

TIGHT BEAM 19

This 19th issue of TIGHTBEAM, the letterzine of the National Fantasy Fan Federation, is edited and published by Dave Hulan at 3806 Pinedale Dr. SW, Huntsville, Ala., on Jötun Press, making this Jötun Publication # 29. TIGHTBEAM is published by a rotating editorship, which I have decided should be interpreted to mean that the editor goes around in circles...

EDITORIAL

Rather than apologize for the lateness of the issue (since it's on time, barely), I will begin by apologizing for the large number of uncorrected or struck over typos in this issue. Personal problems (chiefly the fact that my baby has been in the hospital most of the time since the last ish and that I've had to work considerable overtime on the job) have cramped me severely for time; naturally the letterhacks picked this issue to decide that they'd all write long letters at once, and I've just barely managed to get this thing typed up in time as it is. So bear with me - I don't think that I missed any typos that are likely to be questionable in their import.

I have a lot to say here and there through the zine about various topics, but there are a few things that I want to say as a coherent whole in the editorial.

In the past few issues of TIGHTBEAM and THRU THE HAZE a certain small group has been making strong accusations of misfeasance in office against the elected officials. It is very difficult to answer most of these charges, because while they sound terrible they say nothing specific. For instance, there are accusations that the officials are trying to rule by "secrecy and fiat". Now this is interesting. How can you run a correspondence club in secrecy? About the only thing that can be done secretly in this sort of club is stealing from the Treasury - and if there is one thing that every member of the NFF is agreed upon it is that our Treasurer is scrupulously honest. Anything else has to be made known to the members before it can be done - and article V, 1 of the Constitution enables the membership to set aside any such actions if they don't agree with them. Who are the Secret Masters of Fandom, who enforce these "fiats"? To rule by fiat means that the rulers say "Let it be done" and it is done. Anybody who has ever tried to persuade a fan to do something he doesn't want to do knows that it's plain ridiculous to think that the officials of this club could rule by fiat - and the addition of "secrecy" to the phrase just makes it that much more ridiculous.

Another frequently-heard cry is that the Directorate isn't consulting the membership. Interpretation: the Directorate isn't consulting them. Actually, the 1961 and 1962 Directorates consulted the membership about equally, which is to say hardly at all, if by "consulting the membership" you mean publishing accounts in TNFF and TB about what the Directorate was considering but had not yet passed. As far as individual Directors consulting individual members about particular things which they thought might be of interest to that member, and about which they thought that member's opinion would be useful to have, This has been done all along. Let's face it; TNFF and TB are both bi-monthly publications; with the arrangement of deadlines and publication dates such that even if they're always on time (which TB frequently isn't) there is at least a month's delay between the deadline for material to be submitted and the date the members get them, plus any delays between the time the members get the pub and can write the Directors with their own opinions, plus an even longer delay before

any reaction from members can be published which might influence other members. For the majority of Directorate business this is simply too long to wait. So far this year the Directorate has voted on 48 motions. Of these, 11 were one-time appropriations which had to be passed within a reasonable time of their proposal or they would have been useless; 2 concerned internal Directorate matters; 16 were concerned with deciding what are the by-laws of N3F left over from past Directorates and which ones are still pertinent; 1 appropriated some money for the Story Contest this year (a matter which was thoroughly discussed outside the Directorate - it is a Presidential affair and the only thing the Directorate did was to approve an appropriation which was requested by the President); 7 concerned Constitutional interpretations; two concerned a Constitutional amendment (which will be printed in the next TNFF, allowing ample time for discussion); and the balance were new rulings on a variety of subjects which are classified as by-laws and can be found in the list of by-laws below. Now, in the majority of these cases there is neither time nor necessity for consulting the whole membership. If every one of these motions had had the attention of the whole membership called to it before it was passed, we probably wouldn't have a motion passed yet. The Directorate and President are elected by the whole membership presumably because the membership trusts them to run its affairs. Any flagrant abuse of this trust will show up immediately when the reports of motions passed are printed in TNFF. It is then the privilege of the membership to vote out the derelict officers in the next election, or sooner if they care to by a petition.

The 1962 and 1963 Directorates have accomplished a great deal in the way of constructive projects for the club - I need mention only the Information Bureau, the Fandbooks, and the indexes to the prozines, although there are many others. If you feel that the present officers are doing a good job for the club, you can show it by voting for them in the next elections (such of them as run again - Don Franson and I are, I know); if you think they aren't, then vote for someone else.

The following are the proposed new By-Laws of the N3F. Most of them are not new rules, but they have never before been officially compiled and designated as By-Laws. The date in parentheses following the individual section indicates the year that the particular section was passed - (0) means it has been in effect since 1961 at least, but I don't remember the exact date; (P) means that it isn't in effect yet but is a new proposal going with these By-Laws. Anyone who thinks there should be any additions or changes to these by-laws should write one or preferably all the Directors suggesting changes desired - we're always open to suggestions.

ARTICLE I. AUTHORITY: Under the authority implied in Article II (3) of the Constitution of the NFFF, the Directorate shall establish certain Bylaws to regulate the affairs of the organization, such bylaws to be effective when approved by a majority vote of the Directorate as set forth in Article II (4) of the Constitution. The Secretary of the NFFF shall keep a permanent record of the Bylaws, and current Bylaws shall be published in the Official Organ of the NFFF not less often than once a year.

II. THE PRESIDENT: The following shall be included among the duties of the President

1. The President will keep himself informed on all the activities of all the officers and committees of the NFFF, so that he may bring before the Directors matters which need their attention. (55)

2. The President will bring to the attention of the Directors all important Constitutional dates. (55)

3. The President will call attention to violations of the Constitution. (55)

III. THE DIRECTORATE

1. The Chairman of the Directorate shall report to the membership all measures passed by the Directorate. (P)

2. Copies of all official Directorate correspondence shall be sent to the President and the Secretary-Treasurer. (0)

(cont. inside bacover)

ROY TACKETT, 915 Green Valley Rd, NW, Albuquerque, N.M. : Lee Riddle is to be congratulated on TB 17. A fine job and the cover was excellent. But who was the artist? Was it you, Lee? The Double-Bill issue was also a good job. On the whole our TB editors do a fine and conscientious job. The rotating editorship does have it's advantages although there is some loss of continuity and the general lack of editorial commentary is detracting. I hope that you, Dave, will put your comments in whenever the mood strikes you since they do add to the magazine. //Don't worry, I will. Now is as good a place as any to announce that editorial comment will be set off by double virgules, as this is. Should any other writer actually use such punctuation in a letter I'll change his to something else appropriate - the double slash is ME! - dgh//

Phil Kohn: The problem of foreign exchange is a perplexing one and I can see no satisfactory solution at the moment. If the NFFF had its own library or something of the sort we could accept books and magazines in place of cold cash for dues. I should think that the best solution at the present time is some sort of individual trade arrangement - a US fan could agree to pay the dues or whatever of the non-US fan and in return the non-US fan could send along to his "banker" books or whatever to complete the transaction. It could work out to the mutual benefit of both fans involved, and the non-US fan would be relieved of the burden of getting involved in the red tape of foreign monetary exchange. How about giving us a report on the SF field and fandom in Israel?

J. Stanley Woolston: Concerning non-renewals. A somewhat disturbing point was brought home to me a couple of weeks ago and it is one which behooves all of us concerned with the club to do a bit of cogitating on. The point in question is the "image" of the N3F. Bill Wolfenbarger stopped by to see me a while back and mentioned that he hadn't renewed his NFFF membership because he felt that he no longer needed the club - that he had been in fandom long enough to have outgrown the N3F. It would seem that we are putting too much emphasis on using the N3F as a bridge to general fandom for the neofan. I have noted that many bureau reports are written as if they were an explanation of fannish activity to the veriest neofan and this is disturbing. If we continue along this particular line renewals will become even more scarce as members "outgrow" the club. The N3F is not just an organization for neofan and I think this should be emphasized. We have much to offer all of fandom. It would behoove bureau heads to think twice about the membership of the club.

Richard Roberts (and anybody else): All business completed by the Directorate is reported in TNFF. Unfortunately too many Neffers seem to have no conception of the time it takes to conduct official business by mail. Whenever any motion is submitted to the Directorate time must be allowed for discussion and consideration before a vote is taken. Since the Directorate is scattered from one end of the country to the other - with one member in Italy - it takes a minimum of 30 days to complete action on any one proposition. Your resolution, old chap, is entirely unnecessary. Read the N3F Constitution, Article V; it takes only 5% of the membership to put through a petition on any matter, including a review of Directorate actions. However, if you'd like to make it 10% I certainly would have no objections. (18 March)

BILL BERGER, 5802 Detroit Ave, Cleveland 2, Ohio: I had to write because I am curious why no one ever had asked for more than one page of history of N3F in our club organ. It's frustrating waiting month after month for that one page of the past of N3F. Three pages would at least give us a better and more adequate viewing. //Step up and take your bows, Kaymar and Eva. As for more history per ish, I doubt it would be possible. TNFF loses money every issue as it is, though thanks to Al Lewis' generosity we still get an excellent 0-0.//

I believe that one way of making the Welcomittee more interesting is that its members would send letters with their perspective of the value of science fiction to them or some bit of information that they might have about some obscure sf or fantasy story. (2 April)

STAN WOOLSTON, 12832 Westlake St., Garden Grove Calif.: Wally Weber has been running for TAFF for a while; now another member of this here group is running, too - Bruce Pelz. Marion Bradley, who has been a member of this group, is the third person now running for the Trans-Atlantic Fan Fund, and if they (or a fourth person who may be nominated before nominations close) win, they will be exported (temporarily) to England for their next convention. //If I may venture a personal opinion here in this Official Publication without getting my head chopped off, PELZ FOR TAFF! Wally Wastebasket Weber is a Ghood Man, and I wouldn't be displeased if he won, but he has never come all the way to the fannish wasteland of Alabama to visit me - so you know who I support. THIS HAS BEEN A PURELY PERSONAL OPINION AND NOT AN OFFICIAL STATEMENT OF NFFF POLICY.//

A letter from Ralph Watts says it was reading an article of mine on N3F in Nycon II Memory Book - which he got from Kaymar Carlson - that got him to join. This just shows how long both of us - all 3, I might say - have been members. Of course Kaymar was a member long before I joined, and I'm not sure when I did, it's been so many years ago. Ralph mentions the fans who were older than he was - Bob Farnham, Eva Firestone, Art Hayes, Honey Wood, Janie Lamb, Coral Smith, and so forth. (Seems I'm in a name-dropping mood this letter!) Ralph remembers welcoming Seth Johnson, Ann Chamberlain, and Marijane Johnson to the club, among others, when he was in the Welcomittee. (14 April)

ALMA HILL, 463 Park Drive, Boston 15, Mass.: First, may I reply to the many inquiries in past issues of TB, with regard to IES, with particular thanks for exempting me, as some have done, from complaint or criticism. I tried three times last year to supply some information through Neffer channels, but every time the material vanished.

I am Secretary of the Boston chapter only; the IES Secretary and chief official was and is Michael R Todd, a member of the New York bar, easy to find in the phone book. He won't answer frivolous inquiries, of course; but is a most courteous person, an excellent chairman, on good terms with all who know him - I would call him above reproach. We promised "one or more" issues of the Journal to a mailing list of over 600 and delivered three, plus 5 bulletins, plus a roster with subsequent updating - on funds totalling less than \$4000. I would rather not specify the amount I put in myself, but it comes to more than a \$5 subscription!

Now, as these people have been given much better than we promised, and have each other's names, an idea of how much can be done for how little - and are surely, for the most part, aware that it can't be done for nothing - Mike and I feel that it is up to them to decide what they want to do. We feel that the \$5 subscription deal is not realistic, and we don't want to hold funds. I would suggest that if any members want to collect pledges, they might easily collect enough in that way without risk.

People move and addresses change; unless some postal clerk notices it every time, letters can get lost even from first-class mail. Probably these inquiries come from either non-subscribers or from subscribers who moved. I certainly agree that the project is an excellent one and appreciate the continuing interest and good will expressed on its account. Art Hayes has promised to run a longer exposition on this topic in the near future, after I can get clearance as to what IES will and will not undertake. The charter is right where it has always been, a properly-recorded non-profit organization under the state of New York.

Now, about a state of affairs where such innocent material could be suppressed even in the face of repeated questions among the membership, may I say that this is only one example. I placed it first because it is a matter in which I am the one best able to answer and having the nearest personal responsibility. //Who "suppressed" it? You have criticized Al Lewis for running fanzine reviews in TNFF; since this is essentially the same type of information, I

don't see how you could consistently say that yours should have been in TNFF and his shouldn't. That leaves TB. The last five TBs have been published by Tackett, Weber, Anderson, Riddle, Bowers/Mallardi - and I distinctly remember letters from you in at least three of them. You say you tried to supply this information three times last year - if it's so important, why did you wait till the third TB this year to start trying to get it printed? Editors are editors, and it's their responsibility to decide what's worth printing and what isn't. Just because they may disagree with you doesn't mean that they're "suppressing" things.//

To a member of NFFF, the petitions introduced by Richard Roberts are of more urgent interest. His first suggestion, as to what should go in TNFF, is excellent except that it is just a statement of the purpose of this publication, and the policy it always used to follow! //And is following now...// It's like telling a man to breathe; if he isn't doing it, what use is it to comment?

The petition in behalf of the Secretary-Treasurer is of vital urgency if we, as an organization, hope to retain credit for anything; our fiscal records are the core of our activities; destroy the security of that and all is destroyed.

A motion of similar purport was introduced by myself while a Director in 1962 and was properly seconded, but the Chairman ruled it unnecessary, and so far as I recall, never reported it or put it to vote. Certainly it must have been news to Roberts.

This petition deserves the endorsement of every member.

When Janie Lamb enters a protest, she has enormous reason. She has never been anything but patient and courteous. Her continuing services, over so many years, without trouble or anything but rare clerical errors always promptly and cheerfully and openly corrected, are all the proof anyone could need that she deserves moral support. Janie is a respected member of a country community where people really know one another, and where she has long served in a similar capacity for local clubs. She gives us the benefit of all this talent and care, for nothing but thanks and the satisfaction of a good thing well done. She has records going all the way back to the founding days of this club, with a collection that could doubtless be seen by any courteous person who goes that way, as people occasionally do.

If we want to return simple justice for all this kindness and reliability, we have an easy way available in the rules now existing. It takes 25 members' names to make any petition official; otherwise it not only can, but must be ignored. Those names can be as little as a signature to a postcard message. They have to go to the Secretary-Treasurer to be counted (she ought to really enjoy the chore, and I hope it's a big job!) after which the matter has to go on a ballot sent to all members. Ballot returns are mailed to the Official Teller, who counts them. All this is not to elect Janie, merely to make official Roberts' resolution, or testimonial, that she has our moral support and endorsement. Incidentally, of course, we place it on record that we support careful records and place a high value on fiscal accuracy. I think that this offers no possible offense to anyone, and that if anyone has seemed to offer a denial of Janie's reliability, such persons ought to be the first to sign and be glad of the chance.

To the contrary, do we want to just sit back and let this matter slide? I have already written to Janie that I support this petition for my part. If a ballot comes out, I hope to be still a member and so vote.

If this petition gets lost - then my opinion of the Neffer membership is erroneous and I'll have to agree with the detractors who have been shooting from inside and outside - but I'm not ready to believe that! //One correction - a petition such as you describe will go to the membership for a vote only if the Directorate refuses to take the indicated action within 60 days after the petition is submitted to them.

I personally feel that such a petition is unnecessary - if there were any question whatever about Janie's reliability she would have been dismissed from her office, and the fact that she is still Sec-Treas is proof enough of the fact that she is trusted - but if a sufficient number of the members feel that a positive statement that we trust her is necessary, I would be quite willing to vote for it in the Directorate, and don't know of any Director who wouldn't. So it would probably never have to be sent to the membership.//

This outfit has to operate on very long time-intervals, on publications coming out only once a month, not always that. We do have a chance to confer in person at some regional and national conventions, and many of us are very fluent letterhacks. Also we pretty much agree that the project is a good one, deserving some time which can be given with pleasure. Call it a haywire, paper-glider sort of concern, and we'll be realistic enough. But my best and most-studied opinion is that this is the work of good people who like people. Verbal fluency and mimeographic equipment are extras, not essentials. Social equivalence, honesty of intention, responsibility of action, a willingness to listen as well as talk, an unwillingness to condemn in haste - these are essentials and I think are common qualities in N3F. They are not as common in fandom at large as they ought to be! You can even see fan publications that confuse insult with cleverness, slander with newsworthy comment - don't ask me why, it passes my understanding. I've protested this early and often but I give up - either we get some real chance for some real people to say real things, or what are we here for anyway? //To have a good time? Seriously, Alma, I don't understand you. I'm about equally active in and out of the N3F and my experience has been that proportions of good and bad fans are about the same both places, and are about the same in fandom as in the whole population. I don't know who are real people and who aren't, but anybody who wrote this issue of TB got at least some of his letter published, and I only cut certain rambling-type comments that in general were reiterations of something someone else said, or news notes that I didn't think would be of interest to most readers. I think this is generally true of TB editors - what kind of chance do you want?//

Members have written to me, asking for fuller explanation. This, I would rather avoid as it seems to me that the material already published is ample for decision. It may take special care in examination, as it is like the iceberg, more below the surface or that much would not show. But it seems to me to be all in proportion and adequate - more than adequate. So why increase the distress with details? However, I will stand by the truth and claim the right to do so. //So much is below the surface that even I, who have been a Director now for over 4 months, have yet to see any concrete evidence of anything except that there is a violent personality clash between two groups - who are approximately the 1961 and 1963 Directorates. If anybody sees anything more I'd appreciate your drawing it to my attention.// (4 April)

RICHARD PLZAK, 248 North Linden, Palatine, Ill.: Bill Bowers: I have the same probelm as you, and I'm sure that many other fans share the difficulty. When you're pressed for time (as almost everybody seems to be), it's hard to get very much of both fanac and stf reading done, and it's usually the reading that goes overboard. //You too, huh?//

I have to agree with almost everybody on Campbell. John may still pub some of the best fiction now and then, but he is gradually reforming(?) his Hugo-winning zine into a pseudo-SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN. His latest step has been the "new Analog" which is more fact-oriented than ever. Now, not only the lettercol, editorial, and article leaning towards fact rather than fiction, but also the advertising. His mag looks and reads more and more like a technical science magazine every ish. I've heard that ANALOG may be folded soon, and maybe it's better dead than hanging onto stf-readership by a thread. //Never! ANALOG isn't ASTOUNDING, but it's still the best American stfzine around. Best stories, best art, best pro-

duction, best book column - best everything except lettercol, and there they don't give too much away to the current competition. Now of course compared to the old TMS or STARTLING...// (19 March)

DAVID KATZ, 3001 Glen Ave, Baltimore, Md.: Did you ever notice how many neos preface all their correspondence to TB with "I am a neo" or something to that effect? It seems that they feel obligated to warn everyone condescending enough to read a letter appearing under a new name: STOP! Read no further unless you wish to subject yourself to the humiliation and great trauma which stems from the horrible experience of communicating with a neo!" This is exactly the attitude that could bring about the downfall of not only the N3F, but all of fandom. If only the BNFs and First Fandom types looked down on the neos, it would be bad enough; but the worst aspect of the situation is that fen of every order, from the Legendary Figures right on down to the neos themselves encourage this attitude. Corny as it sounds, there is no disputing the fact that today's goshwow neos will be tomorrow's BNFs. And if those neos are made to feel inferior every step of the way, there just aren't going to be any BNFs. How far do you suppose the present leaders of fandom would have gotten if the same attitude had existed during the founding of fandom? //Who are the "present leaders of fandom"? I question whether there are such animals. BNFs, sure, but while they are admired they aren't particularly followed - at least I haven't detected it. The only fans who might be called "leaders" would be the officers of the various clubs and apas. Since I'm a Director of N3F and the OE of SFPA, maybe that qualifies me as one of the leaders so fandom. I can answer for myself where I'd be if fandom had had the attitude when I entered that it does now. Right where I am - it did! And I strongly suspect that if you ask Roy Tackett and Kaymar Carlson and Janie Lamb and other fans who have been around fandom longer than you've been around the world, you'll find that it had the same attitude when they were neos. However, it's not the fault of the BNFs - with a few fairly well-known exceptions, fans don't criticize neos because they're neos, but because they make gaffes that someone who had been in fandom long enough to know what was and what wasn't done wouldn't have made. A neo who doesn't act neoish doesn't come in for undue criticism.//

Don't get me wrong; I am not advocating that someone start a society for the prevention of cruelty to neofen, or a Be Kind To Neos Week; I do not feel that fans should go out of their way to forgive neofans for statements that would result in a Feud if a BNF has made them. //Though most do...// Rather, I believe that the neos should be treated the same as anyone else. My gripe is not a personal one. I have never been treated unfairly for being a neo. However, I am complaining about all the letters from unknown or little-known fans which were never printed in fanzine lettercols to make room for a letter from a celebrity - about all the carefully and tediously composed contributions that ever ended up in a wastebasket (note double meaning) because of the unknown name at the top, and not what appeared under the name. In short, fandom as a whole would be better off if the term neo were abolished, so that any fan could say simply, "I am a fan" - not a Neo or a WKF or a BNF. //Very few faneds wastebasket contributions even if they don't like them, unless the sender tells them to do so. (For instance Joe Staton, my staff artist for Jötun Press, told me to destroy any rejects, so I do - unless I like them but can't use them, in which case I save them until some other faned needs material and tells me so.) And any who do soon have trouble getting contributions.//

Does anyone out there know the address of any German fans? If so, I'd appreciate it if you would let me know. I speak German fairly well and want to try to correspond in the language. Also, how can I contact someone in the MIT stf club? I plan to go there if I can and so I would like to get some info from a student as to what the place is really like, as well as about the local fanac up there. You can't find everything in the catalogues. //For Gerfandom, look at your N3F roster - there were several German fans on it last time I looked. For the

MITkey Mice, find Bernie Morris or Dave Vanderwerf on the roster - both are students there. Rick Norwood used to be a student here and can tell you what happened to the ics fans at MIT...//

One more thing before I go: We have formed for the first time again //?// the Baltimore Science Fiction Society. So far we have all of six members, as compared to the six we had when the club started. We're getting pretty damn discouraged out here. So PLEASE, if there are any fans in the Baltimore area, contact me or Jack Chalker (5111 Liberty Heights Ave, Balto.) for info about the club. We meet on the second and fourth Firday of every month at 8:00 PM or thereabouts. The meeting place varies every week, so if you want to attend a meeting (please do) call FO 7-4948 any time between 12 midnight and 12 midnight and ask for me. If I'm not home you can call Jack Chalker at FO7-0685. //Well, there's Ted Pauls in Baltimore. He taught me how to edit a lettercol... But he's already said he's not interested. Rots of ruck, anyhow - I had to marry one and beget another to get three fans in Huntsville - six xounds like a positive crowd!// (23 March)

BOB FARNHAM, 506 Second Ave., Dalton, Ga.: My letter to TB #18 is hereby retracted. I received a letter with information in it that was proven false by the events that followed on the heels of said letter; a visit by a fan whom I know I can trust all the way. I have written Janie Lamb not to remove my name from the N3F Roster. I hope this mess between the Rapps and Janie Lamb will clear itself away. I've known Janie for years, personally - and no harder worker, no more honest a person ever lived.

I am forced to inactivity because of inability to type; hardening arteries in my neck cause fainting spells. Lately I find I can walk without my cane for a few steps but this is risky. I may improve with warm weather but the heavy corry I had before Dec. 25 //couldn't make out this part entirely - looks like "Dec. 25 - "25 or something of the sort// can not be again. I am not leaving fandom after all!

Hope this sets me straight again. //I'm glad to hear that you're not leaving fandom, Bob - you were one of the first fans I ever corresponded with and one of the first I visited, and even though we've sort of lost touch lately I was sorry to read in TB 18 that you were quitting. Glad it was a false alarm.// (20 March)

LEE RIDDLE, 144 Elkton Rd., Newark, Del.: I would like to congrtulate Bill Mallardi and Bill Bowers for the excellent job they did on publishing TB #18 on such a stringent schedule as I forced upon them by my lateness in getting TB #17 mailed out to all the members. They did a wonderful job considering the handicap they had to work under and I think the entire membership owes them a vote of thanks.

As for my part in this mess, I can only apologize to the general membership, and say I am very sorry about the whole thing. I do not wish to go into the details as to the reason for the delay. Let it be sufficient to say that there was a very compelling reason for the delay. The magazine was assembled and ready in time for mailing by the deadline, but circumstances beyond my control made it impossible for it to be mailed out until it was.

I do appreciate those kind remarks made about the appearance of the issue I published, especially the cover. However I cannot take credit for the artwork - only the printing og the cover. The artwork was done by an unknown artist on the staff of a "clip" service I subscribe to. I did do the offset work on the cover myself, however. The cover was a service donated to the N3F.

I think for the guidance of future editors, that there ought to be a limit set as to the number of pages he is supposed to print. I printed the issue you saw at exact cost, and it still ran far more than the authorized reimbursement. What with the postage raise recently, I feel that the Directors ought to authorize an increase in a per-copy reimbursement fee. I

don't mind contributing extra time and money to the work of the N3F, but some members who publish TB might not be in as good a position to contribute some \$20.00 extra. Another rule that might be imposed is to limit the number of pages of letter you are supposed to publish from a contributing member.

All in all, double-Bill, an extra fine issue and one to be congratulated on. //The Directorate has raised the allowance for TB from 10¢ per member to 12¢ per member. This essentially pays for a 20-page issue, no more. That's why this issue is not going to run over 20 pages no matter what I have to cut. Alloting much more money would start running the treasury in the hole, and would necessitate another dues increase eventually. Since we want to avoid this if possible, it is likely that future TB editors should edit with an eye to the 20-page mark or should be prepared to foot the extra expense themselves. They'll have our gratitude, but they'll still get 12¢ per member. And no editor will be expected to produce over 20 pages.// (9 March)

PAUL WYSZKOWSKI, Box 3372, Sta. C, Ottawa 3, Ontario, Canada: Today I have on agenda the MOTLEY project, feuds, new ANALOG, and communications between N3F Directorate and membership at large.

Ejo, I am surprised that you haven't discovered earlier that Seth is an unselfish and generous soul. In these respects, Seth reminds me of Art Hayes, whose selflessness is monumental. Clay Hamlin, while we're on this subject, is perhaps the most generous fan in the world, although he scores lower in selflessness. In any case, I am happy to see three outstanding fans (yourself, Seth, and Elinor) working harmoniously on a project whose importance to those benefited by it is so enormous that it cannot be possibly overestimated. I doubt if many of us are even capable of imagining the state of mind of a child who has just received a letter or a card under the project MOTLEY, or the fantastic difference it makes in that child's life. Yet the cost of such a letter in terms of effort, time, and postage is insignificant, and out of all proportion to the effect it produces. It takes so little to give so much.

Feuds - are a particularly idiotic way of wasting time. Some people, apparently, enjoy them, and make a hobby of them. Feuding is their type of fanatic. These types are found elsewhere but they seem to be more abundant in fandom. //Name five.// As far as I am concerned, I wash my hands of any such activity. I consider myself feud-proof in that I believe it is impossible for anyone to start a feud with me. I don't fight back, and I am practically unassailable. I am far too busy with constructive projects to engage in a public exchange of insults. Graphically, ANALOG is the best prozine published. It is definitely heavyfotted in the science part of science fiction; however, the fiction appearing in ANALOG is best of its genre which might be called "scientific science fiction". It constitutes a valid form of science fiction, even though it may not appeal to many or even most science fiction fans who prefer more far out type of story. Bill Osten: You have it the wrong way around. It's Palmer who is as bad as JWC but without his good points. After all, JWC is reasonably rational and he is a rather good writer. Palmer is neither.

Finally the matter of administering N3F and communicating with the members. Isn't TNEF the official channel of communication between the Directorate and the membership at large? I should think that it is entirely adequate for this purpose. The problem lies not in means of communication but in willingness to use them, both by the members of the Directorate and by membership at large. Writing down rules of conduct is meaningless if no one is willing to follow them. It is up to the individual directors to make an effort to communicate via the existing and available channels and it is up to the individual member to use the same channels to add to the published body of general opinion which represents the ultimate control on the actions of the Directorate. Any provision for a call for review of directorate action by a set percentage of the membership is not a practical solution. Rather, we should pay a great deal more atten-

tion to whom we elect to the Directorate. We should refuse to vote unless sufficient information on past record, policies, character, and capability of the candidate had been made available in a campaign which should start early enough to make this possible. //I couldn't agree with you more on most of your points. Trouble with feuds - nobody ever feuds, they get righteously indignant and refuse to stop attacking the other side until justice has been done. TNFF is only partly the official channel of information between the Directorate and members. TNFF is primarily to report completed Directorate actions and to carry the reports of the various appointive officers. TB is a better forum for discussion of matters which the Directorate has not yet acted on. If I have room in this issue I plan to discuss some items before the Directorate at present which may be of interest to the members.// (undated, around 1 April)

DR. ASKOLD LADONKO, Apartado 911, Caracas, Venezuela: There are many comments to be made about the letters in #18, but to do this would make my letter so long that it might result in trying the Editor's patience, not to mention the very valuable space it would uselessly occupy in his wastebasket. The thing I want to discuss is psi, ESP, or call it what you prefer. Most fans love to read about it, and I believe that they even go as far as to daydream about having unusual psychic abilities, but this is where they seem to stop. Holly Horowitz has a little group that wants to find out what all this is about, for which he and all the members of that group deserve an applause loud enough to be heard even in hyperspace. But what about the others? How many of you would like to have or develop some psi abilities, I prefer not to call them "powers", and put them to practice? This letter is NOT what it seems to be, that is, a propaganda campaign for some charlatan's book about how to develop hidden powers, but rather an honest appeal to fandom to wake up to the fact that psi can be found not only in fiction stories, but also inside each of us. Did anybody stop to think that fans are the best suited to perform real research about psi - at least, most of them are able to read about it in fiction without shrugging their shoulders. We all enjoy science-fiction, what about fiction-science? What about N3F having, in due time, the first extrasensory communications system on this planet? //Sell your AT&T stock, folks...sorry, I couldn't resist that one.// I can see some of you laugh when you read this, and others stop at this point and have a few seconds of nice thoughts about how glorious such a thing would be. The above statement is not pure imagination, such a communications system is only a question of time, and a question of which organization will make it first. So why not fandom? According to some research I have performed some years ago, most people have remarkable ESP abilities, which can be developed! So this is the time to get moving, or rather, the time to get moving was yesterday, when you were reading a story about psi!. I think, which also proves that I exist, that it is possible to build up a more or less numerous group of fans to perform some really serious, which does not mean boring, experiments with psi. Whoever thinks the same way may write directly to me, so that we might get started as soon as possible. In the very beginning of this project, I believe I can direct it in some slumpy way, at least as long as it takes us to find someone who can do it better. All kinds of suggestions will be appreciated, including those telling me where to go with the whole project. So get moving! //Well, you psientists out there? Dr. Ladonko is a Doctor of Psychology, which means that if anybody should be in a position to know what he's doing with psi he should be the one. I'm a skeptic myself - I want to be shown psi in action before spending time on it - but those of you who have time to write to TB about it should be able to spare enough to write Dr. Ladonko and maybe really prove something. Or do you really want to - do you prefer your daydreams? Like the man said - get moving!//

DEADLINE FOR TB #20, 25 June 63. SEND LETTERS TO LEE RIDDLE, 144 ELKTON RD, NEWARK, DEL.

AL LEWIS, 1825 Greenfield Ave., Los Angeles 25, Calif.: In the last TB I asked people to choose the twelve greatest heroes of stf - your definition of "greatest", your definition of "hero", and your definition of "stf". I received replies from C.W. Brooks, Jr., George Fergus, Don Franson, Dick Hinman, Dave Hulan, Scott Kutina, Rick Norwood, George Price, and Andy Zerbe. 9 out of 295. That's not too many.

Here is the way they voted: 1st place, 6 votes, a tie between KIMBALL KINNISON of the Lensman series (EESmith) and JOHN CARTER of the Barsoom series (ERBurroughs). 2d place, 5 votes, GILBERT GOSSEYN of the Null-A series (AEVogt). 3d place, 4 votes, GILES HABIBULA of the Legion of Space series (JWilliamson). 4th place, 3 votes, a 5-way tie among DICK SEATON of the Skylark series (EESmith), FAFHRD AND THE GREY MOUSER (Fritz Leiber), NORTHWEST SMITH of "Shambleau" etc (CLMoore), HAROLD SHEA of The Incomplete Enchanter and sequels (LSdeCamp & FPratt), and CURT NEWTON of the Captain Future series (EHamilton). And then we had a whole flock with a pair of mentions//for space-saving I omit authors and series on these//: Alvin of Lorelei, Conan, Lazarus Long, Burl, Jommy Cross, Tarzan, DD Harriman, The Lieutenant, Clare Linn, Martin Padway, Robert Hedrock, Richard Arcot, Hawk Carse, Professor Challenger.

We also made this the subject for discussion at a meeting of the LASFS, and in a sampling of 20 votes we came out this way: 1-15 votes: KIMBALL KINNISON. 2-10 votes: NORTHWEST SMITH. 3-9 votes: JOHN CARTER. 4-7 votes: PROFESSOR CHALLENGER, TARZAN, BUCK ROGERS. 5-6 votes: JOMMY CROSS, FAFHRD AND THE GREY MOUSER, ARCOT, WADE, AND MOREY (as a team). 6-5 votes: DICK SEATON. 7-4 votes: GILBERT GOSSEYN, HAROLD SHEA, CURT NEWTON, CONAN. 8-3 votes: CAPTAIN NEMO, FLASH GORDON, SUPERMAN, FRODO BAGGINS.

There were plenty with two mentions and a single mention, but they are of no significance. Combining both lists, we come out this way: KIMBALL KINNISON, JOHN CARTER, NORTHWEST SMITH, FAFHRD AND THE GREY MOUSER, GILBERT GOSSEYN, PROFESSOR CHALLENGER, TARZAN, DICK SEATON, RICHARD ARCOT, JOMMY CROSS, HAROLD SHEA, CURT NEWTON, and BUCK ROGERS.

Which makes thirteen, and how come the rest of you readers didn't vote and help us get this sampling down to a point of statistical validity, huh? //All I can say is that some people sure use a looser definition of "stf" than I do. I only listed John Carter and Harold Shea after considerable debate as to whether those stories qualified; Fafhrd and the Grey Mouser and Tarzan are certainly not stf, and Tarzan isn't really even fantasy. There are three Tarzan stories that I can think of that might by a wild stretch be called stf - TARZAN AND THE ANT MEN (a device that causes men to shrink), TARZAN AT THE EARTH'S CORE (a Pellucidar book starring Tarzan), and TARZAN'S QUEST (an immortality drug). Oh, forgot TARZAN AND THE LION MAN (humanizing apes by thrsnplanting human "germ cells"). So much for that. Fafhrd and the Mouser aren't stf by even a wild stretch - there's nothing scientific in any of those stories, except the cross-continuum machine in "Scylla's Daughter", which had nothing to do with the story and which I am therefore convinced was stuck in to make the story fit an already-produced cover (though I could be wrong...). You might note that the high placing of these fantasy characters is mostly due to the LASFS vote. They're fantasy fans out there. So'm I, but I don't vote for fantasy characters in a stf poll. It's all that evial ol' LASFS...//

DAVE LOCKE, PO Box 335, Indian Lake, NY (the rumors of whose death have been greatly exaggerated...): I've been getting quite a kick in the head out of TB, since the beginning of this year when I started reading each issue from cover to cover. I don't think it's a bad fanzine, but it's the most uneven one I've ever read. TB has so many high and low points that I'd think it should be called THE OZARK GAZETTE, or GRAPH, or SEX, or whatever.

The most interesting letter in #18 was by Dave Ettlin, or David M. Ettlin, or whatever he calls himself now. "N3F needs reforms desperately"...

"I have submitted a plan"... "a collective farm of fan writers"... "That is what it is and what it is meant to be"... "it is a collective farm of fan writers"... "decent fanzines"... "the entire idea"... "must be maintained if we are to continue moving forward"... All these wonderful phrases and colorful expressions and such, and only 50 other words in the entire letter to tie them all together. Offhand, this would seem to inspire a sense-of-wonderish-type feeling. Actually, Ettlin has been cribbing from John Kennedy, which isn't such a bad thing except that his ideas might have been cribbed from Caroline.

Some of Clay's advice to newcomers is valid, but when he applies it to professional writers as well I find him in error. Altho he would have us believe differently, there have been stories sold which concern themselves with only a single incident. Some have even been good. Bradbury has written a few such stories, tho unfortunately they weren't among his best. Since the number of stories of this type are few, I'm not surprised that Clay doesn't seem to remember any. But if he thinks I misunderstood him, let me qualify what I think he meant by saying that he was thinking of stories which bring up, and mention, only one single incident, and not stories which revolve around one single incident. Stories of the latter type are quite common, but those of the former have also seen print. Of course, Caly may be stating his own personal opinion, in which case he isn't borne out by fact and therefore shouldn't be passing along his views as if they were fact. Some people like to think that "plotless mood-pieces" do not make stories, but other people must think so because there are more of them being sold every year.

Still, anyone entering the story contest would be wise not to make a story out of a single incident. It might turn out that his is one of the winning entries, but the chances are heavily against it.

Don Franson: You damn near lost the Presidency. Few people in the club know me, but I was going to run against Rapp anyway, just for the halibut. I didn't because some fluke might make me Pres. and I probably wouldn't have time to take care of the duties. As it happened, such a fluke would have come up. Rapp bowed out at the last minute, and I would have been the only candidate running. No opposition, and no write-in votes. So I would have been President. Wouldn't that be a hell of a note? //Write-in votes are permitted, by a Directorate motion passed several years ago. The current Directorate is compiling a list of such by-laws at present, so that at long last all of the members will know just what the rules of the club are. This was one...//

NATHAN A. BUCKLIN, PO Box 4, Dockton, Wash.: Holly Horowitz: I'd send this direct but I think that the whole club deserves to hear about it. Myself and a 7th-grade boy (I'm 8th grade) held hands and tried to guess which color the other was thinking of. We made varied comments on the colors; they ranged from "Darker than most yellow" to "Your blue is merging slowly into purple, now it's red, now it's black, just following it gives me a headache." but our scores on accuracy were up to 70%. This spread until various other pairs tried it. Two boys with utterly nothing in common tried it, with no physical contact, and got 90% out of 20 tries or 18 right. Two others decided to block the mind of the 7th-grader who's first started it so that he could read no minds. Not only did it succeed, he got low grades all that day and got extremely sick and couldn't come the next day. Frightened, the pair quit. There have also been a few attempted long-distance messages, none successful. But one prediction made by me came true completely - that when KIDNAPED was serialized on TV it would end at a certain spot. It did. //That might be more due to your good sense of timing and plot than ESP - if you're familiar with a story, you can guess about how far they can get in an hour show, and with the general part of the story pinned down by that it's usually fairly obvious what would be the logical stopping-place. But then again, maybe you do have esper powers...// A mental conversation between

me and a member of the opposing team in a spelling contest: "Jane. This is Paul. Reservoir is spelled RESORVOIP. Don't get flustered. RESOR- it's tricky, but that's how it's spelled. Remember that." Jane spelled it Resorvoir, sat down in disgrace and looked at Paul bewilderedly. (19 March)

VIRGINIA MARSHALL, 120 Locust Ave., New Rochelle, NY: Fred Haskell: When you say that you believe that psi exists it is like saying that you believe that blue eyes and blond hair exist. Of course it exists but try to prove it to anyone who has a hide-bound viewpoint about it. //I've never had any problem proving that blue eyes and blond hair exist to anyone - could it be that the situations are not quite analogous?//

Harvey Forman: What is a Genzine? What kind of column would you want? //A Genzine is a general-circulation fanzine, as opposed to an apazine which is circulated to a fixed group. Then of course you get something like WARHOON or SCOTTISCHE or my own LOKI which are both and you realize that all is really Chaos anyhow...//

Holly F. Horowitz: Long before I started reading SF I was interested in psi and actually went to the Chicon in hopes of meeting someone else who was equally interested. I would love to be a member of your group who are investigating psi phenomena.

Donald F. Anderson: I don't know if I can convert you but my theory is that as God created man with free will and as He is omniscient, He knew that man would disobey Him so he had to make a place of punishment just as we build jails because we know that some people have criminal tendencies. //Reasonable enough, if a rather light touch on a deep subject. I agree in general.// (from 2 undated letters)

FRANK HILLER, 99 Sellinger St., Rochester 5, NY: This letter is not to be construed as either praise or condemnation of the Heinlein novel STRANGER IN A STRANGE LAND. For the purposes of discussion I prefer to remain neutral on this point. What I do wish to discuss are the standards of criteria some people use to judge a literary work. (I'm using the terms "literary" and "literature" in a strict dictionary sense - mine makes no mention of quality in its definition of either term.) It seems that when a person is revolted or otherwise disenchanted with the philosophy expressed in a particular work for some reason they attack the skill of the author in artistic terms or at least the quality of the one particular work they found the unadmirable philosophy in. I've found this to work the other way round as well, if they find that the philosophy supports "everything they've ever believed in" they go into raptures on - not the philosophy, but the literary merits of the book. Somehow they don't feel qualified to criticize the philosophy but they do feel eminently qualified to praise or damn the literary merits of the book.

What prompted this outburst is the pernicious habit of some to damn or praise the literary merit of a work purely because they may or may not like the ideas expressed therein. They speak, or write, purely in literary terms but their disenchantment with the philosophy shows through. They say it's either "written wrotten" or "written wonderful", though I doubt if they've actually bothered to really look at the way the book was put together from a literary standpoint.

In my opinion it is possible to judge, independently of each other, the philosophy and literary merit of a work. But they should be kept that way - independent of each other. It's fairly obvious that Heinlein's primary purpose in writing SIAASL was to put forth (or over, whichever way you wish to look at it) a particular philosophy and only secondarily to tell a story. Consequently the story suffered. (Whoops, I did allow an opinion on SIAASL to slip in here even though I said I wouldn't.) I know that I sound as though I'm contradicting myself from one sentence to another but I think that if you really think about it you'll find that I'm not. At least I hope that I'm not. //I don't think so. I agree, pretty much.//

FREDERICK NORWOOD, Bellingrath, Southwestern, Memphis 12, Tenn.: First off, I have some Hugo comments that I hope will see print before the final voting. Only one Hugo award in the entire history of the awards has gone to a pure fantasy story ("That Hell-Bound Train" by Bob Bloch). This year there are two fantasies eligible for a Hugo - IT'S MAGIC, YOU DOPE by Jack Sharkey and "The Unholy Grail" by Fritz Leiber. Fantasy lovers of the world, unite! //Rick then plugs IF and THE DAY THE EARTH STOOD STILL, but since the nominations are closed and they didn't make it I'm cutting those comments.//

Best Professional Artist: Roy Krenkel for his Ace book Burroughs illustrations. He is eligible, and he is best - what more need be said?

On the other hand, F&SF is not eligible for a Hugo award, not even as best fan fiction. It is not "devoted primarily to science fiction and fantasy", in that over half of the stories it has published during 1962 have been neither. It has published horror stories, sick stories, slick stories, sex stories, and just plain stories, with absolutely no element of SF or fantasy anywhere in them. //But it's a Neffer!//

Last year, a clearly ineligible series won the short story award. Thanks to the N3F, the rules are available, and there is no question that the rules say "A science-fiction or fantasy story" the Hothouse series was not "a" stf or fantasy story. This year, while I don't see much risk of F&SF even getting a minimum number of votes, I hope the judges pay a little more attention to the rules, or else repeal them officially. While they are at it, they might also note that the "primarily stf or fantasy" rule applies to fanzines as well.

Horrors, Osten. 99 44/100% of comics are not crud, only the 90% guaranteed by Sturgeon's Law. Your condemnation of 9.44% of comics is thus utterly unjustified. //According to Sturgeon, Sturgeon's Law is "Nothing is always absolutely true." The statement about 90% of everything being crud is Sturgeon's Criterion or something like that. Though everybody calls it Sturgeon's Law, and it will probably take its place as such in the history books while the ghost of Sturgeon wails on and on "no...no...no..."//

Al Lewis's proposal is incredibly difficult, if the emphasis is placed on the word "hero", ruling out characters that are just nice guys, or who are in great stories. I am sure that there are really a great number which I just can't think of offhand. And there are many near greats, like Johnny Mehem, Space Hawk, and Adam Link, and many more in fantasy, like Gandalf, Tarzan, Bilbo, John Carter, Frodo, Conan, Gray Mouser...but as far as actual stf heroes go, that are truly heroes, and that are truly stf, there are really only three: Kimball Kinnison (the one who got 15 votes, I'll bet), Gilbert Gosseyn, who I would bet as the ten vote man, and Mayor Amalfi, who a lot of people will probably forget entirely. The best stf books seem to go in for more reasonable and likeable characters than the true Hero.

With all the complaints going out against the government of the N3F, there doesn't seem to be a one of them complaining about the way the various projects are being run, and the N3F is, after all, not an entity in itself, but simply the sum of its projects. As long as they are running smoothly, I don't see how who happens to be in office at the moment matters, except that the people doing the work deserve considerable credit for taking the job, rather than envy for winning it. //Thanks, Rick.//

Will the fuggheaded Neffer who wrote a letter to a comic book and said that they were the last hope of sf please stand up and take a bow? That is only a reasonable conclusion from the premise that all stf has no hope, with the minor premise that comic books are good stf. Actually that letter was printed when the prozines were at a surprising low. Now, they are back up on about the level of the Sat. Eve. Post //that's a cuss word in Alabama, son!//, rather than the level of comic books.

Actually Scott Kutina quotes

out of context. The letter was meant to imply that comic books were the last hope of SF recruits. In other words, now that the adventure stf pulp is gone, most new stf fans start out by reading comic books before they graduate to ANALOG. This has proved to be a simple fact. Many, a great many, of the roughly 1000 active comic fans read stf, but don't even know stf fandom exists. For Scott to call an attempt to recruit a few of these fans for the N3F asinine I would call narrow-minded. Just because they read comic books, they aren't fit to associate with high minded stf fans like you? //You might also mention that Fred Patten, OE of N'APA, and Bruce Pelz, OE of SAPS, are comic fans too. That's two pretty highly regarded fans. ~~Of course the OE of N'APA is a better stf fan~~

Actually, Scott Kutina just has some very strong opinions, to which he is entitled. I just think he should express his opinions without resorting to unsupported name calling. I happen to hold equally strong opinions that comic books (some of them) have a lot to offer, and that the first large size ANALOG was absolutely great, with a very impressive format, fine illustrations, and a higher quality of fiction than any other magazine on the market. This isn't exactly penetrating analysis, but neither is "terrible, it literally stunk". There was nothing about that issue to inspire terror, and literally, it had a bland but rather nice smell similar to that of the New Yorker. (undated)

PIERS JACOB, 800 75th St. North, St. Petersburg 10, Fla. Far be it from me to grind gears and ruin the differential, but if Mr Wyszowski will read an issue or two of TB, he will see that some people have no particular difficulty arousing emotion simply by utilizing words normally available in the English tongue. I would prefer to say "you fascinate me" instead of "you croggle me"; the old order has not passed that rapidly. //Say what you please, but "croggle" ≠ "fascinate". It is closest to "amaze, astound, ~~stun~~", except that it can be used either transitively or intransitively ("I croggle at your ignorance"). I don't use fanspeak a great deal myself (aside from useful contractions like fanzine, gafia, etc.), but I think that "croggle" is a beautifully expressive word when saved for the exact right moment.// I repeat my original question: does this "in-group" lingo contribute to the enjoyment of SF? Or does it tend to make fandom an object of ridicule to outsiders, thereby discouraging the growth of fanmembership? As for suggestiveness - possibly you mistake the cause of my alarm. There is nothing wrong with it. But is it fair to have these suggestive females thousands of miles out of reach? //That's what cons are for...//

I must confess that I am indeed real, for much of the time, Don Anderson. I even have a name all to myself to prove it. How about you? I'm sorry if you doubt my statement that some letters are literate. I thought that Stan Woolston's was the very model of a modern missive. I also like that "Anti-Croggle" switch of James McLean's. And I especially like to see a man who will speak his mind plainly, such as Clayton Hamlin. And going on into #18, I would be happy to see more pride exhibited of the sort that Bjo Trimble has. Aside from all that, Don, I think you're mistaken in assuming that everyone must descend to the level of the lowest elements. I would hope that fandom has something better in store than mob psychology, porcine or otherwise. ~~Aside from that!~~ I appreciate your offer of a place in the mud, but I'm afraid my roaches wouldn't like it.

I see that the anti-ANALOG clan is out in force. I suggest to Bill Osten that he read a sample copy of ANALOG before forming his opinion on it. He might discover that he actually liked genuine science fiction, even if it is a little intellectual for him. As far as I'm concerned, ASF stands for Appearance, Schuyler Miller book reviews, and Fiction, all near the top in the field. If Bill, Scott Kutina, or Dave Keil care to name the magazines that they feel are superior, I will be happy to debate specific issues in these pages. Invective along is not usually a valid argument. Or am I unfamiliar with the rules again?

I feel

flattered that Ida Snipe considers me enough of a faan to be worth picking an argument with, although I can conceive of ~~the gods to play with~~. You crog- er, fascinate me, Ida; I wish I could bore everybody enough to get my name in their letters twide. Share mud, sister. //You know, I think you and I would get along famously, Piers old boy. Any chance you could make it up here for the Mid-SouthCon July 6-7? Get to meet several other fans from the area (where do people from Florida go on vacations/).// (31 March)

G.M. CARR, 5319 Ballard Ave. NW, Seattle 7, Wash.: I am very pleased to see this public praise of Seth Johnson. In the past he's taken a lot of verbal lumps with good nature, and it is nice to see him getting some verbal sugar for a change (to mix metaphors madly). Come to think of it, Seth has been the point of origin for quite a few good ideas that have grown up to become full-fledged additions to fandom. As I recall, it was Seth's comments in a Round Robin that eventually became what is now called "Project Artshow". It was Seth's idea to start the Fanzine Exchange Project (or whatever it's called)//Fanzine Clearing House//. Seth has been responsible for nursing the RRs and keeping many a birdie alive that would otherwise have perished. (Although it is obviously impossible for him to keep them all flying...) It seems to me that Seth, in his unassuming way, has contributed a great number of very constructive ideas during his N3F membership - and not ideas only - some doggone hard work as well. It's about time he got some public recognition for it. //Amen.//

However, I find the most comment-provoking letter this to be that of Richard Roberts. I agree that Janie Lamb does deserve a public vote of confidence for her long years of hard work. Roberts' resume of the recent dues mix-up is succinct. I'm all for burying the subject and letting it stay buried. //So am I. So are all the Directors. So are practically everybody except Art Hayes and a couple more.//

As to the suggestion of requiring a report to the membership of all matters adopted, with the proviso that on application of 10% of the membership any matter can be reviewed by vote of the membership and rejected - I don't know. Having been a Director once myself, I can remember all too well the voluminous correspondence that transpired. The endless pro-and-con that went on covered just about every possible contingency before a measure was adopted. To try and publish this minutiae of thinking would require a full-sized fanzine.//The size of WARHOON, monthly...// If it took that much yacking and discussion to get the measure passed - just among 5 Directors and the President - just think what endless paperwork would be entailed by the same discussion and argument by all the members!

Besides, we elect our Directors to handle the business for the club. Any matter requiring the membership's attention is called up for a vote. I agree that it is a good thing that the membership be informed of action taken. But once the action is taken, for heaven's sake let's leave it at that. Putting everything up for review and possible rejection would be just too much of a good thing!

SCOTT KUTINA, 16309 Marquis Ave, Cleveland 11, Ohio: This is getting downright silly and Asinine. First there were people accusing each other of being thieves //or to be more accurate, one person accused another person of something which the second person considered to be equivalent to theft.//. Now accusations of a "clique, long jealous and derisive of N3F, getting into high places and spreading corruption." What the heck is going on? I'm just a poor little innocent neo, confused and nauseated. Just who or what are these (subversives, communists, fascists, democrats, BEMs)? Will the real culprits please stand up, and clear this putrid mess up.

Now for some personal fanac. We, that is a small group of teenfen (male), have formed a little group called WORLDCON RIDERS ASSOCIATION INCORPORATED, DISCON CHAPTER, and are

planning to go to the Discon in a group (I bet ya never could have guessed in a million years). Any single male fan who wants to join our little group, either contact Larry Pinsker or myself for further details. Calling all Lovecraft fan, I'm trying to start a fan club, dedicated to him, similar to the Hyborian Legion or TFotR. //Calling it the Sons of Cthulhu or something?// I notice a high school club has joined, well how about a federation of such clubs, you know to knock ideas for constitutions, governments, etc. around and to tell about the various activities. Anybody interested in any of these, I wish they would please contact me.

I just received my copy of A FIGMENT OF A DREAM, pubbed by Neffer Jack Chalker, and written by David H. Keller, M.D. I would like to comment on it here. No offense, Dr. Keller, but I DO NOT think it was one of your best. As a matter of fact I have read much better, some of the older fantasies you wrote were much, much better. The quality however is much better than the fantasy that is being turned out today; much, much better. I hope you keep it up. We need more fantasy today. There is too much science fiction today, and not enough fantasy. //Since you mention his story, this seems an appropriate place to print a letter from Life Member...// (12 March)

DAVID H. KELLER, M.D., 55 Broad St. Stroudsburg, Pa.: I have always read Tightbeam with interest but never wrote to it. However, #18 has material which deserves my comment.

In reply to the letter of Donald Franson - page 5-6 - you wrote to Harvey Forman regarding the reprinting of "Sign of the Burning Hart". This was first published in France in 1938 - edition of 100 - almost all copies sold and the last 3 at \$25 each. Reprinted 1948 by the NFFF - edition of 250 - sold to members at \$1.75. Now all sold - last copies I sold for \$6. This was one venture of the NFFF which made some profit. I note you have not read this tale - too bad because it is really fine. Cannot say regarding advisability of reprinting but there are several hundred who like you know of it only as a title.

To Donald F. Anderson - Read with interest your short review of Heinlein's story STRANGER IN A STRANGE LAND. Will you please write me telling the magazine and date it appeared in? I have written of various Heavens and Hells in my last story "A Figment of a Dream" (39 pages single spaced - 5 illustrations by Prosser) Can be purchased from Jack Chalker, 5111 Liberty Heights Ave, Baltimore, or from me. Only 175 copies and am told they are nearly all sold. My theme has also been used by Mark Twain in his recent "Letters from the Earth". //Thank you for the information about your stories. In return, I can tell you that STRANGER IN A STRANGE LAND didn't appear in a magazine, but was an original hard-cover book. There is a paperback out now; Avon Book V-2056, 75¢. I enjoyed it, tho I've read better.//

CW BROOKS, JR., 911 Briarfield Rd., Newport News, Va.: I agree with George Andrews about the endless red tape and bureaucratic details that seem to fill about half the letters in TIGHTBEAM. Ten-time-around rehashes of the Rapp-Lamb thing, whether to raise the dues, Alma Hill's resignation, the Welcommittee, etc. etc. etc. I realize these details have to be taken care of but if there aren't more interesting things to talk about...? What does Andrews mean about his letter being altered? I guess you are limited in length but what other changes would the TIGHTBEAM editor want to make in someone's letter? //Some people don't like a word cut out of their letters. Some issues this isn't necessary, but I'm having to cut fairly heavily because I have three times as many letters as I can print. The reason that feudish things stay in and other things get cut is because if the editor cuts something feudish the cry is "censorship"! Cutting non-feudish things may irritate the individual whose letter is cut, but he seldom gets mad enough to make a real issue about it. I have it on excellent authority that some members think I'm going to cut out feudish portions of letters, so that they're thinking of running them in a zine of their own. In that, at

least, they're wrong.//

In regard to Kohn's question about the complex or imaginary index to a complex or imaginary number, I have not been able to find anything yet but would like more details. I assume that by "index" you mean an ordered identification system such as the standard matrix notation " a_{ij} ". I found in a mathematical dictionary that "index" can also mean exponent. What field are you working in? That is, a mathematical notation is invented for a purpose. If I can find out the exact problem or the use to which these complex indices of complex numbers are to be put I should be able to find out something from the prof of a graduate math course I'm taking. If he doesn't know, he should know someone who does. There is also a large technical library here at the Langley Research Center (NASA). If you just mean by index a complex power of a complex number such as:

$(1+i)^{(2-i)}$ then the answer is just another complex number, in this case, $(1.490+4.126i)$. Well, anyway, let me hear from you. //The most likely thing that I can think of that he might have meant would be the log of a complex number - i.e. to what complex power must e be raised to give the number. This is simple enough if the complex number can be written in the form $(\cos x + i \sin x)$, in which case it is simply equal to:

e^{ix} and presumably ix would be the desired index. But I'm not sure if this can be generalized to cover all complex numbers or not. I rather think that it can, but I wouldn't bet on it - it was 5 years ago when I took my graduate math courses, and I haven't used them since.//

I just saw the movie of THE RAVEN with Boris Karloff and Peter Lorre. I would like to know why the hell they had to make a farce out of it. I know Karloff and Lorre can do straight horror and so can Richard Matheson, who wrote the screenplay. //I saw it too, and make the observation that Karloff, Lorre, Price, and Matheson obviously also can do side-splitting farce. I loved THE RAVEN - it's the funniest show I've seen in ages, except for HAROLD LLOYD'S WORLD OF COMEDY. Some people like farces too, y'know...//(8 March)

DAVID KIRK PATRICK, 12 Girard Pl., Maplewood, NJ: I have just gotten the first copy of TB that I have ever seen. I really don't know what I expected but it seems to follow the impression that I have gotten over the past half year.

for the birds.

On the whole, fandom is

Generally speaking, fandom is just a group of people who use science fiction as an excuse to gossip and shoot off their mouths. They are interested in "number one" and no one else. You realize, of course, that I am speaking in generalities. There are exceptions who are sincerely interested in what is being done in SF and the people who write it. But most of the others are just interested in the participants of fandom. They want to see what they can get out of fandom, not what they can put into it. They would rather write letters and form little groups that exclude everybody else than expand to better horizons, if I may be so poetic. //Feel free - but what is so wrong with the fanish attitude? I'm in fandom for what I can get out of it, and can't see any other reason to be in it. There are fans (as you point out) who have a sincere interest in stf and want to improve it. Fine. I like to read stf, but have no particular ambition to write it, and from the general reaction of prozine editors they aren't interested in what the active fans think about what they print anyhow, so improvement-by-criticism seems impossible. Let's face it: fandom is just a bunch of individuals, most of whom got involved in it because they were interested in stf. But once they got together, the majority found that there are other things in the world quite as interesting as stf, and that other fans are also interested in these things too - so naturally these topics are included in fanish discussions. Whether Fandom Is A Way Of Life or Just A Goddam Hobby, it is something to be enjoyed. It is not a duty. It is for every fan to fan in his own manner, seeking out those others who share his approach if he cares to, but not trying to force his viewpoint on

others who disagree.//

What order does fandom or the NFFF have? I can see none whatsoever. This goes double for the N31. Can a person with no previous contacts in fandom just step in and find himself? The answer is obviously no. When a writer can start writing to people and find markets or when a publisher can find writers, then there might be some organization. As it is, you are lucky if you meet anybody of value in two months. My personal experiences are not too wide. So far I have had four stories put out but these stories have been the product of two amateur publishers. I have nothing against them but they are only - I repeat, only - amateur publishers I have gotten to know. The writer is expected to find his own market. He is to write to a publisher with little hope of getting an answer. Shouldn't the publisher be on the lookout for good talent? As far as I have seen, this is not the case. //You were unlucky enough to join during a short hiatus in the operation of the Manuscript Bureau. This is an N3F service which does exactly what you say we should - provide a clearing house where publishers needing material and writers needing markets can find each other. The bureau is hard to man because it requires a highly reliable fan to act as chairman - one not prone to fits of gafia or just plain procrastination. It has just been reactivated under Owen Hannifen (check roster for address) and I'm sure that he'd be more than happy to hear from you - or any other writers and pubbers who may be reading this.//

Getting to the pubber himself. Can he find material if he wants it? Can he write to Joe Blow and get an answer, any answer? Of course not. They have formed their own groups and that's it. It's stagnant for all its protest. There is no direction to fandom. There is no purpose other than to express ideas of dubious value. Something is definitely wrong when so many people get together and do nothing. //But they don't do nothing. They have a good time - which is to me sufficient justification for any hobby, as long as it's legal.//

One last general comment. I and a couple of other people have noticed an increasing tendency to print factual material rather than fiction. What does this prove? I have as yet to see anything really new. All that is done is an interpretation of something else. Originality is the better part of fandom or valour, take your pick. I suppose I am taking a writer's narrow viewpoint but why do people write articles and the such. These are basically for the consideration of other fans and have no meaning to the world at large. Again they seem to be on a single track rather than expanding. //I'll tell you why I both write and print in my fanzines almost exclusively articles and other non-fiction. By and large, most fans write terrible fiction. An article can be written rather poorly, and if it contains interesting information it will still be worthwhile to a reader who is interested in the subject at hand. A badly-written piece of fiction has no such saving grace. Humorous stories are sometimes good for a few laughs even if they aren't of professional caliber, but my general attitude is that a serious story that is worth reading is going to be in a prozine, so I don't bother. There are exceptions, but they're rare, and hardly worth plowing through the 99.98% crud to find. And that goes for my own fiction as well as anybody else's.//

GEORGE W. PRIDE, 873 Cornelia, Chicago 13, Ill.: Here is my list of the 12 greatest heroes of SF, in alphabetical order: "Pop" Baslim (CITIZEN OF THE GALAXY, Heinlein), John Carter, Giles Habibula, D.D. Harriman ("The Man who Sold the Moon" & "Requiem", Heinlein), Mr. Kiku (THE STAR BEAST, Heinlein), Kimball Kinnison, The Lieutenant (FINAL BLACKOUT, Hubbard), Clane Linn (EMPIRE OF THE ATOM & THE WIZARD OF LINN, van Vogt), Captain Nemo (20,000 LEAGUES UNDER THE SEA & THE MYSTERIOUS ISLAND, Verne), Martin Padway (LEST DARKNESS FALL, de Camp), Nicholas van Rijn (THE MAN WHO COUNTS & others, Anderson), and Verkan Vall (Paratime Police stories, Piper).

The specification was stf; if fantasy were included I would drop The Lieutenant and Verkan Vall and add Conan and Frodo Baggins.

It is hard to say why I favor these particular characters, but I'll try. They are all heroic; that is, they are all men of courage and competence, and in the end of the right, as the right is defined in each story. The courage may be either physical or moral or both. I have not tried to list the men who demolished the most galaxies or overcame the blackest villains; rather the choice was primarily on how well I remembered them. Essentially, the decision rested on the author's skill at characterization, making these heroes stand out above others of equal courage and competence. To play fair, I did not look up any of the names or run through a list of story titles; I feel that if I can't remember a character off-hand, then he didn't make enough impression on me to be worthy of the list.

A few were left off because the list was limited to twelve, such as Dirk Barnevelt of THE HAND OF ZEI and Don Channing of VENUS EQUILATERAL. If a "group character" were permitted, I would include Stefan Rostomily and the "band of brothers" who were exogenetic duplicates of his, in Poul Anderson's "Un-man" stories. If there were a place for a heroic society, I would nominate THE SURVIVORS, by Tom Godwin. Finally, if villains were permitted, I would include Helmut, who spoke for Boskone. //Ahead of Blackie DuQuesne, Gharland of Eddore, and Dr Fu Manchu? Chacun a son gout...//

I include Baslim, even tho he appears in only the first quarter of the story, because he is the primary influence in the whole book thru his life in the memory of Thorby.

Some fans deplore Smith's characterization of Kinnison, as too Boy Scoutish. Well, Kinnison is a Boy Scout type, and well done as such. Our culture has changed since Doc was in his formative period, some fifty to sixty years ago; many of us are more cynical and find it hard to believe in a Kinnison. But there really were such men, there are still a few, and if we are fortunate there will be more, and Doc has shown the type well. //The only objection I have to the characterization of Kinnison (and I voted for him too) is that at times he acts out of character, i.e. does some action that is not really required by the circumstances instead of using his brain as he usually does. Nadreck of Palain usually made better sense with his actions - at least to me.// (17 March)

AL LEWIS, 1825 Greenfield Ave., Los Angeles 25, Calif.: Firstly, I'd like to take up the matter of the release of Directorate information, a point raised by both Clayton Hamlin and Richard Roberts. The allegation that "The Directors this year have adopted a stringent policy of security to prevent opinions and discussion of directorate matters in public and official publications" is wholly untrue. In point of fact, there has been more information released concerning the activities of the 1962 and 1963 Directorates than at any time since I have been a member of the club. I think Richard Roberts might find it educational to take the six issues of TNFF published during 1962 and the six published in 1961 and set them side by side and see which Directorate made a conscientious policy of getting the information regarding the measures it had passed to the membership. In 1961 he will find just two reports of Directorate action, both of them written by the President. Clay Hamlin was a member of the 1961 Directorate as was I, but I think that without his memory to assist him he would have a rather difficult time determining from published accounts just what that Directorate did. At the beginning of 1962 I initiated the policy of printing, in TNFF, the exact wording of every motion passed by the Directorate. They are all there, every one of them, and when there were no motions passed that fact was reported too. At the time of the election a complete recap was made of all Directorate actions taken to date in the year, so that members could have as much information on which to base their votes as was within the power of the Directorate Chairman to give in an objective manner. Any Director was free, at any time, to supplement the official accounts by letters to TB, nor was any attempt made to control the opinions there expressed.

Directorate discussion, however, does have certain restrictions placed upon it.

Every Directorate establishes its own standing rules and the following rule was set forth by the Directorate Chairman to the Directorate in a letter dated 3 January 62: "Directorate correspondence is privileged, and should be quoted with discretion." In other words, what the Directors divulged to the membership was left to the judgment of the Directors, with the privilege of being jumped on if their judgment did not correspond to the judgment of the other members of the Directorate. But this is nothing new. Compare this statement from Art Hayes letter of 17 Jan 61 to the members of the 1961 Directorate: "But, basically, communications of Directorate discussions to non-Directorate members, should be kept to an absolute minimum and a lot of discretion used when any is passed along."

There are some excellent reasons for this. In 1960 the immediate occasion for the imposition of such a rule was the discovery that then-Director Alan J. Lewis was publishing directorate letters in the Cult for the purpose of making fun of them. In going through back issues of TNFF to try to find how many rules of what kind were still officially on the books and in effect Janie Lamb discovered a rule from 1955 forbidding discussion of Directorate matters outside the Directorate. Why these repeated injunctions? Several reasons, the most important being that complete freedom of expression is necessary and no Director is willing to be held to account for a half-baked or tentative opinion put forth in the course of a discussion - an opinion often modified by collision with the opinion of others. Also he must be free to state opinions regarding members of the club - even uncomplimentary ones which are not intended for general circulation. Also, if involved in an argument, one nearly always tends to overstate his case. Simply in order to properly transact business one must be able to speak with perfect freedom - and that means that communication must be privileged. When, however, that discussion has reached the point of action, the Director must be willing to take his stand before the people who elected him - hence the official reports of Directorate business and of the voting which appears in TNFF.

One class of business did not get into the official reports of last year, and that was feuding. There are two reasons for that. First, it is quite impossible to report in an objective manner, and second, once feuding becomes public, the members will invariably choose up sides, based on whatever partial information they are able to get hold of. No statement should be taken out of context, and the context of last year's trouble is a pile of Directorate letters about four inches thick. We had a real donnybrook going last year; the election solved the Directorate's internal problems, and the 1963 Directorate is functioning quite well. However, during all of 1962 our donnybrook involved a grand total of six people - Art and Nancy Rapp, myself, Alma Hill, Janie Lamb, and Art Hayes. If a quarrel cannot be solved, the next best thing is to keep it down to manageable size, and let everybody else get on with the proper business of the organization.

Now part of the proper business of the organization is publishing, and that brings up Clayton Hamlin's second point, postage rates. I don't know to what two Directors he wrote originally //me for one - though at the time I wasn't a Director.//, but the letter I received arrived via Art Hayes in January, well after the deadline of the January TB. This issue crops up periodically - fans are always looking for a cheap way out, and the membership might be generally interested.

At present we mail at standard third-class printed-matter rates, 4¢ the first two ounces and 2¢ each additional ounce. The average cost of mailing TNFF under the old rates was usually about 6¢ which would be 8¢ at present prices. This was generally true both of my TNFFs and those Ralph Holland edited. There are several cheaper rates which at first glance seem desirable.

SECOND

CLASS is quite cheap, but the regulations forbid mimeographed matter. CONTROLLED CIRCULATION PUBLICATIONS are also cheaper, but the rules forbid enclosures - which would mean that such things as ballots, Fanbooks, etc. would have to be sent out

separately, 3d Class, cancelling out any savings. BULK MAILINGS, NON-PROFIT ORG. 4-12¢ a pound, but hobby clubs are specifically prohibited from this class. //The preceding is condensed from a more detailed explanation in Al's letter. Continuing in his own words...// That leaves the 18¢ rate//for bulk mailings, other than non-profit org., 18¢/lb.//. Here we do qualify - at least for TNFF, which comes out of a single postoffice. But here a permit fee is required - \$30 per year under the new regulations. Supposing that TNFF averages four ounces, four issues to a pound, we would pay 18¢ instead of 32¢ for four copies, a saving of approximately \$10.50 per mailing of 300 copies, \$63.00 a year. But deduct the \$30 permit fee and we have an annual saving of \$33 only. Now this is not negligible, and it is here that the personal preference of the editor must come in. Section 134.425 describes preparation of mailing - sorting, labelling, and tying into packages of 10, and considering that there is already something in the neighborhood of 40+ manhours of work going into the production of an issue of TNFF, sorting and tying thirty packages of fanzines might just be the straw that broke the back of the editor's willingness to work. Editing, rewriting, stencilling, mimeographing, collating, enveloping, labelling, and mailing is already an oppressive chore when it must be done over 300 times. Since the cost of each issue normally runs about \$10 over what the club reimburses, I don't feel that I am cheating the club financially. However, if an editor could be found who was willing to do the additional work involved, I would be deliriously happy to unload the magazine.

Clay makes a point regarding the story contest. Like the 1961 and 1963 contests, the 1962 contest was set up by the President under his power to conduct the affairs of the club, and was not a subject for Directorate discussion last year. I think if Clay felt strongly about the conduct of last year's story contest he should have made it an issue in the election last year when Art announced his candidacy for the Presidency - not wait until the results are in before beginning to complain about what has become past history. As it was, not a single one of Art's detractors were willing to stand up to him in an open election - nor were these public-spirited people willing to try to take on the tasks of club administration once Art received orders for overseas shipment and was forced to withdraw and the filing deadline was extended.

As for the Janie Lamb-Nancy Rapp exchange, I have said all I think needs to be said on the matter in the flyer that accompanied THRU THE HAZE 19 for November 1962. As I said therein, that particular blowup was a result of a misunderstanding caused by a failure of communication which, though unintentional on my part, was partly my fault. The facts as stated therein are correct to the best of my knowledge, and I see no need to repeat them here. //If those of you who are curious would just look up TTH 19, and not 20 or 21 or any of the others which say what other people say Al said, it would be more fair to all concerned. I have heard this business beat about from pillar to post from the day it started, and the only thing which Al stated as a fact which has been questioned is whether Nancy actually wrote Janie asking about their dues before she wrote TB. Al said in TTH that she had, Janie says she hadn't, Nancy said in a letter to this issue of TB which I have unfortunately lost that she had. Whether she had or hadn't, Al told the truth as he knew it. The thing about that flyer that got some people so worked up was the fact that Al said he thought that the tone of Janie's reply was way off base - that a simple statement of the fact that she had reported the dues, which Al could and did confirm, would have sufficed, and that jumping on Nancy with both feet was unjustified. This is debatable, but it's a question of taste and judgment and not one of facts. Al's facts as stated were substantially correct, with the one questionable point as noted.// (14 April)

//This issue is running way too long. A recalculation tells me that the new 12¢ rate for TB will allow a 24-page ish without costing me anything. Since I have been more than usually verbose in my editorial comment, I'll donate an extra 4 pp to the N3F as

compensation for my self-indulgence in inserting comments. And I hope that nobody objects too strenuously to that. Don told me to comment, but preferably just a short paragraph at the end of each letter. I got carried away. If I've offended anyone, I offer my apologies. And now excerpts from two long letters from James MacLean and Ed Meskys)

JAMES MACLEAN, PO Box 401, Anacortes, Wash.: I've an interest in ESP/psionics, all right, and have had "experiences" and know a bit about the field. There's quite a bit of pragmatic knowledge in psionics kicking around, but of course no acceptable experimental proof capable of convincing the compulsive doubter - as JWC points out in the March ANALOG none is possible, by current definition of "acceptable experiment". //I am a doubter of psi. However, I can be convinced. I won't go into it here, but if I have time I'll write the next TB just what it would take to convince me that psi is for real.// To someone who is, however, capable of looking a datum in the face even when it doesn't fit his current framework of theory and of applying straightforward inductive logic //please define//, with little emotional bias, to such data, that pragmatic knowledge can be pretty useful. Work in the field has already reached the point, despite the "groping in the dark" character of most of it, where one lifetime is too short to repeat and re-validate all the significant experiments (I use the word loosely, in the Webster, not the strict scientific, sense) done to date. One has to apply common-sense criteria of trustworthiness and accept the reports of some workers in the field as being honest attempts to accurately describe their experiences, tho always recalling that it's a field in which charlatanny is particularly soul-satisfying and remunerative, hence very common. Trouble is, the probably-valid reports of experiences and experiments are scattered all over the place and each new person who acquires an interest in the subject has to wade through tone of mystical and even pseudo-mystical (i.e. deliberate, sucker-baiting hogwash) junk to locate a few lines of some apparent validity.

//He then deplors the lack of imagination of the Duke/Rhine experiments, mentions the importance of obtaining personal subjective experience just as basic science courses include duplication of some of the classical experiemnts not because the students are going to check all past experiments but to give them the feel of scientific experimentation and a sort of spot check on the validity of accepting past experimental results. He then suggests a program.//

Learn hypnotism (sure it's potentially dangerous, but so's a hunting rifle and I will spit in the eye of anyone who tells me ownership and use of firearms should be restricted to official types because of their potential danger - there are a few simple rules which, sensibly followed, make hypnotism quite safe); you can do most things without it that you can with it, but it speeds things vastly for most people. Then do a water-dowsing experiment, build a Hieronymous machine, do some automatic writing and Ouija board work (not for any "info from the dear departed", but to become familiar with them, since they will be useful from time to time and are in themselves interesting phenomena; some hypnotism may be necessary to get started on them), make or get a set of Rhine cards and see how the different members of your group do in the usual experiments for telepathy and clairvoyance, build one of Dr. Puharich's "Faraday Cage" telepathy amplifiers if you have any pairs in your group who get consistently above-chance scores on standard telepathy tests and see what happens to their scores when they use it, and finally take members of your group who have good recall of their early life and, in hypnosis, run them thru a few past lives with a tape recorder going.

Don Franson: First, re Jerry Pournelle, there is absolutely no logical connection between your premise, that no scientific theory is any good that doesn't take into consideration and explain any phenomena that may contradict it, and its supposed consequence, that a religion, to be good enuff for the whole human race, cannot be exclusive; in fact, I find it rather difficult to envision a state of mind in which the one would seem to imply the other.

What on Earth or off it can promising everyone, non-exclusively, "their fair share" of Heaven or Nirvana or what-have-you have to do with the criteria for acceptability of a scientific theory. Either a religion is Revealed Truth, in which case it's True and no quibbling; or it's a handy social stickum and an opium of such masses as feel the urge, in which case it's a phenomenon within the province of cultural anthro and while one could argue loud and long about how good a stickum and/or opiate this or that one makes or would make, it would take a pretty cold-blooded type to propose starting a new one for just those purposes (tho it's been done before) and its effectiveness would have nothing to do with the criteria for judging scientific theories and everything to do with the relationship to the parameters of the particular culture into which it was to be introduced; of, finally, it's an attempt, more or less successful, at a scientific approach to spiritual phenomena, with perhaps some techniques for bettering the lot of the individual spirit insofar as such techniques can be developed and prove to be practical. In which case it's almost a dead certainty that it'll be "exclusive", in exactly the same way biochemistry or nuclear physics or proficiency at chess are "exclusive" - you'd have to learn, study, work, and practice to accomplish anything. //He then compares inability to use psi to hysterical blindness - it takes willingness of the patient and work to cure the repression that caused it.//

//He then goes on to say that his earlier statement that a theory's validity depends on how well it predicts observed data is not at all the same thing as believing anything and everything. He proposes a gradation of belief, varying in proportion to how well the given theory predicts your own direct perceptions. He continues:// The degree to which it "accounts satisfactorily" should depend on these factors: it must not predict events which, on observation, are found not to occur; it must not predict the non-occurrence of events which on observation are found to occur; and the more a priori premises it requires to fill those two requirements the less satisfactory it is. What I'm objecting to is people who, sloppily and carelessly, believe those theories which are generally accepted by those around them or whom they consider Authorities (rather than taking the trouble to form their own independent probability-judgment), disbelieve those which are generally not accepted, and as a necessary consequence, judge the accuracy of perception-communications according to how well the reported perception jibes with the set of theories which they Believe. This last I consider a cardinal sin, and it's apparently a sin of which you're guilty as hell - so there! //One hasn't time in this life to investigate everything there is, and forming an independent probability-judgment requires investigating the field. I for one am not especially interested in psi - why should I devote time to investigating it when I can think of so many other things I'd rather investigate? If one thing seems certain about psi, it is that in the present state of our knowledge nothing very useful can be done with it. Who the hell cares whether he can score above random on Rhine cards or not? Now if you tell me that you can teach me a way to always be sure who has the missing Queen in a bridge game, I'll at least give you a try. Otherwise, why bother? So If I'm not going to investigate, I can only judge by my opinion of the reliability of the people asserting the different viewpoints. How else? You make the very common mistake of thinking that just because you're intensely interested in something that it's so interesting that everyone else is interested in it too, and that those who deny it are identical with those who do not affirm it or at least express willingness to look and see. They aren't - a large group, including me and possibly Don, are simply indifferent to it. Except we can't resist an argument about anything...// (20 March)

ED MESKYS, Theor Div, Bldg 162, LRL, Box 808, Livermore, Calif.: Back in TB 14 Ron Wilson said that most examples of religion in stf are sacrilegious, and cited DARK UNIVERSE and A CANTICLE FOR LEIBOWITZ as examples. I hold exactly the opposite viewpoint and feel that only a small minority of religious stf is sacrilegious.

I most emphatically agree with Gary Lebowitz (in TB 15) when he praises CANTICLE and just don't see how it could be considered sacrilegious. Sacrilege generally refers to an action which defiles an object held sacred by some religion, so that the act is usually sacrilegious only to members of those faiths which hold the object in question in veneration. So in almost all cases an act would be sacrilegious only to members of one faith. I suppose that this could be extended to statements - a statement derogatory to or mocking of the beliefs or philosophy of life of a particular faith, group of religions (such as Christianity as a whole), or even religion as a whole could be considered sacrilegious. But it seems to me that a better word for that would be profane or heretical.

Anyhow, criticism on the grounds of sacrilege/profanity/heresy must be made in context with the background of the story. A Christian could hardly accuse a religious background story written from the viewpoint of Islam as s/p/h and a Buddhist couldn't complain about a Jewish story even if said stories went against the reader's precepts. OK, let's take a few examples.

Beginning with the story that started all this fuss, A CANTICLE FOR LEIBOWITZ, one immediately sees that it is written from the viewpoint of Roman Catholicism. So one could complain of s/p/h only if the story somehow violated the mores of Catholicism (or Christianity in general or religion in general...but if this were the case it would have also offended C'ism, so that it was already covered //there might be those who would say that any resemblance between Roman Catholicism and Biblical Christianity is purely nominal, but I won't, out of deference to the feelings of the several RCs I know of in the N3F...//). Now as far as I can see there is only one thing in the whole book that seems even remotely questionable, and I doubt if anything is wrong even then. I am referring to the "unfallen" nature of the mutant's second personality which came alive at almost the very end of the book. Even that is only (perhaps) theologically impossible and not actively offensive. And could anything be considered offensive if the offense were detectable only by a theologian?

TICLE in any way sacrilegious.

So I just can't see considering CAN-
//He then goes on to comment on A CASE OF CONSCIENCE, saying that though it is also from an RC viewpoint it does not seem to have the same "feel" for RCism that ACFL has. He then mentions the Clarke story, "The Star", and Betsy Curtis' answer, "The Rebuttal". He says the Curtis story, ostensibly from a RC viewpoint, is theological nonsense. He then continues://

Stories like DARK UNIVERSE which set up a new religion which is obviously wrong and have the hero discover the loopholes and loose his faith present an interesting question. They obviously attack no existing religion so can't be objected to on those grounds by believers. Should they be considered as attacking religion in general and thus called "sacrilegious" or should they be considered an attack on fraud in religion and so be praised?

In my opinion this depends on the intentions of the author. If this is obviously meant as an attack on all religion it should be considered as such. (An example of an obvious attack on Catholicism is Steinbeck's fantasy "St. Kathy the Pig", reprinted in Bradbury's anthology TIMELESS STORIES FOR TODAY AND TOMORROW.) But if it merely postulates some religion arising as an outgrowth of unusual physical conditions, isolation, and a reversion to savagery (as in DARK UNIVERSE) which is merely an incidental bit of "local color" added to the story I just can't see anything wrong with it. Nor even with stories like Del Rey's "For I Am a Jealous People" in STAR SHORT NOVELS which postulated that God gave the Earth over to a race of ETS which are his new (to us) "Chosen people". //He then gives a brief description of the story. Since it is currently back in print, I suggest that anyone interested read it himself - it's good, I think.//

In fact, there is only one SF story I remember which I

considered to be offensive. It was in ASTOUNDING back around '54 and was called something like "These Shall Not Be Lost". It went strongly against all Christianity by hypothesizing that Christ was in no way divine but was an ET sociologist who used scientifically faked miracles to start a new philosophy of life to get mankind out of a rut and eventually have him work out desirable sociological changes. //If true, what a failure he must have been! If Christianity is a true religion, then it may have saved souls, but as for producing desirable sociological changes...hah!//

//Then

Ed goes on to tell of his new project - completing and stencilling Piers Jacobs' index to book reviews in SF mags. And he asks for help.//

You see, while it covers complete runs of many magazines it still does not cover everything simply because Piers does not have a complete collection. Thanks to Dick Tiedman and Al HaLevy several other titles will be covered, but there are still major gaps. Principal among these right now are early ASTOUNDING and AMAZING, about 1/3 of THRILLING WONDER, all of the British magazines, all of WEIRD TALES, and most of the short lived zines from the 1953 deluge. There are other gaps but these are the major ones. I could fill about 1/5 of them myself, but my collection is in MY which I visit for a week or so every 3 months so I can't do much then.

//He says he hopes that some of you might already have such indices for some mags; if so he'd like to know titles of mags covered, what years, whether complete runs or scattered issues, do you have full name of author, any indication of length of review, how long the review had to be to be included on your list, and whether it is on index cards, sheets of paper, or what.// Finally, perhaps some of you would volunteer to help complete the missing portions of the index? If so please drop me a line telling me what zines you have, about what portion you are willing to go through for the index, etc. and I'll return a list of needed issues & a standardized format for you to follow. //I personally hope that everyone who can will help with this project. It will be another of the many recent N3F publications which are of value to all fans of stf, and will probably end up making money for the club through sales to outsiders, as the Fandbooks and indexes already published have. The more complete it is the better it will go over.//

Looking over

the last few TBs a thought strikes me. Here we are merrily discussing various topics - particularly that of the relationship of the N3F with the rest of fandom - and it must be all very confusing to the 50 or so of the 100 new members who have had no previous contact with the N3F or any other aspect of fandom. They must really be wondering just what is going on. Please, in writing your letters try not to blather too much about N3F business but also include some stuff of general interest. I mean, like this is a stf club so how about discussing some more stf, huh? Or anything which isn't boring old N3F business. The first half dozen or so issues of TB were a real pleasure to read with all sorts of wild arguments and discussions going on and I think the turning point was my own 8th issue 1½ years ago. I think I made a mistake by printing virtually every letter that came in, and most of those complete. I should have edited out some of the N3F discussion so that matters would have been more balanced. Ever since there has been less and less outside material and TB has been getting less and less interesting.

//And that, people, is the last letter. I didn't print any of the letters that the Bills forwarded to me, since I was pushed for space and figured that since their ish was on time anyone who had had anything vital to say would have time to write me separately. I also lost letters from Nancy Rapp and Don Franson that I know of; I apologize to them specifically and to anyone else whose letter I might have lost. I have just moved into a new house, and in the shuffle that always involves some things may easily have gotten mislaid. All letters that I could find were printed, with editing to try to keep this thing in bounds. I've enjoyed it, though.//

3. Official Directorate correspondence and statements shall be regarded by officers of the NFFF as "DNQ". This "DNQ" shall in no way be construed to preclude an officer publicly expressing his own views on any subject whatever. (P)

4. Each Directorate shall adopt standing rules of procedure. (P)

5. The Directorate Representative to N'APA shall have the following duties:

(1) To bring before the Directorate any items of business regarding N'APA which need Directorate attention.

(2) To act as trouble-shooter in cases where there has been an actual or alleged dereliction of duty on the part of the Official Editor of N'APA. (63)

IV. THE SECRETARY-TREASURER

1. The Secretary-Treasurer may bill the Treasury, as needed, for expenses incurred in the discharge of the office, including purchase of supplies for new members, the sum not to exceed \$35.00 per year. (P)

2. The Secretary will maintain a current membership roster, and will report new members, renewals, and changes of address to the President, Official Editor, Chairman of the Welcommittee, and such other officers as the President may direct, not less often than once a month. (P)

V. ELECTIONS

1. All candidates must, by the filing deadline, have paid their dues for the year in which they will hold office if elected. (0)

2. Write-in votes for the offices of President and Director are permitted. Candidates so elected must submit a written statement of their willingness to serve and renewal dues for the year in which elected to reach the Secretary-Treasurer by January 1 of that year. In event of non-compliance, the election will be voided, and the candidate receiving the next highest number of votes for that office declared the winner. (P)

VI. PUBLICATIONS

1. THE NATIONAL FANTASY FAN

(1) The maximum amount that the Treasury will reimburse the publisher of THE NATIONAL FANTASY FAN shall be //12¢ or 13¢; balloting currently in progress// per member per issue, except for the election issue, the ceiling for which shall be 15¢ per member. Any unused portion of this allocation may be permitted to accumulate for the purpose of paying for the increased size of the election issue. All unused funds shall revert to the treasury at the end of the year. (0, except for amount)

(2) The Official Organ shall contain a list of renewals, as reported by the Secretary-Treasurer, a current roster to be published semi-annually, and annual publication of the Constitution. (P)

2. TIGHTBEAM

(1) THE maximum amount that the Treasury will reimburse the publisher of TIGHT-BEAM shall be 12¢ per member per issue. (63)

(2) If the letterzine does not appear as scheduled - within the first ten days of the month in which it is due - the sum allocated for its publication will revert back to the Treasury and not allowed to accumulate. (0)

(3) The Stand-by Editor is to be compensated for any issues of TIGHTBEAM which he publishes, provided that such publication occurs within two months of the originally-scheduled date of publication, in a sum not to exceed that which would have been due the originally designated publisher, upon presentation of an itemized bill to the Secretary-Treasurer. (63)

3. PUBLICATIONS BUREAU: The duties of the publications bureau shall be:

(1) To publish or to supervise the publication of all N3F publications not of a recurrent nature.

(2) To distribute publications, for a price and on request, that may be of interest to the membership.

(3) To furnish the Treasurer, not less than bimonthly, an accounting of all funds received and disbursed by this Bureau, in such form as the Treasurer may specify.

4. GENERAL

(1) Publications issued by subordinate bureaus of the N3P, but not generally distributed to the entire membership, shall be sent to the President and the Directors for purposes of information, and to the Secretary-Treasurer for information and record. In the case of N'APA, this shall be construed to mean THE ALLIANCE AMATEUR or other official business publication, and not the entire mailing. (63)

(2) To facilitate an exchange of information, the principal officers of the British Science Fiction Association shall be provided with copies of each of the generally-distributed club publications during their term of office, the cost to be borne by the Treasury of the NFFF. (62)

VII. RESCISSIONS: Directorate motions in the nature of Bylaws passed prior to the original compilation and publication of these Bylaws and not included among them are rescinded. (P)

There are some minor amendments to these by-laws already under consideration - this is the list as it appeared on the initial ballot, with one minor modification which has already been agreed to by the person making the initial motion. The remaining amendments are as follows: IV, 2, proposed to add the N'APA OE to the list who must receive reports of new members and renewals. V, 2, to change the deadlines to the voting deadline for dues and 1 Dec for acceptance. VI, 1, (2), to add a list of new members and change the roster publication to annual instead of semi-annual.

By the time most of you get this these motions will have been voted on and passed or rejected already, but if you have any desires to make known please do. It's physically impossible for the Directors to write each and every member to find what he thinks would be a good idea, but any member can and should write the Directors if he has something on his mind - how else can we know what you'd like to see. Tell us, and if it's feasible we'll do it, or give a reason why not. If you don't tell us what you want, you can't blame us for not giving it to you.

This has been a long and somewhat political editorial. It was not intended to be feudish. I am sure that almost all of the people criticizing the administration are quite sincere. I do feel that they have allowed a personality conflict to blind them to the fact that on the questions of club business there is little or no difference between the sides - I have heard no criticism of our projects. I ask of you all one thing only - to look back thru the past five months of club publications (including THRU THE HAZE, which isn't a club publication but which circulates almost exclusively to Neffers) and see who has been feuding and who has been tending to business. Then draw your own conclusions.

FROM: Janie Lamb
Route #1, Box 364
Heiskell, Tenn.



PRINTED MATTER ONLY
MAY BE OPENED FOR POSTAL
INSPECTION IF NECESSARY

RETURN REQUESTED

Through rain, and fog, and show,
Through heat of day and dark of night,
Deliver this to:

John P. Tucker