

-----  
maLaise #13  
Vol. 3, No. 1  
25 Jan 65

in which Dave Van Arnam is still testing out ABDick stencils and has found that the bastiches is at least a pica narrower, which is Wrong  
-----

No, Tom Gilbert, I didn't get your warning letter. So there we all were, sitting around at the FISTFA meeting, about one in the morning, and there's a knock at the door. The door is opened...a uniformed figure stands there ominously. But what is this? He is handing Mike McInerney a package. Mike is opening it. "Gee," he says, and hands me my copy of Apa L #14. "Tonnere!" I say, and then, "Guh, guh, guh, it's impossible!"

But there I was, at the FISTFA meeting, with tonight's Apa F mailing in my lap and last night's Apa L mailing in my hands. "Fleebl-fleebl," I went on to say. Then everybody but me sat around reading my Apa L mailing, while I went off and ran my head under the cold water faucet...

Rule Of Thumb, if anybody (hi, Tom!) ever wishes to repeat such a tour de force: even-numbered LASFS/Apa L meetings/mailings precede by one night the FISTFA meetings at Mike McInerney's; odd-numbered m/s's precede Fanoclasts meetings at Ted White's. Once in a while meetings are held elsewhere, but not very often at all, at all.

It was a helluva kick, Tom, getting the mlg that way; and the Eller contribs for the Apa F mlg. Thanks! And now it's time for some Comments In Depth, TOM GILBERT: You, sir, are Wrong. I most definitely mailed off your mlg Saturday. Late Saturday, true; perhaps around 4 or 5; but the pickup schedule shd have assured the envelope of getting a Saturday postmark and (from the speed with which things get from LA to NYC) of getting to LA by Monday. /&/ Shadow-FAPA? Gee...maybe if you cd persuade DON FITCH to third-class whatever he'd accumulated for the last mlg, then I cd combine in what I've accumulated for the one that shd have gone out just after FAPA/109. Now, where I realize that there is no longer a waiting list to FAPA, its having been, as Steve Stiles put it in Apa F, "blackballed by a bunch of skulking cowards, mad turtles who bit us in our insteps (we know who you are)...", still, I would have you note well -- there is still a Shadow FAPA! Shapa Lives! Consequently, I wd welcome with delight anything you might want to put through (125 copies is the minimum; 5, 10, or 15 more wd be appreciated, to have on hand for subsequent additions to the w/l). Anyone else in LASFS on the w/l (as of FA 109, that is) is welcome, if not downright begged, to contribute. ++DWAIN KAISER: I dig your comparison of FANNY HILL with Doc Smith's brand of space opera; everything does get bigger and better and more powerful as the story continues, in both cases. But that it also gets less believable...it ain't true in my case, anyway, for either type. Believability, of course, is in the eye, or Something, of the beholder (or Something). ++BDGOLD: Very sensible comments on free verse; I wd say that your point about line-breaks and reading is probably a more comprehensible way of putting it than my attempt to show that line-breaks indicate various subordinations of thought -- after all, that the line-breaks indicate how it shd be read aloud must take account of the fact that the way it is read aloud itself is intended to reveal the meaning...

-----  
Null-Q Press  
Undecided Publication #87  
-----

++JACK HARNESS: Your visual pun much appreciated (or, "I laughed my F head off"). /&/ Hey, here's a free Punch Line for you: "The winced and Future Kong." It's too late at night for me to think of the proper lead-in for that monstrosity...sleep well! /&/ As for judgements or suggestions on lines of poetry, Tom's interests me. Your "1 & 2 & 3, 4" form for the next-to-last line appeals to me; it's a good, solid, deliberate poetic irregularity. Tom's amendment to "1 & 2; 3 & 4" would, therefore, automatically lose out if it were up to me; ordinarily, I wouldn't consider such a change. But there is one variable in this case that makes Tom's suggestion interesting, and that is the sheer weight of the phrase either way. Bitter, dense, impervious, vast, these are big, solid, heavy words; they could almost stand with no connectives whatsoever (that's where the free-verse form is so handy; you can Scatter, and the overloaded grammer of the phrase has some of the weight taken off it) -- in fact, that sort of thing, taking out the small words, the useless words (as he described them), was one of the things Pound was talking about. I had, a year or so ago, the Experience of having Lin Carter take apart three or four of my longer poems and put them back together again according (for the most part) to his interpretation of this dictum of Pound's. It was a remarkably interesting thing to compare the version Lin had typed with my own version; the net result was that, though few words were actually changed, yet, somehow, it came through looking not at all like anything I had or ever could write. /&/ Welcome to Apa F, by the way (and the rest of you that Tom Gilbert sent your copies to me, through, by, at the office this morning, hey) (Hey, Mike, put down that mimeo crank!).

☐☐ RICH MANN: I find this "evolving neofan" discussion interesting; I'm rather grateful, myself, in a way, that I gafiated when I did (i.e., before the second issue of DARK UNIVERSE, back in 1953). I'm well aware of how long it took me to learn to express myself with even minimal competence, and the thought of doing this while in fandom chills me in retrospect. I was very slow to learn; in fact, FIRST DRAFT (and the rest of my weekly fanzines, he tossed off casually...) is a good demonstration of this. I am learning how to write on-stencil, though. But I sure am glad I was saved from making all the really stupid mistakes and all that I certainly wd have made back in my First Incarnation (I did manage to make one or two at that; but I don't think I'll mention that I seconded, as St Petersburg 'delegate', the nomination of Baltimore for 1953, at the Chicon II...as co-chairman of the NY in '67 bid, it wd be too embarrassing to let that story get out...).

☐☐ JOHN BOARDMAN: That economics may become an exact science, at some time in the (not-too-near) future, I wd be willing to admit; but that it is now an exact science seems to me quite arguable. Possibly I have misread you; certainly I agree with you that neither Marxists nor Randians have yet achieved exactitude.

☐☐ MIKE McINERNEY: I'd probably be willing to put excerpts of WHEN IN ROME... through Apa F/L, except that I'm writing the first draft, and if you've ever seen me tangle up my prose and fall on my face in fanzines, you shd see me when I first-draft fiction. As for sending it thru when Ted's done the rewrite, well, I'll then be typing the final script ASAP for submission.

☐☐ RICH BROWN: -- rich brown??!! What are you doing here? Oh, well. I think you've covered pretty well the NYC fan-scene. There's almost no bickering in the Fanoclasts because it was specifically set up to avoid any proximate causes for bickering in its structure.

NEW YORK IN '67! ☐☐ LEN BAILES: There will be more FDs, but it takes time to do those reruns, and I haven't had that much to spare recently. Actually, that's a "lie" (hi, Calvin!), but wd you want me to admit I'm just lazy? ☐☐ Hoping you are the sane...