

warhoon

Warhoon is edited and published quarterly for the Fantasy Amateur Press Association by Richard Bergeron at 333 East 69th Street, New York City 21, New York. This is issue number 21, dated November 1964. It is available to contributors, writers of letters, in trade for your publication, or for 20¢ per copy or 5 issues for \$1. All material is created by the editor, unless otherwise credited and represent his opinions and viewpoints. Material that is credited expresses the opinions of the contributor. All letters will be considered for publication and may be published unless otherwise specified. Try Terry Carr for TAFF. He's milder. Much milder.

UNHAPPY ANNIVERSARY

(The following was written late November, 1963, and for some reason managed to be crowded out of anything I've published since. As this issue goes to the publisher it will soon be one year since the terrible events last November in Dallas. It seems a good time to present this piece as it was written: first draft and fresh with shock.)

The night before it happened a friend of mine dreamed that President Kennedy had been shot. I've heard that evangelist Billy Graham called the President three times to warn him against making the trip. But portants of doom were to no avail.

The first news about the tragedy flashed through the agency like an electric shock leaving us numbed and staggered. We stood around a radio waiting for the worst. Many stations had not yet exploded with the news and as the dial raced across the wave lengths the radio blarred out rock-and-roll alternating with the ghastly dispatches. I could feel the hair crawling up the back of my neck.

I had to leave the agency to keep a photographic appointment but the last word was that the President was alive, though seriously wounded. As luck would have it the taxi had no radio and when I arrived at the studio the photographer was listening to classical music. As his radio warmed up the sound came in dimly that two priests had just reported having given extreme unction to the dead President. The announcer went on to say that it was not an official report but one of the utmost gravity, but it had not been confirmed. One hoped for hallucinatory seconds that the priests were liars. The next thing we heard was "The President is dead." The photographer, a Frenchman, an altogether reserved and distant individaul, threw his arms around my shoulders and moaned "Your country!, Your country!" I was in no mood to direct a photograph at that point but I gave him the prop (a mouse) and an idea of what was needed and returned to the agency. The place closed down at about 3 o'clock and I went home in a subway car packed with motionless and silent people. This is the first of the silences that I'll always associate with President Kennedy's death. The second ocured on the Monday of his funeral at precisely noon. I was having lunch at the Brasserie, a restaurant in the Seagram building, when an apparently officially suggested five minutes of silence desended upon us. Suddenly I noticed in this crowded restaurant that not a single dish was clattering, not a sound could be heard. Everyone sat motionless locked in their thoughts. I wondered if this was a silence observed around the world. I thought; we'll miss Jack, we'll miss his marvelous enjoyment of his office, his call to aspiration, his vigor, his ability to seize the moments that transform politics into high drama. I thought; it's not the fact of his death that is so saddening, (from all reports sudden and painless) but the untimeliness of it. The cheat of it. The decision of a madman, it apparently served no ideology, apparently totally pointless -- the wind changed directions and he was no longer with us.

Feelings on the death of a President arn't the sort of thing that should be second
(Continued on page 15.)

.....
AUFGEKNÖPFT

by
Robert A. W. Lowndes
.....

The title of this department translates to "unbuttoned", and is a term that Beethoven often used in speaking of some of his compositions. They were long-thought-out and deeply felt, but the form of them was quite informal. ... The quotation that opened and closed the first appearance can be considered a motto for all, but I see no point in repeating it each and every time, like Cato ending each speech with "delenda est Cartago." Any department may be composed of discrete items, although some may be centered on a single theme, like the last one. A paragraph opening in capital letters divides themes.

THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN "LIE" AND "LIAR" which was brought up last time can, I believe, be of value in relationships and, if borne in mind, avoid needless personal ruptures at times. I agree that it has little value in a court of law, which, let us remember, is usually a place where relationships already broken are dealt with as well as the total circumstances allow. Even there, the question of whether deceit was intended can be relevant. Of course, without something like a form of telepathy allowing for full disclosure, intent is more often than not hard to prove positively. But I have scant interest in the legalistic view (outside of where it may be necessary personally), and scant interest in the moralistic view of things.

THE BERGERON HAS SEEN TO IT I received copies of various publications dealing with the Walter Breen case, and has asked for my comments. Since he knows that I am managing editor of a magazine dealing with sexology and psychosexual problems, and this case includes such elements, he probably thought that I could say something relevant which persons without such background haven't said.

Let's get to the matter of my competence and qualification to say anything on this subject, first. For the past four years, I've been managing editor of REAL LIFE GUIDE, and have read some millions of words of material by licensed, practicing (or one-time practicing) psychotherapists on psychosexual problems, case histories, etc. The job has also included reading many books (I haven't kept count) by qualified doctors and psychotherapists. I can, therefore, make some sort of report on areas of general agreement among the several schools of psychotherapy.

But the most important thing I have learned is that this reading and study does not make me competent to apply any of them to any specific person. I cannot diagnose Walter Breen, or anyone else. Even if I knew him as well as some (not all) of those who have written about him, I still would not be qualified either to diagnose him.

From what I have seen in print, none of the writers are so qualified, either. The far-from-perfected field of psychosexology is one where a "little knowledge" is not only dangerous; it can be as deadly nitro. There are many books floating around, so that today's bright teen-ager (and adults, too) can use Freudian terms as easily as scat terms -- and apparently many of them do. In fact, almost any person who has read a book or two is likely to jump in with pat labels that no competent and qualified psychotherapist would apply without thorough examination, and very possibly not even then. A large percentage of such talk you hear or read from layman is irresponsible at best.

We live in an atmosphere of fear, guilt, ignorance, and anxiety when it comes

to sexual matters and a large amount of psychosexual problems, if not traceable to these things, are certainly aggravated by them. As Mark Twain is supposed to have said, the trouble with most people isn't their ignorance -- it's the things they know that ain't so. A current paperback by a competent doctor is titled "Ninety Percent Of What You Know About Sex is Wrong." This might be an exaggeration when applied to you, dear reader; but it is not an exaggeration when applied to the general populace.

But when ignorance is coupled with fear and guilt and anxiety (as it is in regard to sex and sexual problems) then many otherwise sensible people lose their good sense and react emotionally and thoughtlessly in the area where fear, guilt, and anxiety prevail. And to a very large degree, with most of us, the fear, guilt and anxiety is subconscious. That is we do not know, we are not aware, of the real reasons why we behave in the way we do. Our reason is applied to justifying our emotions, rather than to finding out the facts in the case. That is why "sex crimes" arouse far more repulsion and violent cries for vengeance than other types. (And it must be remembered that a great deal of what is labeled "sex crime" may, alas, indeed be behavior for which local laws apply penalties, but is not, by any means "unnatural".) It is not "unnatural" for anyone to be fond of children or to want to behave toward them in an affectionate manner. It is not "unnatural" for a man to show physical signs of affection toward a little boy or girl, even one whom he does not know too well. But such is the atmosphere in which we live, any man who does so may be running into danger; anyone who sees him doing so, or hears about his doing so, may be suffering from the sort of inner fear (or guilt or both) which makes this person panic and cry "child molester!"

It is as "natural" then for one to feel momentary erotic stimulation in respect to a child of either sex, or an adult of the same sex, as it is to feel the urge for urination while crossing a busy street. To take action on any of these urges is illegal. It is not the urges themselves, but the way you re-act to them inwardly, and what you do about them, which can be symptoms of emotional disorder.

Let's take a look at that mythical person, the "normal man". He's mythical because it is very doubtful whether any actual person fits the description perfectly, in each and every respect. However, there is a fairly large area in which we can consider a man "normal", and outside of which we can consider him "abnormal" -- which, again, is not an absolute but a matter of degree. There's a wide spectrum of "deviation" or "abnormality" which ranges from the amusing-but-harmless, annoying-but-harmless up to the intensely dangerous. One result of general public ignorance is the identification of anything outside the range of "normality" (which itself is not understood) with "intensely dangerous."

Our "normal man" has, among other things, the following qualifications: he is reasonably well-informed about the facts, rather than the fictions and folklore, of human sexuality: therefore, he is not loaded with guilt-feelings about his own desires, which are not equated with "sin". He may find this or that child, male or female, or this or that other male sexually stimulating; but because he is not loaded down with fear, guilt, or ignorance, when he feels such erotic arousal, he can do two things easily" he can consider the consequences of acting upon his feelings, and consider whether such action is likely to harm the object of his erotic arousal; he can consider whether the consequences of acting upon his feelings are likely to be more trouble than the momentary satisfaction is worth, and whether (in any case) it is not best to postpone any possible action.

Because he is not loaded with guilt, fear, and ignorance, his methods of sexual relationships will not be physically injurious to any sexual partner, regardless of age or sex. Because he knows the facts of sexuality in our society, he also knows that,

regardless of whether he physically injures this child, or this young man or not, the negative, fearful atmosphere in which such an action takes place is very likely to be injurious. The child may have been taught that such things are wrong and wicked, and will then feel guilty, no matter what. The child's parents, or other contemporaries, are likely to panic if the act is discovered, then or later -- and their reactions will be more damaging to the child than the initial act itself. Knowing these things, our "normal man" will greet the impulse with a smile (inwardly, at least) and say to himself, "Too bad, but I don't have to make love to this child, or this young man. It would be nice if we lived in a society where I could do so without risking wrecking a life and bringing the wrath of society down upon me -- but this is the way things are, and I can take it. Besides, adult sex with a freely-consenting, unmarried woman (or my wife) is more fun anyway."

Still within the range of "normality", all things considered, is the person who may receive similar impulses and reject them saying to himself, "It's wrong, it's illegal, I shouldn't, I won't" -- even if, at times, it becomes a little difficult. He feels a little guilty, perhaps (unconsciously) a little resentful, but his reactions to his feelings and the action he takes in relation to them will not be extreme.

Extremity can run in either of two directions, from the person who feels intensely guilty at the very thought of doing such things -- equating "temptation" with the actual commission of the "sin" -- and must somehow punish himself for having such impulses, which he is sure are "unnatural"; through the person who has these extreme reactions but is not consciously aware of them; to the person who is obsessed with such thoughts and his guilty reaction to them; to the person who is compelled to seek out such impulses in himself and others and try to punish all wicked people who have such "unnatural" impulses. This person is just as much of a "sex criminal", clinically speaking, as the opposite extremist who rapes, tortures, seduces, and assaults children; the important difference in our society is that in most instances, the law is on the side of the negative sex extremist, unless and until he flagrantly violates laws in his pursuit of "righteousness."

In other direction, abnormality runs in a spectrum, too, from the man who is obsessed with sexual impulses toward children and/or persons of his own sex, but does not carry them out, to the man who cannot postpone his desires, to the man whose guilt and drive toward self-punishment (for his "unnatural" desires) is so great that he commits crimes in such a manner that his apprehension is certain. (He may think, consciously, that he is persecuted and all the luck is against him).

In all this I am not considering the more-or-less "normal" person who may turn to children or members of his own sex under conditions of extreme sexual deprivation. These are special cases.

These things are all very real, and very possibly some of the fans who have been disturbed at reports about Walter Breen (contradictory reports, a great deal relying upon hearsay and dubious memory) have thought of them. But the fact remains that no one whose statements I have read has shown himself or herself to be competent to apply them to Walter Breen, or to anyone else, where no competent psycho-diagnosis and/or prognosis has been made available. (I have not seen grounds for considering scientology a valid resource for making such diagnoses or prognoses. That scientology-based treatment may have been of help to some people, I do not doubt; any course of treatment may be of help providing that the patient believes he can be helped by it. Just as no system, however "scientific" sounding, has yet been able to cure all psychic ailments and cases, so no system, however bizarre, has not been a means of cure for some.

To repeat: I have no positive opinion on whether Walter Breen is what he is

of being, and my suspicions (that he is not) are beside the point.

Nor can I pretend to be above feelings in this case, and the side issues relating to it. Whether the charges against Breen are true or not, he is still the victim of public ignorance, fear, guilt, and anxiety -- one among millions to have been convicted without trial in the minds and hearts of his fellow sinners. If HUAC, were concerned with investigating genuine dangers to our country, real Un-American activities, then this sort of thing would be investigated; for whenever any person is convicted without due process of law, and a fair and impartial trial, then America is thereby subverted. Of course, such an investigation would not be for the purpose of tossing anyone in jail or making headlines; it would be for finding out (a) the nature and extent of public ignorance about the meaning and proper use of the civil liberties which any of us may be called upon to defend (b) what can be done to improve the situation. This would not cure irrationality and irrational behavior; education has its limits, at best -- and the best is often none too good.

But as things are, the Convention Committee, and those who were swept along with its panic, are no less victims than Breen. I agree with Al Lewis' comments upon the justifiability and unjustifiability of the several aspects of its behavior. Part of this behavior was rational, part of it irrational.

Rational behavior relates to a goal. The requirements are (a) that the goal itself be possible (b) that the goal be possible under the circumstances (c) that the means adopted be appropriate to realization of the goal.

Let us assume that the first goal of the Committee in this case was the protection of the Convention from what was believed to be a real danger. And I assume that the Committee was empowered to deal with a real danger of this sort. (I am by-passing the question of to what lengths the Committee ought to have gone before deciding whether the danger was real.)

Then: (a) it was possible to avert this danger by seeing to it that Walter Breen did not attend the convention, (b) it was possible to make the decision to bar him, and to inform him that he was being excluded. Right or wrong in their estimates of the situation, the action thus far would be rational.

But then another situation arises. A well-known fan has been excluded. This is going to arouse resentment. This, too, may damage the Convention. The goal is to preserve the Convention from damage, wherever we can.

Now the action becomes irrational, because the means taken to avert widespread reaction were the sort of means which could only result in even greater damage to the Convention. Admitting Breen, as the Committee saw it, was to risk endangering the Convention; the means of promulgating statements which could be libel, in order to gain fandom's assent to the exclusion, and drawing police attention to possible law-breaking at the convention, insured damage. Truth is a defense against libel, providing you can prove it beyond reasonable doubt; however, you must also show that there is no malice involved in stating this truth. Unless the members of the Committee have been libelled by the friends of Walter Breen (unless statements attributed the members of the Committee are the inventions of Breen's supporters), then there was a great deal of malice involved, for not a few such statements are malicious on their face.

We do not have to be competent, practising psychotherapists in order to judge that this sort of behavior is foolish, or to pinpoint the damage that may result from it. We can draw upon an area in which many fans can be competent, and some are:

history. While, as stated above, the sexual and psychosexual atmosphere of our whole society is poisoned by fear, ignorance, guilt, and anxiety, there are other areas where not a few people also react with panic when someone is accused of something. And panic-reactions bring forth counter-reactions from persons who have not been carried away by fear. Panic-reactions lead toward persecution; and persecuting a person is going to make that person a martyr in the eyes of other people. Barring Walter Breen from the Convention (rightly or wrongly) would have brought protest from some; but the manner in which this was followed up, the extreme measures taken to justify the action and to try to gain approval for it, guaranteed the larger counter-reaction that took place. As it stands, Breen has (of this date, August 19, 1964) done no damage to the Convention that I have heard of; but the Convention Committee has done powerful damage.

We cannot help our inner drives when we do not know what they are, or have not received competent psychotherapeutic assistance in overcoming them. Any one of us might be put into a position where suddenly our inner (unconscious) fears are triggered off, so that we behave in just the same way as the Convention Committee did. It could happen to you; it has happened to me. I have used the term "Convention Committee" collectively, yet I wonder if all the members were equally driven. Perhaps some consented out of a different sort of ignorance -- ignorance of the danger of assenting to and collaborating with extremist positions. Ignorance of what constitutes an extremist position. This is something where we can help ourselves; a study of fan history alone could have alerted some Convention Committee members to what was happening and might have enabled them to cut off some of the actions which brought forth such damaging reactions, even if no one of them cared about (or were too upset to consider) the injustice (to put it mildly; the tone of some of the statements attributed to the Committee, and not denied by anyone so far as I know, is definitely sadistic) to a fan whose contributions in Warhoon alone have been valuable. And there is, further, the galloping irrationality of the attempt to blackball Breen in FAPA. (Since I have emotions, too, I'm not going to try to pretend that I have none.)

I do not know Walter Breen, and it is very possible that a brief acquaintance with him might make me decide I didn't want to -- let alone how he might react toward me. I would not care to be a close associate of Oscar Wilde, Richard Wagner, Charles Baudelaire, Giordano Bruno, or Sigmund Freud, etc. etc. etc., if any of them were alive and available to my acquaintance today -- which doesn't in any way interfere with my finding their writings valuable. Even were Breen no less than what is charged, such activities aren't carried out by mail; and I assume that FAPA's constitution provides for the exclusion of material which would bring postal authorities down upon it.

Someone expressed the hope that, as a result of this case, fandom would "grow up". There are at least three requirements: one is for individuals in fandom to acquire the faculty of rational thought; the second is to be freed of unconscious fears, guilts, and anxieties; and the third is to become informed on the facts and meaning -- not the folklore -- of human sexuality and of history. I wouldn't suggest anyone's holding his breath, waiting for this to happen.

Meanwhile, those whose fears drove them to behave monstrously toward Walter Breen are no less victims of this episode than he. -- Robert A. W. Lowndes

.....

UNITED WE FALL
by
John Baxter

I am not now nor have I ever been a member of the NFFF, yet a month ago, much to my surprise, I received a copy of THE NATIONAL FANTASY FAN. Mainly out of curiosity I skimmed through the 'zine, then found myself reading sections of it. My reaction after the last page was sheer astonishment that such a worthless travesty of organisation as the NFFF could be existed as long as it has. Not, I hasten to add, that I mean this criticism to apply to individual members, many of whom see the faults in the group but are more optimistic than myself about the chances of correcting them. But speaking as a disinterested observer it seems to me that the whole structure of the NFFF, its organisation, its aims and its policy are incredibly inept. If this group really does represent fandom as a whole, then God help us.

But of course the NFFF doesn't represent fandom, and never has. Most people view it with polite contempt, amusement or perhaps grudging admiration for its energetic devotion to a large variety of lost causes. Like all quasi-national and international fan organisations it has failed in its objective to unite all fandom and almost everybody realises it was doomed to do so, as was the WSFS, the Futurians, George Willick's Fandom International and others. There has never been a successful attempt to organise fandom on any but the most local level, a fact which gives some interesting indications as to the true nature of fandom and its status as a social unit.

There is a surprising contrast between the efficiency of fan organisation on a regional level and that on a national or international level. In almost every major city in the world where science fiction has caught on there is a club or group which can trace its ancestry back to pre-war days. There may have been a complete turnover of membership, many changes of venue, of aims and of attitude, but the club as a unit has never lost its personality. The LASFS is a prime example of such a club. It has weathered more storms than most other organisations could ever expect to encounter yet it is a unit with purpose and life despite an almost complete lack of formality in its activities and only the minimum of organisation. Why does it succeed while the NFFF fails?

"Lack of formality" ... "minimum of organisation" - these I think are the touchstones. In most fan groups the beginning of tight organisation marks the end of efficiency. Apas are a good example of this rule in action. Apas grew out of the free exchange of fanzines that has always been a feature of pubbing fandom. They were designed to help out hard worked fans, both editors and readers. By joining an apa every fan would, in theory, be supplied with as many fanzines as he would want to read. If he was more interested than most it would at least supply him with a large proportion of those he wanted and leave him time to trade for others that were not included in the apa. For the editor it removed the necessity of paying postage, addressing envelopes, trading and all the other tiresome chores associated with publishing. On this basis apas were probably a good thing, but there were never allowed to continue in such a simple state. The formation of the apa was followed almost immediately by the adoption of a constitution setting up among other things minimum contributions, dues, provision for censorship etc, and this was followed in turn by the formation of a large number of conventions and unwritten rules. Mailing comments for instance became mandatory, and the position has worsened until today they are more important than almost every other type of apazine material. Some 'zines consist of nothing else, an apa that tried to do away with them -- IPSO -- folded quickly, and if your apazine doesn't carry copious and detailed mcs you are unlikely to be a very popular member of the organisation.

Apas tend also to encourage the most vicious sort of feuding. Many of the most unpleasant fan scandals during the last few years have had their genesis in an apa. The White/Moskowitz business and the Ed Martin affair are just outward indications of an inner tension in many apas. The degrees of unpleasantness to which apas are sometimes moved is well illustrated by some remarks made by Ethel Lindsay in the March 1964 OMPA mailing where she blames any faults in the group on its increased non-British membership, and uses this as an excuse to withdraw her customary contribution. I doubt that such a comment would have been made in a genzine where it is necessary to back up one's views in public debate, but the insulated atmosphere of an apa encourages breaches of good taste.

Conventions are another example of a good idea debased by over-organisation. The basis suggestion was simple and worthwhile. To meet friends previously known only through letters, to discuss things, to make plans, to just booze and have a good time-- it sounded like fun, and in the early days it was. Even now it remains fun, though in a more limited way, and the indications are that it will get worse. These days, on top of the basic conviviality, we have all sorts of formal activities -- seminars, meetings, banquets, speeches, polls. As I've never attended a convention I don't know if these things are entertaining or not but the number of conreports which make it plain that very few of the formal events were attended by the reporters indicate that only a small section of the membership is interested. More alarming is the recent trend towards the imposition of rules of morality by the Con Committee and an autocratic attitude towards the membership. If decisions are to be made, surely it is up to the membership to make them and not to a self-elected committee.

There is a pattern to all these failures. Most of the basic ideas are good or they would never have progressed past the discussion stage. In the beginning they work well but as they catch on organisation takes over and before long they have ceased to be fun for everybody but those organising them. This is I think because fandom works best when confined to basic primary or face-to-face groups. This basic unit of two, three, four or five people usually represents the nucleus of every fannish activity. A fanzine starts on perhaps two or three people -- an editor, and a couple of contributors -- and as a rule it stays like that. Unlike other publications a fanzine lives on solicited material gathered personally by the editor or through negotiation with a writer. The continued supply of this material depends on the maintenance of the contact by the editor and the solidity of the basic face-to-face relationship. It is not by accident that fanzine publishing is the most efficient and worthwhile type of fanac. In club activity the same rule holds good. As long as a club is on a face-to-face basis it can manage its affairs efficiently, but expansion, as in the case of the New York movements of the 30s and 40s, is the kiss of death. Conventions likewise, and apas.

I suggest that fandom does not exist as a integrated movement. Rather it is an association of small groups, the basic unit being the primary face-to-face group of two or three people. A group has been defined as "a plurality of persons who interact with one another in a given context more than they interact with anyone else". But fandom is only a part-time activity to most people and contact is almost always on a level other than social. Polls like WHY IS A FAN? have pointed out a number of times that fans have little in common, but nobody cares to believe it. Perhaps when we have over-specialised ourselves into chaos, blackballed, banned and sanctioned ourselves into complete confusion the truth will make itself apparent to those still interested.

If anybody is still interested. -- John Baxter

.....

MAIL WARP
Letters

In order to cut down the verbiage on the Donaho mess a great many letters are going to be cut or eliminated entirely. I think the readers have seen enough castigation of Bill Donaho and the Pacificon Committee to last some time and the point of last issue's attack against their positions was not to reveal that they were monsters but to force them into proving their charges against Walter Breen. I failed. No additional incriminating facts have been brought to my attention. Several writers asked to be added to the list I gave last issue of those who had voiced criticism of Donaho and/or the Committee in forms ranging from disapproval to apoplexy. Those heard from (either here or in fanzines received) include:

Richard Geis	which brings the total to 90 people. :: There was some comment not
Michael McQuown	particularly flattering to Walter Breen but the point at issue is much
V.J. Vignes	more important than whether or not Walter has (metaphorically speaking,
Earl Noe	of course) fleas in his beard. When the question being debated is
Ida Ipe	whether or not a man should be thrown into jail there is little time
Len Bailes	for picking at nits. However, BETTY KUJAWA revised in a downward
Lang Jones	direction my high estimation of his fannish conduct by reminding me
GMCarr	of a Breen retort which somewhat exasperatedly included a reference
Creath Th ne	to the votes a fan had received in the Fugghead of the Year section
Richie Benyo	of Walter's still unpublished FANAC poll. That <u>wasn't</u> very nice. ::
Robert Lowndes	Another letter arrived dealing with broader aspects of the case and
Carl Brandon	touching on the underlying issue of civil liberties which Robert
Bill Morse	Lowndes has quickly seen at the heart of the matter in his column in
Lee Hoffman	this issue. ERIC BLAKE wrote: "The question seems to revolve around
Rusty Hevelin	the sufficiency of the evidence on which this person was barred. The
Pete Graham	guiding principal should have been 'Why take chances?' It would be

better to do an injustice to one man, supposing these accusations to have been false, than to expose dozens of young people to him, supposing the accusations to be true. The defense of this man seems to follow the usual liberal fallacy. During the time that the late Senator McCarthy was active in his exposure of pro-Communists, some liberals came to the defense of these pro-Communists and said that, while Senator McCarthy had made accusations, he had insufficient proof. Either the Senator was correct or incorrect. If he was correct, the men he identified (and supported these identifications with evidence, as you can read in his speeches) should have been jailed. If he was incorrect, then the country would be done no harm by removing these men from the government service. Ideally, the men he named should have been suspended from the government payroll pending hearings on the charges. But what is the result? Today they are back in power, and we're still taking unnecessary chances with their loyalty, which has been called in question." The answer to which is to note that Dwight Eisenhower's loyalty was "called in question" by Robert Welch. Should he have been "suspended from the government payroll pending hearings on the charges"? And should you, Mr Blake, be suspended from your place of employment while your loyalty is being decided and during this time of decision should your friends, relatives and fellow employees be circularized with lurid distortions of your past activities? :: ALVA ROGERS went into detail on the history of his suspicions and other's suspicions but presents no new facts on which to evaluate the charges. Since enough sordid interpretation has been given of Walter's relationships with children, I don't think fandom will miss a retelling of the story Alva presented at some length in the Committee report on the cancellation of Breen's membership. Suffice it to say that his run through of the incident is in substance identical to the version given in

the report. Please refer to it there if you are interested. The quality of the judgement against Breen is, I think, concisely indicated by Rogers: "As far as I was concerned I didn't have to catch Walter en flagrante delicto with my child or any child before I made up my mind about him." Alva also asks "What is a reasonably intelligent, concerned individual to do in the absence of tangible evidence?" 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 and making all kinds of wild charges. Alva's detailing of the suspicions of other Berkelites does not advance us one step further toward proving anything. Aside from the fact that I'm reluctant to record more suspicion in defense of a case that is based on it, I'm afraid to publish it. After dwelling on a fan for a couple pages, Alva writes: she "told me that if I ever mentioned her name in print in connection with the Breen Scene she'd see that I ended up 'in Leavenworth'". While it's wise to take anything that comes out of Berkeley with a grain of salt, events of the past year indicate that it's also wise not to take chances.

I owe GMCarr an apology and do hereby tender same for the rude implications that could be drawn from my loose statement that "no rational person" had advanced her case as deserving official redress by FAPA. She did, of course, protest the handling of the termination of her membership at the time and "refused the offers by Burbee & Purdue to circulate a petition for reinstatement".

GMCARR goes on: What would indeed be "ironic" should the blatant flagrance of the sheer cruelty toward Breen cause fandom generally to take a long, backward, look at some of the previous attempts by self-appointed fannish BNFs who tried (as you quote Donaho as stating) "to perform a surgical operation separating (substitute any name you like) from fandom". :: That's been going on for years-- even the now almost mythical Claude Degler was a victim. Sometimes it was justified (as the N3F expulsion of a troublemaker) and FAPA's quiet dropping of George Wetzel from the WL and the subsequent forwarding of his abusive letters to the Postal Authorities. Sometimes it was sheer personal malice, as in the hounding of Harlan Ellison during the difficult (and obnoxious) period of his transition from fan to Pro. Sometimes it was merely amusing --as the nearly three-year-long battle by Ron Ellik and Bruce Pelz to get GMC out of fandom, but merely moved me over from FAPA to N'APA. Or the recent N'APA "by law" passed to drive Jack Harness out. :: But what has been done to Breen has been so extremely unkind that it could well serve as the starting point for someone to start unravelling all these various "feuds" for the purpose of "driving out of fandom" someone or other who had incurred displeasure; just to trace if there is any one recurrent personality who ran like a faint thread tying them all together... It could be possible, you know. And, if so, a tragic indictment of the mind capable of such sadism. (5519 Ballard Ave, N.W., Seattle, Washington)

TOM PERRY: ...I can't neglect to comment that you've done a very thorough, even exhaustive job here in delineating the Donaho camp's various conflicting statements and evasions -- in fact I can't help thinking this may have had a lot to do with Donaho's apparent change of heart. You are to be complimented, Sir, for your efforts along this line -- as much for exposing the essential contradictions of Busby and even Calkins when they make fools of themselves -- as for your work on the Donaho mess. It is a Good Thing, I aver, to have someone like yourself working tirelessly against these foes of reason; some of them, like Eney, publish such a grat deal it's hard to keep track of everything they've said, and give it the point-by-point refutation it deserves. As for Eney's tendency to fail to answer his mail, I, too, sent him a letter which I asked him either to publish or to tell me he was not going to, in which case I would. No reply. My respect for Eney diminishes more and more.

I don't consider Busby's treatment of the D.N.Q. very surprising. The expression

is damnably equivocal -- Is it the writer or the words that is not to be quoted? If the latter, is paraphrasing okay? Unlike its twin D.N.P., which has a definite meaning and a legitimate function, the D.N.Q. is openly violated all the time: I frequently get letters that tell me such-and-such is true but I mustn't tell anyone 'cause it's DNQ. Presumably if I do tell anyone, as my correspondent just has, I am to repeat the invocation and that makes it okay. It's like that old chestnut: "A secret is when you tell one person at a time."

Furthermore, the DNQ is almost always imposed on someone. Seldom has anyone said to me, "If I tell you something about so-and-so, will you keep it DNQ?" ...he goes ahead and tells me and then tells me I can't tell anyone (if indeed that's what he means). I consider it okay for a fan to DNQ his personal observations or remarks or opinions -- his feeling, for instance, that so-and-so is a cruddy writer, DNQ'd because he wants to stay friends with so-and-so -- but when someone announces to me that Fan X, for instance, has been sleeping with Fan Z, and the fact is widely known and very obvious in a con report written and published by Fan X, I will not stand still for a DNQ imposed by someone who thinks he's letting me in on a secret.

Strangely enough Walter Breen's discussion of "Glory Road" becomes involved in this question. I'm not much impressed by Walter's revelation that that dull story is interwoven with private jokes and allusions. These may enrich a story, but they are no substitute for one. Walter's implied statement that they can be is -- to pick a Heinleinian comparison -- like implying that knitted yarn is sturdier stuff than high-grade steel because the topology of the former is more intricate. And "Glory Road" is surely the poorest yarn by a good science-fiction writer in some time.

But it's Walter's final statement, that "Instead of criticising (Heinlein) for what he was not trying to do, we might as well at least first understand what he has been in fact saying," that interests me. Unless he actually contends that these 90 thousand words were devoted to disproving the old cliché "And they lived happily ever after...", Walter has not offered us an interpretation of "what (Heinlein) has been in fact saying" or attempting to say. The reason for this, I gather from correspondence with Walter earlier, is that he met Heinlein at the Chicon and The Old Master gave him some of the inside lowdown on what he has been in fact saying, but cautioned Walter he was not to tell anyone. If I'm right in this conclusion I think Walter has hurt his value to fandom and stef as a critic by accepting this DNQ; and if so I regret it, for Walter can be a good critic, and stef needs some good ones, Ghod knows. A critic's acceptance of a DNQ from an important author in his field is rather like the city hall reporter's accepting a confidence from the mayor about those irregular paving bids. If I understand the situation correctly, I think Walter ought to feel honorbound to break -- rather than keep, this particular DNQ. For certainly if Heinlein has been trying to say anything other than what he has seemed to be saying, he deserves to have someone tell fandom. It would be good to know that, at least, his intentions are not bad. (4018 Laurel Ave., Omaha 11, Nebraska)

TOM PURDOM: On Blish's column: I started reading science fiction, and continue to read it, oddly enough, because I think the best of it is about something, and something very important which is left out of most mainstream literature today. It is about man in society, or, perhaps better, about man in history (or man against history). All science fiction stories have to begin with some major historical change, and the dramatic conflict is the struggle of human beings to adjust to the change. Unlike the kind of stuff which dominates mainstream literature, the sf hero does not lead a completely private life; he lives in a society, and is affected by history, and even attempts to affect history (sometimes he even succeeds). I think one could do a very fine study of the attitudes toward historical change which have been expressed by the better -- and even some of the cruder -- sf writers. :: I tend to disagree with the

idea that a writer's message or his opinions about his subject are the most important part of his work. A writer may have lousy opinions, or no opinions at all, but if he can make me feel, in somebody or other's words, "what it's like to be this kind of person going through this kind of experience" or if he can simply make me react to the wonder of a man doing such a thing, then I think he's done his best. I want to read about men who are involved with their society, and grappling with the great problems created by historical change, but I do not necessarily want to hear the author's opinions about these subjects. I'm not even sure anybody's opinion on these matters is worth anything -- or ever will be worth anything. :: Orwell's statement about power did not seem particularly terrifying to me when I first read it. It seemed obvious, and it didn't stick in my mind. But the rats and the rest of the torture chamber stuck because they are what this obvious idea means in practise. Instead of the maxim being the meaning of the experience, to me the experience was the meaning of the maxim.

On this question of amateurs: I agree in general with the Willis column which started it, but I would go much further than Willis in stressing the difference between the fan writer and the pro writer. Few people seem to recognize that pro writers and fan writers not only work for different reasons, but also work in different mediums. The pro writer writes fiction and articles, and the best fan writers work in an entirely different form, the personal essay. I like the personal essay, but it is in some ways an easier form to work with than the story or the modernday magazine article. In both the story and the magazine article, you have to make every sentence do at last two jobs, and sometimes three or four. And the whole thing is complicated by the audience you are dealing with. The fan writer is writing for a small literate audience, but the pro article writer is writing for a minimum of fifty thousand people, and he is supposed to assume that they are (1) not very bright and (2) not interested in what he is saying. I find much magazine writing extremely crude, but this is the main reason for it. You can jar the nerves of the sensitive reader all you want, but you must not lose the vast mass of your readers. And since there is a limit to how many smooth devices for gaining attention one writer can think of, there are bound to be crudities. :: I read everything in Wrhn with pleasure, but I do not read everything in any magazine now published. And in most of the pro work I read, I generally have to overlook some flaw, and remind myself it's a hard craft, and there's a limit to what one brain can do -- some guys can plot, some have nice styles, some have something to say, but few can do everything in one story, or one article. :: For those who feel that everything must be written for the sensitive, literate reader, I have a question which has been intriguing me recently. How do you give a man with an IQ of 100, and no intellectual interests, a liberal education? How do you not only teach him enough to hold a job, but also enough to be a good citizen, make sensible political decisions in a complex, technological society, and even enjoy all the personal satisfaction which I believe we all get, though it isn't always fashionable to say so, from art, literature, and increased knowledge of the world? This question intrigues me partly because I think if we don't find an answer to it, we won't have any civilization left. (1213 Spruce St., Philadelphia 7, Pa.)

JOHN BAXTER: Jim Blish's article is one of those curious compositions that, despite intelligent, even faultless reasoning, excellent construction and felicitous style, is ultimately a failure because it just isn't true. Taking Jim's particular line of reasoning and sticking only to those examples that he quotes it's perfectly possible to find yourself after the last sentence agreeing with him. But then one opens one's eyes and realises that one has been had. The plain fact of the matter is that, aside from the books that Jim instances -- "1984", "Limbo 90", etc -- there are hardly any sf-type novels that have succeeded with the general public. In fact the current trend is away from the novel of ideas -- that Is About Something -- towards the novel of observation. Every major critical and financial success during the last five or ten

years has been personal, even introspective. "Catcher In The Rye" and all of Salinger's later books, Updike's "Rabbit Run" and all his later books, "Ship Of Fools", "Catch 22", Mailer's books, Styron's books, the novels of Nabokov, Greene....there are dozens of others. Personally, I think the success of "1984" and the failure of "Starship Troopers", for instance, hinges on the approach of the writer. Science fiction writers invariably think in terms of "things". Heinlein's novel is about a thing -- society -- and other things -- characters -- who have been constructed to prove something about things in general. The story, like all sf novels, is completely anti-humanistic. "1984", on the other hand, may be unpleasant but at least it is about people, and the people in it seem to matter. Orwell was sick and embittered when he wrote it but he was a socialist and interested always in people. Heinlein, however, even in good health is concerned only with ideas, as are all sf writers. I don't look on this as a fault, of course. Most people read sf for ideas and go to mainstream fiction for their other needs. It seems to be an ideal arrangement for the reader but less successful for the writer. (Australia)

RICK SNEARY: I've only partly read Wrhn 20, but think I better write about the James Blish letter before something happens. I feel there is a major misunderstanding here, and I'd like to get it cleared up. ... First of all, I have never thought, did not mean, nor believe I implied, that I'd ever held the silly idea that a critic must be able to equal any work he criticises. I agree completely with Mr Blish's dissection of this idea, which I have heard of, but never suggested seriously by anyone. I have re-read my letter carefully, and I can't see how what I said could have been taken to suggest this -- and, even if I was stupid enough to believe that, I would not have suggested it applied to Mr Blish. I stated that I thought "Blish is one of our field's best writers, and an even better critic of the art..." While I can no longer tick off my favorite stf writers in proper order, Blish is among the top. And while not in my opinion in the same class as Boucher and Knight as a critic, he is very close behind. He is certainly qualified to criticize anything in the field. :: I feel Mr Blish has badly misunderstood my reference to "our code", which is quite understandable. To the best of my knowledge I invented the "code" while I was writing the letter, and by now have forgotten just what I did have in mind. It certainly was not a wish to see Mr. Blish agree that any of his stories that I happen to dislike was indeed a clinker. My own likes and dislikes are quite as personal and different as anyone else's.. I can think of a couple classic stories (by other authors) that I have never liked, and little known stories I am fond of. I would think it very strange indeed if I had perfect taste. (Only Mr Willis has impeccable taste.) :: More what I had in mind was this. Over the past several years I have read more reviews and criticisms of Blish's stories than any other writer excepting Heinlein or Campbell. This is not to say that the reviews found Mr Blish a poor writer, any more than they find RAH a poor writer. It is just that a number of writers have found flaws in his science, or his logic, or in plotting. (While others have been full of praise.) In nearly every case, (when there has been an answer) Mr Blish has answered back hotly, defending every point. It would seem that while over the past few years he has frequently lamented the lack of letter columns to aid in a dialog between writer and reader, he is more sensitive to criticism than others. I would not suggest that he should let critics say he writes "clinkers" without answering back. But it would seem that we are all well enough aware of the problems of a writer and writing, for him to answer a critic of his science, say by merely saying he thought it made a better story written the way he did. Too, if Mr Blish and my relative position of importance in the field were reversed, I doubt that I would have bothered to answer such unimportant thoughts. :: Yet it is strange -- he does not answer the one criticism that I clearly defined. That of criticizing Fritz Leiber for writing a non-stf story, when he had done the same and sold to the same market. The quality of the story as such had had nothing to do with the criticism, but the subject matter. I didn't suggest that Mr Blish couldn't write as well as Mr Lieber. I didn't really

mean that neither writer should be pleased with what he had written. If there is any fault to be levied, it is toward the Editor for publishing either story. I think Mr Blish was perfectly right in criticising the story for not being stf, but I think he has great enough status in the field that he could have admitted to the same failing, without anyone thinking the less of him. (2962 Santa Ana St. South Gate, Calif.)

BILL BLACKBEARD on Wrhn 19: Now that you've left your SAPSIng stone to FAPA, having taken a little independent flitter in between, and are actually seated in that august body of apafandom between the Censorious Cato of F.M. Busby (and his Catorie) and the Gracchi of Boggs and Warner, it will be interesting to see how Wrhn develops to meet and reflect this change. :: Doc Lowndes is damnear my favorite film critic. I enjoyed his sensitive awareness of film composers' thematic contribution to a movie viewer's total involvement with the screened image -- a contribution almost universally slighted or entirely ignored by picture commentators in general. Those very few narrative films made entirely without background music (in one or two instances a deliberate, conscientious departure from routine cinema practice) seemed to me somehow crippled -- though not as much as pictures scored by composers obviously out of empathy with their subject matter, or composers inclined to deal too blatantly in the older cliches of dramatic music -- but in such reviews of these rarities as I read, the reviewers managed to be wholly unaware of this exision of musical counterpoint and enhancement. Something worse than so-called tone deafness is involved here: there seems to be an unconscious and tragic lack of valid musical orientation in the perceptive persona of these individuals. Accordingly, Doc's commentary on "La Dolce Vita" shone with a contrasting luster and definitiveness, no less in the original piece in Wrhn #18 than in the further remarks in #19. :: These latter, reassessing remarks pleased me a great deal, too. It is true that Lowndes has the opportunity in a fanzine column to reconsider earlier critical statements and advise us of his errors and oversights, an opportunity largely denied to the genzine and newspaper reviewers; but the point is that he avails himself of it at length and in detail rewarding to both the reader and himself, while it is doubtful if the majority of reviewers and critics, including many of those in the avant garde cinema journals, would or could make such effective use of such privilege even if it were allowed them. I feel he is in error at only one point here, and Virginia has made my point nicely in advance in her comment on the (very real) "poetry" of the original review: Doc's analytical and comparative imagery, even if imprecise or not refound on a second and third viewing of the film, may still tell us more of memorable worth about the initial impact of "La Dolce Vita" -- here, as with any other movie, the only really important one, for it is the only one the vast majority of viewers will ever have -- than any amount of cautious re-appraisal. Setting aside such omnipresent hazards of film judgement as ill humor, personal preoccupation, and an improper screening, in most cases the first exposure to a picture will provide a sensitive individual with all he really needs to properly judge and criticize it, and will as well, in someone like Doc, provide an illuminating "poetry" of reaction that even in error can more adequately delineate such poetry as may exist in the seen film. (192 Mountain View, L.A. 90057)

CREATH THORNE: I'll jump in belatedly on the subject of "can one love Wrhn". When I first read the question I felt that perhaps you would play some tricks on your readers when they innocently replied to your question. It all rests on the definition of "love" and apparently each person had a different idea of what you actually meant. "Love" as it is commonly thought of, is a two-way proposition. In other words, you can't really love someone unless they love you back. I think that most anyone will agree with me on this point. No one can love someone who is far off up on a pedestal. Do you love the President of the United States? Probably not, at least not like his wife does. But (and the following is devoid of politics) you might admire him. You can admire someone very much, and still not feel the sensation of "love" in the general usage. Wrhn, obviously does not return any affection to its readers. When I speak of

Warhoon, I am not speaking of this bulk of blue paper that lies on my desk, but rather of the personalities that come thorough and "hit" the reader with their ideas. Warhoon deals principally in ideas, but there are some bits of pure personality and it seems that any idea must convey the personality of the writer, perhaps even more than a "personality bit" that some zines are so fond of. So here we have the magazine, bursting with the ideas and personalities of Richard Bergeron. Of course, there are many other people represented in Warhoon besides Bergeron, but Bergeron is the one who chooses the people who go into his zine. In the last ish, you made a statement in which you said that you do very little editing. Nothing could be further from the truth. You are the one who chooses the people who write, and that makes all the difference. In a magazine like yours, there is a large variety of subjects and opinions, yet we find that the epeople who write these opinions are essentially the same ish after ish. One may assume that Bergeron assembles only those who are conductive and representative of his ideas and thoughts -- thus one may assume that the general air of the magazine is one that represents at least one facet of the Bergeron personality. One might say that meeting Bergeron in life would be much different from the personality that comes through the fanzine. Yet, if you have read all 20 issues (and I regrettably have not; I've only seen very few) you would begin to get a consistent idea of the person who edits the zine, and in your dealings with the zine, you could expect the image to remain fairly consistent, no matter how the editor acts in personal life. So now we have a definite image of the Warhoon editor in our minds, and I've concluded that this image shall stand for the magazine. Is this image one that you could love? Warhoon gives very little appreciation to the reader. It first deals basically with ideas. When it desends to people, usually it desends to people of a high rank -- ones that are not fans. And then, once in a great while, Warhoon desends to the average fan -- as in the piece on QUARK? in the current issue. But even there, it is an appreciation of the fanzine first, and the editor only second. Does Warhoon deal then with the reader emotionally? From the above one can conclude that it does not. It deals with the intellect, rather than with the emotional section of the personality. Because, yes, Warhoon will appreciate your ideas, but it will never become emotional to the fan. As long as "love" is kept to the emotional level one can never love Warhoon. To love Warhoon, we must completely redefine love, and even then I am not sure that I would love the magazine. Respect yes, but love, no. I think that it would be a hard thing to love most any fanzine. To love a fanzine one would have to first know the editor and "love" him; the zine would have to deal with the emotional rather than the intellectual level. Given these circumstances, (and perhaps a few others) one might come to love a fanzine. But I am afraid that Warhoon is doomed to a life of bachelorhood. (Route 4, Savannah, Mo. 64485)

.....

UNHAPPY ANNIVERSARY -- continued: drafted. One either burns them into the stencil with fresh emotion, like Dick Schultz, or ends up issuing a Statement for the Press. But I do want to record here in Wrhn something of the dismay and disbelief of people during these first moments and days. It struck me that the most profound expressions of grief that I was exposed to came from the French. The photographer mentioned above was beside himself. And the next day a cable arrived from a woman I met in Nice this summer. It read "HERE WE ARE ALL NEAR YOU SADLY -- ANNA."

A few days later a letter arrived that perfectly expressed the consternation of a world:

"Sunday...Six o'clock of the morning, I can't sleep, I am more and more sad, in my bed-room, cocktails, dress, furs, stay, like that not finish, I am in mourning like you, down, with a big gloomy, all is grey and for long time I think. Nixon, Johnson... Alas, no one can come marvelous like Jack Kennedy. When like me, a people return of

(Continued on page 20.)

DISSONANT DISCOURSE
Mailing Comments

THE BNF OF IZ -- Brandon: White's notation that Carl Brandon was so successful a hoax that "his reputation eclipsed that of his creators; and no doubt had they not revealed their hoax at the 1958 World Convention, he would have remained the most successful hoax in years" somewhat eases my conscience. When Mrs Camper interviewed me she asked about hoaxes and I told her that when Carr and Ellick found their hoax becoming more renown than they were they revealed his identity. She thought this was pretty fabulous and made a note to include it in her Cosmopolitan article. Later it occurred to me that this might be one of those bits of misinformation that color and alter the shape of history and I was sorry that I had passed it on. (There has been speculation in fandom recently that Mrs Camper might have actually had no connection with Cosmopolitan: the editor of the magazine told me that they intended to publish the article. This was the summer of 1963, I think.) EAST GREENBUSH INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC OPINION -- Bradley: In a nutshell!

KTEIC MAGAZINE #118 -- Rotsler: I liked the cartoon about beautiful girls who make you feel inferior. I went to a shooting recently and ran into a perfect example of the type -- in fact I was struck so club-footed by this bewitching creature that I wasn't at ease with her until after she asked me to dinner! I'm not about to tell you who this is but you can find her in any current national fashion magazine, on a cover of McCalls, and in a magnificent series of color spreads done on her in McCalls. But I must confess that most of the girls who are really "ring-ading dames with all the accessories" have also had the accessory of being able to put you at ease before you become scared by their beauty. If they don't have that ability they run the risk of spending their evenings at home because all the men think they're in such demand that they have no time for them. The last time Marilyn Monroe went to bed was early on a Saturday night. My favorite model right now is a tall warm Italian who shares my passion for Picasso. (And speaking of Pablo, did you see the news item about how Jacqueline tries to keep him at home as much as possible, since he has taken to giving away paintings to admirers on the beach. Framed, yet.)

LIGHTHOUSE -- Carr: With publications like Lthse, SELF-PRESERVATION, and KTEIC at hand that line about FAPA being "composed of illustrious has-beens sitting around waiting for each other to live up to their names" becomes regrettable -- since I no longer believe it myself. Actually I'd rather wait all year for something from Dean Grennell than get something quarterly from several people on the waiting list. And the proposal to liven FAPA with an annual vote to admit a lively waiting lister loses a great deal of urgency with the appearance of fanzines from Main and Wells -- good men, both of them. :: I don't know if it was Sturgeon who wrote "The Stars are the Styx" But I guess it might as well have been. Your categories are slipping somewhere when you say "I know it wasn't Philip Jose Farmer, as you have it here". The bit you're commenting on was quoted from Redd's "Fiction Fantasy" in the Spring 1954 SKYHOOK. Redd said Farmer reports that he is working on a book about the visit of a "rustic colonist" to the mother planet Earth. "The title is "The Stars Are The Sticks." :: Would those butterflies really fly out of the box and swoop around the room in a riot of color? I would imagine that the light would stun them and they would cling stupidly to the inside of the open box. Better to fill up her umbrella with confetti and send her out into the rain to get some milk.

TARGET:FAPA -- Eney: How do you reconcile your laudable "resolution to avoid insulting assumptions" with your remark about your "41 worst-guided fellow members" and your request that Breen's supporters "skip the grosser forms of hypocrisy"? :: Dick,

I've tried to reach you by mail but I seem to have failed. A letter of 23rd July in which I enclosed a stamp and in which I asked about the fan poll remains unanswered. I never received a copy of the poll and I voted and enclosed a quarter. But maybe your mail isn't reaching you so perhaps FAPA is the best medium to address you. I don't feel that I have taken a stand on the guilt or innocence of Walter Breen -- as far as I know, he is innocent -- but I can't testify that he is; just as I couldn't testify that you would be guilty or innocent of the same charges. I have noticed, though, that the charges are only supported by a web of suspicion. If his detractors had been able to anchor them in solid ground Breen would be in jail now. But instead the case against him has been stated in distortions and innuendoes. If Breen is guilty, why is all this viciousness necessary? Wouldn't it be much

less messy to state the case simply and effectively than to distort events into monstrous forms and twist lurid accusations from them? In the last mailing Metcalf provided an example of just the sort of thing that has crippled the credibility of Breen's accusers: Metcalf called on Breen on 5 June 63 for \$25 owed him. Metcalf writes "So Walter hauled out a Boggs petition which I filled out incorrectly after re-reading it carefully. It was left lying on the mantel. I was thinking of sticking it back in my knapsack but decided to see what happened if it achieved circulation." Walter paid him \$20 and Marion gave the remaining \$5. Two days later Metcalf writes the FAPA president "Please don't count my signature on Boggs' petition to reinstate Breen. Breen paid me \$25.00 to sign for him." The letter was postmarked July 16th. Now, on the word of a person who gives his signature in bad faith, who describes himself as a bribe taker, who had opportunity to retrieve his signature since it was left "lying on the mantel", and whose transcript of the conversation explicitly stated that Breen stated that the money was for hi-fi repair work, we are expected to believe that in addition to all his other "crimes" Breen is also a bribe artist. Really. Walter's enemies have twisted every straw they have been able to clutch at into an indictment of him and your own comment that "if we're going to discuss the matter in anything like a sober way, shouldn't we skip the grosser forms of hypocrisy, and take off from Avram's useful phrase... "We all know Walter's proclivities, but..." is only the deplorable latest example. Davidson is firmly on record as disapproving of children being introduced to sex by adults and on the subject of child molestation has said that he "might perhaps even resort to violence or the law." But here you are, instead of proving your charges, giving more innuendo, more distortion. Davidson's out of context statement is hardly a confirmation of all the charges you and others have made against Breen and no amount of leering will make it so. As one who had to apologize to Walter for similar slanderous implications in the past, don't you think you should be a bit more explicit? :: "If there is enough insistence on 'proof', there is more proof which will be forthcoming". How much insistence is "enough"?

KTEIC #117 -- Rotsler: I would imagine it's just a matter of the area of the ocean and the time of the year. When I was there the water off Waikiki was yellow and muddy close to the shore, clearer further out. And the "gritty and grey Atlantic" contains the Caribbean which has the most miraculously clean water I've seen. The waters off Nice and Lido were none too crystal either.

CADENZA -- Wells: Could you ask Page whatever happened to that article on Wrhn he once planned on publishing? Was it ever written? :: Why should Republicans have had guilt feelings over the death of Kennedy? :: I agree that Redd's letter in this CADENZA is more valuable than the last BETE NOIRE. Also more interesting. And I think his attitude that a letter of comment is not primarily written for publication is fairly unique. Most of the letters I've received commenting on Wrhn have been intended for publication -- each issue I warn that letters may be published unless the author indicates otherwise and offhand I don't recall anybody asking me not to publish their letter. I wonder if this is why Boggs has only sent me installments of "File 13" and never a letter of comment? I've always felt it a failure of the magazine that it never stimulated him into commenting but was always confounded by his desire to .

contribute to a magazine whose discussions and milieu he never became involved in. :: I particularly agree with Redd's plea for care in writing (of even mailing comments) but it's pretty distressing to see that fine mind and all that talent lavished on the minutia of the LASFS -- it's like Bill Blackbeard writing the minutes of a club meeting. What a waste. JESUS BUG -- Andy Main: I think the waiting list is being Cruel and Heartless to me. Very few of them commented on the last Wrhn and it was sent to everybody on the list. Let's hear no complaints now when the mailing list is cut down. THE PERSIAN SLIPPER -- Johnstone: Don't you remember Bill Blackbeard's "October Observations"? :: What do you think Richard Burton's "real work" is? Movies like "Look Back In Anger" and "Alexander The Great", which he made before meeting Taylor or productions like "Hamlet" which he became involved in after his marriage to her? DAMBALLA -- Hansen: I think it truer to say that you have no confidence than that you have no "artistic Talent". That cover was quite excellent and a good deal better than what passes for art in most fanzines. :: I loved that remark that the blackball action was "fattening".

HORIZONS -- Warner: "those who have been outspoken in favor of Martin have either maintained or stepped up activity." Hmm, but the president of FAPA was saying that they were concerned over Martin "apparently" because they were producing "page-count for their own membership requirements." ? :: "A Girl Of The Limberlost" has haunted me all these years too, Harry. What fascinated me was her ability to make money by catching butterflies -- in Wrhn #10, Jan. '61, in "A Lust For Lepidoptera" I recalled her to fandom when I visited the shop of a man who deals in butterflies: Gene Stratton Porter's girl of the limberlost would have had to be carried from the room" -- the sight of all those butterflies would have been too much for her. :: Why do newspapers often give the addresses of people involved in criminal proceedings? In New York, Jonas Mekas was recently apprehended for showing what the police called a pornographic film (though I understand that the same film is being shown publicly in San Francisco with no trouble) and his address and the projectionist's and the ticket taker's were all recorded in the local papers. Is this done so people interested in pornographic films can contact them, or so they can be harrassed by the DAR?

SERCON'S BANE -- FMBusby: Gee, I didn't think that contradicting FMBusby could be construed as an attempt to "work up an Issue over which to make a Big Splash... in FAPAish waters" and I don't know anyone else who thinks so either -- except possibly FMBusby who brings it up in his fanzine. :: Why did I publish in Serenade and not pursue the subject by letter? I told you that in the last Serenade. I gave up when you wrote me "it is always difficult to get one-to-one correlation between the argument in the writers mind and that which gets onto paper... I can leave a big hole in the written presentation and fail to notice it upon rereading; a checkup does no good because the mind fills in the missing parts and there we are." I felt like I was debating with limberger. Why then in Serenade? I've gone over that too: When Willis came out with an argument very close to my own "The discouraging results of our correspondence led me to try a more public and therefore possibly more potent detonation..." Why did it take so long? Well, I challenged you in Serenade #3 (not #2, as you have it), August 1962 and answered your reply in the very next issue, May 1964. It didn't seem like a terribly pressing matter. :: Thank you for pleading "Guilty as Charged" but you weren't charged with "utterly failing to convince me that I was off my head in my commentary on the Gibson article". You were charged with utterly failing to try to convince me. Want to plead guilty to that? :: Point 7: The John Birch Society is versatile: they have named "all kinds of Names in connection with wild accusations" and made many blind accusations and examples of guilt by association. In "The Blue Book", Welch, the leader of the society, cites not naming names as the better form of attack because if you name names you can be sued and the society could be ham-strung by law suits with affronted liberals. In the current QUARK? I see that Tom Perry reports that Gibson has stated that it is a policy of his not to name names.

Apparently, the thesis of my Kipple article wasn't too far off. I note in passing that there is a subtle contradiction lodged in this seventh point of yours: "from the daily papers I had the idea that the Great Sin of the JBS was not the failure to Name Names but rather the somewhat-fantastic Naming of all kinds of Names..." Indeed? Then why, when Willis cited Gibson in connection with "fearlessly attacking nobody in particular...this creeping film of suspicion, this Nouvelle Vague, this Menace of the Faceless Monster", why did you applaud Walt for making "some good anti-Birch remarks"?

But when I said the same thing about Gibson, you said the JBS slant was strictly in my eye. Which way do you want it Buz, coming or going? :: Point 8: I agree that "it is no rebuttal of a thesis to duck its points and holler 'John Birch Society' at the manner of its presentation". I agreed with Gibson's thesis. As I wrote in the original Kipple article "there's no reason why we shouldn't be aware of the predatory among us and every reason why we should". So who ducked its points? If you'll recall, however, Gibson's manner of presentation (though not his thesis) was subjected to attack from a great many fans -- fandom was generally alarmed and wanted to know who to look out for. In fact, in CRY #156 FMBusby allowed as how he was "all for naming names in preference to the bit of making vague accusations against unspecified parties..." :: The second dedication of this issue is perfect ("to the 14 members who voted Section 9.2 in the foreseen face of the predictable emotional backlash"). They deserve it. (You include yourself in the dedication. Odd, I don't recall an editor dedicating a fanzine to himself before.) Pelz and you have both admitted your blackball votes, so I guess you have been collecting your richly earned egoboo, but why are the others so reluctant to step forward and claim theirs? Maybe they need some prodding..lets see: further study of Vol 21, #3 of THE FANTASY AMATEUR inspires the following thoughts: Allegedly 14 fapans voted to bar Breen from FAPA. Ballots were received from only 25 members: Ballard, Boggs, Brown, Busbys, Calkins, Caughran, Chauvenet, Coxes, Donaho, Eney, Evans, Hansen, Harness, Kemp, Lewis, Lichtman, Metcalf, Moskowitz, Pavlat, Pelz, Raeburn, Sneary, Speer, Tucker and Warner. The following voted to reinstate Breen: Boggs, Brown, Caughran, Chauvenet, Hansen, Lewis, Lichtman, Metcalf, Sneary, Tucker and Warner. That leaves 14. Well, gentlemen, take your bows.

MOONSHINE -- Moffatt, Sneary: Are the old Miller-Rotsler woodblocks still around? This cover is, of course, a reprint from MASQUE, isn't it? :: An excellent issue. DAY STAR -- Bradley: I support your plea to repeal the blackball and feel that any genuinely dangerous individuals can be taken care of by special rule. And congratulations on the little fan you've placed an order for! GODOT -- Deckinger: Norm Clarke sent me a copy of the Feiffer cartoon. Fabulous. :: Re the Sullivan Law and its enforcement, when I returned from Mexico the customs agent asked if I had any switch blade knives in my luggage. I said "No, why should I bother? I can buy them on Times Square." AMPERSAND -- Grennell: How many issues did SPACEWOOF run? :: The pack of Three Kings displayed "as an authentic historical relic" reminds me that the old LuckyStrike roll cut tin with the green and red label is fetching \$2-3 now in New York. You'd think they were comic books or something. And Shirley Temple glass is right in there too in the collectors price category. SELF-PRESERVATION -- Hoffman: Great cover. :: I've recently gone quite auction happy. At Lawner's on University Place you can bid on and get chrome chairs for less than the materials you bought to redo the upholstery on the ones you found in the street -- and they won't need reupholstering either. The last time I was there carpets were going for \$1 each -- you can't buy padding for that! :: The only true airplane buffs left seem to be Lee Hoffman and the editors of Esquire. CELEPHAIS -- Evans: If the Secretary-Treasurer, at least, isn't notified who voted to blackball then what confirmation is there that any blackball ever took place? The Secretary-Treasurer is empowered to refuse membership on the testimony of one person?

RPM -- Metcalf: Nice to have Donaho's statement that his "alleged attack" on Marion was not "obscene and unmailable" in the same publication as Roger's quote from

the letter where he omits the "alleged attack" thus: "I find that it's generally believed throughout fandom that he ((eleven words deleted here because I'm chicken))." Since Donaho himself has 7 pages in this magazine I assume the only reason he didn't quote himself is because he didn't have room. (Though there was room for 17 lines attempting to make up our minds about the content, intent, and effect of the attack. Can't we judge for ourselves or is Bill also "chicken" about this remark that was not "obscene and unmailable"?) :: I think Donaho summerizes the case beautifully when he says "As for proof, eyewitness accounts are the most basic proof offered in a court of law, and these we have given." Of the eyewitness accounts of members of the Committee, one case does not constitute child molestation in my opinion or the opinion of the father and was not charged as such by Donaho himself in the Boondoggle; in the other case Alva Rogers has stated that his account does not prove the committee's charges. Not too impressive a case for the prosecution, I'm afraid. :: Alva, I think your speculations on the way fannish posterity will remember Donaho are a big waste of time but nevertheless highly interesting; like those "new trend" articles Terry Carr used to write. Personally, I think that he will be remembered in addition to HABAKKUK for the authorship of a pamphlet that aroused more disgust and condemnation than any piece of writing in fannish history, and for his espousal of the big brother mentality exemplified by his intention to perform a surgical operation separating someone from fandom. Your estimation of him as a fan "with at all times the best interests of fandom at heart" doesn't sound like a fan who implicated a whole fannish community (in the eyes of the police) with tolerating an alleged criminal or a fan who thought any means justified his ends: in QUARK #7 he stated "if I had it to do over again I'd still do it, not naming names." Not long ago you were commenting on the effects of the words of another fan who thinks not naming names is the proper way to safeguard fandom. In a reply to Joe Gibson's "Cheats, Frauds, Thieves, Whores and Moochers" you wrote "Suspicion breeds distrust, fear and hatred, and God knows, there's too much of that in the world today without inflicting its cancer on the body of fandom." A fan with at all times the best interests of fandom at heart ?

.....

UNHAPPY ANNIVERSARY -- Concluded: Algeria, he understand more well what big protector was Kennedy. All the world as lose the best brother. :: I think many of you and at all the American people, is so a big shock, I can't think, never we see new the charming Kennedy so in life, so young and warm and clever. :: All is stopped in me, a brother is going, I think in U.S.A. is a big breakdown, we must hope so many this death make a miracle and the world go not in war, but, more friends. Anna."

.....

WHEN WE WERE VERY YOUNG

"Here's my plug. I am publishing my own fanzine (as of Jan 1st) named OOPSLA, a bi-monthly for a measley dime (10¢). First issue has Hoffman, Covington, Phillips, Vick and others. It will need various articles (Humorous and with a fannish slant) and short, very short fanfiction. Some humorous poems will be used. A new type of advertising will be featured, so try the first copy and see just what you would have missed if you had missed it. Oh, yes -- sub rates are 3 for 30¢ or a year for 60¢, and that includes the likely probability of an annish. You should at least try one copy to see. This new fmz is really gonna be something if I can get the material."

Gregg Calkins in Postwarp, January, 1951.

.....

"It was Tucker who died several times at the age of 40."

.....