Joanna Russ, 3121 Washington St., Boulder, CO 80302

18 October 1976

Dear Tip,

Thanks for the letter. I laughed at your description of the wordtsunami--intimidated and furtive indeed! Rather like villagers fleeing a volcano. ("Whatever the Gods are, they aren't angry," in one Chas. Addams cartoon with fimeworks & Roman candles coming out of Mt. Pelee.)

Your letter somehow touched off some more thoughts about Ursula. It's true that I worry at her work and keep nipping at it. But I think the quarrel between us (me and her) is far more basic than feminist politics and is more like the politics of being, to coin a phrase. I feel somewhat like the heroine of <u>I Never Promised You a Rose Garden</u>, who after graduating from her inner mythical world of saints and demons, when asked her religion, answers without thinking, "I'm a Newtonian." I never lived in a world of demons and angels (very much alike, I should think) exactly, but I tried very hard and believed in it very hard. From about 15 to perhaps 30 I was so intensely lonely and messed over that I really did try my best to escape right out of reality (without being in the least mad enough to go mad; it's a type one finds a lot of among s.f. fans). I loved Lovecraft. I read bushels of fantasy. I believed that literature was a "higher" truth than the mere things that happened every day around and about. I didn't <u>quite</u> think that the Great Love Affair in the Sky would rescue me from myself and my horrible situation, but I hoped conscientiously that it would and tried very hard. I could appreciate rational arguments against thinking that if I only met The One, He would solve everything; that writing wasn't (after all) real and that one had to live in the real world, and so on. But I was in the pea culiar position of knowing perfectly well that if the outre solutions I had devised or made up for my life didn't work, neither did the commonsense ones. Which fact I kept trying to explain to my shrink--who wouldn't listen--until feminism came along and I found out there was another kind of uncommon common sense.

I loved Lovecraft. I read George MacDonald. I must've read every fantasist who ever breathed. I existed on Hammer films! And vampire movies and s.f. I've tried to put the unreality of those years in New York into fiction, but haven't done it all yet; it was genuinely schizoid and neurotic and miserable. And I kept looking very hard for the fantasy or belief or religion **X** that would truly rapt me (or all of us) up from the mundane level into the realm of Platonic abstractions.

It never worked. I don't mean that works like MacDonald's or Poe's or <u>The Well at the World's End</u> are hard to **warkxar** write or seldom good; I mean that they <u>never</u> work. I've tried to explain this to students enraptured by s & s and of course they don't listen. The kingdom of fantasy is inevitably regressive in the sense of being **r** traditional and conventional. The damned stories always begin well, only to fall apart. I'm talking now about <u>Water Babies</u> and the greet Victorian fantasies. They start with such an extraordinary promise of freedom, only to steadily contract--or grow shabby--until you realize you're right back **x** in your own living room and that under the exotic surface of that story is good old incest again, or Authority is Good (C.S. Lewis) or I Want Mama (Mac-Donald) or some utterly threadbare piece of silliness that if you'd seen it for itself at first go you would've rejected outright. The only mode in which fantasy can escape this fate is the comic/satiric (which is a kind of anti-fantasy) or the psychological, in which what finally counts



loanne wuss, 3121 Hashington .t., Houlder, 00 5030

Dotober 1976

Dear Tip,

Thanks for the letter. I laughed at your description of the wordtsunami--intimidated and furtive indeed! Rather fike villagers fleeing a volcano. ("Whatever the Gods are, they aren't angry," in one Ghas. Addams cartoon with freworks & Roman candles coming out of Mt. Pelse.)

lour letter somehow touched off some more thoughts about traufa it's true that I worky at her work and keep is far more basis than feminist polities and is more like the politics of being, to coin a phrase. I feel stray praduting from her inner mythical world of sainis and here. a fitz graduting from her inner mythical world of sainis and here. I aver lived in a world of themes and here, is very much ality, be well that I perform a stray of the same and here is a stray much ality. I aver lived in a world of themes and angles (very much ality, be made that I perform a world of themes and angles (very much ality, be made that I perform a stray of themes and angles (very much ality, be made to a stort 10 go perhaps 30 i was so intensely longly and messed over that I really did try my best to escape right out of fentasy. I pelievber in the less made enouge to go mad; it's a type on hinds a tot of that lives there and a soont. I didn't quite think that the dreas the source of the the stray and a soont. I didn't quite think that the dreas tor at 1 hopsed conscientionally that it would and tried very hard. a triait in the sky would reason as the myself and ty intrible situation, and. Hopsed conscientionally that it would and tried very hard. I could a difficient the sky would reason as the would and tried very fare. I could a could be used to be the tried world, and tried very hard. I could a difficient house the very thing; that writing wash; the difficient at a hopse on and the real world, and tried very hard. I could a duit hopsed conscientionally that it would and tried very the source of a difficient of knowin perfectly will that if the outre solutions and the vised or made us for my life didn't work, <u>meither will be connon</u> and so it andown common sense the sourd on there was another wind a duite thermal fact I keep trying to avplain to be sourd one and the source of works each trying to avplain to be source with a source of and the inclus to the sense alone and I found out there

I loved Lovecraft. I read George SacHonald. I must've read avay fantasist who ever breathed. I existed on Hammer films! and vampire movies and s.f. I've tried to put the unreshity of those years in New fors into fiction, but haven't done it all yet; it was genuinely schizoid and murstic and miserable. And I kept looking very hare for the fantasy or belief or religion in that would truly rapi me (or all of us) up from the munche level into the realm of Platonic abstractions.

It never worked. I don't mean that works like schonald's or Poe's or <u>The sell at the sorle's and</u> are hard to werkxars write or seldom good; resptured by s a s and of course they don't listen. The wingdom of fantasy is inevitably regressive in the sense of being r braditional and conventional. The damned stories always begin will, only to fall epart. I'm start with such an extraordinary promise of freedom, only to steadily contract-or grow shabby--until you realize you're right bear in you out incest secing that under the exotic surface of the story to steadily uponal of the startes always begin will, only to fall epart. I'm start with such an extraordinary promise of freedom, only to steadily contract--or grow shabby--until you realize you're right bear in you out incest secin, or suthority is Good (C.S. lewis) or I want heme (kac uponald) or some uttariy threedbare ble exotic surface of that if you'd seen it for itself at first so you would've rejected ourright. The only mode if which instary can seeme the fate is the conic/settric (which is a start four and that start or you would've rejected ourright. The only mode if which instary can seeme the fate is the conic/settric (which is a start for itself at first so you would've rejected ourright. The only mode if which instary can seeme the fate is the conic/settric (which is a



is the realism or psychology <u>projected</u> in the tale. I still like some of James for that, some of Kipling, a very few "ghost" stories. LeFanu is still fine. But these can be read in the same way one reads realism; they bring you face to face with the same problems, they are tough-grained and concrete and specific in the same way.

Now I believe that the fantasy I was after in my 20s was a kind of Platonism, an attempt to short-circuit real experience and the vagaries of real life, and go right to the heart of the great essences: truth, beauty, love, and so on.

I believe that Ursula is a kind of Platonist. She is not centrally interested in specifics (or has not been until fairly recently). The attempt to get "inside the song" as **Bithermark** Frodo (or somebody) says in <u>The Lord of the Rings</u> is exactly this kind of motive. Its hallmarks are nostalgia, the exotic, the magical.

I think it's no accident that the two writers in American s.f. who have done most with the real <u>feel</u> of magic are two anti-romantic, anti-Essentialists: Blish (in <u>Black Easte</u>) and Leiber (<u>Conjure Wife</u>). I love the hero's attempt to do magic in Leiber's book: the "slipperiness" of things, the feeling of immense forces resisting him, &c. But Leiber can only do this because for him exoticism and glamor only dissolve into kindliness (unless he's writing horror stories, which he does badly), or love (the witch lady in"Mirror World") or facing oneself ("The Change War"). The supernatural is a deliberate objective correlative for something else. He doesn't want to lose himself. And Blish may be a Platonist intellectually but he certainly isn't emotionally; his whole body of work denies it. A dryer writer never lived.

What I dislike in Ursula's work is exactly this longing for the magical, the exotic, the lyrical moment, the Meangingfulness of everything. When I got to the Immanent Grove in her last children's book, I believe I snarled aloud.

How can anyone write about anything except life? There isn't anything else. Abstractions grow out of the concretes, and death and life and good and evil are observations made about concrete specifics. That is my view. Ursula x seems to believe (or rather, to feel) that the value and beauty of specifics: characters, places, things, come x from their participation in the Great Abstracts.

At which point I snarl out loud again.

Death, indeed! I've written a whole novel on the subject. Only to conclude that there is nothing to write about death per se because death per se isn't. Wittgenstein says somewhere "Death is not part of life. Death is not lived through." And in the end, that's it. It is perplexing and horrible and heartbreaking, but it <u>is not</u>.

She's not an abstract thinker. She'd write a lot better if she were (say I, snidely). She doesn't think at all, in fact. She <u>participates</u> in the Legend, the Essences, the Magic, the Great Old Things.

The only thing wrong with such things is that they don't really exist. They are cultural constructs pretending to be Universals and Timeless. They are very old, but they are not timeless. Ursula is an Essentialist who really believes that objects-in-the-world are a kind of language, that the world can be <u>interpreted</u>. It is medieval thinking.



is the realism or psychology <u>prosected</u> in the tale. I still like some of James for that, some of hipling, a very few "chost" stories. LeFand is still fire. But these can be read in the same way one reads realism; they bring you face to face with the same problems, they are tough-rained and concrete and specific in the same way.

Platonism, an attempt to short-circuit real experience and the vagarian of real life, and go right to the heart of the great essences; truth, beauty, love, and so on.

I believe that Ursula is a kind of Platonist. She is not centrally interested in specifics (or has not been until fairly recently). The attempt to get "inside the song" as **xix**xxxxx brodo (or some body) says in <u>The Lord of the Rings</u> is exactly this kind of motive. Its hallmarks are mostalgia, the exotic, the magical.

I this it's the additions that the two writers in American s.f. who have do a cast with the real feel of maric are two anti-romantic, anti-Escenticitists, illsm (in also<u>d faste</u>?) and leiter <u>Conjure wife</u>). I leve the here's attempt to do maric in leiter's book; the "slipperiness" of things, the fastim of immence forces resisting him, fc: sut siber to only do this because for him excitism and flamor only discove into windliness (unless he's writing horror stories, which he does badly). or love (the witch leav in lirror Warld") or facing oneself ("the chance war"). The supernetural is a deliberate objective correlative for something else. He doesn't want to lose himself. And Blish may be a ristonict intellectually but he certainly isn't emotionally; his whole body of work denies it. i grver writer never lived.

what I dislike in Ursula's work is enactly this longing for the asgical, the exotic, the Lyrical moment, the Reargingfulness of everything. When I got to the Immanent Grove in her last children's book, a believe I sharled sloud.

How Gua Bayone write about saything except Life? There isn't supthing else. Abstractions grow out of the conortes, and death and Life and good and evil are observations made about concrete specifics. That is my view. Ursula z scend to believe (or rather, to feel) that the value and beauty of seecifics; characters, blace, things, cone z from their previoustion in the creat Abstracts.

At which point I sharl out loud aget .

Leath, indeed! I've written whole novel on the subject. Only to odnolude that there is nothing to write about death per se because death per se isn't. Littgenstein says somewhere "Death is not part of life. Death is not lived through." and in the end, that's it. It is perplexing and horrible and heartbreaking, but it is not.

She's not in abstract thinker. She'd write a lot better if she were (asy D, shidely). She doesn't think at all, in fact. She participates in the Legend, the assences, the mario, the Great Old Things.

The only thing wrone with such things is that they don't really exist. They are cultural constructs pretending to be Universals and Timeless. They are very old, but they are not timeless. Ursula is an Essentialist who really believes that objects-in-the-world are a kind of language, fust the world can be interpreted. It is medieval thinking.



I do not so believe. The only things-in-the-world which in any way contain humanxx Ideas are those things human beings have created--only they embody ideas. Ursula thinks (or writes as if) everything embodies ideas. I don't believe it.

Everything in her work is mysterious and yet familiar. But I love surprises. Real ones. I love <u>real</u> mysteries, like Stapledon's Martians. Not, mind you, objects which radiate Mystery but which have at their core a strange and awesome familiarity--these are merely Freud's return of the repressed--but really strange things, things we don't yet understand and may never understand. That's why I love Lem so much. In <u>The</u> <u>Invincible</u> and still more (they say) in <u>Solaris</u> he creates material we genuinely cannot fully know. There are no surprises in Poe's horror stories, either, though he **AM** does put themin his detective stories and his satires.

Nothing really new happens in LeGuin's work, or in most of it, certainly.

Real mysteries can, of course, be solved. They don't contain the essence of mysteriousness. It is simply happenstance that we don't (or probably won't ever) understand them fully.

Mystery, magic, nostalgia, and legend are fakes. Or rather not exactly fakes, but effexcts produced by point of view, i.e. where you're standing. Hop down to another hill, move the lamp about, and they cease to exist. They're very much like optical illusions.

Ursula's first short story, "Semly's Necklace" at one point has a man asking another man **(MAX** (upon beholding the heroine) something like: don't you feel as if you're in a legend? The answer to which in my mind is absolutely impulsive: Don't be a damned fool.

Good and evil and death are not "as yet" peripheral in my writing; they are in fact very much in my thoughts a good deal of the time. But I reverse the cause-and-effect. These Great Subjects do not exist unless they arise from particulars. In no way **xa** do the particulars borrow their life from the abstractions.

Ursula is, goddammit, an abstract writer. You can, I suppose, put it that way. Blake is not a Platonist in this sense. His experience is visionary but it's quite concrete; in fact, he had the most organic view of abstractions of anybody I've ever read. That's why he can do such marvelous epigrams. Blake thinks <u>in specifics</u> even when he is thinking about abstractions; that's why he's marvelous. And, of course, thoroughly political, as you may have noticed!

Yes, Ursula's images are real, especially the king in the drafty, scrubby stone castle. And the ice-fields and the rocks. I don't think her forests are real. I was re-reading a section from Dispossessed (where Shevek assists at the birth of Takver's baby) and was very impressed. I suspect that Ursula's fragments, something like A.E. Van Vogt's, are terribly impressive, and that they lose in context, don't gain. Chip's critical article on LeGuin compares her to Van Vogt, a comparison I thought rather nerdy at first, but there is a genuine analogy there. Although Ursula is obviously not a scatterbrain, like A.E.

There is nothing except life. There are no angels and demons. My feeling about them is Genet's; they are really politically conservative



I do not so believe. The only things-in-the-world which is any wa contain knamar. Ideas are those things human beings have are ted-orithey embody ideas. Ursula thinks (or writes as if) everything embodies ideas. I don't believe it.

Everything in her work is mysterious and yet familiar. But 1 love surprises. Real once. 1 love real mysteries, like Stapledon's vertians. Bot, mind you, objects which radiate yetery but which have at their core a strange and swesome familiarity--these are merely read's return of the represed--but really strange things, things we don't yet understand and may sever understand. That's why 1 love sem so auch. In The invincible and still more (they say) in <u>Solaris</u> he creates meterial we genuinely cannot fully know. There are as surprises in foe's horror storics, either, though he as does put themin his detective stories and his satires.

Nothing really new happens inchecuin's work, or in most of it, certainly.

keal mysteries can, of course, be solved. They don't contain the essence of mysteriousness. It is simply heppenstance that we don't (or procebly won't ever) understand them fully.

Lystery, magic, nostalgis, and leven are fakes. Or nother not exactly fakes, but effexcis produced by boint of view , i.e. where you're standing. Hop down to shother hill, move the lamp about, and they cease to exist. They're very much the optical illusions.

Ursula's first short story, "Semly's Mecklace" at one point has a man acking another man (wax (upon beholding the beroine) something like, don't you feel as if you're in a legend? The answer to which in my mind is absolutely impulsive, Don't be a damned fool.

Good and evil and death are not "as yet" peripheral in my writing; they are in fact very much in my thoughts a good deal of the time. But reverse the cauce-and-effect. These Great Subjects do not exist unless they arise from particulers. In no vay is do the particulars parrow their life from the abstractions.

Jraula is, goddammit, an abstract writer. You can, I suppose, put it that way. Slake is not a Blatonist in this sence. His experience is visionary but it's quite concrete; in fact, he had the most organic view of abstractions of anyoody f've ever read. That's why he can do such marvelous epigrems. Blake thinks in specifics even when he is thinking about abstractions; that's why he's marvelous. And, of course, thoroughly colitical, as you may neve noticed:

iss, Ursula's images are real, especially the kine in the araity, scrubby stone consile. And the ice-fields and the rocks. I don't think her forests are real. I was re-reading a section from Dispossessed (where Shevek assists of the birth of Fakyer's baby), and was very imprese ad. I suspect that Ursule's frequents, something like A.E. Van Vogt's, are tarrialy impressive, and that they lose in context, con't gain. Chip's thought rather nergy of first, but there is a continue analy.

There is nothing except life. There are no angels and demons. If feeline about them is demot's; they are really politically donservative



parents dressed up in angel (or devil) costumes. One impresses them on a child's tender mind at the imprinting age and voila!--a whole preternatural world, or, if you've got the mind for it, a whole philosophy.

To dig down to the experiences themselves, to the "archetypes" that are really Pleasure and Pain and Horror and Ecstasy <u>in themselves</u>, and you can get a wonderful visionary world, like Blake's or Sexton's, but I suspect that verse is better for this than prose. Certainly to try to hook up the experience of the feelings-in-themselves with a Magical/ Nostalgic vocabulary of dramatic events derived from literature is fatal. After all, MacDonald also has his moments when the magic works, but then it works because it's really a distorted version of real experience. I am not, you know, plumping for <u>analytical</u> or observing writing. Only for a view of experience that doesn't ring in Platonic Essences.

By the way, marchen themselves are much more tough-minded and concrete than the kind of thing I'm talking about or the kind of thing Ursula (or Tolkien) writes. Theyre not <u>fantasies</u>, although they may be full of wonders. People who told them had to half-believe and that gives them life.

I really begin to think that the Platonic Essences plus the philosophy is the fatal combo. <u>Water Babies</u>, a book I loved when I was in my teens, now gives me the pip. Although parts of it are still lovely, but they could be just as lovely in Victorian-real-life terms. Like the Magical Lady, who is really mamma going out to dinner in hew new dress and diamonds.

People who can write the kind of work in which everything or nothing is metaphor--in which the whole story is one single objective correlative-are the visionaries. But as you say, Ursula isn't one.

My dear friend, what else is there except life?

To my mind Ursula is writing (and thinking) backwards. And they are all foregone conclusions, which is a horrible sin.

You talk about the "neutral" themes of mortality and virtue--and yet, you know, isn't Chip one of the most insistently moral writers doing anything today? Aren't I? Except that abstractions have no existence except a mental one, and so must be constantly re-checked against the experience that one <u>can't</u> manipulate. Which is why children can be so fine; they haven't learned to distort their feelings in the service of abstract morality. Be wary of books in which children (or adolescents) must learn from the wisdom of their elders; usually (as in Heinlein's juveniles) they are learning a fixed morality given by authority. I find myself in my new book having a forty-year-old superwoman learning everything from a silly twelve-year-old baby poet girl.

I'm not really against x escape, you know. If one could! But it doesnt' work. Even those who devour s & s feel the sense of xincompleteness, the need to go on, to devour another, &c. And if you're lucky you eventually see through the whole enterprise. It's a whole different universe when you finally **EERXXEX** realize that magic and nostalgia are only tricks of the light, that they don't exist. I think Ursula may get there, but she is certainly backing into it.

I am an existentialist, not an essentialist. I consider essentialism wicked and in bad faith and the cause of endless evils.



perente dressed up in angel (or devil) costumes. One impresses them on a child's tender mind at the imprinting age and voilal--a whole preternatural world, or, if jou've not the mind for it, a whole philosophy.

To dig down to the exeriences themselves, to the "crohetypes" that are really ileasure and rain and Horror and Ecstary in thamselves, and you can get a wonderful vicionary world, like lake's or lexton's, out accept that verse is better for this than prose. Certainly to try to hook up the experience of the feelings-in-themselves with a sector! Hostalsic voce ultry of dramatic events derived from literature is fatal. After all, accompted also has his moments when the maric works, but then it works because it's really a distorted version of real experience. I am not, you know, plumping for analytical or observing writing.

By the way, marchen themselver are much more tough-minded and goncrete than the kind of thirs I'm talking about or the kind of thing trans (or folkien) writes. Theyre not <u>famicales</u>, although they may be full of wonders, feople who told them had to malf-believe and that gives them life.

I really begin to think that the latonic basences plus the philosophy is the fatal composenater Bablos, a book I loved when I was in my teens, now gives he the pip. Although norts of it are still lovely, but they could be just as lovely in Victorian-real-life terms. Like the magical hady, who is really manne going out to dinner in hew dress and diamonds.

Feeble who can write the kind of work in which everything or nothing is metachor--in which the whole story is one single objective corrolative-are the visionaries. But as you say, traula isn't one.

Wy dear triend, what else is there except lifer

No my mind Ursula is writing (and thinking) backwards. And they are all foregoes conclusions, which is a horrible sin.

ou talk shout the neutral themes of cortality and virtue--and yet, you know, isn't Onip one of the most insistently moral writers doing anything today: aren't 19 except that sostrections have no existence except a mental one, and so must op constantly re-checked areinst the exberience that one <u>can't</u> actual their feelings in the service of abstract the haven't tearned to distort their feelings in the service of abstract actainty. Be war of books in which children (or adolescents) must learn from the wisdom of their selders; usually (as in definicin's juvenites) as new pool having a fixed morality riven by authority. I find yeelf in ay new book having a forty-year-old superwoom tearning everything from a silly twelve-year-old superwoom tearning everything from a

I'm not really against s escape, you know. If one could! but it soesnt' work. Even those who devour a a sfeet the sense of sincondeteness, the need to go on, to devour another, ic. And if you're lucky you eventually see through the vhole enterprise. It's a whole different univers when you finally maintee realize that magic and nostelgie are only tricks of the list, that the don't exist. I think urable may get there, out and is certaily backing into it.

I am an existentialist, not an essentialist. I consider essentialing



and the sea

I certainly don't see how anybody can be an essentialist and a feminist both--although that is where Jung comes in, you see, enabling such women to both hold on to the Ancient Universals and avoid existentialism, and yet **Enda**xx enlarge the sphere in which they personally can exist.

I loathe essentialism more than I can say (even in 4 pp.).

In fact, I could write better Nostalgia/Magic/Legend stuff with one hand tied behind my back than most s.f. writers now breathing. Not better than Ursula, though. I don't, by the way, wish she'd turn into a realist, in the manner of **kxtekf**xx <u>Lathe of Heaven</u>. I wish she'd trust her images more and write less connected stories, perhaps, or find some way of <u>not</u> integrating the philosophy and the images. They don't, in fact, go together.

You are **write** right about the images: stone, ice, dragons, kings, cold castles! And stone, stone, stone. Chip does a lovely bit on these in his article. Dispossessed (which he persisted in spelling Dispossed in the ms.) is full of cross-connections of this kind and there really are extraordinary passages in it about Anarres, which have nothing at all to do with her politics and everything to do with something else.

And yet what sort of world can this woman inhabit, finally? Not one where they'd let her in. That's what I keep coming back to. For a woman this kind of g regressive/traditional/mm nostalgia is so absolutely fatal. She is actually performing miracles in putting the two together, and yet where the dickens can you go from her early work? You have to remain always a man-in-disguise, a woman-in-disguise-as-a-man, or there's no imaginative place for you in your own imaginative life. I believe her when she says that men attract her artistically because men are alien; that's what happens when you want to make literature, not life.

I don't write literature, you know; I must've stopped some time ago, somewhere between <u>Picnic</u> and <u>Chaos</u>. At least that's what I keep getting told anyhow, even by you ("loose ends" huh? Feh!).

I must go watch Beverly Sills in <u>Elizabeth Regina</u>. Two sentences of the libretto and you know it's Italian opera; it is totally cracked. Every time I hear "Reynaldo is torn between love for Isabella and his honor as Duke of Boston" I <u>know</u>. They are such wonderfully horridly silly plots.

But alas, there is no future for fiction that doesn't get away from doing what music or paint could do better. One reason, probably, why s.f. illustration is so good, so often, and the writing so **ad** bad. Illustration is the real medium.

What's"in here" is <u>never</u> "out there." Fiction can only be written on the understanding that kt it's a <u>language</u>. Marxistly speaking, Ursula tries to substitute Nature for History, and that'w what I hate.\*

Have you read Roland Barthes' <u>Mythologies</u>? Says all this better than I can.

\*To be more clear, she is denying that history is history and insisting that it's Eternal Nature, which is bullshit.

Joanna Joanna



- 朱5-

inist both--although that is where Jung cames in, you see, encoling such wouch to both hold on to the Ancient Universals and avoid existentialism, and yet axiaxis enlarge the source in which they personally can exist.

I losthe essentialism more than I can set "(even in + pp.).

In fact, I could write setter satalate/ sgic/lerend stuff with one hand tied behind my dack than most a.f. writers now breathing. Not setter than drauls, thour. I don't, by the way, wish she'd turn into a realist, in the manner of kargarray state of leaven. I wish ane'd trust her images more and write less connected stories, bernaps, or find some way of not integrating the chilosophy and the images. They don't, in fact, go to, ther.

You are written right about the images: stone, ice, dregons, kings, cold castles! and stone, fons, stone, while doos a lovely hit on these in his article. Dispossessed (which he persisted in spelling Dispossed in the ms.) is full of cross-connections of this kind and there really are extraordinary passages in it about marries, which have nothing st all to do with her colitics and overything to do with something else.

and yet what sort of world can this women innabit, finally? Not one where they'd let her in. That's what I keep coming Deck to. For a woman this kind I x repressive/traditional/an nostalpia is so absolutely istaland is atually performing miracles in putting the two together, and yet where the dickens can you to from her estly work? You have to temain always a men-in-discuise, a woman-in-discuise-as-a-man, or there's no imaginstive place for you in your own imaginative life. I believe her when an a start han attract her artistically because wen are slien; that's what happens when you wont to make liferature, not life.

I don't write literature, you know; I must've stopped some time ago, somewhare between <u>fonic</u> and <u>Chaos</u>. At least that's what I keep gottin told snyhow, even by you ("loose enas" hur? Feb!).

I wint so watch severily silts in <u>Alizabeth Revins</u>. Two sentences of the libratto and you know it's limit orers; it is totally crecked. Every time I hear "Re haldo is torn between love for isabelia and his honor as use of spatoh" <u>L.Know</u>. They are such wonderfully borridly silly clots.

But also, there is no future for flotion that doesn't set away from doing what music or paint could do better. One reason, probably, why s.f. illustration is so good, so often, and the writing so ad bac. Illustration is the real medium.

what's"in here" is <u>hever</u> "out there." Fiction can only be written on the understanding that Mi Lt's a <u>lemvine</u>. Merriatly speaking, Ursula tries to substitute Malure for mistory, and that's what I hate.

have you read notand Barthes' windle ties? . says all this better than

To be more clear, she is denying that hintory is history and insisting that it's starnal nature, which is bullshit.



- 2 -