

This inside cover is the last page typed before the magazine is ready to roll.

It soon became evident that POSTER will not be out in time for the Federal business to come to light.

I do wish to say that in POSTER, my article on the conduct of one Paul H. Roberts as related to his charges and the coming election -- my seeming two faceness in a paper by Star Woolston -- attempted to make clear my position.

The situation has changed now. It is no longer a question of my attempting to support the least undesirable candidate, but because more than the one candidate someone has the guts to take the opportunity to run for office which has been created.

That a time the circumstances were that I attempted to bring out the information and let the voter decide, expressing my opinion why Paul Roberts would probably be better (than his district) to make people angry with him would leave little compensation about something out of office if he did go -- as compared to the ability to get away with about anything without any efficient agency to get a stop to future activities.

But if anyone runs and declares his intention to let the directors manage regulate the affairs and control the finances of the organization, and to have the duties of any office or official, including that of the President -- I would support that person.

We need a President who is not contradictory to the directors. And one who will not presume to hold two contradictory offices at the same time (that of policy maker, the directors' function; the action end, of directors' decisions, the presidency) which need not be used as the directors can use more direct methods when desirable in calling upon any other officers to do something).

I do wish to say up a few points: I never do try to get Roberts support of a self-appointed committee's support for my own election. I do wish to have my own methods and pointed out to the constitution says. He was very kind for a club controlled by his own officials and with a director who would be a member of the club. I have been in the past a multi-headed snake with a one-headed, single-willed thing. I have been in the past a one-headed, single-willed thing. I have been in the past a one-headed, single-willed thing. I have been in the past a one-headed, single-willed thing.

When it became known that Paul Gardner had accepted a position in the NCF this year, he said: "You do not wish to be director of a group of mystery of our part. We in the national regional and regional sections and sub-sections agents for the organization had wanted the NCF to be run in a positive manner. When others in the NCF were not willing to run the NCF in a positive manner, I had to leave the NCF. I had to leave the NCF. I had to leave the NCF."

When it became known that Paul Gardner had accepted a position in the NCF this year, he said: "You do not wish to be director of a group of mystery of our part. We in the national regional and regional sections and sub-sections agents for the organization had wanted the NCF to be run in a positive manner. When others in the NCF were not willing to run the NCF in a positive manner, I had to leave the NCF. I had to leave the NCF. I had to leave the NCF."

When it became known that Paul Gardner had accepted a position in the NCF this year, he said: "You do not wish to be director of a group of mystery of our part. We in the national regional and regional sections and sub-sections agents for the organization had wanted the NCF to be run in a positive manner. When others in the NCF were not willing to run the NCF in a positive manner, I had to leave the NCF. I had to leave the NCF. I had to leave the NCF."

When it became known that Paul Gardner had accepted a position in the NCF this year, he said: "You do not wish to be director of a group of mystery of our part. We in the national regional and regional sections and sub-sections agents for the organization had wanted the NCF to be run in a positive manner. When others in the NCF were not willing to run the NCF in a positive manner, I had to leave the NCF. I had to leave the NCF. I had to leave the NCF."

When it became known that Paul Gardner had accepted a position in the NCF this year, he said: "You do not wish to be director of a group of mystery of our part. We in the national regional and regional sections and sub-sections agents for the organization had wanted the NCF to be run in a positive manner. When others in the NCF were not willing to run the NCF in a positive manner, I had to leave the NCF. I had to leave the NCF. I had to leave the NCF."

23 September 1955

This inside cover is the last thing to be typed before the magazine is ready to roll.

It does become evident that POSTIE will not be out in time for the Rehorst business to come to light.

I do wish to say that in POSTIE, my article on the conduct of one Paul H. Rehorst as related to his charges and the coming election -- my seeming two faceness in supporting Stan Woolston -- attempted to make clear my position.

The situation has changed now. It is no longer a question of my attempting to support the least undesirable candidate, ~~now~~ because more than two are running.... if someone has the guts to take the opportunity to run for office which has been created.

I ~~must~~ merely say here about POSTIE (when it does come out) that at that time the circumstances were that I attempted to bring out full information and let the voter decide, expressing my own opinion why I felt Rehorst would probably be better (~~than~~ his ability to make persons angry with him would leave little compunction about booting him out of office if he did go too far -- as compared to the ability of Stan Woolston who can get away with about anything without raising sufficient anger to put a stop to future actions). But if anyone else runs and declares his intentions to let the directorate ~~manage~~ regulate the affairs and control the finances of the organization, and define the duties of any office or official^s, including that of the President -- I would support that person.

We need a president who is not contradictory to the directorate. And one who will not presume to hold two ~~mutually exclusive~~ elective offices at the same time (that of policy making, the directorate function; the action end/ of directorate decisions, the presidency -- which need not be used as the directorate can use more direct methods when desirable in calling upon any other officers to do something).

I do wish to clear up a few points: I never did try to get Rehorst support or his self-publicity committee's support for my own election. But I did bitch to him about his own methods and pointed out to him what the constitution says. He was very avid for a club controlled by his own policies and with a directorate who would pay lipservice as has been the case so often: To quote: "In the past a multi-headed demon has governed N3F, in the future a one-headed, single-willed giant will successfully and without feuding, lead N3F to much greater things than it has ever known or dreamed of before" (quoted from his 19th of July letter).

When it became known that Barry Gardner dared accept a position in the N3F this year, he said: "Your 10 July epistle to the directorate cleared up a point of mystery on our part. NP in selecting regional and regional sectional and sub-sectional agents for its operations had wondered why Barry Gardner answered in such a negative manner, when others the country over had replied in such glowing terms. ((note: lack of space -- must skip parts)) ((Changed mind -- will continue on next page))

(Continuation of Rehorst comments)

Gardner did agree as to Susan's perfidy, but seems somewhat remiss in condemning all of the directorate - small wonder now that we learn you were instrumental in getting him the posts of Supplies head and Welcommittee chief. We may have convinced him otherwise by now - but at anyrate if necessary he can be replaced easy enough, being one of the smallest regional cogs."

It is to be noted that because Bary decided that he had every right in the world to accepting a place ~~within~~ as a working member of the NSF, he would not be allowed to hold any office if Rehorst became president. It should be noted that Rehorst condemns all directors and anyone connected to this administration. Yet he supports Bary (who doesn't want anything to do with Rehorst), Ray Schafer, Jr. (who has withdrawn all support, and was to a very large extent Susan's right-hand man and appointee). I never tried to make myself a part of any subversive organization, as he claims I did (trying to become a part of NP). His claims I did were pure hog-wash. Rehorst also knows of three attempts earlier in the year to ease matters between Susan and myself and get on better terms (I had asked Janie Lamb to contact two or three different persons who knew that I made efforts at patching up the differences, and Janie was aware of the fact that I made an announcement that by-gones would be by-gones sometime during the year -- that I would not attack Susan for past grievances to the membership or directorate, but would concern myself only with the future, unless the situation demanded otherwise, and the directorate was granted permission to sit in judgement on my actions: Janie answered my letter and Rehorst with copies giving out information -- which I had hoped to be used in combating the Rehorst remarks -- Janie did not want to commit herself by saying anything one way or the other in a membership publication, or take sides -- even to clearing my name. However; I do wish to point out that I did make some ten actual steps in attempting to get Don Susan to cooperate with the directorate and to easing his feelings.) *I claim partial success.*
I do make myself clear to Rehorst that I did not approve of his
criticizing the Presidency ideas
of course I can be doubted. This is a fact: Don Susan did not answer personal letters to him asking for private discussions to get at the basis of his actions until relatively late.

ATTENTION:

A very Serious and Timely subject has just been brought to my attention.

It seems that in matters of crisis, there are individuals who attempt to provide an answer. I am one of those individuals, but I happen to believe that the personal approach is sometimes fine for the particular individual, but not necessarily for all.

A volunteer O-E approached one of the officers of the NSF with the proposition that he would put out the O-O if he were given complete freedom to do as he pleased.

The O-O is a very serious subject as it is the chief contact with the membership, and he who controls the publication also to a very large extent controls the club.

It is my belief that the O-E is given a certain latitude to do as he wishes. But the directorate as a whole (because it is a club publication and affects every member) has the entire right to (while representing the membership as directors) vote for certain changes when they feel it is necessary.

I do not believe the Publications Director has or should have any direct control: His function is to published matters outside of the O-O. The O-E is an officer in his own right -- like the Secretary, Treasurer, MS^B Bureau head, etc. And as a result, subject to the policies of the directorate.

It is also my belief that the position of Publications Director should be done away with entirely as this places excess power in the hands of one person (this is no slam at Gary Labowitz). I believe that a publications head should be outside of the directorate entirely, so not affected by the likes or dislikes of one person.

I also believe that one can not remain on the directorate without getting some pretty fixed ideas. I believe that with the enormous duties of those within the policy making end of the NSF that a director heading publications can find excuses for laxity on his own part, where objections would be found in others. I know that the person holding publications directorship within the NSF will fight bitterly any attempts to change his policies, and the fight will become personal to the detriment of needed policies in other areas.

I address this to Next Year's Directorate, potential O-E's, and the membership. The directorate as a whole must be recognized as the over all policy making position which can countermand, change, or uphold individual policy for the NSF. Decisions where needed should be answerable to the membership by the membership recognized directorate which is composed of five members. Any officer or participating member must recognize that the directorate (indirectly or directly responsible to the membership) is the last word.

SPEAKING
FROM THE SHOULDER

Let us start with a general picture: Fandom to a large extent is a way of life. It is composed of many organizations, but no organization can be considered fandom its self. A fan may join one group, several groups, start one of his own, or not be a member of any group. It is to this large variety of freedom which appeals to the average fan -- he doesn't have to believe in any one set of values, doctrines, religions, or methods. He doesn't even have to believe in the organization of which he belongs.

Now we come to the N3F -- this is a truly unique organization in that it stands for membership representation by the members themselves. Five members are chosen each year for the specific job of representing the membership in forming its policies and direction. The post of president was created to help the directorate in carrying out these policies, although this position was not made for the creating of red tape. The election of the president was made to give an official voice to the directorate. He can hold only one elective office, otherwise he would be making policy (which came about anyway) and creating conflict above the representative government. It must be remembered that it is far easier for one man to make up his mind and put something into effect than it is for one man to accomplish something through several.

All in all this is a fine democratic system: It gives a representation to the membership, it allows five individuals a better chance at catching something which is missed by the other four; and while one ear may be closed to suggestions, others are open.

Before continuing, I should make this clear: I have spent many hours of each day thinking about the N3F and what must be done. I assure you that I had quite a bit of emotional conflict which was practically tearing me to pieces. To do the popular thing would allow me to shut my mouth and do nothing what-so-ever and let the organization fold up. The only reason you even now are receiving any type of benefits is because of my actions in getting things started. This is no lie. I also realize that I could easily save my skin from retaliation by remaining silent: But this I know: If I do remain silent, the N3F will be dragged back into the mud.

Its problems have been so heavy that I have at times chose escape by hiding from the problems. But they never escaped me. I went to the movies to loose myself. My school work suffered, and so did other crifanac (critical fan activities). It was finally at a movie called "A Man Named Peter" that my moral and obligatory duty was driven home. My duty must be for the membership so long as I am a director, even at causing hard feelings. The future must be considered.

The past can not be altered, and it is the now combined with the past which determines the future. With the directors we have now, no changes of any size can be brought about -- it is up to the directors of the future who can start things off right. And before they become trapped, they must know what awaits.

In doing this I run a risk -- that of damaging the N3F in presenting so many trees that the forest can not be seen. I only ask that each and every one of you attempt to see the complete picture of what I am attempting to get at.

It is thus that I come before you now and request your help in making the N3F an organization represented by five chosen members, and directly accountable to the membership. It is because the membership is kept in ignorance that certain things are done without permission. It is because the directors themselves find it easier to ignore violations of the constitution than to uphold it. This may be due to the personality of a member -- where the directorate chooses that member above the club interest. That member is more important than the wellbeing of the club itself. Most of the actions have taken place on the personal level. That the club has been slowly going on the rocks is because the directorate fears to make an objection when they see something wrong.

What needs to be done is to make them fear not making an objection. This business has gotten so deep that it is easier to clam up entirely and not do anything. What may be called a feud is the daring to raise an objection -- the obvious course is to suppress everything. This in turn means hiding from the facts, and it offers further opportunities for mismanagement. It also imparts a fear against doing anything which might conceivably rock the boat -- and anything can conceivably do that.

This has a great bearing upon the situation as it stands today. Your representative government has gone to hell by way of individual actions taking place above the general will of the directorate. Sure, quite a bit was accomplished as far as paper work went -- agreements galore, but when it came to the test of the individual, it met with utter failure (except, of course, where the desired action happened to coincide with what the individual wanted.)

The proper test of a director is: Can he stand behind his actions if the truth were known insofar as the membership is concerned?

Let us examine the situation a bit more closely: When things start piling up, it is not so easy to give an explanation. A way has to be found in order that the membership can vote intelligently and that feuds (when actually the case) when they do develop, can be turned to constructive use. A method of preventing unilateral action and hedging, of preventing false information from being passed. A method to bring up objections immediately when something is wrong.

I think you all know that frustration may end explosively. A safety valve must be created -- not a bottling of pressures which may explode.

This directorate is so far gone that they will not take the action themselves. However; they can be influenced -- your directorate is governed by emotions rather than reason. Direct those emotions to the proper channels, and you can have a club run for the membership as a whole and governed by reason. But the stage must be set for this.

Enclosed is a petition for a major constitutional over-haul. Actually, these changes are not changes, but suppliments and do not conflict with the constitution. They only set up specific regulations which are preventative and have a few teeth. I only ask you to think carefully what each is designed to do. They provide an answer. Failure to vote them into being (if it reaches that stage) may mean the failure of accomplishments in the future, unless the directorate will adopt them as standing rules after failure to meet membership passage. Remember: Standing rules can not be put into effect without the consent of each new directorate. One directorate can not legislate to the next -- they can only suggest legislation for adoption.

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

By Agreement of Orville W. Mosher, Ray Schaffer, Jr., Kaymar Carlson, and Gary Labowitz: The deadline for applications to filing are now open again. No new deadline was set, but as election ballots are to be distributed before the 10th of October, I suggest that all applications be in by the first of October. An official ruling will be made as to the exact deadline and if possible will be announced.

All who wish to run for the presidency or directorate file with Janie Lamb, and send me a short write-up on some of the things you wish to accomplish -- keep it short, I'm probably going to end up footing the bill.

Special notation: Stan Woolston has declaired ~~his~~ his support of the extension and has voted. Gary Labowitz withdrew his vote.

I hereby serve notice that I am withdrawing my name from the candadicy of the directorate for next year and will not run for office. - Orville W. Mosher-

Now President of NSF elected: Walter A. Coslet, P.O. Box 6, Helena, Montana was elected unanimously. Vote was introduced by Stan Woolston. Walter was the founder and first operator of the NSF Mss. Bureau. More information to be carried in CRIFANAC.

CRIFANAC will be out a week from the time you receive this. Time is offered for statements from Stan Woolston and Paul H. Rehorst. Other news of interest will be included.

I wish to state that I am proud of my own record and will stand behind it. The following is what I attempted to do for the N3F: 1) Provide a chance for all to vote, provide an O-O and O-E. 2) Put out FANSPEAK much earlier; 3) Put the directorate on a working basis; 4) lesson tensions between Susan and myself and get him to work with us; 5) Introducing Susan legislation to give him a litho-format for first issue of O-O, full litho O-O for second, agreement to appointments he made, agreement for him to work on and put out Fantasy Pseudonyms; 6) Providing a list of possible publishers; 7) Attempt to get special membership issue out before membership, make-up issues; 8) Legislation passed upon to be announced, announced; 9) positions for Australian Representative, publications director, Ideas Committee head, Official Stastician, Librarian, Supplies, Welcommittee, and other offices; 10) Removal of treasury to safer hands; 11) volunteer work in cutting stencils for publications. I wish to state here that Stan Woolston thought so much of Susan that he prevented other legislation from being passed for vote, failed to announce them after made, and has on occasion twisted the truth -- all of which I can back up. The remarks about the Ideas Committee not being original were explained to the directorate in words to this effect: Susan objected to the Ideas Committee on the basis that it was untried. This is the same publication which was to have been the membership issue, and I suspect that he only volunteered to take it on to keep Susan happy -- the deadline given for platforms was his excuse, but this deadline never had directorate sanction, and neither did the constitution name the specific date at which applications cease -- it only says the announcement is to be given at least two months in advance of the deadline (for the simple reason that any later and you would have the opening and closing of the announcement in the same issue of the O-O). It is for a certain amount of hell-raising on this issue that you may now file for office.

To those who may have doubts, I open the following offer: For the sum of \$2.00 I will give a fairly complete history of what took place from the first of this year along with documentation, quotations from letters, and comments by the participants in each case. Any funds left over will be turned over to the treasurer for club use. No punches pulled, even on myself.

I believe in the N3F and what it is supposed to stand for. That I seem to be knocking it now, or knocking some well liked individuals does not change the situation: I worked hard and took a lot of punishment in order that the constitution would be upheld. I worked hard for myself, the officers, members, and club as a whole. I made the serious error of placing Stan Woolston in such a position where he was responsible for taking action on legislation, and counting the votes by submitting legislation to that effect. Continued excuses for withholding legis-

Note: In running off the master sheet, it became crumpled, and was made useless. While I can retype this page, I feel that it is sufficient to say that Stan Woolston cheated on legislation in ignoring the directorate, and refused to pass material. I have no faith in him ever bringing the constitutional agreements before the membership for vote -- continued reminders do not help.

This is NOT passing the buck, because I did do my fair part of the work, and the directorate (excluding Ray Schaffer, Jr. as he only recently joined us) knows exactly what happened.

I will here skip my prepared text to bring out some facts concerning the charges leveled by Don Susan as he did present a signed petition sometime after his directive to Eva Firestone telling her to hold up the issue of the O-O. At the time the petition reached us from Eva Firestone, it was unsigned, and I supposed at the time was to be a petition to the membership for the signing.

Charges of withholding the O-O: False: Don Susan was left as O-E. I was against this to start with, but Stan insisted that Don remain O-E until he put out the first issue. Susan did after periods of time report on progress ... Woolston placed an undo burden on my shoulders by continued failure to come to the point with Susan about the O-O, and it was through my pointed questions that he did report. He informed us that he was putting the O-O out on a school mimeo. After another month went by (you must remember that we didn't come officially into office for a couple of months after we were supposed to be in office) with no results, I attempted to get immediate action started.

Stan has failed to move legislation in the past. My bill for the \$1.50 membership dues was held up, and all I could get out of him was that it might hurt Don's feelings. This time I took the precaution of informing all of the directorate that I was sending a round-robin legislation, first getting the agreement that we would go ahead and put out the O-O and this would be done as soon as my round-robin reached the directorate for consideration (containing the plan on how we would get our material).

Stan Woolston held this up for several weeks, and he and I did get inquiries about what became of the legislation. It was not until I wrote a member (a one-time officer) who lambasted the President and Directorate that Stan wrote me saying he was in agreement with the plan, and he would volunteer to put out the O-O.

This plan called for Gary Labowitz to collect the material (meanwhile contacting all available publishers -- John Murdock had volunteered to do an O-O, and Eva was ~~standing by~~ standing by). I wrote Gary and he gave his permission to Stan to collect the material in his name.

All directors were to write up the legislation they had passed, as well as the President (He got permission for a litho-format for his issue, an all litho-issue for the second, permission to put out Fantasy Pseudonyms, and had made a few appointments which the directorate retroactively okayed after making them, with an exception). The Recruiting Bureau was to write to the membership for material. The various groups of the N3F were to have reports in.

A gentlemen's agreement was to the effect that for the purposes of this issue -- a membership issue (not a Susan, Woolston, or directorate issue of the O-O) -- the directorate would not indulge in any mud slinging. I volunteered for Stan to proof-read what I wrote for this issue to see that I did not attack Susan.

Well, it was the hot letter which pried Woolston's ~~interim~~ agreement, and he did state that we should not wait for the legislation to make complete passage, but to start at once, and he would put out the O-O. It only needed one vote, and I was positive that this proposal would receive the needed vote and more. I informed the directorate that the legislation was being passed, and that I felt that it would receive unanimous support. Also that it contained specific information for each director. It developed that after a ~~month~~ week Stan had not sent the legislation at all.

Jim White sent me a round-robin which Stan had substituted in its place calling for freezing of all legislation. I sent this round-robin (it had only passed to Jim) back to Stan Woolston and reminded him of what he had done in cheating the membership of an O-O in the first place and preventing me from a fair election and the membership their right to vote (reference to Interim Agreement). I wrote the directorate mentioning the withholding of legislation.

Stan countered by claiming something entirely different than what was included in the legislation, making the plan unworkable if such were the case. I called him on this and repeated in general what was in it, and called him a moral coward and he would stand condemned in the eyes of the directorate (this was not the first time he had ignored legislation) unless he bent that legislation for vote. You see, I had already started the action called for under the assumption that this legislation was being passed.

His attitude changed, it seemed, when he quoted portions of the legislation and made the excuse that he had a poor filing system and was sending it along. He ran for vote by direct letter some of the items covered. THAT LEGISLATION WAS NOT PASSED ALONG. But my plan did meet with agreement.

Then he cooked up this deadline business as an excuse for not waiting. The constitution does not name the deadline for filing, but it does have to be made ~~announced~~ before the ballots are put out (obvious) and can ~~be~~ the announcement is to be made ~~announced~~ atleast one issue of the O-O in advance. The deadline he gave was not authorized, nor was ~~in~~ the announcement of the deadline required for that issue at that time.

Let me make this clear. The deadline its self could be October 1st (although this cuts it rather short). The announcement would have to be made at least in the proceeding issue. But Stan insisted that this particular ~~hasue~~ had to meet a certain date; three weeks from the time he informed the directorate: This is why I sent out the booklets to the membership requesting material to be sent in within three weeks. I called Stan and talked with him long distance about allowing more time, and he insisted that he would not do it.

I did send in my legislation: He was supposed to, under the plan, write up other legislation -- like "standing rules" (a name he put to my legislation which originally was supposed to be used by this directorate -- I have continually stated that my methods may not prove out, and I objected on the grounds that bad rules may live on. I believe that one directorate is intitled to their own mistakes. By continued argument, Stan finally, after ignoring legislation to be run, did submit a vote that each directorate was to examine these rulings and they would not become effective until each item is voted upon separately. I understand that this did meet with passage. At anyrate, each directorate and administration is separate, and one can not place rules upon the other without ~~making~~ the regulations being written into the constitution, or without their consent. I make this clear right here so that if you ever are told by someone in the directorate that such and such a rule is in effect, -- that is, if you are elected -- make that person produce the names of those who voted, and make that person explain why you were not notified -- Standing rules provide that all directors must be notified of legislation, and that the Chairman of the Directorate shall notify all of the directorate who voted and how)

When I sent in my write up on the Ideas Committee & Fan News Reporter plan, I also outlined what items were voted upon specifically to be included (this included that filings were open for the treasury position, and Recruiting Bureau Head -- both were acting positions until applicatnts could be secured). It included Stan's own legislation that their was a devision of powers between the directorate and president and that the president was to be kept informed of all legislation (something he failed continually to do).

It was not until the 0-0 came out that I discovered he had ignored everything, put it out (the 0-0) as his own, gave several false announcements, and made the false crack about the Ideas Committee being unoriginal (excuses were that Susan and others would blame Stan and not the whole directorate, and that the crack was to please Susan on the grounds he objected to it as untried -- Susan objected to it on the grounds I had it in my platform and made up a false story at the time he cut into my platform).

Do to this, I sent in my name to run for the presidency in order to keep Stan from running the club from the presidency --- should I win. His continued "pussy-footing" had caused most of the directors to loose interest, some thinking others had lost interest as nothing had been reaching them for some time. It is interesting to note that the membership didn't take too much of an interest in the club to send out a few gripes on their own UNTIL AFTER the 0-0 was put out.

Withholding of legislation to be sent, and failure to announce legislation after passage. This I charge Stan Woolston with, and I say that much of the problems could have been avoided if he had only cooperated. The fact he has some good friends is because he doesn't want to become unpopular with anyone. And to do his job, he had to, of necesesity, stepped on a few toes.

He is highly diplomatic, and it was quite easy for me to continually let him get by with his actions. Sympathy routine was used a great deal, excuses, supposed agreements (which could not be backed up), and what have you. He would agree with about anything you said, than when the test came ---.

Yes, I did think that after he took it upon himself to vote Susan out of office for ceasing the treasury (He issued orders without directorate consent and over my objections for Susan to act as liaison between the treasurer and directorate, and appointed Susan as overseas representative).

Stan and I had a little argument on his sending out a benefits list which contained items of extreme doubtful nature. It seems that I did make an error in assuming that this fake list of benefits was all of Susan's work. It was a result of the first issue that I learned that I was named Supplies director and supposedly responsible for supplying a list of fanclubs, a checklist of books and magazines, and Fanspeak -- Well, I was not Supplies Director (that little item did come from Susan), I did not offer my fanclub list (which is not N3F property -- it was offered years back under condition that the N3F pay for the stencils, but I was never contacted about this: My long distance talk with the treasurer mentioned this as the excuse for inclusion). Also, the Check List of Books and magazines (once more, according to this to be offered yearly and for free!) was voted down.

I had volunteered to ~~handwrite~~ type the stencils for FANSPEAK, and had asked for a vote. Woolston side tracked the issue many months ago by claiming Charles Lee Riddle promised to give them to the N3F free (That was when he was running against Venable, wasn't a member of the N3F this year), and that he would check with Charles so not to vote. Well, he didn't, and it wasn't until I got hold of the benefits list that I raised Cain. It has been Woolston's list year after year that has resulted in the promises of things to come. I put it up to Woolston -- after learning that the whole list was not Susan's fault -- that FANSPEAK was his responsibility, that it was up to him to retract or produce.

I meanwhile wrote to Charles myself to see if he was willing, asked Jim White to do the same. Notified all/ that I had received no answer. Gary Labowitz did finally get a letter answered, or learned through other sources that Riddle had moved. I submitted a constitutional amendment that FANSPEAK would be put out, and it should be up for membership vote (unless Stan withholds this like other constitutional votes to be presented).

However; I degress. When Rehorst started his operations, I found him so much like Susan with the one idea of controlling the club through the presidency (the directorate just being an advisorate body which could be ignored when desired) that I made up my mind that I would drop from the presidential race. I felt that the club had a better chance with Stan.

My platform contained the standing rules (which are supposed to be written up and presented for vote to be placed into the constitution) dealing with the position of the presidency. This bit of legislation was passed long ago, and through some hell-raising on my part to get Stan to give a complete review of legislation and what was voted upon (a direct ~~membership~~ directorship vote on this forced this out into the open) produced the standing rules as passed. In order to save face, he did offer them for another vote to be included in the constitution.

Why he failed to present them before Susan was kicked out of office (if they had been, I believe we would have had a stronger case), I think it was because it might offend Susan.

These standing rules dealing with the president were in my platform before it was cut at Stan Woolston's directions. They were, however; included in the O-O. Here are those rules for the president:

1. The president will keep himself informed on the activities of all officers and committees of the N3F so that he may bring before the directorate matters which should be acted upon in order to insure the well-being of its individual members and the membership as a whole.

2. The President will bring to the attention of the directorate all important constitutional dates.

3. The President will call attention to any violations of the constitution.

4. The President has no authority to appoint or make policy without the expressed consent of the directorate.

I felt that some pressure could be exerted here, as I was sure that my platform would be read -- resulting from last year's platform tampering. I see with all the shouting for precedents (like sticking six men in the directorate because the Chairman when he became president would be unable to vote on legislations, only appointments) was applied to my platform. For this I withdrew my support of Stan Woolston.

I knew he would continue to balk at passing out any type of information: I hereby repeat another portion of my platform which was cut (I made the serious mistake of sending copies to the whole directorate, Stan included):

"This time Don went too far: he sent word to Eva Firestone to withhold the O-O and publish an unsigned petition declairing that he was freezing the funds of the N3F and setting up a dictator form of government due to breach of contract: The directorate failed to get out the O-O and they offered fraudulent benefits! (NOTE: Susan was to have got out the O-O, and he did infact offer benefits which were never discussed, and one actually voted down. Only Fantasy Pseudonyms was legitimate. This notation was not in my speech).

"From my own pocket, I paid the sum of \$24.95 for an hour long, long distant phone call to the Treasurer to look into the situation and discover what actions were needed. I did meet with a lot of hedging, but I think that I accomplished the promise to get the return of this money to the directorate upon majority vote. Action has been started, and it is hoped that Janie Lamb will receive the club funds -- if not than legal action will have to be used (we are legally responsible as the directorate controls the funds).

"I am sure that we have the unanimous vote to remove Don Susan. One of the directors is on vacation and can not be reached, but he did leave word in one of his previous letters under what circumstances he would vote to remove the president (this to earlier vote on the

the fake benefits list).

"This petition, unsigned as it is, will be published. A majority of the directorate feel that even if it is passed (Stan Woolston, Kaymar, myself) and funds refunded, we will attempt to start the N3F over again. I am sure that Gary feels the same way, and Jim does too -- this agreement was expressed in private letters but as yet has no official vote.

But let us look behind this situation and get at the cause: It did not come about just because of Susan -- Susan was only an end product. It came about because of the general misconception not only of the club, but the candidates for office. And that was, the President is the head of the N3F!

For years now there have been persons who have run for the presidency in the belief that in winning this position, they could make the club over. These same persons have put directorates in power for the sole purpose of giving them a free hand. The leadership is supposed to be in the directorate as is the policy. But it takes a president who goes out and does things on his own to destroy a directorate and make the club into a dictatorship!

If a president does things without permission and against directorate policy, the directorate is forced to pay "lip-service." They do not wish to go as far as removing the president. Soon, it becomes apathy, and the running of the organization is left in the hands of one man. And that one man is not open to suggestions except where they co-inside with his own. He resists any attempt to take away his authority -- which he never had without consent of the directorate by the constitution.

"This person is usually satisfying his ego, and everything is swell as long as the 0-0 is put out regularly. If he gets tired or wants to take it easy -- the whole organization hinges on him -- and that is exactly what has happened year after year. In the directorate this year, certain attempts were made to make Susan feel important as well as to keep the club in the hands of the directorate. They gave up part of that power in hopes of being able to work together and prevent any feuds. It was a fine plan, only it didn't develop the way it should: Susan wanted "All or nothing", and he didn't have plans of accepting our meeting him over half way -- and he didn't plan on the "nothing part" either.

"Susan is merely my horrible example, although I can point to other persons, places, and times. It is this business of one person wanting to run not only the show, but be the show.

"When I ran for office last year, it was with the intention of putting the power back into the hands of the directorate and supporting the various members in doing things for the club.

"But this year I did intend to run, but I see before me the specter -- the ghost -- of past administrative failures returning to haunt the N3F.

"And that phantom is the person running for the presidency with the intentions of running the club his way.

"Now more than ever the club needs a president who will inspire leadership of the directorate without self-glorification. One who will follow these standing rules set forth by the directorate of this year:"

The standing rules were listed.

Do to the cutting of my platform, I became very angry. I should

point out that when I talked to the Treasurer, I had legislation already before the directorate to name James White the Treasurer, or if he didn't want it, I would take charge. The treasurer was previously informed, and in our talk, she did agree to send me the treasury if the directorate cast a unanimous vote. However; Stan played it cute by ignoring the legislation pending and substituted Janie Lamb (Mallinger and Janie had not hit it off too well, which is why we did save around \$15.00 of the club funds -- Janie evidently had reason to believe something might develop). Do to confusion of my letter demanding immediate action, and Stan's naming Janie, I decided (not knowing at the time of this split) to back down and let Stan have his own way. Do to lapse of time, I believed along with the confusion, Mallinger (as I predicted) chose to side with Susan. In phone call, she said she didn't agree to plan, but she was worried over the state of the NSF -- her fears were played way up do to letters originating (I make this as a pure guess as no names were named) from Paul H. Rehorst demanding funds to put out some issue (I take to be POSTIE).

Some data should be given here about Mallinger: She was handed over the treasury without directorate consent at the time Bill Venable appointed Don Susan in his place. This should have gone to the Chairman of the Directorate (the presidency), but you couldn't say we even had a directorate. She said that Don gave it to her for her wonderful work with the Pittsburgh club. She was over 21, but she had not paid her dues so was not actually a member. This year she payed up for this year and last -- she and Susan joined about the same time. It is my belief that Susan waited nearly half a year before rejoining (he might have been booted out on grounds of not being a member, but Janie had insisted that only until a membership roster in the O-O was published, could such a thing be legitimately done) because he counted upon his petition to put the directorate over a barrel and place him as head of the club -- I can only guess this. When I first came in contact with her, it was ~~through~~ through legislation which I followed up myself (instead of leaving it up to Stan) calling for notification of all expenses and recommendations from the Treasurer. I wanted to see that the Susan Handbook of how the club will operate did not receive funds and that the check list of books did not receive funds -- just incase he did try to go over the directorate's head as he had done on several occasions. She said that she did recognize that the directorate controlled the funds, and did at that time send me an accounting which was sent round-robin. She was highly sarcastic about the coming directorate issue (something which probably upset Susan's timetable), and wanted to know if she could charge off postage for letters to the directorate. She did cooperate, but in working close to Susan, much of the bitterness rubbed off on her.

Her position as Treasurer was never made official, except by an act of this directorate which gave her an acting status. She had, I understand, written Stan of her willingness to quit. This is something which was never brought to light except after the Susan action in attempting to dissolve the club. Rather than announce the unanimous vote for her removal, Stan chose to write her that he accepted her resignation. My legislation had called for all to send direct letters to her and file with Woolston. This bit of diplomacy was wasted.

No one can know for sure that if my legislation in this respect were followed would have produced any results. I only know that I followed her own conditions.

I do not know if presenting the petition in the O-O as it was for membership vote would have lost us the club or gained the club and brought back the treasury. I do not think that we will be able to get our treasury back even if the vote is to our favor.

But that vote for Susan's petition will have to be answered as he does have the necessary percentage.

Several of the members listed on his petition were not on our roles. At the time the signed petition was presented to us, Janie Lamb was the new and official Treasurer. The constitution only says that one can join by paying the sum of \$1.60. Normally this is through Janie Lamb who is the Secretary and who takes these names and addresses of new members and makes a list so that they can share in the benefits of the organization. Yet, some slip-ups have resulted in the past by the treasurer receiving funds and not reporting who sent them to the Secretary. Even the treasurer's payment was in doubt as no notification was made that she paid herself the dues. There is no way of telling just when these particular members joined -- before or after the post of Treasurer changed hands (not the cash), and where they live. We must assume the petition presented to us is legitimate.

Let me point out that Stan has escaped his responsibilities upon his ability to make friends. It is this that fights the chances of success. It is morons like myself who believe the N3F is worth fighting for, and that duty to the membership while in a responsible position comes first. He does have the ability to bring persons to his defence, and who will follow his advice, even when the interest of the club is not being served. The directorate for a large part has taken a non-committal attitude.

However; on August the 13, 1955 (after enacting legislation dealing with the absence of vote from a member after any more than reasonable time -- intensions are asked, followed ~~minutes~~ later by letter from Chairman, and finally action is had, or director is out of a job and member is chosen from his choice, failing that, from past candidates, than active workers p= which is why Ray Schaffer, Jr. is now a director) I received a letter from James White. He said:

"Dear" Orville,

"As you can see, I've reenlisted in the service. I had too little time to broadcast my intentions because I learned from some friends in recruiting that people in my category are being drafted right now & I might get my notice at any time. Since I got in I've been on the move from 4:30 to 9:00 PM and later, and had just enough energy to climb into my bunk.

"I did tell Stan about it last week and managed (at the cost of a broken rib) to get time to write you now.

"So due to the lack of time for the next six months or so, I'll have to resign from the directorate. And since I wasn't planning to renew in '56, I might as well drop out right now.

"If you feel I deserve a bit of chastisement, you have my address on the first page, but I'm sure you understand knowing the demands the reserve puts on you (or is it Bill Venable?) ((Must have been Venable -- however; I did spend a couple of years at a military school and have been a member of the National Guards for eight years now -- Orv.))

"One thing I wish to mention: Out of the many N3F'ers I'm acquainted with, I feel that John Murdock would make one of the best directors for '56, but don't ask him to take my place for the remainder of '55. It would put three strikes against him if he wanted to run at a later date.

"The copy of your platform which I received was a masterpiece and I agree to every line except for the last few: Stan Woolston must not be president! I don't know of a suitable substitute for him, but with his pussy-footing, or over-diplomatic methods, I honestly believe he would finish N3F off completely. The membership might possibly even be limited to president, directorate and Secretary (Janie Lamb would be the last to quit).

"Naturally, with my resignation on page one, I have absolutely no voice in N3F. But I feel it is the duty of anyone who is interested to voice their opinions.

"Before I go, I want to wish you all plenty of luck in keeping N3F out of the dictatorship which threatens it. Do your damnest, because if it ever becomes something of the sort it might conceivably wind up on a list being circulated by the government. That would make a number of people mighty angry.

"Regards,
Jim"

It is with regret that I have had to present this material. For I can not help but like Stan -- silly as it sounds.

But the main issue is something which will continue to affect the membership.

This next year can be the start of a much better club, and maybe my efforts have not been waisted. This year saw a club ruled by fear of the unknown and a certain flapping of wings around a candle -- this is a poetic way of saying that we acted like moths around a candle.

We must have a president who will work for the directorate, not for himself. The leadership must be placed into the hands of representatives who settle questions by vote. The president must be on hand to help in carrying out the duties assigned him.

I only hope that one among you or many of you will run for the ~~president~~ position of the presidency. And I hope that the persons with ideas will run for the directorate. The way is open.

His excuse for ignoring the directorate was that by putting out the O-O in his name, he would receive the blame for anything objected to. I feel this was a grand stand play, but he has the full honor to any blame.

((SPECIAL NOTE: Picking up prepared text))

~~Succeeding issues of the O-O failed to mention legislation which was brought forward, until Susan decided to take over the club by withholding the treasury. My own attempt to bring out legislation and agreements made in the directorate were always censored by Stan Woolston. My last attempt to get across information was through my platform. I sent copies to all of the members of the directorate, Jamie Lamb, and Eva Firestone. This was an error because it was through agreement of Stan Woolston and Eva Firestone and Jamie Lamb that my platform was cut. The only reason why I did uphold Stan in my platform was because Paul H. Rehorst looked to me like another would-be dictator -- and Woolston payed a lot of lip-service to much of what I believed in, besides being the only alternative (I had withdrawn my name from the presidential race when I realized that I could possibly split the vote enough for Rehorst to get in -- In my long distance phone call to the treasurer, I did learn that Rehorst had been filling her ears with a lot of accusations and demands for cash to put out some publication or other -- reports from other sources indicated that his poison pen tactics had brought about more dissention. Prior to this, I had assumed him to be a harmless crank).~~

But what should be brought out is that despite my little talk ~~here~~, and ~~the~~ general gripes expressed all the way around, the club is in good shape even though we do not have our treasury. It has been the indecision which has broken to a great deal. We now have some very fine members working their heads off in the various groups. Now more than ever, the membership is actually taking an interest in their club.

I tell you this in all frankness: I firmly believe that Stan Woolston has the interest of the club at heart, but was sure that his answer was the only one. Heck, Don Susan believes in his ways. I believe in mine too -- but that only through the working of four other directors. Stan has claimed implied powers to regulate legislation, but in so doing, it would allow him to put only what he wants to see passed before the directorate and withhold other legislation. He has invented various excuses for not passing legislation -- I have called him down several times by demanding the names of those who voted upon the policies -- he has not replied, but insisted on repeating them again and again each time he finds some personal motive not to uphold legislation or pass it. At times he has claimed I said something, and I have demanded an exact quotation.

But this deals with your directorate and why it's so easy to quit trying or even to vote. Objecting to bad practices does not endear one director to another. This is one reason why something must be done now. First, a record is needed of all legislation passed upon. Secondly, a guarantee that anyone of the directors who falsely represent legislation will have some good explaining to do in the event the other director's names are tossed around.

Thirdly; the membership should know how they are being represented.
Fourthly; Credit should be given for those who introduce something for the benefit of the club as this will encourage participation;
Fifthly; When a director feels another director is not doing his job (like publications for instance) it causes hard feelings when objections are made and spite action may take place; besides, the holding down of other jobs detracts from the work of the directorate is supposed to be doing and also removes an opportunity for others to participate. The whole duty of the directorate is to the membership in letting them participate.

This is by way of illustration. I have said a few things which have been very pointed. It has been slanted to an extent, and it is sure to make me more enemies than I had before. But I believe what I am doing here is correct.

By no means is Stan Woolston a heavy villain, a liar, a cheat. He has worked for the NSF in his own way, and I suppose he considers that what he was doing was in the best interest of the club. He has upheld some legislation and did locate a new president, he did at least put out a publication. He has worked and voted with the directorate to an extent above most of the directors. He has done quite a bit of paper work, and to an extent kept the directorate informed. He is highly diplomatic.

Your club in general is in very good shape. We have more members actually working for the club than any time before, and it seems that even with the lack of funds, we are still coming out ahead publications wise. For the first time since I got hooked into this job has any member written to me about the club.

We must remain optimistic about the NSF, but have the good sense to see what should be done and gripe when needed. Those who don't gripe do not usually give a darn one way or the other. And I am glad to say that some members can gripe loud and long. But it is where you gripe that counts in getting the job done right: Gripe to the directorate first and then to the membership if that fails, but never be afraid to stand up for your rights.

Well, I'll see you in GRIFFANAC.

-Orville W. Mosher-
429 Gilpin Ave.
Dallas 11, Texas

See Postie for comments on Rehors

-page 8- 15

GRIFFANAC will skip this issue except for comments, by Woolston & Reh. I do promise something better to read.

Orville W. Mosher
429 Gilpin Ave.
Dallas 11, Texas

Return postage guaranteed
Duplicated matter only
May be opened for postal inspection

DALLAS, TEX. 1011



707

D. M. Carr

8325 31 N.W.

Seattle 7, Washington