



TIGHTBEAL #33, September 1965, published for NSF by G.M. Carr, 5619 Ballard NW,
Seattle, Washington 98107

TIGHTBEAM

TIGHTBEAM #33 is the official letterzine of the National Fantasy Fan Federation.
October, 1965, issue published by G. M. Carr, 5319 Ballard Ave. NW, Seattle, Wn.

(Pat McDonnell, Jr., 110 E. Moore St., Rock Hill, S.C. 29730.) 7/6/65

Dear G.M.,

Many of the Welcomittee letters I have received as a new N3Ter have suggested that I "get active", specifically that I write to TIGHTBEAM. I haven't yet seen a copy so I don't know the usual format, but there is something I would like to say. So here is my offer for TB #33:

There are two main paths to knowledge. One is the resolution of inconsistencies in our picture of the universe. The other is through finding new ways of looking at old facts and ideas. One of the reasons why I personally enjoy SF so much is because of the way it so often presents new ways of looking at old things. Such a book as Mark Clifton's Eight Keys to Eden comes to mind as a great example of this.

If man, and each of us individually, is to live and grow it is through the finding of new ways of looking and the resolution of inconsistencies. One of the best sources of these (besides SF in general) has been John Campbell's editorials. I have always found them to be interesting, stimulating and challenging -- especially when I've disagreed with them. I think his editorials should be read and re-read many times. It was for this reason that I wrote to John and suggested that he publish a collection of his editorials in hard covers.

I recently got a letter from JWC, Jr. (notice that he never uses the "Jr" lately?) informing that such a book will be published early next year by Doubleday (editor, Harry Harrison). This book would be, I feel, a valuable addition to any thinking-man's library, and I'm sure there must be many other fans who feel the way I do about this subject.

Hopefully yours,

Pat McDonnell, Jr.

Editor of TIGHTBEAM #34 will be CINDY HEAP, BOX 1487, ROCHESTER, NEW YORK, 14624.

(Gregg Wolford; 9001 Joyzelle, Garden Grove, California 92640) 071565-18

Letter for TIGHTBEAM 33 (Get it out on time, hear?)--

Gee, two good issues in a row. I wonder how long it'll be before TB gets zonked again.

Joe Saunders: Hmmm, those radio shows sound interesting. Maybe I should move back to New York... Will you be selling any tapes of the shows to fans (slightly cheaper rates if we supply our own tape? will you? huh? if you don't I'll get some friends of mine to start a payola controversy in New York.).

Roy Tackett: Well, I confess I AM slightly prejudiced against MOH--the fact is that I don't particularly care for the weird tales school of fiction, with very few exceptions. But then I've read quite a few of Lowndes' other recent mags (FUTURE, ORIGINAL SF) without being particularly impressed. Quite the opposite in some cases.

Clayton Hamlin: Well, I guess to a typical sercon solid-SF fan paperbacks can seem better than magazines. But I prefer a mag to any old impersonal paperback novel. What I would like to see is something like AUTHENTIC SF MONTHLY, a paperback with lettercols and things like that.

Donald Francon: So that's what the "Title Project" was all about! I attempted something similar to it when I still had 700 pbs cluttering up the place, but gave up after a while. Hmmmph.

David Bradley: Oh, come on now. Some editing of letters is always needed--it would have been nice a few issues back in the Wright letter. It seems to me there are three broad topics that we're dealing with: sercon, faan, and mundane. Why not leave the 1st 2 to TB (should that be the other way around?) what with FAPA and a good deal of N'APA battling around politics and religion.

Ellen Cox: Well, the Syracon/Tricon thing is The Main Topic around today. Besides, the TB editor couldn't do too much editing on that discussion, he was one part of it!

Tom Dupree: As long as we're quoting from the Mar65 ANALOG, I've got a few quotes for you: "It will be printed on...one of the family of "Antique" papers, but a white stock instead of the ivory tinted material this issue uses." So, I still contend that I is right and you is wrong and ANALOG's printed on the same kind of paper only "colored differently" as it was last year. I don't know why I'm arguing this with you. Heck, as a Little Monster I'm not even sure I should acknowledge your existence. I mean, anybody that can go for FRANKENSTEIN, JR. and GODZILLA vs KING KONG vs THE NBC PEACOCK just isn't really human, somehow...

Al Jackson: I'm expecting another big upsurge in SF movies right after CHRONICLES makes its hoped-for smash. Once that SF has become "respectable" most all producers will probably turn out more miles of crud in the hopes of big box office...what with all those people who decide to try another SF movie after MC. I don't seem to have answered your questions, but I DID comment, anyway.

Alma Hill: I can't see anything wrong with Cohen using those big-name reprints. As long as it sells copies it's good. You're absolutely right: Save Our Landmark!

Art Hayes: With all that work to do you deserve congratulations for getting out a 24-page TB. But: do you really, REALLY like the way Fred LERNER has handled N'APA? If it was Fred PATTEN I'd agree, but I think Lerner has done a rather rotten job...at least with that resolution which would enable N'APA & NST to part company.

Dear Gem:

..071765-19

Forgimme! Pleeese forgive me! I mean, for mailing that letter without a stamp. At least, I THINK I mailed the letter without a stamp. I think. And I THINK it'll go through at 5¢ postage due rather than bouncing back to me. I think. Well, anyway, here's another 5¢ stamp to pay you back--TB editors lose snuff money as is without having to shell out 5¢ postage due (wouldn't it be funny if (a) the letter DOES come back, leaving you to wonder just what the devil this is all about, or (b) I put a stamp on it after all, and I had one more stamp lying around the house that I thought, which is why I found one extra. Owell...)

that was a genuine mishap,

Gregg Volford, Uninc.

(GmC: You did. It did. They do. It didn't, I didn't & you didn't. Thanks.)

Deadline for the November TIGHTBEAM #34 is October 15, 1965.

(Jack L. Chalker, 5111 Liberty Heights Ave., Baltimore, Md. 21207) July 15, 1965

Members:

I would like to put in a short note to the effect that I am running a Postal Diplomacy game through the Games Bureau. The monthly magazine, which - judging from response - may handle more than one game per issue, will be available to Postal Diplomacy umpires in trade for other Postal Diplomacy 'zines. Only PD 'zines, however. It will be available, too, on a subscription basis - 10 issues for \$1.00. Only 10 extras will be run off each issue, so if you'd like to keep track of the Bureau's Diplomacy activities & watch how the GB folks play the game, or you want to pick up some pointers on your game from our experience, or you want to learn the game of Postal Diplomacy, a buck brings you close to a game's worth - including nasty and insidious Propaganda.

(Chalker - cont'd)

AXOLOTL is the journal of the 1965 series of Games Bureau Diplomacy games. It is not used in actual conduct of play except in build and retreat Winter situations, but it contains Propaganda, decisions, pointers, and a complete resume of all moves for the game 'year'.

All GB Postal Diplomacy games will contain a waiting list; if there is a resignation from a game, persons who are on the waiting list will be invited to take over.

AXOLOTL is not, however, a fanzine telling you with articles & illustrations how to play the game. It is the game -- an essential part of it. You can enjoy Postal Diplomacy with the game's 'zine as a spectator sport. It's fun & instructive, since you learn where not to make mistakes, whenever one player makes such a mistake & gets clobbered.

I am, further, running for reelection to the post of Director. My platform will appear in TNEF -- if there is a TNEF -- but, quite basically, there has been some stink about Tackett's resignation & condemnation, etc. Ridiculous. A smooth-running, active organization is evidence that the Directors did their jobs well. I should think. If -- as Tackett said -- the club were always falling apart with the Directors trying to put it back together again, that's a helluva state and a pretty bad Directorate.

The only resignation was because the club was functioning smoothly. I think that is a recommendation for the present slate, or, at least, all who plan to run again.

Your vote will be appreciated.

According to the July, 1965 WRITER, Gnome Press is back in business and planning to resume the publication of books shortly. From Ozzie Train is the news that we may soon see Prime Press back again, with Seabury Quinn's ALIEN FLESH as the first book. Arkham House has added SOMETHING BREATHING, a collection of poetry, to its 1965 schedule; Ken Krueger is bringing out the EE Evans Memorial-collection FOOD FOR DEMONS -- first Shroud book in 8 years -- and Don Grant is thinking of publishing a good bit more special material after the phenomenal success of GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ERB, including fiction. The specialty presses are really at it again!

On a less professional -- but barely so -- scale, Mark Owings and my Anthem Chapbooks Series will have MIRAGE ON LOVECRAFT -- Autobiography/Notes on the Writing of Weird Fiction? Some Notes on Interplanetary fiction, all by Lovecraft, plus NOTES ON LOVECRAFT by David H. Keller & A REBUTTAL TO LOVECRAFT CRITICISM by August Derleth, with Prosser cover. This will be \$2.00. If you ordered this from me prior to January 1, 1965, please drop me a card to that effect. There has been a snarl in the records. If you ordered from a dealer, or from Mark Owings, do not write. That is, unless you haven't received this by the time you read this letter.

Also probably out by the time you read this will be the mammoth bibliography of the SF specialty house publishers, INDEX TO THE SCIENCE FANTASY PUBLISHERS, edited by Owings & Myself. Not a checklist -- a full scale biblio, including contents listing, illustrators, etc. -- for over 35 SF specialty houses. That's \$5.00.

In the works will be things like PORTRAIT OF LOVECRAFT, by W. Paul Cook; WHITE-HEAD: CLARK ASHTON SMITH: A LITERARY VIEW, etc.

The business is really looking up. I may even be able to get out another MIRAGE this year -- indeed, it's nearly certain! And Don Fryer will publish the 150-plus page complete CAS biblio in a small edition this December.

One slight note -- I don't believe that SF readers and writers will ever like an stf film or TV show. Reason: OUTER LIMITS was "too much monster".. Well, look at the July ANALOG: taken at random I see 4 very alien creatures in two stories, including a thing that looks like a giant brontosaurus/centaur, a cat-thing, and a wolf-like creature of horrible and loathesome shape. If the best-intentioned TV producer with plenty of money were to produce either tale, how would those creatures look with the best of special effects? Like monsters, of course. And we'd hear screaming about

that TV show being "just old terror monsters." SF is monsters; the problem is when we read about them they seem real to us -- but when we're confronted with a video visual image of them (1) it isn't our concept as we see it in the mind's eye, or (2) it looks phoney.

In this case, you'll never have a good SF story that does not involve only humans (HALF A LOAF, same ANALOG, is one such) materializing to good results on the TV or movie screen.

If OUTER LIMITS had gotten around to FIRST CONTACT, that Leinster classic scheduled for the last 13 of the past season & so never done, we would have been outraged at the stupid faked alien monsters. We really would. And it would be very close, probably, to what Leinster envisions the other race as being.

Ever think of what a Courel would look like on TV?

My best to ye all;

Cordially,

Jack Chalker

Send your letters to TIGHTBEAM #34 Editor CINDY HEAP, BOX 1487, ROCHESTER, NY 14624

(Cuyler Warnell Brooks, Jr., 911 Briarfield Road, Newport News, Va. 23605) July 16, '65
Dear TB,

Or maybe I should say "Galloping Consumption". TB32 says they don't know the editor of #33 yet, but that I can send this to Janie Lamb. So I will.

First off, my letter in TB32 did not appear quite as I wrote it. The sentence "Naturally Walter Breen does not write to TB about coin collecting, it is a very narrow field of interest among people who attend lodge dinners" does not make sense. What I really wrote, as far as I can remember, was "Naturally Walter Breen does not write to TB about coin collecting, it is a very narrow field of interest. The fact that Janie Lamb does not discuss SF at lodge dinners merely shows the narrow range of interests among people who attend lodge dinners." That still may not make sense, but at least the nonsense is my own. Looking at it now, I guess it was probably a typing error on Hayes' part.

Saunders: In reply to my remarks on Janifer's YOU SAME MEN, you say the society depicted is casually sketched in and merely stage setting. Stage setting for what? The plot is meager and never comes to any resolution, and the characters are sketched no better than the society.

Mann: In regard to your comment to Kohn on stationary orbits (whether they are possible only around the equator), I think there is some confusion in terms. Any stable orbit is stationary in space. If you mean an orbit such that the satellite remains fixed over one point of the rotating earth, this is called a synchronous orbit. A synchronous orbit is only possible in the equatorial plane, at a distance from the earth such that the angular velocities of the surface of the earth and the satellite are equal. If the earth were not rotating, there could be no synchronous satellites. Any satellite must orbit in a plane which passes through the center of gravity of the earth. The equatorial plane is the only such plane for which points on the surface of the earth have no velocity component perpendicular to the orbital plane.

Bucklin: Who is Austin Hall? ISLANDIA was written by Austin Tappen Wright.

Eric Blake: Every letter of yours I see, I grow more confident that you are a clever hoax.

I hope the next TB editor will NOT follow Hayes' method of typing the letters, "continued on P. so-and-se". Is there some advantage to this that I don't know about? Wouldn't it be just as simple to do it the usual way? I certainly can't see that it's any help to the reader.

Best

NED

Send your letters early -- the deadline is October 15, 1965 -- give Cindy a break.

July 20, 1965

(Note: This is being typed in the tub, so in case any of my ideas are all wet, you know why. (Ouch!)) I opened the latest TB expecting to see my letter in there and Awrrrk! Hayes, you blunderer! Not Saunders, Sanders. And not Joe; Jim, or J. (...but where in Ghod's name did you get Joe?) The rest of the zine is very good, with one exception - the arrangement. Why did you cut those letters into page lengths and then stick all the leftovers on pp. 12-13? It is a bit confusing. (Understatement). I'd better shut up before I get a ticking package with Canadian stamps. As someone in the middle of pubbing a 300 copy 22 page zine, I understand. But now to the comments:

Klein: You and Duncan would make a great vaudeville act. You've been practicing long enough. Seriously, I know I will be deluged with another month of bidtalk, but I am getting tired of seeing Dunc punch holes in you.

Saunders: Couldn't have said it better myself. Excellent, pithy prose, brilliant wisdom.

Tackett: Further evidence of Judy Merrill's wisdom is that she gave a high review to Wm. Burroughs' incomprehensible NOVA EXPRESS. (!) In her earlier anthologies (up to, say, Yr's Best #3) she had a good idea of what SF was and selected quite a bit of good stuff, but then she started her big campaign to ~~eliminate~~ assimilate SF. Agreed on Lowndes. Haven't seen MoH, but all his other zines were fun to read, even if they didn't publish GREAT stories. There were always (at least up to the ending year) a great number of good stories, despite Columbia's little and late payment policy. His departments were the best of any magazine I have ever seen (and I've seen one issue of all but about two mags pubbed since 1950 and many before.)

Franson: I can't agree that "...a membership card is enough; all else is gravy.." If this is true, then I am tossing \$1.75 a year away. Membership cards I don't collect; info, mags and fanzines I do. This is why I joined NFFF. I don't write many letters and so the correspondence aspects meant nothing, but it was the only way I could get into N'APA, so I joined. If N'APA separates, as I expect and am voting for, I probably won't rejoin.*

(GMC: *See Stan Woolston's letter for comment on this.)

I like receiving TB and I find your columns in TNFF valuable, all else is not needed. And I doubt that this will be worth it.

Mann: F&SF may have literate pieces of fiction, but they rarely are SF. This is the same reason I don't like Bradbury, his writing is very "good" but it isn't interesting, and neither is F&SF. Examples of prose style I can get many places, if I really want them, but if they don't have those special qualities that are SF (don't ask me to name them, but I can recognize them) and are dull besides, why bother. I see no reason for APA45, and apparently many others don't from the way people are dropping. Ah, well, some like it.

Lerner: Fred, you don't read AMAZING, FANTASTIC, or IF, so how can you comment on their styles? Furthermore, the "style" of many of the F&SF regulars I find destroys the story that they may have. And most of the time they don't have a story, just that goddam style.

Ipe: "Fahrenheit 451...shows what happens when McCarthyism(sic) takes over the space program" -- Is we reading the same book???

Wolford: While Judy Merrill's articles may sound like articles on recent SF, they are written by someone whose knowledge of the field may be good but whose knowledge of what SF is is bad, and who is trying to eliminate the barriers which keep SF from being emasculated.

Cox: Good Lord, first Janie Lamb wants to limit everything in TB to SF and fandom, now you want to cut the fandom down a bit. I agree that I would get sick on a diet "exclusively" of SF, or politics, or religion, or (talking about) sex, but that is what I liked about TB - it had a varied diet. Now it has a limited subject and may get tiresome. I have softened from "will" to "may" because although the Metcalf issue was bad, the last two have been rather good, and still interesting.

(Sanders - Cont'd)

Dupree: What is this, is everybody starting an apa? Is this the new fannish status symbol? Well, I might as well steal another idea from Fred Lerner (who's probably started more apas than anyone else and never mind if they never had a mailing) and revive YAPA, the Yearly Amateur Press Amalgam. No dues, mailings once a year (Deadline October 31), no membership limitations, send all zines to the OE, me, and ALL ZINES MUST BE COMPOSED OF MAILING COMMENTS.

Jackson: Allrightey, I'll attempt to answer your questions:

"What should sf drama and cinema be?" I am going to take a slight cop-out and use the Sturgeon(?) definition, and say that it should be a dramatic representation of a story which could not be told without its SF characteristics. It should contain some idea which is an interpolation of current knowledge, placed in a setting consistent with that idea. It should not be a trite love story with a monster for unintentional comedy release, nor should the new idea be the whole of the story but rather the story should be composed of the reaction of people or society to this idea. (The idea may be that there are aliens, or that there is a new biological creation, it does not have to be an idea of a character in the story, but of the author /Just don't want you to think I only want Skylark-type stories/) A note in passing: This definition would include many of the monster pictures, however they are excluded by the second part of my definition which is that sf drama must also be good drama, as well as sf. Another note is that it is the tendency to make the idea the whole story; the lookee-what-I-thought-up that hurt much of Twilight Zone, and the same flaw plus the lack of dramatic ability that hurt Outer Limits.

"Should original material or dramatizations be used?" I tend to prefer dramatizations, but original material can be used if it is good.

"Have the sf pros been successful in Hollywood?" PSYCHO was the second or first highest grossing b and w movie in history. 'Nuff said. However, they have not been successful in doing sf movies. Most of the better sf movies were, I believe, done by Hollywood vets and not SF writers.

"Which type of sf is the best for drama purposes?" A lot of it. The humorous, slapstick like the Bloch (fine writer, Bloch, wrote a lot for Gzorkle Tales, but that pub was only available on Mars, so I have one of the few complete sets) or Bloch Imaginative Tales, the Manning Draco or Magnus Ridolph stuff; the serious earth invasion stories; almost all the Hugo winning novels; much of Eric Frank Russell's stories, much of Asimov, etc. In other words, any story where there is a reasonable amount of action and which is basically set in an Earth-like environment without an overwhelming amount of assumptions that the watcher will need to have explained.

"Is sf 'too advanced'?" Which sf? Some forms are perfectly understandable, others would never be swallowed. I would, for example, love to see some of Mark Clifton's work on the screen, but the "masses" won't accept the treatment that Clifton gives them, and if this is left out, the story is DEAD.

"Is the idea of good sf drama useless?" Only in that drama is a considerably more limited form than literature. But while drama will never be able to surpass literature, it is still a worthwhile medium, and shouldn't be overlooked.

Kaymar: I am one of the people who talk against NFFF. I think it is in general a pretty pointless and useless organization, but I belong because it is now the only way to get into N'APA. As I stated elsewhere, if this is no longer true, I probably will drop it, because I am not getting a proportionate return on my dues, and I don't have the time to work to make the organization any better.

Blake: Skylark is resumed in IF, the very mag you are complementing. I agree that IF is slowly pushing to the top of the heap, but not with stories of The Altar at Asconel type. ...Why in hell can't there be a substantial body of the NFFF that is athiestical and radical? You have moral principles that you believe in, and as an ex-Catholic I understand the principles. However, the way that I was always taught to proselytize was through reason and changing the other person's views through the force of logic, not by forbidding him to say these views. And that about 'avoiding the appearance of evil' - it doesn't fit here. If this were an official publication..of the Church, or even of an individual Catholic, it would be bound to avoid pubbing anything of an atheistic tendency in such a way that it looked as if it believed or even agreed with it. But even in this case, an LOC or an article could be run explaining -- and praising -- atheism, if a disclaimer was added.

(Sanders - Cont'd)

Hamlin: I hope you are wrong in thinking that pbs have taken over the sf field. If they have, it is the end of sf. However, it seems that you are wrong in many of your other assertions, so you may be wrong here. First, it was not paper-back #1 that was Lost Horizon, but "Pocket Book" #1 - a different kettle of fish. Second, where do you think that the Lensman series, and Davy, first appeared? Magazines! Yes, Davy - or at least parts of it - came out in F&SF. And when it comes to trying something new and different, the mags have always been the leaders. Examples are too numerous. However, your main point is that the mags are in a current state of doldrums. You are right, too. At least to some extent. But this is where science fiction exists, in the mags. The pbs can never support the field. First, they have to aim to a wider audience and this in general tends to water down their fiction. But most important is that the pbs serve basically as a REPRINT market. They can not develop new authors. The history of the field shows that writers, with very few exceptions, must learn their field by writing short stories before they can start turning out good novels. Heinlein was in the field for ten years, as were Asimov and Sturgeon before they started writing novels (though the first two wrote series that later got put into novel form). The same may be said of many of the writers now gaining prominence, such as Mack Reynolds, Cordwainer Smith, Fred Saberhagen, etc. There has never been a pocket book or paperback of any kind that has printed short stories of unpublished writers. True, pbs occasionally publish new writers, but these writers generally write the old reliable action adventure type of sf, and not the cerebral type. And if there are nothing but pbs -- if the mags die -- then the only thing left after a while is the a'n'a, and this will be the death of sf. Don't forget, sf is the only field to be supported by the magazines which have also moved into heavy book publication. There never was a strong book pubbing of sports stories; mystery magazines were always just adjuncts to the field. But sf, for the last 15 years at least, has been supported by both. Thus, any comparison with other fields is specious. Furthermore, pbs will take the chance on sensationalism, but they rarely take the chance on thought.

Ward: I don't know if I should admire your energy or laugh in your face. This is an interesting idea and if you want to work for Boston in '70, more power to you. But not for '67. In the first place, you just don't know enough about it. There is no conflict with the rotation plan for Boston in '67. Secondly, the Eastercon (which will be in '66 and '67 as well as '68) is a regional con and does not come in conflict with you....there are quite a few other flaws that I will skip over (including the general tone of your letter) but let me suggest that you hold a regional con this year and for the next few years, and then try. I gladly will support BOSKONE in '70 if I see any evidence in favor of it, but until then, work on getting yourselves known and your knowledge of fandom improved.

Well, thus all till nextish

J. Sanders

Letters that can't be read, can't be published. Type or write clearly.

(Janie Lamb, Route 1, Reiskell, Tenn. 37754)

July 22, 1965

Dear TB:

I'd like to clear up some misunderstandings which some seem to have about my statement I would like to see only stf matters discussed in TB. First, the secretary has no official status when it comes to making rules or giving orders. Second, there has never been any command to any TB editor about how they should edit (with the exception of not printing anything which is libelous in nature and could cause the club to be sued).

The things I mentioned, I did as a member, not as an official. Often I'd like to enter a discussion but refrain because someone would think I was doing it as an official of N3F. I simply became disgusted with the same topic being discussed TB after TB and with no sign of stopping. Even too much candy makes one sick. As always, the verdict on what TB uses is up to the members -- I'm sure their letters will be printed (providing they do not all say the same thing).

I'm glad to see the compliments sent Don Franson's way. I suppose I was in closer contact with Don than most during his terms as president. I'd like to add my bit to what has been said. I've never worked with a more congenial person than Don. When he took office the N3F was having some trying times, but Don - in his diplomatic way - kept out of controversy as much as possible. He worked hard and long at the job and he did a remarkably good job. At times, he reminded me very much of Ralph Holland. I hope he finds time again to be active in N3F.

I'm very much against the plan for N3F government Rick Sneyry presents. The Directors and President are both needed, we do not need a dictator. This sounds like the "Bruce Pelz Plan" which was being rumored at the Pittcon - when we were told that the Califen were going to take over N3F, do away with the directors, and let one man run it. This rumor kept some very capable members from being elected to directorate that year. As our Constitution stands, the President has plenty authority -- but to turn one man loose to make all decisions on how to spend money, Heaven forbid! Suppose this plan were in effect and a fan feud developed. The Directors could kick out the President because he was a friend to X and they supported Z. The members could only shake their heads, but would be helpless. This is something along the plan Don Susan wanted -- only he wanted to kill off N3F, organize another club in its place, and he would direct it. There would be no officers, except the one! (In all the clubs I've ever been a member of -- stf or otherwise -- not one has given the President sole authority for spending money or making all the decisions.)

What do you members think of having book reviews, Stf TV reviews, Stf Movie reviews in TNFF? Would you rather make TNFF more of a gazette? Or do you prefer it to carry only official reports? Let's hear your views on this. What do you think about reviving the "Garner Plan" for future stf con-sites?

*(GMC: What is the "Garner Plan"?)

It's beginning to look as if we are going to have to revise the plans now for choosing the con-sites. So few fans can attend a con in London that regardless of what place is selected for the site for the 1966 con, it will have been selected by only a few and therefore be unfair to fandom as a whole.

Janie-The-Lamb,

/s/ Janie Lamb

Correct spelling and grammar prevent guesswork -- Remember, TB Eds aren't Telepaths!

(Stan Woolston, 12832 Westlake St., Garden Grove, Calif. 92640)

7-25-65

TIGHTBEAM Editor G.M.Carr:

The subject that stuck in my mind the longest concerning the latest TIGHTBEAM is Sneyry's suggested constitutional change to make the President a dictator. I don't like dictators and so am not in favor of his idea -- except to comment on. In my own picture of things, a director should be someone who is ready and willing to help the club by taking time to decide policy and vote on money matters. They should work well with whoever is President -- as long as that person does his job well. It is true that directors are not apt to vote the president out of office now, but they could. And if all 5 feel he is undesirable, they would do that without a constitutional change.

There are two kinds of President, I'd say: the one who wants to run the whole show, and the one who wants the others to do their part. (This is, of course, an oversimplification. Some individuals might find it easier to be the "Chief Executive" if they thought they had power over the other members.)

The veto power in the right to remove the president might theoretically be enough, but in practice it would mean that, once voted out, this person would probably want to leave the club -- meaning one less potential worker. I think what is needed is more active workers, not fewer. Finding willing workers is the biggest job for any officer, and I don't plan to discourage anyone. If I'm re-elected, I hope to be able to see that others are asked to be active in various ways -- in bureaus and by appointive jobs.

To "grow" members willing to help the club, I think activity on all levels should be encouraged. Activity in various bureaus, in publications and so forth encourages those members to enjoy themselves in the club; and the more they know about it, the more opportunity they find for this sort of activity. I've been taken to task in a personal letter for using the word "activity" so much, so maybe I should explain why I use it: fans may be readers of SF who don't correspond, don't read fanzines, etc.-- but when they do, they enter another phase of fandom -- actifandom. It is challenging because it has so many branches (which have a way of taking time from reading and collecting). With a mind, however, we can organize our imagination and our fanactivity and when our thoughts are published (or otherwise made known to others) we are enhancing fandom to that degree. Whether it is as simple as corresponding, or as complicated as organizing a bureau, this is true.

So many things said in TIGHTBEAM break down into the categories of personal interests and personal evaluations, that I wonder if we might consider most subjects from that viewpoint for a little bit. Criticism can be based on a personal whim, or it can be intended for guidance. As guidance, it can suggest to another a way to evaluate or to improve. For instance, editing is something like criticism, something like censorship. When an editor snips out a "nugget of thought", the individual who wrote it may feel frustrated. I'd suggest such a person write again; the next editor might leave it in...

When one group seeks to prevent another from reading or possessing a certain type of material, it is a form of criticism with the emphasis on influencing the way a person acts. The goal of anti-pornography might start out to prevent a child from being "brainwashed" in filth -- and end up limiting the right of a fan to collect a story by Philip Jose Farmer. As SF plays with ideas, it is natural for fans to do the same. In correspondence, just about everything is discussed. In some publications it is "policy" to limit subject matter, just as in some clubs they may have a "purpose". In N3F, the Preamble of the Constitution touches on this: we are a club dedicated to imaginative fiction -- SF and fantasy -- one way or another. Not everyone has the same interests in this wide area. In the official magazines it is logical to emphasize this prime interest. Of course, we aren't robots: it isn't a "prime directive" with everything not in that area cut out ruthlessly. But with imagination it is possible to relate almost everything we say to this area, I think. In our personal letters we can wander as we wish, as in our personal 'zines.

The Constitution and the By-Laws are available for anyone to check who is in doubt about the purpose of this club. Anyone running for office should read both -- and the members might find it interesting, too. Every so often someone in N'APA tries to amend the Preamble of the By-Laws, for example. This Preamble is a permanent part of the By-Laws, with the individual items available for amendment as long as they meet the spirit of the Preamble. The Directorate acts on matters relating to the club, which includes seeing the Preamble of N'APA is upheld. Anyone who wants to write to me about this is free to do so. The club has many activities -- Bureaus and so forth -- that are an integral part of the club, as is N'APA. Anyone who wishes to suggest changes in any Bureau or Activity may write to the Chairman of that Activity, or to the Directorate, or to myself.

I had hoped to include one or two future editors of TIGHTBEAM in this letter. So far this year I've had 2 ahead -- even though 2 editors didn't include them for one reason or another. Art Hayes didn't get my letter; I've decided that it would pay to send 2 letters (or a card to follow a letter) with such information. (Still, as Art said, either I as President or Janie Lamb as Secretary will pass on mail for the next editor of TIGHTBEAM). However, I just located/discovered/materialized (etc.) the next editor of TIGHTBEAM. In New York State -- quite a distance from Seattle. But a gal, again. In Rochester. By phone-call. I've asked Cindy Heap to do the next TIGHTBEAM and she said yes. She says there will be others to help, and she has the equipment and willingness.

Sincerely, STAN WOOLSTON

(Eric Blake, P.O. Box 26, Jamaica 31, N.Y.)

July 26, 1965

Dear Mrs. Carr:

TIGHTBEAM #32 has at last reached me. Lately I seem to be getting each issue of TB just after the comment deadline for the next issue - I hope that I am in time for #33 with this letter.

Clayton Hamlin's comments on paperback books vs magazines seems to be a good summary of the present situation. It's good to see the classics reprinted, and I think that the demand for them exists because people are at last getting thoroughly fed up with the amoral, plotless, hero-less fiction of present times. The writings of Edgar Rice Burroughs and "Doc" Smith have heroes with whom the reader can identify. He cares about what happens to them, and how they get out of the perils which they encounter.

Still, I don't think that "Davy" should be mentioned in the same breath with these classics. Davy may be the protagonist of this book, but he is scarcely what could be called a "hero". He is a murderer, a thief, and a seducer. The novel seems to have two themes which are practically fixtures in contemporary fiction: an unnecessary amount of sexual description* and attacks on organized religion.

*(GEO: What seems like "an unnecessary amount of sexual description" to mature adults who do not need to have the sex act described to them in detail, may not seem so "unnecessary" to adolescents or immature adults who have to have everything spelled out for them because they have neither the imagination nor the experience to fill in the details for themselves.)

Like so many other authors who take a look into the future, Pangborn has constructed a tyrannical hierarchical church as a parody of religion, and set his "hero" in opposition to it. This sort of thing may pander to the rebellion against our society's religious and social customs, which seems to be ingrained among younger readers, but it scarcely represents a healthy trend.

Yours truly,

Eric Blake

.....
Deadline for TIGHTBEAM #34 is October 15, 1965

(Michael Viggiano, 1834 Albany Ave. Brooklyn, New York 11210)

August 6, 1965

Dear Gem:

The first NSF publication that I received when I joined this club was the September '63 TIGHTBEAM that you edited. It gave me a good first impression of the club. Now in your next TIGHTBEAM, I would like to announce to the membership that I am now Manuscript Bureau chief.

I will probably run things a little bit different than previous MSBureau heads, but I have the same request of the membership that previous heads had...mainly the Bureau needs material. Artwork, articles, fiction, art, and all the rest. All you people out there know what fanzine readers like to read, so write it, and send it to me. I particularly want articles relating to science fiction, but I will take anything. Contributors sending me material should make a carbon copy for themselves. I'll try to take good care of your material, but accidents do happen. As soon as I receive your material, I will mail you a post card acknowledging receipt of it.

Fanzine editors requesting material should follow these instructions:

1. Send me a request telling me what you want, and also give some pertinent information about your fanzine (e.g. format, frequency, etc.) A copy of your latest issue with your request will be appreciated, but it is not required.
2. Please send me an acceptance or rejection of the contribution(s) within 21 days of receiving them. Rejected material should be sent back to me along with your rejection notice.
3. Accepted material must be used within 6 months of the day you mail your acceptance.
4. Send the contributor one copy of the fanzine his material appears in. Also send a copy to the Manuscript Bureau.
5. The Bureau pays postage to you; you assume responsibility for mailing rejected material back to the Bureau.

Sincerely, MICHAEL VIGGIANO

(David Bradley, % the Zimmers, RFD #1, Sagendorf Road, East Greenbush, NY 12061)

Thursday, July 29, 1965

Dear Lamb, Tightbeam and people:

I received Tightbeam this morning, and immediately sat down to look it over. I'm sorry if I have wronged you, Art Hayes, but I expected that you would cut about the same sort of things as the others--everything not stfish. And as for my letter making you laugh, I'm at least glad somebody got something out of it!

Saunders: Well, somebody out there likes me. I was beginning to think I was all alone out here! Seriously, I tend to take opposite viewpoints occasionally just to frustrate someone, but this is something that I feel quite strongly upon--the editing of a letter to save money. In most cases a person doesn't say something just to hear himself talk ***cepting maybe Hamlin*** and wouldn't say it if he didn't think anyone was interested -- Hi, Clay. Actually, tho, and opinion on stf is usually fixed, and seldom subject to change--and why argue with someone unless there is a possibility they will change their minds, if only a little bit.

Tackett: Thanks, but I have discovered who Austin Hall is, and even bought one of his books (someone has said it was one of Hall's better books--I forget the title--) and was about to read it when we started on our trip to N.Y. Owell...

Hamlin: Seems like you've gone and done it again! Hamlin's lectures seem to me to be about the most boring thing in the entire ish--but owell, I guess someone must like it, or you wouldn't have written it--would you?

MANN oh man: Okay, maybe the kind of thing that they put on Twilight Zone was better quality--more fantasy-wheel's of If--but the acting quality, the sets, the--but I think that maybe you get the idea? True, the plot ideas seemed a bit overused, but I still prefer OL. Okay? Okay.

Wolford: Nononononono! I did not ever say I liked the MUNSTERS, I just said that I happened to think it was better than TwilightZone--I agree with you on MUNSTERS--it's killing fantasy if not stf. And you will notice that Breen generally keeps his coin-work out of TB. Now doesn't he? But was anyone complaining when politicking and such were brought into TB? Nobody I could see except Lamb... and she said something about it--that at least I admire her for--she didn't sit back and think that maybe she was alone and what could one do among the many! For her, my compliments. Now people are beginning to say whether or not they liked it. (Incidentally--TZ did show a couple of good things--like something called BZZZZZZZ and a fairly recent thing--I forget the name. Owell...

Dupree: Practically everyone is a Monster Fan at one time in his life--but when a person passes that stage, I think that this fact should not be re-hashed. I am ashamed at those remarks that Nate Bucklin or Breen or who-ever made about my being a little monster fan--agreed, I occasionally read those mags that are published with those horrible words Monsters -- or so say "trufans" -- upon them--but not as a permanent. I bear a permanent grudge against whoever it was that said this and say that I am not now nor have ever been what is referred to as a Monster Fan. And, as I said to Wolford, I said that I happened to believe that even Munsters was better--and I'm afraid that I must say that, having seen some of the more recent TZ's, I can no longer say that--the quality has either--well, TZ's gone up or M's have gone down! (Probably both, but I don't see how one could accomplish the latter!)

Chalker: Who has taken over MsB?

(GMC: Viggiano's letter, just previous, answers that question.)

Those are comments on TB32. Perhaps I tend to be a bit over-vociferous, but I can't help it--I get carried away. Sorry, and all that. Incidentally, it seems to me as tho the mag is thicker, but fewer people wrote. I may be wrong--but it seems to me as tho fewer people wrote more. Am I wrong?

(GMC: Probably not, inasmuch as the Mailing Comments are starting to take over again. TB is supposed to be a Letterzine; a place for fans to express ideas for the benefit of ALL the N3F membership. But it seems to be impossible to prevent a few from trying to use it as their own private apazine, sending in

their LOCs and addressing them just to the few TB contributors who wrote in last time. I don't know how to put the point over that a ~~remark~~ directed to an individual is NOT an open letter and therefore does NOT belong in the official letterzine. For instance, thish only McDonald, Chalker, Janie Lamb, Woolston, Viggiano, McElroy, Poland & Boston wrote letters. The rest of you merely wrote apa-type Mailing Comments. I include them because TB is so slim thish that they are not crowding out any other material. But a column of fanzine-review is NOT a letter; nor is an LOC on the previous TB a "discussion" in the opinion of GMC!)

Best,

/s/ David Bradley

P.S. Met the author of the letter published in TB 32 that was headed JOE SAUNDERS. Don't everybody go changing the address in your address books about Saunders--because the author of that letter was named JIM SANDERS and I met him at Fanoclast. Okay now?

If you want to write MCs, join an apa! If you want to write MCs, join an apa! If (John Boston, 818 South Seventh Street, Mayfield, Kentucky 42066) August 17, 1966
Dear TB-ed, whoever you may be:

The response to my proposal of a transatlantic book exchange has been something less than overwhelming: its general tone has been a sort of apathetic "that's nice." Certainly no one has actually suggested that he would participate in it. Nothing daunted, I shall take Don Franson's advice ("If you want something done, do it yourself.") Anyone who would like to swap books with a British fan, write to me at the above address. I promise to make some sort of response to everyone who writes, even if it is only to say the idea has been abandoned because of lack of interest.

I'll need the following information: name, address, type of material you'd want, and the approximate amount of money you'd be willing/able to devote to this each month or about how many books you'd want per month, or something to give me a general idea of how big an operation you're interested in. I wouldn't want to team up a completist with an occasional purchaser, but I do want to take care of everyone if at all possible. Incidentally, in about 16 months of trading with my contact, I've spent about \$30.00--a little over that, now. He wanted mainly book club editions. Let me stress this: if you would only be interested in an occasional title, write anyway and we'll see what sort of response from England on this. ("Our ambassador reports..") Anyone interested in Roy Tackett's suggestion of trans-Pacific trading should write Roy Tackett.

To give you a general idea of what sort of thing may be had from England: Most of you will know about the magazines. England's sf paperbacks are comparable in volume now with ours, generally run about equal in price with American pbs, and don't seem to be quite as well made as most American paperbacks, both from the standpoint of workmanship and quality of materials. However, they are still quite adequate. As for content, England has more reprints and fewer originals than we do; they also have many things in the paperback editions that are not available over here, such as the Penguin editions of Stapledon.

While their original paperbacks are few, their hardcover sf is much more numerous than our current low ebb. Many books are hardcovered in England which only came out in paperback here-- eg, John Brunner's The Whole Man (as Telepathist), Vance's The Dragon Masters, and Blish's A Case of Conscience. English hardcover prices generally run from \$2.00 to \$2.50--much less, of course, than American prices. Unlike their paperbacks, the hardcovers are generally much better-made than ours--better bound, with better binding and paper, although build on a much more compact scale. Also worthy of mention are their SF Book Club editions, which cost 6/- (84¢) and are as well made as many publishers' editions. Incidentally, book-rate to England is very reasonable.

Write me if you're interested.

Sincerely,

John Boston

write him if you're interested - write him if you're interested - write him if you're

LIBRARY REPORT

The SF Lending Library has a new address:

1876 So. 74th St., Apt. 309, Omaha, Nebraska, 68124

For those who are new to the club, it takes only 4 used sf pb's to join. For this you get a list of books, rocket bookmark, and all the new books to hit the stands as well as the old classics for your borrowing pleasure. There are also many books available for trade. This information is also on the list.

MYSTERY FANS! I have piles of mysteries to give away. There is just not enough room for them in our new apartment. So let me hear from you. Read 'em and pass them on; keep them; sell them; or throw them away. I'll pay the postage to get rid of them.

There are still quite a few prozines left on the shelves. I'd like to trade these off for sf novels. Many of the new members have asked for some of the issues and trades have been completed. There are about 100 left.

Anyone who needs books from the ERB series may have some titles that are piling up on me. Also Childhood's End is free for the asking. Seven and eight copies of one title is too much for the crowded library shelves.

The new members are very active in the library and are keeping the books flying back and forth. Those of you who have donated books will be pleased to know that many, many people are enjoying the books that you might have discarded.

My heartfelt gratitude to all of you!

/s/ Elinor M. Poland

TB editors aren't telepaths -- if he can't read it, he can't publish it -- write right

(James Lewis McElroy, Jr., 14½ E. Union St., Penn's Grove, N.J. 08069)

In 7½ handwritten pages, James McElroy say (as nearly as I can make out):

I. Inasmuch as his proposal to revive IPSO FACTO got nowhere, he suggests an ORDER OF BEATNIK TERRESTOS (ORBETE for short) with \$2 dues and 3 mailings per year. If 20 people send him \$2 before Oct. 15, he'll arrange to put out the first mailing by New Year's Day. For further details contact him.

II. Besides stf, he likes mystery & detective stories, and suggests starting a Spy/Mystery/detective story Round Robin with different authors doing a chapter each.

III. But most of all, James is perturbed at the lack of interest shown by the general membership towards the Elections. He feels there should be hotly contested races for the 6 elective posts, and suggests a two-party system for N3F -- "Radicals" vs "Fanatics" -- which could start campaigning about May, so as to stir up interest among the members. He says further that the only reason he put his name up for the post of N3F President was to stimulate interest in the forthcoming election, and because he did not like to see only one name listed for each post. He goes on to say, and I quote: "I've only been a member of the N3F for a year and do not have the experience to run this club as it should be run, and I honestly and truly do not want to be elected, so please do not vote for me." Unquote.

Read your TNFF -- read your TNFF -- read your TNFF -- read your TNFF -- read your TNFF

That's all for TB#33. Today is Aug. 23, 1965, and I'm closing it at 14 pp. Without mishap (such as a broken arm or leg) I expect to have TB#33 in the mail by the first week in September, thus breaking up this cycle of confusion which seems to have hit N3F. I note there is considerable confusion among the members as to where to send the letters: This is something I cannot understand, because the April TNFF listed every TB Editor, giving name, address, and mailing Deadline, up to and including this TB#33. (Pages 2 & 10). Also there are complaints because TB didn't arrive until after the deadline... So what? Unless you're going to send in mailing comments, why do you have to wait for TB? If you've got something to say to the membership, send your letters to the appropriate Editor whether TB has arrived or not! This TB#33 should arrive early enough to allow everybody to write the next Editor, so there'll be no excuse! (Please overlook the occasional blot -- the August sun, beating down on my open-drum mimeo, makes the ink as hard to control as Quick-silver. Sorry.)

TIGHTBEAM #33 - PRINTED MATTER ONLY - RETURN REQUESTED

Return Address: Route 1, Box 364

Heiskell, Tenn. 37754

E. M. Carr