
FIRST BASE #9

Vol. 2, No. 3

15 May 64

being Dave Van Arnam's on-stencil fmz
for the Fanoclasts, etc., with locs
receivable at 1730 Harrison Ave., Apt
353, Bronx, NY (what, me hint?)

Ah, but it was a fine old Fanoclasts Friday last week! People piling fanzines on top of Walter Breen (lessee, I gave him the first 8 FIRST DRAFTS, SPECTRUM/5, and Poor Richard's Almanac #17) interspersed with lengthy discussions of Topic A. And I bumped into Steve Stiles or vice versa on the subway over, so he was quite properly the first one to read his loc in FD8. rich brown was there and was saddened at the sight of FD8, since he had just written it up somewhere as "the best 2-page fanzine currently being published."

Mike McInerney was there, and a fan who was at one previous meeting but who I can't remember the name of him, I think. Ted White, naturally, and Les Gerber, and the Spirit of Calvin Demmon. And others. I cannot at this time recall who, or Whom. Earl Evers was not present, and this was connected by some to the fact that he was due to be drafted the Monday before. I cannot see the connection myself. The Army wouldn't dare interfere with fanac.

Speaking of Walter...it has come into my mind to first-draft a letter to comment on Eney's AVANC 7, and what better place to publish it than in FIRST DRAFT? Hey? Especially as the Fanoclasts have all either received it or at least read a copy of it. Then I'll polish it and send it off to Eklund. Hm. No, I won't. I see Eklund is due to publish Monday...

Eney and others have much to say on the matter, ranging from fairly clearcut logical statements to a heaving around of insults that is rather startling to such a goodhearted and jolly fellow as myself. Eney is not the least offender in this matter; but rather than rise up in arms against such things as his reference to the pro-Breen and/or anti-Donaho/concom group being the "pro-pervert faction," I'd rather deal with the portions of his material that presumably form the logical substructure which he feels justifies his more entertaining remarks. (Though I was not particularly entertained; one thing that has struck me from the start is the much greater amount of levity with which the pro-exclusion faction treats this situation, and this levity I tend to find ill-chosen and in bad taste. No, I'm not a stuffed shirt, and I do find some of such material wildly funny; I don't happen to remember, just now, any particular examples, but...)

Eney states flatly that "...Walter's defense rests on [1] the Trimble idea that the con had no right to exclude, and on [2] the White-Boardman claim that Breen is innocent and anyway it doesn't hurt the kids to learn about sex from an adult. (It's a bit unkind to include Boardman, but his agreement with the White line is substantial.)" ((the [] 's are my addition)) He then flatly states also that "Neither of these will hold water..." Ok, let's see. For one thing, there has been almost no discussion per se as to whether the con has the right to exclude anyone, and several defenders of Walter have said that of course it does. My own

Null-Q Press

Undecided Publication #10

opinion is that it does not have the right to exclude, as someone described it, "anyone it wanted to." (In fact, it was either Bjo or Al (WC) Lewis.)

The claim that Walter is innocent certainly holds water insofar as it certainly has not been proven that he is guilty. The question of his guilt or innocence, in fact, is what much of the controversy is about. And it relates directly as to whether or not the BOONDOGGLE is or is not substantially correct. The BOONDOGGLE having been published to a sufficient number of fans to insure its immortality, fans who seize on its myriad insufficiencies and contradictions would certainly seem to be within their rights. I mention this since the Copcon I faction seems to be so incensed that anyone has found such myriad etc., and has even had the gall to publish relevant evidence and analyses relating to the problem...

Eney states "the New Yorkers" disprove their case by "resorting [1] to the attack ad hominem, [2] to a hoked-up plan for a ((Anderson/Boucher)) Rump Convention ... and [3] to mutters about Fascism and What Next, We Can Be Expelled for Unpopular Opinions If This Goes Through." In fact, Donaho Himself waxes wroth over the attention given him, which he terms "trying to focus attention on me" and which he refers to the "devil theory of history" for a possible explanation. Bill, you did write and publish the BOONDOGGLE, didn't you?

John Boardman is the only one who has mentioned Anderson and a Rump Con. Boucher's name was put forth early in the game as being against the exclusion of Walter, but this was soon admitted to be based on a misapprehension of certain events Way Out There in California. This was one of the few pro-Breen inaccuracies so far discovered.

As to Eney's lengthy analysis and put-down of the Where Will This End line of argument, it has become irrelevant. I refer you to the absolutely incredible and nauseating line of reasoning Ben Jason has adduced in support of his action as head of the bidding Cleveland group for '66. He is not banning Walter from the proposed Clevention because he is a pervert. He is not banning Walter because hordes of people have demanded such action (they haven't, and Don & Maggie Thompson resigned from the committee rather than support such banning). He is banning Walter because Walter has, since the publication of the BOONDOGGLE, become a "controversial" figure. The controversy would hurt the convention.

I don't know whether "Fascism" is the precise term needed to describe such an impossible reasoning. But certainly "What Next" applies, eh, Dick? Needless to say, the bidding Fanoclasts group for NY in 67 has no intention of banning anyone from the proposed Nycon.

Here I thought blackballing Walter from the apas was a self-exposing action of utter ridiculousness. I think Ben Jason gets the Willick statue. For the whole decade. No other single action or statement, conceivable or unconceivable, could possibly reach such a height of sublime asininity. Come on, gang, tell me it couldn't. The unspeakable depth has already been reached. Hasn't it?

Well, this is first draft. I will polish this and remove some of the sneers I found I couldn't avoid; I swear I'm going to keep my end of the debate calm and rational. And as for the Subway Incident, well, gee.