



NUMBER SIX

JUNE 1969

is published by John Bangsund of PO Box 109 Ferntree Gully Victoria 3156 Australia for the fifth mailing of the Australia & New Zealand Amateur Press Association and for a few favoured outsiders. This issue, like its predecessor, is small (you noticed, didn't you) and mainly devoted to mailing comments. Future issues, I hope, will run to about 24 pages, and in effect will replace poor ol' ASFR. THE NEW MILLENNIAL HARBINGER will still not be available on subscription, and circulation will be limited to a total of about 150. If you would like to continue to see it (and ASFR 20 is a fair sample of what future issues will be like) just keep on sending me material, commenting, trading, being a nice feller, or whatever you think you've done to get this issue.

Just offhand, I think I might change the title to SCYTHROP next time round. If I don't, someone else might take a fancy to it?

oo

OFFICIAL EDITOR

Ninety-three pages without Gillespie and me: now isn't that something? Not that it came quite up to the standard of earlier mailings, all in all, but there was certainly enough worthwhile material to justify reading right through, and that too is something. ::: I would like to ask, worthy OE, whether postmailings (such as my NMHS) will be supplied to people who join during the two-month period when the postmailing went out? I ask this because our latest member, who lives quite close by, did not receive a copy of NMHS with her ANZAPA 4. I think this point needs clarifying, and from his remarks in the last mailing I gather Peter Roberts agrees with me. ::: I would also like to ask you, Leigh, whether you have been sending sample mailings to people who might be interested in joining us. Perhaps we could all suggest names to you, and if you get too many you could perhaps organize a poll or something to decide who should be invited. My personal list would include Brian Richards, Mauricio Kitaigorodzki, Michel Feron, Paul Anderson, everyone we know in New Zealand (we must have someone from New Zealand), Alan France, Don Symons and Dennis Stocks. Americans I would leave to you, Leigh; you know who is worth inviting and likely to be interested. ::: Your comments on the deadline noted, and I hope you do mean it. ::: Kevin Dillon is a hoax.

So I turn the page and notice that you intend telling us this time about the spare mailings anyway. Carry on.

GARY MASON

Very interesting, but I remain unconvinced. I picked up a Buck Rogers reprint at the MSFC the other night, and hell! it's awful! Worse even than the Flash Gordon film. Trouble is, Gary, I judge all these things by literary standards, more or less, not as communication, and not as nostalgia. If I wanted nostalgia (and I'm pretty strong on it in other ways) I wouldn't mind having a BEN BOWYANG comic book from the 40s or a collection of the original ROD CRAIG strips, but this would simply be an attempt to re-live the past. The artwork doesn't normally affect me one way or the other. Harding says I have a non-pictorial mind, or whatever the McLuhan jargon is, but the fact is that I like to make my own pictures, inside my skull or on paper. In other words, I'm a participant, not an observer, and comics readers are observers, the same as tv viewers.

PAUL STEVENS

Get up off your prayer mat and do more writing, Paul. You're not too bad yourself, old comrade, but the standard has dropped a bit this time round, possibly through your tendency to protest just a little too much. Liked LSD as usual, but find nothing I want to comment on right now.

JOHN RYAN

Arghh, your Bester book still unposted. Must do it tomorrow. But at least this time you get to see ASFR, if not a really typical issue. I agree with you about our apa title page, but understand something was arranged at the Con about this. Hope so. Maybe Ron Clarke's cheap offset man could do a good job for us: I'd be interested in comparing prices. Whether Ron Graham has Stan Pitt doing VISION covers is entirely up to him, now. I had arranged for an Australian artist to do work for us, but this may go by the board now that I'm out of the VISION show. Your reply to me this time, John, is one of the most delightful things I've seen in an Australian fanzine for some time: I refer, of course, to the revelation that you are actually Pat Terry. Brief, but inspired. I don't look like ever pursuing higher learning. The new job is just about all I could ask for, and if I learn enough about Industrial Relations, magazine layout and a few other things, I could be on a university lecturer's salary this time next year. I hope you'll have no more complaints from me in this line; I was rather more than usually depressed the day I typed all those wingeing comments in NMH 4.

JOHN BROSNAN

Others may disagree, but I hope you'll skip the mailing comments and give us more autobiography, John, if you have to choose between them. You score 2½ in the contest. Complete answers (if I remember them) possibly in the next issue, since a lot of people will be getting 4, 5 and 6 together. And 3, come to think of it.

PETER DARLING

TRIVANA 1 didn't sell, to my knowledge, and I couldn't get anyone to review it for ASFR. Any reader who cares to verify your review may have my hardback copy for a 13¢ postage stamp. A nice urbane issue as usual, Peter, but I have the OZ article already and there's nothing else I want to comment on just now.

KEN BULL

Thanks for the Lindsay bibliography, Ken. I probably have all that information somewhere, but now I know where to look in a hurry. Have you read

Jack Lindsay at all? I enjoyed his autobiographical trilogy some years ago, and most of his books are quite readable. Jack Lindsay is a sort of poor man's Robert Graves. Re duplicating facilities: You are welcome to the services of Boanerges, my loathsome elderly Roneo, at any time. How about coming over for some Wagner and apazing some time? We have TRISTAN, RHEINGOLD, GOETTERDAEMERUNG and TANNHAEUSER, plus some odd overtures, and we tend to listen to them only when we have company. (Forgive the odd spelling there, but I can't be bothered putting in all those umlauts, particularly on capitals.)

JOHN FOYSTER

Strictly sic, as you say.

ALEX ROBB

I am tired of Vanity Fair.  
Herald, Age, Australian and Time.  
The funny pages don't quite make up  
For all that dismal commerce and crime.

Copyright JB. Recording rights and official theology available on application. You do go on, don't you, Alex. But even your exposition (I won't call it exegesis) won't stop me enjoying S&G. A Baptist existentialist? - you're having us on, Alex. Either us or the Baptists.

More seriously, I would dispute your statement in the Australian Baptist article, that S&G "give an incomparable explanation of what life is like without God". Rather, I would say they give a picture of a civilization struggling to emerge from its primitive reliance on a mythical deity. "Every way you look at it, you lose" is not so much an ironic as a nihilist statement, and I can't imagine any of your other quotes giving much solace to Baptist readers. Your comments about "the saving message of Jesus Christ" and so on clash grotesquely with the S&G home-truths (and look decidedly quaint in a fanzine). Seems to me you're kidding yourself, Alex. By all means be a Christian if you find it helps, and by all means enjoy pop music, but I think your efforts at reconciling the two are pretty puerile. It's much easier to reconcile the Rolling Stones and Beethoven. The Christian Revolution, as you call it at the end of that incredibly boring exposition of Don Symons's quite straightforward poem, consists mainly in the act of turning away from reality. Mind you, if I'm wrong about this, it's millstones for me, fellers. (Matt 18.6)

PETER ROBERTS

Welcome, O Fogbound One. Not much to comment on here, but there's a breath of professionalism in even this small sample of your approach that should inspire us lazy Sundrenched Ones.

MIKE O'BRIEN

Nice flashes of wit here, Mike, but how about extending yourself sometime? We who have met you at Cons (and even, some of us, in that glorious pub you live in) have generally got the impression that here is a young feller with lots to say but a little too shy to say it all. On paper you could really open right up if you wanted to, and dispel forever your mysterious image. Tell us about Hobart, Mike, and about yourself, and Don Tuck, and those interesting people we met at Don's place one long far-off day.

GARY WOODMAN

Crimson paper is \$1.51 a ream + tax at Gestetner. Your guesses at the contest are at least ingenious, at worst unfunny. You got three right, and

your answer for no.3 was close. My dear fellow, if you ever write me a publish-able LoC, I shall publish it. You might be surprised to know that I've had letters from Big Goshwow Name Authors that weren't publishable. Your comments on Alex Robb's meanderings are on about the same plane, and it's obvious that your Atheism is not the One True Holy Catholic & Apostolic Atheism that I subscribe to.

LEIGH EDMONDS



Leigh, for the misguided tribute. (That's a rotten-looking K, isn't it.) For the record, ASFRs 1-9 were typed on the IBM, 10-15 on your Optima, 16 and 19 on my Optima, 17, 18 and 20 on this Triumph. Of them all, I fancy that the IBM was the best. At least the earlier issues seem to look the neatest of the lot. But that was such a nasty machine, that electric monster, and I swore I would never have another. Which I haven't. Gary Mason, I think, thinks this Triumph is motorized, but it isn't.

Pascal's Bet may have been okay for Pascal, being as there were not so many gods to choose from in his day, but what if you bet on the Anglican God and it turns out that the Seventh Day Adventists or Christian Israelites or Two-Seed-In-The-Spirit Baptists were right all the time? Hard luck, chum. Tatts is a better investment. At least someone wins every time in Tatts.

NOEL KERR

The little old ladies' friend. Aw, gee, Noel - you've got to be kidding? If the Government can't afford to hand out mantel radios to poor people on the 20% of my income which they take, let's not do their job for them - let's change the Government! Hey, after we give Leigh all our vital statistics, maybe we could fingerprint everyone? Incidentally, you seem (forgive if I'm wrong) to think I write everything in NMH. Most of your comments on no.4 were about Bob Toomey's article. I'll have you know, sir, I'm a dirty hippie. All the best for the VISION OF TOMORROW project to you, too, Noel. Enjoyed your Sweet Aughts, chum: you're one of our dark horses, I reckon.

JOHN BANGSUND

Thought because you sent out a postmailing last time you wouldn't get a mention, didn't you? But I remembered you. How long do you think you can get away with 4 pages, Bangsund? you skinflint.

o o

And that's it for another mailing. Bouquets to 11 Wilson Street, thank you kindly - they wilt in the Box.

Here, since we're still doing lists, is a list of my favourite Leigh Edmonds:

LEIGH EDMONDS

Next issue, a list of my favourite Diane Bangsunds. There must be thousands of them, just to name a few.

PARTING IS SUCH SWEET SORROW  
BUT I HAVE TO GET UP FOR WORK TOMORROW  
CHRISTMAS COMES BUT ONCE A YEAR  
MORE'S THE PITY - DO YOU READ THOREAU?