

This is Volume One, Number One and is intended for general fandom distribution, plus the following Amateur Press Associations: Prefanzine 11, LASFAPA 17, and APA-nu (March 1978) (No one need read anything but that which interests one.)

Volume III

February 1978

Number 1

## CLEAR ETHER!

Personal-APA-genzine of Samuel Edward Konkin III for LASFAPA, Prefanzine, trades, locs and artwork. Address all correspondence to New Libertarian Enterprises, Box 1748, Long Beach, CA 90801; Personal: SEK3.

Next issue: CE! will be appearing monthly, in whatever APAs are being published in that time period, with comments for those collations and and locs received in the interim. Response to this issue will be most welcome. —SEK3

# Harlan Ellison As Authoritarian

It is not enough to talk the right line; in this life we must walk it straight as well. Otherwise we are contradictory big-mouths.

That lead paragraph paraphrasing Harlan Ellison's recent challenge to Fandom is as far as I intend to follow in his mode. For you see, I have a serious point or two to make, I understand what I'm saying, I've thought it through carefully, and I want you, the reader, to understand me fully. If you understand me to imply that Ellison has done the opposite, has written an incoherent, badly understood, frivolous, and self-contradictory rant in *Locus* 207 (December 1977), well, so be it, though it's not quite that bad. As you might expect, it is written well and tugs at your heart-strings: pure Ellisonia. But I'll deal later with the tens of side-issues, red herrings and free associations that Harlan Ellison shotguns in his "A Statement of Ethical Position by the Worldcon Guest of Honor" titled by *Locus* "Re: The 1978 World Science Fiction Convention Iguanacon." Let's first get to the real issue.

## Primary Issue

There are certainly enough positions taken in this statement to make one wonder if Ellison is really doing anything. After all, ERA and hurting innocents aside, he is keeping his commitment to attend Iguanacon over the Labor Day Weekend as its Pro Guest of Honor (GoH). So is it all just wind? No, he wants something concrete. He wants us (fandom) to do something, something for him, on his authority. On his authority? Yes, for if we have not decided to do it ourselves, judging the facts and making our own decisions, but now are to override our previous decision because Harlan Ellison asks it of us, then we are bowing to his authority.

Whether or not we should submit to Ellison's authority, I'll leave to the other section. This section is rigidly restricted to discerning the primary issue, *sans* red herrings.

What, specifically, does Ellison ask us to do, then? "As for those who share my belief that the ERA is a vitally important issue and must not be allowed to be killed by intransigence or by reactionary religious elements in the Arizona state legislature, I suggest fans coming to the convention figure out ways to withhold money from the state as much as possible."

Fair enough it seems. Libertarians expect their fellow refren to not give money to the State under any circumstances, though we certainly would not waste our breath on

statist fen who like to pay taxes. But that kind of thing is *not* what Ellison means.

"Set up feeding arrangements with local fans. Don't shop in the stores. Spend your money with the out-of-state dealers in the huckster rooms, but stay away from the tourist facilities."

Who is supposed to be punished by this action? Ellison says it's the state of Arizona. But he lists *nowhere* in his tactics anything that could discomfit a politician. He wishes to withhold business from native Arizonans, regardless of their stand on the ERA or complicity with the state legislature. The people to be hurt are Arizona businessmen, Arizona hucksters, Arizona workers who may lose their jobs from the lack of tourist business—and all the fans at Worldcon who forego their needs and pleasures to satisfy Ellison's strategy.

As you can see, the question is not "how good is the cause" or "is the issue worth it?", the question is what in the world is Ellison doing?

Of course, the "boycott" strategy is not Ellison's original idea; he adopted it from the National Organization for Women. The fact that their strategy is aimed at harming innocent tradesmen and their dependents who will then (hopefully?) take out their frustration by voting out politicians who don't reflect the views of all these out-of-state busybodies.

The flaws must be obvious, but I'll mention a couple anyways: one, suppose the pro-ERA candidates are also in favour of lots of bad things, too? Such as shutting down the space Program (not really that bad), or herding science fiction writers into concentration camps or... Second, suppose the person being boycotted can't vote—alien, underage, moved into state late, etc.; or won't vote as a conscientious objector—pacifist, libertarian, Amish, etc.; or voted for the ERA candidate but he or she lost anyways?

NOW's position is to pass something called the Equal Rights Amendment *at any cost*. Ellison says that he doesn't want to harm innocents. It is clear that following NOW's strategy to obtain "equal rights" via Constitutional Amendment through a blanket boycott harms innocent people. Ellison wants to follow NOW's strategy. Contradiction.

How can you be expected to rally around a contradiction, dear fellow fan? There is no question of the merits of Harlan Ellison's position. A contradiction has no merits.

That is the primary issue. Or it should be. But maybe Ellison doesn't mean what he says.

This essay may be reprinted by any Science Fiction Fanzine for usual payment. If no payment is usual, crediting author and original publication will suffice. © 1978 Samuel Edward Konkin III for those who care about such things. (Type may be used too.)

To resolve the contradiction, he must either change his strategy to not harm innocents, or follow the strategy for its own sake and damn the innocents. OK, if Ellison changes his strategy, that's a whole different game. I might even be on his side.

But if he doesn't change, then realize that *you* are being exhorted by Ellison to hurt innocents—including yourself. You're being told to "walk the walk"—but actually it's more akin to bombing civilians to force a government to surrender. We're not talking civil rights marches; we're talking Dresden, Hiroshima, and Viet Nam.

I'm certainly no Worldcon Guest of Honour so I'm not going to tell you what to do. My authority is that of Reason, not a title. Do what *your* reason and conscience tell you. Walk your walk, not Ellison's drunken stagger.

## Secondary Issues

Many fans have told me they were annoyed by Ellison's turning the Guest-of-Honor position into a podium for special pleading. That's not the primary issue (see above). For all I know, fans may indeed want a political spokesman, a leader, an authority figure. And Ellison is certainly correct that that was what Heinlein was at MidAmeriCon, with his blood drive.

But make no mistake about it; that is exactly what's going on. If you accept the Con Committee's allowing Ellison to evangelize and mobilize fandom behind this issue (or any other he picks), then fandom will become a political pressure group like unions, corporations, and ethnics. Is a GoH chosen each year to tell us what burning issue fandom should support, or is he or she chosen solely by celebration, as a *guest of honour*?

Ellison is not arguing authoritatively; he not only does not know what he is talking about, but is willing to admit he's no expert. In fact, he's deferring to NOW "feminists" judgement—their authority.

Now there is a word for someone who asserts authority over your decision-making when he is not "authoritative"—it is authoritarian. (Note the title of this article.)

Now for some of the side issues I promised you. ERA is supported by the "liberal" (read "conservative" in classical terms of "pro-Establishment") feminists. Radical feminists, however, such as libertarians, Marxists, and separatists oppose it in large number, seeing it as a co-opt to a system they don't support. Ellison damning you as unfeminist if you are not for the ERA is a red herring; you could be *more* feminist than Ellison and oppose ERA.

(For those who won't rest until they find out where this author stands on ERA, I don't support any laws or any government acts. I won't lift a finger to either pass or defeat the amendment. Since I'm a revolutionary, I stand to profit from the result of legislation which will disillusion reformers trying to save a system and will drive them into my camp. Since I think ERA is a co-opt and socially conservative, and it will fail miserably to accomplish the ends of its idealistic supporters, thus driving them closer to me, I support the Equal Rights Amendment to the extent of wanting to see it pass. My guess is that the Establishment is making a mistake in the long-run. End of Disclosure.)

Other issues Ellison drags in are references to a religious conspiracy to stop ratification (shades of the Jewish Conspiracy and the Popish plots!), not filling out his contract to Iguanacon, getting sage advice from a bunch of female pros and fans (only Big Names mentioned, none of their qualifications for judging ethics mentioned, though), getting a chance to make a statement (we don't have a chance anytime we want to do so now?) and . . . but enough.

If Ellison is "between a rock and a hard place" because he feels morally obligated to both attend Iguanacon under contract and to boycott the area in which it appears, then the Iguanacon can do both Harlan and us a favour—let him out of his contract.

Ghod only knows why someone who's "left Science Fiction" so many times (and *never* said he's returned) should be a GoH in the first place. Moreover, nobody voted for him. The Bidding Committee selected him after they won the bid (or at least announced it then) and they can change now.

How about it, Iguanacon? Let us all off the hook. —SEK3

## EN GARDE AT THE RIPOSTE OFFICE

### FREFANZINE

#### Frefanzine 9

Cover But what are the libertarian implications? (Is Ariocho a Stirnerist?)

Vic's Official Organ There are mistakes on this page. I'll bet you'd just as soon not have me point them out. OK, only one: *je ne sais quoi* (= "I know not what"). Furthermore, if you put my zine on top of that of a willing female, I may just copulate anyway. So there! (You mean that's *not* how to reproduce fanzines?) And if I could figure out a way to typeset an eldritch rune, why, I would, right here in this space. So there again.

Lee Gold How can you stay in Washington, D.C., and avoid "all government institutions but . . ." Is not D.C. *itself* a government institution? I've only been to Washington for Cons (little pockets of anarchy) myself. ¶ Of course you're a BNF (D&D). I'm surprised you're surprised. You are nearly the Richard E. Geis of D&D now. Soon you'll pass over the barrier and become the Ted White, I suppose. Last time I was in the Military Shop I noticed two imitations of *The Dragon*. The pro market for D&D is expanding. . . ¶ One suggestion I have to your new printing format: for three or four hundred dollars, you can get a used IBM Executive (with proportional spacing). This would give you not only the carbon ribbon (excellent for offset and reducing), but also typeset-looking type—especially after reduction. *You need not justify* (it would about double your time on typing, even after I showed you the standard tricks) but even rag right you would look very professional. (Probably only a trained typesetter or someone in the printing art would notice otherwise.) Unlike a typesetting machine, the

Executive requires no chemicals and photographic paper to replace at some expense—just the ribbon. I've actually thought of using this dodge myself when I ever lose my typesetting access. ¶ Sith Lord. Or is it Cheryl's fault and you're [sic]? ¶ Olivav as libertarian? Oh, yes, if we could only get Asimov to come over. Did I ever mention I told him that the (non-Earth) society in *The Gods Themselves* was an anarchy, and he agreed, though saying he hadn't noticed it before (he subscribed to NLN for a year after that). ¶ I thought all good guys (and gals) smoke? At least they do in Apartment 3. ¶ Eddie Willers. And there are not so much flaws in Galt's Gulch as things you (and in one case, I) would have done differently. ¶ Agree with what you said to Bob about backing his claim. Almost identical to what I told him verbally. ¶ Your article on Susan of Narnia was superb. I too was shocked by her eventual "Fall." While they won't pay, you certainly would reach a wider and very appreciative audience if you submitted the article to *The Lamppost* of the Southern California C.S. Lewis Society or the New York C.S. Lewis Society's publication. I can dig up their addresses if you call me at home.

Kay Jones All right, I won't join any more APAs. (But where should we meet, then?) ¶ Of course! on *Star Wars*. ¶ Well, at least the Q-tip-eating circuit designer doesn't stick 'em in its ears. ¶ SCHav sounds suspiciously Discordian. (Hail Eris!) N.C. Shapero Can't say I am as down on "modern capitalism," but I'm sure I'll prefer "future free enterprise." How about more on Mencken or more Menckenesque writing for *Fref*?

Vic Koman I also was surprisingly pleased by *Last Remake of Beau Geste*. Didn't seem to do all that well. ¶ I note a certain

hostility on your part to Scientology and its practitioners. Perhaps it can be Cleared up...? (And EIAA! Thanks.) ¶ That's *Helvetica Black Condensed* and I just used it to space-fill. ¶ "KSAM"? ¶ "By the time we get to Phoenix..." ¶ Right, Vic! \*kiss\* ¶ You can't sound like me when you type; I go clickety-click while you go clickety-clack. ¶ I've said enough about *Close Encounters* in LASFAPA. My conclusion was (and is) "I don't want to be identified with UFOlogists. Let them stick to their genre and, I'll stick to SF & fantasy. The movie is *bad news*."

**Don Markstein** Glad to see you! ¶ Can't say I buy the "born anarchist" position of Fred Woodworth (*The Match!*) or James J. Martin, and your "instinctive anarchist" sounds quite similar. In my youngest period, I was an "instinctive fascist," becoming a reactionary in Junior High, a conservative in High School, a conservative-libertarian (like LP types, for example) in university, and an anarchist in Graduate School. I've since gone Beyond... ¶ Thanks for the NLN mention. Hope you try out the latest incarnation, *New Libertarian* (\$12 a year—or you could earn it writing for me at 1¢ a word). ¶ Appreciated your speculations to Lee. ¶ Check out my review of *The Anarchist Colossus* in *NLW* 99; turned out pretty good. Not at all like Niven's rotten misportrayal. ¶ [Remark to Curley] And yet another example why time travel must be fantasy.

**The Thornton** Hope the Spirit keeps moving you. ¶ Don't remember that Nock quote. From what book or essay? ¶ O.K., you can have those definitions if you want. I mainly dislike your use of Ego for material-realm pertaining to the Self. I use Ego strictly for the Order which is the unique self which could be superimposed on any matter capable of that ordering, not the matter itself. What you call "ego" I call the Ego-sphere. Then again, you believe in a soul, so you don't need to make my distinction. ¶ I also don't care about what happens on a Hollywood set but I don't think they're all geeks—just workers. ¶ If we pat each other on the back instead of ourselves, our arms would remain non-fractured. Have one on me. \*pat\* ¶ Here's one for your court: do you think Ariocho was in Corum's world (five planes) before, after, or simultaneous with the Earth of

Melnibone? We know he was in a world Hawkmoon entered very late, near the twilight of his power and that of the Gods.

**Charles Curley** Yes, let's hear the one for Earendil. (I don't have diacritics either.) ¶ In a free market society, all property would be owned or not yet reached. Hence, no "neutral" territory. Now, there are just ill-defined boundaries. ¶ Deism usually includes belief in a god, but a non-intervening one.

**Bob Cohen** Your zine is looking much better. ¶ I didn't say that to "say a nice thing about your zine so you would say something nice about mine." I said it because it's true and worth mentioning. ¶ Bob, you are ultimately contradicting yourself. If a slave cannot free another slave, how can he free himself (a slave)? ¶ I doubt your belief in a "God" will warm The Thornton up to you anymore; now you're a heretic.

## Frefanzine 10

Cover \*sigh\*

ToC \*sigh\* ★

**Vic Koman** ...and integrate over all space. Needless to say (but I say it anyway), you'll be missed.

**Beth Schwarzin** Hello yourself, anarchocousin. As you can see, we've gone from minac to anac. Well, maybe not me, but, alas, poor Vic. ¶ I agree with your suggestion to Lee concerning shared childraising by men. (In fact, after the birth, the man *could* have the entire privilege [I don't consider it a duty].) Witness our ex-OE (Ken Gregg) and Jamie. ¶ Don't bother reminding yourself to request *NLW*. Now *NL* is another matter... ¶ See my review of *The Anarchistic Colossus* in *NLW*. We disagree on its merits somewhat. ¶ You and Jeni are both wrong. Austin O'Brien Road in Edmonton, Alberta, is the Center of the Universe (with 7th and Cherry in Long Beach a meta-center). ¶ He spells it Jean Berkman (as in Alexander Berkman, anarchist and husband of Emma Goldman).

**The Thornton** Tolkien's bad guys get lots more coverage in *Silmarillion*, especially Morgoth and Sauron. I think the "perversion" of Saruman is covered fairly well. ¶ What's this sudden heresy on *Star Wars*? ¶ I never heard of motorizing models you build yourself. How long has this been going on?

**Don Markstein** I agree with you

on copyrights. ¶ Obviously, Vic can't wait to give the OEship away. You want it? ¶ Weight loss at death should not have anything to do with the existence of a soul unless you wish to claim that "soul" is material (and hence has mass subject to gravity). This is certainly not the usual definition. ¶ More filks! Maybe I'll whip up some soon myself. ¶ Just another reminder that Robert Anton Wilson has long been a columnist in *NLW* and now *NL*. ¶ Agree with you on Scientology, oh sensible fellow, in both your comments.

**Will and Linda and Don and Beth** I have also read *Cosmic Trigger* and hope to do a review Real Soon Now. It got me reading Alan Harrington's *The Immortalist*, of which I am in the middle at this writing. ¶ Oh, no, Herbangelism has made it to Texas? ¶ *Rocky Horror Picture Show* fandom is also big in the Anarchovillage. ¶ I'm with Linda over Don on the calculator question. I suppose having type means no one needs learn how to write (form letters) or having records/tape means no one need learn to read? *Au contraire*. Knowledge is wealth, power, maybe fame...in fact, I'm getting more and more interested in Information Theory being the Fundamental Technology (as Philosophy is the Fundamental Science). Anybody else into this? Any other Nexialists out there? ¶ And Hail Eris—All Hail Discordia to you!

**Lee Gold** Thank you, Lee, for the Historical Con report. Wish I had been there. ¶ Good thing you got that weather report in early. *Après cela, le deluge!* ¶ I saw that *Pygmalion* film you mentioned. Leslie Howard did a great Rex Harrison. And speaking of whom, Rex Harrison did another good Shavian characterization (General "Gentleman Johnny" Burgoyne) in the Ahmanson Theatre's *The Devil's Disciple*. Superb. ¶ I don't wish to gainsay you, Lee, but I thought you told me you dropped out of LASFAPA because of the length of comments that were standard. I had no idea you and Marty were on the outs. I have had many disagreements with Cantor, but he has been a competent OE, if a trifle authoritarian. I do begrudge his keeping his Nittany Mixture formula secret, but you would probably support him on that. ¶ I do not understand why you, Thornton and others insist on defining morality pejoratively and ethics

approvingly. Moreover, if one wishes to make useful distinctions, how about one between the personal code of good behavior (morality or whatever) which can never be known externally (until we have thought reading), and the behavior observed of one externally (objective morality). Also, to a libertarian, especially, another useful distinction is between personal morality (e.g. non-coercive good and evil) and agoric morality (libertarian vs coercive = good vs evil). "To thine own self be true" is a moral question to be sure, though of the first kind, not the second. Seems libertarians tend to dismiss it altogether (some), since it does not involve aggression. ¶ Bob is taking courses.

**Charles Curley** Correcting your correction I am: it's either *tu ne sais quoi* or *vous ne savez quoi*. ¶ Concerning your "Washington, Domain of Chaos," the Discordians in *Fref* may resent your equating Chaos with Evil. A little constructive Chaos in the District might do wonders for freeing things up. ¶ "Sculpting Potatoes" idea is one of your better. Finish the filk. ¶ Vitor? Explain, please (origin). ¶ Lee herself accepted the label! Scientist (with qualifications as she always does). Let's deal with Bob's real errors, shall we? (And this goes for a couple of others in this zine; you're really not so bad.) ¶ OK, you've creebed about *Fref's* management; gonna take it over now that you have the chance to do it right?

## LASFAPA

### LASFAPA 16

Thanks to all for the good wishes and welcome-backs. For those following my tribulations, I am still making money at the same place, I should have the first issue of *New Libertarian* out by the time you read this, and I seemed to have got myself engaged. More news as it happens.

And now to your concerns. By the way, I have an incomplete, so if you've been slighted, I'm Officially Excused.

**Cover** A genuine Susan Schulman. Yes, folks, another success story of someone who started out at *New Libertarian* (and previous incarnations). Wonder what the woman lurking has in mind?

**Wurlitzer** I see the rules are still changing, and there's a new "Emergency Editor" and now a

Cover Editor. *Plus ça change, plus c'est la meme chose.* ¶ Bill Bridget won the "Stevie" Award this issue. More pages than the next two (Andy & Marty) combined. How long has this been going on? Do we have another Tymon?

**Bobbi Armbruster** What party? Bavarian National Beverage? Sounds good to me. If I can be there, I'm with you! Why, German bbeer is even better than Canadian! ¶ I'll just *laisser passer* your unlibertarian comments to Charles; I'm currently out of context. ¶ Szechwan (in all its spelling incarnations) is the only Chinese food I find fit to eat. Some (of us) like it hot! ¶ Fascinating to hear how you and Ron have worked things out. You are an inspiration to some of us. I know what you mean about "falling in lust" and being "embroiled in your own passions." You certainly sound like an incredibly desirable woman all around. How can Ron stand to be so lucky? ¶ Speaking (as you were) of *War of the Worlds* on German TV, I'd be interested to know what the German title of *Star Wars* is. According to the *Match*, in France it's known as *La Guerre des Etoiles* which translates fairly well. ¶ Same with me about verbalizing for the past 4-5 years. Maybe it's a culture shift. Your mention of "foreplay" reminds me that the term has almost vanished from the sex publications I typeset. Methinks it's because with all the myriad ways being sought to get off, the idea that some procedure is "leading up to the main event" is considered *passee*. The word "foreplay" seems to have already acquired an archaic ring. ¶ I see you are inundated with flattery these days. So as not to bore you, I'll keep the compliments down to the absolutely necessary. ¶ Florida humidity is bad, and so is New York. (One night I was soaking in my bed, 86°, at 5 A.M. in New York City. I lay there planning my move to California.) ¶ And New York is as filthy as you portray London. You don't even have to brush something. Just let it sit around a couple of days and the grime settles on it. ¶ I suppose someone told you that *Asterix and Obelix* (as it's called) is a comic strip in the *LA Times* now. I compared their current story to the book translation and there's been wholesale change in dialogue and even character's names. Some panels were shuf-

fled around to change the plot and several were dropped entirely. Butchers! ¶ Baader-Meinhof? Are they still calling these Marxists anarchists? (We anarchists are offended.) ¶ Love that last comment to Cantor. \*savour\* ¶ And speaking of savouring, pardon me while I come down from your support, welcome, and invitation. There was a time, in my darkest, youngest moments, that I feared women like you didn't exist. Thanks for being. Aw, shucks, I'm getting mushy, time to move on . . .

**R. Laurraine Tutihasi** Good luck and welcome received. You're the second woman I know who prefers to sleep alone (no such men, yet). What a drag!

**Elena Pirov** Speaking of "coeds" (to Swanson you were), I always wondered why women were singled out as "co-educational." I mean, aren't men just as "co-"? And shouldn't that be "girly-whirlies" (I only heard that expression once, in *South Pacific*, I believe) or maybe "ghirly-whirly"? ¶ Right after you retired as "Vic Koman groupie," Vic retired from LASFAPA. Hmmm. Give you a solipsistic feeling? ¶ Yeah, there is a certain feeling of homecoming. Thanks for being part of it. You read me dead on. ¶ Nabokov? I've read little by him so far, but an awful lot of good stuff about him. Is *Ada SF* or fantasy as it's been reviewed? Should I start with that?

**Marty Cantor** What, still another vote? What is this obsession with limits you have, Marty? Hardly appropriate for fans of (inner and outer) space exploration, old chap. ¶ I see you and Charles are having it out with shotguns and pistols. Mind if I decline to "second" in that duel? ¶ I seriously doubt Guy is a racist. You have to admit that the word "Jew" is multi-ordinal. I can't count all the definitions I received from Jews when I first moved to New York and asked them to define their terms. If Guy was saying "blood" is the only criterion for defining "Jew," he's just as wrong—but I hardly see him as a candidate for tattooing a Swastika on his head. By the way, there are still some ruffled feelings over your nazi-baiting over Ayn Rand last year. (See Lee Gold's recent *Frefanzine* comment as to why she left LASFAPA.) ¶ Sorry to see you've been bitten by the political bug. I'll send a get-well card soon. ¶ Thanks for defending me to Jim (I think?). ¶ I've also seen new research published (actually the

news reports on it) that finds inadequate correlation between lung cancer and smoking. Down with Prohibitionism! ¶ Thanks for making up that wait list omission by putting me back on the full list. As you can see, I've justified your faith in me. ¶ We can only disagree on Space Opera it seems. But if you really consider me a child with an uncritical mind, why converse with me? After all, you say elsewhere you don't care for children. ¶ I also find Christmas Day overly hectic. I prefer Boxing Day. ¶ You are certainly off on your comment to Beth concerning democracy's mutability. Democracy can change laws instantaneously, or draw out the procedures indefinitely. It all depends on how it's used and by whom. What you consider the checks and balances of the American State are usually attributed to its republican, not democratic, elements. (Please re-read this comment before answering. It is value-free with no libertarian implications whatsoever. Just the facts, man.) ¶ Your vituperative reply to Virginia Bauer is also illogical. A "look at" statement is demonstrative, requiring no "proof." If you see a dictatorship with privately-held weapons, then you say so and negate her contention. Until you can do so, her contention stands. (By the way, there are several Latin American dictatorships in countries where everyone is armed to the teeth. Nicaragua, for one.)

**Lee Ann Goldstein** Sorry to hear you lost your job. Good luck on the new one. ¶ You were at McSorley's and only drank the beer? Ah, that wonderful dark porter I remember, and the plates of *Liederkrantz* and onions . . . ¶ Nope, I didn't vanish forever. Good to see you again, too.

**Charles Curley** No, I'm not pulling any "guilt by association." UFO superfan J. Allan Hynek was advisor to *Close Encounters of the Third Kind* and the movie fit my (extensive though undesired) knowledge of UFOlogy (as their fen call it). *Star Wars* made me think of all sorts of wondrous things; the UFO flick made me think only "Yech!" ¶ Thanks for the welcome and your libertarian comments are seconded, as usual.

**Fred Jackson** Interesting what you say on the gun problem. You've got a point there.

Next Issue I catch up if I have to make it an all-comments issue!

**Beth Schwarzin** My goodness, this is getting downright serious, adopted relative. I get disgustingly mushy and sentimental about people who care about me, and become obsessively loyal and doting and such. Sure you want to go through with all that? If so, maybe we should define just what I have adopted you as. Neice? Sister? Cousin? (Anything but Mother!) My best relationships with female relatives have been first cousins, so how about that? It would also give the relationship symmetry, and "cousin" has no gender, so it's wonderfully equal. ¶ I'm willing to do one or two collations of *Frefanzine* but I'm worried about the association problem. I'm considered very sectarian in the libertarian movement, and it would be far better for *Fref* if it had an OE not identified with a particular faction. How about you? Or Don? Or both? ¶ I'll try to remember to send you a sample of *NL*. ¶ That Doonesbury strip was one of my favourites too. ¶ Lot of good libertarian answers, I notice. Hard core! as we Anarchovillagers say supportively. ¶ I was not disappointed in *CT*, but Siriously, folks . . .

**Mark Swanson** I disagree on *Amber* series going downhill. I thought it got better. But I have not yet finished *Courts of Chaos* so we can pick this up next disty.

**Eric Lindsay** Good answer to Marty. And most of your libertarian comments are seconded. I can't really say I'm as anti-car as you, but I don't drive. ¶ What's this about kissing refrigerators? ¶ Would you like one of us (me, for example) to buy and ship you some paper of the size and weight you wish? ¶ Thanks for the consoling thoughts on *NLW*. *NL* should be on its way to you. ¶ How much of Szasz have you read? ¶ Rather than banishing people who don't want to fit in a society, why not let them leave of their own accord? ¶ I owe you some locs, but ghod, your zines are coming up to a year after dates on them. A lot of good answers to the locs you get make me eager to send you some. Next one? [Just mailed one after I wrote this.]

**Guy H. Lillian III** And I just told Marty you were no Nazi! ¶ Double aargh! I am missing Mardi Gras for the ninth straight year since I decided I wanted to go (1969). Next year for absolute sure!