

THE CRUZZINE

APA-F 41
& FAPA 110
QUARTERLY
#30

Published by rich brown, without premeditation, for the unsuspecting but totally prepared FISTFA, on this 16th day of April in the Year 1965. We who are about to file salute you.

The reason for this issue of CZQ isn't quite obvious to me, though I think I have some sort of motivation for putting it out. I think, in fact, that there may even be Good Reason to put this out. I should mention, perhaps, that for the first time CZQ will have Outside Circulation -- previous issues have been for APA-F and its participants only.* This, however, intends to say a few things that are outside the purview of our circle, to a few people that are not in APA-F. What it's doing in APA-F I'm sure I don't know. The topics are just a few things that I've always intended to Have My Say on, but never got around to it. Now I'm getting around to it.

TERRY CARR: I've noticed, both in your exegesis of THE BNF OF IZ and in Lighthouse (not to mention your collection of Boob Stewart pieces), that you have attributed the line about the beanie protecting the fannish headbone from unfannish thoughts to Boob. So three times, at least, I've mumbled to myself, "That's not right." Of course, I could be wrong, but I believe that line appears in THE ENCHANTED DUPLICATOR. Since my copy is back in California, I can't check to be sure; what I am sure of is that I heard the line somewhere before I even knew that Boob existed. It's possible that I first saw it in THE CATCHER OF THE RYE, if it appeared there, and misremember it; in that case you'd be right in attributing it to Boob. But I wish someone with a copy of TED would check it out to be sure.

VARIOUS PIPPLE WHO'VE ASKED: Yes, my Point Has Been Proved in re: the FAPA black-ball. My objections to Pavlat's decision is purely on constitutional grounds: the constitution is quite specific about his duties as sec.-treas. ~~are quite specific~~, thus negating any "implied powers" in the situation. And no one, as yet, denies that Bob's "implied powers" are quite specious. Bob has proven his point, too -- that the FAPA constitution is a totally worthless piece of paper and any FAPA officer may do damn well what he pleases. It is my intention to introduce a motion to drop the pretense of having a constitution. Since FAPA officials are not going to pay any attention to it anyway (as witness the Martin matter or Pavlat's Decision), and since the majority of FAPA seems to approve of this (implicitly if not explicitly), the constitution should be abolished so that the officers won't have to worry about quibblers. True; there are a few FAPAs who have objected to either or both of these flagrant misusages of power; but who are Ted White, Terry Carr, Harry Warner and Redd Boggs compared to a Bob Pavlat or a Jim Caughran?

Jim, I think, is the biggest disappointment of all. He answered my constitutional objection by asking me whether I wanted a waiting-list or not (and the answer to that is, yes, I do want a waiting-list: a constitutionally legal one) and saying that he would act as if I had not submitted an objection. In other words, the FAPA official who is supposed to judge constitutionality has refused to listen to my side of the argument -- I assume because he realizes I am right, but does not wish to admit it. I thought Jim had more guts than that.

This has turned, suddenly, into a FAPazine. Whatheil. It's over now.

--rich brown, 1965

*except the first two, which were riders with the Vick's Tired Feet.