



GODLESS #14, Aug-Sept 76, is published by Bruce D. Arthurs, 920 N. 82nd St., H-201, Scottsdale, AZ 85257. Special all-editorial issue, distributed to the regular GODLESS mailing list, and thru TAPS and AZAPA. Since this issue is so short and so closely related to the editorial in GODLESS #13, this issue will not count off on subscriptions. A Malacoda Press publication.

THE KING IN PLURAL

OH, WE'LL CUT CRAIG MILLER DOWN FROM THAT APPLE TREE... My editorial in GODLESS #13 was a fiery blast at Craig Miller for various and sundry distortions I felt he had made about the Phoenix bids for the '78 Westercon and Worldcon.

I was wrong. I apologize to Criag Miller.

Specifically:

I accused Craig of putting into SFINCTOR #9 the following "quote":

A Worldcon is not 'like putting on a 200 person con, only bigger'.

I also said that the context this line appeared in made it appear that Craig was quoting someone on the Phoenix committee. A long phone call and a letter got

this straightened out. Craig said that he did not intend to have that line read as a quote of any specific person, but rather as an aphorism, a witty saying. Unfortunately, as I said, the line looks like a quote and reads like a quote, and not even a particularly witty one. If Craig had run the line without the single-quotes, it would have been a simple statement of fact that no one could have complained about. (I would have still felt that the context was bad, and that, no, no one on the Phx committee felt that way, but at least it wouldn't have looked like a deliberate misquote.) Craig said on the phone that he was sorry if anyone had misinterpreted the line in that manner, and he apologized for any misunderstanding about it.

(Unfortunately...and very embarrassingly, to me and to the rest of the Phx people...it turned out that someone associated with the Phoenix Worldcon bid had said the very thing I had said nobody was dumb enough to state. A few days after the last issue was mailed out, I received a postcard from Bob Vardeman saying that he had met Rick Gellman, who ~~has been throwing~~ "Phoenix in '78" parties at numerous Eastern and Midwest conventions for us, at Minicon in Minneapolis, and "...the bit in quotes is almost verbatim what he told me." *flinch* I guess there are people dumb enough to believe a Worldcon is like a larger 200 person con...but I don't believe that, none of the other local people believe that, and hopefully Rick Gellman won't believe that either as soon as we ~~get out hands on with~~ have a chance to talk with him.

The second point I raised against Craig Miller...but first I have to move ahead of myself for a bit and make a correction to something that came later in the editorial: I jumped to the conclusion that the wording of the LA-in-78-Westercon-bid ad in the 1976 WESTERCON PROGRESS REPORT #4 was the work of Craig Miller. This was incorrect; the ad was written by Mike Glyer, and more than one person wrote to say that the style was more Glyerish than Millerish. I apologize to Craig for letting my anger blind me to the true identity of the writer.

Getting back to that issue of SFINCTOR, the first point I raised against Craig Miller -- the '200 person con' statement -- by itself, though it disgruntled me strongly, was not enough to make me lash out in print like I did. Instead, I wrote a letter to Craig, pointing out how the line in SFINCTOR could give the wrong impression to people. But before I could mail that letter, WESTERCON PR #4 arrived....

One of the other things Craig had written in SFINCTOR #9 remarked on the fact that Phx was bidding for both Westercon and Worldcon. His comment was, "Not even LA is foolhardy enough to bid for both." And then WESTERCON PR #4 arrived, with its LA ad informing everyone that Craig Miller was a member of the LA Westercon bidding committee, when he was already serving on the LA-in-78-Worldcon-bid committee. The obvious conclusion was that Craig Miller was indulging in some good old-fashioned cold-blooded hypocrisy. Disgruntlement turned to outrage and anger, and it was right after that that I began to prepare last issue's editorial.

At least, the conclusion I reached would have been obvious except for one little fact of which I was unaware: Not only was Craig not a member of the LA Westercon bid at the time he typed up SFINCTOR #9, but when the WESTERCON PR #4 came out, he was still not a member of the LA Westercon bid, the contents of the LA ad therein to the contrary.

See, Craig had offered his help and advice to both Westercon bids, LA and Phx. The Phx bid appreciated this. On the LA side, Mike Glyer appreciated the offer so much that he declared Craig Miller to be a member of his committee...without bothering to inform Craig of his appointment to the position. So at the time PR #4 appeared, Craig Miller was really as much a member of the Phx bid as he was of the LA bid; the Phx people, at least, know the difference between someone saying "I'd like to offer my help to your bid" and someone saying, "I'd like to be on your committee." (Craig did officially join Glyer's committee shortly before the '76 Westercon, an action I don't really understand; if someone had pulled a similar stunt on me, my response would have been along the lines of "Up your nose with a rubber hose", if I could have managed to be even that polite about it.)

Now that Craig Miller has been exonerated, we can turn to the other person mentioned in my editorial -- Mike Glyer. Much as I hate to admit it, I owe Mike a few corrections and apologies too...though not totally, as in Miller's case.

First of all, concerning the short deadline we had for the Phx "SMUST" ad in PR #4, I was misinformed. The ad was sent in before the deadline, Glycer thought it was a pretty putrid ad too, and he wrote back to say that we could send a better ad to him if we got it to him by April 25th -- this was the short deadline Tim Kyger wasn't able to meet.

Second, I said that the line in the LA ad in PR #4 that read "Even our opposition has sought [Craig Miller's] advice" implied that we had sought information on hotel liason work from Miller, and that this was an incorrect implication. Again, I was misinformed; the advice Craig sent us included information on hotels, hotel contracts, and related matters, and it certainly wasn't rejected when received.

The last correction to the editorial concerns the following quote from the LA ad:

And we will be speaking for ourselves -- we will
have a policy of complete financial disclosure.
CONVENTION PROFITS WILL BE DISTRIBUTED BY A VOTE
OF THE ATTENDEES, if profits there be.

I said that these lines implied that the Phx committee would not be speaking for themselves, that they would not have complete financial disclosure. What do I have to support this claim about the dreadful implications of those lines? Nothing, unfortunately. I realize, now, that no way can I say 100% for sure that those lines were meant to imply that the Phx committee was crooked. Therefore, I take back my remarks, and I apologize if anyone took my remarks on that matter as Gospel. (The Phx bid always took "complete financial disclosure" for granted, and never even thot to emphasize such a point in their literature. Unfortunately, ever since the controversy over the '72 LA Worldcon profits, any LA bid for any major convention will be looked on with suspicion and a damned-if-they-do-and-damned-if-they-don't attitude by some people. If the LA bid says nothing about their financial plans, the attitude will be "What are those LA people up to?" If they do say something about their financial plans, the attitude will be "Aha, but what are those LA people really up to?" This is unfortunate for LA, but it's an attitude that exists, and I suspect that any major LA cons would have to be very complete, honest, and candid in their financial disclosures in order to eventually wipe out this mistrust and suspicion.)

I also said I owed Mike Glycer an apology, in addition to the above corrections. Not, however, for anything written in that editorial, but rather for some things I wrote after putting that editorial on stencil.

See, last issue's editorial was an angry one, but nevertheless a fair and rational one (Mike Glycer's accusations of "paranoia" and "libel" to the contrary). I went to a lot of effort and numerous drafts to get that editorial as accurate as I possibly could (and the fact that it contains as many errors as it did is quite embarrassing, believe me), and I recieved several locs on last issue complimenting me for not flying off the handle about the subjects under discussion and the obvious attempt to maintain an attitude of fairness throughout.

However, writing that editorial did not disippate the anger I felt, particularly whenever I took another look at the LA ad in PR #4 and again saw how Mike Glycer had abused his position as Publications Chairman for the '76 Westercon to design an ad belittling the Phx ad in the same issue, then placing his ad directly across from the Phx one so they would be read in the "proper" order. (Yes, that part of the editorial, the most important part, still stnads unchanged -- stronger than ever, in fact, since at the '76 Westercon Mike Glycer admitted to me, in front of witnesses, that his actions had been deliberate. See below for more details on this.)

Anyway, this anger didn't go away. It grew, it fed on itself, it began to fester. And this festering began to show itself. I sent copies of that editorial thru TAPS as well as the regular GOMLESS mailing list, and on the introductory page to the TAPS edition, I said that I would never be able to trust Mike Glycer and that...

...if by chance LA should win the Worldcon bid,
and if by chance Mike Glycer should be placed in

charge of tabulating Hugo nominations, I wouldn't be a bit surprised to see SCIENTI-FRICTION getting a place on the ballot, that's how I feel about Mike Glycer right now.

Now, that's not a nice thing to say. It's nasty. It concerns itself not with what Mike Glycer has done, but with what he might do. More of the same sort of reasoning appeared in my AZAPazine for the August mailing. That's petty behavior and shoddy argument, and I regret it. I offer my apologies to Mike Glycer for saying those sort of things about him.

The first part of that TAPSzine, though, about how I would never be able to trust Mike Glycer again, still stands. I can't place any trust in him. The evidence is right there in WESTERCON PR #4; Glycer was unable to keep his responsibilities as Publications Chairman and his desire to win a Westercon of his own separate in his mind, so he took advantage of his Publisher's position to give an additional push to his Westercon bid, in what I consider to be an unethical manner.

And here's as good a place as any to give the details of the Westercon incident I mentioned above: Saturday morning at Westercon, I, several other people from Phx, and some El Paso fans who were going out to eat with us, caught up with Mike Glycer in the parking lot. I voiced a strong complaint to Mike Glycer about one of the errors in the program book, an error in the advertiser's index that made it appear that Phx was responsible for a satirical ad for Glycer's bid. If that ad had been correctly attributed to LA, it would have been humorous; attributed to Phx, it made it look like we were indulging in petty belittlement of the LA bid. (Glycer's excuse? He said that he'd switched the inside covers of the program book around at the last moment, and hadn't bothered to reflect this change in the index. This, along with a number of other errors and incidents, leaves me with a very low opinion of Mike Glycer's competency to handle publications or manage a convention.)

At any rate, I also raised the question of Glycer's handling of the Phx and LA ads in PR #4. Not only did he not deny his actions, but -- if I remember his words correctly -- he said that such actions were "standard business practice" and that he saw nothing wrong with what he had done. (I'd love to get a good corporate lawyer's opinion on what Mike considers to be "standard business practices.")

"Mike," I said to him. "Do you mean to tell me that if the shoe had been on the other foot, if we had been in charge of publications, if we had taken your ad, had assigned our own ad as a direct response to yours, and had not only put them in the same issue but had placed our ad on a facing page so they'd be read one right after the other, do you mean to tell me that you wouldn't have considered that to be just a bit flaky?"

"Well...maybe a little," he replied. (Double-standard, anyone?)

Let's sum this whole thing up, shall we? I've already spent too much time and worry, lost too much sleep, been angry too many times for me to want to continue this any longer. (And if I had the energy, I could probably make this zine twice as long and drag in a lot more complaints and criticisms of Mike Glycer...but those would be minor and not-that-important nitpicking, and that's not necessary. All I have to do is look at WESTERCON PR #4 and I realize that Mike Glycer has already cut his own throat as far as any good reputation he had is concerned.

So what have I learned from all this? Well, I gained some respect for Craig Miller: He managed to stay calm and reasonable throughout the affair, he didn't become abusive and venomous in tone when he received and read my editorial. Of course, I don't always agree with Craig Miller's views and opinions, but I do have respect for the man. Thank you, Craig.

I lost a bit of my own self-respect. I found that I could fly off the handle under pressure, that I could indulge in nasty and petty vindictiveness when aroused. I've always had a very high opinion of my temperment and intelligence, and the discovery that I could sink so low was very disturbing.

As for Mike Glycer...let's just say that I no longer like him. I no longer re-

spect him, and that I no longer trust him, and leave it at that, shall we? And if Glyer isn't satisfied with that, if he still believes I'm being "paranoid" and "libelous", well, I'm afraid that I just don't care what Mike Glyer thinks of me anymore.

-- Bruce D. Arthurs

POSTSCRIPT ONE: I had hoped to have this special issue of GODLESS out in time to have in the mail before MidAmeriCon. Some of the people on my mailing list may have decided to vote for Phx for Worldcon over LA because of some of the erroneous things my last editorial contained. I wouldn't want that to happen; like I said in GODLESS #13, people should vote on the basis of impartial, fair, and accurate information (and speaking of accurate information, see Postscript Two). Unfortunately, the issue of money raises its head at this point; I can run these pages off and staple them with the supplies lying around the apartment already, but I don't have the money available to buy stamps for about 250 copies at the time; I've already budgeted too much of my savings for Bubonicon and MAC, plus my GI Bill payments are fouled up at the moment. I will have copies of this with me at Bubonicon (hopefully) and MAC (definitely) though, and the other copies will be mailed out as soon as possible.

POSTSCRIPT TWO: The LA Worldcon bid has come out with a Worldcon '78 Bidders Comparison Chart which I presume will be given out at MAC. The chart is definitely slanted towards the LA bid, but then, the comparison chart the Phx bid included in its promotional pamphlet was slanted towards Phx, so I suppose the motivations even out. Besides, I feel that if the LA bid is going to win, they'll need every advantage they can get (see Postscript Three). I would, however, like to correct two serious errors included in the LA comparison chart:

1) Under "Parking", the chart shows Phoenix as "Sufficient for 700 cars." That's a correct figure...if you're only talking about one of the hotels Phoenix is planning on using. If you count both hotels, the Municipal Parking Garage across the street, and the Convention Center Parking, there are over 4,000 parking spaces available.

2) Under "Costs, if any, for Function Space", the LA chart has this to say about Phoenix: "Convention Center to charge up to \$1850.00 per day." Again, this would be a correct figure, if we were planning on using the entire Phoenix Convention Center. However, the PCC is designed for conventions in the 10-15,000 people range. Since we're expecting, at the very most, about 5,000 people, we would be using only part of the PCC facilities, at a cost of \$500.00 per day.

POSTSCRIPT THREE So, how do the chances look for Phx to win the Worldcon? Very good, I'd say. Last issue's editorial convinced a number of people to vote for Phx (and I'm sure it may also have convinced a few people not to vote for Phx, but I haven't heard from anyone that it convinced to change their vote that way). This is my own fanzine, so I'm undoubtedly getting a heavily prejudiced feedback, but the locs I've been getting on last issue have been running about six to one in favor of Phx.

The LA bid also has a few things working against it. One of these is that Glyer's bid did win the '78 Westercon (by seven votes, *sigh*). And just like Craig Miller was reluctant about the thought of Phx possibly winning both Worldcon and Westercon, now that LA has already won a major convention for '78, a lot of people don't feel they should have both, so they're voting Phx for Worldcon.

Plus there's the fact that, until the Phoenix bid came into being, almost no effort was expended by the LA bid to give out any information on their plans. This was one of the main reasons the Phoenix bid got started in the first place; we felt that even if we didn't have that good a chance of winning, at least our competing bid would light a little fire under the LA people. And indeed, it has. This was something I discussed slightly with Larry Propp at Westercon: "The LA bid was unopposed; why should they go to the trouble of publicizing their bid?" he

asked. "Because," I replied, "the fans deserve to know what they're voting for, they deserve to see some sort of evidence that a bid is making serious plans, that a bid will expend some effort at putting on a Worldcon. I haven't seen much evidence of that from the LA bid, and if there wasn't an opposing bid, I wouldn't have bothered to vote at all."

Actually, after I realized that my anger over the Glyer/Miller affair was making me into a very unpleasant person, I did some wondering about whether I really wanted Phoenix to win or if I just wanted the LA bid to lose because of the anger I felt. I even seriously considered voting "No Award" for the '78 Worldcon. (And actually, that's something I would like to see on future site selection ballots; give the fans a real choice!) But then I received PR #5 from MidAmeriCon, with a most incredibly shoddy and badly prepared ad by the LA bid (one of the leftovers from when they were still an unopposed bid; the deadline for that PR was May 1st, and the LA bid didn't learn of the Phoenix bid's existence until the deadline had passed; the Phx bid itself barely got its own ads in under the deadline). That decided me: Maybe Phoenix doesn't have the best facilities, maybe Phoenix doesn't have the most experience, but, goddammit, we care enough about what we're doing to work at it. Therefore, I did vote Phoenix for the '78 Worldcon.

Of course, the LA bid might still win the '78 Worldcon, but to do so, I think they're going to have to do a heck of a lot of campaigning at MAC, and even then I suspect it'll be a very close race. I don't intend to lose any sleep about it.

And now for a few more normal things to discuss: The FANTHOLOGY '75, the collection of the best fanzine writings of 1975, as chosen by me, won't be available by MAC as I promised. Sorry. The brouhaha resulting from last issue's editorial, along with school demands and other mundane business, commitments and pleasures, kept me from getting it done. However, I do hope to have it ready by October. The collection will be about a hundred pages long, have a print run of 250 copies, and will cost \$2.00 a copy.

The next issue of GODLESS will probably be a while in coming out. For the first time in my life, I'm pursuing a course of study where a lot of the work is out-of-class, and it's going to cut into my free time considerably. Plus the fact that I'm going to have to get a job one of these days. The VA checks pay most of my expenses, but not all, and it's not pleasant to see my savings account shrink more and more each month.

And that, I think is all for this issue.

(Illo on page 1 is by Al Sircis)

Bruce D. Arthurs
920 N. 82nd St., H-201
Scottsdale, AZ 85257

FIRST CLASS MAIL