



they would be overthrown or forced to revive the State to bring the masses back into line. Basically, the plutocrats fueled by intellectual fraud, and Jonathan E. threatened to topple their house of cards. I loved the theme. Another thing that bothered me about your review was your evaluation of Jonathan E. as a stupid extrovert: That seems to be the characterization of Moonpie, but Jonathan rejected that and became intellectually curious as he sought understanding of why he was to give up what he loved. Simply imagine a person becoming a fan late in life (some have). I agree with your comments on the treatment of violence in the movie; I dislike it the most. No opinion about the technical comments you made, not my field.//Now that you remind me, did not "Walt Disney Presents" have a TV show concerning the animation of "We Are Siamese..." with Peggy Lee shown synching?

Matthew Tepper: Check it out. Suitcase nukes already exist. I gather from other comments that not all fans are up on this. Filthy Pierre has done a lot of articles on this, and he predicts that pretty soon groups like the PLO and even SLA will have their own nukes as they slide into the black market. As to your specific question, I named (by pseudonym) two libertarians who are into building "private" nukes. Incidentally, both are fans. So yes, they were acting out of free will. Concerning the "in-group," Gasperik originally suggested to me that I do a chapter for the explicit purpose of introducing my "in" group. He pointed out Ted's reference to "The Libertarian Underground." Furthermore, I am handicapped by being new to LASFS, so it made sense to write about characters I know, and incidentally introduce them to the rest of the club. If nothing else, it increased the number that others could later use. For example, you could have one of us obtaining something you might need for your chapter.

Finally, I asked Bruce at the Director's Dinner if he was looking cruculently, and he agreed he did. OK? (By the way, you might consider introducing some San Francisco fan in via your chapter.)

Dan Goodman: On your quibbles, some medicine is perishable. As to the other quibble, you probably know Bruce better than I, but I wanted to set somebody up with a chapter where he could have a lot of interplay. //I assume you are not serious about owning a job, especially a Federal job. I certainly have never owned a job and I have not the faintest idea of how one could try to establish boundaries and title. My property rights are not defined by the State but by the nature of me (Man) and the property in question. The State, by its nature, threatens to steal it at the first opportunity. But let's not more the rest of the readers with arguments they have already heard to death, I am sure.//Thanks for the egoboo.

Fred Patten: So far, Jack has not been in to work when I have been, but I'll keep trying. I may have the information for you by the time I see you Thursday.//I assume your headline xerox is to prove what I suspected--we're in Heinlein's Crazy Years.

Dan Deckert: Your comment was cryptic so I'll take it for a compliment. Say, what brandy is that that has seven stars? I'll try it.

Fuzzy Pink Diven: Do many Angelenos really object to L.A.? I have not noticed it, but then I have not talked to too many aborigines, so to speak. I'll stop if it bothers you.

Karen Anderson: I gather since photography is not properly anachronistic, your comment was in jest. However, I'm not so sure an Anglo-Saxon Chronicle could not exist. Maybe not Gutenberg, but how about an enterprising Chinese traveler?//Liked your poems and filks.