

RECEIVED JAN 24 1964

SPELEOBEM 22.2

another damn unofficial official post mailing

2110-12064

Good grief. I wonder at the advisability of putting this out — surely anyone who has been in SAPS for more than half a year knows that that little mess which calls itself 'Speleobem 22.2' was a fake. Rather too obviously put out for SAPS by our own dear Phil Castora in an attempt to confuse the issue.

But, for the record, let me point out the mistakes that should have already proved this point to you.

First off, we have what was probably a very unconscious mistake; he numbered his fake SPELEOBEM 22.2 and called it Incunebulous Publication 220, while claiming that SPELEOBEM 22.1 (Incunebulous Publication 219) was a fake. I regret to inform Phil that I do not include false SPELEOBEMs in my numbering system.

The next thing, though probably less obvious, is that Phil does not recognize the significance of the numbers I run at the top of the pages of SPELEOBEM. I will explain. The number Phil ran in his fake SPELEOBEM signifies that 'I' began typing that stencil at 1840 (fourty minutes after six in the evening) — 1 (January) 14 (the 14th day) 91 (in the year 1991!). The number I have above shows that I started this stencil at 2110 (ten minutes after nine in the evening) — 1 (January) 20 (the 20th day) 64 (in the year 1964) — which, it must be agreed, makes more sense.

Thirdly, even if rich brown published a fake SPELEOBEM to try to take the SAPS election away from me (which, from recent hints received in correspondence of his of late, I thought he was going to do), I would not call the practice "foul, undignified and unSAPSish tactics" because it was I who first used exactly such a trick when I took the SAPS election away from Toskey and the Lichtman-Durward duo. But Phil cannot be expected to know that. Along the same general line, anyone who knows me at all will certify that I am much too jaded to believe in a "clean race for the office of OE [of SAPS]" — that would be going, I think, against SAPS tradition.

As if that were not enough, the issue is laden with typos — on what looks to me to be on Phil Castora's typer. I do not claim that I do not make typos. The fact is that I make almost as many as Phil does. The major difference here being that I at least try to keep up the pretense of correcting mine.

Lastly, the phraseology is most unBruce Pelzish — compare it with anything I have written in the past year and I am sure the comparison will prove it phony.

As to why I am voting for rich brown. Simple. Rich happens to be a friend of mine (not that Phil isn't, but you understand what I'm driving at) and he also happens to have more SAPSish experience. It boils down to the fact that (of the two) I think rich will make the better OE. I admit that it may cost me more to send my zines to the East Coast — it is precisely this factor, I think, which may still get Phil the majority of the West Coast vote — but it's my hope (and I think rich's too) that the majority of SAPS will give more sensible thinking to the matter. SAPS needs something a little better than what that fake SPELEOBEM 22.2 showed us and the treasury is fat enough that it can easily carry whatever slight burden ensues. That is why I am voting for rich brown — and, to quote that fake SPELEOBEM again, "That should be that."

---

Types again courtesy of UCIA's Library catalog department

---

This has been  
SPELEOBEM 22.2  
Incunebulous Publication 220

from Bruce Pelz  
Box 100, 308 Westwood Plaza  
Los Angeles, California 90024