

Fanzine Advisor

Recently I have had some requests for ways of handling artwork for mimeo. One question leads me to believe the mimeo process is not very well understood. So, this column will cover some basics.

The mimeograph stencil is made of a tough fiber woven into a sheet and attached to a paper strip. This paper strip is used when the stencil is attached to the mimeograph machine. Almost all the stencil manufacturers make each of their stencils with the two major types of strips. The standard in the US is a four hole heading; each hole is pear-shaped and they are evenly spaced across the top. The Gestetner stencil uses a nine hole heading, eight of which are fairly equally spaced across the top (not exactly, though) and a slightly larger ninth hole placed between two of the others (the third and fourth from the left). Don't ask; I don't know why. Perhaps this configuration keeps the stencil on the machine better. In addition, the Gestetner stencil is wider and longer. Some special machines used for postcards, and other special size paper use special stencils; it's probably best to use the manufacturer's products on these. Otherwise, the regular US size and Gestetner stencils can be bought from a variety of brands and prices and availability of supply should govern your choice. Although the original manufacturer's brand is a little higher in quality (Gestetner's is very good) I have not noticed enough difference to justify the higher prices charged (Tempo, Speed-o-Print, A. B. Dick have all been good).

The stencil is coated with a wax which is non-porous to the mimeo inks used. The stencil "cutting" process you hear so much about is not really cutting but rather is a pushing away of this wax coating. When a complete cut is made too much ink is allowed through to the paper (as happens with many of my letter o's when I hit the key too hard). Large dark areas, then, become hard to mimeograph unless some trick is used. The most common is the use of shading plates (more later). Machines which electronically cut a stencil are also used, usually through a dealer or supplier since the machines cost so much. The new "cheaper" models run about \$900; professional models run about \$1900. A full page costs from \$1.50 to \$3.50. This can be made up of a single page drawing or many smaller drawings which are later cut out and pasted onto other stencils.

Stencil bases (on which the wax coating is placed) are supposedly made with different weaves and therefore different strengths. The manufacturers color code their products but I have never gotten a satisfactory explanation of the code; I suspect it is simply a matter of taste and what you find easy to read as you type. One Gestetner salesman explained that blue was their standard stencil, good for general typing work. Green was a slightly tougher stencil which could take more handwriting and art work and supposedly lasts for more copies. However, I've never noticed any difference in stencils except as a function of their freshness. A dried out stencil "cracks" on fold lines more easily and is not as sharp cut as a fresh one. The stencils used for electronic cutting are different. They are a light plastic and the process actually consists of punching tiny, tiny holes in them with a beam of electrons. These are so small that the usual difficulty of too much ink through an actual hole is not present. Stencils also come in white and yellow and with a variety of printed guidelines on them. The usual gives line numbers down each side, a center line, positioning for postcards both vertically and horizontally. They have both pica and elite spacing bars across the top and sometimes the bottom. Specially printed stencils can be had with 3 x 11 cross-ruled lines for mailing labels, bulletin size which are cut apart, typed sideways, and glued together to be run, three column "newspaper" style, etc.

When typing the stencil a piece of wax-surfaced paper, a backing carbon, is placed between the stencil itself and its backing sheet, a paper backing glued to the stencil at the top (and actually making up the heading strip discussed earlier). This carbon sheet is of a contrasting color (white with green and blue, black with yellow and white, etc.) and makes it easier to read what is being typed. It's presence or absence also affects the thickness of the typed letters but the major factors affecting the "crispness" of the type is the sharpness of the type bars and the force with which the keys are struck. When typing, therefore, the typewriter is placed in the Stencil position on the ribbon control so that the ribbon does not rise up and get in the way (and dull the impression). Another problem now occurs. Since the keys are typing directly into the wax coating some of this wax comes off on the keys and tends to clog them up, especially frequently used keys like "a", "e", etc. To solve this you must clean the keys occasionally, or use something between the type and the stencil. Stencils can be purchased with a special plio-film sheet over the stencil which does not interfere with the cutting process, I think because it tends to stretch when struck. Pliofilm sets can also be purchased separately from the stencils and I have even heard of fans using Saran Wrap.

When mistakes are made a special fluid (correction fluid, also called corflu and obliterine; corflu is also used as a verb) is used to put a new layer of ink-blocking material on the base. After it is applied and it dries the area can be retyped, but since it is not as strong as the wax and because the base beneath has been weakened the new copy should be typed much more lightly than the original. Artwork is usually impossible to correct in this way, but it can be done with much care.

Now a bit about the mimeo itself. The machine is a big ink pad and a rubber or composition roller called the impression roller. The stencil is attached to the ink pad so that the ink, coming through the spaces in the wax is reversed print. The pad (and stencil over it) are on a drum which can be turned while a piece of paper is fed between it and the impression roller. When the portion of the drum with the stencil presses down on the paper (the impression roller beneath) the ink is deposited onto the paper, re-reversing it and producing the text. When the paper is missing (usually due to a misfeed) the ink goes onto the impression roller, a catastrophe! The roller must be removed and cleaned. Mimeograph machines become very complicated as more and more labor saving devices are added. A feeding mechanism on one side of the rotating drum pushes the paper, one sheet at a time, into the maw; a stacking mechanism on the other side (usually a tray with sides to guide the paper into a stack) collects the output. Wet ink on the top side of the last sheet run often transfers to the back of the next sheet into the tray. This is called offset and is avoidable only through the use of faster drying inks or by slipping in a sheet of paper or cardboard between each sheet mimeographed (slip-sheeting). Some machines offer a slip sheeting attachment (Gestetner's is \$60). In any event, the usual machine has a feeding mechanism, a drum on which the stencil is placed and which allows ink to be added to the inside, an impression roller, and a stacker tray. That's the minimum.

Naturally a mimeograph machine is a little more complicated than the above description; the paper must be fed at just the right time or the ink goes astray; it should feed the same for each sheet so that the copy is generally in the same place from page to page; most machines have some sort of counter that lets you know how many copies have been run, or to turn off the feed mechanism when a pre-set number is reached; the feed tray may rise as you crank away because the stack of paper is getting lower all the time; etc.

If you now understand the process from the above description (a minor miracle) I hasten to point out that the Gestetner is completely different. More next time.

Since I first sent in my letter to join N3F back in July a bunch of people have written and the other day I received your new member packet. Your Fanspeak dictionary would be a big help I guess to the neofan who doesn't even know the fundamentals of fannishness and fanspeak. I found the thing adequate tho I already knew all of it. I must say, probably the greatest thing that could happen would be a new, not "revised," but much enlarged version of FANCYCLOPEDIA II. I hear that Dick Eney is going to put out a much shortened third edition soon and I think this is a crime. I don't really see how he can shorten it without losing the priceless touch of fannishness it had. A new edition is long overdue but it should not be shortened but added to. There's a lot of material to be combed from a decade. I only wish those who work on it, had endeavored to include more fannish history and legendry in the dictionary. They briefly mention the ghods Ghu, Foo and Roscoe but never explain them; they mention hoaxes but never mention any of the famous ones like ODD TALES and the non-existent fans who came to great prominence in fandom; this and a million other things. The dictionary was a sercon venture it seemed, and tho it was adequate for what it attempted to do, I was disappointed it did not do more. I hope that FANCYCLOPEDIA III will soon be out and that Eney will not shorten but enlarge it. I hope that fans everywhere will all buy it no matter what. It is worth any price he puts on it. The legends and history of fandom are things that all fans should know. I think one problem today is that this history and these legends are not being passed on as new fans appear. How many copies of FANCYCLOPEDIA and FANCY II (that's the standard abbrev. ghl// were bought? Not that many and most are now on shelves somewhere almost completely unavailable. SaM's The Immortal Storm may not be one of the finest books ever published and people may disagree on its accuracy but how many others really tried to put it down for posterity? I say the same for Eney's work and Jack Speer's. Reportedly Harry Warner will have a fan history published by Advent sometime in the future and I'm looking forward to it with great hopes. Everyone should buy it. Besides making Harry that much richer it will hopefully fill the almost vacuum in fandom today and bring back some of the old days of fannishness. At least it will let fans know about the days of yesteryear and the heritage they possess all the way back to 1931. But enough said here about this. I just hope others will find it in them to cough up the dough and at least view fannish history second-hand, since most of us didn't get the chance to see it first-hand.

//Ulp!! First, credit on the first FANCY goes to a number of people. Although it has the Bristol name on it (Speer) it also says "Published by Forrest J Ackerman" and "NFFF" and "LASFS" on it. Also about ten people are given credit for various jobs; mimeoing, stenciling, etc. In comparing the two (Fancy I and II) I have found the main index items to have been expanded and amplified. For example the LASFS entry in I reads (in part) "Between Mirta Forate on the one hand and the Moonrakers or others on the opposite, there have at times been sustained differences." This becomes in II: "Mirta Forsto (Morajo and Ackerman; it's Esperanto for "Myrtle Forest") dominated the club all during the war years and for a long time before and after. Between them and the Moonrakers, Knaves, Outsiders, and Insurgents -- successively -- there had been sustained differences during all this period, which in the end caused the Blowup and knocked the LASFS out for a decade." Quite a difference and for the better. As for the ghods, they seem well covered to me in II. All in all the job Eney did is truly remarkable. And, oh yes, there were 450 numbered copies of Fancy II and 250 numbered copies of Fancy I. Only Roscoe knows how many unnumbered copies there are. Fan History can also be gleaned from such things as Lee Hoffman's Fanhistory(s) and "The Incomplete Burbee." As for fannishness, it is still around in various forms, though possibly not in the Vortzimer sense.

GEORGE INZER

26 Walker Hall, 116 Cox St., Auburn, Ala.
36830

Bill Marsh just forwarded a letter of yours dated Nov. 23, concerning why you "rather arbitrarily" rejected for printing his letter about our fledgling organization, SPASM. While admittedly the letter was asking for members to join, it was done so in the way of an announcement to the general membership through the only medium that we members have, the Tightbeam. The TNFF was out of the question since that is the official organ of the club and SPASM was/is in its formative stage.

You seem to base your dismissal of Bill's letter on two reasons: 1) because you believe that it was an "ad" and 2) because "SPASM doesn't seem to have a very broad base to interest many people." These are pretty flimsy excuses for not printing a letter in TB and here's why:

//There followed two long paragraphs explaining GE's position. I have indeed changed my mind concerning publication (space is one, we will definitely send this issue third class) and the original letter appears following this one. See, I'm not hard to get along with. ghl//

The point is, however, that the editor of Tightbeam has the duty to print the letters sent to the letter column. The editor is not there to pass judgment on the amount of interest that they will generate.

Please print this letter in the next Tightbeam, in full, and without alterations (other than the corrections that every editor is expected to make).

//Well, as you see George, I did not publish it in full. Are over 400 members really interested in your reasons against my reasons? Obviously not. Your ideal of an "editor" seems to be more like the definition of a proofreader. Unfortunately for people who believe everything they write is deathless prose worthy of being published, an editor is there to pass judgment on the amount of interest that the things he published will generate. I shall continue to do just that (pass judgment) until relieved of duty or until my brain turns to butterscotch pudding. ghl//

BILL MARSH

P.O.Box 785, Sparks, Nevada 89431

The undersigned fans, //George Inzer and Bill Marsh// being aficionados of the past and present AMAZING STORIES magazine, and feeling that this venerable publication deserves preservation and promotion - not solely out of regard for its past history of substantial contribution to the field of science fiction and fantasy literature, but recognizing that it should continue as a much needed outlet and voice for the genre - call upon all like-minded fans to join in organizing SPASM (Society for the Preservation of Amazing Stories Magazine).

Suggested objectives of this proposed organization would include the following:

1. The establishment of a continuing research into and compilation of a history of the magazine.
2. The establishment of a central, fan-administered archive and library, wherein documents and memorabilia associated with the magazine can be preserved.

3. The eventual establishment of a periodical publication dealing with the activities of the organization and articles in relation to the history of the magazine, its content, contributors and etc.
4. General endeavor to promote and preserve AMAZING STORIES as a continuing and vital contribution to science fiction and fantasy literature.

All those in sympathy with the above stated aims and with interest in or ideas toward their promotion are invited to write to either or both of us.

//What can I say? Well, as regards point 2. I doubt that this would work out unless and until there was a permanent fan shack of some sort. LASFS comes closest to establishing one (I believe their building fund for permanent quarters is somewhere about \$5000; 4ej can correct me if I'm wrong) or perhaps you will accept the various library archives which are being formed to collect sf and fan memorabilia. As to the first and last two aims why do you need a special club? You can recruit interested parties from N3F easily enough and I rather doubt that fans will become dedicated to one specific prozine just as they are diffident about forming one author fan clubs. Stay loose! is the motto of the smart fan. Anyway, good luck. ghl//

LEO DOROSCHENKO 410 Springfield Ave., Newark, N.J. 07103

The last few issues of TB have carried opinions to the effect that the new author policy is a key, if not the key, factor to IF's successes in the Hugo sweepstakes. Allow me to present a dissenting opinion.

An early lesson anyone learns in Journalism is that "names sell the publication," a big name flashed across the cover is a guarantee of finding a buyer. This axiom holds doubly true in the sci-fi world, even to the point of annihilating literary quality, as in the case of IF.

A new title by Heinlein is certain to attract buyers, (even though the author has gone senile) each one of them expecting a new classic. What do they find? "Farnham's Freehold," The Moon is a Harsh Mistress. But what attitude prevails? "A Heinlein or Blish CAN'T write a poor book, merely one that we like less than some other..." In other words, a big name produced this story, so it MUST be equal to his better works.

The other big names also sneak in, attraction is more important than the craftsmanship involved: a once competent writer whose current reputation rests solely on the accolades bestowed unto him by his literary agent (van Vogt); writers who, legend and rumor tells us, are great, but whose output runs in the opposite direction (Ellison, Laumer); resurrected hoary "old masters" (E.E.Smith, Harl Vincent); good writers caught in an off day (Farmer, Silverberg, Zelazny); one of their own discoveries, constantly tooted as "the find of the year," though his absence would be no great loss to the sci-fi canon (Niven); and a professional idiot who devoted his column to ranting about how great he was, and filling up the rest of the space with half truths, inaccuracies, and the obvious (Lin Carter).

Since it won, the stories should be of a high median quality. But where did we find such pieces of knockwurst as "Invader," "A Bowl Bigger Than the Earth," "The Soft Weapon," "Spaceman," and Lin Carter's rantings? If I were to present a '67 issue of IF to any of my mundane friends as an example of our best, I'd have to hide my face in shame: so loud would he laugh.

So long as the seal of approval, the Hugo, is being bestowed on IF, no change in policy is imminent: why strive for high standards when low ones win the Hugo? Should we act now and deny IF the Hugo for '68, quality should improve. Or does one prefer IF to take the Hugo on the strength of "The Proxy Intelligence," "Slowboat Cargo," "Rogue Star," "Worlds to Kill," and Lin Carter? I don't.

Fen of the world unite for St. Louis. You have nothing to lose, but your crud. You have a quality zine to win.

Moving on to another source of anger and frustration, the small screen, I weep every time I watch this current season of the Avengers: what was once subtle satire has turned into high camp, the suspense is nil; the acting terrible. How pathetic when one remembers those twenty one black and white episodes released in the summer of 1966, they had everything and Diana Rigg, too. Those episodes I remember fondly, for anyone of which I would gladly swap the last couple of TV seasons. Emma Peel was with the show from 1964, following the departure of Cathy Gale, and in those three years before the show went to color a considerable amount of episodes were made, of which (GRRR) we only saw 21. So glum do I feel when I check a British publication and glimpse the titles of those episodes denied us: "A Touch of Brimstone," "Honey for the Prince," "A Surfeit of H2O" ... If we could only see them. I'd even settle for re-runs of those 21.

From "Films in Review," November 1968:

"Through March 1968, approximately 83 different filmed one hour segments of The Avengers were telecast in Canada, West Germany, and about 80 other countries, but only 47 were networked here, and all of the 47 were not seen in any US 'market area.'"

Now, ABC-TV is in bad straits. If we were to launch a well-coordinated letter attack asking them to show us just the black and white Avengers, we just might succeed; after all, we did save Star Trek -- much to our dismay.

Okay, so black and white TV is a pariah to the networks, but with ABC's condition we can at least try. Even if we can only get it on during the summer, in lieu of re-runs, we'll bring some irrigation to that vast wasteland. We have nothing to lose but Tara King.

I recently read a book so bad that I must discuss it to get the bad taste out of my mouth, not to mention warning those naive fen who expect Daniel Keyes to equal the power of Flowers for Algernon in his latest work The Touch.

Once, after the blasts that ended WWII, there was a wave of stories where a man is exposed to radiation, makes his wife pregnant, and finds a big gap between himself and his mutant child. Rather than concentrating on the last phase, Keyes elected to play with the wait, with the pressures confronting the parents.

Now, one of the most enduring themes in literature, is the crumbling of men under pressure, the laying bare of souls. But, what happens when they crumble into stock situations (the old Polish father disowning his son for changing the good old family name); scenes left over from FFA (the son caught in the act of auto-eroticism); and some rehashing of FFA (the other woman with whom the hero has a vicarious affair)...
YEEEECHHH!

Then, all the characters have one reason for living: if male, to unfasten a woman's brassiere; if female, to have a hand placed on her thigh, and slid up her skirts. Now, the author may think this very daring and earthy, but it gave me the impression that their brains were not in the heads, but between the legs.

Why would an author with the stature and sensitivity of Keyes bother writing such tripe? Why would the publisher of Clarke put it between covers? And why would anyone read it? Maybe the sphinx knows.

A note about Hugos: while I have little doubt that "2001: A Space Odyssey" has the drama category all sewn up, there is one hour on the small screen that deserves at least a nomination. It was the most fascinating hour of quicksilver imagery ever put on the telly: "Fallout," the concluding episode of "The Prisoner." "Star Trek," "Planet of the Apes," "Charly," "Barbarella," and "2001" pale before it.

//OK gang, go get 'im. Any person, living or dead, mentioned good or bad in Leo's letter, member or not, should feel free to get out the ol' blunderbusses and fire at will. Leo is a big boy and can't take it, can't you Leo. I hope so. ghl//

LEAH LABOWITZ

1100 Betzwood Dr., Norristown, Pa. 19401

This is my first entrance into the lists of Tightbeam even though I know the editor rather well.

Television and movies tend to take the goose bumps out of already published short stories and novels.. Journey to the Unknown, a televised hour of fantasy, took Charles Beaumont's story "Miss Gentlebelle" and removed most of the shivers that the printed story gave. Also, to sell the story, they made more of the sex angle of the inhibited villainess than was indicated in the story. Did anyone see this program? Also did anyone see Eando Binder's "Adam Link, Robot" on television in which they took the first chapter of his book and tried to make this a complete story and distorted the story and characters until they became cardboard cut-outs.

I've been trying to think of stories and books that might lend themselves to television or movies. What about scrapping "Star Trek" and having a series based on the Deathworld books by Harry Harrison or what about Dune or The Moon is a Harsh Mistress? Dune could be a series with blue contact lenses.

//That's enough!
the flesh! ghl//

silence

Gosh, if it were that easy in

JERRY POURNELLE

12051 Laurel Terrace, Studio City, Calif.
91604

Re: John Jeremy Pierce's letter in the very late November TB. //Stop rubbing it in. ghl// Here is a thoughtful piece of work by someone who seems to have taken the trouble to know what he is talking about. Congratulations to him. Let us hear more. I am particularly impressed with the line "Ellison knows nothing about people except that he doesn't like them." Oh, 'tis true, 'tis true. But Mr. Pierce doesn't understand the situation. The purpose of the New Thing and this kind of Science Fiction in general is to destroy the Old Thing and traditional science fiction, and implant some new heroes in the media. Then they can run schools on How To Write. Actually, one should exempt Harlan -- he'll quit when it's a definite school.

As to the proposition that only Engineers can read Analog, there must be some terribly stupid non-engineers about; I haven't had to get one of the engineers who work for me to explain an ASF story in years. I do get a bit upset about the simple minded political science ASF shows, a complaint I have had since my address to the Chicon all these years ago; but it applies with even greater vigor to the New Thing.

Man is the measure of all things; Socrates in the Theatetus replied to this proposition, "No, the dogfaced baboon is the measure of all things; prove otherwise." The New Thing has managed to compromise; humanistic misanthropy. A wondrous beast indeed.

BILL LINDEN

83-33 Austin St., Kew Gardens, N.Y. 11415

I didn't read Thorns, Chthon, and The Einstein Intersection (I still don't see what's so great about the last) until after I got the ballot. Gripe: I could not afford the hardcover of Lord of Light, and there was no paperback, so I had to ignore it in the vote. The same was nearly the case with Nova which is sure to be on the ballot. Paperback publishers owe it to us poor students to Do Something.

My opinion of Ellison is directly opposite to Ed Reed's. I see no cause for enthusiasm over "I Have no Mouth..." etc., but I think he is improving with his recent stories. (Of course he'll probably assassinate me for saying that if I ever get to St. Louis.)

Analog may not be playing a worked out vein, but I still feel that Analog is playing out. I am beginning to see what its critics mean by calling it an engineer's magazine. For example, see Poyer's "Pipeline."

Mr. Pierce, your comment that "Zelazny ... is not really a member of, but only being exploited by, the New Thing" comes dangerously close to such comments as, 2001 is too good to be science fiction. (Quoted by Ted White, ask him for source).

I am vociferously plugging Lafferty's Past Master for the Novel. Is anyone with me this time? For Novelette, perhaps Ellison's "The Beast That Shouted Love." I hesitate to state my thoughts on the Drama Hugo, for fear of bombs in the mail.

I will conclude by letting off steam at one who is probably our worst writer, Mack Reynolds. I don't see why editors tolerate him. His method is apparently to check what the current news topic is, and write a story around it. He is nauseatingly contemporary. Gossip flies about Svetlana Stalin, he drags her into a story. And he keeps on and on halting the story for lectures about what we frequently know already because we are living amongst it. This summer, it looked as though he was finally learning to write but my hope was shattered by the first half of "The Computer Conspiracy." On which angry young note I will conclude.

SETH JOHNSON

345 Yale Ave., Hillside, N.J. 07205

One thing I would like to call to the attention of our membership is the Fanzine Clearing House. At present I am getting well over ten orders per month and for some reason it keeps increasing which is somewhat strange when you consider that the advertisement is worded exactly the same today as it was ten years ago. If each N'APA editor would send me ten copies of his zine each quarter this would solve all the problems and also give the neofan a pretty good idea of what apa fandom is all about. If each faned in N3F would send ten a month it would also solve the problem.

//And create some, no doubt! Nevertheless, the FCH has indeed been an excellent recruiting device not only for N3F but general fandom as well. And thanks for the PgHLANGE convention announcement. If it is as bad as they say, I must go to this one. gbl//

Today the reminder that came in was from a new Neffer, who says he joined the NFFF partly on account of the Writer's Exchange, about which he wishes information. He says he wants to improve his ability to write, and that he has just written "two stories both trash." His letter is brief and to the point, and that in itself indicates strong ability. I wish I could write short letters, but have never been able to do it very well. But the thing that caught my eye was the fact that he has actually been doing some fictioneering, not just dreaming about it. That puts him ahead of half the starters right there. And of those, how many can take a second look and see room for improvement? This boy DESERVES help. To that, add that he must be of a communicative nature, since he has somehow heard of W/X without belonging to the NFFF at all. Now a great many writers feel that they work better by themselves, without consultation -- for others, this is doing it the hardest way. Sometimes one does have to just sit down and fight it out with one's typer and characters; but a straw poll of readers, such as W/X makes available, can be a real guide and staff on the path of progress. It has been a help to me, and I could overstuff a fanzine with unsolicited testimonials from friends who never sold before. So although this service is very optional indeed, and many members would never be interested in using it, still this new Neffer has sent me an inquiry I hasten to answer. So I'm putting a carbon under this letter for him, and sending these details to you also, in case others may be wanting to know.

The Writers' Exchange is a self-help manuscript criticism for writers of imaginative fiction, with no objection to an article or poem or other literary dinbat, but specializing in sf. There does not exist at this time any other service exactly like it. The new outfit, A.W.E., may be able to carry some of this load, and if so three cheers; no doubt many fans do a certain amount of informal comment on mss for one another, not to mention the practice-ground provided by fanzines. But there is no other list of writers who stand ready to help all comers in this way. Of our list, some are pros and some are not, but any may have just the idea you happen to need. I also know some unadvertised pros who are willing to comment if I think a ms. deserves and needs highly-skilled opinions, as long as I don't overdo it.

New Exchangers are asked to fill out an address card which carries a notation in my handwriting: VOLUNTEER CLUB WORK, NO CHARGES OR OTHER OBLIGATIONS. I mean that; no obligations. Things can always get lost; an Exchanger may be ill, absent, on the run, or in jail; how'd I know? No obligations; but the average is, apparently, good and strong and willing.

It is very hard to get thrown out of the Exchange; the chief crime is vanishing without a forwarding address. That notifies me, at my own expense for reverse-postage, that the Exchanger is no longer interested. After that I'm not interested either. New Exchangers, however, are asked to prove sincerity by sending me three copies of any original work, different or duplicates, with return envelopes. One such batch came in while I was sick abed and hasn't been found yet, but normally I reply directly with a comment of my own and forward the copies to various Exchangers, for their opinions. This gets them off to a good start for a new Exchanger, and sometimes reminds the others to write to me too.

That's about all there is to it. As long as a ms. is easy to read I don't care if it's typed or handwritten, single or double spaced, folded or flat; it's not for publication but for comment and revision, we assume. Editors want double-spaced flat beautiful mss. of course, but everybody must know that already.

N E W S

Your fifth Director for 1969, chosen by election among the four membership-chosen Directors, is Mike Zaharakis. We wish all the winners our deepest condolences. And we offer our congratulations to those who escaped this year (that includes me, I guess). A full list of your officers and chairmen will be in Tightbeam next issue.

This is Tightbeam # 53 (I think), the letter column of the National Fantasy Fan Federation. All letters sent to the editor will be edited and every attempt will be made to publish letters sent without alteration to their meanings. Send letters for publication to: Gary H. Labowitz, 1100 Betzwood Dr., Norristown, Pa. 19401. There is no deadline; however, letters mailed within two weeks of your receiving TB stand a good chance of making the next issue. This issue is January, 1969.

Cut on the dotted line and paste in last month's issue:

This is Tightbeam, #52, the letter column of the National Fantasy Fan Federation. December, 1968.

The electric mimeo is here, so issue will be getting out more regularly now. Had a debate as to whether to enlarge this issue and go third class, but since I ran out of paper and Saturnalia would make it at least a week before I could restock, I've chosen the option of going first class once again and saving some letters for next time. Better write if you want to talk to the people: I have twenty letters for the Feb. issue already. Happy New Year to all, and keep smiling,

Gary.

From: Janie Lamb
Route 1, Box 364
Heiskell, Tenn. 37754



FIRST CLASS

TO David Lipsky
612 N. McKean St.
Butler, Pa.

16001