DECEMBER '63 VOL 3 N° 3



"CRACKING THE WHIP" AROUND REGULUS

is published monthly by &available by subscription only -- no trades, except trades of subs.

Joe & Roberta Gibson 5380 Sobrante Avenue El Sobrante, Calif. USA

Sorry, no back issues available. Sample copy free on request. All material here is ours.

Subscription rates:

Stateside 3/25¢, 6/50¢ or 12/\$1 Europe: 3 for 1/9, 6 for 3/6 or 12 for 7/-

European Agent:

(You sub'd for 7 more g2's

Colin Freeman, Ward 3, Scotton Banks Hospital, Ripley Road, () Your sub has expired now. Knaresborough, Yorkshire, England

) This is a sample copy.

"There you go, Jim Caughran!" We've cracked the whip about Regulus and now we've shot off in the direction of the Hyades we've shot off in the direction of the Hyades as was diagrammed lastish. Both James & I knew the .9c velocity with which we cleared Sol wasn't enuff; 9/10ths the speed of light means you need 11 years to cross 10 lightyears. But we'd continual acceleration all the way out (our magnetic "scoop" feeding on the interstellar gas at one hydrogen atom per cubic centimeter, mean-average) and got up to .998c in the past two months; that may be the absolute limit for a "ram-jet" type starship. But Regulus is a giant sun, yellow-white, 150 times brighter than Sol; and even little Sol's gravity-field is powerful enough to bend light from distant stars -- so Regulus grabs us and pulls! Then too the light from distant stars -- so Regulus grabs us and pulls! Then, too, the interstellar gas is somewhat denser around this giant sun; we get more mass to feed into our thrust-beam...we literally catapult past the giant!

Besides, we wanted to change direction and bear off toward the Hyades without splattering ourselves all over the walls! Regulus helped.

Velocity: approximately .9992c, now; and we can expect to average a little more than 1,000 lightyears in about one year, shiptime. (Both Jim & I know from .998c to .9992c requires more power than any previous jump!) But this might seem to belie my previous claims about Faster-Than-Light travel being uncalled-for, unnecessary and foolishly contrived in stf.

It isn't. It becomes a problem to us simply because I want to take in so much territory. We could've stopped far short of Regulus and found all we need, here. I'm going to show you that, now, while we're probing out across the Deep Black toward the Hyades, the next star-cluster beyond our own (and I've some beautiful astronomical illos for when we get there).

Now, having discovered this knowledge, having -- for my own enjoyment as a stf fan -- explored among these stars, I have charged that modern stf is a "fake" and is "cheating" us, particularly in its galactic stories. want to do more, tho, than simply prove those charges. I know that any nut of a faaan in an amateur publication trying to lay the foundation for a New Golden Age of Stf is absurd. I choose to be absurd.

I've postulated our $\frac{1}{2}$ -mile-wide starship H.M.S. Indecontaminable full of 500 fans (by hook or by crook) going out to explore these stars, and I've dedicated this fanzine to reporting what we find Out There. I want you to see the things I've seen, things you won't find in modern stf, until you have greater knowledge of this vast frontier than any stf writer or editor alive today -- except the ones who're on this journey with us!

I think that's a hellova lot more fun.

Now, why has Mr. Donaho been so insistent on seeing the Captain? We'll see.

PART ONE OF THREE PARTS

The entire job of "mapping" our local star-cluster, the Ridge, could be done in this issue. If it filled the whole issue, the 'zine still would probably not exceed 20 pages. It wouldn't require any HABBAKUK. But, as you'll see, it would be an awful chunk to have to swallow at one time.

I've divided it into three parts. Part One, this month, is the hardest of all -- telling what astronomical research I've done, naming my sources, quoting my authorities. This is technical. But it must be made untechnical if I'm to put it across.

Part Two, next month -- BUILDING A STAR CHART -- will be mostly illos showing the basic shape of this star-cluster which includes our Solar System, showing how we can reproduce that shape in a "star chart" here in Ol' Indebuggable, with enough text to explain the simple steps.

Part Three is where I'll take your breath away. Included will be an astronomical illo, a two-page spread, showing the actual Ridge in space. The text will discuss what's known about it, what we can deduce from such facts, and -- where the Unknown awaits us, where our only remaining tool is the imagination, where only science-fiction can explore.

For those of you who weren't reading g2 a couple years ago, the January '62 issue had my piece called A SAUNTER ALONG THE RIDGE which was actually the 2nd time I'd gone scouting and done a report on our star-cluster. Almost ten years ago, for a fanzine editor named Bill Venable, I attempted a crude sketch of this star-cluster. But here in g2, I did a bit more; my sources were better; I scouted a bit deeper.

But it was only a brief glimpse of our cluster of suns (named "the Ridge" in a book by E.M. Hull called PLANETS FOR SALE) -- I'd dug up just enough information to describe 10 of the giant suns (luminosity: 1st magnitude) which etch the Ridge in a trail of bright sparks across almost 100 lightyears of space. From Alpha Centauri at our end of the Ridge, I took each giant sun in turn, gave its distance and location, how big it is, what color, whether it's really two suns or (as in the case of that "star" Castor) as many as six suns circling each other, ending up with Regulus at the other end of the Ridge. Then I gave some idea of the stars to be found within just a dozen lightyears of Earth, faint stars as well as bright giants.

For this, my references were both meager and outdated -- though even with that much, I was surpassing anything to be found in most science-fiction today. For me, tho, it was just enough to indicate how much more could be found if someone really worked at it. . . perhaps even someone without much technical training or background!

Perhaps even -- ghod help us -- a science-fiction fan!!!

The thought came with a jolt. A science-fiction fan? Why, that's me! But I was conveniently placed to undertake some such foolishness, too. As an inventory field-man, my work at the University of California takes me into every nook & cranny of the Berkeley campus. Besides being concerned with classroom & office furniture, typewriters, even dormitory and cafeteria equipment (and such oddities as a set of janitor's mopbuckets) I must find my way around botanists' herbariums that would puzzle a nuclear physicist, cosmic ray research labs that would puzzle a paleontologist, and be able to distinguish a paper electrophoresis apparatus from a square/sine-wave signal generator. Or an autoclave.

So I hied myself over to Campbell Hall one noon-hour and had a chat with some o' the bhoys up in the 7th floor electronics lab of the Radio Astronomy Department. . . which, despite some kidding and horseplay, soon led me downstairs to their coffee-break room on the 6th floor. They have quite a nice collection of astronomy reference works there in that coffee-break room! Yes, indeed.

Naturally, the fellows directed me to what they thought I'd need -which was, first of all, a good set of THE AMERICAN EPHEMERIS AND NAUTICAL
ALMANAC -- called just "the Nautical Almanac" for short. They had one.
This thing is a hardcover volume published annually, which (I noticed
immediately) can add up to a set filling several bookshelves.

It was absolutely worthless.

What it'd give me, they said, was the classification, the magnitude and the location in the Earth's sky of most of the stars I was interested in. What the blamed thing also gives is that selfsame information on many thousands of stars -- but without giving their distance! How should I know which stars listed in those shelves of Almanacs would be in our cluster? Furthermore, all that data appears in long columns of numbers, page after page of 'em, which might be very nice for some astronomer chap but couldn't mean less to me.

But then, the fellows had realized I might just have some slight difficulty there. So they told me I should look about amongst the other books for something pertaining to star clusters. I did, and there were quite a lot of 'em -- all about distant star clusters and other galaxies! Very handy, no doubt, if you're exploring by telescope rather than by starship. But then I spotted a thick tome that rang a bell.

Poul Anderson had told me about this book some time ago -- at least, I think it's the same book. He said he'd found it quite useful. (If this is the one, I can't quite agree that it's all that useful, tho it's certainly better than nothing at all to go on.) It's rather technical. Okay, I'll stop hedging -- it's Too Damned Technical.

The full title is: "STELIAR POPULATIONS - Proceedings of the Conference Sponsored by the Pontifical Academy of Science and the Vatican Observatory - May 20-28, 1957 - Edited by D.J.K. O'Connell, S.J. - North Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam - Interscience Publishers, Inc., New York." At least, that's what it has on the title page.

Overleaf, it adds: "Reprinted from Pontificial Academiae Scientiarum Scripta Varia 16: Semaine d'Etude sur le Probleme des Populationes Stellaires as Volume 5, Ricerche Astronomiche, Specola Vaticana." If you don't like this translation, you can always consult the source.

making up lists of 'em as "groups" in which, for sundry reasons, this kind of "group" is presumed to include younger or older stars than that kind of "group" --such "groups" being merely the way they're listed on paper, mostly, with no relation to their location in space-- and these "groups" are what they're calling "populations." So y'might say that only in astronomy are men, boys, women-under-forty and women-over-forty classed as separate populations regardless of race or creed or where they live.

However, there's a bit of just one chapter that's most interesting.

Are you ready?

It starts on page 287 and goes like this:

VI. STELLAR POPULATIONS IN OUR OWN GALAXY

1. A. Sandage: The Stars Within 15 Parsecs of the Sun.

I. Introduction.

The Yale 1952 Catalogue of Trigonometric Parallaxes contains 167 entries for stars with $\pi \geqslant .100$ and entries for 407 stars with $\pi \geqslant .067...$ The discovery and parallax determination of all the stars within 10 and 15 parsecs is of course not complete. The Saltpeter luminosity function gives 0.12 stars/pc³ as the star density in the solar neighborhood. We therefore expect that the total number of stars with $\pi \geqslant .100$ and $\pi \geqslant .067$ should be 503 and 1700 respectively. This shows that parallax data is available for less than 30% of the nearby stars. The discovery situation is even more serious for the white dwarfs. Various authors estimate that about 10 per cent in the solar neighborhood are white dwarfs. This suggests that 170 white dwarfs exist with $\pi \geqslant .067$. Parallaxes for only 15 are known within this limit. Many candidates exist but the faintness of the white dwarfs has made observation difficult.

And further on, in this chapter:

....First rate photometric material is now available for 195 of the 408 entries in the parallax catalogue with $\pi \geqslant .067$. The 195 entries contain data for 204 individual stars. Over 90% of the remaining 213 stars which have not been observed are dK5 or later.

That last sentence still puzzles me; I have no idea what "dK5" means. What's important, I think, is that 195 entries in the Catalogue are revealed as being data on 204 suns. The text explains, in the midst of other data, that this was because some of the entries were about binaries -- that is, two-sun systems. Though the book then uses the phrase "the remaining 213 stars" I suspect it should've read "the remaining 213 entries" which may give data on as many as 299 suns, making the total 503 suns as indicated by the Saltpeter luminosity function.

But you see what's happening here? I'm beginning to write like the blamed book reads! That's precisely what I must not do. Instead, I've got to "decode" that mess of jargon so we can all use it.

First, the author has made it conveniently obvious that those funny 100 and 10

...You guys wanna go back to Earth?

Someday, the efforts of a complete observatory will have to be dedicated to this task -- perhaps an observatory on the Moon, or in a space station orbiting far out from anything as bright as a sunlit planet, perhaps far out of the dust & debris in the Solar Ecliptic Plane -- and the job will be even more demanding than any study of Mars by Lowell Observatory when old Percy was alive. But we'll have to know where all the nearby stars are -- the suns of our cluster; we don't dare ignore them! I can't imagine men going halfway across the galaxy (as so often happens in modern stf) to find Earthtype worlds to colonize, to build an interstellar empire, while there still might be some alien species camped right on their doorstep on any hunk of rock circling these nearby suns.

But I digress -- back to "decoding" STELIAR POPULATIONS, or at least those small portions that are of any use to us. References to parallaxes and photometric material simply mean measurements of the distances of stars. The whole trouble is, y'know, you can't tell how far away a star is just by looking at it. You gotta take a sight on it, jot down the angle your telescope's pointing, then take another sight on it from another spot -- maybe 6 months later, when the Earth's swung around to the other side of the Sun -- and compare your two angles, the distance between the spots you took 'em and triangulate how far off that star is. But faint stars are an even worse problem. Any telescope powerful enough to see 'em with also brings in the far more distant stars by the hundreds and thousands. You have to get two sightings on every damned one of them to just find out which ones are your nearby suns, and to make sure you've got all of 'em.

The astronomers have a rule-of-thumb, in that Saltpeter luminosity function, which at least gives 'em some notion of how many stars there ought to be in one sector, even if the faint ones are hard to find.

But you'll notice, nowhere does this book give any kind of hint that we have any <u>local cluster</u> at all. It speaks of nearby suns as if they must extend equally in all directions from Earth, makes use of radii such as 10 parsecs and 15 parsecs and talks about the suns (503 and 1700 of 'em) which should be within those spheres of interstellar space.

Most science-fiction stories give the same impression.

A sphere with a radius of 10 parsecs or 32.6 lightyears has a volume of slightly less than 150,000 cubic lightyears. Drop 500 suns in there and each sun could be rattling around in 300 cubic lightyears all by itself, or something like 7 lightyears from any other sun. The suns in our local area simply aren't that goddam far apart!

Worse yet, the majority of 'em are binary systems -- two suns circling each other. So our 500 suns can't have 500 equidistant locations; we can only give maybe 300 locations, some with two suns. So even if we're conservative, an equal distribution would put 'em as much as 9 lightyears apart! (This was absurdly difficult to do with my gradeschool arithmetic; but Poul Anderson told me his reference works do give this average distribution!)

So it seems to me a sweep of 32.6 lightyears around Earth must include a big chunk of our local cluster in both directions, plus a bigger chunk of the empty space all around it, because our local suns aren't much more than lightyears apart -- less than from here to Alpha Centauril And distant star-clusters have been observed; they're much easier to see, and even the nearer ones have their suns generally moving in the same direction. If the distant suns are in clusters, why won't our nearby suns form one?

The above sketch was rather clumsily copied from a notably good chart on page 209 of PICTORIAL ASTRONOMY by Alter & Cleminshaw (Copyright 1948, 1952; Thomas Y. Crowell, publishers: \$5) altho the shaded "mainstream" area is my own addition. This chart represents a flat plane in line with the Solar Ecliptic Plane; north and south directions would extend above and below this sheet of paper. The caption in PICTORIAL ASTRONOMY says, "some stars which are much separated in a north and south direction appear close to each other." Other distances between stars are approximately correct.

You can see that the distance between the Solar System and Alpha Centauri is not by any means the shortest of distances between stars.

You may also note that the chart's outdated. Tau Ceti isn't indicated, nor Epsilom Eridani -- the book's latest Copyright Date is 1952. In all other respects, however, this book is an excellent addition to any stf fan's library; I've made extensive use of it in exploring the giant suns of the Ridge -- altho here, too, you'll find no local star-cluster mentioned. But you will find excellent chapters on the Hyades and Pleiades Clusters, as well as mention of Kapteyn's Cluster, or what he and other Earthbound astronomers call the Scorpius-Centaurus cluster. And there's lots of illos.

Similarly, my references from STBLIAR POPULATIONS are outdated; its material was compiled in 1957 -- and there, in my excerpts, it refers to The Yale 1952 Catalogue of Triginometric Parallaxes! We may safely assume that parallax data is now available for somewhat more than just 30% of the nearby stars. But how much more? Considering the difficulties involved, I'd be surprised if such data yet exists for more than half those stars.



STEVE TOLLIVER, 24 E. Peoria, Pasadena:

...How do you manage to work out a thousand light years in a thousand years time? Will admit I know not enough "relativity theory" to do more than snow people who know even less, but I question your rather casual sounding numbers.

Steve, I have make everything sound "casual" on this kick! You know full well I can't print essays just for guys like you, Ellik, Caughran, Briney, Perry, Grant, Zettel, Stark, Halevy -- where were we? Oyes. So what's a couple extra centuries in a thousand years or so, anyway?

So we won't get back to Earth until maybe the Thutty-Second Century, thassall. Casual-sounding, y'see. A mere detail. I'll try to be right on the mark when getting down to cases, tho. Please criticize Please criticize.

HARRY WARNER, JR., 423 Summit Ave., Hagerstown, Md.:

Gregg Calkins should try journalism, if he wants to lament the lack of spare time. I've just checked back and find that Labor Day was the last occasion when I got through 24 hours from one midnight to another without putting in at least two hours on the job....

- And every letter we've received from you in the past few months has
- been grouchy and pessimistic in tone -- it's been telling on you, fella.

Makes me wish I could help, somehow.

I keep fearing that your starship project is going to turn into an effort to fix the form that science fiction stories should adopt for the exploration of space, a kind of stagesetting and prop-arranging which the future histories of all writers would utilize. This I wouldn't care for at all. Your inability to find any really suitable job for me on the ship is symptomatic.

- On the contrary, it's guys like you and gals like Bjo whom I suspect would become the hardest-working people on a starship like this. Such "stagesetting and prop-arranging" is exactly what I've charged modern stf with having -- I called it Campbellian Orthodoxy, remember -- so I definitely do not want to suggest any substitute orthodoxy. I want to reveal a vast frontier where writers' imaginations can roam free;
- nothing less will do, here. Watch and see -- and call my hand if I fail.

I suspect that about one year from now you'll be a member of an apa. You're talking just about the way Don Franson did before he joined N'APA. As you probably know perfectly well, you're exaggerating the situation dreadfully. For years, there has been at all times at least one ayjay group ((+Would it shock you to learn I don't know what that means, offhand?+)) with vacancies permitting instant membership by anyone who has published or written anything in fanzine fandom. If Robbie hasn't seen an apa mailing, it's her own fault because several of the groups sell complete mailings to outsiders on a first-come, first-served basis. I can think of no more than four or five fans who fit your description of individuals who vanish into apas and are never seen again outside those organizations. ((+Granted: I

escape the obligation that I feel ((+And they know it, don't they?+)) to write letters of comment to the many members who have me on their mailing lists. Yes, I know I could tell them to stop sending the magazines, but I could also cut my throat, and I enjoy fanzines and life too much to do either; it's just a temptation to think that I could get these fanzines and keep a clear conscience by the simple process of cutting a few stencils once each year.

- You saw through my trap, of course. I have considerable faith in guys like you and Rick -- to my mind, two of the most well-meaning guys in
- fandom -- tho I don't neglect ways to haul you clear of any trap I set, if need be! But the bait I used just doesn't appeal to you guys, thank goodness. Consequently, it does the job quite well.

RICK SNEARY, 2962 Santa Ana St., South Gate, Calif .:

I was going to write after issue #25, and try to reasure you and help you regain your senses. Mental breakdowns require a good deal of unterstanding from ones friends. But on reading the October issue I find it wasn't as bad as I'd though. ((+Yeh -- it may even be worse!+)) Maybe some day I'll really learn to listen to Joe all the way through and stop falling for his trick of stampeading the troops off in the opposit direction from the opposite direction tion from the one he's going.

As for SSF - I thought you were starting up your own fantasy world, and opening the door to others a la Coventry. As an old but not very serious player of that game, I liked the idea as such, but couldn't believe it was you. ((+This reaction of LA fans took me by surprise, too.+)) I gather from the current issue that while it is a fantasy world project, that it will be all your own doing .. This makes for better organization, but doesn't insure the fanatical interest of all your readers.

sounded very much like an idea Don Simpson, Bjo, and I brainstormed one day when she was back on White Knoll Dr. Briefly outlined it would have had acouple dozen people writing exploration reports of a newly discovered planet. Each person writing from his specialty--geology, meteorology, cartography, etc.. The Reports were to be carefully inter-related, so that while writen by different people the world they were pictureing was the same. As the Reports were published the whole "team" would study them for flaws in logic. --- The project didn't develope, and I thought maybe that was what you were going to do, but I guess not ..

- You're getting warm, tho! And LOX may turn into something like that,
- as this goes on...but perhaps you see, now, that what I kept calling "a frontier in interstellar space" is a frontier, a whole new realm where the hand of Man has never set foot -- and tho I've made a couple
- brief scouting trips into it, the rest of you have never seen it. So I've got to be the leader; I know where it is. Once the rest of you do,
- this may develop into something else, entirely.

I would much rather be Chief Purser on the Indecontaminable. Some record of ships stores has to be kept, and I'm a hard man to pry anything out of with out a very good reason. (I maybe brain-washed, but I find it easyer to carry money around than hams and new robot floor scrubbers) I enjoy becoming records. enjoy keeping records, which seems fits in with your requirement for office, too. And while I don't know all the job would entail on your ship, I hope you will follow the old British custome of awarding the Purser 10% of all stores not expended by the end of the voyage.

belongs on everything else -- and of course there are books, and records, and magazines. We work on a barter system as well as cash. Oh yes, I shouldn't forget the five pounds of unroasted peanuts, either....you can pick up some of the damnedest things in return for a fanzine.)

This is second-hand, of course, but my cousin in the Marines says you fire a submachine gun by swinging it across the target, and <u>letting</u> the recoil kick it up, thereby cutting your opponent in two on the bias, as it were. (You start off aiming low and to the left, naturally.) I can't vouch for it, but it sounds reasonable. (Said cousin is a career man, having so far worked his way up from Private to Major.) This would cover any little mistakes in elevation as well as windage (and possibly handle any cowardly foes who were addicted to leaping, Tarzan-like, into the overhanging branches at the first shot.)

- I used that technique just once, by instinct, certainly not by training.
- It figures a Marine would get close enough to a target where it's big enuff to stitch patterns on -- but this is interesting, Buck; you know,

- it'd work as well from right-to-left as left-to-right; a couple bursts like that might be pretty effective cover or searching fire on a jungle trail, and certainly you'd want the swiftest, most effective shortrange technique. For open fields like Europe has, I'd prefer other techniques as well. But now, with the AR-16, I understand there's little recoil...

Oh yes, these issues were about starships, weren't they? We11, never been one to comment on a subject just because everyone else did. Send me a picture postcard from Centaurus.

F.M. BUSBY, 2852 14th Ave W, Seattle 98119:

Apas have their limitations, certainly. They begin, basically, as convenient distribution systems with built-in trading arrangements for smallvenient distribution systems with built-in trading arrangements for small-circulation of fanzines. They wind up as a sort of multiple correspondence with slight added amounts of items of fiction, essays, poetry, art, etc; people occasionally gripe about this but it does not seem to do much good. Or harm, for that matter. But I don't see your beef: "in fandom for 11 years and never seen one of those apa-mailings" ... "leaves you feeling kind of 'left out' through no fault of your own"?? Now look, Joe: what do you expect the apas to do? Run you down with bloodhounds or something? ((+Don't give 'em ideas!+)) You, personally, have been in the Bay Area for some years, along with a shifting number of friendly fans belonging to various apas. Are you trying to tell me that none of these would lend you any mailing of any apa during all this time? If you had asked?

- Why, Buz, we could get our own apa-mailing anytime -- they're sold to outsiders. Of course, Waiting Listers get first crack and even then it's held up until all members are known to have received their mailings and that means we'd wait at least six months and it'd be pretty stale reading for any purpose other than a mere academic interest. But we could ask some local fan and remind 'im a few times before his mailing arrived so he wouldn't throw means of it out or seather the rost to hellandsone

- he wouldn't throw most of it out, or scatter the rest to hellandgone.

OK, then: "closed little apa groups" bug you. Closed HOW? Numerical limit on memberships, yes -- but there is constant turnover; with the one exception of FAPA, most Waiting Lists move up pretty rapidly. (Of 3 members ... And so you wish to -- you MUST -- return to 20th Century Earth, huh? Yes. +++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++

of the different APA's find that being members answers some of these needs better than not being a member. The editors of g2 find that editing the type of personal-opinion-cum-letterzine that they do, answers their needs There does not seem any easy way of determining what is the best best.. There does way of being a fan.

And Joe, I don't know if you are right about TAFF or not. It is just that you sound so sure, and Art Hayes is the only one else I've read suggesting that stuff. I have said I'm naive, but I hoped I wasn't blind.

You've been no more blind than the rest of fandom, and you certainly saw my trap. I'll admit it only caught a couple of small tigers, but doubt anyone will contend that both Buck Coulson and F.M. Busby lack teeth! They must've known it was a trap, too, this being the 2nd time I've used it. First time, of course, was that "Thieves, Whores & Moochers" thing in Shaggy. Generally speaking, I was right -- but I didn't explain how, much less offering any proof; instead, I deliberately went out of my way to almost force everyone to disagree. And when they did, they gave better proof of what I'd claimed than I ever could with any statements or evidence of my own choosing. (And the ones who really hated my guts for that were those who'd commit petty theft, distribute narcotics or molest children, preferring fandom to remain "tolerant" toward them.)
But that trap's a very old technique in the art of debate. I'm surprised it would fool anybody. In fact, I denit really think it has even bete

BUCK COULSON, Route 3, Wabash, Ind., 46992:

In every issue of g2 there is one item (usually not the major subject of conversation) which inspires me to comment. I read the mag and make mental notes -- then I put the mag aside and forget about putting the notes on paper. This time I've broken the jinx; my comment may be belated but at least it's here.

it would fool anybody. In fact, I don't really think it has, even here.

It's about this anti-apa bias of yours and how poor Robbie is being discriminated against. First, I might say that I'm not trying to say that apas are the greatest things in fandom. When I had to cut down on my fanac, FAPA was the first activity to go because it was the least interesting, and I've no objection to anyone who considers apas too dull to bother with. I don't put them in quite that category, but genzines are far and away more fun. ((+You might have added that you weren't logsing anything by dropping your FAPA membership, anyway, since Juanita retained hers.+)) your FAPA membership, anyway, since Juanita retained hers.+))

However, this business of leaving you "feeling kind of 'left out' through no fault of your own" is so much bullshit. ((+Here we go!+)) It's just too, too bad that Robbie has been in fandom eleven years without seeing an apa mailing. She's been in fandom longer than I have, then, and I've been apa mailing. She's been in fandom longer than I have, then, and I've been in FAPA for over five years. If she'd wanted to belong to an apa, she could have belonged (and don't try to pull any more bull about having to publish a fanzine to belong; Bloch was a FAPA member for years and as far as I know he never published a fanzine in his life. A member has to contribute, not publish.) If she's never seen a mailing, then it's because she didn't want to bother with apas and you've got a hell of a nerve yelling "foul" about it. Same to you only moreso, because I know damned well you've been in fandom longer than I have.

Haven't you better sense than try that tone on me, Buck? Now I'll not apologize for breaking into the context of your letter with my little plus-sign asides. Since Bloch hasn't been very active for years, even in FAPA, I should think you'd give better examples -- Bob Tucker and Bill Rotsler are good ones -- but to that, I offer just one comment: let's see you try it. There isn't a thing in any of the apas to offer encouragement or recognition to an apazine editor who'll publish others' contributions -- not even those few fans who really enjoy being an editor and do it well.

What problem's that, William? +

+ Those few who enjoy editing enough to give their apazines the semblance of a genzine, and to distribute it to outside fans as well as in the apa mailings, are criticized for not being "fannish" enough, not "putting their own personality in print" -- in short, for not pubbing an apazine.

+ Anyone contributing to an apa, unless he's enough of a BNF, had darned well better expect to publish his contributions since he'll find darned few others to do it for him. Then the apas go thru cycles of interesting activity with dull periods between, and members wonder why -- never thinking that any good fanzine has a good editor, and good editors do get good material at times when nobody else seemingly can find any.

All of which has nothing to do with fans like Robbie. Or like me, either, for most of the time I've been in fandom. Sure, we could've joined an apa. Any of thecfans like us could. All we'd have to do is contribute -- which means, let jokers like you tell us what our fanac ought to be. If we aren't active your way, to hell with us. Why, it must be we aren't even faaans. People who simply read? Who don't write? Unthinkable!

* Nothing I could've said would have proved this as much as you have.

If you want to say that apas are ridiculous, go right ahead. They are — so are most other fan activities, but that's beside the point. But that they are unfair — poo. So an apa member won't send you his mag unless you join the club and send him a mag in return. So you won't send him g2 unless he sends you a quarter. What's the difference? You're both demanding something in return for your mag. If you had ever been refused membership by an apa, then you could say they were discriminating against you, but from what you've said so far you've never even tried to get in. Why the hell should you have seen a mailing? ((+0h, I've seen 'em.+)) You expect people to send you fanzines just because you're a BNF? ((+They do that, too.+)) You sound like Bob Madle. He used to complain because I wouldn't send him YANDRO. I said I'd send him a copy any time he wanted to pay for it. He said he'd give me a review in whichever one of Lowndes' mags he was writing a column for, I said I'didn't want acpromag review; we had too high a circulation the way it was. ((+Never having considered Madle a fanzine fan, I'm not surprised; and I knew just enough about fanzine fandom to find his reviews even more disoriented than Rog Phillips' were, a fault your reviews will never have.+)) He never seemed to understand that the reason I wouldn't send him the mag was that he wasn't offering me anything that I valued in return, and I wasn't about to give out free issues. So you don't seem to realize that you aren't offering apa members anything that they value in return, and they're not about to give out free issues, either. The fact that their values are different from yours doesn't mean that they're any worse —— or better. The fan who is used to getting fanzines in return for letters of comment has just as much justification for complaining that you're discriminating against him as you have to complain about apas.

+ You mean I can complain that much? But Madle could've sent money for YANDRO; money is a standard item of exchange. So to you, it's the same thing for the apas to demand contributions from anyone who doesn't or seldom does write for or comment on fanzines, who doesn't enjoy it, who likes reading and talking about and -- oh, contributions are the same as money, are they? Hell, every apa charter that's been written excluded me from even trying to join by its own rules. But it's no fault of the apas. They were supposed to be exclusive, for chrissake. For apa fans. I once refused to attend any Hydra Club meetings for much the same reason, despite repeated invitations to do so. The only fault such exclusiveness may have in fanzine fandom is that it's the only fandom some fans can contact. And then, the apas have become the major factor they are.

- Now, that I don't mind at all, Buz -- except when some fool tries telling me it's The Thing To Do and Everybody Does It and I Gotta. The
- only bitching I've done toward the apas for years is when they start acting like theirs is not only A Way of Life, but THE Way of Life. And when it gets so everyone's supposed to publish his fanzine a certain way,
- distribute it a certain way, write a certain way, spell "poctsarcd" a certain way -- and fans raise hell with me because I don't, at the same time they're bragging about how "tolerant" they are -- I start looking around. And the first thing I see is these little apas are the most powerful directive force in this fanzine fandom, today.

You must get a different crop of zines from those we get, because I see very few zines that do not want subscriptions. You give a list of those that don't, if you will, and I'll match it (but I won't go to all that work unless you do first; I may be ignorant, ol' buddy, but stupid I ain't). Sure, you'll find a few that suit your thesis, but I'll find more that do not.

- I wouldn't run out of fingers naming off the fanzines I've seen that offer subs, and for the vast number I don't see, I refer to Buck's reviews; the
- "accepted" policy seems to be to name a price for one copy, and that's all.

 And that's no subscription. If there are many fmz that offer subs, I'd

 like to see 'em. Could be I won't because I refuse to trade, tho. And

- I have to refuse or stop accepting cash-subs -- or stop publishing g2.

As to faneditors setting aside "maybe 100 copies of each issue" for trades: you must of been off your head for a minute there when you wrote that one, Joe, if you meant it to apply in the general case. ((+It was pretty much the case in the past, when there were more well-known genzines than there are now & 250 total circulation wasn't unusual.+)) Of course, I can't speak for any other fanzine, authoritatively, but I doubt that the general run is all that much different from CRY, on which I can speak with authority ((+and length! Buz concludes here that about 95 copies of CRY 170 went for cash and 42 didn't, maybe 10 of which went for trades.+)) So like I say, I think you are off your head a little bit in the genzine discussion. ((+Yeh - I'm amazed you guys haven't more circulation than that.+))

And I think I know why, too, if it comes to that. Like so: judging from your remarks re TAFF to R Sage Sneary, you are living in an alternate universe, Joe. "..that noisy...little minority of active fandom who publish & write for fanzines", you say, is responsible for all the ills of TAFF. Now without disinterring that old fallacious beef of "fanzine fans" vs "conventional distributions." tion fans" ((+dreamed up, wasn't it, by some fanzine fans who didn't know what they were talking about?+)) may I ask a question (since I will, anyway)? If we omit the even smaller and noisier minority of active fandom who actually publish fanzines, just who out of the (implied) vast majority of active fandom sees to it that anyone even hears of TAFF and its doings: like, who is running, and when is the deadline, and where do you send your ballots, and like that? Word of mouth at Conventions? Aw, come on, man.

- Oh, if you want to say TAFF (and anything wrong with it) is strictly the
- property of those who publish fanzines -- that other fanzine fans, much less the rest of fandom, have nothing to do with it -- I wouldn't argue
- much, tho there are undoubtedly exceptions. Or what are you saying?

I think, Joe, that in this as well as in your assumptions about apas and about genzine circulation, you are living in a universe in which the good old SS, TWS, and Planet lettercols are still a major forum of fandom, independent of fanzines. Maybe it isn't an alternative universe; maybe you are just still living in 1954. Well, that's all right. 1954 was a damn good year. But in 1963 (my 1963, anyway) those good ol' lettercols are only a treasured memory, and many of their fannish functions have for better or worse devolved upon the Fan Press-- simply because fanzines are the only extant vehicles for them. You don't have to like it, Joe, but I do think you should face up to it. Unless of course you have a workable

It WOULD seem that you have a problem, there...

The reaction both Robbie and I have, Buz, is that you must be living in an alternate universe where fanzine fandom -- all of it that's fit to

print, with its many divergent interests and groups, with its fannish

fans who don't read stf -- is the only fandom that exists. Except, perhaps, for a half-dozen odd fanclubs which are pretty dull, generally.

But that's all right. I've accused fanzine fandom of discrimination; but's nothing compared to the discrimination others practice against you fanzine fans. D'you know they almost despise you? It amounts to that. I've accused fanzine fandom of discrimination; but

Your bitch at TAFF would have carried more weight if you had listed dates at least, if not a few more names. As it is, I find it hard to relate your blurb to the history of TAFF in my universe, which includes TAFF-winners as follows: Bulmer 1955, Hoffman 1956 (passed the trip), Madle 1957, Bennett 1958, Ford and Bentcliffe 1960, Bllik and Lindsay 1962, with...Weber for 1964. I recognize that you are discussing the 1957 campaign (Madle-Stu Hoffman-Eney-Raeburn-Ellington-McNulty & 2 others I forget now) and its repercussions in 1958-59 (TCarr-Ford-Bjo, running); I just don't quite see where it could have been that you were standing when you took the picture, is all. Oops; there was another winner, before Bulmer, who "passed" the trip; this puts you two off rather than one, in pegging LeeH-'56 as "the first election". ((+First we'd heard of TAFF in my universe!+))

As Voltaire might have said if need be, I will defend to the death your right to say it a little more accurately.

Complete rundown of TAFF candidates and winners was in g2's April '63 issue; the winner before Bulmer was A. Vincent Clarke. LeeH was the

first US winner and of course, I should've said so. You got the bait, tho.

Add TAFF, page rear: the '57 beef was due to accusations of vote-buying at the Midwestcon. ((+Here's where we dispense with mytical "convention fans"; d'you know, Buz, this is the first time I've read the details of that deal? And I've never seen the furor it supposedly caused in fanzines, far as I know.+)) There were two things wrong with these accusations: it wasn't vote-buying, but vote-subsidization by a candidate, and it wasn't the winner but another fella. Aside from these minor matters the beef was correct; I was there and saw & heard it. Another beef was that it is a pretty thankless chore for (ech!) fanzine fans to beat the drum for TAFF at their own publishing expense if a candidate can canvass a regional con and round up votes from people who never heard of any of the candidates before this one fella cornered them in the bar: the Ignorant Vote was deplored, yes.

So there were only "people" and "the Ignorant Vote" at a Midwestcon?
Besides fanzine fans, that is? But some of them did know one candidate,
Buz: he won! As I told Buck, I never considered Madle a fanzine fan.

Be it noticed that despite all the furor, there are still no rules against the supposed abuses, and yet TAFF seems to have survived its growing-pains and can now handle a campaign without all the hassle that occurred 4-5-6 years ago. ((+And without much else, either, except 500-word nominations on the backside of a TAFF Ballot, judging from this last campaign.+))

However, I join R Sneary in asking "a little proof" of any contention that TAFF races were "fixed." Like, from the above list, which ones do you mean? I was not much With It up through 1956, but if you finger any race since then, you will get nothing but a big fat belly laugh. And if it is 1956 that is bugging you-- well, that is quite a while ago, but welcome up from 1954, anyway.

Far as I can see, LeeH couldn't possibly have lost that '56 election unless she'd declared for Lesbianism or somesuch. Now, the '57 election was a long time ago, too -- and at the time, I never heard about that

+ the deed. In my universe, it was probably mentioned by someone returning + from that Midwestcon, got a snort of derision from others, and was ignored. + Something else had occurred there, that had those fans aroused.

+ But I'd better give you the background. From 1948 in Los Angeles to 1950 in New York/New Jersey to 1955 in Chicago to 1958-60 in Berkeley, I've been active in the fandom which has nothing to do with fanzines. They have a well-bred sneer for anyone who even mentions fanzines. I doubt if most of them would even condescend to write letters to each other without having some definite need for it. To write a letter to a faaanzine editor -- to be published by him -- is simply unthinkable to them! You've had them in your Seattle group, undoubtedly, and may well consider them an indifferent faction...as LASFS does, where they're the ones bitching because fanzine fans control the club; if they did, nothing would happen, nothing would get done except what little some poor guy like Walt Daugherty could accomplish, which is precisely the way they like it. LASFS is derided by such fans on the East Coast simply because it isn't "their kind" of club; they simply ignore any credit LASFS fanzine fans have for that. But if you call these fans "club fans" you wouldn't be entirely correct; many are active only a few times a year, a few are strictly convention fans. But they all read stf, or fantasy; and they all consider fanzine fans childish, juvenile, immature fools. At a conservative estimate, I'd guess there are 5-600 of them on the East Coast, maybe 4-500 throughout the Midwest, and 3-400 on the West Coast. But try telling 'em (I have) that there are more than 300 fanzine fans on the entire planet and they'll probably call you a liar.

My "noisy, ultraconformist little minority" slap at fanzine fandom was virtually a direct quote from those fans. It wasn't the first time I've tried to arouse someone in fanzine fandom who'd know where my remarks originated; I've tried repeatedly to prove my observations wrong, that there are not two major factions of fandom with utter contempt and intolerance for each other -- two "alternate universes" as you've so aptly put it.

The charges I've made that TAFF was "rigged" is how TAFF was introduced to those fans by someone trying to "help" Dick Eney. This fool claimed Eney'd been nominated as the most-popular winner, all the other candidates were "also rans" simply for the honor of it, but one of them was trying to beat Eney, refusing to keep in his place. Now, all that was known about Eney in this crowd was that he'd published a glossary of terms used by that juvenile bunch of fanzine editors & fans; this crowd couldn't care less about him. But Bob Madle was one of those candidates; Bob was well-known to them. And it seemed like he'd been suckered into a dirty deal. (I recall hearing*that he denied it, emphatically, but the seed was planted.) And the following year, this crowd had the same suspicions about all the TAFF candidates from fanzine fandom opposing Don Ford. You want proof? 1957 and 1958 were the only years the fanclubs showed any real interest in TAFF. Most of 'em who voted never saw a TAFF Report; few really cared. You'd probably find their interest was mentioned in fanzines at the time. Most fanzine fans actually applauded it! (*THIS DOESN'T MEAN IT'S A FACT.)

The most obvious fault of these "alternate universes" is that they

+ don't always remain alternate. What's less obvious, but I think more serious,

+ is that quite a few of us enjoy interests in both directions -- and we're

+ the only ones who really know the contempt and intolerance those two factions

+ have erected against each other. D'you see where I stand now, Buz? And I

+ believe there was some truth to that picture of TAFF elections with big slates.

Now then. As master of the HMS Indecontaminable, you buckle all the swashes you want, up there in the control and passenger areas. But just keep your cotton-pickin' brassbound lunch-hooks out of my engine room, is all. You go ahead and bulldoze that crosseyed navigator into going the wrong way, if you like; any place the drive will take you, it will also bring you back (within obvious limitations)....

((+Obvious, hell!+))

PRINTED MATTER

JOE & ROBBIE GIBSON
5380 SOBRANTE AVE
EL SOBRANTE, CALIF.
#94803

PLATE 2:

SHIP'S LOCATION & FLIGHT PATH
AS VIEWED IN THE TUCKER
PROJECTANK — SOMETIMES
REFERRED TO AS 'THE
ROSEBUD THEATER' —



