

volume 2, number 10

Chunder! is published every three weeks by John Foyster, GPO Box 4039, Melbourne, Victoria 3001, Australia, and is available at the rate of 8 for one dollar (no subs over a dollar, please) or for contributions.

Registered for posting as a publication (Category B)

• • • • •

EDITORIAL INTRODUCTION

In the November APPLESAUCE (discussed later in this issue) Jack Herman suggests that Chunder! might carry news of fancub goings-on. Right on, Jack! Indeed, that should be an important function for Chunder!, but my previous requests for contributions of this kind have met with a mind-numbing silence. Lemme therefore repeat my request from the past, for news of what fans (individually or collectively) are doing which might be of interest to other fans. In its first incarnation Chunder! used to carry columns on fan doings by John Sangsund, Edmonds, Grigg, Stevens, and the like. The major point is that the stuff should be interesting, and the adventures retailed might be those of the only fan in town. So if you want to spread some information around, here's a chance.

ARARAT NOOZ

On the local front, namely Ararat and District, things are looking good. TV is excellent for SF fan. STAR TREK runs each Saturday night at 7.30 pm before the 8.30 pm movie on BTV 6. BTV 6 also runs all the current Yank stuff as well as surprising me with some interesting movies. WUTHERING HEIGHTS (1970) was on Saturday 22nd and tomorrow at 8.30 pm is BARBARELLA starring Jane Fonda when she was in her prime (yum, yum). I finally get to see the bits I missed at AUSSIECON! I can thank the Vic Rail for once instead of cursing them (it?). Being on afternoon shift usually would mean I'd miss something like BARBARELLA, but tomorrow they have given me a 9.30 pm start in the shed labouring.

My pilot-instructor Barry Need has grilled me about ANZAPACON, apas and SF fandom. I have promised him copies of CRUX 1-3 and the loan of some back issues of ANZAPA and APES. He seems quite interested and this is another indication to me that I should drop my preferred low-key fan status for something closer to formation fan (recruiting general) of an Ararat fandom. (from ace reporter, James Styles)

A VICIOUS, UNWARRANTED, AND UNPRINCIPLED ATTACK ON INNOCENT,
CLEAN-MINDED SYDNEY FANDOM BY ONE OF MELBOURNE'S BULLIES

(or, Paul Stevens' DUFF ADMINISTRATOR's Report)

After arriving back in Australia, very broke and minus my luggage and duty-free fags I looked at the DUFF bank account. It stood at \$5. It now stands at \$225, with \$71.30 still due from the editor of this rag, about \$100 due from Sydney, and the possibility of some more money later. Bill Rotsler told me just before I left the States that the account there had between \$900 and \$1000, and that was over two months ago, so DUFF looks rather healthy at the moment.

On the other hand my name is mud with certain people in Sydney who seem to think that I should be a mindreader. The problem as I see it is this.

As the Australian administrator of DUFF I had been unhappy about the length of time given to candidates to prove to fans that they should be voted for. It works this way. Nominations close in either October

or November and voting closes either March or April, which doesn't give much time for an Australian to get a DUFFzine across to America or vice versa and it doesn't give the candidates much time in which to go out and hustle money for the DUFF bank balance. My idea was to extend the period of nomination, voting, and buck-hustling from a year to two years and have candidates from both America and Australia standing at the same time and as the US winner was touring Australia the Australian candidates would be actively campaigning for the following year and nominations would be opening in America for the next candidate two years on. Hope I put that right!

I was also concerned over GUFF. With a limited amount of fan dollars up for grabs I didn't think there would be enough money for both fan funds and so I thought that holding up DUFF for a year wouldn't upset anyone - after all, I had talked to lots of fans about it and no one had thought the idea was wrong. Of course it was.

Quite suddenly I found myself cast as that evil Stevens person from Melbourne who was trying to deprive the Brave, Noble, Honest Sydney fans of an American SF fan who they would honour as a Guest of Honour or somesuch in August 1979 at their convention. It was Peter Toluzzi who first confronted me with my sins at ANZAPACON, a week after my return from the States.

I had mentioned the DUFF/GUFF business during the auction, and my news croggled him. Well, in fairness his news croggled me! At dinner later that evening Merv Binns tore strips off me and only shut up when I pointed out that he hadn't thought of the Sydney convention wanting a DUFF candidate either.

I was rather embarrassed, so after a night of furious thinking I realised that a letter to Bill Rotsler could very likely get things rolling again so I sat down and wrote to the aforesaid Bill asking him to activate DUFF for 1979. I also talked to Kevin Dillon and asked him to get the word to the various Sydneysiders that ole PJ was trying to make it up to them. I also rang Ken Ozanne and told him what was going on and asked him as Chairman* of the 1979 Australian National Convention would he guarantee free membership, room, etc, for the American DUFF winner if he attended the con in Sydney in August 1979. He would and he did and I apologised for any trouble and sat down and wrote that letter to Rotsler. So far there is no reply.

Now what started me off on this diatribe is the report that certain people in the Sydney apa APPLESAUCE have been badmouthing me about the lack of a DUFF candidate for the 1979 Sydney Convention. I don't know what they have actually said since I am not a member of APPLESAUCE.

I am not going to say I don't care what is said about me because I do. I also tend to get angry with people who say nasty things behind me back and generally tend to go into print and say even worse things back. This time I won't say anything nasty except to make one point and that point is TALK TO PEOPLE! If the Sydney Convention Committee had thought to have the courtesy to write me (or ring me) and say: 'Hi Paul! As you are the Australian DUFF administrator we thought we would let you know that we would really dig having the American DUFF winner for 1979 as our guest at Syncon '79.'

The trouble was NOBODY SAID ANYTHING! Talk to us down here in Melbourne, you guys. Tell us what's going on. Tell, if Adelaide can talk to Christine Ashby about the 1977 DUFF visit you could have talked to me. I really don't bite and I got rid of all the communicable diseases. I really truly promise to listen... If I have one fault it is my inability to read minds.

In the near future you can look for the news of who is standing for DUFF in 1979 and you can think of nominating an Australian for

CHUNDER! volume 2, number 10, November 28, 1978: page 3

DUFF 1980, nominations will close next March and voting April 1980. The Australian winner will get to go to BOSTON (lucky devil!). Only a few rules apply to DUFF nominations; you must not have been overseas before, you must be an active SF fan of at least twelve months standing, and you must have three Australian nominators and two Americans. There are a few more points but I won't worry about them here. The three successful Australian DUFF winners have so far been all from Melbourne so when are we going to see someone from Sydney or Adelaide winning? Let's get with it, gang! (PAUL STEVENS)

(JF: * Ken Ozanne is not, of course, Chairman of the '79 Syncon. But Paul had no way of knowing this, since it doesn't appear to have been until the publication of SYDNEY 3 (received Melbourne late October) that the Chairman was identified as Peter Toluzzi. At various earlier times I have thought Ozanne, Jack Herman and Keith Curtis was Chairman.

I have two strong objections to Paul Stevens' general argument.

1) I do not believe that it is appropriate to nominate for DUFF first and then show that you are an A-OK fan by publishing fanzines afterwards. People should be fans - active fans - first, and get nominated afterwards. DUFFzines are a poor substitute for real fan activity.

2) Why is Paul Stevens continuing the conspiracy of silence about nominating procedures started by Christine Ashby? Why, for example, is it not possible to state publicly the rules for nomination of candidates? Are Australian fans being deliberately prevented from nominating Americans to come to Sydney in '79? We need to know the dates (not the months...) relative to nomination, and the exact conditions, in a public document and promptly, if we are to organize Australian nominations for BOSTON in '80. Even if the rules were published with this Chunder! (and plainly they are not) we would find it very difficult to do the organizing for the nomination of an American to come to Sydney in '79. If DUFF administrators cannot publish reasonable information about nominating and voting dates and conditions they should be sacked.)

ALDERSON FOR GUFF!

Somewhere between 80 and 100 dollars was raised by the wine auction in aid of GUFF on the 28th at Blackburn. All stocks of books and wine were cleared. The complete total will be made known by the administrator (Leigh Edmonds) when he gets the money - after the debts have been settled. Due to the absence of Lee Harding who had been going to act as auctioneer the goods were sold to those making a reasonable offer. We hope that Lee has recovered from the emergency which kept him away. The day was organised by Bev Monger and her friends on behalf of the GUFF candidate John J. Alderson. (John Alderson)

(JF: Indeed Lee has recovered - in a way. I checked: Lee was expecting a call from Bev Monger with final details of the auction, and the call never came. This version of events is supported by an undated letter I have from Bev - postmarked October 24, so it probably arrived October 26 - stating that "It promises to be an entertaining afternoon - Lee Harding has 'tentatively promised' to be auctioneer.", which suggests that when she wrote the letter Bev was expecting to confirm arrangements with Lee. But this is beside the point - the afternoon was obviously a smashing success, and congratulations to the organizers. I wish I could have been there, but the cough referred to a couple of issues back has kept me away from fannish gatherings since ANZAPACON.)

EDITORIAL ASIDE: I'm starting to get telephone calls of comment on Chunder! Should a response like that entitle one to an extra issue?

CHUNDER! volume 2, number 10, November 28, 1978: page 4

THE SPEEDER REEKS (letters from long-suffering readers)

Richard Faulder (October episode): Nearly 5000 people at IGUANACON?

Strikes me as about 4000 people too many. No way all of those people could get full benefit from the panels, etc. Perhaps the Yanks ought to start thinking about having their big cons at camps, or somesuch. Strange, persecuting Harlan Ellison for political activity - whatever happened to fannish tolerance?

Leigh Edmonds' comment that he gets a 1 % response to his 'zine, but that he hasn't LoC'd any Aussiezines this year probably sums up a general situation. If 'more than one or two Australians who are not impressed by the Sydney performance so far' have any suggestions to make, why don't they make them to the Sydney Committee?

From your selection of LoCs and your own comments I get the impression that you think all apas should be strangled at birth because they encourage second-rate fanzines. Is this true? I remember when we were starting off ENIGMA that the only useful comment we had was from Kevin Dillon and Eric Lindsay. In contrast I get more useful comment from the other members of APPLESAUCE than that.

(JF: Until late October more than one or two Australians didn't know what the names of the members of the Sydney Committee were. For that matter, the address for SYNCON '79 has recently changed. I certainly don't think apas are bad news - most of my own activity has been in that area. But I do not think them the best place to learn about publishing fanzines. No one has ever sent me a copy of ENIGMA to comment on, so I reckon I'm excused.)

Richard Faulder (November episode): Does your comment on the Biggle bit (September '78 ANALOG) arise from his article alone, or on other reading? "as certainly appalled by the nit-picking that apparently goes on in such 'journals'. Afraid I've always found the idea of literary criticism rather suspect (sorry, Van), since literary criticism is the function of each reader.

You to me: surely my address as Sec/Treas of the SSFF (was it three years or four?) would have been more widely known than just Sydney fandom. (And no more cracks about Sydney fandom being isolationist. Have never gained that impression - perhaps we are isolated, rather than isolationist.)

Comment to Bob Smith: ignore the fads and fancies followers and go and see STAR WARS.

Please state concretely what you think a 'good' fanzine should consist of. I find your comments on ENIGMA quite disturbing. Your comments on fan fiction remind me strongly of George Turner's comments on SF in general. Presumably you think that all great authors spring full-blown into the prozines - see the editorial in ENIGMA 2(1). Do you consider SCIENCE FICTION a fanzine? Hope Van will agree with me when I say it's not supposed to be. "either of the above 'try to imitate science fiction magazines' - their evolution has been entirely indepent, except for occasional advice from people such as Eric Lindsay and Kevin Dillon. Like you I had a positive reaction to ARGO NAVIS, but I'm at a loss as to why you apparently consider it superior to ENIGMA.

(JF: The 'serious criticism' of SF I've read in other journals suggested to me that Lloyd Biggle's criticism was too mild. The name 'Richard Faulder' has been familiar to me for some time, but not an address. There is a tendency in Sydney to separate names and addresses. I never knew who lived in Heron St, Glebe until long after it ceased to be a meetingplace for the SSFF. The November APPLESAUCE gives the SSFF address as 11 Terrace Rd, Dulwich Hill, and so does FORERUNNER. But I don't know whether that is the address of a Sydney fan or not - it certainly doesn't match any name I have. You may be right about Sydney

fandom being isolated rather than isolationist, but I suspect that it is a self-inflicted wound: see, for example, Shayne McCormack's remark in the November PAGE OF PENTACLES that 'I think maybe one of the reasons not many general fanzines are forthcoming from Sydney is that everybody is so busy going other things that we just don't have time to put out a fanzine.'. Every good fanzine is edited by a person, and no reader is unaware of the existence of that person. Fanzines which conceal the editor's personality seem to me to lack the necessary vitality. Some professional magazines have the same problem - but their purpose is different. If you accept the idea that fanzines are for communication between real people, then more or less anything goes. But an editor who can project a personality is the essential ingredient - after that it is a matter of taste. Of course I don't believe that all great authors spring full-blown into the prozines - but I don't know of any who spent years publishing shit-grade fiction in fanzines, either. Lots of authors were involved in fanzine-publishing - but not publishing fan fiction (in the Australian sense). If SCIENCE FICTION isn't a fanzine, who makes a living out of it? (To adopt a currently-popular criterion) What is it, if not a fanzine? I didn't consider ARGO NAVIS superior to ENIGMA.)

Lee Harding: Thanks for printing your very fine review of THE WEEPING SKY, and for drawing your readers' attention to the mauling given to my ms. by a 'freelance' editor working for Cassell. The interview I did for Van Ikin's SCIENCE FICTION was typed in November last year; at that time I had barely recovered from the excruciating experience of having to correct the diabolical page-proofs of the book and had not seen the finished product. When I eventually managed to get around to reading it some months later I was shocked to discover that less than 10% of the corrections had been made - and some new errors inserted in the process. When the new Managing Editor at Cassell wrote asking what had happened to the new book I had promised them, I promptly sent him a copy of SKY with seventy-two major corrections (I didn't have time to bother with the minor ones...). His prompt response was to say that this was 'pretty horrific', and that before returning my copy he would transfer my corrections to their file copy (I hope this does not disappoint John Bangsund, who was heard to mutter recently that he thought Cassell had brought out a special edition for poorfreaders: I sometimes feel sorry for copy-editors and proofreaders and for the books they never get a chance to read...). Anyway, the upshot of all this is that I did manage to get a new - and much better - contract negotiated for my next Cassell book, and this includes the right to okay the copy-edited ms. Nothing so strange about that: my new publishers, Harper & Row, are courteous enough to send me air-mail Xeroxes of my copy-edited mss. with all queries indicated - even if it is only a misplaced comma: even Anne Godden of Hyland/Quarter was moved to comment that 'they are damned fine copy-editors', although their familiarity with English Literature leaves something to be desired. On the other hand, my favourite notation so far has been this: 'We cannot find Albert Park Lake anywhere on our maps. Could you be more specific?'

Your review of THE WEEPING SKY was fine in a way that so many reviews are not: in writing it you revealed something of your own nature as well as the book's. I can understand your reluctance to review the works of friends. I take this a step further and find myself reluctant to raise my pen to praise or damn a fellow writer. Arnold Schoenberg has said that an artist's major concern is his own work, and that if he criticises one of his peers then it will be for the purpose of forwarding his own ideas - I think that in the SF field Brian Aldiss and George Turner would spring to mind as the most likely contenders in this regard. Since I am neither old enough or wise enough to have formulated a Theory About Writing - did I hear someone say not perceptive enough? - I feel no urge to write reviews of anyone

else's writing. Not any more.

World views: de gustibus, etc. However, I wish to pick a nit and disclaim your suggestion that (my writing) suggests 'there are things we are not meant to know'. I would prefer to be absolved of that cliché and instead make a point that - perhaps - there are things we simply cannot know. Perhaps I seek the numinous, or whatever?

Wasting my time: I remember a conversation we had several years ago, when I remarked that in Puccini's music the melodies all sounded similar, as though he had only one tune to write. You replied that this was not necessarily a bad thing, if the tune was a good one: many painters have only one picture to paint. And so on. Also, Brian Aldiss expressed his opinion to me over wine and a good dinner that while he considered Ballard to have an extraordinarily limited imagination, he could think of no other living writer who had mined his narrow bed of ore so magnificently (aside: when he expressed his great appreciation of CRASH to Ballard, the latter replied 'Damned right: and every bloody sentence cost me a bottle of whisky' - or something like that). Perhaps you are sorry, not for the fact that I appear to be obsessed with my limitations, but because the ore I have brought back has been fool's gold. Should the cobbler stick to his last? I'm not sure.

Tomorrow we try again.

(JF: There are things we simply cannot know - there's no 'perhaps' about it. So even when we agree, we don't. However, I'm not in the absolution business tonight, so for a while you'll have to try to survive that nasty attack of the clichés. One could argue (though I wouldn't) that Puccini's tune is the tune. But I'm almost prepared to argue along a similar line for one painter. One occasionally comes across references to faces as being Modigliani-like, or Fra Angelico-like. And so on. The one which throws me is the description of some people as having Botticelli faces. The description had some meaning for me until I tried looking at faces to see if they were Botticelli faces. Lee, the fact of the matter is that, without even squinting, everyone has a Botticelli face. He, you see, had the tune. What I am sorry about is that I cannot appreciate your obsessions.)

Peter Toluzzi: (C! 6) People who produce crudzines in apas do learn, as they are usually lambasted by others; I don't agree that starting in an apa is a hindrance to learning good publishing techniques. Letter-writing: I too despair, as a faned. As a reader I am as guilty as any. I'm not schizophrenic, and neither am I.

(JF: I'm still sticking to my view that one learns faster and more painfully through the publication of general fanzines than through the publication of apazines.)

(C! 7) Interesting comparing the three apas. Naturally one can't fairly compare FAPA to the Oz apas. How do you think AIFS rates? How about an up-to-date review, as we (APPLESAUCE) have lotsa new members and enthusiasm. KERRY PACKER FOR GUFF?!

(JF: I intend to review amateur press associations every three or four issues, and the next installment is to be found in this issue.* I don't 'rate' apas (or fanzines, or books - but ask me about my system for rating letters of comment some time...). On balance, and say with England needing 100 runs and four wickets in hand, I think someone more mobile than Kerry Packer is needed. Consequently I stick by DENNIS LILLEE FOR GUFF!)

(C! 8) I was most impressed by Lloyd Biggle's attack on pseudo-sf-intellectuals. I am intending to nominate the piece for the Atheling Award. Unfortunately, it was nit-picking (if deservedly so) and many might be turned off by its apparent pettiness; not I. Don't, for ghod's sake, restrict letters to one page unless that's all the

*Lies, all filthy lies (Publisher's note)

CHUNDER! volume 2, number 10, November 28, 1978: page 7

publishable stuff you've got. We (i.e. Aus fandom not heavily into genzines) need an informal forum like Chunder! Same goes for fanzine reviews.

Re FZ reviews: ENIGMA is exceedingly pretty and well-produced; I do not find the colour use excessive, though a tighter control of quality of printed matter and artwork might be justified. SF is to be commended if for no other reason than attempting something that's not yet succeeded in Australia; unfortunately it is like much of Bruce Gillespie's work in that it is unrelentingly SERCON; okay in small doses... I don't think the fiction in SCYTALE was that bad, but opinions do differ. Thanks for the reasonably favourable review - I've got lots of ideas for the next issue, but precious little time and virtually no outside help ... it's not much of a 'clubzine' in that sense. SPECTRE was certainly excellent throughout, but I do object to interviews which are several years old. Still, Perry has done an admirable job. And the PARERGON PAPERS (just how do you pronounce that?), which is presumably the same that appeared in ANZAPA 64, was also of a standard to earn an ATHELING nomination from me. Indeed the Aus FZ scene is looking quite good.

(JF: Clearly letters aren't restricted to one page this time. But there will have to be an upper limit eventually (like APPLESAUCE...?) What is the point of producing a 'pretty and well-produced' fanzine which needs much improvement in both printed matter and artwork? Precisely, old friend, what does the rainbow of colour in ENIGMA add to its appearance? Having ideas for a fanzine can be far removed from actually producing the thing. "eigh Edmonds and I worked out the contents of the next BOYS OWN FANZINE back in 1975, and we are still trying to pry promised contributions out of two authors (howdy, gents). PARERGON PAPERS pronunciation? As written.)

(C! 9) Sydney is uncivilised? What does that say about St. Kilda? I'd love some photos from ANZAPACON, dependant upon price, of course - prefer colour prints. Hope there's another ANZAPACON.

Why protest Bakshi's LOTR? If Tim Lawson wants support, he should state his objections. Interesting point raised by John Rowley re the Geis influence: John, you credit us young 'uns with too much fanac! My inclusion of the Zelazny interview in SCYTALE (aside from being relevant, as the talk was at the Uni as the Society's guest) was probably prompted by the appearance in several Aus FZs of interviews. The most painful aspect of your Lee Harding review was the tale of the Mad Copy Editor! Shock! Horror!

More to the point: you seem to have a bhee in your bhonnet about what Sydney is "doing to the Ditmars". Just what, in your learned opinion, have we done, that we should not have? From my vantage point close to the source I have seen all that has gone on, and all I've seen is far more publicity and discussion than ever before, and I think that a Good Thing. Please, if you have complaints, be specific and not cute and bitchy; that's the sort of attitude which fosters the intercity paranoias of which we've spoken before.

Poor Bruce is an unhappy person, isn't he? Only three or four Hugo nominations, and not one winner! Only his many Ditmars to polish - my heart bleeds for him!

(JF: I still believe that Geis is ultimately responsible for the recent spate of interviews, even if the transmission of wisdom is second- or third-hand: you'll not rob my of my prejudices so lightly!

With respect to the Ditmars themselves, SYNCON'79 appears not only to be destroying the tradition of a decade (four Ditmars, three of them fixed as Best International Sf, Best Australian SF, and best Aust. fanzine, with the fourth category (not the award) at the discretion of the Concomm), but by doing so in a 'constitutional' environment,

CHUNDER! volume 2, number 10, November 28, 1978: page 8

seem to be enshrining a 'new' tradition pretty promptly. My second problem, I guess, is the way the discussion of the Ditmars is being carried on. So far as I can make out Blair publishes stuff in APPLESAUCE, but otherwise seeks opinion by writing letters to fanzines, which may mean that views are sought from far and wide (and maybe Blair gets plenty of replies) but the discussion is diffuse - no one else can follow it, since it crops up all over the place - and shallow - one letter from Ramage, one reply, and that's about it. An alternative approach, which occurs naturally to us fanzine nuts, is to publish a bimonthly one-sheeter (called perhaps DITMAR DISCUSSIONS) which can summarise whatever else has been mooted, but also allow protracted discussion of particular points. Apart from a desire to shovel awards at everyone in sight, do we really need to go as far as creating a Ditmar for the best female left-handed writer in Newcastle? With respect to the Australian awards and the number of professionally published stories, we are getting preciously close to that overkill.

But I'm so cute when I'm bitchy.)

WHY YOU SHOULD ATTEND UNICON V (by Tony Howe)

(JF: a publicity release for UNICON V accompanies this Chunder! When Tony asked if I could circulate it, I said 'Sure matey, but is it okay if I ask you a question? Why should people who have nothing to do with universities (and maybe don't want to) attend a Unicon? Isn't a Unicon intended for university students?' I have been to two Unicons and found both somewhat boring - are university students really as stupid as they make themselves out to be? Despite being more than a little busy, Tony has taken the time to answer my questions. As it turns out, having studied the PR I was already convinced that I should go to UNICON V and had sent my money. Read the following, read the PR - and perhaps you'll join me.)

Why should you attend a University SF Con? The label UNICON is not meant to exclude non-university people. I think the original intentions of UNICONS was to 'institutionalise' a second Annual SF convention with a national, as opposed to local, bias. Hopefully there would therefore be two such 'national' cons each year. (UNICON 4 went against this but largely by accident - not design.)

What should determine whether someone wants to attend a con is not just its label ('never judge a book...'), but its programme, so each con - even local ones - should be judged on this basis. Let's face it, the attendees for all SF Cons, even World Cons, are in large part students, so cons organised by uni people are likely to be similar (at least) to non-university conventions. There is no requirement for a UNICON to be just a 'relaxacon' with a heavy film bias.

UNICON V is not the usual 4-5 day UNICON - it will be only 2½ days. One of our problems (believe it or not) has been a vast surplus of programme items - note the small number of films in favour of traditional convention fare, eg talks. Too often, recently, films at cons have swamped the programmes. This is not conducive to participation in discussions or social events involving all attendees. What do others think about cons with films dominating the programme?

(I'll run, or rather re-run, an old questionnaire with the next Chunder! to try to gauge the preferences of Chunder! readers. JF)

CHUNDER! CRISIS- EDITOR SEES WRITING ON WALL

Here's the bottom of page 8, plenty of news and letters to go, and there are supposed to be book and fanzine reviews as well. This issue is restricted to 10 pages, so some of that will have to wait. I promise to try to catch up with the year-end issue, so keep the news coming!

=====

===== THE NOVA MOB =====

=====

The Nova Mob next meets on Tuesday, December 5, at 863 Hampton St, Brighton at 7.30 pm, when Rob Gerrand and Bruce Gillespie will lead a discussion on 'Brian Aldiss'. Also to be discussed at this meeting - a program for 1979 (and indeed, whether the Mob can continue in '79 in view of declining attendances - if you have any ideas for modernising The Nova Mob, please come along and tell all), and in particular what shape the January meeting will take.

MORE CONVENTION NEWS - WAYCON 79

The fourth SWANCON is to be titled WAYCON 79. It will be held Friday (evening) March 2 to Monday March 5 1979 at the Ozone Hotel, 27 Adelaide Terrace, Perth. The Guest of Honour is LEIGH EDMONDS. Accommodation (limited in numbers, and available on a first-come, first-served basis, except that Eastern States fans will have some priority) goes for \$7 a night. Membership rates: Attending - \$8 to November 30, \$10 to January 31, \$15 thereafter and as much as \$20 at the door; Supporting - \$6. Daily memberships also available.

The program includes films, talks, panels, competitions, a book auction, banquet and fancy dress party. One speaker is Dr Dan Milech whose talk at SWANCON 2 was very well received. There will be a STAR TREK blooper reel and the first showing of an SF film made in WA called BARTHOLOMEW MARMALADE. The banquet will be buffet style and cost about \$3.

For membership and further information contact Bob Ogden, 11 The Quarterdeck, Willetton, WA 6155.

(Thanks to Roy Ferguson and Rob McGough for the above.)

PEOPLE NOOZ

Derrick Ashby is wandering about sporting a new pair of dark glasses and is actually going into action on the next Melbourne EASTERCON: good, we need someone new to kick. // John Litchen recently gave a lecture on underwater filmmaking at Queenscliff and the listeners lapped it up. John has a very good illustrated article titled 'The Day of the Whales at Gunnamatta' in the October '78 SKINDIVING IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND. 'The sea was red with blood that morning.' it begins. // Alma Tabaka, 19 Mayne Street Sunshine 3020 wants to acquire some back issues of STARLOG (no accounting for taste....) // Joe Pilati, now a member of the J P Stevens boycott staff of the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union in NYC, is co-author of an article on the Stevens boycott in the September 21 WIN. (Thought I'd better include some news for you older fans...) // Oh yeah, and Eric Lindsay is back. That Eric Lindsay of the Eric Lindsay for GUFF campaign. Eric arrived back in Australia on November 16, having spent a couple of days near Auckland with comrades Knapp & Thurogood. Eric will be publishing trip reports in various amateur press associations, including ANZAPA and APPLESAUCE. He has about 100 000 words of notes to work from. Swears on a pile of HYPHENS that Gordon R Dickson is coming out for SYNCON '79. (But can he be so sure that R A Heinlein will not turn up?) Eric reports, as did Paul Stevens, that OMNI has sold out its print run of one million copies. No comment. // Merv Binns will be a little late with the next AUSTRALIAN SCIENCE FICTION NEWS: no sign at all of the Australian Science Fiction Foundation leaping in to help. The problem arises from the need to get the SPACE AGE Xmas catalogue out before Xmas.

ADDRESSES

EBL cleverly sent me an old list of NSW fan addresses - now I know who lives at 11 Terrace Rd! Similar lists from other states would be great.

BOOK REVIEWS

I was going to review ROOMS OF PARADISE and OTHER WORLDS in this issue, and have done the appropriate preparation. However I am stunned, bowled over, etc, by Bruce Gillespie's review of ROOMS OF PARADISE, in The National Times for the 'week ending Dec 2.' (what does that mean? Do those copies self-destruct at the appointed hour?), and will need several weeks to recover my equilibrium. It is sufficient to say that Bruce says so eloquently so many things that I wouldn't in my most careless moment think of saying that I am forcefully reminded of Rob Gerrard's legendary review of THE WEEPING SKY. Stay tuned for a "soul-searching review in the next Chunder!"

FANZINE REVIEWS

7 fanzines and 7 apa mailings - hopeless situation, have eaten last of the huskies - will telegraph fmz reviews.

CHECKPOINT 91 (Peter Roberts, 38 Oakland Dr, Dawlish, Devon, UK - 6 for a quid for airmail Oz sub.) Excellent coverage of Pom fandom, and a series of killer book reviews to gladden the heart of man ('cold and lifeless', 'thoroughly unexceptional', 'lightweight', 'pathetically wretched', 'feeble satire', 'witless', 'No hope', 'Moronic' (book by SYNCON 79 GoH), 'Abysmal', 'rather amateurish', 'machine-written hacking' (book by editor of Omni), etc etc); the book review column concludes with what must fairly be described as an optimistic request that books for review be sent to the editor: want to try him, Lee?

SCIENCE FICTION REVIEW 26, July 1978 (Richard E Geis, 1525 NE Ainsworth, Portland, Oregon 97211, USA: \$8 for 6, double for double) This issue's episode of ONE IMMORTAL MAN improves on the previous, and overall the issue is probably the best for the year: the fanzine for science fiction fans.

CRITIFAN 1 (Ellen Pedersen and Niels Dalgaard, Horsekildevej 13, IV dør 3, DK-2500 Valby, Denmark, at 3 for \$6) 28 pages offset and a bit pricy - contributions by Kurt Vonnegut, Jr and John Foyster, so it can only improve. Oh shit, here's Paul Stevens again!

CUPDAYCON REPORT (By PJS)

I got up late, very, very late, and of course I developed a headache. A good start to the afternoon. About 1.45pm I left my flat and walked over to Merv's place and enjoyed the sunshine, the black clouds, and the thought of a couple of Aspros when I finally arrived at my destination. I made good time and found a crowd of fans being sold books by Justin Ackroyd, a passtime that netted a goodly amount of money for ASF News (which needs all the money it can get). I later sold off a Rockwell/Omni T-shirt that I picked up at Phoenix and a few Rotsler drawings and made \$22.50 for DUFF and justified my existence.

The usual bunch of people were there as well as some MSFC members, the Straedes and some tiresome woman who had a hate for Paul Collins and let everyone know about it in a loud voice. My headache had got worse and as I happened to know why the tiresome woman hated Paul I lost my temper and had an argument with her. At least she shut up! The programme, such as it was, consisted of an auction, a film (ASTERIX) and a barbecue. The film was very witty and the barbecue was very tasty and my headache eased off. It also rained somewhat. Later on in the evening, due to the collapse of the Nova Mob's scheduled discussion I was forced to talk about my recent DUFF trip to the USA, a fate worse than death. Other than the events described, nothing much happened except that there was some sort of horse race and it rained a lot. I wonder what the rest of the world did?

(See you before Xmas, gentle readers - I'll try to catch up on contents.)