
COSMOPOLIS

Volume 1, Issue 2

February 2000

The *VIE* Vision

The idea of a complete edition of Vance is an attractive one which has occurred to many people. But if you actually roll up your sleeves and try to create it, you are confronted with many, many questions. There are legal, financial, organizational and promotional questions. But more important even than these are questions like: what is "complete"? Should the books be hard or soft cover? What size should they be? Should the novels be grouped in single volumes by series? Should there be illustrations? What type face and point size should be used? These questions are most important because, after all is said and done, it is these things which define the *VIE*, which make it what it is. Such questions cannot be answered on the basis of good sense and taste alone. Basic choices are involved which have more importance than is immediately apparent, and only a coherent vision can resolve them.

The vision which defines the *VIE* began its evolution one day in March of 1999. At that time I was working on my essay on Vance — the thesis of which is: "Jack Vance is a great artist." In Norma Vance's office I picked up a book entitled *Die Domänen von Koryphon*, published by Andreas Irlé. This hardback, unlike any book of Vance I had ever seen, was not an object that yapped: "I am a science fiction book!" Nor did it boast: "I am a luxury edition!" It was just a book. It was a beautiful book, but its beauty was in its sobriety and simplicity. Discovering this book was the spark that started the *VIE* fire. I have since met Andreas and worked with him on the *VIE* format, which is closely based on his German editions. I consider our book format a most vital element of the *VIE*. But it is not the only one. What are the others? Out of what basic ideas do they spring? How do they fit together?

The most compact formula for describing the *VIE* is: "all Vance, in chronological order, in restored texts, in a readers' edition of sixty octavo volumes." But why this, and not an equally plausible formula, such as: "the best of Vance, in a three box deluxe set: Mystery, Fantasy, and Science Fiction"?

Or again: "the annotated Vance, with commentary and critical essays, in seven quarto volumes"? Or, yet again, "The illustrated Vance, with all published cover art and illustrations from all English and foreign publications: ten folio volumes in full color!"? Each of these models will have its advocates. So why our choice? Here are the four pillars that support my vision of the *VIE*:

1 - Vance is a great artist. He is as great, or greater, than the greatest twentieth century writers. Among these I might count: Solzhenitsyn, Forrester, Kundera, Borges, Wodehouse (Vance's own favorite) — a list neither consistent nor exhaustive but merely intended to set the tone. My conviction of Vance's greatness is not independent from my criteria of judgement. I make this remark, which is less obvious than it seems, because the criteria in question are out of fashion.

To articulate these criteria I must digress; the particular virtues of characteristic twentieth century "greats", like James Joyce or Picasso, can be fully enjoyed only by people with a certain temperamental and ideological equipment. Everyone else must settle for admitting a degree of incomprehension, and, in consequence, being considered a boor. To escape this, many people pretend, above all to themselves, an admiration they do not feel. This dilemma is specific to the modernist situation, for it is an exclusively modernist fad to discount what an artist does, in favor of what he is. An Artist, in modernist terms, is not first and foremost an artisan, a maker of beautiful things whose value is evident to anyone, but a "genius" who must be worshiped blindly, in spite of any revolt of the instincts. Those in charge of such things have not promoted Vance to this godlike status, so no one holds him in uncomprehending or self-satisfied awe, much less use him as a symbol of their own superiority. Instead, those who have found their way to him simply love him.

What motivates their love? Gratitude for what he has made. Vance, once discovered, is with one always, like Shakespeare or Jane Austen. Like any of the true greats he can be infinitely read and reread, with ever-growing pleasure and profit.

2 - Vance is trapped in genre literature, and cannot escape. This for two reasons: a) his books are stigmatized, for most serious readers, by the quality of the editions and the cover art; and, b) within the genres he does not have enough appeal — except in some European countries like Belgium, Sweden, Holland and France — to rival such artistic pigmies as Herbert and Asimov. Thus he cannot escape the genres by crawling to the top of the heap, where he would, at least, be conspicuous — both Lem and Bradbury have enlarged their audiences in this way. The result is that, effectively, Vance is unknown.

3 - Almost all Vance is out of print.

4 - Here I must venture a few more steps out onto the tortured terrain of modern philosophy. I spoke of: "the modernist fad to discount what an artist does, in favor of what he is." This is a corollary of modernist disdain for the difference between good and evil. In other words, if an artist is "great"; whatever he does, however ugly, tedious, graceless, encoded, ridiculous, despicable, crass, crude or corrupting it might be, it is, ergo: great. This is the sense of the phrase: "beyond good and evil", as applied to Art where it might be rephrased: beyond beauty and ugliness. The progress of the effort to suppress the difference between good and evil (and beauty and ugliness) is the crisis of our culture. I am not whining about rampant vulgarity, sloth, crime and so on! All these are eternal problems which, though susceptible of containment, cannot be eliminated. Nor am I deploring, as such, the existence of forces working toward the suppression of good and evil, which, though indeed deplorable, are another eternal presence. What is specific to the modernist situation is the unprecedented advances made by these forces.

I am sensitive to this because, as a painter, I have been close to the destruction of Art, achieved several decades ago, by the late modernists. Progress may be less marked in other areas, but the danger is constant. The single historical precedent for our situation is the progressive and total collapse of Western culture in the early centuries of the first millennium A. D. The immediate danger today, as then, is not fire and the barbarian's sword, which is merely the final consequence. The immediate danger is dissolution: cultural and personal. The stars are being put out and souls wander lost, shrinking into cold, grey formlessness. Pleasure — read: "power" — becomes our highest good.

Vance is an inoculation against this cultural disease; bringing him to general attention is important. I will not speak about how Vance is valuable in this way, but I will mention two things which some of my alert colleagues might wish to

point out: there are two high-profile aspects of Vance which would seem not to help, but to reinforce, the crisis I have described: a) the moral relativism espoused by the neo-Rousseauian Baron Bodissey; and, b) a number of passages clearly motivated by a certain type of American anti-clericalism. But these do not characterize Vance's work in depth. Indeed, opposite tendencies strongly predominate. Otherwise, someone such as myself — a militant anti-relativist and devout Catholic who knows his catechism — could never enjoy him. This would not be, as some may want to argue, ideologically motivated. For me Goodness and Beauty are one. Genuine moral relativism (as opposed to a mere posturing) is too odious to be supportable to thoughtful people. As for Vancian anti-clericalism; most of it would be better characterized as "anti-idolatry" — with which no Christian, at least, should quarrel — though genuine pagans would. For the rest: Vance's sense of the reality of the invisible world is remarkable.

All Vance, in chronological order, in a reader's edition; the *VIE* idea revolves around one point: Jack Vance is a great artist. So Vance must be offered as himself, not as the exponent of one genre or another, and the *VIE* books must be about presenting his texts, not about other people's interpretations of him. As for chronological presentation, it reinforces the idea of Vance as artist. His development is rich and interesting; it is an aspect of his artistic achievement. Insignificant writers do not develop, or their development is without interest.

Should the *VIE* be a scholarly edition? Though we are intent on presenting Vance's texts in an authoritative form — which will mean a considerable deployment of scholarly muscle — the *VIE* will not, in the strict sense, be a scholarly edition. It will however, be the ineluctable starting point for any ulterior scholarly work. This means that, while we will have an addenda volume containing materials of interest to students of literature, the books themselves will simply be readers' books: no notes, no commentary, no parallel readings, no cross-references. Why? Because we want the *VIE* to contribute to hoisting Vance up into the literary mainstream. Vance is in the basement of the literary house. Where we want to see him is up in the salon. A scholarly edition, at best, might catapult him straight into the attic.

How important then is our textual integrity work? This work is crucial to the *VIE* and will contribute importantly to the prestige of the edition and the *VIE* goal: getting Vance widely recognized as a great. Reciprocally, this is the

motivating principle in our textual integrity work: Vance's texts themselves are the ones we use, not "improved" or "corrected", much less corrupt versions of them.

Such statements may cause some people to wonder: how much of the Vance we know is not Vance? In fact, apart from a few spectacular examples — including the title "The Dying Earth" and several chapters in two of the early novels — not a dramatic amount. The Vance of the *VIE* will be more strongly etched, but not other than the Vance we already know. However, there will be enough significant changes to make reading Vance in the *VIE*, or later *VIE*-text based editions, obligatory for serious Vance readers. Restoring the author's intent on the scale, and to the standards, of the *VIE* will be a formidable task; even an unimaginable one in any context but our volunteer project.

The impulse behind the *VIE* is to offer Vance to the world and to help perpetuate his work. We hope to do this by a) creating a basis for his recognition by the literary establishment; b) getting people who would never have read what they thought was sci-fi or fantasy or even mystery, to read Vance and so discover a great; c) providing authoritative texts for future editions. The books themselves must, therefore, have no taint of genre. On the other hand, they must refuse the temptation of the deluxe edition. Deluxe editions are for collectors but the *VIE* seeks to get out of and beyond the tiny Vance club. The *VIE* is not about projecting the sense that Vance is beloved of his readers, or that he is the best of a type, but about bringing him into his own as a famous classic who belongs to the world. So the *VIE* will be a modest, sober, tasteful, complete edition of an Author — as if Jack Vance had already seen countless complete editions, like his natural peers: Twain, Stevenson, Dickens, Balzac. Of course, our limited edition will not do this in itself. But we are taking a strong first step of which the *VIE* project itself is a part. We want to emphasize in all we do our conviction that Vance is, in the French phrase: "un classique incontournable."

Paul Rhoads

Proofreading Update

The story so far

The proofreading team is by far the largest on the *VIE*. At the last count there were 85 of us. Unfortunately it hasn't been possible to give a job to everyone in such a large team — yet. I can assure you that this will change!

We are currently at the stage we are calling "pre-proofing". This is where every text is given a single proofread (occasionally another may be necessary) prior to entering the labyrinth known as Textual Integrity, the domain of Alun Hughes. All texts which have been digitised — and that's most of them — have been assigned for pre-proofing.

Once texts have been through the textual integrity phase, proofreading will undergo transformation. Each text will be proofread up to ten times. With over 120 novels and stories to proof, that adds up to well over 1,000 assignments — enough to keep even the most enthusiastic of you quiescent!

Where are we now? Well, 100 pre-proofing assignments have been made and 60 of those have been completed. A staggering 1.8 million words have been proofread. A special mention is due to the Stakhanovite labours of Steve Sherman, who's proofread a quarter of a million words already. Rob Friefeld, Ron Chernich, Michel Bazin, Evert Jan de Groot, Till Noever and Patrick Dusoulier have all proofread over 100,000 words. So too have two members of the *VIE* Management Team who must remain nameless [*that's you and me, Bob...*]

To those of you who have contributed so far: your time is very much appreciated; to those of you who have not: your patience is equally valued. I hope you will all be interested in the Proofreading Game outlined below.

The Proofreading Game

I outlined earlier the enormous scope of the proofreading job which would be facing us after the textual integrity stage of our work. Alun Hughes writes elsewhere about the timetable for this process, but already we are looking ahead to how the proofreading is organised. To help us generate momentum and excitement, we will be instituting a friendly competition designed to keep proofers on their mettle!

Each text will be proofread in parallel by up to ten proofreaders, who will create a log of all the typos they find. For each text, the proofreader identifying the most genuine typos will be declared the winner, with plaudits published in

Cosmopolis! There will also be a running total for the person who spots the most typos cumulatively. Awards will also be made in other categories yet to be determined.

Participation in the game is purely voluntary: those who prefer their results to be between me and them will naturally have that option. The game is intended as a piece of fun to speed the long months of proofing — it certainly isn't hussade and no ravishments or other penalties will be inflicted on the losers!

More details of the game will follow in later issues. It is as yet untitled: if you can think of an appropriately Vancean name, please send it to me at tim.stretton@bigfoot.com. Three free "typo credits" to be applied to the text of your choice once the game gets underway will be awarded for the best suggestion.

Tim Stretton

The New Textual Integrity Principles

Basics

Following the meeting in Oakland, and having had a chance to review the range of textual evidence available to us, I am now in a position to issue an outline of how the new textual integrity (TI) guidelines will look. Those detailed guidelines are in preparation, and will include supporting and contextual material not within the scope of this note. However, it seems appropriate now that we are about to enter the "TI phase" of the project to indicate to volunteers who may be about to start TI work or switch to it from text entry or proofreading — whether they know it or not, yet! — how they are to be expected to work, and the principles that will apply to that work. These principles are also of interest to proofreaders still on the job.

VIE veterans will note something of a return to the use of manuscript evidence. I make no apology for this — we find that its status is easier to assess than I at first thought, and the nature of some of the changes that have typically been made to the texts strongly indicate its use where possible.

It must be emphasised that we should not see this central task of the *VIE* as re-editing Jack Vance. The work has been

edited already, by professionals — they were, presumably, paid to do it — and by no means all that work has been slipshod or cavalier. We do not presume, as amateurs, to do the job better. Our task is to undo the editorial interventions which have changed the character, meaning and artistry of Jack Vance's texts, to return as closely as we realistically can to his intent.

We are digitising from published editions — ideally, the preferred editions, i.e. those that we hope are the closest to the author's original text. Even where we have manuscripts, we are not digitising from those. It is recognised that the published editions have a certain status; that there is a legitimacy — even necessity — to the publisher's proofreading and copyediting process which has contributed to the final form of the published text. We do, however, recognise that some — too much — of this work, especially during the "middle period", has been lazy, incompetent, capricious, disrespectful. Our task is not to reject all the editorial work that has been done but to undo that part of it that is unacceptable by the standards of the *VIE*.

We start with the digitised text. Changes to that text must be *supported by evidence*, and must also be *justified by argument*. Those arguments must be consistent with the textual integrity principles.

Evidence

For each text, a key early TI activity is the identification and assessment of the available evidence. This will include manuscript material, where it is available. There may be correspondence or other contextual information. Evidence will also include the "preferred edition" and other published versions of the texts. It is tempting to think of the published texts as being serially degraded by reproduction from the "best" source, but this is not necessarily the case: more than one edition may have been prepared from manuscript; later (or even earlier) versions may incorporate changes by the author — or someone else; some editions may omit or restore text passages. Finally, we have Jack and Norma Vance to refer to — but that resource should be used intelligently and sparingly.

To do the TI job properly we need to understand the range of evidence available for each text, its structure, and its status. That will involve at least some TI workers in some genuine research. We also need to understand the processes by which each text was generated — it is, for example, useful to know that Jack Vance hardly ever made changes in proof. There will be more about this in the full TI guidelines.

Argument

Having established our evidence, we need guidelines on how to use it. There are two guiding principles, which are applied in this order of priority:

- Restoration of the author's artistic intent
- Production of a uniform edition — the *VIE* — to a common set of standards and as far as possible in accordance with the author's preferences

If the principles conflict, the first priority will apply.

These principles need to be unpacked into "acceptable" arguments, and this will be done more fully in the complete TI guidelines. I should emphasise, though, that the guidelines will develop over time, as we gain experience in the analysis of textual evidence and the development of argument.

Not every textual issue is a matter of artistic intent. For example, we have, for now, placed the form of hyphenation of standard English words outside the scope of the first principle (see the section below).

Specific textual issues

Jack Vance is his own authority on spelling, grammar, punctuation and vocabulary. Obvious typos will be corrected. Jack Vance's mannerisms, or his coined words, or his choice of words, will not be "corrected". His choice of spelling will not be homogenised.

Hyphenated words

We will be leaving these as they are in the preferred edition, unless there are exceptional reasons for changing them. A general exception is made for proper names, where the author's usage should be restored in all cases. We define this issue as presentational, not affecting artistic intent. Restoration is only possible where we have manuscript evidence; Jack Vance is not consistent in this regard, and where we lacked evidence we would not be able to guess with confidence. There are many such words in Jack Vance's texts: either we introduce many new errors, or we have an edition which is not integral, or we leave well enough alone. The third option is preferred.

Ellipses, dashes, exclamation points

These will all be restored to the manuscript reading, where that evidence is available. Otherwise we will accept the reading of the preferred edition, unless there is clear evidence to the contrary. In line with Jack Vance's preferences, ellipses will

have three points whether they are in the middle or at the end of a sentence.

Commas, semicolons, colons

We will always restore the author's original, where the manuscript evidence exists. Exceptionally, subject to review, we may accept a copyeditor's change where this is necessary to preserve the correct meaning. In the absence of manuscript evidence, we hope to be able to restore some constructions where Jack Vance consistently uses a particular style, e.g. "So then" (no comma) at the start of a sentence of dialogue. That will be the subject of further work.

Continuity issues

Minor inconsistencies, continuity problems, and the like will not be "corrected." TI workers, and others, are welcome — even encouraged — to note these when they see them, and if they are particularly serious, affecting meaning or understanding, we may draw them to Jack Vance's attention. But it is not the task of the *VIE* to edit out these inconsistencies. It may, however, be the case that an apparent inconsistency points to editorial interference — in that case we will certainly try to put it right, and the TI worker should therefore be vigilant.

Order of work

The TI process will start with those texts where the evidence is most complete and straightforward, that is, where we have reliable manuscript evidence. We will be dealing with texts where there is much less evidence later on. This is for two reasons: first, we hope to turn up some more manuscripts; second, we hope to develop a better understanding of the whole evidence base which will aid us in our treatment of those texts where, in particular, there is no manuscript evidence. We are evolving a concept of "cognate texts" where we think that we might be able to apply principles from one text in a cognate set where we do have good evidence to others where we don't. For example, the manuscript for *The Palace of Love* is available; as I write, we don't have the manuscript for *Star King* or *The Killing Machine*. We might hope that analysis of what was done in copyediting to *The Palace of Love* might give us clues to "restoring" the other two. But that is part of the ongoing research programme of the *VIE*.

Author's note: Comments on this are welcome. I expect the TI guidelines to evolve as we encounter more evidence and real examples.

Alun Hughes, Textual Integrity Lead

Statistics from John Schwab

Fellow Volunteers, I would like to thank all of you for the excellent work you have done over the past month. We have now nearly completed the text-entry process.

There are still a few hard-to-find items yet to be digitized. Below are listed texts that are still unassigned. If you have one of these, and would be interested in digitizing it, please let me know and I will make the assignment.

Please be sure to check in at the Text-Entry Web site at <http://www.users.uswest.net/~jschwab/textentry.html>. This site will carry downloads of help files and other information as it becomes available.

I would like each of you who is currently working on a text to please check in with me. Please send a copy of your progress to this point as well.

Thanks you all for your cooperation, it is truly a pleasure working with each of you. As always; if you have a question regarding text-entry/digitizing, send me a message and I will get back to you as soon as possible.

Current VIE Progress as of February 21st, 2000

| | |
|--------------------------------|-----|
| TOTAL NUMBER OF STORIES IN VIE | 133 |
| Assigned for digitization | 125 |
| Digitized | 87 |
| Assigned for 1st proof reading | 84 |
| 1st proof completed | 51 |
| Assigned for 2nd proof | 10 |
| 2nd proof completed | 5 |

The following is a list of those titles not yet digitized:

Strange Notions (Underwood-Miller 1985)

Sabotage on Sulfur Planet (Lost Moons, Underwood-Miller 1982)

Four Hundred Blackbirds (Lost Moons, Underwood-Miller 1982)

The Five Gold Bands (Startling Stories, Nov. 1950)

The Languages of Pao (Satellite Science Fiction, Dec. 1951)

There may also be a few other oddments that will need to be placed in digital form.

Thank you,

John A. Schwab

Text-Entry Coordinator

Photo of Crew at Work



Working at the Vances' home, from left to right: Tim Stretton, John Robinson, John Schwab, Suan Yong

Subscription Fees

VIE management is now considering the scheduling of payment for the sixty-volume *Vance Integral Edition*.

Many factors will determine the payment schedule. Exact cost of production, handling, shipping to the subscriber's address, insurance, and the print production schedule all add up to an interesting logistics problem.

Consider for a moment the mere bulk of the VIE. A single volume is around five by eight inches, by three-quarters of an inch thick. For the full set, this is multiplied by sixty to give a physical volume (without packaging) of just over a cubic foot. The estimated weight is forty pounds (eighteen kilograms), if each volume weighs in around 300 grams.

If three hundred sets are printed, the amassed volumes occupy eleven and a half cubic yards (just under 9 cubic meters), and weigh about 12,000 pounds (5,400 kilograms).

None of these estimates include packaging for shipping, which will increase the volume considerably.

Shipping costs may vary somewhat by country: our books will be printed in Milan and the cost to ship to Houston will most likely vary from that to Sydney. Within the United States, U. S. Postal Service "book rate" is good for only 15 pounds per package, so multiple shipments may be required. Shipping to points other than the U.S. will be consistent with good practice in the country in which the subscriber resides.

Insurance is another issue: you want your volumes to arrive in perfect condition, and so do we. (I like to put my own marks of wear and patina upon my cherished volumes.)

And finally, we are not yet sure of the production schedule: that is, what is the time duration from the end of production of volume 1 until the end of production of volume 60. This will affect the time between your full payment and your receipt of your set.

What does this mean to you as a subscriber? As we resolve the details of our production run with the printer, and firm up the most likely schedule of possible deliveries, we will begin to consider payment schedules. One thing is certain, however: a subscriber's full payment will be required before any volumes are printed for that subscriber.

A range of possibilities present themselves. When production and shipping schedules become firm, you may be asked for a substantial deposit. This will guarantee the production of a set for you, and determine your shipping priority. Prior to actual printing, you will be asked for the remainder of your fee. It is our intent to give our subscribers as much notice as possible on the payment and shipping schedule. This information will be found in subsequent issues of *Cosmopolis*.

Your purchase of the *VIE* set will be a transaction governed in part by the laws of the State of California, where the Vance Integral Edition is incorporated.

As always, I am interested to hear your questions and comments.

Bob Lacovara

Response to Paul Rhoad's Vision of the *VIE*

You don't have to agree with Paul's analysis of the state of contemporary art — which, to greater or lesser extent, I don't — to subscribe to his central vision for the *VIE*. Paul speaks of a great writer trapped within genre identity, whose books bear flags saying "Monsters and rayguns within. You wouldn't like it." Our aim is to let the texts speak for themselves, free from the prejudices of genre packaging, and free from the obscuring film of (some) popular fiction editing. The *VIE* is not going to have a wide audience - the small size of the edition precludes that. But the texts themselves will outlive this edition, and, we hope, make it possible to present Vance to a new readership in a way that he and his texts deserve.

Alun Hughes

Notes from Readers

Responses by Bob Lacovara

I just read *Cosmopolis* and I think it is a very good idea to do it, and it is well done, too.

Will we get further information about text changes in the future?

Thank you

Andreas

Andreas, some information goes out directly from the team leads, other information is found in Cosmopolis. Also, there will no longer be a public mail-list where editorial issues will be discussed. Now that we have entered phase two, text review work will be done according to the TI principles as established, in part, on the basis of those discussions. TI workers will discuss textual issues directly with their team leader.

What a wonderful undertaking! I have derived such pleasure from Jack Vance's writing since discovering Cugel about 30 years ago. I have written and perform a 1 1/2 hour 1

man play on Churchill, and I only realised tonight how Vance has much the same attraction as a personality:

- humour
- immense command of the English language
- vivid imagination
- mischief
- intolerance of 2nd best.

I cannot imagine what I can do to help particularly - but I am open to suggestions.

I recently initiated a friend into Jack Vance. He had kindly introduced me to James White, who comes closest to Jack Vance in humour. He can hardly bear to start *The Book of Dreams* because he knows it is the last of the Demon Princes series!

With very best regards,

Andrew Edlin

P.S. I obtained quite a few of my collection at Fantasy Archives in Greenwich Village, Jackson Square.

*I'm never averse to praise, but *Cosmopolis* is a joint effort among team leads and others in VIE management.*

Your discovery of Jack Vance is similar to that of other readers: one does not merely come across his words, one discovers them: a rich treasure trove.

You may find suggestions for your potential involvement arrive as soon as the team leads read your letter!

Thanks very much for sending *Cosmopolis*, and thanks for your work on behalf of the VIE! I'm a big fan of PDFs, and make and use such files frequently at work. I think it was a good choice for the newsletter.

Joel Anderson

Acrobat PDF seemed to be a "no-brainer." Everyone has it, or can get it. I'm sorry that I set it to splash into the center of everyone's screen in a black border, though. Your arrow keys will work at that point, but to get to the usual Acrobat controls, you need to hit the "escape" key.

A really great publication. Thanks for sending it.

I never expected to be able to read a real issue of '*Cosmopolis*'

Best regards/thank you

Willem Timmer

The Netherlands

*You may not have expected to read a real issue of *Cosmopolis*, but imagine my state: I never expected to edit it!*

Congratulations (to all involved) on a splendid first issue! Great design, and good content.

(Personally I am happy to be reading the same periodical that will someday be owned by a Mr. Gersen.)

Kind regards,

Evert Jan

I hope to live up to the eventual exacting standards of Mr. Gersen.

Thank you for your kind letters and notes. We are always happy to hear from volunteers and subscribers, and hope to publish more of your thoughts in the next edition of *Cosmopolis*.

Bob Lacovara, Editor, *Cosmopolis*

Bob's Closing Comments

With these last few paragraphs, I bring the second issue of *Cosmopolis* to a close. Thanks to the gods: the second issue did not require the effort of the first! (I had fears before the first issue that *Cosmopolis* might be a yearly report, not monthly.) Our newsletter has once again been a collaborative effort among contributors and proofreaders: to issue *Cosmopolis* is an astounding amount of work.

Now, a few items for your attention.

Reader's Articles

If you would like to address your fellow volunteers and subscribers on your experiences or thoughts related to the VIE or your own effort, consider writing an article for

Cosmopolis. I plan to write of my own experiences when I attended the Oakland Festival: I explained my actions to so many friends, associates and strangers that their varied reactions may prove amusing to you.

(One of the most consistent reactions is related to the Internet. Most literate people understand that the Internet is changing the way many of us work and shop. Few understand that even more fundamentally, new modes of work and expression are coming into existence. The *VIE* is one such new organization: spanning the Earth, held together by messages, yet producing a tangible product. As people start to understand that the *VIE* is not a collection of computer-literate "fans" but a new kind of publisher, their estimation of us, the *VIE*, and of Jack Vance himself rises.)

Short Stories

If you have a short story that (a) has been influenced by the writings of Jack Vance and (b) that you would wish to see published in *Cosmopolis*, you may wish to submit it to me for possible inclusion. If a story is of excessive length, we would consider printing it as a serial. Alternately, we might print the beginning, and point readers off to a web site for the conclusion. (Of course we'll keep a counter.)

Letters to the Editor

Letters to the editor are warmly appreciated. You may note that I have not printed critical, caustic, or contentious material. There's a good reason for this: I did not receive any. However, I am at liberty to print your constructive criticism, and of course other readers may wish to comment on your thoughts as well.

An Amusement

"*Cosmopolis*" is printed in italics in the newsletter except in one case. Without resorting to the "find" command, where does "*Cosmopolis*" appear without italics?

Corrections

In the last issue, Alun Hughes' name was misspelled "Alan." Sorry. Don't know how that happened.

Deadlines for Publication

Deadlines for any particular issue for *VIE*-related articles are the 21st of the month, but for short story inclusion I must have your copy by the 14th. If you have any questions about publishing your story in *Cosmopolis*, drop me e-mail.

Useful Addresses

The *VIE* Web Page

www.vanceintegral.com

Bob Lacovara, Editor of *Cosmopolis*

Lacovara@infohwy.com

Paul Rhoads, Editor-in-Chief of the *VIE*

prhoads@club-internet.fr

John Robinson, Publicity Coordinator

johnange@ix.netcom.com

Steve Sherman, Volunteer Coordinator

Steve.sherman@compaq.com

Team Leaders:

John Foley, Composition

johnfoley@lucent.com

Alun Hughes, Textual Integrity

a.hughes@newi.ac.uk

Tim Stretton, Proofing Text Entry

tim.stretton@bigfoot.com

John Schwab, Digitization

jschwab@uswest.net

The Fine Print

Letters to *Cosmopolis* may be published in whole or in part, with or without attribution, at the discretion of *Cosmopolis*. Send your e-mail to Bob Lacovara, with indication that you'd like your comments published.

Cosmopolis is assembled, edited and transferred across the Gaeon Reach from Houston, Texas, United States of America, Sol III.

Cosmopolis is delivered as an Adobe® Acrobat® PDF file. If you wish to have the most current version of the free Acrobat reader, follow this link:



<http://www.adobe.com/products/acrobat/readstep.html>

Cosmopolis is a publication of *The Vance Integral Edition*, Inc. All rights reserved. © 2000.