

WHEN THE GODS
WOULD SUP #3



WHEN THE GODS WOULD SUP #3

It probably comes as a surprise, but this is the third issue of that infamous S&Pszine WHEN THE GODS WOULD SUP, prepared by Al Lewis, SA, 338-873; AT B-10; USCG Training Station; Groton, Connecticut for the ~~Revolutionist~~ neonism of my fellow S&Ps. This is intended for the 54th S&P mailing; dated January 1961.

*

I suppose an explanation is due on why I've suddenly popped up again in S&P without having the chastising experience of working my way back up the waiting list. Well, it's all due to the overwhelming fairness of O'Neary. He may have a black heart, but it's also a big one, and when I pointed out to him that it had all been a mistake--I hadn't resigned, and I had been told I was safe 'til this mailing, he returned my membership to me. (Or so Howard says) I trust no-one will jump on Dick for this. I am utterly convinced it hurt him just as much to return my membership to me as it's hurting you to see me still fleunting my S&Psmanship.

*

In the past, a few people have offered several hints to me. Included in this number are Shelby Vick, Bob Lichtman, Bruce Palz and Vic Ryan. In fact, quite a rogues gallery. In general, the hints have boiled down to one simple sentence; in words of one syllable it goes, "Why don't you get the hell out of S&P if you don't like it?"

The thing is people, right there you've answered your question. Why don't I drop out of S&P if I don't like it? Simple--I like S&P!

On first glance, this probably seems astounding to most of you. I suppose the only one who takes it at face value is Howard. Why? Because of the large amount of grotching I've done.

For example, I've grotched about the large amounts of mailing comments in proportion to the more formally written material. Does this show I don't like S&P? I don't think so. I'd prefer to read Squink Blog fiction by Rich Brown to his mailing comments any day; the same for Jack harness and many more of you. But I don't dislike reading your mailing comments to such an extent that I automatically dislike S&P.

I mentioned once I think FAPA is "better" on this score. I still believe it is. (Aside to Ballard--at the time Kennedy and I agreed on this, I'd seen some 30 S&P mailings and 10 FAPA mailings, and Kennedy had seen two current S&P mailings and about the same number of current FAPA mailings.) FAPA has a larger quantity--not necessarily a higher quality--of formally written material. To my mind, this is a good thing. So I'd like to see S&P approach this to some extent. This is bad? This is unforgiveable? To judge by the comments I've been receiving, it is, whether I enjoy S&P or not.

As for mailing comments, I've explained several times I detest doing them, and I have given my reasons. Buz in his comprehensive article upon the subject though, utterly ignored my points, so I'll restate them.

First of all, to me mailing comments mean complete mailing comments. This is very important to me, because I know what it means to the poor fellow you don't review. If you're going to do MCs, for pity's sake, make them complete! Most of you I'm sure don't realize what endless frustration it brings on to work to bring out a fanzine, and then receive utterly no acknowledgement at all. I personally don't expect to get much, because the material I use isn't that

commentworthy (MC-wise). But the simple "I liked this. More, please." of harness' in the last mailing was extremely gratifying.

The above is just my own reaction to mailing Comments. I feel since I respond this way, I can't honestly do mailing comments without giving you your bit of worked-for egoboo. This is important to me--I just don't feel it's at all fair to do it any other way. So I've made the house rule I won't do MCs unless I can do complete MCs.

Now all this is nice, but you see I haven't been able to find the time to do complete MCs. Now I'm attending a Coast Guard electronics school, I have even less time than before.

So to sum everything up, I feel no MCs are better than some, and I don't have the time to do competent MCs on everything.

Unfortunately, though, you don't agree with me. So this time, to show my happiness at being brought back to the fold, I will do a few MSs. But I reckon this'll be the last time for quite a while. One thing I do want answered by you is your opinion on the matter. If enough of you feel that some are better than my "all or none" attitude, I might concur. There have been many things I've been aching to break out and say, but conscientiously I can't.

*

This may come as a shock, but I would like to apologize for the last publication I inserted in a SABS mailing. I honestly didn't think the furor which arose over its crudity was merited, but apparently the sensibilities of many of you were insulted. So I'll assure you, I won't try it again. It was fun putting out the one-shot--next time I'll simply find another title! (And Ryan, let me assure you that if I should drop out of SABS, it will never be to let Gerber enter.)

*

In the fan press of late there have been questions and answers concerning some type of a permanent "Fanzine Foundation". I personally haven't entered the discussion, but I'm intensely interested in the subject.

The major fly in the salad seems to be setting up such a foundation. "Who will handle it?" is the major question. Art Rapp has suggested the NFFF, but with all due respect, I don't believe it would work. The NFFF may not be due for extinction in the near future, Art, but whatever fan is intrusted with their care may gaffiate at any time. A good example would be the way John Moning left the NFFF with the imz files Pavlat had donated to the organization.

I wrote a letter to Ackerman on this several months ago. In general, I wanted to know what the Fantasy Foundation had, and how it was set up. I received the following reply:

"The Fantasy Foundation now exists in a kind of a state of limbo. I guess you could say it has somewhat become amalgamated with my own collection altho it is still kept in a separate section of my fantasy world. Actually, as I am leaving my entire home and library intact to fandom, I suppose that takes care of the future of the Fantasy Foundation holdings. I can't see any objections to your starting something along similar lines...."

Although I wrote Forry again, I was unable to discover just how he was leaving his home and collection to fandom; just who would be the trustees, etc. And this is the thing that seems to be holding up the entire project!

I have come to the conclusion, therefore, that the only practical way is to have one person--one fan--announce he is willing to start such a foundation himself, and then just keep it going through his own efforts. I wouldn't expect other fans to donate items (can you imagine all fandom becoming so altruistic it would vouchsafe fanzines?) but I could imagine our hypothetical fan trying to keep up with the flood.

Now I'm not trying to offer myself unequivocally, but I've lately put myself in such a position where I'd certainly logically be considered. A little while ago I told Pavlat if no-one else came forward, I'd be interested in keeping up the fanzine index. Well, no-one else came forward, so I suppose the job descended upon me. So lately I've been trying to get the fanzines to help complete the job. Within the last two months, I completed negotiations with John Berry and Bob Swisher for their piles of fanzines. Berry has somewhere over 1000, and Swisher has 94 inches of the things. The cost? In the end when all postage is paid for it'll probably come out to \$250. (And before some of you point out Swisher's stuff has been indexed before, I'll freely admit it has been--and inaccurately, as well. His work abounds with mistakes, as Pavlat can well testify.)

One large rub which enters into the formation of such a foundation is the question of who gets the fanzines if the curator dies. I don't know how any of you have handled the problem with your collections, but I think I've found the answer for myself. It will go to two fans whom I trust. My parents have been told what to do if anything happens, and Howard DeVore has been asked to collect my fannish belongings and either use them himself, or pass them on to Bob Pavlat. Such a system won't keep my collection intact if I die, but at least it will tend to keep the good stuff together. Since I have loaned much of my stuff to Howard "for the duration" and when the bundles of fmz begin arriving Howard'll probably receive them, there won't be much of a sweat about Howard getting hold of my collection. Even if what I have at home now were destroyed, not much of value would be lost. I have a typical beginners' collection--I'm going to have to use Berry's, Swisher's and others' as the real "building blocks" on which to base what I hope will eventually amass.

One question which hasn't entered into the discussion of late is "what would the duties of such a foundation be?" This may sound quite elementary, but back in the early 1940s if the same question was asked of the then new NFFF, I'm sure the answer must have seemed just as rudimental.

The fanzine index itself, I believe would be the first object. But beyond that, I believe some sort of reprint department would be needed--a sort of "Basic Works of Fandom" series."

In the actual business of reprints, I think Bill Evans' REMEMBRANCE OF THINGS PAST beats all the other former reprint fanzines (including, I'm unhappy to say, FANTASY ASPECTS) all hollow. I am sad it comes out so infrequently, and the distribution is rather puny compared to what that of an ideal foundation's zine circulation would be. But I do think something on the order of KOTF would be the best kind of a reprint magazine.

How about a more common reprint fanzine as well? The more I think about it, the more I'm inclined to think whatever would be published must have a definite theme behind it. The helter-skelter reprinting of long gone articles or satires is no good by itself. There should be some kind of cohesiveness about it.

But no matter what is published, it would be the duty of such a foundation to see it is perpetually in print. It is sad to note as soon as a reprint fan-

is out of print, it is as hard to obtain as the material it is reprinting!

But is this all a foundation would be able to accomplish? Lord, I hope not, but I'd like to read ideas from you.

*

There is one thing which I think S&PS needs, and that is some system of reclaiming members dumped through some process of the OE's rules. Whether it should be a petition, or just a generally accepted notion that on such-and-such an occasion the OE can break his own rules doesn't matter, but this is something we need. When I glanced over the last SPEC I was shocked to see Weber had disappeared. Isn't there something we can do to get him back? I just can't imagine S&PS without Wally. Can you?

*

I have begun to realize I've been luckier than most fans with the accumulation of fannish riches. Last night, for example, I dropped over to Martin Alger's house to pick up the four FAPA mailings he had been holding for me. They swelled my collection to the last 13 mailings (mostly complete--only 2 or 3 items missing from each mailing). I was up until 5 am reading through the mailings--not pausing too long on any one item, but just glancing through to fathom the mailings. I also lifted several items out, which I trust will be replaced by the time I pack them up this week. The most notable of these was Bill Rotsler's QUOTEBOOK.

I don't know what the average fan's impression was of QUOTEBOOK from the rumors heard. Everything I heard was understated. The quotes are indexed, ranging from Acting to women; from "I'm not intelligent. I just quote." to "What are you going to call that sweet old lady now that 'mother' is a dirty word?" I had expected just a quotebook of fannish expressions--what I received was much more. It's content was what I should have expected from seeing Bill's artwork and what I've read about him--I didn't. A second volume is being planned--try to get it in if you can; it's well worth the effort.

*

I would like to publically thank John Berry for the many kindnesses he has shown me. One was the inclusion of several extra pages in my copy of ROT POUH-I last mailing. They concerned the suicide craft both the Germans and Japanese used and planned during the Second World War. I believe they were tear sheets from an article in CAMBET. At any rate, they were appreciated. Just like reading the series on Aviation Oddities has been appreciated. I'll not put up a pretense of being a red-hot aviation bug--but I am interested in the field, and I've enjoyed reading John's articles.

Thanks John--I'm glad I gave you an excuse to write them.

*

Vic Ryan quoted Buck Coulson last mailing (WARTAGE, P. 14) about the maps (mundane apa) Johnny Bowles is in and its incredibly ill-produced fanzines. This brings forward a few thoughts of my own on this apa--it's the American apa, and I've been a member for the last year.

I originally became interested in the mapes several years ago. I had been a fan for just a short time (perhaps a year) and figured it would be nice to join some mapes--especially as it seemed to be a long wait before I'd be able to enter either FAPA or SAPS.

For some reason, Kacy Riggs in one of his crudzines chose that time to advertise the annual conventions of all the apas he was in and gave names and addresses. So I wrote, asking for information from each of them. Three answered: NATIONAL, UNITED with a bundle, and Roy Bitzer of AMERICAN. I didn't answer--that UNITED bundle scared me off.

About the time I entered SAPS, though, I began correspondence with Bitzer again. He had seemed the most enthusiastic of those who had written (and at that time AMERICAN's dues were lowest, too). Besides this, I had gotten to thinking of how UNITED's bundle couldn't be typical. I had seen the issue of THE FOSSIL when Helen Wesson had entered in FAPA which made a considerable impression on me. I had also seen such publications as READER AND COLLECTOR which had been sent to both fannish and mapes, and which seemed to indicate a higher quality of material than the one bundle I'd had a chance to examine. Even the warning Ray Schaffer gave me when I discussed it with him failed to arrest me--a few weeks later I joined.

I had mentioned the fannish apas to Bitzer. He was intensely interested, and bowled over to learn of the page size of the mailings--even equating the monthly mailings to quarterly leaves a wide gap in the size, and in the range and quality of the material.

The FAPA can best be explained by mentioning a new movement which has been started by some of the founders. They call it the "Silver Spur program", referring to their 25th anniversary.

"It is a spirit which it is anticipated will motivate the entire Mapa membership with the enthusiasm to make this 25th year the best yet."

---THE ECHO, #49

How much is this needed? In another paper in the same bundle, when discussing a recruiting campaign around Brooklyn it was stated:

"response was reported good. But it was noted at Brooklyn that recruiting efforts fall flat unless a newcomer finds something worthwhile when he joins. In other words, beefy bundles and lots of activity."

---THE AMATEUR PARADE, #14

This is something they haven't got!

The bundles themselves are...well, they're amateur journalism. Ayjay that restricts itself to a high school level insofar as most of the writing goes.

It was most shocking to me that the most "fannish" ayjay I found was being castigated right and left for the type of material he was using. His name's Jim Lemon, and he puts out a mimeographed, decently written paper. But he's gained a horrible reputation, because he is fannish in his own way. Apparently his enthusiasm is unimpaired, but I can't tell you why!

"The new president tentatively offered the appointment ~~of~~ official mailer to Lemon, noted for his 'sweetness & light' criticism of Weiser during Ken's official editorship.

"To Weiser's surprise, Lemon agreed to serve--if no one else wanted the job. He also attached a reservation or two, insisting on the right to criticize other officers if he felt they needed it!

"Some sources say the new president heaved a sigh of relief when he learned that young Mike O'Connor would serve as mailer!

"For 'tis said he didn't relish the prospect of a caustic critic in the mailer's job after all..."

---THE AMATEUR PARADE, #14

There are a few partially fannish people in AAPA. Ed Martin, Johnny Bowles, Larry Anderson, Helen Messon. But I've yet to see a contribution from any of them which even begins to approach what they've contributed to fandom. In fact, in the 9 months I've been a member of AAPA, only Bowles has contributed at all, and only a very small paper!

The September 1960 bundle might be characteristic. It contains 12 papers, 11 printed and one mimeographed. 75 pages! Many of the papers are small 4-sized printed sheets. The largest is a 4-sized WORLD POETRY DAY DIRECTORY. The smallest is a one page printed paper, devoted to "cuts" of rubber stamps (pictorial variety) various members send the editor. I hesitate to use the term "tug-headed", because somewhere someone must enjoy them.

The printing isn't too bad--most of them are in color and require several impressions. But most of the printed papers are actually just leaflets. Bill Danner has done much more (some pages of his printed STEFANTASY have required 10 impressions) for AAPA than anything shown here. The mimeographing I've seen in this isn't bad either--it just has shown a total lack of imagination in respect to layout and format.

The writing? Usually it's quite superficial. In the last 9 bundles only one or two have contained anything worth mentioning. One or two papers have had occasional interesting, well written articles, but for the most part everything has been lacklustre. It seems most of the problem of the mundane apas is their large membership and their inactivity.

I'm still not convinced that this is all there is to the mundane apas. There must be something there--I just haven't found it yet. I've heard that the best of the papers are not sent through the apa itself, but to people who show an inclination to respond to the papers. But this is scuttlebutt--and fannish in origin. But it's sensible--can you imagine Bergeron or Warner; Bjo or Economou; Lichtman or Calkins making up several hundred copies of their apazines, and getting a response of maybe twenty?

Besides....I still have to get Jim Lemon into fandom!

I was just watching TV, where a newscast showed a family who instead of sending out X-mas cards, took 15 orphans and fed and clothed them instead. A good idea? Why don't we all do it? Well, look at all the people you'd throw out of work: Card manufacturers, glue factories, paper mills (and lumberjacks), oil refinery people who make the gas and oil for transporting

cards, postal employees, printers, ink manufacturers, teamsters, and probably others I haven't named.

All this for the sake of 15 orphans?

*

Like MCs anyone? Okay. First, mlg. 52--Jacob's EGOTARE in particular. I can't review--I'll give a quasi quote.

"Your lack of mailing comments is bound to be unpopular with the other members. It pits 34 against one. Yet, as I pointed out, when 50% or more of the material is MC, things have gone to an extreme. This came when the Busby-Loskey gang was in power, but now they have fallen, I trust during this next year there will be changes. As Jane says, this is an amateur journalism group, not a sewing circle."

Lee Jacobs is a ghod man.

Now mailing 53-

BUSBY: There's a very simple ditty we learn at the Electronics Technician Training School, which, although somewhat dirty, sticks in the mind. It goes: Blackhearted Brown Rapes Our Young Girls But Violet Gives Willingly ; Go Sea. The first letter represents the first letter of the colors in resistor and tolerance coding, as : Black, Brown, Red, Orange, Yellow, Green, Blue, Violet, Grey, white. And tolerance: Gold Silver. It's a much easier way than trying to memorize the list.

LIGHTMAN: Al and Abby Lu Ashley shared a joint membership. I don't have the FAs of that period yet, but I remember their FAPazine. I also remember someone stating way back in the early '40s he'd met 26% of the membership, the split coming with the Asuleys. ** HTBS is one of the high spots of the mailing for me. Although I don't always like the personality displayed there, I do enjoy the zine. And, of course, at the other end of the scale was your one-shot. I feel sure Coitus was more readable than this!

ENEY: I knew it was too good to last, but why must your SPFC follow the format of so many other SPFCs in the past?

BERGTON: BERGTON is, of course, the high spot of the mailing for me. I'd enter into the discussions more--but you recall "I'm not intelligent. I just quote." which I quoted from QUOTEBOOK. I can't be entirely sure that's not what I'm doing, so I'm more or less holding my peace.

JOHNSTONE: Like it was interesting, dad, but if we had a choice I'd rather read some of your fiction along the lines of the pseudo-mythology you created for that rider with FAMAC.

METCALF: Enjoyed, but are you sure it isn't unethical to be doing this for both FAPA and SAPS? ** I'm a quad-apan, now. My dues have been accepted for FAPA, and I suppose I'll be counted among those present next mailing. (and maybe I can make remarks to Felz, who's claiming to be an elephant even before he enters FAPA.) Needless to say, I'll remain in SAPS.

FELZ: If you think Coitus was abortive, whaddya think this will be if I find out Howard is wrong and I'm not a S&P after all. You see, for some reason Eney dislikes taking the time to write me, which was how the whole mess started in the first place.

RAPP and SHARE: Congratulations! I didn't find out until reading this mailing with its many mentions. In fact, I called Howard, to make sure it wasn't just a hoax. It sounds like a SAPS' dream come true.

This has been when The Gods Would Sup #3, January '61 for SAPS 54. Everything aside from mlg. comments was previously drafted. (with aid of a thesaurus, dictionary, and grammar book.) GPF #something. Published with a grunt.