

I didn't really intend that slash-out stuff on this issue's Slogan; it's just that three or four years of typing the incantation NEW YORK IN '67 on every little fannish creation got me pretty well in the habit of typing 1967.

FIRST DRAFT #187

Vol. 32, No. 1

13 Oct 67

Honest mistakes are the best policy.

ST LOUIS IN 1967 1968 1969!!

This is the Incredibly Weekly fanzine of Dave Van Arnam, of 1730 Harrison Ave, Apt 353, Bronx, NY, and it is available to all attendees of Fano-clasts and to subscribers to ~~DEGLER~~ SF WEEKLY, which is available from Andy Porter, weekly, at 14/\$1. You can also get SF WEEKLY by sending news items. You can't get FD by sending money, however. BUT if you were interested in trading your fanzine...

FD is also available in Apa L, for which I theoretically send 40 copies a week and get a mlg back. I backslid, however, and didn't send off last week's, the birth announcement. *sigh*

I did get all the mlgs since I rejoined, however -- and, with a generosity which stuns me to contemplate, Jean Berman sent me the 25 odd mailings I had missed. I believe that Jean Berman deserves the Fanoclast Hug, or something. (Though I think I shd point out that the Fanoclast Hug has certain traditions which have grown up about it; this may be one reason why it has only been tendered four times...)

ONE OF THE THINGS in one of the recent Apa L mailings got thru to me sufficiently for me to respond to it in FD, which generally speaking I never allow myself to do because it wd be too easy for me to turn this into an all-mc zine for Apa L, and that is not FD's purpose.

Bjo has taken me to task for a couple of things, one of which is not entirely clear in my mind, the other of which is a simple misapprehension. Apparently my discussion of the Pan Pacificon/Baycon hassle, though I was entirely on the side of L.A., was couched in terms too strong; I suppose the first time I decided to really speak out in FD on something I might have looked to getting stomped. Indeed, I did get a little stomped; I got a phone call from Big Bill Donaho, who set me straight on some misapprehensions I had set down in my 4-page NYCon report, and which I duly reported in the next issue. Anyway, I got the impression that Bjo was stomping me too. This nonplusses me a bit, which is why this paragraph has been so confused so far.

She also strongly objected to my mild little jab at Ted White in my con report; I don't have that issue with me so I can only quasiquote: "It was a gas to see hundreds of fans jump to their seats and rush forward to donate a quarter each so that the original STAR TREK presentation cd be donated to the Smithsonian. It is also a gas to realize that, deep in the bowels of the Smithsonian, STAR TREK and the NYCon 3 will forever be linked together. Sorry about that, Ted!"

The only purpose in this mild jibe was to rag Ted about how his convention and STAR TREK will forever be associated in federal files somewhere, and, to explain where no explanation shd be necessary, it is of course necessary in appreciating this to realize that Ted White loaths, hates, despises, and rejects everything about STAR TREK, and has with great skill and glee

Null-Q Press
Undecided Publication #235

expressed himself at length on the subject in the pages of YANDRO and in conversation at the Fanoclasts and elsewhere. How jolly, then, that the official records on that STAR TREK presentation shd record that the deed of donating it to the Smithsonian occurred at the NYCon 3, which was pretty well stamped as Ted White's convention.

Bjo, however, distressed me by taking this as some kind of slur on all the people who had worked on Pan Pacificon and on TOFF -- for the benefit of the latter cause was the purpose of the STAR TREK auction, and a good cause too.

I guess I'm just dreadfully defensive; when someone thinks that I have done or said some particular thing with the intent of scorning or doing injury to parties I have nothing whatsoever against, I get upset and nothing will do but that I go thru the whole schemoz and try to make clear what I intended.

At other times I have had the intent of scorning (or conceivably even Doing Injury To) various parties; in these matters I am not particularly defensive at all. The present instance is not in this category.

To repeat and belabor the obvious, then, I am most distressed when people misunderstand me -- and supremely distressed when people misunderstand me and are needlessly aggrieved thereby.

...Well, this has been New Depths in Philosophizing by dgv, and we will proceed on to other matters.

SUCH AS: How does the idea of the President of the United States being a Holy Roller strike you? A Two-Seed-In-The-Spirit Baptist? A spiritualist (Pike for President?)? A Jehovah's Witness? A Black Muslim? (Or, hell, a White Muslim, for that matter)? A Scientologist? (That's not quite fair, however, since Scn may well work.)

I'm not going to multiply examples of lunatic fringe religious that all of us are probably far too familiar with in the first place (and besides, I can't offhand think of any more outstanding ones, and I'm in a hurry to finish this...). The point of this is that we already have two such lunatic-fringe-religion-candidates being taken seriously right now.

Gov. ~~Brainwash~~ Romney is a Mormon. Sen. Percy is a Christian Scientist. Both are nut cults, and I am appalled that representatives -- devout representatives at that; both are very sincere about their nut-cultery -- of these aforesaid nut cults are presently in any way likely to become president of this country. Christian Science is to me more ludicrous than Mormonism, mostly because I've read Mark Twain's savagely hilarious book on the subject (in which he meticulously examines every aspect of Mrs Eddy's gibberish and shows their inherently self-contradictory foolishness with consummate ease). Mormonism may well be even worse, however, since included in it is an inherent anti-Negroism which is enough to make sensible people vomit all over Gov. Romney's feet. Most religion is, of course, pious slop anyway, but Mormonism manages to make racism pious, something that Southern Baptists at their most neandertal have found it difficult to do convincingly... Of course, we survived having a Catholic president, but I'm still not sure about what happened there; besides, a nut cult like Catholicism, having survived for a millennia and a half, to most people does not look like a nut cult any longer, from which observation other amusing conclusions might be drawn... Hoping you are the sane...

-- dgv