
maLaise #21
Vol. 4, No. 3
11-12 Mar 65

in which Dave Van Arnam ponders over
how much information he used to be
able to pack into his colophons, &
thinks it may be Ted White's fault

EASTERCON!!

NEW YORK IN '67!!

TAFF!

Well, there I was listening to the radio a few minutes ago, digging an old D'Oyly Carte version of Pirates of Penzance, with several old favorites in the cast (George Baker, Leo Sheffield, Derek Oldham), and then the 10 o'clock news came on.

And so I learned from Fred Lerner that Rev. Reeb had just died in Selma.

I suppose that paragraph sounds odd in more than one way. The station was WKCR-FM, Columbia University's outlet, and Fred Lerner currently attends Columbia, as several current apa WLs attest. I'll admit I was surprised to hear him on my own radio, but it's a Small world.

The Rev. James Reeb? Odd name, and out-of-date occupation, all in all. But the late Rev. Reeb, doing his best for two causes, one in its (hopefully) latter moribund phase and the other coming into a long-delayed maturity, has done that which I, among others, have been too.. 'cowardly' is the only word (and I have been thinking about this for some months now)....to do. The Rev. Reeb went down into that land of howling murdering swine to help demonstrate that Man has come some little way out of savagery, and grotesquely both proved and disproved his point when he went down forever under the clubs of men who have in their ignorant bestiality themselves proved a point of mine I wish were not true -- that though Man can be better than the animal stock he is still a part of, he can also be worse.

I wd hate to think that machine guns and Marines are the only answer to this witless bloodletting, this continuing attempt by a clot of Southern jackals to prove that, low as they endlessly prove they themselves are, there are those who are lower than they. I can understand why John Boardman feels the way he does. Still, I think that the nonviolent approach is winning the day, and not so slowly that the Negro is dismayed. I think there's still hope for this country. And I also hardly think that the death of two men in Alabama makes us worse than, say, Indonesia and her imperialist war on Malaysia, or the Gbenye rebels in the Congo and their incredible slaughter of thousands of natives on the basis of their being "intellectuals" -- i.e., having gone to school... Let us not compare our oppression of the Negro with the genuine bloodbaths Communism and Naziism have been guilty of. Hm, End Of Speech.

☐☐ This is going to be another Messed Up issue. Already I put too much space under the heading, thru trying to be Clever. The paper this issue is again rather unattractively varied, I think, tho the white paper is better because we've switched to a better grade of ABDick ink, and it's a better grade of paper. And the date on the colophon will be Wrong, since I won't get the last 2pp of this issue done till the weekend... *sigh* ☐☐ Inconsequentialities of yhos continued on page 7. ☐☐ Ted?

Null-Q Press
Undecided Publication #101

MALAISIAN FLU :: A Column of Mlg. Comments for APA L by :: Ted White

...

BEST LAID PLANS DEPT.: It had to happen: right when at last I'd caught up with the one-week lag in my mailing comments, Dave has to go and shred an impression roller or somesuch. I suppose he'll go into the whole gory story somewhere, so I won't repeat it. But it's for the best, in the long run...I guess. I blew an entire Monday reading the 19th mlg and doing comments on it, and that's ridiculous. "That's ridiculous" was about the way I put it to Dave. "We're wasting too much time and money on APA L," I told him. "We ought to cut back to a one-week lag, and cut out this last minute rush and expense." What I didn't bother to add was obvious: too much else had been subordinated to that ever-present weekly deadline. Dave had a lot of work at the office, and I'd given him around a hundred pages on Probe Into Yesterday to be typed up, and he had done nothing lately on When In Rome or the short fantasy we'd worked out for him.

What had I said, a month ago, about cutting down on fanatic? Sheesh!

So this momentary disaster had its silver lining, as they say. Maybe with the more relaxed schedule this will afford us, we won't get so compulsive. Feeling that deadline bearing down on one can be pretty non-conducive to contributing anything worthwhile, too. The last four and a half pages (my comments on mlg 19) in my last column struck me as no where near as good as the first three and a half, which were produced under more relaxed circumstances.

Well, I hope I'm relaxed sufficiently now. The tv has been on since 7:30 this evening, and it's 10:40 now. First it was Lloyd Thaxton, who had the Shangri-La's as guests (the blonde, Mary, grooves me no end), then Hullabulloo, which was if anything worse than usual. Then TW3, not nearly as good this week, despite some biting comments on Selma, Alabama, and then half an hour or so of watching Chuck McCann showing filmclips of Laurel & Hardy. I watched McCann's children's show this afternoon at 4:00, to see what he was like on that, but I was disappointed. Lee Hoffman says his best show is Sunday mornings, when he reads and acts the funnies -- but who's awake Sunday mornings? *Sigh*

Anyway, on to mlg 20:

CARCASILLA #20: Gilbert - I am by no means an apologist for Scn. -- I think L. Ron Hubbard's god-complex has shorted it out pretty successfully -- but I will join Jack's claim that Scn. raises the I.Q. Of course, he means on measured tests; that's all I.Q. means, after all.

The first point to bear in mind is that an I.Q. score indicates only your ability to solve problems of a particular sort, on paper (unless you have an orally-administered test, of course; but those are rare these days). The second point is that the I.Q. of a particular person is by no means fixed. It is subject to two variables: first, it depends upon your specific condition when you take it. If you took two tests, a day apart, the first after little sleep and in a bad mood, your score would be lower than the second, taken after a sound sleep and when feeling well. This accounts for a fair variation in scores; people often score lower than they are actually capable of under optimum circumstances. The second variable is one's actual overall psychological "tone" -- to use a Scn. term. If a person is "low-toned" he will score

lower than if he is "higher-toned". Generally speaking one's "tone" is the average psychological condition of one's present existence. More a long-term thing than one's day-to-day ups and downs, but still subject to change. Scn. raises I.Q. by raising tone. I don't believe Scn. raises the tone as significantly as Scn. thinks it does, but I took a one week P.E. course, free, as a sceptic, and came out of it with a) considerably less scepticism; b) increased confidence in myself as a person (which I'd guess meant a higher tone); and c) a rise in I.Q. of around 20 points. So did John Hitchcock and John Magnus, both of whom were as sceptical -- if not more so -- than I.

The claim has been made that the tests Scn. uses to measure the before-and-after I.Q.'s are inadequate. I don't know, but I've undergone considerable testing in high school, civil-service job applications, the army, and an ill-fated Mensa application, and it is true that -- allowing for differences in the scales of the different tests -- my I.Q. measured somewhere in the 120's or low 130's before that P.E. course, and now measures in the high 140's or 150's. (I was one point too low for Mensa, when it required 155, as I recall.)

Now I frankly set very little score by I.Q. tests -- I've observed that those who score high on paper don't always meet actual life-problems as easily, and more than one self-professed hi-IQ type has impressed me as a total incompetent.

I don't know whether my own personal proof is disinterested enough for you, but I cite it for what it's worth. There's a lot of good in Scn., and one shouldn't throw out the baby with the bath water. In my own "squirreling" (thanks, Bruce), I've found a lot to use from Scn. and I don't let the source prejudice me. Go thou, and do likewise.

Re: your comment to Betty Knight. It seems to me that it is much more fair to judge a value system by those who practice it than it is a literature by those who read it. Presumably, the practitioners of the value system represent it in action. And their failings may well indicate areas of impracticability in the value system, as well.

I must confess your pleas for a cover from me are moving; I may actually do one for you. But, I should make two disclaimers: first, the APA F cover is from a master I did in 1957 for John Hitchcock, which I gave last year to Steve Stiles. Second, I am a totally derivative artist; I am a technician, or renderer, not a creative artist. I have an extremely difficult time thinking up ideas for drawings, and rarely can I execute them when I do visualize them. My paintings are almost without exception improvisations (wherein I slap paint or ink down and mess around with it until a picture begins to appear; then I develop it), and the exceptions, like my black and white work, are based largely on photographs or the like. I consider myself a good hand with a pen or a Windsor-Newton #2 brush, and I am facile with CraftTint and Zip-A-Tone, but these do not lend themselves to stencilling. (I do have a photo-offset cover coming up on ENCLAVE 8, though; it makes use of a sample drawing Andy Reiss and I did in 1960.) The BNF OF IZ drawings are taken from Neill -- as I explained in the afterword, and while I can claim credit for the stencilling, I certainly can't for the original art. Now that I've discouraged you, I'll try to see if I can sketch anything worth putting to stencil.

You don't understand the Fanoclasts. It is our perhaps unwittingly Objectivist stand that intelligent people do not have to be told what to do, when requirements are a matter of common sense. Therefore, as far as I know, no rule as to margin requirements has ever been made for APA F -- nor can I imagine the necessity for any.

Rules are a way of enforcing a common law upon diverse individuals -- presumably for the common good. But when the group in question shares attitudes and ideals as closely as the Fanoclasts usually do, formal rules are unnecessary. And that was the whole point of forming a congenial fan-group.

I for one have very little patience with the sort of fan who enjoys wrangling over rules. It seems to me that these people -- whom I think of as American Legion Types -- have forgotten the point or spirit of the rules in order to debate the letter of the rules. Parliamentary squabbling is something I avoid whenever possible in fandom, and the Fanoclasts have eliminated its possibility all together.

This has nothing to do with our "Individuality and Freedom", as you so sneeringly put it. As a group we encourage conformity, not individuality -- in the sense that any clique does so in order to perpetuate itself. On the other hand, we do not sacrifice our freedom, because we are all close enough in thought and friendship that we can tolerate our differences. This seems to be totally unheard-of in fandom outside our group, although I'm sure it really isn't. But I am amazed at your amazement that we do not need rules and regulations to hold us together as a club. You say "Rules aren't bad per se." No, but neither are they necessary, per se. You suggest "reasonable" rules; but if the idea is reasonable to start with, it probably requires only an informal suggestion, if that, to meet with agreement. I mean, who'd be foolish enough to make his margins so thin as to be unreadable, once bound? And if someone did, well, who suffers? He does. QED.

I shudder to think of a directory to NYC fandom. There must be over a thousand, once the fringe-fen are counted. I attended the Annual Open ESFA Meeting last Sunday, and there was something depressing about a room full of people, all of whom think of themselves as fans, who regard Sam Moskowitz as the greatest fan alive and have never heard of most of us -- nor I of them. You may be amazed to hear that this "Other Fandom" is producing its own FANCYCLOPEDIA. Yes, Fred Lerner talked Harriet Kolchak, of all people, into beginning a new one, to be called THE FANCYCLOPEDIA. (I mentioned this to Terry Carr. He shuddered.)

SAGANA #8: Boardman - Speak for yourself, John. I know of no other Fanoclast who shares your view of Calvin Demmon, and many of us consider him a close and valued friend, and would like nothing better than to have him back here in NYC again. It seems to me time you woke up to this fact; your disparaging remarks about Calvin do not meet a warm reception here.

On the other hand, I'd wish George Scithers a fast trip back to Palo Alto if I hadn't been there once and thought it too nice a place to wish him upon.

NIDDHOGGR #11: Dave Hulan - It's a curious thing to me: this dislike you and some others (like the Rapps, I believe) hold for New York as a city. I don't understand it, since I find myself judging cities by a set of personal criteria which boil down to: a) do I know people who live there? b) how convenient is it to get around in? and c) what's available there? Appearances mean little, because any city of size will have its attractive and unattractive areas. When I moved from outside Washington D.C. to Baltimore, I thought of Balto as a slum city, and I've heard others echo these sentiments. But I lived on North Charles (a block from where the Ostens live now) on a lovely tree-shaded street which I often think back nostalgically upon. Close by was Druid Hill Park and the Hopkins campus, and the blocks were well kept up.

My feelings about city-living are ambivalent. From time to time I threaten to buy a house upstate (and I probably will, as a summer home), or move out to Far Rockaway or Staten Island. I grew up on a farm, so I have few illusions about the bucolic life, but I like space around me and green things. Presently I plan to compromise by buying a house near Prospect Park, here in Brooklyn. It's a lovely park.

But in general my reasons for living in the city -- and in this city -- can be weeded down to these three: a) I have many friends here; b) it is easiest to pursue my chosen career here; and c) of all the cities in this country, this is the most complete and the most convenient. That last means a lot to me, too. I can't see living in a compromise city -- like any of the midwestern cities -- because they are neither big enough nor small enough. And suburbia turns me off 100%. I want to live in the heart of the city, or totally removed from it.

Fortunately, for all its size, NYC is a compact city, a concentrated city, and less than three hours' drive will take one upstate into the mountains where total escape from the city is possible. For this reason of accessibility, NYC also scores heavily with me.

Now, I regard Los Angeles as a pretty unpleasant place, city-wise. I don't like its nebulous spread-outness, nor the smog, nor the lack of efficient public transportation. But, if my job or suchlike took me there, I'd probably find myself an attractive area to live in. And my feelings about it as a city certainly have never entered into my consideration of it as a consite (I really dug the Solacon) -- because, after all, how much of a city beyond the con hotel does one need, anyway?

If I have an aversion to any one city, curiously enough I think I'd peg the Bay Area. It's a prejudice, I think, and probably owing in part to the way people like Terry Carr and Andy Main rave about it -- I always tend to react against things like that -- but I sensed also a sickness to the area that I could not pin down. It seems to me that the Bay Area, which has the highest rates for alcoholism and suicide in the country, has subtly invaded the psyches of the fans living there now. I cannot imagine the Bill Donaho of New York writing the Boondoggle, nor can I understand the amazingly irrational actions of other people whom I respect who live there. But, I'm digressing.

As far as cities go, I'm capable of enjoying a con in any city -- or even in a motel between cities -- and I just can't see basing one's decision upon one's prejudices about cities. Besides, Dave, how much time, if any, have you spent in New York City?

Your comments to Phil Castora are eminently sensible, but as soon as you began speaking of 'your' reality and 'his' reality, you went outside the concept limitations of Objectivism. Because, you see, you are now speaking of subjective realities. I agree with you, of course; in the end discussion of objective reality will always boil down to this. That's why I put so little stock in Objectivism...

K-LUTL-LUTL #3: Russell - Thanks to you and others who've reacted kindly to my "Views from the Inside" on writing. I really feel a bit of an imposter, though, since my views are inadequately reflected in my own writing, as yet. But I've been toying with putting a portion of a Work In Progress through APA L, if the reaction is favorable to the idea.

THE BIRTH OF A MOUSE: Al Lewis - Is this intended for publication in SHAG-GY or somesuch? It's an excellent article, and shames me a bit in my own lack of scientific pretensions. But

I shall try to keep from flaunting my lack of knowledge as openly as the examples you cite.

HOMBREN #20: Mann - Well, I suppose I ought to tell how I started in stf too...

I think I was always, as I said last time, future-oriented. I had a great sense of wonder as a kid; airplanes flying over the house used to fascinate me. We were under a commercial air route, and we'd also see bi-planes and other weird craft during and before the war. I used to delight in the great diridgables, and more common blimps. I still occasionally have dreams of great tangles of outre machinery moving eerily across the sky -- reflections, I think, of my childhood attitude of wonder at the magic of it all. When I started to read, I consumed the fairy tales -- probably more than was healthy for me, since I identified with the more paranoid and unhappy stories. I read the Oz series, of course. In the third grade I encountered John Keir Cross's Angry Planet, my first real science fiction. I started in on Heinlein and Rocketship Gallileo less than a year later. It seems to me I was aware of stf as a category then, but I also read children's mysteries, and all the boys' books to be found in my church library, school library, and town library. I also scouted the attics of friends and relatives for such rarities as Tom Swift and the Rover Boys. By fifth grade, I had a large collection, which included Dave Dawson and the Hardy Boys.

But somehow, although I'd read the anthologies and some of the novels (all the Heinleins), it was not until I entered eighth grade and high school that I discovered the magazines. I remember once, two years earlier, picking up a copy of ASTOUNDING, thumbing through it, and not being interested in it. Ah, woe... But the summer before high school, I read an ASTOUNDING, and then lept to my bicycle to hit every newsstand in the area for more sf magazines. I bought and read them all, for several years. It was a glorious moment in my life. And, by late 1951, I was a fan. I received my first fanzine in January or February of 1952, and started my own in August, 1953. Ah, youth!

Recently I sorted through my school papers from my junior year in high school. The math was unintelligible. The spelling papers amusing. And the themes and whatnot depressing. Not only did I express myself ineptly, I had little to say. Since this period corresponded with my third or fourth year in fandom, it pains me to think how poorly I compare with today's teenaged and high school fan. I never really thought of myself as having changed that much in my intellectual deveopment in the last ten years; what really depresses me is the lurking suspicion that I haven't, that I'm just a bit more facile, now. I was reading through some story fragments I wrote in 1958, too, and my writing style hasn't improved much there, either. This does not bode well for future development, and I don't want to think about that...*sigh*

EL MANANTIAL #14: Baker - cop-out, huh?

You're not an Objectivist? What are you?

GALLSTONE #20: Harness - Yes, and she took some Scn. courses here in NYC, too. But the NYC people don't seem too great.

The NyCon bidding committee is composed exclusively of Fanoclasts, and you can be damned sure that Judy & Co. are not.

WHAT SHALL ETC. #3: Glass - Your index is somewhat invalidated by the fact that your page numbering was not followed by the Coulsons. Better to have indicated the month by a prefix-num

ber and then given the actual page number as in that issue. If I wanted to look up my columns, for instance, page numbers like 82, 180, and 385 would not tell me where to look unless I had carefully gone through my entire file for the year at one time and renumbered each page.

NULL-F #40: me - I hope APA L members will accept this as general discourse along subjects relevant to APA L; I had you as an audience in mind when I wrote this, as well as FAPA. It is, in this sense, the first bi-apan issue of NULL-F ever published...

I was amazed at how well artwork came out on those one-buck-a-quire stencils. On the other hand, this column is typed on expensive, Sovereign-type stencils, because my job-lotter was too busy to sell me the cheap stencils even when I waited around an hour. I finally left in a new stainless-steel Huff, bound for Brighton Beach. Oh well. At least I haven't chopped any 'o's this time...

- Ted White

Over to you, Dave.....

...

TED WHITE: (NULL-F/40) I wonder how many people feel the way you do about pornography? I'm all in favor of it myself, as you know, and I knew several others who feel that it's never been proven that pornography/obscenity/dirt/smut/whathaveyou has any ill effect on anyone, young or old (Dick Lupoff and Lin Carter both spring to mind). It is true that it may offend some people's sensibilities; I believe Katya Hulan has made it quite clear that she dislikes loose language, and of course it is her privilege to dislike and avoid anything she pleases. Insofar as one shd not like to unnecessarily hurt anyone's feelings or sensibilities, one shd keep this in mind -- as in fact I believe I myself have in my fmz. I have allowed myself 'hells' and 'damns', a 'bastard' or two, and several 'sons-of-bitches', but all-in-all I have kept away, in fanprint, from the more scatological and primitive terms. That I am also known to have a pretty liberalized Army vocabulary and use it in conversation (except in mixed company), and that I have written several pretty Fundamental scenes in certain literary works of mine, doesn't mean that I can't watch myself in the mixed company of the fanpress. Hm, what this has to do with anything I can't imagine, least of all your remark that started it off...owell.

JACK HARNESS: (GALLANT GALLSTONE/20) God damn you, Harness!! (Sorry, Katya...) First you give away 'Aquon Forla', then you come up with the same theory on Continuous Creation -- in effect that we cd suppose the hydrogen atoms are reappearing from somewhere. My theory was slightly different, however; I merely thot it possible that the galaxies expanding beyond the limits of the red shift might somehow account. And not only do you think Ahead of me, you express yourself more clearly and far more wittily. +++ Your remark about "mentation is not an attribute of matter," and the other remarks on Scn by you and by TW, have gotten me interested. But I suppose any Basic Texts on Scn wd be pretty expensive...owell. +++ I wish also to associate myself with Ted's habit of more or less automatically taking the opposite side in a dogmatic argument, and with your caution on such absolutist response. The danger of taking the Other Side can also be that, tho you might well agree with the speaker, you find on pressing him that he can't defend the position you both are really more or less in agreement on...it can be Disillusioning. +++ You seem to have picked out a number of flaws in Ed Baker's arguments. I hope he answers them rather than simply sneering at them; there's been a bit too much of that substitute for discussion on Both Sides (Present company excepted).

BRUCE PELZ: (FANZINE SALE/3) If I didn't have the sure feeling that all the items you are listing (especially the ones I wd especially like to buy) are selling out immediately, I'd send you some money...I'd love a fair run of FANACs or FLABBERGHASTINGS or G²s or GAMBITs or HYPHENs...owell (as I seem to have said before, this issue).

ED BAKER: (ELManential/14) In Brandon's '63 report (in AL/17) he spoke of a "...growing...revolt against the prevailing dogmas of our age:...(1)...(2) depravity worship in art..."{{my ()s}}. I'll grant you that my violent antipathy towards Stupid opinions such as that one may have caused me to overstate my case; my Anticensorship Button was pushed rather briskly. Your point. +++I also grant you that your (possible) inability to prove Rand's theories wd not disprove them. +++ 1. P-K4, P-K4; 2. P-Q3, P-QKt3; 4. -- +++Your remark to Bill Glass, to pick a title from Smith or Tolkien, reminds me, or inspires me, to remark to TED WHITE before I forget it, that if I have a col'm in BEARDMUTTERINGS I'm gonna call it "Area K." All right, JACK HARNESS, field that one!

I. DUNNOWHO: Several people (it may have been in AL/21, which I have in hand as I write this) have remarked with regret that their comments are incomplete or scant certain people because they ran out of space before they'd gotten thru the whole mlg (in sequence). I wonder if anyone ever noticed (either in AF or AL or, for that matter in my sole appearance to date in SAPS) my solution to this dilemma. It has not held true with maLaise for the most part because I've given up any attempt at Completeness Of Comment. I always comment from the back of the mlg. Ho.

KATYA HULAN: (OUTSIDE WORLD/5) Your recipes make fascinating reading; it sounds like an incredible amount of work, cooking...the most complicated bit of cooking I ever did was to roast some five pounds of first-cut rib roast, whatever that may mean. It was incredibly delicious, and all I did was put it in for some 3, 4 hours till the thermometer had registered the proper heat for the proper length of time that the directions said were required to get it well-done. Delicious. I refrigerated what I didn't eat, of course; but the next day, it was almost inedible, and that ended the Experimentive Cooking phase of my existence. Cooking's just too complicated for me. Marriage is the only answer.

RICH MANN: (HOMEBREW/20) Yes, I loved miniature golf; then also, at the last Fanoclasts meeting but one, came the first stirrings of Paper-Route Fandom...rich brown, Ross Chamberlain, myself, Ted White, we sat around for half an hour comparing the various ways of folding newspapers prior to sailing them thru a customer's picture-window...

AL LEWIS: (THE BIRTH OF A MOUSE!) You define neatly several typical sf stories and their utility in collections ('downbeat' stories and what they usually accomplish, is what I'm thinking about). Your scientific demolishings were quite effective and confincing. One thing, tho -- I'd always had it in my mind that "high-grading" was a trick of conmen akin to "salting" a mine. But since most of my knowledge of words/vocabulary has been gained from in-context study, I've been wrong before on such points... I also seem to miss the meaning of "orbital radius is independent of planetary mass." Your conclusions are justly made.

T.H.EREST: I realize it's unfair, Tom, John, Dave, Sam, etc., but I don't have space to cover the first few zines in the mlg. Tom, CARCAS/20 is especially heavily marked; maybe another Extra Issue, to catch up (again) w/the mlg...which is silly, I suppose; hoping you are the sane...