



A FANZINE FOR RICHARD ENEY +
and also anyone else who is willing to read it

A product of L. Shaw Ltd.
to be read, if ever, after
FREDDIE THE FIREMAN
FAPA Feb 1957

My first stencil of the new year. Jan 4, 1957

Lee Here

TO RICH ENEY IN HIS OFFICIAL CAPACITY (.00005 mu) AS FAPA OFFICER, AND IN REPLY TO COMMENTS IN SS: I see one good reason for limiting membership in combos. It would defeat completely the system of membership limitation? What would be to prevent the entire waiting-list from banding together and becoming a member? Well, possibly the giving of a single mailing bundle to them. But what about allowing separate votes to the entire N3F, or any other large group? That's throwing control into the hands of a clique which would theoretically hold only one membership?

I advocate husband/wife memberships on the grounds that a husband and wife, according to our culture, can act as an individual. The old saying is that man and wife are one. As an individual, they can hold a membership in an organization in which "Not more than sixty-five persons can be members" But they should share one mailing bundle and one vote between them. And any votes made by them must be mutual, and any laureate votes, etc, received by them must also be mutual, or the concept as the husband/wife as a unit is worthless and the whole system must be redefined. If husband and wife cannot act as a ~~member~~ unit and do not wish to vote/ receive votes, etc, as a unit, they should maintain separate memberships, or let one member be a member and the other merely a contributor.

The differentiation which Larry and I make on our material, such as my name above, is solely for purposes of identification on the part of the reader, and to help prevent confusion. It is not because we want the FAPAs to distinguish between us for membership purposes. individually

As far as AS FAPA GOES...? goes, I didn't vote/because I wasn't voting in the national election, since I haven't been in NY residence long enough, and because my husband's vote expressed the opinion of us both.

I would like to point out again and again, that a husband and wife, in my opinion, can share a FAPA membership only if they feel that they are able to act in regards FAPA matters, as an individual. And that is something the husband and wife have to decide for themselves. If one member of a family is a non-fan, there is no reason for him/her to want a listing on the membership roll, anyway. If the two are inclined to disagree, they will want separate votes, and therefore should maintain separate memberships. If both members agree, can act together, and both want to publish, under a one-person membership, the other person would probably be a contributor to his/her mate's zine. Under dual membership, both are likely to produce, and therefore add more to the bundles.

Lee on dual memberships (2)

As I see it our dual membership makes the following difference in the way of FAPA:

1. We are addressed as L. Shaw Ltd, instead of as Lee Shaw.

2. Larry is not consuming a second mailing bundle, and space on the roster, such as he would if he'd stayed on the waiting list and gotten his own membership. So someone else will be able to join in his place.

3. Larry is actively reading and contributing to the mailings. He would undoubtedly do these anyway, since it is his interest and not his name on the roster, that makes for his contributing. But he is possibly contributing (or will contribute if he ever gets time) more than he would as a mailing-reading non-member. I wonder if a m-r n-m would feel free to do mailing comments, or would have the inclination? Larry puts more time into reading the zines and writing comments than I do. (Since he makes notes and rough-drafts instead of stencil-composing like I do, more of my work eventually filters through. But Larry has the interest.)

4. We act cooperatively in our mags, instead of competitively. If we were separate members, and one of us landed higher on a FAPA laureate poll (Since we'd be voting for ourselves, we're certain we'd get onto the poll results somehow) it could break up our home, and ruin our maggiège. Ghu knows FAPA wouldn't want to do that.

So that is a part of my argument for the husband/wife membership, and an even smaller part of my argument against opening FAPA to group memberships. Little did Larry and I realize what a Big Thing calling ourselves L. Shaw Ltd, would be.

Anyone desiring to argue further on the subjects above listed should arrange to do so in person, or with somebody else as I dislike paper discussions on the grounds that between through-the-mail bits of the argument, I lose interest.

Wonder why my a is all of a sudden out of line....

The name of that McCurdy record we mentioned in FREDDIE THE FIREMAN is (in full) WHEN DALLIANCE WAS IN FLOWER AND MAIDENS LOST THEIR HEADS.

It suddenly occurs to me that STUPEFYING STORIES is listed as a Letter Substitute and nowhere in it can I find anything about FAPA distribution. Eney, you better have sent copies to the membership, or this stuff of mine is going to confuse a number of people. Well, maybe you can reprint your comments in the next mailing.

Or something.

Lee still to Eney (3)

Speaking of Hi Fi, our machine is one of the package units that the public relations people label hi-fi. It is a Webcor with 6V6s and three speakers, so is closer to hi-fi than the machine I saw once that had a "hi-Fi" label, a 3516, a selenium rectifier, a dual needle cartridge, and a three inch speaker.

But what I started to say was that, anticipating the prospect of buying a component hi-fi in about a year or two, and because we were bitterly saddened by a recent experience, we've embarked on a new program ~~of~~ of handling our phono records in a decent manner.

The saddening experience came recently when I discovered a groove jump in one of my favorite discs. Most of my LPs were ruined somehow en route from Savannah to NY. Almost everyone I brought from Savannah is scratched up, and some are virtually unplayable. But when I discovered how badly the records we had bought since being married were holding up, we decided that we liked our music too much to let the phono-changer throw them around, and to slip them unprotected in and out of coarse folders. So we bought a mess of surface spray, "discovers" (I think that is the right trade name), and a new needle. We tied back the changer arm, so that it could be loosed for 45's, and 78's, but so that it wouldn't accidentally swing over while we were putting on a record, and scrape across the surface, as happened once. And we took to hand-changing the lps, and keeping them in the film shucks, inside their folders, and properly stored. We've been unsystematically going through the collection, separating the good records from the damaged ones, and marking their folders. From the stock of damaged ones, we're making a list of the ones that have got to be replaced.

And we are dubbing off tapes of the good records that we like to play often. That way we can put on a tape, and here the music from several discs without the bother of changing, or the waste or needle and groove wear.

True, the dubs are not hi-fi. Neither is the phono, ~~mmm~~ by honest definition, and when one is working around the house, like I am, and has a tin ear, like I do, it takes real low fidelity to be annoying. While none of the dubs are of suitable quality to be played to others, they all suit me.

Blasted "a". Wonder what's got into it????? Pretty soon it'll be right up out of the line. Suppose that's the problem with an electric. I haven't got the nerve to tinker with it.

I was going to add a comment on the Postmailing problem, but I think I will keep my nose out of it, thank you.

-----Lee