



# THE INSTRUMENTALITY

of the Australian Science Fiction Foundation

Vol 3 No.4

May 1991

1991 Committee:

President:

Cath Ortlieb

Vice President:

Alan Stewart

Secretary:

Mark Loney

Treasurer:

Carey Handfield

Committee:

Donna Heenan

(Memberships)

Gerald Smith

(Sydney)

Publicity Officer:

Greg Hills

© 1991 by Greg Hills.  
Rights revert to contributors.  
All uncredited material  
is by The Editor.

Printed by  
Brass Cannon Unlimited.

Mail:  
ASFF  
PO Box 428  
Richmond 3121  
AUSTRALIA

## ASFF To Establish New Award 'The Chandler'

Intended as Complement to Ditmars  
But Administered by Foundation

The new award represents the implementation of a resolution of the ASFF AGM on 20th January this year. On the basis of that resolution, the Secretary prepared a draft paper containing suggestions and ideas from various sources within the Foundation. This draft, after discussion and amendment by the Committee, became the framework for the new award. It has been reproduced (as amended by Committee) for your information on page 2 of this issue of *THE INSTRUMENTALITY*.

*Continues on Page 3...*

## A Modest Proposal Revisited

To date the Foundation has received thirteen petition slips from people urging it to take up the ideas in 'A Modest Proposal' (as reported in last issue). The Foundation has now considered this proposal.

It should be noted for the record, since some of the petitioners seem to believe that the Foundation is behind 'A Modest Proposal', that the organisers of 'A Modest Proposal' have no relationship with the Foundation. They are neither members nor did they discuss the matter with the Foundation before canvassing their idea.

The Foundation has decided that while the ideas in 'A Modest Proposal' simply duplicate the job that *THYME* exists to do, there is a need for a basic information sheet similar to Eric Lindsay's proposed 'Information Sheet' (see the copy distributed with the last issue of *TI*). The Foundation is willing to subsidise the production costs and distribution of such an information sheet, within limits. The Foundation is now waiting to hear from Eric Lindsay regarding the mechanics of his suggestion.

The plan as discussed at the Committee of Management Meeting on 28th April involved a quarterly or three-times-per-year sheet containing basic contact information about clubs, conventions, etc, to be distributed and co-ordinated with *THYME*. However, copies of the sheet would also be distributed to Bookshops and other places where people interested in sf&f may be found.

*Continues on Page 4...*

[The following Discussion Paper formed the basis around which decisions were made regarding the establishment of 'The Chandlers'. It was prepared by the Secretary after the following unanimous resolution of the ASFF AGM on 20th January 1991: (M: Alan Stewart, S: Carey Handfield.)

*'That the Foundation establish an award, provisionally called the Chandler Award, to be presented for Professional Achievement in Australian Science Fiction.'*]

## Award Proposal: Discussion Points

The establishment of a jury award for achievement in Australian science fiction has been suggested to the Foundation several times in recent years. This discussion paper outlines a number of considerations relevant to any such award and makes suggestions about the most appropriate course of action.

### *What should the award be for?*

The award should be for "Outstanding Achievement in Australian Science Fiction". It should not duplicate the award categories of the Ditmar Awards presented annually by the Australian Science Fiction Convention (ASFC).

### *What should the award be called?*

The award should be called the "A. Bertram Chandler Award", to be known colloquially as the "Chandler Award". This is in recognition of the continuing popularity of the writing of Bertram Chandler, his long association with Australia and, in particular, with science fiction in Australia. This association included Bertram Chandler's patronage of the Foundation.

### *What types of achievement would be recognised?*

Presented annually, the Ditmar Awards are understandably biased towards the recognition of specific pieces of work or short term performance. Another characteristic, a result of the fact that they are determined through a vote of the membership of the ASFC, is that they tend to be presented in fairly closely defined categories where there are a number of potential nominees. It is difficult for the Ditmar Awards to recognise unique, long term or specialised contributions. And, unlike the Hugo Awards presented by the World Science Fiction Convention, there is no provision or precedent for the ASFC to present a Ditmar Award without going through a balloting process.

The Chandler Award, therefore, should recognise specific or long term contributions to Australian science fiction that are unlikely to be recognised by the Ditmar

Awards. Additionally, the Chandler Award should be biased towards the professional science fiction community. This is not to rule out the possibility of a Chandler Award for fannish activity, but to emphasise that the Chandler Awards are to recognise achievement that has impacted on the broader community of which fandom is a part.

### *When, and how often, would the award be presented?*

The award should be presented at the annual ASFC. An award, however, should only be made when there is indeed an "Outstanding Achievement" to recognise. Given the small size of the Australian science fiction community, it is likely that there will be some years when it would not be appropriate for an award to be made.

### *Would nominations form part of the award process?*

The fact that the Chandler Award is to be a jury award does not preclude a nominating process to draw the attention of the jury to potential award recipients. The following guidelines should apply:

- (a) A nomination should be made by a small group of people (two to five people perhaps) rather than by individuals,
- (b) The nomination should consist of three parts:
  - (1) An opening sentence that identifies the nominee and briefly states the achievement that the nominators feel should be recognised,
  - (2) A detailed supporting statement,
  - (3) The full names and addresses of the nominators.

### *Who would comprise the jury?*

Given that the Chandler Award is to represent "Outstanding Achievement in Australian Science Fiction", it seems proper that the jury be drawn from individuals involved in as many aspects of science fiction from as many areas of Australia as possible.

### *How would the award process work?*

The Foundation should call for nominations in the second half of each calendar year. This is after all the traditional dates for the ASFC and would minimise any possibility of confusion about when a nomination is to be considered and any subsequent award made.

The Management Committee of the Foundation could keep itself in the award process, if it was thought necessary, by considering nominations at the first meeting of the Management Committee in the New Year. At this meeting the Management Committee would decide, on the basis of the nominations received, whether the Chandler Award should be presented in that year. If the decision was to proceed, a jury should be appointed and provided with all the nominations received. Alternatively, the Management Committee could appoint a jury without considering the nominations at all and simply pass all the nominations to the jury.

The jury should have the power to make a nomination for the Chandler Award if it feels that a deserving nominee has been overlooked. The jury, however, should be limited to one unanimous nomination.

After considering all the nominations, including any nomination made by the jury, the jury would determine the Chandler Award for that year. In exceptional circumstances, and only after agreement from the Management Committee of the Foundation, additional Chandler Awards could be presented.

### *What would be the design of the Chandler Award?*

The Chandler Award should be a standard design chosen by the Foundation. The Foundation, rather than the jury, would be responsible for the manufacture and preparation of awards.

---

Prepared by Mark Loney, following a resolution of the Annual General Meeting of the Foundation, after discussions with Carey Handfield, Alan Stewart and Greg Hills.

---

## The Chandler

### ...Continued from Page 1

The Foundation assigned Vice-President Alan Stewart the responsibility for advancing the award. Since the 28th April Meeting he has contacted Susan Chandler and has obtained permission from her to use her late husband's name in the name of the award.

It is worth noting here that Carey Handfield showed the Meeting a copy of *THE INSTRUMENTALITY* Volume 1 Number 2, which featured a letter from A. Bertram Chandler suggesting an award somewhat similar to the current proposal. It therefore seems appropriate that an award sponsored and run by the Foundation of which he was patron should bear his name, even more than a decade later.

The Foundation cannot as yet confirm when the first 'Chandler' will be presented, though it could be as soon as *SynCon 92*. (The proposal for the Award suggests that likely candidates would be sought in the latter half of each year, with the decision on whether to give an award being made at the first Committee of Management Meeting of the New Year.) There is still a great deal of organisation to be done, including identification of

potential candidates, selection of any initial jury, and determination of the design of the trophy. In the meantime, *THE INSTRUMENTALITY* suggests that you start looking around you and barracking for likely candidates! The Foundation is not bound to accept the popular choice, but will appreciate the feedback.

---

## Ditmar Design Competition

This competition is now closed. The Foundation has discussed the matter and has decided that due to the overwhelming lack of participation by many who were loud in their calls for a better design, and the comments made at the *SunCon* Business Meeting, the so-called 'traditional' design — black monolith — wins by default. The Foundation would like to thank our entrant for her support and regrets that we are unable to adopt her design.

The Foundation is now in a position to offer future Australian SF Conventions the choice of producing their own designs or, if they prefer, approaching the Foundation for a standardised black monolith. *SynCon 92* (1992) and *SwanCon 18* (1993), the two currently existing Australian SF Conventions, are now being informed of this.

---

## Committee Members Appointed

The ASFF Committee of Management has filled vacancies for two Ordinary Committee Members. We welcome Donna Heenan and Gerald Smith to the official family. In the best traditions of the ASFF (get 'em before they realise what they've let themselves in for). Donna has already been assigned the job of organising and maintaining our membership files.

---

## Minutes of Committee Meetings

At the ASFF Committee of Management Meeting on 28th April, it was decided that edited Minutes of Committee Meetings should be circulated (to members only) with *THE INSTRUMENTALITY*. Confidential or sensitive matters will be removed in order to maintain privacy.

This proposal was made because of the modern wide distribution of *THE INSTRUMENTALITY* through fandom. It was felt that while *TI* should continue to be disseminated widely as the Foundation's most visible means of communication and publicity, more should be offered to members than the simple privilege of attending and voting at the AGM.

The Minutes of the 1991 AGM are being circulated (to members only) with this issue; the Minutes of subsequent Committee Meetings are being edited now and will be circulated with future issues.

---

## A Modest Proposal ...Continued from Page 1

The discussion area was wide-ranging and included the roles of *THYME* and *THE INSTRUMENTALITY*.

No proposal was tabled regarding *THYME*. The prospective future editors (Greg Hills and Mark Loney) had already decided *THYME* should continue to be separate from the Foundation. Committee members also felt that the Foundation's neutral position in fannish politics could be jeopardised by direct involvement in the production of a news magazine. A suggestion that *THE INSTRUMENTALITY* could be used as the information sheet in 'A Modest Proposal' was declined as this would leave the Foundation without a mouthpiece. This led to discussion of the future role of *THE INSTRUMENTALITY* and resulted in a resolution, proposed by Mark Loney and seconded by Carey Handfield, 'That *THE INSTRUMENTALITY* be limited to ASFF news and information and that it be distributed to members and within fandom as appropriate'.

---



# Minutes of an ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

Date: 20th January 1991

**Present: Committee**

Cath Ortlieb, President  
Alan Stewart, Vice-President  
Mark Loney, Secretary  
Greg Hills, Publicity Officer  
Carey Handfield, Treasurer  
Irwin Hirsh, Committee Member

**Members**

Marc Ortlieb, Clive Newall, Lync

**Apologies:**

Justin Ackroyd, Jack R. Herman

**1. Commencement of Meeting**

Cath Ortlieb declared the meeting open at 2.30pm

**2. Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

Motion: That the Minutes be accepted as circulated.  
M: Irwin Hirsh, S: Carey Handfield  
Passed unanimously.

**3. President's Report**

Cath Ortlieb tabled the President's Report and spoke briefly to it.

Motion: That the President's Report be accepted as tabled.  
M: Mark Loney, S: Carey Handfield  
Passed unanimously.

**4. Secretary's Report**

Mark Loney advised that, due to pressure of work commitments, he had been unable to prepare a written Secretary's Report for presentation to the AGM. In a verbal report to the meeting he spoke briefly about a number of topics.

Elaborating on the President's Report, the Secretary expressed disappointment at the lack of entries in the Ditmar Design Competition - there had only been one expression of interest so far and no actual entries had been received. A number of fans had expressed their opposition to the *imposition* of a standard design for the Ditmars, despite the clearly stated position of the Foundation that this was not the intent of the Ditmar Design Competition. The majority of other fans, however, seemed to have little interest in the physical appearance of the awards that were presented on their behalf.

The Secretary also drew the attention of the meeting to the increased frequency with which *The Instrumentality* had appeared during 1990. Greg Hills, as Publicity Officer, was responsible for the production of *The Instrumentality* and the Secretary felt that his efforts should be recognised.

Motion: That the Secretary's Report be accepted.  
M: Lync, S: Alan Stewart  
Passed unanimously.

**5. Treasurer's Report**

Carey Handfield tabled the Treasurer's Report and spoke briefly to it.

Motion: That the Treasurer's Report be accepted as tabled.  
M: Clive Newall, S: Lync  
Passed unanimously.

**6. Election of Office Bearers**

- a) As only one nomination was received for each of the following positions, the nominees were declared elected unopposed:
- Cath Ortlieb was declared to be elected President
  - Alan Stewart was declared to be elected Vice-President
  - Mark Loney was declared to be elected Secretary
  - Carey Handfield was declared to be elected Treasurer
- b) Irwin Hirsh withdrew his nomination for Ordinary Committee member. As there were no other nominations for the positions of Ordinary Committee member (the position of Publicity Officer is not an elected position), the President advised that the Committee would seek to fill the three vacant positions by appointment.

**7. General Business**

**ASFF Logo**

Greg Hills presented a proposal for an ASFF logo and letterhead.

Motion: That the logo and letterhead for the ASFF proposed by Greg Hills be accepted.  
M: Greg Hills, S: Cath Ortlieb  
Passed, Alan Stewart dissenting

**Chandler Award**

Motion: That the Foundation establish an award, provisionally called the Chandler Award, to be presented for Professional Achievement in Australian Science Fiction.  
M: Alan Stewart, S: Carey Handfield  
Passed unanimously.

**The Mentor & The Ditmars**

Correspondence between Marc Ortlieb and Ron Clarke of *The Mentor* about the relationship between the Foundation and the Ditmar Awards was tabled.

Motion: That the tabled correspondence be accepted.  
M: Mark Loney, S: Cath Ortlieb  
Passed unanimously.

**8. Close of Meeting**

Cath Ortlieb thanked those members in attendance and declared the meeting closed at 3.15pm

**NOTE**

These Minutes are being circulated to ASFF members only. They should not be reprinted or directly quoted without explicit permission from the Committee of Management of the ASFF.