals. And I believe that each super mind in turn must attain maturity and coalesce into a great whole enriching with its hard won experience each new being — each of which is again more than those which united to form it.

Mr creed is an extension of Buddhism largely. I'm inclined to Buddha's doctrine of karma and rebirth, but the Eight Fold Path is surely only the law for the progress of the individual. When the soul is fully developed it attains Nirvana, but arguing by analogy with the indefinable something which is the soul

of a nation, I believe that a community of souls can achieve to a higher truth than the fully developed individual. Progress lies in the search for unity.

EEE comments: We have long wished that we might have an expression on the CO question from one of our British cousins, and now we have it, and exceptionally well expressed. Your comments on your Buddhistic views also interesting, and giving new vistas of thought which one would do well to follow in his personal search for Truth. I recently purchased a book on the Religions of the World, which I am finding interesting reading.

"All men are born to greatness,
because all are born to possess
God."

— Geddes and Thomson.

LOUIS RUSSELL CHAUVENET.

Dear EEE,

Thanx for THE TIME-BINDER (#4). Nobody can say you don't mean well, and though, as you are aware, your present optimism seems rather weird to me, I have at least learned my own limitations sufficiently to be without any wish to jeer at others, how ever wildly mistaken they may seem to me.

Until fairly recently, the influence of my wide reading among humanitarian and socialist writers rather prejudiced me in favor of the ultimate ability of man, somehow, sometime, to live amicably in the "Equality" of which Bellamy wrote, or in that fair, fantastic world of "Men Like Gods" which Wells set forth for me, a beacon in the night, when I was many years younger.

The conflict between these ideal societies of just men and what I actually experience in the world we live in has troubled me more and more as I have grown older. My chief reaction was an increased short-term pessimism, but, as my letter in the #2 TTB indicated, I never abandoned my hope for a future improvement of man's status; I simply relegated the date far up some indefinite future. Of course there was a fundamental contradiction between the observation of no improvement in man's civilization (as distinct from his technology) for recorded history, and my unfounded assumption that a glorious improvement was to take place in some unspecified future by some unknown means.

But this belief in a future Golden Age was practically my religion for a long time, and religions are, after all, matters of faith, not of logic. Then, too, I was helped by the cheerful capacity of the human brain for believing contradictory things without being much troubled by the contradictions. All this is fortunately no longer necessary. The dilemma has been explained to me, and I am greatly relieved to have been shown why I was having such trouble to reconcile two different worlds. The man who brought enlightenment was Albert Jay Nock, in his book, "Memoirs of a Superfluous Man". He in turn drew the waters of wisdom from an essay by Ralph Adams Cram, entitled "Why We Do Not Behave Like Human Beings". I shall quote:

"Mr. Cram's thesis is that we do not behave like human beings because the great majority of us, the masses of mankind, are not human beings. We have all along assumed that the zoological classification of man is also a competent psychical classification; that all creatures having the physical attributes which put them in the category of Homo sapiens also have the psychical attributes which put them in the category of human beings; and this, Mr. Cram says, is wholly unwarranted and an error of the first magnitude. Consequently we have all along been putting expectations upon the masses of Homo sapiens which they are utterly incapable of meeting. We have accepted them as psychically-

human, dealt with them on that assumption, and expected a corresponding psychical reaction, when actually nothing of the sort is possible. They are merely the sub-human ~~raw~~ material out of which the occasional human being is produced by an evolutionary process as yet unexplained, but no doubt catastrophic in character, certainly not progressive. Hence, in as much as they are the raw material of humanity, they are inestimably precious.

"All this," (Nock continues, and my reactions to a large extent parallel his -- LRC), "upset me frightfully.....I still believed that the masses of mankind are indefinitely improvable. Yet all the time I could see clearly that this view presented difficulties with which I could do nothing. How was it, for example, that I could find no shred of respectable evidence that psychically the masses of mankind had budged a single peg in six thousand years? Again, what about the enormous psychical spread between Socrates, Confucius, Marcus Aurelius on the one hand, and on the other hand, Akka the Australian bushman? This spread was prodigiously, almost infinitely, greater than the spread between Akka and the anthropoid I ended by striking my colors as gracefully as possible.

"My change of philosophical base had one curious and wholly unforeseen effect, though it followed logically enough. Since then I have found myself quite unable to hate anybody or yet to lose patience with anybody One can hate human beings, at least I could—I hated a lot of them when that is what I thought they were -- but one can't hate sub-human creatures, or be contemptuous of them, wish them ill, regard them unkindly. If an animal is treacherous, you avoid him but can't hate him, for that is the way he is. If cattle trample down your garden, you drive them away but can't hate them, because you know they are acting up to the measure of their psychical capacity. If the mass-men are not human beings you cannot hate them for not behaving like human beings. The mass-men who are princes, presidents, politicians, legislators, can no more transcend their psychical capacities than any wolf, fox or polecat in the land. How then, is one to hate them, notwithstanding the appalling evil they do?

"My acceptance of Mr. Cram's theory also caused me for the first time really to like people at large. Before that I had frankly disliked people in the mass, though never unkindly. I was often amused by their doings, often interested, but with no feeling of affection But when one gets it firmly fixed in one's head that they are living up to the measure of their own capacities and can not by any conjuration increase those capacities to the point of marking themselves as human beings, one comes at once to like them. At least, to my great surprise, I found myself doing so."

At this point in reading Nock's remarks, I, too, struck my colors, and yielded to the inescapable truth of Cram's theory. Moreover, I was able to recall Odd John's very similar remarks,

when Odd John was admiring birds, fishermen, and other animals and humans who were living up to the measure of their capacities. What Odd John (and Stapledon) did not realize was that the bulk of the human race, on which they poured such scorn, was doing no more than that. Odd John sickened of us for not being fully human; had he realized how few of us possess the capacities for being fully human, I feel sure he would have laid his contempt aside.

I can see you, EE, protesting against the view that we have made no psychic progress whatever for at least the 6,000 years of recorded history. The illusion of progress is strong in this era. It is an illusion based, not on any increase in the wisdom and understanding which are the marks of the psychically human being, but rather in the increase of the technical information accumulated by the sagacity and cleverness which are the marks of the psychically sub-human, anthropoid mass-man.

((I promised not to interpolate, Russ, but I har forgotten, for the moment, this remark. I do NOT base my conclusions as to man's past advances merely on his technical discoveries. To me, he HAS made a lot of great psychical advances, particularly when you consider the greatly-increased proportion of present-day men who believe in, and practice the concepts of the few great philosophers of the past, and those who are forming new concepts today which have leave their mark on future history.—EEE)).

The human being can be educated; the mass-man can only be trained. There is a world of difference in this distinction. The society built up by trained, clever mass-men is a society permeated through and through by the philosophy of economism, rooted in the idea that the production, acquisition and distribution of wealth is the chief or only purpose in life.

In the words of Nock, "Economism kept bringing in a steadily increasing volume and variety of the apparatus of civilization, its comforts, conveniences, devices to save time and labor, with a curious consistency, the larger this volume of apparatus grew, the fewer and scantier the amenities of life became, and the faster general standards of civilization declined. One remarked the progress of this deterioration wherever one looked, in the current ideals of taste, manners, education, culture, religions, morals and art."

"Here again the neolithic masses of the present day have no historical measure of their own society; virtually no one knows anything of what has gone before him, still less could understand its interpretation. Virtually all accept economism's word for it that where you have 'prosperity', railways, banks, newspapers, industry, trade, there of necessity you have civilization. One who hinted that a society might have almost nothing of any of them and still be highly civilized, or that a society might have all these and yet remain uncivilized — anyone hinting at this would be laughed at."

I have quoted from Nock because I know that a mere urge to you and your readers to read his book would have much less effect than his actual words; but I think that if you now read his "Memoirs of a Superfluous Man" (published by Harper's Bros., in 1943) you will find it worthwhile. After all, in THE TIME-BINDER we are searching for truth, not for what pleases us most to imagine is or might be true.

Nock gives Cram's theory to explain why we do not act as human beings, and it is the only satisfactory theory I have yet seen. He also gives the 3 fundamental laws governing the conduct of mass-men: Epstean's Law, "Man tends always to satisfy his desires with the least possible effort", (this implies the fundamental nature of all types of exploitation); Gresham's Law, "the lowest common denominator sets the standard for the whole; bad money drives out good, etc."; and the Law of Diminishing Returns.

I have given you much of the discussion of Cram's theory. I should be interested to hear your reaction to Nock's discussion of the 3 basic laws in his book, if you read it.

Turning now to THE TIME-BINDER, the most striking thing appears to be Dr. Smith's letter, because his gloriously contradictory attitudes furnish me with such appetizing examples to emphasize the points previously made with the help of Nock. On the one hand Dr. Smith speaks with biting contempt of such members of the SF group as are unable to "think a lick"; and goes on to bring up the parable of casting pearls before swine. This is a clear indication that Dr. Smith becomes disgusted and contemptuous, at least to some extent, when zodlogically human individuals fail to exhibit psychically human behavior.

Unfamiliar with Cram's theory, Dr. Smith apparently fails to realize the rarity of human beings; and he expects from the anthropoid mass-men what they are incapable of giving him. Or, rather, he does not expect really human traits like wisdom and understanding from the anthropoid minds of mass-men, but nevertheless he blames them for the anthropoid character of their thought, while it will be at once clear from Cram's theory they cannot possibly be expected to outrun their natural endowments.

On the other hand, Dr. Smith joins you in believing man on the up-grade; he cites his stories as evidence of this view. I am sure Dr. Smith is quite sincere in this, but greatly as I have admired his many fine legends of the future, I can scarcely see anything more attractive in the world of Kimball Kinnison, than in the world of today, or the world of Cretan civilization, some millenia ago.

An endless proliferation of technical knowledge and devices is hardly to be confused with civilization, and I am personally rather unenthusiastic about having us undertake the familiar Conquest of the Universe, though I suppose if one does encounter

the nefarious Fenachrone & Co., prowling about interstellar regions, one has little choice.

Incidentally, lest I be misunderstood regarding the Cram hypothesis, let me say that I do not necessarily claim to be on the side of the angels. There is for me much grim evidence in favor of the theory to be found right in my own mind and character. There are only too many evidences of anthropoid thinking or behavior in my life; often I behave like a human being, but there are certainly times when my conduct could not be distinguished from that of the sub-human mass-man. This is by way of emphasizing the fact that there is no sharp division between the black and white, but always an inbetween gray area partaking of the qualities of both.

Returning to the beginning of THE TIME-BINDER, my ideas of religion are of course widely different from yours, but that does not prevent me from admiring your forthrightness in saying what you sincerely believe. Very likely you may be more nearly on the right track than myself; my ideas are based on my own experience and thinking, but I do not need to be told how limited both have necessarily been. The time has apparently passed when one may presume to take "All knowledge" for one's province, and I was never that presumptuous!

With these qualifications, then, I can go merrily ahead and express my personal reactions to the points of your credo. First I have no reason to suppose that such a thing as a Supreme Being exists, and if it be made a point of faith that such a being must be infinite, I at once dissent. I have no objection to the concept of beings immeasurably higher than men; there is evidently at least a possibility there may have actually been a "creation" of the world by such a superior being; but I am unable to believe any being, however superior, can be infinite. Certainly I never want to meet an infinite being; and MOST certainly never, if it has the attributes the Judaic-Christian mythos gives it.

My trouble is that even if it were shown me beyond a doubt that there existed a God with the character God shows in the Biblical record, I could not possibly feel the slightest wish to worship the "superior" being. I have always felt that the "superiority" of the Biblical Jehovah lay only, and exclusively, in such greater physical force as he was supposed to possess. God as a super-Hitler, complete with his Dachau and Buchenwald (otherwise known as Hell) evokes none of my admiration.

In this paragraph I have wandered from your simple statement into a denunciation of the God of orthodox religions; the reason for this is that I was brought up in such a religion (Catholic), and it has forever spoiled for me the whole idea of any Supreme Being, which otherwise might be a harmless and even beneficial philosophical concept.

I believe it is possible for a human mind to rise far above

its ordinary powers but I do not call this "understanding an Infinite Will", or anything like that. I should call it simply ~~tapping the ordinary unused portions of the human brain; we are~~
~~are given by Nature more resources than, in our inertie, we are~~
~~capable of~~

I believe the "Sons of God", the founders of great religions, were real human beings; indeed, exceptionally so. For this reason I'm not at all surprised at seeing how untold generations of mass-men, the anthropoid minds, have perverted their wise teachings. These perversions of, for example, Christ's sayings, foisted on me when I was young and defenseless, have rather unfairly prejudiced me against Christ's actual advice, much of which I might well profit from had I less distaste for "Christianity".

It has been well observed the first thing the "Christian" churches will do on Christ's second coming is to crucify him again, because obviously the first thing Christ would do would be to denounce them for the aforementioned perversion of his teachings. Of course, religious leaders who are divine would have no meaning for us; Christ's teachings are valuable for us if he was a man like us; they are worthless for US mortals if he was a divinity. To be sure, some, excessively concerned with their own salvation, cherish the divinity idea, but anxiety about one's own salvation does not seem to me truly religious.

I believe a man may increase his own insight by study and prayer. Whether an increase in such insight is identical with following the Will of God, etc., I'm sure I couldn't say; all my natural feelings lead me to doubt it, but I am often wrong.

I believe Christ's methods, which you consider workable and logical, are not even possible for any save a relatively few; they are so little apt to be generally adopted I have not troubled myself too much to inquire into their desirability. I know there are too many of his teachings I am far too anthropoid even to want to try to follow.

I believe the attainment of inner peace is of most value when achieved by one's own efforts. The 'peace' obtained by limp surrender to some powerful being, such as God, I identify with the 'peace' in the well known saying "They made a desert, and called it 'peace'."

What you say about good coming from following an infinite Will, and evil from crossing that Will is an old but meaningless catchword; if good results from any action, you say it was in accordance with God's Will; if evil results from any action, you say it was not in accordance with God's Will. Under these terms, how can God possibly lose? It's one of those heads-we-win, tails-you-lose propositions, of the sort that long since soured me on organized religions. (Your child is well? Give thanks to God. Your child has died? The Lord giveth, and the Lord taketh away;

blessed (!) be the name of the Lord).

"When man comes to ... practice the golden rule" you cheerfully say, the first step of the Infinite plan will be fulfilled. Ah well, these are sweet dreams. But as is clear from Cram's theory and the Three Laws governing human (ie, anthropoid-human) conduct, there is no chance of the even you hope for. As a practical rule for conduct the Golden Rule in its positive form, (as stated by Christ), is workable only in a society of psychically human beings. In a society largely composed of the Psychically anthropoid it is less useful except maybe as an exercise in self discipline. The Golden Rule in negative form, (as stated by Confucius), works in both societies pretty well, but is more a device for keeping out of trouble than anything else, and so hardly a real key to the Higher Life.

On the importance and value of small things, I quite agree with you, insofar as you refer to the trivia of our everyday lives. As to the glorification of the lesser tasks, I am less confident; it is convenient for me that there exist those willing to serve as garbage collectors, elevator operators, and to the innumerable other monotonous, moron-level jobs offered by our just society to the innumerable monotonous moron-level (or average level) mass-men who comprise the great majority of our population. It is convenient, yet I myself would not take such a job; and as far as I know, those satisfied with such jobs are largely the ones incapable of filling jobs much higher in classification. ((Russ, may this not be "Tallwood" talking now?))

In so far as I have had casual acquaintance with those in such lower strata of society I have found nothing in them that urges further acquaintance, or to suggest that they were fully human human beings; the anthropoidic stigmata are all too common. This is not to condemn them, of course, but merely to mention that 'the least of these' seem to me to be worth far less to humanity than the occasional fully developed psychically human human beings.

I quite agree that prayer can be strengthening, though with me this is more theory than practice. If I need strength I seek it within myself, not through prayer, a pragmatic method which seems to work well enough. (See Dr. Smith on "I am the captain of my soul".)

As to the Father concept of God, I should put it that, assuming God to exist, he feels towards me, in infinitely LESSER measure, desire for my well being like that I felt for my goldfish when I kept goldfish.

I agree whole-heartedly that the churches have lead the parade away from religion. But they had to, for most of their congregations are naturally, and have naturally always been, the psychically anthropoid mass-men and women. "Be ye good boys, go seek for heaven; come pay the priest that holds the key" aptly

dismisses most of our present degenerate creeds.

As to bringing about the will of the Infinite; if it be indeed Infinite is needs no help; if not, it is fallible and the question of whether it should be helped or not is debatable. I have never been able to understand why, even assuming the existence of a God, unquestioning, unthinking obedience to him or it should be viewed as the highest type of worship. Let it appear that God is limited, not infinite, in his powers; let it be plain that instead of being sole overlord of All, he is instead having troubles of his own, and experiencing difficulty in holding off the "Powers of Evil"; well, then, I should feel infinitely more sympathetic and like chipping in with my own miniscule aid. But the God of the orthodox, the God you describe as an "Infinite Will", has plainly no need of me, nor I of it. (It is a curious irony of the human character that an invisible, powerful deity has to be endowed with sex and called 'him', or 'her', to be acceptable for worship; gods taking the pronoun 'it', which is an impersonal God's proper pronoun from the standpoint of logic, will never be popular!).

In the last couple of pages I have run your cherished beliefs through the unfeeling meatgrinder of my own way of thinking; I am not sure that this was too well advised, for you are bound to feel a natural horror at what has been made of beliefs you sincerely cherish, and will undoubtedly tend to blame the meatgrinder rather than the philosophy that went into it. What could be more natural?

Yet my mind, however well equipped to dispose of philosophies not conforming to my arbitrary standards, does not consist solely of such meatgrinders and other destructive devices. Behind these outworks, and to some extent protected by them, exists the philosophic square cut stone tower, in the topmost chamber of which I toast my toes at the cheerful fire of a winter's evening, or walk on the balcony and contemplate the landscape reaching to infinity when the weather is fine. I need not tell at length the labor that went into the construction of this edifice or describe in detail how I strove with the giant blocks of other men's wisdom and the rough-hewn timbers of my own thinking, as I constructed this secure retreat. It is enough to mention that the very amount of time and thought gone into the building endears it to me.

Recently I redecorated my turret room rather extensively, and threw away a certain amount of my formerly cherished belongings in the process (see the earlier portion of my letter); but it is unthinkable that I could ever bear to leave my own strong tower to dwell in colorless anonymity in a hole in a wall, like millions of similar holes, in a vast communal dwelling of orthodox religions, of whatever creeds. What a man has created for himself, or had a share in creating, must be and is inestimably more precious to him than what he merely inherits, unchanged and unaltered by any efforts of his own, from some presumably 'high-

er' authority. But enough of this explanation: let me describe my philosophy, my stone tower chamber, with what brevity I may.

1) I believe in life, its endless variety; its stubborn tenacity, its triumphs and failures; its heights of joy; its chasms of despair. I believe in life as a wondrously diverting show which needs no ulterior purpose or meaning to justify it; I believe human fulfillment and peace of heart can be and by many is found simply in the enjoyment of life and the exercise of our powers.

2) I believe in happiness and contentment, and whoso destroys these in others, him I regard as evil and to be opposed. I believe all one's own self interests lie in being kind, generous and helpful to others; I believe that a crime against another is a crime against oneself also.

3) I believe that evil exists and must be vigorously opposed; I believe life must be destructive as well as constructive, or it could not long endure. This is the world we live on: Life feeds on life, as it has done for ages beyond our knowledge. Life is a struggle: I hold it weakness to refuse, for whatever motives, the challenge it presents. There are innumerable ways of accepting the challenge; there is the bold way of the fox or the peaceful way of the hare; all have their own rightness, but to turn one's back on life's challenge is death, if not to the body, then to the spirit, and usually to both.

4) I believe in the utter insignificance, not only of my own individual life, but also of our world in relation to our Universe, and possibly of our Universe in relation to some higher scheme of things beyond our understanding. I believe that it is just because we are, literally, not worth a damn, that all our fate and our future lies in our own hands. I believe that we are not the puppets or playthings of some higher sensate Power we are helpless to resist; I am thankful for our insignificance; it is precious to me, just as my own individual insignificance is something I am grateful for.

5) I believe in laughter, in children, in kittens, in green things growing; in friendship, in loyalty, and most of all in love.

6) I believe in death, its value, its necessity, even its cruelty; but most of all in its sure release: "Good night. Ensured release. Imperishable peace. Have these for yours!"

7) I believe, finally, in Serenity. Behind all the noise and hubbub, the crowded jostle of our diverse and interesting lives, I believe there should be an undisturbed and tranquil inner self immune against all fortune, good or ill. To my mind's tower room, of which I have spoken, I go most often in search of serenity. Many years ago I first perceived the necessity and value of serenity of the mind (which some call peace of the spir-

believe the things they do; they in turn are amazed that I can believe what I do. In circumstances like these jeering at faith seems unwise as well as unkind; I have no hesitancy in criticizing some particular creed, but who am I to condemn the believer in it, who finds his needs satisfied by it? I think my words are addressed rather to those who do not find their needs satisfied by their creed; and if I go to the trouble of writing all this, it is simply because I am interested in life (Point #1 of my own philosophy); and life of course includes ideas about life! And I cannot expect to sit in at the feast of ideas in THE TIME-BINDER with out occasionally contributing fare myself.

Passing over a few items I would ordinarily comment on if this letter were not already so monstrously long, I cannot resist some remarks on your reply to Harry Warner. Thank you for your example differentiating optimists and pessimists.

I feel thankful, reading your "optimistic" comment on the train wreck, that I fall into the "pessimistic" class here. The attempt to minimize disasters by the use of the word "only" is something I have always felt an instinctive revulsion for, just as I dislike euphemisms ("Passed away" for "died", etc.). "There is a severe shortage of food in Europe; however, ONLY a few million people will starve to death this winter; and scientists have discovered new methods of improved food production", is a statement in line with the "optimist" theory, but it makes me feel sick. So does the bright glad remark about the railroad wreck which you gave as an example.

Harry was right in calling on the ghost of Pollyanna! Everett, you are a fine man in many ways, and I admire you for many things (or I would not be writing this at all). But my difference with you is fundamental on this question, if your definition of 'optimism' is to be accepted. See point 3 in my philosophy. To minimize human tragedies is to undermine human values.

As to the rest of your remarks on p 19, I have previously indicated my reluctant admission of the fact that however much cleverness and sagacity have succeeded in giving us novel technical devices, there is no evidence at all of any increase in wisdom or understanding over the men of thousands of years ago, whose names have come down to us as the best of their times; I mean our best do not exceed their best (and we have a tremendously larger population to draw on).

Of course, it is clear that without an increase in human wisdom and understanding we will be unable to master the technical devices our entropoid cleverness and sagacity have burdened us with; the fabric of our society may endure no better than did that of Rome or more ancient civilizations.

As one who has from an early age killed repeatedly and remorselessly, without ever suffering any troubled conscience from it, I am rather indifferent to the argument over C.O. I have

er' authority. But enough of this explanation: let me describe my philosophy, my stone tower chamber, with what brevity I may.

1) I believe in life, its endless variety; its stubborn tenacity, its triumphs and failures; its heights of joy; its chasms of despair. I believe in life as a wondrously diverting show which needs no ulterior purpose or meaning to justify it; I believe human fulfillment and peace of heart can be and by many is found simply in the enjoyment of life and the exercise of our powers.

2) I believe in happiness and contentment, and whoso destroys these in others, him I regard as evil and to be opposed. I believe all one's own self interests lie in being kind, generous and helpful to others; I believe that a crime against another is a crime against oneself also.

3) I believe that evil exists and must be vigorously opposed; I believe life must be destructive as well as constructive, or it could not long endure. This is the world we live on: Life feeds on life, as it has done for ages beyond our knowledge. Life is a struggle: I hold it weakness to refuse, for whatever motives, the challenge it presents. There are innumerable ways of accepting the challenge; there is the bold way of the fox or the peaceful way of the hare; all have their own rightness, but to turn one's back on life's challenge is death, if not to the body, then to the spirit, and usually to both.

4) I believe in the utter insignificance, not only of my own individual life, but also of our world in relation to our Universe, and possibly of our Universe in relation to some higher scheme of things beyond our understanding. I believe that it is just because we are, literally, not worth a damn, that all our fate and our future lies in our own hands. I believe that we are not the puppets or playthings of some higher sensate Power we are helpless to resist; I am thankful for our insignificance; it is precious to me, just as my own individual insignificance is something I am grateful for.

5) I believe in laughter, in children, in kittens, in green things growing; in friendship, in loyalty, and most of all in love.

6) I believe in death, its value, its necessity, even its cruelty; but most of all in its sure release: "Good night. Ensured release. Imperishable peace. Have these for yours!"

7) I believe, finally, in Serenity. Behind all the noise and hubbub, the crowded jostle of our diverse and interesting lives, I believe there should be an undisturbed and tranquil inner self immune against all fortune, good or ill. To my mind's tower room, of which I have spoken, I go most often in search of serenity. Many years ago I first perceived the necessity and value of serenity of the mind (which some call peace of the spir-

it); a long time passed in which I had little hope of attaining to any such state; but within the last couple of years I have been encouraged to believe that in another fifty years I may well be able to attain complete serenity of mind at all times. In the meantime my rare moments of serenity slowly become more frequent and each is uncommunicably refreshing. I can understand now, as I never could before, what it is that monks and hermits seek, though I hardly think their paths the surest. One learns to become serene in spirit by learning to surmount the perpetual trivia and troubles of daily life, not by removing these through an artificial isolation. In any case, I have said most about the 7th point because of them all it is perhaps the most important, ill as I should like to rate them in any order of importance.

Returning to THE TIME-BINDER, I liked Milt Rothman's article, not for any novelty of facts or thought, but for the unpretentious simplicity of the angle from which it was written (and observed).

Leslie Croutch's ideas on Every Day Religion made me smile not unkindly. You often hear his remark about adhering to the 10 Commandments being a recipe for a better world, but do you hear it from people who have studied them in their original phrasing carefully? (Exodus Ch. 20). Nobody can object to the simpler injunctions to refrain from committing various crimes; but the primary fault of the 10 Commandments is the negative character. It is not enough to refrain from killing a fellow man; you should help him when he is in danger. It is not enough to refrain from looting his house; you should turn out to help him save it from fire or robbers in case of need. It is not enough, not to bear false witness; it is needful to speak the truth, even when it might be easier to be silent. Aside from this, it is idle to expect us to admire one who openly proclaims himself a jealous God. This automatically rhrows out the provisions of the 10 Commandments concerned with this jealous God's honor and glory.

Another thing wrong with the 10 Commandments is that for psychically human members of our race, they are superfluous for the most part; whereas the psychically anthropoid, the great majority, have never pretended to keep them, and there is no conceivable expectation of their ever wanting to. (They would also ignore my suggested positive code, I know).

As for Croutch's belief in God, that seems important only to him; to me the question "Does God exist?" is nearly meaningless, varying in such meaning as it may have, depending on how you define "God". It's absurd of Croutch to postulate atheists either 'egotistical' or afflicted with 'deficient imaginations', but it is all too common a human trait to assume that something must be wrong with someone who doesn't see things your way. I have been trying to eradicate this trait from myself for a long time, but it is difficult to do.

Croutch does not notice that when he 'explains' the Universe

by God, he has avoided explaining God. The usual religions say God was self-created, but that sounds neither more nor less absurd to me than the idea of the universe being self-created. It is also sometimes asserted that God was always around. This again is neither more nor less plausible than the assertion that matter and energy in one form or another have existed from eternity. How can we possibly KNOW anything about these assertions? It's mere verbal flimflam, and means hardly anything at all.

Croutch also, it seems to me, is off-track in demanding his mythical 'doubter' to set up scientific reasons for his emotional behavior. What has all this got to do with religion or the existence of God? Very little, unless Croutch means it as a defense for religion being emotional rather than logical; and of course hardly anyone (not I) would try to defend any such proposition as the logical nature of religious feelings!

As for Croutch's methods of prayer; well and good insofar as they go. Undoubtedly his prayings help him to concentrate better after a brief moment of complete relaxation; he is able to draw on strength within himself and can do better. It is unimportant that he imagines the 'help' to be external. Incidentally, if I thought he was actually receiving external help from an immortal being for the accomplishment of his various jobs and tasks, I should protest vigorously to Croutch's union, and have him expelled for taking unethical advantage of his fellow mortals deprived of such celestial assistance. But as it is, I believe the idea of the Creator and Ruler of a Universe stretching untold billions of light years, populated, for all we know, by untold millions of races of diverse creatures, with billions of individuals per race — the idea of such a being taking the time and trouble to interfere with the daily activities of one individual of one such race seems wondrously funny to me. My sense of humor would never let me imagine myself that important; perhaps after all Croutch is right in saying people like me have 'deficient imaginations', flexible as mine has sometimes seemed to me in other respects.

Croutch's idea that it takes 50 years to evolve a philosophy of living overlooks the fact that times flows at such varying rates in the mental and physical life of living organisms of various kinds, especially human kinds. Maybe it would take 50 or 70 or forever, in an uneventful life marked by few or no crises and little spiritual awareness; or it might take 10 or less for a child brought up amid violence and upheavals. Or you can have all intermediate stages. My philosophy is not complete; to return to my analogy, I may find always more changes to make in the furnishings of my tower chamber; but the tower itself is now built, for better or worse, and short of unimaginable stresses destroying it completely I will scarcely forsake its shelter and venture out into the wilderness again!

Yes, faith is marvellous, but not necessarily the way that Croutch meant it. It often seems amazing to me that people can

believe the things they do; they in turn are amazed that I can believe what I do. In circumstances like these jeering at faith seems unwise as well as unkind; I have no hesitancy in criticizing some particular creed, but who am I to condemn the believer in it, who finds his needs satisfied by it? I think my words are addressed rather to those who do not find their needs satisfied by their creed; and if I go to the trouble of writing all this, it is simply because I am interested in life (Point #1 of my own philosophy); and life of course includes ideas about life! And I cannot expect to sit in at the feast of ideas in THE TIME-BINDER with out occasionally contributing fare myself.

Passing over a few items I would ordinarily comment on if this letter were not already so monstrously long, I cannot resist some remarks on your reply to Harry Warner. Thank you for your example differentiating optimists and pessimists.

I feel thankful, reading your "optimistic" comment on the train wreck, that I fall into the "pessimistic" class here. The attempt to minimize disasters by the use of the word "only" is something I have always felt an instinctive revulsion for, just as I dislike euphemisms ("Passed away" for "died", etc.). "There is a severe shortage of food in Europe; however, ONLY a few million people will starve to death this winter; and scientists have discovered new methods of improved food production", is a statement in line with the "optimist" theory, but it makes me feel sick. So does the bright glad remark about the railroad wreck which you gave as an example.

Harry was right in calling on the ghost of Pollyanna! Everett, you are a fine man in many ways, and I admire you for many things (or I would not be writing this at all). But my difference with you is fundamental on this question, if your definition of 'optimism' is to be accepted. See point 3 in my philosophy. To minimize human tragedies is to undermine human values.

As to the rest of your remarks on p 19, I have previously indicated my reluctant admission of the fact that however much cleverness and sagacity have succeeded in giving us novel technical devices, there is no evidence at all of any increase in wisdom or understanding over the men of thousands of years ago, whose names have come down to us as the best of their times; I mean our best do not exceed their best (and we have a tremendously larger population to draw on).

Of course, it is clear that without an increase in human wisdom and understanding we will be unable to master the technical devices our entropoid cleverness and sagacity have burdened us with; the fabric of our society may endure no better than did that of Rome or more ancient civilizations.

As one who has from an early age killed repeatedly and remorselessly, without ever suffering any troubled conscience from it, I am rather indifferent to the argument over C.O. I have

wrought destruction of untold mice, rats, flies and other living creatures whose existence seemed to menace or impair the well-being of myself and other forms of life I considered more worthwhile. If I kill flies to keep them from spreading disease germs which may kill me or people I like, (or people I don't like), then I do not see why I should hesitate to kill other sources of threats to me and those I like and love. I know what the Germans did in Poland and other countries; I spent the war in the peaceful comfort of the USA, and have no desire to be a fire-eater on paper when I saw no combat; but had I been called on to serve I would have done so to the best of my ability, with no regrets over the destruction being meted out to the destroyer. (Point 3 of my philosophy covers this).

It is possible to hypnotize a hen by putting her beak on the ground and drawing a visible white line away from her beak; the poor creature remains helplessly in her awkward attitude, oblivious to reality or (presumably) to a fox that might be on her track. I do not condemn the hen, she cannot help it; but surely I do not admire her either. My attitude towards COs is much like my attitude towards the hen; they are in my eye paralyzed by the non-violence idea; they can't help being like that but God help the human race if their ideas prevailed; we'd need divine aid then, for otherwise it's a sure road to extinction.

Of course, this attitude of mine refers only to the CO part of a CO's philosophy. Insofar as a CO may be also a brave man, and serve his country well in dangerous or peaceful pursuits, surely I am quite willing to give him all the credit he earns. The bravery it takes to stand out against the crowd I acknowledge, too; but it will never be possible for me to admire a philosophic concept so unrealistic and almost literally hell-doomed (for if it prevailed among our intelligent classes, the psychically anthropoid masses would unrestrainedly create a glorious(?) anarchy in which it would be little consolation to reflect that the COs would be the first to perish).

The basic fallacy of the CO line of thought is that life MUST live on life. I have little doubt that a carrot, in its limited way, enjoys life just as much as the vegetarian who thinks he is humane because he feeds on the innocent unsuspecting carrot instead of the ditto lamb. The CO may object to killing to the point where he will not even voluntarily kill an insect of any kind, but if he eats at all he will have to get along on a diet of milk, fruits, (taking care not to destroy the seeds), and well, there is not really much else available if he wants to be thorough. Even so, he cannot prevent his body from destroying bacteria that seek to invade it, or if he does manage this feat, it will positively be his last one! There was a faintly amusing story in Astounding along these lines not too long ago; perhaps suggested by the customs of the Jain priesthood in India.

To be sure, few COs attempt to carry their conclusions to

this extreme point. They stop somewhere along the road, as suits their convenience. The most plausible case is the simple refusal to kill a human being, without implying any refusals to kill flies, etc. Point 3 of my philosophy entitles me to oppose evil. The most effective way to do it is to exterminate it. Ordinarily we do not judge others to the extent of killing them because they possess certain evil traits; we know people are like that, including ourselves. I myself have never felt a personal wish to kill any particular person; but I am sure that if I could do it I would kill in self-defense or in defense of my wife, or a friend, etc. I would not be particularly trying to kill the assailant, but to disable him completely so as to make further assault impossible. Should this result in his death, it certainly wouldn't bother me.

Suppose, on the other hand, I should not be defending, but an avenger. I think if someone killed my wife or anyone close to me, and I surprised him in the act, I would do my very best to mete out the same savage penalty he had inflicted. These reactions in myself I have been discussing are I think deep-seated instincts, and on the whole have been and will be useful to the race, as far as sheer survival goes. But unless any advanced type survives, is it really advanced? I think not; I have always considered Odd John a biologically inferior mutant, because self destructive.

As for relationship between atheism and CO, I myself never heard that the CO concept had to be identified with any particular set of religious or irreligious beliefs.....

Art Widner's letter is, as usual, interesting; but the only thing I want to say about socialism vs. capitalism is that it is a rather unimportant thing which system happens to be in effect; what matters is the way the system is being run. As long as the philosophy of economism prevails, I don't see much hope for anything more significant than an endless, meaningless proliferation of technical devices; civilization will remain at the same level, as low as usual. Socialism offers the chance for greater opportunities; but turn the coin over, and see that it also offers the chance for greater tyrannies. It has been long known that when you hand over to the State the power to do things FOR you, you also give it the power to do things TO you, and it seems to be the lamentable characteristic of all known States to exercise the latter power as much, and the former power as little as possible. So I am not a Socialist any more.....

Your reply to Art finds me quite inclined to agree with you.

EEE comments: Although this letter was much longer than any of the others hitherto printed, I felt that it was so ably written, and contained so many fine points, that it should be run in its entirety.

I shall not attempt to analyze it — it speaks for itself, as I have spoken my own philosophies for myself. Suffice it to say I have read and reread and studied it carefully, and shall again. It may be that some points therein expressed will dorce a change in my own philosophies as I find new data which contradicts or contravenes which I have hitherto known; or it may not.

Anyway, I sincerely feel that Russell deserves the thanks of myself, and also of all the readers of THE TIME-BINDER, for the time and effort he has put into this splendid work. I only wish that more of our readers would do the same thing.

MARI BETH WHEELER, U. S. C. G.

Dear Everett:

I have just finished reading THE TIME-BINDER. I must admit it leaves me with mixed emotions. I'm inclined to agree with Dr. Smith. Fans being what they are you have laid yourself open to a lot of criticism.

Most fans (of the ones I've met), seem to think being a fan also means being a non-believer. Frankly I don't know what I believe. I was raised a Catholic as you know, and do not come from an overly religious family, as you also know. I'm sure that if I were to analyze my feelings fully, I'd find that they follow the Catholic concepts pretty closely. That being a pure case of believing more fully the things that one has been taught from early childhood and also arising from the fact that I have never found a religion that fills the bill better for me.

The format and general appearance of your mag comes closer to what I think a fanzine should look like than any I've ever seen -- even LeZ. It has dignity and a "quietness" that I like. Good luck, Everett.

EEE comments: Coming from the editress of "ROSEBUD", one of the finest magazines in Fandom, that is high praise, indeed, and very much appreciated, Mari Beth.

I do not think the particularities of one's religion are of so much moment as whether or not it satisfies that person's own innermost feelings and longings.

Thanks again for the comments, and best of luck to you, and hopes that you may soon return to civilian status.

JAY CHIDSEY.

Dear Everett:

Received the third THE TIME-BINDER last night. This effort of yours fascinates me. Thank you very much for sending it to me. In return I am going to try to set down here upon paper my ideas, ideals and beliefs. Immature, and half-formed, yes. But the ideals of youth are important too, 3E — they are the building blocks, the unmixed mortar, of that bright new world we too see.

I am seventeen. In March I shall be eighteen. I will probably be allowed to finish high school before I am called into service. If, by that time, the draft has coughed its last, I intend to go to college next year. Ohio State, or Oberlin (where Aluminum was first commercially separated from its ore (Al_2SO_4 , or something.))

I like school very much and participate in many activities. I'm not much in athletics, but am manager of the football team, Editor of our School Paper, President of our Class and probably some other stuff. I even have time to dabble in school work. The point is, I'm not neurotic, I think my ideas are fairly representative of today's youth and of fandom.

I believe in myself! That is my first and probably, when everything else is stripped away, only tenet of faith.

Because I believe in myself, my ability, my destiny (made by myself, not predestined) and purpose, I believe in people, in my race, in man. In VanVogt's marvelous race of man. In Smith's magnificent star-strung civilization. Not as a thing to be striven toward, but as containing the essence of my idealism for my brethren. Man will reach the stars.

God. Do I believe in a supreme power? I am sure I am not a true atheist. I don't have a ruffled beard, I don't blaspheme God's name (except in initiation), I don't try to convert people who believe in God. I admire their belief. I feel sorry I cannot emulate them. Perhaps someday I shall gain the "insight into the Supreme Being" you speak of.

It seems to me that any Being all powerful enough to do all attributed to him would have small time to bother with me, or to be a "big brother". I am not ridiculing Lesles Croutch, believe me. But I can sympathize with those who do scoff. I am a great Christian without belief, an atheist without ardour, a crusader without a cause, or a saint without a reason.

I do not believe in predestination. If I believed I was not at the controls of my life I should lose almost all joy of life. "What profiteth it a man who gains the world and loses his own soul?"

To me the soul is the ego — the self-determination we all should have. "Invictus" curiously enough, is one of my favorite poems, others are "Osymondius", "How Do I Love Thee", "If", "patriotism", "On His 75th Birthday" (Landor), "Little Boy Blue" — that is about it. I think the poetry one likes tells much.

EEE comments: It is my considered opinion that as long as this world continues to produce 17-year-old men who think as logically, cogently and concisely as Jay does, we shall keep on progressing. You are absolutely right when you say that "the ideals of youth are important, too". They are, if anything, far more important than are those of mature men, since they are the beginnings (through such dreams, hopes, aspirations and forming -ideals) of the THINGS THAT ARE TO BE!

Many of us who are far older than Jay would do well to emulate his open-mindedness, his eagerness and willingness to learn new facts AND ACCEPT THEM WHEN PROVEN, and his tolerance of the thoughts and ideals of those whom he does not yet fully understand.

Such a letter from a youth makes all the efforts put into the publishing of THE TIME-BINDER more than worth while.

POSTSCRIPTUS.

Thus begins the second year of this attempt to make, with all of you, some Adventures Into Thinking. Both the quantity and the calibre of the letters and articles submitted for publication, following the initial issue, have confirmed my belief that there is a real place for such a magazine of sincere attempts to delve into the life philosophies and beliefs of the Common Men and Women of our circle.

It is your Editor's sincere hope that you have gained something worthwhile from the reading and study of the various articles and letters that have appeared in this journal. Not that we want or expect you always to agree — your Editor very often does not agree with all that is printed herein, coming from others.

But he does sincerely believe that no one can afford to set himself up as the ultimate authority on anything; that only from keeping an open mind and searching constantly for new ideas and new facts and brighter ideals which he can study and then either accept or reject as seems best to him, can anyone advance himself along The Road, and become an Adequate and Well-Integrated Personality.

Incidentally, I have been very much pleased to learn from a reader, that this magazine and its contents has been used as the basis for discussions in a group of people to whom it was introduced, and that they find much of interest and profit in it.

We take great pride in presenting our new cover, the work of our good friend and grand artist, Jack Wiedenbeck. We hope you will study it carefully and note its symbolism. We think it has a very fine message for you.

May we wish you all a wonderful 1946, with true progress in life, and the nearer attainment of all your goals.

"We must at all costs get rid of this despair of any amelioration of man's lot. There is too much chopping of words. People say to me, 'But man will in himself be no better for amelioration of his physical conditions.' To which no reply whatever can be made. For if people wish to be saved as pigs instead of being saved as humans, and refuse to see that a self-respecting man in self-respecting circumstances, sound in head and limb, has more chance of coming to some sane conclusions as to the universe and how to adapt himself to it, it is quite impossible to find any ground for discussion."

Robert Nichols, in "Golgotha & Co."