

# Voice of the Lobster



MIKEMA 079



### THE VOICE OF THE LOBSTER #3

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, that doesn't mean you get a refund if you already have a subscription.) No trades as such, but we'd like to see other 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).

Edited by George Flynn

Mimeography by Tony Lewis

Cover by Stu Shiffman

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

George Flynn	The Voice of the Editor	2
Donald Eastlake	The Saga of the Ballots	3
Leslie Turek	Planning for the Worldcon - Part 3 (Nov 1978 - Jan 1979)	14
Ellen Franklin	Excerpts from News Releases	22, 54
The Readers	The Voice of the Locster (Letters) (Bidding Strategy, 23; Membership Rates, 26; Date of the Convention, 27; Membership Cards, 28; Progress Reports, 28; Children's Memberships, 29; Advertising Rates, 30; Hotel Relations, 30; Programming (General), 31; Auction Blochs, etc., 33; Art Show, 34; Banquet Vs. Award Ceremony, 35; Art Hugos, 37; Fanzine Hugos, 38; Gandalf and Other Non-Hugo Awards, 41; Publication of Voting Results, 43; Worldcon Site Rotation, 44; The "World" in WSFS, 49; Other WSFS Business, 50; Miscellaneous, 51)	23
	Addresses of Contributors	55

You are getting this zine for one or more of the following reasons: (1) You sent money (if you have a subscription to all issues, an "A" follows your name on the address label). (2) Something you wrote is printed or referred to herein. (3) You are a member of the Noreascon II committee, a newszine, a Worldcon bidding committee, or someone else with a need to know. (4) You are the sort of person we think likely to produce an interesting response (but if there's an "X" on your label, this is your last chance). (5) It was the Editor's whim.

(last stencil typed 5/2/79)



## The Voice of the Editor

George Flynn

As our faithful subscribers will have noted, I did not fulfill my hope of getting this issue out by the end of March; in fact, I didn't even make the end of April. It was a variety of things: I was busy with other matters and got a relatively late start; I couldn't begin the segmented letter column until the articles were on stencil; then I lost two weekends going to Lunacon and Balticon; and meanwhile the letters kept coming in.... And since so many letters did have time to arrive, the issue is considerably fatter than last time - would you believe a 31½-page lettercol?

This of course also means that the zine is heavier than last time. First-class postage should run to at least 80¢, so we'll again consider the question of whether to switch to bulk rate. (I keep suggesting it, but thus far Leslie's overruled me on the grounds that the rapid feedback is worth the expense - which is a rather small fraction of our budget.) You'll know when you get it. In any case, from this point on new subscribers will get back issues via book rate (48¢ up to a pound). Overseas subscribers - except for our agents and newszines - have all along been sent their issues by book-rate surface mail.

(I should mention a suggestion we received from several people. Jeanne Gomoll: "If you still don't have enough people on your VotL mailing list to make bulk mailing possible (200), look into the possibility of sending the remainder back to yourself. It's legal. And I'm pretty sure you could save money. I know we are able to do this, saving money doing it this way on our non-profit, tax-exempt bulk-mailing permit." We're aware of the possibility, and we're about to try it for an interim mailing of PR1. But it's no longer necessary for VotL: paid subscriptions are now up to 201 (mostly thanks to the 47 we sold at Boskone), with a few score freebies on top of that.)

Well, in this issue we finally have Don Eastlake's article on the site-selection ballots. Then there's the latest installment in Leslie Turek's "Planning for the Worldcon" series, and that incredible lettercol. And yes, this time I did include the list of contributors' addresses.

Some of you who've been getting this free will find an "X" on your mailing label. This means that you won't get the next issue unless you respond in some way. It seems only fair - after all, even the great majority of our letter-writers are subscribers. While I wouldn't go so far as to call this zine "a fast way to the poorhouse for Noreascon II" (John Charles McCormack), we do want to cut the losses somewhat.

On the other hand, we are going back to press on the first two issues. We didn't expect to run out of them anywhere near this soon (I'm now down to one copy of #1, and about a dozen of #2), and subscriptions are still coming in at a fairly brisk rate; so we'll print another couple of hundred, but that's it.

I am not going to make any promises about when the next issue will appear. Certainly it won't be before July, and August is probably more likely (at NorthAmericon, perhaps?); time gets scarcer as the con gets closer. I have no specific material for #4 yet; but I assume Leslie will have another installment, and there will no doubt be more letters....

Until next time, then.



## The Saga of the Ballots

Donald Eastlake

Considering the de facto power of Worldcon committees and the importance of choosing a site and committee fairly, you might think that the "site selection" ballots would be designed, safeguarded, and counted in a secure, carefully planned, and uniform manner. Then again, you might know how hassled some Worldcon committees are, and guess that the details of site-selection voting could fall through the cracks.

IguanaCon ("Iggy"), the 36th World SF Convention, had the obligation of supervising the selection of the 38th Worldcon, to be held in 1980. The contenders were Baltimore and Boston (plus a humorous hack bid from Flushing, N.Y.). Site-selection ballots were sent out along with the Hugo ballots, accompanying Iggy Progress Report 4. The ballots had some problems, as will become apparent.

### PART ONE - Before the At-Con Voting

#### The Ballots

One thing done right was that the ballots gave more than just the names of the bidders' cities. The World Science Fiction Society (WSFS) Constitution used to refer to just selecting a location, but it was changed in 1977 to specify that a city and a committee are being selected. Furthermore, bidders are now required to file letters of agreement with their facilities. The ballots distributed by Iggy listed each bidding committee's name, officers, and proposed facilities. This seems like about the right amount of information to help the voters without cluttering up the ballot too much.

The ballots were designed as self-mailers, i.e., so you could fold them up, staple (or more commonly tape) the edges, and mail them. I think that self-mailers have a poorer chance of making it through the postal system intact than the same material enclosed in an envelope. (This is why the Postal Service prohibits self-mailers in international mail.)

The ballots were to be returned to the same Tucson, Arizona P.O. box as the Hugo ballots. There they would be picked up and processed by Jim Corrick, head of the Hugo Awards Subcommittee. Jim found out about this in late April: without any prior consultation, he was told that the ballots were already printed with the Tucson return address and he'd have to take care of them. Gay Miller voluntarily assisted him.

They report that a number of the ballots arrived with the ends unsealed, which might have let the \$5 voting fee fall out. But then there were many more people who did not enclose \$5 at all, because it wasn't obvious that they had to. The words "It takes \$5 to vote" appeared amid three paragraphs of fine print.

#### Pre-Convention Arrangements

Anticipating some possible problems, and uncertain about various details of the site-selection procedure, we (the Boston in '80 Committee) had talked to Greg Brown and later Tim Kyger, the successive chairmen of IguanaCon. We sent Tim Kyger a letter strongly suggesting, among other things: (1) that Iggy send back unpaid ballots with a note, or send postcards to those who didn't enclose \$5; (2) that they open a separate bank account in the name of "The 38th World Science Fiction Convention" and



deposit the voting fees, so the account could simply have signatory authority changed to the winning committee, rather than giving the winner a brown bag full of partially stale checks. Not only did Iggy agree to these points, but Tim Kyger sent the Baltimore committee a letter, dated 9 July 1978, saying they would do these things.

But when the time came, Tim Kyger annulled any previous agreements and said that the "Tucson group", which was also handling memberships, was too busy to open a special bank account or send anything to people whose ballots were defective due to \$5 missing. If they did have any spare time, Kyger said, they would (reasonably enough) give higher priority to those whose ballots were defective because they weren't Iggy members (since they might be able to get these people to buy Iggy memberships, to validate their ballots).

In fact, Jim Corrick and Gay Miller, like many on the IguanaCon committee, were overloaded. Though they would have had difficulty responding to checkless ballots, they would have been more than happy to deposit the checks in an account. Gay did keep a detailed log of 400+ ballots that arrived at the box. Checks were removed and stored in a safe-deposit box. A little over 100 ballots that arrived just before they left for Phoenix were not processed.

#### Saga of the Bank Account

At Westercon we had talked briefly to Mary Williams, one of the series of IguanaCon treasurers, who gave us the name of her favorite bank, the United Bank of Arizona. Mary said Iggy had tried to open a special account like we wanted, but had trouble with some bank. Jill Eastlake, Boston treasurer, later called the United Bank of Arizona and explained that the 36th Worldcon was administering an election to determine the 38th, and collecting money payable to the winner. The bank representative could see no problem, and said that if Jill wanted to open an account with her social security number and signature, they would be happy to have it under the name "38th World Science Fiction Convention" or any other name not obviously fraudulent. We considered this as, if nothing else, a place to deposit the checks just after Iggy if we won; but since most of the checks would be out-of-state no matter where we deposited them, it didn't seem worth it.

What had actually happened was that Jim and Gay went to the Tucson bank where they had their personal accounts, talked to one bank officer, and were told that they'd need a letter from the "parent organization" (i.e., WSFS) on "official letterhead", authorizing them to open the account. They turned the problem over to the next Iggy committee meeting, and also mentioned that a lot of ballots were arriving without money. Tim Kyger said that Bob Hillis (chairman of the WSFS business meeting) would be consulted and asked to write such a letter.

Hillis was also asked about sending notices to those who didn't enclose money. Apparently he merely suggested that it was not necessary or traditional to send notes to those who didn't pay, that depositing the mail-ballot fees in a special account was not necessary, and that most cons just turned over the collected checks to the winner. With that, the whole idea was allowed to completely evaporate. (At this point Hillis didn't know that an unprecedented 27% of the mail ballots were unpaid.)

(The World Science Fiction Society is a strange organization: In a sense, it has no officers. All power is held by either the members (at the business meeting or through balloting) or the convention committees.



If a true letter from some sort of outside officer were really necessary, one would wonder how any Worldcon ever opened an account. The WSFS Constitution made Iggy trustee for the 38th Worldcon as far as holding the mail-balloting fees went. Though policies can differ greatly from bank to bank, if a bank wanted a letter, it should have sufficed either to get a letter on Iggy letterhead with a copy of the WSFS Constitution attached, or to design some WSFS stationery and write a letter closer to what the bank probably expected. The bank's only obligation is to avoid things that look fraudulent. While it was a good idea for Iggy to consult Hillis as a procedural expert, he had WSFS authority only through appointment by Iggy; in principle, either he or an Iggy officer could have signed either type of letter.)

About this time we began to wonder how to make sure all our initial membership records could be straightened out if we won; we decided the exact names and addresses on all the checks sent in with the ballots might be very useful. If Iggy really didn't have the manpower to just open an account and deposit the checks, as Kyger said (though maybe the real problem was just opening the account), it seemed unlikely that they would be willing to Xerox them all before deposit to preserve the information. So we let that aspect drop.

Wednesday, 30 August 1978

The mail ballots and checks were brought from Tucson to Iggy (in Phoenix) by Jim Corrick and Gay Miller. At this point their responsibility was supposed to end; however, they couldn't find anyone on the Iggy committee willing to take the stuff. Finally Gay was told to dump it on Sharon Maples, the treasurer.

Sharon didn't want it either, since there wasn't enough room in her safe and she had more than enough else to contend with. After replacing some cash with Iggy checks payable to the 38th Worldcon, she tried to just give the materials to Sue Wheeler, chairman of the Baltimore committee; but Sue, displaying the same high level of conduct that Baltimore showed throughout the site-selection campaign, refused to take them without the involvement of someone from the Boston committee.

Seth Breidbart of the Boston committee was working on Iggy operations, so a little later he and Sue Wheeler accepted the bag of mail site-selection material. Both signed a receipt for "Site Selection Ballots & Monies & All Responsibility". They didn't examine the material. Since both Sue and Seth were staying in the Adams Hotel, they took the bag there. None of the safe-deposit boxes were big enough, so they had to check it with hotel security. It was checked under Sue's signature, but Seth kept the claim check; thus it would theoretically require them both to get it back.

Thursday, 31 August 1978

Bob Hillis, presiding officer of Iggy's WSFS business meeting, arrived and took over supervision of the site-selection process. At last there was an "IguanaCon official" interested in having the ballots. Thursday afternoon Leslie Turek, Sue Wheeler, and I got together with Bob and decided to see what shape the mail ballots were in. We got the claim check from Seth and went to the Adams. While we were waiting for someone from security to show up, Bob went off for a moment. Then a man from hotel security appeared, and we realized Bob had the claim check; however, it was the same person with whom the bag was originally checked. He recognized



Sue Wheeler, and was happy to give it to her with no claim check or signature; this shows how ineffective the previous dual security actually was.

We went up to my room to see what we had. There were several smaller envelopes of checks, one large pile of ballots, a smaller pile in an envelope inscribed "ballots without checks", and a few obviously defective ballots (with no name, address, etc.). We pulled out all the checks and spot-verified that there indeed seemed to be checks for the ballots in the main pile and not for those in the "ballots without checks" group. There were 147 ballots without checks; Bob Hillis, from previous experience, found this number amazingly high. Leslie said, "I told you so," referring to her previous comments on the ballot design and its obscure mention of the \$5 requirement.

After some discussion, we decided Hillis would take possession of the checks and paid ballots. The "unpaid" ballots would be sorted and a list of names posted at the site-selection table, so people could validate their ballots by paying. Everyone trooped over to the Hyatt, where Bob obtained a safe-deposit box, put the checks in it, and took the paid ballots to his room. Leslie, Sue, and I went back to the Adams; Sue, who was working on Iggy operations, got someone else from Baltimore to replace her. We then sorted the "unpaid" ballots, prepared a sign listing the names on them (as I recall, 3 of them didn't even have a name), and afterward gave these ballots also to Bob Hillis.

#### PART TWO - The At-Con Voting and Tallying

Meanwhile, Iggy had taken the extra blank ballots printed up for at-con voting and given half to each committee. Baltimore actively solicited people to fill out ballots and give them \$5 at their bidding parties, etc. Boston did not do this, but recommended that people show up at the site-selection table. Both committees brought their remaining blank ballots to the table.

Friday, 1 September 1978

The at-con voting table was open from 10 A.M. to 8 P.M. by agreement of the bidding committees. A representative of each committee was always present, one at each end of the table, which was near registration in the Hyatt. Each ran his or her own cash box and had his or her own pile of blank ballots. The ballot box was in the middle of the table. There were also piles of literature and stickers from each committee on their respective halves of the table. The table was quite crowded in practice; there was generally no place for people to set down the ballots while filling them out.

Voters would come up to the table and (in somewhat varying order) pay \$5 to one committee, getting a receipt from a duplicating receipt book, get a ballot from that person, mark the ballot, have it marked "paid" by the person they paid, and deposit it in the box. Boston supplied a stamp pad and a rubber stamp saying "The 38th World SF Convention", which was convenient for filling in checks. For those on the unpaid-ballot list, \$5 would be accepted and their names were written on a "paid" list. Baltimore also deposited the paid ballots they had been soliciting around the convention, while Boston deposited a few they had brought with them from some last-minute voters.

At the end of the day, Bob Hillis took the money from both cash boxes, put it in his safe-deposit box, and took the ballots to his room (keeping them separate from the mail ballots).



Saturday, 2 September 1978

The voting table was open from 10 A.M. to 6 P.M. (Iggy had proposed a closing time of 10 P.M., but this would have caused those on duty to miss most of the masquerade.) Things were as they had been on Friday.

Tallying Procedure

Just how the votes were to be tallied had been a controversial question. Greg Brown had published that they would be counted by a committee of four: one each from Iggy, Baltimore, and Boston, and a non-partisan fan at large. Bob Hillis was strongly against this, believing that the WSFS business meeting should supervise the procedure. He wanted the votes to be counted by the business meeting staff (originally himself as presiding officer and Larry Smith as secretary) unobserved. He apparently contemplated that the bidding committees' representatives would then be sworn to secrecy, told the tally, shown the piles of ballots, and asked to join in certifying the results. Some of this was incorporated in a general way in the Standing Rules proposed by Hillis and Smith /but this particular rule was withdrawn and not voted on/. However, both Boston and Baltimore found it unacceptable and demanded on principle to at least observe the counting.

The original committee-of-four plan was republished on the ballot by Iggy without any thought on the matter, but it had its problems. No one could think of a good candidate for a "non-partisan fan at large". Furthermore, Larry Smith ended up not attending Iggy, so Bob Hillis's original plan could not have been followed exactly in any case. Eventually it was more or less settled that Bob and a representative of each committee would do the counting.

Bob also felt strongly that the winning site should not be announced before being officially proclaimed at the business meeting, and that the vote totals should not be made public unless everyone agreed to it.

The "Count"

We originally thought that the ballots would be counted right after the table closed; if things went smoothly, the count might be finished before the masquerade started at 8 P.M. However, Hillis was heavily involved in Iggy operations and would be on duty until late that night. He told both committees that the count would be in his room after the masquerade.

I was the Boston representative at the count. A while after the masquerade, I went to Hillis's room and found him and Sue Wheeler waiting. After Bob announced that he had made no sample counts or otherwise examined the ballots, we proceeded with the count. It soon became obvious that some additional help could be used, so Sue called in another Baltimore committee member and I called Leslie Turek.

The ballots had the voter identification on one side and the vote on the other. First we scanned the voter-ID side and rejected ballots on which it was blank or otherwise screwed up. (There were also two adjacent ballots identical except for Iggy membership number; both were rejected.) The "unpaid" ballots that had been validated by payment were pulled from the "unpaid" pile, specially marked, and merged with the mail ballots. At Leslie's request, we kept the mail and at-con ballots separate at all times.

The next step was to turn the ballots over and sort by first-place vote. Groups of ballots were given to each person to sort into three common



piles on the floor: Boston, Baltimore, and "Flushing". (You see, the hoax bid for Flushing, N.Y. had been listed on the ballot as a "no preference" vote.) About 9 ballots with no vote marked were also put in the "Flushing" pile. Finally, there were 3 ballots preferentially voted for Flushing and then for another site; how to correctly tally these might have been problematical, but it turned out not to matter.

All this was done in two parts, first for mail ballots, then for at-con ballots. In each case the vote for Boston was obviously greater than the vote for Baltimore, which was in turn obviously greater than the no-preference vote. No attempt was made to cross-check the voters with the Iggy membership records, which would have been extremely tedious. The results were so obvious that, on Bob's suggestion, no exact count was taken at that time.

Hillis said that normally the ballots would be cut, with only the names and addresses of voters given to the winner; however, Iggy had designed the ballot so badly (ignoring advice he had sent them on the subject) that this could not be done. Boston wanted to sort and cross-check everything the next day so we could open a table for conversions, etc.; thus we were given the complete ballots.

Bob also said that, if neither bidder objected, he planned as a joke to initially announce at the business meeting that Flushing had won, and then announce the Boston victory. He added, most vehemently, that if we told people we had won before his official announcement, he would not give us any time at the business meeting to make announcements about our con.

I carried the ballots over to the Adams in the ballot box from the site-selection table. When I got to my room, Jill Eastlake, Ann McCutchen, and I did an actual count of the votes for each site. Later we were joined by George Flynn and Leslie Turek.

#### Reconciling the Records - Part 1

We sorted the ballots alphabetically by name, still keeping the mail and at-con ballots separate. (Actually, at this point there were 5 sets of ballots: good mail ballots, good at-con ballots, unpaid mail ballots, otherwise defective mail ballots, and defective at-con ballots.) We noticed that it was possible, by very carefully cutting through some text on the front of the ballot, to separate the vote part from the voter-ID part if the ballot was correctly filled out. As soon as we figured this out, we went through and cut the ballots there, carefully checking first and copying the voter-ID info onto the non-vote part for the many ballots not correctly filled out.

#### PART THREE - After the Tallying

##### Announcement at the Business Meeting

At the Sunday business meeting Bob Hillis announced the Boston victory in the humorous way he had planned, saying that Flushing had won but was disqualified. (Unfortunately, many people took him seriously. At Monday's business meeting Bob had to announce that he had been joking when he said Flushing had won, and that there had been only 61 votes for Flushing and 130 invalid ballots, out of a total of 1154 ballots.) Leslie Turek made a brief speech, and we started handing out our Progress Report Zero.

We had brought the vote parts of the ballots to the business



meeting in a large bag, and we gave them to Bob Hillis after the announcement of the winner. Unfortunately, when the meeting adjourned everyone forgot the ballots, which were left sitting on the floor by the head table. The next function in that room was Ross Pavlac's con-running seminar at 5 P.M. Sunday; George Flynn happened to be there and recognized the bag of ballots, which Ross then returned to Iggy headquarters.

### Reconciling the Records - Part 2

Jill Eastlake, as treasurer, obtained the mail-voting and at-con checks from Hillis on Sunday, and we set about sorting them and comparing them with the ballots. Many at-con voters had paid in cash, but in most cases we had the copies of their receipts from the receipt book. We found it was even useful to have the traveler's checks some people had paid with, since the signatures could often be matched with those on the voter-ID part of the ballots. Although it might have been invaluable under other circumstances, we made no use of the mail-ballot log carefully compiled by Gay Miller, since (1) we didn't know at the time who had compiled it or how accurate it was, (2) it wasn't complete, (3) we had the original documents to work with.

It took 8½ hours, with 3 to 4 people working solidly, to do all the sorting, cross-checking, totalling of money, etc. This was mostly done by Tony Lewis, Jim Hudson, Jill Eastlake, and Ann McCutchen. There were a few unexplained things left over, as always, but we think we got the records as straightened out as possible.

We had originally planned to open a table Sunday afternoon for conversions, new memberships, etc., and to clean up the records when we got back to Boston. But on Sunday some people were working away at reconciling things and others were exhausted. We decided it was better to just open a table at our victory party that night, and the next day to accept conversions at the former at-con voting table. Our rates were not to change before the end of 1978; one reason we decided on this rate schedule (rather than allowing a special bargain rate at the con) was to avoid being swamped with new members at Iggy, when we would mostly be exhausted from the con, bidding, running the masquerade, etc.

### Final Disposition of the Ballots

On Monday I went by Iggy headquarters, and Seth Breidbart offered to hand me the vote parts of the ballots; however, I said they should go to Bob Hillis or be destroyed. I'm told that the ballots were no longer at Iggy headquarters when it shut down, but I don't know just what happened to them.

The voter-ID parts of the ballots were brought back to Boston and ultimately merged into a smaller number of stacks by combining the mail and at-con ballots. A special mailing was sent to those whose mail ballots still appeared to be unpaid.

At the end of October we received an envelope from Iggy with a note from Sharon Maples and 12 more ballots (1 unpaid) postmarked between 28 August and 2 September. (It is, of course, only to be expected that some would come in after the con, even if an early deadline had been mentioned on the ballot; in fact there was no deadline of any sort mentioned in the ballot instructions.) We immediately cut off the vote parts of the ballots and mailed them to Bob Hillis.



PART FOUR - Recommendations

I think the above account is reasonably factual, and the few places where I give an opinion are identified as such. In this section, however, almost everything I say will just be my opinion.

The Ballots

On or with the ballots there should be a step-by-step list of instructions, in large type, telling how to fill out the ballot and vote. There should be a clear deadline, at least a week or two before the convention, by which mail ballots must be received. It should be clear that payment must be enclosed, preferably a check made out to the "Nth World SF Convention" (the one being selected), and what this payment will get the voter (nothing but a credit toward membership now, unless the bidders agree otherwise; a full supporting membership, if one of the pending WSFS constitutional amendments is ratified). A simple, clear "no preference" option is probably a good idea (and would be required by another pending amendment), so voters with no real preference don't feel forced to choose one bidder, perhaps for insubstantial reasons. Wherever the voter is to put name, address, membership number, and signature, it should say something like "Give your address as you wish it to appear on the rolls of the winning convention," to make it obvious that the information is important and will be used.

The ballot should give a reasonable amount of information about the bidders, without being cluttered or biased. Since the WSFS Constitution speaks of selecting "locations and Committees", the bidding committees should be listed by city and the committees clearly identified; giving the name the committee goes by and the names of its officers would be a good way to do this. (For a bad example, see the ballot produced by SunCon. Despite the emphasis on quality of committee members in their own bidding advertising, and despite the fact that they ended up in a different city from the one they bid for, the site-selection ballot they distributed listed bare city names.) Since bidders are now required to submit copies of agreements with their facilities, it would be good to also list the facilities on the ballot, as Iggy did. The Constitution has just been amended to require bidding committees to make copies of their organizational rules available on request, so all future ballots should mention this and include the bidders' addresses.

If the ballot is a single sheet of paper, the vote part and voter-ID part should be on opposite sides of the sheet (to make it easier to have a secret ballot) and be positioned so the ballot can be easily cut to separate them. I think it would be a bad idea to perforate the ballot, as it might tend to fall apart or be separated prematurely. It should not be a self-mailer, but voters should be encouraged to put it and the voting fee in an envelope.

Another possibility, besides a single-sheet ballot, is an envelope system: The vote part is sealed in a special envelope, on the outside of which the voter-ID information is written; then this is usually enclosed in a further outer envelope to be mailed in. This system is how mail ballots are conducted in many large societies; however, though it is frequently advanced as an idea to improve the Worldcon balloting, I'm not sure it would be worth it. It might make secrecy of the ballot a bit easier to maintain; and if the voting fee were enclosed in the sealed inner envelope, validating the vote would be easier when it came to tallying. On the other hand, it's more expensive for the con committee and more complicated; also,



having the vote and the voter-ID on separate pieces of paper, even though one encloses the other, would make tampering or premature separation easier. [What's more, having the checks in the inner envelope would partly cancel the added secrecy. - G.F.]

### The Voting

The mail voting is fairly simple. You have to get the ballots out in time for people to vote (something that some recent concons have found a bit difficult for overseas members). You have to collect the ballots and voting fees as they come in, and at least keep them reasonably secure. Ideally, you should open an interest-bearing bank account in the name of the "Nth World SF Convention" (the one being selected), Xerox all the voting-fee checks, and deposit them in the account, charging the account for the cost of copying (which wouldn't be much, since you can fit four checks on a page). Finally, when the winner is known, you just give them the copies of the checks and an authorized blank-signature card for the account, thus turning over the mail-voting fees.

Unfortunately, few Worldcon committees seem to have the manpower to do all this while they're struggling to complete the last-minute preparations for their convention. Therefore, as a practical matter, it's probably best to just put all the ballots, checks, etc. in a safe place and give them to the winner. Although SeaCon apparently had a lot of problems with stale checks due to this, that was probably some quirk of British banks. For small checks like the voting fee, few U.S. banks would care if they were several months old, which is as old as they're likely to get.

When you move from the mail voting to the at-con events, things get more complicated. The WSFS Constitution provides for the current convention committee to administer the mail balloting and turn over the voting fees to the winner, but puts the final administration of the site selection under the control of the business meeting. On the other hand, unless it is somehow injurious to WSFS or its members, it's probably best to go along with such procedures as have the support of the bidders. The bidders are generally the parties most strongly affected, and are the ones who have expressed willingness to take on the (sometimes unenviable) task of running a Worldcon. Since the business meeting is in overall charge, and its presiding officer should be someone generally capable and neutral, a reasonable practice has developed of his taking custody of the voting materials at the convention (including the at-con materials at the close of each day's voting).

The exact procedures at the at-con voting table may depend on the state of relations between bidding committees. Normally the table is staffed by a representative of each committee, with no representative of the current convention or the business-meeting staff continuously present; however, the presiding officer or some other clearly designated person should help set initial procedure and must be available to settle disputes. If the bidders don't trust each other, it might be best to firmly attach the voting fee to the ballots (this would be particularly easy in a double-envelope system) and put the whole thing in the ballot box. Normally it should suffice for each committee to put a distinguishing mark on the ballots they give out, after collecting the voting fee. In case of dispute (which can't be settled at the time) over the validity of a ballot being cast at the table, it should be accepted and possibly annotated, with the matter left to be settled during tallying.



### The Tallying

The tallying process should be as open as is convenient. Representatives of the bidders should be allowed to be present (as would be required by a pending constitutional amendment). Generally these representatives can do the counting under the supervision of the presiding officer or someone else from the business meeting staff. To be formally correct, they should be constituted a Tellers Committee by the business meeting, to which any dispute that can't be settled at the tallying can in principle be brought.

In general a counting procedure like that used at Iggy can be followed. First a scan of the voter-ID information to eliminate those with obvious problems. All at-con voters should have paid, but the mail voters who failed to pay should also be set aside. Then the votes are tallied preferentially; with more than two bidders, more than one pass may be needed, as those with the lowest number of votes are eliminated. If the two aren't visually distinguishable, the mail ballots should be kept separate from the at-con ballots (if nothing else, this will help the winners to straighten out their records). Validating the voters against the membership list of the current convention, while theoretically proper, would be very time-consuming, make little difference, and has thus been rarely done; however, some year there will be a really close race and/or significant evidence of fictitious voters, so one should be prepared to do a complete validation if necessary.

Although this has not been done for the past few years, exact vote counts should be made, and a written tellers' report drawn up and signed. This report should be presented to the business meeting and all the exact votes reported, at which point the presiding officer has the obligation and authority to officially announce the winner. Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised says (pp. 352-353):

The chairman of tellers, standing, addresses the chair, reads the tellers' report, and hands it to the chair without declaring the result. ... The result is always declared by the chair.... The tellers' report is entered in full in the minutes, becoming a part of the official records of the organization. Under no circumstances should this be omitted in an election or in a vote on a critical motion out of a mistaken deference to the feelings of the unsuccessful candidates or members of the losing side.

I agree. After all, how much confidence would you have if the winners in your legislative elections were announced after a secret count, with no vote totals given? In some cases a committee's margin of victory might indicate how much of a mandate it has. And those who are privy to vote totals that aren't announced have an advantage in future campaigns, in that they alone know just how the voters were leaning.

(It is said that exact vote totals are in the minutes of some business meetings, which are in the custody of their secretary and can be examined for a legitimate purpose by any member of the society willing to take the time; trouble, and expense of visiting said secretary. This has none of the benefits of publicly announcing the vote.)

### The System of Mixed Mail and At-Con Voting

A final comment on the mixture of mail and at-con voting used for site selection. To show that I don't quote Robert's only when it supports me, it says (p. 355):

An organization should never adopt a bylaw permitting a question



to be decided by a voting procedure in which votes of persons who attend a meeting are counted together with ballots mailed in by absentees, since in practice such a procedure is likely to be unfair. Yet I think the mixed voting system has worked quite well. Robert's is presumably thinking of a case where all who attend some meeting have a right to vote, rather than a case where an additional fee is charged for voting. There is a rough parity in the mail and at-con votes. The at-con votes don't swamp the votes from those who can't attend, partly because many of the attendees don't care much about site selection, and partly because a fee is charged to vote. There are other factors. Many who plan to attend still vote by mail for convenience; others feel that the combination of the postal system with a convention committee under time pressure is apt to be unreliable, and thus will vote only at the con. Although in principle new information might come out very late which would make the at-con vote radically different from the mail vote, this does not seem to happen. If it did and the new information were particularly startling, it might provoke a higher at-con vote.

In any case, here is another reason for publishing the site-selection vote totals, with the mail and at-con votes distinguished. How can WSFS ever decide whether to change or keep the present system, if it is kept in ignorance of how that system contributes to site-selection decisions? I think the present mail/at-con system should be continued (probably with a voting-fee increase in a couple of years, to compensate for inflation), but it does bear watching.

POSTSCRIPT

I would like to apologize for any factual errors or omissions that may remain in this article.

Copies of an earlier version were mailed to Bob Hillis, Sue Wheeler, and Jim Corrick c/o IguanaCon. Jim Corrick's detailed comments, for which I am most grateful, have for the most part been incorporated in the article. Copies of essentially the current version [before editing] were sent for comment to Seth Breidbart, Sue Wheeler, Jim Corrick, Bob Hillis, Sharon Maples, and Tim Kyger. Sue Wheeler responded with a letter including the following comments:

To my recollection, the statements are factual and I have no major differences with your recommendations on future handling of ballots. Frankly, I am glad you are publishing this, as I was quite upset by the handling of the ballots, but I felt that any comments I made after the fact were in danger of being ignored as sour grapes. I don't see that Iggy's methods in any way changed the outcome, though. ... I feel that Sharon Maples acted well under trying circumstances....

And Tim Kyger wrote:

Sad to say, I can find no factual error nor do I tend to disagree with Don's assessment of the way things were handled. I plan, then, on not commenting on it other than this paragraph.

[The preceding article has been somewhat heavily edited for stylistic purposes - mostly to shorten sentences - but I don't think I've tampered significantly with any of Don's points. I should add that I also thoroughly agree with the bulk of Don's conclusions. - George Flynn]

\* \* \* \* \*  
 \* \* \* \* \*



Planning for the Worldcon - Part 3(Nov 1978 - Jan 1979)

Leslie Turek

The period covered in this report had its ups and downs. The first six weeks were mostly taken up with getting Progress Report 1 ready for the printers. Then we rested over the holidays. In early January we processed the end-of-year membership rush (which wasn't as big as we expected), got PR1 back from the printers, and prepared it for mailing on Jan. 17. After that we took another break from Noreascon business, as most of us geared up for putting on Boskone 16 (held Feb. 16-18). But even as we did these major projects, lots of other things were happening; I'll try to include as many as I can remember.

The Committee

We continued to hold monthly business meetings, interspersed with one or two work sessions a month; but we decided to increase the interval between meetings to 5-6 weeks after January, and to hold smaller, more topical discussions on specific areas (budget planning, programming, etc.). The committee took on two new members who had been actively helping out - Rick Katze and Peter Neilson. It also adopted a rule that members who attended no business meetings for six months would become "inactive" and lose their voting rights. Five members are now in this category, though two of them were inactive only due to geographical restraints, continuing to participate in the committee apa. (The January collation of Apa:80 was the biggest yet, at 52 pages.)

Finances

We had a great deal of income from new memberships and not a whole lot of expenses, the major expense being the printing of Progress Report 1. Our operating budget as of the end of January is given in the Appendix to this article; some of the expenses will be mentioned or explained in the text.

We decided that we'd probably have a large cash surplus right up to the convention, and that it might be a good idea to find profitable things to do with the money. Specifically, given the current interest rates, I suggested a money market fund, since it would be (1) safe, (2) high-yielding (at least in the current market), and (3) extremely liquid. I currently hold shares in a fund that pays around 9% interest with no investment fees or other charges; to get your money out, you just write a check on the account. Jill Eastlake, our treasurer, checked with her father the CPA, and after receiving his approval made an initial deposit of \$5000.

Incoming Mail

The mail continued to flow in, at about 30-50 pieces per week, and George Flynn continued to keep track of it all. We only got a few "nut letters" - unfriendly, irate, or downright abusive letters of complaint. We tried waiting a day to simmer down and then attempting to write a calm, rational, and sympathetic reply (it wasn't always easy). This approach seemed to work in most cases, turning growly lions into apologetic lambs; but it's a drain on our time and mental energy, so I hope we don't have to do it too often.



Membership Processing

In Part 2 I described the various membership hassles involving people who didn't understand our various discounts. The problem was finally alleviated in January, when all the special discounts expired. There are still a few people trying to join at incorrect rates, but that's a more straightforward situation than the discount complications.

One problem was that our original form letter requesting additional payment didn't specify a deadline. Thus on Jan. 1 we still had about 50 outstanding invalid conversions or new memberships. So we sent a follow-up letter, this time with a deadline about a month later. If the proper payment were not received by the deadline, we'd refund the partial payment; since the rates went up on Jan. 1, failure to respond also meant the person would have to pay the higher rates. Most people paid by the deadline, and on Feb. 1 we had only 17 invalid memberships still pending.

The processing of valid payments proceeded much as before. Ann McCutchen managed to cut the time before sending acknowledgments down to one week (after she received a two-week batch) by sending them out herself rather than waiting for the next work session. We were pretty liberal about the Jan. 1 deadline for the old rates, accepting postmarks of Jan. 2 and 3 that arrived up to a week later. Even so, Ann managed to enter all the "old rate" memberships and conversions and produce a set of mailing labels in time for the Jan. 17 work session, when we prepared PR1 for mailing. The total at that date was 1479 memberships, 1090 attending and 389 supporting.

At the end of January we did one last (?) special mailing. In Progress Report Zero we promised to refund \$1 to the Boston pre-supporters who voted but didn't take advantage of the conversion discount by Dec. 31. It was easy to get a list of these people, since our main data base included a flag to mark the pre-supporters. So Ann just prepared a listing of all flagged members still in the Supporting category, and Jill Eastlake wrote about 20 \$1 checks, which we mailed with an explanatory letter.

Publicity

We didn't have much time to prepare fancy ads, but we did put together a basic, dull, functional ad for Seacon PR3, the Boskone Program Book, and anything else that came along. To prepare this ad we had to ratify the \$30 membership rate for July 1979 to June 1980, which we had been talking about but hadn't finalized.

We kept putting out news releases on a monthly basis after each regular meeting. Although several fanzines published excerpts, hardly any of the editors sent us sample copies. This was a problem, because sometimes they would excerpt or rephrase our words in ways that actually distorted the meaning. We wrote to correct the ones we knew about, and just kept our fingers crossed that any others weren't too bad.

Voice of the Lobster

I've heavily edited this section, since it's mostly been covered in my editorials. -- G.F.

VotL #1 was mailed (first class) on Thanksgiving. I was disappointed that the repro was so poor, but there didn't seem to be much we could do about it. Tony Lewis explained that the paper we used wasn't absorbent enough, so the excess ink rubbed off on the following page. We used the same paper for #2, but now we've finally used it up.



There were few reviews of #1 by the end of January, but quite a few letters of comment were received. Right at the end of January we started to get a rash of new subscriptions; since these came mostly from New England and adjacent areas, we surmised they were from people who read about VotL in PR1. Meanwhile George was busy putting together issue #2. By Jan. 31 the first 26 pages were on stencil, and the rest was finished on Feb. 3. It only remained to be seen whether there would be time and manpower to run it off and collate it before Boskone. [There was. -- G.F.]

### Progress Report One

Each of our Progress Reports will include some traditional material and some room for innovation. The traditional material in PR1 was:

- Photographs of and information about our Guests of Honor.
- Basic information about the convention, including a committee list, membership information, hotel and travel information, etc.
- A list of members (printed in alphabetical order for easy lookup, rather than the more traditional numerical order).
- A map showing the distribution of members across states/provinces/countries.
- A glossary of fannish terms used in the PR.

Some new features we included were:

- An article about Noreascon I's PR1 (the first of a series).
- A graphical comparison of past Worldcon membership rates.
- The first article in this "Planning for the Worldcon" series.

(This was included to show people the kind of information we'd be providing in VotL, and seems to have been successful in generating subscriptions.)

We also wrote to several previous Worldcons offering to print final reports, financial statements, or other information, but none of them had sent us any material yet.

While we had some artwork at the beginning of November, we knew it would be useful to have a variety of shapes and sizes on hand for the PR layout. So we arranged to send out an appeal as part of the Boskone Art Show mailing. For any artwork donated and accepted, we offered to mat it and enter it in the Boskone Art Show at our expense. We also sponsored an award for the "Best Lobster". This approach got us about 20 pieces of usable art from several artists. We photostatted each piece to the correct size for the PR layout, so we were free to use them in either PR1 or a later publication.

Some of you have asked why a PR that you got in February had a membership list dated Nov. 1. Let me explain. Around Nov. 1 we gave the memberships accumulated until then to Ann McCutchen, who entered them into her computer. Then they had to be proofread and final corrections made. Next Ann ran a program to sort the names alphabetically and write them on a magnetic tape, which got passed to Don Eastlake, publications editor. This whole process took about two weeks. Don read the tape into his computer, added typesetting commands, and produced a paper tape that could be fed into a typesetting machine. This didn't take long, but at the same time Don was preparing all the other text to be typeset for PR1. Around Dec. 1 all the paper tapes were run through the typesetting machine, and printed galleys were produced. Some of them didn't come out right, and had to be corrected and rerun. Titles, captions, and other material also had to be set. Then we got to take all the galleys and try to cut them apart and paste them up to come out with an even multiple of four pages. This is a skill that takes some learning, so it probably took us longer than if we knew better what we were doing. The membership list was one of



the easiest parts, since it didn't need much complicated layout. By Dec. 15 the copy was pasted up and ready for the printer. Since the printer estimated  $3\frac{1}{2}$  weeks for the job, we scheduled a work session for Jan. 17 to do the mailing. (See the next section.) The mailing got out promptly, but bulk rate can take 4-6 weeks to be delivered, which brings us into late February. And that's why the PR you got in February has a Nov. 1 membership list.

By the way, that's also why we didn't indicate membership status on the list. We knew many people would be converting at the end of the year, so their status as of Nov. 1 would be meaningless by the time PR1 was received. (In fact, about 200 people converted during that period.)

In spite of proofreading, the finished PR did have a few errors. For example, I spelled Seth Breidbart's name wrong in the committee list and set IguanaCon in 1977 in the glossary. We did find and correct a number of others by showing Xeroxes of the galleys to as many people as we could. (George Flynn remains the committee's champion error-spotter.)

### Mailing Progress Report One

As mentioned in Part 2, we had some trouble with our application for a non-profit bulk mailing permit. As the deadline for printing the mailing wrapper loomed closer, things looked more and more desperate; finally Rick Katze, a local fan who's a lawyer, volunteered to see what he could do. It was a good thing he went down and talked to them, since it seems their standard method of dealing with such applications was to toss them in a corner and hope they'd go away. The "old fossil" I mentioned last time had retired, but he left a legacy - a long list of detailed objections to our application. Rick patiently argued against each one and politely asked the current official to explain his objections. After about an hour of this, including a phone call to Washington, he finally caved in and gave us his blessing. [Rick did a write-up of the process, but I decided it was too detailed to print in VotL; however, I imagine he could furnish a copy to anyone who's having similar problems. - G.F.]

This really turned out to make a big difference: the non-profit rate was about 4¢ per PR while the regular bulk rate would have been about 10¢ and the third-class printed-matter rate around 40¢. On a 1500-piece mailing, that works out to paying only \$60 instead of \$150 or \$600! (The foreign PRs - about 100 of them - couldn't go bulk rate, so they cost another \$46 to send out.)

Jan. 17, which we'd set for preparing the mailing, was the day of our first snowfall of any size for the season. In spite of that, about a dozen people showed up and made short work of the job - it only took a little over an hour to label and bundle all 1500 PRs. It was a big help that they came already wrapped from the printers, so we didn't have to stuff them into envelopes. That seems like a small step, but multiply by 1500 and you have several fan-hours of work.

The requirements for preparing bulk mailings aren't too complicated if your labels are printed in ZIP-code order, as ours were. First we gave each person the labels for one state to work on at a time. For each state, first we scanned through to see if there were more than 10 labels for any one ZIP code. If so, those labels were affixed to PRs and the PRs combined in a bundle with elastic bands. The post office supplies little day-glo stickers to identify the various types of bundles; the sticker goes on the top piece in the bundle. (Haven't you ever wondered about those funny little stickers? Well, now you know.) The bundles containing only



one ZIP code get a "D" for "direct"; we had only one of those (to Boston, of course) in the whole mailing. Next you scan through the remaining labels to see if there are more than 10 ZIP codes beginning with the same three digits; these bundles are labeled with a "3". If there are still more than 10 labels left for that state, they're bundled and labeled "S" for "state". If there are fewer than 10, they go into the mixed-states bundles, which aren't labeled at all. At some point we may write a computer program to print out the labels already grouped into bundles, but right now the sorting doesn't take all that long.

We had about 2000 PR1s prepared with wrappers, the remaining 3000-plus without. We'll use the remaining wrapped PRs for new members who join from now until PR2 is ready to go. After that, new members will need to get more than one back PR, so we might as well stuff unwrapped ones into an envelope together.

Then there's the storage problem. 3000 left-over Progress Reports take up a lot of space, and most of the local fans have already donated most of their free space to NESFA, which is sort of in the book-publishing business. We investigated commercial storage places, which ran about \$21/month for more space than we'd need; but then I managed to arrange to store the boxes free (at least temporarily) in an unused office where I work. Eventually we may have to pay for storage, though.

The post office didn't do too badly with the mailing. The PRs seemed to reach the local area over the next week, and the rest of New England the week after that. (One got to Alaska in only 5 days, but the theory is that all mail to Alaska probably goes by air anyway.) And there was even one positive report from a contact in California by the end of January. By that time we had only one bounce - and we got two address corrections from the post office, implying that the PRs were actually being forwarded!

We did want to be prepared for the inevitable bounces, so we had 200 postcards printed up for that purpose. The theory is that sometimes a first-class postcard will get through where a large bulk-rate piece won't (especially if the bounce was an error in the first place. Our plan was to follow up all bounced PRs with a postcard and remail them only if we got a response; it's a lot cheaper to mail a postcard (10¢) than a PR via third class (53¢). So far I've sent out about 10 of these postcards, and they did work twice. - G.F.

### G&H Projects

We decided even before winning the bid that we'd like to do some sort of special projects related to our guests of honor, something like the Boskone Book series put out by NESFA. So we discussed the idea with our guests at IguanaCon, and came up with some good suggestions.

Damon Knight and Kate Wilhelm had a pair of stories, one written by each of them, with a similar theme. The idea was to publish the two stories together in a souvenir book to be sold at the convention. And since there was no reason to leave this job for the last minute, we started typing the stories into the computer in December; by the end of January they were both proofread and ready to be typeset. Damon and Kate were to send us additional introductory material in February, and the next step was to spec out the book and start getting estimates from printers.

Bruce Pelz has two projects that he thought we could help with. The first is a tarot deck, each card illustrated by a different pro or fan science fiction artist. Bruce has been working on this project for years,



but we thought that providing a target date for completion might encourage the artists to meet their deadlines. We can't afford to actually publish the deck, but if it were professionally published we could feature it at the convention. Also, Bruce retained ownership of most of the artwork, so we definitely plan to stage a special exhibit of it.

Bruce's second project is the compilation of a fanzine index. Because of its large size, he's been putting the information on punched cards, intending to transfer it later to microfiche and distribute it in that form. We're going to try to help by having our computer types locate inexpensive microfiche-making services.

#### Requests for Our Mailing List

We received several requests for the use of our mailing list, and we had to decide how to handle them. We knew some of our members would love to receive additional SF mailings, while others would be very upset if we released their addresses to others. So we compromised - we decided to give out the list only for purposes related to the Worldcon or the World Science Fiction Society, including con-site bidding, charter flights, proposed WSFS business, etc. We also instituted a few safeguards: the list would be provided on labels rather than on magnetic tape, so it couldn't be easily reproduced; and we asked for sample copies of all mailings, so we could monitor them. We'd charge 1¢ per name to cover the cost of labels and postage. We notified the various requesters of these terms, but didn't hear anything before the beginning of February.

#### Worldcon Planning

This far ahead of the convention, the planning effort has three interrelated parts. The first, which I'll call scheduling, is deciding what will happen at the con, and to some extent when, where, and how. The second is staffing, deciding who'll run each area. And the third is budgeting, determining what each part will cost. You can't work on any of these planning areas without an impact on the other two. The schedule affects our staff and budgeting needs. The person running an area will have some say in its schedule and budget. And the amount of money available will determine how much we'll be able to do. So we've been cycling through each of these areas, making tentative plans as a basis for discussion, though we know they'll be adjusted as we proceed.

The main effort during this period was in scheduling. We listed all the major things that would be happening and assigned each of them a tentative time and location, considering such things as the size of room needed, security, minimizing changes of setup, etc. Fixing the major functions will give us a better idea of what space is left for the special-interest events that are even now being suggested to us.

For those of you familiar with our facilities, here's a summary of the current version of the layout:

- Hynes Auditorium - main program; masquerade (Sat. night); GoH speeches and Hugo awards (Sun. night)
- Hynes Lower Exhibit Hall - art show, auctions, special art exhibits
- Hynes Upper Exhibit Hall - hucksters
- Hynes Room 200 - programming
- Hynes small meeting rooms - special-interest programming
- Grand Ballroom - films
- Republic - second-track films or programming
- Independence - programming
- Constitution - registration, information, site-selection voting, etc.



Commonwealth - WSFS meetings (mornings); authors' forum (afternoons);  
fan cabaret (evenings)

Andover through Hampton - offices, storage, repro room, etc.

Beacon and Liberty complexes - helper room, press room, special-interest programming

Jefferson/Kent - operations

Board Room - green room for program participants

[You can find many of these rooms on the diagram in PR1. - G.F.]

### Policy Questions

The main policy question that came up during this period was who, if anyone, would get free memberships in the convention. We felt the number of people who SHOULD get free memberships (all who appear on the program or work a significant amount) would be so large that we might not be able to afford it. (300 memberships worth about \$20 each totals \$6000.) So our solution was to ask everyone in the SF community to pay in advance, and we'd try to make refunds after the con to those who deserved it. If funds wouldn't permit a full refund, then we'd distribute partial refunds. For those participants who aren't members of the SF community and wouldn't normally attend the con, we'd provide free admission; but these people wouldn't be "members" or be eligible to vote on WSFS business or awards.

I'd like to emphasize that the refunds for participants won't be just a matter of seeing if there's any money left after the con. They'll be treated as an important part of our budget, and we honestly intend to make these refunds if at all possible.

Another policy question was about the various SF organizations and special-interest groups that will be requesting space for meetings, exhibits, etc. While the committee has made no formal decision, I've suggested a few guidelines we might use in evaluating such requests. In general I expect we'll prefer:

- (1) Groups of general interest and relevance to SF.
- (2) Groups wanting space for a short-term meeting or program item (as opposed to those wanting a room for the duration of the con).
- (3) Groups with something concrete to contribute (speakers, films, exhibits, etc.).
- (4) Events open to all convention members (as opposed to those open only to members of a group).
- (5) Groups willing to organize and run their own program item (rather than expecting the committee to do it).
- (6) Groups that apply to us well in advance of the con.

### Appendix - Income and Expenses Through Jan. 31, 1979

Starred (\*) expense categories are closed and not expected to change, so they won't be repeated in the next installment. The "current" column gives the amount actually spent to date; the "expected" column gives what we estimate we'll spend before the category is closed. (Obviously the two are the same for closed categories.) "79-I." means "first half of 1979"

	expected	current
Administrative expenses		
Stationery order (5000 pieces)	317.62	317.62 *
Victory party at IguanaCon	263.12	263.12 *
General postage, phone, Xerox, parking (1978)	224.93	224.93 *
General office supplies (1978)	184.41	184.41 *
Apa:80 (1978)	69.74	69.74 *
Advertising (1978)	80.32	80.32 *



	expected	current
Administrative expenses (cont.)		
Filing fees (1978)	10.00	10.00 *
Refreshments for work sessions (1978)	23.48	23.48 *
General postage, phone, Xerox, parking (79-I)	300.00	18.60
Agents' expenses	75.00	16.00
General office supplies (79-I)	150.00	5.88
Advertising and flyers (79-I)	100.00	
Refreshments at work sessions (79-I)	50.00	
Apr 80 (79-I)	125.00	36.67
Total administrative expenses	1973.62	1250.77
Registration expenses		
2000 acknowledgment postcards	187.00	187.00 *
Mailing PRO to initial members	227.95	227.95 *
Bulk-mail and imprint permit	70.00	70.00 *
Supplies (1978)	24.76	24.76 *
Special mailings (1978)	40.00	40.00 *
Bulk-rate renewal (1979)	40.00	40.00 *
Bulk-rate mailing of 2000 PR1's	80.00	
Foreign mailing (surface) of 150 PR1's	60.00	45.88
Bounce and remailing expenses (79-I)	100.00	20.25
Supplies (79-I)	50.00	
Total registration expenses	871.18	647.31
Publications expenses		
General		
Typo-Tech overhead (1978)	16.18	16.18 *
Ad solicitations (1978)	32.20	32.20 *
7000 mailing wrappers (including wrapping)	716.00	716.00 *
Artwork solicitation (1978)	51.00	51.00 *
Progress Report Zero		
Printing 5000 additional	97.50	97.50 *
Progress Report One		
Copy preparation (before 17% rebate)	352.02	352.02 *
Printing	1755.97	1755.97 *
Progress Report Two		
Copy preparation	350.00	3.75
Printing	1600.00	
Voice of the Lobster		
Supplies, printing, and postage (1978)	183.63	183.63 *
Supplies, printing, and postage (79-I)	150.00	12.84
Total publications expenses	5304.50	3221.09
Other expenses		
World Science Fiction Society		
Donation to Constitution Committee	50.00	50.00 *
Donation to Art-Hugo Committee	33.71	33.71 *
Guests of Honor		
Library of works for committee use	100.00	
Donations		
TAF?GUFF (1979)	30.00	
Capital equipment		
Mimeo color change kit	126.50	126.50 *
Operations - Member services		
Recording PRs for the handicapped	25.00	



	expected	current
Total other expenses	365.21	210.21
Total expenses to date	8514.51	5329.38
Additional cash out		
Bidding committee reimbursement	2155.90	2155.90 *
Overpayment refunds and bad checks	195.00	195.00
Total cash out to date	10865.41	7680.28
Income to date		
Administrative	111.69	
Registration	14812.00	
Publications - General	80.00	
Publications - PR1	265.20	
Publications - VotL	185.50	
Total income to date	15454.39	
Current cash balance	7774.11	
Cash balance if all estimates were spent in full	4588.98	

\* \* \* \* \*

From Noreascon II News Release #4, March 21, 1979:

Noreascon II is pleased to announce that Guests of Honor Kate Wilhelm and Damon Knight have collaborated on a commemorative book which will be published by the committee and made available at the convention. The book, entitled Better Than One, will contain two previously published short stories, plus poems and introductory material by each of them. The price has not yet been set.

APPOINTMENTS

\* The following committee members have been appointed to oversee the major divisions of the convention:

- 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, hucksters' room, special exhibits)
- Chip Hitchcock     Functions (Hugo awards ceremony, masquerade, fan cabaret, parties, special functions)

Heads for the various areas that fall under each division will be appointed during the next several months. Anyone who would like to volunteer for any major job at the convention should contact the committee as soon as possible.



The Voice of the Locster  
(Letters)

((We have altogether too many letters again, but I'll try to get in everything of general interest. As usual, comments by the editor are enclosed in double parentheses. The segmented lettercol seemed to work well last time, so I'll do it again; I'll work out the order of topics as I go along.))

Bidding Strategy

Gary Farber:

Flyers: I think you ran a very intelligent campaign in this area. Early on utilize flashy, amusing flyers of a simple but catchy graphic nature, and this will create a high visibility for your name and bid. These first ads need have little-to-no hard information. Then, once your recognition factor is high, come thru with the informative "hard" ads that convey an overall tone of competence and experience. These should have as much information as possible, so that the voter "feels" like he knows "all about" your bid. By then, he/she should be both comfortable and impressed with your bid. Targeting ads, if done properly, can be of immense aid also. Of course, while one must target primarily at those who are already members of the Worldcon at which your bid will be voted on, it is also a Good Idea to convince other people to become part of this group, and get them to join the Worldcon, voting for you.

(Note: I'd love to believe that the voters would simply vote on the merits of the respective committees and facilities, without "campaigns", but even if worldly experience didn't convince us it were otherwise, let those who so touchingly believe that fans are "different" or (god bless their simple little hearts) "more intelligent" than the general population simply look at the last few years' Worldcon campaigns and the results.)

Stickers: Can indeed be of great use in upping recognition factor, as well as providing the "endorsement quality" (i.e., BNF wears a St.Ghu sticker -- if he's for it too, it must be good, thinks Jophan X). However, it pays to take care to use restraint in giving them out; don't push them on people -- you alienate them. But, if you do catch them in the right way, you can actually get a mental commitment started which probably won't change unless you then do something horrendously stupid.

Bidding Expenses: I suggest humbly that your stated bidding expenses are actually quite on the low side compared to what some future bid committees will need to spend, due to peculiarities of your own race. First off, of course, is the fact that you really shade your figures considerably towards the low end by dropping all the money you spent as individuals on con parties. Second is the extremely major factor that NESFA as a group has a reputation second to none (none even come close, in fact) for efficiency and competence at con-running. ... So you start from a position of strength that no other SF organizations have. NESFA's immensely strong positive recognition factor and fandom's sense of its continuity lead far over Baltimore, despite the recent growth and positive reputation of Balticon. Lastly, for the most part their ads were absolute junk, just terrible, whereas yours were usually fine. Let us not forget, of course, the inflation factor, which won't stop increasing. In past years, Phoenix could win against LA precisely because of LA's high negative recognition factor. In the future, Detroit and Chicago promises to be a very hot and strongly contested fight in '82. If Australia remains quiet (or chooses to concentrate on



1988), then it seems likely a DC/Baltimore bid will not be hotly contested. (NY in '86, on the other hand, will probably have to spend heavily to overcome negative images.) But bidding costs, they shall continue to rise.

((I probably spent \$50 of my own money on con parties; but I think I went to more cons than anyone else on the committee, and I'd estimate the total for everyone was only about \$300-400. -- While it may look now as if we had an easy race, we were running scared all the way and never seriously considered spending much more. -- Australia in '83 is not "remaining quiet": they'll have an ad in our PR2.))

Pre-supporting memberships are mostly not worth the effort. They certainly don't serve to raise any money. At \$1 per, you usually lose money, or barely break even. Getting people involved is a very good idea, but p-s m's are not the most efficient. I'd like to see committees use their imagination more about this.

Slide shows, like all presentations, are good to have if you've got a good one, but none at all is better than a bad one. In general, I think that unless you put together something really fine, that will amuse fans enough to actively get them to come and see your film/slide show, and spread word of mouth about it (such as the Aussiecon film), it's a wasted effort. Ordinary Chamber-of-Commerce slide shows are unbelievably boring, most of the time....

I tend to agree with Glycer's and Turek's view of bid parties. They seem to be a necessary sign of life, to convince people that a bid is really and truly there, but I've rarely observed anyone to change their vote because of one. They merely provide a noisy atmosphere for fans to come in and rip off beer. I find the quiet approach with no alcohol, no smoking to be a more preferable one. In this type of atmosphere, people can actually talk, and even be convinced to vote a particular way. Not to mention that it is a far more pleasant environment, so far as I'm concerned.

To sum up here, what people should vote on are simply the ability of the facilities to sustain a Worldcon-size convention (which size depends on the region, amount of advertising, local history, and Rotsa Ruck -- Boston in '80 should get between 5-8000, could get 10,000 easily, and chances of 12-15,000 if you pushed it like crazy. I won't be at all surprised when the Worldcon peaks 20,000 -- it could easily come in the next 10 years, if the SF boom doesn't break, and the Worldcon committee didn't fall apart unable to cope (as they probably would). I think it's horrifying, and sad, but I fear it's, as Walter Brennan might say, no brag, just fact.) and the competence of the committee. Unfortunately it seems that the average voter is not judging by these qualities, and in fact mostly is not educated enough to judge in many cases. I.e., to talk about facilities, you have to know something of the hotel business, of crowd control, of budgeting, of regional differences, etc. You want to ask about room capacities, occupancy rates, auditorium sizes, banquet charges, hotel age, experience and management history. You want to ask the committee most of all about their own knowledge of these and a multitude of other matters. Chiefly, this boils down to experience and the unfortunate cliché that a concon is best able to put on a Worldcon the day the con ends. Very few groups in this country (of SF fans, that is) have the combined experience and competence required. Few can field the trained treasurers, administrators, people who know something of conflict-resolution, flow-chart planning, hotel liaison, crowd control, budgeting, security, not to mention fannishness. You have a very unfortunate situation when you have an inexperienced, naive group of fans bid for their city, too ignorant to realize how ignorant they are. It



becomes more than unfortunate when uneducated voters put them into the position of the winning bid. Again, we may all gather into a circle and chant "Look at recent Worldcons."

((You can see how uncensored this zine is, when I'm willing to print an obscenity like that suggestion of 20,000 members. -- In evaluating the above remarks, readers may wish to take into account that Gary has been on the last two Worldcon committees.))

Michael Tallan:

The sheer cost and amount of preparation necessary to first win the bid and then actually put on the convention is clearly going to increasingly limit such activities to the larger and better organized clubs in North America and abroad. There has already been much discussion in the past as to how the size of recent Worldcons has grown to the point where only major cities can handle them. If we project all three of these trends linearly into the future, I can foresee the time when the Worldcon is simply rotated annually between a half dozen cities. Simply trying to keep memberships down, as was tried at MAC, may therefore be only a partial solution if fewer and fewer clubs can afford the expenses or the time that go along with the convention.

((And MAC's attempt to limit attendance didn't even work, except for making people mad at them.))

John Charles McCormack:

Maybe future bidding committees should try to get some "boosters" around the country instead of pre-supporting members.... While the value of people in many areas of the country boosting a particular bid is inestimable, surveys of site-selection voters reveal that most decide on the basis of each bid's site and assured facilities. To prevent the headaches that always occur over discounts for pre-supporters, future committees should stop selling such memberships and instead offer to those wishing to support a particular bid a pin or badge for handing out flyers expounding that bid's virtues at cons and club meetings. ... Anyone who has had to deal with the headaches caused by this problem will understand and can explain it to those few too hardheaded or feeble-minded to get it through their skulls.

Laurie Mann:

I happen to think presupporting memberships are very useful. They help to generate some enthusiasm, you have an early base of support to work from, and so on. Preopposing memberships were rather confusing.

Irvin Koch:

It's about time someone showed that bidding committees put up a batch of their own cash and got repaid from the CONVENTION memberships if they won. I do wonder, tho, if it wouldn't have looked better if you'd waited until after the convention - assuming it had money left over.

((If we lose money, we'll probably end up paying for it one way or another. This practice has been common knowledge for a long time; Ted White had a couple of editorials about it around 1972, and by his account it went back at least to the early sixties.))

David S. Bratman:

Mailing refund checks to all the pre-supporters would be silly, especially since the idea is to encourage them to convert anyway. Send in full fees, all you pre-supporters, and we'll refund part of it later. Sure, sure. It



sounds like one of those newspaper ads where the company will mail you a check for 15¢ if you send them a boxtop.

### Membership Rates

Linda Bushyager:

I thought the article about setting membership rates at the con was a very useful one for other cons. I had always wondered how it was done. The inflation membership fee chart ((in PR1)) was a good idea too, so that people would come to realize that rates really are not all that high. Our Worldcon rates are extremely low compared to professional con rates.

((True enough. As Mike Glicksohn puts it in Nabu 6, "The whole registration fee at an SF con - covering probably 25 or 30 or more hours of structured activity - wouldn't cover one panel or speech at most regular conventions. The fan who pays five bucks to attend a regional con is paying maybe a quarter an hour just for organized activities, and that doesn't include whatever he or she may decide to do during 'free' time. An SF con is usually one of the best bargains anyone can possibly get." I recall seeing a notice for one publishing con that charged \$45 per (morning or afternoon) session.))

Gary Farber:

Your con rates are, IMHO, quite sensible and necessary, given the current structure of the Worldcon. Both Iggy and Suncon suffered from early cash flow problems, Iggy from the initial low fee, Suncon from the small amount of memberships brought back from an overseas con. People (fans) are shielded from the realities of other convention rates (\$50-\$150-\$350) which often don't provide food or rooms, any more than ours do. Facts is facts, and the poor are poor, but one doesn't change the other.

Carey Handfield:

I must say I am rather impressed with the general level of organisation of the Noreascon II committee particularly when it comes to memberships and finances. When I think of the way we organised Aussiecon there is just no comparison. Still I suppose we ran the last of the small informal Worldcons.

I was very interested in your financial reports in the VotL and PR1. In fact I have a suggestion to make and that is that it could be a good idea to publish (either in VotL or PRs) the final financial statements from the last few Worldcons. This could give people an idea of the way the costs have risen over the years. For example compare Aussiecon 1975 - 2000 members, turnover \$19,000 with IguanaCon 1978 - 7000 members, turnover \$130,000! I could let you have Aussiecon's final financial report if you need it although I am pretty sure it was printed in one of MAC's PRs.

((Actually it was on p. 83 of the MAC Program Book. Iggy has promised to have a financial report soon. We'd welcome reports from MAC and SunCon, but haven't seen any evidence that they exist.))

Laurie Mann:

I was somewhat concerned when I noticed that you had "only" 1249 members as of November ((list in PR1)), and only slightly over half were attending members. Iggy had 1370 when they published their first PR, and SunCon had 793. At that time, neither con was saying how many memberships were supporting, and how many attending. What happens if, this August, when you sit down to talk things over with Hynes Auditorium, you have only about 1000 attending members? Will you still go with Hynes?



((This isn't a problem, since we already have about 1250 attending members, and will probably have quite a few more by July 1. Iggy's first 1268 members (those who joined at MAC) were attending by definition; that was one of their problems. I think a significant factor in the number of early joiners is the distance between where the bid is won and where the con will be held.))

As it is, I think the rates through about July of 1979 are justified, given the Hynes Auditorium situation. However, \$30 for an advance membership a year before the Worldcon, even given Don's inflation graph, sounds rather outrageous. This might price yourself beyond the range that fans would be willing to pay (unless, of course, inflation does hit hard, and the price of a paperback is up to \$15...).

((Maybe so, but the alternative, given our total budget, would have been a flat rate of at least \$20 from the start. While that'd be even less popular, it may be the fairest way to go: the minimal response at the first deadline suggests there may be no way to keep the majority of fans from procrastinating.))

I like John Millard's suggestion on family memberships - to a point. Last year, Jim and I saw there was no way we could go to England, so we just bought one supporting membership. The problem is that, although we only need one set of the publications, we have very different ideas as to the Hugo awards most of the time. For two people as opinionated as the two of us are, this is sort of frustrating. Once is enough.

Gary Farber:

I think John Millard blurs a fine distinction between the vast hordes of middle-class fans who indeed do as he says and spend much money in the huckster rooms, restaurants, etc. However, with few exceptions (although the exceptions do manage to be particularly loud), these are not the people who protest the higher rates, but rather those who genuinely can't afford it. There are those who attend by catching a ride with friends, or hitchhiking, crash on someone's floor, and eat stored sandwiches, spending under \$20. They're not an insignificant number, either: at least 5-6%. Otherwise, I agree with him. However, I disagree strongly with the proposal that site-selection members need not be full members of the con. I think that anything that increases the number of uneducated voters is Very Unwise.

((True, but how justified is it to use the rates for this purpose? Maybe a system could be devised in which you'd pay the same total amount to vote, but could apply more of it toward the con being voted on in lieu of getting the sponsoring con's Program book, etc.??))

#### Date of the Convention

Laurie Mann ((with the only comment we got on this subject)):

Labor Day weekend is a really rotten time of year to have a convention. I got back from MAC on a Tuesday, thoroughly exhausted, but spent all that day moving into a new apartment. School started the next day. Other colleges start as early as August 20, which would really make Worldcons more difficult for a number of people. I realize that some people prefer having Worldcon over Labor Day weekend because that's already a holiday; however, a number of fans already take extra time off from work around Worldcon so they can attend DeepSouthCon, so they can travel, and so on. Moving the convention back a few weeks would, I feel, end up being more convenient, rather than less so.



Membership Cards

Andy Porter:

Print them on card stock with a tab so they can be bound into the Progress report. Members can cut them out and put their own membership number and name where indicated. I've always found membership cards to be a nice part of the Worldcon. It also reinforces the idea of a "membership" rather than a "ticket" admittance; I know many places where you have to pay sales tax for an admission event, none on memberships.....

((That's probably how we'll do it if we do it. PR2 will have a discussion of the issues involved, and a questionnaire asking people's opinions on this and many other things. For now, though, this was the only comment we received.))

Progress Reports

Joe Scanlan:

Looking through PR1 I ran across the map showing the number of members by state and the list of members on the same page. Naturally I looked at Nevada first and saw only six; the obvious question is who are the other five. In a future PR could you give a list of members by state.

((It wouldn't really be much help without full addresses, and that'd take a lot more space. However, we are going to do some things along this line. (1) We'll print addresses of people who specifically ask us to, so they can get in touch with each other; details in PR2. (2) We should have a list of members in ZIP-code order available for inspection at the convention itself.))

Brian Earl Brown:

Personally I think the first progress report was overproduced. I mean, is my \$1.5 membership fee financing a 5-issue Algol?

((There'll only be 4 large-format PRs, and the production cost works out to less than 50¢ per PR per member, on PR1 anyway; Algol/Starship is currently \$2.25.))

Crispin Burnham:

Have in a future PR a listing of any member needing a room or a roommate. At IguanaCon, my roommate and I met through mutual friends, but I think such a system as I propose would make sure that everyone in the situation above would breathe easier.

((We're doing that too; again, details in PR2.))

Irvin Koch:

There were a couple statements ((in PR1)) which might bear rechecking: "Iguanacon was the only con where the minimum voting fee got the voters attending memberships." Huh? I think a batch of previous Worldcons did that and I saved the money to prove it. Of course my memory isn't infallible but.... Also, it might be interesting to compare the TIMING of the various rate increase dates.

((The "only convention covered" in the graph, i.e., since 1971. The key word is "minimum": some years the voting ballot allowed the option of buying either supporting or attending membership in advance. But that requires agreement of all bidders on what the rates will be. On the timing, the really steep increases were usually at the door.))



The other statement I question is that no other con got tax-exempt status from the IRS. Didn't Iggy, MAC, or others which did, I seem to remember, get nonprofit corporations made (using ~~\$\$\$~~ lawyers) not also go thru IRS via those lawyers?

((Not according to what we've been told.))

Gary Farber:

On advertising: You'll do a lot better than you otherwise would if you have someone aggressively hitting all possible advertisers, including every SF-related publisher, etc., and following up on it with subsequent letters and phone calls. Don't hesitate to call where it will help (often it will) - the ad will pay for the call. I'd also suggest considering budgeting your pocket program as if it were part of the program book (only taken out), and allowing program book ad revenue to pay for it.

### Children's Memberships

Irvin Koch:

JoAnn Wood wouldn't wonder why charging for children's memberships came about if she ran registration a few years and went crazy explaining to some parents THEY could get in free if just accompanying the fan child. If the con she was working on had the benefit of a few school, young, clubs, and increased children's attendance due to the existence of ST and SW, she would soon realize that fandom and cons have changed. Half price for children under 12 accompanied by an adult (full otherwise) and free only if under 6 becomes the only rule you can LIVE with (I have a couple dozen ChattaCon workers as witness).

((My impression is that this is something that varies significantly from region to region.))

Jeanne Gomoll:

I think the serious consideration you are giving to children's programming is great. Isaac Asimov explaining quarks and charm to adolescents? I'd go to that one.

((The trouble is, so would most of the con.))

Laurie Mann:

Having some special children's programming sounds like an excellent idea! Why not set aside a room, buy some paper and crayons and have a children's at-the-con art show? You might even display some of their works on the walls of this room, and maybe even have judges for it. If you think you will have a number of children there, definitely have a children's division in the costume show. Perhaps a trip to the Children's Museum or to the Science Museum could be arranged. The day after your play you could set up a place for the kids to do improvisations (most kids over about the age of four or five love to "make-believe" they are astronauts or monsters or ...). Have some of the better kids' cartoons, like old Warner Brothers, Max Fleischer, or even Johnny Quest as part of the film program, or maybe someplace separate, if you think you have enough children to warrant it. Since most children are bored by speakers (generally), emphasize having activities that the kids can participate in. And, before I forget, I assume the Mitchells and their puppets will be there? Finally, a magician would also be a good idea.

((Laurie sounded so enthusiastic that we asked her to organize our children's programming, along with her husband Jim. They accepted, so



now you have some idea of what that part of the con should be like. Oh, by the way, we aren't currently planning a "play": we at least will probably be too busy to produce one.))

### Advertising Rates:

Carey Handfield: .

A comment on your PR ad rates. I feel that they are too high but I can't see how they could be any lower. Let me give you an example. In 1972 Australia in '75 had 14 pages of ads in the L.A.Con program book. At \$12.50 fan per page that makes a total of \$175. Now you haven't published your program book rates yet but let's assume a fan rate of \$75 per page (a 50% increase on your PR rate of \$50). At this rate, if Australia in '83 wanted to put 14 pages in your program book, it would cost \$1050! Okay, it probably is not necessary to have 14 pages in the program book the year before the vote is taken. However, my example shows how bidding costs have risen and how easy it is for bidding committees to spend thousands of dollars. You could probably lower your ad rates by having a digest size PR but it wouldn't be by much. The committee must make sure the ads cover costs. We (Aussiecon) made the mistake of setting our program book rates right from the start (2 years ahead) and had to pay for it. We actually lost money on the fan ads!

((L.A.Con's publications were 5½"x8½", while ours are 8½"x!!".))

### Hotel Relations

John Charles McCormack:

Leslie's article in #2 reveals that another Worldcon has been duped by their hotel with golden promises that they never intended to keep. Hotels always promise that they won't book other conventions immediately prior to or after the Worldcon as to give us time and room to breathe. It seems that we all too soon forget the headaches at Midamericon when the convention booked immediately before us stayed an extra day and held up the entire Worldcon by using our function space and holding onto the rooms for that extra day. Hotels know that any convention needs time to set up their special functions and this is especially true of Worldcons with the Art Show, Huckster Room, Command Center, etc. With each bidding committee aware of their chosen dates for the con and a letter of intent required to be eligible for consideration, it should further be required that the hotel allow at least one day before and after the scheduled convention dates with no other groups or conventions able to be booked. While one day is the minimum time that should be asked for as a buffer period, I am aware of professional organizations and union groups that are great conventioners that demand three days (before and after their scheduled starting and departing dates) in which no other groups may be scheduled. This policy is becoming more and more prevalent in the face of complaints by convention goers of problems caused by other groups extending their stay beyond the allotted time, thus holding up the next convention from taking occupancy of the rooms and function space. If such terms are made part of a binding contract with the hotel (before the site-selection balloting) of each bidding committee, with penalties for non-performance by the hotel, the problem of "no room at the inn" experienced by so many Worldcon attendeed would be a thing of the past. I hope the future bidding committees will take note of this problem and at least attempt some solution to avoid this thing which has ruined many a Worldcon for its members. Please God, these bidding committees will know that hotels are so anxious for convention business that they'll do almost anything to get it; it might be well for the committees



to select someone with patience and a little larceny as their hotel liaison to wheel and deal with the hotel's professional liars, or as they are more commonly called, the convention staff.

((That's quite a letter, but a lot of it's nonsense. We have had excellent relations with our hotel's convention staff for years. However, the hotel is in the business of selling space, and the staff would be irresponsible if they didn't sell as much as they could. Of course you can reserve space for as long as you want - if you're willing to pay for it. I don't know what it would cost to hold the hotel virtually empty for several days, but it's probably staggering. It's true we should have reserved somewhat more space, but that's mostly our own fault for not anticipating the competition. The fact is that the convention business is booming. And there's no way you can get a binding contract before the site selection, unless you have a bidding committee sufficiently foolhardy to pay penalties if they don't "perform", i.e., if they lose the bid. This may become increasingly a problem, since a lot of other groups can make commitments further in advance than a Worldcon committee can. So to solve this problem you could pick a site 3 or 4 years in advance, pray the committee can hold together that long, and raise the rates to professional-convention levels to cover reserving the space for extra days. Good luck!))

Laurie Mann:

I've rarely seen fans act as destructively as James R. Madden describes. Although many fans (and, I hasten to add, most attendees of any convention) do engage in room-stuffing, I've never heard of any fans not paying for a room at all. ((I've heard of at least one.)) I do agree that fans who do act destructively do reflect on all of us - but we have a long way to go before we "young, irresponsible" fans get to be as destructive as the Masons, the Shriners, or any other mostly male, middle-aged, "responsible" groups.

Gary Farber:

James Madden misunderstands the way hotels work. Unless you are in a luxury hotel, if you are a convention filling them, they couldn't care less about crashers: they have a full house, and beyond that they care not at all. Only if you are a minor proportion of their business do they start to notice (an important reason to keep the size of your con tied to the size of your hotel). Certainly we must protect SF cons' reputations. However, the Worldcon's rep, where security is concerned, is excellent. We are well-known for being funny-looking but harmless. We don't come close to Shriners, who typically trash rooms, throw Coke machines thru windows, smash TVs, etc. Although his point is well-taken, his examples are somewhat off.

A note for history's sake: Iguanacon's hotels were not sitting empty before and after the con. There was a chess tourney filling 70% of the Hyatt only as the con week began. Maybe you didn't notice, but there was a Lions' luncheon right on Friday in the Adams. A Civil Air Patrol was coming into the Hyatt as we were leaving. We successfully worked around them - obviously, since you didn't notice them.

#### Programming (General)

James J.J. Wilson:

I am already beginning to have nightmares about having a nervous breakdown



while deciding which of several simultaneous events to attend.

David S. Bratman:

For what it's worth, I think an effort should be made to schedule panels of different interests at the same time. This should cut down on cases of people who want to see 2 items at once. The problem is that most attendees have several interests, and if you have enough programming, there is no way you're going to avoid complaints about scheduling. Worldcons being huge, attendees should (unfortunately) not expect to be able to see everything and everyone they want to, as they can at regionals.

((I can't, even do it at regionals!))

Gary Farber:

While I agree [with John Millard] that leaving people wanting more is liable to be better than leaving them convinced that they've been overworked and bored, I still tend to mildly incline to overprogram than underprogram. After all, while the worst complaint you can get underprogramming is that people are upset, bored, unhappy and you are failing them, etc., the worst that you can get by overprogramming is complaints that they want to see everything. In the first, you genuinely fail them. In the second, well, they may want to see 2 simultaneous events, but if you don't give the one, or the other, they still won't get to see it.

Brian Earl Brown:

I noticed [at Iggy] that people lost their pocket programs with shocking frequency. The concom would do well to stock up on these well in excess of actual attendance. Or, too, print up daily activity sheets to be left in public areas. My own gut feeling is that the flyers would be better since it's hard to keep hold of a program booklet for the full duration of the con. Also because of the small size most program booklets end up getting printed in, a daily flyer makes sense. (Not the newsletter, but a readable-sized copy of the day's programming. I like the idea of bulletin boards also with the day's programming listed being posted in prominent nexi.

((The bulletin-board idea is one that we've used at recent Boskones. It is hard to fit all that belongs in a "pocket program" into something that'll actually fit in a pocket, and we're thinking about various alternatives, or rather supplements. One outside possibility is the use of TV monitors (like the ones in airports) showing upcoming programming.))

Evelyn C. Leeper:

There should certainly be smoking and non-smoking sides of all program rooms. This should be done in a consistent manner, such as smoking on the left side only in all rooms, and enforced. If you are going to have people checking badges, etc., anyway, this shouldn't be a problem.

((We do intend to have smoking and no-smoking sides.))

Heckling of films should not be permitted! One of the main features of a convention for me, and for a lot of other people, is the film program. Even when the film is a turkey, we would prefer to hear the film's sound track, rather than the audience's. Recent conventions (particularly Iggy) seem to indicate that some fans think that they can make as much noise as they wish in the film room (not just heckling, but talking loudly to friends, etc.). This should not be allowed!! And if you intend to show Rocky Horror Picture Show, you should also not tolerate the audience participation for that movie that seems to have become a way of life. I, for one, would like a chance to hear the dialogue for a change.



((I share your opinion. Speaking of Rocky Horror....))

Harry Andruschak:

Programming opposite the Hugos. My own suggestion would be a showing of The Rocky Horror Picture Show. I get this impression from several cons I've been to where the Rockys paid attendance for the sole reason of seeing the picture for the 144th time (it is gross). They will probably show up at the Worldcon, so pander to their tastes. Let them pay \$20 or whatever for admission and see their favorite movie while the Hugos are on. We won't bother them and they won't bother us.

((I guess this is as good a place as any to put a few miscellaneous programming suggestions.))

Ed Wood:

I hope Noreascon II will keep in mind that 1980 marks the 50th anniversary of Astounding-Analog, the greatest magazine the field has seen and the source of more good science fiction than any other source. The first editor, Harry Bates, is still alive, and I hope there will be room at Noreascon II for a retrospective on the magazine.

((There will be. Actually this was my own idea (inspired by a remark of Fred Pohl's). By the way, 1980 is also the 50th anniversary of fanzines, and we hope to do something to observe that too.))

Crispin Burnham:

With your proximity to Rhode Island, a panel devoted to Lovecraft would be very appropriate. I thought that the best panel at Iggy was the HPL one.

((Possibly; however, the World Fantasy Convention is in Rhode Island this October, and this is more in their line.))

Frank C. Olbris:

Why not get together all the [SF] books published in English in 1979 (the award year)? I know a lot of them will be in the huckster room, but as a "program display" it would be interesting to see all the books together. You could easily, I imagine, get the publishers to agree to handle the organizing, logistics, and tending of the display.

((Well, the 1978 book summary in Locus 219 listed 1189 books from 104 publishers, so it would be a fairly massive project to organize. If anyone wants to volunteer....))

Jeanne Gomoll:

I'm with Avedon [Carol] about wanting lots of feminist programming. What I've seen at other cons, what we've been doing at Wiscon is just proving to me how many new things there are to discuss and get into under that heading. Programming isn't stagnating under the label "feminist programming", it's just beginning.

Auction Blochs, etc.

Gary Farber:

Selling off pros at an Auction Bloch can be a Fun thing, but let's not forget that (a) this only benefits one (rather rich) person, not a horde of dissatisfied neos aching to meet their favorite pro, and (b) some people indeed consider this demeaning. If people want their bread and circuses.... Multiple-person lunches do satisfy more people.

Irvin Koch:



I was mildly amused by John McCormack's letter in #1 concerning "Your idea ((?)) of a few fans banding together to buy lunch, breakfast, dinner, drinks, whatever..." (for one's favorite willing pro). As you will note from the enclosed NorthAmerican flyer, that was MY idea. ...

The reasons I did not go for the auction idea were (1) It would "give" the willing pro to the person with the most money. That wasn't the idea. The idea was to try to divert a bit of time to the maximum-sized small but devoted group of the author's fan - those with enough money and willingness to split the cost of a meal, and to write in or take up the deal fastest. (2) The normal art auctions are long enough as is. A special extra auction would have to be arranged if the Auction Bloch were revived. (3) More pros would, I think, be willing to go for the "take 'em out" deal than an auction. Or BNFs even. How would you feel if offered either deal? (4) With the group idea it would be conceivable to have more than one session. Or, the way I'm running it, the pro is not even asked, and possibly later disappointed as happened at LACon, until there are enough people to make it go. With an auction some pros might be disappointed at going for little. (5) The group idea gives a better idea of who to try to make arrangements with in advance. In either case, that's mandatory. (6) As you noted, some pros would want no part of either an auction or a deal like mine. With my system, this is more likely to be found out much earlier and the interested fan - ONLY - so notified. And it's easier for the pro to beg off.

Jack Chalker should know why the Auction Bloch disappeared from World and other cons. He's partly responsible. As cons grew solvent, they grew less desperate for \$ from any source ... like that. Also the Auction, I think, predates the Art Show. Originally the staple was donated manuscripts, books, and - only when available - surplus prozine art originals. When Art Shows got going, they ate the auction alive, and the supply of donated artwork dried up as its worth rose.

((The last part may well be valid; I can remember those old days of general auctions. But the Auction Bloch isn't dead. I saw one at Lunacon that seemed to go well and be enjoyed by all involved. However, it's not obvious how well this would scale up to Worldcon size.))

### Art Show

Jeanne Gomoll:

Just as professional/amateur differentiations have plagued Hugo definitions, so too have the necessity to make them plagued art shows at SF cons. The reason it is done is for the sake of fairness, not wanting to pit artists who have years and years of experience and are making significant amounts of money from their work against artists who are just beginning and haven't begun to be financially successful with their work yet. Also, just strategically in terms of giving out awards, it is necessary to divide up artists according to some categorization and this seems reasonable. ...

In every art show, you have situations like this: One artist says, well, last con I sold some artwork, and I was commissioned to do a poster for a campus group three months ago. I must be a professional artist. Then another artist says, hell, I only made \$5000 on my work last year. I still have to work odd jobs to make a decent living. I'm still amateur. It's incredible the number of ways individual artists make the decision about whether they are an amateur or professional artist. Bill Rotsler commented recently in Locus [216] on the meaninglessness of the categorization because of how different artists interpret the labels regardless of how the art shows advise that they be defined. [Jeanne went on to describe the details



of a questionnaire they used to distinguish between pro and amateur artists at Wiscon. What I'd like to see happen is for regionals to pool their ideas, and more specifically criteria for pro/amateur status among artists, so that the criteria can become consistent for all art shows, and eventually be useful to very large SF art shows at large regionals and Worldcons.

((This is a can of worms. At Boskone art shows we've left it up to the artists to decide what to call themselves. As you say, this does lead to some anomalies; but as Bill Rotsler pointed out in the excellent article you mention, perhaps they should be entitled to pick the level of competition they wish to enter. I rather doubt that we'll try to impose standards, unless some representative group of artists themselves (such as ASFS) settles on a definition of professional status. Anyway, we tend to be more concerned with improving the conditions of sale than with awards.))

On the subject of other kinds of categorization of artwork in a show, there has long been a problem with the difficulty of judging works that are in the same category (fantasy, for example, fannish or SF, or whatever) but are produced in such widely varying mediums as pen&ink and acrylic. I've found that judging seems less absurd when the categories do not reflect subject matter but are based instead on medium: at WisCon 3, I used 3 categories - Black & White or Monochrome; Color; 3-D or Unusual Medium. ... Art work can still be judged using criteria such as scientific background when applicable (spacescapes, etc.), humorous success when that is the point, originality of fannish references or fantasy themes when those are the point.

((Jeanne had a good deal more to say about the practical details of art-show running. I'm hoping to get one of our more experienced people to write a general article on the subject for a later issue.))

#### Banquet Vs. Award Ceremony

Harry Andruschak:

Most banquet food is terrible, I think I have never had a really good one. The question is whether or not it is needed. Perhaps at local cons as part of the hotel package it is needed. But both the 1976 and 1978 Westercons got along quite well without the food function, substituting a reception or two in its place. These cons were about 1700 attendance. For the Worldcon, with 5000+ expected, it is not really needed. Still, it may have to be done as part of the hotel package. The question is how to package it.

If you really need it, perhaps another "roast" might be indicated...; the Iggy affair seems to have gone over well enough despite some complaints of length. Or perhaps some other reason can be devised for a banquet function.... Like, say, having a banquet for Dick Geis if he promises to attend and withdraw SFR from the fan Hugos. A going-away-from-fanzine award. Or maybe Heinlein would agree to appear at a function open only to blood donors. Limit membership that way, if nothing else.

I for one would like to see the Hugo awards continue the tradition of Iggy and be set in an auditorium big enough to hold lots of members.

((It's virtually certain that we won't be having a banquet, because of the practical problems I mentioned here last time; more details on this in PR2. But we might as well continue the discussion here, since other cons may have different options. (Obviously, in our case a banquet is not required "as part of the hotel package".))

James J.J. Wilson:



I am highly in favor of a banquet as opposed to an auditorium-type presentation. I also feel that all members are entitled to a free lobster dinner (just kidding). Seriously, how much would admission to a banquet cost?

((More, than it'd be worth. Iggy's was \$15, and prices aren't getting any lower.))

Michael Tallan:

I feel strongly that the banquet should be completely separate from all other convention activities. The rising costs of banquet tickets, though undoubtedly necessary, are becoming prohibitive for some people. Even the current practice of broadcasting some events on closed-circuit TV to other rooms is at best only a partial solution, because the cameras cannot possibly capture everything that goes on. Let those who enjoy the banquets attend, but do not penalize the rest by associating another event with the banquet that they too would like to see.

((In which case, what's the point of having one at all?))

Jeanne Gomoll:

I like the idea of assembly-hall style much better than banquet-style, especially if it means that only and not even all of those at the banquet will actually see the awards being made. I don't intend to go to the banquet even if the Hugos were given out there; I'd just be angry because I was effectively kept out. And I should think the award ceremony could be made a lot more entertaining than the tacky ceremonies that have been put on so far. (Silly, smirking Academy Award imitations.) If you're going to refer to the Academy Award tradition (the envelope, please...), at least the good parts should be copied. Instead of film clips, for instance, perhaps there could be (very short) dramatic readings (2-3 minutes) from each of the novels and short stories. Perhaps slides of the book-jacket art, or for the artist awards of actual artwork, and for the film awards actual film cuts. I think the Hugo awards could be more of an entertaining show than it has been, with more emphasis on the work being awarded than on the toastmaster's cornball/off-color impromptu jokes.

((We like these ideas very much, and are thinking along these lines. There may be problems with film clips (union projectionists?), but we'll see what we can do. Mind you, some people like the idea of imitating the Academy Awards....))

Paul K. Abelkis:

The Hugo awards have always been intended to honor persons who are exceptional in what they write. Yet the Awards ceremonies have in recent years honored no one. Take Iggy. People came dressed in cut-offs, T-shirts, looking like total slobs. Is this how people come to the Academy Awards, the Grammys?! ... The awards had the feeling of an event tacked on for the hell of it, instead of being a climax.

I suggest stating that the Awards are a semi-formal affair (at least), offer a cash bar, have the presenters do more than just read the nominees, perhaps decorate a little, and, if monies permit, print a program (one-sheet). Maybe then the Hugos would gain the status they truly deserve.

((These are dubious proposals. As you may know, Heinlein tried to impose such a dress code at the MAC ceremony; I know some people who deliberately dressed outrageously in protest. To say the very least, a very large segment of fandom is philosophically opposed to anything that would make the Worldcon more "formal". Fandom is basically a



functioning anarchy, and there's a perpetual tension against even the degree of organization needed to put on a convention; this is the sort of proposal that inspires outcries of "Regimentation!" Besides, quite a few Worldcon attendees don't have semi-formal clothes there.))

As to banquet vs. theater-style, a banquet is more classy but the awards should be open to the total WSFS membership. A stage-type production can be highly enjoyable if done right.

David S. Bratman:

Not having been to any Worldcons where the awards were given out at a banquet, i can't pass judgment on how much of a "fitting climax" the presentation is to me, except for one thing - getting everybody in who wants it is vital. I think of those long lines at MAC and Iggy. These are not people who are going to go away willingly.

Laurie Mann:

I think the Hugos should be given out theater-style rather than at a banquet. That way, more people can watch, without having to sit at an awkward angle at a table. The Fan and Pro GoH speeches should also be given then, rather than at the banquet, as well.

((I think that's all the comments I got on this issue. Let's move on from the award ceremonies to the various questions involving the awards themselves.))

#### Art Hugos

Gary Farber:

The art Hugo proposals are indeed interesting. However, I am skeptical at fans knowing enough about art to make educated judgments about which is a "better" piece of art. I'm even more skeptical about their ability to pick out and remember a specific piece. One wonders if the artists will truly end up more satisfied. We shall see.

Mike Glycer:

The desire to create a different art Hugo category is bound to lose out in the long run. It is not within the power of most voters to get around to all the major con art shows, and now the galleries, even if they do manage to keep track of the magazine and paperback covers, the calendars, and the art books. The "Best Color Piece" proposal flies in the face of complex reality. To provide voters with a reasonable opportunity to become informed about this category, it would either have to restrict nominees to pieces that had been mass-published, or else certify certain regional art shows (and the Worldcon art show) as central display points for pieces artists want considered for Hugo nomination. Even if the latter idea were implemented, mass-produced work would inevitably dominate the category. There might be some logic to that - after all, the people doing the best work presumably are making their livings selling it to publishers. But because the category focuses on a single piece, there is no guarantee that would be fair to all artists.

((I made many of the same points on the committee, and that's in part why the draft amendment specifies "published" art. I share your concern that only widely-circulated work would have much chance. All the same, how different would this be from the present situation?))

James J.J. Wilson:

I have long been in favor of separate art awards.



Rebecca Jirak:

Art illos: so what's the problem? Can't we, wouldn't someone print them in popular zines? Maybe big magazines (Yes, those) publish them in their zines, in minute form (say about as big as you'd need to see the major details but not big enough that someone wouldn't want to buy the original or a print)? If the artists would give permission to have them published in a few major zines, or in a special zine (ohh, the \$), lots o' people would see them and be able to vote intelligently (or at least biasedly). I bet people would buy the art portfolios and maybe we could have the extra \$ go to TAFF or etc.?

((A number of problems with this idea, mostly "the \$" and the time. Prozines take a minimum of several months from editing to newsstand; similarly, we are just now (in April) wrapping up the Progress Report that most of you won't see until July. Before you reprint any artwork, you have to secure permission from all the artists and original publishers involved. And this process can't even start until you have the list of nominees. I'd hate to have to count on pulling it off in time for the balloting.))

### Fanzine Hugos

Jeanne Gomoll:

((This begins with an expansion of Jeanne's editorial in Janus 14; the parts taken from the original text are in quotation marks.))

"I'm especially interested (obviously) in the fanzine category, or 'amateur magazine' category, as it was called for this year's awards. There has been much argument about the definition of 'amateur' vs. 'professional' ... In recent years, the appearance of several semi-pro zines which are all quite ambiguous with respect to the category in which they belong has caused a great deal of consternation among some fans who see these zines as a force that will prevent nonambiguously amateur fanzines from receiving recognition." Perhaps as some people have suggested, we need a third category for these semi-pro zines. "Maybe, but I think that's too cumbersome and unworkable a solution. There will always be shady areas and why should we trade two shady areas for the one we already have?" Besides that, it seems that many people believe that we already are awarding too many Hugos, watering down the significance of those already awarded, not to mention the special awards also given at the ceremonies.

((No argument so far.))

"No, the idea I'm leaning more and more toward is one that I first heard Gil Gaier mention at IguanaCon. And that idea has to do with some cutoff number with respect to the circulation of a publication: Skip all the pro/amateur or pro/fan distinctions, how much profit is made, whether contributors are paid," whether editors earn a living or live on food stamps, etc. "Regardless of whether a zine declares itself as amateur or not, the main overriding factor in the voting process has come to be the number of people who have access to the zine. This factor, though sometimes correlating highly with the quality of a given zine, does not always do so. Considering the huge impact of the factor of circulation - far beyond, I think, the importance it should have in the choice of a best magazine, pro or amateur - I think the categories should take this factor into consideration...." (Consider the latest Locus and File 770 polls: each reflects their readerships' familiarity with certain kinds of zines, in other words, the accessibility of various circulation-level zines, along with their readerships' judgment of the quality of same.) "People are not nearly so aware of a



given magazine's professional or amateur status as they are by the simple factor of its availability. I think that drawing some line - say the print number of a zine that would still make web-offset printing uneconomical for most fanzines (our printer, Randy Everts, suggests 1500) would be a good thing. There would still be a 'shady area' between the larger print runs of some offset zines, Janus included, as opposed to some mimeographed zines. Aside from the possibility of a bias created by self-interest, I still think a redefinition of magazines for Hugo Awards according to their circulation rather than the too arguable definition of professional status would result in fewer gross absurdities. One could, with less room for doubt, establish the actual circulation of a zine as opposed to trying to determine whether a given editor is involved in a professional or amateur occupation. And we could eliminate the oft-occurring situation where a very good magazine is denied an award merely because not enough people saw it. I'd like to see which zines are nominated when the factor of circulation does not obscure the far more important factors of content, appearance, style, and personality of any given zine."

((End of quoted material. I wrote a letter in answer to this, which I'll get to in a minute; but first more from Jeanne.))

We've already gotten quite a bit of comment based on those remarks (together with an article published in the same issue by Jane Hawkins supporting the idea of a third, semi-pro category). I guess the reactions were about equally divided between those willing to talk about revamping the fanzine definition for Hugo awards and those to whom the whole controversy had proven to them that the problem was not worth untangling. For those people the best solution was to get rid of fannish awards because there is such a small percentage of Worldcon attendance that is able to vote in those categories, so as to make the categories useless or meaningless and especially absurd when compared to the number of people voting on best novel, short story, etc. ((At Iggy 1130 people voted for Best Novel, 958 for Best Amateur Magazine.)) But obviously the percentage of fans among Worldcon attendees is small, not to mention the often-pointed-out difficulty of any one zine being available to many voters. I still think the award means something important and I think it could mean more were the definition to be changed to reflect the realities of circulation. Other reactions we got included yours, George, ...

((And this seems the appropriate place to quote it: "The trouble with this ... is a question of practicality. Basically, how do you tell what a zine's circulation is? Most don't even give the print run, which of course isn't the same thing.... The concom can of course ask the editor; but if he/she lies about it (to get into a category where there's a better chance of winning), how can you prove it? And how do the fans at large know when they're nominating? Other complications: If some of a zine's issues fall in one category, some in another, which is the governing factor? Few faneds send out all of a given issue at once, and it may take years to get rid of them all; so as of when do you measure the circulation? One would have to write a pretty complicated rule to make it even hypothetically workable, and even then you'd have the honesty problem. See what I mean about practicality?" Back to Jeanne:))

... and had to do with the feasibility of actually putting a system into effect that would define fanzines by circulation. The word "impractical" came up often. ...Well, not so impractical as you seemed to think. Though not as easy as looking at a zine and knowing by whether it is dittoed, mimeoed, or offset what its generally probable (or at least upper-limit)



circulation must be, one can pretty easily find out if a zine is produced using web-offset. It's not something an editor or editors could easily hide. My suggested method of dividing up zines by circulation would depend on the probable circulation (or upper limits on circulation) that would be dictated by the method of reproduction. For instance, a dittoed zine, by the life-expectancy of its master, can only produce about 50 or 60 copies. ((More like 200.)) For the same reason, mimeo reproduction can only produce 5-600 (I think; though I'm not familiar with the actual figures). ((Wrong; see below.)) For a different reason, offset zines can produce at most 1000 or so copies; not because of limitations in the technology of offset printing but because of the economics of the thing. By the time you get up to at least 1500 (the figure our printer worked out for us), the difference in costs between simple offset and web-offset printing become so incredibly great that an editor would be crazy not to take advantage of them. In any case these are "self-evident" classifications, not at all dependent on editor honesty (or at least easily verifiable) and if circulation numbers are to be used to divide the fanzines from the prozines, it is a logical method to use.

((First of all, how would you write the rule? If you define the categories in terms of circulation, I don't think it would be legitimate to assume the circulation on the basis of the printing method. And if the rule itself specified the printing method, I wonder how many of the voters know what "web-offset" means. But alas, your dichotomy isn't even valid: it's perfectly possible (though a hell of a lot of work) to get several thousand copies from mimeo. In fact, 5000 copies of the IguanaCon daily newsletters were mimeoed, and I'm told that 10,000 is possible. (As for economics, we know that anyone who decides to put out a fanzine is crazy. Though not as crazy as a Worldcon committee....))

((One thing that bothers me in this argument is how many people seem to have no compunction about throwing out the "semi-pro zines". As I've said before, if they're the best of their kind (which is not the same as the mostly-fiction prozines), why shouldn't they have a chance to win an award for it? And if there isn't room to honor both these and the small-circulation zines, doesn't the group that more of the voters are qualified to evaluate have a better claim? Of course, not all of those involved want the chance....))

Andy Porter:

I'm really sick and tired of the people who talk about the usual Algol/SFR/Locus Bastards winning so many Hugos. I was nominated 4 times before I withdrew (in 1977) and won half a Hugo in all that time. The next person who talks about me in derogatory terms, I'll bite in the leg.

((The obvious thing to print next would be a letter talking about Andy in derogatory terms, but I didn't happen to get any.))

Seth Goldberg:

I realize that putting voter qualifications on the fan Hugos is essentially duplicating the FAAn awards. What I was trying to say [in #2] is that this may very well be the only way to go and that the fan awards should be turned over to the FAAn people. However, as you point out the Hugos are by the membership at large. Since the membership at large has proved over the past several years that they are not fanzine fans, perhaps these fan Hugos are simply no longer necessary and should be replaced with a Best Semi-Pro Magazine award. Let the FAAn people handle awards for fan areas,



as all the fan Hugos are doing is making the voters look stupid. Let them vote for what they have a chance of actually seeing. There simply are far more Worldcon fans than there fanzine fans.

((Democracy is the system that guarantees the voters the right to look stupid. As for the FAAn awards, their main problem is apathy: only 76 people voted last year, and in some categories the number of nominators may have been under 10. The overall problem isn't so much voting by the unqualified as failure of the qualified to vote.))

James J.J. Wilson:

I feel that there should be a separate category for professional magazines such as Analog; Destinies, F&SF, etc., semi-pro mags such as SFR, Starship (sorry, Andy), Unearth, etc., and fanzines with low circulations. Also I feel very strongly about the addition of "No Preference" to all award categories so that "No Award" wouldn't win simply because few people are familiar with a given item. In addition to this, there should be a way to have people tell which of all the nominees in a given category they have seen or read. With this, a nominee would win by the percentage of people who are familiar with it and like it, rather than just having large-circulation items be given an advantage.

((Not many people vote "No Award" first, I think, but they do tend to vote for what they know and then vote "No Award". The first business meeting I attended, in 1969, tried to come up with a way to prevent this; it had no better luck than any since has had.))

((Your voting system strikes me as an administrative nightmare. And it doesn't address the problem of how the low-circulation items are to get nominated in the first place. Other than that, though, it's rather similar to a more workable scheme proposed by David Gerrold in the June 1979 Starlog - essentially, to rate each Hugo nominee on a scale from 1 to 10, rather than ranking them in order; the voter would presumably avoid rating anything he/she hadn't read. This is described as basically a modification of Gil Gaier's system for rating SF books. Interesting idea; let me point out only that any such change in the actual voting process would require a constitutional amendment.))

### Gandalf and Other Non-Hugo Awards

Linda Bushyager:

I object very much to the Gandalfs. They have no place on the Hugo ballot. They really would seem more appropriate to the World Fantasy Convention, and I think it is time that a Worldcon took a stand and said, no, we won't handle these. They cost time and energy, and probably money to process, they confuse the fans (who can't tell the difference between Gandalfs and Hugos), and they tend to divide the awards into hard science (Hugos) and fantasy (Gandalfs). As I remember the Hugo rules, they are for both fantasy and science fiction. ((Yes.)) With two competing sets of awards, some people may be nominating fantasy works only as Gandalfs, rather than as Hugos, which they are also eligible for. The Gandalfs have gone from one to two awards, and I'm under the impression that Lin Carter plans to eventually have a whole bunch of Gandalfs such as best fantasy short story, novel, novelet, dramatic award, who knows? Why do we need so many sets of awards? And the Hugos do overlap the Gandalfs to some degree. What if a great fantasy or science fantasy novel comes along, it may end up being nominated for both a Gandalf and a Hugo - and possibly winning both. It is just duplication and possible added confusion. (As I said, what if people



nominate it for a Gandalf, but not a Hugo, because they think it can't be a Hugo or would be more appropriate as a Gandalf - but really it deserves the Hugo?)

The GandalFs are not in the WSFS constitution (and for that matter neither is the Campbell). So why is the Worldcon taking on additional responsibilities in giving these things out? ... Where will it end? What if other groups want to start awards like the Campbells and GandalFs? A bad precedent has been set - these other groups will say, "If the Worldcon can hand out the Campbell and the GandalFs, why not our awards too?" In short (sorry I'm so longwinded), get rid of them now - or the Worldcon may be stuck with them and even more proliferating awards forever.

((I spoke to Lin Carter at Lunacon. He hasn't sent a letter yet, but he felt it was important for the Worldcon to administer the awards so people would have confidence in their integrity. With any other system, of course, there'd be a problem of deciding who was eligible to vote. These are good arguments from the sponsors' point of view, but leave the question of what the Worldcon gains from the transaction. I should mention that eliminating these awards and retaining the status quo are not the only alternatives: the Worldcon could distribute and count ballots on a separate form from the Hugo ballots, with the sponsors paying the costs. Our mail thus far has shown very little support for the GandalFs (no one seems to care too much about the Campbell); but we should get a better sampling from the questionnaire we're including in PR2. Meanwhile, more comments.))

Laurie Mann:

Although counting non-Hugos does take up more of the committee's time, I fail to see how these extra awards "cheapen" the Hugos, as Jack Chalker claims. Since most SF fans do read fantasy, what's the problem?? Perhaps it might be possible for the Worldcon to distribute non-Hugo ballots, with the stipulation that the sponsoring group count those ballots.

((Doesn't really address Linda's complaints, though. I should mention that we expect to be counting the Hugo ballots at least by computer, so "the committee's time" isn't a major issue.))

Seth Goldberg:

I agree with the people calling for the non-Hugos to be on a separate ballot. I have no objection to these awards being handed out at Worldcon but I do think the sponsors should at least use a separate ballot and hold their own ceremony. It would also be preferred if they were to count their own ballots as well. Since they are not Hugos, they definitely do not belong on the Hugo ballot.

Rebecca Jirak:

I would split the SF and fantasy as two different categories, they're getting too large to be lumped together.

David S. Bratman:

I wonder just who exactly was responsible for getting the Campbells and GandalFs to be given out at Worldcon? My guess is that they were done by agreement between the sponsors and the committee of the cons where they were first given out. ((Right.)) If that is so, then they could be taken away again by similar agreement. ((Or by fiat of the committee.)) This should be done only if it's the desire of a clear majority of the Worldcon members - altho, come to think of it, i don't recall being consulted as to whether i wanted a Grand Master award; why should i be consulted about



getting rid of it? In any case, it is Lin Carter's stated goal to produce, eventually, a whole gamut of Gandalfs. ~~Can you imagine Fan Gandalfs?~~ And i don't really know how it's possible to stop him.

((Once again, that's his business. But the Worldcon is under no obligation to participate in the process.))

Harry Andruschak:

The preferred order [of the award ceremony] for me would be..... Pro GoH speech; Pro Hugos; Fan GoH speech; Fan Hugos; Toastmaster's spiel; all the other crappy awards. This is my level of interest in each aspect of the Hugo awards. It puts junk like the Gandalfs at the rear, so the rest of us can clear out after the Hugos and get on with the parties.

#### Publication of Voting Results

Mike Glyer:

From VotL 2 it looks like the issue of releasing voting results from site selection and the Hugos has become tangled up with authors' wounded pride. (Hey - I would just hate to be nominated for a Hugo and lose - please don't throw me in that briar patch, b'rer fox!) Perhaps the strong consensus on publishing the site-selection figures can be preserved by dividing the question into two separate proposals:

Proposal 1: The voting totals from site-selection balloting shall be made public at the time that the winner is announced, and at the Business Meeting.

Proposal 2: The committee shall post or otherwise make available to the public complete voting results from the Hugos and all other awards circulated on the Hugo ballot, within 24 hours after the awards presentation.

Because the site-selection winner has been announced, leaked, or unofficially circulated eight or ten hours before the "official announcement" at all but one of the Worldcons I've attended, anyone who is going to give out the results ought to be obligated to give out all the results. But in any case they should be available to the Business Meeting, in one of its many guises....

The Hugo results will be known in advance of the con, so it works no hardship on the committee to post the statistics once the winners have been revealed. The reason Hugo statistics should be released is so that fandom need not administer its highest award in utter ignorance. After Iggy's partial publication of the nominations results in 1978, many were surprised at the low level of participation. Are other surprises awaiting us in the unpublished voting results? It is true that the figures are a source of amusement (primarily to fans who also enjoy doing their income tax returns), and one of the very few sources of hard data on fandom. Outweighing all of those reasons, it contradicts the principle of a popularly voted award to conceal the mechanics of selection.

Frankly, if a writer or artist can't take pride in being picked one of the five best of the year for his works, that is his problem. I don't believe the principle of operating the Hugos above board with free access to the numerical results ought to be sacrificed to misdirected pride and a "winning is everything" mentality.

Laurie Mann:

It was interesting to note that the only person who did not want to see the final vote tallies for all the Hugos was a writer!



David S. Bratman:

I consider it disgraceful that voting figures, let alone order of finish, for both sites and Hugos are kept secret. Aussiecon ran "on the apparent theory that the full results of an award instituted, voted on, and awarded by fandom at large is no business of fandom at large. (Anyway, one must needs protect the presumptively tender ego of a professional author who might be devastated and embarrassed to learn that his or her short story was considered to be merely the fifth best of the five hundred or so of the year.)" (Denny Lien, Rune 46) I think this quote says it all.

((I believe in publication, but I think some of these remarks are excessively harsh on the nominees. There's no question that the Hugo nominee are under a terrific strain - David Gerrold gave a vivid account in the May Starlog, as a prelude to his proposal mentioned on p. 41 - and we do have to ask whether the process is really honoring those involved. But there's no totally satisfactory solution to this problem.))

Ed Wood:

For the benefit of Mike Glycer and others interested in the Hugos: it was very difficult to establish the Hugos as a viable award. The number of people voting was very small, even up to the Tricon in 1966. (I have been on the staff of 5 world conventions and know the problems that come up.) You can imagine telling some publisher or editor that his candidate lost 37 to 38! In fact it was only the good will of the convention committees that kept the fan magazine award on the list. Far too many people would write in and ask, what are they and how does one get them and why are we wasting their time asking them to vote on such junk? So certain members of fandom in their infinite wisdom replace one weak award with 3 weak awards, fan magazine, fan artist, and fan writer. Wonderful.

((Interesting, but not particularly relevant to the present, with close to 1000 people voting in every category.))

#### Worldcon Site Rotation

Carey Handfield:

The proposal [introduced at IguanaCon] as I understand it is to add a non-North American region to the site-selection process, making 4 regions - 3 within Nth America and 1 outside. One of the reasons for doing this is that it would formalise what already exists - an overseas (non-Nth American) Worldcon every 4 years - and that this would be the best thing for overseas fans. I believe that this is not the case and it would be against the best interests of overseas fans.

There are a number of reasons for this. First, as you mentioned in VTL 1, a similar idea was proposed at St. Louiscon in 1969 and rejected at Heicon the next year. One of the reasons it was rejected was due to doubts that the foreign fans could assemble bids often enough. There are 2 sides to this, one the amount of fannish activity outside Nth America, and two the fact that any foreign bid suffers real disadvantages being outside Nth America. I was membership secretary for Aussiecon and on the bidding committee from 1970, so I can describe some of the disadvantages of running a bid from Australia some 12,000 miles away. To win a Worldcon you need to be active at several Worldcons before the bidding year. When you are talking about spending \$1000 to \$1500 in fares and expenses just to get to the Worldcon, there is a limit to the number of people on the bidding committee who can afford to go. Australia in '75 had people at Heicon, Noreascon I, L.A.Con, and Torcon. Numbers varied from 2 to about 7 people at Torcon.



Compare this to a US bid which might have 20 to 30 people at any Worldcon. Then there is the cost of getting to regionals, of getting promotional material sent half way round the world, of just communicating. Foreign fan-nish activity may have increased, but the disadvantages still remain.

Okay, there have been an increasing number of non-Nth American Worldcons over the last few years, but is that enough? Heicon, Aussiecon, and Seacon all had to beat US bids, there is yet to be a year when there have been 2 or more foreign bids competing against each other. This is what you will need if the extra region is added. Personally I don't think that this is likely to happen. If it doesn't, then you are left with a walk-over - just one city bidding, or no bid at all. This is something that should be avoided at all costs.

I don't think that Nth American fans would be too interested in a situation where they have to spend 2 to 3 years plus a couple of thousand dollars on bidding for the Worldcon, then have some foreign city walk in and get the con every 4 years just because they were the only ones bidding. More importantly, I think having to go through the bidding process, that is, win the con from other cities, is vital to any Worldcon. Winning the con doesn't necessarily guarantee a good convention, but it does mean that the bidding committee has shown the ability to organise, keep a committee together for a couple of years, and presumably convince the voters that they are capable of running a Worldcon.

Right, for the above reasons I feel that the interests of foreign fans would best be served by keeping things as they are. I have spoken to several Australian fans who agree with me on this point. We will probably be putting a motion at Seacon that the Bloom/Smoire amendment be dropped.

((The above letter has already been published in the Feb. 27 issue of Chunder!, John Foyster's Australian newszine. The previous issue had reprinted all the material on this question from VotL 1, plus some from File 770, and Carey's was one of several responses. I think I can fairly say that Australian fannish opinion seems to be just about unanimously against the proposal (apparently including some people who disagree on everything else). Some representative quotes from Chunder!: "If passed the Worldcon would be held once every four years, the other three years being a North American Science Fiction Convention exclusively. To hell with that idea!" (Paul Stevens) "Right now we (and Sweden of course) have the freedom to bid when it suits us, and at the moment that freedom is not being abused" (Irwin Hirsh) "I suspect that even a very strong overseas bid from here for 1983 could lose to a strong US bid.... Thus a 4-year rotation could be of help to Australia in 1983. However, I really doubt that it will ever be established, and doubt even more that it is the best way of running things...." (Eric Lindsay) "The idea ... is appealing, but I think the allure is false. It codifies what should be a 'time-to-time' decision. ... We should be forced to justify our bid against the best the US can offer." (Jack Herman) "The proposed change to the Worldcon rules should be stamped on thoroughly. It assumes that the North Amerifans have a ghod-given right to 75% of all Worldcons." (Richard Faulder) John Foyster himself suggests that the rotation plan "should be designed not to ensure that the convention is shared equally, but rather to ensure that it isn't dominated by one (or two) regions. I would rather have a rule saying that any region could bid at any time, provided that the Worldcon hadn't been held in that region in a specified region in the past." The main problem with that idea is that it's hard to reserve hotel space far enough in advance -



cf. p. 31 - if you don't have a specific year to bid for.))

((I haven't had any similar feedback from Europe yet. Chunder! did have one letter from Christopher Priest: "Although 'worldcons' are an American invention, they are not, or they should not be, something that is loaned out on sufferance to the rest of the world. For this reason, I am against the proposal of donating the fourth year to overseas fandom. ... It's not that I fail to recognize the gesture, but by accepting that donation, world fandom would be forced to accept the corollary, which is that the three-year rotation within the States is a fixture. ... I'd like to think that at some time in the future there would be a three-way rotation of worldcons: America, Europe, Australasia... with the option to extend it whenever viable fandoms make their presence known in other areas." Well, let's proceed to some opinions from North America.))

Paul K. Abelkis:

Personally, I don't see adequate reasons for all the debate over instituting a "non-North America" zone. When has a well-organized and good "foreign" concom not won a bid? There has been no monopoly on N.A. cons. What's more, outside-N.A. cons have an advantage in that they can bid for any year, while concons bidding out of rotation have a poor chance of winning. So why change an excellent system for the sake of change?

Harry Andruschak:

I have never seen so many Crocodile Tears as when the DC fans described how the main reason for the change of rotation was to help the overseas fans. FUCKING HYPOCRITES. How about a slight change in the wording of the proposed amendment so that the rotation is ... West, Central, East, and Overseas. This would put the 1984 bid in the overseas zone. I'm sure both the British and Australians would like that. Let's see how many of those Washington fans who are so willing to help the overseas fans vote for that amendment. You and I both know that none would ... that all that talk about doing something for the overseas fans is just pissing in the wind.

Gary Farber:

Most of the sensible objections... have been made, and I need not restate them. They can be summed up by saying that Washington (some people therein) thinks all disadvantages are outweighed by their wanting '84. Is this overly partisan the way I say it? But how does one seriously contend that taking away the overseas right to bid every year and requiring Tokyo, London, Melbourne, Peking, Moscow, Munich, Paris, Pretoria, Tel Aviv, Bangkok, Iceland, and Antarctica all to compete for the same slot only once every four years is a favor to non-North Americans? And does everyone really always want the NASFiC in LA, a not unlikely proposition if the NASFiC is always voted on from a Western zone. Etc. This seems a silly case of singular, thoughtless - one might even say selfishness.

((I won't censor this debate, but I don't like the tone it's taking.))

Laurie Mann:

Why couldn't voting for the NASFiC be held on the same ballot as the Worldcon is? Simply make it clear that one vote would be for an out-of-the-country Worldcon, and the other vote would be for a NASFiC. Memberships for the NASFiC would only be taken after the ballots have been counted, and a winner has been declared. It's a very debatable point as to whether one must be a member of the current Worldcon or not to vote for the future NASFiC.



((My error: the proposed system would indeed have no problems with a mail vote for the NASFiC; it's the current system for which this is a problem. The results would still be skewed, though; a lot of people aren't dedicated enough to join a con they can't attend just to vote on a future con site.))

Seth Goldberg:

Again I say the putting in of an out-of-North America region is unfair to whatever region that is opposite the out-of-North America turn, since they would have to always bid at an overseas con.

((That would be the Western zone under the proposal before us. North American opinion, as reflected in our mail anyway, also seems to be fairly strongly against the plan. Meanwhile, a variety of people have been coming up with different zone-rotation plans.))

Irvin Koch:

The problem, one of MANY, with an outside-North America zone comes when there are enough foreign bidders for several years in a row or several wanting it in one year or NONE strong enough in the year their zone is. I still say the present system has only one thing wrong with it, a Worldcon dictating to ONE continent. Quite discriminatory. On the other hand, if anyone seriously wants to make foreign bidding more fair, they might try one of these ideas.

A. Six zones instead of three. Three outside the Western Hemisphere and three including only the Western Hemisphere. Or three just for North America.

B. This one I'm more seriously proposing. It equalizes some nasty imbalances in the present divisions AND makes Foreign bidding more fair. (1) Create a 4th zone which would basically include the Southeastern US, the Caribbean, and Africa, and related areas. (2) Add South America, Antarctica, and related areas to the Central zone. (3) Add Asia and Australia to the Western zone. (4) Add Europe to the Eastern zone. Conceivably most of Asia at some future date would have to be split off into a 5th zone and further additional zones created as, if, and when their fan populations became strong enough.

James J.J. Wilson:

I feel that it is a good idea to make provisions for a regularly scheduled foreign Worldcon. I feel that one should be held, or at least be eligible for bids, every four years. The present system is:

East - 1980	East - 1983	East - 1986	East - 1989*
West - 1981*	West - 1984	West - 1987	
Cent - 1982	Cent - 1985*	Cent - 1988	

My suggestion is that in the starred years, bids would be presented by both the North American zone in Question and by a foreign concon. Should the foreign bid lose, nothing would change. Otherwise, a North American bid would win a NASFiC bid. Thus, the NASFiCs would rotate zones in the same manner as the Worldcons, and there would be no favor to any given zone. This would be the same as making "Outside North America" a separate, rotating zone and still rotating NASFiCs.

((Essentially that would codify the present de facto system; but why start the 4-year rotation with 1981, only 2 years after the last overseas Worldcon? It's much too late to change the rotation for 1981 anyway: 1983 is now the earliest year that can be altered. The letter said "NorthAmericon", not "NASFiC"; that's probably a better



term, but it's the specific name of this year's NASFiC - or "Continental Convention" if you prefer.))

Seth Breidbart:

Proposed amendment to WSFS Constitution. I would appreciate comments and suggestions:

Convention sites shall be considered to be "in rotation" in the order Western, Central, Eastern region. A site outside the three regions will always be considered "in rotation". Any site, whether "in rotation" or not, may bid.

Ballot runoff shall be as follows: Each ballot shall be tallied to the voter's first choice. If any site receives at least seventy-five percent of the votes, or any in-rotation site receives a majority of the vote, it will be declared the winner. If not, the out-of-rotation site with the fewest votes will be eliminated and votes for it redistributed to their next choice. If there were no out-of-rotation sites in contention, the site with the fewest votes is eliminated and its votes redistributed. This process is repeated until a winner is determined. For purposes of this section, only votes for a site still in contention will be counted to determine a majority.

Replace Article III, Section 3 and the first sentence of Section 4 with the above. Delete from Section 1 the phrase "with runoff ballot as described in Article II, Section 16;".

((I think that's self-explanatory. If it isn't, I don't feel up to trying an explanation. Finally we hear from our soon-to-be French agent.))

Pascal J. Thomas:

I'm amazed that so many people have raised against the proposal of a mandatory overseas Worldcon every four years the point that voting would be disturbed... to spread evenly the purported disturbing effects of having overseas cons voting on the location of an American con, you just have to introduce a subrotation among the American zones ensuring that successively Eastern, Western, and Central zones will be voted upon by overseas cons... or to put it in plain English, create an overseas zone, but in the following way: impose one overseas Worldcon every four years, and just suppress the US Worldcon which would have taken its place. Let me demonstrate (E=Eastern, W=Western, C=Central, O=Overseas) (if the proposal is adopted, say in '80, with the first out-of-country con scheduled for '83):

80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91
E	W	C	O	W	C	E	O	C	E	W	O

and do it all over again.... Of course, this gives a 12-year cycle, since twelve is the least common multiple of 3 and 4, which are unfortunately relatively prime. Well, fandom ought not be afraid of long-range.... Of course, it means that every 12 years, each zone will have to wait 6 years between two Worldcons.... But that's what was happening randomly under the old system, after all. Remains the fear of not finding an able overseas committee on a given year.... Phooey! I think the combined strengths of British, Australian, and Belgian fandoms, to name only three, should be enough to dispel such fears. (P.S. And, yes, I'm a math graduate. Why the hell that question?)

((An area can have a strong fandom but not be ready to bid in a given year. There have been several fairly recent years with only one bid, or only one viable one, in the appropriate North American zone.))



The "World" in WSFS

Laurie Mann:

I agree with Yves Bellefeuille's complaints about the use of the word "World" in WSFS. It's always seemed like calling the games between the National and American Leagues "the World Series"; it's American chauvinism. Although most SF fans do reside in the US, it somehow seems unfair to call an essentially American event "Worldcon". The term has stuck.

((Everyone seems to use that same example of chauvinism, the World Series. Yet the term was perfectly accurate when first adopted - there was virtually no baseball anywhere else in the world. As for the Worldcon, the hope from the beginning was that it would become a truly "world" event, and thus far every serious non-North American bid has won.))

Seth Goldberg:

I very much would like to see the Worldcon recognize awards from countries other than the USA. Several other countries have national and foreign-language awards (foreign to us, that is, not to them). Perhaps some sort of plaque could be given to foreign award winners attendees at the Worldcon and the others could be announced at either the Hugo ceremony or the non-Hugo award ceremony if there is to be one.

((Our French agent also has something to say on the subject.))

Pascal J. Thomas:

I will ... go directly to ... as Yves Bellefeuille puts it (that name is too French to be true!) "the W in 'WSFS". Now, I don't want to make too much of the name; I have already remarked elsewhere (Ailleurs et Autres n° 25) that whereas the word "world", in English English, refers to all nations on the face of Earth (or at least in the former Colonies of the Crown), in American English, however, it is usually taken to mean the North American continent, and often only the part of it located north of the Rio Grande. Think for instance of what the phrase "world series" covers. Hmm?

((See what I mean?))

Anyway, I do think that it would be Good Idea to acknowledge in some way the existence of SF in foreign language. The proposals of Bellefeuille are certainly highly unworkable; the only worthwhile modification I could see to the present system would be to let the foreign works (original or translations) compete in a category apart; but that would result in a cheapened Hugo for these works, given by voters who would be even more incompetent than for the regular Hugos. ((That's how it seems to work for the Oscars.)) So, indeed, recognizing the foreign awards ... especially when (like in the case of the French "Prix Apollo") foreign-originated works run against translations from English (who overwhelmingly dominate the field, in terms of commercial success, in all cases I know of) ... could be a good idea. But the fact that such a proposal can be made points out to the fact that, if the American SF community has with Locus an excellent medium of information about what's happening at home, there is little information about what's going on beyond the barrier of language. (Maybe also because inside the said countries there is no equivalent to Locus. By the way, Plug of the Week: the French-language fanzine from Québec, Requiem, does give some infos on books published in France.)

I just want to add that there's another - and probably more interesting - way of acknowledging foreign SF: make a rule - or at least a Respected



Tradition - of the addition of a Foreign GoH to the present set of GoH's. It would be a way to (a) introduce to the American audience a writer they probably don't know, (b) make come to the con a writer who certainly would not have come under other circumstances (because he would not have felt interested... or because of plain lack of money: the spiraling advances have been limited to the American market), (c) and also draw to the con other foreign fan/editors/colleagues...

((I can see one possible drawback: would Worldcon committees in general have the expertise to make a suitable choice?))

### Other WSFS Business

Gary Farber:

Amending Article III (Worldcon bidding) to allow for business meetings to pick the Worldcon in the event of a "None of the Above" winning could be most interesting. While in one sense it would reduce the voting population to a smaller, and perhaps theoretically more educated, group, it would also mean giving the Worldcon to someone with next to no information as to their ability to perform. That is, unless you already knew and trusted them, you wouldn't have enough time to carefully think and consider, and neither, presumably, would they have enough time to put together a well-considered bid. I think the experiment (essentially going back to the old smoke-filled room) an intriguing one; I wonder again if people would genuinely be happy with the results. What about a No Award that means simply that: that there is no competent Worldcon committee that year, and that we can all wait another year. Surely fandom could survive, and surely that is wiser than a complete fiasco? But perhaps this argument will become obsolete by passage of WSFS, Inc. in one form or another.

((That would of course be one of the options the business meeting could consider.. But no doubt about it, in such a situation all the choices would be bad.))

The amendment requiring a CPA seems silly, and superficial. What the Worldcon needs is to have a competent bookkeeper, not hire a CPA at large expense. A CPA can look over the books once a year, and that is all that is necessary. Furthermore, if a concon really is all that intent on thieving, it could easily be concealed from a CPA anyway. This is a well-meant amendment meant to clear up what is seen as a genuine problem that practically won't help, I think.

((I'll have to show that remark to my two CPA brothers.))

Andy Porter:

Why not have the Business Meeting in the late evening, say at 10pm in one of the function areas? No one ever shows in the morning - I know at many cons the BM is scheduled opposite the SFWA General Meeting, or else I've gotten to sleep at 5am, or I've got to go work my huckster table... If you held it at 10pm in the grand ballroom, you'd have to put back the movie program by a couple of hours - but I think the Business Meeting would have a much better attendance, and it's as important - more! - as other functions.

((But there's usually a major event every evening of the Worldcon (masquerade, Hugo ceremony, etc.), and nowadays the business meeting takes 2 or 3 sessions. There's just too much to do at a Worldcon: everything conflicts with something else.))

Mike Glyer:



A recent conversation about ideas for dispersing the Iggy profits reminds me that I would like to see the Worldcon Emergency Fund discussed in VotL. When Iggy considered sending some of its money to the WEF I had to laugh. Here when Iggy looked like it was in real trouble, the fund administrators didn't even give a lukewarm damn. Then in all naivete, when the con produced a surplus, what was the first cause they thought to send some to?

Some of the fans who formed the Discon 2 committee still hold the Worldcon Emergency Fund, and have since 1974. Consequently it has become inaccessible to fandom. I mean, what else would you call it when the fund's custodian outright refused to take an interest in any Worldcon which had not published its financial records? Excuse my short memory, but I don't recall any con, including Discon 2, which has ever published its books on a regular basis. ((Well, we're trying.)) The way I feel, if a group is going to sit on the WEF, they might take a little interest in the financial health of Worldcons, rather than wait for a committee to remember the fund exists and present its prayers for intercession. Originally this fund was passed from Worldcon to Worldcon and it was each committee's discretion what to do with it.

The \$1000+ reportedly in the WEF was a more significant amount of money when Torcon passed it on - cons were smaller, money was worth more. ((Not that much more!)) Today the WEF would represent just .0076 of Iggy's total business. Since the fund can no longer insure the solvency of a Worldcon, or even pay the tips for bellhops, there might be another way it could provide tangible protection to the society and Worldcon committee: Let it be used as seed money to pay the incorporation fees for successive Worldcons.

((Well, I guess it's always been something of an embarrassment. It was established (at St. Louiscon) mostly because they didn't know what else to do with the money ... but that story's too long to tell here.))

#### Miscellaneous

Mike Rogers:

I want to commend you for your effort to collect and publish information on Worldcon running. As the Worldcon grows, it comes closer and closer to the point where it will be too big for an amateur group to run. If we are to avoid having to hire a professional convention consultant (at a steep fee), concons must give each other as much information as possible. A Worldcon committee that ignores the problems of previous conventions is dead. The con will be a disaster.

John Charles McCormack:

Planning a Worldcon, unfortunately, is an art, not a science, so each committee must find their own way through the minefield that winning the bid brings. Knowing of the many problems that come with a Worldcon; each of which could blow up in your face, I don't know where we keep coming up with so many crazy people each year that want to learn a fast way to get ulcers. But God bless them, because without them and the Worldcon, fandom would be a much less enjoyable life.

Gary Farber:

I know all too well what a silly thing you're doing. And no one can tell me about the hazards and insults that will be thrown in your direction. I hope you're prepared for even the little amounts you should get, in comparison with recent cons.



Ed Wood:

All praise to the many people [at recent Worldcons] who worked their hearts out trying to put on decent enjoyable conventions for the attendees. I've never met a group that tried to put on a poor convention. Some, of course, have had more luck or brains or just plain common sense than others and so have put on more exciting and memorable affairs than some.

Seth Goldberg:

Tim Kyger makes some good comments, which is to be expected given his experience. Anyone who fails to realize that the Worldcon is big business is a fool. Add on the expanded interest created by Star Wars, etc. and just that SF is an idea whose time has come, it will only get bigger.

You had a nice pair of covers. Yes, it would be hard to choose one over the other. If it was not for the staples, it would have been difficult though to tell which side to open. I do not know how I missed commenting on the Shiffman cover last time, especially as he is a favorite fan artist of mine.

((That's one of the reasons we put staples in every copy.))

Andy Porter:

I liked the cover and the strange little critturs for the various cons. really liked that lemon wearing the school beanie...

((The artist assures me it was an orange.))

Brian Earl Brown:

Please switch to tacky twiltone or bother to slipsheet. VotL #2 looks like a real crudzine - looks, mind you, not is.

((I believe this issue is on twiltone, and the pages already run off look better.))

Redundancy in printing equipment makes a lot of sense. Who ever heard of the only available mimeo breaking down halfway through a Worldcon? 5000 copies of the first three newsletters were printed up at Iggy, and by the end of the convention between 3000 and 4000 of them were left. So a lot of paper was wasted, and more importantly the time and energy of the printers - mostly Jon Singer. Surely not that many copies need be printed. Perhaps 2000 in one batch, or 1000 first and another 1000 if it appears that they are all going to disappear. Actually at this point it might be well to arrange for a print shop to be contracted to remain open for the duration of the convention for the concom's use, so as to take a lot of tedious and mundane work off the staff.

((From another note, after I asked for more details on the numbers:))

I sat at the information desk twice at Iggy, once on Friday and once again on Sunday. ... Sunday my recollection is that most of the first, second, and third issues of the newsletter were still there. This may be because people didn't know that the newsletter was available only at the information desk, or that they didn't care. I suspect the latter. I didn't count the number of copies left over, but [on Monday] the stacks were about a foot tall each, which I estimate as a good 2000 left over and possibly more. ... I didn't consider it an important item and wouldn't have worried if I had missed them. I suspect that's true of many other fans, since except for a listing of the award winners there isn't anything really important in a newsletter.



((I have a total of about 3 more pages of comments on newsletters, from Victoria Vayne and Linda Bushyager - demonstrating if nothing else that faneds are articulate! But it's very late in this zine, and they made the same major points as Brian: save as much of the staff's effort as possible, perhaps by using an outside print shop; have plenty of redundancy of equipment; if mimeo is used, use a separate machine from the one used in the fan room, etc.; distribute the newsletters widely around the con, but lower the initial print run; keep individual issues short; prepare headings in advance; etc. We plan to follow as much of this advice as is feasible. Back to Brian:)):

I was impressed by something I saw in the Australian fanzine Epsilon Eridani Express #3. The editor had taken photographs of the winners of an art show and ran them in his zine. Since in most cases the winners of art shows are never exhibited elsewhere (being sold to collectors...), it would really be nice if photos of the winners could be run in a Worldcon-related publication. In fact, to expand on this point, I would like to suggest that instead of preparing an elaborate Program Book to be distributed at the opening of the convention, that a post-con "Memory Book" might be made with photos of the con, the Hugo winners, masquerade winners, art show winners, etc. This, I think, would be more interesting to supporting members and even to attending members. And after all, how many people actually read the program book before the convention is over?

((Attractive idea, but problems with it: an at-con publication at least saves on postage (and can probably get more ads); you can't always get artists' consent to publish pictures of their art; you'd have to set money aside for it; and the committee may fall apart after the con. The Noreascon I Proceedings, a variant on this idea, didn't finally come out until 5 years after the con....))

((Finally we have a few items from letters that arrived too late to go into the appropriate sections of the lettercol.))

Ed Wood:

It is only right to charge more for conventions in these inflated times. Far too many of the older conventions seemed to be auctions built around a few program items. This does not mean that convention committees should forget about being frugal. There is little glory in paying twice for a program book or sending out that peerless fannish invention, the beautiful but informationless progress report. I must dig out the single mimeographed sheet I got from the New Orleans convention of 1951. They made up for the terrible thing by sending out hand-tooled aluminum membership cards.

Rebecca Jirak:

Behavior: Oughtn't we to have a basic rules to follow as a joke (no sleeping in the stalls in the men's room, etc.) and slip in a few real ones; it would make people laugh and think and maybe behave a little? Did I just add another \$300.00 onto the cost?

Umm, children. Any child that did not pay does not attend our lovely programming, unless they can keep quiet and allow the paying members the best seats. Special programming for tiny tots in a tiny-tot room would be just swell, and would be considered babysitting at a low fee. ... Those children who pay should be considered members with all the rights of members. BUT those parents who were registered before the announcement should be able to buy a membership for their child at the same price or equivalent



as they bought for themselves. Fair's fair.

Now, now, Harry [Andruschak], kids don't make as much \$ as adults, yet I know a couple really neat kids (you'd almost think they were adults, for heaven's sake), so they should have the chance at full membership. Just because some kids are kreesps shouldn't make them all suffer, just the kreesps.

Please make the banquet and the awards different events. \$ shouldn't keep me away from hearing what I already paid for. Maybe have a few bitty banquets; a BNF roast banquet; a general banquet, umm, maybe not.

Don't accept any memberships after JULY, but WARN EVERYBODY!

Richard L. McKinney:

We have recently formed here in Lund, Sweden a committee which has the goal of winning the bid for the 1983 World SF Convention. We have given ourselves the formal designation of Worldcon Scandinavia [address: P.O. Box 10040, S-220 10 Lund, Sweden], and, should we achieve that goal, the Worldcon for 1983 will be held in Copenhagen, Denmark. ... Our present energies are going towards building up a broad general support, first of all here in Scandinavia, then in the rest of the SF world. ... Pre-supporting memberships are being sold at a rate of ten Swedish crowns (\$2.00). We have also had preliminary contacts with those hotels in Copenhagen which are appropriate for housing a Worldcon. We feel that we can create a good Worldcon here in Scandinavia, and we would naturally appreciate any advice, warnings, assistance, etc....

((And that - finally - ends the lettercol.))

\* \* \* \* \*  
\* \* \* \* \*

From Noreascon II News Release #4, March 21, 1979:

PUBLICATIONS

Progress Report One was mailed to all members in mid-January. Anyone who joined before Jan. 1 and has not received it should notify the committee.

Progress Report Two will be published in June. It will contain a questionnaire asking the members of the convention to rate the various parts of the convention in terms of how important each part is to them. The committee intends to use the results of the questionnaire in making its planning decisions, so they urge all members to fill it out and send it in.

Many people have requested art show, hucksters, and hotel-reservation information. This information is not yet available, but will be included in Progress Report Three, to be published in December. In addition, the questionnaire included with Progress Report Two will have a section in which the member can check off his areas of interest (art show, masquerade, hucksters, babysitting, etc.) so as to receive any special mailings the committee sends out.

MEMBERSHIP

Noreascon II's Australian agent has moved. Robin Johnson's new address is: P.O. Box A491, Sydney South, N.S.W. 2000, Australia.

Current convention registration is 1570, with 1208 attending members and 362 supporting. Noreascon II now has a member from every state in the union, having at long last received a membership from South Dakota.

((As of May 1, my unofficial count of memberships is 1657. - G.F.))



Addresses of Contributors (to issues # 1, 2, 3)

Paul K. Abelkis (3), 5275 Somerset St., Buena Park, CA 90621  
 Harry Andruschak (1,2,3), 6933 N. Rosemead #31, San Gabriel, CA 91775  
 Yves Bellefeuille (2), 2372 Haddington, Ottawa, Ont., Canada K1H 8J4  
 Kent Bloom (2), 338 N St. SW, Washington, DC 20024  
 David S. Bratman (1, 3), P.O. Box 4651, Berkeley, CA 94704  
 Seth Breidbart (3), 100 Fairview Sq., Apt. 2P, Ithaca, NY 14850  
 Brian Earl Brown (3), 16711 Burt Rd. #207, Detroit, MI 48219  
 Joanne Burger (1), 55 Blue Bonnet Ct., Lake Jackson, TX 77566  
 Crispin Burnham (3), 1051 Wellington Rd., Lawrence, KS 66044  
 Linda E. Bushyager (3), 1614 Evans Ave., Prospect Park, PA 19076  
 Avedon Carol (2), 4409 Woodfield Rd., Kensington, MD 20795  
 Jack Chalker (2), 4704 Warner Drive, Manchester, MD 21102  
Chunder! (3): John Foyster, GPO Box 4039, Melbourne, Vict. 3001, Australia  
 David Emerson (1), Apt. 17, 1930 Aldrich Ave. S., Minneapolis, MN 55403  
 Gary Farber (3), 1047 East 10th St., Brooklyn, NY 11120 (now in Seattle?)  
 George Fergus (2), 1810 Hemlock #204, Schaumburg, IL 60195  
 Mike Glycer (1,2,3), 14974 Osceola St., Sylmar, CA 91342 (File 770)  
 Seth Goldberg (2,3), Dept. of Chemistry, Bilger Hall, Univ. of Hawaii,  
 Honolulu, HI 96822  
 Jeanne Gomoll (3), 2018 Jenifer St., Madison, WI 53704  
 Carey Handfield (3), PO Box A491, Sydney South, NSW 2000, Australia  
 Rebecca Jirak (3), 205 Sheldon Ave., Pittsburgh, PA 15220  
 Mark Keller (2 covers), 101 S. Angell St., Providence, RI 02906  
 Irvin Koch (3), c/o 835 Chatt. Bk. Bg., Chattanooga, TN 37402  
 Tim Kyger (2), c/o IguanaCon, P.O. Box 1072, Phoenix, AZ 85001  
 Johnny M. Lee (2), 3705 Cedar Hill, Houston, TX 77093  
 Evelyn C. Leeper (3), 29-C Peach Lane, Old Bridge, NJ 08857  
 Rebecca Lesses (1), 18 Gray St., Cambridge, MA 02138 (permanent address)  
 Tod Levitt (1), 214 E. 19th St. #205, Minneapolis, MN 55403  
 Paula Lieberman (2), in transit  
 James R. Madden (1,2), P.O. Box 18610-A, Univ. Sta., Baton Rouge, LA 70893  
 Laurie D.T. Mann (1,2,3), 5501 Elmer St. #3, Pittsburgh, PA 15232  
 John Charles McCormack (1,3), 43 Florence Ave., Apt. 10, Trenton, NJ 08618  
 Dawn B. McGhiey, (2), 1112 N. Ohio St., Springfield, IL 62702  
 Richard L. McKinney (3), Fack, S-221 01 Lund, Sweden  
 John Millard (2), 18-86 Broadway Ave., Toronto, Ont., Canada M4P 1T4  
 Frank C. Olbris (3), 284 N. Farms Rd., Florence, MA 01060  
 Andrew Porter (2,3), P.O. Box 4175, New York, NY 10017  
 Marta Randall (2), 1700 Mountain Blvd., Oakland, CA 94611  
 Mike Rogers (3), 233 Barton Ave., Chattanooga, TN 37405  
 Ronald M. Salomon (1,2), 1014 Concord St., Framingham, MA 01701  
 Joe Scanlan (3), 1829 La Vante Ave., Las Vegas, NV 89109  
 Charles Seelig (1), 1309 John Jay Hall, Columbia Univ., New York, NY 10027  
 (after 5/1: 38 Oxford St., Springfield, MA 01108)  
 Stu Shiffman (1,3 covers), 880 W. 181 St., Apt. 4D, New York, NY 10033  
 Michael Tallan (3), Eigenmann 806, Indiana Univ., Bloomington, IN 47401  
 Pascal J. Thomas (3), 16 Wright St., Cambridge, MA 02138 (soon in France)  
 Victoria Wayne (2), PO Box 156, Stn D, Toronto, Ont., Canada M6P 3J8 (DNQ)  
 Eva Chalker Whitley (2), 4704 Warner Drive, Manchester, MD 21102  
 James J.J. Wilson (3), 21 Spinning Wheel Rd., Hinsdale, IL 60521  
 Ed Wood, (3), 873 Tower Ave., Hartford, CT 06112  
 JoAnn Wood (1,2), 873 Tower Ave., Hartford, CT 06112  
 Ben Yalow (2), 3242 Tibbett Ave., Bronx, NY 10463  
Leslie Turek (1,2,3), George Flynn (1,2,3), Ellen Franklin (1,2,3), Don Eastlake (2,3), Jim Hudson (1), Tony Lewis (1): c/o Noreascon II box