

RPM #8, f/r 148.4216 from Norm Metcalf, P.O. Box 336, Berkeley, California, 94701, USA. This is also intended for the Aug 64 FAPA mailing. Since Choate's collection of lies titled Postmortem was in the last mailing we might as well have something in here ourselves. Crudpub #81.

Table of Contents:	Metcalf	page 1
	Donaho	page 6
	Rogers	13
	Eklund	18

Introduction for those FAPAns not aware and/or interested in The Cult. This consists of comments on the last few Cultzines plus some additional comments. None of them are too interesting PARTICULARLY SINCE MOST OF THEM CONCERN THE BREEN SITUATION AS EXPOUNDED RECENTLY IN THE CULT. So those of you who wish to skip all this can do so. This is not a typical Cultzine, thank heavens.

Pillycock #9, f/r 146.11218 - John Boardman

Boardman: Your remarks on the first page are based on an assumption that everyone opposed to Breen's ouster from the Pacificon thinks he's innocent of chasing children with lustful intentions. Try reading what has been said on the subject by those people.

Your sarcastic remark that Scithers' "...present location in Frankfurt-am--Main gives him an excellent perspective on the doings of Berkeley fandom." makes me want to know just what unique condition is responsible for some of New York's fandom being able to make false statements with such seeming assurance that they're right.

Scithers: I made no statement of Poul Anderson's position on the Breen situation in f/r 143.01 because I didn't know his position. I did make statements about Boucher's position because Stark and I had talked over the matter with Boucher, shown him pertinent zines and received his permission to use the quotes and statements that have been made by me.

Choate: You amaze me with your willingness to make false statements such as "Metcalf and Donaho have tried to cast doubt on the sincerity of the other parents' support of Breen; they have distorted facts to do so; a fuller reply to them will be in my Breenzine." Your other parents excludes the Rogers since I happen to be solidly with them. Ellington's attitudes, as I have reported them, are backed up by Dick's written statements plus one direct quote which Dick wished amplified and which I've already done. The Clintons expressed their views in front of fourteen other people at the hearing, including you in case you've forgotten already and further amplified by Jessie Clinton for an hour or so on the night of 16 May 64. Marcia Frenzel was both amused and annoyed by your calling her up to say I had published a Cultzine attacking her and then reading my letter in Pelz' f/r to see what you were talking about. The only point in my statements she wanted clarified was that while it is true she doesn't anything more to do with Breen she doesn't mind if her son sees Breen.

Boardman: Did it ever occur to you that the reason Busby has incriminating letters from Breen is that possibly Breen wrote them to Busby?

Why worry about police at the Pacificon?

Why do you keep dragging in such a red herring as "The Boondoggle is the basic document on which the Exclusion Act is based; it was circulated by Donaho before the "trial" ((sic)) at which the Con Committee expelled Breen."? As has been pointed out to you and others several times both Donaho and Rogers are eyewitnesses to what you consider "perverted sexual acts" (though perhaps you wrote those words with tongue in cheek and you do have a lot of cheek) by Breen. Breen told Halevy about himself and Halevy and Stark both have eyes. The committee had Breen's expulsion under consideration over many months, long before the Boondoggle. And don't try to tell me I don't know what I'm talking about. I was at many of those meetings.

Also, since you consider Donaho to be lying, why don't you read Dick Ellington's statement in The Loyal Opposition.

What has being parents got to do with the side taken with regard to Breen? We know what side of the children Breen prefers to take.

Boardman: If "the Exclusion Act has disrupted so many fruitful friendships" isn't it more indicative of the "friendships" than anything else.

Your listing of fannish "psychotics" such as Degler, Wetzel and ((D. Bruce)) Berry left out a couple of recent outstanding examples, most prominent being Claude Degler, Jr.

Pillycock #10 - FR 147 - John Boardman

Boardman: It's interesting to compare your reaction to Dallas with other of your attitudes. To quote you:

The city in which our president was murdered, the city in which a lyncher's gun prevented the alleged assassin from getting a fair trial and the country from getting the facts, the city whose authorities connive to keep knowledge of the assassination conspiracy from coming to public scrutiny, the city which still steadfastly refuses to regulate the promiscuous use of firearms -- that city has a great deal to answer for.

Your habit of making questionable assumptions, not bothering to get the facts, ignoring evidence when presented to you and leaping to conclusions which you proceed to proclaim and defend as dogma show up quite readily. Translate the quote into fandom and see if you don't realize your own inconsistencies.

Shorter: Whatever gave you the idea that the "charges" against Breen are unsubstantiated? You seem to be another one of those who don't realize that some of the committee members are eyewitnesses, one of them to Breen with his own child.

Castora: It doesn't matter how many times Breen hasn't tried to seduce children, it's how many times he has tried. Once is one too many. And, according to witnesses and Breen, he hasn't stopped at once. Look, when someone advocates such actions, tries to justify them and then repeatedly practices such acts, then quite a few of us say he's gone too far. And his present hypocrisy in not coming out and proudly proclaiming that he indeed has been living up to his principles is rather sickening.

Tapscott: I'm amused by your championing of Blackbeard's F/Reebooter by

adopting it as your f/r and your last "As its publisher, I respectfully disagree with every word in it."

Boardman: In my book a liberal, genuine variety that is, believes in human dignity, progress, greater freedom for the human individual and all the rest of the catchphrases attached to politics which inspire people to worthwhile ends. I don't consider as liberal anyone who believes in bringing about what they consider right whatever the method of attainment, force, law, falsehoods, etc. A genuine liberal doesn't believe in a police state (while lambasting police states other than the one he'd like to see established) run by people of his persuasion, death to anyone disagreeing with him and quite a few other extremely reactionary, regressive and anti-liberal beliefs. There are quite a few of these so-called liberals. Fandom has been subjected to at least one of them.

Look here, I happen to know precisely what is in this letter that Donaho wrote to the Knights and the Clintons. If it is slanderous (and not libellous, just how many times does the distinction have to be pointed out to you before you can grasp it?) then I can publish quotes from the writings of Marion Bradley and Walter Breen which would make the accusation of defamation by Donaho look pretty silly.

Apparently you've yet to get it through your head that the Berkeley police won't do anything about Walter unless a parent of a child concerned signs a complaint. Since the only set of parents willing to sign a complaint live outside the jurisdiction of the Berkeley police the case is being handled by another enforcement agency with different methods.

Verklarte Nacht #13 ((sic)), FR 148 - Ted White

Look here Blackbeard, do you believe everything certain people tell you. I never told Sapiro that Cox's article was supposed to be in WF #4. I didn't solicit the article from Cox, Sapiro sent it to me saying it was something I'd be interested in publishing. I didn't say when I'd pay for the article. Who do you think I am, a millionaire or something. WF is essentially on a pay-as-it--goes basis, though I have lost about \$75 so far on it (back when I could sort of afford to lose that much). And if you think Sapiro never threatened to sue me I suggest that Lee show his copy of a letter dated 18 Oct 61, postmarked 19 Oct 61 in Fullerton, California, airmail, registered with No. 13828, return receipt requested, which arrived at Tyndall AFB, Florida on 23 Oct 61, the day I signed for it. As Sapiro went to all this trouble he should have a copy and/or recollection of it. Saying that my saying Lee Sapiro threatened to sue me is "so hopelessly asinine that it defies comment beyond simple denial. You could use a Think Twice Pill, Norm; why not take one?" reveals your first magnitude simple-mindedness. I just happen to keep all correspondence received and carbons of all letters sent. Any further point you want to bring up about this matter should be made after checking, not before. And you've just been added to my list of people it isn't wise to send postcards to.

Breen: Since you weren't at the hearing you missed hearing the Clintons say that you had been chasing their son as described in the Boondoggle (except for Donaho having the room wrong into which you went). Too bad you didn't go, you wouldn't be suffering from so many apparent misapprehensions as to what was said there.

Choate: Your intellect is showing again if you try to dismiss my remarks on transmigration of souls as "I know you're putting me on, but of course one

would normally migrate from one planet to another only between lifetimes." Try to think up some answers to where all those souls are coming from since you consider each sculd to have had a prior existence. And if one soul leaves a body how about the next soul for replacement purposes? Is that an automatic process? I'd be very glad to see a genuine answer out of you. Since you say "the evidence ((for transmigration of souls)) comes out of auditing sessions" I'm waiting.

Choate, if you can't remember what you've heard, read and written as you've manifestly demonstrated time and again then Hubbard help you -- if he can. But perhaps you're just playing games on paper trying to confuse the issue with lies in full knowledge of what you're doing. I don't know you well enough to choose between the two and it's quite possible that it's a mixture of both. Anyway, you wouldn't look so silly if you'd check back to see what has gone before and then say something that isn't obviously untrue. If you're deliberately lying you're pretty clumsy at it.

Tripping hither, tripping thither,
Nobody knows why or whither;
We must dance and we must sing
Round about our fairy ring!

We are dainty little fairies,
Ever singing, ever dancing;
We indulge in our vagaries
In a fashion most entrancing.
If you ask the special function
Of our never-ceasing motion,
We reply, without compunction,
That we haven't any notion!

Iolanthe or The Peer and the Peri (sic)

Your badinage so airy,
Your manner arbitrary,
Are out of place
When face to face
With an influential Fairy.

We never knew
We were talking to
An influential Fairy!

Iolanthe

The next page contains a sample of what can be done with tampering with the words. The original version was much closer to the original G&S, preserving the rhymes, alliteration and avoiding awkwardness of phrasing. Unfortunately it was in poor taste.

THE CULT EDITOR'S SONG

Editor: I am the editor of the Poppycock;
Cult: And a right good editor, too!
Editor: You're very, very good
And be it understood,
I publish a right good zine.
Cult: We're very, very good.
And be it understood
He publishes a right good zine.
Editor: Though printing sometimes a smear
I can type, spot a queer,
And shoot a rightwinger;
I am never known to quail
At the fury of my tale,
And I'm never, never sick of me!
Cult: What, never?
Editor: No, never!
Cult: What, never?
Editor: Hardly ever!
Cult: He's hardly ever sick of him!
Then give three cheers, and one cheer more,
For the hardy editor of the Poppycock!

Editor: I do my best to irritate you all--
Cult: And with you we're quite disgust.
Editor: You're exceedingly so right,
And I think only polite,
To return the compliment.
Cult: We're exceedingly so right,
And he thinks it only polite
To return the compliment.
Editor: Bad language or abuse,
I always, always use,
Whatever the emergency;
Though "Bother it" I may
Occasionally say,
I never use a big, big D--
Cult: What, never?
Editor: No, never!
Cult: What, never?
Editor: Hardly ever!
Cult: Hardly ever swears a big, big D--
Then give three cheers, and one cheer more,
For the well-bred editor of the Poppycock!

Norm Metcalf

The space on the right is reserved for your own versions. My first draft was discarded out of regard for the editor of the Poppycock. And if any of you aren't familiar with the original and think I twisted some lines too far I suggest comparison. Oddly enough, especially considering the circumstances that caused this to be written, Gilbert & Sullivan prophetically titled the entire work H.M.S. PINAFORE or The Lass That Loved a Sailor.

Well, it's nice to know that so many of you out there are going to vote for me. Gives one a beautiful warm glow and all. I understand that Ted has withdrawn; however Blackbeard has already given the kickoff to a Goldwater-type campaign so I don't guess we'll be missing anything. And if the opposition keeps working for me like that, how can I miss?

BOARDMAN Well I'm glad to see that you support my version of the alleged attack on Marion. And shorn of your political rhetoric your account jibes with the one I gave back in UNFITTED. But if you thought that version of the rumor was bad, you ought to see the uncleaned-up versions. They were obscene and unmailable. And as you well know that version I put down isn't--although of course Walter's lawyer may well have said so for tactical reasons.

As a matter of fact I don't think the rumor is true myself. But I still can't see why Marion is so upset. She's been advocating this specific type of thing for years; why should it upset her when people believe she means what she says? I've always thought it was highly laudatory to practice what one preached... Or perhaps this big upset is for tactical reasons also.....

However I certainly did not intend my repetition of this rumor in a private letter --with one short mention of Marion in 6-1/2 pages--to be an attack of her. And if her feelings are really hurt and she is genuinely upset, I'm very sorry. I've always liked Marion and had a high regard for her. But I neither invented this rumor nor spread it around. I don't feel I actually injured Marion in the slightest. But if I hurt her feelings I'm still sorry.

Oh, come now, John, leave us not confuse dropping Walter from the convention with the FAPA blackball. The "Exclusion Act" has long since been accepted by the great majority of fandom--even those who don't think it necessary admit it was our decision to make. And they don't hold it against us. But apas are different. As I've written to several people "I don't think it's important whether or not Walter is in FAPA as long as people know about him."

In FAPA I'm going to adopt the position of completely ignoring him. But this is actually a neutralist position. As some others have said, "Perhaps we can't drive him out of FAPA, but we sure as hell can make him wish we had." Well, it should be interesting. Too bad you aren't in FAPA. But Blackbeard isn't either and I imagine he'll be heard from on the question. Get your stuff in too.

As I see it the following results have come out of the Breen Scene:

1. Walter Breen has been expelled from the PACIFICOM and this has been accepted by fandom. It is highly probable that various future conventions will also expel him. But it is extremely unlikely that anyone else will be.
2. All of fandom now believes that Walter seduces children. Even fans who for rhetorical purposes or from principle say it hasn't been proven, believe it and will take precautions to protect their own children. It would be extremely uncool for Walter to approach any fan child unless the parents have specifically given permission.
3. Nevertheless certain fans still like him and others who don't will support his right to be in apas, clubs, etc. from a matter of principle.
4. However many fans feel very strongly on the question of seducing children and will continue to attack Walter heavily as long as he's around.

5. Many fans feel equally strongly about this "persecution" of poor Walter and will attack equally strongly all those attacking Walter, getting in a few side licks at me who am somehow responsible for it all.

6. The whole fight will be used for various fans and groups for their own purposes and to vent their own antagonisms. Fans will translate the situation into their own personal terms and carry on as if the whole "battlefield" were just their own corner of things blown up giant size.

You, John, are translating it into your political terms; Prentiss is analyzing it all from the standpoint of scientology; to some it's a matter of naked principle with the individuals involved hardly mattering one way or the other; to others it's just a matter of people interacting and reacting and the principles involved are entirely irrelevant. Each fan has his own Breen Scene.

7. All fandom is plunged into war and is likely to stay that way for some time. Even if Walter quit fandom or the committee completely backed down it would hardly make a dent in the fracas.

8. However all is not hopeless as more and more people are admitting that the other side is not a bunch of hate mongers or what have you, just acting from different principles. And that it is even possible to respect members of the other side for the way they have conducted themselves and fought for their principles.

PERDITA I don't really see the relevance of this or that it makes any difference one way or the other, but the orgone accumulator in my "bedroom" at the Munnery belonged to Don Bratton. I was storing it for him while he was in a mental hospital and never used it for anything except a room divider.

AS for your plague-on-both-your-houses attitude, obviously all good Cultists feel that "Extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice and moderation in the pursuit of justice is no virtue."

And as a matter of fact, it's easier for me to empathize with and understand the points of view of John, Ted and Blackbeard than it is Don Fitch's. John, Ted, Blackbeard, Scithers, Eney, Buz, Metcalf and I have all reached what we consider basics in this situation and are behaving rather monolithic about it. (Gordon is being much more civilized and damned if I know what Prentiss is doing.) And for that matter we can all see and understand the others basics, we just disagree. For that matter if I didn't think Walter were dangerous I can well see myself acting like unto John, Ted and Blackbeard.

Ben said "condone", not "approve", Perdita. No one thinks you approve of child molesting. If I understand your position correctly it is that you think seducing children is bad and that Breen does probably seduce children, but that there are more important issues involved here. If this is true, "condone" may be a harsh epithet, but it's an accurate one, at least denotatively. It has connotations that go beyond that. So Ben was emotional about this and was rude; he's long since apologized to you.

BOARDMAN Again--I forgot. Since Walter isn't going to be at the convention, what makes you think that if Walter is still being investigated by the Berkeley police, it automatically means the Oakland police will be at the convention? I've puzzled over this statement of yours several times, but it still makes no sense...

Drop-outs now total 9: You, Perdita, Lichtman, Tom Perry, Mike Domina, Lou Goldstone, Calvin Demmon, Paul Williams and Joe Pilatti. However, one of these has since written saying he made a Big Mistake and will attend if he has the money. However, he hasn't rejoined as of yet. Any additional dropouts will be too late to be listed in the Program Book.

PATTEN Walter is doing a "Walter Breed" again. Notice that his statement still doesn't contradict my previous answer to your question. The key word in Walter's latest evasion is "consult". No, we never did ask Walter's advice or opinion.

CHOATE Prentiss, you are incredible. As I said before I'm in doubt that you are basically well-meaning, chock full of good-will and all, but I'm damned if I can follow your thinking processes. And many of your assumptions leave me floundering. Not to mention that you often take as assumptions very doubtful things which would need a great deal of proof. No, I'm not talking about Scientology.

For instance your picture of the Berkeley social scene is utterly unreal. You're talking about a minor segment of Berkeley fandom--and it has several--the one in which you move. And that is largely composed of fringe fans. And aside from the Breens, Ray NELSON AND Miriam Knight are the only fans well-known to national fandom who are part of it. All the other well-known fans are either neutral or on our side. And we have a lot of fringe fans too of course. And actually the shoe is on the other foot; one of the things we noticed earlier in this was that we are much less emotional about the Breen scene than is the opposition. We got together and laughed and had fun whilst the opposition was extremely bitter and fuming. Maybe that's changed now--I hope so. But I don't know of course as communication has long since ceased.

Strangely enough I wasn't even aware that I had a psycho-spiritual role, much less that I took it seriously. And I am somewhat croggled to learn that I attempted to help Walter and failed. Like, when? And what did I do? The only thing that I can think of that might be interpreted that way is THE WALTER BREEN APPRECIATION ISSUE and that was over two years ago. If I was supposedly so upset by that, what was I waiting for?

I think that you and Metcalf are at utterly cross purposes. Metcalf has never said that the Berkeley parents said that Walter was dangerous or that the committee was justified etc. But you see, the important thing to him--and to me and the rest of us--is not what the Clintons, or Ellingtons, or Marcia think of the various BOONDOGGLE incidents, but that they admit they took place substantially as described. To him this is the important thing. To you the important thing is that they thought all these things were more or less innocent.

and for the umpteenth time, prentiss, NOTHING THE COMMITTEE HAS DONE HAS BEEN DESIGNATED TO PROTECT ANY CHILD IN BERKELEY. Like it's an unimpeachable principle--as far as I'm concerned anyhow--that if parents know the score and don't choose to protect their children, it's their business. Berkeley incidents are cited because they show Walter's typical behavior, what can be expected of him when he can get away with it. And as you said in P.M. if the parents had objected he wouldn't have. What's that got to do with anything? Do you think he's going to ask the parents permission if he gets the kid alone? He'll "ask" the kid, of course.

And what's all this jazz about Walter's being a human being, not an abstraction? Of course. The statement is a tautology. But do you think a murderer is any less a murderer because he is good to his mother and loves children and dogs? No one is all bad, but what's that got to do with anything?

Why is it so difficult for you to accept that many people regard seducing and/or engaging in sex play with children as something which is not just sick or bad, but something which is always extremely dangerous and potentially damaging to the child and something utterly reprehensible for an adult to do, no matter what other good qualities he may have?

You just can't seem to accept that many people think this way and you go to all sorts of reaching for some other explanation for their behavior.

But why do you refuse to accept that people feel this way?

I realize of course that even though all standard psychology and/or psychologists say the same thing doesn't mean that you have to accept it. But doesn't the fact that this is the case at least make it possible for you to see that people can think and feel this way?

Actually I think one's opinion on this point is the basis on which people are choosing sides and the one thing which is separating the sheep from the goats. (whichever side one considers to be sheep and which side goats.)

No one is getting up in public and saying that seducing children is good. All say that it is bad and sick. But one chooses sides on the Breen Scane on the basis of whether one thinks it's dangerous or not.

If one thinks that Breen is dangerous then obviously one thinks that his activities must be stopped and/or that he be given no opportunity to perform. If one thinks he's merely sick and that his actions are merely bad, then one protects his own children, but is more concerned about helping Walter than about the consequences of his present course of action for others..

And strangely enough opinions on this dangerousness don't follow any usual liberal-conservative dichotomy. There are liberals and conservatives on both sides of the fence.

WHITE Well, no, Ted, the BOONDOGGLE doesn't damn by innuendo. It describes perfectly plainly and straightforwardly various incidents in which Walter was involved. It makes no judgment on these actions; these judgments are furnished by individual readers. Any contradictions in it are due to the fact that it is a chronological account and naturally peoples opinions and reactions do change throughout the years.

There seems to be a difference of opinion here. Anyhow from what we hear MINAC and THE LOYAL OPPOSITION have convinced more people of the rightness of our case than anything we have said. Actually I think now that all the arguments, etc. have been completely superfluous and that from the beginning it has been for most people on the one hand of--as you say--Did he or didn't he? and on the other my above point about the dangerousness. Since now it has been most thoroughly established that he did, the only question remaining is the point about the danger.

I don't think you are deliberately misquoting, but I never said anything about Walter's "loving children being worse for them than his having sex with them might be." I sure you'll disagree just as much as with what I actually said, but we may as well have it clear. I said that if an adult seduces a young kid, the kid is more or less safe if he's only looking for sex, but if he's looking for love and gets it in that fashion, he's in for trouble. Of course if the kid got the love without sex that's a different kettle of fish.

You are also guilty of an interesting bit of double think when you say "I think those who have so vigorously censured him, to a man, desperately need psychological treatment." You see since one of the biggest guns in our attack is the unanimity of psychological opinion about child molesting--and I'm sure you know this since you've never attempted to refute it--it would be rather ridiculous to seek psychological treatment --presumably from psychologists; or did you mean Scientology?--for a "condition" which the psychologists would thoroughly approve of.

Les didn't get the horselaugh because of his approach of painting Walter "gray" but because of his gerberazation. In Les this is usually because of his inability to express himself clearly nor realize the sense in which his words will be taken. He had many howlers in his editorial in MINAC 12. I remember particularly: "If you think I'm too naive to know what homosexual advances are, well I've watched Walter Breen play with children many times" and "All of this means nothing unless you believe everything that Walter says." Now obviously (or is it?) the first one of these is just most unfortunate phrasing and the second is a valid point put so badly that it reverses the effect it is intended to have. Since Les does this sort of thing so constantly I'm not too surprised he slipped again, but I am surprised that you didn't catch this sort of thing when you went over it--as you said you did.

Also, there are grays and grays and Les's approach of admitting everything--or almost everything--but denying it at the same time was trying to do two contradictory things at once. And so succeeded in doing neither.

No, it wasn't Les's approach. It was that his editorial was illly conceived and badly written. That's what Gerberization is--or the cause of it anyhow.

TAPSCOTT What makes you think a pathological quibbler can't lie when it's "necessary". After all, the fact that Breen has refused to answer your question proves nothing. Someone might be provoked into sending various photo copies of his letter thru the Cult if he came on all innocent like.

And if he's been quoted correctly he's told several lies already. For instance Lerner says that he has denied that any of the incidents in the BOONDOGGLE ever took place. Of course he may have been quibbling and Lerner failed to detect the quibbles. What were his exact words, Fred? For that matter I believe he has denied it to Boardman too. Was it a flat denial, John? Or another quibble.

And speaking of quibbling, did all of you get Les's in MINAC 12. In trying to deny that Walter had ever had homosexual relations with any young New York fans Les didn't actually say he hadn't. He just said that Walter had never made any homosexual advances to anybody in New York fandom. And later on he reaffirmed that Walter was "always the one who is seduced." But somehow or other he never got around to saying that no New York fans had ever made homosexual advances to Walter. But along these lines is a quote from the BOONDOGGLE: "Walter may always be the one who's seduced, but he makes it goddamn clear he's available." And if you'll remember Les's reply to that it was "And what's wrong with that?" And indeed there may not be--depending upon age. But to claim that making clear that one is available is not initiating seduction is pretty damn ridiculous.

LICHTMAN Well, really, Bob. My publishing the BOONDOGGLE sure doesn't look as if I were trying to keep my part in the Breen Scene "as quiet as possible." Walter's interjection in your letter is likewise nonsense. What I said in the BOONDOGGLE was that as proof of the fact that I had no axe to grind was that all this was bound to hurt my TAFF race.

BLACKBARD I agree with Ted. I think the anti-Breeners have used more levity and humor than the pro-Breeners. You see for the most part our conviction that Walter is dangerous is an intellectual one, not an emotional reaction. We are not nearly as emotional about it all as the pro-Breeners. And since Walter is screamingly funny--in spite of his dangerousness to children--we can still get a kick out of laughing at him. But the pro-Breeners are too emotional to be funny; they have reacted strongly and frantically to what has been done. They have tried to use ridicule and satire as weapons, but in the large majority of cases it has proved ineffective or even boomeranged just because they were too emotional to see how people not as emotional as themselves would look at the matter. My God I never dreamed Roy Nelson could draw such lousy and ineffective cartoons as he's been doing on the matter. (Remember that Norm Clarke is a neutral or at least uninvolved enough to laugh at both sides.)

As for the anti-Breenites being rational and non-humorous when writing to you, this illustrates a general trend in rhetoric, not something peculiar to the Breen Scene. In any violent controversy when a vehement member of the opposition shows a willingness to listen to the other side, naturally he is going to be approached in a rational manner. Neutrals can be swayed by humor, but not partisans.

CASTORA Well, to answer your questions: (1) Walter Breen's sex habits or anyone's habits of any description can and should become a matter of discussion when they are dangerous to other people. (2) Quite adequate details--yea, even fulsome details--have been given of W.B.'s sex habits. As for proof, eyewitness accounts are the most basic proof offered in a court of law, and these we have given. And since Walter's friends admit that he does have sexual relations with children, what more do you want? (3) Why in the world should we have consulted Walter? He had already informed us that we couldn't keep him from coming to the convention and he would sue if we tried. We believe him to be so completely irresponsible that his assurances of good behavior would be worth nothing. And even if he meant any such assurances--highly doubtful we think--psychologists say that anyone who seduces children has an appetite he can't control, even when his own safety is at stake. (4) I don't see the relevance of asking why nothing was done before. In any case we can't answer for other people. But the reason we never did anything before was principally our carrying the "Non-e of our business" syndrome to the point where it became an evasion of responsibility.

A further point to your question #3. Even Walter's friends admit he is irresponsible. In fact that's part of the defense: he's an irresponsible child.

BOARDMAN Yet again. As for that letter to the Knights and the Clintons being unmailable, libellous, obscene or what have you, according to Jessie Clinton it was turned over to the Post Office. Since the Post Office Inspectors never bothered to get in touch with me, that disposes of that little point. And it wasn't an attack either.

CHOATE You mis quote our letter to Walter. It sent something like: We are considering cancelling your membership in the Pacificon II because of the charge that you are a child molester. We are holding a hearing on this question.....You are invited to attend if you care to defend yourself.

People in positions of responsibility for gatherings, cons etc. are legally responsible--because of his General Reputation--even if nothing has ever been proved in a court of law. And we would have been even if BOONDOGGLE, etc. had never been published. It matters not if the General Reputation is a mass of rumors, not the eye-witness reports, his own and his friends admissions which are now on record. All that would be necessary to establish is that we had heard the rumors. And this would be easy as hell, this sort of investigation being thorough as hell.

And, again, no further hearing was thought of. And even now months later no one has come up with any argument that changes these fundamental facts: (1) Walter seduces children. (2) We are legally responsible if he seduces a child at the con and morally responsible if he makes contacts there which he follows up later. (3) Psychologists have an almost unanimous consensus that in our culture anyone who seduces a young child is not in control of his actions; so neither Walter's word nor his own regard for his self interest is to be relied upon to guarantee his behavior.

Come to think of it, Prentiss, how come you don't think seducing children is very damaging and dangerous to them. Doesn't it give them all sorts of engrams? Since I really would expect you to be extremely concerned about this danger if you believed in it, I'm quite curious as to why you think it isn't dangerous.

GOLDWATER AND ALL THAT You've really got to hand it to the conservatives who have just taken over the Republican party. They've done what the liberals in the Democratic party have never dared to do: they've forsaken politics for ideology. They believe in their cause and principles and they are going to fight and work for them. To hell with expediency.

At least I hope they've forsaken politics for ideology. But I keep remembering that there about twenty million or so eligible voters--outside the South--who never have bothered to vote. I understand they are mostly lower class too, people at the bottom of the economic ladder who have never been reached by the Democrat's economic arguments. It strikes me that it just may be possible to reach these people on the issue of bigotry.

But in spite of that fear it seems clear that the conservatives have no hopes of winning this election. Their plans go further into the future. Their plans now seem to be to grasp firm control of the Republican party machinery and to drive out the liberals so that they can never control it again--or even influence policy.

And of course Goldwater is not their "leader". He's just their standard bearer, although he seems in basic sympathy with their goals and an active member of the conservative forces.

But of course as someone has pointed out, these people aren't real conservatives; they're vile Whigs. Their domestic program can be reduced to the following proposition: an emerging middle class intends to grasp firm hold on the reins of government to put itself firmly in the saddle and remove all restrictions on its economic activity, while at the same time keeping down the lower class and wresting away privilege and money from the elements which have previously ruled.

Their foreign policy seems less clear cut. As a general principle of course they'll want whatever is profitable to them and i'm not sure just what stake they have in the defense industry. But in spite of Goldwater's statements about Victory, it seems unlikely they are much interested in "victory" in those areas. The most probable thing they would do is retreat to isolationism, an isolationism backed up by atomics. They would ignore brush fires, but draw a line saying: This far and no further. Then, boom.

But that is just the most probable. When I start thinking of their possible courses of action, I really get the Willies.....

Anyhow the coming campaign should be real interesting. And almost as dirty as the coming TAFF campaign. Not quite of course as it will be a wee-bit more impersonal. And there is another big difference. In the national campaign it will be the conservatives shoving the dirt. In the TAFF campaign, it will be those who think of themselves as liberals. Oh well. On the whole it should win me votes.....

Alva Rogers, 5243 Rahlves Drive, Castro Valley, California, 94546

Pillycocks #9 and #10 finally arrived and I for one wish to thank Boardman for sending them to us lowly inactive waiting listers. These make marvellous additions to my collection of anti-committee publications.

First to Pillycock #9 and the questionnaire: how would you like some unbiased answers to your questions from a member of the committee, John? You would? Fine....

Question 1 ((What is the present state of the Non-Vention?)) is well answered by Meskys, Choate, et al, and nothing much has changed since you got your answers. One minor quibble on one of Pren's statements, though. He says that "it's possible some of the parties ((presumably parties by local con attendees)) will be held off con premises to avoid possible police harassment." One gets the image from this of uniformed and plain-clothes police cruising up and down the halls of the Leamington opening doors at will and subjecting the occupants to all sorts of indignities. Believe it or not, Oakland is semi-civilized. Not even in Oakland do the city police have the authority to indulge in unwarranted search and seizure, or arbitrary invasion of private premises. For one thing, the management of the hotel is fully aware of their rights as a taxpayer, and are pretty jealous of those rights.

On Question 2 ((What are the attitudes of the Andersons and Tony Boucher? Has Boucher, as reported, refused to concur in the actions of the "court" which expelled Breen? Will the Andersons be hosts for the Non-Vention? Will Boucher? How about other local pros?)) Meskys and Scithers give the most accurate answers. Choate's answer is partially correct. Poul Anderson is neutral in the controversy, but supports the committee in its action. On the other hand, Tony is somewhat less than neutral in the controversy, as Prentiss should know from his presence at the hearing. I can't speak for Tony, but don't believe everything you hear about how friendly he is towards Walter.

Question 3 ((Have any of Donaho's original associates in these charges begun to back down from them? In particular, are Alva Rogers and Al ha-Levy beginning to withdraw support from Donaho?)) All three of your respondents are substantially correct here. However, again Pren is slightly in error. He says "all three ((I suppose by three he means Halevy, Stark and Rogers)) have privately expressed regret that they ever started it." Not quite so. No regrets at having started it, but some second guessing as to how we might have possibly handled it some other way.

Question 4 ((What is the attitude of each of the parents of the children whose name is linked to Breen? I'd like to know which ones supported the Exclusion Act at the time of the "trial" and which ones still do support it?)) Obviously, I supported the committee action. Evers' little bit of versification is lamentably flawed by inaccuracies. All the 'victims' moms' didn't show up to make a plea for Walter's case as legend would have it. Sid Rogers wasn't there (and probably a good thing, too, because if she had been the hearing would have been considerably more explosive than it was), nor was Pat Ellington, nor one other mother whose son was mentioned but not named in the Boondoggle.

Question 5 ((Has Donaho been making, by word of mouth, private letter, or any other means, attacks on Marion? If so, what has been the nature of these attacks? Does Donaho deny having made such attacks? Do you believe him if he so denies them?)) Hah! Who is spreading slanders about Marion? Donaho? Or the opposition? Now, this so-called slanderous letter that is too hot to trust to the United States mails was a personal letter addressed to the Knights and the Clintons, and to no one else. Dated March 1, 1964, the letter detailed in calm and reasoned

tones the main elements of Donaho's personal position on the Breen Scene; and, in a search for clarification, an exposition of the Knights' and the Clintons' positions as he understood them. The "slander", as nearly as can be determined since they haven't said what it is, is found on page four, third paragraph, part of lines two and three. To quote, beginning with the paragraph immediately preceding the paragraph in question:

If the BOONDOGGLE is slanderous, Walter has every means of redress right at his hand. And do you really think for one little minute that Walter wouldn't have sued immediately if he thought he had a case? Yes I do take this to be an admission of guilt.

But when it comes to that, the BOONDOGGLE hardly added to his reputation at all. I find that it's generally believed throughout fandom that he ((eleven words deleted here because I'm chicken)). And at the MidWesCon last year the Cincinnati group kept a day and night watch over him to be sure he didn't do anything. And even before receiving the BOONDOGGLE the London committee was preparing to do the same if he showed up in London in '65.

The deleted words above, taken out of the context of the entire letter, or even of the paragraph which contains them, are in questionable taste, but in context it is certainly questionable as to whether or not they are slanderous. Now, it is more than obvious that this letter has had considerable distribution and not by Donaho. According to Breen Bob Chazin, in Berkeley, has either seen the entire letter or the significant sentence. Who else in Berkeley is privy to this private letter I know not. According to you, John, Ted White and Prentiss Choate have acquainted you with the contents -- or partial contents -- of this letter. It seems there's been a lot of broadcasting of the "slander" -- and all of the broadcasting has been by supporters of Walter Breen and not by Bill Donaho or anyone on the committee. Donaho has not been spreading slanders about Marion, or attacking her in any way. Our argument is with Breen, not Marion.

Question 6. The following have cancelled their memberships: John and Perdita Boardman, Tom Perry, Lou Goldstone, Mike Domina, Bob Lichtman, Joe Pilati, Paul Williams and Calvin Demmon. And, of course, Walter Breen has had his membership cancelled by the committee.

Question 7 ((Some of Donaho's partisans claim to have letters by Breen which admit to various illegal sexual acts. Do you know or believe this to be true? If so, how the hell does Busby happen to have a file of randy letters from Breen? Do you share my conviction that Walter Breen's principal sexual activities are oral and digital intercourse, that is to say, talking and writing about it? How widespread is this interpretation of Breen's known statements and opinions on sex?)) Letters exist.

Question 8 ((What fanzines has Donaho turned over to the USPOD and/or the local fuzz? Do these include any Cultzines? Have either the postal authorities or the local police been questioning fans about the contents of their fanzines?)) Donaho and I left with the Berkeley police copies of Tesseract 1 two Panic Buttons, the Bonndoggle and Minac #12. The idea of turning any of these, or any other fanzines over to the postal authorities never even for an instant entered our minds.

Question 9 ((Did the Berkeley police summon Breen for questioning? Were any criminal charges filed against him? Is it known what they talked to him about?)) The answers to question nine are correct. I fail to see the logic in your comment on Donaho's inference that the police haven't ceased their interest in Walter

Breen. Why should it necessarily follow that because the Berkeley police are keeping an open file on Breen that we should therefore expect Oakland police at the con, when the Oakland police have no interest in Walter; and besides which, Walter won't even be at the con.

Question 10. ((What will the Berkeley police do about Pacificon II? Are they also interested in the Non-Vention?)) What would the Berkeley police be doing at a convention in Oakland? Everyone is so hung up on this police jazz. This obsessive worry about the police by a few fans causes one to wonder what ghastly skeletons hang in whose closets. Do you for one minute think that all the Oakland or Berkeley police have to worry about during the four days of the con is what a few hundred science fiction fans may do in the way of amusement at the hotel or in private homes? They won't do a thing and you know it. Scithers has correctly and succinctly answered this question.

Question 11 ((What has become of the suggestion, made at the "hearing", that users of drugs also be expelled from the Pacificon? Has anyone been following through on this, or on expulsions of persons other than Breen?)) Ho-hum. No user of drugs is going to be expelled from the Pacificon unless he breaks out a stick and lights up. Make no mistake, anyone -- and there are no exceptions to this -- caught smoking pot at the con hotel is going to have the book thrown at him so fast and hard he won't know what hit him. All four members of the committee feel that the law concerning marijuana is arbitrary and unrealistic and in need of revision; but the law exists, and in California, it's a rough one, and none of us are about to lay our heads on the block because we don't approve of it in the abstract. And when we say we'll throw the book at anyone so uncool as to smoke or distribute pot to others, we don't mean anything but the law book.

To quote Prentiss Choate; and John Boardman:

It is very much doubted whether anything at all has or will happen regarding drug users. ((And for a very good reason, considering the personnel of the Con Committee.))

Pren's naivete is answered above. All I can say for you, John, is wow! you sure sure use words loosely. Your parenthetical insertion strongly intimates that all four members of the con committee are depraved drug addicts. Whether or not one, two, three, or four members of the committee have at any time used marijuana, peyote, LSD, or anything else loosely defined as a proscribed drug, has no bearing.

How's that for unbiased answers?

On to the rest of Pillycock #9. Loose use of words, again, John. Bill never said in the Boondoggle that "Walter Breen committed perverted sexual acts with a 3-year-old girl." He related verifiable and verified incidents in which Walter indulged in objectionable "sex play" with a 3-year-old girl, not sexual "acts". There is a difference.

We've received strong support from many fans who are parents -- two can play at this game. But regardless, one doesn't have to be a parent to abhor sexual exploitation of defenceless children, only adult.

I'm glad you brought up my article in Shaggy #59 rebutting Joe Gibson's call to arms. The whole purpose of my argument against Joe was to resist the use of vague shotgun charges and the condemnation of people by labels -- specifically ex-communists and homosexuals. And my article was also a plea for tolerance of

the eccentric and nonconformist. It was not a defense of serious anti-social conduct. My position is the same today as it was in 1961 when the article was published. Both you and Ted Pauls, in Kipple, have quoted me in an attempt to make it look as if I had completely reversed myself since then. Nothing I've done or said or written concerning the Breen situation in any way negates my Shaggy article, as a careful reading of it will show. Naturally, I hold the same position today regarding ex-communists as I did then, but that's not germane to this discussion. What is germane is the apparent abandonment on my part of tolerance of homosexuals. At one point in the article I said: "Let's take a look at homosexuals in fandom: There are queers -- and there are queers. I've known some I couldn't stomach, and on the other hand, I've known one or two -- both in and out of fandom who have been my very good friends." At another point I referred to "harmless homosexuals" (emphasis added). At all times I was thinking, and I think it is perfectly obvious, in terms of homosexuality between consenting adults carried on in a relatively discreet and civilized manner. The quote you give from my article is high sounding standing all by its lonesome, but it's a little more realistic if the following sentence is added to your quote. The quote you give and the sentence following:

What is important is the evidence of the deterioration and erosion of the tolerance that has been inherent in fandom since its beginnings. A fan is, and should be, judged on the basis of his contributions to fandom -- not on his private sex life (as long as he keeps it private), and not, certainly not on the basis of what political philosophy he may have been fuggheaded enough to embrace ten or twenty years ago."

The concern expressed in the first sentence was caused by Joe's seeming blanket condemnation of homosexuals and ex-communists without any extenuation. I feel as strongly about this as I ever have. But, you will kindly note, I qualified my defense of the homosexual by insisting that he keep his sex life private and not parade it before preponderantly heterosexual fandom, extolling it as the way of life, dragging out all the tired old justifications for homosexuality and child-love. And finally, I had this to say toward the end of the article:

Perhaps we were starry-eyed and innocent in those days (the early 1940's), and believed in the sanctity of the Brotherhood of Fans, and accepted a person because he was a fan without probing too deeply into his character; but sooner or later the axe would fall if the fan proved unworthy of the trust tendered him.

The housecleaning process is a continuing one in fandom.

The LASFS cleaned its Augean Stables without mortal consequences.

New blood is continuously being pumped into the mainstream of fandom, and the mature older heads who have been around for a decade or two act as antibodies against any poison that may come in with it.

Let's clean house if necessary, but let's do it in a sane and sensible way, being sure the dirt is actually there before swinging the broom.

Exactly.

Tolerance has its limits. Is it any worse to be intolerant of extreme anti-social sexual conduct when it involves children than it is to be militantly intolerant of rightwing social and political extremism?

With weary tread we march on to Pillycock #10.

Shorter: Contrary to what you may believe the committee has every legal right to refuse membership or withdraw membership in the convention for cause.

Castora: Yes, indeed, actions speak louder than words. In years to come Donaho will be remembered as a giant of a fan, publisher of two of the most highly regarded fanzines of this or any other fannish era, Habakkuk and Viper; a writer of no mean talent; a genial and generous friend; a fan with at all times the best interests of fandom at heart; a courageous man who did what he felt had to be done and accepted the abuse and calumny from many of his friends with tolerance and good humor. Donaho will go down in fannish lore as a positive force in fandom, Breen, in time, will be recognized as a negative element and fit company of Degler, Wetzel, et al, in the limbo of fannish history to which they have been relegated. Fandom's traditions and raison d'etre nonsense? Yes, Phil, fandom does have tradition and it does have a raison d'etre. As far as I am concerned Walter Breen is not and never has been to any extent a science fiction fan, has ignored or dismissed as square the best traditions of fandom, and has attempted to establish himself as a focal point and interpreter of the raison d'etre of fandom according to his own peculiar bent. This, of course, doesn't particularly distinguish him from a number of other fans, and isn't any reason to kick him out of anything. No one objects to Walter being a kook, as Tapscott points out, the objection is to a facet of his character and certain activities indulged in which have nothing to do with whether or not he is a fan. Not even the Mattachine Society will defend or have anything to do with child molesters. If a homosexual organization whose purpose is to defend and explain the homosexual's role in society refuses to tolerate homosexuals who prey on children, why should science fiction fandom, which has an entirely different raison d'etre from the Mattachine Society, provide a haven and sanctuary for them? Science fiction fandom should, and does, tolerate the widest extremes in the area of thought and ideas as expressed verbally and in writing. It also is almost limitlessly indulgent towards nonconformity in personal and social behavior. But let fandom not confuse nonconformity with anti-social behavior. The one is an individual's means of asserting his individuality and refusal to conform to a mold and harms no one; the other is a refusal to accept certain basic standards of social conduct which usually results in serious injury to another member of society. One is harmless, the other injurious to others. It's as simple as that.

Ostens: Congratulations to you both on your marriage.

Busby: Thanks for the kind words. You're right about sf cons. As you point out the Hyatt House chain likes sf cons. After the SeaCon and the Westercon last year the Hyatt House is sold on science fiction fans and their conventions. The Burlingame Hyatt House begged us to hold the Pacificon at their place, but we had to turn them down because it's just not quite big enough to handle a worldcon. The 'hunderbird, a big motel just down from the Hyatt House, has been after us for two years to put on a con in their place. Last spring Al Halevy, Sid and I were wined and dined by the Sheraton-Palace in a bid for the Pacificon. The Jack Tarr Hotel has been after us for any future cons we might put on. (Make a Date For the Gate in -68) We've even had offers from hotels as far away as Phoenix, Arizona. Science fiction conventions have a top-grade rating with hotel men all over the country. As far as the Leamington is concerned, after two conventions in their hotel we can do no wrong. And, incidently, we've kept the hotel informed of the action on the Breen front and have their whole-hearted support, now and during the convention.

G O R D O N E K L U N D

A few comments follow on recently arrived Cultzines, primarily John Boardman's FR 147, which, for a fanzine published by someone like Boardman, wasn't all that bad.

Gee whiz, folks, but this Breen business doesn't seem to be dying down too quickly. I notice, however, that John Boardman, Himself, has declared His Side the victors in PILLYCOCK #9. Well, as they say, that ought to end it, and close all discussion. However, I am somewhat of a stubborn bastard and refuse to quit even when I have been obviously defeated. So, much as I might rather not, the following Cultletter appears to be going to be one full of Breen commentary mostly. Such, of course, is unfortunate, but since this issue seems to be about all anyone is talking about these days, I won't go against the grain. Even if I have been beaten.

FR 147:

BOARDMAN: Norm Metcalf is all of the time telling neat stories about how he runs into Walter Breen in the post office. Norm Metcalf must be a real lucky sort, or else he spends whole heaps of time in the Berkeley P.O.--usually looking in other people's mail boxes, I bet. However, it should be noted for the sake of Norman's immaculate reputation that any conversation that flows between Walter and Norman on these occasions concerns money (bribes) or fandom (Boon-doggles). All good clean American fun and games.

I know what you mean about the scene of the Kennedy assassination in Dallas. I was there a mere two weeks after the murder, at a time when not only the actual scene of the shooting but the whole city seemed to have an aura of doom about it. Dallas was quiet, reserved, even dead, one might say, and the assassination scene itself, so clear in my memory from photos taken just weeks before, was almost filled with an atmosphere of past grief and horror. I don't think I shall want to return to Dallas, Texas, soon, if at all.

The Elliot Shorter letter is perhaps the most fuzzy minded thing I have yet seen on the Breen scene. Like, if it takes him all these words to mouth what everyone else has already said one million and two times over, somebody ought to swipe his pen. He might get writer's cramp--in his mind, as well as his hand.

Nastiness aside, I can't see why you felt it so wonderful that it must be published in the Cult. Besides, what good is it. Everyone knows that this Shorter fellow is just a satellite of yours. Satellites ought to be shot or maybe lynched. For every Breen satellite lynched in the South, I suggest two Donaho satellites ought to be kicked in the teeth in the North. How's that grab you, Johnnie.

I don't know about acid-throwing, John, but I've come across something quite close to it. A well known fan, I won't mention his name, except to note that the fan is you, has been known to spit in the eye of various Northern conservatives. This fan has been noted as having an "acid-tongue" (an outright lie, I'm sure, if not a falsehood by omission). If that isn't acid throwing I don't know what is. Anyhow, I've been trying to convince Bill Donaho that this guy out to be third in line for the purge. After, that is, all fans living together out of wedlock are taken care of.

CASTORA: I could consider a vote for Goldwater as a vote against militant integration. However, George Wallace is a considerably different story. While Goldwater is not, so he says at least, a real live racist, Wallace is, and has never made any attempt to hide this fact. To vote for Wallace one would have to be, I would think, pretty much willing to accept the theory of White Supremacy. I realize that I'm straying from the accepted liberal position—that the votes for Wallace were protesting unpopular local Democratic administrations. I am quite willing to accept, however, that there are a hell of a lot of racists residing in the United States. Inferior people will grasp at any straw to make themselves feel superior to someone, anyone. White supremacy is an excellent method. Would you be willing to vote for Wallace, Phil? If so, what would you be protesting against? If anything.

You're sort of making an ass out of yourself by trying to bring up the Tapscott constitution's legality at this late date. But, if you're really all this eager to do so, you have my welcome.

SCITHERS: Thank you for the support (if that is what one is to term it) for my trick of placing that rather mild insertion in Boardman's letter in FR 145. Actually, I didn't mind John's attempted reply at all. It was rather weak, of course, but then, too, it allowed me to perform the rather enjoyable bit of turning his words around on him. Say, I've been under the conviction all along that Boardman was kidding about publishing that fake article by my favoring Red China. You mean he was serious? Gad. Say it ain't so, John.

TAPSCOTT: If you'd bothered to have read my FR, you would have noticed the page which contained the first Walter Breed letter. So far as I know, Walter and Walter have no connection, sexual or otherwise. However, I am seriously considering trying to convince Walter to get on the IWL. He has certainly proven himself, through his numerous Cult contributions to be an "obviously well known fan." Ho.

I'm against allowing Blackbeard into the Cult because he disagrees with me. As you well know, a person should have the right to refuse membership to someone because you don't like his looks, or the way he parts his hair, or because he's black and you're white. These may not be, objectively, good reasons for exclusion, but they should be acceptable. After all, it would be an infringement of private property not to let people act this way. Human feelings and rights are not so important, of course. Isn't this right, Don Fitch?

Apparently the main reason behind Enoy's clarification outlawing carbon copied FR's, was to prevent Walter Breen from doing his trick again. All in all, however, I favor the measure, despite the fact that it is so obviously aimed at one individual. Carbon copied FR's are sort of irksome and terribly unfanish, so I'm against them. Besides, it would appear to be so much easier merely to type up a few postcards, if one is so terribly pressed for time when the pubdate roles around, and publish a full fledged FR a few weeks later. Carbon copied FR's and one-sheet FR's are a pain in the ass. Thankfully, the Cult seems to be getting away from them.

EKLUND.....3

SEIDMAN: I can't see much point at all towards publishing a KIPPLE letter of yours in the Cult. In fact, I think it's a rather silly idea. In the Cult, mostly, I'm interested in reading reactions to things myself (primarily) and others have said in previous Cult publications. If I were interested in KIPPLE letters, I would be a KIPPLE subscriber, which I am not. I am particularly incensed by the apparent fact that your KIPPLE letter is another goddamn Walter Breen epic. Presumably the last and final word on the subject. There's much too much Breen affair oriented crap in the Cult as it is. Most of it, however, does have the satisfactory element of being Cult oriented Breen stuff. Besides, I am personally having a fine time baiting various members of both sides, particularly the Other Side. If you send me a goddamn KIPPLE letter sometime, Mrs. Seidman, I'll burn it out of hand. Or maybe Throw Up.

BOARDMAN: Why are you on this anti-neutral kick, old boddy? Like I catch these reference to people who are "high-mindedly" trying to say nothing. And other one, too, which puts down Seth Johnson among others for adopting a neutral policy on the Breen Scene. For kicks, I ask: Isn't it possible that one or two people in, say, Moscow, Idaho or Brooklyn, New York, might not know enough things about the War in order to arrive at a decision? Like, not everybody has the excellent perspective on the doings in Berkeley provided by your seat in Brooklyn. You might point out how there's been so much said on both sides that nobody can claim not to know something about the affair. Such is so. However, 99% of this has been written by people ignorant of 99% of the facts (how many have even read the BOONDOGGLE, for crissakes?). These people (or "Pip-squak noofans as they say in Mexico) are merely making asses of themselves by not remaining neutral. Or, at least, saying they don't know what they're talking about. I'd hardly term this "highminded" merely intelligent, even, mature.

From your comments more directly answered above, Mr. Boardman, I get the impression that this is, to you, just one huge political fight. Nobody can remain neutral, because this isn't in the rules of the game. You don't much care about Walter, himself, and certainly not for the Pacificon II. You simply enjoy fighting. You're not concerned for any high minded ideals of freedom, just for arguing. You chose the side you did not because of ideological considerations, but because it seemed at the time as the most "liberal." You may disagree with the above psychoanalytical insights. But that's okay. You don't have the excellent perspective on the mind of John Boardman that I have from 3000 miles distant.

By the way, since you're opposed to neutrality so strong, I have a real live swiped from FIMBusby type question. If a convention committee did not bar Breen, but did not specifically favor him, at some time in the future, would you attend their convention? Said hypothetical committee keeping, shall we say, a "high minded aloofness from the whole bit. I'll be interested in reading your answer.

Curiously, I understand that a favorite hobby on liberal youths is carrying a miniature bomb on their persons, against the possibility of meeting some conservative youth worth blowing up, just for the hell of it. I have never heard of conservative or reactionary youth

EKLUND.....4

youth pulling this fun gambit. And in my experience, liberals are far more skilled than conservatives in the use of bombs.

BUSBY: Judging from the replies Lichtman and White gave to your questions directed at them, such queries appear to be a huge waste of time. One of the more pleasing things about fanzine debate over in-person debate is that you don't, mostly, have to answer questions. Like, you can ignore them quite out of hand and not have to sweat the fellow asking the question simply repeating his inquiry. Like, weeks or months between questions is a long time. I suppose we ought to award some sort of statue (maybe a huge bust of Walter Breen) to Bob and Ted for not just ignoring you, but instead quibbling, like.

BOARDMAN: STOP BRESS! I am now in possession of absolute and irrefutable truth that Walter Breen is not only a child molester but also throws acid and drops bombs on helpless blind-type widows. He also hates Dogs. I cannot, however, say anything more than this about my information, or disclose the Real Facts. Some of Breen's defenders (or "John Boardman") will interpret my silence to mean that I do not have such possession and that Wally is really innocent as a queer boy-scout (they believe in "painting his actions grey, remember.") However, this much I'll do, just for kicks. I will henceforth take as proven fact that Walter is all that has been said about him by Bill Donaho, Alva Rogers, and Les Gerber and even more hugely worsely. Anyone wishing to argue the entire matter with me in going to have to accept this as part of the discussion, or there will be no discussion.

By the way, Boardman, whoever told you what about the non-existent Donaho libel on Marion was Off His Ass, or maybe Out Of His Goddam Mind (or "a child molester.")

If you wish to argue the question of Jefferson's civil libertarian philosophy with me, Boardman, you'll have to read the goddam book, cite from it, and not state something from a review of a book you haven't even bothered to read as proven fact. Also, what is so terrible about "using the Army to enforce laws in time of peace." This is exactly what Kennedy did in Oxford, Mississippi in 1962. I don't recall you attacking the gentleman for his odious anti-civil liberties action. :: Jefferson supported the French Revolution of 1789.

If the "Donaho Affair" is a 1964 affair why did all your brainwashed buddies vote for Bill Donaho as "Worst Fan of 1963." (all eight of them, that is.) If you're going to publish some fake election results you may as well go all the way with your lying.

PILLYCOCK 9:

BOARDMAN: You did a fair to good job of reporting here, John, although Meskys did at least admit that he "didn't know" all the answers while Prentiss just made up answers to those questions he was in ignorance of the facts about. However, I think you're claiming victory a bit too early. The FAPA blackball overthrow did not destroy the fact that the committee's ouster of Walter Breen from the Pacificon II was not only the correct move, but perhaps the only one.

I am, though, willing to take your lead and try to place down right here and now what I think are the final and total results of the Breen Affair.

Firstly, I think Walter is finished in fandom. He will undoubtedly remain in publishing fandom for a while, perhaps for years to come. But, whether justly or not, his reputation has been publicly soiled. People can't and will not forget the BOONDOGGLE. Walter will be watched, he will be guarded against, he will probably find life at conventions almost unbearable. Although, throughout this I have displayed a notable lack of recognition of the existence of Walter Breen, the man, as opposed to Walter Breen, the evil beast, I can, objectively, say I feel rather sorry for him. I frankly suspect that, right or wrong, Walter will find fandom intolerable.

Secondly, the Pacificon Committee and Bill Donaho pretty much succeeded in doing what they set out to do. Fandom now knows, to a person, what Walter Breen is, whether they will admit it or not. It is now up to each person and each organization as to whether they wish to accept him or not. Many won't and many shall. Partisan debate, however, is now mostly useless.

Lastly, I think the whole thing has opened a long due open split between two separate factions in fandom. Most of the past friendships split by Walter Breen will not heal rapidly, many not at all. Busby's call for a split within SAPS is merely an indication, not an opening gambit, in the split. People, such as myself, who took one side or the other in the Feud, but were not so entirely hung up on the utter Rightness of their own views that they couldn't see the relevance of the other will probably get along with both sides quite well, after the minor wounds are healed. Whether you wish to call this a split between the liberal and conservative factions in fandom, or the fannish and the screen, or even the old and the young doesn't really matter. The split is there. Many fans of the present time, by their own very philosophies of life and living, are completely at odds with another group. They have managed to get along in the years before now. It took Walter Breen, certainly an extreme within the one faction, so extreme in fact that many members of the "liberal" faction found themselves standing on the Other Side over the man, to break the differences into the open. Many of the wounds will never heal. Walter Breen may become merely a name, a rather infamous one no doubt, in the annals of fandom. What he brought about will not soon be forgotten.

A note on my own participation past, present and future might be worth adding here. I am mostly sick of the whole bit, like. In this letter I think this becomes pretty apparent. Although most of this is concerned with Walter Breen, I have allowed 99% of my comments to remain either simply baiting, for the hell of it, or satire, equally for the hell of it. I can't see much point in serious discussion of the issues involved in Walter Breen's actual expulsion from the Pacificon II. Everything that needed to be said one way or the other has been said, at least once, more often twice or thrice; everyone with a mind to make up, has made it up.

So, this seems to about do it for Walter Breen as far as I'm concerned. I probably won't bother discussing things deadly seriously and all like

this any longer. I'm in fandom to have fun, mostly. I plan to do this; baiting John Boardman, I find, is monstrous fun.

VERKLARTE NACHT 13:

As a note: I found Eney's refusing of credit to Jack Harness's tiny "15 page" f/rational the height of stuffiness. Like, I thought it was a gas. As a matter of fact, I believe the original Tapscott provision requiring members dropped for failure to pub to publish 15 pages worth of f/r had a statute of limitation of one-cycle. Since Eney apparently didn't bother to check that document, it should thus be noted that Harness was eligible to enter the IWL with FRI46, with or without the f/r. He ought to be reinstated in his previous spot.

BLACKBEARD: I think you're rationalizing like mad here. Frankly, I don't think you give half a damn about liberal principles. I don't think this has much if anything to do with your stand on the Donaho-Breen matter. If so, you wouldn't compose as many apparent outright lies (like, about the police laughing Donaho and Rogers out of town) as you do. As a matter of fact, I consider myself to be pretty tolerant and liberal (down, Boardman) and all. I have, how do you say, liberal principles, maybe. But, when you claim that child molestation is a liberal principle I must say that you're Off Your Ass. A primary objection of mine to Walter is that he has so viciously exploited other's liberal principles. First with their children; now by bringing them to his defense. I could easily forgive Walter for screwing an occasional 11 year old, if I really thought he'd quit, but I doubt that I can ever forgive his crass exploitation of the principles of people I like.

Paying people \$300 bucks a month to marry a nigger is the most asinine idea I have read since the last time I read one of my own fanzines (note: coy self-depreciation.) Like, I have nothing against niggers, mind you. I just wouldn't want my sister to marry one. Unless she was willing to split 50% of the take with me.

BREEN: I suppose turning UNTITLED "distasteful" and "disgusting" you're trying to prove your critical abilities. It should be noted, however, for posterity (all our chocolate colored kiddies) that about 50% of that particular zine was written by friends of yours—defenders, yet. Like, not all the letters were forged.

As a matter of fact, people who choose their friends just because they're Negroes, as you apparently do, have almost as much of my personal distaste as those who refuse to associate with Negroes at all. At the present time about 85% of the people I regularly associate with out of choice (excluding fans) are Negroes. Big thing.

VAN ARNAM. You react fabulously. :: Actually, old buddy, I was putting you on up one side and 93% of the way down the other about being "a somewhat frightened" stuffed shirt. Actually, I think you're neither frightened or a stuff shirt. Perhaps it should be noted here that Gordon Eklund gets a big kick out of fooling around and saying serious type things in an unserious way. One should only believe about half of what I say as being my real opinion. I like to put on more than most fans, apparently, and I have recently discovered that by doing so, I find out more about the real nature of people around me than I do by playing serious with them.

As a matter of fact, I saw no humor coming out of the Kennedy assassination, but this hardly means, to me at least, that such was impossible. Death can be, and frequently is, a very funny subject. People have taken death so terribly serious for so long that it has become a proper vehicle for humor. I repeat, like, nothing is too big to be laughed at (even the American government or Walter Breen) and anything that reaches the stage where it has become too big to be laughed at ought to be cut down to proper size. I don't consider the affair of Walter Breen and his pot hang-ups to be the great question of the universe. I think 90% of the commentary wasted on it has been silly.

GHOATE: If I can find those letters I'll gladly send them to you.
If I can't find them, and I probably can't, I'll settle for suing you for libel.

Metcalf no where has stated that the Clintons or anyone else agreed with the charges against Walter Breen. He has merely stated, which seems to be accurate, that these people have vouched for the descriptions of Breen's public acts in the Boondoggle. Perversion, like mostly everything, is in the eye and the mind. Given that the descriptions are accurate, and nobody has said they are ^{not} except maybe you, who was never present so far as I know, each person must draw their own conclusion as to whether Walter's actions with these children are or are not perverted acts of a child molester, or a probably child molester. The law says they are; apparently you disagree.

Who has ever written any ridiculous statements and then forged Walter's name to them? If you answer as asinine as I hope you will, I shall turn three saundersaults and burst into two or three peals of laughter.

PATTEN: I did not consider THE CULT SKETCHBOOK to be all that icky. The major fault with it was that certain of the cartoons weren't all that funny. I think the subject of pederasty, as you so quaintly put it, is funny as hell, even side splitting. Why just last night I was strolling down the streets of wild, Mexican-whore filled Vacaville, California and spotted a child molester molesting a whole group of children. I burst into immediate laughter at which point said molester quietly walked up to me said, quite loudly indeed, "Aaaargh" and punched me in the nose.

I bet you're a Catholic.

WHITE: I think you're projecting all over the place in this letter, but I don't think it's worth it to try to say why or point out specific instances. Like, I no longer have any interest whatsoever in debating the Walter Breen case with you or in trying to point out your own rather extreme psychological hang-ups. Like, you think I need "psychological treatment," apparently, and I am beginning to think that you may need something more than scientology yourself, right now. But, fuck it. Debate on this level seems like a silly waste of time.

Heard any good jokes lately?

THE GREAT BREEN BRIBERY

or

Down Among the Dead-Beats

It's too bad you aren't all here in person at this moment: I'd probably hand each of you a \$10 bill just out of sheer gratitude. --

Redd Boggs in Hurrah For Our Side #1

Boggs, you're a cheapskate. Breen paid me \$25 to vote for him. I suggest the rest of you who voted to reinstate Breen on the FAPA w-l send him bills for your \$25.00. He might even put you on the Fanac mailing list.

Of course, this bribery didn't cost Breen too much seeing as how it was my very own \$25 he was bribing me with. Back in Oct 62 (or thereabouts) I went to a GGFS meeting. This was somewhat unusual for me unless the program was supposed to have something to do with SF (science fiction, not sex fandom Walter). So to get on with the tale Calvin W. Demmon says to me "I hear you volunteered to build Walter's hi-fi set for him." This was news to me but I finally found out what had happened. Jerry Knight was going to build it for Walter (and had built a Scott tuner for him) but Jerry was off to Poughkeepsie and had suggested me. (When I later asked Jerry about the matter he said that he figured that I could use the money.) So anyway I built a Citation pre-amp and power amp for Walter and he kept stalling off payment. This was about par for Walter anyway and I wasn't in any big hurry for the money. I was out only time and effort.

Walter owed Jerry still for the building of the tuner. But Jerry wasn't in any hurry either. Finally come Sep 63 Dave & Virginia Rike and myself went over to Walter's. Virginia charmed some money out of Walter but he said that was all he could afford to pay on his debt to Rike. He promised to pay me soon which promise I regarded in the light of Walter's character.

Then on 5 Jun 63 I pedalled up to Walter's new abode. He was back in town and I figured to try him again, particularly since I needed money. Breen is quite a ways up the hills behind here so I was panting, puffing, sweating and the rest of the routine when I arrived at his house. Walter was just inside the door arranging some records when I rang the bell. No reaction. I rang again. No reaction. So I knocked on the door. Walter swings around, opens the door (blocking it with his body) and growls, "What do you want here?". I replied my money. Then Walter bellows out 'Did you blackball me in FAPA!!!!'.

'Whatever gave you that idea?'

'It's all over that you did blackball me.'

Then quoth I: 'There was a list in Zeen #2 which is supposed to be people who blackballed you.'

'I can tell you exactly where that list came from, Big Bull Donaho.'

'Are you willing to sign a petition for me?'

'I've already sent one into Pelz.'

'Are you willing to sign another one?'

'Sure.'

So Walter hauled out a Boggs petition which I filled out incorrectly after re-reading it carefully. It was left lying on the mantel. I was thinking of sticking it back in my knapsack but decided to see what happened if it achieved circulation.

After that Walter got out his wallet, handed me two ten-dollar bills and got a five from Marion who wanted to know what that was for. Walter explained that it was working on his hi-fi set.

So then Walter turned into friendly, lovable Walter and the three of us discussed various subjects for a while until dusk when I pedalled off.

On 7 Jun 64 the following letter was written:

Dear Gregg,

Please don't count my signature on Boggs' petition to reinstate Breen. Breen paid me \$25.00 to sign for him, details in the Aug FAPA mailing. And as you may notice the information called on the ballot wasn't supplied which right there should invalidate it (along with everyone else who used a P.O. Box or APO address or whatnot). But regardless of technicalities I repudiate my signature on that petition as well as repudiating Breen.

I guess I should have sent a carbon to Boggs though whether or not he would have ignored it I don't know.

And Walter I would hesitate before terming as you did your reinstatement on the FAPA waiting list "a moral victory".

No, I'm not one of those who is going to resign from FAPA or its waiting list just because Walter Breen has been re-instated on the waiting list. I prefer to stick around and watch the fun. But I don't want to go on record as an accessory before the fact if Walter uses FAPA to make contact with some minor for the purposes of seduction and the parents haul Walter into court. Admittedly, dragging FAPAs into court for letting Walter loose in our midst isn't the most highly probable occurrence but it is a possibility.

And then I'm in a slightly different position than a good many of you. While I missed all these interesting GGFS gatherings where Walter was supposed to be seducing and/or trying to seduce children I do know the people who say that he is guilty well enough to be reasonably sure that they are telling the truth. And since I have read Walter's own words where he has been advocating, hinting at and in general being enthused over minors I'm willing to accept as a working hypothesis the fact that Walter is indeed guilty. And the antics of Breen's "defenders" create no desire to join in with them, in fact I concur with Tackett that some of them shouldn't be in fandom, if anyone is to go.

If I were in Walter's place I'd feel ashamed to have all these people standing up and lying away, being hypocrites, mudslingers, etc. And I'd be even more ashamed to have some of the people who actually seem to believe Breen innocent trying to proclaim Walter's innocence of an activity he's been previously proud of.