



Welcome to *Union Street* (issue #28 and *Obsessive Press* #127), the zine with the transmogrifying masthead (this month reminding Pat Hario to give peace a chance). It is published by Jeanne Gomoll and Scott Custis, who reside in their home at 2825 Union Street, Madison, WI 53704-5136. Phone 608-246-8857. *Union Street* was created on a Macintosh computer—a IIx or an SE at various points in its lifetime—and hardcopy was printed on a Laserwriter IINTX printer. Text was created with Microsoft Word 4.0 and laid out with Aldus Pagemaker 4.0. The *Union Street* Logo was designed with Aldobe Illustrator 3.0 and Adobe Photoshop 2.0. All contents are copyrighted © by Scott Custis and Jeanne Gomoll, 1992. February 1992 for Turbo-Charged Party Animal APA #68. Members FWA.

## OFFICIAL BUSINESS

(JG) Tracy, I appreciate that you spelled out your philosophy of OEsip. Everything you wrote sounds pretty sane and reasonable to me. Also, I very much like your interpretation of rule 9, especially with respect to the use of the verb, “set.” I think it’s a very good idea to allow enough time for foreign members to join in on rule change discussions, as well as to allow flexibility for amendments and hotly debated discussions.

I’m very interested that the process for signing up new apa members be changed, but at this point, I think I’ll wait until after the WisCon discussion to express an opinion.

(SC) I agree with Jeanne that Tracy’s “Notes from the Dictator...” section was a welcome statement of policy. Thanks should also go to Tracy for finally changing rule 9.

The Turbo discussion planned for WisCon promises to be lively judging by comments expressed last month. I am specifically referring to negative responses to Bill Bodden’s illegal proposals from Karen Babich, Lynn Morse and Kathryn Beth Willig. They all raised thoughtful points. I voted against Bill’s method of regulating membership because I felt it was too complicated. I voted for his proposal on joint memberships. With the addition of Kim and Kathy to the list of joint accounts, we have already almost reached Bill’s proposed limit of one third of the membership devoted to joint contributors. I feel we could reach the 50% mark in the near future.

I have traditionally taken the view that the fewer rules, the better. The apa has existed for over 5 years with very few changes, why fix something that works? Still, I think these issues deserve at least to be discussed. Joint memberships have grown significantly recently and that is a troubling trend because joint accounts often work against the purpose of the minac requirement. They also swell the size of the apa beyond its original limit putting a strain on collating and handling and the cost of mailing. We also have no control over membership. Members can’t be ousted (which is a good thing) but there is no way to stop someone from being placed on spec, even if they have a track record of causing problems. Once on spec, there is no way to stop them from eventually becoming a full member. Past OE’s have assumed they could reject a candidate from the spec list, but that power is not clearly expressed in the rules.

I am not going to respond specifically to Karen, Lynn and Kathryn’s comments now. My mind is far from made up and the WisCon meeting will be a good starting point for discussion. But I wish to say here that these are legitimate issues and new proposals may appear for wider discussion next month.

## JULIE SHIVERS

(JG) When I got my tubal ligation (at age 29), Planned Parenthood provided me with an invaluable xeroxed list of doctors in Dane County who perform the operation. Each physician’s name was accompanied by address, phone number and a note about the doctor’s “requirements,” if any. I was very grateful to be able to avoid discussions with doctors who require that their patients be married women over 35 years of age who bring along a signed permission slip from their husbands. That experience, plus the fact that Planned Parenthood provided me with practically free birth control pills during my destitute years, has kept their name on my annual charitable donation list ever since. They may still offer the list. You might want to call them and ask about it.

You can continue to be honest with me in your zines, Julie, as long as you accept the fact that I’m likely to be equally honest and blunt in response to you.

## JAMES BRON/ALISON DAWSON

(SC) Aren’t you two supposed to be doing a joint membership? If not, maybe you should consider doing that soon. In terms of saving you money and trouble it would make a lot of sense in your case. Looking forward to seeing some stuff from you soon. Where have you been?

## JAE LESLIE ADAMS

(JG) If I suddenly found myself without a full time job (and without the financial need for one), I’d probably attempt to find a way to keep doing art on a computer, whether for money or not (and if not, then without bureaucracy). Some of the ideas on your list vaguely tempt, but then they are on your list, not mine. I haven’t read the book, but I love the title which goes something like, *Do What You Love; The Money Will Follow*.



Some stupid things have happened recently at work, mostly the result of Blind Bumbling Bureaucracy in Action, but out of it all, I've emerged with a surprising insight into myself, and about what I need to get out of a career—or maybe out of life. Through a shortage of computers for the artists, I temporarily lost my usual 'round-the-clock access to a Macintosh. A new computer actually arrived just a couple days ago, and things will return to normal in a couple more; but for a month, I was really only working for four hours a day. The other four hours I spent reading computer magazines and manuals, planning work, sometimes slipping in some personal projects (but not many of those, because most of those nowadays require a computer, too). I went crazy. It was much much worse than the time last year that my raise turned out to be far more piddling than my boss had lead me to expect. The thing I discovered during the past couple of weeks of hell is that the most valuable thing I get out of work is not recognition or money, but simply the things I make. Only when I have very tangible, physical thing in my hand, and can point to it and say, "I made this," do I feel good about myself. More money would be a nice thing, but is a more peripheral issue for me. Being told to sit quietly and not work illuminates the heart of things. The frustration I felt certainly has been making me think a little harder about the job offer that my sister Julie keeps dangling in front of me.

### DIANE MARTIN

(JG) With a story like that, you can be sure that I'm not going to be able to resist making that cookie! Have you made it yet? I'll let you know what I think.

We're looking forward to those 20 pages from you and Laura...

### BILL HOFFMAN

(JG) Received drugs. Thanks. Major side effect was that both members of the dyad (plus a third individual accidentally included in the the test) displayed the weird side behavior of compulsive cleaning and dish-washing. Effects wore off in 2h. All parties slept for 10 hours afterward. Maybe we should have risked a higher dosage.

(SC) It's always interesting to me the personal information people reveal about themselves in the pages of the apa. Your apparent irrational hostility to boring midwestern states with short names flanked by vowels probably is a manifestation of the trauma suffered as a child having first glimpsed the world in Columbus, OH. I prescribe a short daily meditation session alternating IOWA and OHIO as a mantra. Or just take more drugs.

### MIKE DUCHARMÉ

(SC) I have been noticing a lot of new uses for power drills lately. You say they use them in the hospital to remove pins from peoples' arms. Jeffrey Dahmer was apparently using one on his victims in an attempt to turn them into zombies. Black and Decker just might come out with a new slogan; "Power drills, not just for woodworking anymore!"

### BILL DYER

(JG) Good comments to **Jae** on Mistress N's piece. So, have you been successful at all in efforts to find

employment in Madison? Is there any information that Scott and I (as state employees) could send you?

(SC) Thank you for the compliment on our beer. It was nice to see you again. We're looking forward to seeing you around more often.

### MICHAEL SHANNON

(JG) Interesting speculation about the possibility that stories about "little people" represent memories of Neanderthals. I like that.

### KAREN BABICH

(JG) You (and **Lynne Ann, Kathryn Beth** and **Vijay**) have a good point that Madison members of the apa should not use the fact that we constitute a quorum of the apa to propose and vote on changes outside the apa. Everyone should have the opportunity to voice an opinion and join in discussions that affect all of us.

However, I think you're just going to have to accept the fact that Madison members frequently discuss the apa among themselves here. Jim Nichols (a Madison SF Group member) last week bemoaned the fact that it would take several years to get into the apa (so he hasn't even bothered asking to be put on spec) and—with a little bit of anger in his voice—complained about the fact that so many of the fans who attend the regular Wednesday night meeting are Turboapans and end up spending a significant proportion of the evening discussing the apa. He feels excluded from something that is obviously very important to most of the people in the group, and I sympathize with him, but don't think it's possible (or desirable) to try to enforce a rule which would restrict apa discussions entirely to apazines. One of the reasons I joined the apa and why I continue to enjoy my participation in the apa is that it has given me the opportunity to get to know local members and ex-patriot Madisonians in a way and to a depth that often isn't possible on a purely verbal level. The experience has been tremendously rewarding to me, giving my interactions with local people a wonderful richness and interwoven texture. Of course the apa has also been a wonderful thing in that I've gained friendships with people I may otherwise have never met, like **Steve Swartz**. I think all of us here in Madison have enjoyed getting to meet so many interesting new friends, and I don't think anyone here is interested in exiling out-of-towners (which is what I hear some of you worrying about). The thing I'm trying to explain in a sort of fumbling way is that the apa has become extremely important in the day-to-day social network of Madison fandom, and in fact the Madison component is probably the thing that makes Turboapa different from other apas. It's a component that I want to keep.

### TRACY SHANNON

(JG) Gosh, I'm sorry to hear that there won't be any awards for "Best Worried Look." I'm sure I would have been in the running. You really scared me, Tracy! And I'm incredibly relieved that you are experiencing no side-effects or flashbacks to your fall. Scott and I are thinking about putting up a (rubber) plaque on the wall marking the spot of the impact. We may also require all high heel shoes to be surrendered at the door at next year's New Year's Eve

party. (Yes, we're doing it again. Mark your calendars today!)

I wonder if **Steve Swartz** will feel complimented at all the poems being written about him in this issue?

At first glance, I liked your idea about using the number of votes received to determine how many votes constitute a majority. In theory it seems like a very fair way to go. Though possibly, that method should be used only when a rule change does not necessarily affect all members in a big way. On the other hand, by requiring that all rule changes attract a majority of *all* members, we do avoid the specter of rule changes for the sake of rule changes a la Richard Russell. (Remember?) I'd hate to see rule changes being proposed and a few bureaucracy-lover types voting, and you saddled with more and more regulations just because most people in the apa don't care enough to vote.

(SC) I agree with Jeanne that there is a real danger in making it too easy to change the rules. But rule changes should at least be possible. A clearly stated voting procedure coupled with voting via postcard (that worked well the one time we tried it) should be tried before we go to a majority-of-votes-received system. Maybe part of the problem in the past was simply too many members who didn't care. Perhaps just having new and more responsible members will help.

Michael in a tux and you in Victoria's Secret pajamas? What a romantic scene that conjures up (does that include champagne, pillows, candlelight and PUNS?)

### KATHRYN BETH WILLIG

(JG) No, I don't feel compelled to finish a series if I begin one and don't like it. But a single book usually has to be pretty bad for me to fail to finish it once I've begun. When I dislike a book, like I did Sherri Tepper's recent *Beauty*, I just start skimming, reading very quickly, even skipping chunks, checking to see every once in a while if I was mistaken about my assessment.

"Practice Random Kindness and Senseless Acts of Beauty," could easily be the title of the film *Grand Canyon*. I liked this movie a lot.

(SC) Your point on contraception is well taken. The woman does indeed have the most to lose and therefore has a greater motivation for making sure risk is eliminated. Of course it should also be made clear that all men don't fail to take responsibility. Many of us would not consider it an option to abandon a pregnant partner. That should, of course, be the universal male attitude.

It looks like Magic Johnson is encountering advertiser cowardice as you predicted. I have seen other stories similar to the one you included last month. Magic is hardly letting this slow him down. He has had a highly publicized meeting with the President and he will be playing in the All Star game and the summer Olympics. It may only be a temporary lull in advertiser support if he keeps his name in the news. Or maybe he won't need them.

My objections to S&M are personal. I think mixing pain and pleasure in this way is a volatile combination and has sinister implications. I am also disturbed by the dominant/submissive role playing. Especially with the male as the dominant partner because the scene too closely resembles rape and abuse to me, which is a turn off. These are personal perceptions. I can't pass judgement on other consenting adults engaging in this game.

### BILL BODDEN

(JG) Cynthia Heimel, the author of the article, "Women," that you franked through the apa, recommends that we convert the word "guys" into a genderless term. And I guess that's OK. But I generally prefer to use the word "folks" or "people" in slightly more formal situations. (More formal, I mean, than the times I say, "Hey, you guys...")

### KIM WINZ

(JG) You asked whether I was "condemning all women who change their names when they marry," by my statement that "we make definite statements about what we think of ourselves," by adopting a husband's name at marriage...

It worries me a bit that my writing may be so unclear that you interpret my writing as a condemnation of you. I checked the issue in which I said that, and no, there wasn't any more to what I said than the quotation you excerpted. Perhaps you were basing your interpretation on **Julle Shivers'** reaction to my statement. As I told her, whatever disappointment she read in my facial expression when she talked about changing her name had more to do with the self-dislike she was expressing, than with her decision to change her name.

I meant what I said: by our decisions to keep or to change our names (whether in marriage, or for other personal reasons), we make definite statements about ourselves. We make a statement to the world about who we are and we make statements that are interpreted by society in ways we are usually powerless to guide.

In our society, it is almost always the woman who chooses either to change or not to change her name at marriage, which—as some people point out—is a rite of passage, significant enough to be marked by the adoption of a new name. The significant point, however, is that it seems to be mainly the *woman's* rite of passage, for she is the one who traditionally changes her name, not the man. This custom suggests that marriage is not a significant rite of passage for a man: he stays the same; he simply acquires a wife. The woman *changes into his spouse*. In our culture, today, a woman who chooses not to adopt her husband's name, may feel that she is thereby saying that she remains herself; that she does not view marriage as a significant change of identity for herself. Couples who choose to change both their names are perhaps trying to say that they both view their marriage as a rite of passage involving a change of identity for both of them.

As both you and **Julle** point out, there may be other, personal reasons for choosing to adopt your husband's family name. Not liking your birth name, liking his name, reinforcing the sense of a family unit. There are lots of possible reasons. But it seems reasonable to assume that just as many men dislike their birth names, and just as many men—if given an objective choice—would prefer their wife's birth name to their own. I think—again, in our society, today—the reasons women cite for changing their names are not considered relevant criteria for most men. Likes and dislikes are not even considered by most men: their identity is bound up with their last names, whether they like them or not. And it seems equally probable that most men consider the identities of everyone around them—



men and women alike—to be bound up with their last names.

Which gets me back to the statements we make which are interpreted by those around us. This is the part of the communication process that we have very little power to influence. We may feel we're making a loving statement, but most members of our culture interpret that action using their own terms and assumptions.

In our culture, dominated by men whose personal identities are bound up with their last names, the tradition of women giving up their last names makes a significant statement about power and whose personal identity is the most important. In our culture, the mere rejection of that tradition, symbolically communicates a woman's attitude about herself and power.

Have you heard what happened to Hillary Rodhan Clinton, presidential candidate Bill Clinton's wife? She's a strong feminist and an extremely successful lawyer. When she married Bill, she moved from Boston (I think) to Arkansas, where her husband had just been elected as the youngest US Governor. The people of Arkansas apparently took extreme offence that their governor had married a feminist. The fact that Hillary chose to keep her own last name actually became the biggest issue of the next election. Clinton lost the election because of his wife's choice. Subsequently, she decided that the people of Arkansas cared more about her last name than she did, and she changed it to Clinton. Her husband won the next election.

I condemn no one for choices they make about their own bodies or their names, Kim. We're all trying to work out our lives as best we can in an institutionally sexist culture. We can't all fight wars on all fronts. We must all chose our own battles. All I'm saying is that it's important to be aware that our choices are interpreted as statements by others, whether those interpretations are accurate or not. (On not such a societal level, it's like choosing to wear jeans to work. Some people will read our casual clothes as an intentional snub or a statement to the effect that we do not consider ourselves professional or do not respect them enough to wear proper business attire. Whether any of those assumptions are justified or not, it's a good idea to be aware of probable reactions when choosing an office wardrobe.)

**LYNNE ANN MORSE**

(JG) I can no longer remember what I was saying about communion hosts. But when I was in grade school I was "allowed" to be a sacristy cleaner (which was the girl equivalent of altar boy, I guess). We were "allowed"/required to dust, vacuum and clean the sacristy during our lunch hour. During my stint, I used to steal unconsecrated hosts from the priest's cabinet, put them in little baggies, and pull them out of my paper bag at lunch time, munch on them, and enjoy the gasps of my schoolmates sitting at my table. Funny, I don't remember being "allowed" to be a sacristy cleaner for very long.

That was an unsettling story about a condom in the purse being considered evidence of soliciting. I guess it goes back to the related idea that teaching kids about contraception actually causes sexual promiscuity. Given the means to escape punishment, people just feel com-

pelled to have sex.

Great condom pages by Roelof. Really fun, and colorful too! But what a horrid idea, musical condoms. Wouldn't they be awfully hard to hear? Well, unless we all start having sex like they do in the porn flicks, where the guy thoughtfully ejaculates outside so we can see—and now, hear—the climax.

(SC) A big "Gosh Wow" is in order for you for your contribution last month. A comment loaded zine, with a delightful article by Roelof, plus a funny postcard and a cool apa cover. Wow.

What the "fan" thing comes down to is self-identification. Even if you have no other fanac than reading SF occasionally and hanging out with the SF group, if you think you are a "fan," then you are one. If you don't think you are, then no one should be able to force that label on you.

The greed factor as it relates to Greyhound concerns its decision to negotiate its latest contract with drivers in bad faith in order to prompt a strike. Once the strike was called, management carried on operations by hiring scab replacement drivers that could legally become permanent replacements for the striking drivers. This is an increasingly common union busting tactic these days and efforts by Congress to reduce or outlaw the practice have been consistently defeated by the Bush Administration. Of course the strike has also provided Greyhound with an excuse to cut back service in rural areas in order to concentrate the staff that remains in more profitable urban routes. Once the strike has been resolved, service will likely not return or only partially return to those rural areas that don't generate big profits, but desperately need a low cost transportation option.

**RICHARD RUSSELL**

(JG) Dick, if you want to know what I think of the Rule of 100, you're going to have to ask me in person. I don't believe you're reading this anyway. Prove me wrong.

