

CONFAB

Aug. 23, 1954



Bob Peatrowsky

Box 634

Norfolk, Nebr.

CONFAB is published approximately monthly by one (according to Redd Boggs) "Old Bob Peatrowsky" for the betterment of serious constructive insurgent-type fans everywhere.

I say "approximately monthly" because CONFAB and its editor are now entering their gafia season. So don't rejoice too quickly if an issue is a few days or a week late during the next several months. We're not giving up; we're just slowing up to allow for the heat and the fishin' and such things.

This issue is delayed by several things. The first, known as Project Sandhills, was a fishing trip to the Nebraska sandhills brought on by a GI-type brother of mine who wanted to do some fishing before leaving for overseas. This project has been completed. We are now engaged in the second, known as Project Buying-A-New-House-Trailer, and are readying the old for departure and preparing for the arrival of the new. (Yes, CONFAB is published from a house trailer, in case you didn't know.) This second project will soon be completed. I don't know yet just what will come up to delay succeeding summer issues but I have no doubt that there will be some delays. Therefore, CONFAB is scheduled only approximately monthly.

Recently received was Walt Willis' and Bob Shaw's THE ENCHANTED DUPLICATOR. If you don't have your copy, you're missing something wonderful. It's been reviewed so many times and so favorably already in the current fan mags that there's little left to say except to heartily endorse all the praise that has already been heaped upon it.

(Aug. 16) Over six weeks have passed since the above was typed. True to my prediction, the gafia season has hit me, although I believe it's beginning to wear off a little by now. So possibly I can resume my almost monthly schedule again.

I hope the letters this time aren't too outdated, as most of them were written about two months ago. At least, I hope that everyone hasn't changed their opinions in the meantime.

I'll be back into the swing of things again before long. And thanks to all who continued sending me their zines despite my silence. Till next issue, then...

CONFABulously,

Bob Peatrowsky

So how can it be a letterzine without letters already????

((Someone, I think Gregg Calkins, has suggested that I print dates with the letters. So be it.))

REDD BOGGS, 2215 Benjamin St. N.E., Minneapolis 18, Minn.

(June 22) There are so many discussions going on in CONFAB now that it's hard to keep up with all of them. I'm not sure what caused George Wetzel to defend the "controversial" article because I wasn't aware that it needed any defense. I doubt that the majority of fan editors "little desire" controversy, and I have seen a good many such articles in fanzines during recent years. The reputation of at least two top fans -- Elsberry and Ellison -- has rested largely on the controversial articles they wrote, and Ellison's own fanzine has carried considerable material by others which was controversial; for instance, a three-fan attack upon SF Plus, and my own "Are You A Pseudo-Campbell?" which Harlan, at least, thought very controversial. Even QUANDRY, primarily an easy-going, fun-loving fanzine, has its share of controversy -- an article about fanzines by Ed Wood, and any number of letters about James Kepner's outcry against conventions in the segregated South. More recently HYPHEN published "The Fun-lovers", which seems to have been somewhat controversial. But I don't suppose Wetzel saw these fanzines.

I'm fairly sure he hasn't seen most of the fapazines in recent years which have carried controversial articles. My own magazine comes easiest to mind, naturally. Over the past two years I have published a column called "The Issue At Hand" by William Atheling Jr. and this has stirred up considerable controversy -- arguments pro and con from everybody from H. L. Gold to Ed Wood.

There may be some prejudice among fanzine editors against controversy for the sake of controversy, if that is what Wetzel means. For myself, I have never seen any good reason to send anybody "a plea for something controversial", and I won't publish an article just because it happens to be a probable storm-raiser. An article "proving" that the earth is flat may be a highly controversial item, but I wouldn't print it. For very much the same reason I wouldn't print an article "proving" that "as a critic Edmund Wilson stinks".

Wetzel laments that fan editors are so "narrow-minded" that they won't print articles concerning fantasy, but he wants to focus down the range of fanzine material even more by foreclosing against articles dealing with, as he says, "world politics". He declares that "World politics has no place in fandom", by which he means, of course, that "world politics shouldn't have a place in fandom", not that it hasn't. By his own demonstration, such articles have appeared in fandom, and I haven't any doubt that they'll continue to appear in fandom. Wetzel gave no reason for objecting to such articles, and it seems to me "a form of dogmatism and stagnation" to omit world politics from fanzines.

((That seems to cover the other side of the "controversial article question" pretty thoroughly and doesn't leave me much to say. George,...?))

"The letters tickled me into comment..."

GEORGE WETZEL, 5 Playfield St., Dundalk 22, Md.

(June 15) I am not going into any lengthy rebuttal of your reply to my recital of the discrimination against fantasy that is so wide-spread in fandom. I would like to point out that I did not mean that fandom should be obligated to give equal space to fantasy, so much as to point out that the dividing line between them is getting hard of determining; and by that fact, I contend that many fantasy style topics are actually forming the basis of new sciences. One reason that UNKNOWN WORLDS was so popular was because of the fact that fiction of such a borderline type between s-f and fantasy has a freshness in itself to the jaded s-f majority. Science of late years has been reexamining superstitious beliefs and finding in some of them an obscure scientific principle operating. Physical medicine, in antibiotics, has vindicated the centuries belief of the Chinese that moldy bread helped if not cured ear infections. I gave you other instances in my prior letter. I think I might eventually put all this scientific reexamination of old beliefs in an article some day. So much for that.

The fanzine CANADIAN FANDOM has been publishing a black list of fanzines that take sub money and do not send copies to subbers. This is an old beef of my own; and I suggest you or some other USA fanzine print in each issue a similar black list, since CANADIAN FANDOM is not so well known here. I perceive some argument against the mere suggestion of such an idea and with allotted space in CONFAB, I would like to discuss this black list idea.

To begin with, I think such a black list should not be limited to just the dishonest or careless handling of subscriptions but should apply to another unkind practice of fanzine editors. And that is the keeping of contributed manuscripts even though they are not used, and the silence when the writer endeavors to learn--after a terribly long interval--if the editor has it, will use it or just plain "what the hell is the deal"?

If you think some of this is but a few personal beefs look at Lyons' public "A Gripe And An Offer" in KAYMAR, April 1954.

For a long time I have suffered at the hands of such inconsiderate editors, both as regards material sent in good faith and sub money. However, I will make public the names of a few whom I have been so imposed upon by.

When Stan Mullen was printing his GO-GON I sent him my story "Cualgl" for it. He eventually writes me back that my story was so good he was going to market it for me professionally. That is the last I have heard from Mullen and the last of my story. All letters since then have come back marked "addressee unknown".

Some red hots will now want to jump down my throat but see Geis' letter in the N3F POSTIE, May 1954. Geis mentioned of a simi-

lar experience when he sent (in this case to the N3F Ms Bureau) in 1952 two stories. Both of them went out to faneds and both had difficulties similar to such as experienced by me. But I will recount only one of them. The faned recipient of the first story of Geis' decided it should be marketed professionally and that is the last Geis ever heard.

It is noteworthy that the present head of the N3F Ms Bureau has decreed a similar practice: submitted mss he deems worthy of promags he will so market professionally. I don't mean to get into a criticism of the N3F Ms Bureau (especially as I am a new member of the N3F itself) but some of it ties in with my topic.

I once sent a story to Redd Boggs who passed it through FAPA to Ray Higgs for his zine. A year went by in silence. Then I wrote Higgs. More silence. Finally I wrote Boggs who replied he could exercise no discipline over such an inconsiderate character. Higgs I understand was once a big name fan but to me he is a small minded jerk.

Then there is the character in Dorchester, Mass., who put out a mag patterned after KAYMAR. I sent \$1 sub to Thomas Carrigan for his MARTIAN TRADER. After quite a number of months went by with no copy at all, I wrote him requesting my \$1 refunded, or copies of his zine due me. No answer. In about a month's time I wrote again with no reply. Carrigan can offer no excuse as he is out and out unprincipled. Carrigan, it must be pointed out, ran an ad in K. Martin Carlson's KAYMAR TRADER, May 1953 offering mags for sale. Let this serve as a warning to anyone who answers that or future ads of his. In view of my two follow-up letters he cannot claim it all a mistake. Like I say he is but one of many who have taken my sub money but neither sent sub copies or a refund. Carrigan is but one out of many flagrant cases of thievery.

Sam Moskowitz wrote me in May 1952 of two New York fans who obtained for their zine an unpublished short story and novellette of Clark Ashton Smith. They attempted to trade said mss to Sam for books!

I have given you here not only some scattered incidents of my own sad experiences but some of others to prove my contention that flagrant dishonesty and lack of ethics exist in some parts of fandom. I trust you will not delete any, lest my case look only like that of an isolated writer.

One of my worst experiences regarding unprincipled handling of a submission was with Dave Hammond. Of that I think you may have heard. It illustrates just how crummy such SOBs can be!

In conclusion I would like the comments of CONFAB readers to my idea of a black list of such culprits here in the USA. Maybe such a list would tend to inject some much needed ethics among the inconsiderate and down-right dishonest among faneds. The hardest thing in writing all the above is to control my temper when recalling them and a number more of such sad experiences. If any show of rancor showed, I think I can understandably be excused.

((This might be a wonderful place for me to say that the opinions expressed in all letters printed in CONFAB are those of the writers and do not necessarily represent my own opinions. I'm just the innocent bystander trying to keep from getting hit with a stray brickbat myself. # I must have been lucky so

far George; I haven't run into any of the troubles you mentioned. # I dislike running letters criticizing people who don't receive CONFAB and thereby don't have an opportunity to present their side of the story. But the sad truth is that none of those mentioned in the previous letter are on my mailing list. I don't have any of their addresses. But if some one will supply their addresses I'll send them a copy of this issue and give them an opportunity/state their case if they will. Naturally, the pages are also open to anyone else who wishes to get into this particular fray.))

"It was only an old spittoon, sailing over me harmlessly..."

PHYLLIS H. ECONOMOU, P.O. Box 182, Coconut Grove, Miami 33, Florida

(June 18) Thanks for sending CONFAB....

Coming in in the middle as I did, there little I can contribute to the current confabulations. My age is classified; I'm too new (but enthusiastic) a Fapan to expound; I consider religious discussions the essence of futility -- no one convinces anybody of anything -- no one even listens to the other side of the story -- and the Church has survived too many centuries of spitball barrages to need me jousting to the defense; I don't even know what Grennell said to Hirschhorn, or viva voce.

I can't even match Norman Browne's claim...

But give me time. If Tucker is an imminent grandma, I'll be a Fan-Dad any day now.

((Welcome to the fray, P. H. # And just how literally did you want that last sentence interpreted?))

"When I heard the EC group might be banned, I got MAD!"

ROBERT BLOCH, Box 362, Weyauwega, Wisc.

(June 12) Maybe I am going gafia about the edges, but it strikes me that if the current CONFAB is any index of presentday attitudes and preoccupations in fandom, then this is where I came in.

When I came in, many years ago, the topics under discussion were (a) religious beliefs (b) speculations regarding the age-divisions of fandom (c) the value of fanpublishing groups such as FAPA (d) merits of current books and movies, and (e) the conflict between sf and fantasy interests in fandom.

And that's precisely what I find @discussed in the present issue of CONFAB.

Nor, surprisingly enough, would I have it otherwise. I'm not complaining a bit...only too pleased to see that Fandom (whatever its numerological disguises as Sixth, Seventh, Eighth) is still a fray of strife.

And when various individuals come to their separate conclusions on all these topics (as I did in my time: viz, that religious

beliefs differ; that FAPA or SAPS or NFFF are just as good or bad as the material they put out; that fans are of all ages, sizes, shapes, colors and flavors; that some current books and movies please some people and displease others; and that science-fiction per se is a form of fantasy and not really a separate entity) then a new wave of insurgents will take over and rehash the topics until they in turn arrive at their own conclusions.

All of which is not much of a contribution or commentary. I can, however, add one bit of information relative to a current puzzle.

In the matter of the fan who styles himself "Redd Boggs"... perhaps these facts will shed a little light. There is, to begin with, no such person, in my opinion. The individual calling himself "Redd Boggs" is in reality William Atheling, Jr.; I'd guess his age at roughly somewhere between 28 and 95, and I'd hazard his occupation as harpooner on a whaling schooner (cf. his interest in Herman Melville). Since there are very few whaling schooners operating on the Great Lakes out of Minneapolis, it shouldn't be too difficult for somebody to check the accuracy of my statements.

One of the reasons why there are so few whaling schooners operating on the Great Lakes out of Minneapolis is the fact that Minneapolis isn't on the Great Lakes. Another is that the Great Lakes don't, to my personal knowledge, contain any whales.

If this kind of thorough and painstaking attention to the facts doesn't prove that William Atheling, Jr. is really Redd Boggs, then I'm not the cool, clearheaded logician I think I am.

Hoping you are the same.

((As I'm discovering every day, there's very little new or different in fandom; just new fans discovering and discussing them. # Very little I can add to the facts in the "Redd Boggs" case after that clear, coolheaded discussion, I'm afraid.))

"Wonder how many fans feel pangs about things they did as a neo?"

BOB SILVERBERG, 760 Montgomery St., Brooklyn 13, N.Y.

(June 12) ...Too bad you're staying out of FAPA for lack of "first-hand" info; why not join and get that first-hand info? You're missing the rarest treat in fandom by staying out...

((Perhaps I didn't word that remark quite right, Bob. I didn't mean that I was staying out of FAPA because of lack of info; rather, that I was staying out of the discussion of FAPA because I wasn't a member and didn't have first-hand info. All clear? As a matter of fact, I have been considering getting into FAPA. I'm now on the SAPS waiting-list---or does that disqualify me for FAPA?))

"...and in a few years the kids could put out a 'Fan Kids' zine."

G. M. CARR, 8325 - 31st NW, Seattle7, Wash.

(June 9) Geis' indignation at the intransigence of the

"religionists" when it comes to "contrary evidence" amuses me. He seems so completely unaware that this "assumption of truth and actuality" IS what makes a "religionist". They couldn't possibly take an objective attitude, as he would like them to, any more than a surgeon could take an objective attitude toward a patent cancer cure, or a mathematician could take an objective attitude toward algebra. As far as they are concerned, there just isn't any "contrary evidence"...merely contrary people. There may be varying religious doctrines, which they will gladly discuss for hours on end in the hope of convincing the other fellow of the superiority of their understanding of the eternal verities over his understanding of them... but as to arguing whether or no these verities exist -- impossible. Might as well try to convince a sailor that there isn't any ocean.

The other item was George Wetzel's comment that articles about world politics have no place in fandom. I have long been in favor of controversial articles, as you all know, for the simple reason that when people get a little hot under the collar about a subject, they tend to speak up what is really in their mind. Also, under the pressure of argument, they tend to clarify their ideas...or get them clarified for them. Nothing like a good, hot controversy for blowing away the fog. However, I do not see why world politics should be excluded. This is the only world we have, at present, and we have an acute interest in the way it is run. Stfans, more than anyone, should be interested in what is going on because they have sufficient imagination to evaluate trends...or should have. One of the favorite stfplots concerns the politics of the future. But world politics today will determine the politics of the future. What are we building for, 1984? (It would be interesting if somebody made a compilation of all the well-plotted social structures as depicted by stf... some trends are good, some are bad. But all are based in the present. So why not discuss it?

((Why not, indeed? World politics would certainly seem to be a controversial-type subject.))

"FAPA for the Fapans, I say!"

RICHARD E. GEIS, 2651 N. Mississippi, Portland 12, Oregon

(June 13) ...I note that in Bob Tucker's letter he gives Jim Bradley's name but no date of birth opposite it. Now, I wonder if this is the same Jim Bradley who used to put out DESTINY along with Malcolm Willits? If so, I can inform the readers that Jim is now just barely 21 years old. After all these years of drinking (nay, guzzling) beer, he can at last do it legally. A true fan....

Leave me now plunge into this religious thing we have going...

I think you missed the point of the deathbed conversions I mentioned as an argument. The sudden conversion of an atheist on the night before he dies is not a conscious thing as you seem to think; the sick old man who converts is not doing it with the cold calculation of hedging...of thinking to himself that maybe it would be best to cover his bets as it were because there just might be some-

thing to this religious business after all...he's embracing religion because he knows he is going to die soon. The end is in sight. The absolute end. And his ego is unable to face the concept of total extinction. He is scared. From the tips of his toes to the end of his hairy old head he is scared silly. The will to live, in many men, will simply not admit to final and irrevocable extinction. So how easy it is for the subconscious to shove aside the intellectual certainties of the young man, to rationalize them away, and substitute the wishful thinking of the old and the weak; to seize upon the promise of LIFE after death if he will but capitulate and abandon his convictions.

My point is that deathbed conversions are not an argument for the religious at all, that they quite clearly, if they are an argument at all, are an argument against the validity of the religious doctrines. To me the psychological basis is clear and unquestionable; raw fear takes over and squelches the frontal lobes most effectively. This deathbed conversion business is usual in cases

where a man as a child was a member of a religious family and then rebelled against religion in his young adulthood. Later, when death seems imminent and there is time to think, the teachings of his childhood emerge to overwhelm his later thinking. But the fact that a man succumbs to fear of death and howls with piety on his deathbed is not a valid proof of a god, any more than the fact that he rebelled is a proof that there isn't a god. I'd much rather argue the points for and against with logic and clarity of thought. But, then, religion cannot stand that kind of an attack, hence the emotional arguments, the emphasis on "faith", etc.

((We must have studied our logic out of different books, Dick, as I fail to follow the point of your argument. Whether the deathbed conversion is made consciously or sub-consciously, just what is the point of it at all if there is no life-after-death? # But then neither of us will convince the other of his views as neither of us wants to be "converted" to the opposite viewpoint. So I won't pursue the subject any further. I'll just refer you to G. M. Carr's letter.))

"That's the nice thing about a really irregular schedule,
everything is so delightfully uncertain..."

PAUL MITTELBUSCHER, c/o George Werneke, Sweet Springs, Mo.

(May 27) My eminent colleague the Fond du Lacian (DAG) seems to have borrowed from my rescinding oratory of #3 in which I stated that "This would seem to indicate that man prefer to place the emphasis on people instead of an abstract 'thing'"...with his "people in the end are more interesting than abstract ideas" thus bearing out my surmise. Frankly, I do not concur with either you or Dag. I feel that a critical analysis of the field (similar to Atheling's in SKYHOOK) is of much more value than all the numerous fan satires. I refer all to Bretnor's SFA article "On Taking Science Fiction Seriously". Let us endeavor to understand however that science fiction, or anything else, can be taken too seriously. I most emphatically

do not feel that science fiction is the ultimate in literature, the end achievement of all....however I do feel that science fiction, much as any other serious attempt at producing literature deserves recognition and critical review. It boils down to the fact that there is too much emphasis placed on authors and not enough on fiction, too much appreciation of fans and too little of fan writing, too much acclaiming of movie actors and too little criticism (or acclaim) devoted to movies..."'tis not the player but the play".... I should like to refer you to Boggs' article in HYPHEN #7 and (if WAW is good enough to print it) my letter of comment in #8(?). There is of course a place to ramble on about this and that, in fact there are at least two recognized organizations formed for such a purpose...called FAPA and SAPS. This is well and good, such is needed, little question about that. However I believe that a subzine is equivalent to any publication produced on the basis of money for value returned. An editor of a subzine is under an obligation to present the best material possible dealing with science fiction (fantasy). Look at the early fannags. The pros and fans worked in close accord because all were interested in science fiction.. Today things have disintegrated into a mutual admiration society where fans are compensated for the fact that the world "knows nothing of my genius"...retreat into a small group to be somebody because on the outside you are nobody. There are exceptions naturally. As I've mentioned before, "Too many young impressionable nees are cajoled into believing that a QUANDRY is superior to a SKYHOOK". No, I do not want 95 SKYHOOKs...as Redd remarked, this would be equally boring.

It would be best if I corrected an unfactual statement. Ed Wood does NOT scorn all active fans. I know not why Dag professes such dislike of Edward but I am inclined to rise to Wood's defense. Admittedly, I am a trifle prejudiced. Whenever anyone, and especially a fan, treats me in such manner as Wood did on my visit, I'm inclined to feel more than grateful. Suppose someone handed you a first edition, DJ'ed, autographed copy of TRIPLANETARY with the remark "it's yours"....would you wish to make derogatory remarks? If nothing else, Wood is a generous soul. Moreover, Wood certainly didn't impress me as a hater of humanity; in fact I would go so far as to say he is much less cynical than I. As for his "scorning" all active fans...if I remember correctly he spoke highly of Silverberg, also of Capt. Slater...even had a little praise for Ellison I believe.

Re the great fannish survey: After reading McCain's letter I propose adding the question "Who is your favorite movie star?" (Male & Female or otherwise...like Francis yet... you know, animals) and/or "What movie star do you dislike the most?" Yes, I realize few of us intellectuals bother with the cinema, still something should come of this.

((I don't deny that Atheling's column is a worthwhile contribution to the field, but very few have the ability to write a critical analysis that will stand up under any cross-examination. And wouldn't 95 Athelings be a little boring too---what with each one trying to out-critical the other? # Seems to me like the old law of supply and demand would pretty well take care of the humorous vs. serious zine question. # I am a firm believer in a fanning editor being complete lord

and master of his publication, with little serious obligation to his readers. After all, he isn't in business to make money like a pro-editor; he's in business for the enjoyment. And if he isn't putting out the kind of zine that he wants, then he isn't getting that enjoyment, whether his zine is serious or humorous. If the readers don't like the kind of zine he puts out, they'll quit subscribing. And if he can't continue without the financial help of subscribers, he'll have to fold. Sad, perhaps, but still true. Readers will naturally subscribe to the zines that appeal to them rather than to try and reform the others to their ideas. I believe the fanzine editor has a perfect right to say, in effect: "Here is the type of zine I like to publish. If you like it, I'll be glad to have you subscribe. If you don't like it, you don't have to read it".))

"The enthusiasm of a neofan usually cools from a flame to a warm glow before too many months are past."

HARLAN ELLISON, 41 East 17th Avenue, Columbus, Ohio

(June 25) latest grist from the Ellison mill. Plans are all 100% changed again. I'm not going to New York. The Dean of the Arts College here at Ohio State (who, strangely enough, was best man at the marriage of Malcolm Willits' father) and my Mother both set to on me with both hands and feet, rendering me something of an insensate hulk. So, much against my better judgement, I'm back at OSU, at least for all Summer, and perhaps three more years. Who knows?

GNOMBODY was bounced from BEYOND with a dandy reject explanation by Gold, also accompanied by a dandy explanation of the reject explanation by Gold by Budrys. But the story, Algis contends, is a good one, and so he's mailed it out again, probably to F&SF, though I don't know for sure. Only time...

Right now I'm working on a book. Andre Norton, the well-known author and editor of such volumes as BULLARD OF THE SPACE PATROL, SPACE PIONEERS, SPACE SERVICE, etc., has been made head of the juvenile department of Marty Greenberg's Gnome Press, and while I was home in Cleveland putting out DIMENSIONS (still no abbreviation) she called and authorized me to whip up a science fiction juvenile for her and Greenberg to look at. The guarantee, if they like it, is \$400, which is about \$200 more than most juveniles get before publication. It will be 17,000 words and the title at present is STAR STONE. ...

...It is going to be work and more work.

Seen DIMENSIONS yet? Any comments either from you or your childish little readers who want to abbreviate the title?

((Comments, children?))

"When I say my zine is irregular, I mean IRREGULAR..."

BOB STEWART, Rt. 4, Kirbyville, Texas

(May 26) ...Yes, I, too was a 7th Fandomist for the FAPA. And I'm greatly disappointed in it. It's not quite what I expected, and I intend to drop out when membership expires. I was looking forward to fanzines not much different from subzines, but I found very, very few of this type (SKYHOOK and GRUE are about the only ones). Others are content to sit back and make comments on the other's work and comments on the other's comments (there's nothing wrong with that, you understand, but sometimes side discussions on such subjects as building radio sets are conducted. It's terrible to wade thru stuff like this that should be carried on by individual correspondence.) It seems all the fans in FAPA who are active in regular fandom save their better work for a subzine, and all the other FAPs don't produce their better work. Maybe the limited circulation has something to do with it. Producing a zine to be circulated thru FAPA with an additional circulation thru the rest of fandom is a solution, but the ideal solution was the case of Grennell where he mailed GRUE thru FAPA and fandom, and then postmailed his comments on the FAPA mailing thru FAPA only.

The source of your interlineations puzzle me, but, of course, it's your privilege to keep them a secret. If they are taken from the letters you print, why not print them in the letter? I'd really like to know who said some of those things?

((But if I printed them in the letters, then where would I get some interlineations to print between the letters? They do come mostly from letters though. Do you recognize yours from a few pages back?))

"They may not give a darn for it, but they'll feel obligated to send me their zine in trade."

GREGG CALKINS, 2817 - 11th Street, Santa Monica, Calif.

(May 25) ...I suppose you have by now been informed that your "Who's Who" project is by no means new. A couple of fan-directories have even been published from time to time, though they were vastly incomplete for the most part. Nevertheless, the subject is vastly pertinent.

At the Chicon, in '52, I remember well a couple of "serious" discussions held between myself, Dave Kyle and Shelby Vick over this same subject. I think that if it hadn't been for the fact that Shelby had just arrived at Chicago from Florida and was desperately tired and anxious to get away and meet Walt Willis, plus an overabundance of gin-and-tonic and an underabundance of capital, that we might have decided something, but as it^{was} all we did was talk about it. A couple of times, after getting back home, I wrote to Kyle about the idea but I never did get an answer. It's one of the things I'd like to see him about in Frisco this year.

Actually, we talked quite a bit. We thought over the idea,

won't it Colkins who said SFB
was filled with info acti fans
already knew?

photo-offset with pictures and all, and almost had a workable scheme. Annual supplements and all...

The way I feel about it, it's a damn worthwhile idea. In fact, I'll go so far as to say that I'll take the responsibility of editing it, printing, et al--all the headaches and work--if somebody, group or otherwise, can be found to pay the bill. I have several ideas about it already, and even one or two about financing the thing... charging \$1 or so, say, for each individual entry, and making the thing an 'invitation' basis....in other words write to selected fans and inform them they had been deemed appropriate to go in a fannish "Who's Who" only for lack of cash it couldn't be done unless they wanted to pay some money for the thing. If they provided a picture it would be printed, but otherwise none would be run unless one were available from somewhere else. Actually \$1 isn't so much at that, since they would also get a copy of the zine...well, say two copies of the "Who's Who" and sell the others to interested fan at 50¢ each.

Dammit, it's a worthwhile idea at that. I think that beginning immediately after the convention in 'Frisco, with or without Dave Kyle, COPS is going to start work on a fannish "Who's Who" comprising as many entries as can be obtained. I'd like to hear from any and all interested persons, especially those with ideas or with financial support? Anybody?

Would you mind printing, just for the record, that I am still a teen-ager? Just so nobody gets me confused with this horde of amazingly ancient critters tottering around fandom nowadays. But please also make it known that it's really a rather late 19, at that, so as to keep me safe from 7th Fandom.

((Hope you're still in the mood to put out that "Who's Who" after the convention, Gregg. I, for one, would like to see such a publication.))

Robert Peatrowsky
Box 634
Norfolk, Nebr.



PRINTED MATTER ONLY

RETURN POSTAGE GUARANTEED

Rich Bergeron
R.F.D. #1
Newport, Vt