

SOUFFLE

This is SOUFFLE 2, intended for the 31st OMPA mailing, March 5, 1962. It is edited by John M. Baxter, easiest found at Box 39, King Street Post Office, Sydney, New South Wales, AUSTRALIA. The duplication however is carried out by that sterling (if beardless) doyen of British fandom, Bruce Burn, to whom much thanks. Date typed is 27th January, 1962. All cartoons in this issue are by Philip Baxter.

Before I kick off with the mailing comments, there's a small matter I'd like to bring up. As I mentioned in the intro., Bruce Burn has very kindly been running my OMPA material off on his mimeo. It's essential that I have somebody do the duping for me, as there is anything up to an eight week mailing delay between Britain and Australia. As you can imagine, knocking out more than six pages and sending them back by sea mail intime to meet the deadline would be impossible - or at least a pretty close thing on most occasions. So Bruce suggested that I airmail him the stencils and he run them off for me, and of course I gratefully accepted.

However I feel a bit of a skunk doing this to Bruce, who apparently has a number of other things on his mind at the moment, not the least of them being the administration of OMPA. To take a little of the load off his shoulders, I was hoping to find some other helpful Britfan who would be prepared to alternate with Bruce in assisting me with my duping problems. If anybody has a Gestetner mimeo (I can switch to Roneo if it's essential, but I do get Gestetner stencils for free) and has enough spare time to run off six or eight pages every second mailing, would he care to give me a hand? Naturally I'll pay for paper, ink and work, at whatever rate seems reasonable. There wouldn't be a great deal involved in the job, because I intend to confine myself to small comment-only 'zines for some time, or at least until I buy the ditto we're always talking about out here. I could airmail the stencils to you at least a fortnight before deadline time, leaving plenty of time to run them off....so any takers?

Now..... Comments on the 30th Mailing.

OMPAssible Science Fiction. (Lewis) Mmmmm, this is not a very good starter. With the best will in the world, I couldn't say I enjoyed this issue, Alan. It is not so much that the material is all rather poor - that's a criticism which can be applied to 90% of the 'zines around today. And it's not your duping or layout, both of which are capable enough. I guess my dislike is directed mainly towards the general tone of the magazine. It has no life, no personality, and while a fault like that may be forgivable in genfandom, it can hardly be countenanced in an organisation like OMPA where the accent is on personalities rather than writing talent. As I understand it, OMPA is a group of people with similar interests who enjoy talking to one another - a

kind of "fandom in miniature". Consequently I think any OMPazine should rely heavily on conversation-type material rather than fiction and so forth. Of course, maybe other members disagree. I'd be interested to hear if they do.

In the Keller story, I noticed "....various sects...believe that the soul remains within the body until the onset of rigor mortis and that if these rites are given between what we call clinical death and rigor mortis, the soul is saved from eternal damnation." What sects are those, I wonder? As far as I know, the Roman Catholic attitude on last sacraments is fairly representative, and it certainly doesn't claim that the soul continues to occupy the body "until the onset of rigor mortis". Rigor Mortis takes about 18 hours generally, although of course it's a gradual process and parts of the body may be in rigor about two or three hours after death - the jaw muscles, for instance. In the Roman Catholic church, Extreme Unction can be given up to about an hour after death - or at least apparent death - on the theory that the essential mental processes may still continue long after the bodily functions, like breathing, have stopped. I don't know of any group which claims that the "soul" continues to occupy the body for up to seven or eight hours.

UL 4. (Metcalf). Yes, I agree with you that it's the monapans rather than the multiapans who are at fault in the matter of delinquent contributions. If a guy is keen enough to purposely set out to join all or many of the apas, then he has sufficient leftover enthusiasm to keep up his requirements. There is of course the question of whether a man in three or four apas can really give his best to any one of them when he's spread that thin. Certainly the multiapans contribute with religious regularity, but in some instances what they publish is somewhat uninspired. As far as I can figure without having seen Archie's original statement, that's the basis of his argument and I personally think it has a lot to recommend it.

What you say about disliking stories being read to you can be applied to movies. Have you ever come to the end of a mystery movie and thought "Now that doesn't seem quite right?" The infuriating part is that you can go back and check the clues. I have a great many doubts about THE NAKED EDGE, the recent Kerr/Cooper/Joe Stefano epic - it just didn't add up in a number of places. Trouble is it's too lousy to see for a second time - I'm not sure how I managed to sit through it even once.

Vol Molesworth is not an "Australian fan" - he dropped out of the sf field years ago and currently occupies the same position as does Laney in US fandom, without the benefit of a reputation for brilliant writing. There are those who spit or swear when they hear his name mentioned (I'm not joking - really). For God's sake, don't wish him on us again.

TRIAL 1 & 2. (Hannifen) Huh?

THE SECOND SATURDAY etc etc. (Mercer). Did you print page 4 upside-down just for me, or did everybody get their copies that way? I know you look down on me because all Australians call Englishmen "pommy bastards", but this is ridiculous. And in case it was an honest mistake, I'd like to assure you that despite rumours to the contrary, Australian's read things right-side up. Don't let our upside-down position fool you.

AMBLE 8. (Mercer). Yes, there was one Tom Lehrer album recorded in Australia.

Or at least it was pressed in Australia, and the cover was Australian designed and printed. The title is TOM LEHRER DISCOVERS AUSTRALIA and vice versa, a 12" lp released on local Columbia, as I recall. The material overlaps his earlier 10" release of SONGS BY TOM LEHRER, although it has his alternate line in concert patter added to THE OLD DRUG PEDLAR, BE PREPARED, LOBACHEVSKY and so on. If you want to hear the line of patter he usually uses, plus the songs which are generally considered to be his best, ie. WE'LL ALL GO TOGETHER WHEN WE GO, POISONING PIGEONS IN THE PARK, THE MASOCHISM TANGO, BRIGHT COLLEGE DAYS and so on, the best bet is AN EVENING WASTED WITH TOM LEHRER, on British Decca (I think). This was a concert recording and pressed in England, so perhaps that was the one recorded in London. Personally though, I doubt it.

If you're an animal lover, Archie, you would probably enjoy Shaw's introduction to THE DOCTOR'S DILEMMA. Ostensibly it concerns doctors, but it wanders off onto all sorts of subjects such as vivisection, fur ranching and such. He is, naturally enough, agin the lot of them. "I would swear fifty lies than take an animal which had licked my hand in good fellowship and torture it" says CBS, his beard quivering indignantly. "As a matter of fact, the man who once concedes to the vivisector the right to put a dog outside the laws of honour and fellowship, concedes to him also the right to put himself outside them; for he is nothing to the vivisector but a more highly developed, and consequently more interesting-to-experiment-on vertebrate than a dog." Great stuff.

I liked the first instalment of your autobiography - hope you keep on with it in future AMBLEs.

Try THE DEVIL'S DISCIPLE by Bernard Shaw (what? again?) for some interesting new views on the War of Independence. By "new", I mean not generally considered, and perhaps not considered by you before writing your comments on the whole business.

UL 5. (Metcalf again). By God, I tell you that it can be a lot cheaper to publish a fanzine than sub or write letters of comment, and it isn't a "silly excuse" at all. It's one I've used on a number of occasions and which I find is quite reasonable. You're looking at the whole matter from a Stateside point of view. Remember that it costs a British or Australian or European fan at least 25¢ to write a letter of comment on a US fanzine. If he sends a sub, it costs him 25¢ over and above the sum for postage, plus charges for issuing the money order which, in my case anyway, amount to about 30¢ or 35¢. In other words, it will cost me at least 25¢ an issue if I write a loc, and about 35¢ if I sub. However, if I publish a reasonably regular small genzine, I can work up a trade with a number of US editors, send them an issue every two months for 5¢ and stop worrying altogether. Providing you don't have to pay for professional duplication, publishing a fanzine can be a damn sight cheaper than any other form of international fanac. Of course, I personally found the system a bit hard to figure, but I put this down to matters not unconnected with my being an Australian (vide SOUFFLE I).

Don't joke about the suspicion falling upon any American who got mail from behind the Iron Curtain. Quite a few people take it seriously. Roy Tackett is one. I recall a couple of months back that he mentioned Alan Dodd's sporadic Russian correspondent, and how Alan had suggested he get in touch with him. Roy wouldn't have it on at any costs, and I gathered he felt the USMC might look down on a man who was, so to speak, conversing with the enemy.

I don't suppose you can blame Roy, because after all American officialdom appears to be the most suspicious in the world, but it just shows how things are.

ZOUNDS 6. (Lichtman). Yes, I agree about those blacked-out words in CONVERSATION 13. If publications using the excised words are available on open sale in England - I refer, of course, to ye ivied LADY CHATTERLEY'S LOVER - then why in hell should they be cut out of something else? Could be that the words are still illegal until a court case decides on the individual circumstance, hmm?

ERG 10. (Jeeves). Nice cover, Terry - I especially fancied the logo. // Page 10/11 "....I'm not in favour of any off-colour words in general circulation", whereas on page 12 "By and large, I don't think society is worth wasting time on". Er.....isn't that some kind of contradiction? If you choose to support the moral code of a society, you can hardly be dead against it. // Speaking of the first astronaut sent up from the US, have you heard Dick Gregory's bit on the subject? The Administration said it didn't know which man would be chosen to go up first - what they really meant was they didn't know which one they would be able to catch.

ENVOY 2 & 3. (Schultz). Your spoof spiel on page 4 is wild, Dick - one of the most amusing things I've seen in a while.// You don't say "one bob" - it's "a bob", rather as you would say "a nickel" or "a quarter".// "The immense sales that 'prestige' and 'intellectual' pocketbooks receive in the (American) states" don't necessarily indicate high intelligence on the part of the buyer. In TIME a few months before Christmas, there was a long article on the whole matter of "ogghed paperbacks", the conclusion of which was that many people buy the book but never read it, while those that do read it sometimes don't "get the message" because they have done no preparatory reading. Just looking around my own shelves, I can see a couple of items on which I was caught because of interesting covers and blurbs. Stendhal's THE RED AND THE BLACK in a Signet pb, for instance - according to the cover, it's a masterpiece, the first psychological novel etc etc. I found it incredibly tedious on first reading, but then somebody told me that it made more sense after one had read MADAME BOVARY and a few other slow-paced French novels. It did, and I quite enjoyed it on second reading, but not many people are going to have that kind of advice. Covers mean everything these days. People buy a book not so much on content but on outside appearance, and those designers know what will coax half a buck out of the willing consumer's pocket. Veblen's THEORY OF THE LEISURE CLASS gets a six-colour cover on the Mentor edition with a humourous "crest" (poodle and a Rolls, surmounted by a top hat, crossed cane and polo mallet) and the blurb "The challenging analysis of social conduct that ironically probes misused wealth and conspicuous consumption". On Jeans' NATURE OF THE UNIVERSE, there is the startling query "ANY RUSSIAN COULD UNDERSTAND THIS BOOK. CAN YOU?". America is the only nation which feels the need to sugar the cultural pill in this way, and consequently I tend to be a little sceptical about the value of the medicine to the patients whotake it.

ENVOY 3. (which I just woke up is edited by Ken Cheslin). I saw someplace that Kemp and O'Meara are running a "long-term project" to work out exactly what a fan is, and to this end they will be running IQ tests at the ChiCon for all those interested.// Jazz and sf fandom are quite unusual, you know, in that

they are "following fandoms" rather than "participating fandoms". I mean they are both made up of groups devoted to a particular professional movement, and most of the fans occupy themselves writing about the pros., studying the work they put out and discussing their hobby amongst themselves. Other fandoms however like model train, bird-watching, stamp-collecting etc are "participating fandoms", in which the fans are the hobby. The hobbyists do all the work; there are no pros except those that grow up because the fandom needs some kind of official organ, information exchange and bargaining place. All these "participating fandoms" are hobbies in themselves, whereas jazz and sf fandom are like auxiliaries tacked onto another sphere of interest.// That "review" of an "sf comic" in SIZAR was about two years old - maybe three. I sent it to Bruce just after he arrived in England because he said he was desperate for material, but apparently he moved from the address to which it was despatched and it has been sitting on the letter rack ever since. If I had known he was going to publish it after all this time, I'd have revised it or scrapped it altogether, but it's appearance in SIZAR was the first intimation that he had ever received it. Ah well.....

paraFANalia. (Burn). You make it hard, Bruce. About the only thing I can say about this issue is that The Wandering Ghu was fine, and your fiction was poor, two comments which I've made on a number of previous occasions. But I liked this issue of FAN a lot, if only for the good repro. and the most entertaining episode of your travel tale.

SUWAYYA 2. (Main). Swipe me! Here is yet another page duped upside down. I tell you Australians don't read their magazines any different to what you Statesiders do. Really. Believe me. // I see by your mention of a few books on Ingmar Bergman that you're a fellow admirer of this particular director. Tell me, do you know where I can get a copy of that FOUR SCREENPLAYS? One of the highbrow book clubs was advertising it in ESQUIRE a while back, but I never got around to ordering it and so missed out. If you know a bookshop across there which might have a copy, I'd be obliged for the address.

CCON and PHENOTYPE. (Ency). Interesting, but no comment.

VIPER. (Donaho) It's very difficult to make a confident evaluation of THE CATCHER IN THE RYE, so while I'll agree with you that it does seem a little devoid of worthwhile social comment, I won't go so far as to say that there is nothing of "significance" in it. Salinger can write extremely meaningful work as his earlier short stories prove - I doubt if any writer has ever managed to catch so accurately the peculiar relationship between adults and children. The wistfulness of FOR ESME WITH LOVE AND SQUALOR, those weird fantasies in THE LAUGHING MAN - admittedly most of the stories are sketches, but what incisive writing, what insight. CATCHER IN THE RYE is an extension of those early stories, a further attempt to catch the feelings of a growing child coming in unsatisfactory contact with the adult world. Holden Caulfield is one of the most believable characters in literature, and CATCHER is a full-length portrait of him - a living moving squirming adolescent startlingly like many of us during our teens. I think it's this portrait that Salinger wanted to draw, and in view of its quality I don't see why a strong story-line was needed. It's a work of art that you can appreciate as it stands. It "says" a great deal about life as it appears to an adolescent - perhaps this is why the

ideas expressed are adolescent. You could hardly expect anyone as callow as Caulfield to express worthwhile opinions about life, and if he had done so it would have been completely out of character. This is all conjecture, of course. Salinger's unwillingness to give interviews or write about his work gives one a very sketchy idea of his motives, but I have enough respect for his skill to feel that a man who can write a book like CATCHER IN THE RYE has enough intelligence to "say" something in his work, even if what he "says" isn't obvious to those who read it. It might be Joyce all over again.

"What you 'say' is still more important than 'how' you say it." Weecell, I respect your opinion, but it would be interesting to hear your reasoning. Don't you recognise writing as an art? If so, then you will be hard put to find any worthwhile critic who will say that aesthetics are not the most important consideration in art. It's nice if a book or poem or play or painting should happen to "say" something, but it isn't essential or even desirable. Quite a few fine authors have been wrecked on the conviction that they should be social critics rather than skilful writers. Some American poet (MacLeish?) said of a poem that it should be "palpable and mute" (my underscoring). He continued "A poem should not mean, but be". Fair enough.

PACKRAT. (Groves). Surely the reason "you can't get servants" (assuming you want and can afford them) is not because they were badly treated by the Victorians and Edwardians, but because this, mate, is the era of the Common Man, and people don't want to take orders. In demom knight's WORLD WITHOUT CHILDREN (SIX GALAXY SPORT NOVELS in a recent Permabook) there is a cafe in a future USA which is fabulously expensive merely because it happens to be the last place in the world employing human waiters. The food is lousy, but it costs a fortune because of the high wages the owner has to pay his waiters. Extended far enough this idea could give us a hypothetical world where being waited on was a perversion fancied by both sadists and masochists. No doubt every reliable vice den would be fitted out like a luxury restaurant where those interested could order and be ordered for high fees. Who said there were no new ideas?

MORPH. (Roles). Interesting (I mean it) but no comments come to mind.

SCOTTISSE. (Lindsay). If you can, read Aldiss's THE MALE RESPONSE - it's a classic. I'm sure he wrote it in a weekend while under the influence of something pretty potent. The writing...well, to quote one immortal phrase that sticks in the memory "...the sun was like a red swollen undropped testicle in the belly of the sky". Urk. Speaking of Aldiss, I liked his "Taking Mescaline" poem. Have you seen the December ESQUIRE? It has an article by Budd Schulberg on hallucinogen mushrooms. Apparently he trugged up into the mountains of Mexico with his wife and a friend, sought out an old witch doctor-ess and went through a whole lot of mumbo jumbo just to participate in a rite where everybody eats these special mushrooms and has visions. His wife and friend responded, seeing all sorts of strange things, but it didn't work on Schulberg at all. He just sat there all night watching his wife write on the ground and see purple snakes. Disconcerting. I guess these exotic drugs only work for people like Aldous Huxley.

MAILING COMMENTS. (Ellington) Thanks, but no comments. Like the little Patchen quote - must get Bob Smith to translate the Japanese for me.

S - E - X AND FREE LOVE!!!!!!

Now that I'm assured of everybody's attention, let me remove it from the above heading (which has absolutely nothing to do with the matter under discussion, by the way) and direct it to the questionnaire on the following pages.

It isn't a poll. Stop trying to remember if the fact that you hated your mother had any effect on you becoming a fan. There will be no need to express an opinion on what (or who) killed science fiction, and if you have any views on Kennedy's foreign policy, I'd be happier if you kept them to yourself. No, people - this is something different, radical, revolutionary. Brace yourselves - it's a SCIENCE FICTION QUIZ.

I hope that the initial shock will stop you from throwing SOUFFLE into the wastebasket for at least a few seconds, giving me time to explain that it isn't an ordinary quiz. For one thing, it's a quiz with a purpose - from the results of this and future series, I hope to get an idea of what sf and fantasy OMPAns read and have read in the past, the extent of their general knowledge in the subject....oh, and quite a few other things. It's rather difficult to tell exactly what I'll find out from the quiz until I've had a chance to see some of the answers I receive. Yes, well that's the first unusual thing about the quiz - I didn't just run through the Tuck HANDBOOK and pick ten curly questions. The second is....hold onto your hats....the second is that I'm offering a prize! I'm sure this is unprecedented in apa history - has anybody ever actually offered to give anything away before?

The prize isn't anything special, of course. I'm giving it mainly to show that I'm prepared to give up something myself in return for the work you people do on answering the questions. The prize for the highest score will be a copy of the FANTASTIC UNIVERSE OMNIBUS - new, mint in d/j and all that. Admittedly not a world-shattering masterpiece of science fiction but nevertheless a handsome hardcover US first-edition and something you would probably like to have especially when it's free. In addition, the winner can have a dozen US second-hand prozines or a dozen of British ditto, whichever he happens to prefer. These aren't rubbish - the bundle will include six ASTOUNDINGs from the 1950 - 55 period, and six b-class zines such as INFINITY, SF ADVENTURES, E&SF and the like. All in fair to good condition, and certainly a bundle of good reading if you don't happen to have a large amount of sf in your collection. The British mags will be SCIENCE FANTASYs and NEW WORLDS from the 1954-58 period. Again, good reading.

If you want to enter (and I hope everybody will), fill out the duplicate sheets enclosed with SOUFFLE 2 and mail them to me. Deadline will be May 14th. This will give me time to collate the results, advise the winner and print up a full report in SOUFFLE 3 for the June mailing. US OMPAns will have to use air-mail, but after all, this is for fandom, so hang the expense.

I hope everybody will try the quiz. If you feel your score is embarrassingly low (I'd say 20 was average, 25-30 good, anything over that damn marvellous) then don't fill in the "name" spot. But please send back the quiz, even if you don't attempt any of the questions. All I want is an honest answer. I've tried to make the quiz as entertaining as possible, and perhaps slightly informative, but basically it's a fact-finding project. So get to it. And in case you didn't note it up front, my address is Box 39, King Street Post Office, Sydney, N.S.W. Australia.

SCIENCE FICTION QUIZ.

(Distributed with 31st OIPA mailing).

Possible score is 50. Value of each question is bracketted at side.

1. These are the opening paragraphs of five well-known novels. Can you give the names of the stories and their writers. (10)

"On Earth, it would be a fearful thing to see a man chasing down the street after the skin from a human face, a thin layer of tissue blown about like a piece of paper by the wind." _____

"The stone door slammed. It was Cleaver's trademark; there had never been a door too heavy, complex or cleverly tracked to prevent him from closing it with a sound like a clap of doom. And no planet in the universe could possess an air sufficiently thick and curtained with damp to muffle that sound - not even Lithia." _____

"The creature was like an eye, a globular eye that could see in all directions, encysted in the grey, cloudy mind that called itself Alfie Strunk. In that dimness thoughts squirmed, like dark fish darting; and the eye followed them without pity." _____

"Yes, I said ghostgirls, sexy ones. Personally I never in my life saw any ghosts except the sexy kind, though I saw enough of those I'll tell you, but only for one evening, in the dark of course, with the assistance of an eminent (I should also say notorious) psychologist." _____

"The messenger rose from her chariot seat and sharply cracked her whip. The ueg, its big hands gripping the shafts, craned its long neck around, grunted its indignation, and slightly speeded up the slap-slap of its big flat feet. Many-jointed creeping things scuttled across the wet sand of the beach and slipped with small splashes into the Scarlet Sea." _____

2. Now a round on personalities in the field. (6)

Under what name does William Parker White write? _____

Who edited THE CLUB HOUSE in AMAZING? _____

What writer collaborates with Ken Bulmer on the "Kenneth Johns" articles in NEW WORLDS? _____

Who edits the American "Ace" Book series? _____

What does the "W" in John W. Campbell stand for? _____

What still-active sf writer has the longest career? _____

3. What character..... (4)

Worried whether he had blood under his nails? _____

3. (cont)

Blew a Galton Whistle under tons of Chicken Little? _____

Came all the way from Cress Village, Florida, but never did make it to the Games of the Machine? _____

Stole salt from a baker's stall while a Citizen ran Amok? _____

4. What writers authored the series dealing with these characters or groups? (6)

The Baldies. _____ Jirel of Joiry. _____

The Philosophical Corps. _____ Hek Below. _____

Solar Pons. _____ The Med Service. _____

5. Criticism is a major part of the sf field. Can you say who wrote the following comments, and on whom were they commenting? (8)

"He was full of story. He could shape a whole novel to its last two words, and make them what the whole thing was for. His was the soup spoon which thickened at the edge when it approached a man's mouth, puckered up and coldly kissed him. His was the liquor organ of the forgetful Gallagher, whose hands would stray inspired over the console and produce wondrous solutions, some potable and others belonging to the problems he couldn't remember until that deft last paragraph. His were the chill, strange, kind visitors of "Vintage Season" and in "When The Dough Breaks", whimsy-horror; and more, so much more".

By _____ About _____

"I was forced, in an agony of jealousy, to return again and again to his stories, to dissect, to pull-apart, to re-examine the bones. Whether or not I ever really discovered his secret is a moot question. It is pretty hard to dissect laughing gas with a scalpel. Wit and spontaneity are far too evasive, they are brilliant gaseous material all too soon exploded and vanished. You put your hand up, as to a pulsation of fireworks in a summer sky, cry "There!" and pull back, for even while you tried to touch the wonder it blew away."

By _____ About _____

"Despite his regrettable tendency to dime-a-dozen sensitivity, he is a good writer, wider in range than any of his colleagues, capable of seeing life on another planet as something extraordinary instead of just challenging or horrific, ready to combine this with strongly-held convictions."

By _____ About _____

"There is a part of this writer which we reject and part which we embrace. We embrace his bigness, his daring to write in billions of years. We embrace his wonderful fertility of invention which fills the planets of his universe with strange but plausible beasts and men. We embrace his piercing, endless quest

over/...

5. (cont)

for meaning. We embrace his obsession with coalescence; that is the stuff religious ceremonies, Nuremberg Party Days, sales pep meetings and family reunions are made of; we all of us at one time or another yearn to flow together. And his social criticism? We sweep it under the carpet! "

By _____ About _____

6. Below are the names of four now-defunct but once thriving prozines, and two fake names. Can you pick the ring-ins? (Strike out the fakes) (2)

Tales of Fantasy.	Space Adventures.
Wonders of the Spaceways.	Rocket Stories.
Imaginative Tales.	Stirring Science Stories.

7. What connection do you see between the following? (Besides the fact that they all write sf, of course) (1)

Idris Seabright.	Theodore Sturgeon.
J.T. McIntosh.	William Tenn.

8. The following are particularly memorable titles. Can you remember who wrote the stories to which they were attached? (6)

The Moon Is Well.	<u>J.W.C. DE.</u>	Minsky Were The Borogroves.	_____
Who Speaks Of Conquest?	_____	Shuttle Bop.	_____
Placet Is A Crazy Place.	_____	Griffle-shaped.	_____

9. What writers gave us the following peculiar creatures? (4)

The Gnurrs.	_____	The Waitabits.	<u>F.F.R.</u>
The Gnoles.	_____	The Ruum.	_____

10. These are the titles of the first published stories by now well-known sf writers. Can you name the authors? (3)

Lifeline.	_____	The Graveyard Rats.	<u>KUTNER</u>
The Pendulum.	_____		

This entry submitted by _____

Do you think this quiz was too hard-) _____ too easy-) _____ about right-) _____

Would you like to see such quizzes a regular feature? _____

If so, what suggestions would you make for future quizzes? _____

SCIENCE FICTION QUIZ.

(Distributed with 31st OAPA mailing).

Possible score is 50. Value of each question is bracketted at side.

1. These are the opening paragraphs of five well-known novels. Can you give the names of the stories and their writers. (10)

"On Earth, it would be a fearful thing to see a man chasing down the street after the skin from a human face, a thin layer of tissue blown about like a piece of paper by the wind." _____

"The stone door slammed. It was Cleaver's trademark; there had never been a door too heavy, complex or cleverly tracked to prevent him from closing it with a sound like a clap of doom. And no planet in the universe could possess an air sufficiently thick and curtained with damp to muffle that sound - not even Lithia." _____

"The creature was like an eye, a globular eye that could see in all directions, encysted in the grey, cloudy mind that called itself Alfie Strunk. In that dimness thoughts squirmed, like dark fish darting; and the eye followed them without pity." _____

"Yes, I said ghostgirls, sexy ones. Personally I never in my life saw any ghosts except the sexy kind, though I saw enough of those I'll tell you, but only for one evening, in the dark of course, with the assistance of an eminent (I should also say notorious) psychologist." _____

"The messenger rose from her chariot seat and sharply cracked her whip. The ueg, its big hands gripping the shafts, craned its long neck around, grunted its indignation, and slightly speeded up the slap-slap of its big flat feet. Many-jointed creeping things scuttled across the wet sand of the beach and slipped with small splashes into the Scarlet Sea." _____

2. Now a round on personalities in the field. (6)

Under what name does William Parker White write? _____

Who edited THE CLUB HOUSE in AMAZING? _____

What writer collaborates with Ken Bulmer on the "Kenneth Johns" articles in NEW WORLDS? _____

Who edits the American "Ace" Book series? _____

What does the "W" in John W. Campbell stand for? _____

What still-active sf writer has the longest career? _____

3. What character..... (4)

Worried whether he had blood under his nails? _____

3. (cont)

Blew a Galton Whistle under tons of Chicken Little? _____

Came all the way from Cress Village, Florida, but never did make it to the Games of the Machine? _____

Stole salt from a baker's stall while a Citizen ran Amok? _____

4. What writers authored the series dealing with these characters or groups? (6)

The Baldies. _____ Jirel of Joiry. _____

The Philosophical Corps . _____ Hek Below. _____

Solar Pons. _____ The Med Service. _____

5. Criticism is a major part of the sf field. Can you say who wrote the following comments, and on whom were they commenting? (8)

"He was full of story. He could shape a whole novel to its last two words, and make them what the whole thing was for. His was the soup spoon which thickened at the edge when it approached a man's mouth, puckered up and coldly kissed him. His was the liquor organ of the forgetful Gallagher, whose hands would stray inspired over the console and produce wondrous solutions, some potable and others belonging to the problems he couldn't remember until that deft last paragraph. His were the chill, strange, kind visitors of "Vintage Season" and in "When The Dough Breaks", whimsy-horror; and more, so much more".

By _____ About _____

"I was forced, in an agony of jealousy, to return again and again to his stories, to dissect, to pull-apart, to re-examine the bones. Whether or not I ever really discovered his secret is a moot question. It is pretty hard to dissect laughing gas with a scalpel. Wit and spontaneity are far too evasive, they are brilliant gaseous material all too soon exploded and vanished. You put your hand up, as to a pulsation of fireworks in a summer sky, cry "There!" and pull back, for even while you tried to touch the wonder it blew away."

By _____ About _____

"Despite his regrettable tendency to dime-a-dozen sensitivity, he is a good writer, wider in range than any of his colleagues, capable of seeing life on another planet as something extraordinary instead of just challenging or horrific, ready to combine this with strongly-held convictions."

By _____ About _____

"There is a part of this writer which we reject and part which we embrace. We embrace his bigness, his daring to write in billions of years. We embrace his wonderful fertility of invention which fills the planets of his universe with strange but plausible beasts and men. We embrace his piercing, endless quest

over/...

5. (cont)

for meaning. We embrace his obsession with coalescence; that is the stuff religious ceremonies, Nuremberg Party Days, sales pep meetings and family reunions are made of; we all of us at one time or another yearn to flow together. And his social criticism? We sweep it under the carpet! "

By _____ About _____

6. Below are the names of four now-defunct but once thriving prozines, and two fake names. Can you pick the ring-ins? (Strike out the fakes) (2)

Tales of Fantasy.	Space Adventures.
Wonders of the Spaceways.	Rocket Stories.
Imaginative Tales.	Stirring Science Stories.

7. What connection do you see between the following? (Besides the fact that they all write sf, of course) (1)

Idris Seabright.	Theodore Sturgeon.
J.F. McIntosh.	William Tenn.

8. The following are particularly memorable titles. Can you remember who wrote the stories to which they were attached? (6)

The Moon Is Hell. _____	Minsky Were The Borogroves. _____
Who Speaks Of Conquest? _____	Shuttle Bop. _____
Placet Is A Crazy Place. _____	Griffle-shaped. _____

9. What writers gave us the following peculiar creatures? (4)

The Gnurrs. _____	The Waitabits. _____
The Gnoles. _____	The Ruum. _____

10. These are the titles of the first published stories by now well-known sf writers. Can you name the authors? (3)

Lifeline. _____	The Graveyard Rats. _____
The Pendulum. _____	

This entry submitted by _____

Do you think this quiz was too hard-) _____ too easy-) _____ about right-) _____

Would you like to see such quizzes a regular feature? _____

If so, what suggestions would you make for future quizzes? _____