

B-roll Negative no. 2

published by Ted Johnstone for the 16th APA-L, 4 February 1965. Fornchy Pub # 88

Instead of taking things in the order they were in the mailing this time, I have one particular item I want to comment on first, and that is the reason I'm contributing to this distribution. I hope Ellie Turner gets a copy of this; if she doesn't, I may have a separate one to send her. This is, of course, an answer to her attack in GRIMALKIN #6.

Ellie: I think you are being more than a little unfair in your editorial complaining about the non-appearance of SHAGGY and the NEWSLETTER. You say you put the blame for SHAGGY's lateness entirely on me (you did in line 6), despite the fact that I only assumed editorship after a five-month hiatus and got an issue out only three weeks after receiving the material and two weeks after receiving the mailing list. I think this is pretty good, and I think the issue is remarkably well done considering the haste it was tossed together in. As for my keeping the Newsletter on a regular schedule -- how often would you like? Bi-weekly? It costs about \$8 to put out an issue. Is the club treasury currently showing a profit of \$16 a month to give the Newsletter?

Of course you say there'd be more attendees if we had a Newsletter to keep them informed of our programs and parties. Well, we haven't had any programs or parties since the last issue of the Newsletter, which advertised both the Christmas gift exchange and the New Year's Party. If you didn't get a copy, I'm sorry, but the issue was published and sent out. Our responsibility for the individual copies ceases the moment the mailbox lid closes behind them. If you missed an issue, take it up with the Post Office.

If you think we should have programs and parties to keep people interested in the club and to supply things for the Newsletter to report, may I suggest you volunteer your services as Program Committee Chairman? This would be a faster and surer way of solving the problem than simply complaining about it in APA - L, the which only a comparatively small portion of the LASFS even sees. (In point of fact, if somebody hadn't told me you were sniping at me, I probably wouldn't have seen this distribution myself.)

I GOT A PACKAGE FROM the Book-of-the-Month Club today (Wednesday 3 Feb) which I'd ordered some time ago. It arrived in the middle of this stencil, and I broke off near the end of the last paragraph to go take a look at it. That was a number of hours ago. Besides a good non-fiction book, the package contained a set of four I'd been awaiting a long-delayed reacquaintance with: the four MARY POPPINS books, by P.L. Travers.

I read these books long ago, when I was at the age they are usually assigned to, and I enjoyed them then. This afternoon and evening I leafed through, reading a chapter here and several there (each chapter is essentially complete unto itself) and it was all very real to me once again. There is a deep and peaceful beauty and drama in the stories that I was unable to see when I first read them, and I have found what only the very finest children's books have -- that quality which enables the grown child to return to them and discover the same paths he trod in childhood are not changed, and that the changes in himself have only enhanced the enchanted gardens and strengthened their magic. I can't rhapsodise in detail -- and there is no "best" one of the four books, and not even a "least" one. There are four, all different, and all Practically Perfect In Every Way, as you would expect. And I am most honored and pleased to have them now gracing my own library, where I can visit with them at my will.

MAILING COMMENTS: There seems to be an ever-increasing amount of discussion and debate on Objectivism in these pages. And it is bringing out some reactions which rather surprise me in a number of people. Most everyone is reacting about as I would've expected them to, except that a few I'm rather surprised at the sides they have chosen, and several I'm somewhat disappointed in. Boardman couldn't be an Objectivist, but I would have expected him to be able to marshal some good arguments against it; and Jack Harness has come up with some fine serious points, revealing layers to his character he usually keeps hidden. And of course I'm trying to stay out of things, which you may or may not have expected, depending on your opinion of me.

BAILES: Right! Too many people overlook the second half of the Galt oath ("nor ask any man to live his life for me") and see only greed expressed therein. // Incidentally, when did "Liberalism" become "Conservatism"? I was raised as a Democrat, but if I could get rid of the emotional block I have against the Republicans, I'd probably be over on their side. But I am not essentially political. Sam Goldwyn's description of Charles Caplin seems to apply pretty well: "His prejudice is against anything which interferes with his own personal freedom. The censor, the income tax, any supposed obstruction -- these are hateful to him to the degree to which they infringe upon that coveted sense of power."

STINE: Answer to Blackbeard logically put together -- more fool you; haven't you realised there is no place for logic in his consideration of ATLAS?

HARNESS: Your text is even better than your artwork -- possibly because I agree with it. Am I wrong, or are the anti-Randists really less logical than the Objectivists?

PATTEN: You want a Coat of Arms for APA-L? Howabout: argent: a raspberry, proper? Or do you prefer something a little less representative? // U didn't mention that the Balboa Park merry-go-round is also the only one left (as far as we know) that still has the rings you can grab for to win free rides.

Well, I've finished reading the mailing, and the above were all the comments I could find to make. And my eyes ache from the general quality of the repro. Judging from several comments this time, I'm sorry I missed Dave Van Arnam's "Zantain" piece -- it sounds like the sort of thing I would dig. Well, probably somebody around the Lab has a copy I can see.

"After we finish this disty, let's go have a little drinky-poo." ...Yuchh!

Fred Patten brought up the subject of coats-of-arms, and I guess I'll take the last few lines here on that subject. If I'd read this distribution before I started stencilling, I might've come up with a blazoning for APA-L. Heraldry is a hobby of mine -- my own family arms (no, not Johnstone) is: or, an eagle displayed gules, thereon a lymphad sails furled saltierwise with flags flying of the second, within a double tressure, flory, counter-flory of the second. The crest is described as: A hand in armour holding a cross crosslet fitchy, gules. This, as I said, is my family's official and registered arms. But besides this, I have designed my own personal arms, and one of these days, if the Hyborian Legion College of Heraldry ever gets sufficiently organised, I'll have them registered there. Unfortunately, I have neither the rank or the position to attract the recognition of the real College of Heraldry -- yet.

My own arms are blazoned as follows: Vert, a sword argent saltier with point in chief dexter, across a scroll of the second. The crest is: An Irish harp, or. And the motto is: Semper Felix. I'm not sure about the exact blazoning of the arms, especially the description of the sword, but I'll talk it over with the local pursuivant one of these times, and see if I can get it ironed out.

And that wraps it up for this time. End of page, end of zine.