

# PITFCS 148

## NOTICE!

THIS BROCHURE CONTAINS AN ADVERTISEMENT FOR ADULT MATERIAL DEALING WITH SEX. IF YOU ARE A MINOR OR IF YOU ARE NOT INTERESTED IN ADULT MATERIAL DEALING WITH SEX, PLEASE RETURN THE ENVELOPE BEARING YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS SO WE MAY REMOVE YOUR NAME FROM OUR FILES.

***DON'T GO TO...***

**DENMARK!!**

***We GUARANTEE We've Got What You Want***

**NO**

LOSSES TO YOU, WE GUARANTEE OUR MERCHANDISE

PROBLEMS WITH CUSTOMS AND CENSORS

GAMBLES WITH FOREIGN SHIPPERS

OUTRAGEOUSLY HIGH PRICES

LONG, TEDIOUS WAITS

**NO. 16**

S  
F  
W  
A  
  
F  
O  
R  
U  
M

PROCEEDINGS OF THE INSTITUTE FOR TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY STUDIES

"Vini, vidi, aber ergen wie."

SPECIAL SERIES 148

Theodore P. Cogswell  
Secretary  
Committee on Reactivation

November 1970  
Box 186  
Chinchilla, Pa. 18410

ACTING BOARD OF CONTROL

A. A. CRAIG  
GEORGE E. DALE  
JACQUES DEFOREST ERIAN  
STUART FLEMING  
WARREN F. HOWARD  
EDWIN JAMES  
MALLORY KENT  
CALVIN KNOX  
DONALD LAVERTY  
LYMAN R. LYON  
JOHN MACDOUGAL  
TALLY MASON  
ARTHUR MERLYN  
E. G. O'BRIEN  
KENNETH PUTHAM  
DALLAS FOSS  
ROSE SHARON  
LUKE TORLEY  
ERIK VAN LHIN  
ALLEN WARLAND  
CHARLES WILLIS

FROM THE EDITOR

Dearly beloved:

In this, my first issue of the Forum and my 148th issue of PITFCS, I hope to strike a note of temperance and restraint that has on occasion been missing in the past. We are all men and women of good will, and it seems to me that we should be able to reason together rationally without resorting to those unseen fits of pique that have too often been seen in these pages. I think it stands to reason that unless we become as little children, and begin to love one another, SFWA may well degenerate into an organization of brutes who are more interested in washing their dirty linen in public than demonstrating to the world that they stand united against those evil forces which seek to destroy that bond of fellowship that unites us in a brother-and sisterhood dedicated to a cherished profession. Ours is the future! Let us march toward it united! As your

editor I dedicate myself to doing everything which is within my limited powers to see that sweetness and light prevail in this and future issues. Although I am not a religious man in a formal sense, during my stewardship instead of Matthew X, 16, "I come not to send peace, but a sword," I hope to take as my texts Luke X, 5, "Peace be to this house" and Mark X, 14, "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not."

Your obedient servant,

Theodore P. Cogswell

SFWA Forum is published for the members of the Science Fiction Writers of America. Proceedings of the Institute for Twenty-First Century Studies is published for the members of the Institute for Twenty-First Century Studies. All members of SFWA are, by definition, members of ITFCS. All letters express the opinions of their authors and do not represent the official positions of SFWA or ITFCS except when explicitly stated. Copyright 1970 by Science Fiction Writers of America. Permission to quote from SFWA Forum or PITFCS is expressly refused. All rights are assigned to individual authors of material published in this issue. Contributions to PITFCS should be addressed to Box 186, Chinchilla, Pa.; those for the Forum to 198 Robinson St., Chinchilla, Pa.



# ITFCS MEETS THE UN



UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE  
TO THE UNITED NATIONS

799 UNITED NATIONS PLAZA  
NEW YORK, N. Y. 10017

YU:am 6-2424

March 26, 1970

Mr. Theodore R. Cogswell, Director  
Institute for Twenty-First Century Studies  
Dept. of English  
Keystone College  
La Plume, Pa.

Dear Mr. Cogswell:

I am writing to express my hope that your association can play a part in the observance of 1970 as the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary Year of the United Nations.

For many years the United Nations Association of the U.S.A. has carried the responsibility for organizing, coordinating and providing material and services needed for the United Nations Day each year, in cooperation with such outstanding U.S. National UN Day Chairmen, appointed by the President of the United States, as James McDonnell, Chairman of McDonnell-Douglas Aircraft; - Leonard J. McCollum, Chairman of Continental Oil; - and, most recently, Mr. H. I. Romnes, Chairman of the Board of American Telephone and Telegraph Company.

In response to the call of the President, UNA-USA has already begun to prepare for a significant nationwide observance of the United Nations Twenty-Fifth Anniversary Year in 1970, culminating on United Nations Day, October 24, 1970.

Although these services have been undertaken each year at the request of every President of the United States since the founding of the United Nations, no government funds have been granted or requested, nor will they be in the coming year. The leadership of the UNA-USA has acted on the belief that it is more appropriate to its own position as a private voluntary organization to look for support for this annual program in the private sector.

This year, because of the special demands and opportunities connected with the Anniversary Year, UNA-USA is going beyond the individual corporations and educational organizations which have supported and participated in past programs, and is seeking to enlist the cooperation

of leading business and trade associations, in the belief that these associations share the same enlightened self-interest in helping to work toward more effective international institutions for peace.

As the United States Representative at the United Nations, I welcome the leadership being exercised by the UNA-USA and count on the broadest cooperation of the organized groups in this country to enable the United States to make the fullest use of this Anniversary Year.

It grows plainer every day that there is no solely national way to achieve national security or to solve major national problems -- from pollution to monetary policy, from narcotics control to weather prediction -- without international cooperation. At such a time, whatever any of us can do to strengthen the UN's capacity to work for peace, justice and progress is a real service to our own self-interest as well as to the peoples of the world.

I hope you will see fit to join in supporting the observance of this major milestone in the history of our search for a better international order.

Sincerely yours,



Charles W. Yost

+++++  
NOTES ON FUTURE ISSUES

Transitions play hell with deadlines. I don't intend to apologize for the lateness of this issue, but I do hope to get the Forum out at fairly regular intervals this coming year. Timeless prose is welcome at any time but it would be appreciated if responses to a particular issue would be dispatched within a week of receipt. My experience has been that a response delayed is a response that never gets written. I imagine that the next few issues will see a thorough working over of dues, Nebula Award procedures, and membership requirements -- in short, the usual ill-tempered parlor game in which nobody really gets hurt -- which could make for some fairly interesting copy. All that I ask (futilely) is that in your communications some of you grant the same felicity of word choice and thought polishing to your colleagues as you do to your reading public and that the rest of you, for perhaps the first time in your writing careers, begin to treat the language with the respect it deserves and strive for a modicum of wit, polish, and coherence in your effusions. Above all, I wish that all of you (with a few happy exceptions) would stop taking yourselves so seriously. Writing, like sex, should be practiced for the joy of it and not viewed primarily as a commercial commodity (an exception is made here for a few of our big-time call boys who take enough home from their appointed rounds to be honestly concerned about the current state of Tasmanian rights). Therefore I propose a moratorium on (1) trying to throw everybody else out of the club (2) whimperings by novices who feel they are being forced to prostitute their art but brutal editors. I would suggest to the latter that while masturbation may be fun, there has never been much of an outside market for it. --dmc

Honorary Chairman  
 Harry S. Truman  
 Lyndon B. Johnson  
 Dwight D. Eisenhower (1955-1969)

Honorary Co-Chairmen  
 Ralph J. Bunche  
 Fred Hoffmann  
 Anna Lord Strauss

Honorary President  
 Herman W. Steinkraus

Chairman of the Association  
 Arthur Goldberg  
 Paul H. Goldberg, Rilkind,  
 Wharton and Garrison

Chairmen of the Board of Governors  
 Robert Benjamin  
 Chairman of the Board  
 United Artists Corp.

Vice Chairman  
 Oscar A. de Lima  
 Chairman of the Board  
 Roger Smith Hotels Corp.

Ernest A. Gross  
 Curtis Mallet-Prevost,  
 Colt & Mcsie

Leonard F. McCollum  
 Chairman of the Board  
 Continental Oil Co., Houston

Mrs. Harvey Picker  
 Interchange Foundation

Harry W. Knight  
 Chairman of the Board  
 Martin, Gladieux & Smith

Frederick S. Beebe  
 Chairman of the Board  
 Newsweek, Washington Post Co.

Jacob Blaustein  
 Director, Standard Oil  
 Co. (Indiana), Baltimore

Harvey W. Greisman, Student  
 College University  
 President of CIRUNA, Collegiate  
 Alliance of UNA-USA

Walter E. Hanson  
 Senior Partner, Peat, Marwick,  
 Mitchell & Co.

Mrs. William Beasley Harris  
 Attorney  
 Washington, D.C.

Joseph E. Johnson  
 President  
 Carnegie Endowment for  
 International Peace

Philip M. Kutznick  
 Chairman of the Board  
 Urban Investment and Devel.  
 Co., Chicago

Franklin A. Lindsay  
 President  
 The Corp., Lexington, Mass.

Waldemar A. Nielsen  
 President  
 African-American Institute

Arnold R. Reuther  
 President  
 UAW, Automobile Workers,

Robert Ruder  
 President  
 Ruder and Finn

Norman A. Schmechel  
 Wright, Simon, Todd &  
 Schmechel, Seattle

Mrs. James Schramm  
 Burlington, Iowa

Cyrus R. Vance  
 Simpson, Thacher and Bartlett

Joseph C. Wilson  
 Chairman of the Board

# UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION of the UNITED STATES of AMERICA



833 UNITED NATIONS PLAZA, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10017  
 Cable Address UNASAMER • (212) OXford 7-3232

Chairman, National Council  
 Earl Warren  
 Former Chief Justice  
 U.S. Supreme Court

National Chairman, UN Day 1955  
 H. I. Brown  
 Chairman of the Board, American  
 Telephone & Telegraph

President  
 Porter McKeever

Vice Presidents: Elmore Jackson, Policy Studies • Robert M. Ratner, Finance and Administration • Jeanna Singer, National Program

April 17, 1970

Dear Mr. Cogswell:

Through an administrative error, there was recently sent to you an invitation, endorsed by Ambassador Charles W. Yost, to join a Roster of Business and Trade Associations for the 25th Anniversary of the United Nations.

You will readily recognize that this particular appeal was not intended for an organization such as yours, although we are sure you share the interest of concerned citizens in the future of the United Nations.

May we ask, therefore, that you disregard the communication and accept our apologies for any inconvenience that you may have been caused by the mistake made in our office.

Sincerely,

*Porter McKeever*  
 Porter McKeever  
 President

# Keystone Junior College

LA PLUME, PENNSYLVANIA 18440

26 April 1970

The Honorable Charles W. Yost  
United States Representative to the United Nations  
799 United Nations Plaza  
New York, New York 10017

Dear Sir:

On 26 March 1970 I received a letter from you inviting our organization, the Institute for Twenty-First Century Studies, to participate in the observance of the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary Year of the United Nations. Since our membership, which is made up of the leading science fiction writers of America, England, and Europe, has long been both personally and professionally interested in a united world and a peaceful future, I of course accepted with pleasure, taking the invitation as another recognition of the success with which our members, through their books and other publications, have been able to awaken the interest of a mass readership in the horrors which await man if practical solutions to the pressing problems of war, over-population, and pollution are not found soon. I am sure that you are familiar with the contributions that already have been made by such pioneer participants in the work of the Institute as the late Willy Ley, Arthur C. Clarke, Kingsley Amis, Kurt Vonnegut, Isaac Asimov, Calvin Knox, and Avram Davidson.

You can therefore see why I was somewhat distressed when I received a letter from a Porter McKeever informing me that the invitation which had been extended to the Institute for Twenty-First Century Studies had been withdrawn. We cannot, of course, object to such an action, providing it was taken by you. We do feel however, as a matter of common politeness, that the person who extended the invitation should be the one to withdraw it. I feel further that our membership would be interested in being informed as to why a group which devotes several million published words a year to an affirmation of the very principles which the United Nations espouses should not be considered worthy of officially joining in the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations' struggle for world peace.

We are awaiting a reply at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

*Theodore R. Cogswell*

Theodore R. Cogswell

Director

The Institute for Twenty-First Century Studies



UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE  
TO THE UNITED NATIONS

199 UNITED NATIONS PLAZA  
NEW YORK, N. Y. 10017

YUN: 6-2424

May 8, 1970

Mr. Theodore R. Cogswell  
Director  
The Institute for Twenty-First  
Century Studies  
Keystone Junior College  
La Plume, Pennsylvania 18440

Dear Mr. Cogswell:

Thank you for your letter of April 26th advising me of the continued interest in the U.N. by the Institute for Twenty-First Century Studies. I can well understand that your organization of science writers shares our concerns over problems of peace, environment, population and development of international cooperation as the United Nations approaches its second quarter century. I enclose several recent statements on the 25th Anniversary plans.

I shall ask the United Nations Association of the United States of America and its President, Mr. Porter McKeever to keep you on their mailing list. By a mistake in a mailing operation they used an inaccurate list in sending out the original March 26th notification over my signature. The later letter from Mr. McKeever was an effort to explain this to groups who were patently not interested or who had been otherwise informed.

We of course welcome your interest and the support of your membership in problems which as you so correctly point out concern us all.

Sincerely,

  
Charles W. Cost

Encis: As stated.

*"As you see, gentlemen, something like ninety percent of the treaty boiled right out of the analysis as being meaningless, and what we end up with can be described in the following interesting manner:*

*"Obligations of Anacreon to the Empire: None!*

*"Powers of the Empire over Anacreon: None!*

*--Isaac Asimov, Foundation, p.64*

NEBULA AWARD DEPARTMENT:

I have long been fond of John Campbell for several good reasons: I like him as an individual, his wife, Peg, is a doll, and he is a most worthy adversary. In fact, as far as the last goes, I'm never going to be idiot enough to get on the platform with that man as long as I live [the which, considering that I was hauled off to the hospital a short while ago in style with sireeeeen, flashing red lights, and a continuous supply of free oxygen, being a question somewhat more academic than I care to contemplate at the moment]. I made the mistake of letting myself be put on a panel with him once at a convention and came strutting forth, bowing to the crowd, chuckling at the thought of how I was going to demolish ole John with a few well chosen words. It should have been easy; I forget the question, but it was one on which he'd taken a rather untenable position and I was on rather solid ground. So, like a cocky Scranton club fighter about to demolish Cassius Clay, I let loose a roundhouse swing. John didn't even bother to duck, he just let loose with a barrage of non sequiturs that shortly had me so tangled up that within two minutes I was futilely trying to prove to the audience that I had so been in China once. In fact, he finally got me so confused on the subject that even today every once in a while I find myself pulling my Order of the Cloud and Dragon, Third Class [and how I got that after never hearing a shot fired in anger is a lovely story all in itself], to reassure myself that I was really there once. Now John knew exactly what he was doing, and I knew exactly what he was doing, but the beer-breathed fannish masses out in front [this was before the days of the pot-breathed fannish masses out in front] were thoroughly convinced that my position had been completely demolished. I should have known better than to go so far out of my weight. Once before in my young Stalinist days I had the temerity to take on Norman Thomas and ended up slinking out of the auditorium muttering to myself while thousands jeered; but the point is that though ole John he fight tricky, ole John he fight fair. To switch metaphores [though I have no objection to mixing a good one if the occasion is auspicious], he didn't use a single hold on me that I wouldn't have used on him, given the opportunity -- which I wasn't. Though the experience of being turned into a stuttering idiot wasn't particularly enjoyable at the moment, I cherish the memory of the moment because of the aesthetics of the operation. I gain the same pleasure from many of his editorials in Analog. Instead of being infuriated -- a rather common response among my liberal friends -- I find myself being intrigued, and sometimes end up doing the homework that I should have done a long time before and somehow never got around to. But I wish sometimes that he'd stick to his editorials and let somebody else do his buying for him. I mean natural compassion or not, he doesn't have to give every mangy dog who comes wandering up to his back door a home in Analog, especially one of the dimensions of "The Siren Stars." For three whole months that misbegotten cur came bounding in the house every time I opened the door and crapped on my carpet. And me a paying guest. But on the other hand there was a Clement to look back on and a Dickson to look forward to during the interminable kidnappings of stupid people by even stupider people. Hal couldn't write a bad story if he wanted to, and Gordie's no mean yarn spinner himself -- which isn't surprising since, as he's always the first to admit, Poul Anderson and I taught him everything he knows.

"Weren't the brightest boy on the block, but he were a plugger, that Dickson boy were. Up before dawn every day, rain or shine, pounding away on that old typewriter of his. Brave little tad, too. Couldn't ride a bike like the other boys cause he had that dreadful case of hemmorrhoids. Kept getting caught in the sprocket, they did. Must have hurt like hades, but Gordie, he'd never complain.

"Shucks, Mr. Simak,' he'd say. 'Man wants to be President some day, can't let a little thing like a pain in the ass now and then stop him.'

And just as soon as he got them there piles worked out from where they was caught between the sprocket and the chain, he'd limp back into the house again and start pounding away on that old typewriter of his. Clean boy, too. Never fooled around with girls the way the other kids did. Had himself a play telephone instead. Used to really turn him on, that little old telephone did. Right hand would reach out and get hold of that thick black shaft and start stroking away. Then he'd bring his lips down toward the thick bulgy end.

"Mr. Vice-President,' he'd say, playacting like, "how we doing on them there bookmarks?"

Used to go on like that for hours. Wonder whatever became of him?

As I was saying, the good minutes make up for the bad.

But getting back to John, as he would be the last to admit, the man does have buttons. Now I have no objection to button pushing, providing that the story designed to push that particular button is reasonably well engineered, but there are those among the brotherhood who have been turning Analog into a dumping ground for fanzine objects.

Now it is obviously not within the province of the editor of this publication -- at least the Forum part of it -- to use its pages to make recommendations for the Nebula Award in his official capacity; there is, however, nothing in the bylaws which forbids calling the attention of the membership to the occasional story that seems to warrant special attention. The one under consideration at the moment is Keith Laumer's "The Plague" [Analog, LXXXVI (November 1970), 8-27]. I think Keith deserves special praise for this one because, old pro that he is, he could have made a fast buck by slanting his story to take advantage of John's obvious conservative bias. Instead, however, he had the intellectual guts to stand by his own convictions and turn out a story that takes an ideological stance diametrically opposed to everything John believes in.

"The Plague," like Orwell's 1984, is a mindblowing look into man's future. Its protagonist, Dr. Peed Nolan, "khaki-clad, gray-haired, compactly built, dark-tanned by the big sun of the world Kaka Nine," is a man who would "hardly have been recognized by his former colleagues at the university where he had spent the early decades of his life." Reed has a twelve year old son, Timmy, and a wife, Annette, who is "a petite blond." Their island paradise on Kaka Nine, which they have tamed by the sweat of their collective brows and those of several thousand rhino-type warthogs who descend once a year to root

up the fields and destroy noxious native plant life and pests, is suddenly invaded by a member of the Eastern crypto-liberal establishment and a number of unpleasant henchmen. Director Fraswell has both a "mottled complexion and a wide unsmiling face" and a toady, "a lean, bony man with a crooked face," who speaks to Nolan "sharply." Fraswell also has a son, "a lanky, teenage youth with an unfortunate complexion," and a wife who is "thick-necked, red-faced, with grimly frizzled grey hair, dressed in drab-colored clothing and stout shoes." When Nolan discovers that Fraswell, whose source of authority is never quite made clear since legally Nolan could have solved the whole problem on page two by calling in the cops and having Fraswell and his cohorts ejected for illegal trespass, is requesting his beloved island for the resettlement of several thousand lazy relievers, he naturally objects.

"The facilities as you call them happen to be private property."

"You'd prate of selfish interests with the welfare of hundreds at stake?" Fraswell barked.

At this point another of Fraswell's henchmen, a renegade priest named Padre, chimes in with a line that could have been lifted directly from a Campbell editorial.

"Our people are not criminals, condemned to hard labor. They have the same right to nature's bounty as yourself."

Once again Keith lets John have it in the ideological chops when he has Nolan reply:

"Aren't you missing the distinction between Nature's bounty and the product of human effort? There is an ample supply of nature on the next island. You have plenty of labor available. If you take virgin [how did this one slip by Kay Tarrant? TRC] land, in a year you can harvest your next crop."

At this, Fraswell, obviously no gentleman, not content with barking at a man to whom he has not been properly introduced, emits a seventeen-word snort while the padre nods approval.

"You expect me to subject these unfortunate people to unnecessary hardships, merely out of your personal selfishness?" Fraswell snorted.

During the next several pages a sharp vocal distinction is made between the two ways of life. While Nolan and his wife and child address each other "genially," "mildly," "patiently," "levelly," "gently," and "cheerfully," Fraswell, who is not only "plump" but has a "red face," "snapped," "demanded," "barked," "snorted," "made choking noises," "yelled," "queried grimly," "roared," "shrilled," and otherwise betrayed his lack of breeding. [Note: Though Laumer, like Kafka, tends to hide the direction of his thinking in a subtle interplay of ambiguities, as with Finnigan's Wake, careful attention to key verbs and adverbs will sometimes supply the reader with a chart to the baffling interskein of tertiary nuances.]

Like the author of Waldon, Nolan is incarcerated for his convictions,

But for the equally short time since Timmy shortly comes to his rescue. Tired of being put upon, the whole family takes to the hills, first taking all the fuses out of the fuse box so the relievers can't cook supper. However, ignoring the fact that green wood won't burn, the economically disadvantaged intruders cut down Nolan's fruit trees for firewood.

*"Reed -- the baby peach trees, and the pecans, and the limes," Annetta mourned.*

*"I know," Nolan said tersely. They watched the fire for an hour before turning in.*

Anyway, after a while, having eaten all the peanut-butter sandwiches in the fridge, Fraswell comes to the cave where Nolan and his family have taken refuge. He insists that Nolan return the missing fuses.

*"The relocatees will arrive in less than a fortnight! Unless you give up this dog-in-a-manger attitude at the expense of these poor, helpless souls, I won't be responsible for the outcome."*

Nolan, legitimately annoyed at what the intruders are doing to his lawn, finally turns on.

*"I know these good people, Mr. Fraswell. I tried to hire some of them when I was breaking ground here. They laughed. They're the untrainables, the unemployables. They've had a free ride all their lives. Now they're overflowing the trough. So you're trying to dump them on me to maintain. Well, I decline the honor, Mr. Fraswell. It looks like they are going to have to go to work if they want to eat."*

Shortly after this, because it is a science fiction story, Nolan gets captured again.

*"Listen, you rich scum," a wild-eyed, busy headed man with gaps between his teeth hissed in Nolan's face, "You can't hold out on us --"*

Which strikes me as being a rather long hiss for even a man with normally spaced teeth and a crew cut: but if Fraswell can let out a seventeen word snort, I don't see why his henchman can't hiss for ten. Anyway, Nolan escapes and calls in his rhino-type warthogs who make Fraswell and his clients retreat to the ghetto and go back on relief. All of which shows what happens to a bunch of uppity nigras when they messes around with a honky's petunias. Fraswell has his revenge, however, because his son stays behind, miraculously transformed "from a lanky teenage youth with an unfortunate complexion" to a "tall, lean youth."

*"Do you know anything about farming, Leston?" Nolan asked dubiously.*

*"No, sir." The boy swallowed. "But I'm willing to learn."*

There have recently been a number of comments about compulsory fellatio scenes in science fiction stories. I am pleased that, in spite of the suggestiveness of the last line of the dialogue, Keith does not let his

intrude into his fiction.

In conclusion, may I quote James (Pretty Boy) Blish in the last issue:

A new Para. 6 should be added to this section, to read as follows:  
"Any member who fails to publish 15,000 words of science fiction accepted for publication, in any calendar year, shall be dropped from the roles and may not be readmitted except under the same eligibility credentials as those required of new members."

*Pro:* This amendment would eliminate a lot of deadwood; would tend toward the filling of rosters with members with enough experience to be familiar with the ordinary standards of professional conduct; and might direct the energies of some of our beginning members from whining about plots and cabals to the production of science fiction.

I concur. In all the years I have known Comrade Laumer I have never once heard him whine about plots and cabals. Instead, being familiar with "the ordinary standards of professional conduct," he directs his energies to the writing of science fiction.  
*"Actus non fecit reum, nisi mens sit rea."* Or as old Squire Turner used to say, "When a feller sayss it ain't the money but the principle of the thing, it's the money."

--trc

\* \* \* \* \*

#### THE REFERENCE LIBRARY

LUCKY STARR AND HIS ELECTRIC PENIS  
OR, TWO CHUMS IN ANCIENT GREECE

by

Capt. Paul French, U.S. Army, Retired

In this live-wire narrative of peril and adventure laid in prehistoric Thebes, Lucky, his faithful companion, Rastus, and his mutant wonder dog, Spot, embark on a series of thrilling adventures. Armed only with a solid state electric penis powered by Lucky's own modification of the Dean Drive, our young heroes journey back through time in a desperate attempt to save young Prince Oedipus from a fate worse than death. While gripping and holding the young reader's attention from the opening words to the breathless finish, this swift-moving story is at the same time instructive and uplifting. As those readers who have already made friends with Lucky and his "bunch" know, there are few difficulties, no matter how insurmountable they may seem at first blush, that these up-to-date gritty youths cannot overcome with flying colors. A clean-cut, real boys' book of high voltage which drives home a strong warning against the dangers of illicit mother-fucking.

Cloth Bound.

Price, 50¢ per volume.

At booksellers everywhere.

--trc

## REPORT OF THE NEBULA RULES COMMITTEE

After closely following the 1969 Nebula Awards elections, and spending most of 1970 in deliberation, the Nebula Rules Committee has drafted a revised set of rules for the Nebula Awards. The Committee consists of Jesse Bone, Joe Green, James Gunn and Ben Bova, chairman.

The suggested rules are given in their entirety below. The most serious changes from the 1969 rules are:

1. Increasing the number of nominations required on the primary ballot to five (5), rather than the three (3) now required. This is in the interests of making the primary ballot a slightly tougher hurdle for a story, so that the final ballot reflects a closer screening of the year's stories. This change is in Item 4.d.

2. Item 5, in its entirety, stretches out the dates for both the primary and final balloting. This is based on the assumption that the Nebula Awards Banquet will take place no earlier than mid-April. Doubleday has agreed in principle to a later deadline for the Nebula anthology, so there should be no problem from that quarter. By giving the members more time to read and vote thoughtfully, we remove one major problem from the earlier voting.

3. Item 4.i codifies the results of last year's referendum, where it was decided to have a panel of judges with the power to insert one title in each category of the final ballot.

4. A Preamble has been added to the rules. This Preamble states the purposes of the Nebula Awards and establishes a standard of ethics for the entire Awards procedure. The Preamble was drafted by James Gunn, and has the wholehearted endorsement of the Committee.

### PREAMBLE

#### to the Nebula Awards Rules

The Nebula Awards have three purposes: 1) to establish and elevate standards of science fiction writing; 2) to present to the public, as a means of promoting greater appreciation and readership of science fiction, the best science fiction writing of the year selected by members of SFWA; and 3) to reward the writers whose works are selected by increased financial return for their work and by less tangible benefits accruing from the honor.

If the Awards are to fulfill all their purposes, each

member has a responsibility to read, to recommend what he considers worthy, and to vote for those works he thinks best. If a member cannot read the works nominated, he has a secondary responsibility to abstain from voting, recognizing that if he cannot vote he thereby weakens the value of the Awards.

The Awards will fail to fulfill their purposes and ultimately be discredited or destroyed if members do not read, recommend, and vote; or if they recommend or vote for works for reasons other than their merits, or if they persuade others to do so; for the result will be selections which do not represent the best judgment of the SFWA members.

Because the Awards have significant value for those who receive them but even greater value to SFWA and to science fiction if the Awards maintain and enhance their reputation as honest selections of those science fiction works considered the best of the year by the members of SFWA, a statement of ethics is an essential preamble to a meaningful Awards competition.

Responsible members of SFWA, to the best of their ability, will read, recommend, and vote for works which they consider on the merits of the works to be the best science fiction of the year; and they will consider unethical any effort to campaign for a work, either one's own work or that of another, or to permit a campaign, whether through statements in SFWA publications or other publications, in letters, in public address or private conversation, or in any other way.

## NEBULA AWARDS RULES

Following are the rules under which the Nebula Awards winners will be selected:

### 1. Award Categories

(a) Awards will be made in the following categories:

- Short story - less than 7500 words
- Novella - at least 7500, but less than 17,500 words
- Novella - at least 17,500, but less than 40,000 words
- Novel - 40,000 words or more

(b) In event that fewer than (3) titles in any given category qualify for placement on the ballot under the Qualifications for Placement on Ballot rule (see Item 4 below) that category will be declared "No Contest" in the balloting, and no Nebula Award will be made in that category for that year.

### 2. Eligibility

(a) Stories and novels are eligible for nomination for

Nebula Awards if they were published for the first time in an American magazine dated in the award year, or in a book first published in the U. S. in the award year. A serialized work is eligible if the final installment appeared in a magazine dated in the award year.

(b) When a story has appeared in a magazine version during the award year and the author plans to publish it in book form, he may, at his option, notify SFWA that he wishes to withdraw the magazine version from consideration for an award. In this event, the subsequent book version of the work shall be eligible in the year in which it is published.

(c) Science fiction and fantasy stories are eligible. Anthologies and collections of stories are not eligible as such, but an individual story published for the first time in an anthology or collection is eligible.

(d) No work is eligible in more than one category. If a work has appeared in two versions during the year, for example, as a magazine novella and as a paperback novel, the author may notify SFWA which version he prefers to be eligible. If the author expresses no preference, the book version alone shall be eligible; if neither version is a book version, then the longer version shall be eligible.

(e) Works are eligible whether or not their authors are members of SFWA. Previous publication in another country, or in a foreign language, does not make a work ineligible.

### 3. Recommendations

(a) All SFWA members in good standing may recommend eligible stories for placement on the primary ballot, and may vote on the final candidates for the awards. Each Bulletin will list recommendations in all categories received since publication of the previous Bulletin, with indication of the total number of recommendations each title so listed has received to date. Early in January, a complete list of all titles recommended through December 31 of the year will be circulated to all the members, with indication of the total number of recommendations each title has received to that date.

(b) No member's recommendation of a title, in itself, will guarantee placement of that title on the primary ballot. Multiple recommendations will be required to qualify a title for placement on the primary ballot, as detailed in Item 4 below.

(c) Recommendations will be closed on January 15 of each year, and the primary ballot will then be compiled.

### 4. Qualifications for Placement on Ballot

(a) After the cut-off date, the Secretary will circulate

a primary ballot bearing titles of ALL stories recommended throughout the year. Each member will then be permitted to nominate one and only one title in each category. Write-in nominations will be permitted. Adequate time for decision will be permitted with a deadline set for the return of these primary ballots.

(b) Upon return of the primary ballots, the Nebula Awards Committee will select a final ballot to include all titles in each category that qualify for final ballot by virtue of five (5) or more primary ballot nominations, providing that three or more stories in each category so qualify. (If three or more stories in a category do not so qualify, NO CONTEST will be declared in that category.)

(c) The final ballot will be limited to no fewer than three (3) nor more than six (6) qualifying titles in each category, except as provided in Section 4.f below.

(d) Any title receiving a total of five (5) or more nominations from the primary ballot will be considered to qualify for placement on the final ballot in its appropriate category. Any title with fewer than five (5) nominations will be disqualified.

(e) From among the qualifying stories in each category, titles will be placed on the final ballot, within the limitations of 4.c above, according to the total number of nominations they have received. In each category, titles with the largest number of nominations will be placed on the final ballot first, then titles with the next smaller number of nominations, and so on until the ballot limitations have been filled in each category.

(f) The number of qualifying titles to be placed on the final ballot in any category must be expanded beyond the limit of six if, in the judgment of the Nebula Rules Committee, the circumstances of nomination demand it. For example, if only three novelets qualify with five (5) nominations each, and six (6) more qualify with four (4) nominations each, the Committee will decide whether the ballot shall carry only three (3) titles in the novelet category or be expanded to include nine (9) titles. However,

(g) The number of qualifying titles to be placed on the final ballot in any category must be expanded to include all titles with the given number of nominations if any individual story with an equal number of nominations is placed on the final ballot.

(h) Stories which qualify for inclusion on the primary or final ballot but which are eliminated by the "No Contest" rule (Item 1.b, above) may still be selected as "runners-up" for inclusion in the Nebula Anthology for that year, at the discretion of the editor and publisher of the anthology.

(i) A special panel of judges appointed by the President, and independent of the Nebula Rules Committee, may select one additional story in each category for inclusion on the final ballot.

## 5. Voting and Ballot-Counting Procedures

(a) Primary ballots will be distributed to the membership no later than 30 January, for return within a month. The primary ballot will have a specific deadline date printed on it. Primary ballots returned after that date will not be considered in the voting. Primary ballots will be counted and tabulated by the Nebula Rules Committee.

(b) Final Ballots will be prepared by the Nebula Rules Committee and distributed to the membership no later than the first week of March, for return within approximately one month. The Final ballot will have a specific deadline date printed on it, and late returns will be disqualified. Final ballots will be counted by an independent legal or public relations firm unconnected with SFWA or its officers, to be announced later.

(c) On the final ballot, voters will cast 1st, 2nd and 3rd choice votes in each category. A winner will be declared on the first ballot in each category if one story receives at least two (2) first-place votes more than any of the other stories. In event of a tie or a one-vote margin, second place votes will be counted and the highest aggregate total of first and second place votes will determine the winner. In event of a recount tie, third place votes will be added to the aggregate totals, with a margin of one vote again sufficient for a victory. In event of a continued tie, duplicate awards will be presented.

## 6. Modification of Rules

Any of the above rules may be modified by majority decision of the incumbent SFWA officers in the event that some modification is deemed mandatory in the interest of preserving and strengthening the Nebula Awards program.

=====

## WHO'S WHO IN CHINCHILLA

COGSWELL, Theodore R., educator; b. Coatesville, Pa., Mar. 10, 1918; s. DeWitt Russell and Marguerite (Rose) C.; B.A., U. Colo., 1947; M.A., U. Denver, 1948; postgrad. U. Minn., 1949-52, U. Denver, 1955-56; children--Megan, Cathleen. Ambulance driver Spanish Republican Army, 1937-38; instr. U. Ky., 1953-58; asst. prof. Ball State U., 1958-65; prof. English Keystone Jr. Coll., La Plume, Pa., 1965--; Dir. Inst. for Twenty-First Century Studies, 1962--; Served to Capt. USAAF, 1942-45. Decorated Asiatic Pacific Theatre Ribbon with two bronze service stars, Order of Cloud and Dragon (Republic of China). Mem. Modern Lang. Assn., Nat. Council Tchrs. English, Conf. Coll. Communication and Composition, Sci. Fiction Writers Am., Mensa, VFW. Author: (with John Jacob Niles) The Roper, 1955; The Wall Around the World, 1962; The Third Eye, 1968. Home: 108 Robinson St., Chinchilla, Pa. 18410. Office: Dept. of English, Keystone Jr. Coll., La Plume, Pa. 18440.

THINGS I NEVER KNEW ABOUT WILLIAM HOPE HODGSON UNTIL I FINALLY GOT  
AROUND TO READING THE HOUSE ON THE BORDERLAND AND OTHER NOVELS (Saul  
City: Arkham House, 1946):

p. 469, "And I was minded that I would wash and bind her feet . . . And truly, they were very small and shapely."

p. 469, "And I did lay here very quiet and sweet in the cloak, and covered her feet."

471, "Yet ere I should sleep, I did mean that I bathe her feet . . . and truly her feet were very small and pretty."

472, "And in verity I must kiss her again; For she did be with her hair all about her, that she look pretty unto me; and her little feet did bare, and so that they made my heart new tender to look upon them; for true she was utter lost of foot-gear."

473, "And surely, they did be utter big and clumsy upon her little feet, for indeed she was too pretty to be so hid and muffled."

490, "And she cared not that I did be naked; but was in utter anger that I strove to do this thing alone. And she took the pot of ointment from me, and made me to lie, and she rubbed me very strong and tender."

496, "And I minded that we find some place where I should have a hot pool, that I was able to bathe Naani's feet."

496, "Then I took the Maid's little feet, and rubbed a portion of the ointment from the pot all about them."

504, "And I caught her up again; and I kist her, and I told her that I did sure be her Master, in verity; and she mine own Baby-Slave."

504, "And she did rub me very skillful and gentle for a great hour, until I was all refreshed."

506, "And presently I slipped her shoes from her little feet, with my right hand, the while she did nestle within my left arm. And when I had looked at the Maid's feet, I tied her shoes on again."

508, "And I freed her shoes, and bathed her feet, and afterward rubbed them very steady with ointment."

526, "And while we talked, I bathed the little feet of Naani; and surely, I was taken that I should kiss them; and surely I kist them. And afterward I rubbed them with ointment for a good while, and the Maid was quiet."

529, "And in verity a young man doth want that he whip his maid and kiss her, and all in one moment. And, indeed, he to have delight in both."

529, "And when she did rest, I lookt to her pretty feet, and rubbed them very gentle and constant with ointment; and I to like that I should tend them, and to have joy to feel their littleness within my palms."

536, "And I took then the boots from her, so that her little feet did show pretty and bare."

536, "She stretched out her pretty foot, all in a moment, and put her pink ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ toes sudden upon my lips."

541, "And truly I said that she did go the way to earn that she be flogged like any boy."

554, " For she only put her toes to be kissed; for her foot-gear was off from her feet . . . and truly I kissed her pretty toes."

554, " And Indeed I pulled a small branch from a tree that did be near, to be for a switch as you shall whip a boy with; and I held her with my left hand, and in verity I laid the switch thrice very sharp across her pretty shoulders. And she did nestle very quick unto me, that had whipt her."

557, "And truly, the One did be smiling very naughty and dainty to herself; so that I perceived that I had not truly whipt her enough."

567, "And in verity, I to have meant that I flog her, very sharp, if that there be no other ~~XXXXXX~~ way that I might bring her to reason."

570, "And I took the belt from her pretty waist and I whipt her very sharp over the shoulders with the belt. And truly she did nestle unto me a moment."

571, "And, in verity, I set the belt thrice across her pretty shoulders, where they did be bared, and surely the blows did be very stern and sharp."

584, "I did scold her, because she had no proper care of her pretty feet; and I bid her to set her feet toward me, that I look the more clost at them. And she did think I mean to be kiss them."

593, "But indeed I bid her that she to dare do this thing, when that she to know how I did delight that her little feet be bare unto my eyes; and she did set her feet very sly where they did be anigh to my hand; for she to know that she did be Mine Own and I to be her Master."

594, "And she now to slip her foot-gear, that her feet be bare unto me, as I did love."

-- The Night Land, pp. 309-637

trc

\*\*\*\*\*

*The humanoids living on Venus  
 Belong to a bolixed up genus.  
 Of octamerous form,  
 Their sexual norm  
 Is eight to ten suckers per penis.*

--trc

POUL ANDERSON SAYS:

Two words for Jim Blish. First, as regards editing the Nebula series, of course the interval is too short between the announcement of the awards and Doubleday's copy deadline, and something ought to be done about that. However, it is not necessary on this account to destroy the suspense at the banquets (which I, at least, rather enjoy) by notifying the winners in advance so as to clear permissions.

What I did was, immediately on seeing the final ballot, send to everybody on it a photocopied form letter requesting an option on nonexclusive one-shot anthology use of his or her story(ies), said option to expire if not picked up within a week or two after the banquets. No one refused. Of course, I also arranged to get advance notification of the voting results, so as to have that much more time for planning the volume; but I kept my mouth shut.

Manuscript was prepared either from the authors' carbons, if they wished to lend me these, from tear sheets (two copies of each magazine being obtained in advance from a dealer) simply Scotch taped to paper, or, in one case, just by taking a book in which the story had already been reprinted. All of this I then had photocopied -- two for Doubleday, one for Gollancz, as per contract. At that time it cost three cents a sheet in several local places, with collation thrown in. Now the price is up to four cents, but it's still a bargain. Both Larry Ashmead and John Bush were satisfied with the result.

I recommend these procedures to all future editors.

Second, regarding Jim's proposed tightening of membership requirements to a minimum 15,000 words per year of science fiction, I'm dead against it, not so much because of the loss in revenue (since dues ought to be increased anyway to at least \$25) as because of the loss of labor. Most of the work of SFWA, and there is much more than appears on the surface, is done by enthusiastic neophytes. That's quite proper, since they stand to gain most from a successful organization. We just haven't enough steady producers with enough time and energy to substitute for them. Nothing would remain but a small mutual admiration society.

Or mutual detestation society in some cases. But even then we wouldn't have "cut off our hangers-on from the spectacle of our unlovely internecine squabbling." Word would get around, one way or another, in this field where fandom and prodom are so intimately -- sometimes downright incestuously -- intertwined. No. the only solution here is for certain of us to master the techniques and manners of civilized debate.

GREGORY BENFORD SAYS:

Interesting Forum. Note you carry the Delany speech. Probably it hasn't penetrated through the SFWA network, but I'm editing the proceedings of the 1970 west coast Banquet & Day Program, for publication by the SFWA. Plan is to distribute to SFWA members free if SFWA can afford it, and sell to others along with the other saleable items SFWA has.

Anyway, I'm almost through editing the transcripts--it took many months to get them back from the radio station, where they were played through twice for the Bay Area -- and will be sending them along to, I guess, you. Question: I'd planned on carrying the Delany speech (in fact Sid Rogers has transcribed it -- a waste of her labor). Perhaps you still have these stencils? Could use them over on the booklet. Anyway, the booklet will run perhaps 40 pages in all, or maybe only 30. Could make us a fair amount of money, and it carries some good stuff, like Straight Talk by H. Harrison on contracts, some discussion of agents etc...

Now, the Forum.

I agree utterly with James Blish's proposed amendments. The price of operating without them is painfully obvious, these days. I personally don't much care whether SFWA costs more money, but I am concerned that it is decidedly unprofessional.

The speeches by Damon Knight and Kate Wilhelm are interesting, though rather low-cal. It is rather disturbing to see people fearlessly defending the middle of the road, since I wasn't aware that it was under attack, but -- stopping to consider -- perhaps all this is a matter of geography. The east coast has a lot of old guard writers and editors and the west has few (or at least the ones out here aren't so vocal). Much of this rivalry stems from real economic issues; writers think they see their markets being subverted by a brand of fiction they both despise and don't want to write. What to me is a literary discussion is bread and butter to, say, Lester del Rey. Thus the Knights take to pouring pulpits and (in Kate's speech) constructing straw men like the Perfect Optimist Hero, which nobody in the Old Wave faction or anywhere else has ever believed in.

A pity, too, because the prime criticism of the approach Damon advocates is rarely seen in print. It is, simply, that the ORBIT series is tepid. It lacks spark. A cocktail-party idea -- what if kangaroos were aliens? -- passes as a brilliant sense-of-wonderish concept. There is little dash in the prose, a great deal of directionless "sensitivity" and not much real science fiction. Clinging to the middle ground has leached most of the content out of the series.

I say this, fully aware that I haven't sold Damon a story, never will, and can be accused of sour grapes. Anyone can point to

the awards the ORBIT series has won (Nebulas, anyway...but few, if any, Hugos). But I think Harry Harrison's points against the Nebulas are particularly germane here. When are we really going to admit that the Nebulas are swayed intolerably by the simple device of sending some free books to members -- and then try to compensate for this? I don't advocate no more free books, but rather, just as Harry says, a little house-cleaning.

One step in that direction is given by the Blish letter. Blish has always had the clearest concept of the SFNA and I think we should listen to him more than we do. His summary of the way he chose the stories for the Nebula volume is fascinating, and the first admission of anything other than Olympian objectivity I've seen from a Nebula editor. (Aside from Poul Anderson, who, thank God, just said "I liked it, so I printed it.") Publication of such cavils keeps rumblings of favoritism and plotting at a minimum. Interestingly, I agreed with virtually all of the Blish choices, except the Sturgeon. (On this one it may be that the Blish ear is off. The story smacked of self-parody to me, much like Hemingway's later work.) One question unanswered: does the D-day contract constrain the length of the Nebula book? I don't see why we should only publish two long novelettes and three short stories, plus analysis. There is more in the year than that.

#### ALFRED BESTER SAYS:

Congratulations on your appointment. It will be a delight to have your feisty editing with us again. If the interesting discussion of the problems of character and characterisation needs any help to keep the kettle boiling here are a few observations from a former science fiction writer.

The crux of characterisation should be conflict. It's all well and good for Mr. Stine to conceive of his characters in depth but that's only half the job; it's also necessary to put the character to the test with an interesting conflict and it's his response that illuminates him for the reader.

One of the ills that besets science fiction today is the fact that too often a character faces a physical conflict, that is, a conflict with his environment. This worked very well in the past when an exotic environment was a novelty. Today we seem to have exhausted the ingenuity that went into the creation of novel physical worlds and are forced to face up to the problems of genuine conflict, man against man or man against himself.

Miss Eisenstein points out that I've often used obsessive-compulsive characters in my stories. She's quite right. The question is, why? There can be a number of answers and I'm not sure of any of them, but I'm sure of this; that a compulsive-obsessive character is bound to be in conflict with himself as well as other men. If there is an interestingly exotic environment for the story, splendid, but the environment is merely the background, not the story itself. There's another reason for my predilection for obsessive-compulsive characters, outside of my belief that most

people are like that anyway; these driven creatures possess a tremendous energy which imposes healthy constraints on the author. They must be confronted with strong conflicts; their antagonists must be worthy of them (and very often I've made the antagonist so worthy that I find myself rooting for him instead of the protagonist); the tempo and temperature of the story must match the energy of the characters.

But it's always dangerous for us to discuss our writing concepts and techniques because so often it can be misleading. I agree with many critics who insist that when a writer describes the method of creation he used he's merely making a guess about what was essentially an unconscious process. And I believe this holds for characterisation. We may imagine that the creation of a character was a conscious act but the truth is that buried knowledge and experience, instinct and emotions, reflected facets of ourselves come bubbling up from deep down inside to form the character and shape his conflicts.

All my best as ever...

JIM BLISH SAYS:

Thanks for marking my Forum envelope "Special Blish Issue," but really there's no need for such devices; you have my attention already. Indeed there does seem to be a lot of Blish in the issue, but two pages of it should have appeared in 1968.

If you are planning to run my piece about living in England, and it isn't on stencil yet, please delete the sentence about not bringing animals. The situation has changed again, substantially back to where it was before.

I share Harry's feelings about the Nebula awards; some have been excellent, some have done us discredit, and the latter are in the majority. Okay, what do we do? Some have resigned from SFWA for this (among other) reasons; this has not improved the awards. Harry is withdrawing worthy work from competition; this is even less likely to improve them.

Part of the trouble surely stems from the fact that fine work often takes time to sink in, and its merits tend to grow larger in retrospect. At the Birmingham (U.K.) conference this year, panelists and audience were cheerfully kicking to pieces various recent assemblages of junk, when someone asked: "What's appeared this year that the panel especially liked?" There was a long, and increasingly embarrassed silence. We did eventually come up with some titles, but what my mind automatically began to produce in response to the question were works five to ten years old.

Under these circumstances, it's not surprising but outright predictable that the voters are more often bowled over by novelty or sensationalism or topicality than they are by merit; or that a

determined publisher or author can get an award by campaigning for it. These things do not invariably happen, but they have indeed happened. I confess to having damn little hard evidence for these allegations, but some of the awards I find inexplicable in any other way.

One possible remedy is the addition of a jury to our present system. How to make up the jury? Well, presumably our best members are best able to see merit and resist spurious reasons for choice; and we already have a formal definition of who these members are.

I propose, therefore, that voting go only to the point where it has produced a list of ten favorites in each length. At this point, the jury steps in and selects from those ten the three it considers best, disregarding which three have the most nominations. The jury's selection is then offered to the membership-at-large as the final ballot.

The jury is actually four juries: each consists of the three preceding Nebula winners in the length to be selected. Were the system to go into operation this year, the novel jury would consist of Ursula K. LeGuin, Alex Panshin and Chip Delany; the Novella jury of Harlan, Mike Moorcock and Annie; and so on down the line, with no bars to anyone serving on more than one jury if he's qualified. However, if a jury member finds that one of his works is among the ten he's called upon to choose among, he must swap places with a member of one of the other three juries who isn't so disqualified, the substitution to be specified by that year's SFWA president. If there are more such situations that can be accommodated by swaps among the 12 jurymen, then the jurymen with the most representations among the 40 nominations is replaced by the president, and so on down the line. (By replaced, I mean that the president himself becomes a jurymen.)

It's complex to describe but I think it wouldn't prove to be so in practice. And I also think it would be campaign-resistant, more judicious, and would automatically liquidate faddism.

This incidentally is also an idea I tried to get into print back in 1963. If I hear any sounds of assent, I'll undertake to offer it as a formal amendment.

One way to save money would be to eliminate the speeches from the Forum. They all appear elsewhere eventually anyhow, and usually before they get into the Forum.

I continue to think that there's a lot of lard in our budget, and Annie's report isn't sufficiently clear to explain where it is. For example, she includes \$177.48 in payments to Dick Lupoff some of which the poor fellow has apparently been waiting for since 1966, and the last of which was made in, or was due in, 1968. The Gestetner and the Adresser are one-shot expenses, not annual ones. That's \$653.98 right there that won't be in this year's expenses, and the balance on hand gives us a potential surplus of \$865.45 -- depending upon how many of Tom Purdom's expensive and dubious p.r. projects are undertaken.

The telephone bill is colossal and horrifying. During Bob Silverberg's administration, he used to dress down my wife (restrain yourself, Cogswell) for phoning from Washington to New York about Nebula production problems -- which were then her responsibility -- when a letter would have served the purpose just as well. But I have received two overseas telephone calls from Gordy (one of them, actually, to Ted Carnell for the purpose of finding my telephone number) just to ask how one of our members comported himself at a British convention. I don't know whether those calls came from Minnesota or New York, but even from Bermuda they would have been expensive. I have no way of knowing just how far this bill could be cut back, but even without it, I consider the case for \$25-a-year dues to be unmade. Maybe \$15 is fair, and I will pay it cheerfully once it's voted upon; but despite my known enormous wealth, I am not about to chuck donations into the pot until I see a clearer explanation of the need for them.

++++

Re public relations: Radio London is inaugurating a weekly half-hour show on science fiction, to consist of five minutes of local s-f news, ten minutes of book reviews by yhos, and a fifteen-minute interview with a celebrity. However, the supply of s-f writers in England is rather limited and I foresee that we will soon be scratching for celebrities.

Hence any member who is planning to visit England who would like to be on the show would be welcome. Contact George Hay, Environmental Consortium, 27 Nassau St., London W1N 8EQ, as far in advance as possible. His phone is 01-636-0726; if you are phoning from within London itself, you knock off the 01.

I doubt, as you seem to, that one-shot radio interviews sell books, but there's no way to measure such things. I once had a landlady in NYC who was an ardent fan of Lester del Rey as a participant on the Long John show, but nevertheless had never bought a one of his books. But the Radio London thing will be both regular, and wholly sf-oriented, so it may well attract listeners who actually read the stuff.

Recently I spoke before a meeting of the sf fan club at Cambridge University -- a turnout of about 85 -- and when Vic Hallet, who is a bookseller, told Faber & Faber that this was coming up, they sent him a big batch of my books for display, and he seemed to have sold the majority of them on the spot right after question period. And when both Brian Aldiss and I were speakers at a conference in Birmingham, F&F provided a big display of the jackets of all our books they had in print. This suggests that it might be a good idea for any author to give his publisher advance notice when he's going to be in the spotlight at a regional meeting. The cost to the publisher in exploiting this is minimal and he'd be reaching the interested people, which is a lot better than an inaccurate (and often mocking) interview in a local newspaper; and it doesn't cost SFUA a dime.

About blurbs: While J.V. Clarke is of course wrong in judging

a book by its blurb (or its jacket), the sad fact is that many newspaper reviewers confronted with anything odd will reprint the flap copy or the publicity release (if there is one) verbatim, and sometimes even sign their names to them. It's therefore a good idea to ask your publisher for final approval of any such copy. Don't try to write your own - it always shows - but get agreement to correct theirs; and remind your editor, each and every time, that you have such an agreement. I've only just started doing this and I wish I'd thought of it years ago.

Sprague asks how many "have gone the entire course" with Joyce's Ulysses. I don't count, I'm a specialist but of all the writers that I've met since 1940, I've encountered very few who haven't. Last year, Penguin brought out the first paperback edition, with an extensive advertising campaign, and paid fifty thousand dollars for the reprint right alone -- which considering the size of the British market is an outright incredible figure. (Unhappily, the Penguin text is the most corrupt in the novel's history.) Even Finnegans Wake is not the incomprehensible coterie novel people like John Campbell like to make it out to be. Anybody who doubts this should look at the printing history the next time they see the Viking paperback edition. Agreed that not everybody who buys a book reads it through; agreed also that late Joyce is difficult reading; but he has many readers besides academics. I encountered three other ardent Joyceans in the p.r. agency where I used to work -- one of them my boss, a senior vice president of the firm. No book of his but his play, Exiles, has ever gone out of print -- and I think he will last a lot longer than any of us.

ARTHUR C. CLARKE SAYS:

Just so you can tell the faculty that you've received a letter from Arthur C. Clarke.

CHESTER CUTHBERT SAYS:

Many thanks for sending me the very interesting August 1970 issue. I hope that the membership will not ratify James Blish's proposal which might eliminate associate membership, for which alone I can qualify. My interest in the science fiction field has been constant for more than the period during which Amazing Stories has been published, but my only professionally published two stories appeared in Wonder Stories in 1934, and although both have been reprinted I am not currently writing science fiction. I am, however, compiling a "Checklist of Fantasy and Science Fiction Books by Canadian Authors"; and one reason for my joining the SFWA is to enable me to ask the membership to notify me if any of their books should be included. Gordy Dickson has already very kindly supplied me with a detailed list of his books (he was born in Canada); I hope that other writers, either born in Canada or having resided

in Canada while writing some of their books, will be equally kind so that my Checklist will be as accurate and complete as possible.

Australia, England, and the United States have fantasy and science fiction Checklists, and as Canada has contributed over 200 titles to the field, a Canadian list is overdue.

Probably I deserve Mr. Blish's appellation "hanger-on". I assure everyone, however, that I desire to be useful; and that I have only admiration for people like Don Wollheim, Damon Knight, "Doc" Lowndes, and others including Mr. Blish who have achieved success by overcoming difficulties which I refused to tackle.

In addition to serving as my plea for information, I trust that this letter will support the continuation of associate membership.

L. SPRAGUE de CAMP SAYS:

For professional reasons, I am interested in tracking down the locations of some groups of original letters to and from H. P. Lovecraft. These are known to have existed as discrete collections but have dropped out of sight. None is now in the Lovecraft Collection at the Brown University Library or in the hands of my philepistolic colleagues August Derleth and Glenn Lord. If they still exist, they are probably in possession of collectors, to whom some SFWA member might be able to give me a lead.

These papers are: (a) Letters from HPL to Robert E. Howard, inherited by R.E.H.'s father, Dr. Isaac Howard; lent to Derleth, who copied excerpts and returned them; then, perhaps, either accidentally destroyed or sent to HPL's aunt Mrs. Gamwell. (b) Letters from Robert E. Howard to HPL, about 500 pp.; these passed through the hands of Isaac Howard, E. Hoffmann Price, the California fan Francis T. Laney, and Laney's widow. (c) Letters from HPL to Fritz Leiber; also excerpted by Derleth but then lent by Leiber to somebody else unknown who disappeared. Any information leading to the finding of these materials would be esteemed a great favor.

With all the whooping and hollering about awards for stories and the fairness or otherwise thereof, why doesn't somebody put up one for fantasy -- especially heroic or sword-&-sorcery fantasy? We could call it the Ronnie (after J. Ronald R. Tolkien) or a Klarkash (after Klarkash-Ton, HPL's version of Clark Ashton Smith's name) or any of several other sobriquets. My motives in making this proposal are 93% selfish, since this is the only kind of imaginative fiction that I am now writing or am likely to write in the future.

RICHARD DELAP SAYS:

Upon reading the current Forum my conscience forced me to immediately rush out and get a \$10 money order -- enclosed, but

you must fill out the addressee blank yourself as I was uncertain how to do it. This still only brings me up to the needed minimum \$15, but this is simply all I can afford at the moment since I have made no attempts to write or sell fiction during the past year while attending school. Unfortunately book reviews (Amazing) don't count toward membership obligations so I'm still in that "deadwood" class I suppose, despite two Hugo nominations in the "Fan Writer" category. However, school ends in January and I hope 1971 leaves me more time to write once more.

Forum #15 has a couple of startling letters about which I would like to make comment.

In a way I think Harry Harrison is sincere in his belief that the withdrawal of his stories from consideration for Nebulas is warranted. I take personal pride in the fact that I have never (and will never) vote for an award without reading each and every one of the final nominees, but I'm not surprised at Harrison's revelations. The thing is if Harrison receives letters from every member, stating explicitly that each promises to read and rationally evaluate the nominations, who's going to guarantee that this will actually be done? Harrison seems to think that the yearly winners would reflect this action, but isn't it possible that this would scatter the vote and the eventual winner would be perhaps a marginal caprice? There are many possibilities, of course, few if any of which could ever be confirmed. His idealism is nice to contemplate but its practicality is nonexistent. SFWA can ask its members to cooperate but it can't demand without assuring a negative backlash. I don't have an answer, I wish I did, but Harrison's "superior attitude" is relatively useless since it won't effect anyone but himself.

Harlan Ellison seems to want to lay the blame on fans for "certain writers [who] slowed their writing output" as a result of those fans' "pointless animosity." Now I'm sure I don't know nearly as many authors as does Ellison, but the ones I do know show far more interest in what editors buy than what fans say afterward. True Artist vs. Commercial Hack? It don't make much diff, do it, since both must get published one way or the other. If fandom had the destructive power Ellison ascribes to it, I have the feeling there'd be even less sf on the market than there is now. Sounds more like personal grievance to me.

Wish I had time to write more but time is short at the moment. Maybe later.

**TOM DISCH SAYS:**

In reply to Sprague de Camp's reply to me (for which, thank you, Sprague): I'd like to ride by hobbyhorse a bit farther down the road.

I said: Science-fiction is a branch of children's literature.

Sprague replied: that "a main purpose of fiction" is "to provide escapist entertainment, wherein the reader can for the nonce forget the troubles and tediums of real life."

I maintain that there is little essential difference between these two statements. Two blind men are feeling up the same elephant.

"Children's"--as in "children's" literature--is not necessarily a pejorative, as I tried to suggest in my first letter, but it is a definite limitation. It is limiting intellectually, emotionally, and morally. Often these limitations have been a source of strength in individual works, for by reducing these variables a writer can get close to something like "laboratory conditions" in which a single simple hypothesis can be tested out in ideal isolation. The result can be a heightened sense of objectivity, reassuring if sometimes spurious.

Many other good things can be said for children's literature and/or for childlike qualities in writing prose or poetry. I will leave them for someone else to say, however, and say something instead about other purposes of fiction that Sprague neglects to mention.

I propose that the main purpose of (an adult's) fiction is to gratify the esthetic sense, and that in achieving this purpose entertainment is of far less importance than the kind of "illumination" a great writer can bring to his material, whether that material be airily fantastic or hard-edged and documentary. It is this quality (Joyce calls it radiance) that I look for in a book, and which if altogether wanting makes it impossible for me to read on for very many pages. Sprague finds it doubtful whether anyone willingly reads all of Ulysses. I am astonished at people who can make it all the way through another retread of John Carter of Mars.

Art, if you will forgive the expression, has the potential ability--indeed, the obligation--to take "the troubles and tediums of real life" (and its other qualities as well) and to transform these in such a way that they become meaningful. Like philosophy and religion, art creates values. This is the reason why both erotic realism and formal experimentation occupy a significant place in the modern novel. Erotic realism, because no human relationship can be understood without a clear appreciation of its sexual components. Sprague seeks to put down erotic realism by asking, jokingly--"Who wants a story that minutely describes every step in a man's meal?" Well, gastronomic realism has an honored place in the history of literature, though being uncontroversial it has often gone unremarked. The Cook is a splendid work of s-f (speculative fiction) that follows Sprague's directions almost to the letter--and is irresistably exciting all the while.

Formal experimentation? If this were pursued in the spirit, Sprague envisions--"the spirit in which one solves puzzles"--it would not, I grant, be worth mentioning. Experiment exists because writers, since the invention of papyrus, have tried to wring more

meaning from language (or stone, or song) than that recalcitrant medium would seem at first to be able to yield. Experiment is a function of the artist's consciousness of his medium. It is not an invention of some Modernist cabal; it is as old as Homer.

My bone of contention with the field is not that it tolerates, or even applauds, such conventions as (to quote Sprague again) "an imaginery world wherein all men are mighty, all women beautiful, all problems simple, and all life adventuresome," but that it has been consistently hostile to any other imaginery world.

Come to think of it, I guess I am as intolerant of the world Sprague describes (I would not be so harsh as that in describing, say, the Grey Mouser stories, even though I don't much care for them) as I feel he is of mine. Life is more adventuresome in a world (like ours) in which men, women, and problems are complex.

DAVID GERROLD SAYS:

In the tenth issue of Beabohema, Perry Chapdelaine writing as Paul Hazlett (or whoever is writing Paul Hazlett's articles these days) has an article about the Pig in political patronage systems.

In that article he uses the following example: "A science fiction anthologist accepts an advance in trust for his writers. With a grandstanding flourish he presents \$100 to SFWA. He refuses to pay the writers until after publication, although contracts have been signed and the mss accepted. Isn't a publisher's advance a fiduciary trust? Or shouldn't it be?"

I assume Hazlett/Chapdelaine is referring to me. I know of no other anthologist who has donated \$100 to SFWA recently.

However, a few facts should be brought to light.

The anthology referred to is known as GENERATION. It was submitted to Dell Books on Sept. 5, 1969. I received word on Sept. 18 that Dell would buy the book. The contracts for the book were dated Oct. 3. The completed manuscript was turned in to Dell's editor, Gail Wendroff Morrison, at Philcon, Nov. 16, 1969.

On December 4th, 1969, Kathleen Sky was paid for her story out of my own pocket, before the check from Dell was received. On Dec. 10, 1969, the following other writers were paid for their stories: Steve Goldin, David R. Bunch, Jim Sutherland, Ed Bryant, Jody Harper, Chelsea Quinn Yarbro (current Sec'y of SFWA), Gardner Dozois, C.F. Hensel, Evelyn Lief, Robert Pay, James Tiptree Jr., Jim Stevens, Barry Malzberg, Paul A. Carter, Joseph F. Pumilia.

On January 6th, 1970, the following writers were paid for their stories: Piers Anthony (who was paid a half cent more per word than

originally promised), Alice Laurance, and Dennis O'Neil.

At the time of this writing, Vonda McIntyre has been only partially paid for her story. Two other writers, Gene Wolfe and Roger Deeley have not been paid. This is because both of their stories were added to the book in April and will have to be paid for out of my own pocket. I was contracted to produce only 75,000 words of original fiction. The finished book (minus story intros) is close to 85,000 words; hence, anything more than the original advance to the writers is coming out of the editor's pocket.

The \$100 donation to SFWA was also made out of my own pocket, (NOT as once mentioned by tithing the writers.) It was made because of the great help given me by several very thoughtful members of that organization and offered as a tangible way for me to return that help to all other members of the group.

GENERATION is scheduled to be published early in 1971. Although Dell has recently cut back their publishing schedule, this anthology has not been affected and will be published.

(I have also assembled a second anthology -- one which was supposed to go to Dell because of an option clause in the first contract. Dell has indicated that although they are interested, they are not in a position to buy it. Other publishers are interested in the second anthology though and I have no doubts that it will be sold soon. No writers in the second book have been paid yet because the book is still unsold.)

(I would like to note that in order to pay a higher word rate to the writers of the second book, I will not be taking the customary editor's share of 50% of the advance. Instead, I will take my share from the royalties (if any) when they come in.)

I would like to mention also that as an anthologist I do one thing that no other anthologist does. I send out periodic progress reports to the writers involved in each project. This is done to keep them posted on the state of the book and also to help slow down the rumor mill. \*sigh\*

Thank you for giving me the space to reply. My books are open to anyone wishing to verify this information.

P.S. There is one other writer who has not been paid for his story in GENERATION, and probably will not be. His name is David Gerrold.

H.H. HOLLIS SAYS:

Sensational!

Page after mewling, puking page of SFWA Forum 15 I kept thinking "My God, I've got to comment. We can't go on with these medieval debates about metaphysics." Then WITHOUT WARNING THAT ZONKED,

LAUGH-A-LETTER MESSAGE FROM THE EDITOR WITH ITS WEIRD INSIGHTS AND ITS WICKED COMPASSION! ZOWIE! MY SUGGESTION, BROTHER EDITOR, IS THAT IN NUMBER 16 YOU DON'T PRINT ANY OF THE LETTERS, JUST YOUR COMMENTS. I'D EVEN SEND IN A SASE FOR THAT.

Please feel free to bend, fold, staple, mutilate, or edit this missive.

Ever your soul brother,

PIERS ANTHONY JACOB SAYS:

I liked FORUM #15, especially the expose of nefarious members by Theobore Clogsmell, who seems like one of my own feather.

I am a lame duck, as I am leaving SFWA at the expiration of my current term. (I'll spell out my reason if assured freedom from censorship, as I feel the matter has grave implications for the future of the organization.) Thus it ill behooves me to make recommendations on future SFWA policy--so naturally I shall do so forthwith.

James Blish's series of Bylaw amendments intrigues me. At first I was tempted by the notion of a requirement of 15,000 words sales per year. The "con" argument strikes me as specious; if money is all SFWA cares about, it can make a fortune by opening the membership to every person who desires to become a writer. Instead of charging "reading fees," call it "membership"; the value delivered would exceed that normally received by the hopefuls. You could even put ads in slick periodicals headed by the picture of twelve famous SFWA members, which members could be paid a commission on every new membership inspired.

But second thought produced a couple things against this proposal. For one thing, I believe a majority of the present membership would be eliminated by the 15,000 word requirement, which I think is about ten times the present credential of one short story every three years. It is idiocy to depend on that majority to vote itself out of eligibility. If it did pass, membership would drop to something like 50, and that intermittent as members sold a novella one year and failed the next year. Dues would have to rise to about \$50 a head. (All figures are guesswork, but I trust I make my point.) What could SFWA deliver to established writers one half so precious as the booze they might otherwise have bought with the extra \$35? And few such writers have the time or inclination to contribute massive labor to organization endeavors, or to read extensively in the interests of an authoritative Nebula ballot. It is the fringe professionals, who would be excluded, who really need SFWA's services, and who now contribute so much to the organization. In fact, it might make more sense to exclude only those selling over 15,000, for many, like me, are in fact deadwood. I can make that minimum ten or fifteen times over--but I no longer donate service or vote on awards because the necessary efforts would cause my livelihood to suffer.

I do, however, endorse Mr. Blish's second proposal--to publish proposed amendments promptly and discuss in two FORUM/BULLETIN issues. So what if some are crackpot? Air them for two issues and vote them down. It is a small price to pay for protection against officerial suppression of the will of the membership.

I have my quarrels with Harry Harrison, as I do with most people living, (to put a reasonable limit on it), but this does not blind me to his occasional virtues. He is dead right on the Nebula problem. What kind of award is it, for example, when the winner of the novel category has already stated in print that another person's novel is superior to her own? Does she feel proud to accept an award she believes is undeserved? I hold nothing personal against Miss Leguin, as she did have the best novel on the ballot. (My own was not on the ballot, and neither was the one she referred to.) I'm not withdrawing my own works from consideration (I commend Harry's stand on this, however), but if the award is ever proffered to me I shall decline it if I feel it is not deserving of the dubious honor or if the honor is not deserving of the novel. I would indeed appreciate the extra money publishers will pay to a certified award winner, but there are sharp limits to my greed--as will become evident if my bluff is ever called. My conscience is not for sale.

Yet I am aware of the problems of Nebula balloting management. How can you police an errant membership. Barry Malzberg, as I recall, withdrew his works from consideration during the period he was active in SFWA management; why did no one else? Tom Disch withdrew his because he had no other recourse against injustice; why didn't SFWA help him? Now Harry Harrison, to make his point. How many more must be sacrificed before the house is cleaned? I fear it will never be cleaned unless the system is drastically changed, and the only really positive recommendation I can make is to scrap the present procedure and set up a panel. Find about ten members who do not have works of their own in contention and who will undertake to read everything, or at least everything anybody recommends, and who will vote strictly by the assessed merits of each piece. Put the Nebula in their hands. If in all SFWA ten good men can not be found, perhaps it is better for the fires of heaven to obliterate the Nebula entirely.

andy offutt (editor please note his lower case) remarks on the problems posed by the actions of certain publishers. I think my own stand is exemplary, so I present it here: I plan to submit no more material to ULTIMATE until Philip Jose Farmer publicly states his satisfaction with that publisher. I hate to let anyone else do my thinking for me, but I just can't keep up with all ULTIMATE's nuisances, while Farmer has organized that record and he strikes me as an honest man. My grievance is not personal; I have sold two novels and a story to Sol Cohen, and had (as far as I know) one reprint; all have been paid for per agreement. But now that I am assured that others are being mistreated, I must remove my support. As for UNIVERSAL--I am, as far as I know, on good terms there. The

editor has shown me that he will buy and publish the kind of science fiction I like to write, and I have not suffered unduly from the blue pencil. But despite denials, my observations suggests that the policy Chapdelaine complained of is fairly general, and that most manuscripts are held without report until the editor is ready to publish same. My answer is very simple: I submit only one manuscript at a time, and do not send more until decision is rendered on the first. If UNIVERSAL wants to see more of my work, it has only to report more promptly. If everyone did the same, things at that publisher would quickly change, I'm sure. (Now that I have an American agent, I can't guarantee continuation of my policy; but I still recommend it.)

Tom Purdom's advice on publicity is impressive, and I do not quarrel with it. But one cautionary note: I did something similar a couple of years ago, and was featured in the Sunday supplement of the local newspaper. But the article was published six months after the interview, during which time my situation had changed. In addition, the reporter inserted so many embarrassing misstatements that I don't care to show the article around. Finally, I was aware of no particular increase in local sales, because my work was not generally available. The usual distribution problem. So my advice is, do it if you like, but be wary. I myself want no more of such publicity.

I have no missing manuscripts to report at ULTIMATE, but have never received the reader's comments on my novels there that the editor claims to forward to authors. Minor matter, perhaps not relevant.

++++

This letter related to my parenthetical remark in mine of the 22nd; having been assured of no censorship, I shall spell out my reason for leaving SFMA.

Not long ago I had an altercation with a publisher. The details are complex and not immediately relevant to this discussion, so I'll give a fictitious summary instead: my serious manuscript Silent Summer was published without my consent as Please Don't Fuck The Daisies. (I'll discuss the real issue at such time as seems propitious.) This much is a lie; what follows is truth and opinion.

I made strenuous objection directly--and only--to the publisher concerned, citing contract terms and prior correspondence and saying "Please be advised that unless I receive satisfactory answers to the questions raised in this letter, I shall make formal complaint and documentation to SFMA." (My prior, more polite query had been ignored.)

I should like to describe the answer I received, but can not. At a later date I wrote the publisher "I intend to formulate a complete and accurate statement of my position utilizing, with your permission, direct quotations from both your letters to me and the ...contracts. I will ask SFMA to publish this intact in the SFMA

FORUM which, as you know, is copyright with permission to quote expressly denied. I feel that this is the best way to present further misunderstandings..." But the publisher refused permission. So I shall just say here that I received no satisfaction. (I do not mean to imply that the response was abusive; it merely was not satisfactory.) And a boycott against my work was thereupon established at that publisher--presumably for my temerity in demanding information and threatening SFWA complaint.

So much for private negotiation. I attempted to telephone the SFWA Contracts dept. but was unable to reach it, so I went to my local lawyer for immediate advice. He began a dialogue with the publisher that also brought me no satisfaction. Meanwhile I wrote to the Contracts dept. privately and informally, summarizing the situation and quoting the relevant contract provision. I asked for advice: "Should I complain formally to SFWA? Should I take the case back to my lawyer? Should I cancel my fanzine expose? Or should I back off? Your word carries weight." (I wrote a complete description for fanzine publication, but have held that in abeyance --in case that reference is unclear. I do a fair amount of fanzine writing.)

Contracts dept. gave me no answer. Instead, without my knowledge or consent, it turned my letter over to another SFWA member who did more business with this publisher and was very close to its management (!) This person talked with the publisher, and then wrote to me. Parts of this letter were helpful, as some of the information the publisher had not provided was given here. But the real issues were cleverly glossed over; I was told the publisher had acted properly (I emphatically deny this); that I should not badmouth the publisher in the fanzines or attempt litigation, as I should certainly lose and just might be sued myself for libel. This despite the fact that I have never libeled anyone, and expressed my intention in this case of presenting nothing but the truth.

But a couple of direct quotes from this letter: "However, there damned well is such a thing as a grapevine. If word gets around (and it will) that Piers Anthony has called in a lawyer over a simple misunderstanding of the terms of a contract...then other publishers are going to get the impression that Piers Anthony is troublesome, obstreperous, and perhaps dangerous to do business with." Thus I stood condemned for consulting my own lawyer after the publisher had refused satisfaction...and was further threatened with an extension of the boycott to other publishers.

"I mean all this in the friendliest possible way. If unsolicited advice offends you, so be it; but I must tell you that you've dealt hastily and rashly with one of the most fair-minded publishers in our world, and that you've done yourself no good by it, and possibly a fair amount of harm." I repeat: the matter in question had been developing for over six months and a polite query ignored before I put the question more forcefully to the publisher. Even then, all I did was ask my lawyer for advice and the same for the SFWA Contracts dept.--after the publisher had squelched me. And this letter-writer was aware of this. Of course I would do myself harm by making unfounded accusations against a publisher--if ever I do do such a thing--but in this case I had not. I had merely protested wrong done me.

Thus my private and sincere efforts to obtain authoritative advice has resulted in viled but serious threats against my livelihood. Gripe #1.

But another section of this letter was more interesting. "In view of your obvious distress, I've asked (the publisher) to waive (his) contractual rights and send you your \$500...(He) has agreed to do this, provided the matter is allowed to drop there." (Ellipsis and parentheses are mine: the purpose is not to distort but to protect the present anonymity of the publisher.) The publisher reiterated this offer to my lawyer: I was in effect being offered \$500 to shut up. This with the seeming sanction of SFWA.

I think the ethical implications are clear. Gripe #2.

I declined, of course. My lawyer felt I should accept--he felt I would be ahead the money and avoid being blacklisted--so I terminated his interest in the case. He meant well; he just didn't comprehend my own ethical standards.

I then made formal complaint to SFWA, providing a full informal summary of the case including the actions of SFWA members and naming names. SFWA suggested that I accept arbitration--one arbiter to be selected by each party and the third by SFWA. I agreed, and so did the publisher. I named my arbiter and expressed my readiness to provide full information and documentation to the arbitration group. However, I explained, my recent bad experience led me to this attitude: "I must stipulate that at least a minimal report be published by SFWA for the information of its membership. This should explain that an altercation has occurred between Piers Anthony and (the publisher), consisting in the main part of charges by the first party against the second of discourtesy, unethical behavior, and illegal behavior. Some decision should be announced on each of the three charges, whether it be as simple as 'justified/unjustified' or 'matter of interpretation.' If a verdict of justified is rendered on any charge, SFWA must then be free to take such steps as it deems necessary to correct the condition." And I offered to resign from SFWA if I could not substantiate my charges to the arbiters' satisfaction.

Now I felt--and still feel--that this was a reasonable position. I was prepared to negotiate if it proved objectionable, however. But SFWA rendered the matter academic: it took no further action that I was aware of. After some months of silence, I wrote to my arbiter directly and verified that he had been notified of possible impending action--which never materialized.

My arbitration had been quashed, and I still did not have satisfaction from the publisher. Gripe #3.

I then obtained a New York lawyer of large caliber and prepared to take the publisher to court. The publisher abruptly gave me a settlement of virtually everything I had contested, with no further request for my silence. Perhaps they had intended to settle all

along, and the timing was coincidental...but I trust this suggests the merits of my case. The New York lawyer retains my documentation of the case, though there is no present likelihood of court action. As far as I know, I remain boycotted at that publisher; time will tell.

Subjective summary: After being balked by the publisher, I tried to obtain redress for my grievance through SFWA. Thereby my livelihood was threatened, my personal integrity questioned by a degrading offer, and fair arbitration denied. The erring SFWA members involved remain in good standing, and no criticism of the publisher has appeared. In fact, the episode struck me as heavily weighted in favor of the publisher's reputation, to the detriment of my own--when I firmly believe I had the rights of the case. There is no evidence that SFWA intends to change its orientation in future cases. Publishers who are on good terms with the officers can continue to wrong SFWA members with impunity--and they know it.

This is why I am letting my SFWA membership expire, taking only time to wind down my SFWA commitments gracefully. I can no longer lend my support to an organization that functions in this fashion, whatever genuine good it may do in other areas. I hope that other writers who have suffered similar frustrations will now present them here--for my case is not unique. Some are going, some are gone--but perhaps it is not too late to clean house, beginning with financial disclosure by officers, though some very hard realities remain to be faced.

P.E.

#### JOHN JAKES SAYS:

Alfred Bester (#15, August Forum) is right. Good luck with the pub, and best wishes.

#### DAMON KNIGHT SAYS:

In his review of S F HALL OF FAME (Galaxy, December), A J Budrys says, "Clearly, in the minds of today's writers who are SFWA members, the 'Golden Age' has migrated at least a decade forward in time," because "the fabled, war-blighted 'Golden Age' of the late 1930s" is represented only by HELEN O'LOY, whereas the book is full of classics from the 1940s--"the very time in which John Campbell's fillers and blurbs themselves promised a return to far better things when the 'wartime pressures' were off and absent hands returned to the plough. The only absent hand of any eventual significance was that of Cyril Kornbluth..." Then he says it is astonishing that the Golden Age hasn't migrated farther than that, & specifically that

the anthology is not very New Wavish.

All these statements are untrue. What would the point have been if they were true? The "Golden Age" of the anthologists is the late 30s and early 40s, when del Rey, de Camp, Heinlein, van Vogt, Sturgeon and Asimov were all turning out their best work. Of the nine stories AJ cites as having been published during the war years, one was actually published in 1940, two in 1941, and one in 1948. These dates are all given in the acknowledgments in the front of the book. Other "absent hands" included Robert A. Heinlein, Isaac Asimov and L. Sprague de Camp. As for the Old Wave tone of the stories, Silverberg's introduction says, as AJ surely knew, that they were chosen from "the era ending on December 31, 1964: that is, the period up to the point covered by the Nebula awards." I wish I knew what it is that has made AJ so chronically furious that he can no longer read or count.

++++

Poul Anderson is right when he says there ought to be a rulebook for the guidance of Nebula anthology editors. There ought to be similar guidebooks for the other working officers and the heads of committees, too; otherwise everybody has to start from 0. As a first step, I offer the enclosed draft of a Nebula editor's rulebook. After some others have had the chance to comment on & correct it, it might be a good idea if the S/T were to mineo or xerox some copies in order to hand one to each new editor as he takes over.

I oppose the suggested increase in dues. Gordy is urging us to raise the dues because we are spending more than we earn. But what are we spending it on? What is the organization getting in return for that fantastic \$600 phone bill, for example? I gather that our membership is now over 400, and that our per capita income is \$17, counting dues, subscriptions, donations and royalties. That gives us a projected annual income of \$6800.

At present, under the voluntary system, we are averaging about \$10 per member in dues alone. For this the member gets six issues of the Bulletin and Forum (except when the organization can't afford to print them because it has spent its year's income in the first six months), the opportunity to participate in the Nebula Awards, some PR work which may eventually benefit him indirectly, and a few peripheral things such as the speakers' bureau. At \$5, this was a bargain. At \$10, it is just worth it to me. If I had to pay \$25 or \$30, I would quit. I think enough other people would drop out to make the dues increase largely self-defeating, and if the officers continued to spend money without restraint, we would wind up in the red just the same.

#### EDITING THE NEBULA AWARDED ANTHOLOGY

The editor makes up a list of contents, beginning with the three short-fiction Nebula winners of the year, and adding to these other stories which appeared on the ballot

but which need not have been among the highest-ranking stories. Stories which did not appear on the final ballot are not to be included. The editor chooses these stories and arranges them in order to create a balanced and entertaining collection. At his discretion he may write an introduction or afterword, or blurbs for the stories: he may write on or commission a review of the year or other material. Having made his choices, and confirmed them with the publisher, the editor sends contracts to the authors or their agents. There are standard forms for this purpose: apply to the publisher for a copy. The division of royalties from the anthology is as follows: 25% to the editor, 10% to SFMA, and 65% to the authors.

The purpose of the Nebula anthology is to publicize and promote science fiction in general, and the Nebula winners in particular. The editor should never lose sight of this fact. He may have an ethical problem if one or more of the Nebula winners are distasteful to him. If he cannot solve this without letting his attitude appear in the book in any way, he should not undertake to edit the anthology. Above all, the Nebula Anthology must never be used as a platform to attack any science fiction writer or work of science fiction, and this applies a fortiori to the winners of the Nebula.

The copyright page must be prepared carefully, since any error or omission may invalidate an author's copyright. This is less easy than it looks. The name of the copyright owner must be given exactly as it appears in the original copyright notice, unless the author has since obtained an assignment of copyright, in which case the author's name is substituted for the publisher's, but the year is not changed. If a work has been copyrighted more than once in different versions, each such copyright notice must be given in full. If only one has been assigned, the others are given as they originally appeared. Note that in the case of a magazine version, it cannot be assumed that the issue date is the same as the date of the copyright. Issues dated early in 1968, for example, are often published and copyrighted in 1967.

To illustrate these pitfalls, take the case of an imaginary story, "Leapers of Orthor," by James Flynn, which appeared in the January, 1968 issue of Colossal, and later in 1968 was published in a different form as part of a novel, Leapers, by Schlitz Books. The story has been chosen for the Nebula anthology which appears in 1969, and the author has obtained an assignment of copyright.

WRONG: "Leapers of Orthor," by James Flynn. Copyright c 1969 by James Flynn. Originally published in Colossal, January 1968. Copyright c 1968 by Garbageworld Publishing Co., Inc. Appeared also, in a somewhat different form, as

part of the novel Leapers, Schlitz Tasty-type Books, 1963. (This adds a supernumerary and invalid 1969 copyright instead of changing the original copyright to the author's name. It omits a necessary copyright notice for the novel. It gives the date of the original copyright erroneously as 1968. And Schlitz Tasty-type Books is an imprint, not the name of the company.)

RIGHT: "Leapers of Orthor," by James Flynn. Copyright c 1967 by James Flynn. Originally published in Colossal, January 1968. Appeared also, in a somewhat different form, as part of the novel Leapers, copyright c 1968 by Schlitz Books, Inc.

It is not legally necessary, but is courteous, to add to each notice, "Reprinted by permission of the author" (or "the author and Talent, Inc.," or "Schlitz Books, Inc.," or whoever gave permission.)

#### VIRGINIA KIDD SAYS:

Good to see a firm hand at the helm, under the hen, raised in stiff salute. Carry on. The Forum will never be PITFCS, (The Forum is PITFCS. Take another look at the cover. TFC) but the acrimony may now be sweeter, wilder, wittier. I expect great things of your incumbency, including reason. In the meantime, I would like to put an opinion on the record. I speak not only for myself but for all my non-dissenting clients [which means most of them] some of whose work will be submitted to Ultimate and will be published there, with their full awareness; and in a few cases, cheers. Reasonable?

I have previously made clear that my sympathies are as much with Sol Cohen as the facts allow, on the question of his being 'required' to pay for reprints. The facts are--basically and originally--that ill-informed and inexperienced writers, a long time ago, signed away more rights than they realized in accepting Ziff-Davis' money; and that Sol Cohen is within the law in reprinting stories whose contractual rights he purchased from Z-D. (Where he has reprinted stories all of whose rights were not purchased, he is no doubt in trouble. I am equally sorry for him and sure that such reprintings were made in error, but not, so to speak, in sin.)

In any event, I hold no animus against Sol Cohen. He has always treated me with courtesy and scrupulous regard for the authorial rights involved in every instance of my dealing with him. I plan to continue.

Markets are too damned scarce to stomp on one that is small but hungry, in my opinion. Ted White is too intelligent and accommodating and receptive an editor to be by-passed. I have dealt with him infrequently in the past, and henceforth plan to sell him all I can--with due attention to where he stands in the rates hierarchy, of course. I've been thinking this over a long time.

It is not solely that I am an agent, and that a market is a market. It is that Ted White is doing the best he can with what is offered him, and I do admire yea-sayers. I dissociate myself now and henceforth from any embargo against his magazines that SFWA or any fractious faction thereof may propose, because I think that weapon has been adequately used (or more than adequately) and should not be used again. Besides which, I think, considering the many difficulties he operates under, he is making pretty good magazines out of Amazing and Fantastic. Support is in order, from the better-informed and more experienced authors around today, not disciplinary action or sending-to-Coventry on the basis of shaky old grievances...so long as they know exactly what they are selling and what they are getting! Based on my experience, I'd say: Ted will do the best he can for you, and Sol will honor any agreement reached between equals. (He doesn't respond well to badmouthing. Who does?)

On a totally different subject, I'd like to ask for some publicity within the organization for the Circulating Book Program. I've run into several SFWA members recently who, if they had ever heard of it, had forgotten about it--or had never heard of it. It is a good program; redounds to everyone's advantage.

Carry on some more -

ROBERT LOWNDES SAYS:

Jim Blish's proposed amendments for tightening up the standards for admission or renewal of membership in SFWA remind me of a discussion I had with Anne McCaffrey and other members at a private gathering last Spring. My feeling then, and it is stronger now, is that SFWA badly needs reform in the matter of who is qualified to be a member; and the best way I can aid in such reform is to start with my own case.

I have not written a really new (fresh from end-to-end) story since 1960. everything I have written since The Puzzle Planet, which was my original credential in SFWA, has been a reworking and expansion of something published earlier. Mostly, these have been stories originally published close to thirty years ago. No matter that I feel they are new in a sense, and that the present SFWA constitution allows me to claim them as credentials for renewal of membership. No matter that some readers have praised them. The point is that in this respect the letter of the law (to which I have conformed) killeth the spirit; I am not a working science fiction writer in the sense that SFWA intends, or should intend, its members to be.

Anne was sweet enough to say that my past contributions to science fiction, and to imply at least that my present writings on the subject, in editorials, make me desirable. That may be, in some ways; but I am fundamentally an editor, rather than a creative writer, and this puts me on the other side of the fence.

This year, the dues were raised; I shall try to get in a contribution, as requested, before the end of 1970. Expenses have gone up. However, costs should also be cut, and one of the ways of cutting them is to eliminate the costs of producing and mailing copies of the Bulletin and the Forum to deadwood members.

I enjoy reading these two publications. I should like to continue to receive them. But I'd rather let them go than, by continuing to accept what I consider to be a false position (I only really started to think about this this year) abet the deterioration of what still might be a worthwhile organization.

In its present state, with such loose standards of membership, I'm not at all sure membership in SFNA would be worth the proposed increased dues even were I able to qualify by selling some genuinely new stories. At the present time, I do not have the time (or, more bluntly, do not have the motivation to get to it in time that is made for the purpose) to write science fiction. That situation could change, but I do not see any immediate prospect.

So I am not going to take further advantage of the present membership standards, through which I am actually qualified to renew membership for 1971. I shall let my membership expire at the end of this year.

Perhaps in a few years, I'll have the urge to write science fiction again, and maybe such fiction would sell, so that I could qualify under more strict standards. Right now, the situation seems to call for a bit of ruthlessness in eliminating those who do not really belong; if so, then it has to start somewhere, and it may as well start here.

#### WALLACE MACFARLANE SAYS

I enjoyed your lively CAP comments in the Forum, and here's some comment for the next issue:

Idealism is a lovely thing but financial well-being should be based in reality, not capriciously on volunteer dues. It's a truism that no organization can exist half equal and half more equal, and a coercive stance of righteousness does not correct the initial error. I'll be content with \$15 dues when they're official. In the meantime I suggest we pay the price of sweet idealism and live within the circumstances this educational opportunity has afforded us.

Because I agree that the Nebula awards are feckless, will not someone defend the present system? Or explain why we can't find judges to judge the entries? It would be more pleasant to nag at them than ourselves.

If you think this devisive, don't print it. I'm not emotionally engaged with either matter & while I get a good deal of entertainment from the SFWA publications, I can do without if some of our outstanding knotheads run the old bus off the cliff. So edit, Mr. Editor. Cross my heart, I won't complain.

BARRY MALZBERG SAYS:

I loved every word of your diatribe in the new Forum and find it all high time. (I would like to believe that I would have still loved it even if I had taken the edge of the knife and I hope I would.)

What a field this is.

VONDA N. MCINTYPE SAYS:

I'm most upset by this issue of the Forum. Everybody is bounding around advocating "professionalism," but...

First, the amendment that states, "Works not explicitly labeled as science fiction are unacceptable as membership credentials, and are ineligible for Nebula Awards." Just how many of us have control over what the publisher puts on the cover of our books? But more important, for the first time in 40 years sf has a chance to climb out of its self-constructed and poverty-stricken ghetto, and you "professionals" are trying to pitch it right back in. This amendment is preposterous, and unworthy of you.

As for Article II, paragraphs 1 & 6, I'm really hurt that the only "con" Mr. Blish could think of is that they would cost the organization money. They would also cost you a lot of members. Some of them are members you might rather keep. I can understand your wanting to toss out the dabbler, the one-story-sold-in-1950 member, and the ones who stay in because for \$5 they get egoboo and free books (the ones who will probably drop out when the dues raise--which I think is great but not enough--is passed). But what about writers who are just beginning to sell and become established, the ones SFWA can potentially do the most for?

I can only speak for myself. SFWA has helped me a great deal, bolstered my ego, given me information, introduced me to a whole lot of damned fine people. I appreciate it/you. I like it/you. So I am deeply hurt that it/you are trying to exclude me from your company, that you value me less than some hack who writes the off half of an Ace Double every year or who caters to John W. Campbell's racism at 15,000 words per year.

I've been selling stories for 15 months; I've been a member of SFWA for 15 months. I've sold stories to Ed Ferman, David Gerrold, Robin Wilson, Harlan Ellison, Damon Knight, and

Chip Delany/Marilyn Hacker. I won a New American Library story prize. I get nice notes from Atlantic Monthly. Several different editors want to see my first novel. But under the new rules, I'm not eligible for membership in SFWA. My 1969 sales totaled 10,700 words, my 1970 sales (so far), 9,100 (this despite the fact that I sold 2 stories in 1969 and 4 in 1970). I feel like a professional. I'm still a novice, but I'm a professional. I'm also in graduate school: they're giving me a lot of money; they have first call on my waking hours. I can't write full time. I write rather slowly and my stories tend toward extreme brevity.

If you pass these amendments, particularly the continuing-eligibility amendment, you're going to lose a lot of good people. Like a couple of current and/or previous officers, who do and/or did most of the work. Several potentially outstanding writers in the same position I'm in. Etc. And what are you going to do the year Isaac Asimov writes 15 non-fiction books but doesn't get around to writing any sf? What are you going to do the year Chip Delany decides not to write a novel? Are you going to throw them out? Sure you are. Come on, people. Don't add hypocrisy to SFWA's flaws.

Very few of you know me, and even fewer of you know that I can write, and write well, so for me to present the following as an ultimatum of sorts would be thoroughly ludicrous. It's not a threat, it's just a statement, made with regret. My ego and my pride bruise easily. If you throw me out once, I won't give you a second chance; I won't come back. I never go where I feel I'm not welcome.

#### RACHEL PAYES SAYS:

After reading your cherse comments at the end of the SFWA FORUM #15, which I received today, it takes courage to write a letter to said FORUM; but I want to comment on two very different things that should be of interest to many of the SFWA members.

First, a report on a recent example of a P. R. deal on sf that should warm Tom Purdom's heart. And because it was spontaneous and unsought, I think it is even better than engineered publicity.

Last Saturday my husband and I attended the ARRL Hudson Division Convention sponsored by the Hudson Amateur Radio Council in Tarrytown, N.Y., and found that the program committee had gone all out on the sf bit because Chris Moskowitz, Sam's very talented wife, was guest of honor and the principal speaker at the banquet. Her talk had nothing to do with sf -- she was there in her roles as physician/surgeon/ham radio operator -- but as you'll see from the enclosed pages from the Convention program, Sam and sf were given a big play. At the dinner, when the guests at the speaker's table were introduced, the toastmaster made much of Sam's eminence in the field of sf for 30 years.

I even found some of the glory sloshing over onto me! In the sixteen years I've been attending ham radio functions with my husband, this is the first time that I've been introduced not just as W2SZJ's XYL, but as Rachel Payes, science fiction writer.

This was a big convention, with hundreds at the banquet -- so lots of people were at least exposed to the term Science Fiction.

Second, I am distressed by the proposed amendments to SFWA bylaws, Article II, Membership, that appear in the SFWA FORUM #15; so, as one of the most marginal of the marginal members, I feel qualified to speak for all of us.

The only reason given for retaining us as members is money -- if we get kicked out because we aren't publishing enough sf, the SFWA will hurt from lack of our dues. (I thought it was just colleges that demanded Publish or Perish.) There have been earlier letters in the FORUM protesting marginal members -- and the recurrent theme is, "They aren't doing anything for SFWA." This may well be true. I wish, though, that the lucky ones who sell a lot of sf would flip that coin to the obverse side and ask themselves, "What is SFWA doing for these writers who haven't made it, yet, into the big time?"

For me, and I'm sure for many others of the sf writers who sell only occasionally, membership in SFWA has been very valuable. I have learned a lot about my craft since joining the organization -- I DON'T WANT TO BE KICKED OUT BECAUSE THE EDITORS IN A SMALL MARKET DON'T APPRECIATE ME! I fail to see how I'm harming SFWA by staying in it, avidly reading the FORUM and the Bulletin, attending the Nebula Banquets, reading and voting for award stories, and paying my dues, even if my sales are few and far between.

I'm selfish enough to be glad of certain monetary gains that have come to me as a direct result of my membership. Because I attended a Nebula dinner and talked with an editor, I've had two non-sf novels published in a field I hadn't even thought of entering. Thanks to some Good-God-Girl type of advice from Bob Silverberg, I learned that I didn't have to write for \$300 a book. The last time 'round when I got a contract from a publisher, I dug out the issues of the Bulletin that had Damon's contract articles in them, and by using them, I wound up with a better deal than I'd have had if I'd accepted the standard contract as offered.

There are plenty of us who sell little -- but want to sell more. If we aren't allowed to belong to SFWA, does that make it a better organization? Maybe, for a few, it does -- but it cuts the rest of us off from a tremendous source of professional help and encouragement.

Come on, fellers, that ain't a very charitable attitude. (And in fond anticipation of the comments that should generate -- no, SFWA is NOT a charitable organization.)

Finally, and most important of all, it's fun to belong to SFWA. The Nebula dinner in N.Y.C. is my "night out" each year. Don't tell me I can't attend!

And a final comment to Miriam Allen De Ford: Cheer up, luv, you are not alone. Ultimate bought a novelette of mine in 1968 and, so far as I know, it hasn't been published, either; although I did get paid for it. Someday. Maybe.

Which, going back to the membership eligibility requirements, brings up an interesting point. What if this novellette Miriam sold in 1967 were her only membership credential? As it has not been published, even though bought and paid for, would this make her ineligible for membership in SFWA? And on the other side of that coin, would publication of an sf story make you eligible for membership, even if the story had been donated by you to the publication, and you received nary a cent in payment -- but got it into print?

This was to have been the end of my letter, but as there's still white space at the bottom of the page, I'll add one further comment. I want to say, loudly, "Amen!" to L. Sprague De Camp's letter. For me, the main purpose of fiction is to provide escapist entertainment, and I'm not a bit ashamed to admit it. I have enough troubles of my own -- I have no desire to read some dreary account of somebody else's sordid situation. Unless I'm doing research for something I'm writing, I read only mysteries, sf, spy, or adventure. So come on, fellers, write me some good escape stories. I'll bet that reading escape stuff helps keep down the population in our already overcrowded booby hatches.

#### RICHARD PECK SAYS:

In the last Forum, Tom Purdom described his plan for publicizing sf via letters written by SFWA members, signed by Tom, then mailed out as press releases. I live near Tom, had a story in the current Worlds of If, and agreed to test his idea. Because no one knows me as a science fiction writer, the results prove that the idea works; editors responded to the letters, not to a reputation (which I don't have).

I typed and stamped nine letters; Tom signed and mailed them. To date (31 Oct.): six positive responses, two tentative queries for more information--a good batting average. Two newspapers ran the releases verbatim. One of those two notices got me a letter from a college classmate I haven't seen in eight years. He claims he picked up If because of the newspaper notice and has been re-hooked on sf after years of being on the wagon. On the basis of the other notice, four people in Racine, Wisconsin (not a hotbed of fandom) called my parents to claim they'd picked up If. (One did say, "not for me, understand; for my boy.")

The point here seems obvious. If a notice about an unknown's publishing some sf can attract new readers, however few, writers

who publish more often than I ought to benefit. I know several copies of If sold because of my letters; I hope there were others. I won't play games with vague statistics, but each new reader attracted to sf--for whatever reason--means more money somewhere in the writer-agent-editor-publisher cycle.

The others reactions to those releases were: (1) an interview with the Philadelphia Inquirer (to be published Thanksgiving Day); the reporter I talked to read the copies of If, Orbit, and F&SF I lent her, said "it's great," and asked whether she could cover the PhilCon for the Inquirer. (2) interviews with the Temple U. (where I teach) faculty and student newspapers; these were the only ones to pay off immediately for me. I've been pleading for two years to teach a course in sf; request denied--usual academic conservatism. The two campus interviews got me not only permission but a request that I teach my course (and that sells books, and recruits readers, and ought to be fun).

Two other newspapers may yet respond, so I've heard from staff spies there. If they do nothing but notice the PhilCon, that's another plus.

I'll grant that a flood of such letters concerning every story published would turn off most editors, but a notice on your forthcoming book, or on a story you consider exceptionally good, can probably help SFWA as much as you. The letters I wrote won't put cash in my pocket; they may help some people discover Robert Silverberg, or Joanna Russ, or \_\_\_\_\_ (fill in a favorite). And I'm missionary enough to like that idea.

Finally, before the argument's raised, over Tom's signature the letters don't look like ego at work.

#### TOM PURDOM SAYS:

A report on the bookmark project will probably be included in the minutes Audrey Bilker typed up for us, but the members might like a more complete report on the distribution of the things. Something like 1500 went to the West Coast for Quinn to distribute; 2000 were distributed here in Philadelphia; Joanna Russ, Dean Koontz, and Jim Gunn helped me distribute another good number around Ithaca, Harrisburg, and the University of Kansas (where they were accompanied by a display in the book stores); Dan Galouye arranged for 500 to be distributed at the New Orleans Public Library (with a special science fiction display); requests for five hundred bookmark packages came in from half the libraries in Lloyd Biggle's list of cooperating libraries; the Boston library asked Ben Bova for 4000 and got 2000; and Chris Steinbrunner arranged for the New York Library to distribute 4000, or fifty in every branch library.

I only have about a thousand left, but will still appreciate getting requests from other places, even if we can't fill them. It looks like we could have distributed 40,000 with no effort, and

I would like to collect donations for that amount if we do this next year.

I didn't work as hard on Philadelphia publicity this year as I did last, but the results were still pretty good. Gordie and I appeared on a radio show on which we learned that the interviewer--a leading local Republican politician--is an SF fan; Lester appeared on TV; stories appeared in the Bulletin, Inquirer, and in the University of Pennsylvania student weekly magazine; Ben Bova and Larry Niven were interviewed for the Voice of America; and several writers were interviewed by an Associated Press reporter.

The AP story did go on the wire and members have spotted it in newspapers in New Jersey, North Carolina, Kansas, and Indianapolis. If anybody sees it in his local paper, I'd appreciate it if you'd let me know about it and send me a clipping.

The story is a pretty good one which concentrates on the new academic interest in SF, and starts off with the statistic that was mentioned a lot at the Philadelphia meeting--that 150 SF courses are now being taught in universities. We can't afford a clipping service, so any help we can get from members will be appreciated. The more of this stuff we can put together, the easier it will be to ask for contributions from publishers.

Somewhere else in this issue of the Forum there should be a letter from Dick Peck about his luck with the local publicity scheme described in the last issue. I haven't heard from any other members who are interested in doing this and I would very much like to hear from at least a dozen people in the next couple of months. If we can prove this scheme will bring in local publicity, I want to start asking publishers for grants that will pay for secretarial help. I'll then be able to draft the letters myself, and the writers who get the publicity won't even have to do their own typing. (Though I'll still need help selecting stories and preparing mailing lists.) This will take a good bit of money, however, and I can't ask for it until we've proved we can get results. So anybody who uses this scheme in the near future will be doing all of us a favor.

Two of the most experienced PR men in the organization think this is the best scheme on the list I published in the last Forum, and seem pretty confident it will bring in a lot of publicity. And the preliminary results seem to bear them out.

I also recently spent an hour on the phone with a Time reporter who was doing an article on DUNE and STRANGER IN A STRANGE LAND, and called me up because one of the Philadelphia press releases had crossed his desk two days after the meeting. I don't know how the article will turn out, but it sounds like it's worth watching for anyway. With a little luck, it may be a broader survey of the field than it would have been if he hadn't gotten in touch with us.

A United Church of Christ publication, COLLOQUY, is doing a special issue on SF, which should be out in the spring. This is a magazine used to encourage discussion in church discussion groups and the issue should be pretty good. As of now, it's supposed to include articles by Joanna Russ, Alexei Panshin, and yours truly, and interviews with several writers. The editor has promised me an extra hundred copies for our use, and it should make a good publication for us to circulate and include with informational mailings. If you've received a questionnaire from this publication I hope you'll take the time to answer it, since this could be very useful.

PAMELA SARGENT SAYS:

In reference to James Blish's proposed amendments to the SFWA bylaws: I am in sympathy with any proposal for stricter qualifications for membership, and I feel that the criteria as they stand now are too lenient. I may be cutting my own throat as far as SFWA is concerned in saying this: I am a doctoral candidate who is being paid by a university to study and teach, not to "fool around" writing stories. Consequently, my academic work must take priority here, and I might not be able to meet stricter criteria. But that is my own decision, and if criteria were more difficult to meet in my case, I would simply have to admit that I am not a professional writer, or rearrange my priorities. I am sure there are other members whose circumstances are similar to mine, but I do not think we have the right to impose these circumstances on SFWA and try to make its criteria for membership easier for ourselves. Either our writing is the most important thing, or it is not; if it is not, perhaps we have no business in a professional organization for writers. I do feel, however, that Mr. Blish's criteria might be a bit too restrictive; why not two story-length pieces a year, around 6,000 words? This would assure the membership that a writer is at least producing some amount of work consistently, and the money problem could be alleviated by a membership fee of twenty dollars or so.

I am violently opposed, however, to the proposed amendment to section 2, and I quote: "Science fiction is defined as any work published as science fiction for general circulation, regardless of medium. Works not explicitly labeled as science fiction are unacceptable as membership credentials, and are ineligible for Nebula Awards." God knows what "explicitly labeled" means here. Does it have to have "science fiction" under the author's byline? Does it merely have to be in a book with a freaky cover? I submit that a criterion of this sort will open the door to endless hair-splitting of the sort that has not been seen since Thomas Aquinas first formulated the "essence-existence" distinction, and will create almost as many problems as that distinction. I would submit the following criterion in its place: if the writer is willing to call his work science-fiction, is willing to let it be nominated for awards, or submits it as a

credential, then let it be science-fiction. I do not know whether Mr. Blish wishes to preserve the supposed "purity" of the field (a move of which I disapprove) or simply wishes to keep borderline pornography with a science-fictional setting out (a move which I might be in sympathy with), but drawing distinctions here would raise more problems than it would solve. Let the writer decide; the distinctions are fast collapsing at this point anyway, and for the better.

In regard to the problem of the Nebula Awards: why not omit direct voting of the membership on these awards? I think we should consider a proposal that would allow the membership to vote on a panel of judges who would use the list of recommendations as a guide (although they would not necessarily be tied to it) and who would then themselves vote on the awards. This would eliminate ballots from those who hadn't read the books, take the issue of personality out of these awards, and the membership itself would choose the judges who would decide on the awards. I think we would then have an award which would have some relation to merit, although I don't believe the awards have been as undeserved as Harry Harrison has made them out to be.

In reference to Hank Stine's letter: we have here the Hobbesian view of the state of nature (dubious anthropologically) combined with an essentially Schopenhauerian view of man's nature which is ultimately extremely pessimistic in tone. It's too bad, for all this verbiage obscures Mr. Stine's main point, with which I am in complete agreement: we are desperately in need of characterization in this field. In science fiction, we are writing about man, his works, his world and his relations to it, and the emphasis here should be on man. If a story is not an outgrowth of the way in which the characters function in their world, it will ultimately fail. Certainly we need "idea-oriented" stories as well, but they must explore the relations, both psychological and otherwise, of men to these ideas and concepts, if they are to be more than fictionalized essays. Mr. Stine is correct, and many of us, myself included, seem to be too lazy to do the work required to characterize the people who populate our stories.

#### BOB SILVERBERG SAYS:

This new FORUM inspires all sorts of comments.

BLISH. I'm in agreement with his essential reform proposition: that SFWA is now so loaded with one-story and two-story authors that it has drifted away from its original purpose (as a service organization for professionals, offering news of markets, suggested strategies for out-witting unscrupulous publishers, etc.) and has become a kind of postal koffee-klotch for status-seeking amateurs. We were all one-story authors once, and I don't mean to put them down for that; but they aren't professionals, and they

now outnumber the pros heavily, with some resulting odd skews in the Nebula voting and much consumption of official time on non-professional matters. So I favor a tightening of the rules on eligibility, at least to the point of requiring a sale a year to remain an active member.

But I don't like the idea of kicking out anyone who once was able to make it on our more lenient criteria. Let them stay, so long as they feel like paying dues; but retain the category of associate membership, so that they don't participate in elections even though they get the other benefits of belonging. I'd fight the dropping of the associate membership category on another count: not everybody who qualifies as a pro writes 15,000 words of s-f every year, but that doesn't mean he doesn't belong in SFWA. During my presidency I was much helped by several old-timers who would, under the proposed Blish eligibility rules, now be expelled for inactivity. So let full membership be reserved for the active pros, the Blishes and Harrisons and Aldisses and Andersons, and keep associate membership for the veterans and for those of our amateur members who care to hang on, I say. But tighten things up so that the influx of amateurs is checked.

ANDERSON. The editor of the Nebula anthology is the only member of SFWA who carries our official image, whatever that may be, before the public. Therefore he ought to be restrained in voicing literary or social or political opinions that don't necessarily reflect the views of the whole membership, which is to say he really shouldn't voice any but the blandest sort of opinions. I don't like to see the editor using the anthology introduction as a pulpit for praising (or denouncing) Agnew, or for announcing that he feels the winner in some category is a tenth-rate job. We needn't have a formal set of restrictions; he merely should go about his job impersonally, just as the editor of the Bulletin should. He is a vehicle, not a voice.

BLISH AGAIN. The Ellison story that won in the novella category was several thousand words too short for that category, a fact that went unnoticed until it was too late to do anything about it. Since such human error is always possible, I think we ought to add to our Nebula rules a bugger factor such as the Hugo rules include, to forestall a lawsuit by some losing nominee who objects to the ineligibility of the winner: something to the effect that the officers of SFWA can utilize discretion up to 2500 words either way in assigning a story to its category. Ideally that's an idiotic rule, but in practice we may need it. #Interesting to see Jim call my story PASSENGERS a "fantasy." I disagree; by my own definition a fantasy has to draw upon the accepted body of the supernatural -- ghosts, warlocks, spells, demons -- and there's nothing in PASSENGERS that can't be interpreted rationally. On the other hand, there's no science in PASSENGERS either. It's s-f by association, is what it is; but so is 96% of the S-f being written today. (I don't feel defensive in any of this; I'm just trying to arrive at categories.) The only out-and-out fantasy I can recall that won a Nebula was Fritz' GONNA ROLL DEM BONES. I don't think fantasy (in the sense

defined above) ought to get Nebulas, but I wound't sponsor amendments preventing it.

Blish is dead wrong that the sending out of permissions forms tips people to the winners & losers. I knew that PASSENGERS was going to be in the anthology a month before the banquet, but I wouldn't have known that I had won the Nebula until the moment Gordy handed them out, had not one of the officers gratuitously and spontaneously told Barbara the names of the winners a couple of weeks earlier. I wish we had more tight-lipped banquets, but it can't seem to be managed. Someone always blows the news. My year as President I kept the winners absolutely under my hat until we had our fire; then I had to ask another member to take over the award process, and the first thing he did was tell his notoriously gossipy pal X who the winners were.

CLARKE. So we have a member who won't read a story "if there is a cover too lurid or a blurb overly dramatic"? God. Would a right-wing magazine editor reject a story because it was mailed to him with FDR postage stamps?

PURDOM. Nice to see some people are concerned with public relations. But let my right hand forget its cunning before I start sending out press releases! The more promotion we get involved in, the less creating we do. Of course, if there are members who want to volunteer to do the promoting while the rest of us do the writing....

THE PRESIDENT. I'm appalled by that financial statement and by the pressure for vast increases in dues. For one thing, capital expenses (like the gestetner) have been lumped in here as if they're recurring ordinary budget items. For another, what's this \$628 phone bill? How come \$1200 for postage? \$578 in officers' expenses? \$325 in mimeo? Christ, I don't think I spent \$1200 all told my year in office. Before we hand the present officers a hefty increase in funds, I think we have a right to know how frugal they've attempted to be. Not very, I'd say. Has any thought been given to lumping our official mailings to cut down on that godawful postage bill? Have officers been making phone calls when postcards would have served? My vote is against any increase in dues past \$10.

#### ERNEST TAVES SAYS:

I was much amused by your description of your struggles with the Gestetner. A few months ago I, for my sins, ran the same course with an identical machine. All you need is stamina, patience, fortitude, anger, martinis, and time. The art of putting on those electronically cut stencils can't be taught, but it can be learned. And they do work, they do. Patience, martinis, courage, martinis . . . .

A. E. VAN VOGT SAYS:

Because of being unusually busy, I didn't read the last SFWA forum until someone recently called my attention to George Zebrowski's comments on my nove, The World of Null-A. George Z. seems to have set himself the task of placing in proper perspective the works of the better-known writers of the 1940's, particularly. His qualifications for this self-assigned task do not seem as obvious to me as they appear to be to him, and I especially take issue with his statement that World is merely "entertaining; nothing more."

Last year, when I revised this story for its Berkley re-issue, I was struck anew by the fact that the entire work is written in General Semantic-ese. In thousands and thousands of paragraphs, the English language is twisted tot the Korzybski precepts. Even if General Semantics were as controversial as G.Z. states, or even if I were writing in the terminology of an obscure African witchcraft cult, the fact of my adhering consistently to that terminology would be something "more" than "merely entertaining."

It seems that such writing efforts have their own time and place. For four years, I have been prodding myself to write a third null-A novel--a sequel to Players--but so far I haven't been able to get the old feeling back. I don't know of any other writer (sf or main stream) who has written a novel in a sustained GS style.

So it was a unique event, whatever its basic merit as a story or whatever the basic merit of General Semantics--which I still consider to be about as important as anything in this wide world.

P.S. The World of Null-A has just been re-issued in France by J'ai Lu, the editor of which informs me that they publish only works of literary merit, and have so far printed only two other sf books--2001 by Clarke and MoreThan Human by Sturgeon. George Z. will surely agree that's a rare duo, and a professional point of view.

KATE WILHELM SAYS:

As the "anonymous proposer" Jim Blish referred to I am happy to give my reasons for changing the dates of the awards banquet and the change-over of S.F.W.A. officers.

Jim says correctly that the Nebula manuscript must be in the hands of the publishers in April in order to have publication that year. In the beginning the ms. had to be turned in then in order to have publication in time for the Labor Day convention. Who can say if publication in the same year can be guaranteed in the future since production time becomes more and more extended? I

don't think it would be catastrophic if the book didn't come out until the following year, and I think we might have to resign ourselves to this later date if the present trend continues. But that wasn't part of my proposal. I can't see any reason for the Nebula editor not to have the ms. ready in April.

The only date that has to be considered here is that mid-April date. There's nothing sacred about the banquet date, or the date for the change-over of officers. Each could be moved six weeks, one forward, one back, to coincide. I think the benefits far outweigh any possible adverse effects this would have. The officers now assume office off stage with absolutely no recognition on assuming office and no appreciation at the end of their terms. Also, unless you have personally met them, they might easily remain anonymous during the entire year. Then, too, the New York banquet has become such a drag that many people are talking about never attending another one. It seems so obvious that an awards banquet doesn't need outside speakers, or even long winded insiders. But we get them.

The next point I'd like to bring up is the business meeting that I proposed to be held the afternoon of the banquet in New York, as I understand is done on the west coast. I think this is the only time any official S.F.W.A. meeting should ever be held. I am very strongly opposed to business meetings at fan conventions. It should be understood that no binding votes can be taken at those meetings; no changes in the by-laws enacted, etc. But opinions can be swayed, and I am uneasy about whose influence is being felt when the whole atmosphere is that of fandom. These meetings are grossly unfair to those S.F.W.A. members who have no interest in fandom, or who can't afford the time or the money to attend what is primarily a meeting of fans. I think the time, energy and money that is expended on these official meetings that are not representative of the whole of S.F.W.A. would be much better spent on a business meeting tied in to our business of inaugurating officers and awarding Nebulas.

On to the question of secrecy about the Nebula winners. The only reason I can see for not notifying the winners as soon as the vote is counted is to have the pleasure of surprise. And I can see many reasons that far out-weigh this. It downgrades the Nebula by treating it like a candy bar won at a children's party where the surprise is the award. The value of a literary prize is lasting, not ephemeral. I think it is sadistic to have four or five people who aren't going to win under public scrutiny at the moment of disclosure. Four or five in each category, I should add. The winners should certainly be on hand to receive their awards, which we as an organization should honor even if we don't personally approve of the individual works so honored. If the winner can't afford to make the trip, then publishers should be asked to help finance it, as was done with Brian. It is asking a lot to expect all finalists to attend the various banquets, sometimes at prohibitive expense with great personal or family problems. If the winner knows beforehand, perhaps it will help him to negotiate a better contract while he's in town. Or his

publisher might be able to arrange a bit of publicity for him to help a current work along. There are practical reasons for giving up the secrecy. And as for everyone knowing, they won't. The handful of people who will know the winners aren't the whole of the organization. Even now most of our people don't know who won until the Bulletin comes out telling them. There would be rumors and guesses and so on, but the winners and the losers, those intimately concerned, would be able to plan on attending or not, and they should know.

GEORGE ZEBROWSKI SAYS:

James Blish's remarks on SFWA membership credential requirements should be considered without anger or personal involvement. Let's look and see what the 15,000 words per year really means in terms of practicalities and art. To begin with the rule would be prejudiced against short story writers and would favor the novelist (his concern with the rules is really of no interest to him if he usually writes nothing but novels.)

The short story writer, however, is faced with a number of stupid to insane possible predicaments: 1) he writes 3 solid stories, but they come to only 13,500 words -- out he goes. 2) he writes 2 solid stories which total 12,000 words and one of them wins a Nebula -- out he goes. 3) he writes 3 stories totaling 14,000 words -- one wins a Nebula, and one a Hugo -- out he goes anyway! 4) he writes 3 stories totaling 15,000 words, one of them is not published because the company folds -- meanwhile SFWA has given him credit for the story (as it should) -- but subsequently it does not sell elsewhere. I think regardless of no publication this story should be a legitimate credit -- out he goes? There are many more such cases that any of us could come up with, and justice would be reasonably on the author's side. What all this goes to show is that productivity and sales are not necessarily a mark of professionalism or quality -- they might be, but need not be. A writer, to paraphrase a remark of Blish's, should not write if he has nothing to say; he will anyway if he has to make a living at writing, which makes him a tradesman just like a bricklayer. I don't think the SFWA would want to restrict itself to only that kind of membership. Now I'm not knocking a writer who wishes to do such a thing; he too will have to achieve a kind of competence. What I'm saying is that many of us would like to aspire to more. Okay, now what should be done? Remain reasonably flexible. Say three stories a year, regardless of wordage; add to this a number -- to be put on the declared credential slip -- of how many stories were completed, and how many are still going the rounds. Past triumphs should not be ignored either. What it comes down to is yes we should have a minimum requirement, but it should be enforced in moderation, perceptiveness in regard to an individual case and with some set of qualifications which link the rules to practical reality. James Blish's rules would be rigid, literal minded -- having only the beauty of logical discipline. Just think: if a man sells three stories

a year out of six which he writes, then he will have to write 1000 word fillers if he falls around 14,000 words with the stories. The credential requirement would thus be dictating the length of what he writes. Furthermore, even the 3 stories per year idea has difficulties -- what if a man writes 2 stories totaling 15,000 words -- out would he go? Well maybe a combination of two rules might work, --- three stories or 15,000 words.

Actually there is one perfectly adequate rule which seems to be foolproof; one story per annum. This raises the present requirement by 3! Either you publish or you don't. There's no question about it. A novel would continue to give 5 years.

Most of the arguments above are pretty conclusive, I think; unless we would all prefer to become medieval scholastics and argue how many stories can be bought in one year by the whole sf market? If there room economically for each SFWA member to sell 15,000 words annually?

Personally I have fulfilled any of the possible rules for sales -- active and proposed. I enjoy competing. But that has nothing to do with it. I'll admit that real go getters among writers will easily make any credential; others need the start in spirit that SFWA has been giving, shelter, a haven for kindred souls; still others don't need SFWA at all. Up to now SFWA has been relatively moderate and humane. True, in certain areas of policy it should be tougher; but we should guard against the zealous among us. Professionalism is a state of mind, a faith in your work -- which makes it not entirely an economic matter.

One more predicament: a man sells 2 stories -- 12,000 words -- and five minutes after midnite or New Year's eve at a party with his publisher he receives a check for third story totaling 3,000 words. Now he cannot join SFWA for the previous year, obviously; and makes only 14,000 words the next year. He might go on like this forever, being fairly productive, winning Nebula and Hugos, and never have enough stories to join. I think what James Blish has done is to invent a new kind of game, much better than all the scholastics. What is the number of possible predicaments?

Gee, let's make MEMBERS ONLY for the Nebulas. That still leaves the Hugo and possible foreign awards. I give up.

8\*\*\*8\*\*8\*\*\*8\*\*\*8\*\*\*8\*\*\*8\*\*\*8\*\*\*8\*\*\*8\*\*\*8\*\*\*8\*\*\*8\*\*\*8\*\*\*8\*\*\*8\*\*\*  
A VOICE FROM THE PAST UNTANGLES THE ACRONYM FOR THE NEWLYS:

There once was a journal named DLEFCS  
Delightful to all Sci. and Lit. bucks  
For its shrewd analytics  
Of writers and critics  
And chortling explosions of wit (yucks).

--Tont Boucher