

Dave Van Arnam still gets mail at
1730 Harrison Ave and lives in Apt
353 with wife, daughter, 1 tomcat,
and three female cats. Anybody want
two small fannish female kittens?

FIRST DRAFT #198

Vol. 33, No. 6

29 Dec 67

Or maybe just one? They've got quite
a fannish bloodline -- their mother,
Sunny, is a Fabulous Ted White Pussy
Cat, and their father, Mickey (Mouse),
is a Lupoff New Breed Pussy Cat, one
of whose progenitors in turn was an Incredible Bob Silverberg Siamese
(I disremember the precise details at this moment of writing, but a full
geneology wd be provided on demand along with the kitten...).

For those of you for whom fandom is anathema -- and what the hell are
you doing reading this fanzine, anyway! -- I might mention that I might
just as well describe our two kittens as Magnificent Professional
Progeny, inasmuch as all the abovenamed fans are Pros. Wow. First
come, first served...

WE STILL GET LETTERS DEPT: Actually the following was for Andy, but
since FD has covered the topic -- and since Andy didn't feel like filling
up most of an issue of SFW, I'm printing it here. It is from...

TED WHITE ::

Dear Andy:

I'd like to put this as strongly as I can: I am opposed to the
idea of a 'rump' American national convention being held in this country
on those years when the World Convention goes to another country. I am
opposed to it as a private fan, and I am opposed to it as a past Chairman
of a Worldcon. I have been opposed to it since the abortive attempt in
this direction was first launched at the NyCon II in 1956.

Put bluntly, I think it is highly unethical. I think it's ethically
wrong. I can't think of one valid argument in its favor, and the only
argument I've heard is the venal one: "I want a Big Con here." This
argument, carried to its reductio ad absurdum, would have fans on the
East Coast holding a pseudo-worldcon every time the con was in the
Midwest or West (an idea which has been broached by a few fuggheads), or
those in the Midwest, or the West Coast, wanting the same thing for
their area.

The whole idea of the Worldcon is to attract fans in convocation from
(as much as possible) all over the world. The first worldcon (NyCon I,
1939) wasn't much by present standards in this respect, but it was the
first to bring fans from both coasts together. And the movement westward
(to Chicago, then Denver, then L.A.) indicates a willingness to sacrifice
the con to another area, even though perhaps a majority of those in
earlier areas would not be able to attend (it cost a lot more, propor-
tionately, before the war to travel coast to coast). It was never ex-
pected that everyone from all over could get to every convention. But
fans dreamed of the Big Trip, hoarded their money for it, and were still
hitch-hiking coast to coast as late as 1956 (when Ron Ellik travelled
the Big Thumb route).

I dreamed of going to the 1957 Loncon, and I'm sorry I couldn't. But
even so, I opposed a 'national' con to take its place. I did attend my
first Midwestcon that year, and my first Phillycon, as well. And that
brings me to my second point: If those screaming for an 'American' con
are simply looking for accessible action, the regional conclaves pretty

Null-Q Press

Undecided Publication #297

well have the country covered. There are now regionals in February, March, April, May, June, July, August, and November that I can think of just off-hand. Some of these (the Lunacon-Eastercon, the Westercon) are large and ambitious conventions, boasting memberships as large as had the worldcons of the late fifties and early sixties. Anyone who feels this isn't enough for him is obviously a glutton for punishment, and can probably afford an overseas trip anyway.

The proponents of the 'American' con plan point to the national cons in other countries. They ignore the fact that these countries have no 'regional' cons, and that attendance of an American Worldcon is beyond the pocketbooks of most overseas fans. (That, after all, was the reason why TAFF was started.) If we had no regionals, the idea of a rump con when the worldcon left this country would make more sense. But for now, it doesn't. It is simply an insult to the overseas Worldcon hosts, redundant, and unethical.

To comment directly on the letters you've published on this subject: Rick Sneary's objections to fixing a foreign con in the Rotation plan could as easily be leveled at the Rotation Plan itself. And therein lies its fallacy. The Rotation Plan provides for the possibility of weak bids or no bids from the rotation area eligible. This provision would apply as easily to overseas bids as any.

Bjo speaks from purest ignorance when she says of the 1965 London voters, "most of the voters could have cared less where the next con in the US would be." I was there; she wasn't. She's wrong. British voters displayed a more conscientious attitude towards the consite selection than most US voters have proven to have. They were less swayed by irrational appeals, and more concerned with properly handling the trust we had given them in allowing them the vote. The actual campaign broke down between those who felt Dave Kyle had by far the better presentation for a good convention (which he assuredly did), and those who felt that the preservation of the Rotation Plan (in which they had no personal stake) was the most important issue. (I seconded for the Tricon bid with Dick Eney, <(!)> and I stressed the point, suggesting that if Dave wanted a good campaign, he bid against us the following year. By ghod, he called me on that one!) The British voters have been less cynical and much more willing to involve themselves in what were mostly our internal arguments (at our request) than we have ever shown ourselves to be. What most galls me are the insular and idiotic statements like Bjo's, which follow a tradition launched in 1956, by Dave Pollard, who (speaking against a London convention) said, "There aren't a half dozen fans over there, anyway." And, in 1959, Jack McKnight (hold still for this, Bjo), speaking against the Rotation Plan at the Phillycon, wondered why we bothered with West Coast Worldcons, when "There aren't more'n a dozen or less fans out there anyway." It's high time American fans stopped acting like Ugly Americans in their dealings with foreign fans. <(The Ugly American was the Good Guy, Ted...)>

Finally, I do think that altering the Rotation Plan so that the foreign excursion would come every five years is a good one. That way, at least, the gap between US-based worldcons would also rotate. Either that or put the foreign con where it belongs in the rotation: between East and West-Coast cons.

Fans make a great thing of their Broad Mental Horizons. Let's use them a bit, huh?

Yhos, Ted White

☐☐ Aha! Now, off with this imitation bald spot and back into my disguise as mild-mannered Dave Van Arnam. I too like that five-year idea. Twice a decade instead of once, that seems reasonable. But the bottom of this stencil is flapping in the breeze, so, hoping you are the sane...