

THE ZINE FAN #4 is published for the Committee by Don D'Amassa,  
19 Angell Drive, East Providence, Rhode Island 02914.

.....  
COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Bill Bowers, Donn Brazier, Linda Bushyager, Don  
D'Amassa, Tom Digby, Moshe Feder, Mike Glicksohn, Mike Glycer, Eric  
Lindsay, Sam Long, Ray Nelson, Darroll Pardoe, Peter Roberts, Jim  
Shull, Jeff Smith, and Harry Warner.

.....  
ANNOUNCEMENTS:

The next issue of THE ZINE FAN will be published by Moshe Feder,  
142-34 Booth Memorial Drive, Flushing, NY 11355, shortly after  
Midwescon.

\$5.00 in cash was contributed this issue by Mike Glicksohn and Harry  
Warner, and stamps were provided by both Eric Lindsay and Ed Conner.  
Thanks to all concerned.

A total of 71 nominations were received before the deadline, one too  
late. Assistance in counting the nominations was provided by Susan  
Palermo, Barry Smotroff, and Lou Stathis. 59 final ballots had been  
received by Moshe as of June 3. The final ballot was distributed with  
KARASS, RANDOM, and overseas.

Moshe now has \$79.46 on hand for the awards. Randy Bathurst has had  
some apparent difficulty with the firing of his models, but he still  
hopes to have them ready in time. Moshe will try to have them  
assembled in Cincinnati. Although it is not clear how much money  
will remain, Jim Shull is still interested in ideas about the design  
and/or language of award certificates. Ideas should be sent to Jim  
at 5454 Sylmar Ave, Van Nuys, CA 91401. Jodie Offutt is interested  
in suggestions about the presentation by Bob Tucker. Considering  
the tradition of unprograms at this con, the presentation should most  
likely be short, light, and unborning. Ideas on this should be sent  
to Jodie at Funny Farm, Haldeman, Kentucky 40329. Moshe would like to  
receive copies of either set of suggestions.

A satiric treatment of the FAAN awards was presented in Roy Tackett's  
DYNATRON, and I have it on rumor that a similar piece appeared in  
MOTA.

There appear to have been postal problems with delivery of the last  
ZINE FAN. For this reason, I am dropping no one from the mailing list.  
People interested in receiving copies of the third issue should con-  
tact Mike Glycer or Moshe Feder.

A binding vote is presented on page 10 of this issue. Please respond.  
.....

Non-committee members receiving this issue will include: Ed Conner,  
Al Sirois, Don Keller, Bruce Arthurs, Grant Canfield, Richard Delap,  
Richard Eney, Don Markstein, Fred Haskell, Terry Jeeves, Randy Bat-  
hurst, Terry Carr, Tony Cvetko, Meade Frierson III, Norman Hochberg,  
Jerry Kaufman, Suzle Tompkins, Ruth Berman, Leigh Edmonds, Bill  
Fesselmeyer, Alexis and Doll Gilliland, David Gorman, Ben Indick,  
Hank & Lesleigh Luttrell, Don Miller, Roy Tackett, Bob Tucker, Susan  
Wood, Dan Steffan, Jay Kinney, Paula Lieberman, Andy Porter, Darrell  
Schweitzer, George Flynn, Lou Stathis, Mike Gorra, Ron Nagey, Lin Lutz  
Sandra Miesel, Jodie Offutt, Mike Shoemaker, Milt Stevens, John Berry,  
Bill Rotsler, Michael Carlson, Dave Jenrette, Wayne MacDonald, and  
David Stever.

## CRITICISM OF THE 1975 FANZINE ACTIVITY ACHIEVEMENT AWARDS

by David V. Jenrette

After receiving several copies of the FAAA plan for fanzine awards I currently find myself unable to support it. This is not meant to be a gesture against the originators of it, because I trade with them and respect them greatly. Anyone who chooses to comment may help me overcome -- or at least moderate -- my objections:

### 1. PERSONS WHO ARE MOTIVATED TO DO SOMETHING WHICH IS FUN NEED NO FURTHER MOTIVATION.

I believe that persons fall into two main categories: those who are extrinsically motivated and those who are intrinsically motivated. Of course, no one is exactly in one camp or the other. Although I like to think of myself as being primarily intrinsically motivated -- that is, I do things for the pleasure or satisfaction they give me in doing them and not for an extrinsic reward -- I also work for a living. The person with extrinsic motivation is concerned with the rewards for what he does and not for the fun of it. I, myself, took many education courses that I hated in order to get a degree.

Now my idea of fandom and my idea of noble fan is to be part of a group that enjoys doing something for the pure and simple fun of it. When fandom ceases to be fun is when I exit. Now, how do you demotivate someone?

If a person is extrinsically motivated, take away his reward. If a person is intrinsically motivated, GIVE HIM A REWARD!

This may seem strange, but it has been demonstrated in many situations that if you reward a person for what he enjoyed doing it reduces his enjoyment. Example: have you ever done a school assignment for the sheer joy of it and felt embarrassed when this was recognized? One study had groups of children select activities that they wanted (as well as being required to participate in other activities); the selected activities -- such as painting, sports, etc. -- were extravagantly praised. After a time, the kids tended to select those activities less. Consider the whole history of the Hugo fan awards. Consider all the persons who have won it over the years and answer this question: After winning it has the person engaged in more fanac, less, or about the same?

### 2. THE DOUBTFUL QUALITY OF PEER EVALUATION.

Whenever an academy of peers is established it almost invariably produces a stultifying effect on its field. Are you aware of the peer evaluations given to Poe, Thoreau, and Van Gogh (to coin a rhyme)? In motion pictures, the average age of an academy award winner is (I believe -- correct me if I misremembered) 53 years. And worst of all, once a person has been repulsed by the Academy it takes iron balls to hang in there.

For example, when I was at the University of Miami I had my own photographic business, sold pictures regularly to national publications, and -- one year -- won 18th prize out of 180,000 entries in a US CAMERA contest (see Aug '59 issue). I had confidence in my ability to make reasonable pictures and had some tangible evidence of it. This was shaken when a friend of mine who belonged to an amateur camera club called the Daguerre Pictorialists suggested I submit a picture to their 'salon'. I did and it was not hung or even accepted and it was my US CAMERA prizewinner! At this club, a large number of new people

appeared, got rejected, and left, leaving the field to the old farts who did the judging -- judging of pictures that I felt to be incredibly bad. Here's what David Linton said in PHOTOGRAPHING NATURE:

"(The rules of competition) were invented by a group of amateur photographers who called themselves 'pictorialists' because they imitated paintings. They held sway within the camera clubs during the first half of the 20th Century, where they conducted contests called 'salons' and awarded tin trinkets to one another. By now most of them have died off, leaving no trace upon photography in general except the loss of some potentially talented people whom they scared away."

I, frankly, do not care to be judged by my peers. If they're really my peers then their opinion is no better than mine, so who needs them? I'd be as embarrassed to get an award as not to get it. How would you feel if you were a rock musician and received an Outstanding Music Maker Award from Ted Mack?

### 3. TO YOUR BATTERED BODIES GO!

We all know that none of us can have our own way all the time. Into the life of every anarchist, a little reign must fall. However, there are styles of dealing with life that take away some of the pain. Most people's styles can be classified as falling into 3 categories: lose-leave, win-lose, and win-win.

The lose-leave personality sets up an impossible situation and then drops out: "If I am not elected chairman I will resign!" "If I can't be the pitcher, I'm taking my bat and ball home." etc. The win-lose personality, on the other hand, turns everything into a battle and confrontation: "You're either for me or against me!" In recent issues of OUTWORLDS I have found the letter columns full of lose-leave and win-lose; I also find these styles depressing in the long run. After all, you can't win all the time, so sooner or later everyone ends up a loser. You have to be a masochist to knowingly go into a system like that.

To me, fandom should be 100% Win-Win and it can be. You put out a fanzine, I put one out, and THEY put one out. We can all trade. We can all publish Glicksohn and Warner letters and print Birkhead and Rotsler art. As soon as we're forced to pick a BEST in any category then the others all lose. Not only don't we need it, we don't have to have it. I, personally, would have no objection to discontinuance of fan Hugos, but at least with the Hugos I don't believe there's ever been a serious questioning of the results, has there? Do you think that with a smaller number of persons voting -- many of whom have vested interests -- there will be more serious questioning of the results? Or less? I don't know, I'm just asking. I understand that the committee who operate FAAA have not disqualified themselves from awards...and that's not meant to be criticism -- just comment.

### SUMMARY

In conclusion, I find myself unable to support FAAA for the reasons preceding and summarized as follows:

1. 'Awarding tin trinkets to one another' may take the fun out of fanning.
2. Peer awards are not necessarily peerless.
3. Win-lose situations lead to win-lose battles and resultant misery.

And my last word to the committee: if you don't enjoy fanning just for itself, then why do it?

MY LAST LAST WORD - the preceding is a revision for Don D'Amassa of an article by me in YANDRO 231. Since he requested permission to reprint it in THE ZINE FAN I also requested permission to change it since I discovered some things about it that I did not like; in particular, I seem to be violating my own suggestion about trying for a win-win (everybody wins); my article reads like a lose-leave or win-lose proposition. Can I hasten to correct that?

I believe the FAAA Committee wants to make fandom better and I support them in that, even though I don't agree with their plan. Can this plan be modified? Can the committee as a whole do something to completely encourage fan activity in positive, non-threatening, non-competitive ways? I dunno, I guess it depends on whether or not they want to -- I hope that doesn't sound nasty -- it's just that I know personally only one or two of the committee and don't know if they are extrinsic or intrinsic motivated.

One suggestion: Roger Sween is going a great job with his FANZINE PUBLISHING RECORD. FPR doesn't review zines or give awards, but I always enjoy seeing TABEBUIAN listed. Maybe the committee would like to help subsidize/sponsor FPR...I dunno how Roger feels about that so maybe this suggestion is out of line.

One more suggestion: Maybe the committee would like to assemble each year a boxed set of contributions from all publishing fanzines? The edition would be limited to -- say -- 500 issues and each fanzine that wished to contribute would produce the number of pages it wished to have in the finished box (up to some maximum perhaps?) and each fanzine would pay for this itself, too. Then the committee would box up the pages -- or bind them? -- and send each contributor one set and offer the rest for sale at conventions charging enough to pay for the boxing, postage, etc., and using any profits to pay for the next binding, etc. The committee would possibly set minimum standards of legibility/libelousness/etc. This would encourage fanac since the only way to get all the contents would be to publish or pay some price; it might be nice if there were special editions involved of each fanzine available no other way. There would be, it seems to me, prestige in being included in the annual collection, but it would be a prestige available to everyone who was a regular fanzine editor.

. . . . .  
(((When I asked Dave's permission to reprint the above, I warned him that I would have some replies to make. I think his basic misassumption is in identifying the FAAN award with motivation. Accepting for the moment his division of people into three categories, I am frankly of the opinion that lose-leave and win-lose personalities and situations already abound in fandom, and the FAAN awards aren't likely to make so much as a ripple in that aspect of reality. If these awards were going to turn fandom as a whole into a bunch of award gropers, the fan Hugo's would already have done it.

Neither do I agree with his interpretation of rewards demotivating people. I'm an ex-teacher myself, and I read that very same (or one closely paralleling it) study. But I attach considerably different significance to it. Dave himself points out that the children were "extravagantly praised" even when their efforts didn't deserve it. The experimenters de-valued their praise by applying it in grossly inappropriate situations. Quiet, thoughtful praise, given only when deserved has a definite tendency to motivate people. So

even if I were to accept that the rewards are designed to motivate people -- and I don't -- I would still draw a conclusion opposite to that Dave has drawn. The point that many Hugo winning fans are no longer active is irrelevant. I'm still a relative neo, and the only fanzines that have spanned my decade in fandom that I can recall offhand are YANDRO (which did win a Hugo), DYNATRON, and a few club and apazines.

The committee did consider disqualifying itself. But there are some very good reasons why they shouldn't. First, it was necessary to get several well known fans on the committee in order to be taken seriously in the first place. Second, and I think Bill Bowers made this point, if you disqualify anyone, you are in effect saying that so-and-so put out the best fanzine of 1974 with the possible exceptions of X, Y, and Z. It is this argument that is causing me latterly to believe the committee erred in designing the rules to eliminate ALGOL, LOCUS, and whatever Geis now calls his fanzine. For it is still a fanzine.

I can't speak for the other committee members, Dave, but I do enjoy fanning just for itself. Oh, I don't claim that the idea of winning an award of some sort is a matter of complete indifference to me. I'm human; I enjoy praise. But if I were to tailor my fanac to some sort of generalized ideal in order to win such an award, it would then have no value to me. I'm a stubborn, opinionated, sonofabitch and I don't intend to mend my ways for anyone but myself. My main reason for supporting the fan awards is because I occasionally read or see something or things by another fan that impress me so much that a loc alone is inadequate to express my appreciation. I don't agree with every aspect of the FAAN's, and I doubt anyone else on the committee does either. But it's a lot better than the fan Hugo to my thinking, and I'll stick with it until someone comes up with something better.)))

#### OTHER LETTERS

[R. FARADAY NELSON]

There's just one point I would like to really harp on this time, and that's Leigh Edmonds' suggestion that the committee have "at least one agent in Australia and one in Europe." As a former European fan, I have to tell you that there is considerable justified resentment "on the continent" about the way "American" fandom ignores them. I would consider it essential to have one Eurofan committee member, perhaps more. However, this brings up a problem which has always been a major roadblock in the development of fannish international projects: the language barrier. A great deal of fanzine publishing is done in German, and some in French and the Scandinavian languages. How are monolingual fans going to be able to evaluate zines they can't read? I think I could jump the language barrier myself by publishing a cartoonzine featuring captionless cartoons from fans all over the world, but what other kind of fanzine could be really international?

It might not be fatal to limit ourselves to zines in the English language. Most Eurofans (but not all) are fairly fluent in English as a second language, but there are of course few Jean Linards, who can master English as a second language well enough to develop a personal style in it. Jean Linard, come to think of it, would be the ideal fan to act as our French agent. (He still lives at 24 rue Petit, Vesoul, Hte-Sne 7000 France.) For Scandinavian agent I nominate Roar Ringdahl, Skogerveien 52, 3000 Drammen, Norway.

Am I the first one to bring up the language problem? I think so. And the more I think about it the more perplexed I become. The artists, both humorous and serious, could jump the language barrier easily, but if anyone else is going to jump it, there has got to be some sort of translation activity.

((Although I agree in principle with the spirit of the above remarks, I think we have to accept the fact that this is a limited operation with limited resources, and not the fannish equivalent of the SFWA.)))

/MIKE GLICKSOHN/

This is mostly just to say I got TZF #3 and to enclose a buck or two to offset costs since I'm certainly not contributing much to the discussion. This is mostly because I don't have the time to do so, certainly not because I lack interest in the project. Despite Buck Coulson's implications, I'm not merely faunching for an award or a pat on the back. Hell, I don't need a poll to tell me I'm one of the runners-up to Harry Warner in the Best Letterhack category or that I don't as yet publish good enough or often enough to oust Father William from his position, in my eyes, of pre-eminence in the fanzine field. But I sincerely believe that the idea is a valid one, and I hope it works out as well as I'd like it to. Let's give Buck the benefit of the doubt, though: perhaps when he looked through the list and saw Brazier, Warner, Bowers, et al, he realized that these men certainly are not his peers, they're his superiors, and this is his typically coy and modest way of admitting it.

I agree with Mike Glycer that the award has an inherent significance and while we should encourage as many active and qualified participants as possible, mere numbers is not what it's all about. I'd hate to see the concept of the awards break down and the committee members get too hung up in procedural wranglings and jargonese. Let's try and keep things simple, yet clear cut, while spreading the word to as many people as possible. Above all, this should be something that generates good feelings in those who choose to participate: let's do it, but let's have fun while we're at it. (Come to think of it, one of the other times I found myself diametrically opposed to Buck on a fannish question was when he said he'd stay home and refuse to attend Fan Fair II and enjoy himself because of the conflict with HEICON. Despite that, Fan Fair was a great success, and led directly to TORCON, perhaps the most successful fannish worldcon for years. Let's hope Buck's refusal to participate in this project spurs it to such heights of success!)

/HARRY WARNER/

On Buck Coulson's attitude, I see no reason for alarm or panic. It's milder than some of the things that were said about the Pong proposal...It would be best for the FAAA committee to avoid a declaration of war or replies in tones as truculent as Buck's, I think. If I have anything to say publicly about this particular criticism, it will probably take the indirect form of devoting my occasional column in LOCUS to the new awards...I'd like to outline for people who may be ineligible to participate the reasons why I favor the new set of awards. Otherwise, they may never hear any reasons in their favor, through failure to subscribe to more than one or two of the mass circulation fanzines. My main brunt of rebuttal to Buck's stand would be that the set of awards differs from many established fannish awards in only one way: its newness. Aside from that newness, his criticism must be considered valid for the Hugos for fans, for all

the apas that stage polls, for the LOCUS poll, and even for such other backslapping activities as artshows and masquerades at cons and the creation of guests of honor for cons. I personally feel myself immune from the Big Man on Campus syndrome, simply on the basis of my past record. I disqualified myself twice from more Hugo nominations after winning the things, I don't enter any of the 465 different competitions I could get into as a journalist, and I offered as a committee member to disqualify myself from the letterhack category, the only one that I had any reason to expect getting nominated for.

I'm inclined to agree with Mike Glyer on the question of how many participants we need in these awards. The number of people who nominated was about double the quantity I expected for the first year. There is no hope of finding out by these awards how all fandom judges all fanac, because every fan receives a different batch of fanzines each year. All that will result is recognition for a batch of people who are best-liked by those who participate. There should be efforts to persuade as many people to participate as an energetic promotion job can accomplish, but I think it would be a mistake to go out for quantity in unrealistic degree. One suggestion I made in that belated letter last time: try to dig out information on how many people nominated and voted in the first few Hugo contests. It probably wasn't more than a few dozen and if the total were publicized in the course of the first year for the FAAA, it might silence anyone who felt impelled to say uncomplimentary things about the comparison with this year's Hugo turnout.

Even though I was the one who suggested choosing committee members from among nominees, I've since realized that there's a potential source of trouble in that procedure. Assume that someone who is nominated this first year becomes the FAAA's hardest worker, most eloquent propagandist, and in general takes the leading role in the venture, following his election to the committee. Wouldn't there be a temptation to nominate him time after time in future years, even if his quality or quantity of output declined drastically, just for the sake of keeping him on the committee to which he's so valuable?

The final ballot itself is splendid, particularly for the ample space provided on the voting side. It looks easy to vote, somehow. I'm not comfortable for having been nominated in the loc category while serving on the committee but I'll try to make some people angry as soon as possible, to lessen my chances for winning.

[TARAL WAYNE MACDONALD]

Something...bothering me is the ballot. No, not the ballot, but the attendant explanations. Each ballot states that reproduction by fan editors is encouraged, and promptly discourages him with five pages of typing and three sheets of mimeo paper per ballot to be paid from his own pocket...Surely a 5 page ballot is not really necessary?

[PETER ROBERTS]

Firstly, I think the whole thing has gone off at half-cock: I was stunned to receive the ballot itself - I never expected the scheme to start this early, and after only one full discussion with THE ZINE FAN. It's a mess at the moment. There's been insufficient publicity for one thing - people have come across the ballot before they've even heard of the idea, and it's hard to generate any enthusiasm from such a cold start. Some sort of build-up was necessary to get people interested. There also hasn't been enough time - Darroll managed to distribute ballots in CHECKPOINT and I sent some last minute ones with



EGG, but...And, most importantly, the wording of the ballots isn't yet adequate (for example, "literary SF" suggests something pretty pretentious - that's one of the points Eric Bentcliffe has made in the last EGG - it should be "written SF" or some phrase that's less ambiguous than "literary SF") and neither are the rules: 50p to nominate? You'd be lucky. Anyway, I've only found adverse reaction so far; I haven't heard from Darroll since the deadline passed, so I don't know if anyone has actually voted - I'd be surprised if more than one or two fans did, and I wouldn't be surprised if Darroll received nothing.

((One of the most important things, as I see it, that needs to be done by the committee is setting up a timetable for next year. If fanzines start announcing now that ballots for the 1976 FAAA awards will begin appearing in, say, January, then it should provide enough time to stir up some interest. The other major task for the committee, again in my own opinion, is dissolving itself; that is, providing for a means to replace the individual members. An on-going power structure of the same faces will, justifiably or not, arouse suspicion. It is time to arrange for the succession, so that the rest of fandom can be shown that this is not a private club, but one open to all.)))

[NORM HOCHBERG]

I'd like to volunteer, at this point, my services for help on the FANTHOLOGY project and recommend that we begin preparations for a Best of 1975 volume immediately...

((Norm went on at length in this vein. I suspect that the FAAA committee should not be directly concerned with a fanthology, index of fanzines published, eligibility lists, or what have you. We aren't centralized, organized, or financed for that sort of activity. The fanthology is a worthwhile project though, and I hope that anyone reading this who is interested in contributing write to Norm at 69 Fifth Avenue, Apt 4F, New York, NY 10003.)))

[NORM again]

I think Seth McEvoy (in his zine PRIMORDIAL SLIME) has a valid point. The committee members should not be eligible for awards. If they are, the awards will become suspect.

((My old sparring partner, Seth, re-emerges. On the surface, this seems a good point. But once more I must point out, if you remove Harry Warner and Mike Glicksohn from the loc competition, Brazier and Bowers and Bushyager from the best fanzine competition, you are saying that so-and-so had the best fanzine of the year, with the possible exceptions of OUTWORLDS, GRANFALLOON, and TITLE. That would make their validity a lot more suspect than the present arrangement.)))

[MIKE GLYER]

One thing I'd like to know is how many of us are trading with the British and Australian fanzines? I'd like to see either or both places better represented on next year's ballot and judging from what I've heard it'll take US votes to carry.

((I can speak only for myself. We've never formalized it, but I get zines from Leigh Edmonds, Eric Lindsay, and John Bangsund, and I think I'm writing for Bruce Gillespie. I sent the last two issues of MYTHOLOGIES to ten British fans, but haven't received anything back except MAYA.)))((And a loc from Peter Roberts.)))



[GEORGE FLYNN]

While I agree that a lot of votes on the fan Hugos are cast by people who don't see many fanzines, I don't think one can simply look at the print runs. After all, there must be a fair number of fanzine fans who show their zines to others (as in all the zine-passing-around at RISFA meetings). I'm familiar with quite a few zines I don't get myself. It'd be interesting to know what actual readership is for the average zine; LOCUS is probably the only one for which such data are available. Thus I don't think the size of electorate that Moshe has in mind is necessarily unrealistic. All the same, it's not that much smaller than the number of Hugo voters. Going to the other extreme, I wonder if anybody is familiar with all the zines/people that an omniscient observer might consider worthy.

On Mike Glyer's response to my comment on final-ballot voting: I for one am doing my best to familiarize myself with those nominees I wasn't familiar with already. But even if others don't do this, the fact of having nominated doesn't prove such familiarity either.

Mike says we shouldn't gear the system to criticisms. I agree completely; I only say we shouldn't gratuitously offend people without good reason (by such tactics as a list of eligibles).

On the "best artist" categories, the thing that surprised me most on the final ballot was that Jim Shull appears as non-humorous artist. I take it this was his own choice?

Despite Moshe's fears, what we've got is inevitably a self-perpetuating power structure. Indeed, all power structures are self-perpetuating simply because they're self-selecting: some people like to get involved in things, and do so; others prefer to stand back and gripe; and each group tends to attract more of its kind.

Not a bad idea to publish a list of those who were nominated but didn't make the ballot, but don't include the number of nominations. Too embarrassing for somebody who got only one vote, say.

((The stickiest question still seems to be the method of selecting and composition of the committee. I still think the best way is to have nominators indicate on their nominating ballot whether or not they are interested in serving on the committee. Then an election of the committee for the following year can be included on the final awards ballot. This avoids a second election, indicates some interest on the part of all potential committee members (after all, they'll have paid their buck), and will be easier to administer.

A rule forbidding consecutive terms might be advisable. I also suspect that either immediately or one year from now, the committee should be pared down to about three members. This concern with geographic and activity representation among the committee members leaves me cool. A big committee is too awkward for such a project, once the rough spots have been ironed out, and each year's program follows logically on the heels of the previous year's. Since it's already too late to do this now, perhaps each current committee member should find his own replacement, or some portion thereof. I strongly contend that next year's committee should not be a carbon copy of the present one. In fact, I can and will insist, because I am resigning effective with the presentation of this year's award. I remain an interested party however. Regardless of what shape next year's committee takes, I think it would be good to emphasize the range of support among well known fans, but I don't see any reason for them to dominate the committee.)))

Moshe has requested that I include a binding vote on the question of choosing new committee members. I have already discussed this matter earlier, so simply present the alternatives that occur to me. I would like to have seen a bit more discussion of this first, particularly about the size of the committee, but so it goes.

HOW SHOULD NEXT YEAR'S COMMITTEE BE CHOSEN?

- a. The present committee should elect a new committee from a pool of volunteers.
- b. The nominees themselves should choose from a list of candidates.
- c. The present committee, or a segment of the present committee, should continue to serve in order to set up a system where next year's nominators indicate on their ballot their willingness to serve, and where the final ballot shall be used to allow all voters to decide the following year's committee.
- d. We have not discussed this enough. Put it on the ballot again next time.
- e. None of the above. I prefer \_\_\_\_\_.

Ballots should be received along with letters for the next TZF to Moshe by the Fourth of July ~~JULY~~ **AUG**

.....

THE ZINE FAN #4  
Don D'Ammassa  
19 Angell Drive  
East Providence  
Rhode Island 02914  
USA



DEFEAT  
EAR DYSTROPH  
PORT MDA

**RICHARD ENEY**  
**6500 FORT HUNT ROAD**  
**ALEXANDRIA, VA 22307**

FIRST CLASS MAIL