NULL-F 27

Since there are a number of items on the agenda for this special issue, I'll begin without further ado.

1. The matter of Ed Martin: I received Ed's mimeod copy of Trimble's letter too late to comment on it in the mailing. Frankly, I don't see one whit of legality in Trimble's position. It is quite obvious that the last GROTESQUE was substancially Ed's own work in "compiling, writing, and/or rewriting" (most certainly the latter), and in publication. The mere fact that the plots were unoriginal has no place in the discussion or issue. I think it is incumbant upon Trimble to show direct copying or plagerism, on a word-for-word basis, in order to expell Martin. I am calling this to the attention of the Vice President, and asking for a ruling. (And, since the Veep's only comment to date has been to nit-pick with Martin's own conclusions, I may as well state the obvious: if stories whose plots are unoriginal will not count for activity credit, can we claim credit for ideas expressed in m-c's which are not totally original with us? This is known as the reducto ad absurdum. And it is certainly immaterial whether or not "a small clique" in California is "running things;" the point is that one Californian officer acted in dubious legality. I object.)

2. The matter of Jane Gallion/Jacobs: I am extremely curious as to why this woman is at the head of the w-l. Presumably she was put on the w-l in the position she would have occupied had she applied to the w-l at the time she married Lee Jacobs. However, two places below her is Miriam Carr, who to the best of my knowledge had married Terry Carr previous to the Jacobs' marriage. If she too was returned to an analogous spot on the w-l, why was it not ahead of Jane Gallion? This situation is one I would like information about.

3. The matter of the Fan Art Show Award: As far as I can see, this "AMENDMENT #2" is illegal, by FAPA constitutional procedure. It is my understanding that the President of FAPA must propose the amendment in its proper wording, at least one mailing before it is to be voted upon. The Constitution itself is a bit vague here, specifying only that: "The gist of the amendment must be given in The Fantasy Amateur before it comes up for vote." But I recall that when I was President the procedure was to itemize amendments up for vote in a previous FA, and then to present for vote an unchanged amendment. This has not been done here. In the last FA the President speculated over the idea of an Art Show Trophy or donation in generalized terms, appointed a committee to study the question, and asked for its report "no later than the May mailing, so that matters may get in train for presenting such an award, if we choose to do so, in Chicago." (Sic.) She added, "If you want to present the report in February, and answer the objections and comments in May, that's all right too." That doesn't sound to me as though Marion intended the amendment to be voted on as of the February mailing, and without any chances for discussion based upon the committee or the final wording of the amendment. Further, the constitution specifies: "Unless the President orders a special vote, amendments shall be voted on at the annual election." The President called only for a special vote on "AMENDMENT #1," and she did so, legally, in the November mlg. I don't believe the "gist of the amendment" #2 was presented "before" it came "up for a vote," nor have I seen any presidential authorization in either the November or February FA's for a special election on the amendment. And, speaking for myself, I am disturbed that

this amendment is apparently being railroaded through for a fast vote by the FAPA officers who coincidentally happen to be running the Fan Art Show, initially proposed the idea, and would seem to have something to gain by the passage of such an amendment. I must contest the legality of the present election on this amendment, officially, to the Vice President. (It seems to me that the amendment could still be legally proposed and voted upon either in May or August if we must rush in order to make the Chicago convention--but also, inasmuch as passage of such an amendment will be binding upon FAPA for more than just this one year, I think that whether or not we pass it prior to Chicago is a lot less important than whether or not we give proper deliberation to the amendment itself.)

4. And, just for the hell of it, the matter of J.V.Taurasi: I contest Taurasi's activity credits. I do not believe that he had sufficient new and original material in FAPA as of his third mailing, although I am not certain of this. There are two alternate criteria which I will get to in a minute, but ignoring them for a moment, I think his only chance of having had proper activity credit must rest on the "news summaries" in PHANTASY PRESS, which I believe appeared prior to Taurasi's entry. The remainder of the material he has put into FAPA has consisted of the Pittcon editions of SFTIMES (reprint), SCIENTIFICTIONAL TIMES (reprint) and SCIENCE FICTION AGE (mostly reprint). There may have been a few other reprints, like MONSTER TIMES. I would like to ask FAPA's officials for a check on this; I do not believe James Taurasi had eight pages of new activity in FAPA within his first year--nor do I believe he has put eight pages of new activity into FAPA at any time since rejoining. The two alternate criteria I mentioned, however, are these: I claim that a fanzine published for another audience, on which the press run has been increased in order to allow 68 copies extra for FAPA, and upon which no note is made of FAPA circulation is made, is a reprint. When a fan can grab a bunch of old zines he's produced for someone else, and put 68 copies through FAPA to save his membership, I claim foul. However I've been told by others in this area that for his publications to constitute reprint status, Taurasi would have had to rerun old stencils. I think that's nitpicking; who can tell the difference? However, SFAGE was assembled from items (or stencils) previously published in SFTIMES--and the original pseudonyms were left on. Of course...by the Martin precident Taurasi's material wouldn't count anyway; I've asked all the FAPAns in this area, and they agree that none of the news items/articles/sotries (sic) were new to them--even upon original publication...

In throwing out all these legalistic (and probably nit-picking) points at one time I hope I am not prejudicing their individual consideration by either the officers or members. And I hope that no implied criticism will be read where none is intended. I am not "attacking" anything; these are points which seem to me either in dubious constitutionality or about which I feel a personal doubt. I have listed them here for FAPA's consideration.

Two other points, FYI:

5. White vs. Moskowitz/Haycock: I have been served papers by Christine Moskowitz's lawyer, Mr. Seitel, and I am being sued for $75,000.00. The suit is based on two charges, which are the same two quotes objected to by Mr. Seitel in his letter in NULL-F #23. The first quoted is claimed to have caused damages to the sum of $50,000.00, and the second damages of $25,000.00. I think that's ridiculous.

6. I've moved again: As of March 1st, my address will be: 339 - 49th St., Brooklyn 20, N.Y.

-Ted White