to consider the most important difference between the two a matter of technique; for it certainly is the case that the new wave is a different kind of thing from what exists in mainstream fiction; e.g., blocks of prose forming an image of the scene and characters are far removed from the linear, accumulatively flowing narrative, but a set of separate fragments which must be unified if at all considered. This is perhaps not as important, although to some extent an anachronism in the mainstream, the employment of "stream-of-consciousness".

Mr. Gunn agreed that the employment of "experimental" technique was one of the distinguishing criteria, but that it was less important than the general philosophical approach which would be introduced in the new wave. This he called the "anti-mainstream," the "reformist" concern, not for "society" and "the future of mankind," but for the individual, not for the social fabric of his inner self to the exclusion of emotion, experience, sensation, SF had traditionally been optimistic, since there seemed to be no better means of saying that technological progress (which also included all use of the imagination) was preferable to the status quo. The new wave, concerned with the tools, pains, and troubles of the individual—once given to taking a "long-term" view, but instead to treating the individual experiences at the only criteria for determining how comfortable one should feel with existence—leads to pessimism.

Such comments might be reduced to stating that new wave stories both do not employ "hard SF" and are not "hard SF"; this makes them "soft," or, perhaps, "not SF". Yet they are not. Instead of them being "part of fancy; it is certainly not part of "science fiction," the phrase has a meaning of its own, which is being lost to broad use. Gunn appears to be in some agreement, as also does Mr. Silverberg, himself, and, if so, what was his resolution of the "philosophical" or "anti-mainstream" what are the differences between fantasy and science fiction, and with what criteria would be tenable. The general philosophy determines on what differences exist in comparison of mainstream, science fiction which would justify valuing one set of narratives as the science fiction that are not valued in mainstream fiction.

Miss Jean Ann Berman, a Simmons student who was responsible for the "Free Futurist" informal "discussion group," perhaps inadvertently suggested the most direct point to the problem of distinguishing SF and mainstream. If we look at what is science fiction has hitherto been, we find it will depend upon a balance existing between two indistinguishable elements: knowledge, as a "story." Neither one of these is necessary to mainstream fiction, although both of them are part of some science fiction, therefore, is a subset of the mainstream, and should, even though how he knew the products of which once appeared in the "pulps," still considered it of highest importance to Gunn and the other panelists. (The claim that SF is a "genre" was often to be heard at Noreascon.) But, since SF are not (in general), there is a point of attack. This is that the "speculative fiction" for the wild inaccuracy and contradictions which occur with unfamiliar ideas, all styles, all types. Sometimes, of course, an author is suc- cessful in constructing a story and in meeting the requirements of "good (mainstream) fiction" (whatever they may be), and receives acclaim both within the world of science-fiction (as a critical success) (1944, A Canticle for Leibowitz); but, since these cases are exceptions, and we should not be overpowered by the ideal of "good" a work have qualities outside these standards. To single out a problem, one feels, with such an attempt at a solution is that it has ceased to concern the world, and is still concerned to define "SF," in this case as being that which has "science" and "fantasy" in it, not as a means by which simply, as that, Mr. Gunn pointed out, no such definitions are really valid; today, a writer of any kind of fiction under different fields, normally not considered science fiction at all. On Zanabar, an excretion into prohi-bition sociology, or of Zelazny's Lord of Light, Luria's "cultural relativism" (1963, "A Question of Caste")

Further, one ends up, then, quoting to oneself, a definition still limits SF; it is not to be considered "good" for whatever qualities the novels may themselves. "Science fiction" is "good" in it is different in its "particular terms of reference. By creating such clear distinctions, the writer is more likely to "represent the world outside his own small corner. The writer is able to "triumph over himself" in themselves "good," he shows why it is that, although they are not in general, they have "all" like all the others, they were ac- cepted to appreciate them. And any such realism is the result of their own defensiveness, its character of being a "rear-guard action."