



## N 3 F OFFICERS AND BUREAU HEADS , 1 9 6 8

### President:

Donald Franson, 6543 Babcock Ave., North Hollywood, Calif. 91606

### Directorate:

C.W. Brooks, Jr., 713 Paul St., Newport News, Virginia. 23605. (Chairman)  
Gary Labowitz, 1100 Betzwood Dr., Norristown, Pa. 19401 (Note CoA)  
Wally Weber, Box 267, 507 Third Ave., Seattle, Washington. 98104  
Elaine Wojciechowski, 4755 N. Keystone Ave., Chicago, Ill. 60630  
Stan Woolston, 12832 Westlake St., Garden Grove, Calif. 92640. (Vice-Chairman)

### Appointed Officers:

Secretary-Treasurer: Janie Lamb, Route 1, Box 364, Heiskell, Tenn. 37754  
Editor, TNFF: Donald L. Miller, 12315 Judson Road, Wheaton, Md. 20906  
Editor, Tightbeam: Gary Labowitz (address above). (Deadline for Sept. issue: Aug. 15)  
Stand-by Editor of TNFF & Tightbeam: Wally Weber (address above)  
Official Historian: K. Martin Carlson, 108 3rd Ave. South, Moorhead, Minn. 56560  
Election Teller: Harry Warner, Jr., 423 Summit Ave., Hagerstown, Md. 21740  
Fanzine Advisor: Gary Labowitz (address above)

### Bureau Heads:

Collectors' Bureau: C.W. Brooks, Jr. (address above)  
Complaints Bureau: Bob Vardeman, P.O. Box 11352, Albuquerque, New Mexico. 87112  
Correspondence Bureau: Michael Dobson, 214 Lafayette St., Decatur, Ala. 35601  
Fancubs Bureau: Fred Lerner, 98-B The Boulevard, East Paterson, N.J. 07407  
Games Bureau: Donald L. Miller (address above)  
Information Bureau: Donald Franson (address above)  
Manuscript Bureau: Stan Woolston (address above)  
Membership Activities Bureau: Rick Johnson, 217 Drinnen Ave., Knoxville, Tenn. 37920  
Overseas Bureau: Michel Barnes, 1716 Summerlane SE., Decatur, Ala. 35601  
Publications Bureau: Wally Gonser, 10257 5th Ave. S.W., Seattle, Washington. 98146  
Publicity Bureau: Michael Viggiano, 1833 Albany Ave., Brooklyn, N.Y. 11210 (Note CoA)  
Recruiting Bureau: George Nims Raybin, 1367 Sheridan Ave., Bronx, New York. 10456  
Assistant: Ann Chamberlain, 4442 Florizel St., Apt. #99, Los Angeles, Calif. 90032  
Tape Bureau: Laurence C. Smith, 216 E. Tibet Road, Columbus, Ohio. 43202  
Welcommittee: J. Arthur Hayes, Box 1030, South Porcupine, Ontario, Canada.

### Miscellaneous Services & Activities:

Neff Amateur Press Alliance, Official Editor: Roy Tackett, 915 Green Valley Road, N.W., Albuquerque, New Mexico. 87107  
Directorate Representative to N'APA: Wally Weber (address above)  
Round Robins: Richard Labonte, 971 Walkley Road, Ottawa 8, Ontario, Canada.  
Writers' Exchange: Alma Hill, 463 Park Drive, Apt. #11, Boston, Mass. 02215  
New Fanzine Appreciation Society: Paul Crawford, 505 N. West St., Visalia, Calif. 93277  
Story Contest: Stan Woolston & Michael Viggiano (addresses above)  
SF Lending Library: Elinor Poland, 1876 S. 74th St., Omaha, Nebraska. 68124  
Renewals Committee: Elaine Wojciechowski (address above)  
New Member Packets: Janie Lamb (address above)  
NFFF Trader & Kaymar Awards: K. Martin Carlson (address above)  
Birthday Cards: Elaine Wojciechoski (address above)  
Fanzine Clearing House (Seth Johnson, 345 Yale Ave., Hillside, N.J. 07205)  
Neff News Service: Stan Woolston (address above)

ELECTION REMINDER: Deadline for filing is August 1. It's later than you think!

Bobbie Breeden, Box 448, Mt. Berry, Ga. 30149

Jay Kinney: It is a fact that there would be very little progress without criticism, but I think you are unduly harsh on N3F.

1. What organization do you know without red tape? Is the N3F Bureaucratic because it has bureaus? It has red tape, too, so is it Communistic?
2. Which original objectives has N3F turned from in order to keep itself going? You forget that self-preservation is the first inclination (e.g. original objective) of any living organism and not one that it turns to later.
3. Neofan? What's a neofan? I've been one for so long that I guess I've been one longer than any other person in fandom.
4. "SF is not worth much in itself"!!! Just what kind of fan are you anyway? You can certainly delve into such things as politics, sex, fantasy, economics, sociology, psychology, etc. without them being a part of stf, so why are you involved in stf fandom at all? On the other hand, it is almost impossible to discuss stf without at least touching upon these other areas. Most stf contains one or more of these elements so how can anyone "restrict SFan discussion, etc. to just SF in itself"? What is your point? Your discussion confuses me.
5. Fans don't need N3F. Fans came before N3F not vice versa. After all N3F is an organization created by fans to serve their purposes -- it provides a channel through which they can express their ideas and opinions and just generally interact with one another. Fans don't need N3F, but N3F does need fans.

I have not received the last few Tightbeams, either. Nobody is perfect, especially our dear club. Perhaps one day soon you will receive TB 46, 47, and 48 all at one time. Just think what fun you will have reading them all.

Joe B. Drapkin: "Flowers for Algernon" was indeed a great short story. But somehow I don't feel it would have as great an impact in book form. It was one of the saddest stories I have ever read. I can't wait to see the movie.

Steve Rasnic: I don't know what you mean in your letter by "trash" literature, but I don't believe I have ever read a book, no matter what kind of book it may be, that I didn't get something out of. Don't you think that if someone wants to "waste" his time reading such material instead of a 'best seller' it is his right and privilege to do so? Besides, I have read many a cruddy looking book that turned out to be pretty good reading.

Thanks to the powers that be for Star Trek, Leonard Nimoy and Shirley Meech. Hurray, for the continuation of Star Trek!!

David Malone, 815 Long Ridge Road, Stamford, Conn. 06902

It has come to my attention that right now the field of Science Fiction is undergoing one of the most dramatic upheavals in the whole of its long and fascinating history. I am referring to the battle of New Wave vs. Traditionalism. So far as I can see the only true difference between them is that the Traditional author says "Here is my message and here is my substantiation" while the N.W. author says "Here is my substantiation" and then leaves it up to the reader to figure out the message. A rather trivial point to start a war over, isn't it?

The main sore points on either side of the fence are, as most fans realize, the prozines. Should we accept Analog (Trad.) or F & SF (N.W.) of If and Galaxy which presents them both but in a rather poor quality format (bad art, printing, etc.)? I personally feel that there is a place for both N.W. and Trad. SF. What really bothers me are people like Harlan Ellison who insist that there is no place in modern SF for the Trad. type story or novel.

I myself prefer the Trad. style although I do enjoy a good N.W. story. The reason for my preference is probably because it's so much easier to spot a bad writer when he is writing in the Trad. style. It is much harder to fake realism than it is to fake surrealism!

All in all I am satisfied with the present S.F. writing (with a few notable exceptions) and would hate to see either side of the picture be lost to us.

Arthur Hayes, Box 1030, South Porcupine, Ontario, Canada

It is with some nostalgia that the rotation of TB editorship has come to an end, at least for now. The permanent Editor is a good idea, and I'm sure you'll do well with the zine, but the rotation plan, coming from difficult times, succeeded beyond the wildest expectations, an experiment that worked well. That it worked well is a tribute to the club and I am glad that the experiment that was tried worked when it shouldn't have.

I have nothing against ERB group, Tolkien, etc., but they tend to fractionalize Fandom, to spread it out thinly. It is my opinion that a Fan has too wide an interest in all things to restrict himself to one author, one idea, and for one fan to join several activities is to spread oneself too thinly. So, I am not against a Heinlein group, but I do not think it is a good idea.

\$2 dues. I chuckle on this. Here, a \$2 bill is normal and common. With you it is rare and I understand it is about to be done away with. As far as I'm concerned, the only reason for \$2 dues, is the ease of mailing, no coins. Other than this I do not see any good reason. This year, the club has been extravagant with TNFF, extravagant to an extent that even a \$2 dues wouldn't be able to handle. I don't think TNFF has material of sufficient interest to warrant a monthly scheduling. In less than six months, nearly \$200, has been spent on TNFF. Was it worth it? Better plan on a much greater increase than this to cover this type of expenditure.

Subsidizing a Bureauzine? What with current expenditures, I don't think that the club can afford to subsidize any other publication than it does now. Just as NAPA is expected to pay its way, so should a Bureau that requires a heavy publication scheduling should pay its own way. I am not criticizing the Tape Bureau, any Bureau with this, but the general principle remains that if the club subsidizes every Bureau, then we better be ready to pay a \$5 annual fee.

Larry's request in regards distribution of such material as he mentions for the tape Bureau, has been under discussion between him and me, and this applies to others, too. I am willing to distribute, in TTH (with copies for New Member Packets) such material as other Bureaus and I agree upon, at no charge to the Bureau or the club.

Incidentally, backtracking to the Bureauzine, R&R, R&B, Classical, Jazz, and Whatever-else music, record reviews do not belong in an SF club paid or subsidized publication. If there is a group wanting these things, they could publish their own zine.

I think A. C. Ellis should be straightened out in respect to the Story Contest. SOME of the winning stories have been bought by Prozines, but there is no promise no guarantee of this. All that is guaranteed or hoped for is that you will have fun trying to compete against other fans, and small prizes are offered by N3F. If prozines (Pohl) decides to publish the story(ies), that is something else again.

Markstein: As I am sure others have already mentioned, while TB is a Letter-zine no one contributing to TB can be assured or guaranteed full reprint of his letter, for several reasons. One is that there is a budget that allows only so much money for an issue of TB. Anytime a section of a letter is written better by someone else, sure Editorial judgment, then that portion will be dropped from one letter. Of course, there are other reasons to cut letters which I don't imply applied to this one, such as language, too controversial in a political or religious sense, and possibly of a libelous nature.

Welcommittee: The initial delay involved in welcoming is something I can see no way of overcoming, unless the whole Wc had a "ham" network, including Janie Lamb. An application with dues is received by Janie. To send out notice to me for every single new comer, could involve a letter-a-day to me, and a letter-a-day to 20 or 30 people, an impossible situation. So, the compounded delays add up to situations where newcomers are occasionally disappointed, for a while, at the lack of response by the Wc. I am certainly pleased that eventually, we came through. I wish it was in my powers to avoid these delays, but no one fan can be restricted to only one activity, and to reduce the delays, not to nothing, but merely reducing the delays, would force me to abandon other phases of activity I also enjoy. I am not criticizing Don Markstein though in pointing these matters out. I am merely explaining why something I don't like either, does exist.

//Let me go on record right here in stating: "No deletions from letters I edit for TB are made in an effort to change the meaning of the letter as I understand it. Deletions are made for the following reasons: another letter contains the same information; the matter does not pertain to N3E as such and has no connection with stf; the matter is libelous; the matter is personal in nature, directed to me." If anyone thinks I have been unfair in my editing, write me. I'm not unreasonable. Thanks for your confidence, Art. gh1//

George Fergus, 3731 N. St. Louis Ave., Chicago, Illinois 60618

On Star Trek I agree pretty much with John Pierce. Roddenberry devised a good background for the show, with interesting characters. In the sets, special effects, and other details of production, the initial ideas have been transferred magnificently to reality. Character development and conflict has proceeded nicely, and the final scene on the bridge is often pleasingly humorous. Unfortunately, they can't seem to get good scripts from anybody anywhere. I doubt that any ST episodes except "Mirror, Mirror" and "The Trouble With Tribbles" have any chance of getting on the Hugo ballot next year. The latter few episodes of this past season showed a regrettable deterioration in the characterizations of Spock and McCoy, almost to the point of caricature. This is apparently Roddenberry's doing, since he wrote one of the scripts that display this. Spock used to be, to quote Kirk, "the best first officer in the fleet", extremely capable, knowledgeable, logical, and unemotional. Now he's the stereotype "absent-minded professor", who upon encountering any new phenomenon assumes a blank, absorbed expression and mutters "fascinating..." and at the slightest provocation launches into an involved and often introspective (and certainly undesired) lecture on physics, and subsequently has to be rescued or brought back to the reality of the situation by Kirk. McCoy started out as a slightly cynical but basically warm-hearted character, but now does nothing but make emotional outbursts and look sullen. If Roddenberry and his scriptwriters don't stiffen up again next season, he's going to lose what few intelligent fans he has.

//I doubt that -- once a person makes an emotional commitment to ST (as you have not) he continues to serve his commitment whatever happens. The "I love ST" groups will back the show regardless of its quality and content. Or does that exclude them from the "intelligent" fans? gh1//

Why Call Them Back from Heaven? has a very interesting and well-constructed background, but the writing is lousy. In every other chapter Simak introduces a new character and situation completely unrelated to the main plot, solely in order to give a lecture on the background of the novel. As far as I am concerned, an author should reveal the background through action and dialogue, not by sticking in a lecture every few pages. And once the background is taken away, the plot and characterization leave much to be desired. Most of the action turns out to be pretty meaningless. Linda Eyster to the contrary, at only one point did I become interested enough that I wouldn't have gladly set the novel aside for something else. The structure would seem to indicate that Simak was trying to write like Philip K. Dick (and not succeeding).

Some of Merritt's novels get off to slow starts, and The Moon Pool may be a little too high on fantastic details and low on action, but I should think that Dwellers in the Mirage and The Ship of Ishtar would entertain anyone. What's the problem?

//I've always liked Creep, Shadow, Creep, too. It has the scarriest ending. ghl//

Although Lester Del Rey's review in Galaxy isn't very well done, he is right in saying that 2001: A Space Odyssey is awful. The only reason it's doing well at the box office, aside from the initial publicity and the Kubrick name, is that the rubes are awed by the special effects. In trying to revolutionize film-making, Kubrick has managed only to throw out anything which would have made for a good film.

I think that most of us prefer traditional SF (and, to a limited extent, other special genres such as mystery-suspense, western, or historical novels) to mainstream fiction because SF was always understandable on the literal level, whereas a lot of the contemporary stuff doesn't even make sense unless you grasp all the allusions, parallels, ironies, symbols, etc. Although it is usually better written than most SF, it succeeds in a different purpose. SF, taken at its own literal-level purpose, usually succeeds better than mainstream. The so-called "new-Wave" or "new thing" in SF resembles this mainstream type of fiction in that it shifts the emphasis from literal meaning to symbolic meaning. However, new wave SF differs from mainstream fiction in that it tends to be concerned with things larger-than-life, especially myths, whereas 20th Century contemporary fiction has tended to concern itself with psychological and religious insights, and more recently with depression and alienation. Ballard is a typical mainstream writer, but the mythic mode of Zelazny grows out of the heroic tone of most SF and represents the establishment of SF's new wave as an independent movement. Too much of the new wave fiction, however, has imitated the mainstream in disdaining literal meaning. The Einstein Intersection is incomprehensible on the literal level, although it remains enjoyable from a stylistic standpoint. The widespread nature of Cordwainer Smith's popularity is due to his use of highly imaginative characters and settings in strong plots, so that his works are enjoyable on the literal level, entirely aside from considerations of allusion, symbolism, and implication which classify him as a new wave author. (The type of fiction which I am calling "mainstream" here should not be confused with "best-sellers," which can be of any type. Although many best-sellers are trash, most of them aren't. More often they are just dull.)

But of course the creation of mythic characters and societies is only what I would call the major direction of the New Wave in SF, which also encompasses the experimental writing (mainly in form and style) that's going on in NEW WORLDS, and the taboo-breaking that Harlan Ellison and Norman Spinrad are making a big thing about. Actually, there ought to be a separate name for the New Wave sub-category consisting of Zelazny, Lafferty, Delany, and such outsiders writing SF as John Barth. But these are my personal opinions. Perhaps you disagree, or have something to add?

//How about allegory employing the new wave style such as Report from the Red Windmill, Hayden; or The Centaur, Updike? ghl//

Jerry Kaufman, 2769 Hampshire,, Cleveland Heights, Ohio 44106

A few comments before I get to the main bout of this letter: the cover is a good Gaughan; Gersman's letter was next to impossible to understand; there were lots of letters this issue, a good sign that people still like talking about stf; Jurgen was so dull that I concluded that most of its popularity was due to its reputation; Ted White and Arnie Katz to the contrary, Larry Smith is a GhooD Man.

Now to Pierce. First, I'm not against the hard sciences, as J.J. seems to think. I don't think that science is "played out". We are today continually making momentous advances in a geometric progression. (Side issue: scientific romances weren't scientific. Princess of Mars is a good example of that genre.)

Where I do differ with you is in the literary field. Does hard science still offer itself as a subject for fiction? Are we, the scientific laymen, going to be thrilled and awestruck by the hardware of today, or tomorrow? I'm not. Some people must be. Analog is read more than any other zine. But as Campbell's various polls show, the majority of Analog's readers are engineers who read little or no other Stf. The place for Joe Poyer's tales of purest gage, dial and valve stories is among the people trained to appreciate them. Not me.

There is really nothing new about the "New Thing." Campbell, in a previous incarnation, started it himself, with his call, his demand for an emphasis on people and the effects of a different environment on them. This was the beginning of the deemphasis of the machine in stf. H.L. Gold picked up the torch in Galaxy and someone or other held it high in F&SF. Bradbury, Sturgeon and Heinlein have always written New Thing stories.

What's so different about Ellison's New Thing? Or Merrill's? Or Moorcocks's? (Each says, by the way, not to get his New Thing mixed up with the others'.) Well, Harlan is saying that too many authors are not trying to show us anything about people, how they are or how they will be. These authors are writing in styles more fit for those scientific romances of the turn of the century than for a present day story. Harlan has also, with great help from Spinrad, dragged in the half-dead horse of censorship. Between them, they claim that there are certain subjects which are of importance to people, but about which the stf author can't write about if he uses a stf outlet.

Please, J.J., tell me what the Mainstream has to learn from stf. You say it has to catch up with stf. In what particulars?

The best measure of a new technique is: results. In writing, this has to be one of the hardest things going when it comes to pin-down time. But...I try. If you have not gone to the trough, may I lead you to it? Try reading "Paingod" and "Repent Harlequin, Said The Ticktockman" from Paingod and other Delusions and "I Have No Mouth And I Must Scream" and "Pretty Maggie Moneyeyes" from I Have No Mouth and I Must Scream. These are not hard science stories, no sir! They are New Thing, just the way Harlan means, and they are damn good stories, with more impact and solidity and people and experiment than a month of George O. Smith novels. And, I do not hesitate to repeat, damn good stories.

As for your analytical psychiatrists, they'll be analyzing all stf, not just New Thing. What makes you think that they'll be carrying a soft spot for any of this madness, let alone Hard Science fiction (I capped it that way and I mean it that way).

Phil Muldowney, 7 the Elms, Stoke, Plymouth, Devon, England

I find it rather interesting that when sf is proclaimed as the literature of the modern age, the voice of the times, etc., etc., science fiction has hardly seemed to touch on perhaps the most important development in modern times; the disillusionment with the modern, western technological-industrial - bureaucratic society.

Something is wrong. The discontent has erupted into running sores on the face of western society. It is not easy to define, this malaise, this sickness in a democratic society. Yet it is all too evident from the neo-Nazis in Germany, to the anarchy in France, from the riots in America to the cynicism in Britain, all symptoms of an ever widening disease. Seemingly modern government has become too remote. In effecting the government of the vastly complex societies of today, a beaureaucracy has grown up that has come to insulate the politicians, make them remote from the people they represent. That feeling that the individual can do nothing, which is perhaps fatal to modern democracy.

One can only judge from one's own society, so I cannot speak for America. But increasingly in Britain at least, one finds a cynicism and contempt for politicians. They no longer seem to represent the people, but only power for its own sake. Perhaps the most fundamental cause is that one is helpless, the politicians and bureaucrats seem to walk on, empty to the cries of public opinion, in their own sweet dream world. One continually hears that fatal 'them' on whom all the woes are shed, no longer seemingly can the individual effect his own life, society just rolls on with just a few at the helm.

Hence perhaps the violence. Peaceable means seem oh so terribly slow, violence the so easy answer, and perhaps it does bring results. The European students (or at least some of them) turn to the nut-fringe philosophies of Mao, Che Guevara, and Macouse rejecting both communist and Capitalist society, seeking some mythic, anarchistic, utopia, in which all will be sweetness and light. Since they seemingly could get no reaction from the processes of democracy so they turn to other means.

The solution? If only one knew. The John Birchites et al. presumably believe in simple solutions, more police, better riot control; it is all an international communist plot to corrupt the youth of the free world, etc., etc. If only life were so simple! Just a few simple actions and the whole world is bright and cozy again. Alas, our present society is a vastly complex affair. Just as one cannot condemn a whole society for one terrible, pointless, deeply saddening act of madness like the Robert Kennedy murder, no more can one apply to society the simple solutions of an agrarian society that has past.

Perhaps De Gaulle got near to the point in his philosopher-king act on television last week. One needs an organic society rather than the out of work mechanistic one that has seemingly grown up. Worker participation in industry, referendums, a closer attention to public opinion (but then what is public opinion?). Many ideas, maybe impractical, maybe not. To point the faults is easy, but to provide the remedy? Aye, there's the rub!

2001 A Space Odyssey opened in London at the beginning of May to almost unanimous rave reviews from the British press, a very rare occurrence! I have not seen it myself, as it is only on view in London at the moment. An interesting point is that as yet one has not noticed the usual "fallout" that one comes to expect from new films. The picture ad and public relation men are particularly effective. The usual 'book of the film,' press interviews, etc. have been missing. Maybe Arthur Clarke is too busy in the U.S.A! Too early to tell over here, but has there been any 'sf fallout' from the film in the U.S.A?

//I am under the impression Arthur Clarke lives in Ceylon. ghl//

Talking of films, one well worth seeing if it ever gets over U.S.A. way is The Devil Rides Out starring Christopher Lee from the Black magic book of the same name by Dennis Wheatley. No great earth shaking developments, but some good special effects, and on the whole an enjoyable piece of hokum.

//Christopher Lee has been a favorite of mine since I saw him as the phantom of the opera. He was magnificent! ghl//

Jim Boskey, 102 W. Michigan, Indianapolis, Ind. 46204

Re: Donald Markstein's letter in TB 49.

The basic problem with Clarke as a writer is his lack of originality of thinking. I can see distinct merit in the Clarkian approach to specializing in writing about the near future, but there is no question that such material is 1) easier to write and 2) a bit less challenging for the reader as it does not require a substantial change in patterns of thinking. Clarke's far future works are good, but they are so few in number that there is little basis for comparison.

Let me note that I do not mean by far future only galactic conquest period stories. I mean by this far enough in the future to require the development of new or variant societal institutions. It is for this that most people read Heinlein, and it is in this area in which he excels.

As to the If vs. Galaxy controversy. I am reasonably certain that Pohl would not agree with Markstein that the two magazines have the same personality. I certainly see a difference in the type of stories that are published in the two and prefer those in If. I approve of the new writer gambit, however, I agree that this is not the proper basis for selecting a magazine for a Hugo. Neither, however, do I feel that this is what was done.

Darrell Schweitzer, 113 Deepdale Rd., Strafford, Pa. 19087

Bill Linden - Great Ghu! What has happened to Analog? Nothing except the greatest improvement that I have ever seen. Harry Harrison's The Horse Barbarians deserves a Hugo for this year. Also Poul Anderson's Peek! I See You! was better than most. Have you seen the May ish? Poul Anderson, Isaac Asimov, Katherine McLean, and James Blish on the inside and Chesley Bonestell on the cover make an unbeatable team. The only poor story in the last few months was Anderson's the Inevitable Weapon in the March ish.

Linda Eyster - If 20 people came consider yourself lucky since it is a new club. The Phila. S.F. Society is one of those big long established groups (circa 1935) and if 20 people show up for one of those meetings it is most unusual.

Mr. Goldsmith's question was answered. I'm glad, but Mist Demons! You all forgot to mention Fred Saberhagen's poetical type character Mitchel Spain. He has appeared in Stone Place, Masque of the Red Shift and In the Temple of Mars. Maybe more, I don't know. Doesn't anybody read the recent stuff?

Before closing, I would like to say that Leroy Tanner, the book reviewer for Amazing is the worst in the History of S.F.

//Bye the bye: is there a new abbreviation for Analog? It used to be aSF and I rather liked that. ghl//

Joe Drapkin, 577 E. 91st, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11236

Firstly; I'm glad to see there are some sane fans left who are finally taking Star Garbage to task and giving it just what it deserves, nothing. The above mentioned, with the possible exception of Voyage into the Abyss of Stupidity and Morons Loused up in Space, is the worst S.F. show to see the light of boob tube ever. The plots come down to an even further stereo-type than Gary mentioned. They are, briefly, this: 1. Super-Computer. 2. Super man/them/it. 3. Technical mishap, either on board ship or something out there. "Answers:" 1. Trap it in some stupid obvious paradox which any computer worth its salt today would reject as non-computable or insufficient data. Or they overload its circuits on occasion.

2. Trap it in some stupid paradox, or physically over power or get he/she/preferably it to either fall in love with/ become friends with/ or lose interest with Kirk as a plaything. 3. Kirk finds an illogical solution to the problem which he "wisely" follows over Spocks logical one. The poorness of plot is only exceeded by poorness of and over acting. That's what comes from hiring frustrated soap box actors. The only thing I really find hard to believe is that good SF writers can turn out such bad plots.

//Some people will do anything for money. ghl//

The concensus of opinion seems to be against me about Why Call Them Back From Heaven? This has never bothered me before since I've always had oddball tastes. However, I will attempt to point out some basic flaws. Firstly to Linda Eyster; the idea of grandparents saving to leave money to their children or grandchildren seems a bit grusome to me. Old people should have all the fun with their money as they can. As long as the kids are reasonably solvent there is no reason for them to scrimp on things for themselves so they can leave a nice nest egg for their kids. If these were my parents or grandparents I could not live with myself afterward. To each his own anyway. Simak fails to convince me of his basic premise for the following reasons: 1. His characters are entirely cardboard, they are like puppets and don't behave with the emotions human beings would with the intensity that human beings have, instead they behave with the emotions the author wants, to suit his purpose while not creating the situations to evoke these responses. 2. His basic premise is all wrong, the development of cryogenic freezing would create two classes of people, very distinct and very large. They would be the mad spenders and Simak's class of savers. This is obvious. Think of twenty people you know; at least five will be mad spenders. 3. The book is full of small holes and unexplained points, which I'm quite sure are not intended to provoke stimulating imagination, but are examples of bad craftsmanship.

Simak's new novel deserves the Hugo more than WCTBFH. It is called Goblin Reservation and it is much better than WCTBFH.

Mr. Pierce is very good at lacing into Spinrad, and I really did enjoy that comment about Spinrad being a writer because Ellison told him so. I do disagree with John about the so called "New Thing" having no value. I think it has a great deal of value, and many things have been accomplished under the New Thing form that never could have been done under standard forms. Mr. Pierce is going to have to accustom himself to this kind of writing or not read very much S.F. any more, since the trend seems to be toward less hard S.F. stories.

Jacqueline Lichtenberg, 45 Blauvelt Road, Monsey, N.Y. 10952

Re: Star Trek, so anybody not interested stop reading.

We're all fairly well agreed that ST started out to be the first real sf show on tv. Some of us have become disenchanted lately, claiming the show is going downgrade. I'm inclined to agree. Here's my solution.

Among all the talent of the N3F we should number enough really good snoops to be able to get personal addresses of a lot of top sf writers. We have a few already. We could publish a list. I don't propose to use this list for sculdugery. Rather, we would all gang up on our favorite authur and deluge him with pleas (a post card a week) begging him to write and submit a good ST script to Gene Roddenberry.

Now, I know these things are done through agents and they don't accept unsolicited manuscripts, etc. But a show like ST cannot afford to ignore NAME writers in this very specialized field. If enough of them show an enthusiastic backing for the original quality of ST, that quality will be restored.

Those authors who don't write script style can write their usual narrative technique. The Hollywood pros can do the adaptation, and the "original" would be ripe for Bantam.

If I were a NAME sf writer, I'd do such a script and give it to ST scot free. (As it is, they wouldn't accept a gift from me, even though I'm bursting with good ideas.)

Now, I don't expect a NAME pro to feel this way, but they should at least help us salvage them a rapacious and high paying market. Where ST succeeds, other shows will follow and be soliciting manuscripts from them at competitive prices.

If anybody figures out how to get material through to Leonard Nimoy, let me know. I've got something I want him to read, but the secretarial screen at Paramount filtered it out. Also, we ought to all get busy and write and score some good material for him to record. Both the ST records are terrible.

A project like Star Trek requires active support, so lets drum up some action. Let's influence people who'll be listened to. Let's set a precedent (after all, that is the business of sf, isn't it?) in methods of running a tv show.

//I disagree with you on several points. First, you seem to have some mystique about writers -- sending a letter to their agents or magazines that publish them should do nicely. Stars on the other hand do need the insulation. But writers??? Secondly, ST is not the first good stf show on tv. There were others that fluttered around trying to make up a trend but they generally ended up as fantasy shows; the old Science Fiction Theater, Twilight Zone, and One Step Beyond were not bad.

And, ST, its producers and staff can afford to ignore NAME writers -- and do! ghl//

Jean Nash, c/o Navy Recruiting Office, 340 Main St., Norwich, Conn. 06360

1. The mentality of Lost in Space should be advanced a few years. This is so that some of June Lockhart's former Lassie fans can watch it, now that they're not in the first grade anymore.

2. More men should be put aboard Captain Nelson's sub. I'm sure if the two officers and three enlisted men had a little help, they would be relieved of 24 hour duties and quit falling asleep. This, I believe, would solve all their problems of hallucinations and the danger of monsters would be eliminated. Since and because this advice will not be taken I suggest they at least change their theme song to "The Monster Mash." Also, I suggest they consider contacting the time tunnel as soon as it comes around so that they can reveal to us how half a dozen men can run a nuclear submarine so soon in the future (if anybody knows anything about subs or ships in N3F, they'll understand).

3. If such as the above continues to lag ahead of the times (and mentality) let's bring back Flash Gordon! Or if the Italians continue to produce such movies like "The 10th Victim" they should replace many of our movies and series 'till we get the point. Science Fiction is a farce to me when an actor takes out his portable laser ray, and flaunts it first ("Ah-ha, this is my new duplex portable laser death ray!"). Science Fiction should display reality. Reality isn't for us to impressively switch on the TV. The man of tomorrow will non-chalantly lift off his anti-grav vehicle, etc.

4. Star Trek is a bit of a farce too, I feel. I can say more about it though, because it's worth criticizing. Today, a ship's captain is the most important man to the ship. It is he (and his 1st executive officer) who really know how to run and co-ordinate the ship. The captain must be present on the ship and is held responsible at all times for it except a) when docked, 2) when passing through the Panama Canal, in which the officials there are responsible for the passing of the ship. I know things will change in the future. But isn't it a little ridiculous that the first four officers gallantly leave the ship when it's their job (even in the future as shown in Star Trek) to co-ordinate?

Secondly (in 20th Century Rome and in others), they're off gallantly again trying to get to the city without being seen or attacked. Heroes don't use probes for detecting life forms, I guess.

Also, a little sloppiness is present. In the episode where men are reduced (or crystallized) to cubes, and can be restored if the cubes are not crushed, the Negro man and woman were reduced, then one crushed, the other was restored. But "Donnerwetter?" The man was crushed and when the other cube was restored, the man reappeared! I know, it's too easy to criticize, but I criticize the series I like most because it's worth improving. It's too late; I can see I've already hurt some fans but truth is I've said what I believe and haven't mentioned half the blunders. So forgive me because I can't polish my excuse any more than I have now.

//You have sharper eyes than most. Or perhaps you're clairvoyant (?) ghl??//

Michael Viggiano, 1833 Albany Ave., Brooklyn, N.Y. 11210

I would like to apologize to those who I owe letters to, especially to Linda Byster, editor of Granfalloon, a fine new magazine which has offered to cooperate with Publicity Bureau. So far I have confined my work to distributing news of N3F activities through the newszines. But now that I have moved (please note new address) and have graduated from college, the Bureau is open to new ideas, especially ideas on how to avoid the draft. //Close the window, har har. ghl//

S.F. Weekly has ceased publication, so there are even fewer newszines now. But most of the well-known genzines carry news items and so do club magazines. The World Convention progress reports and program booklets also offers a place where news, such as the 1968 N3F Short Story Contest, can be publicized.

A.G. Ellis asks some questions about story contest in TB 49. Frederik Pohl is sent the finalists, usually from 8-12 stories, of the story contest and he comments on all of them and chooses the three best. If he thinks any of the stories are publishable he buys them; if none are publishable he doesn't buy any. This arrangement is both satisfactory to Pohl and the Story Contest. We want a story to be bought because it is worthy of being printed in a professional magazine. Usually Mr. Pohl gives excellent advice to the three winners as to how their stories could be made publishable. One year I believe this resulted in two stories being bought. The winner of the 1967 Contest was bought without a rewrite, just the title of the story being changed. So those who want to see what a contest winner looks like, and frankly one of the better winners, should see the July 1967 If which contains "Pelandra's Husbands" by E. A. Walton. I'll be glad to answer any other questions fans have about the contest. I hope they will enter this year's by sending their entries soon to Stan Woolston. If you know of any non-members who also like to write get them to enter too. This year, like the last two years, members of the British Science Fiction Association along with N3F members do not have to pay an entry fee. All others must include 50¢ with each entry. So write now, right now.

Mike Zaharakis, 802 11th Ave. NW, Minot, N.D. 58701

Matt Hickman, why did you nominate me? I am not that much on ego booster.

On to mundanity, and I do mean mundanity. I have a proposal. It all came about when I was arguing my most regular argument with a mundane friend who shall remain unnamed. He said that fans were nothing intellectual or special. I replied that fans had a higher IQ. I cited several examples of Valedictorians and such who had been fans. He did not believe me.

So, in order to offer proof of the pudding I would like to know if someone can suggest a way to test the IQ of all the members of N3F. Perhaps an IQ test that has

passed into the public domain. Perhaps someone from one of those Universities with fabulous computers can help.

I'd like to know what fen are like in the brains dept. and I think most Neffers would too. How about it someone?

//Why not have all members of N3F apply for MENSA? I wonder how many would make it? I'd tell you my IQ but the typewriter doesn't have fractions that small. ghl//

Bob Tucker, Box 506, Heyworth, Ill. 61745

Information for Miss Bristol, who was asking after Cordwainer Smith's first published novel in your May issue:

ATOMSK, under the pseudonym Carmichael Smith, was published by Duell, Sloan & Pearce in 1949. The same year it was reprinted as a selection of the Detective Book Club (because it had been originally published as a mystery novel.) It was a very good mystery novel too, but bore little resemblance to his later science fiction stories.

I would suggest two sources where the book might be found: Richard Wittier's Fantasy & Science Fiction Book Company, P.O. Box 415, Staten Island, N.Y. 10302; and The Fantasy Bookshop, Howard Devore, 4705 Weddel Street, Dearborn Heights, Michigan, 48125. If they don't have it in stock, a request to put it on the want list will keep both places continually on the watch for it. I never saw the original book, but was able to get a copy of the Detective Book Club edition. Sad to say, even that is now gone from the shelf, borrowed, lent, or lost somewhere.

The same two bookshops also might have odd copies of James Branch Cabell's books available from time to time. I have a hazy memory of getting a copy of Witch Woman from the Staten Island store many years ago.

## N O T I C E !

Just when everybody is saying "Keep up the good work" I don't. Yikes, I feel like a dog. However, although this is still July and this is the July issue perhaps some method will come out of this madness. I will undertake to publish monthly (I know I swore I wouldn't, but I didn't drink water on it). I am holding a few of the letters received for the August issue and the much promised fanzines reviews (they're brilliant, I tell you, brilliant!). I need hardly point out that the August issue will be on time!!! Also, a GIANT surprise in the August issue! So, til then, keep smiling,

ghl

FROM  
JANIE LAMB  
Route 1, Box 364  
HEISKELL, TENN.  
37754



TO:

Elaine Wojciechowski  
4755 N. Keystone Ave.,  
Chicago, Ill.  
60630

PRINTED  
MATTER