

-----  
FIRST DRAFT #12

Vol. 2, No. 6

4 Jun 64

composed on-stencil as always by Dave  
Van Arnam for the Fanoclasts, FISTFA,  
and the Richard Wayne Brown Science  
Illustory Fandation, hey

-----

The hectic round of NY fangatherings is becoming, you shd excuse the expression, fantastic. FISTFA, with Earl Evers apparently safe in the warm and welcoming arms of the Fort Dix branch of the US Army, is now under the benign direction of Mike McInerney and rich brown, new tenant of what I suggest you might call the Second Fandation, or maybe (hi, Calvin!) Not.

Ted White made his first appearance on the FISTFA scene, and, I think, was the villain responsible for the decamping of all present, late in the evening, for the Village and pizza (ghoddam pizza made me sick). On the other hand, the Village jaunt did result in bumping into Dave MacDonald and Marty Jukovsky in front of what used to be the Caricature, and Walter can now count on two more defenders... What the Cultish supporters of the various Expulsion Acts call a small group of evil and/or misguided NYC fans totally under that well-known Svengali Ted White, has now spread to include, by count, at least fifty fans across the country. (Damned interruptions! -- read: "under the malign spell of that well-known etc." in the last sentence.) That is, fifty that have come out in print and/or in conversation against the Concom Exclusion Act or, granting that, against the various apa Blackballs now rolling.

Erratum in the last FIRST DRAFT: add Frank Wilimczyk to the attendees at the last Fanoclasts Friday.

Frank was also at the FISTFA meeting, with Ted, myself, Mike, rich, John Boardman (another addition to last FD: daughter's name is Karina, carefully spelled to me by John, and a good thing too, since I've always thought it was spelled with a "C"), Arnie (#1 Neo) Katz, Sly Steve Stiles, and Andy Porter. Anti-Exclusionists all, I might note.

The Big Money Making Deal is still hanging fire, but we still have Great Expectations. Champagne will yet be flowing in the streets.

Arnie Katz thinks the anti-Exclusionists are making a strategic error in the arguments they are putting forth; saying such things as "assuming Walter is guilty, Donaho is still wrong because thus-and-so..." is not the way to do it. We should be firmly saying, "Walter is not guilty, so Donaho is wrong." Ok, it's true, Arnie, that there should perhaps be a little more emphasis on logical analysis of the Exclusionist fallacies (I've not yet gotten around, for instance, to my projected analysis of the multitudinous illogicalities of the BOONDOGGLE). But, as someone pointed out in the meeting, in fighting a battle one picks out the ground on which one's opponent is more susceptible to being beaten. When, for instance, Gordon Eklund, in arguing the reasons for blackballing Walter, hypothesises a bystander asking a pro-Concom fan "If this Breen cat is so evil, why is he a member of FAPA?" and then rhetorically asks us "How do you answer?" -- then I think it is proper to allow the possibility of Walter's guilt and still answer Gordon's question by quoting his own

-----  
Null-Q Press

Undecided Publication #13  
-----

immediately previous statement, namely, "Breen cannot, as they say, rape anyone from long distance."

True, we tentatively grant Walter's guilt with this ploy. On the other hand, we have, I think, destroyed one of the pro-blackball arguments rather neatly. I would add, "and rather humorously, too," but I am a stuffed shirt about humor.

No, I'm not. My point about ill-considered levity on the part of the pro-Exclusionists was meant to be critical of the remarks of Donaho and Eney which do seem in poor taste, considering that the subject under consideration is the deliberate attempt so to blacken one fan's name that, hopefully, he will cringe away and Not Bother Us any more. In fact, it was Eney himself who chided Mike McInerney and stated that "This is stark stuff, Mike. Somebody may well end up yet, playing a twenty-year game of rock hockey." The point is valid, tho the sentence seems a trifle steep.

But I'm going to be putting out a decimal oscillator on all this. I will, I will, I will. Soon.

Got a note from John Boardman this morning, enclosing two clippings on the Involvement question. One clipping was an Arnold Schuster type story, the other concerned the NY Police Dept's opposition to giving more police powers to their Auxiliaries. John says: "Dear Dave, Here are a couple of items about involvement. The item from Los Angeles can be repeated too many times, which is why people don't risk getting involved. (See also Jules Feiffer's cartoon this week.)//Of course, the police are about as enthusiastic about these self-appointed neighborhood patrols as the Department of Defense is about the Minutemen, or the Roman Emperor Alexius I about the Crusaders. It takes months to train a policeman properly. If this vigilantism ever catches on, the cops will have not only a crime wave but also a series of inter-neighborhood civil wars on their hands. The West, too, tried vigilantism with high hopes, but in the end it turned out to be more harmful than the crime and corruption it was designed to stop. ... Stay well, John." (He also suggests I send FD to Elliot Shorter; I will, if there are any of the older issues left after I send out the copies I've promised to various fans.)

John, I'd like to know just what is to be done about the situation? The Schuster-type incidents are sickening, even terrifying, true, but do such incidents really justify a man's failure to act in defense of his fellow citizens? As I said, if the man in the Subway Incident had pulled a gun, I don't know what I would have done in the face of it (probably I would have finked out if I could), but there are many occasions (including the Subway Incident) where one could presumably act with reasonable personal safety to protect someone else in grave danger. And Arnold Schuster (and the man in the clipping) performed analogous actions, in putting the police onto a criminal at presumably minimum personal risk. (The solution here would seem to be to insist that the police not fink in turn on the helpful informant.) As to your insistence on calling the Maccabees "vigilantes," I again point out that they are unarmed and they do not attack: they merely defend. Last week's murdered schoolteacher would have been saved if she had called on them. There must be some civilized way out of this filthy morass -- what, then, is it? But until a solution is found that is a noticeable improvement on the Maccabees, more power to them. As for the possibility of neighborhood civil wars, I frankly consider that preposterous; but, granting it, what is the answer?

-- dgv