

AN EGObOO A DAY FROM ALL OVER 2

or, YES, SETH, WE ALSO GET LETTERS.

Many of these, though not all, came after THE ADMIRABLE CRYCON.; all are appreciated as are those that didn't get squeezed in here or couldn't be located in time. The first "Egoboo A Day From All Over" was edited by Terry Carr and included as a rider with FANAC 56, 19 April 1960; sorry, no copies are left.

DONALD W ANDERSON: Over the last few months I have come to realize that the Breen-edited issues of FANAC have become more and more welcome with each issue. For what it is worth, I want to say thanks for interesting and informative comment, for the personality that you project through your zine, and for just making the zine what it is. # The con-report made very pleasant reading. I found your description of the SaM debacle hilarious, though I suspect that it seemed more embarrassing than funny at the time. If you are anything like me, in a case such as this you find yourself suffering the embarrassment that the true culprit is too ignorant to feel. # Reports such as this make me wish more than ever that I could attend a con, but the outlook is bleak. # Thanks again for a very interesting series of FANACs, and keep up the good work. # ROCHESTER IN 66!

RUTH BERMAN: "The Admirable CRYCon" (Yes, Mr Barrie, and then what happened?) ((Why, the Admirable ChiCon, of course.)) is an admirable report. It gives what happened plus your reactions to what happened without being dull in the former or whiny in the latter. Only trouble is a slight awkwardness in style. Am I right in supposing that you spent a lot of time on the report, but not as much as you'd have liked? # My, isn't "Beanie" wonderful! Especially the "Stranger" bit.

¶ It was second-draft only, and I had to go to press. The major problem was holding it down to 16pp and still getting in everything I wanted to say. # Ray Nelson appreciates your remark on "Beanie". The series will continue as long as I can continue to get Ray to do them. The next few strips, by the way, will have more continuity from one to the next than has until now been the case.

ART CASTILLO: Judging by your remarks in THE ADMIRABLE CRYCON, Heinlein has an admirable grasp of the nature of communism. He understands it well, which is more than I can say for myopic jerks like Anderson, Aszinnov, etc., who only know what they read in David Lawrence. They think it's merely one more corrupt autocracy (like George III or Louis XIV) instead of what it actually is, a virtuous super-morality of the Machine which refuses to recognize the validity of old-fashioned humanist morality. (Hence, their seeming contempt & unscrupulousness with regard to what we call morality...In their world, only the logic of Double-think can determine what is guilt and what is not. Anything else is irrelevant.) But Heinlein, like the others, doesn't quite understand the genesis of the Totalitarian attitude. He doesn't quite grasp where it came from and how we got that way, largely because--like the others--he doesn't want to. And he doesn't want to because it would mean an indictment not only of Christianity but of Beloved Science (not to mention the concept of organized militarism--"heroism"--stemming from Rome). ... Of course Heinlein is dead wrong in calling communism a "religion". It is a super-scientific theory. This is the same mistake Parkinson makes in referring to communism as a "theocracy". But religion is based on organic desires projected onto the universe as anthropocentric illusions, i.e. "faith", whereas a theory is (when it becomes a Way of Life) an attempt to repress emotion, and the dedicated Red Dialectical Materialist is a super-theorist who tries to repress ALL emotion and carry scientism to its logical conclusion. (Fortunately, scientism

contains the seeds of its own destruction, not so much in biology as in psychology and psychoanalysis.) ... Science for science's sake is not only as futile as art for art's sake, it is absolutely D*A*N*G*E*R*O*U*S. Unless, like art, it can be related to a humane religion, a way of life, a psychological attitude, an ideology, --which defines man's relationship to nature, god, tao (or whatever you want to call it), and to himself and his fellow man, it will inevitably lead to regimentation.

¶ I saw this spelled out almost verbatim in some of B.F. Skinner's more messianic passages in that dreadful piece of propaganda masquerading as stf, "Walden Two". It is also implicit in the quote from Madison Ave. Magazine reproduced in my review of THE REALIST #29. It is also hinted at in "The Space Merchants", though I suspect you had 1984 more in mind. Strange how the Search For Truth as a Way Of Life can give rise to such diametrically opposite results. But of course the answer is obvious--the scientific method does not involve any judgment of values, and so it is used (under orders from the military and political leaders) as readily in developing Bigger & Better Bombs as for finding a cure for cancer. Put that way, it's almost a truism. # But Art, everything depends on how you define a religion. I suppose you have in mind the content of belief among those of religious orientation, while Heinlein, Parkinson & I presumably had in mind the concept of religion as formally organized future-oriented belief-system, complete with hierarchy and Sacred Writings and insistence on literal adherence to dogmas enunciated by Authority. In the latter sense, though I will grant not in the former, communism still has to be called a religion.

It is in this connection--between Progress and Totalitarianism--that the Heinleins and Andersons and Campbells and Asimovs do not want to see because they feel they would be striking at the roots of their own reason for being. And so such people become unconscious fellow-travelers in the camp of the very enemy they profess to despise, simply because of this naive confusion in outlook. (And of course this is just the sort of thing outfits like the John Birchers take advantage of, because to them everything in modern life appears to be headed towards "communism". And they are dead right, but not for the ingenuous reasons they espouse. You could hang every communist on this planet overnight and we would still be headed for totalitarianism, because it is primarily a problem in ideology, in world-orientation, and not in simple politics.)

¶ I would call this letter a piece of egoboo in the Ted Pauls definition. I appreciate this kind of response even more than mere goshwow. # Something I forgot: The downward slippery path towards regimentation is also pointed to--even overstated for effect--in John Hersey's "The Child Buyer", a most incredible, exasperating, infuriating and heart-rending book. I hope that readers will not mistake me (or Art) for anti-scientific, or Back To The Noble Savage, anti-intellectuals. No, The objection is to this divorce of scientific method from an overriding humane value-system.

DON FITCH: I liked the old FANAC under the Carrs, and I like the new FANAC under Breen. #

It seems to me that using 1st class mail is an added expense not justified by the improvement (?) of delivery service; I'd rather see an additional page or two, and the whole sent the usual way. The emphasis on E. Coast fandom (most of the names are only vaguely familiar to me) is understandable considering that Nos. 73, 76, 77 were published there, & the lack of thorough W. Coast coverage is overbalanced by the treatment of the whole toot & scramble of fandom, or at least another segment of it than was previously emphasised (in the Carr FANAC). It is to be hoped that FANAC will eventually develop into a truly international publication covering all aspects of fandom. # Has anyone suggested that FANAC include a checklist of all fmz pubbed between issues? Or would this be entirely impracticable? Something of the sort is needed somewhere.

¶ You got your wish, Don; it was a choice between reverting to 3rd class with the last few BIG issues, and spending unconscionably huge amounts on 1st class postage & envelopes. 12¢ apiece on #78-plus-conreport x 250 copies is TOO MUCH. # Between FANAC, AXE, TNFF & HAVERINGS the fmz field gets pretty well covered. But I know of no faned right now who gets EVERY crudzine published, with the possible though improbable exceptions of Harry Warner, E.Coast Al Lewis for the Fmz Foundation, and maybe Pelz.

FRED GALVIN: I'm beginning to suspect that a Gigantic Conspiracy is afoot to keep me from getting my mail. I didn't think too much of it when my copies of FANAC...were lost in the mail; my magazines, fmz, postal chess cards, etc., have been getting lost for years, so that I've gotten used to this & come to accept it as the normal state of affairs. Well, last Wed. the latest SFBook Club selections...arrived here, about 5 weeks late, postmarked "St. Paul Island, Alaska" and stamped "Missent to St. Paul Island, Alaska". Now St. P. Island, as I discovered (I had never heard of it before), is one of the Pribilof Islands in the Bering Sea; it has an area of 35 sq. mi., and the population consists of a few hundred Aleut Indians and a lot of seals. The books took 16 days to get back to me from the date they were postmarked in Alaska. I can see how mail addressed to St. Paul Island, Alaska, might end up in St. Paul, Minn., by mistake, but vice versa...? Why didn't THEY want me to get my copies of FANAC? When will THEY strike next? Anyway, now we know where my missing fmz are--they're probably on the Pribilof Islands. Owell, it could be worse. Suppose I lived in Syria, and the PO sent my mail to Sirius. # COMPLAINT: Why did you leave out the prices in most of your fmz reviews? As a result of your favorable reviews in FANAC 78, I decided to send for GAUL and VINEGAR WORM. Unfortunately, you didn't say what I have to do to get Bob Leman to send me a copy. ((Write him.)) Getting GAUL will be even more of a problem, if not an impossibility, for it says "trades & locs". I know I'm not clever enough to write an loc on a zine I haven't read, & I can't imagine what I'd trade for it. ((Most faneds who specify trades & locs or "the usual methods", mentioning no price, will send the first copy free. Write, sending 6¢ in stamps because GAUL is a Big Zine, promising a loc.)) # I liked "The Admirable CRYCon" very much. It was one of the least boring conreports I've ever read. ((!)) I think that reporting what was said in the various speeches & discussions was a worthwhile innovation. # The trouble with slogans like "Would you rather be red or dead?" is that they oversimplify everything. The choice between enslaved and killed is obscured by the fact that there are degrees of freedom & slavery: I am not now as free as I would like to be, nor is it likely that I would be oppressed by the Russians as much as one could imagine--

(You're assuming you would NOT be in a slave labor camp?)
and by the fact that a slave may not always be a slave, but a dead man will always be dead.

(I suggest you read 1984, or reread it.)
In any case, to decide to fight a war just because you personally "would rather die free than live in slavery" seems rather selfish and unheroic.

(Selfish? Unheroic? You're fighting for your wives, kids, friends, too.)
I think I would rather be a slave than a corpse, though that would depend on how much I would have to suffer as a slave and on what the prospects were of eventually being freed. (Please note that this better-red-than-dead attitude is perfectly consistent with military heroism of the traditional or pre-nuclear type. Although I believe that personally I would rather be red than dead, & that the country as a whole is better off conquered than annihilated,

(Ghod, what a ghastly alternative. Isn't there a third way--via conference table?)
I still agree with Heinlein that it's better for me to be killed than for the whole country to be conquered.) A more pertinent question than "Would you rather be a slave or a corpse?" is "Would you rather be a slave or a murderer?" and my answer is that I would rather be either a slave or a corpse than be a murderer. For us to destroy our nuclear weapons & resolve to defend our-

selves against invaders by other means, violent (conventional warfare, guerrilla warfare)
(which also kill innocent women & children & other noncombatants)
or nonviolent (passive resistance, strikes)

(in other words, first becoming slaves and then corpses)
rather than incinerate millions of innocent people, requires more courage of us than it does to throw H-bombs around. Anyway, we may manage to become slaves on our own, without any help from the Russians.

I think you've shown clearly enough that on the pacifist/ultraliberal side there is almost as much confusion as on the militaristic side misnamed the Right. I don't know that any simple answer to these problems exists yet, within the rules the western society seems to have set for itself (which are not necessarily the rules, if any, under which the soviets operate). I tried to examine two facets of this gigantic problem in the last two DAY*STARS. The trouble is, most readers seem unready to consider the pos-

similarity that their own positions might have to change. And so we get regrettable hassles like those between Leman and Bergeron, Roul Anderson & Art Castillo, GMCarr and almost everyone; the participants retreat, bruised but without having learned anything from the encounters (most of the times, anyway). Abandoning old positions, confusion, rethinking--all this requires considerable effort, more so if one has a great deal of emotional investment in a particular religious, political or economic position. It is undeniably unpleasant, and for many may well not be worth it. I'm right in the middle of it and I admit I don't know where I'll end up ideologically. The contact with fandom & having my nose rubbed in certain socio-economic facts of life have done for me what Hume did for Kant: roused me from "dogmatic slumbers". But enough of sermonism. Fred again:

Why are only the Hugo winners announced? It would be interesting to know in what order the candidates finished, and for that matter the number of votes received by each. ((Buz?)) # Say, about this Room 224 bit...I didn't know that such goings-on took place at s-f conventions. I mean, I mean, what does it have to do with science fiction? Say, are femme-fans auctioned off on the Auction Bloch too?? Why, I may even go to the next con myself!

BOB MARGOLIN: I can't tell you how glad I was to receive, with FANAC 78, your account of the Season. It was like living through the experience without being there. I appreciated your attention to little details and careful recording of anecdotes and remarks; like playing Boswell to the Johnson of fandom.

(I never thought of Heinlein as being like Dr Sam Johnson, but both were dogmatic...) Maybe next year...Chicago is a lot more accessible than Seattle.

VIC RYAN: As others have doubtless told you, that conreport was fine, one of the most "definitive" I've as yet read in fandom. George Price read aloud from it at the last Chicago club-meeting, and I'd say it--particularly the sections on Heinlein's speech--was pretty generally enjoyed.

HARRY WARNER: FANAC continues to be most interesting. I am happier to find the writing sounding more like you and less like an imitation of the Carr-Ellik style. Even the best tailored suit is a good fit only on its owner, and you sound much more comfortable in these last few issues.

AND PURE EGOBOO FROM: Dirce Archer ("Long may FANAC wave!"), Robert BLOCH, Redd Boggs, Marion Zimmer Bradley, Dave Bell, Eric Bentcliffe, Richard Bergeron, FMBusby, Anne Chamberlain ("You have kept the format & info at the same highlevel as your predecessors--bless you!"), John Champion, Chuck Devine, Gordon Eklund, Phyllis Economou, Don Franson, Phil Harrell, Betty Kujawa ("Must say I am most pleased with the way you've been pubbing FANAC. And the Season report is one of the best reports I've ever read--specially appreciated the details of the speeches and all--superb job, Walt. Congratulations."), Jackson B. Lackey, Bruce Pelz, Wm. Rotsler, George W. Price, Arthur (ATom) Thomson ("I think that your Seattle Con report was slightly fabulous - and one of the best reports I've ever read"), Claude Saxon, and various members of Berkeley, LA and NY fandom, and many, many others. Thanks to all of you.

Ah HA, George Scithers!

30 November 1961

This has been AN EGOBOO & DAY FROM ALL OVER, a rider with FANAC 82, & Irreverent Publication #25.

-iv-