


of the mo
more prom
tions to
minority
Decline o
which hav
lurs agai
rity. Sev
bestselle



**" WE HAVEN'T TRANSLATED ANYTHING, YET;
BUT THIS PAGE IS THE FIRST ONE, SO IT
MUST BE THE COVER. "**

TIGHTBEAM

TIGHTBEAM - July: is the letter column of the National Fantasy Fan Federation. TIGHTBEAM is published for the N3F in January, March, May, July, September, November and is distributed to members of the N3F and for trade of other fan-zines. Persons mentioned in passing are invited to comment, regardless of membership status. Contributions (letters and artwork) should be sent to the editor: BETH SLICK, 9030 HARRATT, APT. 2, WEST HOLLYWOOD, CA 90069, not later than the 5th of the month of publication. (Please write TB on the envelope.)

---- TABLE OF CONTENTS ----

Editor's Letter	2
Don D'Amassa	3
Roy Tackett	3
Greg Costikyan.	4
Bud Webster	5
Eric Jamborsky.	6
dAniel j. oAkes	7
Lynne Holdon.	8
Eleanore Walter	9
Jacqueline Lichtenberg.	12
Alyson L. Abramowitz.	13
Thomas J. Walsh	13
Don D'Amassa	15
Kingston Gerald Kane.	17
Will Norris	18
Gary S. Mattingly	20

illos. C. John Fitzsimmons

-- OFFICERS --

President: Stan Woolston, 12832 Westlake Street, Garden Grove, CA 92640

Sec-Treas: Janie Lamb, Rt. 1, Box 363, Heiskell, TN 37754

Directorate:

- Gary Mattingly, c/o Denise Rehse, 4177 Ashland, Detroit, MI 48215
- John Robinson, 1-101st Street, Troy, NY 12180
- George Wells, 24 River Avenue, Riverhead, NY 11901
- Ned Brooks, 713 Paul Street, Newport News, VA 23605
- Leah A. Zeldes 21962 Parklawn, Oak Park, MI 48237

— EDITOR'S LETTER —

HOWDY--

How about this?---a 21-page TIGHTBEAM? Also, I've finally gotten a little tired of green paper, so I'm giving this pink color a try.

*

John Robinson sent me a pc dated 28 June announcing (in part)...

I'll make it official and tell you that the Directorate is now made up of GH Wells, Ned Brooks, Gary Mattingly, Leah A. Zeldes and myself.

John Also announces that he is planning to run for the Presidency.

*

Plans are being made to compile a Darkover Concordance. Also a meeting of the Friends of Darkover is being planned for KC in '76. Darkovan enthusiasts should write to: Diana Paxson, c/o the Blackstone Literary Agency, Box 472, Berkely, CA 94701.

*

C. J. Fitzsimmons, who has provided us with the clever cover and illos that run through this zine, is wondering what has become of James H. Schmitz. Anybody know? Write to him at: 5805 Arnsby Place, Apt. 1, Cincinnati, OH 45227.

*

Sharon Wilkerson is NOT looking for someone to take over the Welcommitte. She is always looking for those who would like to be active committee members. Write: 6755 Lewis Avenue, Long Beach, CA 90805.

*

I have very little news as far as I'm concerned--things remain pretty much the same--terrific! 22 August will mark the beginning of my vacation. I'm planing to visit a friend in Hammond, Indiana, who I've been writing to for a number of years (5 years, I think). I'm very much looking forward to it as it will represent the first time I've ventured far out of California. The only other times I've been out of the state was when I went to Tiajuana (with my parents) about 7 years ago and a weekend in Las Vegas (also with my parents) about 3 years ago. Since I'm going by plane, that will be another first as I've never been anywhere by plane, either.

I think it's somewhat ironic. I've been zipping about the universe with SF for a long time and I haven't even been in a plane! Oh well.

I hope you enjoy this large and interesting issue of Tb. A lot of issues are raised (not just STAR TREK) and I hope you'll want to send me a letter in response. Communication is the name of the game. Keep on Writin'.

D
ON

19 ANGELL DRIVE
EAST PROVIDENCE, RI 02914

D
'AMMASSA

6 MAY 1975

Another nice issue of TIGHTBEAM. I suspect that its very regularity is going to get you an increased number of letters. When I first joined the N3F, TB appeared regularly, and there were often too many letters, if anything.

Although I agree with most of what Gerard Houarner says about Burroughs, I think he misused the word "imagery". Imagery is figurative language. Now, I've always enjoyed Burroughs, who was a great story teller, if a somewhat dull writer, but I've never spotted any particular imagery in his work. I think Gerard was trying to point out that Burroughs had colorful settings.

Nathan Gavarin should contact the F&SF Book Co., PO Box 415, Staten Island, NY 10302. They distribute a catalog three or four times per year, and handle only SF. Orders over \$25.00 get a 20% discount. If Nathan and a few people in his area pooled their orders, I'm certain they could get the SF paperbacks they wanted considerably more cheaply than by buying them in newstands. I've dealt with this same company for over ten years now with complete satisfaction.

Kingston Kane doth protest too much. STAR TREK was indeed better than most TV SF, but that still doesn't make it anything special. It's of slightly higher quality than Captain Future is all. I enjoyed the show, but I certainly didn't mourn its passing. The animosity he detects among many fans is at least partially a reaction to all the Trek fans who insist that STAR TREK is what SF should be, when most of us realize that it was that a long time ago. Does he really think a starship in interstellar space would go WHOOOSSSSHHHH or that stars would move visibly as it traveled?

Plug time: The best book I've read this year is THE PRINCESS BRIDE by William Goldman, from Ballantine Books. It's one of the funniest fantasies I've ever read, while being very serious at the same time. It was originally published in 1973, so it's not eligible for any awards, and I suspect that it was never mentioned simply because it was totally ignored in the fan press and didn't appear in paperback at the time.

B
OY

915 GREEN VALLEY ROAD NW
ALBUQUERQUE, NM 87107

J
ACKETT

9 MAY 1975

...DON D'AMMASSA: You say "fanzine media" one more time and I will be forced to take some sort of drastic action, invoke the spirit of Degler or somesuch. "Media" is what may be termed a Madison Avenue term used by the advertising business as a designator for television, radio, magazines and other things which carry advertising. "Medium", in this instance, designates a carrier and in this usage pertains to advertising. I have an intense dislike for the term because it carries the connotation that the things we normally consider as sources of public information are primarily designed to carry advertising. This is, of course, true but it is not something we accept without protest. In any event the term "media" can not be applied to fanzines which do not, normally, carry advertising.

I really don't want to come to the defense of Wertham and his The World of Fanzines but I should point out that any book is only as good as its sources. TwoF is not a good book by any means (although it can be considered adequate for its purpose) but Wertham received little cooperation from most fanzine editors. "Fanzine media." By Klono's beryllium bones, that's almost as nauseating as "sci-fi."

KINGSTON KANE: Tsk, you do get overheated, don't you? If you keep your cool we may discuss STAR TREK. Since you cited credentials I suppose I should do the same. You say you've been reading science fiction for 20 years. I have been at it for twice that long. (Yes, chillun, the "O" in HORT does indeed stand for "old".) I must admit that, if you have indeed seen almost every science fiction film ever made, you are up on me there. I find about 95% of the "science fiction" movies to be an insult to the intellect--and the stomach. They should be avoided with the same vigor with which one avoids the stories of Barry Malzberg.

But STAR TREK...I am not, by any means, a STAR TREK hater. When the show was on the tube in days gone by I watched it regularly and enjoyed it for what it was--a light entertainment of no particular consequence. The main things the show had going for it were the character of Spock for the girls, a pompous ass of a captain with which middle-America could identify and a fine assortment of lightly-clad girls for us Dirty Old Men.

I will pass on making comments about the writing, acting and filming as these are mostly subjective judgements. If, however, you consider that STAR TREK was "accurate, all the way down the line" then I suggest that you need to read something other than science fiction. The technical and scientific flaws in the show were legion.

And, Oh Ghru, here is GERARD HOUARNER with all sorts of blather about great literature and art and "proper perspective as to what sf is all about." Sheesh. Miss Pym's Thursday afternoon art appreciation and creative writing class. I don't suppose there is any way we can keep these types away from the field but we can, at least, ignore them.

 REG

coa
1675 YORK AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY

 OSTIKYAN

15 MAY 1975

This is in response to Kingston Kane's letter of 18 March.

I, too, am a science fiction fan first and foremost. I, too, am a Star Trek fan. As such, let me defend "Star Trek Haters" without getting into acrimonious disputes regarding the value of Star Trek.

Most science-fiction fans who detest Star Trek, in my experience, do not really detest the show so much as its fans. Along with their traditional distaste of fringe-fans, there is the fact that Star Trek fandom is larger than sf fandom. SF fans are threatened. Always before, that noisy rabble labeled "fringefandom" has at least had the good taste to remain smaller than fandom's nucleus, sf fandom.

And because "Star Trek Haters" have a feeling of ST fans as being "the lowest of the low", said people transfer their distaste towards ST fans to ST itself.

All the objections I have heard raised are spurious, and would be ignored under normal circumstances. In a normal sf story, such objections would be filed under "suspension of disbelief," and promptly forgotten. The Enterprise is badly designed--if it works on mass-reaction principles. Star Trek never present's Earth's culture--the networks didn't want to do anything that might be controversial. Star Trek is often inconsistent--as must any seres TV show be.

It is not a hatred of Star Trek that is present, but rather a hatred of "Trekkies." If Star Trek fans would stop ripping pieces of clothing of stars (or attempting to do so,) and screaming at Leonard Nimoy, and wearing Starfleet uniforms, and even chewing gum in the elevators, I think one would find that hatred of Star Trek would ease off. It is the lack of dignity among ST fans that inspires the hatred of Star Trek, as much as anything else.

And calling people morons, and calling their ideas bullshit isn't going to help.

Ah well. And let's get rid of these stupid oh-so-sanctimoniously-peaceloving-pretenscious-ending-messages, shall we?

B
UD

W
EBSTER

P.O. BOX 5519
RICHMOND, VA 23220

19 MAY 1975

Foist of all, right off the bat, to Gerard Hournner: Yes, some of the stuff Silverber and Ellison wrote way back when was crap. But, it was so much better than a lot more of the crap being written by other new writers. As I go through my meager collection of Early Ellison I read a lot of Kyben stories, a few he anthologized in later pbs, and one or two others like "My Brother Paulie: and the like. All crap, yes, but comparison with later Ellison. But Superb Crap! Some of the best Crap I've ever read, and you can see where the later Ellison developes.

To Reed Andrus: I didn't even know that Tim had quit as head of the NFAB. I will send you a separate letter.

Now to the biggie. To Kingston Kane: (First of all, I don't believe that this person actually exists. Firstly, he states that he has been reading SF for 20 years. Right off the bat my mind says "Alright, this guy is in his 30's". However, let's be charitable and assume that he's been reading SF since he was 7, when I started. That would make him 27 years old. His letter has the semantic quality of a 14 year old paranoid schizophrenic).

I wrote Steve Beatty (Photron) 3/21/75 about ST and said in part, "I am weary of the whole thing. It no longer matters to me if they reinstate it or whether they just let it die quietly. I wrote my letters to the network when they first cancelled the bloody thing..." Kane strikes me as being a fanatic, no matter what his age, and I have no sympathy or patience with fanatics of any sort.

It is the Trekkies that give general SF fandom a bad name. It is Trekkies that the newsies write about when they write about SF cons, almost always with a contemptuous note in their voice about SF freaks and weirdos.

In all actuality, Kane's letter brings me very close to the same kind of reaction that he has to anti-trek letters, and I don't want to descend to his literal level,

but goddammittohellandback I am up to here! with Trekkies who think that Roddenberry is Jahweh and that Spock is his only true prophet. It was a good show, sometimes a great show, but it isn't a religious experience, for crying out loud, any more than Ozzie's Girls was.

In closing, let me say this: Kane, you have not heard the last anti-trek remark, and as long as the supporters of ST are of the same mental quality that you are, they will continue to come thick and fast. For some reason, I don't look forward to meeting you as I do most of the fans I correspond with, and I keep getting visions of you pointing down and saying, "Is that my ass, or a hole in the ground?"

(beth(I feel compelled to make one comment at this point: Although ST is not a religious experience (even most religious shows on TV are not religious experiences) it did have a bit more to offer than Ozzie and crew. ST did offer some tantalizing philosophies (like IDIC) and concepts that takes it lights years from Ozzie))

RIC

AMBORSKY

BOX 358
HARRIMAN, TN 37748

27 MAY 1975


Kingston Kane's letter has prompted me to write, adding some fuel to the GREAT STAR TREK CONTROVERSY.

I am not a Trekkie. And, Ghu forbid, I would never be caught dead at a Star Trek con. But I LIKE STAR TREK. I've been reading stf since I discovered Jules Verne years back. Then Heinlein, Bradbury, Clarke, Leinster, Juttner et al for years. Also, like Kane, I'm an stf film fan, even suffering through trash like FIRE MAIDENS FROM OUTER SPACE.

But I must disagree on some points. STAR TREK was not the best filmed stf, either theatrically sf or for TV. True, certain episodes, such as DEVIL IN THE DARK, MIRROR, MIRROR, and quite a few others were excellent, but TWILIGHT ZONE and OUTER LIMITS had SOME better shows. But these two also had their clunkers. Other series, such as SCIENCE FICTION THEATRE and MAN IN SPACE were also pretty good, but MIS was too inaccurate. Yet it handled the stories straight.

The Enterprise is indeed a nice star ship, but I prefer the Klingon ship. It looks more business-like and real. But then, the Enterprise looks like something designed here on Earth. But, most important, ST was an amazing show considering budget limitations. They established a consistent universe. Everything fits. I believed.

"SAME THING HERE-
THAT PRINTING AGAIN"



ST could have been better stf, but it could have been worse. It could have been TIME TUNNEL, PLANET OF THE APES or THE SIX MILLION DOLLAR MAN. Star Trek gave us three years of what could be done on TV despite short sighted executives and self-centered critics.

The way general fandom is treating Star Trek also leaves much to be desired. I can understand banning ST costumes from the masquerade at MidAmericon, but closing the Huckster Room to Trek is too much. I hope they will reconsider that action, especially since I've already paid for my membership.

Despite some people, STAR TREK is Scientifiction. And I am looking forward to the film.

DANIEL J.

518 OUTLOOK DRIVE
LOS ALTOS, CA 94022

OKES

12 JUNE 1975

Last August I was (privileged) to join a fan group called the National Fantasy Fan Federation. This group, I was assured, would increase my fanac, help me get to know people, etc., etc., etc...

Well, in a way it has. I've picked up a few interesting correspondences (and dropped a few others, most of which seemed to be potentially interesting, sorry to those people) and discovered exactly what it was that the N3F was doing.

Nothing.

I am (to put it mildly) annoyed. The N3F (as I see it) is potentially the most powerful group of fans around, with a membership rivalled by few fan groups. We also have some first-class minds (like John Robinson...any relation to Spider... and Joanne Burger) some BNFen (4e and Don D'Ammassa, for two) and some nuts (like Mike Kring and new member Mark McGarry).

But somehow, in the 10 months I've been in the N3F, I've seen absolutely nothing to come of it. To dissect what I get in my box every two months:

One (1) TNFF, which includes a rephrasing of Stan Woolston's unanswered pleas for help from two numbers ago; the NFFF Trader (probably the most useful section of the of the zine); a news page of news that was printed in LOCUS a month or two ago; something called "NFFF History" which seems to me a cheap way of filling a page of TNFF. And similar things running 3-10 pages of vivid nothing.

One (1) Tightbeam, which is at least something occasionally interesting. Usually, however, it contains people's letters concerning Harold's letter of two issues ago, which in turn concerns Melvin's of six months back, which probably stretches back to the earliest days of the magazine, fanzine or whatever you want to call it.

There is also the correspondence, which by the sixth or eighth letter tends to degenerate into puns, inane insults about fellow correspondents, and Harlan Ellison short jokes.

All of which is pretty fucked up. I said before, and I repeat and emphasize "The N3F is potentially the most powerful group of fans around." Let that phrase swirl around in your mind for a moment, then continue:

In the N3F, there are dozens of "Bureaus" which do nothing except change heads. (There are exceptions; some of these are N'APA, the News Bureau--despite what I said earlier, this is a group which operates well within the limited area set up for it--the Welcommittee, and Kaymar Carlson, who seems to be a one-man convention full of fen of every type.) Half of these heads might just as well be called tails, or what the tail is attached to, for all they seem to get done.

Remember what I said before? "Potentially the most powerful group"! POTENTIALLY!!!
Unused potential is waste; waste is nearly criminal. Something must be done; the
time is now.

The N3F has several troupes which seem to be modeled on the worst sections of the US
gummint. Example: bureaus are appointed left-and-right with none but a few under-
standing what the others are doing. Example: Our Constitution has things set up
so that if something was in desparate need of being done, no one could do it for at
least two months--and then, it's at the whims of the Post Office. The Presidency
should be far more powerful in time of crisis. Example: because of the multiplicity
of bureaus, the NFFF is something like the two-headed snake. (Remember him? he
starved to death because his heads couldn't agree which way to go around the pole to
get the food!)

There's more, but I'm sort of monopo izing thish of Tb as it is. Two last things:
One, I'd like people to take note of my name, it is misspelled on the roster. Two,
I want to throw in a plug for my genzine, GeminI, which I co-edit with Bob Rogers.
It's one of the best fiction-oriented fanzines around, 60-odd pages, photo-offset,
and only 75¢. The current issue has an article by Fritz Leiber. And (surprise) an
editorial by me in which I don't (!) go into a diatribe about anything.

*(both I hope we'll be seeing your name among those seeking office to 'run' the N3F.
And, as the man says, he prefers his name to look like this: daniel j. oakes.)*

1
JYNNE

51 LEONARD PLACE
WAYNE, NJ 07470

2
JOLDO

24 JUNE 1975

Boy, I no sooner get into fandom and get the first issue of Tightbeam than I am con-
fronted by controversy concerning Star Trek--one of the few subjects that I have no
strong opinions about. Sure I enjoyed most of the episodes but it was not great SF:
great for TV maybe considering the other SF I've seen. I surely isn't mere coinci-
dence that when on a visit on ST Thomas last winter, my relatives were amazed that
I wasted time on it. "You're much too intelligent for that stuff," was a typical
comment. On the other hand, my aunt expressed great interest in the possibility of
contacting other intelligences in the galaxy and in alternate possibilities of or-
ganizing society. My uncle became fascinated with the "world of If" theories of
history. "But that's SF," I said. "It is?" they replied. Seems that they thought
all SF was typified by "The Creature from the Black Lagoon" or "The Eggplant that
Ate Chicago."

I suppose I was almost destined to be a SF fan. Both my parents read SF. In fact
my parents saved one apartment block in Nutley, NJ from panicking during The War of
the Worlds broadcast because they'd read the book. When my Dad died in 1969, I went
up to clean out the attic and found scads of SF books--mostly Ace doubles--that he
had bought during airplane flights. As a result I have some SF that is quite old.
Also my parents gave me my first SF book: Red Planet by Heinlein.

As a note to Kingston Kane: "Have you read The Dispossessed? In it Ursula LeGuin
tries to portray an anarchical society. I don't think the book is totally success-
ful but it is always interesting and certainly better than 99% of SF. I agree that
Ursula LeGuin is the best SF writer today. I also like Poul Anderson, Jack Vance,
Philip Jose Farmer (when he's being himself), Marion Zimmer Bradley, and most RA
Heinlein. Arthur Clarke, no - except for Childhood's End and I think Harlan Ellison
is much better writing about SF than actually writing it. His introductions in his


Dangerous Visions anthologies are marvelous." Oops, I forgot Larry Niven in my favorite author list.

I also have a great conviction that reading SF should be fun. Why read otherwise? You may as well collect bottle caps. If someone enjoys Edgar Rice Burroughs, (a writer who puts me to sleep on page 4), why not read him. At 14 I thought the "Conan" stories were wonderful, now I wonder what I ever saw in them. Tastes change, people change. I still enjoy SF though my list of favorite books may have changed over the years.

I wouldn't mind exchanging paperbacks. Sure fan "A" may send out all dogs but fan "B's" tastes are probably different. I didn't like Rendezvous With Rama and would have sent it out had that been an option then. So you can see what my opinion's worth. On the other hand, a friend returned a Jack Vance novel that I like with the opinion that it was unreadable.

I would like to second David Dyer-Bennett's opinion that SF readers, (I haven't met too many fans yet) are on the whole more tolerant and open to new and different ideas. Most see the world from an oblique angle denied ordinary people. Most have at least been thinking about the implications of technology in the modern world. One personal note: while I enjoyed seeing the moon landing, I was wishing it were Mars. The moon seemed so mundane; I'd been there so much in SF novels.

"I HOPE IT'S ALL SAYING NICE THINGS"



LEANORE

2231 W. MELROSE
CHICAGO, IL 60618

ALTER

23 JUNE 1975

This letter is being brought to you in response of the letter of David Kleist, an obviously intelligent person, and its purpose is mainly to add my voice to the growing number of fans who are becoming dissatisfied with the current situation in fandom.

I myself have been 'in' fandom for a period of not quite a year, and therefore, there will undoubtedly be people who do not feel I am qualified enough to be as critical as I am. Most of what I am relating, is in regards to the current state of Chi-fandom, or rather the lack of it.

When I first went to a Worldcon, DisconII, which was the first time I was really 'into' fandom, I was amazed, awed, and generally stunned at the number of people who were as 'crazy' as I was. Like I never knew that there were that many people in the entire United States who cared that much about S.F., right!

To say that I was delighted and overjoyed, was an understatement. I finally found something that I had been looking for, for years--fandom. Unfortunately, and regrettably, the fun ended in 3 too short days, and I found myself thrust once more into the much more mundane and everyday world of fandom; meetings, etc.

To say that Chi-fanac did not live up to my expectations, would be a severe understatement of the truth. Rather, after being in the throes of these wonderful D.C. people, I was shocked at the extreme amount of apathy that existed, and still does, in Chifandom. There is no excuse for Chicago not to have had a worldcon for over 14 years, much less a mini-con. I asked, naturally, why?

The reply I was given by many, pros and lesser-knowns as well, was, "Duh, uh, well, I understand that Chi-Con III was a real-bomb...duh." Or else, there was a lot of hemming, and hawing, because not one person could really come up with a decent answer. Fortunately for all concerned, since Chicago fanac was in various stages of dying a slow death, a couple of fans, (more like ten) decided to get together and hold Windy-Con I, which was last year in October, and was greeted with varying degrees of success.

There were, admittedly, a lot of things 'wrong' with it, but for a first con, the feedback was very good, even though in some cases the panels, etc., came off as rather amateurish, on the whole it was good, and the people who were in charge of it, deserve a lot of praise for their efforts on behalf of Chifanac, which, at long last, people now know really does exist.

What I think really ticks me off most of all are the fans, and in this case I detest using the word, who are still blaming an entirely new generation of Chi-fanpeople, who were not even involved in the 62 farce, for the bomb that took place 14 years ago.

Now, not only are these people repeating hearsay, (did I spell that right?) but the entire business by now, should be completely irrelevant. I was 7 at the time, The people who are telling me this are not that much older. And thus, my disgust at aforementioned situation grows.

There is good news however, and I don't really think I am letting the proverbial "cat out of the bag" by mentioning it. Chicago fandom has finally gotten its act together to use a cliché phrase, and formed a Chicago Science Fiction Assoc. About time, you say? How heartily I agree. At least there are some fans in Chicago who do care enough about Chifanac to do something about it. Why did it take 14 years to develop? I don't think anyone will ever ever come up with a really decent answer. There will be future Windycons. There might even be a bidding attempt for ChiCon IV. It would be nice. But things are at the 'forming stage', so know one can truthfully say at this point, what will take place. But Chifandom has now only one way to go--up.

And yet another reply to Kingston Kane. Star Trek was not perfect. It was not expected to be. Those who did were deceiving themselves. What matters is not how good or bad what episodes were, or whether you hated or love the show, but the fact that it did something far, far more important. Star Trek set a precedent. It set a standard and proved in the interrum that there can be good S.F. on T.V. Will there ever be another show with the same quality as Star Trek? And yes, the quality was there. Who knows--only the future knows for sure--but we can only sit back and hope, that with the onslaught of controversy that the series brought, that the situation as regards to S.F. and T.V. improves.

There are only a few more things I would like to say, and it regards Neos and fanzines. Those people who condemn fanzines, the people who publish them, and the fledgeling fan, are going to eventually look like the fools they are. It is the faneds, zines, and neos in fanac who keep it alive. Why? Because it is the new fan, who has the most enthusiasm. It is the new fan who cares enough, and has not yet had his imagination thoroughly squashed, to want to do something new and innovating. Or old and traditional. They have not been in fandom long enough to be overcome by that apathetical attitude I have seen in so many fans of late. They are the ones usually more than willing to lend their time, and effort to some new venture, be it fanzine, or the forma-

tion of a new fan group. It is the Neos, through a subconscious, or who knows, a conscious effort who are keeping S.F. alive. If we left it up to some of the B.N.F.'s or pros, fandom would have died out a long time ago. The fact remains that it is the fanzines of S.F. that keep the faith and pass the word. Without them communications would be almost nil. Secondly, there are an awful lot of fans who turn into pros, mainly because of their early efforts in fanzines--if it were not for the fanzines, would artists such as Freas, Kirk, and others too numerous to mention have become the pros they are now? It's highly doubtful. It was through fanzines, that they became famous, and it is to fanzines and their ilk that they owe their present reputation. People have a small tendency to forget that, and fortunately for all concerned, those who would so sway with our alter-egos and children are too few to really be heard in the din of it all. Let us thank those people rather, who give us a chance to escape from a world that all too often, is too mundane and material. For thank them we should--for giving us a world of our own imagining--a world where other people, nay, fans, care about each other, individually and collectively.

All right. Enough for being critical. Therefore, looking on the positive side of things... what does one do to become more involved in fan society? Probably, for a start, you could start a new fanzine. Do I hear groans out there? Now, not only does this net you a lot of new correspondees, the fun part of it all, but it also gives you a lot of ego-boo. Or else you gaffiate completely. So how does one go about starting a zine? Seek out the fanac in your area. Get your name put up on local bulletin boards. And yes, Ghod forbid, even send your hard earned money, to pro-zines like Amra and the Alien Critic, for full-page ads. If you have not guessed by now, I intend to start a zine, right? Right. I said that for a long time, but I finally have the means and time to do something about it. By the time this is printed, I hope, H-13 will have been well on its way toward a second issue. Contributions, anyone? When your a fanzine ed, you cram a plug in anyway you can...you also wander around, and bug a lot of people for contributions, until they say yes just so you will go away. This will not endear you to a lot of people until they see their name in print, which has a tendency to do a lot of strange things to fans...

So you don't want to start a fanzine you say. What's left? Use your imagination. Start a new fan group. This is a lot easier if you have a zine behind you to advertise your activities, but not an absolute qualification. If what you are doing is halfway decent, word-of-mouth should suffice.

Organizing the above, this depends solely on how formal you want to be. In my case, the above is going to be eventually about a new organization, entitled, tentatively, United Federation of Planets. Or some such thing--we have not talked about it a great deal yet. The federation will be involved in doing one thing in particular; and that is creating your own world in which to live. This is a complicated situation, but one begins from the ground floor up, creating a history, species, culture, sub-societies, weaponry, technology, laws of magic, designing costumes; and once the formal business is done with, there the fun then begins. We are 'looking' for members, so if you are in the area, look me up--the more people there are, the more fun it gets. I am more or less involved with this together with Phil Foglio. We are more or less a splinter group, from one of the same in New York, named The Tholian Web. Now obviously, I did not want to be connected with the Star Trek bit, since this also limits your universe, so we decided to go ahead and recreate our own, mutually feeling that it was too good an idea to simply let die. Now however, much to our delight, I discovered in letter recently received, that the group in New York, of which there are 43 members, noted to disregard their original name--so, we might become the local branch, depending on how the situation develops. I hope I hear some replies in regards to this; it would be nice to hear from other mutually interested people

Well, those are a few ideas, and they are certainly not the last; all I can say is don't always leave the organizing in your area up to the same people--if you don't

like what's coming off, (or not), then do something on your own. In fandom, everybody counts, from the newest Neo, to first fandom, and that is what is important to remember--don't ever let anyone tell you otherwise.

JACQUELINE

9 MAPLE TERRACE
MONSEY, NY 10952

LICHTENBERG

24 JUNE 1975

Interesting debate on ST/sf relationship in TB Mayish. I am bemused by the everlasting energy that drives sf people to discuss the subject - that in itself seems a curious thing.

For me, ST was sf done in a NEW medium (sf had never been done on weekly tv as a continuing series before, so production problems were different). Therefore, ST cannot be judged by either sf or tv standards, but requires a whole new set of criteria.

As an sf fan of nearly 20 years standing, I of course see ST's shortcomings as sf. However, as a professional writer I understand why it had to have these shortcomings. Since I hate the shortcomings as much as any sf fan, my objective is to change the cause of the shortcomings - rather than simply hating ST per se. A large number of pros in this business feel much as I do, and surely one day some of us will succeed.

Wouldn't it be wonderful to have a tv series which even the most demanding sf fan couldn't fault seriously? We can do it if we don't waste energy hating ST. It broke the ice for us. It proved our product has a wider commercial market than ever thought before. It proved sf fans are not a downtrodden freakish crazy minority, but part of a tremendous power structure embracing not just the "egghead" community, or the "flower children" or the "drug cult" or the "NASA Labs", but present in every nook and cranny of our entire society. SF-wise, however, they are ignorant and unorganized.

I am as irritated as any sf fan at the "man off the street" elbowing into sf cons and screaming righteously for ST films. But I don't expect to solve the problem by shutting them out. I want to see it solved by turning "them" into "us". Not "us" into "them"!

Yes, it seems impossible for something like ten thousand to absorb something like ten million without being absorbed by them. But sf is the literature of the impossible, the literature of problem solving. So why not? It's merely a matter of setting the goal and sticking to it rather than wallowing in self pity.

Our book, STAR TREK LIVES! (by Jacqueline Lichtenberg, Sondra Marshak and Joan Winston, Bantam Books - on stands now) was intended to be a step in this direction. It turned out to be a much smaller step than we wanted it to be. But we do think we made the point that ST evokes "sense-of-wonder" in people who had never experienced it before or even knew it was possible to feel such a thing. That's why "they" are so wide-eyed about STAR TREK, and they have a right to be. Why, weren't we wide-eyed worshipful about those dreadful pulps of the early 40's? (oh, how wonderful it felt to DARE to believe there was life on Mars! Oh, how naive we turned out to be! But who cares? Even if the science was rotten, the CONCEPT is still valid. We'll meet up with other residents of the universe somewhere sometime.)

If any of you anti-ST people read STL!, just substitute "sf" for "ST" in the first chapter, and see if the FEELINGS expressed there don't run in suspicious parallel to your own when you first discovered sf. If ST has that power - a power no other such series has had - then it can't be wholly a failure - even as sf!

 LYSON L.

638 VALMONT PLACE
ELMONT, NY 11003

25 JUNE 1975

By Ghu, this time I AM going to loc a TIGHTBEAM. This is certainly one of the most comentable ones I've gotten, anyhow.

But first, an Important Message: my address is not and has never been 6638 Valmont Place. It IS 638 Valmont Place. Phlease change it. Now onward...*((I'm sure this comment is directed to me, but in case I've transmitted this incorrect information to anyone--please take note of her correct address.))*

On David Klesit's letter, I'm wondering just how long he's been in fandom due to some of his statements. Author's detest fandom? I suppose Ted White, Wilson (Bob) Tucker, andy offutt, Michael Bishop etc. aren't authors then. I've seen contributions from each of those I've mentioned in fanzines within the last few months, not to mention the cons they go to, or the fact that some of them publish or have published fanzines and been "active" themselves.

"SF and sf fandom should be one in the same." That's something which is totally impossible. For one thing, SF fandom never has and never will attract all sf fans. Yet, sf fandom has always concerned itself to varying degrees with sf. There are sercon fans and zines which only talk about sf. Obviously David hasn't found them, yet.

As to the statement, "Because sf today is generally poor, fans that would normally become active in the true sf side of science fiction and fandom also are turning away", let's take this in two parts. "SF today is generally poor". I don't know about that. It's certainly better than it was in the 30's and 40's when we had alot of those prozines that are so important to David. There is ALOT of junk being published today, but then there is ALOT more good sf (and sf period!) being published. Now to the other part of David's statement: "fans that would normally become active in the true sf side of sf are [therefore] also turning away". Could someone (David?) please tell me then, how come fandom has gotten so big in recent times?

Obviously, my views of True Fandom are different than David's. Maybe when he's been around a little longer he'll see that it isn't necessary to talk/write about sf all the time. Then, again, maybe he won't. Fandom tolerates all kinds. May you find an enjoyable niche, David.

I really don't know what constructive critisma to say about the N3F. I've found little of interest there--in terms of activities--though many interesting people (and THAT is what fandom is all about, for me, anyway). Certainly, the Welcommittee can improve. Though I'd been in fandom a couple of years, most of the welcommitte treated me as a virtual neo (there are some worthy exceptions: Stan Woolston wrote one of the weirdest postcards I've ever gotten, George Wells, said "hello" to me at a con and we've become friends etc.). Yet "Welcome to the N3F! May you have a long and enjoyed neffer stay!" (an actual pc I got from someone I know can write well) isn't very helpful.

Anyway, it's nice to see such an interesting TIGHTBEAM. More artwork though, please.

 THOMAS J.

102 PEOSPECT AVENUE
IRVINGTON, NJ 07111

25 JUNE 1975

I don't believe I ever told Kingston that Heinlein showed himself to be an anarchist... merely an extremist Libertarian. He comes close but never quite makes it. Kingston,

ole buddy, you're right about one thing though, I am a genius... and I'd say so more often if not for my overpowering humility. ((cough, cough))

To David Kleist:

Wherever did you get the idea that SF authors detest fandom? Most of them are fans too.

You may have gotten this misconception from the over-publicized raving of a so-called writer in one of the glossy SF magazines..which is no longer. Just because some, evidently, drug-crzed, hippy, egomaniac wants the glorious cheers and snobbish praise from college professors and lisping New York Times critics and is willing to debase himself, foresake all pride, and generally grovel in worm-like fashion to get it is no reason to consider such a preposterous idea. Most pro writers are amateur fans and most pro fans are amateur writers. Ghod only know about those caught in between.

So please don't accept the words of those who wallow in the pretentious dogma of pseudo-liberation as gospel. It's not.

(hey Kingston, you thought you were good at staring a battle, where do you think this'll lead to... nuclear war?)

Well, so far Kingston's been called a booby, an idiot, a fool, and threatened by a letter bomb. The joke's on you people. I know for a fact that Kingston is the world's greatest Star Trek hater alive. Many's the time that I and others have had to restrain him from wringing a Trekkie's neck. Why he even kicked in his television set one night when Star Trek was advertised. I'll just give you a quote from one of the letters he's sent me...

"...(Trekkies) make me sick. I go to a convention to examine the ideas of others regarding serious problems which presently confront our society. In the past, I have found that Science Fiction is so versatile a literary genre that one is quite capable of doing so within its boundaries (if indeed it has boundaries). Alas, such things are merely pleasant memories to be cherished in my old age. The most interesting discussion one is apt to hear at a convention these days is a group of acne-infested teenagers arguing the exact degree of angle to Spock's ears. The extent of my sorrow eludes description in words..."

Does this sound like a Star Trek lover?

No, to me it sounds like a lie. It is. Mea Culpa, I couldn't resist.

Anyway, on to reality.

I've taken time out to respond to TIGHTBEAM. Time is something I don't have, at least not at the present. After July, I'll have a break. Then I can play catch up.

I've taken the Corry Bureau out of the mud and it seems to be standing on its feet. Lately, however, I've been forced to neglect it. Not because of choice. Since I fear it will collapse once again if not attended to shortly, I have asked Stan Woolston to find someone willing to handle it, as I shall be unable to do so for at least three months.

It is for the same reasons that I have neglected N'APA. I shall, hopefully, have something for it by August.

At this moment I owe letters to many people including: John Andrews, Laurie Rawn, Kingston, Valery, Will Norris and others. Hopefully by the time this is printed I shall have replied. If not, my reponses shall follow shortly.

Since I expect my confused and hectic existence will end by September... along with my poverty I have a surprise for you:

Will Norris insisted that there was an Eastern conspiracy to gain control of the N3F. He listed the Corry Bureau as being involved. I, as acting head of the Bureau, deny this most emphatically. Will Norris is merely exhibiting the paranoia which has been his claim to fame these past years.

I also wish to announce that Kingston Gerald Kane and myself are going to run for the Directorate of the N3F. We are running on the same ticket. Just because we live in the East, in New Jersey, twenty miles or so away from one another and have strong ties to other international conspiracies is no reason to believe what Will says is true. After all, Will belongs to the same conspiracy... no I didn't mean to say that. I meant to say that Will lives in the East too. Yes. That's what I meant.

Kingston has just undergone serious surgery and the doctors (all specialists) have given him a fighting chance. (He really did have surgery...not all that serious... and is probably up and around by now... but the sympathy note might help).

WALSH AND KANE FOR DIRECTORATE IN 75

(The way we figured is Kingston's supporters will cancel out my supporters and mine his... so if you want to bet on (you bet on us to win, of course) either of us, Kingston and I are giving good odds.

P.S. My views on Star Trek? Well, it was better than radiation virus. Not bad tv... but then that doesn't take much. After all, the product of television is the viewer, who is sold to the advertiser. Since they can't afford to turn away the idiot they must shoot for the lowest common denominator. This should change with the advent of the video disk.

DON

19 ANGELL DRIVE
EAST PROVIDENCE, RI 02914


D'AMASSA

26 JUNE 1975

Ah, I see we have stired up some controversy in TIGHTBEAM. Reminds me of the good old days when John Kusske and I used to assault each other with fresh tirades every issue. Forward into the fray:

David Dyer-Bennet has a remarkably thin skin, if he is so easily irritated when an expressed opinion on a subject area about which he knows so little disagrees with his own. The fan press has been full of attacks on HEROVIT'S WORLD. Just off the top of my head, I recall critical reviews or comments in MOEBIUS TRIP and GUYING GYRE, and a half dozen other places I'm too lazy to look up. The thrust of their arguments is that Malzberg was making a direct attack on SF writers, because Herovit was an SF writer who prostituted his art for the sake of money. At least some of this was tongue in cheek; Malzberg himself has churned out a variety of potboilers, including

"OBVIOUSLY NON-
INTELLIGENT PRINT,
A PECULIAR NATURAL
PHENOMENON"



the novelization of the SF monster movie, PHASE IV. Despite that, Malzberg did not indict SF writers alone, but all artists and writers - including himself - who allow their talent to be suppressed in favor of a higher income. He wasn't particularly moralizing, but he did graphically illustrate that fact.

David also seems to deny that mainstream writers are likely to produce much good SF. Bull. A good writer is more likely to produce good SF than a bad SF writer. Again, just off the top of my head, I can think of many good to excellent SF and fantasy novels by mainstream writers: GILES GOAT-BOY by John Barth, A FABLE by William Faulkner, GRENDAL by John Gardner, GOG by Andrew Sinclair, 1984 by George Orwell, IT CAN'T HAPPEN HERE by Sinclair Lewis, TERMINAL MAN by Michael Crichton, BRAVE NEW WORLD by Aldous Huxley, A CLOCKWORK ORANGE and THE WANTING SEED both by Anthony Burgess, most of the short fiction of Donald Barthelme, ON THE BEACH by Nevil Shute, MALEVIL and DAY OF THE DOLPHIN by Robert Merle, although I suppose he ought to be considered an SF writer by now, THE WALKER THROUGH WALLS and THE GRAND SEDUCTION by Marcel Aymé, THE SHORT REIGN OF PIPPIN IV by John Steinbeck. For that matter, H.G. Wells was a mainstream writer who dabbled in SF.

On to David Kleist: No one familiar with fandom is going to claim that D'Amassa isn't as serious as they come. I expect that in the last 12 - 18 months I've had published more pages of book reviews and critical articles than anyone else in fandom. I probably read more SF than 99% of all fans. I'm in fandom chiefly because of the literature. But I am pretty tired of hearing people say that fandom ought to be something other than it is. David asks "Why do authors detest fandom to such a great degree?" I suspect that some pros detest all fans, and that most pros detest some fans. So what? I don't have a particularly high opinion of some fans and some pros. What possible difference does it make? David just assumes the statement to be both true and pertinent, and it is neither. Fandom does not exist for the pros, it exists for the fans. There is no such thing as the "true SF side of science fiction".

He also charges that the state of SF today is "awful", but since I can't figure out exactly what he means, I'll ignore that. But I do take issue with his statement that SF cannot survive the death of the prozines (which he seems to equate with pulps, for some reason). Most SF is sold through paperback houses already, and if anything, the death of the prozines will increase paperback sales. With two exceptions, the quality of fiction in the prozines has struck me as consistently under the quality of the fiction in original anthologies of the last three years.

Onward to Kingston Kane, who apparently likes to label people. According to his letter, Simak, Zelazny, Anderson, Asimov, and Pohl share the same political philosophy, conservatism. This is obviously why Fred Pohl has written stories such as "The Midas Plague", sharply critical of our conservative, consumer oriented society; it's why Clifford Simak distrusts many aspects of our technology, and is critical of our space program. Even in the case of Poul Anderson the label "conservative" should only be applied with care. As Gordon Dickson has pointed out, Anderson actually embodies many of the ideas of the 19th century liberals. Anderson's stories have always stressed the importance of individual liberties, have been sharply critical of wars; his female characters act with heroism far more frequently than with most SF writers. Anderson has called patriotism "nob hysteria", has said that "Knowledge, all knowledge, is good", attacked Puritanism, praised liberals, expressed tolerance of a variety of economic and social systems. He has criticized "meaningless words setting of automatic emotional responses - 'free enterprise', 'progressivism', 'Radical',..." He has rejected the idea that a small minority of "talented" individuals should make man's decisions for him. He has rejected Christianity. Despite all this, Kingston considers it plausible to rubber stamp Anderson a "conservative" and dismiss him thereby. If that's not prejudice and bigotry, I don't know what is.

Enough arguing. I probably should mention here that I will henceforth be running the Information Bureau instead of the Collector's Bureau. People with questions on any aspect of SF should write to me, and I'll try to have answers in the next appearance of TNFF.

(beth) OK, gang, a breather here before we go on to the letter from Kingston Kane. I'd like to quote an article in the 'Paper Back Talk' section of the NEW YORK TIMES BOOK REVIEW, dated 13 July--perhaps a little out of sequence of these letters, but relevant nevertheless:

"It lives! There's one publication that's been selling so furiously in book stores during recent weeks that it would be included on the (best seller) list above except for one fact. It's not a book. 'Star Trek Blueprints' is a set of 12 reproductions of precise designs by Franz Joseph Schnaubelt showing every foot of every level of the fabulous starship Enterprise. Since Mid-May Ballantine Books has sold 150,000 sets, enclosed in a plastic and leatherette portfolio, at \$5. This week it goes back to press for 100,000 more."

Few sci-fi books sell more than 40,000 copies. 'Star Trek' books account for close to 500,000 copies each."

Perhaps some of the monies realized from these tremendous STAR TREK sales are going to encourage and support other sf books that sell 40,000 copies or would otherwise not get a chance to be published.))

 KINGSTON GERALD

940 EAST GLEN AVENUE
RIDGEWOOD, NJ 07450

 KANE

27 JUNE 1975

I just finished reading this month's Tightbeam. I never laughed so hard in all my life. You people out there have failed completely to understand my March letter. All you saw was the surface. You didn't see what lay underneath. For all fairness, however, some of you have seen underneath the surface. You took the trouble to write me first hand to find out my real intentions in fact to "test me" the way you others should--but did not. DUMMIES!! Only 50% of my letter was true--if you can figure out which 50% it is, well more power to ya. You also proved out several statements that I made in my March letter. You still don't understand Star Trek. Its beyond your comprehension. Star Trek is, in my opinion, still tops in Science Fiction Films. Why? Because it has done something that no other T.V. or motion picture has ever done before. If you can't understand what that "something" is, I suggest that you read the book Star Trek Lives by Jacqueline Lichtenberg, Sondra Marshak and Joan Winston published by Bantam Books. That should give you some idea of the power of Star Trek. As for the fan movement--Lord Love a Duck--you don't understand Star Trek fans either. I don't mean Trekkies--they are a minority, not the majority! I know--I'm a fan--I know a whole bunch of other fans. Star Trek fans are far more intelligent than you give them credit for. Jerks.

When I wrote that letter I knew full well what I was doing. My intentions was to weed out the dummies from the smart ones. Well--the dummies came out of the woodwork in spades! They read that letter, turned beet red, and downright catotonic, and fired off letters to Tightbeam without thinking. As for Capt. Kirk's actions being not true to life. Someone made the assinine statement that a World War II ship Captain wouldn't put his arm around a pretty yeoman's waist before an attack. Ofcourse not asshole! Because there were no pretty yeomen on WWII carriers. In fact, if the Captain of said ship did that he'd be considered a Homo! As for getting himself into dangerous situations each week--Bull! He didn't. Again, you have not been watching carefully. Those missions were usually assigned to the Enterprise. As for Contact Teams, forget it. I disagree on that. Not on those types of missions where the fate of the Galaxy rests in the hands of one man--you don't send a team down for alien contact, no way. That's a delicate job. You can't reduce that to a routine. If you do

that, you're asking for trouble. I'm quoting now from Star Trek Lives.

"The decisions may turn on a slight shade of expression on the answer to a question only he (the Captain) would think to ask and only if he were on the spot. And if he has to go it only makes sense that he takes his best men to go with him--Spock and McCoy. You don't send a contact team down to do that kind of job."

They're right, you don't. Okay for routine planet surveys, rescue missions and the like, but not for most of the kind of thing you see on Star Trek. The Captain and his first officer are expendable. Despite all that training. The ship is not. About the Enterprise. As far as Starships go, I'll stick with the Enterprise. It's comfy. It's roomy. It's perfect. I know the designs you mean and I think they're good, but hardly the type we would want for those kind of voyages Star Trek depicts. No--'fraid Roddenberry is one up on you there. That design "Constitution" class starship is just right.

One final note: To the dummy who wrote the last letter in that issue. Your analysis of "The Apple" was wrong. Again, you have failed to understand Star Trek. What you saw was only one small segment. Just the first part of the story. At the '75 Star Trek Con in New York City, author Hal Clement gave a detailed talk on "The Apple" explaining the whole story. It was called, "The Peeling of 'The Apple'". Did you know that the Enterprise spent a whole year in that system? Did you know that they found out about those exploding rocks? Did you know that they found out who built Vaal? Didn't huh? 'Course not, you don't understand Star Trek. Who's the boob now--huh?

WILL

1073 SHAVE ROAD
SCHENECTADY, NY 12303

MORRIS

29 JUNE 1975

Well, well, well, Star Trek has invaded Tb and t'would appear that the forces have marshalled on their respective sides. Sniping begun in the March ish has escalated with the May ish. Question: Will it continue in the July ish? Will someone trundle out heavier weapons? Will war--nuclear or guerilla or conventional--break out? Or will apathy (yes, David Dyer-Bennet, apathy--David, to quote or paraphrase Harlan writing to Dave Romm, "You have all of the tact of a psychopathic axe-murderer with psycho-motor epilepsy" . . . and if you send a bomb to ME, you'll get Nyarlathotep and three Nazgul by return carrier) restore Tb to normal drowsiness? Answer: See it all in the July Tb today.

I found the Star Trek squabble somewhat amusing. I think everyone is ignoring the real aim of ST. Entertainment. It wasn't intended to be anything more than sf on television, adventure sf at that. Sure, there are elements right out of the pulp era. Sure, you could put the ST stories with minor substitutions anywhere on tv. But the one unalterable fact remains: ST was an honest attempt to give to television a type of sf that fans could watch and enjoy. I think it was successful, based upon its aims. It certainly is a much better and more honest picture of sf than LOST IN SPACE, THE STARLOST, and UFO. Face it. The producers of tv are not yet ready for sf of the kind Ellison invisioned for STARLOST. They are still back in the age of "The Jellyfish from 30,000,000 BC that ate Detroit". Be thankful you got Star Trek. That was an anomaly. One day . . . but perhaps we expect too much from that wonderful bunch that gave us I DREAM OF JEANNIE, GILLIGAN'S ISLE, THE CBS EVENING NEWS

with R. Muad and W. Cronkite, and your friendly 30/60 second idiot break with the latest inane drivel from some ad company wanting you to buy underarm deoderant or a playtex living cross-your-heart something or the other that you can't believe it's a, but it is, and so on ad nauseum. Let the so-called trekkies worry themselves and NBC or whoever may pick ST up again or may make a film of ST. As for me--when ST comes on the tv, if I haven't anything pressing, I'll just sit back for an hour's worth of relaxation . . . if I can put up with the commercials.

Turning to other, more serious, matters, I've got several suggestions for consideration by the M3F membership. I'll just throw them out and see what all you think about them.

First on my list concerns the Worldcon, other cons of whatever persuasion or loyalties, and groups. I think a motion should be presented at the worldcons and before all cons and group membership cons that authorizes the relevent officers of each respective group to sell their membership mailing lists for as much as the market will bear to the markets most likely to be interested in such mailing lists: sf publishers (pro and fan); sf specialist markets; writing markets; and so on. The funds thus received through the vending of such lists can then be used to alieviate membership dues and other pressing expenses of both cons and groups. A con with 1000 memberships (excluding duplications & c) should be able to charge between 1¢ (\$10 for the list and \$1 (\$1000 for the list) per name, depending upon the type of con and regularity and upon the market. A more realistic method and price range would be to split the list into a smaller grouping of, say, 100 each list and sell on that basis. An ad in a recent issue of a sales oriented magazine was advertising 300 names for \$8 and 1000 for \$20, with no great specialized interest. Worldcons are reaching 4000+ Trekcons 8000+, and LOCUS 173 reports that Italy's Roman Science Fiction Film and Literature Festival sold (get this!!!) one hundred and ten thousand (that's right, 110,000) paid admissions. So why not sell mailing lists to the market. Then use the funds taken in to offset the increasing costs of memberships, mail, prints &c.

My second item concerns all of us. The Postal ~~Distraction~~ Service will again raise their rates in October. First class will be combined with Airmail and will be 12¢. Other classes will jump considerably. The ramifications are not yet fully visualized. All faneds will pay much more. Corresponders will pay more. Magazines using 2d class mail will be hit by whopping increases--on top of jumping costs for production. Time has said their rates will probably double, maybe even triple if the rate increase goes into effect--as will the majority of all of the magazines and newspapers being published, if they do not simply fold. Today, a government does not have to seize zines or use guns and dogs to thwart freedom of speech and press. All they have to do is allow, perhaps even encourage, higher postal rates which in turn will make the publication of zines prohibitive. What professional magazines do you take by sub? Would you pay double or triple what you pay now? The time has come to put a stop to increasing postal rates. What alternatives are available? Suspension or limiting franking privileges that Senators and Representatives, as well as governmental agencies and certain past associated persons enjoy. Cease the stupid issuing of new stamps on a random and haphazard schedule in favor of the sale of ad space on both stamps and mail-related regulatory stickers. If special stamps are desired for collectors, then let them be sponsored by a company or business that pays for the privilege. Let the postal service be operated like a business, not a charity. But don't make the consumers the suckers. The only solution to continually getting the shaft from the postal service is to turn the heat on Washington--remember '76 is an election year, Also, pressure businesses and magazines and news-related industries to put and keep pressure on the politicians. For all of our sakes . . .