

SWINGLINE 6

SWINGLINE #6, by Joyce Katz, 59 Livingston St., Apt. 6-B, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201, and dated for the sixth mailing of Apa on August 5, 1972. Somewhere the sun is shining, but it's not evidenced much in my mood tonight. Since I believe in getting all the unpleasantness out of the way first, let's get right on with it.

DAVE I'm not going to attempt to make a point-by-point refutation of your attack on Arnie and me. I've very carefully read your words, and even more carefully listened to the echoes of your words written and spoken outside of apa, and you've made it extremely clear that at present we seem to have no point of philosophic contact from which to try to build a better understanding. Considering the vehemence and duration of your attack, it would appear that you have less interest in gaining a hearing of your views--which differ so notably from ours--than of stripping us of what regard we might have gained with others in and out of apa. This is distressing, of course. It is saddening, certainly. We aren't enjoying it--as I'm sure you knew we would not. However, I have never conducted fanac (should it be called feudac) on this level, and have no wish to begin now. But apa contains several of the persons whose opinions I hold most dear in all the world, and in order to try to maintain at least some regard in their eyes, feel I must make a defense on at least a few of your accusations.

On the Glicksohn conversation: I'm sorry, but we see this differently than you. Perhaps there'll be an account elsewhere in apa of another version of this encounter. You've described it as us attacking Mike. To me it seemed more nearly the other way around. Also, I might add that you apparently saw that conversation as somehow being sinister. I did not; I saw it as a fair exchange of valid views of fan ethics between a group of fan editors, and a discussion on the quality of friendship between a couple of pretty good acquaintances. While I can see that the conversation wasn't held in the best possible manner, nor at the best possible time, I'd hardly consider it to be "shameful", and actually think the subjects were very appropriate for discussion by fans.

Secondly, I strongly resent your implications that you put down Christianity for Arnie's sake, and that you were "being a whore for Arnie" when you were in your anti-religious phase. If you'll look back over the very small amount that Arnie's written on the subject, you'll find he's got no more tolerance than any of the rest of us about others forcing their religious convictions on him; for this reason he doesn't care for the Jesus Freaks, the Process People, Jehova Witnesses, or any other strongly evangelical movement. However, Arnie is an agnostic and, inconceivably to me, conceives that anyone's religious belief could be correct. (I, on the other hand, am an atheist and think that religion is harmful. However, I'm happy to say that I've not felt the need to attack other people's beliefs for more years than I've enjoyed your acquaintanceship.) If you put down religion, Dave, at least have the guts to face up to the fact that you did it, and stop trying to blame your actions on someone else.

I was surprised at your account of Lunacon. As hostess of Saturday night's party, I am of course sorry to learn that you didn't enjoy yourself. On that night I thought you did; and you certainly seemed very friendly and happy the next day, which makes it even more difficult for me to grasp the notion that your Lunacon experience was so full of suffering. Certainly there were numerous exchanges..particularly on Friday..regarding some of the things you'd written in Apa's first mailing, specifically in regard to your uncivilized views on women's rights and abortion. When you wrote those views, you expected to get response, didn't you? But considering your actions at the time, I have to wonder if

perhaps the Saturday night party wasn't that uncomfortable to you only in retrospect. I recall that you laughed and cut up and talked quite cheerfully; at one point you and someone...wasn't it Charlene?...sat on the floor and had a very long animated conversation. - Oh well. No matter. If you didn't enjoy yourself, certainly I'm sorry... although I'm somewhat at a loss to understand why you didn't leave if it was all that bad, and why you seemed so intent on expressing your enjoyment at that time if it wasn't real.

There were numerous other things in your attack, Dave, that I would take issue with... for example, the erroneous impression you gave that there is some kind of friction between the Katz's and Jerry Lapidus--a fan with whom we've always had a very mutually satisfying relationship (what are you trying to do, set up another Jeff Schalles situation?); and your hints that our lack of attendance of conventions is due to some kind of fannish snobbery when in actual fact the reason we don't attend more conventions is simply because we don't have the money. But, I think there is little can be gained by going through your apazine point-by-point.

I'm very sorry, David, but it seems to me that we have nothing else to discuss.

TO EVERYONE ELSE I don't guess I have to explain to any of you why it's been hard to get it up for apa this month. I'm fairly fannishly despondent, and under the circumstances don't really have the heart to continue poking & prying into the psychic phenomena of the Lives & Loves of Linda Lovely, Girl Fan. Not only is there the really obvious problem that's barring my instinct toward talkativeness, but in the last month something else has come up that's such a Delicate Problem that I hate to mention it. Arnie and I have received a letter from a non-apan referring to things that I'm virtually certain had only been discussed in apa. This upsets me more than I can say. I really have no desire to distribute my confidences to fandom-at-large, and am disappointed that someone has already violated their promise of privacy. Some of the things I've already written in apa I consider to be highly personal, and I certainly have no wish to continue writing in that vein..or in this apa..if I can't hope to have my girlish confidences kept confidential.

Arnie has very rightfully pointed out that my threat to leave apa if the privacy restriction isn't honored, may actually act as an incentive for David to show his mailings around fandom. Perhaps the rest of you should give some thought to what actions you'd want taken in case of continued violations of this nature. It appears to be a very real problem that we now have to face.

Actually, if you wanna know the truth, this past month has just been bad all around for Arnie and I. Remember the squirrel? Well, when the Big Rains came, apparently they washed him away..or at least washed away the trail he followed to my kitchen; we haven't seen him since. And when the lightning struck our apartment and burnt out the electricity, it was pretty damn uncomfortable for a while. And there was the heat wave... And I got clumsy and pulled the phone out of the wall... and there was a sick spell with something intestinal and horrible. And probably the single thing I was second most upset about is the fact that I had numerous pages written for apa, and managed to lose them. I absently stuffed them into a mail box, when sending out some other stuff...and they're not recoverable from the belly of the postoffice.

Ah, well. Perhaps next month things will be better. From the way it looks now, I'm not the only one who's going to be so bothered by the developments of the past month that they cut back on their apa contribution. Perhaps we'll all feel better about it by the time next mailing comes around.

Meanwhile, here are some very brief newsnotes...things I had wanted to talk about, but instead will just tell.

We're going to Missouri; leaving here the weekend of August 19. We'll probably be back in St. Louis (from Poplar Bluff) on 8-22 or 8-23. Pam Janisch (COA:3809 Shaw, St. Louis 10) is probably the person who'll know where we are. Sure would like to see everyone possible if it's possible for any of you to be there.

Hank -- Steve Shucart passed through NY this week and spent a couple of nights with us before leaving, on his way to England, Europe, Pakistan, India and Nepal. A few months back he sold an sf story to an underground paper in Buffalo. Now it appears that it's going to be picked up by an anthology being planned (but not yet sold to a publisher) by Gellman/Hensley.

Oh, hell...let's see if I can try to make at least a comment or two. There was some fine stuff in the last mlg., despite it all...

TED It was somehow comforting to have the Hate New York/ers phenomena spelled out so clearly, as well as the fact that this attitude has been going on for a long time. And, perhaps what you say is true. Everyone knows that a person's personality is set by the area where he lives. For example, we all know that Bay Area fans are gafiated, and very Spiritual. And L.A. fans are power-hungry and Warped. And Midwestern fans are very folksy and easy-going (unless they move elsewhere, at which time they immediately adopt the characteristics of their adopted home.) And, of course, New York fans are very snobbish and Overbearing. But--you've shown us the way; there is hope. Considering how your personality has changed since you've moved to Virginia (..some people don't even think you're a fan..) I do believe that Arnie and I will go to Pennsylvania.

I understood just enough of your description of the sound system to know that it must be Good...and to know that it's really beyond my capabilities to duplicate. Indeed, good sound is a very sensual experience..and I agree that the surf-like waves of sound of an interesting result of a good system. I'll have to hope that someday I'll be invited to listen to yours from the foam rubber vantage point you mention.

Speaking of realism in sound, I've had a funny reaction every time I've ever attended a non-rock concert. (This doesn't apply to rock concerts, of course.) It really sounded bad; not nearly enough base, the middle-range muted, the treble very flattened out. And this in some accoustically very fine halls. I suppose I've got to admit that realism isn't actually what I like; I like the slight distortion produced by a folded horn speaker.

Hmm. You and I graduated from highschool the same year. But my class ring long since has gone the way of all gold. It was in 1960 or '61 that I got broker than usual and sold it to Poplar Bluff's closest-thing-to-a-fence. A few month previous I had pawned my typewriter to PB's only pawn dealer..a combination jewelry-pet-pawn shop that made instant slum of whatever neighborhood it located in, run by a lady evangelist who was also a real-estate dealer on the side. (And her husband was a mortician; there were few areas of life that one of the two of them couldn't have a hold on you.) Preacher Hooker gave me \$20 for my Underwood portable..the first typewriter I ever had. I had literally shed tears, and just like in the movies, told some far-out lie about why I was so desperate for money; perhaps my sob story raised the ante by a few bucks, but I don't know. At any rate, of course I never redeemed it, so I was ashamed to go back to Hooker's with the class ring, where I assume I could have pawned it instead of selling it outright. The man who ran Bluff City Jewelry, a seedy run-down hole in the wall that displayed tarnished jewelry and dead flies in dirty glass cases and specialized in paying cash for "old" jewelry--no

questions asked--leered at me and made a couple of Strange Suggestions while explaining that class rings are only worth the weight of the gold. I regretted that the PB ring was so delicately formed, and wished for more massiveness. But, I could see what he meant; just how likely was it that another graduate of Class of '56 would wander in to the Bluff City Jewelry, wanting to buy a PB class ring with the initials JW just opposite the year.

I'm always somehow surprised to learn of someone still having their class ring after all these years.

SETH I've still got to stick to my original statement that even a porn flick has a great deal more attraction to me than any violent film. Just the tv ads of "Ben" are enough to give me nightmares without even seeing it. Heck, just the subway posters are enough to terrify me, without even seeing the tv ads. I really am weak-stomached for bloody mayhem in any form, to such an extent that I openly request my friends to steer me away from such films, books, etc.

On the other hand, I'll also continue to stick by my statement that a porn flick of non-violent sex (ie, I really don't like the whips-and-chains people, a whole lot,) isn't going to have anything similar to the affect on me that Psycho did. I haven't seen all that many skin flicks and don't know anything about the films you mentioned, so I don't know if they are more-or-less hardcore than anything I've seen: you're the most experience in this field, so perhaps you can answer your own question. How does "Mona" and "Harlot" stack up against "Schoolgirl" and "The Nurses"?

Oh..to try to head one off at the pass: I'm sorry for my use of the word "defend" when I was discussing fan-family relationships. There's certainly nothing to "defend" you or Lesleigh against, any more than there are really "slings & arrows" headed for Lane, or rooms full of clucking Insurgents when Alice's name is dropped. Silly of me to use such a word as "defend" which left itself so wide open for misunderstandings in this presently very-nervous group.

NEAL: Well, Harry Warner wasn't right, but he wasn't exactly wrong either. I mean, tho it was inevitable that Ray and I would eventually call it off, the con certainly did nothing to help, and actually accelerated the problem. -- I wouldn't say it would necessarily be bad for a couple to be on a con committee together though; look at Hank and Lesleigh for a really good example...or, for that matter, consider Leigh & Norbert Couch who were both on the St.Louiscon committee...and those are just two couples among many. I do, however, think that co-chairmanship opens up very special stresses for a married couple (--maybe it opens up stresses between any two fans; Ted, were your relations with Dave affected much by NyCon?--) And, as long as I'm in my present mind about it, I guess I'd try to talk any married couple out of attempting a co-chairmanship. Thing is, to be true co-chairmen, both people have to be pretty active..and fans being as they are, both are likely to have fairly large egos. But the nature of conventions being as it is, one ego almost has to be subordinated to another on occasions. Also, while I definitely feel there's enough work for two chairmen, I don't really think there's enough reward to cover two equally active people. Somehow fans find it easier to believe that one person is more responsible. But, Harry Warner was indeed wrong in his assumption that St.Louiscon is the reason Ray and I got a divorce. And, I'm glad if I corrected that impression. Fandom has many flaws (though it's still the best mud puddle I ever made pies in) but I don't really credit it with being a home-wrecker....no matter what FT Laney said to the contrary.