

[illegible]

This is TIGHTBEAM #27 (September 1964) published for members of the National Fantasy Fan Federation by Lee and Ira Lee Riddle, 617 Shue Drive, Newark, Delaware 19711. The next issue of TIGHTBEAM will be published by Richard H. Eney, 417 Fort Hunt Road, Alexandria, Virginia 22307. Deadline for that issue--October 15th.

This issue of TIGHTBEAM is a joint endeavor between yours truly and his son. Believe me it has been a very revealing experience to co-publish a fanzine with a member of my own family. I never realized how much I have been out of touch with fandom until I started to work with a bright-eyed, bushy-tailed young fan, full of enthusiasm, such as Ira has turned out to be. I wonder if I was that way when I first became conscious of science-fiction and fandom at about his age? If so, I really must have shaken up my parents!

One of the biggest sources of argument over this issue between Ira and myself has been the matter of interposing editorial comment on the letters, either inside the letters or afterwards. I hold to the view that the publisher/editor of TB can act only as a moderating influence on the letters (cutting out the libel and slander, etc.), and should not impose his view on the readers--leaving any such comments as the subject of a letter to the next issue of TB. Ira felt differently but RHIP and my view won out. However, I do wish to pose this question to the readers of TIGHTBEAM--and hope to read some views on it in the next issue: should the editor of TB comment on the letters in that issue (such as Roy Tackett did in the last issue) or should he hold to the view that I do?

And, on a personal note, Let me leave you with this issue--all in all, it has been a distinct pleasure doing this issue with Ira. He has developed into quite a fan and I am very proud of him. The old N3F members will remember how I used to write about my family during the days of PEON, and how much I enjoyed every member of my family. To show you how old we are getting, Ira is now off to his first year of college.

--LEE RIDDLE

This is supposed to pass for an editorial so here goes:

In fandom, at the moment, there are two real big arguments going on--whether SIALS is anti-Catholic, and whether any censorship is moral, legal, etc. I will now present my views, expecting to be blasted in the next TB. Censorship is first: If a person is brought up right by his parents, he will not need to read any pornography at all, except out of curiosity. So, the fault lies with the parents. If we had a mature population, it would be no problem. Don't forget, there is a bit of pornography in sf too, like in the Monarch pocketbooks. How about damning them, too?

Now to the problem of SIALS. The first time I read it, it was just a good story. The third or fourth time around, I began to think about it. A number of my English teachers in school were Catholic, and I asked them to read it for me. They did, and not one of them thought it was anti-Catholic. They all said that it was an excellent piece of satire, and even made a number of classes read it. So, SIALS has already improved sf acceptance in my school. Mr. Blake, have you read Lester del Ray's "The Eleventh Commandant?" In case you have not, please do so. The 11th Commandant is "Be fruitful and multiply."

My congratulations to Roy Tackett for doing something with his TB that I don't think has happened before. I actually got my July TB during the month of July. Will miracles continue to come true? Usually I get the month's TB around the 15th of the following month. TNFF usually comes the last week of the same month. This TB will (I hope) get you around Sept. 15th. A note to all campaigners--why weren't there any campaign letters in TB?

--IRA LEE RIDDLE

MARC BROUSSARD
763 Robinson Street
St. Ignace, Michigan
49781

Ann Chamberlain mentioned in her welcome letter to me that I ought to write you a letter so that the membership could become aware of me. Really though, I don't have any idea what to write. I'm completely at a loss when it comes to writing introductory letters. From Ann's

letter I am to assume that this letter is only to give you my address or as I say, make you aware of me.

As a new member I expect I will receive offers to indulge in pen-palism which is fine with me. Elinor Poland and I have been corresponding now for the last few months and I find her a very sincere and friendly person. I hope I will find more like her. From what I hear of the N3F it's a great club, and I am really happy to become a member of it.

I'll close for now and Until I hear from somebody.

BOBBIE BREEDEN
2619 Dixie Road
Dalton, Georgia
30720

This is to introduce me to the members and officers of N3F. My name is Barbara Breedon. I'm sixteen years of age and a new member of this club. I've been reading and enjoying stf and fantasy for about two years but it wasn't until recently (about four months ago) that I

discovered fandom, said discovery being quite by accident. I was innocently reading the April issue of F&SF when I happened to run across an article by Terry Carr called "Fanzine Fanfaronade." Being the curious type, I decided to find out what it was all about so I sent for one of the fanzines listed, namely YANDRO. In the months that have followed I've sent for and received other fanzines but none of these are quite as good as YANDRO. Robert Coulson never directly recommended N3F to me but it was in his zine that I first learned of it.

I would like to correspond with others whose discovery of fandom can also be accredited to Terry Carr's article.

Second, this is to thank the members who have written letters welcoming me to N3F. Those whose letters haven't been answered yet will hear from me soon.

JOHN R. DUVOLI
57 Cottage Street
Middletown, New York

I have just received my first shipment of N3F materials, which included the National Fantasy Fan (Vol. 23. No.3), Tightbeam (No. 24) a copy of the constitution, and a "welcome letter from Janie Lamb. To quote from that letter" ...we are happy they've joined us in the fun."

After reading Tightbeam, I am convinced that "fun" is speaking out on topics which we know little or nothing of, insulting other persons ideals, religious beliefs, etc.

I am a firm believer in a theory expounded by Ray Badbury among others that people should leave people alone. Apparently, I am in a minority group. As I write this letter I am thoroughly disgusted. I hope that I feel better tomorrow but I doubt that seriously. Thank you for making me feel at home right away.

CLYDE KUHN
615 Pacheco Blvd.
Los Banos, California
93635

To: what ever the publication is at the moment being produced by the N3F, whom or whatever the editor(s) may be, for which number the issue is, or a semi-mythical zine called 'tightwhatsit' or TIGHTBEAM or some sort.

From: Clyde Kuhn, fresh backwoods Neo-neffer at the moment boycotted by Andrew Porter and Richie Benyo; soon to be ostracized by all good N3Fers, and happy having not made the acquaintance of Roy Tackett and a number of other people'(?).

Re: Membership.

Note: With all due respect to Janie Lamb and Seth (Martyred) Johnson for getting me in NFFF, I wish them not to take anything about to be said personally and that I do hope they will remain my private friends.

Many times have I heard the old saying about looking before you leap, I only wish I had done just that when the bug hit me and I decided to 'belong' by joining the N3F. Misgivings came a month after when I received the first official publications in the mails. I have never seen anything so inefficient, bungling and confused in my life. Nefferism is the worst fannish project in existence unless you count the committees.

The most revolting feature was the way the Welcomecommittee bothered to greet me; except for a few who bothered to write personally about fandom and not the N3F, all I received was a number of halfbaked fanzines, duplicated letters and a postcard from Alma Hill. All long after I had any need for information about fandom.

I shall do my best to make sure that any Neos I know will not make the mistake of joining the N3F. If you ever become something worthwhile, how about telling me so I can publicly praise you. Needless to say, I shan't be renewing my membership. Good Luck, nefferism needs it.

WALLY WEBER
Box 632
Huntsville, Alabama
35804

Hey, look everybody! New address. I haven't had a new address for weeks now, but finally the U.S. Post Office department got sick and tired of sending my mail back and forth across the country and they gave me a post office box all of my own. (I still liave at 224

Holmes Ave. N.W., and in Seattle I've kept my Box 267 at 507 Third Ave., but mail sent to Box 632, Huntsville, will reach me at least five minutes sooner, since I stop by the post office on my way home from work every day.

I haven't recovered from the shock of Robin Wood's blasphemy in TIGHTBEAM 26. Who does he think he is that he can trample life-long beliefs with a simple sneer? Dogs do too go Bow Wow Wow! Though I've never heard one doing it, I believe and have faith. There are certain fundamental things that everybody knows without proof, and such things should not be questioned even in jest.

All other disagreements in TIGHTBEAM seem to be in the hands of capable debaters, so I will condescend to impart to you some of my immense knowledge on the subject of life in the universe instead of commenting on #26.

Life in the Universe, by Francis Jackson and Patrick Moore, published by W.W.Norton & Company Inc., New York, copyright 1962, Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 61-13044, \$3.95 per copy (unless you borrow from the library as I did), is a book presenting current (as of 1961, probably) scientific evidence and opinion concerning life on other worlds.

The opinions are many and evidence slight, but the authors have done a marvelous job of balancing the two. No theory is presented without a summary of arguments pro and con, and even the wildest opinions are not totally dismissed if there is any possibility of truth in them.

The handicaps in discussing the subject of life were frankly admitted. Science has not even decided how to define life. Is a virus alive, or is it lifeless protein and nucleic acid? Scientists argue over that like G. M. Carr and Phil Kohn argue over politics. Even if some mad scientist found a way to construct a living, breathing, mimeo-cranking N3F member out of ray hydrogen atoms, it would still remain to be proven that the process could happen naturally, without a living, wheezing, mad scientist to open the valves and pull the switches.

The authors present the latest consensus of scientific opinion, at the same time cautioning the reader that the most profound educated guess on the subject of life on other worlds is still more guess than educated. But those guesses are such to warm the black little hearts of science fiction fans the world over, because they are in close agreement with what we've been telling them all along (sometimes).

Scientists now tend to believe that life abounds in many forms throughout other worlds in our universe. They even think it is probably that manlike, or even unmanlike, beings on planets belonging to other stars have surpassed our own scientific achievements.

These guesses are based on some interesting assumptions. For one, they assume the occurrence of planets is common throughout the universe and, consequently, conditions similar to those on Earth exist on many worlds. Also, they assume that, given Earth-type conditions, life will occur as a matter of course without the existence of (1) previous life, (2) an extremely unlikely accident, or (3) supernatural intervention.

The real thrill of the book comes from the glimpse the reader is given of science coming to grips with the basic mysteries of our universe. How did life begin? Or was it always here? Where did our universe come from? Or was it always here? The few pieces of the puzzle that have been found are nearly as exciting as the questions themselves.

If nothing else, it is comforting to know science is hard at work on the problem. It saves the N3F from having to set up a bureau for the job and using up weeks of precious fanning time solving the mysteries.

ALMA HILL
463 Park Drive
Boston 15, Massachusetts

There has been a lot of talk off and on for years about creating a department for writers in N3F; Ralph Holland and Don Franson approached me about this but I have never seen my way clear to take on such a responsibility as a part-time hobby thing.

Finally, though, as most of you know, I started Project Semi-Pro on my own (my own time,

postage, and guesswork, that is). It will have to stay that way for the time being at least; anyone is welcome to use any of these ideas -- some have & good luck to them, it saves my time -- as long as they call it something different enough, so that I can handle my own mistakes, they can handle theirs, and nobody is confused as to who's doing what.

There is one thing I can see my way to doing for the club, however, if it's wanted -- set up a Writer's Exchange (under that name to show that the task is cooperative) for writers to swap comments on one another's mss. Of all pro/2's experiments and irons-in-the-fire, this pattern is the one that has proved out most workable and most needed.

I think it would save my time, improve results, avoid trespasses of the accidental sort that amateur organizations fall into so easily -- and what is most to the point, improve services to members -- if this were made an official department, with intercommunication with the related projects. I'm sending carbons of this or similar material to all the people I can think of who have official jobs in the club now, touching on services to writers. These are, as far as I can find, President, Secretary, and Chairman of directors; Apachief, MSBuro, Welcommittee, Follow-Up, Correspondence, Stationery & Supplies; Story Contest, Story Robins, Publications. (Anybody overlooked?)(Whoever thought this club COULD be ruled by a "clique"? Look what everyone has to go through just looking for advice.) I don't expect to hear from all of these, but am willing to keep on in touch with any who do have time to write back and comment. We all do things as a part-time hobby, so it seems to me that informal contact is more useful than a set of rules, especially while figuring out what to do next.

A Writer's Exchange would provide a different service from any of the others, as it would be more general, discussing techniques among technicians. Still, there might be ways it could give and receive help among other departments, and as I said, there may be fences to look out for, duplications of effort -- I've always welcomed information whether positive or negative, just so it's information -- find that most others feel the same way. As I've said before, though, technicalities of writing are the sort of information I find most interesting.

If I set up a Writer's Exchange for the club with the blessing of officialdom, I'll have to be allowed to run it my own way and send reports for awhile until there is a good view available to the club, as to how it operates. In this way, I'll have a free hand to work in what I can in my own time, and meanwhile it will be easier for anyone else to step in and handle the work, if it proves worth continuing.

It is very easy and pleasant, and takes only a few minutes for me, and for most readers, to go through a story. This is a literary hobby and there is plenty of literary talent loose around in the club, both readers and writers. Also as some of you know, my fanac has always been just as open to non-members -- in this instance there is no reason against it as I carry my own costs, plus the good reason in favor of it that it makes friends for the club, has been doing so right along. I could add various details as to what works best, but why not let that go until we see whether the general outline of this idea is agreeable to all? And, of course, what other advice comes in; I've had a good deal of practice at this stuff by now, but somebody always thinks of things I didn't. Over to you all.

CREATH THORNE
Route 4
Savannah, Missouri
64485

I do not believe that a Writer's Bureau under one head would be a good idea to put into practice. I say this despite the fact that Clayton Hamlin and Alma Hill could probably work with the thing and make it one of the outstanding successes of the N3F. One must take

into consideration the future of the bureau. It is possible that some time in the future Clay will find that he could not carry on the duties of the bureau. Then, if he has not primed someone to take over the whole section collapses. Under the present system, if someone should gafiate, the section would still be able to carry on without too much of a disruption. I don't think that we should have gigantic bureaus with sub divisions as it just creates more work and confusion. I repeat this is not a criticism of Clay himself or the way that he handles the Story Contest, but rather a criticism against moves to consolidate related services into one bureau.

I find Eric Blake's letter to be highly amusing, not because I disagree with him on his basic conclusions, but because of the way he got there. So a majority of people believe in the morals set down by the Bible -- there are just several hundred million people who don't happen to believe in that code. But Eric, seriously, every man must be true to himself. He must decide what is good and bad for himself and his dependents. You do not have the right to censor or dictate to any other man. And Eric, the Holy Bible supports the above statement.

I personally feel that if a lettercol was brought back resembling those in the old pulps the editors would not allow such a wide discussion of topics as that in TB. The letter cols was basically for debating the stories and the ideas contained in them. Besides, recently rereading some of the old pulps I found a vast amount of immaturity in them. Almost every letter had such idions as "yuk, yuk. Hoh, ho, ho, ho. Choke, gurgle, gurgle, gasp," using those figures of speech to indicate their opinions of the various stories. Come now, Roy, aren't you just nostalgic for the good old days?

It is hard for the neofen to get into activities around the N3F, even if Bureau heads do welcome inquiries. Often the neofan is unsure of himself and needs encouragement to undertake an activity. The neofan would be helped immensely if the follow-up bureau could be gotten back into action. Over the years Seth Johnson has been taking upon himself many of the duties of the follow-up bureau, but one person can do only so much.

PHILLIP A. HARRELL
2632 Vincent Avenue
Norfolk 9, Virginia

This is your Friendly TAFF candidate Phil Harrell, here to say absolutely nothing at all. The only reason I'm writing this is that Lee & Ira Riddle are publishing it, and I've been meaning to write to them for some time. Ever since DisCon as a matter of fact. I didn't get a chance

to see a tenth enough of Lee, mainly because I was too busy searching for Wally Weber in fact I think I spent 3/4th of my time searching for Wally. I finally found him in of all places the N3F Hospitality Room.

I remember Lee from way back when when Fandom was something to belong to and PEON was one of Fandom's utmost top fanzines along with CRY, OOPSLA!, GRUE, ABSTRACT, PSYCHOTIC and....and....S*N*I*F*F I...I'd better stop. I weep easily and the

memories of things past make me just want to sit down and bawl. Either that or go off into a corner with Lee & Wally and maybe one or two others of the old timers and just talk and reminess about old times (Hey! anybody remember the Tucker Balcony Insurgence of NYCON? Those WERE the old days....) ...and the Great Old Zines about the great times we had when everyone didn't take the wonderful hobby of fandom so ultrasercon. It's really not worth it and taking it so deadly seriously takes all the fun out of it. Back in the days when Lee did a Column in one of the prozines; every issue some editor of a leading Fanmag (fanzine to you neos) would do a column about fanmags, Fandom, and etc. Oh yes, the permanent name of the column was "Fanmag" and the prozine would print reviews of fanzines and everyone enjoyed our Hobby and no one took it seriously. In those days (happy daze) fen had incentive to publish good to excellent fanmags mainly cause not only would everyone ignore the one like are printed today with few exceptions like YANDRO, STARSPINKLE and a few exceptions other than those (a Wally Weber fanmag for instance is without exception always a thing of beauty and shimmering magnificense). But it's not really the fan's fault. The incentive is gone. The incentive that made fans fight to be the best fanzine so they'd be reviewed or receive recognition. The death of the Fannish Prozine is or was the death of really superior fanzines for the most part and brought on what passes for Fanzines now days and with the death of CRY an Era passed ...an era that belonged to SHAGGY, PEON, GRUE and the joy and happiness that was a kinder gentlier era. Exunt Friendliness/Happiness Fandom...enter Nastiness Fandom with its piddling "don't give a damn as long as I'm nasty to someone fanmags. And before everyone hops up and down on one foot and screams "Foul" may I remind them of STARFINK, ZEEN, MINAC #12/13 among quite a number more. This is why I urge a return to a time when everyone wasn't so al-fired serious, and ready to jump down someone's throat because they take out an ad in some publication or the other or say something someone else doesn't like. You didn't find this in the old days mainly because everyone was too busy having fun to take it seriously or even have time to.

RICHARD MANN
131 Belt Road
APO 845
New York, N. Y. 09845

Well, the N3F is up to its old tricks again. Today, 15 days after the deadline for TB 26, I get two different copies of TB 24 from two different editors, entirely. J Jolly! I won't say that I'm disgusted, just discouraged. I send Ken Krueger about a quarter's worth of stamps a couple of months ago to make sure that I would get his TB before the deadline this time. All I wanted was for him to mail it first class, but evidently the letter got mixed up with all the rest of the muddle, and the result is that I'm two weeks late again. And if I know Roy Tackett, two weeks late is simply too late to get into the zine for this time. So, if I don't make it in time for TB 26 (or will you call this one #24, too?), forward this to the next sucker, who will, I am sure, be happy to get it. Like, you editors are always complaining that no one writes letters....

To Norm Metcalf in the Krueger ed'n of TB24, I might say that fandom doesn't help me one bit as a reader of the science fictional genre. Nor as a collector, really. The only thing it has done is take my money I used to buy staf books and magazines and collect with and put it to use for such things as mimeo supplies and paying for getting fanzines mimeographed. Then I end up paying out more money than I can afford for subs to various fanzines that I can't get any other way. Fandom actually hinders me -- and it uses up a great deal of time. This is just too bad, though, because I like fandom. I enjoy the

association (long-distance, tho it is) with other fans, and I like the egoboo I get from it. I enjoy reading about stf as much or more as I enjoy reading it. If all I liked was stf, I would be out of place in fandom.

This andrew j. offutt sounds like a fairly logical fellow. I never did understand why someone would want their name in all lower case letters, and to me this denotes a little bit of immaturity, but then of course, I'm not informed and may be doing the guy a great injustice. But it looks so darn affected and seems to be a plea for attention or something.

A few thoughts on the eternal plight of the neofan. I'm one of the beasties, I guess, but I can't say that it has hurt me in the least. Of course, no one has yet written me a letter begging for material nor has anyone even so much as subscribed to my fanzine unless I practically made them. This is the type of thing one has to expect when just starting out in fandom, and nothing anyone does changes it. Eventually, if I stick with it long enough, I will become known through fandom -- but that won't happen until I do something to earn that distinction. I know that I'm no one special and that fandom can very happily get along without me, and that there are others around me that will certainly someday soon become well known and all that before I come close. But, as far as I can see, this is just life. People will get ahead, and others will fall behind. It's natural. But fandom has a few advantages over life. Fandom is more fair about the whole thing-- you don't inherit anything, and fuggheads just don't become respected BNFs.

As I see it, the neo doesn't have too much of a problem. He has to serve a period of 'apprenticeship' to learn about the realm, but one cannot become skilled in anything without first learning and training for it. My experience indicates that if a neo has any sense at all, he can feel his way around and by asking a few well-placed questions, pretty well figure out what's going on in fandom. Of course, I would love to be in FAPA and SAPS and have everyone rave about my fanzines, but that isn't possible quite yet. Instead, I'm in N'APA and APA 45, and buried deep on the waiting list of the bigger two apas. But, I have my dreams of someday being one of those nebulous BNFs and publishing a zine so good that I can reject half of the daily input of material -- but the important thing is that this is merely a dream, and I won't denounce anybody for not making it come true within the hour. It just doesn't happen that way.

And then I'll agree with Mike Deckinger -- the fannish portions of fandom appeal to me. Before you get into an in group or clique, you have to prove yourself worthy of that. If the clique doesn't want to take anyone into it, then who wans into that sort of a bunch anyway?

Actually, I think that these 'cliques' are merely the result of new fans coming into fandom at the same time. As I have come into fandom, I have developed my own little circle of corespondents. I think that this happens to all of us. In another 10 years, some neo may be thinking we're doing him a great injustice when we don't ask him to join the circle, when the whole thing was just a haphazard growht of a bunch of neos in the first place. So, as far as I'm concerned, the heck with the old cliques -- new ones are just as much fun and amusement.

I'm a pretty religious (deeply) fella myself, and I don't think that Eric Blacke has the right idea at all. Good grief, I've never seen a more disgusting attitude in any publication!

As Chairman of the Publicity Bureau, I have surprisingly little. Reasons: Lack of ideas and lack of anyone to help out. First, I need ideas, and then I'll need people to help get the ideas on the road and moving. As of yet, I haven't been able to find out who has been putting those ads in the convention program book -- I asked Don, but he didn't reply -- I imagine the answer will be in the June TNFF -- if and when that arrives.

RICHARD S. BENYO
118 South Street
Jim Thorpe, Penna.
18229

Re the Foreign Membership "Laws": Let the decision up to the applicant for membership, whether or not he wishes to place himself in a shaky position with the officials of his country. If he does not have enough sense to know that it may get him into trouble, he deserves to suffer the consequences -- if any at all.

Re the "Controversy" over STRANGER IN A STRANGE LAND; I haven't had time to read the book (altho I have it in my collection), but from the comments I gather that some people think Heinlein should watch what he says about (or pertaining to) religions, or the lack of same thereof. Altho I'm not a writer myself (not pro, anyway--is there any other kind?), I feel that one of the writer's purposes of each of his literary works should be to make the reader think in some way, be it from something shocking about the story, something subtle, or something that is just There. If an author wishes to use religion as a means of getting a point across, this does not necessarily mean that the author endorses these same thoughts as they were presented in his novel. Especially a "solid" author like Heinlein, who seems to be rather precise in everything he does. By the very fact that his book caused your comment on this point is a Big Thing in his favor, for he has accomplished his intentions -- the reader thought about what was being said, for once, rather than just read what was said. (End of epistle from a Would-Be-Writer.)

Re Jeff Cole's comment that it is unjust to compare ERB and Heinlein: Your agitation, I believe, is misplaced by your statement. Why does everyone downtrod poor, Laid to Rest Edgar Rice? Face facts, you ERB Haters: Burroughs was a shrewd businessman. He wrote what the people wanted in a time when competition in the literary field was high. He took writing as a science, rather than as an art. After all of the jobs he had, and the struggling he went through, when he found something by which he could gain capital, he naturally capitalized on it. Heinlein, Vintage his last three books, has been doing the same thing, only he has been capitalizing on the loyalties of his fans--fans created from such superb books as STARSHIP TROOPERS, DOUBLE STAR, and many others. Without any degree of rationalization on the part of the Heinlein fans, one can get them to agree that Heinlein's writing style is sliding on the old crest created by the previous works. Perhaps, if I had been brought violently into s-f by Heinlein, I'd be a staunch fan of his too, but I was brought in by Norton, and as things go, I got onto the Winning Horse--one going Uphill, rather than down.

JOHN BOSTON
816 South First Street
Mayfield, Kentucky
42066

According to Ed Bryant, a member should be kicked out if he should be kicked out if he shows "overt signs of the Communist faith". This fatuously vulgar asininity is exemplary of the bigotry that fandom is usually free from. To expel a member of this club for being a Communist, or merely stating opinions which coincide with Communist doctrine, is penalizing a person

for the opinions he holds, and nothing more or less. One of the most desirable features of fandom and the N3F is the relatively free exchange of ideas among its members. If a member of this organization is expelled because of his political philosophy or religion, I will resign immediately and expect a number of other members to do likewise. This narrow-minded tyranny has no place among a fraternity of intellectual freedom such as fandom.

While I can not be termed a conservative by any stretch of the imagination, I must object to Marc Christopher's idea that "the conservatives are mostly Birchers." It just ain't so.

The alternative to censorship is (a) intellectual freedom, coupled with (b) a lot of pornography, subversion and blasphemy. However, one of the most important points about civil liberties is that they go hand-in-hand with civil responsibilities. This means that you are responsible for protecting yourself from Pornography, Subversion and Blasphemy by refusing to read it, if you so choose, or by exposing yourself to it on the principle that ignorance is not bliss. The latter is by far the most mature course. The way to defeat bad opinions is to prove that they are fallacious, rather than ignore them. If you can't prove that they are fallacious, maybe your own beliefs are at fault. For example, take the attempted suppression of the facts of evolution, astronomy, and the like by the Christian church. By the way, the only Christian I know who read Stranger in a Strange Land was disappointed, not horrified. (He is a minister of the Church of Christ.) He had expected better things. I have been in his house, and in his bookshelves are Kierkegaard, Philip Wylie, C. S. Lewis, Nietzsche, and Ayn Rand as well as the usual Biblical commentaries.

Back to the subject. The way to stop pornography, subversion and blasphemy is not to try to suppress it, but to allow the individual to make his own choice about the matter, and to attempt to upgrade the tastes of individuals--a thankless task. Don't try to enforce Christianity, but spread it.

I, likewise, am anti-communism. I am also anti-atheist, anti-"popular music", and anti-Burroughs. However, I certainly don't propose to expell from the club communists, atheists, rock'n'roll fans, and members of the Burroughs Bibliophiles. If some member of the club, starts spouting Marxist doctrine, why don't you argue with him rather than try to burn him at the stake? Or are you afraid they might taint your mind? If so, I recommend that you make a study of communism. It is not a minifestation of Evil. It is a political philosophy containing a large number of fallacies.

I agree with Andrew Offutt's complaints. What is TIGHTBEAM for if not discussion. However, the production of an issue of TB should be left up to the editor involved. If Ken Krueger did a poor job of editing, we'll know better next time.

DON'T FORGET-- Letters of comment and
discussion for November TIGHTBEAM go to:

Richard H. Eney
417 Fort Hunt Road
Alexandria, Virginia 22307
((DEADLINE -- OCTOBER 15th))

NORM METCALF
P. O. Box 336
Berkeley, California
94701

Franson: You are so right. If you want something done in fandom you have to do it yourself without worrying about response. And when you get it done there are usually enough people around who will derive some benefit from it. But where did you ever get the idea that there was ever a

second Day Index? Some people have gotten this idea from somewhere. Don Day never did a second index. He did undo Index 51-60 which he was supposed to publish and which is having to be done all over again.

Hamlin: What's this about Spacehounds of IPC being a preliminary of the universe of the Lensmen? I would really like to see an article showing a definite connection between the two. But since they're both set in our universe I fail to see what you're driving at.

Boston: I'm not suffering from a case of one-sidedness. I have nothing against non-fannish material. But by definition it doesn't belong in fandom. Yet so-called fans and so-called fanzines are either monopolized or have little more than casual connection with fandom. Yet these people and zines are intertwined with fans so that you can't hardly have one without the other. I've been guilty of this intermingling myself. Ed Wood has jumped me for it and I'd like to apologize to Ed for ever having gotten off the track. And if you think the most active fans "are for the most part intelligent, open-minded, and concerned about things which the man in the street ignores--philosophy, politics, literature, etc." tell me where you found these fans? They sound pretty interesting and it might be fun to join in with them. I don't have a 'single-minded passion for the reading and discussion of SF to the exclusion of all other topics.' I have been attacked for not having a single-minded passion for SF. But I prefer to leave such discussion to their proper realms.

Blake: If you're worried about the morality of Heinlein's Stranger in a Strange Land and praising that of Burroughs how about the fact that by contemporary U.S. standards David Innes and Carson Napier were both living in sin with Dian the Beautiful and Duare, respectively? Since you cite the heroes of Burroughs for their moral strength you must then realize that morals are not absolute. So therefore, you cannot logically claim that Stranger in a Strange Land had an immoral protagonist. The Nest had its own morals, which differed from ours, just as the quality of the people in the Nest differed from the quality of the people in the USA today. Their morals were workable for them, just as ours try to work for us. (Notice that I'm not saying that they do work, nor do I state that they've been stable. Even Christian morality has changed with the times over the centuries.)

Fergus: I read Witch World to the end only because so many fans had been saying how great it was. Norton has done far far better. I was highly annoyed in Witch World that every time she came to a critical scene she immediately synopsisized the events instead of writing them out. And the two lead characters are pretty miserably characterized. Web of the Witch World gagged me after a few chapters -- the same faults were repeated and this time there was no interest in the world of the witches being depicted. This was taken care of by the first book. And now I hear she's writing a third one. You won't catch me even starting it.

Lamont: The N3F used to have a test which had to be passed before a potential member

could join. In the abstract the idea of a qualification test is a good one -- it would get rid of the non-fans though not the fans who are also using fandom for their other interests. But on a practical basis it seems impossible to devise a test which everyone could pass who is interested in sf to the proper level. Like, what is the proper level and furthermore, you have to assume that each person has read certain stories which is also ridiculous. Besides, personally, I don't like the idea of such an organization. Right now we've got all these people joining the N3F, perhaps some of them can be converted into fans.

As for the Collector's Bureau you wanted something for nothing, you got nothing just like the rest of them who wrote in wanting something for nothing. Look, if you characters would have read my reports in TNFF and complied with them you'd have received issues of COLLECTOR'S BUREAU from me. As for personally answering each letter I received I wasn't receiving a salary from the N3F (or from any part of fandom). Until then I'll use my time as I see fit. This does not include answering letters. If I were to answer every letter I receive it would be a full-time job. And I know of what I speak. While I was in the service I used to answer each and every letter from anyone. It took a good many hours a day (I was getting sixteen or so letters per day on the average) and I have no wish to go back to that. Then it didn't matter. I was in the swamps of Florida, there wasn't much else to do around there that appealed to me and so I wrote fanzines, letters to fanzines, corresponded, etc. No more.

Don't think that the majority of fans voted for Stranger for a Hugo. A majority of fans don't even vote, let alone vote for any one book. The Pacificon II is planning on stirring up some interest by publishing the vote breakdown. It may surprise some people that you and your friends could have nominated anything you want.

Bailes: The only fanzines still being published these days haven't made the mistake of being sidetracked from sf. If they had they wouldn't be fanzines. And as for those have ceased publishing I wish I had my copy of Ed Wood's final issue of his fanzine out of storage. It had a beautiful editorial in it. As usual, Ed was hitting the nail on the head with regard to fandom's lack of support for fanzines. And then someone tried to put Ed down for decrying fandom without ever having published a fanzine.

There's a simple way of getting hold of sf readers to support fanzines. Get publicity in the prozines. I got about 225 subscriptions that way for one of my fanzines that I know of for sure (mainly because they're the ones who said why they'd sent money in.)

STAN WOOLSTON
12832 Westlake Street
Garden Grove, Calif.
92640

The Art of Writing Checklists as expounded by Don Franson is a fine way of thinking and one that I recommend for those who feel fandom has to be complicated. Some of the complication is that we make it that way. If we'd find what we want from it and then see ways of arriving at that end,

we might enjoy it very much, as Don evidently does. A checklist as he describes it would be swift to construct and usable--and if someone else wanted additional data (he or she--are there women checklists in fandom?) could construct one. Crossindexing might be easier--changing from author index to title or story, say. And if someone else had other ideas they could do 'em, so everyone who like their indexes neatly cross-index-

ed need only get one from each and bind together. Yes, a good way --one-fan projects thus can be allowed to grow and develop.

Ida Ipe's round robin story quads cause reminiscences of past ones. They were enjoyable. I'm planning a more intensive course of improvement by personal effort, or by writing full story with others to give pointers. In the line of writing, a round robin has the advantage of being something that come to a successful conclusion and proves to a beginning writer he can. Can what? Can have an idea, put it on paper, can cause the various mechanical aspects of the story to become organized well enough so they don't show too badly. Then, perhaps, the result can be a sale. And that is a sort of goal, to be a Dirty Pro, as the sentimental phrase goes. A grown-up hope of every little kid who combined fun with a layer of dirt. (Deep Philosophical stuff, isn't this? Read before burning.)

There's lots of things that will cause me to write directly to various letterwriters and to the editor of the last issue to needle him back for injuring us poor directors with his sharp jabs. This is, I'm sure, a form of therapy on his part. Maybe next week (as I write this) I'll be going into Los Angeles to apply the needle in person, as my information is that Tackett will have come out, exploring the fan areas.

JIMMIE McDONALD
722 Choctaw
Alva, Oklahoma

I wish to say that I believe that it is only right and proper that people try not to intentionally or unintentionally offend someone through neglect; however, efforts to not offend have reached the point of absurdity when one

honest mistake is taken and blown out of proportion on the assumption (unfounded, I might add) that it might offend someone. It is simply impossible to go through life without offending numerous people and stepping on countless toes. The sad thing is that so many must insist on spending valuable time just to avoid things which "might" prove offensive. To my way of thinking, it's childish.

Eric Blake is an interesting case of something I've never seen in the flesh before -- a close-minded religious fanatic. I've seen close-minded fanatics before but never one who was religious. Oh well, we all have faults.

I hasten to add that I agree with Phil Castora that "obscenity is in the eye of the beholder." I disagree with Eric about this mythical morality that is "20 centuries old." I have not seen such an animal and do not expect to ever see one.

One more thing. I believe that a monarchy is the best possible government that mankind has ever developed. Unfortunately it has a bad habit of not working. I think that anyone should have the right to join the N3F if he so wishes as long as he isn't a Communist or some such creater with intentions other than benevolent. Since there probably aren't any benevolent Communists who want to join a sf fan club, I'm against commie members.

DEADLINE FOR NOVEMBER TIGHTBEAM IS OCTOBER 15th

CUYLER W. BROOKS, JR.
911 Briarfield Road
Newport News, Virginia
28605

I thought that Tackett's TB was very good. In many cases, the comments by the editor were better than the letters! I was sorry to learn that he had never gotten the long letter on Dr. Ladonko's ESP experiment that I had originally intended for Krueger's offset TB. Krueger says in his TB that he sent it to Tackett. Ah well, that'll tach me to keep a copy next time!

I was amazed to learn that Eric Blake is 56. I would have guessed teenage, like Coulson did. There is little I need say about his letter in TB #26 after Tackett's comments. I do not agree that Phil Castora's "obscenity is in the eye of the beholder" is an example of moral relativism. It is simply another version of the "evil is in the ey of the beholder" which I think is from the Bible. Oops, minister across the street says now. Still, it has nothing to do with moral relativism. Even such an absolutely moral person as Mr. B could hardly be offend by my cursing in a language he did not know. This is what Castora's quote means. Of course, there are obscene and immoral acts in FANNY HILL and TROPIC OF CANCER. This is no reason for not reading them. There are evil men and evil deeds described in the Bible.

As to this question of whether you can judge a book without reading it through, it seems to me to depend on how much attention you pay to the author's style. I find trying to read ERB like wading through mud because his style is so turgid. Of course, I could o it if I had to, but I'm quite sure it wouldn't be worth it. Thus, when I approached a book, I sample the style and then weigh the difficulty of reading it against the probable value. The British fantasy writers like Tolkien, C.S. Lewis and Mervyn Peake write so beautifully that I read all their books without hesitation. Charles Williams and David Lindsay (VOYAGE TO ARCTURUS) are more difficult, but the content does make the effort worthwhile, as it does in the case of George MacDonald. Of course, a writer's style may change. I found LADY CHATTERLEY'S LOVER impossible, but I enjoyed THE ROCKING HORSE WINNER, by the same author, very much.

I notice that Grace Cox suggests that Eric Blak read C.S. Lewis's SCREWTAPE LETTERS. I'm not sure he's ready for that yet -- maybe he should start with Lewis's CHRONICLES OF NARNIA which, in case anybody is interested, are still in print in this country and are available from the publisher, MacMillan, at \$2.95 for each of the seven volumes. Anybody that has British correspondents can probably get them even cheaper from over there. If Mr. Blake really wants SF novels based on Christian theology, he should get C.S.Lewis's trilogy, OUT OF THE SILENT PLANET, PERELANDRA, and THAT HIDEOUS STRENGTH.

Donald Miller's letter on games was interesting but a little frustrating. He tells us that "rythomomachy" is the most difficult game ever invented and then says nothing more about it. Now I have to go to the library and try to find out what it is. I would like to find a good game that four or five people could play by mail, preferably one that doesn't require too much elaborate equipment. If such athing should get started, I'd like to get in it.

LIS BRODSKY
3123 Glenwood Road
Brooklyn, New York
11210

Eric Blake: You must be under a misapprehension, thinking that fans do what is fashionable. Fans are, on the whole, completely individualistic. Never becoming "typical" of our society, not living in tacky-tacky houses, or wearing the latest things, or saying or reading or believing in what

are the current things to believe in. Censorship is necessary to some degree, but not to the point of telling us what we all must do, wear, eat or think about. Censorship is up to the individual. If such-and-such a book were banned, i.e., FANNY HILL in New York City, then I would go out of my way to read it (which I did) simply because I was told NOT to read it in no uncertain terms, because it was bad for me. phooey. True, some books can do more harm than good, but just where are we to draw the line? Are we to then say that anything dealing with Marxism, Fascism, or any ism different from our beliefs are bad and should be banned? At what point do we stop banning books until there is not any mention of it anyplace, until all the books become basically the same, having the same plot, and having the same ending? Killing is bad, therefore, ban anything that has anything to do with killing. Drinking, smoking, all these are bad too, but once you ban these things in books, just where do you stop?

Valentine Smith is a hero and not a "principal character" to quote you. Anything or rather anyone who is uncommon is a hero. Wasn't Valentine Smith born on Mars, having three parents, being raised by aliens, and able to do many things physically that others couldn't? Try rereading SIASL again, if I doubt, you have read it completely the first time...read it with more of an open mind, it is the type of book that should be read more than once to get the fullest meaning out of it. It is the type of book, that the more you read it, the more you get out of it. At least that is what I have found in reading SIASL for many times.

Okay, so we (N3F) bar Communists, then someone may say, what about the Birchites, their philosophy is almost akin to communism, only on the other extreme. Okay, so we bar Birchites. Then what about the Catholics, Jews, Negroes, Atheists, etc., all must be barred, because they don't agree with "our" way of thinking on some subjects. I am sorry, but a limit can not be drawn until all that would be left would be yourself, since everyone else would have some thought or thoughts alien from your own. I am truly sorry for you Mr. Blake, being all alone in this club, but then I guess that was your idea to begin with.

DAVID M. ETTLIN
3424 Royce Avenue
Baltimore, Maryland
21215

This letter is, for the most part, an apology to everyone I owe letters, and is written out of sheer tiredness from overwork. In January of next year, to coincide with my 19th birthday, I am publishing my own book of poetry.

It takes much money, and since the margin of profit is narrow already, I will have to do all my own selling, publicity, and paperwork myself. The book is 24 or more pages depending upon my next few months of writing, and is available in the hardbound, numbered and signed copies for \$2.00 pre-pub, \$2.50 after January, and just numbered paperbacks at \$1.25, or at pre-pub price of a flat dollar (or any other shape dollar, for that matter). But all this work will force me to give up other time-consuming activities, and I am looking for a possible head of the Tape Bureau to be my successor. I hope that he/she has two tape recorders, but only

one is essential. Interested...just write to me. The tape orders are slowly but surely being finished, so don't worry all you people who think I absconded with the funds.

I have a few random comments on TB 26.

Robin Wood: How old are you, if you don't mind my asking.

Marc Christopher: I think idealists (political, that is) are fun and occasionally decent fellows; how in the hell can you make up a democratic world government with 3 billion people of conflicting religions, races and beliefs? I don't mean to deride or injure you, but ALLAH KNOWS that you simply are not being practical...ah, yes, you are an idealist, and much like I use poetic license, political license is valid for you. Lots of luck, fella...let me know how it works out.

Eric Blake: I assume you are Roman Catholic? On that note, I'll say why I don't quite go along with your beliefs: I learned why your religion doesn't allow birth-control-- they would rather have more Roman Catholics. And that, in my opinion, stinks to high whateveritis and onwards into whateveristheopposite.

Your views on censorship are comical. Perhaps you'd like me to listen to what you say, and become another puritan. No person can know how I think, and therefore, no person can or should be able to tell me what I can should would or will ever see, hear, read, or otherwise allow something to affect my life. Do you mean to say that If I see sex (with or without the "holy matrimony" magilla) as something beautiful, that to you it is smut and dirt and all that is blasphemy? My friend, I wish you all the luck on your next date (if you do date, of course) when the old and honorable biological urge smashes into you, and you sit tight and mutter to the sweet dear girl, "But that is blasphemy."

I just discovered that you were 56, so forgive my impudence. But I still think that your beliefs are downright outdated. Oh yes, I wish YOU lots of luck too. Oh, if you are married, please tell me how many children you happen to have. Nothing of too much importance, but the believing Roman Catholic families around this way average 10 children per family, and live in somewhat near abject poverty as a result. Also, the probably reason that a greater percentage of Roman Catholics are in our prisons is most likely that they did not receive a decent childhood due to their parents' religious affiliations. Anti-birth control factions are as horrible to think about as are the extremists who don't allow their children's lives to be saved by blood transfusions.

and an addenda to Mr. Christopher -- isn't it about time you actually LISTENED to the good Senator Goldwater instead of relying on what other people say about him. Your imagination runeth awayeth with you, and I feel dep dymathy for it (not for you, though.) I politically a conservative, and I believe sincerely in one thing Goldwater said a short time ago -- about extremism in the pursuit of liberty. Your world government is not a liberal attitude, either, but also extremist on the far radical left. And is not extremism in pursuit of liberty, but an open invitation to world dictatorship and tyranny -- the very things you abhor.

CLAYTON HAMLIN
Southwest Harbor
Maine
04679

I can't resist jumping in with both feet and leeting loose a blast at Eric Blake. Tell me, Eric, what are your qualifications to judge what people should read? And by what authority do you do so? The answer, you are an individual member of a secondary sect (there are over

200 of them amont Christians), which is part of a minority religion (less than one in three of the world's population are Christians), from a totally insignificant world right out on the edge of nowhere in relation to the total universe. Does this give you the right to say with any certainty that the creator of all this is going to be upset and disturbed if the rest of us are allowed to read a different viewpoint of HIM than your own personal beliefs? Is your knowledge and judgement of his motives complete enough to deny knowledge and opinion to the young and weak. (I always get a good laugh from the idea of an immature adult, it is a contradiction in terms.)

You seem to be claiming this right on the basis of a small knowledge of Holy Scripture. Yet are are hundreds such, plus thousands of religions that never did write them down. I wonder, just how many of these are you personally familiar with, from actual reading of them, rather than in the form of pre-digested slogans and "explanations" from so-called authorities. Did you ever read the Koran, even in translation? The Vedic Hymns? The Elder Eddas? Oahspe? The many books of Confucius, or of Madame Blavatsky? Voluspa? The Book of the Dead? The Book of Mormon?

There are many, and they can't casually be dismissed as right or wrong by any of us. Neither can Stranger in a Strange Land. It can't be done by anyone, mature responsible adults, children, weak and irresponsible adults, or Martians.

No, Eric, I'm not an atheist. Or even that confusing thing called an agnostic. From a casual study of these things over the years, it looks like I qualify as a member, practicing, of the oldest still existant religion known to man. It is the only one I have knowledge of that believes in a direct relationship between a man and his maker, without the need of an intermediary such as a church. Confused by what this is? The best word you have for it is Paganism. It has had other names, nature worship, Saturnalia, even at times, witchcraft. Of course I am not saying it is right, but it DOES allow a great deal more individuality, and needs little or no faith or ritual to practice.

Eric, I wonder if you understand your own motives. Surely, God needs no protection from us, he allows us to think and do as we wish. But, by your insistence on protecting others from influences that you feel to be wrong, could it be that deep down you feel you yourself needs protection? A comfortable niche you have yourself, maybe some of these others might learn something a trifle closer to reality, and upset this whole culture of yours. Think it over, at worse examining one's motives is the best known way of keeping an open mind. It might even help you bring your beliefs a bit closer to reality.

To make a brief mention of stf (this is a stf club, they tell me), I would suggest another Mark Twain book you might find intriguing. Captain Stormfield's Visit to Heaven. A thoroughly delightful book and story, and not nearly well known enough, even among fans. Would that there were writers like that today!

NATE BUCKLIN
P. O. Box 4
Dockton, Washington
98018

TIGHTBEAM 26 was the nicest blend of economy and interest I've seen in a long time. The supereconomical TB 22 was boring (I've only read it twice, and I've read all the others at least three times; sorry, Gary and those who wrote to it) and the superinteresting 23 couldn't have been economical. Congratulations, Roy; and a good job in printing, editorial comments (gigglesworth, even though apt) and editing. I should have written to it.

John Boston: There ARE non-neffers who care...I think. One of my most valuable correspondents is a Neffer who (a) usually files TB unsorted and unread (b) can spare N3F dues without really missing them (like, he's an adult with a paying occupation; I can't say the same, and neither can many others) (c) has exactly one reason for staying in the N3F and has as many for quitting. Outside the N3F he is much more active than within it; he has his circle of friends, too, and hardly any of them are Neffers. This fan read a letter of mine in TB 19 (which he claims to have read on a hunch) and immediately wrote me a letter indicating that he would like to correspond, with lots of comment on my letter. Does this sound uncaring? I don't think this person can be considered more than nominally a Neffer; after all, to join the N3F all you must do is pay your dues. (Maybe the main characteristic of a Neffer is that he paid his dues to Janie Lamb with the express intent of joining the N3F). If he ever decided to quit the N3F, will he automatically suffer a wide change in personality? I doubt it very much.

John Kusske: Has Dave KP begun making sense? I didn't know..I prefer his stories to his letters; but when his letters don't waste space they may do the club some good; I don't know for certain. I am also in no position to judge. I can get cheap vicarious thrills from sf; if it takes me many sf-reading years to get into fandom and stay in long enough to learn how to appreciate these CVT's, they haven't been wasted, either.

Unlimited Freedom of Choice yields Anarchy, and Anarchy isn't perfect because people aren't; I found some other moderately democratic system recently which allowed and compensated for peoples' flaws in this respect, but it didn't allow for Unlimited Freedom of Choice or it would have been Anarchy. I'm against censorship, too; but I thought this deserved to be thrown in. Comments?

Jeff Cole: I agree about ERB; when I was four to seven I read (yes, for myself) Tarzan and found him reasonably interesting, usually. Make that almost always. I can still recreate the state of mind of a seven-year-old occasionally and read some more. I came across Mars at age thirteen and nearly got sick. Maybe at the time Burroughs wrote them one or two of them could be considered sf, but not now. (The whole Mars set up is descientified on biological grounds; six-limbed and four-limbed vertebrates coexisting, large areas infested by and only by carnivores...this was known to be impossible quite a while ago, certainly before Burroughs wrote.) SAVAGE PELLUCIDAR: it isn't even complete in intself; getting into it was like starting a serial in the middle with no synopsis. I voted ERB-dom for Hugo because not one of the zines I wanted got onto the ballot, and I enjoyed ERB-dom's ads; but that's my only concession. (Does anybody want to cooperate with me in forming the Burro's Bibliophobes? I think we could get up a good lousy organization, maybe.)

Erick the Fake: (I still can't believe you exist, sorry.) If subversion, pornography and blasphemy are allowed to circulate, this proves that censorship exists only nominally if at all. Three cheers for circulation of subversion, pornography and blasphemy. Roy made the point on "profitable"; re"good": this is A MATTER OF OPINION AND/OR ONE OF DEFINITION. To some, subversion, pornography and blasphemy may be "good"; even if they are for censorship, these books may be allowed to circulate. However, perhaps religious books, books unrealistic about sex, and U.S. Government textbooks should be banned because they are, from the point of view of these people, Bad and Unprofitable. Obscenity IS in the eye of the beholder, and morality is relative. (So what isn't?) Paraguay is totalitarian; look up totalitarian in the dictionary, as Roy did. It happens not to be communist, but it's totalitarian nevertheless, and Stroessner is the autocrat, though not in Absolute Control (so he's not absolutely powerful, nor absolutely corrupt.) If any neofan wants to be adopted I'll take one. I'm younger than most of the newer members, and can therefore avoid being condescending; besides, I know a little about the N3F and I WANT TO CORRESPOND...so you don't call it adoption. I went it on my own when I was a neo, but as not many of questions ever got answered this "adoption" would have helped.

I'm convinced that I'm right? I am right. How you talk, Grace. Define "immaturity." What isn't censorable? Nothing; censorship is also relative.

Gil: I've seen one NEW WORLDS. I found it and its stories as interesting as the asf's of 1949-50, and the ideas more varied. Admittedly F&SF is better (though no other American prozine is, not even ANALOG). The guest editorial in this NEW WORLDS bored me stiff. Reprints from NEW WORLDS AND SCIENCE FANTASY are also invariably topflight; such as the story LAMBDA 1. The novels from there, I haven't read. Re sf in general: agreed. Between them, sf, fantasy and the historical novel cover all possible fiction, I think; have I missed anything.

The digest sized zines were better in the 50's than at any other time, except for ANALOG, which was best all along until F&SF showed up. (I've got a few more old F&SF's now than I had at TB 22-time). The pulps: only TWS and STARTLING could compare with ANALOG; I think quality of them is a moot-point--their good stories ranked with ASF's but they published triple as much crud.

Right now, I'm interested in starting another inflammatory discussion. Do You Or Anybody THINK That Schools/Education As U.S. Education Is Presently Set Up Is/Are OK As Is, or Should They Be Changed? If So, To What? Self Education? Etc. I'm going to wait for that question to be answered. One good thing about our local high school: its library contains some sf. This makes school an sfnal subject and it may be discussed. Our 8th-grade literature book also contained a mutilated version of The Green Heels of Earth (the title referred, naturally, to all rookie spacemen; rookies were green, and spacemen were heels, so the rookie spacemen from here were...) It was censored; Rhysling's dirty songs weren't mentioned. Even some of the titles were interesting, and they helped round out the picture of Rhysling.

DEADLINE FOR NOV. TIGHTBEAM IS OCT. 15th

ROBIN WOOD
Box 154
Amador City, Calif.
95601

This is more or less a reaction to the latest TIGHTBEAM.
So I shall ramble a bit, and if by any small chance I
should actually say something fit to print, feel free to.
First off, altho this hardly needs saying, if Roy Tackett
did as good a job as hacking off excessive wordage on

everyone else's letters as he did mine, I can see no reason to raise a hue and cry.
Obviously, not everything that anyone happens to say can be published. And I know
that I, myself, sometimes tend to rant on for pages when I started out with the intent-
ion of filling up a paragraph or two. After all, what are editors for? However, when
it comes to the editor who chops something up to mean something other than the writer
originally meant--a pox upon him, I say. But, as I said, no complaints on this
order this time.

And as always happens, the day after I mailed off my bitch about not getting any wel-
committee letters, etc., they started piling in. It figures. I wasn't aware that Seth
Johnson had lost his mother, so if I said anything overly harsh about the Round Robins
situation, please allow me to withdraw it at this moment.

And once again the religiion question pops up. Naturally, nothing will be settled. The
fanatics will continue being fanatics and the disbelievers continue to disbelieve. I,
myself, consider the whole matter more or less an Open Question which won't be solved
until I leave this rather weird little world, if then. Fanatics on either side of the fence
tend to torque my jaws. As far as I am concerned, I would care less if you are God fans
or Sun worshippers--just don't try to cram your beliefs down my throat, and I'll try to
do the same as far as my beliefs or non-beliefs are concerned.

Is it actually possible to recruit new fen? I know that I just sort of happened to blunder
across it due to a series of accidents and stuck around to see what it was all about. If
somebody had forced a pile of crudzines on me and attempted to draft me into this mad-
ness I probably would have run for cover. Fandom is a rather wild little scene. Some-
times I wonder if it can possibly exist--perhaps it is all a hoax.

As for as world government, I dunno. The UN is about the closest thing we've ever had
to it, and it certainly doesn't have the power to definitely say what's what. I fear that
the only way we'll ever get a true world government is to have some dictitorial maniac
overrun the whole place and take over, which would mean a whole series of devastating
little wars, and I'd just as soon as do without them. Of course, sometimes it looks
like the only other solution is to have a whole bunch of devastating little wars without
anybody taking over. Wow. Some choice.

As far as the Spanish thing goes, I believe Dr. Dupla himself has pretty much said the
last word that needs to be said on that issue.

Eric Blake: Censorship is ridiculous. It only draws more attention to the thing you
want censored in the first place (I won't go into other reasons, but there are plenty.)
For instance, let's take outright pornography, the dirtiest and vilest imaginable. Have
you ever seen any? I would bet that you have, yet it is definitely suppressed. Cen-
sorship only drives the object censored into underground channels, and it pops up
anyway. So no matter how much you believe in your cause of suppressing whatever it

is you may chose, you will accomplish nothing. You may manage to get a few people thrown in jail or fined, if you get enough backing, but all in all the censor is nothing but a nuisance and an annoyance.

If anyone wants to see a few things that our government does that could make one panic, I suggest he enlist in the air force and spend a little time overseas.

DONALD FRANSON
6543 Babcock Ave.
North Hollywood, Calif.
91606

This is a good time for me to get in a comment about the Hugos, after the vote is in so it can't be said that I am trying to influence the vote; and before the results are announced, so it can't be said that I am prejudiced because my candidate lost (my candidate was No Award.

There has recently been a strong tendency to want to award the novel Hugos to authors rather than to novels--do you see the distinction? The Hugo novel awards should go to an outstanding novel (as they did last year) whether it is by Heinlein or Joe Blow. If we wish to honor authors, we should have a separate "author of the year" award just as we now do for artists. We don't give the award to Emsh, say, for a certain Amazing cover, but because he was the outstanding artist in a certain year. An additional author category might be a good thing.

A separate author award would give deserved recognition, without distorting the novel award voting. This is a problem that came up with the Oscars, some years ago. The year that "Gone With The Wind" swept the boards, James Stewart gave an outstanding Oscar-deserving performance in "Mr. Smith Goes to Washington." He got an award, the next year, for "The Philadelphia Story", which he was not even the lead (Cary Grant was). This was an obvious consolation prize.

In the battle for Hugos, long deserving authors are squeezed out -- but must not be considered ahead of others the next year. What chance is there then for a truly outstanding work by an unknown or new author, if all the regulars are waiting in line for recognition? Better give the recognition some other way.

The yearly choice system isn't perfect, either. Sometimes a poor year has nothing outstanding and a good year has a wealth of material to choose from. The choice of Hugos for the past ten years is not what would be chosen now as the best ten books of the past ten years. This problem is not exclusively Hugo's either, has always plagued the Oscars, and nothing can be done about it except voting for "No Award" in lean years; occasionally, in good years, giving duplicate prizes (as the Nobel Prize does.)

Though Hugos are patterned on Oscars and the similarity is not harmful, I would not like to see them go Hollywood all the way. This is the first year I've seen promotion ads in con booklets. This is the first year I've received campaign letters from strangers. I don't like it. Let's cut it out, before we find the candidates plugging for themselves in Variety.

There are only six Hugos now. It wouldn't hurt to add another category--there could be a dozen, except for economic reasons (Hugos are expensive). This might serve to satisfy those who think a certain author deserves belated recognition. I would approve of the nomination of Heinlein, or Norton, or even Burroughs in this category. Why not? Burroughs was certainly the author of the year, in sales and readers. On the other hand why honor Burroughs with a Hugo for "Savage Pellucidar" which is not good Burroughs, no more than an outline of a story. Why honor Heinlein, a truly great writer, with a Hugo for "Glory Road" (Or "Stranger" or "Troopers", for that matter?)

Another Hugo suggestion is to eliminate the Fanzine category entirely from the Hugo ballot, and let a fanzine award be presented annually at the convention by the Fan Poll people.

G. M. CARR
5319 Ballard Ave.
Seattle 7, Wash.

I have here TWO (2) Tightbeam 24s and the June 1964 TNFF. All of which deserve comment, but the order in which they serve it is somewhat baffling. Art Hayes' TB #24 was apparently supposed to be TB #25, but it arrived before Ken Krueger's #24, so that would make

Ken's TB the #25...only, according to the way it was supposed to be, it was the other way around, and now I'm lost... Oh well. Anyway, here's hoping the muddle is now straightened out and here are my comments for whatever they're worth:

In Art Haye's TB #24/25, I note Phil Kohn's comments about setting up restrictions against accepting N3F members for "totalitarian countries, U.S.servicement and diplomatic personnel excepted...all communist countries, Spain, Portugal, Haiti, Paraguay, South Africa, are defined as totalitarian for the purpose of this bylaw," Fortunately, Art Hayes tromped all over this idea in his editorial comments -- for which I thank him -- because this type of thing has no place at all in N3F thinking.

In the first place, we have no right arbitrarily to decide which governments are "totalitarian" and which are not. Secondly, even if we knew for sure, we still would have no right to deny anyone membership in N3F merely because we objected to their nation's politics. Thirdly, we have no right to set ourselves up as "censors" of other people's actions -- even though we may be motivated by "the own good." This is the kind of "do-gooding" which is the most obnoxious of all -- that meddling interference in the actions of others which purports to be done only to "protect" them against their own actions. It is one thing to set up standards of public safety and apply such standards indiscriminately to everyone alike. It is quite another thing to pick and choose. Any person who wants to join N3F strongly enough to risk political embarrassment from his own people, certainly is entitled to take that risk.

In Ken Krueger's TB #24/25, I note Eric Blake's comments about the parallel between Christianity and the concepts of STRANGER IN A STRANGE LAND. For all the comments there's been about the latter -- and the impact some of the ideas seem to have had -- this is the first inkling that the reason for all the impact this book made might be because of this parallel. (I haven't read it yet, myself -- I was too doggone busy at the SEACON to get a copy, and just never an across it since... Our Library, which stocks a good number of Heinlein's books, does not have that one.) The point that occurs to me is that so few people nowadays actually DO know the basic tenents of Christian

teaching, that when they come disguised as science fiction, it surprises everybody.. like a brand new idea that nobody ever heard of before.

In the June 1964 TNFF, I note that Don Franson mentions several items of property owned by the N3F. In addition to the Coffemaker (and assorted oddments), the complete set of NEKROMANTICONS, and the 8 issues of FANTASTIC, N3F used to own quite a good-sized library of both hardcover and pocketbooks. I don't know whatever became of all these books -- there were a couple hundred or so -- but they must still be somewhere. Does anybody remember who was the last Librarian?

HARRY WARNER, JR.
423 Summit Avenue
Hagerstown, Maryland
21740

This is the first letter that I've written as a member about an NFFF publication in something like 17 years. There was no TIGHTBEAM when I held membership before. But in those old days, members of the NFFF were worrying about such things as what to do about

fans who might be communists, what to do about fans whose sexual drives might not be normal, how close to science fiction topics fans and fanzines should adhere, and what projects the NFFF should try to accomplish. You can see that I feel at home even though a great deal of the congregation is unfamiliar, in the unchanged pews. One thing that I positively cannot do, even for the NFFF, is to write a short letter of comment. My entire scheme of fannish ethics is based on the moral necessity of writing at least two pages of comments on any fanzine of substantial proportions. I don't want to remain a member indefinitely without showing at least some signs of NFFFish life, but I can't manifest myself with the kind of letter of comment that is desirable for TIGHTBEAM. Your best procedure would be to omit this letter when you choose the material for the next issue because I'm already turning up in letter sections of entirely too many fanzines.

I was glad to see the general trend of thinking on this new communist scare in the current TIGHTBEAM. The trouble with a communist hunt in fandom is fandom's failure to be big enough, organized enough, and wealthy enough to do the searching in the thorough manner, complete with detailed inquiries into people's backgrounds, hearings, surveillance, and all the rest of the expensive procedures. Faced with the inability to do the job in this manner, and with the fact that the real communists are quite reluctant to come out into the open and tell the truth about themselves, the only way that fandom could proceed would be through the poor man's method of guessing, spreading rumors, accusing without evidence, and incriminating accidentally a lot of innocent persons. Even if we accept the premise that communists are a sufficient danger to the nation to require ferreting out in such an obscure and insignificant group as the NFFF, I don't think that there is any way that the organization could do a decent job of keeping them out.

I can't get enthusiastic about these rebellions against the action of a school board or ministerial association that decides to get this or that book taken from a public school library. This isn't censorship by my definition, because there are still many ways in which the student can read the book in question. The anti-censorship forces are strangely silent about the more serious ways in which free choice of reading matter is restricted in this country. For instance, we never hear about the decisions of the people in Washington who decide what may and may not be imported to this country:

printed matter, art work, and so on. Harrison Cairns was the man in charge of this, the last time I heard. I believe that the newsstand operator who puts nothing but semi-pornography and spicy detective publications onto his shelves is censoring the reading of people in his neighborhood just as thoroughly as the PTA group that forces a newsstand to take all the semi-pornography and spicy detective publications off his shelves. If we're going to rave and rant when some self-appointed censor tries to prevent Tarzan from being read, we should get exactly as upset when the newsstand dealer makes it impossible for me to read The Atlantic Monthly for his failure to stock it.

Is the NFFF entirely innocent in the matter of exhibiting all-out friendship toward unknowns in fandom? Since I've rejoined, I've received heart-warming letters of welcome back from a number of members. But I must conscientiously relate the fact that at the Discon, the only moments when I felt myself ignored and even unwanted was the evening when I drifted into the NFFF hospitality room. Several young fans were there, talking or playing games. They glanced at my name on my lapel, obviously didn't recognize it, and went on with whatever they were doing without even speaking to me. I left a few minutes later. I don't mean by this that the NFFF is a cliquish or snobbish group. It simply demonstrates the humanity of its membership when incidents like this occur: when old friends are together, they're going to be more interested in one another than in some total stranger who bobs up uninvited and unannounced. You'll find older, non-NFFF fans quite as friendly toward neofans and NFFF members as I've found NFFF members in general toward me, and occasionally you'll find a circumstance in which inner circle fandom gives an apparent snub to some youngster because he just happens to seek attention at the wrong moment from the wrong person. All that we need to do is to relax in fandom, rather than seek to find in fanac excuses for starting fusses, and when we find an occasional fan who behaves boorishly, shrug it off and stick to the fans with whom we get along perfectly.

Now, I feel that I've at least started to do my duty by the NFFF. I have no intention of attending the Pacificon this summer, but maybe I'll be able to see some of its members in person at a regional fan meeting before long.

PAUL A. GILSTER
42 Godwin Lane
St. Louis, Missouri
63124

I have read with considerable surprise the remarks of Mr. Marc Christopher in the latest issue of TIGHT-BEAM. I know not whether Mr. Christopher made his statement in jest or not, but at any rate, allow me to quote him now. "...it seems to me that the con-

servatives are mostly Birchers and instead of protecting the Constitution, they want to destroy it." "...it turns out that liberals are the ones who stand up for the Constitution." Two quite laughable statements.

To take Mr. Christopher at issue on the first statement, let me say this. In my city of St. Louis, I have repeatedly voiced my opinions, coming out strongly for conservatism and the conservative philosophy of government. I have talked among my friends, and also have spoken via the local newspaper, the POST-DISPATCH, a very liberal newspaper, as any observer on the political scene can tell you. I have had rocks thrown through my windows on several occasions, and have been called quite a few obscene names which should not be printed herein. These incidents are rare, but they

they have happened. I happen to believe that the people who did this are not in any way representative of the liberal point of view. On the whole, most liberals are intelligent Americans who believe in a political philosophy that I have great respect for, even though I do not agree with most phases of it. Here is my essential point. Because Liberalism has a few crackpots inhabiting it, does this mean that they represent the liberal point of view? Of course not. If I were to follow up Marc's line of reasoning, I could call all liberals socialists, but that just isn't true. Nor is it true that most conservatives are Birchers. The Birchers are definitely in the minority. I am sick and tired of being called a Bircher, an extremist, a facist, a racist, and a Nazi. And I'm also fed up with people like Marc Christopher for they are the ones that do all this name calling.

Regarding the Constitution. I find no justification whatsoever in the statement that Liberals are always first to defend the Constitution. Sure, sure, liberals defend the Constitution, just like they upheld it in this latest controversey over the Civil Rights Bill, and just like they upheld it during the Roosevelt New Deal days. In case Mr. Christopher is blissfully ignorant of those days, it was the period during and immediately after the Depression. Roosevelt ran on a platform stressing balanced budget in 1932, which, incidentally, is enough to break me up in laughter right here and now. Roosevelt offered the people prosperity, the prosperity of the liberal never-never land, which would come about, of course, through the paternalistic Federal government taking care of everyone. The constitution didn't matter a thing. Just keep the people satisfied. Spend and spend, elect and elect. People allowed themselves to be carried away by this dream, and awoke not in heaven, but in purgatory. Did Franklin Roosevelt uphold the Constitution during his administration? If you think he did, you should take another look at politics. I choose Roosevelt as an example, for he seems to be representative of the Liberals now in office. They constantly refer to him affectionately and he seems to be their idol. A true liberal. And Marc Christopher is actually asking us to believe that liberals safeguard the Constitution! How ridiculous can you possibly get? It is the conservatives who safeguard the Constitution--not the conservatives of Mr. Christopher's fairytale land, but the Americans who are worried for themselves and their country, the American citizens who wonder what this country is going to be like in twenty years if something isn't done, and done quickly.

I realize that this letter has nothing to do with s-f whatsoever, yet I feel that at least part of it should be printed. When someone sets forth a viewpoint before the membership, there should be room for rebuttal among other members who disagree. I therefore hope that this thing isn't cut down to one or two sentences. I'd like the other members to see at least part of what I have to say.

And there, friends, you have the end of this issue of TIGHTBEAM. Only one letter was received that was not printed--one from Rich Wannan..it will be forwarded to the next editor, with the request that it start off that issue. It arrived just too late for this one. Our apologies for all the typos, but I believe you will get the gist of all the letters.

Lee & Ira Lee Riddle

TIGHTBEAM

Number 27

from

Janie Lamb
Route 1, Box 364
Heiskell, Tennessee
37754

((Return Requested))

PRINTED MATTER ONLY