

VOICE OF THE LOBSTER

4



©MMK
1979

THE VOICE OF THE LOBSTER #4

is a fanzine produced by the Noreascon II committee to encourage discussion of topics related to the running of Worldcons. Price 50¢ for a single issue, \$2.00 for all issues published (including back issues as long as we have them); at least one issue free for a published contribution. No trades as such, but we would like to see zines with material of interest to us. Send all correspondence to The Voice of the Lobster, c/o Noreascon II, Box 46, MIT Branch P.O., Cambridge, MA 02139.

Copyright 1979 by Massachusetts Convention Fandom, Inc. All rights are hereby assigned to the contributors (except for "OFFICIAL" committee-originated material, which may be freely reprinted). Everything except "OFFICIAL" material represents only the views of the contributors or the Editor (who is responsible for all unattributed material, including in particular, everything in double parentheses).

Edited by George Flynn

Mimeography by Tony Lewis

Cover by Mark Keller

TABLE OF CONTENTS

George Flynn	The Voice of the Editor	2
The Readers	The Voice of the Lobster (Letters) (Bidding Strategy, 3; The Saga of the Bal- lots, 4; Membership Rates, 4; Date of the Worldcon, 5; Children at Cons, 6; Hotel Re- lations, 6; "Planning for the Worldcon", 7; Programming (General), 7; Films, 10; Art Show, 11; Banquet vs. Award Ceremony, 12; Art Hugos, 13; Fanzine Hugos, 14; Non-Hugo Awards, 16; Hugo Voting (Miscellaneous), 18; Publishing Voting Results, 19; Worldcon Site Rotation, 19; The "World" in WSFS, 24; Other WSFS Business, 24; Worldcon Emergency Fund, 25; Miscellaneous, 25)	3
Leslie Turek	Planning for the Worldcon - Part 4 (Feb - May 1979)	27
Leslie Turek	The Boskone Art Show	36
Ellen Franklin	Excerpts from News Releases	2, 47, 48
	Addresses of Contributors	48

You are getting this zine for one or more of the following reasons: (1) You sent money (an "A" follows your name on the address label if you have a subscription to all issues). (2) You sent a letter that was printed. (3) Something of yours is referred to herein. (4) You are a member of the Noreascon II committee, and you might as well get something for it. (5) You are a newszine, a Worldcon bidding committee (poor fools), or someone else with a need to know. (6) We think you're likely to produce an interesting response (but if your label has an "X", you probably won't get any more issues unless you do). (7) You didn't do anything, but the Editor likes you anyway.

(last stencil typed 7/7/79)

The Voice of the Editor

George Flynn

You remember how VotL 3 was supposed to come out in a hurry and be mostly committee-written, but wasn't? Well, surprise: this issue is.

VotL 3 in fact took even longer than I thought when I wrote the editorial. I typed the last stencil on May 2 (two months ago today), and the final batch of stencils went to Tony Lewis the next day. However, Tony was somewhat distracted that month: at that point he'd been sick for a couple of weeks, and the following week he became a father 2 or 3 weeks ahead of schedule (Alice Naomi Sophronia Lewis, 6 lb. 8 oz.). But eventually Tony got back to the mimeo; he finished running off the last page around 2 A.M. on May 30, and we collated the issue that evening.

We still rejected the idea of switching to bulk rate, but the issue was heavy enough that we did decide to send it third class (53¢, vs. 80¢ for first class); I had all the copies in the mail by June 2 (and started getting locs four days later). By the way, as of July 2 we have 232 paid subscriptions (and I think con membership passed 2000 today). The reprint copies of #1 and #2 (both now out of print) aren't ready yet, but I'm told they should be available before Seacon.

Meanwhile, we had #4 to get out. We very much wanted to get it to people before Seacon, since so many of the topics discussed have some bearing on the business meeting. But if I had to put the whole thing on stencil, I wouldn't be getting to this editorial till a week or two from now, and the running off would take correspondingly longer. It was suggested that we switch to offset, but besides costing more this wouldn't have saved me any time in editing the lettercol. So we compromised. I closed out the lettercol early (the last letters printed were received on June 18), edited it, and put it on stencil. Meanwhile Leslie and I passed drafts of her two articles back and forth, and she fed the finished versions into her computer to prepare copy for offset printing. It looks as if we'll have the final text in hand by the end of this week, and with luck both parts of this issue should be printed and assembled soon after that.

Thus there's a fair chance that you'll get this issue by the end of July. After that? I think I can promise an issue #5 sometime in the early fall; but no commitments beyond that, until we see how the workload looks. (Not to mention the fact that I'm looking for a new job.) That'll be the first post-Seacon issue; I can't make it to the con myself, but I'll try to commission a report on the business meeting. Leslie will presumably have another installment, and there should be lots of letters (already I have three on #3 that didn't make this issue ... not to mention all the comments on our questionnaires). Looks like a fat one.

From Noreascon II News Release #6, May 30, 1979:

AGENTS Noreascon II now has an agent in France: Pascal Thomas, a French fan who was at school in the Boston area and has helped out the committee considerably over the last year. His address is:

Pascal Thomas, ENS, 45 rue d'Ulm, 75005 Paris, France

DEPARTMENT OF MISSING FANS Noreascon II is currently without addresses for the following people, who were last heard from in the cities listed:

Richard F. Dutcher, San Francisco, CA

Greg Ketter, Minneapolis, MN

Bruce Chubb Miller, Hyattsville, MD

The Voice of the Locster
(Letters)

((As indicated in the editorial, this lettercol will be somewhat truncated. Indeed, as I begin this I have yet to receive any locs from farther away than Illinois. Still, I do have one late loc on #2 and 13 on #3, and that's enough for a fair sampling of opinion. Comments by the editor are enclosed in the customary double parentheses.))

Bidding Strategy

Jan Howard Finder:

On presupporting memberships - for all psm's include in their membership packets a chit worth equal to the psm, which can be used to purchase a beverage of their choice AT the con. If the psm can't make it, then let them consider the buck or two as a donation to a worthy cause. No tiny cheques to mail, no third membership rate (tho I like the idea of a special rate for converting to attending for those fen who took the time to vote).

((But that means you have to have personalized membership packets, and to prepare a special set of them just when the workload is heaviest. Much simpler to get the whole thing out of the way early.))

Ron Salomon:

If I ever become involved with a worldcon bid I'd make sure Gary Farber would be our bidding Guru. Except I'd want to keep pre-supporting memberships, and sell stickers and such (at cost, at the most) for avid boosters who want them badly enough so some money could be recouped.

Laurie Mann:

I still think it unlikely that Noreascon could break 10,000 - and 20,000 in the next few years? Regionals and Worldcons are getting bigger, but not that much bigger. Other than this prediction, Gary Farber's remarks on Worldcons were about the most intelligent I've seen. And he really does know what he's talking about.

John Charles McCormack's idea of boosters was a good one. Why not ask people to "invest" a little money (say, \$5.00 instead of \$1.00) in pre-supporting activities? That would be a little more of a commitment on the parts of fans across the country. Perhaps the \$5.00 could later be subtracted from the memberships of those people who had supported the winning bid.

Andy Porter:

My ghod, to know that Iggy pulled in \$130,000. I think Nycon 3 ((the 1967 Worldcon)) pulled in a gross of \$15,000. We weren't even incorporated, much less a non-profit corporation. I think the only bidding expense Ted White ((the chairman)) got back from the convention was something like \$114 for the Nycon 3 shopping bags we had at Tricon, and even then people complained we were ripping off fandom.

I know I was never compensated for bidding expenses, including my trips out to Midwestcons and Westercons and Tricon. I think the first time people paid themselves back for bidding expenses on any large scale was when the L.A.Con people paid themselves back for airfare for two of their committee who went to Heidelberg...

((Maybe they were just the first to admit it? Note that we didn't compensate ourselves for trips to cons either, just for the money we contributed toward the committee's own advertising and other expenses.))

The Saga of the Ballots

Jan Howard Finder:

Don's tale ... is rather fantastic until you reflect it happened. There is no excuse for such slipshod & clumsy handling of the matter. I wouldn't be surprised if the Iggy concomm weren't liable for a lawsuit. In any case a full listing of the vote totals should be published & released at the time the winner is announced.

((Can't have a lawsuit without an injured party.))

Laurie Mann:

Don's "Saga of the Ballots" read more like a comedy of errors than anything else. I find it hard to believe that Tim Kyger made written promises to both bid committees, only to renege on them later. It's a pity you had so many problems with the ballots and the money. You were very lucky that the site-selection race wasn't closer, or else all those screwed up ballots would have been a source of great debate.

I strongly agree with Don that not only should the cities being voted for be listed on the ballots, but several of the top committee people as well. I also like his suggestion of a double-envelope system to ease "secrecy" and vote-counting problems.

((The committees are listed on this year's ballot - not surprisingly, since Don designed it. Unfortunately, some of the members are no longer the same as when the ballots went to press....))

Eva Chalker Whitley:

Your account of the ballot-handling at Iggy just goes to show that fans can even enjoy a con that's miserably run. So I wouldn't worry if things go wrong - the standard for rotten-con-running will probably be unmatched for many years...

Rom Salomon:

I thought internationally mailable "self-mailers" are sold by the P.S. under the term aerogrammes?

((You have to buy those in the country you mail them from.))

I want exact vote totals known and the mixed voting to be continued too.

John Charles McCormack:

I feel that Donald Eastlake's "The Saga of the Ballots" was very tedious and overly written. If eleven pages aren't a little much to describe a small segment of the events that happened during Iguanacon, then I don't know what is.

Membership Rates

Jan Howard Finder:

While the reg. fee is very low at SF cons in comparison to professional conf., D. West in Nabu 7 makes the telling point that most attendees at prof. conf. have their way PAID BY OTHERS. In any case I think the SF con reg. are very reasonable.

((Most but not all. I've paid my own way to American Chemical Society meetings.))

Date of the Worldcon

Mike Rogers:

Labor Day weekend is bad for me. As Laurie Mann mentioned, some universities (including mine, UT-Chattanooga) start before Labor Day. To go to NorthAmericon this year, I'll have to miss 2-3 days of school. Mid-August would be much better.

Jan Howard Finder:

Interesting, I've promoted the idea of moving the Worldcon to early in OCT. Have it on Columbus Day/Canadian Thanksgiving weekend. It is a legal 3 day holiday in BOTH countries AND it would move the Worldcon into the off or low-season for air fares, which might encourage more travellers from afar to come to N. America for the Worldcon. I, like most working men, work a 12 month year. So taking a week in OCT is no more difficult than around Labor Day. In fact, since most people like to have summer vacations, it might prove easier to get off one week in Oct, than around Labor Day. Now which Worldcon bidding comm will have the gonads to bid then?

((Well, nobody needs to announce the date before they win....))

Eva Chalker Whitley:

As I understand it, cons were rescheduled from 4th of July to Labor Day because many con hotels were empty over that weekend, and men could get low rates. Now, everyone is holding their cons then, and we're not saving anything. I'm self-employed, and you can hold the con over Christmas for all I care - except that it IS a tradition, and an 8-month lead time for nominating & voting on Hugos is probably good for the concom. And let's face it, a Hugo award can mean the difference between an author getting \$6000 on a book or \$60,000! I might point out that up till Feb. of 1978 Jack ((Chalker)) was a schoolteacher, and yet he's made every con since 1969 & quite a few between 1962 & then! I missed Worldcons all through college as PSU made no allowances for missing registration, so I know it's an inconvenience.

((From Harry Warner, Jr.'s A Wealth of Fable: "Most of the early worldcons had been held on the July Fourth portion of the calendar. During the 1950's, worldcons were scheduled consistently over the Labor Day weekend, when the summer rush had begun to dwindle at big city hotels, resulting in a better chance of striking a good financial bargain with their management as worldcon budgets inflated. The switch to Labor Day was also influenced by that holiday's guarantee of a long weekend for almost all employees and by the higher probability of lower temperatures in an era when air conditioning wasn't as ubiquitous in all hotel rooms." I believe hotel rates are still generally lower on Labor Day than earlier in the summer - though not as low as they'd be in October, granted.))

Ron Salomon:

I didn't comment on the date of the con because any time between say, May to October can potentially be a miserably hot and humid time (with the added "spice" over Miami's lousy labor-day climate that you can't depend on a 4 o'clock monsoon at 4 daily in Boston) so that's no reason to change dates, and as for jobs and school, you can always lie and say your great-

aunt is planning a slow death and you're expecting her to want you at her death-bed so she can sell you her valuables, or some other ~~like~~ excuse to take a few days off. After all, otherwise why would anyone go to Boston for labor-day weekend? Not to have a good time, no no no. And considering that labor-day is a paid holiday to some folk the \$ bite is soothed a bit.

Children at Cons

Mike Rogers:

The children situation also varies according to how much local publicity you do. Some Southern cons do little if any local publicity, and so draw few fringe-fan children. (Fannish children aren't any problem. They're a bit rowdy sometimes, but so are the "adults".)

Hotel Relations

Laurie Mann:

John Charles McCormack's hotel comments makes it clear he doesn't know much about how the Sheraton works. Actually, Boston area fans are very lucky to have such an excellent hotel to work with.

John Charles McCormack:

While you did quote me in full and with no sentences taken out of context to distort the meaning, I feel that I did not make my feelings clear on the subject and would like you to know why I am disillusioned by the hotels chosen by recent Worldcon Committees. I am a frequent traveler on both business and pleasure and expect that which I have paid for without unreasonable delay. Most hotels, airlines, and restaurants are in business to please their customers and make every effort to live up to your expectations, but hotels hosting conventions seem to feel that they are to be excused for the rudeness of their staff and the sudden change in what is considered normal service just because there is a convention. As conventions are the backbone of hotel business, and the hotel did not have the convention unexpectedly thrust upon them (indeed they actively sought our business), it behooves them to see that their guests are treated in the courteous and helpful manner that a paying customer deserves. As for my personal experiences with hotels during conventions that led to my disillusionment, suffice to say that I have been mugged once, had my room broken into three times, had previously made special arrangements (regarding my need as a diabetic) for a refrigerator to hold my insulin ignored, and once went into diabetic coma while a hotel operator put me on hold for what was later found to be sixteen minutes; I think that this list (every incident of which happened at a SF con in the hotel hosting the con) is sufficient to explain my determination not to be placed in similar circumstances again.

Mike Rogers:

As to hotel relations, my impression is that even luxury hotels will be lenient if they have a full house.

"Planning for the Worldcon"

Jan Howard Finder:

Leslie article: Whether done the NESFA way or not, her articles should be must reading for any group ~~and enough~~ determined to bid for a worldcon. (I also recommend the articles in the MAC-PR's and PB.)

Re overseas mailings! Once more into the fray. Any concon should make a determined effort to find a conscientious fan at an APO/FPO located in Europe and Australia. The cost reduction in mailing via Parcel Air Lift (PAL - parcel post rate, plus \$1.00 goes air) is worth offering said fan a free membership & a room for two at the con hotel. For not only will there be a savings in money, but in the case of Hugo (Nominating) Ballots & Site Ballots, a huge savings in time. The apparent ignorance of international postal rates by past worldcon comm. is appalling. There is no excuse.

. ((If anyone knows of a suitable candidate for this job....))

Ron Salomon:

Perhaps you could poll people on the subject of releasing the mailing list and "flag" their names. I get very little junk mail and am always interested in seeing what the day's mail brings. Besides, with 90¢/gallon fuel oil threatened for next winter I'm sure fen's fireplaces will gladly accept any and all paper contributions. And as long as things are monitored I'd feel safe having my N&A circulated.

((No way. We have quite enough things to do already in processing membership mail without adding another category to flag. Besides, about 90% probably wouldn't bother to respond to the poll.))

Laurie Mann:

I don't object to getting "junk mail" because my name has been on other mailing lists. What I object to is when other lists arbitrarily change my name. For example, I recently got a piece of junk mail addressed to "Mrs. James Mann." I never use that phrase, and am mad that junk mailers would pervert someone's name like that. Once, a few years ago, when I was stupid enough to send a fannish couple something under a sexist form of address, she got mad at me, and I don't blame her at all. Whenever mailing lists are sold, it should be made clear to the purchaser that the names should not be changed at all.

((Probably it was Jim's name, not yours, that got "perverted": I've gotten similar junk mail addressed on speculation to my (nonexistent) wife. It costs too much for changing names on an individual basis to be worthwhile.))

Eva Chalker Whitley:

You're not guilty of this, but I decided (for social reasons) that I would not change my last name but my middle name. Hence, my name is Eva Chalker Whitley, NOT Eva Whitley Chalker. Just think of me as an unpublished Gothic novelist!

Programming (General)

Avedon Carol:

As a smoker, of course, I'm especially concerned about the idea of having smoking sections. In the past, I have generally seen this handled stupidly, probably because it was handled by non-smokers, most of whom apparently don't understand how smoke works. Evelyn C. Leeper suggests having smokers consistently seated on the left (or right, or whatever) side of the room, but that isn't a great idea. Smokers should always be seated closest to the doors or windows, so that the smoke can pass out of the room without having to go through the non-smokers. And the sections should be very clearly posted - none of this bullshit with someone announcing which side is which after everyone has already been seated, so that we all must

shuffle around again. In cases where the doors are at the front of the room, of course, it would be unfair to reserve the front rows for smokers (or conversely, if the doors are at the back of the room, to make smokers sit in back), and in this case it would be fine to arbitrarily designate the left side for smokers. In any case, don't forget to put the ashtrays only on the smoking side (and place them in abundance), as heavy smokers are in the habit of heading for the first ashtray when entering a room.

((I must admit I can think of only one smoker on our committee. Unfortunately, hotel function rooms tend not to have openable windows (air conditioning, you know), and the doors are often closed to shut out external noise.))

Jack Chalker:

Didcon II's pocket program fit in your pocket. I'm pretty proud of it since it did list all the programming, special functions day by day, and even included a hotel plan (and the Sheraton-Park's no worse than its sister the Sheraton-Boston).

((We've looked at all the pocket programs over the last decade, and will try to come up with the best combination of features.))

Jeanne Gomoll doesn't seem to understand the basic problem with feminist programming - like all the other "obligatory" panel topics it always involves the same people saying the same things. Now, if Avedon & Ms. Gomoll want to suggest specific new and fresh panel topics with a feminist slant I have no objection; otherwise the "women in SF" panel is as valid and relevant as a panel on "Where Do You Get Those Crazy Ideas" or Lin Carter on swords and sorcery. Anybody who's been to 2 or more cons can write the complete text....

((But don't forget there are always people who haven't "been to 2 or more cons". However, we welcome programming suggestions, fresh or otherwise, from anybody.))

I think an Auction Bloch's a fine idea although I thought it overdone at Lunacon. Those writers/artists/etc. who think it's demeaning will not participate - it's strictly volunteer. Give Tony ((Lewis)) and me 50 minutes and about 20-25 appealing pros and I think we can do a really nice Auction Bloch on a worldcon scale.

Jeanne Gomoll:

As for track programming of feminist items, ... ((at the last three Worldcons)) there seemed to be a large number of people interested, enough that I think at least a few of the programs should not be considered small special interest attractions. With the right people they can easily become big items. However, for the most part, track programming seems a reasonable idea. From what I've seen, it does tend to attract a large percentage of people who are interested in and active in feminist issues, both the people publicly identified through fanzines and letter columns and organizations with feminism and the people new to fandom but with many ties to feminism in non-fannish circles. Making connections with these new fans - in terms of getting them involved with Janus and overcoming their preconceptions of fandom - has been most enjoyable for me. Other people that come to the programming are a good percentage of uninvolved but interested persons. And yes, hecklers too, but I think the number of those is influenced neither by the kind or arrangement of programming - and they seem to have been handled easily by those involved with the panels.

Ron Salomon:

Is anyone planning to put on a play? There are a bunch of past fan-written plays from previous cons I'd love to see for the 1st time, so it needn't be a new original effort.

((Well, we'll listen to any proposals. But anyone who did this would have to bring in their own whole production crew: our own people will be too busy on other things.))

Eva Chalker Whitley:

Tell Frank Olbris that a lot of 1979 books will be out of print by Labor Day 1980 - if Fancylopedia II is still in print from us ((Mirage Press)) by then, I will be miserable.

Laurie Mann:

Frank C. Olbris's idea about a book room is a good one. One way to "simplify" this idea might be to ask book publishers to send cardboard display covers to the con, and have someone set them up around the room. I sort of doubt that all 104 publishers would contribute, but the bigger ones - Del Rey, Bantam, Pocket Books, Ace, and so on - almost undoubtedly would.

((But they're more interested in plugging their forthcoming books than the ones that came out a year before. Anyway, Frank Olbris tells us he's looking into the idea further, so we'll see what comes of it.))

I agree with David S. Bratman's programming comments. Although your programming will be extremely varied, it would be worthwhile to not schedule similar program items against one another. What is the sense of having a panel discussing new women SF writers against a Joan D. Winge reading?

George Fergus (a late loc on #2):

Although you see "a clear dichotomy between the people who want less programming so they can see everything, and those who want an umpteen-ring circus", I do not see the various suggestions as being at all incompatible. Since you apparently classified my remarks as favoring an n-ring circus, let me set you straight.

One of the main reasons I suggested that similar program items take place in the same room was to eliminate exactly what Avedon Carol complained about - the programming of two events in the same general category at either the same time or directly following each other at opposite ends of the convention facilities. This sort of thing has happened at just about every worldcon I've attended in the last few years.

My second reason was to allow better allocation of function rooms. Except for certain guaranteed draws like an interview with Harlan, it is rather difficult to estimate the size of crowd any program item will draw. No matter how carefully you estimate beforehand, you will probably find on the first day of the con that some types of programming draw bigger crowds than you expected, and some draw smaller crowds. At this point you can probably look over the remaining days of programming and figure out which items are liable to overflow the rooms they are scheduled for, and which ones will be nearly empty.

Unfortunately, trying to re-allocate function rooms at this stage is a rather difficult juggling act, unless the programming has been arranged in the way I suggested, in which case you need merely announce something like: All "B" program items (fantasy and genre SF), have been moved from

the Vermilion Room to the Indigo Room in order to handle the large crowd of Trekkies; "D" items (writing and publishing), previously scheduled for the Indigo Room, will now be held in the 9th floor corridor by the drinking fountain.

Yet another reason for segregating the programming is so that a separate person can be put in charge of each category. (It's rather hard to find a single individual who knows how to put together the most interesting feminist panels and good hard-science panels as well.) ... I envision a situation where the person who planned the panels can actually be there to make sure things run smoothly, and also be able to sit down and enjoy the fruits of their labors rather than having to dash off somewhere else every minute.

((This particular decision is best made on the basis of the number of competent people available.))

And speaking of dashing off, I also thought it would be desirable to allow people to sit and talk for a while after a panel rather than having to dash off to attend a similar panel somewhere else. It is a lot easier to strike up a conversation with people you don't know if you have a common interest, instead of encountering people at random later on at a crowded party. ... There should be large gaps between program items to allow people to socialize and to allow the occasional "hot" discussion to run over its allotted time for up to an hour without disrupting anything. Also, starting times for the different areas should probably be staggered to make it easier for people who are interested in more than one type of programming. ...

((At recent Boskones there's been an "overflow room", a smaller room close to the main-program room to which people wishing to continue the discussion can repair after each panel or talk. This serves much the same purpose as your suggestion, while freeing the larger room for a new item on a different subject. But it all depends on what space you have available.))

If you are correct that "the main utility of the Meet-the-Pros party is for people who want to see what a lot of pros look like without investing much time" ((this was in a letter to George)), then I still think that autograph sessions like those at Iggycon are better. It is difficult at a Meet-the-Pros event to get close enough to see the people when they're being introduced, to find them later for a close-up view, or even to hear their names being announced over the din of the crowd. With autograph sessions, on the other hand, you simply make a note of which time your favorite pros are scheduled for, and then dash by for a quick peek sometime during the hour each pro is "on duty". No standing in line, no big crowd to push through, no peering at nametags.

((As you will have seen in PR2, we do not intend to have a conventional Meet-the-Pros party. Autograph sessions are among the possible alternatives.))

Films

Laurie Mann:

I've still never seen Rocky Horror..., but agree with Evelyn C. Leeper that it might be a nice idea to be able to hear the dialogue. One solution to this problem would be that if you decide to show Rocky Horror, have an afternoon showing one day, and an evening showing the next. Before the afternoon showing, make it clear that yelling, screaming, and

throwing toast around will not be tolerated. After the evening show, where "play-acting" would be allowed, make sure to schedule a half-hour clean-up session, preferably encouraging those attending to clean up after themselves.

((Of course, it would be simpler not to show it at all.))

Doug Hoylman:

... Why not have two showings at the con: one for the cultists to whoop it up, the other for people who want to see and hear the thing under reasonably normal moviegoing conditions. ...

Jack Chalker:

Evelyn C. Leeper has a valid point in noisy film attendees but it is unsolvable. The fact is we can't keep a huge crowd of fans quiet in a dark hall. It just can't be done if they want to do it.

((Now here's my plan: show it on closed-circuit TV, so you can be as quiet as you like in the privacy of your own room. However....))

James R. Madden:

I would like to see Rocky Horror in a quiet audience screening and I would like to see it with full audience participation and I would like to attend the Hugo awards. That would seem to indicate to me that you should show it at least three times with appropriate restrictions, but, as rumor would have it, I think that 20th Century-Fox has withdrawn the film from the general rental market; too bad.

Ron Salomon:

I don't want audience participation or heckling in the film room but I wouldn't want to see a complete ban on cheers and applause (in moderation at the appropriate times) and strong-arm "ushers" either. And I would like to (finally) see RHPS (and Phantom of the Paradise too and etc. and etc, of course).

Art Show

Laurie Mann:

I think that, without a "valid" definition of pro/fan artist, that self-definition is the best way to handle that distinction. Recently, a woman planning an art show told me she felt pro artists would be insulted if they displayed their art in the same room with fan artists. I assured her I wasn't aware of this ever happening. In fact the art in ((a recent con's)) art show which I felt was the poorest quality, was badly matted, and probably shouldn't have been let in the art show in the first place was by a professional artist!

((By the way, the "ASFS" on p. 35 of VotL 3 was a typo for "ASFA", the Association of Science Fiction Artists.))

Jeanne Gomoll:

At the last WisCon an art show panel turned into a mini-workshop because the few people who showed up for it turned out to be planning their group's first art show and needed some step-by-step instructions on how-to. I wonder if some sort of pamphlet might not be successfully compiled and distributed through fandom talking about basic art show set up, suggested percentages (as differing with the size of the con), security and bookkeeping preparation, etc. Maybe some continued record of awards made to fan

artists could be kept in this way. So that each group is not continually forced to reinvent the wheel, etc.

((Leslie's article in this issue is a partial response to this.))

Banquet vs. Award Ceremony

George Fergus:

Although I dislike banquets on general principles, I've also found that banquet rooms have a tendency to get overheated when crowds pour into them to hear the awards presentations. The auditorium ceremonies at MAC and Iggycon were the only ones where I still felt comfortable at the end.

Jan Howard Finder:

While for many regionals, my NOVACON 9 (WEST) included (had to get a plug in here somewhere), a banquet is a needed means to offset facilities costs, apparently this is not the case for Worldcons. Hence, due to high cost & lack of space, I'd go with the idea of omitting them; the genre/special author luncheon/dinner sounds like a possible way for fen together.

((I think the significant variable is the hotel rather than the size of the con; we never have a banquet at Boskones either. As previously indicated, it's fairly certain that we won't be having a banquet. But this discussion may still be of use to others, of course.))

The awards should be done auditorium style. However, nice (?) clothes do not prestige giveth.

Ron Salomon:

I still hope a banquet or some sort of sit-down meal can be put on the agenda. To cut costs, how about kicking around the idea of: a late breakfast? checking area restaurants for group limitations, menu and price comparisons as opposed to catering in the Sheraton/Pru - perhaps there's somewhere suitable within walking distance, or having Ronald McDonald or the Burger King personally deliver.... Well, it's the thought that counts.

((For several thousand people???! Insane idea.))

I've never been to a banquet where they served enough food, but I can't think of any where the food was bad - maybe I don't eat enough junk food to spoil my palate? But Iggy's \$15 tab was a bit hard to swallow. ((Seacon is charging \$10 plus tax.)) Somebody besides me likes banquets - they did sell out all 1200 or so seats at Iggy, didn't they? Were they all Harlan groupies?

But in the case of an assembly-hall Hugo ceremony, yes by all means make it a "show". And specific seating please to avoid runs inside and lines outside. The seats could be mixed and given randomly either singly or in groups of 2, 3 or whatever so everyone and not just the fleet-of-foot and strong-of-bladder have a fair chance at a "good" seat.

((That would be rather hard on groups (larger than 2 or 3) that wanted to sit together; and do you realize how much effort it would be to randomize all those tickets? More to the point, there are 5000 seats in the auditorium. There's simply no justification for taking on the hassles of reserved seating when you aren't likely to have enough of a crowd to fill the hall. Those of us who ran the Iggy masquerade successfully resisted giving out tickets, for just this reason, and in fact the auditorium wasn't filled. (Note that the Phoenix auditorium had only 2800 seats, and that there were 4-5000 people at the con.))

Mike Rogers:

PLEASE give the Hugos at an awards ceremony and skip the banquet. The cost of a food function just doesn't match up with the quality of the food. And as many people as possible should be able to see the Hugos being given out.

Jack Chalker:

Harry Andruschak is wrong to put the pro awards first. The Best Novel is like the Best Picture; it comes last. Lester del Rey read the awards out of their logical order at Toronto and pity the poor fan recipients when half the hall cleared or was milling about talking while the fan Hugos were yet to be given - because most of the people in that awards ceremony audience are interested in the pro awards. One would suspect also that the Toastmaster's spiel would come first, wouldn't it?

Eva Chalker Whitley:

I rather like Jeanne Gomoll's suggestion of having clips, readings, etc. for the Hugo awards. Our awards ceremonies lack the touch of show-biz... To move down the page, Paul K. Abelkis is crazy when he suggests fen dress up for the Hugo awards. I wore my wedding dress (note: not a wedding gown!) to the Hugos last year, and damn near broke my neck managing it. And Iggy was in the middle of a cross-country, month-long honeymoon, and keeping the dress in good shape was a headache. Ghod knows what it would have been like if we had had two other people with us!

Laurie Mann:

When Jim and I attended the MAC Hugo Awards, we did dress up because we felt it was a big occasion. People who attended in shorts (even if they were wearing tails) and T-shirts didn't particularly bother me. Let people express their opinion of the awards ceremony however they want.

Avedon Carol:

I'm astonished at the suggestion that one cannot be honored by people who are dressed casually. As far as I can tell, none of the nominees or winners in any category has ever felt slighted by the non-black tie atmosphere of the awards - they were just happy if they won. I'd also like to point out that tuxedos have never been enough to make musicians value the Grammy - we'd all rather have gold albums, preferably bought by kids in blue jeans. Anyroad, I'm damned if I'm going to pack the sort of clothing that needs to be kept ironed, for a worldcon. Besides, women's dress clothing doesn't have pockets, and I refuse to wear it.

Art Hugos

Laurie Mann:

Mike Glycer's proposal that separate art Hugos only be for published pieces is an intelligent suggestion. After all, pieces of art, whether they've been published or not, are eligible for winning prizes at convention art shows. Many works of art are displayed at some conventions year after year. Without the publishing requirement, would it be fair for the same piece of art to be eligible year after year?

((No, but nobody's proposing to do it that way. Not that it matters: I don't think anything that hadn't been published would have a prayer of winning anyway.))

Rebecca Jirak's "portfolio" suggestion is certainly interesting but it's totally impractical. Maybe future publishing houses might consider

publishing a "Best of the Year" art book, much like the "Best of the Year" fiction books.

George Fergus:

The current proposal unnecessarily combines two innovations - giving awards for individual pieces of artwork, and giving separate awards for color artwork and black&white. If the former turns out to be unworkable, then the latter (which is a good idea in its own right) will likely be lost in the shuffle, or at least postponed for many more years.

Eva Chalker Whitley:

I've seen it suggested by an artist (don't remember who, tho') that the pro art category be changed to "Outstanding Achievement in SF & Fantasy Art". Discussion please? (And remember, this is not MY idea - I'm just passing it along.)

Mark L. Olson:

I like the purpose behing having the art Hugos awarded to individual pieces, but it is obviously impractical to do that. How can I possibly make an informed choice on individual pieces? I can't even remember what art I've seen without at least a small picture and who's going to pay for that?

((While this discussion has been going on, we put a full-page notice in Seacon PR3 asking for individual-piece nominations to test the idea. Out of Seacon's 3000-plus members, Jim Hudson has received about half a dozen nominations - including those from members of the committee! This does not bode well for the idea....))

Fanzine Hugos

Andy Porter:

Jeanne Gomoll talks printing without knowing much about it. Permit the (former) advertising production manager of a number of magazines with circulations from 10,000 to 180,000 to say that the web press that prints the local village newspaper is far different from the web that prints a magazine. On the small webs that are the size of a car, 1500 is an economical run. For a magazine, the smallest economical run is about 15,000, though this figure changes as prices of paper, inks, labor and machinery shift about. Ten years ago, the lowest economical run on a commercial web was about 40,000. Incidentally, when ALGOL was dittoed I was running 275 copies; I have gotten as high as 500 copies from one master. I understand during World War II propaganda flyers, destined to be dropped over Europe, were printed by mimeo in runs of 10,000+.

Jack Chalker:

It's very possible to get 200 copies out of a good ditto and up to 20,000-30,000 by mimeo (with an electrostencil, for example) - take it from someone who has done both. And it's possible to have an economical offset zine with low circulation - paper masters rarely last more than 600 copies, 1000 tops. We'd better face a couple of facts: (1) there is no solution to the fanzine Hugo problem, and (2) except for a few rare cases (and almost always when the worldcon was a small one for the exceptions) only fanzines with large circulations have ever gotten nominated. Look back at the early winners.... Zines like Xero, Warhoon, Fanac, and Amra, to name 4, all up there winning - all the zines with the biggest circulations. My fanzine was nominated in 1963 - but Mirage that previous year topped 1000 in circulation, larger than the con attendance that year. And I lost to Xero. There's a simple fact: Hugo nominations go to the fanzines who get

the most nominations, and the larger the circulation the more people have seen a fanzine and will nominate it. That's simple. It's also impossible to get around without abandoning democracy and the popular vote.

I do not, however, think the fan Hugos should be abolished. To do so would be to turn the Hugos into popular-vote Nebulas and lose sight, at least the ambiance, of the fact that the Hugos are all fan awards.

George Fergus:

I've got to agree with you that Jeanne Gomoll's proposal of limiting fanzine eligibility to those with a circulation under 1500 is unworkable in practice. The mimeographed issues of Dick Geis's ALIEN CRITIC in 1974-75 had print runs of 3000. And even if you could enforce a 1500-copy limit, I don't see how this really solves the problem. It is still unfair to have a 1500-copy zine competing against a 300-copy zine for an audience of approximately 1000 voters. Indeed, one can make the argument that only fanzines with over 1500 circulation should be eligible, as these are the only ones accessible to the entire WSFS voting membership.

((This would probably happen automatically if more people nominated.))

The resistance to the idea of letting large-circulation fanzines take over the Fanzine Hugo appears to come only from a vociferous minority - the fewer than 100 people who bother to vote for the FAAn awards. They fail to recognize that zines such as ALGOL and SFR fill a definite need that is simply not covered by the prozines, which are still primarily concerned with publishing fiction (or, as with OMNI, speculative non-fiction). The only legitimate complaint about the large-circulation fan magazines is that there are too few of them to be worth giving awards to. But when you add up all the ALGOL/STARSHIP-type zines and the STARLOG-type zines, you may find that there are a sufficient number to make choosing the year's best a worthwhile endeavor.

((Wait a minute, I'm one of those "fewer than 100", and I agree with you.))

P.S. If you limited fanzine eligibility to under-1500 circulation, how would you redefining the other fan categories - make any fan writer ineligible who has appeared in a zine with over-1500 circulation. If you don't, then this writer has an unfair advantage.

And again, concerning the Best Fan Writer award, if you try to eliminate people like Dick Geis from eligibility, all you do is make it more evident that an award should be instituted for all those excellent writers (including those in the prozines) who write about SF.

Ron Salomon:

As a fanzine fan I have for a couple of years been thinking unsuccessfully on "prozing" the fan(zine) Hugos. The latest nominees to me are an encouraging lot, and an all-United Kingdom cast may sweep the trio of awards (what a prediction!) given at Seacon. Whether this promising performance will continue, I dunno. But you have convinced me, George, that numbers alone aren't the answer. Now will someone tell me what is?

((Have you considered the possibility that there is no answer?))

In the meantime, wouldn't it help to send the FAAn nominating and voting flyers out with Worldcon PR's, with the FAAns supplying the paper and chipping in for part of the postage, hoping that increased voting fees would cover the costs and increased participation would boost the awards. And supplying an address for a fanzine directory (is there already one?) or a

servicezine like Brian Earl Brown's WoFan (Whole Fanzine Catalog) would enlighten the con-fandom masses.

((Well, I'll oblige here. WoFan is probably the best comprehensive guide to current fanzines, and is available for 40¢ (5/\$2) from Brian Earl Brown, 16711 Burt Rd. #207, Detroit, MI 48219. (This is an unsolicited testimonial, and has no relation to the fact that Brian just called VotL the most important fanzine in years.)-- As for the FAAns: (1) the overwhelming majority of Worldcon members wouldn't be eligible to vote; (2) they're chronically short of money, and more voters wouldn't change this much; (3) those who run them have in the past expressed distaste for any association with the Hugos (a place in the Iggy Hugo-awards ceremony was offered and declined).))

Non-Hugo Awards

Jan Howard Finder:

As for the non-Hugo awards, except for the John Campbell Award for Best New Writer, ALL the rest should be done away with at the Hugo Awards Ceremony. If need be, I'd even scrap the JCA as well. If a Worldcon wishes to begin a Hugo for Best New Writer, fine, otherwise leave the Hugo Award Ceremony for Hugos & Hugos alone.

Laurie Mann:

I can understand the various objections against the Gandalf Awards. But how can SF fans really complain about the Campbell Award? It is, after all, for a new science fiction or fantasy writer. Furthermore, despite all the complaints about the "non-Hugos", I've yet to hear any complaints about the Big Heart or other special awards? Are these Hugos or not?

George Fergus:

Laurie Mann asks, "Since most SF fans do read fantasy, what's the problem?" The problem is that McCaffrey's White Dragon has been nominated for both the Hugo and the Gandalf this year. In order for the presence of the Gandalfs on the Hugo ballot to make sense, you'd have to amend the WSFS constitution to exclude fantasy from Hugo award eligibility. Then you'd have to add a bunch of new Gandalfs to give shorter works of fantasy a chance at awards. Then the Gandalfs for best fantasy fanzine... Will someone please tell me why Gandalfs aren't voted on by the membership of the World Fantasy Convention? Why is there a Gandalf for Grand Master of Fantasy but no Hugo for GM of SF? Should there be a Campbell Award for best new writer of fantasy? You might point out that the Gandalf for best novel received fewer nominations than any other category on this year's Hugo nomination ballots. (This includes the fan categories.)

((Well, it had the lowest maximum number, but the total number of nominations in each category hasn't been announced; there may just have been a greater scatter. And note that the second lowest was the short story Hugo.))

Ron Salomon:

Now that it is evident that there is such resistance among fans to the Gandalfs, how do we say "thanks but no thanks" to Lin Carter? ... ((I)) am surprised ((he)) hasn't publicized any refuting statement anywhere as to why ride the Hugos' coattail, now that he seems to be alone in his quest to have 'em there.

((This is not evident. It's too early to say anything definite, but as of this writing the first batch of questionnaires returned are

appreciably more favorable to the non-Hugo awards than the people who've been writing to VotL - who aren't unanimous either....))

Mark L. Olson:

I think the Gandalf for fantasy novel is an excellent addition to the Worldcon awards, but I doubt the point of the Grand Master of Fantasy award. There are so many deserving people that it hardly seems sensible to award just one a year. The Campbell award is also a very useful addition to the list. In fact, I think the Hugos could take a lesson from it. The Campbell award covers work done over a two-year period, the Hugos only cover work published in the preceding calendar year. It appears to me that a book that is published only in hardback late in the year is just about excluded from the Hugos. Most fans seem to get their books as paperbacks or from the Book Club, so if a book isn't out in pb or bookclub by a couple of months before the Hugo nomination ballots, it is unlikely to get a Hugo no matter how good it is. A two-year eligibility period would greatly limit this as well as making it easier to vote when there are two really good items up.

((And would a book that won in the first year be eligible again? If not, the next year you'd be in effect voting on "Best of Two Years Except for X". And as your last sentence implies, the vote would also be distorted by people voting X over Y not because it's better, but because Y has another chance.))

Jack Chalker:

What I object to most in the GandalFs is that they are now plural; there is simply no purpose served by a best-novel Gandalf, and it has a bad effect on the Best-Novel Hugo (witness Anne McCaffrey, who this year is competing with herself and may lose a very valuable Hugo). Since nobody can give a good, solid definition of the difference between fantasy and SF, it's an idiotic award. The Grand Master I don't mind so much except that we're just gonna wind up shortly with the same people winning it year after year - we're running low on genuine grand masters.

((Well, there's always "No Award" - though they left it off the ballot for this year's non-Hugo awards. (And I thought nobody was eligible more than once.) -- I agree on the difficulty of distinguishing fantasy from SF; I was just looking at the nominees for this year's Gandalf, Balrog, and British Fantasy Awards (all in Locus 221), and all the lists contain novels I consider SF, not fantasy.))

As to why the Gandalf cheapens the Hugos, not only see above but also please realize that the Hugo is an internationally recognized award even to the mundane world, with an enormous value not only in sentiment to the recipient but also to the pros (and sometimes the fan artists) worth an enormous amount of money. Winning one can mean \$50-100,000 and a tremendous career boost, and can also propel a fan artist immediately into the pro ranks.

((So much for the comments on this issue. Since we have to make a decision on it in time to prepare the Hugo nomination ballot (which goes out with PR3), we should have something definite to announce by the time VotL 5 comes out.))

((What follows is my personal opinion, and in no way represents the view of the committee; No matter what we decide, it won't be binding on future Worldcons. I find this situation unsatisfactory, and would like to see it tied down. I suggest that those who feel strongly on

either side of the issue might do well to submit motions embodying their views to the Seacon business meeting - either to formally authorize some or all of these awards to appear on the Hugo ballot, or to ban them from it. I'd prefer either to what we have now.))

Hugo Voting (Miscellaneous)

Mark L. Olson:

I quite agree with the comments that there are too many awards, but not that there are too many Hugos. The problem lies in having in addition the Nebulas, the Jupiters, the Pilgrims, the Balrogs, the GandalFs, and several more whose names don't come readily to mind. SF has become a varied field: to try to limit the Hugos to a half dozen wouldn't serve anyone well. If I were arranging the categories today, I think I'd be inclined to go along with the idea of three magazine categories: prozines, semi-prozines, and fanzines (maybe with different names). I would, however, let the voters decide which category the zine belongs in, with the editor being able to move to a larger category only. I have my doubts about needing both novella and novelette categories, but I can't get too worked up about that.

I see no reason to add "No Preference" to the ballots as JJJ Wilson suggests - if you have no preference, just don't vote. I don't think it is at all bad when No Award wins; in fact, I think it should win more often. It is a rare year when I don't vote No Award first in at least one category. His suggestion of some sort of weighted voting based on familiarity sounds like a complicated solution to a non-problem. The Hugo is a fan award. It is a popularity contest, and that's what it should be. Let the Nebulas worry about the greatest piece of literature winning, I'll continue to vote for stuff that I liked. I seriously doubt that there is all that much of a real problem with unqualified voting - in any event, it should largely average out.

((The last published voting figures were for 1971 and 1972. In neither year did No Award get as many as 15% of the first-place votes in any category (with Fan Writer the highest both times).))

George Fergus:

James Wilson strongly suggests the addition of "no preference" to all categories. Can you tell me what advantage this has over simply leaving the lines blank on the items you haven't read? I also fail to see how David Gerrold's proposal of numerical ratings will keep people from rating items they haven't read. Does David know why people rate things they haven't read? Maybe they think they have good reasons, and would use the same reasons to make up numerical ratings. Have you ever thought of the profound and incredibly original idea of printing "Please do not mark a rating for an item you have not read" on the ballot? I mean, is there some subtle factor I am missing in this discussion?

((Yes: history. At the Torcon (1973) business meeting, Mike Glicksohn and Richard Labonte moved that "The final ballot shall also include the following message: PLEASE DO NOT VOTE IN CATEGORIES IN WHICH YOU ARE NOT FAMILIAR WITH A MAJORITY OF THE NOMINEES." In spite of being amended to specify that this wouldn't affect a ballot's validity, it lost. Don't ask me why; I voted for it.))

Jack Chalker:

I'd like to know where you get the 1000-people-voting-in-every-category

figures. Last I heard from Iggy, the fan awards were in the 500-600 class while Best Novel was almost 1200.

((From the Iggy press release (the figures from which appeared in both Locus and File 770). 1246 ballots were cast, with the votes in individual categories ranging from 1220 (Dramatic) down to 868 (Fan Artist); Best Novel had 1130.))

Publishing Voting Results

Jan Howard FINDER:

I'm all for publishing the final tallies on the voting for the Hugos. What the hell, so what if someone loses out by one vote. That's life in the big time. It might be a means to get publishers to publicize & push their authors' books.

Mark L. OLSON:

I can't understand why there is a question at all. Of course the results should be published. I can hardly conceive of an author who would be dishonored by being rated the 5th best author in his category one year. If there is such a person, he can always withdraw. Just whose awards are they, anyway?

Jack CHALKER:

Laurie Mann's comment that it was interesting that the only person who didn't want to see the final vote tallies for all the Hugos was a writer is precisely the point. Unless she gets on the ballot and comes in fifth, she will never know how "Hugo Nominee" (great pride, good PR) becomes "Fifth-Rate Writer" and the butt of lots of cruelty and jokes. I've never been in that position (thank heavens), but close friends of mine have and they have been hurt. As for the only 2 times I've been on any sort of ballot (the Campbell), I have no compunction in saying that I came in a distant second to Cherryh in 1977 and very slightly behind Steve Donaldson for third in 1978 - but it should be my place to say that, not the con-coms'.

Glyer is 100% correct - I am talking about pride - but that's what the Hugos are really about, I think. And that's exactly my point. The pride of being one of the 5 best gets quickly denigrated when the order of finish is known. The order is removing that pride which is all the loser ever has. The winner's, as mentioned ((on p. 17)), has cash value.

I have no objection to the number of total nominations (even the high-low used by Seacon is interesting and useful) being given or the total number of votes cast in each category, either. I only object to publishing the order of finish.

((I appreciate the force of the argument, but I remain unconvinced. (And I think I know how it feels: I was a McGovern worker.) The nominees should certainly have a chance to withdraw if they don't wish to risk losing badly, but their feelings must be balanced against the voters' rights. The same line of argument suggests that "No Award" should be removed from the ballot, since if it wins all the nominees are humiliated. By the way, it seems to me particularly undesirable to keep the results from the public but release them to a select few - even the nominees themselves.))

Worldcon Site Rotation

George FERGUS (on VotL 2):

A number of fans apparently object to the proposed new Worldcon site-rotation plan because they see it as a ploy by Washington, DCers to get the 1984 con away from Los Angeles. It might therefore be advisable to separate the rotation proposal from the question of who gets the '84 con. This could be done either by postponing the date when the new plan would go into effect, or by changing the proposed order of rotation.

The latter alternative would also be desirable on other grounds. The current proposal would require all European bidders to travel across the American continent to the Western zone, and vice versa. (I presume that the majority of overseas bids would be from Europe.) It would seem more sensible to have European con sites chosen at a Worldcon in the Eastern zone. An alternative rotation order might be: Central (1982), Outside N.A. (1983), Western (1984), Eastern (1985).

If anyone objects to the resulting 5-year gap till the next Worldcon in the Eastern zone, I might point out that this zone has never had a gap of more than 4 years between Worldcons, whereas Iggycon was the first Western Worldcon in 6 years, and the 1982 Central Worldcon will also follow a 6-year gap. Indeed, now that I contemplate the facts, the idea of postponing the next Eastern Worldcon till 1985 begins to sound like simple justice....

((Under the present system, it's quite possible that the next Eastern Worldcon won't be until 1986..))

James J.J. Wilson:

Regarding my chart on page 47, I only meant the exact years as a hypothetical example. Pascal J. Thomas's chart on p. 48 is impractical, since there aren't enough fans to support an overseas Worldcon EVERY four years.

((Then why were overseas cons voted for 1965, 1970, 1975, and 1979, with two bids already for 1983?))

Laurie Mann:

Seeing all the comments from foreign fans ... is making me reevaluate my opinion on the subject. Although I have been in favor of a four-section rotation (East, Central, West, Outside of North America), Carey Handfield and Richard Faulder both offer persuasive arguments against this system.

Irwin Koch's suggestion for restructuring zone rotation almost makes sense. However, he proposes a zone consisting of "Southeastern US, the Caribbean, and Africa, and related areas". Are there any fans in Africa, or in the Caribbean? And what would the related areas be? ((Probably islands.)) Since Europe and the Eastern zone are probably the two most populated fan areas, what was the sense of merging them in the same zone?

((Noreascon currently has one member each from South Africa, Brazil (with a VotL sub), and the Virgin Islands. There did use to be a South African apa.))

There were many comments about the "fairness" of voting for certain cons in the same region. I'm tempted to propose that at-the-con voting for either Worldcon or NASFiCs be abolished. If only mail votes were accepted, would they necessarily be weighted against or in favor of a certain region? Furthermore, with everyone voting by mail and not at a convention where emotions can be running high, people may be voting more intelligently, instead of on impulse.

((Don't you think that having a chance to meet the bidders can also contribute to intelligent voting? I'm afraid that mail votes may often be based on inadequate information, and that people may be more

likely to vote on the basis of the city rather than the committee and facilities. But this is mere speculation. As far as actual evidence goes, in 1974 the mail and at-con voting looked quite different (but with the same winner); in 1976 and 1978 they were pretty much the same.))

Mike Rogers:

I find myself in the awkward position of arguing against a friend. Well, here goes: Irvin, I can't go along with your proposed Worldcon zone. While, as a Southern fan, I would love to see the Worldcon in the Southeastern U.S. every fourth year, I don't think many others would go along. How would you like California being in its own zone?

Another problem is that, nice as it would be, we just aren't strong enough. How long has it been since there was a Southeastern Worldcon (ignoring Suncon, which was run by Easterners)? Early 50's? The fan support just isn't there yet. ... For now, anyway, the current system should be left alone. The overseas fans can bid whenever they want, so they're not being discriminated against. And we here in the South have an equal chance for a Worldcon - when we're strong enough to put it on.

((For the record, it was New Orleans in 1951.))

Avedon Carol:

The way I understood it, the additional bidding category for Outside North America was just one item on a list of ways to make the DC-in-1984 bid legal. As far as I could tell, the favored method was simply to throw 1984 open as an exceptional year, and I don't know how in the hell the category change ever got such attention. ((Because it's the only one that got formally proposed?)) I do remember that when it was first brought up, an Australian fan who was present seemed to like the rotation-change idea, which might have encouraged its proponents to get carried away with it. If other out-of-country fans seemed to be in favor of that rotation change, I would support it, but apparently they don't like it, so neither do I. I do like the idea of DC in 1984, tho' just because it seems so appropriate. Obviously, if it was just that we want a con in our city, we would have been content with '83.

Jack Chalker:

Harry Andruschak is very wrong about D.C. running from such a proposal as he advocates, with the East always bidding in a non-North American zone. Most area fans would support it. There is almost no disadvantage to doing so, since in that instance there's a preponderance of mail ballots anyway. I know of no Worldcon that won in recent years on the basis of on-site votes; it was all decided in the mail....

Also, I don't think D.C. has been hypocritical about this at all - but I think Harry is a complete and utter hypocrite here. D.C. has very plainly said (including Alexis in VotL) ((no, that was in File 770)) that they're pressing it in their own interests. It's the yells and screams of Southern Californians about "principle" that have been so much shit - never once saying that the reason is they want LA in '84 because it's an anniversary year. In point of fact, the first time I heard this every-fourth-year-out-of-NA proposal was from LASFS in 1973 when they didn't want to skip their turn for a Worldcon to accommodate Australia.

Interestingly, D.C. in '84 is considered a fairly dead issue around here at the moment, which temporarily relieved my conflict-of-interest problems - but while DC can't bid against Australia for '83 because the ACS already

has all the hotels booked, thus freeing me of another real problem (I'm an early Aussiecon II supporter), it's highly likely that 1983 will see Sydney against Copenhagen against - Baltimore, where a bid seems to be forming, rather seriously, around the local groups. Please note that the Baltimore and Washington groups - and cities - are quite separate; this is not one area but two, and the two cities do not meet and rarely mix. I suspect that the entry of Copenhagen into the race will encourage the Baltimore people, since they have a better chance in a 3-way race.

I agree that the Europeans and Australians will always be flatly opposed to being in the rotation - until one of them with a strong bid loses to a strong domestic bid. When that happens, I suspect that the attitude will be quite different.

((In case anyone's wondering, it is not coincidental that all the debate about specific bids in this zine refers to 1983 and later. I have censored out all remarks about 1981 and 1982, since the Noreascon committee prepared a bidders' comparison chart on '81 and will be actually conducting the '82 voting; the danger of abusing this position (or seeming to) was a little too great. But inform yourselves and vote anyway.))

George Fergus again (on VotL 3):

Chris Priest says that Worldcons "are not, or they should not be, something that is loaned out on sufferance to the rest of the world." But, at the present time, that is exactly what they are. If North American fans had voted according to their own selfish interests, there would never have been a "Worldcon" held anywhere else.

Paul Abelkis asks, "Why change an excellent system for the sake of change?" Well, the biggest flaw I see in the present system is that when a Worldcon goes overseas, the zone in which it was originally scheduled has to wait six years for its next chance. In order to make this work fairly, this six-year gap would have to be imposed with about equal frequency on the various North American zones, ... requiring the overseas con either every four years or every five years. ... So, if we're going to be stuck with a de facto 4- or 5-year rotation plan, in order to distribute con sites fairly, why not just make it a simple 4-year rotation plan in the first place?

((Because people are more concerned with symbolism than substance?))

There is certainly a wide range of opinion on the frequency of non-North American bids. Carey Handfield is afraid that there would be "just one city bidding, or no bid at all", whereas Gary Farber complains that all those overseas cities would have to "compete for the same slot only once every four years". Have you ever noticed that a good compromise proposal tends to be disliked by the extremists at both ends?

((I don't think those views are incompatible. The point in both is that it's hard enough to put together a viable overseas bid, without the added requirement that it be in a particular year.))

Richard Faulder complains about the assumption "that the North Americans have a god-given right to 75% of all Worldcons." Well, it just may be that they do have that right, at the moment. ... Also, please note that there is still nothing in the proposed four-year plan that would prevent sites outside North America from bidding out-of-turn, like they are required to do now, if once-every-four-years isn't frequent enough for them. It just seems desirable to reduce the need for such "irregular" bids in order to be fair to the "regular" sites.

I don't know if the 4-year rotation proposal ... is THE SOLUTION, but most of the arguments against it seem incredibly feeble. None of the alternative proposals is without defects, so one might as well choose the least complicated.

The objection that the same North American zone would always have to make its bid at an overseas con may or may not be important, depending on how much is involved in bidding at the con itself. Would Americans have to put on lots of parties at a Tokyo Worldcon in order to get the local walk-ins to vote for them?

By the way, if the 4-year proposal were adopted I would seriously consider disposing of this NASFiC business, which really does seem to me rather chauvinistic. The only reason NASFiC got started, I think, was because of those 6-year gaps that now occur whenever a Worldcon goes overseas.

Jan Howard Finder:

I'm 100% with Carey Handfield on voting down the absurd attempt to create a fourth region.

As for NASFiC, the more I think of this con, the angrier I get. NASFiC is simply a way for N. American fen to cheat a Worldcon not in N.A. For my part it is a statement that "since the bloody foreigners have stolen OUR Worldcon, we'll have one anyway. Hell, everyone votes for the Hugos & site by mail anyway, it doesn't matter where the so-called Worldcon takes place. Let the furriners hold a con, WE'LL hold the REAL Worldcon here where it belongs in good "le NA." (I refer your readers to some of New Orleans' adverts in 1977.)

I'd like to propose that either NASFiC be abolished (how many fen, who might have gone to the UK, decided to go to Louisville instead, since EVERYONE will be there anyway? Notice how "everyone" neatly excludes the rest of the World) or that an official NNASFiC (non-North American SF Con) be made part of the WSFS constitution. In this way NNA fan groups could bid to hold a NNASFiC opposite the World SF Con in years it is held in NA. Fair is fair.

It may be difficult to get to Europe or Austroasia once every 4 or 5 years, but it is a damn sight harder to get to NA every 3 out of 4 or 4 out of 5 years from Europe or Austroasia. American fen are spoiled.

For the sake of complexity, put that NNA rotation slot in every 5th year, thus one area doesn't always get stuck bidding at a furrin con.

((I can't let that diatribe go unanswered. I am going to North American and not to Seacon, for one simple reason: I can't afford to go to England. Abolishing the NASFiC wouldn't change that situation, though I'd probably go to some other relatively close con instead. Britain, Australia, etc. have national cons every year; what is the matter with North America's doing the same, in those years when the presence of a Worldcon doesn't make it superfluous? It's certainly a poor second choice to the Worldcon, but it's better than nothing. Is the Worldcon so undesirable that people have to be blackmailed into attending an overseas one? (After all, Seacon does have about 4000 members and overflowing hotels.) Your attitude sounds like, "If the bloody Americans won't make an overseas trip to attend the Worldcon, then by Ghod they'd better not enjoy themselves at home!" Bear in mind that the great majority of fans won't even go to a Worldcon outside their own zone, much less out of the continent. Your use of the word "cheat" implies that attending the Worldcon is a duty; this does not correspond to my idea of what fandom is about.))

George Fergus:

A final question: How come so few of the people writing to VotL bother to submit proposals at the actual Worldcon Business Meeting, or bother to attend the pre-preliminary business meeting where such proposals are discussed? (If you submit a strange new proposal, for example, but neither you nor your friends are at the pre-pre meeting to defend it, your proposal will simply be left off the agenda of the full business meeting.)

((Good question. The answer, of course, is that not everybody gets to the Worldcon, and those who do usually go to enjoy themselves, not to spend 6-10 hours in business meetings.))

((And that brings us to an interesting point. Lots of you people have been coming up with ideas for changes in the WSFS Constitution. Well, this is the last issue of VotL before Seacon, so it's time to put up or shut up. The procedures for submitting new business can be found in Rules 3 and 4 of the Standing Rules (which are printed in Seacon PR3 and should also appear in the Program Book). You don't have to actually be there, but as George points out, (from experience) your chances aren't very good if you aren't. Failing that, you can always wait and try at Noreascon. Why do I have the feeling that I may regret this...?))

Worldcon Emergency Fund.

Laurie Mann:

I don't understand what Mike Glyer is complaining about when he says, "... the fund's custodian outright refused to take an interest in, any Worldcon which had not published its financial records." If the committee claimed it was in trouble, but refused to divulge its financial records, how could the custodian know for sure that the committee wasn't trying to defraud the fund? ... If a Worldcon's books are so screwed up that some financial record can't be given to the custodian of the WEF, how can the committee even be certain that the money is really necessary?? I don't feel that any one group has the right to sit on the WEF, but they had better be very careful when they decide to use it.

Jack Chalker:

I object to Glyer stating that ((the fund)) is in the hands of "the fans who formed the Discon 2 committee". It is not in the hands of the official Chairman (Haldeman), the real Chairman (Bounds), the real Vice-Chairman (me), nor do we have votes on it. As Glyer knows well, in a series of parliamentary maneuvers a number of fans, only two of whom were on the top concom following Discon, seized the proceeds of the con and kicked out all those who didn't agree or go along with them. They still hold the money. D.C. fandom is still pissed about it, but it was legal, so what could we do? But don't give D.C. the rap - and if you're going to say that it's in the hands of D.C. fans, Mike, be fair and name them. In truth the money was badly needed by Aussiecon and requested, and one of those fans refused to allow them to dip into the ... money because (1) that money should stay in the U.S. for "our" cons (!!) and (2) he wasn't satisfied that they needed it and he was the only one who would decide.

((This is all fascinating, but anybody who does "name names" is asked to keep the libel laws in mind.))

Miscellaneous

Ron Salomon:

A shwell Shiffman cover illo, except the mike sign should be DBC, for Decapoda Broadcasting Corp.

John Charles McCormack:

A more diversified format with more but smaller articles might be of greater interest to your readers; however, this is the opinion of only one person, myself....:

Mark L. Olson:

VotL is perhaps the most interesting fanzine I've ever come across - I'm nominating it for the Hugo next year. Now that I think about that, I suppose there'd be some conflict-of-interest problems, tho.

((Especially since I'm in charge of the voting! No, it's ineligible.))

Eva Chalker Whitley:

You are doing one hell of a job on VotL. I've discovered that not nearly enough has been done on showing people exactly what goes into con-running, let alone what goes on in Worldcon-running. Your comments, rebuttals, whatever to people's ideas, are perfect.

I'm disappointed that few - or no - people commented on my idea of fans contacting their favorite pro before the con to arrange a drink, dinner, whatever at the con. ... What fen should realize is that any author can be reached (who is still living, that is) by writing him/her via their publishers.

Speaking of pros, one guy who came up to the Mirage table at Iggy had on a pro badge, & as I did not recognize his name, I asked him where he was published. It turns out that this self-proclaimed "artist & writer" had done the cover for a program book for a regional con & was an aspiring author (i.e., not published - so he wasn't a REAL writer). ... I think you should try to come up with some kind of policy on who gets VIP badges in advance of the con & try to make it stick. I may ask for too much - there are many fine writers who are not members of the SFWA despite their being eligible, and requiring that only members of ASFA be allowed to get a pro artist's badge would alienate many artists. Maybe it would be a nice gesture to offer VIP badges to all spouses of "Pros" so we can get some ego-boo, too. (In suggesting this, don't think that I'm not aware of being a hypocrite.....)

Jan Howard Finder:

Budgets: Isn't a Worldcon required to produce a financial statement by the WSFS constitution? ((Yes: Art. I, Sec. 5.)) Hmmm, maybe a class action suit is in order?

Jack Chalker:

All this yelling and screaming about how much the con charges for membership is nonsense; what will be the big shock in the 1980s will be the hotel room rates. Right now the 1/3rd-off con rates for old customers for the new Sheraton Washington ((replacing the Sheraton-Park)) will be \$52 single and \$60 double. Even this year the Metropole's \$30 per person, so are most of the other hotels used for Seacon. ...

Worldcons have to be amateur affairs; that's what it's all about. And if some folks are unhappy about the way Worldcons are run, then there should be a lesson to the voters. Voters in a democracy seldom get what they want or need but always get what they deserve....

((And that ends the lettercol.))

Planning For the Worldcon - Part 4
(Feb - May 79)
Leslie Turek

I've got to admit that February was pretty much a total loss, because just about everyone on the Noreascon committee had a high-level position on the Boskone 16 committee. Boskone was held in the middle of the month, and then it took a couple of weeks for everyone to recuperate. Some of the experience was valuable, of course. I ran Operations for the first time and learned a lot about the Sheraton's Convention Services department, for example. But in spite of the advantages, Boskone was a major disruption in our schedule and a drain on our energies, and I was very relieved when NESFA decided that next year's Boskone will be a scaled-down semi-relaxacon (to be called Bosklone!).

In March, April, and May we got back in the groove, in spite of the fact that about half of the active committee seemed to be giving birth - either to a child or to a store. [Footnote: Tony and Sue Lewis: Alice Naomi Sophronia Lewis (May 11); Ellen Franklin and Jim Hudson: Earthlight Gallery (May 17); Don and Jill Eastlake: Donald Eggleston Eastlake IV (June 3).] Our major fannish efforts were directed toward two things: preparing the text for Progress Report Two, and beginning to make staffing decisions. There'll be more details on both of these areas below.

MEMBERSHIP PROCESSING

At last the flood of membership hassles slowed down, and most of the membership transactions we processed were straightforward conversions or new attending memberships. There were a lot of changes of address, which wasn't so bad. But there were a few people for whom nothing seemed to work. For one member in particular, we had about 4 different addresses at various times and some of the mail got through, while, randomly, other pieces bounced. This can be frustrating.

We took in a big rush of memberships at Boskone because we slipped a mimeographed form in with the registration packets. But otherwise they came in very slowly. Our plan had been to wait until 200 new memberships accumulated before sending out a second bulk-mail batch of PR1's. But by mid-April, 3 months after the initial PR1 mailing, we were still a bit shy of the 200 mark. So we decided to do a mailing anyway and bring it up to 200 by adding enough extra copies addressed to the committee. (At 4 cents per copy, even paying for a few extra is much cheaper than using any other class of mail.) So we prepared a mailing of PR1 on May 2. We don't expect this problem to continue, however. The post office rule is 200 copies or 50 pounds, whichever is less. When we start mailing out copies of PR1 and PR2 together, it will only take about 100 new members to make up a legal bulk mailing.

It seems clear to us that even an increasing membership-rate scale doesn't do much to convince people to join in advance. This is too bad, because it's much easier to spend a lot of effort on membership-processing now than closer to the convention. Not to mention, it's a lot easier to plan for the convention if we have some idea of how many people we will have.

For the record, membership at the end of May was 1707, with 1352 Attending and 355 Supporting.

INCOMING MAIL

In dealing with an ever-larger committee spread out geographically, getting the incoming mail to the proper people is a problem. We prefer to have all letters come to the convention PO Box, rather than to committee members' homes. This is for

several reasons: so that we can be sure to get a copy for the central files; so that everyone on the committee who should see the letter does so; so that we can remove and deposit checks immediately, rather than having them sit around and maybe get lost; and so that the chairman can keep track of what's going on. Of course, it's essential to get these letters passed on to the right people quickly, and the only way we have found to do this is to Xerox them. This is both expensive and inconvenient, of course, but appears to be unavoidable. Leasing a real Xerox machine is even more expensive, but we are considering buying a small used copier if we can find one cheap. Such a copier would also be extremely handy during the convention itself.

PUBLICITY

We had been using our Progress Report Zero as a standard reply to requests for information, but it was getting a bit out of date, so Don Eastlake put together a new information flyer in time for Lunacon in March. It contained basically the same information, but also answered some of the most frequent inquiries we had been getting in the mail: "Please send me dealers' room information/art show information/hotel reservation cards." The answer in each case was, "It's not ready yet; wait for PR3." We originally printed 1500 copies of the flyer, but ran out in early June and had to run off another 3000.

Our news releases continued on a slightly less frequent schedule; we averaged one every two months. We still didn't get much feedback from the recipients, but those items that did get printed (at least the ones that we saw) generally managed to keep our meaning intact.

VOICE OF THE LOBSTER

In his editorial, George has described why we took so long to publish issue #3, and why we decided to do this issue partly offset. Some people have pointed out that publication and mailing of VotL costs the committee more than the \$2 we charge for a subscription. This is certainly true, and if it bothers you we'd be happy to accept your (tax-deductible) donation. But let me reiterate that the \$2 rate was set not so much to make money on the project, but to insure that our subscription list would be limited to people reasonably interested in receiving it. We feel that the zine, in some sense, is a service to fandom, and we don't really mind if we lose some money on it. Part of its purpose is to explain to people just how much is involved in putting on a Worldcon, so they'll have some understanding of what the committee is up against (and will be moved, we hope, to lend a hand). Another purpose is to pass on what we've learned for the benefit of future con committees. A third purpose is for us to learn what's on your minds. All of these seem valuable enough to justify the expenditure of convention funds.

PROGRESS REPORT 2

We realized when originally setting up our Progress Report schedule that PR2 would come at an awkward time. There wouldn't be much we could say about the convention in terms of hard facts, since we didn't want to commit ourselves too early before carefully thinking things out. On the other hand, we didn't want to leave too long a gap between Progress Reports, because we felt they at least show that the committee is still alive and functioning.

The solution was to use PR2 to explain some of the decisions we had before us and to invite comments from the membership. We had also been considering the use of a questionnaire at various times in the past, even when we were bidding, and decided this would be a good time to put one out. I'll say more about the questionnaire in the "Planning" section below.

The rest of the contents of PR2 were pretty obvious and followed in the pattern set by PR1 - official information, a membership list and map, and features on Toastmaster Robert Silverberg, Worldcon membership trends, and Noreascon I. The physical production went more smoothly because of our previous experience, and the copy got to the printers just a few days later than originally scheduled.

BETTER THAN ONE

We got a lot of work done on Better Than One (the Knight/Wilhelm commemorative book) during this period. That was the whole idea - to do it early while our general workload was comparatively light, and get it out of the way.

In late February we received the additional material that Damon and Kate had promised us - some poetry, and introductions by each to the book and to the stories. Next we drafted a contract that was pieced together from appropriate sections of the standard Boskone Book contract and a prototype contract that Damon had prepared for SFWA. The basic agreement is that once the book's printing costs are paid the authors will receive a percentage of the gross income.

Chip Hitchcock got printers' quotes for a small, well-bound volume, and also discovered we should print it as soon as possible, since labor and paper costs are continually rising, whereas storage of the completed volumes would cost only a few dollars a month. We decided not to accept pre-convention mail orders, as that would be just too much of a hassle at a time when we'd have hassles enough. We expect to sell the books at the convention at a low price (perhaps \$3), and by mail order thereafter at a higher price (perhaps \$5). There will be no sales to dealers until after the convention.

By the end of May, all of the text had been input to the computer and was being proofread by us. The next step would be to make corrections and produce typeset galleys to send to the authors for their proofreading.

STAFFING

During this period we started to appoint people to the upper-level positions on the convention committee. The first decision I made was that it would be impossible for me as chairman to directly supervise the 50 or 60 area heads we might have. It would be essential to have a small number of division heads who could interact with the area heads on a more intensive basis. We spent about a month discussing the division-head appointments. Although we would obviously have to use many non-local people at the area-head level, I really wanted the division heads to be local people that I had worked with before. We also wanted experience, and all the people appointed have been Boskone chairmen or co-chairmen (with the exception of Chip Hitchcock, but he will be chairman of next year's Bosklone). The final division heads we decided on were:

Jim Hudson	Member Services (registration, information, press relations, special needs, etc.)
Donald Eastlake	Operations (headquarters, security, logistics, setups, troubleshooting, etc.) WSFS Business (Hugo and site selection voting, business meeting)
Tony Lewis	Program (speakers, panels, seminars, discussion groups, films, special-interest programming)
Ellen Franklin	Exhibits (art show, dealers' room, special exhibits)
Chip Hitchcock	Functions (Hugo Awards ceremony, masquerade, fan cabaret, parties, special functions)

Next we assembled the letters from people who had volunteered for responsible positions, and started to fill the area-head slots, a process we're still engaged in. People who have volunteered for specific areas are being evaluated first, and then those who said "I'll do anything" will go into the slots remaining. It's hard to make good judgments when many of the volunteers aren't known to us personally. We use three basic methods of gathering information for our decision. First, if someone offers to do a particular job, we write to them, outline our thoughts about the area, and mention specific problems we've considered. Then we ask them to write and tell us what their experience has been at past conventions and what ideas they have for Noreascon II. If that request receives a well-thought-out response, we explore further. The second method is to watch the person in action at a convention, if possible. We have managed to do this for a couple of our major appointments. The third method is to talk with or write to people who have worked with the applicant and get their opinions. (Although much of the information that we receive has to be carefully analyzed, in the light of the feuds and animosities that are unfortunately so prevalent in fandom these days.) We're doing our best, and we're still interested in hearing from volunteers.

When area heads are appointed, we send them a package containing Noreascon II stationery, flyers, financial-report forms, and a three-page information sheet. The information for area heads covers such topics as: Committee Organization, Correspondence and Phone Calls, Reporting Expenses and Income, the deadline for information to go into Progress Report 3, etc. We also warn them about some of the things we will eventually be wanting to know about their area, such as budget, equipment and personnel needed, schedule, room setup, etc.

PLANNING

Whenever we weren't busy with membership processing, answering letters, getting information, or working on VotL, PR2, and Better Than One, we discussed the various areas of the convention and how we would like to see them work. Many questions came up in these discussions, and a number of them were presented in PR2 with requests for member comments, so I won't repeat them in detail here. These include the questions of membership cards, members' special needs, tours, program items, dealers' room hours, special exhibits, ceremonial functions, the Meet-the-Pros Party, etc.

One of the problems we have is that the time and energy that can be put into the convention, though large, are still finite. There's a tendency to add more and more new features every year, without ever taking away any of the old ones. For example, in PR2 we say we don't expect to hold a Meet-the-Pros Party as has been traditionally done, and we give the reasoning behind this decision. I rather expect this decision to cause great cries of outrage and comments of "How could you do that?" from some fans. We regret this, but we feel it's better for us to take on only those projects that we feel we can do, and do reasonably well, than to try to do everything and end up doing a lot of it badly (and losing our sanity in the process).

This was one of the reasons we included in PR2 a questionnaire that allows the members to rate the various parts of the convention. We certainly don't want to eliminate items capriciously, and if any item is highly rated by a large percentage of the members, we will certainly do our best to retain it. We plan to use the ratings as a guide only - just one of the factors that go into our planning. If an item is not highly rated, or highly rated by only a small segment, we would include it if it wasn't a lot of effort, or if someone came along who was enthusiastic about doing it.

PLANNING - THE HYNES AUDITORIUM

A lot of our planning is being made more difficult by our use of the Hynes

Auditorium. This is an unknown factor to us, since we have never worked with them before, and as our negotiations proceed it becomes even clearer that the situation with the Hynes is a lot different from dealing with a hotel.

A hotel makes money from a large convention by the rental of rooms and the filling of its restaurants and bars. In return the hotel provides the convention with free meeting space, plus tables, chairs, ice water, ash trays, bulletin boards, and so forth. The only things the Sheraton charges us for are food and electrical setups.

A municipal auditorium is a whole 'nother story. They are renting no rooms and filling no restaurants; they must make the whole of their profit from what they charge the convention committee directly. In addition, they're run by the city and don't have as much of an incentive to please the customer as the hotel does. On top of that, they're much more heavily unionized than the hotel. All of this adds up to not only large expenses, but also a certain loss in flexibility. Within the hotel we deal with a single convention coordinator, who arranges everything for us. If we need something changed at the last minute (within reason), we can just call up and ask that it be done. Since the charges are minimal, we can decide on scheduling and setups without worrying about the impact on our budget.

With the Hynes everything is more complicated. The basic rental provides us with only the bare walls, plus lights and air conditioning. Everything else comes extra. In addition, most of the other necessities are not provided by the Hynes itself, but by a whole list of outside contractors. In many cases we're required to use a specific contractor; in others we're free to choose. Most of these companies don't provide a price list; they expect you to tell them what you want, and then they'll tell you what it will cost. This makes it hard to evaluate trade-offs and consider different options. There's also a tendency to find out about some charges only by asking the right questions - then you wonder what questions you missed and what other charges you haven't been told about. To give you a better idea of what I'm talking about, I'll give you the details of some things we've learned so far. Those of you who get upset by large numbers with dollar signs in front of them should probably skip this section. This is where fandom finally encounters the real world.

Starting with the basic Hynes, the whole building will cost us \$4500 per day for the days we're open to the public. We've booked it for four days - Friday through Monday. For each day we pay for, we should get one additional day for setup and teardown. In our case, we definitely have the Wednesday and Thursday before and the Tuesday after, and are tentatively booked for the Tuesday before. If we give up the lower exhibit hall, we will save only about \$800 per day, since the full building comes at a package price. We might also have additional security problems if some other group were to rent that area. So for the time being we're going to plan on having the whole thing.

We must pay 25% of the basic cost 6 months in advance and the rest 3 weeks in advance. Our Hynes contact has advised us that we should budget an additional 50-100% of the basic rental for the additional services required. As we talk to the various vendors involved, it unfortunately appears that he is correct.

Hynes extra charges:

The auditorium has permanent seats in the balcony, but the seats on the floor are removable (for trade shows, etc.), and we must pay to have them installed and removed. That's 3300 chairs at 30 cents per chair or about \$1000. Sound setups in the meeting rooms will cost at least the electrician's time. Electricity costs \$23.50 for a 300-watt outlet and \$40 for a 2-kW outlet. There are no telephones anywhere; installing them costs the standard Bell Telephone installation fee. There are movable-partitioned rooms; to set them up costs \$30 per room. If we don't use the

guard service (but we probably will), it would cost us \$75 per day to "open the building". That's what we know about now, but I wouldn't be surprised if there's more to come. The problem is that no one tells you about the charges unless you specifically ask, "Is there a charge for service x?" So a certain amount of paranoia is highly useful.

Security:

I started to write about the security situation in the Hynes, until it occurred to me that it was something that shouldn't be publicly discussed until maybe after the convention. (I'm afraid that sometimes I'm just not paranoid enough.) So I'll just say a few general things about the Hynes requirements. They have a contract with a guard service; although we aren't required to use guards, if we do hire guards they must be from the approved service or the local police department. We will be allowed to use volunteers also, but we plan to do so only to supplement the paid guards. We've been told that the current contract expires soon and a new guard service will be selected by the Hynes at that time. For this reason, we haven't begun discussions with them yet. The current rate for guards is something like \$5 per hour per guard, and adequate coverage requires many guards.

Decorating

Decorating is a catchall term for the company that brings in tables, chairs, area barriers, and whatever else you want in terms of furniture and other amenities. Their prices include hauling, setup and teardown, and rental throughout the convention. We have been talking to Win-Deco, the largest supplier in the area, although we'll probably check with other firms to be sure we're being quoted reasonable prices. Their price for folding chairs is the same as the Hynes's, 30 cents each; we will need several thousand to equip the various meeting rooms, the art-show auction area, etc. Tables for the dealers' room run \$14.40 for draped 4' tables and \$21.50 for 8' tables, and that will have to be included in the dealers' table-rental fee. Then we'll also need additional tables for art exhibits, art-show business, masquerade check-in, etc. All those must be counted and budgeted for. Three-foot-high curtain dividers, which will probably be used by all of the functions for marking off areas, cost \$1 per running foot. One very nice thing about dealing with Win-Deco is that, since their warehouses are local and their supplies ample, we can modify our order (within reason) practically to the day of the convention.

Stagehands and Projectionists:

This is a real problem area. Because of the Hynes contract with the stagehands' union, we have various limits placed on our activity in the auditorium. Whenever we're using the stage, whether for a presentation or just for setup, we must use 5 people from the stagehands' union. In addition, each person on the crew has a specific function and can't be expected to do anything else. Thus, if we don't need a prop man, for example, but do need an extra lighting man, we would have to hire 6 people.

The stagehands get a base rate of \$10 per hour, plus 9% for their pension fund. Then they get time-and-a-half for evenings and Saturdays from 8 to 5, and double-time for Saturday evenings, Sundays, and holidays. Plus they get double whatever rate they're at for the lunch and dinner hours, which are defined to be 12-1 and 6-7. Thus, if we wanted to run masquerade check-in on the stage as we did at Iggy, it would cost us 5 people x 2 for Saturday night x 2 for dinner hour x \$10 base pay + 9% pension fund, or \$218 for that one hour from 6 to 7.

In the Hynes we must also use union projectionists, who cost \$9 + 10% base rate. In addition there's an 8 to 32 man-hour charge for "setup" of the projectors. In general, that isn't too much of a problem, since we can simply schedule most of our film programming in the hotel. (Although we hear that the unions are trying to get

control of the hotel, also.) The only place it really hurts is in connection with the Hugo ceremonies. We thought it would be a neat idea to show film clips of the dramatic award nominees. But at 16-plus hours of setup labor, plus \$150 screen rental, plus several hundred dollars of projector rental, it just doesn't seem worth it for 10 minutes of film clips. *Sigh*

One thing we can do to cut down the number of stagehands is to build a platform in front of the stage and conduct most of our straight programming from it. As far as we can tell we would be allowed to use volunteer labor to build it, and we estimate it would cost us only a few hundred dollars and 8 people for about 3 hours. When we use the platform, we'll only have to use 2 union stagehands, thus saving as much as \$66 per hour.

Miscellaneous:

There are still a number of areas that we need to get more information about. We have yet to talk to the people who run the refreshment stands, who are also the designated caterers to the Hynes. There is a designated cleaning company, which we are told charges a flat rate of about \$600 per day and also provides bodies like elevator operators. We don't have to have ushers in the auditorium, as we were required to do at Iggy. And if anyone can think of anything we haven't thought of, please let us know.

BUDGETING

During this period I began to hold a series of meetings with our treasurer Jill Eastlake and each of the division heads, in an attempt to create a new planning budget for the convention. This process is very difficult, since everything is still so up-in-the-air. But it's very necessary to have some sort of budget to work with, even if we know it will be extensively revised as time passes and planning progresses.

One of the things we're trying to do is to distinguish between items that we feel are necessary and those that might be considered optional. We are particularly looking for optional expenditures that could take place very close to or even during the convention. In this way we hope to come up with a flexible budget that can be modified near the convention as we get a better idea of what our income will be.

I hope that the new version of the convention budget will be completed before Seacon and can be included in the next installment of "Planning for the Worldcon".

MISCELLANEOUS

With the help of Charlie Brown and Miriam Rodstein of Locus, we placed an order for the Hugo castings (the rocketship part of the award). We ordered 16, to be sure of enough for ties or multi-person winners. We also started to write specifications for the computer program that would count the ballots.

We started gathering information about other hotels in the area and getting specific commitments for blocks of rooms and room rates. (One thing we learned very quickly is that it hurts their feelings to be called "overflow hotels"; they prefer "participating hotels" instead.) We'll be preparing a full description of each of the hotels, along with a map and a hotel reservation card, for inclusion in Progress Report 3.

The committee meetings and the committee apa continued at roughly 6-week intervals. Wendell Ing, who had been assisting the treasurer in doing the books, was voted into membership.

We received \$500 in pass-on funds from Iguanacon.

The committee took out a subscription to Locus. Among other reasons, this was to provide source material for compiling the traditional "In Memoriam" list for the Noreascon II Program Book.

We ran out of our first 1000 manila envelopes and ordered 5000 more.

Rick Katze started to record our progress reports for the blind.

We acquired a French agent, Pascal Thomas, who had been studying in the US for the past year and returned to France in June.

APPENDIX - INCOME AND EXPENSES THROUGH MAY 31, 1979

Starred (*) expense categories are closed and are not expected to change, so they will not be repeated in the next installment.

The "current" column gives the amount we've actually spent to date and the "expected" column gives the amount we estimate we will spend before the category is closed. Obviously, for closed categories the two amounts will be the same.

Q2&3 means our second and third quarters of operation, or Jan-June, 1979.

	expected	current
Administrative Expenses		
Previously closed	1173.62	1173.62
Agents' expenses	75.00	20.00
General postage, phone, Xerox (Q2&3)	300.00	147.23
General office supplies (Q2&3)	150.00	10.83
Advertising and flyers (Q2&3)	240.00	81.46
Refreshments at work sessions (Q2&3)	50.00	14.25
Apa:80 (Q2&3)	125.00	78.19
Locus subscription (2 years)	35.00	17.00
5000 10x13 manila envelopes	400.00	392.00
Total Administrative Expenses	2548.62	1934.58
Registration Expenses		
Previously closed	581.18	581.18
Bulk rate mailing of PR1's	80.00	64.43
Foreign mailing of PR1's (surface)	60.00	45.88
Bounce and remailing (Q2&3)	100.00	54.28
Supplies (Q2&3)	50.00	44.31
Bulk rate mailing of PR2	68.00	
Foreign mailing of PR2	55.00	
Total Registration Expenses	994.18	790.08
Publications Expenses		
General - Previously closed	817.95	817.95
PRO - Previously closed	97.50	97.50
PR1 - Previously closed	2107.99	2107.99
Progress Report 2		
Copy preparation	350.00	152.80
Printing	1600.00	

Voice of the Lobster		
Previously closed	183.63	183.63
Supplies and postage (Q2&3)	500.00	445.63
Total Publications Expenses	5657.07	3805.50

Other Expenses

World Science Fiction Society		
Previously closed	83.71	83.71
Hugo castings	400.00	
'81 site-selection questionnaire	70.00	69.62
Guests of Honor		
Library of works for committee use	100.00	
Donations		
TAFB/GUFF (1979)	30.00	
Operations - Member Services		
Recording PR's for the handicapped	25.00	
Better Than One		
Typesetting	300.00	26.05
Capital Equipment - Previously closed	126.50	126.50
Total Other Expenses	1135.21	305.88

Total Expenses to Date 10335.08 6836.04

Additional Cash Out

Previously closed	2155.90	2155.90
Overpayment refunds and bad checks	264.00	264.00
Donation refund	1.00	1.00
Total Cash Out to Date	12755.98	9256.94

Income to Date

Administrative (mostly interest)	304.79
Registration - fees	19321.00
Registration - other	40.00
Publications - general	150.00
Publications - PR1	275.20
Publications - PR2	94.60
Publications - VotL	419.20
Donations	513.50
Total Income to Date	21118.29

Current cash balance: 11861.35
 Cash balance if all estimates were spent in full 8362.31

The Boskone Art Show
Leslie Turek

George has been heard to comment that someone should do a writeup for VotL about the way we run the Boskone Art Show. This seems like a good idea, because I believe that we have some interesting ideas on the subject. Boskone Art Shows are quite a bit different from the usual SF art show, and if we should decide to run the Noreascon II Art Show in the same way (and that's not certain yet), it might be a good thing to explain it a bit beforehand.

First a bit of a credit line, explaining a little of the history and growth of the Boskone Art Show. It was originated in 1970 by Marsha Elkin (now Marsha Jones) and has been successively run by Leslie Turek, Susan Lewis, and Ellen Franklin. It has proved to be quite popular with both the artists and the art buyers over the years, growing from 18 artists, 172 pieces, and \$2800 sales in 1973 (the first year for which we have accurate records) to 96 artists, 893 pieces, and \$26,000 sales in 1979. Although various people have run the show, we have maintained a great deal of continuity from year to year. Each year the staff gets together to critique the previous year's show and to look for ways we can improve it. We don't claim to have found the best way to run art shows, but we have found a way that works well for us.

MAKING IT EASY TO BUY - THE WRITTEN-BID SYSTEM

One of the things we have been concerned with is trying to make it easier to buy art. Many conventions sell the art at a non-stop auction that can run several hours per day, sometimes several days in a row. It's hard to sell more than 50 pieces an hour at auction, so even if you only auction pieces that have at least 1 or 2 bids on them, a 1000-piece art show with perhaps 500 pieces going to auction can take up to 10 hours of straight auctioning.

Why is this a bad thing? We suspect that when you have so many hours of auctions, the only people who attend them are the real hard-core art buyers. After all, most con attendees are there to attend a science fiction convention, not a non-stop auction. And if they're only interested in one or two pieces, it's just not worth investing the time.

Many auctions are willing to accept special requests to bring up a particular piece at a particular time. But many neophytes don't realize this, and it still means that the piece may sell at a lower price if it comes up when some of the people who might have bid on it have given up and gone off to see the convention.

So the Boskone Art Show has used a system of selling most of the artwork via written bids. The system started about 6 years ago and was a bit shaky at first, partly because people just weren't used to it. But we kept modifying it as the art show grew, until we evolved the current method. First I'll describe how it works, and then explain some of the advantages and disadvantages.

Attached to each piece is a bid sheet with space for 8 written bids. People can write their bids on the pieces until 2 pm on Sunday. At 2 pm everyone is cleared from the room in as orderly a way as we can manage. The art show staff circles the high bid on each sheet, indicating who has bought the piece. Pieces with no bids will still be available for the minimum when the show reopens. Pieces with 8 bids go into a special auction for hotly contested pieces. The first year we did this, only 5 pieces went to auction; but last year we were up to 40 (which took 75 minutes).

The idea here is to get the bidders to settle things among themselves if at all possible, without having to waste the time of the audience and the auctioneer. If

someone really wants a piece more than the others bidding on it, it is often made quite apparent in fewer than 8 bids. A person who doesn't want to sit through an auction can make fairly high bid jumps to discourage other bidders. (Someone who had to leave early this year bid on several pieces by doubling the previous high bid. Needless to say, he got most of them.) A person interested in a piece, but without much time to spend, can make his bid and come back any time between 2 and 5 pm to see if he's won. If he loses, he can browse through the pieces with no bids and pick up one of them for the minimum bid.

There are still problems with the system. First, there's the problem of clearing the room so that there aren't any "claim-jumpers" - people who sneak back after a section has been cleared and top other people's bids when they can't defend themselves. We've attempted to eliminate this by clearing the room with a sort of human chain that moves across the room, but this has to be carefully organized to work well. The people doing the job have to be clearly identified, must fully understand what they are doing, and should not be bidding on any artwork themselves. And they should be able to stay calm, cool, and collected in a situation somewhat comparable to trying to herd a hive of bees in full swarm.

Then there's the person who likes two pieces but can only afford one of them. In an auction situation he can bid on the first, and then if he loses it he can bid on the second. In the written-bid situation, he has to be careful to have the high bid on only one at any given time, or he could end up with both of them. But there are equally difficult strategy problems involved in auctions, and we think the advantages of the written-bid system (particularly for very large shows) outweigh the disadvantages.

There has been some criticism, particularly when it was first introduced, that the written-bid system discourages bids and therefore hurts the artists. We feel that losing the excitement of the voice auction is counterbalanced by the fact that the written-bid system makes it easier for people to bid. We suspect that we get many more bids from people who might not be willing to attend a full-scale day-long auction. It's hard to compare numbers from art show to art show; but if you look at the total sales at Boskone and the large number of artists we have to turn away each year, we think you'll conclude that the artists are satisfied with our system.

FEE BASED ON SPACE USED

Another major difference from other art shows is the fee scale. Both the reservation and the basic fee for artwork are made in terms of the amount of space to be used, or the number of pieces to be exhibited, rather than as a percentage of the selling price. This has several advantages. First, it makes our budget planning much easier. We know how much space we will have and roughly what our expenses will be, so we can set our fees to just cover our expenses. With a percentage system, the amount of income is completely unknown until the show is nearly over. You can go broke or you can make a bundle, depending on how much money the con attendees are willing to spend on art that weekend.

Reserving by space makes reservations easy to handle. We know how much room we will have, so we can cut off reservations at the right point. People who try to reserve in advance will know when they won't fit, so they won't have the double disappointment of bringing their artwork to the show and then finding out that it can't be hung. Since the fee doesn't depend on the sales, we can collect payment in advance. This not only helps the cash-flow situation, but makes it more likely that artists with reservations will actually show up. (Or that artists who find they can't make it will notify us before the show, so we can release the space to someone else.)

A flat fee for space tends to increase the overall quality of the art show. Only a proven artist will reserve lots of space; less popular artists will tend to reserve less space and to select their better work to hang, since they will have to pay the space fee whether or not their work sells.

And lastly, it just seems fairer to us. We do about the same amount of work to handle a panel of artwork, whether it sells for \$1000 or \$10. Why should we make \$150 from the first artist and let the second one get by with paying only \$1.50? Obviously artists who take a lot of space and don't sell anything at all can end up losing a lot of money, whereas in the traditional art show they would just pay a nominal hanging fee. For this reason, we suggest that new people whose work we don't know limit themselves until they test out the market.

We usually set our panel fees on a sliding scale. This year it was \$6 for a quarter panel, \$15 for a full 6' x 4' panel, and \$40 for two panels. We didn't allow any artist to take more than 2 panels. This is because our space is limited, and we're usually filled up months before the con. Given that, we'd rather have a little bit from a large number of artists than a lot from a few of them. Our fee is higher for the second panel so that only proven artists who know their work will sell will take that much space. On the other hand, we try to keep the quarter-panel fee low so that new artists can hang a few pieces without going broke, even if they don't sell.

This year for the first time we charged the artists an additional 1% fee on all sales to cover the Master Charge/Visa fee of 2.15% that we had to pay on all charge sales, plus the cost of mailing artwork which was paid for by large checks after the checks had cleared. Taking credit cards seemed to pay off: although the show increased in size by about 26% over the previous year, and Boskone attendance rose by about 35%, the total art show sales almost doubled!

SETUP PROCEDURES

Although on the whole artists are incredibly nice people, we've found that it isn't a good idea to have them help with the setup of the show. (Exceptions being 3-D items that may need to be arranged by an expert hand - like the 6-foot flying-dragon soft sculpture that was hung from the ceiling at this year's Boskone.) A room full of artists has a tendency to degenerate into groups of artists discussing each other's work rather than getting it efficiently hung. So we set up a separate room for artists to fill out paperwork, consult each other on setting minimums, and lay out their artwork as they'd like it to be hung. We mark out the size of a panel, half-panel, etc., in masking tape on the carpet, and let each artist shuffle his stuff around until he makes it all fit. It's a lot easier to do that than to get it half hung and then realize that it's not going to fit!

This way the artists can take as much time as they need, but to give them an incentive to finish up soon, we provide free drink tickets for the Friday-night party. When they have arranged their art, we take a Polaroid snapshot of the layout and transfer the artwork and the snapshot to the main art-show room, where volunteers do the actual hanging. (The Polaroid also serves as an insurance record of what we have in case of disaster.) Then at midnight, when all the art is hung, the artists are invited to return for a special preview where they can look and socialize to their heart's content (and vote on the art show awards).

PAPERWORK

There are three main forms that we use: bid sheets, master sheets, and tally sheets. (See the appendix for samples.) Most art shows have some variant of bid sheets and master sheets, but the tally sheet is something we added to give us a way

to double-check things when the other systems fail (as they invariably do in a big enough art show).

For every piece of artwork there is a bid sheet, which is attached to and hung with the artwork. It contains the name and number of the piece, the name of the artist, the minimum bid (or "not for sale"), space for 8 written bids, and a space at the bottom for the sales staff to record the ultimate buyer of the piece and the final sale price. The piece number is a 5-digit number, with the first three digits used to identify the artist.

There is one master sheet for each artist, filed in a looseleaf notebook. Since the artists all reserve in advance, we can assign artist numbers in alphabetical order, which makes it easy to find a given master sheet either by name or by number. The master sheet is mainly a list of each piece entered, giving the piece number, name, minimum bid (or insured value if not for sale), and a space for the final sale price. There are also places to record space reserved, fee calculations, fee payments, name of the artist's agent, etc.

As each piece leaves the show, by being either sold or picked up by the artist because it was unsold, we mark on the bid sheet what happened to it and keep all the bid sheets. The object of the game is to be sure we know what happened to every single piece of artwork that we're responsible for. I've seen art shows where they just threw away all the bid sheets for unsold artwork. If you do that, how do you know whether the pieces were picked up by the artist or stolen? You don't.

After the show is over, we sort the bid sheets by piece number and copy the disposition of each piece onto the artist's master sheet. If none of the bid sheets were ever lost, and if all the numbers were written and copied correctly, this would give us sufficient information to determine how much we owe each artist. But this never happens, so we then turn to the tally sheets.

Tally sheets are filled out for each buyer when he pays for his artwork. They contain the buyer's name and address and a list of each piece purchased, the amount paid for each, and the total. The tally sheets serve at least three purposes. First, the tally clerks use them to figure out the total each buyer must pay. Second, after the show we type up a list of buyers' names and addresses for distribution to the artists. (We also send them the bid sheets after we're done with them, so the artists get to see who bid on and purchased each of their pieces.) Third, we can use the tally sheets to do a double-check against the master sheets to be sure that we have the correct final-sale price for each piece of artwork. The double-checking is a tedious job, but every year about a dozen errors or omissions are found and cleared up in the process.

AUCTIONS

We generally have short auctions on both Saturday and Sunday. The Sunday auction is the one for "hotly contested items" mentioned in the section on written bids; it is held in a small program room, and its length depends on the number of pieces that are hotly contested. If it ever gets much longer than an hour, we will probably change our definition of "hotly contested" to try to cut down the number of pieces that go to auction. One consideration is to get the auction over early enough so people traveling home that evening can leave at a reasonable time.

The nature of the Saturday auction has changed over the years. It has always been planned to last about an hour (50 pieces) and to be part of the main program. The theory is to make it a sort of showcase of artwork from the show, and to perhaps attract people who don't normally attend art shows or neofans who don't know about

them. (Besides, auctions are fun and it would be a shame to eliminate them altogether.)

What has changed is the method by which the artwork is selected for the Saturday auction. When we started, we thought that voice-auctioned artwork would sell at a higher price, on the average, than artwork sold by written bid. So we sold auction slots to the artists for a flat fee (\$2 per piece) on a first-come, first-served basis. After a few years we learned two things. One was that the voice auction did not result in noticeably higher selling prices. The second was that frequently the artists didn't select the artwork most appropriate for auctioning. (Obviously, large-scale dramatic pieces are more easily appreciated by a large audience than those which are small in size or subtle in execution. In addition, we found that moderately priced pieces benefit more from an auction than very expensive pieces, because they generate more bidding activity.)

So about two years ago we stopped charging extra for the auction. Instead, we now have one or both of the auctioneers go through the show during the Friday-night preview to select the pieces to be auctioned. They try to select a good range of artists and styles, always keeping in mind how each piece will do in an auction setting.

However the work is selected, we always take care that the art to be auctioned is clearly marked with large day-glo dots from the very first time the show is open to the public. We don't collect payment for the artwork at the auction itself; we merely have the purchaser sign a statement agreeing to pay the amount he bid for the piece. Then the artwork goes back to the show (marked "sold", of course) to give the convention membership more time to view it and judge it for the various awards. This system also makes the money-handling easier for us, because we don't have to run a cashbox at the auction, and because a buyer who purchases additional artwork by written bid can pay for the whole package at one time. This is particularly significant when credit cards are being used and we have to make a phone call for verification. In addition, the buyer doesn't have to carry the artwork around or worry about how to keep it safe until the end of the convention.

(For a comprehensive discussion of how to run a traditional voice auction from the auctioneer's point of view, see Jack Chalker's "A Guide to the Auctions", recently revised and reprinted in Conventional Fanzine Volume 1, Number 2, which may still be available for 50 cents from Eva Chalker Whitley, 4704 Warner Dr., Manchester, MD 21102.)

PICK UP AND PAY

On Sunday, after the room has been cleared, the high bids circled, and the room reopened, buyers are allowed to pick up and pay for their artwork. Although we allow several hours for this process and have lots of clerks, the lines unfortunately get rather long. But at least each buyer has to go through the process only once for all the artwork he has purchased. The procedure we use is very dependent on having two doors to the art-show room. One door is used for people going in and out, is guarded, and no artwork is allowed through it. The second door has a table put across it, and purchased artwork is handed through it. Thus we have complete control of the artwork leaving the room.

The buyer is asked to collect his artwork and bring it to a tally clerk. The tally clerk checks the bid sheets to see that the person is indeed the high bidder, removes and saves them on a spindle, fills out the tally sheet, and computes the total owed. The tally sheet is actually a multi-part form and includes a numbered package tag and a claim check. The art and the package tag stay with the tally clerk, and the

buyer takes the tally sheet to the cashiers.

The cashiers collect payment by cash, check, or credit card. Because of almost getting burned by a very large bad check two years ago, we now have limits on the size of check we will accept. This year we accepted larger checks if the buyer was willing to let us mail the artwork to him after the check cleared. This was a problem because it was hard to get the information out of the bank, and because the packing and mailing of the artwork took a lot of time. Credit cards are much preferred because payment is guaranteed, but they do add the minor hassle of a verification phone call while the buyer is waiting for his artwork. The cashier keeps the tally sheet and gives the buyer the claim check stamped "paid". The buyer then leaves the room and goes to the second door, where he presents his claim check and gets his artwork.

This system may seem excessively complicated, but when you've got a crowded room with hundreds of people carrying around artwork, it's very hard to expect the guard to check everyone coming out. Someone may have a receipt, but it's hard to be sure that the receipt is actually for the pieces he's carrying out. This way, the guard has a simple task - he just makes sure that no artwork leaves the room through his door.

Artists who come to pick up unsold work are handled in a similar way, without the stop at the cashiers. But we do fill out a tally sheet listing the works picked up, we do save the bid sheets, and we do hand the work out through the artwork-pick-up door. We provide space outside the door for both artists and buyers to pack up their artwork, and also provide tissue paper and paper bags for this purpose.

THE AMENITIES - KEEPING THE ARTISTS HAPPY

One way to have a super art show is to build up a reputation among the artists for providing prompt and equitable service. Artists tend to avoid the shows that mistreat their artwork and then take six months to mail out the checks. In this section I'll mention some of the things that we've found to be important to the artists. It's certainly possible that a smaller show might not be able to provide the same services at the same speed. Artists will understand this, if you take the trouble to tell them in advance what services you expect to be able to carry out. Then it will be up to them to decide whether the terms are acceptable.

1) Payment. In the early days we tried to pay the artists within a few hours after the closing of the art show, but it always caused problems. It really takes a day or two to reconcile the paperwork so that all errors are resolved, and when we tried to rush it things had a tendency to get fouled up. (Of course, it would be easier for a smaller show.) So now we take our time doing the closeout, wait for big buyers' checks to clear, and mail out the artists' checks two to three weeks after the show. We also make provision for cash advances against estimated sales for artists who really need the money at the convention.

2) Accepting mailed-in artwork. This really enhances the range of the show, since it allows non-attending artists to participate. Receiving the artwork is not usually too much of a problem, although transporting it to the convention may be if there are a lot of framed pieces, which are much bulkier than artwork that is just matted. It does give the art-show crew something to start setting up before the main flow of attending artists arrives.

The main problem with accepting mailed-in artwork is returning the unsold work to the artists. It has to be carefully packed and insured. If you don't have the manpower to cope with this, then it would be better just to say that you won't accept mailed-in artwork.

3) Supplying names and addresses of buyers. Many of the artists really like to

know who bids on and buys their artwork. Sometimes it's for a practical reason - they didn't have a chance to photograph it for the records before it was sold, or they want to contact unsuccessful bidders to suggest commissioning a piece - but often it's just for the satisfaction of knowing who likes their art. This is easy to do with our system of bid sheets and tally sheets. We just type an alphabetical list of buyers' names and addresses, Xerox it, and send it to all artists with their checks and bid sheets.

4) The award ribbons. Many art shows have some sort of judging, but a surprising number of them just announce the winners and that's that. Artists, not surprisingly, like to have some tangible record of their triumph, and we have found that ribbons are perfect - inexpensive and easy to get, but still impressive. You can get rosettes with one to three streamers of varying colors and lengths, imprinted with the name of the show, etc., for only 80 cents to \$3.50 per ribbon. And the bridle hooks designed to fit over horses' bridles work equally well hung over a mat or narrow frame. We even get some smaller non-imprinted ribbons marked "FIRST" and "HONORABLE MENTION", so the buyer of award-winning artwork will also have something to take home with him.

In selecting the award winners, you have a choice between using a panel of experts or conducting a popular vote. Boskone has chosen the popular-vote system, because we find that the responsibility of casting a vote makes many people go through the art show more attentively and really look at the artwork. This does give the problem of counting the votes, which generally takes 6 to 8 people an hour or more after the voting closes at 10 pm on Saturday. Then we go down to the closed art show, distribute ribbons, and make up a sign listing the winners, so that everything will be set when the show opens on Sunday morning.

5) Specifying rights purchased. We've found that many of the buyers are not aware of the fact that publication rights to artwork are often sold separately from the physical artwork. We try to make it clear that in most cases it's the physical object only that's being purchased, and that to obtain reproduction or publication rights it is necessary to reach a separate agreement with the artist. Of course, if the terms of sale for any particular piece vary from this norm, we encourage the artist to state the fact on the bid sheet. Next time we'll probably have a line on the bid sheet that says explicitly: "Publication rights included not included".

6) Security and insurance. It is our policy that the art show is responsible for the artwork from the time it enters our hands until the time we return it to the artist. To carry out this policy, we find it necessary to have both guards and insurance coverage.

The insurance coverage is obtained as part of our overall convention insurance, so it's hard to say exactly what it costs. We estimate the amount of coverage we need each year by taking the total value of the previous year's show and adding the percentage increase in panel space, if any. The master sheets and photographs constitute our main record of the contents of the show, and these items should probably not be left in the art-show room overnight (although I can't say that we always remember this).

I don't believe we've ever had to make a claim against our insurance, and if we did I sometimes wonder how we'd establish the value of a work. The minimum bid is the obvious number to use, but that may be over- or under-inflated depending on the artist's view of reality. And then there's the problem of not-for-sale artwork, the estimated value of which is likely to have no connection to reality at all. Of course, over the past few years professional appraisers of SF art have started to appear, so maybe it's really not such a problem.

There are three situations where we generally need guards. The first is during the day, to control entrance to the room. This usually involves checking badges, asking people not to bring packages into the room, and checking people leaving the

room to see that they're not taking any artwork out. For this purpose we have always used uniformed guards hired from a commercial guard service for \$5.50/hr. They generally do a reasonable job, and just their presence may have a deterrent effect on some people. The second situation is overnight, when the art show is closed. Until last year we were able to adequately secure the room with our own locks, so we didn't have to use guards at all. But this year we were in a larger room with so many doors that we finally concluded there was no way we could make the room secure. So we resorted to hiring a 24-hour guard to stay in the room all night and repel intruders. The third situation is when large amounts of money are being handled. This year, for the first time, our cashiers were located in a separate room from the rest of the show, and we felt the need for a guard to keep an eye on the cashboxes and escort the money to the safe-deposit box after closeout was completed. Because of the way we handle payment, this was for only about four hours, so we hired a Boston policeman. A policeman costs more than a random guard (about \$9.50/hr), but ours was quite a bit more conscientious and was willing to give us general advice about security for the convention as a whole. (He even helped people package their art!) It was definitely a good investment.

Some conventions use fans as guards to save money, but in a situation like the art show we feel it's not a good idea. Somehow people seem to take professional guards more seriously, and there's less chance that tempers will rise and something crazy will happen. Professional guards have more experience in the proper ways of dealing with people, and we run less legal risk if a guard physically stops a person than if a non-uniformed fan were to do so.

7) Photography. Our method of dealing with personal photography in the art show worked fine for several years, but is going to have to change in the future. Artists used to be pretty tolerant of people who wanted to take pictures for their own personal use. So we allowed people to photograph, if they would sign a statement agreeing not to sell or otherwise distribute copies of the pictures. And of course we always allowed individual artists to specify "no photography" for their work, and listed these artists on the agreement.

In the past few years many of the artists have been burned by copyright infringements of one sort or another, and have become increasingly reluctant to allow any photography at all. Where less than 10 artists used to be on the no-photography list, more than 30 were on the list at this past Boskone. In addition, we understand that ASFA (the Association of Science Fiction Artists) has requested that cameras not be admitted to any science fiction art show. So it appears that our policy must change and photography not be allowed.

8) Lighting. There's no one type of lighting that will complement all styles and media. For a convention art show, the best you can hope for is a hotel room with lights bright enough to let you see the art reasonably well. To brighten up the inevitable dead spots, you can rent clip-on spotlights for about \$3 each. At this Boskone we got 12, and could have used about 30. And don't forget to bring lots of extension cords and duct tape to secure the cords, so that people don't kill themselves.

9) Hangings. I don't really want to try describing all the various systems of hangings that have been devised. Basically, you need some material for the panels, and something else to hold them up with. The two most common panel materials are fabric (which we use) and pegboard. The advantages of fabric are that it's lightweight, easy to transport, and attractive; the disadvantages are that it must be fireproof (thus expensive), and that heavy artwork must be supported directly from the framework. Another option I've seen at sidewalk art shows is wire mesh stapled to a wood frame. The options for the framework are much more varied, including wood, plastic and metal tubing, or the metal angle irons made by Dexion that Boskone uses. All have their problems with cost, difficulty of transport, and complexity of setup.

In addition to the hangings, it is also a good idea to supply glass- or plastic-topped lockable display cases for the small items. These can be expensive, but also can be built fairly easily if you have anyone with carpentry expertise on the committee.

NOREASCON II

Although the system I have described works well for a Boskone, there are a lot of questions in my mind as to whether it can be carried over to work in a Worldcon setting. Not only will there be more art and more people, but a larger percentage of the people may be fringe fans who don't know how SF art shows work. Probably the space-reservation-and-flat-rate-fee system can be adopted for use, although it might be harder to set up if we use a multiplicity of hanging equipment with different sizes and layouts. But the written-bid system may give us many more problems in the way of false bids or no-show purchasers. I really would like to avoid using a system of non-stop interminable auctions, but it could be made more palatable by scheduling them more carefully so that the hour during which each piece of artwork would come up would be stated when the show opened. Because there'll be more people that we don't know, it's probably a good idea to collect payment right away at the auction unless special arrangements are made in advance. But the show does run more days, so even if you sell the work directly from the auction(s) you can still get in one or more days when everything is on exhibit before the first auction. If anyone has any good suggestions for how to handle a large Worldcon art show, we'd be happy to hear them.

APPENDIX

Sample Bid Sheet, Master Sheet, and Tally Sheet

<u>NAME</u>	<u>BID</u>
1. _____	\$ _____
2. _____	\$ _____
3. _____	\$ _____
4. _____	\$ _____
5. _____	\$ _____
6. _____	\$ _____
7. _____	\$ _____
*****eighth bid puts piece into	*****
*****mini-auction, 3 p.m. Sunday	*****
8. _____	\$ _____
*****FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY:*****	
FINAL PRICE: \$ _____ or NOT SOLD _____	
PURCHASER: _____	

From Noreascon II News Release #6, May 30, 1979:

PASS-ON FUNDS

Noreascon II is pleased to announce the receipt of \$500 in pass-on funds from the Iguanacon Committee.

1981 SITE SELECTION

As a service to the voters, Noreascon II's parent organization (Massachusetts Convention Fandom) sent questionnaires to the 1981 bidding committees to gather data about the committees, their facilities, and their plans. The results have been compiled for publication in the next Seacon Progress Report ((which as of this writing hasn't come out yet))....

APPOINTMENTS

Since the last news release, several area heads have been appointed.

Member Services Division:	Ellen Franklin, Press Kath Horne, Babysitting
Operations Division:	Seth Breidbart, Headquarters Bob Spence, Logistics
Program Division:	Drew Whyte, Senior Program Consultant Jean Berman, Discussion Groups Bill Carton, Films Laurie and Jim Mann, Children's Program
Exhibits Division:	Sue Lewis, Special Exhibits Steve Rosenstein, Dealers' Room
Functions Division:	Lynne Aronson, Fan Cabaret
WSFS Business Division:	George Flynn, Hugo Voting

PUBLICATIONS

Progress Report Two is at the printers, with mailing scheduled for June 20 and expected arrival by late July. ((It went out on schedule, which means you should have gotten it by the time this zine arrives. The distribution in fact seemed remarkably rapid: within a week we got questionnaires back from as far away as Alaska and Utah.)) ...

Voice of the Lobster #3 is being collated today, and should reach subscribers soon. ((It also went out on schedule, and everyone this side of Chicago seems to have gotten it the following Monday; haven't had any response from beyond there, though.)) ... Voice of the Lobster #4 will be out Real Soon Now (perhaps even sooner than you think). ((See?)) ...

EVENTS IN THE OUTSIDE WORLD

Some of you may have heard that a disgruntled Sheraton ex-employee tried to set the hotel on fire a few weeks ago, and did manage to do serious damage to one of the restaurants. As far as the committee can tell, this will have no effect on Noreascon II operations.

MEMBERSHIP

As of May 20, 1979, Noreascon II had 1707 members, of whom 1352 were Attending and 355 were Supporting. Membership rates will rise to \$30 Attending and \$8 Supporting as of July 1, with conversions going up to \$22. ...

((Erratum: Somehow in VotL 3 I managed to cite News Release #5 (March 21, 1979) as "#4"; please correct your copies immediately.))

From Noreascon II News Release #7, July 5, 1979:

APPOINTMENTS

Since the last news release, the following area heads have been appointed:

Member Services Division:	Dave Cantor, Registration
Program Division:	Gale Burnick, Authors' Forum
Exhibits Division:	Tom Schaad, Art Show
Functions Division:	Jo Ann Wood, Masquerade
	Mary Ann Mueller, Hugo Ceremony

MEMBERSHIP

Noreascon II has processed memberships received through June 29, for an official count of 1961, with 1604 Attending and 357 Supporting. However, memberships received in the last few days, but not yet processed, have pushed the total up over the 2000 mark. ...

PUBLICATIONS

Progress Report Two was mailed to members 1-1655 on June 21, and packages containing Progress Reports One and Two will be mailed to members 1656 to 1961 on July 6. ... 52 filled-out questionnaires have been received already and a preliminary summary of the returns will be included in the next news release. The items with the highest ratings so far are the Hugo Awards, Dealers' Room, Main Program, Films, Progress Reports, Program Book, and the Art Show. Competing for last place, not surprisingly, are Rock Bands (average rating 0.88) and Disco Music (0.46).

Addresses of Contributors

Avedon Carol, 4409 Woodfield Road, Kensington, MD 20795
 Jack Chalker, 4704 Warner Drive, Manchester, MD 21102
 George Fergus, 1810 Hemlock #204, Schaumburg, IL 60195
 Jan Howard Finder, P.O. Box 428, Latham, NY 12110
 Jeanne Gomoll, 2018 Jenifer St., Madison, WI 53704
 Doug Hoylman, 5480 Wisconsin Ave., #311, Chevy Chase, MD 20015
 Mark Keller, 101 S. Angell St., Providence, RI 02906
 James R. Madden, P.O. Box 18610-A, Univ. Sta., Baton Rouge, LA 70893
 Laurie D.T. Mann, 5501 Elmer St. #3, Pittsburgh, PA 15232
 John Charles McCormack, 43 Florence Ave., Apt. 10, Trenton, NJ 08618
 Mark L. Olson, Dept. of Chem., Ohio Univ., Athens, OH 45701
 Andrew Porter, P.O. Box 4175, New York, NY 10017
 Mike Rogers, 233 Barton Ave., Chattanooga, TN 37405
 Ron Salomon, 1014 Concord St., Framingham, MA 01701
 Eva Chalker Whitley, 4704 Warner Drive, Manchester, MD 21102
 James J.J. Wilson, 21 Spinning Wheel Rd., Hinsdale, IL 60521

In accordance with Murphy's Law, naturally I learned of a bunch of address changes within a week after typing the old addresses for the list in #3; for your information:

David Emerson, 1930 Aldrich, Minneapolis, MN 55405
 Gary Farber, 602 12th Ave. E., Seattle, WA 98102
 Evelyn C. Leeper, 80 Lake Ridge Drive, Matawan, NJ 07747
 Paula Lieberman, 16910 Crenshaw Blvd. #15, Torrance, CA 90504 (temporary)
 Pascal J. Thomas, ENS, 45 rue d'Ulm, 75005 Paris, France

And that ends another issue.