

SERENADE

Serenade is published occasionally for the Fantasy Amateur Press Association by Richard Bergeron at 333 East 69th Street, New York City 21, New York. This issue, number 5, is intended for distribution with the 110th FAPA mailing and a few copies are available for comment. All letters received will be considered for publication unless otherwise specified. February, 1965. Terry for Taff

The need to dash off to Jamaica to help film a television commercial during the end of January pretty much crippled plans for including the February Wrhn in this mailing. If you think that the next Wrhn will be posted separately before the next mailing, or included in the next mailing, or not published at all, you are right. The temperature of my fanac is such that in any given week these three alternatives have probably been seriously considered. This is an unhealthy attitude not conducive to worthwhile fanpublishing, but there it is. The next Wrhn (out soon) will contain an important article by Walter Breen and a piece on love by Lowndes that should turn Wrhn's usual aloof blue into an embarrassed red. Watch for it. In the meantime, lest I be found speechless this quarter, let's have mailing comments on Fapa's 109th: Wrhn: Even second drafting doesn't catch them all: I wrote "fairly unique". Let's see if Speer caught it -- the &##%!"@!! But enough about me. A FANZINE FOR ATOM/ROTSLER: Fabulous. WHERE I STOOD: Political spoof, from either the right or left, usually leaves me totally cold. This did. GANG BANG: I'll be pleased to accept that festive welcome into Fapa, Mr Rotsler, Sir, if you'll finally relent and comment on that article I wrote on Picasso in a long ago Wrhn. Odd how the people whose reactions you most want to have will like as not ignore an article completely -- you on the Picasso piece, Boggs on "The Loves of Yesteryear", Nixon on "The Great Debate". Bums. Many more GANG BANGS, please. DIFFERENT - Moskowitz: Curious. ANKUS - Pelz: I can name more than two items in the last two mailings (let alone the "past two years") that really entertained me "enough to be worth the trouble of membership." Elinor's SALUD, Grennell's "Hup No Mo, Hupmobile", Willis' "The Perforated Finger", from just the last mailing, and the KTEICs in mlg 108, but I assure you I wouldn't inflict membership on myself if there weren't a great many other items I also found highly enjoyable. I suppose your reason for being in Fapa "as a collector and self-appointed historian, Jr. Grade" makes your membership valuable to yourself even though you can't recall even "a couple highly entertaining items" during the past two years. But could you explain why you bother with being Fapa OE if you are only interested in the organization for the reasons you give? If Fapa didn't entertain me, I certainly wouldn't be a member -- much less saddle myself with the job of assembling large quarterly mailings for 65 people. INCLUDED IN - Lyons: What "borderline writers" would you have been "actively bringing" in by opposing the blackball? :: The mention that you have some old fanzines for sale acquired from Laney and Hart revives the old collecting instinct but I just as quickly suppress it: I don't have room to house the present mass of fanzines and I'd only regret having them after I bought them because I know I'd never read them. THE PHINEAS PINKHAM PALLOGRAPH - Hevelin: Enjoyed. VANDY - Coulsons: Juanita: Recently I bought a very large stained glass window in an antique show. It's 45" wide and in three sections that total about 7 feet high. It has a trellis design surrounded by foliage and red morning glory shapes -- very art nouveau. A branch extends from one side of the frame into the trellis and several apples in deep ruby glass are on the branch. Some of the apples are built up in sections -- stained glass on stained glass. Now I'm looking for an apartment with a southern exposure and a large window. The dealer who sold it to me said it was from an old mansion and had been at the top of a double staircase where the sun came through it like a shower of jeweled light. I can believe it for the colors are very rich and the workmanship very intricate. It must contain about a thousand separate pieces of glass. :: Buck: I never said that "'fannish honor'

overrides legal obligations" because I don't feel there is such a thing. MASQUE: The answer to your question "Who'll hang with me?" is "Fact Magazine". Have you seen their latest cover? Their quoted denunciations of the national anthem are even stronger than yours -- about the most vehement coming from Joan Biaz. :: I too had a dream of a situation which occurred many years later. But I told the people about it when it happened. Didn't Don Faubin write an article for Rododigest about his dreams that foretold future events? :: When we arrived at the Playboy Club in Jamaica this fantastic negro bunny came up to the model I was with and told her that she recognized her from Glamour Magazine. I was almost as croggled by the notion of Suzy (for this was indeed the name of the girl I was with) being recognized in the far reaches of Ocho Rios as I was by the sight of this girl so tightly bound into her costume that she was almost falling out of it. I later learned that she was from Flushing and had been a model herself -- Playboy type, I imagine. Four days at the Playboy Club were plenty for me; it's as obnoxious as any other luxury hotel except that it also had loud Jamaican music blaring all the time and surely the loudest air-conditioning extant. But we were there to work so we had to put up with that sort of thing. The bunnies were a redeeming feature, however. Most of them, imported from the US, made no secret of the three month time they were "serving" and how they couldn't wait to get back to the States where money was freer. The Playboy bunny seems to have been accepted as sort of an American myth -- there were many family groups staying at the Club and no overtones of permissive sex. The sort of thing that would be right at home in Disneyland. SALUD - EBusby: Some of this is the best of its type since "Fapa Forever": what else can compare with lines like "I can't have instant empathy with pitiful little shrinking violets who are also exhibitionists" or "There is something very sincerely naked about sagging breasts." Lovely.

SYNAPSE - Speer: In the comments on RPM I note no surprise at Metcalf's machinations. Are you getting blasé? :: What does "Like hell" mean in your comments to Marion Bradley? A beatnik term? :: Re Wrhn: But one of the parents has expressed his realization of social responsibility from which there can be "no equivocating". You overlook this in paragraph one. Paragraph two: No, I don't think a parent is morally bound to wait for any evidence before forbidding association. As I said to Alva last issue: "If keeping a person from one's home requires any justification at all suspicion is certainly adequate but it is not adequate justification for smearing his name from one end of fandom to the other". What gave you the idea I thought "apparently something more than what Boondoggle published" was "necessary"? :: You're correct in saying that I do not "by enjoying something written by Chessman, impliedly invite him into /my/ home or encourage /my/ friends to associate with him". So? Neither by enjoying something written by you (or anyone else in Fapa, for that matter) do I impliedly invite you into my home or encourage anyone else to have anything to do with you. Do you really think that when Benford (at long last) becomes a member that this will constitute an implied invitation on my part for him to visit you? The fandom in which that might have been true went out when FTLaney came in. :: Yes, perhaps "seeming denials are not really that", but don't you think, as you said to Rich Brown re his reference to the alleged slander of Marion (though not to Buz re his citing of unknown written materials), that we should be allowed to judge for ourselves? :: "commonplace to the distractible" was quoted correctly from Jim's mss. :: But are we supposed to suppose, as you do, about what the committee was referring to that constituted a crime in Calif? Are we supposed to take their word for it or, shouldn't we be allowed to judge for ourselves? :: Ellington's evaluation was quoted because I have no information on the act to quote -- that would seem to be a prerequisite to judging the act but I wasn't there so I can't tell you anything more about it. The people who were making the charges have that burden. They're the one's who were beating around the bush, not me. I suggested that the father involved might be just as sensitive to these things as Bill Donaho. And do you know "what opportunity /Donaho/ had to observe, or his reliability in testifying"? But enough.

SELF-PRESERVATION - Hoffman: I also have a trunk of old fanzines moldering away on the homestead. I imagine there must be many such deposits elsewhere in the country. :: Well, I'd like to see all 15 chapters of "The Iron Claw" myself. :: Your description of James Bond is great but it doesn't fit the JB of his latest movie. The "automatic transmission, power steering, power brakes, electric windows and self-emptying ashtrays" all give out just when he needs them most and he spends most of the movie as a captive watching the villain villinate. And Pussy Galore left much to be desired. :: I'm a Harlan Ellison fan, too. He's unbelievable.

THE RAMBLING FAP 34 - Calkins: But, but, but, Gregg, Marion was spoofing the Speer poll ("East Greenbush Institute of Public Opinion", indeed!). You guys were supposed to have had the sense of humor! "We know who you are." Hah! Of course, no one knows (with the exception of the VP). But if you want to take it seriously, I agree that everyone should be considered innocent of casting a blackball until proven otherwise or until they admit it. And don't you agree that anyone should be considered innocent of having been blackballed until proven otherwise? :: The statement that "the granting of fapa membership to an individual also carries with it acknowledgement and approval of his actions insofar as they are concerned with fantasy amateur publishing" is quite beside the point. The acknowledgement and approval of actions which is officially extended is approval of credentials and the further implied possibility that a person would have been blackballed if his actions "insofar as they are concerned with fantasy amateur publishing" had had nothing to do with fantasy amateur publishing; i.e., if he had specialized in publishing pornography or football tickets, say. So, yes, membership implies in some small degree acceptance of actions insofar as they are concerned with fantasy amateur publishing, but what of it? The alleged actions which were dragged before us had nothing whatsoever to do with fantasy amateur publishing. I certainly don't agree that membership carries with it "a certain amount of support and prestige" and I wonder if you could find more than 14 Fapans who think so? If you robbed a bank tomorrow practically any fapan would call the police but it is by no means certain that your membership would be terminated. Would that mean that fapa supported your action? :: Your comment that it's "damned refreshing to learn there is another person in the world still willing to listen and learn; someone who hasn't been convinced of the right or the wrong of the matter since the year one" was based on a quote from someone who had already cast a blackball. The time to think about hanging a person is before you put the noose around his neck and release the trap, it would seem. :: Did you vote to blackball Breen? You can answer "Yes" or "No" to that question but if you refuse to answer you are open to the entire line of reasoning that was directed against Breen. Not very fair, is it? :: I think your questions to Marion were less loaded than her's were in her poll because her's were designed to show just what she thought of Speer's poll -- which, as you apparently agreed with Deckinger, was pretty loaded. But your questions aren't loaded, they're just personal prying of an unexpectly low order. Are questions 2 and 5 the sort of privileges that Fapa membership subjects one to or is some small shred of privacy allowed? Really, this sort of thing isn't worthy of you, Gregg. :: I didn't say that the president of Fapa was prohibited from using sarcasm so I feel no need to document such a statement even though I am "so fond of documentation". I like to document statments I do make. If you thought sarcasm was needed in your conduct of the office, so be it.

THE RAMBLING FAP 35: How can you part with these treasures? I hope that isn't your only set of OOPSLA! Is it? And FANHISTORY! And THE TATTOOED DRAGONS! And SKYHOOK and DISCORD. My god. After seeing these titles falling under the axe, I'm flattered out of my mind that Wrhn isn't listed here. Or did you throw them all away? And QUANDRY? F/R 155.109 - Eney: Scithers' dedication of this to the proposition "You can't be chased if you won't run" is fine by me, because I think he might make a valuable member, but I thought he was running. In a letter to Serenade commenting on the last issue he expresses an opinion about a member and says "I'll be damned if I care

to associate with" him "in any context -- and I don't really think his 'value' as a fanzine contributor outweighs that. I have therefore resigned from the FAPA wait list." THE FANTASY AMATEUR: Wrhm was not 18pgs as listed. It was 20pgs. When Busby said "no rule was perfect" I assumed he was referring to a rule in the constitution re anonymity in blackball voting. I'm aware that previous vice-presidents have set the precedence for anonymity. :: After this proposed amendment, I'll believe anything. I think it's now time to find out if Redd was right; that it "should be possible to find 10 signatures in support of a proposal to turn the treasury over to the John Birch Society." DESCANT - Clarkes: Loved this, but no particular comment.

SERCON'S BANE - FMBusby: Fascinating con report. The tension came right off the paper. :: I don't know what you are talking about. You cast a jaundiced eye at my offer to publish your reply because "RB's generous offer of page space in his zines (for rebuttal) reads better than it works out in practice. I received a very nice apology from him in April '61 for cutting the guts out of one letter; he even offered to print the deleted parts next mailing but I declined the offer since the excerpts hardly hung together coherently without the supporting text." The April '61 Wrhm contains the complete text of a letter you wrote commenting on Willis' first Wrhm Harp. Your next letter appeared in #15. I've just checked the folder for that issue and see that I quoted your letter complete. The next letter you asked me to publish was in #16. I didn't cut anything out of that. If you recall, I offered to publish sections of comment that SAPS members asked me to print and warned that members who sent letters and did not specifically ask for publication would be edited like any other letter writer. In all your letters, except the one for #18, you asked that certain publishable sections or the entire letter be included. You didn't in your letter in #18, so I assumed you wanted it treated like an ordinary letter of comment so I merely published "the first few complimentary-introductory lines" which praised Breen's con-report and neatly undercut a letter of Moskowitz' which immediately followed it (a ploy which Walter was quick to note). A check through my carbons reveals no apology to you for cutting one of your letters. When I find you so unconvincing in areas where I can check on you, don't you find it understandable that I'm ultra cautious about believing you in areas where I have no way of checking on you -- like Walter Breen letters, for instance? :: I don't think "needlework" means that my arguments are not presented in good faith. I don't see why you would devote this much space to them if you really thought they weren't intended in good faith. And it has its uses because after months of effort, I've found out that you didn't mean the "Willis...anti-Birch" line at all! After persistent needling the lock has suddenly sprung and what do I find behind it? Nothing! All a great goof on your part, you say. Where does this leave your statement that my JBS slant on the Gibson article was strictly in my eye? You began by saying we had exchanged much correspondence on the subject when I said you hadn't documented your statement, but you seem to have dropped that now that I've pointed out that it wasn't documentation at all. Now you're conceding that Walt didn't make any anti-Birch remarks. In fact, they were anti-Gibson, weren't they? And, in fact, they were the same comments I had been making, weren't they? And in fact, then, the "JBS slant" was not strictly in my eye, was it? Am I getting through to you? :: I didn't say that Breen had not been blackballed; don't be so touchy. I meant that the only people who knew whether or not he had were the vice-president. They are the only people who can testify that they know whether or not he was; is that not so? :: The reason why I quoted what I needed from your letter and not the whole paragraph was because it seemed to me that everyone should still be familiar with it since I had quoted the entire thing exactly as you repeat it a little over two months earlier in the postmailed Serenade. I certainly didn't think it was necessary to copy down your entire paragraph everytime I referred to it. At any rate, the entire quote serves to make the same point: how do we know what missing parts your mind is filling in if we can't, as Speer says, judge for ourselves? Perhaps you are not filling in any missing parts in this case but on the other hand you saw

anti-JBS remarks that weren't, a gutted letter that I can't find, documentation that wasn't. I'm not saying you're a liar, Buz. I'm sure your convictions are honestly arrived at as you see them. I trust you, but I don't trust your judgment... As, for instance, where you paraphrase me: Where did I say "it's all a Pack of Lies"? I believe I only asked for proof. :: I said "it's not impossible that his correspondence with Busby was deliberately calculated to stand square hair on end", I didn't say that that was the case or base any of my positions on that speculation. So how can you cite it as an example of "contorted and irrational reasoning required to maintain my positions"? Filling in the holes, again?

BOBOLINGS - Pavlat: The certified mail delivery, return receipt requested, for Fapa dues is indicative of the climate of distrust left in fandom by the wake of the Donaho mess. When even so irreproachable a fan as Pavlat is distrusted then things are really out of control. Fapa has never needed a capricious management on the part of its officialdom less than at this time in its history. It will be interesting to read what those who claimed that fapa's officialdom couldn't act on Martin because certain constitutional forms of complaint were not heard will have to say (or do) about the blackball of the entire waiting list.

DAMBALLA - Hansen: It has been my experience that the fannish tradition of requesting permission before reprinting an item applies to publishing a complete or nearly complete piece and not to quotes taken to indicate the substance of something. I obtained permission to publish Choate and Blackbeard but quotes that indicate the reaction to an event are a part of history and reporting such a context can only be done with quotes or paraphrase. Since it is my feeling that fans prefer to be quoted to being paraphrased, I quoted. I certainly would have saved you the embarrassment of being quoted and myself the embarrassment of being reproached for it if I had known that you regretted either the tone or substance of your remarks. But regretting them doesn't change one bit the climate of outrage that greeted Donaho's actions and any future survey of the reaction would be overlooking a true barometer if your comments were ignored. :: Since I quoted the final three paragraphs of your comments intact, I fail to see how I turned them into a "slanted and unfair representation" by not publishing them "in context with the modifying statements". The preceding 7 paragraphs do not modify in any way these final paragraphs and, if anything, the parts I quoted are even stronger in context: a context which I shall spare you the embarrassment of paraphrasing here, but note well your 4th paragraph and the first sentence of the 6th. :: I don't know what kind of gossip you have been listening too, but it must have been potent stuff if you can change from a person who thinks someone is innocent until proven otherwise to a person who joins in condemnation without justifying your condemnation. :: I've just reread the remarks of yours I used in Wrhn and some of them sound so sane that I don't understand how you can write that you "no longer feel that way in any case". You no longer think that if the charges "are true it is sad, but it means he is sick and deserves our pity, sympathy and help, not condemnation"? And you don't mind that Donaho "would protect (?) us by driving from our microcosm a man of whom he disapproves, whether we like it or not"? And you no longer think applicable the injunction "let him among you who is without sin cast the first stone"? :: A check of the constitution (Sec 3.1, sentence 7) reveals that you're correct; we are arguing for the same point. Sorry.

CADENZA - Wells: "Friendship is a mutual spiritual kinship" is a thought that runs through my mind after reading Harrell's page. We don't choose it -- it just happens. When he asks "Is our collective friendship so shallow and callous that an argument over someone you hardly know and could care less about is enough to break up friendships of long years standing?" he sounds as if people could choose their reactions to significant events -- only by changing the principles from which these reactions spring can we change the reactions and then we'd be dealing with weather vanes if we expected our friends' opinions to conform to our concept of them. The more we know

55

I

a.

W

3

.....