

△ MINOR CORRECTION ◁

I returned from Oklahoma this morning to find the 108th mailing, and a card from Redd saying he couldn't run off my stencils in time. So Synapse will be postmailed, with this.

The President's Report in the latest Fantasy Amateur says: "A letter from Speer came regarding his poll about Breen, to the effect that Al Lewis wanted to withdraw his signature, ..."

This sounds as if i had taken it upon myself to ask the president, on my say-so, to cancel someone's signature on the Breen petition. To double the confusion, there are two Al Lewises, either of whom might be the one referred to. Neither Al Lewis told me he wanted to withdraw his signature. If i were either Al Lewis, i would be angry at someone who undertook to make such a request for me.

What i actually wrote to Gregg was this: "... i don't think the effect of the special rule is retroactive. ... Retroactive stuff like that can lead to paradoxes, e g: If there were 66 members as of the last mailing, then 34 instead of 33 signatures are necessary to make a majority; ...# I know the vote isn't actually that close; ... However, i do hear that two who were counted are trying to withdraw their signatures, and i wanted to speak to you about that. # One of these is Alan Lewis, who ... is trying to decide whether the second reason ... alone is enough. As i've just written Lewis, i don't think he can withdraw a signature once given." I went on to refer to the wording of the constitution, and cited a case holding that a legislature's ratification of an amendment to the federal constitution cannot be withdrawn.

Thus the effect of my letter was opposite to that of Gregg's paraphrase. I know it was inadvertent, Gregg, but it's a good rule, especially in such matters, to quote, not paraphrase.

Jack Speer
15 Aug 64

Jack Speer
2034 Riva
Santa Fe, N.Mex.
RETURN REQUESTED



KAREN ANDERSON
3 LAS PALOMAS
ORINDA, CALIFORNIA
94563

MINOR CONNECTION