



*Is this the "new world order" that George Bush promised? No, it's just the new logo for Union Street (issue #20 and Obsessive Press #119). Union Street is published by Jeanne Gomoll and Scott Custis, who reside in their home at 2825 Union Street, Madison, WI 53704-5136. Phone 608-246-8857. Union Street was created on a Macintosh computer—a IIx or an SE at various points in its lifetime—and hardcopy was printed on a Laserwriter IIINTX printer. Text was created with Microsoft Word 4.0 and laid out with Aldus Pagemaker 4.0. The Union Street Logo was designed with Adobe Illustrator 3.0. All contents are copyrighted © by Scott Custis and Jeanne Gomoll, 1991. June 1991 for Turbo-Charged Party Animal APA #60. Members FWA.*

## KIM NASH

### (APA BUSINESS)

(JG) I completely support your actions with regard to John Peacock's membership. But I am very uncomfortable with the rude, insulting comment you made to Hope Klefer. You owe her an apology.

On another matter, I think it's time that you respond in a tactful, business-like way to rule proposals. No need to take a lot of time with it, but you are the only one who can synthesize the issue when a number of people all make various proposals about the same subject. In fact, in business matters like this, I for one would not mind if you actually commented on matters published in the current issue, clarifying if necessary, and announcing the latest date on which you will accept votes. I think that you should allow at least one month for discussion (the one-month postcard method is not adequate) and that you should clearly state how many votes will be necessary to carry the proposal and what you're going to do with abstentions. Then, in the issue published immediately after the deadline, please tell us whether the proposal was rejected, carried, or died for lack of interest.

I think there's a lot of frustration brewing in this apa because there seems to be no clear method to propose changes. None of us, I think, wants to see proposals made at a Russell rate, but there is obviously a fairly sizeable support for a few reforms, and it feels now as if the proposals get tossed into a void and nothing happens: no one knows, for sure, when and how to respond, or how

you handle the bureaucratic details because you do not follow up, you do not tell us how many people voted, etc. It's not necessarily a signal of distrust that people want to understand how you are doing things (although in some cases it is just that, and in the long run, I should think a non-emotional, non-joking, businesslike attitude will save you a lot of grief in those quarters); it's just that it feels like a waste of time for all of us to be proceeding with slightly different understandings of the process. I don't mind leaving the formal rules vague on this procedure; I just want you to be clear about how you are going to handle proposals.

We, in turn, also need to clean up our acts and should respond to proposals in a much, much more businesslike way than any of us have done so far. It seems that very few of us actually bother to vote one way or another on proposals even though it takes very little time to simply say yes or no or no opinion on the matter. I suggest that in order to make things easier on the OE, that we either send a separate note to him with our vote (if we aren't submitting a zine that month), or place our vote first thing in our apazines, in a section clearly marked, so that he doesn't have to carefully read the whole zine in order to quickly find and count our votes.

I absolutely don't want to see business and administration matters take more than a very small proportion of the apa's space, but this confusion and the anger arising from that confusion only increases the proportion of the bureaucratic stuff in the apa. Let's get it cleaned up and out of the way and spend time talking about more interesting things.

### OFFICIAL VOTES:

(JG) In the spirit of that admonition, I hereby vote (my 1/2 of a vote) for both of Kim Winz's proposals to limit the number of joint memberships and guest zines. I think they are consistent with Scott's and my proposals (for guidelines, not rule changes) of last month, and I hope that people will eventually send in their little cards to vote on the matter.

(SC) I hereby vote (my 1/2 vote) for both of Kim Winz's proposals.



## THE OE PROBLEM

(SC) When I started writing for this Apa, I hoped that the practice would improve my writing style and give me more confidence. I don't know how much (if any) improvement I've made in those areas, but I've sure learned a few hard lessons about communicating with people in print. As I've said in the past, it isn't as easy as it looks. It's fraught with hazards and I've been burned more than once. So I'm sharing these comments in the interest of improving communication.

First, I want to clarify a few details on the Great John Peacock Affair from last month. Kim Nash never offered to let Peacock back in the Apa if John promised to lay off or be nice to Kim. Such a deal was never intended. Second, I would like to dispel the impression that Nash made his decision to drop John in a vacuum. Kim asked Jeanne and I our opinions on collation day, and we said we felt he was within the rules to drop. I don't know who else Kim might have consulted, but I doubt we were the only source of support. Finally, (as John Peacock pointed out) Jeanne and I did send out a zine under separate cover a few months ago, but we did so mostly because we had the material ready and we wanted to remain in the conversation steam, and not fall behind a month. We were *not* on must-write at the time (which John insinuated)

John is gone from *Turbo* now and I'm not going into detail as to why I feel this is a good thing for the Apa. If there is a discussion raging on this, I will put my 2 cents in next month. I think it is more relevant to talk about the OE Problem.

The Problem is not that Kim Nash is OE, but that he is both OE *and* contributor and is not dealing with these combined roles very well. As OE, Kim is doing a fine job. He has put the Apa together on a timely basis, streamlined production and introduced high tech solutions to the problems of out-of-town contributors. Kim is also an entertaining writer. Direct, irreverent, punchy and funny. Ideally, He should be able to wear these two hats simultaneously—writing freely while executing power as OE. Unfortunately it is not working out that way.

Kim does not seem to realize that his opinions as a writer are being given added depth and weight because he is OE. He

should not allow himself the luxury of making snide or insulting remarks at others in his zine because he also has vital official business in his zine. Hope has good reason to be pissed at Nash's ill-advised comments to her last month, but she can't really choose to ignore or remove Kim's zine unread (as she might with other contributors) because she runs the risk of missing vital Apa business information. She is forced to read his zine because of his position as OE.

Kim has weakened his case for dropping Peacock by emphasizing his personal dislike of Peacock. It may be true that he was justified for being insulted by remarks Peacock wrote (although Kim is also guilty of making insulting and insensitive comments to present and former contributors), but by stating openly that he chose to drop Peacock out of personal dislike, Kim naturally raises the specter in people's minds that he is likely to use his power against others he decides he doesn't like.

I trust and support Kim as OE. I don't believe, as Peacock suggested last month, that Kim would "lose" zines to provide an excuse to drop people or engage in other nefarious actions. But I *know* Kim personally. I see him regularly at Brat und Brau meetings, parties and social functions. Those of us here in Madison have the benefit of being able to contrast Kim's printed persona with the real McCoy, so I have a solid basis for trust. But out-of-town contributors must rely on what they read and word-of-mouth. Kim's warmth and humor don't always come through in his writing. When Kim said he decided to drop John because of personal dislike, how did he expect contributors who don't know him to react?

I think Kim is a fine OE. I also wish he had the time to do more personal writing for us. But as long as he is trying to do both, he needs to mellow out. His decision a while back to "quit being Mr. Nice Guy because it wasn't getting him anywhere" was not a good idea. It has caused him (and the rest of us) more problems than it has solved. His habit of stooping to the level of his lowest critic has tarnished his credibility as OE and possibly sown insecurity. The plain truth is, he is not really free to do or say what he pleases without consequence. The sooner he gets a handle on the delicate skill of diplomacy, the sooner some of his most vocal problems will fade.

## KIM NASH

### (NON BUSINESS STUFF)

(JG) Great Memorial Day party, Kim and Kathi and Dick!

(SC) Amen!

## PAT HARIO

(JG) I guess I'd be in favor of a more formal description of the "grace" option in the apa rules. As we attract more and more out of town members, the procedure that seems clear here in town [(1) Call OE; (2) Shriek in frustration, beg for mercy; (3) Don't do it too often.] isn't at all clear outside city limits. But I'll wait for you to suggest a concrete proposal before I officially vote for it. I should think that it would have to include a limitation for how often a given membership could avail itself of grace. In any case, as I said above, I agree that the apa could do with a little more businesslike conduct of apa business.

Your comments about what you thought this apa should be and does, plus some of John Peacock's comments concerning how he defined the apa for himself, got me to thinking about what the apa is for me. You said "we're all adults here and should be able to achieve, if not harmony, then a situation we can all agree on, even if it's just to tolerate (read ignore) someone whose 'zines we don't appreciate until they drop." Earlier in the zine you said, "To be honest, I skipped much of the political, scientific and NASA discussions." Well, I don't think it is always a good idea to ignore for the sake of a non-confrontive conversation. I've written to Diane Martin that it is my personal feeling that there are some political topics I *can't* ignore, because to be silent may translate to some as an implicit agreement with them. John Peacock touched on a few of those critical, can't-ignore issues for me. I felt that I simply could not ignore his statements. Thus, I've got to revise an earlier-held opinion on the subject of ignoring certain apa members or zines. I once gave Lucy Nash much the same advice you gave us in your zine, that she should simply ignore zines of persons who caused



her too much pain. I was wrong. My advice turned out to be a faulty rationalization aimed at convincing her to rejoin the apa. On her request, Scott and I even withheld certain zines when we lent her our copy, so she could more comfortably read the apa without painful distractions. But then she started noticing the comments from people responding to bits of those missing zines, and the comments referred to her specifically, and she couldn't help but wonder what had been said about her. It turned out to be impossible for her to actually ignore a member or an entire zine. An apa functions like a conversation. You can try to *exclude* someone, but you can't actually *ignore* them. It is fairly easy to ignore someone who is widely agreed to be boring because few people comment to that person. Take David Busch for example. By not reading his zines, I was barely aware he even existed. John Peacock, however, attacked. He says he considered the apa to be a place to yell "I'm angry and I'm not going to take it any longer!" Well, his frustration had a wicked edge. If the sort of conversation that John Peacock had provoked had gone on much longer I think we would have lost quite a few people—like Diane—who didn't want to stay in a zine in which people scream at each other to relieve their frustrations. [His comment evoked an image in my mind of a cartoon: picture a large party in which people are amiably engaged in several conversation groups, except for one obnoxious person standing in the middle of the room, screaming at the top of his lungs, "I'm angry and I'm not going to take it any longer!" Underneath the caption reads, "If you were the host of this party, what would you do now?"]

I have no desire to establish some formal way to expel individuals from the apa, nor to censor anyone. But I'm glad John made a technical error, and I'm glad to have this chance to get on with an apa that contains fewer senseless attacks.

I'm sorry to hear about your grandfather and hope that you feel calmer now about the process of house-hunting. Good luck with the quit-smoking campaign. Any way we can help? My cousins used to snip their mom's cigarettes with a scissors while Aunt Joyce was smoking. It seemed to work.

(SC) The scene at B & B that night was an unfortunate confrontation that was badly handled. Although I do not believe you were responsible in any way for John's failure to make the deadline, I can see how you must have seen yourself in the middle of the mess. I largely agree with Jeanne's assessment above as to why the Apa will be better off without John. But there is still plenty of valid criticism to go around. *Please* don't drop.

So how is our Realtor working out? Hope you are having better luck with her than with your last Realtor, and I look forward to more house hunting updates.

**BILL HOFFMAN**

(JG) Congratulations on getting funded, Bill. I don't know if I could easily deal with such uncertainty about my income. Certainly there's a greater potential for larger income by going freelance, but I would dread having to worry about whether or not I'd be able to pay the rent next month. Not being like my sister Julie, I *would* worry, alas. I hope you are feeling secure for a while and excited by the

work ahead of you.

(SC) With the exception of a couple brief trips to Texas, I have spent almost no time in the South. It was interesting to compare your impressions of southern racial issues with Kim and Pete's experiences. Amazing that people still say things like that to strangers, especially Northerners. I think racism would be just as entrenched up here, only the explanations and excuses would be more subtle.

Congratulations on the grant.

**LYNNE ANN MORSE**

(JG). Much better looking and readable layout this time. Thanks.

Re your comments to Karen Babich about the national origin of "hostess gifts," I think it's fairly universal. I've heard about similar customs all over the world. I was definitely brought up with the rule that one always brings something along when one is invited for dinner—a bottle of wine or some bread, for instance. And I've seen the custom a lot in fandom, so I'm surprised you didn't encounter it here. Most fannish guests who have stayed with me overnight bring along some little gift, and I've always tried to reciprocate when I've visited myself. It's a wonderful custom, no matter where it originated.

Lynne, since you mentioned to Kim Nash that you were eager to see a mailing address page in the apa, you might be interested in getting a copy of the SF3 Directory which includes all the mailing information from the official Turboapa files—names and addresses of all members, plus phone numbers for members who provided them. See the ad elsewhere in this zine.

My comments to Bill Humphries on his feminist argument against abortion *were* rather confusing, mostly because I tried to simply answer him without prefacing it with a summary of what I thought he had said. A couple months makes some conversations difficult to follow, a phenomenon that pops up occasionally when I read your zines, since we're usually several months out of sync. But never fear, just read how Kim Winz responded to that same comment. She said it better and far more clearly than I did. I wonder if another problem with your's and my conversation in this area is that we have slightly different definitions for words like "feminist," "sexist," etc. I hope you get a copy of *Sisters* (a fanzine published by Pam Wells, Lucy Huntzinger, and myself) in which there's an article of mine on this very subject. Pam is handling the European distribution for the zine, so I suppose it depends on whether or not you are on her mailing list.

(SC) I am not as current on *Star Trek* gossip as serious Trek fans, but I was enjoying the series last year until the departure of Melissa Snodgrass as script supervisor. It seems she was the latest departure from the show of several talented and creative people who left because Roddenberry is too difficult to work for. He has an iron grip on the direction of the show and has resisted efforts to broaden characters, expand plotlines and develop multiple levels and continuing storylines. The difference between the quality of last season's shows and this season without Melissa is startling. This season featured some truly stupid stories and an obsession with plots and themes about families. I don't have a problem with families, but they have stretched the idea to the end of credibility too often.



## JULIE SHIVERS

(SC) Were you as utterly frustrated and disappointed by the ending of *Twin Peaks* as we were? I spent the last hour more absorbed by how much time Lynch was simply wasting and gave comparatively little attention to his silly story. If that was the way he intended to end the season, I'm glad the series is finished.

## KATHRYN BETH WILLIG

(JG) So how did you like *Earth*?

I certainly don't agree with that excerpt from your mom's church bulletin. An "absolute right" is *exactly* the phrase I would use to describe a woman's right to bodily integrity and choice.

(SC) YCT Karen Babich about Desert Sword. I heard they changed the name to Desert Storm as a tribute to Gen. "Stormin'" Norman Swartzkoff.

## TO KATHRYN, JERRY, KIM W., JULIE, AND OTHERS

(SC) Re: Emoticons. I have a terrible confession to make. The awful truth is...I don't always read every word in the Apa. I have been known to (horrors!) skim. I knew I would be found out eventually. A billion apologies. After a scholarly review of the issue of Emoticons I have concluded that Julie is right. Emoticons are dumb.

## DIANE MARTIN

(JG) I've been speaking out more and more often on issues that are important to me. Well, obviously I've been doing it here. You've noticed that. But I'm getting more outspoken at work too, though not because I think I'm likely to change people's minds. These last years, since Reagan took office, have been awfully scary; I didn't really believe we could lose so much ground so quickly. I've come to believe that if I don't stand up for what I believe, that eventually people will walk all over my rights because they figure I won't complain. For a lot of people, silence means agreement. (The Rev. Martin Niemoeller quotation Dick Russell printed in his zine figures prominently in my thoughts on this topic.) Even though I may not have changed people's minds about issues like homophobia and AIDS or about feminism and abortion, I think it's important that people realize that there are other strongly felt opinions, some of them held by people working right alongside them. And actually, I think my publicly proclaimed politics *do* cause some people to rethink issues, at least I've been told as much. Being modestly famous in this tiny pond of ours has to be good for something, and I am glad to make use of the small bit of prominence I've earned in fandom.

To me there is one huge difference between war protesters and abortion protesters. Both protesters object to what they see as a lethally immoral activity, but war protesters object to an immoral activity that implicates them as collaborators. The US made war in the name of *all of us*, and we war protesters stood up and disagreed, "no, not in the name of *all of us*." The simple act of disagreement was treated as tantamount to treason by many war supporters, as if the Constitution stops applying

when war is declared. I will support the right of any anti-abortionist to express their opinion, and though I get really angry about attempts to limit funding abortion through federal funds, I accept the fact that that's the way our country's laws work. I wish we could pass some comparable laws to prevent the administration from using federal funds to pay for weapons. But . . . I would no more accept an anti-abortionist's right to assault (verbally or physically) an abortion clinic client, than I would the right of an anti-war protester to assault a congressperson or embarking soldier to prevent further immoral acts of murder in the name of war. To me, there is a world of difference.

I loved the comparative religion short course. There must be some masochistic, self-hating religion that could be described as "Shits are Us."

(SC) Once again you've managed to be thought provoking in a remarkably short zine. Your question about the War/Abortion "conundrum" was interesting, but I view the issues as apples vs. oranges. I am Pro-Choice and Anti-War. I have no problem with the morality of these positions in relation to each other because in neither case is the question of Life or Death the main issue. Abortion is about the freedom of an individual to exercise the most fundamental of rights, choices concerning one's own body. The War was about a government committing atrocities, manipulating public opinion and suppressing individual rights purely for its own political gain. The issues are not related.

What I found more interesting was your complaint that the Apa is becoming uncomfortably combative. I used to read Jeanne's issue of *Turbo* when she published *Allargando* and. I think the Apa has seen ugly and unpleasant activity within and outside its pages practically from Day One. I don't see recent nastiness being much worse than nastiness that has existed in various forms all along. People are getting angry and putting that anger down on paper. I don't think that is always a good idea, but I will say that I am far more comfortable writing for the Apa now than when it started.

## TRACY SHANNON

(JG) Hey, didn't you call Pat Murphy and Pam Sargeant by their first names at WisCon this year? So there you are, you're on a first-name basis with two professional SF writers. And I'm sure there'll be more. That's one of the great things about SF fandom, the friendly interaction between writers and fans.

Hmmm, a jigsaw fan? I'm not much of one really, but someone at the DNR gave me a thank you gift recently for work I'd done for her. The gift is a rather simple looking puzzle. Anne laughed maniacally when I said that it looked sort of easy. The sound she made reminded me of Bill Bodden when he laughs maniacally, only she combined her effect with tears. So maybe I'll bring it along to some party you attend and see what you think.

Yeah, I liked the covers. I'd love to see a list of what everyone else's backcovers said.

You should definitely send your IBM memo to Michael Feldman at WHA radio. He regularly reads memos on his show, *What D'you Know?* (and does not say where he got them). The show segment is called "Thanks for the Memos," of course.

(SC) You should permanently refrain from doing a cover of horrible puns in the interest of Apa tranquility. For example,

such a cover arriving at Union St. would inspire World War III. Jeanne would want to frame it, I would be inclined to burn it. The subsequent negotiations would be bloody. You wouldn't want to be in the middle of that, would you?

## MICHAEL SHANNON

(JG) Well, yes, probably the reason Viki's doctor didn't want to give Viki an immediate sterilization without all that counselling was to avoid a potential lawsuit. That doesn't make it any less sick in my mind, however. Here was a person who the doctor had himself predicted would *die* if she gave birth, and the doctor was so worried about a potential lawsuit, that he allowed her to go through six months of grave risk in order to insulate *himself* from a very, very small risk. Viki was sexually active at that point, and although she was taking precautions, she was sick with worry about getting pregnant accidentally. My point in bringing up that story was to present the opposite case for your hypothetical situation, that is, that an *antiabortionist* doctor might very well be *less* sensitive to the bodily integrity of their patient than a doctor who performed abortions.

I agree with your comment to **Kathryn Beth Willig** re the controversy about the personal information data bases. I also meant that it seemed outrageous that *any* amount of money could buy entry into areas that should be private. I'd rather see all personal information available to everyone than some information available only to wealthy persons or corporations.

## KIM WINZ

(JG) It was great to see you and **Pete** in Madison for the Memorial Day picnic!

As you will have already noted if you read my stuff to the OE first, I agree with and have voted for both your proposals. I don't think they are incompatible with Scott's and my proposals of last month which encourage people not to choose joint memberships just to save postage since couples can share zines without needing to share a membership. You said you didn't get the point of my second motion. Well, I hoped that people would reconsider doing a joint membership if they were going to regularly submit two zines anyway. It's just a guideline, not a rule, but I thought it might be a good thing to have it in writing somewhere so that new members didn't think they were *required* to join as a joint membership with their housemate even if they were planning on publishing their own zines. I'd like to see joint memberships being reserved for exceptional conditions. My reasons are the same as your's for your proposals—to limit the number of joint memberships and guest zines in the apa: I want to keep the size of this thing down to one that I can manage on a monthly basis.

I've heard and read quite a lot about the computer game "SimCity," since my background in college was in urban planning, though I've never gotten the chance to actually play it. I would like to someday, however. One thing I've heard from urban planners is that the game is really interesting and holds surprising potential use for real-life planning. For instance, one unexpected outcome of the program, something that confirms one major plan-

ning hypotheses is that one can "win" the game by planning your city with mixed-use neighborhoods. That is, rather than putting industry in one area (an "industrial park"), residences in another area, etc., you plot neighborhoods to include residences, entertainment, services, business, industry and employment all together. This seems to provide longevity to all areas of the city, preventing any one area from declining into a slum and discouraging the strangulation effect of suburban sprawl. This was not apparently plotted by the games' authors, but urban planners are intrigued by the game's huge number of variables and the fact that this result seems to occur "naturally."

The Neo-Tokyo Animation fans are a bunch of guys (mostly) who got into a bit of a conflict with Lorelei Manney (who did programming this year) about how much time they would be allowed to use in the media room to show their videos. **Kim Nash** stepped in at one point to reinforce Lorelei's point that they couldn't run their videos all through "prime time"—first because there were other things to be run, and we didn't want them to monopolize the room during a time when the room is most popular, and secondly because their films are extremely sexist and WisCon is trying to reflect its feminist emphasis in all areas of the con, and showing non-stop Neo-Tokyo films didn't seem to be a great way to accomplish that goal. But that was merely the prelude. When they started paying attention to all the feminist stuff going on at the con, they apparently got rather pissed since this is not what a "real" convention is supposed to do. I think these guys belong to a group of con-goers who feels no responsibility for the cons, simply pays its money and expects to be entertained. They furthermore felt that all cons should be the same con, that there is a "right" and a "wrong" way of doing conventions. So they had all sorts of demands, but little inclination to actually do any work. They tried to block-vote Lorelei out of the programming department for the 1992 WisCon (and failed), but only one of them (—a woman, imagine that, and from what others say, the only reasonable member of the group) volunteered to work on the next WisCon. (She is now the publications chair.) They seemed to have a weird idea of how WisCon is run. For instance, they thought that the coordinator got to choose the guest of honor as a "perk" of the office, tended to discount the opinion of any woman speaking at the meeting (which enraged several members of the concom, as I'm sure you can imagine), and seemed entirely confused by the idea that the con does what the concom members want to do, rather than what the con-goers demand.

I guess it's appropriate that the most radically feminist of WisCons in recent history should attract the attention of this ominous group of throw-backs.

My apologies to **Tracy** if I end up repeating material that she includes in an answer to you. If there are any inconsistencies between our two accounts, believe **Tracy**. She was there and far more involved in the convention than I was.

(SC) It was so good to see you and **Pete** at the Memorial Day party. I had a great time. Seems like since we've been corresponding in the Apa, we have grown closer than when you lived here. Why don't you move back and we'll be sure to take



better advantage of the opportunity to get to know you? You can go to work for the State (they are desperate for computer professionals), the money's bad and the frustrations are mountainous, but you could unwind once a week at Brat und Brau with the rest of us. Winters may be severe, but the experience each year builds character.

Although I voted for your proposals on joint memberships, I'm not sure that talking about all this regulation is such a good idea. I'm not sure the *idea* of joint memberships will really stand up to much scrutiny—which is ironic, since you and Pete, and Jeanne and I are all part of two long-standing joint memberships... Consider that regular members must submit one page every two months for minac. That is to force people who are taking up space to contribute. Members are supposed to be active and involved contributors. But joint memberships allow individual members to subvert that process. As long as one half contributes minac (the same minac requirement regular members have) the other half can carry on for months without contributing anything. Full and unrestricted access to the Apa at no risk or cost. That subverts the purpose of minac requirement. On the other hand, a pair of writers can contribute full blown individual zines every month, expanding the size of the Apa beyond its 25 plus 5 limit. None of this is meant as a criticism of *anyone* or how people are choosing to contribute. I just want to point out that maybe we shouldn't rock the boat on this issue. Perhaps we should think about discouraging more joint memberships, period.

**MIKE DUCHARME**

(SC) OK, it was minac, but it was fun travelling with you via your zine once again. You sure get around. Do you spend *any* time in scenic Fennimore?

**ROSS PAVLAC**

(JG) We all thought it was great to see that Pat Murphy had been nominated for a Hugo. She really deserves it. I hope she wins.

I think you're bound to feel disturbed again by the back-alley abortions now that the Supreme Court has gagged federally-employed physicians advising women on their reproductive options. I'm stunned and utterly horrified by this decision, and have decided that I've got to start funnelling all my charitable donations to Planned Parenthood from now on. There is just no more compelling an issue for me at this time. . . .Which leads me into a comment about the abortion conversation in this apa: I know that quite a few people wish that we would all just give up on this topic, and I understand the desire to leave this part of the real world behind when you open the apa, but this is one issue that I cannot fail to respond to when you or anyone else brings it up here. You suggested that you and I call a truce on the subject, and I agreed, but if you're going to continue talking about it to other members of the apa, I'm going to continue to speaking for women's choice. I just plain disagree with you in your contention that anti-abortionists are practicing non-violent methods at abortion clinics. There may be a certain amount of shoving on both sides as tempers flair, but no pro-choice person has ever bombed an anti-abortionist facility. Furthermore, the anti-abortionists' verbal behavior toward the women who arrive for counseling or abortions is in

itself a very real form of violence.

Oh, I don't know about 40 being a "bad" birthday. The only bad thing about it that I can see at this point as I come up on that benchmark (this September, so join me at my BD celebration at worldcon!) is the stupid kidding that seem to have become a traditional part of the event, you know, black decorations, senility jokes, etc. I've never had any problem "admitting" my age, and I don't anticipate any problem with 40. After all, I've been saying that I am "going to be 40" all year already.

**JERRY KAUFMAN**

(JG) Welcome back to Turbo!

Thanks for telling us the story of Janecon. Damn it, I wish that I'd been able to make it for Jane and Luke's wedding. It seemed to me that something extra-special was up when—a week before the event—Debbie Notkin called Ellen Franklin and told her that Ellen and I really *must* attend. It turned out that Debbie knew what was coming off and communicated some of the urgency of the event to Ellen in her phone conversation. But I just filed away the funny feeling and sighed and said it was just impossible for me to go. Ah well.

While you, Nevenah, Vijay, and Karen were waiting for rescue up in Baraboo, Scott and I were waiting for you at Andy and Carrie's house, but finally had to take off before you arrived so that Scott could get to work. (There's another car that couldn't come to your assistance.) And then, we left for Austin by train the next day. So I'm sorry I missed your Madison visit...

You're right—art, literature, movies, music, etc. should be added to the list of religion, tarot cards, etc. as useful models that can help to better understand interior problems. One can jab a finger at a random paragraph in the bible and hope to find an answer to a personal problem, or search for meaning to life in a piece of music. The process is the same. But I'm not any more worried about channeling being intrinsically harmful than I would be about a novel or astrology chart. People figure out ways to believe what they want to believe about themselves. And if they want to deceive themselves, one way is as good as any other.

(SC) Welcome back. Thank God, two trip reports I have been hoping to hear more about for weeks. Janecon and the Infamous Turbo Breakdown Enroute to Madison. Thanks.

.....

**SF<sup>3</sup> DIRECTORY NOW AVAILABLE**

.....

- Contains the names, addresses, and some
- phone numbers for all Turboapa members, Madison
- SF group members, WisCon concom members,
- and even a few midwestern cons, Madison copy
- shops and game stores. Spiffy, *au current* cover by
- J. Gomoll. Send \$1.00 (US), or \$2.00 (foreign) for
- one copy of the directory to Jeanne Gomoll, 2825
- Union Street, Madison, WI 53704, USA . **Make**
- **checks payable to SF<sup>3</sup>**. If you want more than one
- copy, send along an extra 50¢ per additional copy.
- If you would like your birthday listed with the next
- version of the SF<sup>3</sup> Directory, or if you have a correc-
- tion, please send information along.

.....