


solacon

South
Gate
in




'58

report

FINAL REPORT:

SIXTEENTH WORLD SCIENCE FICTION CONVENTION
combined with Eleventh Annual West Coast SF Conference



Held at the Alexandria Hotel,
Fifth and Spring, Los Angeles
August 29--September 1, 1958
Membership: 601
Registered Attendance: 322

solacon

FINANCIAL STATEMENT



Expenses

Revenues	
Membership Dues	
To August 29	471.00
During SOLACON	<u>130.00</u>
	601.00
Registration Fees	
To August 29	145.00
During SOLACON	<u>225.00</u>
	370.00
Auctions	
Main Auction	348.58
Auction Bloch	95.73
Other Sales & Auction	<u>27.00</u>
	471.31
Advertising	358.85
Donations	75.26
Display Space Rental	53.25
Banquet Ticket Sales	<u>756.25</u>
TOTAL	2685.92
BALANCE ⁵

PUBLICITY EXPENSES:	
Advertisements	7.80
Materials	5.90
Printing	<u>3.00</u>
	16.70
CONVENTION EXPENSES:	
Rent	207.48
Decorating	41.89
Program	75.36
Transportation	32.25
Entertainment ¹	117.41
Printing	328.88
Postage	23.14
Trophies & Awards ²	421.99
Banquet	746.75
Losses ³	15.85
Miscellaneous	<u>7.25</u>
	2018.25
GENERAL EXPENSES:	
Transportation	74.70
Postage	188.98
Supplies	57.56
Entertainment ¹	27.38
Printing	225.15
Legal Fees	16.50
Telephone	25.39
Bad Debts ⁴	32.00
Miscellaneous	<u>3.31</u>
	650.97
TOTAL	2685.92

Anna Sinclare Moffatt
Chairwoman, SOLACON

October 31, 1958

Dear Mrs. Moffatt:

I here certify that the signed and attached statement (Financial Statement, reprinted here) is a true and accurate report of all monies taken in and all expenditures paid out by me during my term of office.

An explanation of the noted items on the statement follows:

¹Covers drinks and meals for VIP's and persons appearing on the program, as well as the Committee's Open House.


²Includes the \$95.73 from Auction Bloch to Ron Bennett on behalf of TAFF, 90.50 plus 15.85 worth of beanies to Detroit for the next Convention, and 60.00 to the Nameless Ones for the next Westercon.

³Miscellaneous funds and items that became lost during the Convention.

⁴Balance of Accounts Receivable written off as bad debts to allow closing of the books.

⁵As a non-profit organization we could not make a profit. But, after the Convention there was enough money on hand to pay all the bills--even those personal expenditures for the Convention that one never expects to get back--and still award money to the next World Convention, TAFF, and the next Westercon, and hold an Open House.

Respectfully yours,


Rick Sneary
Treasurer

ALEXANDRIA HOTEL

FIFTH AT SPRING
LOS ANGELES 13, CALIFORNIA

EXECUTIVE OFFICE

September 16, 1958

Mr. Rick Sneary
2962 Santa Ana Street
South Gate, Calif.

Dear Mr. Sneary:

As far as we are concerned there is nothing outstanding concerning charges for the World Science Fiction Convention. I am sure that you are pleased to hear that.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to be of service to your fine organization, It was a pleasure having you here.

Cordially yours,



George H. Karlin
Managing Director
Alexandria Hotel

GHK/al

Page 2



The Coming Together

Richard Matheson

In the earlier part of this year, Harper & Brothers published two books almost simultaneously. This was not, unless you looked for it, a coincidence. However, it struck me that there was a relationship between the two. That their concurrent appearance, in a way, symbolized the coming together of Man's scientific thoughts.

The first of these books was Physics and Philosophy by the Nobel-Prize-winning physicist Werner Heisenberg. Basically, it attempted to answer two questions.

One: What do the verified theories of physics affirm?

Two: How do they require Man to think of himself in relation to his universe?

To begin with: it was once accepted by the giants of early physics that the basic concepts of science were deduced solely from experimental findings. Stated otherwise: that the theories of physics were found by observing experimental facts, then applying deduction to those observations.

Today, physicists have realized that this was never true. If it were, Newton's theories--supposedly based on fact--would stand unopposed to this day.

What is now accepted is that the physicist arrives at his theory first by speculation, then proves his theory by experimentation.

Physics begins with an assumption--which assumption must, of necessity, be as philosophical as physical. Thus it is realized, today, that physics is not and never has been independent of philosophy. Indeed, contemporary physics only started to gain true effectiveness as it worked in harmony with philosophy--for no physical assumption can exist without a philosophy standing behind it.

When did this change in attitude come about?

In the summer of 1900, in Germany, a man named Planck evolved a formula which was to affect the very foundations of Man's description of Nature. In December of that year he published his Quantum Theory.

It stated, basically, that energy was emitted in distinct and separate units--or quanta.

At first it was believed that this formula applied only to the radiation of heat. It was soon discovered, however, that it also affected the theory of light, which had until then been described as a series of electromagnetic waves.

Next, it illuminated the theory of the atom, explaining its heretofore inexplicable stability, an explanation which Newton's laws had failed to provide.

It did more than explain, however. It added a host of contradictions to physical theory. It started scientists asking questions. It began to teach them--to quote Heisenberg--"...that the old concepts fit Nature only inaccurately."

One important result of the quantum theory was the change in attitude toward whatever phenomenon was being observed.

No longer could this phenomenon be observed in isolation. It had, now, to be observed as part of the universe. That aspect of the phenomenon which was specifically under investigation could be isolated only as much as man-made instruments were able to do so.

Thus, a new emphasis was placed on subjectivity. In brief, science now accepts that what is observed is not Nature in itself--but Nature exposed to our own method of questioning.

As Heisenberg puts it, "Any scientific work in physics consists of asking questions about Nature in the language that we possess--and trying to get an answer from experiment by the means at our disposal.

The implications springing from the acceptance of the quantum hypothesis have also changed the philosophical approach to our existence.

Descartes, the first great philosopher in the modern period of science, posited the existence of the world from the assumption that God had given Man a strong inclination to believe in said existence and it was impossible for God to deceive Man.

"This," says Heisenberg, "completes the division between matter and mind started in Plato's philosophy. God is raised so high above the world and men that He appears only as a point of reference between the individual and the world."

Since God was now such a remote and unavailable force, the philosophers of science decided to analyze Nature by strict logic and, by this method, arrive at some truth that was as certain as mathematical conclusion. Scientists believed that empirical knowledge could be arrived at without speaking of God or of ourselves.

So, despite the philosophical discord of this separation between God, the world, and the individual, science concentrated on the external. So completely so that, in time, thought itself became categorized as no more than a physio-chemical process. Free will went out the window.

This partition between the material and the spiritual proved of success only in the natural sciences. For natural science, this partition seemed almost a necessary condition.

The quantum theory changed this.



The quantum theory made it clear that natural science is not merely a description and explanation of Nature. It is actually part of the interplay between Nature and ourselves. No longer can science retain what is called by Heisenberg "...the dogmatic realism of classical physics..." as he states in no uncertain manner, "It will never be possible, by pure reason, to arrive at some absolute truth."

It is pertinent, I think, to note why this last statement could not have been made until the evolving of the quantum theory released the shackles from scientific thought.

Until that theory was arrived at, the development of natural science was influenced by one man--Newton. In a very real sense, he drew a blueprint for Nature by which all men built their scientific hypotheses. More than just creating a blueprint, Newton created a closed system. Each concept in his Principia is represented by a mathematical symbol. Each connection between concepts is represented by a mathematical equation.

This mathematical image of the system precluded contradictions. Once its axioms could be transformed into the provable form of equations, it was considered, says Heisenberg, "...as describing an eternal structure of Nature depending neither on a particular space nor on a particular time...."

For this reason, Newton's system was long considered as definitive--final. The duty of the scientist was considered to be simply "...an expansion of Newton's mechanics into wider fields of experience...."

The quantum hypothesis, while not rendering Newton's system completely obsolete, did enlarge the aspect by declaring that all physical phenomena were not explainable by Newtonian mechanics.

Further, it was recognized that new concepts could, themselves, be evolved into a closed mathematical system. It was also recognized, however, that such a closing in would be just that--a process of contraction, of potential stagnation. Thus, while Heisenberg enumerates four such self-intact systems, it is not with any sense that they are completely authoritative.

So did relativity enter into the philosophy as well as the physics of the modern scientist. The search for reality is now approached by many routes and many means--none of which, alone, can represent reality

The process of science seems, therefore, to have become a steady progression away from the objective and toward the subjective.

No longer is Nature considered to be a mass of separate objects and activities. It is--to use Heisenberg's own words--"...a complicated tissue of events in which connections of different kinds alternate or overlap or combine--and determine the texture of the whole."

Heisenberg goes further yet. He compares science with art. "...Style in art," he says, "arises from the interplay between the world and ourselves. The artist tries, by his work, to explain the features of the world...."

So, too, does the scientist.

Probably the major outgrowths of the quantum hypothesis are the theories of Relativity and General Relativity--which, in one incredible sweep, altered two of the basic factors of our existence --space and time.

It is now recognized by science that time and space belong not to Nature itself but to our relation with Nature. Or--to express it differently--time and space are the conditions we make for observation--not the results of our observation.

Further, because of the theories of Relativity, questions which had been purely philosophical are now taken up by science.

Is space finite or infinite? What was there before the beginning of time? What will happen at the end of time? Was there a beginning? Will there be an end? Only the philosopher dared attempt to answer these questions before. Now, the scientist tries.

In brief, we have today a coming together of physics and metaphysics. No longer is science concerned only with an analysis of the structure of matter and of the forces responsible for this structure.

Now there is an attendant concern with process--with function. Since it is recognized that science is the result of Man's own unique appraisal of his environment, science must also follow Pope's edict that "The proper study of Mankind is Man."



Unfortunately, however, Man in his present state is not truly capable of studying himself.

For, as Heisenberg puts it, "Existing scientific concepts cover, always, only a very limited part of reality, and the other part that has not yet been understood is infinite."

For example, when it comes to the basic matters of life and death, science hesitates, knowing of no measurable way in which to proceed.

Heisenberg has this to say: "In the history of human thinking, the most fruitful developments frequently take place at those points where two different lines of thought meet.

I believe that the line of thought which must, in time, become allied with physical science is that of psychical science.

...Which brings me to the second book I mentioned: Nothing So Strange, by Arthur Ford.

I could have used any one of a number of sim- books with which to make my point. I used this particular one because, as I have said, I found it striking that it was published in the same month and by the same publisher as Physics and Phil- osophy. To me, it seemed a note- worthy albeit unwitting insight that they should have been issued so. Be- cause, although worlds apart, I believe that they complement each other.

Arthur Ford is a medium. He discov- ered his gift during the First World War when, stationed at Camp Grant during an epidemic of influenza, he found himself awakening each morning knowing the names

of those who had died in the night--exactly as the names were to appear on the roster later that day.

From that point on, his psychic gifts developed until he became what he remains today--one of the world's foremost mediums.

He is a remarkable instrument--a man whose psychic achievements have been completely authenticated.

What matters at the moment, however, is his view of the gifts he possesses and of the world of the psychic.

He has this to say: "It may be that we cannot get adequate understanding of the psychic powers until we probe further into the nature of consciousness--and this may have to wait for highly trained biologists and psychologists to become trained mediums.

Already, this coming together has taken place in small ways.

The most well-known, of course, are the tests for clairvoyance conducted by Dr. Rhine at Duke University.

Another, less known, is the work of a former RCA scientist on the nature of the so-called "aura" which surrounds the human form.

Another is a group of seminars in mental healing attended by distinguished members of the medical profession.

Another, I think we may say, is the recent sanctioning of hypnosis by the American Medical Association. Let us recall that, a very little while ago, hypnotism was subject to as much criticism and mockery as, say, spiritualism is today.

There are other examples of this coming together but, in the over-all picture, too pitifully few.

That the physical sciences have, pretty generally, rejected psychic phenomena is unfortunate--primarily because, in doing so, they break their own cardinal precept by--as Arthur Conan Doyle put --"pronouncing on it without examination."

All the more unfortunate because this investigation, when given with fairness and lack of bias, has always resulted in conviction. As William Crookes, one of England's most distinguished physicists, put it--generations ago--"It is incredible--but it is true."

Of course, this coming together cannot be all one-sided. "Those who accept the psychic," says Ford, "hamper their own progress by limiting their knowledge to aspects of that psychic realm. What is needed are mediums with well-equipped minds."

I quoted a statement by Werner Heisenberg a while ago. I repeat it now.

"It will never be possible, by pure reason, to arrive at some absolute truth."

Or, to put it another way--material consciousness has its limitations.

I quote now from Ford. "It is important," he says, "that consciousness be expanded. The race needs to live in the larger context of understanding --which psychic faculties permit."

The one point which seems to have most driven physical science away from the psychic is this: it has not been possible, in psychic investigation, to repeat experiments with the same undeviating results.

Thus, as Ford says, "By standards of scientific inquiry, psychic findings are declared subjective."

However--and here Ford virtually repeats the words of Heisenberg--"Scientists themselves are beginning to acknowledge that, in many cases, the experimenter is a factor in the experiment."

One day, that same subjectivity which is now objected to will have to be considered as legitimate a factor in psychic investigation as it is in physical investigation.

"It is time," says Ford, "that the gap between the terra firma of sensory experience and the terra incognita of extra-sensory experience be bridged."

Further, he says, "It looks as if the physicists and biologists have, at last, thrown a rope across."

He then quotes a statement about the smallest charge of electricity known to science--the electron.

"To what appear to be the simplest questions, we will tend to give either no answer or an answer which, at first sight, will be reminiscent more of a strange catechism than of the straightforward affirmations of physical science.

"If we ask, for instance, whether the position of the electron remains the same, we must say 'no'. If we ask whether the electron's position changes with time, we must say 'no'. If we ask whether the electron is at rest, we must say 'no'. If we ask whether it is in motion, we must say 'no'.

"The Buddha has given such answers when interrogated as to the condition of Man's self after death --but they are not familiar answers for the tradition of science."

That statement was made by one of the world's most creative scientists--Robert Oppenheimer.

Here then are two books written by two men--one of whom has devoted his life to probing the physical, the other, the psychical--both of whom, by such apparently different routes, seem to be approaching the same destination.

Many centuries ago a man named Paul well understood this coming together. He wrote, in the Bible, these words:

Now there are varieties of gifts but the same spirit. And there are varieties of service but the same Lord. And there are varieties of working but it is the same God Who inspires them all in every one." Page 12

Key to solacon in pictures

Audience, including
 John Trimble, Jim Caughran
 John Champion, George Metzger,
 Sylvia Dees, Lars Bourne,
 Bill Rickhardt, Roger Sims
 Ed Clinton
 Steve Tolliver
 BJo Wells
 Dick Daniels
 Ernie Wheatley
 Eleanor Turner
 Nancy

Lysistrata Panel:
 Sylvia Jacobs, Thelma
 Hamm, Mark Clifton,
 Mari Wolf, M. A. Cummings
 Dave &
 Ruth Kyle
 Belle
 Deitz
 Bob
 Bloch
 Rick
 Sneary

Detroit-Chicago Panel:
 Ed Wood, Roger Sims,
 Rog Phillips,
 Dean McLaughlin, Who?
 Rick Sneary

Mas-
 querade
 Ball

BANQUET:
 Anna
 Len Moffatt, Anthony Boucher
 (speaking), Richard Matheson,
 Robert Bloch, Forry Ackerman

Panelists Ed Clinton,
 Hal Curtis, & Eph Konigsberg
 Ron
 Bennett
 Mike Hinge AB
 Jon
 Lackey
 Bill
 Brudy

Anna Sinclair Moffatt

Costume Judges
 A. E. van Vogt,
 BJo Wells,
 Fritz Leiber Jr.
 Committeemen George W. Fields,
 Rick Sneary, Len J. Moffatt,
 Rog Phillips, Ted Johnstone
 The Moffatts
 Joe & Roberta Gibson

Convention Hall Crowd
 includes Prophet,
 McLaughlin, Leiber
 Trina
 Cos-
 tello
 Ernie Wheatley
 Eva Conn & Julie Jardine
 BJo
 Wells
 & Bob
 Bloch
 Jill
 Vuerhard
 Honey
 Weed
 Editors
 Anthony Boucher &
 John W. Campbell Jr.

The names placed above in almost the right orientation are an attempt at a key to the double spread of photographs at the center of this Report. Indulgence is begged for the mis- and non-identification of some inevitable few. Thanks go to Al Lewis and Morris Scott Dollens, and to all the unrehearsed subjects.


This fifth and final SOLACON Journal is published by the 16th World Science Fiction Convention and 11th Annual Westercon as a Final Report to all SOLACON members, by the Committee, from 10202 Belcher, Downey, Calif.

SOLACON

report

CONTENTS

Financial Report	1	Rick Sneary
Business Session Minutes	3	Len J. Moffatt
Chairwoman's Statement	4	Anna Sinclare Moffatt
Guest of Honor's Address:		
THE COMING TOGETHER	5	Richard Matheson
SOLACON in pictures	7	photography: Al Lewis and Morrie Dollens
Key to Photo Pages	13	
Committee's Statement	14	SOLACON Committee



In closing out the publishing Year of South Gate in '58 and resigning as editor thereto, I want to apologize for the delay in publication of this Final Report. I must thank many, many people who have helped me, and can only single out Rick Sneary, Honey Wood, Earl Kemp, and George Young.

— Tom Wilson

STATEMENT of The COMMITTEE

October 31, 1958

Having completed the business of planning and producing the SOLACON (the 16th World Science Fiction Convention combined with the 11th Annual West Coast SF Conference), including the payment of all debts contracted by the SOLACON, we the undersigned hereby resign as officers and members of the SOLACON Committee.

We want to thank all of you for your support and help in making the SOLACON the success that it was!

Good luck and best wishes to all of you, and especially to the 1959 Westercon in Seattle and the 1959 WorldCon in Detroit!

Sincerely,

Anna Sinclair Moffatt *Rick Smeary*
Len J. Moffatt *Roy Phillips*
Stan Woolston *Honey Wood*
Ed Johnson
George W. Field

lost

your

solacon

program?

Souvenir

Menu

we have extras...

10¢

3/10¢

No stamps, please!

**Help us get rid of them, at the cost of sending 'em out
Len Moffatt, 10202 Belcher, Downey, Calif.**

SEVENTEENTH WORLD SCIENCE FICTION CONVENTION

Detroit

DUES: \$ 2.00 in USA
\$ 1.00 overseas

Jim Broderick
2218 Drexel Ave.
Detroit, Michigan

in '59

DETENTION

attend/59/support

WESTERCON XII
SEATTLE



THE NAMELESS

Wally Weber
Box 267, 920 Third Ave.
Seattle 4, Washington

