



DOGIE

is the publication of Bob Pavlat, 6001 43rd Avenue, Hyattsville, Maryland, USA. This magazine is distributed primarily in OMPA at rather irregular intervals, as whim dictates.

Since the name of this magazine has created a small amount of comment on the possible derivation of the word "Dogie," I feel it appropriate to quote here from WESTERN WORDS: A Dictionary of the Range, Cow Camp and Trail: "DOGIE. A scrubby

calf that has not wintered well and is anaemic from the scant food of the cold months; also spelled dogy or dobie. It is, in the language of the cowboy, 'a calf that has lost its mammy and whose daddy has run off with another cow.' Although the word is used commonly in the West and is understood by all cattlemen, there has, in recent years, been some controversy over its origin. One version is that, during trail days, when it was discovered that the northern range was good cow country, especially for fattening beef, there arose a demand for young animals. It became the usage to call these dogies, especially yearling steers, to distinguish them from steers that were fat enough for market. Another version is that the term originated in the eighties after a very severe winter had killed off a great many mother cows and left a number of orphan calves. Grass and water were too heavy a ration for these little orphans, and their bellies very much resembled a batch of sour-dough carried in a sack. Having no mother whose brand would establish ownership, and carrying no brand themselves by which they might be identified, these orphans were put into the maverick class. The first to claim them was recognized as the owner, no matter where they were found. One day on roundup a certain cowman who was trying to build up a herd, drove a bunch in from along the river.

"'Boys, there's five of them dough-guts in that drive and I claim ever' damn one of 'em' he yelled excitedly.

"During that roundup all orphans became known as dough-guts, and later the term was shortened to dogie and has been used ever since throughout cattelands to refer to a pot-gutted orphan calf. This term has recently become popular through western songs, yet too great a percentage of singers call it doggie, as if they were singing of a pup. The word is sometimes used by the cowboy to mean laced shoes." (WESTERN WORDS, by Ramon F. Adams, University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, Oklahoma. Lent to me by Miss Cullen of the Washington SF Assn, to whom my thanks.)

From the same book comes the following: "Bucket Dogie. Sometimes stockmen purchased calves in the corn belt, or from farmers, and shipped them to their ranches to restock the range. These were called bucket dogies."

Barbara Lex also did some research, and sent the following note: "Finally found 'dogie' in A Treasury of American Folklore under a different subject. According to this book, 'dogie' means tenderfoot, 'whether two-legged or four.' Anyway, it seems that the reason that these cattle got that name had to do with the Mormons of Utah buying cattle in the East and bringing them out to the open range. Apparently

the cattle didn't like it and that's why they were called 'dogies,' meaning tenderfeet.

"The only problem NOW is--why were tenderfeet called 'dogies'?"

I'm rather interested in that last definition, since it seems to me to tie into the last sentence of Adams' statement, where he says the term is sometimes used to mean laced shoes--an item of wearing apparel worn by tenderfeet. On the whole, however, I prefer to think that the word came from the term "dough-guts" as described by Adams. The derivation given by Eney in the 15th OMPA mailing sounds possible, but it fails to explain why the term came to be applied solely to young calves rather than to all cattle--or to any other walking critter. It goes without saying that I would be interested in anything else that can be dug up on this subject.

The Adams book, by the way, makes interesting reading if you're the type that can sit and read definitions without going batty. One item in the book particularly amused me, and I think it would amuse anyone else who's heard the particular braying sound that Tucker can give to the word "fa-a-aan." Adams says: "Baa-a-ah. The cowboy's contemptuous name for sheep. If you want to start a fight, just blat this at a cowboy."

Hmm. Just checked one more entry in the Adams book: "tenderfoots. The name originally applied to imported cattle, but later attached to humans new to the country; both cattle and humans are also called pilgrims." In a long list of semi-synonyms, "dogie" is not listed.

Well, enough talking about me for a while. Let's talk about you:

CORRALLED: THE 15TH MAILING

Officialdom's OFF TRAILS. This current mailing arrived in fine shape. # As a FAPA member, I am sometimes startled at the lack of formality with which OMPA affairs are handled, the extension of the voting deadline on previously submitted amendments being a case in point.

Mercer's ARCHIVE. A sub-treasury, as far as I know, is simply a branch office of the treasury. It needs a building to have a place for its employees to pretend to work. A bagel is a Jewish pastry I believe. Like a flat roll; only harder, much harder. Numbers game is a name for an American racket (and I don't mean rock and roll session.) In essence, you select any three numbers - say 356 - and place a bet on them with a "runner." Your bet might be 5¢, \$5, or possibly even more. If your number comes up that day, you win, usual payoff varying between 300 and 700 to one, depending upon your own willingness to accept lousy odds and the greed of the runner and his superiors. The number is determined in different ways, the usual (or at least a common) practice being to key them to the prices paid by the winners of certain horses at a selected race track during the day. Chances against you are obviously 1000 to 1. Your fourth question was how the Empire got into the Empire State Building, and all I can answer is that New York is sometimes known as the Empire State, but for what reason I know not. Probably a hang-over from colonial days. Phi Beta Kappa is an honorary fraternity. College students are elected to it primarily on the basis of scholastic ability, but also considering off-campus activities. The key is simply the

emblem to show that you have been elected into this fraternity. The key is shaped like an escutcheon, and is usually worn on a watch chain by those few people who still use pocket watches. As to kewpie doll, that is a cheap celluloid doll, quite commonly given as a prize at fairs and carnivals. # I complained, in another fanzine, about the slow disappearance of the quote card, and wondered as you Where They All Went. Within the next few days, I received about 50 from fans who wanted to show me that the quote card was indeed not dead. As to your problem of never receiving back any that you initiate, there is one west-coast femme that refuses to pass on QC's; could be that she's the twisted link in your particular chain?

Burn's PARAFANALIA. Probably the mailing reviews of others will inspire me to go back and read this, but right now it just doesn't look interesting to me. Excepting the chick on page 5.

Eney's PHENOTYPE. Someone indicated to me that 16rpm records are becoming more common. Warner also warned me to keep my eye on the tape recorder field, since the 1-5/8ths speed appeared to be practicable. I guess it was Warner also who mentioned the 16rpm record, since I recall that he cited a recent cartoon on the general subject: Clerk in music store displaying rather large record to customer with words "And here, sir, are all the symphonic works ever recorded."

Wild's VAGARY. Your interests are, in general, quite different from mine, but your comments never fail to interest me. Your mailing reviews are more than reviews, they're discussions, and I like the aggressive but not antagonistic tone you give to them. # History bores me, but mythology does fall within my scope of interests (though certainly not of knowledge.) Many thanks for your background on Arthur. I'm now in the midst of Malory's "Le Morte Darthur, and your article has helped no little in making this more understandable.

Wild's SULFURIC. I can only comment on this by referring you to my review of CHUX OWN someplace below.

Mercer's TALES FROM THE OUBLIETTE. Archie, I've only started this, and so far it looks as fine as I've come to expect from you. (That's comendatory, bhoy!) However, it doesn't appear to fall in the "reviewable" category so I'm setting it aside, to read at my leisure in the easy-chair downstairs rather than in my typing chair here on the second floor.

Lindsay's SCOTTISHE. Although GMCarr irritates me mightily, I never actually objected to having her in FAPA. From your comments, and from Bobby Wild's, it appears that she may be giving FAPA a bad name. This is, of course, one way of cutting down the size of FAPA's waiting list, but hardly a desirable one. Yes, "uncivilized" is probably a good term for many of Gertie's doings. # Annis sounds like a wonderful person. Why don't you write her up for the Readers Digest? You have an excellent start.

Roles' MORPH. Fandom would indeed be in sad shape without the Holey Order of Hole Borers to whom you dedicated your issue. Seems to me, though, that you left out the most important holes that they are responsible for: the holes through which the staples go. # The Rollings

continue to fascinate. I hope that when the series ends (a day I deeply dread) you will say a few words as to whether you've ever gone back, or intend to; and reasons either way. # Sure newspapers publish crime and sex and other things that sell. You don't have to read it, but I see no reason to ignore the good because of the bad. Or should I refuse to read MORPH because in this mailing NGW is again illegible?

Berry's THE RON BENNETT APPRECIATION ISSUE. A fine tribute.

Berry's & Thomson's VERITAS. No, I for one would not say that controversy was essential. It need not even be controversy either--discussion sounds better, and is usually a more appropriate term. In a publishing group, technic may be the be-all end-all, but it leads to dullness. Veritas isn't dull at all, in any guise you've used to date, but without some sort of running comment you seem almost like outsiders. If you simply want to publish stories, and if that's the type of fanning that's most to your liking, I'm not the one to complain. But to really be in OMPA, I think some participation in the discussions (even if only by starting them off) is necessary. You contribute your fair share, and more, to the mailings. The real question is how much you want to get out of OMPA--for there is no recompense save the egoboo, and many of us fail to really comment on a piece of fiction or a fine illustration. # Your monetary comparisons floored me. I work about 7 minutes for a gallon of gasoline, $\frac{1}{2}$ year for a car, 1 day for a pair of shoes--but add 40% to working time for taxes, retirement, etc. # Your mailing reviews add that necessary touch to Veritas; no further "controversy" is really needed. # The Sister Lindsay cartoon is about the best fannish cartoon I've yet seen. The second best was yours (Atom's) also, I believe--the slanty floor one in GRUE.

Enever's HOW. This was well done and interesting. I really should know by now your ability to tell a tale well, but both Oddenda and The Magic Tree went so smoothly that it surprised me. # Sage comments on Vinç's "society" but as far as I've yet read in the mailing (namely, HOW) none of the members has yet said anything truly helpful. The subject has, at least, gotten far more comment than WAPPPOTED.

Ratigan's SATAN'S CHILD. As one spectator, if a club organized the way Tubb proposes approached me, I'd run as fast as I could in the other direction. "Offer science fiction." You can't keep up with it now. "Charge." The NFFF does that, as does WSFS. "Have a regular O.O." NFFF has had that for years. "Have regular elections." Same comment. "Give rewards for activity." What better award than egoboo? Some--maybe even most--of Tubb's proposals are logical. I would certainly want regular elections, and I would want something in return for any fees charged--tho Gnod knows that the "something" is not another O.O. Nor is the subject around which I want all of my comment to be centered science fiction; as I said, I can get enough of that now. In fact, fandom is an escape from science fiction in the sense that when I don't want to do something else--whether it's watching television, painting the house, or reading sf--then I "fan." "It is," says Tubb, "supposed to be a SCIENCE FICTION Fandom." To me that statement is as ridiculous as the old saw that fiction was supposed to depict the good, the true, and the beautiful. Science fiction fandom is supposed to be whatever the members of science fiction fandom want it to be. We all have a central

background of knowledge, which interest led us during some parts of our lives to read science fiction fairly regularly. I doubt if there is a fan living today who doesn't know within a few months of when the first atomic bomb dropped, who doesn't know how many satellites were put in orbit by Russia and the U.S., and who doesn't know that the sound barrier is a speed and not a height barrier. I can casually mention any or all of these or multitudes of other subjects, as whim dictates, with every assurance that my audience will know what I'm talking about. In short, fandom is a ready-made audience on a multitude of subjects. By experience I've learned that Linwood is interested in Jazz, Hitchcock in languages, Roles in India, Sanderson in hi-fi, Wild in all phases of history, etc. I would tire unto death of talking to every OMPA member about science fiction; but there are a multitude of other subjects available for me to talk about or listen to. Fannish newcomers have to start someplace, and the only recruiting ground we have is science fiction, so to attract the newcomer science fiction must remain the base. But don't limit the aims or goals of a group to science fiction, or you'll find that the new member grows out of the club. And you can't run a club with nothing but new members. (When I say "club" I'm referring to the non-regional sf association as suggested by Vinç.) # Tubb also seems to believe that fans are leaving fandom because of lack of emphasis on sf. I know of one man who never became a fan because of that very lack of emphasis (or so he says--but he was reading the prozines, and was well aware of fandom way back in 1935 when there was only one emphasis in fandom). Fans have always been leaving fandom. Enever, Rosenblum, Bloch, Shaw--hundreds of names are available, and dozens have left for a period of many years, only to be drawn back into the field. People leave town for many reasons. Some find it convenient to return. The town's primary problem is to hold the turnover to a reasonably low level, and insure that the numbers moving in are reasonably equivalent to the numbers moving out. Right now, I think, recruiting is the major problem. # I can at least agree with Tubb where he says "Don't start an organization unless you mean it."

Harris's CHUX OWN. I'm violating a policy of mine, and am giving Madle room further on in this magazine to say a few words. # You're probably right that most Americans did pick the same candidate for 1st, 2nd, and 3d places. I split my ballot three ways, and I know one Washington voter that split his two ways, leaving the third choice blank. (As an odd aside, I note from Ford's tally that everyone used all three choices on his ballot, with one single exception, who is apparently the above fan.) That's beside the point, however, since I don't know enough fans and their voting habits to be able to either refute or confirm your claim that at least 80% of the Americans voted for the same fan in all three positions. Maybe Ford would want to comment on this, or on the results that would have been obtained under the counting system Willis had used. So you think "the mess TAFF is in now can be laid solely at (Ford's) door." What "mess" is TAFF in (and make sure you select one that can somehow be attributed to Ford)? Ford was "bigoted, stubborn, completely uncooperative." Ford is stubborn - as is any man convinced that he's right, yourself included--as you've adequately demonstrated by your comments here and in FAPA on TAFF. Without Ford there probably wouldn't even be a TAFF for you to be so upset about. Ford bigoted? Look to yourself, my friend, and your obstinate refusal to accept that American fandom elected a representative whom you don't feel was "reasonably well known" to British fandom. Not as well known, perhaps, and Eney

Ackerman, and possibly Raeburn. You cite Ellington as well known--was he during the voting? I don't think that he was except possibly in one or two local English circles. I met Dick in 1955, and could not recall ever having heard of him before that. By the time of the Newyorkon in '56 I'd still only run across his name two or three times in fanzines. Dick's a good man, and he and I will have much talk to make when we next see each other (10 May), but that doesn't change the fact that as far as I know, Ellington's name was not particularly well known in 1956 or early '57. This is beside the point, since it's dealing in vague comparisons which probably shouldn't be made. For the life of me I can't believe your statement that Madle wasn't reasonably well known. My English correspondents knew of him; is your circle so much smaller that they didn't? # I don't know why you want to bring up the subject of how many nominators voted. Since you did, limiting your comments to Madle and Eney, let's look at them all. Three of Raybin's nominators voted. Four of Hoffman's. Three of Ellington's. Five of Eney's (six if you want to count Lee and Larry Shaw as two people.) Two of Ackerman's. One of McNulty's. Two of Raeburn's. Three of Madle's. Only Eney and Hoffman had more nominators voting than Madle--only one of whom you approve. Why are you making such an issue of this--trying to prove a non-existent point? # This rambles on, but so did you. You'r statement that Madle's nominators "fixed it" for him to stand was either a damn poor word choice (and you're usually a damn fine writer) or an intentional insult. You go on and say that the two who didn't vote "did not contribute a solitary cent to the Fund." True in one of the cases. The other case is Ackerman (one of Madle's nominators), who did not vote in 1957. As you damn well know, however, in previous years he's been one of the most generous contributors to the fund, reducing the "facts" you want to see refuted to a farce. Your one and only argument is that Madle was not reasonably well known on your side. I think you're misinformed, and I know through correspondence that he definitely was reasonably well known to some of the fans in England. You say you're not being bad sportsmen, and I'll agree that every English fan I know with one exception has shown that he isn't. Now shall we come to our senses and stop making these assinine statements about personalities and start talking sensibly about what TAFF needs and how to go about getting it? # Unfortunately I'm incapable of staying angry with a person of your writing ability. The rest of the magazine contained the usual entertaining Harris.

Bennett's and Newman's THE DIRECTORY OF 1957 S-F FANDOM. Another darn good job. I'm getting so used to having this as an annual index of who's where that I'm afraid I'll feel quite lost if ever Bennett fails to issue this.

Joy Clarke's THE LESSER FLEA. And the greater stay, no doubt. # I don't object to your economical re-use of discarded paper--I'm in favor of it, in fact. But it is slightly disconcerting to have an upside-down price list facing me 'most every time I turn a page. They are no better right-side up; so I guess you'll just have to admit that this is an insolvable problem, and I'll just have to learn to live with it. # Your 10a.m. to 5p.m. days with an hour for lunch bother me. You actually mean that normal working hours are six hours a day? How many days a week? The standard here is 40 hours a week (5 days, eight hour days) though 37½ and even 35 hour work weeks are not unknown.

Sanderson's BLUNT. I didn't beat Hitchcock to the Morph's in surplus stock. I did, however, beat him to the last copies that Roles had. # Must disagree about the possibility of the Young's coming into fandom via the open fandom rather than the FAPA route. Sundance and Yobber are suitable subzines--and I think they were published as such prior to the time the Youngs entered FAPA--at least I got copies of one or the other, or maybe both. Your point is still valid, even tho I don't agree with the examples you chose. # Your "fandom is an island" sequence was quite well done. On the whole, your argument was similar to Tubb's, but a hell of a lot better since you recognize that the prozine-oriented fan of one day is the fandom-oriented fan of a later day. # Interesting quote re capitalism in "Talking Point." And there is a campaign on (as there always has been) to convince the people that there are no capitalists save the people (that is, that multi-millionaires are on the way out.) You ask if I think any of the five families you named--Morgans, Rockefellers, du Ponts, Astors and Vanderbilts--might sponsor scientific research. They not only might, but at least two do--the Rockefellers and du Ponts. So does Ford. It's only common sense, since it might benefit them, and is no more expensive to spend the money in foundation grants for research than it is to pay the taxes they would have to pay on that money if they didn't spend it in non-taxable ways.

Ving' Clarke's LAUNCHING SITE. Bloch is about the only U.S. author who maintains a full portion of fannish activity. knight is not in FAPA, and hasn't been for years (he was on the waiting list, but decided not to join.) Larry Shaw is moderately active in the fanzine field but still doesn't exceed ten or so pages yearly of his own writing (of course, I can't always identify what he writes from what Lee writes, so maybe I'm shortchanging Larry.) Silverberg turns out maybe 8 to 16 pages for FAPA yearly, and nothing that I know of outside of FAPA. On the whole, very few men in the U.S. have managed to be both pro and fanzine fan at the same time. # Good issue.

Roles' QUESTIONNAIRE: MAN IN SPACE. Are you going to do any analyzing of results? I rather hope so, because I'm wondering just how accurate my statements about the fan's knowledge of scientific advances (in the review of Satan's Child) would prove to be.

If there were any postmailings, I can't seem to locate them at this time. Hardly surprising, considering that I've let everything pile up for a month or more, and thus am surrounded with fannish clutter. To go back to the mailing for a moment, I think it was Bobby Wild that asked why feminists were always masculine. Seems obvious to me. The feminine woman is the one who meets the ideals of femininity at a given time. It is the woman who is dissatisfied with the ideals of the time that will rebel against them--in short, she's the woman who objects to being treated as a "woman" in the code of her period. The only other choice is to be treated more as a man, and thus the outspoken feminist almost invariably has to be more masculine in her ways and in her aspirations than does the more typical woman of the period. Only if she's dissatisfied can she be a feminist of the banner-carrying kind, and the primary reason that she might be dissatisfied is if she is by nature somewhat more masculine than the typical woman. Feminists have brought about changes that are generally beneficial, but I'll take a womanly woman every time.

NUCES TIBI, HARRIS

by Robert A. Madle

For some months now (ever since I won TAFF) I have been following with bated breath the battle that has raged incessantly. (Notice, Harris, that I said won, not bought.) On several occasions I have been tempted to enter the fray myself but felt that the argument was being well taken care of by others. Furthermore, as American TAFF administrator I felt that the less I said about it, the better. In fact, up until the publication of your completely unreasonable outbursts in FAPA and OMPA I was convinced that the less said about last year's election, the better--for this year's election. As a matter of fact, I had gone so far as to pacify some who were in no mood for pacification. Your surly remarks, however, have changed this situation. The statements you have made in FAPA and OMPA are statements loaded-down with half-truths and outright lies. They are full of the bitter hatred of the sore-head loser. They are disgustingly insulting to many people. And both articles, summed up, make quite evident the fact that when it comes to a knowledge of science fiction fandom, you are, to put it mildly, uninforme

First off, inasmuch as Bobbie Wild incurred your wrath with her statements about Don Ford and me, let's discuss her first. Naturally, I was pleased to read her comments in Vagary and, in fact, if you were able to look a little bit outside "our" part of fandom, you would find that her views concerning both Don and myself are quite prevalent among British fen today. By the way, just who is "our" group? Willis, Arfer, Berry, Charters . . . and who else? (As a matter of fact, I'm not even sure of the last three.) And don't try to kid anybody about that "25 of us." Ford, as you are well aware, was far too generous with his estimate. Eight or ten would have been more like it. And of that eight or ten, how many are left?

You say that 75% of the Anglofen that you know personally agree with your opinions. I don't know how many you "know personally," but if you are implying that British fandom -- in general -- agrees with your ultra-fuggheaded statements, then I must accuse you of outright prevarication. And I defy you to prove your point by getting a list of those who agree with your statements. This should be easy if British fandom is so unanimously in agreement with you. You have about a half-dozen to begin with -- all you need is nineteen more. Also, and you are to be excused for not knowing this since you are a comparative Johnny-Come-Lately, there are a helluva lot more than 25 fans in England. Don Ford was not indicating that the 25 he mentioned comprised all of Anglofandom -- he made the statement merely to show what a small group was making all the noise. Unfortunately, the 25, few as it is, was a gross exaggeration.

But back to Bobbie Wild and your success in insulting her to such an extent that she has dropped out as a TAFF candidate. Very well done, Chuck. Now if you can only get any other candidates who don't agree with you to give up, "our" group will have it made. "Our" group will have won by default. Or at least "our" group will have won if there are any candidates left after your housecleaning. And he will take the European

end of the TAFF administration back to "our" group. And won't that just be wonderful!!?? But I'll still be running it from this end, until the following election. But then we can't have everything, can we Chuck?

And now let the "unknown" fan speak up -- the one who is so completely unknown in fandom that he had to have someone "fix" it so he could run for TAFF. You poor deluded fool? Do you have any idea how long I have been around fandom? Do you know how many fanzines, conventions, conferences, clubs I have either organized or been affiliated with? Do you know that science fiction and fandom has been my primary hobby since I was 12 years old? Do you know that one of my fixers, Forrest J. Ackerman, stated in the platform he wrote for me that, and I quote: "Robert A. Madle is one of the greatest fans of all time." The underlinings are mine. Yes, Chuck, Ackerman said that. And coming from the man whom I consider to be the greatest fan of all time, I am quite proud. And, it should be mentioned, I did not offer to run for TAFF -- or "stand" for it. I was asked to run by Ackerman. He contributed money toward my entry fee. He did not vote on general principles. At this point, permit me to quote another of your inane statements: "Two of Madle's nominators lost all interest after they had fixed it for him to stand, and did not vote nor contribute a solitary cent to the Fund." One of these two was Ackerman -- the originator of Transatlantic fan funds.

Pavlat mentioned who the other fixers were. Dot Cole, Phil Bridges, Bob Pavlat, and the supreme fixer, Richard Eney. So, in reality, the only fixer who didn't contribute to the Fund was Bridges. Four out of five isn't so bad. In fact, it is quite good when compared with the record of two of your idols -- two of the All-American Trufen -- Raeburn and Ellington. Between them they only had five, and one of them is Ellington's wife! And between them they got damned few total votes, too. Wise up, Chuck. There is, too, something outside "our" group.

And, while we're on the subject of votes, how many do you think Eney got outside of England? Has it ever occurred to you that certain people could be incredibly prominent among the members of "our" group and yet be pretty damned unknown in general? And still on the subject of votes: Ford will verify that I would have won the election without a single Midwestcon vote -- and I would have won it if he had counted the votes under the "Willis" system without a single Midwestcon vote!

Oh, yes. I was casually mentioning my background in fandom a few paragraphs back. What have I done in the s-f world? An easier question would be what haven't I don? Let's start after the war. (Anyone who has read "The Immortal Storm" is aware of my activities before the war. That excludes you, of course. Because you feel that everything that happened before the advent of Lee Hoffman and Quandry occurred during the dark ages -- and that 6th Fandom was the first TRUFandom -- and have orgasms at the mention of such immortals of fandom as Rich Elsberry and Max Keasler.)

Anyway, I rejoined the Philadelphia S-F Society in 1946, the club that I had helped organize away back in 1935; edited PSFS News, a bi-weekly clubzine; edited progress reports and program booklet for the 1947 World Convention; served as an officer practically every year I was a member of the PSFS; left Philly in 1953 after serving as an officer of the 1953 Worldcon; formed Carolina S-F Society in 1954; sponsored two

Southeastern Conferences in collaboration with Ian Maccauley's Atlanta group -- first one in Atlanta, second in Charlotte -- Publicity Chairman of first, Chairman of second; now V-P of Washington S-F Association. In addition, have written for such fanzines as Varioso, JD, Transuranic, Spacewarp, Stellar, etc. Also, and I know this will impress you not one iota, but I have authored "Inside Science Fiction," a fan department which has been running in RWLowndes' magazines since 1953, and is probably the longest-running professional fan column of them all.

But why the hell do I waste stencils explaining to you that I am, too, a TRUfan. Can I help it if your knowledge of s-f fandom is so extremely restricted that you don't know what the hell is going on outside of "our" group? If a person with an s-f background like the above is not "fairly well known" to any goddamned fandom, be it American, British, or otherwise -- then it is the fault of that segment of fandom, not the person involved. In this case, it is merely that "our" group refused to acknowledge the existence of fandom in general and said, "We are fandom." But, apparently, Chuck, everyone in U.K. but you and a few of your cohorts realize that fandom is a much bigger thing. And they were quick to admit it. But you continue to flay the dead horse -- all the time making yourself look increasingly ridiculous, even to your own Anglofen. Over here, Ellington and Raeburn would probably agree with you, but even Eney has escaped the sinking ship.

By the way, I happen to know who the "...assortment of all-American fuggheads" are. Why didn't you say Don Ford, C. L. Barrett, and Lou Tabakow? And why shouldn't they mouth into a tape-recorder what they thought of Willis? My only regret is that they didn't know you a little better. They were, you know, answering a tape which came out of England immediately following my election. I'll say this: the three "fuggheads" mentioned above are my idea of science fiction fans. You sure as hell aren't.

Anyway, Chuck ol' boy, I'm running TAFF from this end now. This year it looks pretty good for one of the boys to come over. For the year following, it looks like it will be almost impossible to raise \$500 between September of 1958 and February of 1959. Therefore, candidates will be accepted for Easter, 1960. Think of it Chuck, I'll be running it until then and, in all probability, another person whom you'll consider a fakefan will be elected to go to Kettering. And then he'll be running it for another year or two. Why don't you gather together your little group and bay at the moon? That's about all you can do now.

