



little north of the theater on the northbound side, might be a good lunch/coffee place for this--corner of route 35 and Bethany) is free to do so. (We had a very good discussion after THE PUPPET MASTERS last week.) Just look for us in the theater itself (where the seats are). (If you don't know what we look like, we can

THE MT VOID

Page 2

probably provide a description. I will be the handsome bearded fellow in the photographer's vest.)

10/29: STARGATE (1:55 PM, 125 minutes long)

11/05: FRANKENSTEIN

11/12: INTERVIEW WITH THE VAMPIRE

11/19: STAR TREK: GENERATIONS

(You can call me or Evelyn the day before to reconfirm, just in case the release schedules get changed or something.) My number is (908) 957-5619. ECL's number is (908) 957-2070.

Live long. Prosper. Buy bonds. Remember the Maine. Have a nice day. [-mrl]

---

2. Today's lesson is "What is software?" Why is this today's lesson? Well, it is something that effects our lives almost as deeply as television and yet most people either think it is equipment to make frozen custard or they completely misunderstand the concept altogether. Even in my job at a highly technical company you find a lot of people who do not understand the concept of software. From personal observation you can see what happens to you in this highly technological company if you don't understand software. If you are a woman they put you in a big office with an entry-level PC and a typewriter and you can wear whatever you like. If you are a man they put you in a big office with an entry-level PC and a lot of mahogany furniture and you have to wear uncomfortable-looking business suits. They do put some people who do know software in the same sorts of offices, but that is mostly just to keep everybody guessing. What brings this all up is that I have discovered that there now are special courses in computers for very high-level executives. There is a famous anecdote that Ptolemy I got exasperated at the effort required to learn geometry

and told Euclid that he was a Pharaoh and hence entitled to have an easier way to learn geometry. Euclid told him respectfully that there is no royal road to geometry. I always thought the same was true for computers, but now I find out that it isn't. There really are special courses on computers just for those of us with seven-figure salaries and platinum parachutes. (Hey, I can I can say "us." Believe it or not, I have a seven-figure salary. It's even a little longer because it has that period in there.) Now my first thought when I heard these classes exist was to think of Tom Lehrer's line about the doctor who specialized in "diseases of the rich," but then I gave it some thought. You have to realize these guys need special classes because they have a special learning disability. If you are a Captain of Industry (in fairness, most don't use that term to refer to themselves--they don't accept any rank less than Admiral) you cannot be seen reading a book like \_D\_O\_S \_f\_o\_r\_D\_u\_m\_m\_i\_e\_s. These people never self-elect to call themselves "dummies." Can you imagine if it got around the country club? And

probably 75% of the company's stock is owned by people who are members of the same country club. (NOTE: That is not the same thing as saying that 75% of the stockholders belong to the club. Heaven forbid. Can you imagine?) Anyway these CEOs really have to know something about computers but are afraid to let the little people know that they don't know as much about computers as some guy they see walking around--some guy with quarter-inch thick glasses and a pocket protector and whom they pay about one percent of what they pay themselves. At least this way they can surround themselves with other CEOs who are having the same sort of problems and they don't feel embarrassed about raising their hands and asking "What is a control key?" The important thing is to leave the course being able to bluff. I have decided that the way to get rich is to explain computers for CEOs. So here goes:

What is software all about? Software is management. Software is all about giving orders and having them obeyed without question. That sounds very good at first, but it really is part of the problem. Computers, like many of the people you order around, have absolutely no common sense. So if you give a wrong order, they are liable to do something really stupid. You can't blame the computer, since like many of the people you deal with, it is dumber

than a piece of string. I mean it has no more sense than some grunt department head who will never break \$100K, and we all have had to deal with them at one time or another so we know what that is like. So you have to get your orders exactly right. [Excuse me Mr. DuPont. You may want to move your wineglass away from the keyboard. Wine damages a keyboard; you may want to remember that.] When a computer acts really stupid and does just exactly what you tell it instead of the right thing, that is called a "bug." Well, I guess that is about all we have time for today. Mr. Waterhouse is due on the golf course. Your helicopter is waiting. [-mrl]

---

### 3. THE PUPPET MASTERS (a film review by Mark R. Leeper):

Capsule review: T\_h\_e\_P\_u\_p\_p\_e\_t\_M\_a\_s\_t\_e\_r\_s is a no-holds-barred alien invasion film. It is a dark and humorless exercise in which virtually every scene advances the war between humans and parasitic, mind-controlling aliens. Robert Heinlein's 1951 novel comes to the screen in a film that takes little time away from the main plot to develop its characters, but does strike home with a story of a hard-fought battle with a fairly alien and devious enemy. Rating: high +1 (-4 to +4)

The obvious comparison to make would be between T\_h\_e\_P\_u\_p\_p\_e\_t\_M\_a\_s\_t\_e\_r\_s and the three film versions of Jack Finney's B\_o\_d\_y\_S\_n\_a\_t\_c\_h\_e\_r\_s. That

would probably not be accurate, however, since this film is about the aliens possessing humans rather than passing for them. But the paranoid, trust-nobody spirit is much like that of those previous films.

An alien craft lands in the rural town of Ambrose, Iowa, and authorities rush in to investigate, only to find that the locals all now claim that the landing was a hoax. In this case the authorities are two agents of a scientific sub-agency of the CIA: Sam (played by Eric Thal), the head of the agency, and Andrew

(Donald Sutherland). Also along is an expert borrowed from NASA, Mary (Julie Warner). They quickly determine that there is good reason to believe the landing was indeed authentic. And shortly afterward they also determine that humans are being mentally possessed by slug-like aliens who hide on humans' backs and tap into the nervous system to enslave the hosts. The number of people possessed in this way increases super-exponentially.

If one compares T\_h\_e\_P\_u\_p\_p\_e\_t\_M\_a\_s\_t\_e\_r\_s to any version of T\_h\_e\_B\_o\_d\_y\_S\_n\_a\_t\_c\_h\_e\_r\_s, one finds the emphasis very different, and, in fact, different from most other science fiction films. In the earlier films, the time is taken to establish who the characters are and to provide a context for their actions. This is a film in which things start happening in the first minute of the film and from that point on virtually every scene is devoted to the conflict. The people never stand around and talk about each other long enough for the script by Red Elliot, Terry Russo, and David Goyer to develop their character. This makes for rather flat characters but a very tense film. Their script also "downdates" the story, moving it into our present. Heinlien's 1951 novel set the story in a 2007 when interplanetary colonization was already well under way. That and perhaps budget constraints limit this invasion to just a first foothold in a limited area. Perhaps that is more realistic than the novel, but it also leaves open the unspoken possibility that if it came to a question of human survival, the alien menace could be ended with a few carefully placed nuclear weapons. A few other changes are made to keep the film consistent with its present or near-future setting.

Under Stuart Orme's direction T\_h\_e\_P\_u\_p\_p\_e\_t\_M\_a\_s\_t\_e\_r\_s is a film that is fact-paced and yet very dark and somber in tone, reminiscent of John Sturges's S\_a\_t\_a\_n\_B\_u\_g. Donald Sutherland plays his role as the head of the security agency with a sinister dignity. As a man supposedly without emotion, he speaks always in hushed tones which only add to the tension. Eric Thal, who was Ariel in A\_S\_t\_r\_a\_n\_g\_e\_r\_A\_m\_o\_n\_g\_U\_s, plays a character similarly dedicated to his purpose and similarly one-dimensional. It must be disheartening for Thal to be the film's ostensible main character but to be outacted by ten-inch slugs from the special effects department. The slugs, incidentally, are sufficiently alien and repulsive as well as being reasonably convincing as effects. Julie Warner also is given more

distress than personality by the script. The design of the film goes slightly downhill from a rather beautiful celestial event at the beginning to scenes of alien architecture that look a bit cheesy in spots.

T\_h\_e\_P\_u\_p\_p\_e\_t\_M\_a\_s\_t\_e\_r\_s is a nail-biter with some good moments, but will probably be easily over-shadowed by the upcoming F\_r\_a\_n\_k\_e\_n\_s\_t\_e\_i\_n and I\_n\_t\_e\_r\_v\_i\_e\_w\_w\_i\_t\_h\_t\_h\_e\_V\_a\_m\_p\_i\_r\_e. It gets a high +1 on the -4 to +4 scale. [-mrl]

---

#### 4. CLERKS. (a film review by Mark R. Leeper):

Capsule review: One day in the life of two clerks.

C\_l\_e\_r\_k\_s. is a very funny and perceptive film debut for writer/director/editor/clerk Kevin Smith. This ultra-low budget film proves the most cost-effective ingredient to improve the quality of a film is the writing. Rating: +2 (-4 to +4)

The logo at the beginning of the film is a microcosm of the film itself. Technically it is a poor piece of animation. Under the title telling us this is a View Askew Production is a slightly off-color gag that is fairly funny. And C\_l\_e\_r\_k\_s. is the first View Askew production, a comedy about clerks at the local Quick Stop. In fact, Kevin Smith, who wrote the film based on years of experience clerking, shot the film at night, then when the daylight came the actors cleared out and Smith worked behind the counter as (what else?) a clerk. He paid for the film on what little he could get from backers, even less that he could earn clerking, and money he could borrow with his credit cards. The film is shot in black and white with virtually no art direction. To prepare the store for shooting, Kevin Smith moved the lottery machine off the counter. Smith had only two professional actors. Second billing went to Jeff Anderson who has no acting experience (and happens to work in the mail room of the same company I work for). This goes beyond film minimalism; in only slightly less capable hands this would be considered an amateur film. Instead it won top prize in the Critics' Week section at Cannes, has been doing very well at other film festivals, and has been fought over by distributors. Miramax won the battle and will spend four times the cost of the film just promoting it. Why has it been so successful? Because Kevin Smith is a good writer with a great sense of humor. Good jokes and dialogue are cheap and are most of what this film has to offer.

Dante (Brian O'Halloran) didn't plan to work today. He wanted to take it easy and play a little hockey in the afternoon. But when you are a clerk you have to answer even the unexpected call of

duty. The day starts badly with first some vandalism discovered and then an anti-smoking activist trying to scare off cigarette customers. Dante's girlfriend Veronica (Marilyn Ghigliotti) visits, and the two sit behind the counter and have an explicit sex discussion in which each is shocked by the other's experience. Dante's best friend Randal (Jeff Anderson) drops in from the video store next door where he clerks. And so the day goes with friends and weirdo customers coming in and leaving. Through the dialogue we get a story of a love triangle, and another of unfinished business between friends.

In fact, this is not a typical day at all in a Quick Stop. Like the flight in M\_e\_m\_p\_h\_i\_s\_B\_e\_l\_l\_e, it is a distillation of the most dramatic parts of many days. Even with that, the plotting is pretty mundane stuff. What sets this film apart is the dialogue which is often hilarious. Not unlike P\_u\_l\_p\_F\_i\_c\_t\_i\_o\_n, the story is broken into titled substories. The one-word titles of those stories (e.g. "Syntax," "Juxtaposition") do not always make sense, but they do focus the audience in on the story.

Smith tells his story with no more violence than a poorly staged fist fight between two people who are really friends. There is no nudity or on-screen sex, yet the MPAA rated the film an NC-17 for extremely explicit sexual language. This seriously damaged the film's profit potential and Miramax hired Alan Dershowitz to appeal the rating. Without any cuts the MPAA changed the rating to an R. But for those who are bothered by such things, be warned that the language is very explicit. Still C\_l\_e\_r\_k\_s is one of the funnier comedies you are likely to see this year. I give it a +2 on the -4 to +4 scale.

#### SPOILER SPOILER

C\_l\_e\_r\_k\_s qualifies as a genuinely experimental film if for no other reason than that it is the only film in recent memory to have scenes in a convenience store without having the store being robbed. Earlier cuts of the film had Dante murdered at the end in a robbery, but that ending has been excised.

Note: The film and Kevin Smith's cap list the title with a period.

Every place else the period seems to be dropped. I assume that Smith, who titled the film, prefers the title with the punctuation.

[-mrl]

---

5. ConAdian 1994 (con report by Evelyn C. Leeper) (part 5 of 6 parts):

THE MT VOID

Page 7

Panel: Dinosaurs in SF

Saturday, 3 PM

Ric Meyers (mod), Richard Chwedyk, Stephen Dedman,  
Stan Hyde, Hayford Peirce

Description: An exploration of the recent glut of dinosaurs after being extinct for 65 million years.

What is it with dinosaurs?

That's not my question, but rather how Meyers started this panel off. The panelists suggested that dinosaurs were popular because they could deal with their frustrations; because they're no longer around (so they're safe); because their size is awe-inspiring; because they're big, fierce, and extinct (sounds like just a rephrasing of the first three); and because they're not copyrighted or trademarked. As Chwedyk expressed it, "Dinosaurs were created when God still had an imagination."

Why do we want to give dinosaurs intelligence? Dedman claimed, "Dumb characters make for boring plots." The example he gave of an author doing this with other animals was Richard Adams's WatershipDown, which had smart rabbits. (Shardik, however, did not have a smart bear, although Adams did add more human characters in that work.) Hyde said that another reason we make dinosaurs smart is that we anthropomorphize everything. "Look at the fronts of cars."

Someone mentioned Harry Harrison's "West of Eden" series in which

the dinosaurs did not die off, and instead continued to evolve, but humans evolved as well. Dedman pointed out that dinosaurs didn't \_ n \_ e \_ e \_ d to develop intelligence, so they wouldn't have. And the likelihood of humans evolving contemporaneously with dinosaurs seems remote, to say the least. (Until the dinosaurs died off, how much chance did any mammal have?)

There was, of course, the obligatory discussion of \_ J \_ u \_ r \_ a \_ s \_ s \_ i \_ c \_ P \_ a \_ r \_ k. Someone said the whole security system they showed was ridiculous, because zookeepers \_ k \_ n \_ o \_ w animals escape, a fact no one in the movie seemed to acknowledge. Most of the other points about the movie touched upon have been thrashed to death elsewhere so I won't go into them here. One fact I hadn't heard before was that more money was spent in making the film than has been spent for all of dinosaur research for the last hundred years.

I believe it was Meyers who said that \_ J \_ u \_ r \_ a \_ s \_ s \_ i \_ c \_ P \_ a \_ r \_ k was consciously designed to be like a roller coaster: a big slow climb up to the first huge shock, then a series of ups and downs, and so on.

What is next? Well, Sony is making a movie of "Dinotopia." (Hyde predicted a glut of dinosaur movies--pun intended--but Meyers didn't agree.) But the problem with creating new dinosaur stories

THE MT VOID

Page 8

is that you usually can't move dinosaurs to other planets or times very well. Peirce suggested \_ T \_ h \_ e \_ D \_ i \_ n \_ o \_ s \_ a \_ u \_ r \_ C \_ o \_ o \_ k \_ b \_ o \_ o \_ k. Someone else said that there has already been a dinosaur pet care book.

Interesting factoid: There are 665 species of dinosaur known at this time, so maybe 666 really is the "Number of the Beast"!

For those who want to read more, \_ M \_ o \_ d \_ e \_ r \_ n \_ G \_ e \_ o \_ l \_ o \_ g \_ y, Volume 18, Number 2 had a couple of overviews of dinosaurs in pop culture.

Panel: Editing Magazines & Anthologies  
Saturday, 4 PM

Ellen Datlow (mod), Gardner Dozois, Scott Edelman,  
David G. Hartwell, Mike Resnick

Description: If you are an editor, what's the difference between magazines and anthologies? How far should an editor go to shape a story?

The first question the panelists answered was one they say they get from people a lot: why do editors do "invitation-only" anthologies? Why not allow everyone to submit stories? The basic answer, according to Resnick, is that editors of anthologies aren't paid enough to read all those slush pile stories. The editor has a responsibility to the reader which is sometimes better filled by soliciting only from known authors. (Even Resnick admitted this was not a hard and fast rule, and one need only recall that Nick DiChario's Hugo-nominated "Winterberry" was an unsolicited manuscript for Resnick's A l t e r n a t e K e n n e d y s to see why. DiChario, a Campbell nominee, now shows up regularly in Resnick's anthologies.)

I suppose I should explain that there are basically three types of anthologies: reprint anthologies, "invitation-only" anthologies, and open anthologies. (This is a split by selection criteria; one could also distinguish between theme anthologies and general anthologies.)

When asked how many stories an editor must solicit to get (say) thirty usable stories, the answers varied widely. Hartwell said that he needs to ask about 150 authors to get that many stories but Resnick said that since his anthologies were so specialized that it might be difficult for an author to sell a story written for him elsewhere if he didn't print it, once he has gotten a commitment from an author on a specific topic, he won't refuse the story. This may mean working with the author to bring the story up to a certain level, or even ultimately "burying" a sub-standard story in the middle of the anthology, but he feels that in the long run this helps the authors. (Resnick's anthologies have enough stories than he can do this, but sometimes the spottiness shows.) As he pointed

out, he has edited over twenty books, and printed forty-one new authors, eight of whom made to Campbell ballot. Hartwell said that

this nurturing of new writers was something he really admired in Resnick, and of course Resnick did make the Hugo ballot for Best Professional Editor this year. As Resnick later said, "You don't pay back in this field, you pay forward, because the guys you owe don't need it."

On the other hand, some authors are not happy with the changes editors "help" them make. Dozois told of A. Bertram Chandler, who wrote a story for John W. Campbell which Campbell helped him "improve." It went on to become Chandler's best-known story, but Chandler in later years said that he was still wistful for his original story. Of course, as someone pointed out, that was for a magazine, not a theme anthology, and editors do different things depending on the type of final product, which segued nicely into the actual stated topic of the panel.

In a theme anthology there is, not surprisingly, a theme. This theme is usually pretty specific (e.g., time travel, cats, green vegetables). A magazine, on the other hand, is looking for balance and variety in each issue within the general scope of the magazine (e.g., hard science fiction, fantasy). Dozois said that the issue of A\_s\_i\_m\_o\_v'\_s that had two alternate history baseball stories with very similar premises was an exception. And Edelman said, for example, that S\_c\_i\_e\_n\_c\_e\_F\_i\_c\_t\_i\_o\_n\_A\_g\_e has one fantasy story per issue.

The mechanics of editing are different as well. In an anthology, if a story ends in the middle of a page, that's okay; you just leave the rest as white space. Not in a magazine. Some magazines use poems, cartoons, quotes, or artwork as filler, but Datlow said that for a while O\_m\_n\_i didn't do that. The result was that stories had to be a precise length, and she described trying to cut exactly 130 lines from a Stephen King novelette to make it fit. The first thing you do, apparently, is figure out which paragraph breaks you don't need. (O\_m\_n\_i has since changed their policy.) Someone mentioned that Algis Budrys once wrote an essay, "Non-Literary Influences on Science Fiction," which talked about things like this.

Although anthologies don't have this problem, they do have others. For any anthology you need a minimum number of stories, and for a theme anthology, this may be difficult to accomplish. Sometimes you have a maximum as well; Hartwell said he would have liked to add stories by Robert Forward, Joe Haldeman, and Charles Sheffield to A\_s\_c\_e\_n\_t\_o\_f\_W\_o\_n\_d\_e\_r, but it was already a thousand pages long.

Someone asked why Martin Greenberg seemed to be involved with every anthology published. Resnick explained that Greenberg sells the idea to a publisher and does all the paperwork involving rights and royalties, but leaves all the editing to his co-editor. In movie

terms, I suppose one would say that Greenberg was the producer and Resnick, Friesner, Kerr, or whoever, the director. (Resnick says that Greenberg \_ t \_ h \_ i \_ n \_ k \_ s in anthologies.) One idea that Greenberg and Resnick have been trying to sell is a sports anthology with each story about a different sport. They have found eighty-seven sports with stories about them, but can't convince anyone that a reprint anthology would sell well. (I assume these are science fiction stories, though Greenberg has done many non-science-fiction sports anthologies.) They also can't seem to sell the proposed reprint anthology \_ U \_ n \_ d \_ e \_ r \_ A \_ s \_ i \_ a \_ n \_ S \_ k \_ i \_ e \_ s, which I suppose means that the earlier

\_ U \_ n \_ d \_ e \_ r \_ A \_ f \_ r \_ i \_ c \_ a \_ n \_ S \_ k \_ i \_ e \_ s and \_ U \_ n \_ d \_ e \_ r \_ S \_ o \_ u \_ t \_ h \_ A \_ m \_ e \_ r \_ i \_ c \_ a \_ n \_ S \_ k \_ i \_ e \_ s did not do very well.

Greenberg's fame has gotten to the point, in fact, where he does not always put his name on the cover for fear that people will decide anyone who edits that many anthologies must be doing a hack job.

Dozois said that "putting together a reprint anthology is like arranging a Japanese rock garden." Erdman and Dozois both said that reprint anthologies were important because they prevent the loss of the history of science fiction.

Someone asked about the possibility of republishing an out-of-print anthology, but the panelists agreed that an out-of-print anthology is pretty much dead. Even Greenberg probably couldn't sort out all the rights issues.

\_ L \_ a \_ s \_ t \_ D \_ a \_ n \_ g \_ e \_ r \_ o \_ u \_ s \_ V \_ i \_ s \_ i \_ o \_ n \_ s was mentioned, but only to say it would be impolitic to mention it.

Resnick mentioned that his anthologies \_ A \_ l \_ t \_ e \_ r \_ n \_ a \_ t \_ e \_ O \_ u \_ t \_ l \_ a \_ w \_ s and \_ D \_ e \_ a \_ l \_ s \_ w \_ i \_ t \_ h \_ t \_ h \_ e \_ D \_ e \_ v \_ i \_ l should be in the bookstores in a few days. (They were.) His \_ A \_ l \_ t \_ e \_ r \_ n \_ a \_ t \_ e \_ W \_ o \_ r \_ l \_ d \_ c \_ o \_ n \_ s was on sale in the Dealers Room

(and sold out over a hundred copies). The latter had its origins last year at ConFrancisco when someone talking about the convention at a party said, "It could be worse." Someone else asked, "How?" and thus was born \_ A \_ l \_ t \_ e \_ r \_ n \_ a \_ t \_ e \_ W \_ o \_ r \_ l \_ d \_ c \_ o \_ n \_ s. (The answer

to this

particular question was that Zagreb could have won, but to the best of my knowledge, at the time of ConFrancisco Zagreb was not in a war zone or under any sort of trade sanctions. I mention this because people seem to confuse Zagreb with Sarajevo, or sometimes with Belgrade. Whether the intervening war would have disrupted the planning is, of course, a separate question.)

THE MT VOID

Page 11

Panel: Utopia: Who Wants to Live There?

Saturday, 5 PM

Dr. Arlan Andrews (mod), Dr. Janice Bogstad, Donald Kingsbury, Frederick Andrew Lerner, Jack Nimersheim

Description: The pros and cons of the Utopian society.

The first question to be answered is, "Who defines utopia?" The second is, "Who pays for it?" Nimersheim said it was defined by whoever is in charge. Lerner's response was, "Who does the work?" If a utopian proposal doesn't answer this question (or at least ask it), said Lerner, it's isn't worth reading. A lot of utopias, the panelists noted, rely on slave classes to do all the work. And Lerner also mentioned that there never seemed to be any shortages in literary utopias.

Also, many utopias are anarchist, even though one panelist said that the only really successful anarchies in history were fandom and the Internet. One panelist recommended U t o p i a s a n d

A n a r c h y by Nausick, though the only book I could find with that title was by Victor Garcia and was in Spanish.

Another unlikely feature of most literary utopias is that they never have conflicts.

One author who writes utopian works which don't have these defects is Ursula LeGuin. T h e D i s p o s s e s s e d, "The Ones who Walk Away from Omelas," and other works by her look at all these issues.

Too many utopian stories are just reversals that don't fix anything, but just put a different set of people on top. This is particularly a problem with many of the "feminist utopias," but one sees it in real life in the Russian and Chinese Revolutions.

Bogstad said that since she grew up on a farm, she didn't find the "back to Nature" impulse that drives many utopias very attractive.

Another question to be asked about a utopia is whether one can leave it at will. This is the difference between, say, Resnick's Kirinyaga and Tepper's world in S i d e s h o w. For that matter, if you go a new utopia, must they take you in? Bogstad asked if a utopia was still a utopia if it interacted with the outside world, thereby supporting or perpetuating non-utopias. Kingsbury said that perhaps the ante-Bellum South might be an example of this, in that blacks were "outside" the utopia, yet the utopia depended on them.

Someone noted that we are trying to build utopias all the time--we just don't call them that. But we're always trying to get more good and less bad. Sometimes we make the same sorts of errors in whose utopia it will be. Someone said, for example, that the various planned cities, houses, and so on all seem planned for

mobile, agile, healthy people with no children. Lerner responded that utopian plans and utopias need to take into account how people behave. The Modernist movement in the 1920s thought that perfect geometrical designs would result in a perfect society but oddly enough, people didn't behave that way.

Nimersheim thought that in any case "we advance through adversity," and if we eliminate adversity, we stagnate. In large part it boils down to the fact that our choices are always constrained by other people's choices; utopias are relative. On the whole, Nimersheim thought we couldn't have utopia because of human nature.

The classic literary utopias are of course those of Sir Thomas More ( \_ U \_ t \_ o \_ p \_ i \_ a ) and Edward Bellamy ( \_ L \_ o \_ o \_ k \_ i \_ n \_ g \_ B \_ a \_ c \_ k \_ w \_ a \_ r \_ d ). In fact, the name was coined by More.

(No doubt in response to the poor sound-proofing between the room for this panel and the activity next door, Nimersheim said at one point, "Utopia is a dead bagpipe player.")

Hugo (and Other) Awards Ceremony  
Saturday, 8 PM

And the winners are:

- Novel: \_ G \_ r \_ e \_ e \_ n \_ M \_ a \_ r \_ s by Kim Stanley Robinson
- Novella: "Down in the Bottomlands" by Harry Turtledove ( \_ A \_ n \_ a \_ l \_ o \_ g , January 1993)
- Novelette: "Georgia on My Mind" by Charles Sheffield ( \_ A \_ n \_ a \_ l \_ o \_ g , January 1993)
- Short Story: "Death on the Nile" by Connie Willis ( \_ A \_ s \_ i \_ m \_ o \_ v ' \_ s , March 1993)
- Non-Fiction Book: \_ T \_ h \_ e \_ E \_ n \_ c \_ y \_ c \_ l \_ o \_ p \_ e \_ d \_ i \_ a \_ o \_ f \_ S \_ c \_ i \_ e \_ n \_ c \_ e \_ F \_ i \_ c \_ t \_ i \_ o \_ n , edited by John Clute and Peter Nicolls
- Dramatic Presentation: \_ J \_ u \_ r \_ a \_ s \_ s \_ i \_ c \_ P \_ a \_ r \_ k
- Professional Editor: Kristine Kathryn Rusch
- Professional Artist: Bob Eggleton
- Original Artwork: \_ S \_ p \_ a \_ c \_ e \_ F \_ a \_ n \_ t \_ a \_ s \_ y \_ C \_ o \_ m \_ m \_ e \_ m \_ o \_ r \_ a \_ t \_ i \_ v \_ e \_ S \_ t \_ a \_ m \_ p \_ B \_ o \_ o \_ k \_ l \_ e \_ t by Steve Hickman
- Semi-Prozine: \_ S \_ c \_ i \_ e \_ n \_ c \_ e \_ F \_ i \_ c \_ t \_ i \_ o \_ n \_ C \_ h \_ r \_ o \_ n \_ i \_ c \_ l \_ e edited by Andrew Porter
- Fanzine: \_ M \_ i \_ m \_ o \_ s \_ a edited by Dock and Nicki Lynch
- Fan Writer: Dave Langford
- Fan Artist: Brad W. Foster
- John W. Campbell Award for Best New Writer of 1991-1992 (Sponsored by Dell Magazines): Amy Thomson ( \_ V \_ i \_ r \_ t \_ u \_ a \_ l \_ G \_ i \_ r \_ l )
- Seiun Award for Best Novel Translated into Japanese: \_ E \_ n \_ t \_ o \_ v \_ e \_ r \_ s \_ e by James P. Hogan
- Seiun Award for Best Short Story Translated into Japanese: "Tangents" by Greg Bear
- Seiun Award for Best Dramatic Presentation: \_ J \_ u \_ r \_ a \_ s \_ s \_ i \_ c \_ P \_ a \_ r \_ k

- Big Heart Award: Jack Williamson
- First Fandom: Everett F. Bleiler and Andre Norton

Barry Longyear (as Toastmaster) started this off with a quote from J. Danforth Quayle: "If we do not succeed, we run the risk of failure." He then did a long (perhaps over-long) bit about an award for Best Rejection Letter from an editor. (I noted that he talked about the Hugo for "Best Prozone Editor," but it's actually for "Best Professional Editor," and anthology and book editors have been known to make the ballot.) Longyear quoted Gene Fowler as having said, "An editor should have a pimp for a brother--so he has someone to look up to." Eventually the award was unveiled: the "No" award, a rocket headed \_ d \_ o \_ w \_ n. It was won (predictably) by "No Award."

Several non-Hugos came first. The Golden Duck Awards (for children's books) were announced. The two novel-length Auroras were awarded; the other eight had been awarded earlier in the day. When Spider Robinson got up to present them, he immediately said, "And the winner is ... Lan Laskowski!" (a reference to the fiasco of two years ago).

There were the usual jokes and surprises during the Hugo awards themselves. George Barr presented the Original Artwork and Professional Editor awards, saying that although the program book called him "one of the nicest people in fandom," "These are the people whose hands I would most like to break." Steve Hickman (in a thank-you speech \_ f \_ a \_ x \_ e \_ d to the convention) said, "If Harlan doesn't like these stamps I can enter the plea of being self-indulgent, and that he can't fault me on." (By the way, it is also true that the convention was told by the United States Postal Service not to mail the artwork back to them, but to send it UPS!)

Connie Willis got up and said, "You guys have got to stop doing this," but also claimed that George R. R. Martin said there was a move afoot to strip her of her awards because he claims she was on steroids when she wrote the stories.

Now for my usual editorial comments.

I still think that non-Hugo awards do not belong at the Hugo ceremonies, with the exception of the First Fandom, Big Heart, and John W. Campbell awards. Announcing the other awards, without a presentation ceremony, is perhaps a reasonable compromise, though which awards does one announce and which are too minor to be given the time?

Andy Porter said that last year he thought his win as a fluke, but this proved it wasn't. (He won by eight votes this year instead of

by only one. One person said that was because this was because  
this year the \_ L\_ o\_ c\_ u\_ s staff \_ d\_ i\_ d vote.) I suspect that \_ I\_ n\_ t\_ e\_ r\_ z\_ o\_ n\_ e  
may

THE MT VOID

Page 14

win next year (Langford certainly will).

That Whelan was defeated in two categories was a bit of a surprise.  
The Non-Fiction award was no surprise; Hickman's win was also by a  
very wide margin.

Harry Turtledove was very surprised at his win: he said at the  
reception beforehand that he was sure Ellison had it sewed up. (I  
believe someone said Ellison came in last, but that may be at least  
in part due to the difficulty of finding his story, which appeared  
as a small-press novella and in \_ O\_ m\_ n\_ i.) Sheffield was also  
surprised, I think.

And speaking of finally winning one, it was nice to see Stan  
Robinson get a Hugo at last (this was his eleventh nomination). I  
suspect that the vote was more for \_ R\_ e\_ d\_ M\_ a\_ r\_ s than for \_ G\_ r\_ e\_ e\_ n  
\_ M\_ a\_ r\_ s, or  
perhaps for the series, but I think I can live with that.

The "always a bridesmaid, never a bride" title is now shared in the  
fiction categories by Michael Bishop and Bruce Sterling, with eight  
nominations each without a win. The runner-up is Gene Wolfe with  
seven. (Jerry Pournelle also has eight, but four of them were co-  
nominations.)

I suppose I should mention the Great Hugo Controversy of 1994.  
(Does it seem like there's a Great Hugo Controversy every year  
now?) This year it was the shifting of stories from the categories  
into which they would have fallen had the word-count rules been  
"strictly" applied. However, the WSFS Constitution permits the  
administrators to move a story into an adjacent category if it is  
within 5000 words of the range of that category. So, for example,  
a novella of 35,100 words could be moved into the novel category  
(whose lower boundary is 40,000 words). What happened was that due  
to the "5% rule," the short story category would have had only  
three nominees. (The "5%" rule says that a story must appear on 5%

of the ballots which nominated in that category to make the ballot.) And in fact, several longer stories that had barely missed making the ballot had more nominations than shorter ones that made it. Because of this, and because there were stories within the 5000-word boundary, the administrators decided to shift stories into the shorter categories. The result was that the winner in the Short Story category (with a theoretical upper limit of 10,000 words) was actually a 14,400-word novelette (based on my quick estimated count).

Now the problem is that moving a novella that is within 5000 words of a novel is shifting it by about 14%, but moving a 14,400-word novelette to the short story category is shifting it by almost 33%, and many people feel this is too much like comparing apples and oranges. (One might ask why no one has protested that 40,000-word novels have to compete against 150,000-word novels. But last year

THE MT VOID

Page 15

people did bring a similar objection against calling Gurney's "Dinotopia" a single piece of artwork.)

I can certainly see the point of the objectors. However, I think it is foolish to rail at the administrators over this issue. The Constitution clearly says they can do this. If the members of the WSFS don't want them to do this, they should change the Constitution.

#### Other Awards

This is probably as good a place as any to list the various other awards that were announced during ConAdian. I will not be listing them all; for example, the S\_c\_i\_e\_n\_c\_e\_F\_i\_c\_t\_i\_o\_n C\_h\_r\_o\_n\_i\_c\_l\_e's awards may have been announced during the convention, but that seems more coincidence than planning. And I won't be listing all the Hokus because I don't feel like typing all that if I wasn't even nominated. :-)

The Auroras are the Canadian national awards. The two Auroras for novels were presented at the Hugo Awards ceremony, the others, presented earlier in the day were:

- Best Short-Form Work in English: "Just Like Old Times" by Robert J. Sawyer
- Meilleure nouvelle en francais: "La Merveilleuse machine de Johann Havel" by Yves Meynard
- Best Other Work in English: "Prisoners of Gravity" (television series)
- Meilleur ouvrage en francais (Autre): Les 42,210 univers de la science-fiction by Guy Bouchard
- Artistic Achievement: Robert Pasternak
- Fan Achievement (Fanzine): "Under the Ozone Hole," edited by Karl Johanson & John Herbert
- Fan Achievement (Organizational): Lloyd Penney, Ad Astra
- Fan Achievement (Other): Jean-Louis Trudel, promotion of Canadian SF

The Prometheus Awards, given by the Libertarian Futurist Society were:

- Novel: \_ P \_ a \_ l \_ l \_ a \_ s by L. Neil Smith
- Hall of Fame: \_ W \_ e by Yevgeny Zamiatin

The Golden Duck Awards for excellence in children's science fiction went to:

- Picture Book Illustration: \_ R \_ i \_ c \_ h \_ i \_ e' \_ s \_ R \_ o \_ c \_ k \_ e \_ t by Joan Anderson, photographed by George Ancona
- Children's Book, Grades 2-6: \_ W \_ o \_ r \_ l \_ d \_ F \_ i \_ r \_ s \_ t \_ A \_ d \_ v \_ e \_ n \_ t \_ u \_ r \_ e by Peter David

- Young Adult Book Grades 6-10: \_ T \_ h \_ e \_ G \_ i \_ v \_ e \_ r by Lois Lowry
- Special Award: \_ I \_ n \_ v \_ i \_ t \_ a \_ t \_ i \_ o \_ n \_ t \_ o \_ t \_ h \_ e \_ G \_ a \_ m \_ e by Monica Hughes

(Personally, while I agree that age 15 might be "young adult," I think age 11 is pushing it.)

The Chesley Awards, given by ASFA, are as follows:

- Magazine Cover: Wojtek Sludmak, \_ A \_ s \_ i \_ m \_ o \_ v' \_ s December 1993
- Three-Dimensional Art: Jennier Weyland, "And I am the Shining Star"
- Interior Illustration: Alan M. Clark, "The Toad of Heaven,"  
\_ A \_ s \_ i \_ m \_ o \_ v' \_ s June 1993
- Unpublished Monochrome Work: Carl Lundgren, "Impudence"
- Unpublished Color Work; James Gurney, "Garden of Hope"
- Art Director: Jamie Warren Youll, Bantam Books
- Contribution to ASFA: David Lee Pancake, and Teresa Paterson and the Pegasus Management Crew (tie)
- Artistic Achievement; Frank Kelly Freas, body of work
- Hardback Book Cover: Tom Kidd, "The Far Kingdoms"
- Paperback Book Cover: Bob Eggleton, "Dragons"

Panel: The End of the World

Saturday, 10 PM

Mary A. Turzillo (mod), Terry J. Jones, Sandra Morrese,  
Charles Pellegrino, Connie Willis

Description: Every society has their legends of how the world will end. But what happens afterwards?

[I'm sure they had their reasons, but scheduling Connie Willis on a panel starting at 10 PM when the Hugos were scheduled to start at 8 PM, \_ a \_ n \_ d the record for the ceremonies is 90 minutes, \_ a \_ n \_ d the committee is giving out several additional awards, \_ a \_ n \_ d the chances are good that she might have to pose for press photos will her Hugo, is not one of the world's best ideas.]

Panel: Bioethics Considerations

Sunday, 11 AM

Lois H. Mangan (mod), Genny Dazzo, Kathleen Ann Goonan,  
J. D. Maynard, Ross Pavlac

Description: A discussion of the ethics of bioengineering.

Mangan began by saying she didn't really like the questions that were sent to the panelists; she apparently didn't remember that they were the panelists' own questions.

Pavlac said that the whole question of bioethics started with the Hippocratic Oath, which he partially described and partially read. That is, he said that the first two parts dealt with the doctor

promising to worship and sacrifice to the gods and to support his teacher in his teacher's old age. He then read the part dealing directly with the doctor-patient relationship. At the time of Hippocrates, he said, the oath was quite radical.

Maynard, a practicing physician, said that the oath was interesting, but is no longer required of physicians, in part maybe because the specifics of the third part don't fit in today's society. Pavlac asked how physicians could just decide to throw out the oath without replacing it with something else. Maynard had already said that there were several replacement oaths, but based on other statements from Pavlac, I got the distinct impression that his objection was to the abandonment of the clause swearing not to perform abortions. And eventually someone asked him why he felt he could throw out the first part (regarding sacrificing to the gods), yet insist that the rest was untouchable and eternal. (He had no answer.) And indeed there was much loud argument about various people's religious beliefs. (Mangan said that she had heard several people declare that you could not be a good physician without a firm Christian background, which as a non-Christian she found personally offensive.)

When the panelists weren't debating religion, they did ask some interesting questions. Can a person in pain make rational decisions? Do you allow parents unlimited control over their children's treatment? Do you allow the government unlimited control? How do you deal with the fact that doctors are authority figures who have extraordinary influence over their patients whether they want it or not? What about designing children? What about euthanasia--who makes the decisions and how? If a disease like sickle-cell anemia is useful in combating malaria, should it be wiped out because we don't think malaria is a problem these days?

Other than the general descent into loud, pointless religious arguments, the greatest problem with this panel was that one member (who dealt with many bioethical issues on the job) too often "took over" the panel to work out his or her angst about it all instead of to provide an enlightening panel for the audience. [-ecl]

[To be continued]

Mark Leeper  
MT 3D-441 908-957-5619  
m.r.leeper@att.com

The criticism of other intellectuals is ... one of the most important functions of the intellectual, and he customarily performs it with vivacity. We may hope, but we can hardly expect, that he will

also do it with charity, grace, and precision.  
Because it is the business of intellectuals to be  
diverse and contrary-minded, we must accept the  
risk that at times they will be merely quarrelsome.  
-- Richard Hofstadter

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT ALMOST BLANK

