

NO PLACE 3

No Place #3: for N'APA Mailing #6, December 1960. From (or by) F. M. Busby, 2852 14th Ave West, Seattle 99, Washington. Begun here-&-now, October 10, 1960. Hello.

No place to miss, was the PittCon; it was great. My count indicates that 18 N'APA members were present, or nearly half the roster. Not bad at all. SAPS had about the same proportionate representation, with 16 (memberships); FAPA had 20 of 64 on hand, for the highest total but lowest percentage. Dual memberships run up the number of people from each group to something like 19, 17, and 25(?) respectively, but biapanism and triapanism bring the total back down a bit. Anyhow, it is always interesting and a lot of fun to meet one's friends.

A Con is a pretty hectic place to get really well acquainted, though; all of us have so many people we want to see, that we are spread too thin and don't actually get to spend enough time with anyone, let alone everyone. Ten-day Cons, anyone?

And now it's "Seattle in '61!", and even though I expect to be busier helping to produce this Con than I was this year just working on the bid and getting good pointers from previous ConCommittee members, I certainly hope to see as many of you as possible here in town next fall.

The N3F Room at PittCon went over very well. It really got a big play on Friday, before the Con was officially opened, and was a handy hangout and check-point throughout. The manning of the Information Center by N3F members was also a good job and was much appreciated by the PittCon Committee as well as by seekers after Information. These activities, which certainly reflect plenty of credit upon this club, are planned to be carried along next year here at Seattle (and we who are on the SeaCon Committee will do our best to see that good handy facilities are available, naturally). G. M. Carr is taking the job of Official Hostess that Alma filled so well this year; I imagine she'll be able to use all the help she can get, so let her know if you'll be able to spell someone for awhile at one of the stands, hmmm?

And for SeaCon memberships, send two bucks (checks payable either to Wally Weber or to Seattle Science-Fiction Club) to/Box 1365, Broadway Branch, Seattle 2, Wn.

No Place to sit down: it's already clear that this Con deal is going to cut into my other fanatic; for the next year, letters and zines will be more and more difficult to get out. The 6pp each mailing for N'APA won't be a problem; it's the other apas that'll have to go on some sort of similar quota, so far as this typewriter is concerned. Oh, well-- fair's fair, and I have felt guilty at giving N'APA the short end of the stick; just because it's the newest is no excuse, really.

And speaking of N'APA (and about time, you say), this (6th) mailing at hand is a good one, and a nice comfortable-sized one, too. Oh, sure, it's inevitable that N'APA will get the fever to produce big, BIG mailings, and that the group will do just that, one of these years. But when it happens, you'll find yourselves looking back nostalgically to the nice comfortable relaxed days when you could sit down to a 200-300-page mailing and comment on it at length and at leisure, easily. The recent pagecount-boom in SAPS has convinced me of one thing: that an apa needs enough low-activity types to keep the whole thing from getting completely out of hand.

Tell you what, though-- sometime a year or more from now, after we're rested-up from "Seattle in '61!" around here, and anybody wants to plunk for one big oversize mailing, just lemme know, and pages will fly like unto bees from the hive.

No Place to be counting on one's fingers: on our homeward-bound stopover at Wrai Ballard's after PittCon, we got onto the subject of overlap between apas. At that time I made up a little chart of this relationship between SAPS and FAPA, from the CO rosters (July and August, respectively) of those organizations. Then, after I got home and received the 6th N'APA mailing, it was possible to make up a similar tabulation of N'APA overlap with each of the aforementioned groups. The results may be of some interest; if so, please turn the page.

The N'APA roster shows 39 members: 10 of these are in SAPS, 8 on the SAPS waiting-list, leaving 21 with no SAPS affiliations. Of the 4 N'APA waiting-listers, 1 is in SAPS, none on the SAPS WL, 3 unaffiliated with SAPS.

SAPS showed 32 members, with 10 of these in N'APA, one on the N'APA WL, 21 free of affiliation. The SAPS WL (including "invitees", who were listed separately in the OO, but they've gotta either be considered as members or WLers, and they weren't members at that time) totals 27, including 8 N'APAns but no N'APA WLers.

FAPA-N'APA flap: 8 of the 39 N'APAns are in FAPA, and 9 are on the FAPA WL. One FAPAn is on the N'APA WL, and with 8 FAPAns on the N'APA roster, that leaves 55 of the 64 FAPA members with no N'APA affiliations. While the 50-person FAPA WL contains 9 N'APAns, there is no overlap between the WLs of the two groups.

Incidentally, that "one" who is always turning up here, is Ray Schaffer, who is in SAPS and FAPA, and on the N'APA WL. He is also in OMPA and the Cult, last I heard. And is a nice guy.

The N'APA-SAPS situation involves a total of 83 persons; 139 are involved in the N'APA-FAPA rundown.

For comparison, the FAPA-SAPS deal runs this way: 9 of 64 FAPAns are in SAPS; 2 are on the SAPS WL; 55 free of foreign entanglements. From the SAPS side, 9 of 32 members are in FAPA, 18 on the FAPA WL, 5 uncommitted. The FAPA WL has 18 of 50 in SAPS, 13 on the FAPA WL, 19 lone-wolf types. So the SAPS WL has its overlap of 13 with the FAPA WL, 2 FAPAns, and 12 independents. Total of 132 persons involved.

I'll leave it up to someone else to give the 3-dimensional picture of who's in one apa and on two WLs, and like that. Coswal and Jack Harness and I are in all 3 apas, if that's any help.

We should be able to deduce some fannish trends from all those figures. First off, it is apparent that N'APA and SAPS (to lump a summary of individual interests under short labels) are more interested in FAPA, than FAPA is in either of the junior groups. SAPS is more interested in FAPA than N'APA is, or than FAPA is interested in SAPS. Mutual SAPS-N'APA interest seems to be about even if we omit the WL statistics on the grounds that these should only be taken into account after the N'APA WL has had a few more mailing-periods in which to grow and flourish.

So, what is the significance, if any? Well, these figures bear out what we may already know about the various groups, pretty well. FAPA will begin its 24th year with the November mailing; the October SAPSmailing starts the 14th year for that group. So FAPA has a higher proportion of the old-timers, even including a charter member or two-- a number of these "eolithic relics" have long since retired from any sort of general fan activity, preserving their FAPA memberships as the sole source of contact with the fan world. So it's not surprising that FAPAns are hardly to be found storming the gates of SAPS and N'APA in great numbers.

SAPS, having completed its 13th year, is still considered a "young" organization both from without and from within it. With a small membership and relatively-high activity requirements, SAPS is subject to considerable turnover and therefore to a high degree of change in short order. Currently, SAPS has many hyper-active members who can't resist the chance to branch out into new spheres of activity. Traditionally there's supposed to be a SAPS-FAPA feud going, but it would appear that SAPS is abandoning the pitched-battle routine in favor of the infiltration technique.

N'APA, besides being a relatively-new and rapidly burgeoning group, is also unique in being the activity of its parent group rather than being a completely separate undertaking. Actually, the affiliation does not appear to have any great effect on the conduct of the N'APA as an apa, aside from providing N'APA with a ready-made captive-audience potential waiting-list. But as a new apa, mainly drawn from a group without overmuch apa-experience, its members are understandably and mainly concerned with making a go of this organization, just now, before getting around to branching out too much. It figures, and makes sense.

So anyhow, that's one view of the scene. Other evaluations, anyone? And now, before we turn the microphone over to Bertram Entropy in Leopoldville for a stew's-eye view of the situation in the Congo-- a word from our sponsor... ((Like, buy it)).

No Place to sit down: the 6th mailing, yes. The (CENSORED) cover on the OO is a thing of beauty and a joy forever. I'm sorry to see the "non-reply voting system" abandoned so quickly, in the face of enemy fire; it was such a beautiful club for an OE to use on voter-apathy, and oh the lovely lovely ploys it could have sparked. Ha! It is obvious that the present OE's soul is hardly black at all. Personally, I don't see why it is any worse to put the deadhead-nonvote on the affirmative side than on the negative as is usually (and once again, here in N'APA) the case. But, Bello, how about putting the mailing number-and-date, and next deadline, on the cover? And (this is also for future OEs) there are 4 main items to an apa OO: the roster&WL, the list of contents of the mailings, the Rules, and the OE's current actions. Consider for yourself which of these is subject to most reference by the readership, and which next most consulted, etc, and try to make these items most readily accessible in the layout of the zine. (This is a suggestion, like-- not a gripe.)

Bob Lichtman: "If N3f folded, what would happen to N'APA?" Hmmm. Now if the rest of N3F all died or went into politics or something, but N'APA members were all still hot-to-trot, then N'APA would be the N3F, and could determine its own destinies, couldn't it? // I'm agreed with you on several points which can be summarized by saying that it's silly for the left hand to advocate splitting the group so that no one should suffer the indignity of a hitch on the WL, while the right hand allows members to ignore those uncollectible 50¢ fines in lieu of activity credit for maintenance of membership. "Produce or perish" is a good motto for any apa.

Art Hayes: I was pleased to see by your #8 issue that I was not one of the people bugging you in your #7, since the time-scale outlaws the possibility. You and I do have our differences now and then, but so far we generally make sense over the long haul, after we kick it around awhile.// Congratulations on your new fine Gestetner; it's a tremendous improvement (and I fought with spirit-duplication for 2 1/2 years, myself, before giving in and going for the FenDen Gestetner that replaced Wally's 1913-model ABDick, so I know some of the spiFit-dupering headaches).

I thoroughly applaud your pitch for N3F to have fun being what it is (probably the largest single cohesive minority in overall-fandom) instead of working at being what it is not (the majority). After all, the U.S. is about 5% of world-population.

OK, now you do make it clear as to the background, and as to what you meant, about the Detention SAPStable. My previous gripe was purely on the basis of the earlier wording, and you've cleared it up just fine, here. As you said in a letter awhile back, you and I seem to have a real unique talent for temporary misunderstandings. I'm glad we don't leave 'em at that, though.

People are still worrying about the Directorate pushing N'APA around, huh? The present Directorate has certainly given the N'APA membership as free a hand as could be given, I'd say: no interference whatsoever, since the group was formed, and you can't hardly get much freer than that. OK, so the possibility exists that N3F might inherit some command-happy Directors; I'm on your side, Art, in that I don't feel like worrying about coping with such a problem until we see some signs that there is a problem. And so far I don't see 'em.

Hoo boy! So you are being initiated into the delights(?) of trying to run mimeo stencils on a Gestetner! We had that trouble around here off and on for a couple of years, but finally laid down the law: Gestencils or No Go! When we were coping, we crunched the lid down on the header and made our own holes, cut strips from used stencils to widen the mimeo stencils (just put 'em under the Gestencil and in as close to the margins as possible-- ink still leaked through on long runs), and cursed madly all the while.

And I shall not get into the cross-fire between you and

Bruce Pelz: I, too, wish there had been a SAPStable or some such gathering at the PittCon (or was there, and I missed it?)-- one of us should have hit Eney up on it. But you were wound up on all those lines in that play, and I was running around all crogged with learning things in preparation for "Seattle in '61!", & Tosk stayed home. So what is everyone else's excuse, I wonder? There's always next year, though, as they say in one of the locker-rooms after every World Series...

Howcome all this tizzy about abbreviating the titles of zines when listing them in the OO? The SAPS and FAPA OEs have done this at whim for years now. In Mlg5, Belle set up her format a mite too tight, and trimmed more for expediency, I'd guess, than for principle. (That's one item Tosk forgot in his definition. "The OE is evil and his soul is black, and Expediency is his Middle Name", is how it goes.) So there were 21 spaces for titling, and "A Fanzine for Karen Anderson" runs to 28. OK, so "N'APAZine #1", etc, was not a happy choice of label, but it's easy to miss a few good bets when you're in a hurry ("Fanzine for Karen" would have fit, and would have helped identify the zine, which an abbreviated listing should do as well as possible).

You dissect Bruce Berry rather neatly. I do feel, though, that the '53 boom did see a lot of fugghead entries into the field. Names? The jokers who published Vortex & Science Fiction Digest and Spaceways-the-prozine & Cosmos & Orbit & that abortion (Fantastic something-or-other, only 2 or 3 issues, folded over the staples with no real binding) that printed 1940 rejects, and the 3rd (1957) zine called Space-- I don't see DBB's bit of their bringing in "mental and moral filth", but to be sure they did dilute the field with an inordinate amount of crud.

I wouldn't be surprised but what at least 20 gines were published at the same time somewhere between late 1940 and late 1942-- but a large proportion of these were eminently readable, largely due to the precocious prolific talents of the late Cyril Kornbluth, in the lower-echelon zines.

Ron Haydock: Like, man, you really did go ape, didn't you though?

Don Anderson: Nice start, in here.// Adak and Anchorage, hey? Let's swap tall (but true) tales of the incredible vagaries of Aleutian weather, shall we? I've been in and out of Anchorage 8 or 10 times, but have spent a total of only 7 or 8 months there. Which was plenty.// I've seen some of that Hate Literature, but not for a number of years, luckily; sicksickSICK.// Good zine, and thanks for the pic.

Andy Main: A belated Happy Birthday to you as of at-PittCon; wish we had had the banquet on Saturday rather than on Sunday; we could've perhaps fixed you up with a fannish first, with the entire banquet crowd singing the appropriate ditty.

I still like the "something-published-for-one's-first-mailing" requirement. Heck, Andy, it's not all that hard to fill up 6 stencils. In SAPS, the OE will generally try to get a spare mailing to the #1 Wler, if that worthy orders one, so right there you have a start for MCs.

Tsk, I didn't notice anything about "Anyway the Wind Blows" until Phyllis brought it up, except that it was a good lively bit, being killed by the usual over-saturation. And I thought I had one of the dirtiest minds in all fandom...!

Norm Metcalf: ...or NAPOrganization, or NAPClub, or NAPHegemony (sp?), or Institute or Effectives or Publishers... I'd go along with any meaningful title, and your NAPSociety is just fine (except for its possible soporific effect?)

Maybe I'm the one who (among others) is doing the Commodore Perry bit lately...

Bruce Henstell: Glad you agree with me that we don't need brawls in N'APA, Bruce. // Dug your "Fannish Faces"; 's a good feature.

Jack Harness: The Numenorean title is a fine one. // Nice rundown on the extremes of FAPA and SAPS administration. As you say, N'APA will probably end up somewhere between these extremes (but also somewhere off in a direction perpendicular to the direct line connecting those extremes, due to original innovations herein).

You make good suggestions and comments re the conduct of N'APA (and its possible lines of development). And the psychohistory article is a gas.

Buz, you dope, you: you can clarify points better than was done in No Place #2.

Jim Taurasi: Hi, and thanks for the plugs.

Coswal: Heck, I wrote "in condensed form" in my ^{first} few SAPSzines, much more so than I've ever been able to do in FAPAZines. This time, though, ^{in here} condensation has set in.

I got the impression that you are going to be able to get all your projects and fannish activities into good perspective, Cos. Surely hope so.

Guy Terwilleger: Sure, Phone Fandom is great; it is a pleasant jolt to answer the phone and find a fan on the other end. We've had calls from (or made 'em to-- can't remember which way it went, in some cases) Phil Castora, Bob Leman, several Berkeley fans (and once, the whole lot of them, practically), Earl Kemp, Bruce Pelz-- I know there are more, but the memry-function is out to lunch just now... too bad it isn't financially feasible to go all-out on this kick; it is fun. I think the prize deal was a long time ago when the gang here tried to call Wrai Ballard (who has no phone, being several miles from the nearest line). The operator was quite sure that there was no such place as Blanchard, and she was a little doubtful about North Dakota...

Sure, N'APA will be your favorite-- since you've had such a major role in getting it started, and seeing it through its first year, and it's doing so well, and all-- how could it help but hold #1 place in your fannish affections?

Count me as against quarterly serials, Guy-- definitely (but not violently)-- apa fiction should be published in one piece. And one way to do that would be to apportion the typing and duplication as though you were running a serial, but save the completed portions until the entire story is run off, and simply put/a second zine in the next mailing, if you don't want too large a single issue.

While standard usage does not support your definition of "a 3/4 vote", I stand by your interpretation, under the circumstances, as lying within the OE's authority to interpret an ambiguous rule. The circumstances are that the original By-Laws (admittedly tentative) needed a lot of revision, and that it was not Good Thinking to hang a "3/4 of the membership in favor, to change" onto tentative rules. On any issue of any complexity at all, there are bound to be many viewpoints, not just two (FOR change, and AGAINST change). There are bound to be more than 1/4 of any group, who will want to trim and alter and redefine and nitpick in general. And it is an unfortunate fact that many voters are apt to vote against a change, or abstain, on the grounds that the suggested change is simply not quite right just yet. Personally I vote yes or no depending strictly on whether the change is in the right direction and an improvement over the current setup, without regard to omission of a "better" version from the ballot. Like, further amendments are always possible; the main thing is to choose the better of the available alternatives. But it is true that enough people tend to hold out for Perfection, that a 3/4 in-favor vote is not at all practicable. Why, the U S Senate only needs 2/3, to vote cloture, f'CRYsakes.

Very sorry you're dropping out of SAPS, Guy; wish you could've stayed with it.

Hi, there, Chuck Devine! Be seeing you as a full-fledged member this time?

Earl Noë: I see you are going to be a Live One here in N'APA, Earl. I'll be looking forward to your future zines (and hope to get to them with more stencil left, next times). // "Transient"'s Lampley was almost certainly experiencing a "schiz break": living in his subconscious during the story; LSD, etc, can simulate the condition.

Ed Meskys: So now you know about brown ditto-masters (and although my red-carbon pages are OK, I can recall how red rapidly became pale after about the 25th copy, when I was using ditto). // I am not, nor have I ever been, "Richard Ostridge" (who had the remarks on SaMosk in Mlg#5). After all, Alma described "Ostridge" as "a cautious fan"; surely you will have noticed in CRY as well as in here, that if there's one thing I'm short on, it's caution. And aside from the very-open-secret "Renfrew Pemberton", I haven't bothered with pseudos since the days (1955-56) when CRY was overrun with such as Ludwig Schmittelhorn & Erik von Spencer (Otto Pfeifer), Wadagobble de Gook, W Kraus, & Hubbard Green (Burnett Toskey), and Pierpont Holo-caust and Argyle McFoofnik (me). I dunno who is Ostridge, but I'm not.

My copy of Peskys on 5 ends at the bottom of page.P at the start of a sentence, and still has one more page than listed in the OO (Belle missed B', I betcha).

I hate postmailings! That is, I hate it when people postmail good zines instead of getting them into the mailing-proper. Quoth the Walrus and Memoritor 12, for example, are hopelessly lost in The Stack by now, along with PMs (if any) to Mlg #6. I enjoyed both these mentioned zines and clearly recall having several comments to make, but it'll never happen now. Down with Postmailings! Hit those deadlines, fellas!

This has been No Place #3, and I stenciled it myself. --

No Place to Make Stupid Mistakes (but I didn't let a little thing like that stop me):

Somehow I typed the entire previous page under the impression that it was my sixth and final stencil for this mailing under the Elinorial Quota System. I was skimping comments and sweating like mad to get through the mailing. And all the time it was page 5, as I found when I went to reread the stencils to see where my foot was too far into my mouth or typer. C'est la ever-lovin' guerre, folks.

So, a happy Columbus Day to you, one and all; yes, this zine was begun night before last; it went about $2\frac{1}{2}$ stencils that night and gefogged-out. Last night we had a "Seattle in '61'" ConCommittee meeting here, which cut stencil-production to about $1\frac{1}{2}$ or piddling-out at the bottom of page 4. So tonight I must have had some delusions of grandeur and maybe figured I'd finished more stencils last night just because it's more work when folks drop in early, like.

Shouldn't be too hard to dig up comments I wanted to make but left out because of erroneously thinking I was all out of space... well, it shouldn't be too hard.

Ralph Holland: I recall wanting to express regrets that you will not be available for the presidency of N3F next year; the more I see of your overall attitudes in handling the group, the better I like 'em. Naturally, we rebel types never agree 100% with anyone, but your general commonsense attitude toward all the huc-and-cry is much appreciated in these parts.

Switching from the official to the individual level, Ralph, I'd like to present a point with regard to your personal definition of the word "fannish" to mean "stf-centered". This would be OK, except/^{that}for some years, "fannish" and "stf-centered" have been widely and generally defined as opposites in the general fan press. So that your contradictory usage is somewhat jolting or croggling or mind-wrenching; in trying to follow your line of thought (which is otherwise quite clear). Well, I mentioned this awhile back in a letter, I think, but just wanted to put it up in front of the group, too. Anyhow, the thing is that since misunderstandings are so easy to fall into in any case, it's a shame to compound them by launching divergent definitions of an existing term with wide acceptance in the opposite sense. (Why, I might as well stand up and insist that "jeep" should mean what it meant in 1941 before Collier's magazine warped GI slang to suit itself by giving a garbled sort of version to John Q Public early in '42 ("jeep" was originally applied, by Army types, to the oldtime "command car", but with 50,000,000 civilians having read the Collier's version, naturally that was the version that prevailed). Anyhow, since "fannish" is so generally accepted as pertaining to "fandom fans" and the interests that diverge from science-fiction, can't we have perhaps a new and unmistakable term for stf-centeredness in fandom? (s-fannish, perhaps?) Comments?

No Place to run a bluff: Ed Meskys, I'm sorry that I haven't been able to get out a Dean Drive article for you. As you know, I'm supposed to get one out for Hans Santesson, and that too is in a chronic state of incompleteness. Trouble is that every time I think I have the math well enough in hand to do a treatment, I write myself clear off the end of the mathematical limb and have to go back to scribbling more calculations. (I've written and had to dump about 20 pages each of text and of calculations.) For one full evening, I thought I had proved (to my utter and pleased surprise) that the Dean Drive would work, after all; I knew that very likely I'd missed a point, and sure enough it turned up, next day-- and I still have not achieved a full analysis of the holes-in-the-theory that showed up when the hot air was let out of that formulation. So I don't think there's any way that this Dean Drive article can be rushed: it could be done in sections, as one aspect after another comes clear. But it would be pretty bare that way, since while the math would be solid enough, it's the conclusions that are interesting. And the doggone conclusions aren't worth a hoot unless the math is at least one step ahead of 'em.

So far, I might say, the analysis has not invalidated the overall picture as given by my remarks in CRY. The details are changed somewhat from those off-the-top-of-the-head comments, but each mathematical excursion, to date, brings me back to the starting-point: that Dean's device will do what Dean says it will do, but not what Campbell semi-claims for it.

And this is all for No Place #3. -- Buz.