

This is regarding the method of establishing the world convention site for the year following a foreign world convention. As pointed out in our previous communication, the Rotation Plan has now been changed so that every fourth year the World Convention can be held outside of the North American Continent. The first year that this will apply will be 1970; every fourth year thereafter the Rotation Plan provides for the convention being held outside of this Continent.

This committee was formed to study the present system of con-site selection as it will apply to the post-foreign conventions; to discuss various problems to which the present system of bidding might contribute, and to make recommendations at the business meeting at Baycon, based on our findings.

In my previous letter, I asked that each committee member outline the problems that would be faced by the post-foreign convention bidding groups, and make suggestions for possible solutions.

The letters I have received from the committee members follow.

ARCHIE MERCER, 9 Cotswold Road, Bedminster, Bristol 3, Great Britain

Last week I received your letter/circular of the 24th of October, which had been addressed to me at my previous address. If any previous communications on the same subject, from any party, have been sent to me then I haven't received them. Therefore I feel at present a bit in the dark. What I would like to know to start with, please, is the following: (1) Precisely what authority appointed this committee? [[The committee was appointed by George Scithers, Parliamentarian of Nycon 3, at the Nycon 3 Business Meeting.]] (2) How were the committee members selected? [[The committee members were appointed by George.]] (3) Precisely to whom does the committee eventually report? [[The committee will report to the Business Meeting at Baycon.]]

Initial bewilderment having been expressed, I would next like to declare a special interest. I am British Agent for the committee bidding for Heidelberg as World S.F. Convention site for 1970, and thus very much committed to one particular locality/year. So if there's any question of disinterest being essential, I'm afraid I lack same.

[[I am chairman of the bidding committee for St. Louis in '69. Brian Burley and Robert Hillis are members of the bidding committee for Columbus in '69. This committee is bi-partisan; the procedures we hope to evolve would apply to any bidding group.]]

Basically, I don't accept that any particular country has any inherent right to host the World Convention any specific proportion of times. The current geographical and linguistic distribution of sf fandom being what it is, it seems on the face of it fair that the U.S.A. should host three Worldcons out of four at present, but (a) in the face of further evidence I reserve the right to alter my opinion at any time, and (b) the situation is liable to alter in the future in any case. For now, though, I agree that three-in-the-States-to-one-elsewhere looks like a practical working allocation, and a suitable basis for these discussions.

It had already occurred to me that inasmuch as three out of four (or more)

Conventions are at present held in North America, it might possibly be fairer for the voting on all North American Worldcons to take place at the preceding North American Worldcon, whether that is held one or two years before. A corollary here might be that voting on non-North-American Worldcons be held also at the previous such - four years before. Though four years might be thought to be too long a preparatory-time. Another thought that seems to fit in here is that a two-years-before (get that mast outta here!) vote might become the norm, except when it involved a non-Norteamericano site voting for a Norteamericano one.

Another angle which impinges here, and which is much in my mind, is that of the definition of North America for World S.F. Convention purposes. I hear of possible plans to sponsor bids in "foreign" years for Bermuda and/or the Bahamas. Bermuda's a marginal case - it's nearer to North America than to any other continent, but is still a considerable distance therefrom. The Bahamas, on the other hand, seem to me to be just as legitimate a part of North America as the British Isles are of Europe. And somebody from, say, eastern Canada would find it, I should think, both easier and cheaper to get to the Bahamas than to get to California. A Floridan almost certainly would.

Right, then. THE BASIC PROBLEM AS I UNDERSTAND IT IS: (pause for considerable reflection) the varying geographical distances between successive Con locations. MY OBJECTIONS TO THE PRESENT SYSTEM: I think I'll leap sideways here and say that to my mind the present system's greatest defect is the amount of animosity that is liable to be created between rival bidders for the same year, wherever in the world or the United States they may be located. Beside this, other difficulties tend to look insignificant.

POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS: this is a much more difficult matter. Overleaf I've slung around some stray thoughts which if acted upon might serve to ameliorate matters somewhat. It looks very much as if the committee is being asked to suggest ways of pleasing all the people all the time, though. However, let's try.

Recognise that North America is not equivalent to three-quarters of the world. Even if for the time being it is generally convenient for three-quarters of Worldcons to be held in North America, have the North American rotation entirely distinct from the inter-continental rotation.

Within any rotation system (whether North American, world, or both together as now) make a hard and fast rule setting up zones no one of which would be permitted under any circumstances to hold two Worldcons in succession.

So far as possible, let competing localities in the same zone decide between themselves without out-of-zone participation in the voting. (This suggestion opens the way to accusations of underhand deals - though the way is by no means closed to them as things are anyway. It is also subject to assailment by, for example, the New Yorker who prefers Los Angeles to San Francisco and likes to be able in public to say so.) (These places are simply cited as hypothetical examples - I'm not trying to "get at" anyone in particular here of course.)

TREVOR HEARN DEN, 245 Rue Couture, Arvida, Quebec, Canada

Thanks for your letter concerning the worldcon site committee. As you can see, I now have a new address although mail sent to the old address will still reach me eventually.

I've been thinking about the problem and will make a few preliminary observations.

- 1) To discriminate in any way against non-American fans is bad and against the whole spirit of fandom. It could also produce a backlash.
- 2) The selection of the next con-site must follow a standard procedure regardless of whether the '70 con, say, is in Europe or the U. S.
- 3) A proxy system might be the best solution provided there are safeguards and con-attendees have a chance to vote at the con.

So as I see it the basic problem is that some elements of U. S. fandom are still afraid of losing the worldcon for good. This is of course silly as Euro-fandom is not yet strong enough to put on more than 1 worldcon every 4 years and when it is strong enough it'll deserve the right to do this. I have no real objection to the present setup but recognise that it may be necessary to compromise.

The 1st solution proposed, ie, that the Eurocon site and '71 site are selected at the '69 con is surely discrimination and unacceptable to European fan.

The 2nd may be the answer. [[A method of proxy voting, to be devised.]]

The suggestion that the con-site selection should go on the Hugo ballot is unacceptable if this is the sole vote. If those who register at the con or wish to withhold judgement until after seeing rival presentations at, say, the '69 or '70 con can vote at the convention, this is OK.

BRIAN BURLEY, 3840 Shaw, St. Louis, Missouri 63110

The problem of the new four year rotation plan is only on the surface how to select the site of the post-foreign convention, although, of course, there are unique problems there. The problem arises from the structure of the current bidding system: the new overseas bidding provisions merely emphasize the flaws in that system. There is only a quantitative difference, although a large one, in the situation where a West Coast bid committee comes to an Eastern convention, and in the one where an Eastern committee goes to a European or other foreign convention. The same is also true, to a lesser extent, when a midwestern committee goes to the West Coast. In each of these cases, a bidding committee must go to considerable expense and trouble to reach a distant convention site, and convince the voters, a majority of who have no intention of attending the next convention that a given distant site is the best. (The fact that they gladly do so is a sign of devotion, and does not change the basic situation.)

To find a solution to these problems for post-foreign bids a system of site-selection completely different from the present system should be found. Such a system should be such that it could be generally applied to all convention site bidding if the fans should so desire.

Other than establishing an executive committee of some sort with the power to decide convention sites, a solution which is totally unacceptable, there are only two general classes of solution: in-convention voting systems and out-of-convention voting systems. In an in-convention voting system, such as the present system, members vote at a previous convention to select the site of

the following one. This system has two great advantages: it allows the bidders to present themselves directly to the voters just prior to the site selection balloting, and it allows easy control over vote fraud in that all voters are in the room and voting simultaneously. The major disadvantage, the distance of travel, has been discussed above. In addition, a foreign convention poses another possible disadvantage in that since only a small percentage of the attendees will be North American fans, the chances are increased that out of rotation bids will keep the convention out of North America indefinitely.

To overcome the problems of travel and possible out of rotation bids, it has been suggested that North American conventions prior to foreign conventions select both the foreign site and the next succeeding North American site. This poses several problems in addition to those inherent in the bid system itself. First it would tend to indicate to foreign convention holders that North American fans were not interested enough to attend foreign conventions and that they did not trust the foreign convention holders sufficiently to allow them to select the North American site. Although this is not necessarily true, the temptation for foreign fans to view the matter in this manner would be great. The second difficulty arises from the structure of bidding committees themselves. Finnish organizations in general are loosely structured and temporary in nature. The strain imposed on such an organization if it were to have to remain functional an additional year would be great. These objections seem sufficient to remove this method of site selection from serious consideration.

Another suggestion that has been made is to have the foreign convention on a five-year rotation instead of four. This would be an excellent suggestion if the problem involved was merely the additional responsibility placed on East Coast bidders by forcing them to bid at the foreign convention each rotation period. Unfortunately, this is not the case, and this method must be rejected for the same reasons as the previous suggestion. All in-convention systems seem to have these same flaws.

We are now left, by elimination, with an out-of-convention, or mail ballot, method of onsite selection. There are a number of problems in this type of solution - precisely those factors which are advantages of in-convention voting: how to reach the voters and how to insure against vote fraud. However these problems seem amenable to solution, as witness the Hugo balloting. Past convention committees have found it necessary to require some form of identification on Hugo nomination ballots in order to insure against multiple voting, and final voting has been limited to members of the convention. It has been suggested, in fact, that onsite selection be done on the Hugo final ballot. This would be even more limiting than in-convention voting in that the voters are limited to those fans who joined the current convention before it was held. Thus the electorate is smaller and more regionally weighted than it is in in-convention voting. (Local fans would be more sure of being able to attend a convention, and thus would join early. Non-locals, on the other hand, would tend to wait until the last minute, in case adverse circumstances should arise.)

There is nothing to prevent a separate pre-convention mail ballot for the next year's con site, but other considerations would indicate that a post-convention vote would be more desirable. In this case, bid presentations could continue to be presented in the present manner, thus maintaining for

No!
on 6/6/60
to do all the work?

the attendees one of the major advantages of in-convention voting. If the consite mail ballots were made available at the end of bid presentations, those attending could cast their vote immediately. Ballots from both attending and non-attending fans would be accepted for some time after the convention, for example until the end of December of the current year.

The problem now arises as to who shall be eligible to vote and what the mechanics of determining eligibility and what the mechanics of voting should be. Responsibility for the vote could be left where it is now: in the hands of a defacto committee consisting of the current convention committee, and other interested parties. However, safeguards would have to be worked out in recognition of the fact that it would be difficult for all parties concerned to physically assemble. One possibility would be to intrust the ballots to a disinterested party, such as a bank, until such time as they could be counted. Such services are available at a small fee.

Essentially all fans would be eligible to vote. A simple safeguard such as proof of attendance at one regional or world convention (membership card, badge, etc) or being known by one recognized fan would not be restrictive (although in the latter case, some method should be established to insure that interested persons do not inroll non-fan-friends.) One suggestion that has been made is that convention voting be restricted to those who plan to attend the next convention, or at least support it. While this has the advantage of producing a totally interested electorate, it has the disadvantage of forcing a decision a year in advance and creates problems of control. (The specific suggestion is that in order to vote one would buy an attending or non-attending membership from a neutral committee, which would turn over all the proceeds and the list of members to the winner.) This suggestion need be examined more fully, and is not germane to the present discussion as its adoption would not alter the effectiveness of the proposed system.

The actual voting would be done by Australian ballot. Otherwise multiple mailings (and someone to do them) would be necessary. The results could be announced in the fan press.

ROBERT L. HILLIS, 1290 Byron Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43227

This letter is in response to yours of 24 October. You will find at least a sketch of my present thinking in the next Tightbeam in which I urged the N3Fers to give their opinions to the committee members in their area.

I feel that the committee's jurisdiction is limited to only those problems arising from the introduction of a compulsory four year rotation plan. There are many problems connected with the present bidding system, including particularly the prohibitive cost, which I would like to discuss but I know that we can not do this. In the same way the proposal for the five-year rotation has some merits but we can not discuss them directly. All proposed solutions have some valid objections; we can only try to come up with a plan with the least drawbacks.

The biggest drawbacks to the current system lie in the costs involved, both financial and personal. A foreign convention will have a limited American attendance. In addition, because of differences in income levels the following American convention will have an even more limited European attendance. So the bulk of the voting will be done on the basis of personal impressions made

at the Con by voters with no intention of attending the convention at any American city. I see no prospect of the convention being permanently Europeanized since European fandom is not well enough organized to carry a permanent series of worldcons. But it is unfair to force European fans to choose between American cities about which they are totally unfamiliar and it is equally unfair to force the American bid committees to campaign under such conditions.

Postponement must be rejected since it would be a refusal to meet our obligations. We volunteered to serve on a committee which was to present an acceptable solution to this problem. If our solution is rejected at Baycon, the resulting problem becomes the responsibility of the fans present, but we will have done our duty.

Proxy voting is impossible to regulate except in the context of the corporate Criminal and Civil Codes. It is impossible to determine the membership of world fandom. How could we check on the proxies to determine if these absent fans actually exist and if they actually are fans likely to attend a convention? If such fraud actually occurred, it would be impossible to redress, since the Nycon 3 people insisted on establishing the precedent that the World Science Fiction Association is the absolute property of the successful bid committee. I can not imagine any committee unscrupulous enough to use fraud yielding control except on a Court order which might be hard to get if you consider the current state of fandom.

?
doesn't
exist

The same objection must be made for mail balloting. Who will be eligible to vote? Anyone who sends in \$3.00. At that rate, it would be cheaper to stuff the ballot box than it would be to campaign. Members of a least one prior con? Who has the membership lists and current addresses for the last twenty-five cons? Despite these objections, I might accept this as a compromise solution for choosing the 1971 site only if coupled with a requirement to prove membership in at least one prior convention when submitting your ballot. But this would be acceptable only as a temporary measure while we sought a better solution.

This brings us down to selecting the 1971 site at the 1969 convention. This has all the disadvantages of the current system plus adding the East Coast with the permanent chore of campaigning two years early. Granted that a large part of the voters are neofans, they are at least American fans choosing an American city and are open to some persuasion without having to bridge a linguistic or cultural gap. It can be validly argued that European fans have just as much right to choose between competing American cities as Americans do to choose between European sites, but there's been no competition for an European bid, so the vote in that case is a formality. If such competition should arise, I hope the European fans could somehow settle the problem among themselves before arriving at the prior American convention. I might add that I do not expect an Asiatic World Con for some time, and since Canada is considered part of North America under the present rotation plan, the problem seems to be entirely a matter of meshing American and European rotation. The biggest legitimate obstacle would seem to be its permanent burden to the East Coast which could be solved by the simultaneous adoption of Andy Porter's five year rotation plan (A foreign con each 5 years) which would eventually even out the inconvenience.

Thus for the reasons outlined above I favor choosing the 1971 site at the 1969 Worldcon. I might further add that since this plan would require the fewest changes in existing procedures it would probably be the easiest to get adopted at the Baycon business session.

WALDEMAR KUMMING, 8 Muechen 2, Herzegspitalstr. 5, West Germany

After pondering a while about your letter I've come to the conclusion that the possibilities listed by you - or combinations thereof - are probably the only practical ones. No doubt all sorts of schemes - from special polls to a lottery - could be employed to settle the problem, but I doubt that they would be really workable.

You have asked me to state my understanding of the problem and my objections to the present system. Actually, I believe that the present system would probably work in 1970, for the simple reason that German and other European fans will practically go to any length to show that they are worthy of having a worldcon. This might, however, no longer be true at other cons elsewhere, and many American fans seem to think that it might not be true in 1970 and that some attempt might be made to take the worldcon permanently away from the U.S. This idea might well be the cause of not having a worldcon in Europe after all. The best way to cut the ground from under it is an appropriate change in the rules, at the same time plugging up a possible loophole that might be dangerous later on.

I agree that it would be much harder for a prospective consite bidder to make a convincing bid at a foreign convention. This also seems to be a valid reason for a change in rules.

Of the 3 solutions proposed by you, I consider #2 to be least desirable. While it would have the possible advantage of staying closer to tradition than other methods, it immediately raises the question of making sure that all fans voting by proxy are indeed bona fide fans. Otherwise, there will be an attempt at ballot stuffing sooner or later, or suspicions or charges of it, which will be just as bad. Any such checkup will however represent a nearly impossible job for a convention committee outside of the U.S., both because of lack of acquaintance with enough American fans and because of the higher cost and longer time taken by communications. If any such solution is adopted, it would have to be handled by a special committee based in the U. S. A way out of this difficulty would be the restriction of voting to fans who have paid for membership in the convention; while this will not prevent ballot stuffing it will make it too expensive to be practical. However, inasmuch as most of the fans voting by proxy will almost certainly give specific instructions of what to vote for, this will reduce to a more complicated way of doing the same thing as solution #3. [[Solution #3 was to include the con-site selection on the Hugo ballot.]]

#1 has the advantage of simplicity [[choosing the '70 and the '71 convention at the '69 con,]] but it takes an important right - the selection of the next consite - away from the membership of one convention. While the exercise of that right might have to be modified for practical reasons, it should not be abrogated.

#3 appears to me to be the best solution. It is also very simple to accomplish, entailing no additional expense and very little additional work. It

might have the beneficial effect of heightening interest in obtaining convention membership.

It might be worthwhile to consider one departure from the simple procedure. This would be to allow actual attendees at the business meeting to give their vote there and then, instead of having to send it in beforehand. If the voting can only be done with a form given out only to con members, valid if filled out with the members name, no possibility of double voting would exist, and a later checkup in case of doubt is always possible. Quite possibly this will not change the result much. But it just might, and this possibility will probably serve to keep the sponsor's speeches and room parties. While the custom of room parties given by prospective bidders might be open to some objections, it certainly is the accepted custom right now. Just as American fans will expect some European flavor at a worldcon held in Europe, European fans will expect some of the usual worldcon flavor - which in this case means some American customs even if observed more or less by token.

Finally I would like to add a short note on a theme that is probably outside of the scope of the present committee, though I might be mistaken in that assumption. There seems to be some concern about the selection of a site for an American convention in the event of a worldcon elsewhere. The arguments appear to concern the fact that the hiatus in American worldcons will always come between the same two regions in the rotation plan, thus giving to one region the burden - or the opportunity - of putting on both the Worldcon and the American con. To prevent this, the proposal is made to change the rotation plan so a worldcon outside the U.S. will come every fifth year rather than every fourth. I think this change is unnecessary and undesirable. The same effect can be obtained by adopting some sort of rotation plan for the American cons.

RAYMOND D. FISHER, 4404 Forest Park, St. Louis, Missouri 63108

I don't know whether to be pleased or disappointed that there were no new problems suggested in addition to the ones that I had offered as examples. The fact that there were no new problems suggested might indicate that there are no other real problems involved with a bidding committee that is making their bid outside of the country. On the other hand, if there are other problems, it's disappointing that we are unable to think of them ahead of time, so as to fore-stall them.

I note that none of the committee seems to really be worried about the convention becoming permanently located abroad. I'm glad of this, for it is my opinion that it's very unlikely that any fan group would even wish to gain permanent control of the convention site. The thing is, if any fan group who once had the convention wanted to do so, it undoubtedly could win bids to hold the convention in that location indefinitely. And, not only outside of this country: This would apply to any area of the United States, as well. It's unlikely that any fan group would ever choose to do this, and it seems no more likely that the convention hosting privileges should be abused in this way by foreign fans than by a fan group inside this country.

The inconvenience of the fan groups having to journey so far to place their bid is comparable to the foreign fans having to come to this country to place theirs. The worry of having to convince fans who might not know the bidding group and might not be familiar with their merits or home city, applies

equally to bidding groups on both sides of the ocean. How many of us voting for the con-site of the 1970 con will actually have hopes of attending; how many of us will actually be well acquainted with over a half-dozen of the fans who are involved in that bid; how many of us are actually acquainted with the cities that will be presented? That the reverse will be true the following year does not seem inappropriate to me, and giving special considerations to the post-foreign convention bidding groups would be ignoring the fact that the overseas fans have these same problems.

What does seem to be a legitimate complaint, though, is the fact that the Eastern Section is the only U. S. section that will have to face an ocean-hop to make a bid. And, as it now stands, this burden will always fall to the East Coast.

The fan press is, of course, filled with discussion of this particular point and the most frequently expressed wish is to even up the strain between the U. S. sections. The most popular suggestion, which will probably be brought up at the Baycon business session, is the 5-year rotation plan. I can understand very well why this suggestion might not be viewed with favor by Eurofandom, and I cannot in any way blame the European fans for wanting their fourth of the worldcon pie, as promised by the rotation change at the Nycon business session. However, if the 5-year plan is unacceptable, there will have to be an alternative found that is acceptable and that does even up the ocean-hopping burden which is presently borne only by the foreign bidders and the East Coast. While this strain may not be particularly relished by the Midwest and West Coast sections, it's only fair that they should have a bit of it too.

Along with the "problems" that came to me from correspondence and conversation with various fans, has come also some further suggestions. Of course, and as Waldemar mentioned, there's the possibility of rotating the American cons so that the East Coast does not always follow the foreign con. However, in order to have any chance of getting a proposal of that nature accepted, it would be necessary that this rotation be arranged in such a way that no area of the country would be denied hosting privileges for more years than the 5-year plan would necessitate.

As another alternative, the suggestion was made to me that the foreign con be chosen at some large convention in Europe..for example, at Thirdmancon. And, during the year that the convention was abroad, have the post-foreign con selected at one of the regionals in this country. However, I can see a large argument ensuing about which regional. Also, this would remove the site-selection privilege from the worldcons who have their authority thusly abrogated, as site-selection privileges have traditionally been vested in world con members in the past.

A third suggestion that has come to me is that the post-foreign con be declared 'open', so that any city from any section of the North American Continent could originate a bid. If the successful bid were made by, for example, the West Coast, the two following cons would be first in the Midwest, then on the East Coast. If the successful bid were made by the East Coast, the two following cons would go to the West Coast and the Midwest.

The fact that, under the present arrangement, the strain of making an out-of-the-country bid always falls to the Eastern Section is probably the biggest problem that the four-year rotation plan presents, and seems to be the one problem that is most demanding of a solution.

Therefore, unless an alternative solution is offered, I propose that the members of this committee introduce and/or support the proposal for a change in Rotation Plan. The new Rotation Plan which I would suggest would be for a worldcon to be held outside of the North American Continent every fifth year, in order that no one section will have to face the strain of making an out-of-the-country bid each rotation.

I have received indication that the German Con Bidding Committee will support such a motion; however, if this is not true, or if a better suggestion can be offered, I will hope to hear of it before Baycon's Business Meeting.

Although discussion of any further questions within this committee may be redundant, I think that it may be appropriate to mention handicaps that the changed rotation plan may eventually introduce. It is quite possible that, for example, fandom will eventually have to give consideration to language barriers. When/if this happens, will it be necessary to change the method of presentation slightly, so as to allow time for translators? — I expect no answer to this question, as it seems unlikely that it will need consideration at any time in the immediate future. But, fandom may eventually have such a problem — perhaps we'll be prepared with a quick answer, when it arises.

While I dislike getting involved in discussion of this possibility, if any government of any hosting country restricts the amount of money that can be taken out of the country by an individual, bidding expenses will impose a difficulty. This could be true for fans from either side of the ocean, if their government passed legislation of this type. — Perhaps it will be possible to transfer funds out of the country by breaking it into very small amounts, to be sent by international money orders to the treasurer of the convention, to be held against arrival; the transfer funds between conventions would also present a problem in instances of this case. Is there a simple solution to this? — Perhaps, by the time an answer is needed, fandom will have it.

But, for the present, I am glad that we were agreed that there is only one real problem presented by the new rotation plan, and happy of the indication that I've had, that there is a solution that is agreeable with North American and European fans. — Again, if I hear nothing further, I intend to either propose and/or support a motion for the five-year plan.

Raymond D. Fisher
4404 Forest Park
St. Louis, Missouri 63108
United States of America

Shortly after finishing the first ten pages, I recieved the letter below from Robert L. Hillis of this committee, and the Ølentangey World Science Fiction Convention bidding committee (formerly Columbus World Science Fiction Convention committee). I thought it was fantastic and herewith reproduce it verbatim. ...I just hope that Mr. Hillis is speaking as his own individual, personable self, , rather than in his official capacity as Associate Chairman and Treasurer of Ølentangey. I wonder...?

Robert L. Hillis
1290 Byron Ave.
Columbus, Ohio 43227

Raymond D. Fisher
4404 Forest Park
St. Louis, Mo. 63108

Dear Ray,

This is to remind you that you will be called on to deliver a report concerning the best method of selecting a consite for the year following a foreign convention. This report will be called for at the business session which takes place before the con-site vote. Frankly, I get the impression that you intend to block the issuing of any report. This is both unwise, and legally impossible since I will personally ask for your report, and if none is forthcoming present my own views as a minority report. However since we are both connected with bid committees, I have no desire to get us involved in any extended controversy before the vote unless this becomes unavoidable. But this is an important issue and I will not let it get buried.

If the status quo is maintained, there will be no bid parties at the 1969 convention. There is never any overseas competition (which dispes of any argument about American Fans choosing overseas sites) and it would be idiotic for an East coast city to invest money in entertaining non-voters. This will give either Columbus or St. Louis the responsibility for entertaining a large segment of the attendees every night or getting blamed for a dull World-con.

The proposals to go back to the old system or to change to a five year rotation are, of course, outside our juristiction. Even if passed they will only spread around the misery. The Midwest will get shafted since we are the farthest from any foreign site. But the basic problem will remain, TriCon beat Syracuse for the last Midwestern Worldcon by thirteen votes. The London Committee felt no obligation to enforce the 3/4 rule for out of rotation bids.

I understand that response in the committee to your original letter was poor. I am not sure since you seem to make a fetish out of keeping everything secret. Burley's continuing mail ballot is impractical and practically invites fraud. Proposals to limit voting to members of the next Convention, or of two worldcons, etc. are outside our juristiction. As usual you did not give your views.

I still think my proposal is the least objectionable. Since two Eastern cities are already actively bidding fpr 1971, they hardly could be caught by surprise if told next month that the vote will be held in September 1969.

Bob Hillis
Robert L. Hillis

[[Okey, Bob, Baby, if you'll flip over to the next page, we'll take 'em one at a time. RDF]]

— You do seem to derive your 'impressions' from some Strange Source, Mr. Hillis, as your 'impressions' seem to have little to do with fact. Personally, I wish that I had some small contact with this Strange Source, so that I could know exactly what it is you seem to think I would gain by "blocking the issuing of a report", or (for that matter) I would be interested to know exactly how you imagine that this would be accomplished. Precisely what authority do you believe this committee to have, upon the decision (if any) that will be made at the Baycon Business Meeting? The only thing that I, or any member of this committee can do is offer personal opinion, and make personal recommendation. After personal opinions and recommendations have been made, any action that is taken will be taken as result of the decision of the membership of Baycon — not at my decision, your decision, or even at the joint decision of the members of this committee. It would be pleasant, albeit unusual and unexpected, if the members of this committee were unanimously agreed on the recommendation to be made to the Baycon Business Meeting. However, it is certainly not necessary. Even if this committee should be so agreed, the only value that our agreement would have on the outcome would be the value of a certain number of attending members. In no sense of the word is it appropriate for you to believe that this committee will decide the outcome; in no way is it necessary for you to support my views; in no way would it be inappropriate for you to offer a differing view at Baycon, even as you have done in your letter.

You have presented a new "problem" that is introduced by the new four-year rotation plan. It is not, strictly speaking, a problem that this committee was formed to consider. But, as you have brought it into the discussion, by all means let's talk about it.

Mr. Hillis, you have stated that you would like to see the post-foreign con chosen before the over-seas convention — ie, the 1971 con-site chosen in '69 — because, in your opinion, the 1969 con committee will be hampered by the fact that there will be no overseas competition. It is your fear that the lack of competition will cause a lack of bidding parties; and "give Columbus...the responsibility for entertaining a large segment of the attendees every night...". (Let's leave St. Louis out of this. St. Louis' Bidding Committee is one for whom I most certainly can speak, and I'll tell you right now that St. Louis wants the responsibility for entertaining the convention members in '69. That's what we're bidding for. St. Louis most certainly does not feel that it is the responsibility of future con-site bidding groups to provide the entertainment at St. Louiscon, nor do we plan to push this responsibility off on someone else. Make no mistake — in your worry about the lack of bidding parties, you are speaking for Columbus. You most certainly do not, and cannot, speak for St. Louis. St. Louis speaks for itself, Mr. Hillis. If there are bidding groups who wish to have parties at St. Louiscon, we will certainly work with them. But St. Louis does not consider the responsibility for entertainment to be that of the future bidding groups. It is St. Louiscon's responsibility to arrange that the entire convention be successful and entertaining, all the time. You — and may I here assume that you speak for Columbus, in your official capacity of Vice Chairman and Treasurer? — have indicated that you feel the responsibility for a successful convention, should the Columbus bid be acceptable, lies elsewhere. This is a rather unusual approach — a unique idea — for a con committee to have. But, you are certainly free to approach the matter in that way, if you choose. But...get one thing clear: You most certainly do not speak for St. Louis and, furthermore, I would greatly appreciate your remembering this rather basic fact, in the future.)

If the lack of competing bids for the 1970 con were a legitimate reason for doing what you suggest — and I hope my feelings on this matter have been made clear — then, I think that it would only be fair to point out that the method you propose — choosing the '71 con in '69 — would also leave the 1970 convention in the position of having no competing bids to host parties. The 1970 convention committee has not expressed the view that it is the responsibility of the bidding cities to provide entertainment at

the 1970 convention. But, if your objection is valid for Columbus, it would certainly be valid for the 1970 con committee to object on the same basis. If the 1971 convention site is chosen in 1969, who's going to host bidding parties in 1970? (This is an entirely hypothetical question. The German fans have indicated that they also desire the responsibility for entertaining the members of their convention, and have in no way tried to sluff off this responsibility. But, if it's a legitimate gripe for you and your committee, Mr. Hillis, it would most certainly be a legitimate gripe for the European fans.)

I, personally, most definitely oppose the system you propose — the reasons you give for such a change do not, in my opinion, justify such a radical change from the traditions of fandom, nor do your reasons justify taking away the authority that fandom has traditionally vested in every worldcon's membership...the authority (and privilege) of choosing the site of the next world convention.

But, as I hope you now understand, you most certainly have the right to offer your own views on this subject at the Baycon Business Meeting.

Let's talk a little about "jurisdiction" — a subject upon which you seem to be confused. This committee has "jurisdiction" to discuss one thing. — Note: discuss; not decide. — We were asked to give consideration to the effect that the four-year rotation plan would have on the post-foreign con bidders. We were asked to try to determine if any special problems would be felt by the post-foreign con bidders; if there would be special problems we were asked to recommend a solution. (We were not asked to give consideration to the effect this would have on the pre-foreign con committees; in fact, your letter is the first indication I have had that any city felt burdened by the necessity for providing entertainment for the con members.) I want you to read this statement of our "jurisdiction" very carefully, and give careful attention to the fact that we were asked to discuss, to consider, to determine, and lastly, to recommend. We were asked to make these recommendations, if any, to the business meeting of Baycon, either as a committee, en masse, or as individuals, if the committee does not have a unanimous opinion. Now — where in the world do you get the idea that you can tell fandom that the '71 con-site will be chosen in '69? Who gave you the authority to make this decision for fandom? Don't you think that the rest of fandom might have something to say about this, too? Don't you think that it's a little inappropriate to view fandom as some sort of militaristic academy with this committee acting as command headquarters? "Masters", Mr. Hillis, are people that are associated with Boy Scout Troops, and Scout Masters guide the learning of the little kiddies by giving them "orders". Fandom, Mr. Hillis, is not a troupe of Boy Scouts, and this committee most certainly does not have the "jurisdiction" to tell the Eastern Cities when and where they will make their bids.

You, or anyone else in fandom who wishes to do so, are at liberty to express any opinion on this matter that you think advisable, and this is certainly what I expect you, and every other interested fan, to do. But, I personally cannot and will not support the change you propose for the reason that you cite.

A word about secrecy: If you were interested in knowing anything from me, Mr. Hillis, why didn't you ask? Your letters, reproduced earlier, represent the only times I have ever received any communication from you: I cannot take this as any large indication of your deep concern.

Ray Fisher

