

ETTLE TWO

AN OPINION/DISCUSSION ZINE (CURRENTLY DEVOTED TO TAFF) FROM AND BY THE INCOMPREHENSIBLE JACKIE CAUSGROVE, 6828 ALPINE AVE. #4, CINCINNATI, OH 45236. AVAILABLE FOR LETTERS-OF-COMMENT, TRADE, OR 66¢ IN CASH OR STAMPS (1ST-CLASS 22-CENTERS). THIS SECOND ISSUE IS BEING PUBLISHED JANUARY 12, 1985; THE THIRD WILL BE DUE MARCH 12TH.

Of Feuds and Fan Funds...

The response to ETTLE ONE is still coming in. While in the main the LoC writers have followed my request to be brief, cogent, and to the point, some have included questions and/or commentary regarding The Feud (which feud? Don't ask) and/or the TAFF race completed less than two weeks ago. ETTLE, in discussing fan fund reforms, will not be used to air those topics. Seek them elsewhere; there are sources aplenty. The possibility of discussing those subjects, in another zine at another time, exists, but these pages will remain clear of feuds and feuding, to the best of my ability.

That said, let's look at some of the remarks regarding the current state of TAFF which have come in. As ETTLE ONE was sent to as many past TAFF Administrators as I could uncover addresses for -- and who else should know/ON the subject -- it seems appropriate to lead off the Input Section with comments from them.

Voices of Past TAFF Winners...

ROY TACKETT -- 915 Green Valley Road, NW, Albuquerque, NM 87107. November 24, 1984

Well and good. It is about time that someone opened some sort of discussion on TAFF and the other fan funds.

I will pass on most of the discussion of the administrator. All in all, though, it doesn't take too much time. The primary requirements are to set up a separate bank account for TAFF funds and to keep an accurate account of what comes in from who and what goes out. We are, of course, putting full faith and trust in the honesty and integrity of the administrator. I think, on the whole, there has been nothing to complain about on that score.

The big problem has always been publicity. In days of yore when fanzines were in flower most all fanz supported one of the candidates. These days, though, fanzines are a minor part of fandom and it would seem necessary for the administrator to spread the word to clubs and conventions. Particularly conventions. This could be done by contacting the committee and sending along TAFF fliers and/or ballots.

I might point out that I saw absolutely nothing on the last two TAFF races and it is only because Joni and Howard (Stopa and DeVore) ran some stuff through

FAPA that I had any real knowledge of the current race.

The need for more publicity is obvious.

\$\$I'm in full agreement on the need for more publicity at in-person fanish gatherings. Sadly, in most recent years (this past race was an exception because of such in-person publicity) even the participation by fanzine fans has dropped from the highs of yesteryears. We've seen that it can be increased. The question is can that level be maintained? \$\$

ETHEL LINDSAY -- 69 Barry Road, Carnoustie, Angus, DD7 7QQ, Scotland, U.K. Dec. 17, '84

My first comment would be on the amount of work involved by the TAFF administrator. You really must take more into account of the fact that the trip will have been very hectic -- ordinary work has to be taken up again and there is a Trip Report to write. The latter is a big job -- the biggest I have ever tackled.

I was lucky -- the delegate I had to work with was Ron Ellik and he published frequent news about TAFF and sent it to all the voters. Mary thanked him and said this was the first they had ever received. I copied Ron's method and I do think we had it running smoothly. Of course we were both zine publishers so it was comparatively easy for us to put out news and fliers. What we were really doing was to publish a TAFF Newsletter.

Times change, I am very aware, so I would be very hesitant to offer advice. I can only say I thought Ron and I helped TAFF at that time. However you'll note that it takes two active publishing fans to keep this up!

As to the present fuss over TAFF -- well there have been fusses before yet TAFF went on and I sincerely hope it always will. It gave me a dream come true and I shall never forget it.

\$\$Admittedly, a returning TAFF delegate is likely to be worn out. Yet the upcoming race involves the sending over of a fan from the opposite side of the Atlantic, so the bulk of the work should fall on the shoulders of the other, more experienced Administrator. To my mind this has been one of TAFF's strongest points: the alternation of delegates. As reports have been done by less than half the TAFF winners, I don't feel that diving straight in to get one completed is of the greatest urgency (on the other hand, time will be even tighter the following year). Informing fandom of nomination periods and getting out ballots, as well as noti-

tying voters and newszines of the Fund's status, would seem to be more important on the list of Required Duties. ¶¶ This is not to denigrate the value of doing a Trip Report. After all, Informing fandom of the Winner's Impressions of the Other side's fandom is one of the basic reasons TAFF exists. TAFF reports serve as Informational vehicles, fan-history documents, and sources of future funding. Would it be that only we had more of them.. ¶¶ It shouldn't require two active publishing TAFF Administrators to keep fandom aware of news about the Fund. Recently few US Administrators have turned out TAFFzines of their own. You U.K. fen have been far more fortunate in that regard. §§

DAVE LANGFORD -- 94 London Road, READING, Berkshire, RG1 2JU. November 22, 1984

If I have a position, it's that the ballot "rules" plus the conventional wisdom form a fair set of guidelines. It would be nice if they were followed and if courtesies (like saying thanks for hefty donations) were observed. That said, I do instinctively distrust any proliferation of formalities and regulations. I have a leery vision of the decent, honest TAFF winner (me) bogged down in two years of xeroxing bank statements for anyone who cares to enquire; while the person who puts the Fund \$30,000 into the red can be censured but can no more be prevented from doing so than the mighty influence of the WSFS Constitution could prevent, in advance, the Constellation debacle.

Sometimes I wonder if the worst dangers to TAFF aren't its friends.

One of the ways in which "TAFF works the way it is" concerns a happy similarity of the size between UK and US voting pools. Votes on both sides of the Atlantic are important.

Over here we're having fun trying to track down those original TAFF rules. Only one has definitely been established: cf. this passage from Church Harris's fanzine SWAN SONG circa 1959..."Now the decisions reached by these founding members were recorded by Ken Slater and published soon after in a printed report called 'CONsomme' that was distributed throughout fandom. It is from this report that I quote the first rule of TAFF: 'You can nominate anyone you like, but it should be someone fairly well known to both British and American fandom.'" The idea is obviously that some international involvement is a sine qua non. Happily, TAFF candidates since I've been in fandom have filled the bill in this respect. The ones on the ballot, at least.

§§Sorry for butchering your LoC so badly but, as I noted in the previous issue, this is a Forum for discussion of TAFF principles, not the airing of gripes about any one particular race. ¶¶ I, too almost instinctively distrust formalities and regula-

tions, which is why I personally favor a list of guidelines (published, not passed on via oral tradition--a notoriously inaccurate means of data transmission--to serve as reminder (if naught else) to future winners of what the expected duties are. If one knows what's been done in the past, both far as well as immediate, one is less likely to continue inadequate or erroneous practices should the Fund be administered by a pair of mediocre Administrators. As things stand now, two lacksadaisical Administrators in a row could severely damage the Fund's future, if not its existence. §§ There is no similarity between TAFF and the Worldcon. The winners, for instance, cannot borrow funds in TAFF's name; they can only spend what's in the coffers at any given moment. The vision you present is a fantasy. ¶¶ You refer to UK and US voting pools--I thought the ballot reads European and North American. Be that as it may, here's a list of the votes cast in previous races (all I have data on):

YEAR:	EURO:	N.A.:	TOTAL	PERCENTAGE EURO:	N.A.:	TRIP TO:
84/85	134	379	513	26.1%	73.9%	U.K.
84	83	80	163	50.9%	49.1%	U.S.
83	47	85	132	35.6%	64.4%	U.K.
82	107	66	173	61.8%	38.2%	U.S.
80/81	45	80	125	36%	64%	U.K.
80	64	60	124	51.6%	48.4%	U.S.
79	76	112	188	40.4%	59.6%	U.K.
77	N/A	N/A	205	N/A	N/A	U.S.
76	35	109	144	24.3%	75.7%	U.K.
74	115	107	222	51.8%	48.2%	U.S.
72/73	93	161	254	36.6%	63.4%	U.K.
71	181	155	336	53.9%	46.1%	U.S.

As you can see, the Sending side has consistently outvoted (i.e. cast more ballots) ^{than} the Host side, and occasionally by some really hefty percentages. What's this "similar sized voting pool" stuff? The size of the vote-count also varies, rather dramatically. ¶¶ I have sent over the list of zines given by Harry Warner Jr., which are mentioned later on in his letter. Are you having more luck than I in tracking down those? I hear there are some differences/changes which have been made through the years... §§

TERRY HUGHES -- 6205 Wilson Blvd. #102, Falls Church, VA 22044. December 11, 1984

It is always good to see TAFF receiving consideration in a fanzine. However, I did find it quite strange that you did not include a copy of the current TAFF ballot with the fanzine. I mean since you did devote the entire issue to TAFF I would expect you to at least mail this year's TAFF ballot out with it. Why didn't you?

I must warn you that this will not be a brief response as you requested on your last page. There are a number of points I wish to make and in order to make them I am going to take whatever amount of space I feel it will take. Please bear with me.

I have a number of objections to or disagreements with particular points you have raised. For one thing, you seem to lack a full understanding of all the responsibilities inherent with being TAFF administrator. You have part of it but even that is distorted in part. In particular I think you are off base in your attempt to fit a time schedule to TAFF duties. Such things seldom go like clock-work and there is more to it than what can be done properly in the meager amount of time you allotted (an hour for this, an hour for that). Of course since you never have been the TAFF administrator or even a candidate for TAFF delegate, your ignorance is understandable. You did run the successful Tucker Fund back in 74/75 but operating a one shot fund is different in many ways from operating an ongoing fund such as TAFF or DUFF.

Why do you feel TAFF is in trouble now? What kind of trouble do you mean? It is my understanding that TAFF is financially sound (It certainly was while I was taking care of the North American side of things for two years). Why do you concern yourself with TAFF and not with DUFF as well? The two funds have more in common than not and any improvements in one might well be applied to the other. (It may just be a mistaken impression on my part, but I always thought you had more involvement with DUFF than TAFF anyway.) Do you feel that over the years TAFF has been administered less properly than DUFF? I would certainly need to see some proof of that before I would concede that point. How about GUFF?

I would like to know who are the anonymous people who are making the proposals you list under the "of Conclusions and Suggestions and a Call for Comment" heading. These are some of the most scatterbrained notions I have ever seen put forth. These really irked me. Let me deal with the proposals individually.

Why is a grandfatherly/motherly panel of previous TAFF administrators needed? If a current TAFF administrator has a question or feels he or she needs help he or she could call on any previous TAFF administrator for advice. The ones he or she might most readily call upon would be the immediate predecessor. However I am sure that any previous TAFF administrator would be happy to give advice or other input if requested. I certainly would (and have in a couple of instances). There is no need for a formal panel (all of us already know the secret handshake). I doubt if it is a case of previous winners being ignored but rather that subsequent winners have not felt the need to ask for advice. Such a panel would not be of use if its aid wasn't requested anyway. Anyone who stands for TAFF should have already had a fair amount of involvement with the Fund over the years so that he or she would not be totally ignorant. He or she should have at least the degree of understanding you display in this fanzine. The concept of a formal panel is too mickey-mouse.

The suggestion of an official Teller is most abhorant to me. If you don't trust someone to count ballots honestly, announce results and administer the funds with due care, then you should not vote for that person in the first place. In the same regard if there is someone out there so pure of heart to have the trust of all of fandom and also willing to take on this work then why doesn't he or she stand for TAFF? Besides being radical (which in itself is not necessarily a bad thing) this proposal is not worthwhile. Why would this Teller not elected by that part of fandom concerned with TAFF be better for the job than the TAFF winner voted for by a majority of those fans concerned with TAFF?

The third notion of setting up an administrator entirely removed from the TAFF winners is the most ludicrous of the three. The criteria being "their ability to manage accounts" sent me into gales of laughter. Fandom already has such "professionals": they work on Worldcons. Their jobs are to manage large sums of money and they get paid for it.

It seems to me that in accepting such proposals one would just be asking for trouble. I can see only increased opportunities for disagreements and even greater chances for abuse due to personal animosities.

I certainly had not heard of all the charges you list and in one or more cases I think TAFF was not the Fund involved in the problem you cite.

When you were listing scandals in TAFF you omitted the famous one which occurred in the 57 race. There was quite an uproar over the winner of that race, but a more disturbing element had to do with allegations of ineligible ballots being cast for the losing candidate. This controversy resulted in changes in the voting procedures.

You write that "the fund, particularly in the U.S., seems to be in such a precarious position from year to year ...". Where did you get this information? This is the sort of thing only administrators are privy to for the most part. I know for a fact that while I was TAFF administrator the U.S. side was more financially secure than the European side. The U.S. side is larger, has greater voting numbers, and receives donations from a greater number of sources. I'm quite capable of quoting specific money figures. Are you?

It is true that outside donations have increased over the years, but this has been due to damned good work on the part of the TAFF Administrators who actively sought out such donations from conventions, clubs, and other sources. Raising such funds is part of the TAFF Administrator's job and your statement about such an increase indicates just how well things have been going under the present system.

I do not think a financial accounting is necessary, but if one were to be done, it should only be done on an annual basis. No greater frequency would be merited.

However no one has done a financial report in years. Not doing one is the tradition! The only reports I recall seeing were from the very early days of TAFF.

As it stands now the TAFF Administrator is a benevolent dictator, balanced by his or her counterpart across the ocean. This makes for an effective check and balance. The general nature of TAFF regulations allow adequate room for leeway to deal with emergencies to the best of [the administrators] abilities. These problems can range from such minor points as ruling on the eligibility of ballots to major points such as increasing the allotment to the winner. Any other form of administration would be time consuming and cumbersome.

It seems to me that the present system has been working well so why muck around with it? Minor modifications might be okay, however the major changes proposed in ETLE strike me as ill-justified, unwarranted not well-enough thought out, and potentially greater sources of trouble than the present system. In the past TAFF has been adjusted by the administrators. I think this is a fair way to approach future changes: present suggestions to the administrators and if they are convinced then minor changes may be implemented.

You are not the only one who has suggested changes for TAFF over the past few years. I remember some going so far as to suggest TAFF be done away with altogether since trans-atlantic airfares are low enough that anybody can afford to make the trip. I disagree with this notion in part because it totally ignores the honor associated with winning TAFF. Also there are many problems with discount airlines, particularly when one has to be somewhere by a given date -- the con! -- so ultra-cheap fares can't always be used.

Others have suggested that voting be weighted so that votes from the receiving country count more than those of the sending country. I disagree with this since I think that ideally a TAFF delegate would win on both sides of the Atlantic. I think all votes should carry the same weight and any other approach might only create animosity.

Most recently it's been proposed that the U.S. TAFF trip be to regional convention (or a series thereof) rather than to the Worldcon. I objected because the Worldcon has the prestige no other con has and it's something the European TAFF winners should experience. It's by far the best place to meet the most fans. Furthermore the delegate might not be able to spend the additional time and money a series of regionals would require.

Call me a stick in the mud, but I like the present system. No big change has yet to win my support.

Let me touch briefly on a few more points. I do not think the vote-in-progress counts should be released. It is not expressly prohibited but it does not strike

me as fair play. If people want to see someone win (or lose) then they should damn well go ahead and vote. I think a TAFF administrator needs to keep his or her mouth shut about certain matters and this is one of them.

An administrator should strive to remain neutral during a race. One always has a preferred candidate but this should never be publicly expressed. I don't think the administrator should do anything to influence the voting, except to encourage voting. When I was TAFF administrator I didn't even cast a ballot in order to maintain my neutrality--which accounts for my only non-voting in many years--I just gave a donation.

Are there any changes I'd like to see? Sure. One change I would personally like most to see would be to have the qualifications for a candidate clarified to reflect TAFF's original twofold purpose of promoting increased contact between North American and European fandoms and honoring those fans who have worked toward this end who are well known to both fandoms. That's the standard I use when casting my ballot, whether it is spelled out or not.

I told you I'd be long-winded. Despite my sometimes quite serious opposition to what was in this fanzine, I did find things of worth in it and TAFF should only benefit from honest discussion.

§§Ballots were not included with ETLE ONE because it would have exceeded the weight limit for First-Class postage. While I did print and distribute about 750 TAFF ballots (as well as another 200 DUFF ballots), it seemed a waste of money to pay an additional 17¢ each simply to mail them to people who should've had access to them on their own. You, for instance, live in the same town as the co-producer of the ballot used in the most recent race. I mailed out just under 200 copies ^{of ETLE ONE} handed out a dozen or so more, and have about 20 remaining. This is a costly enough venture, thank you. ¶¶No, you weren't brief. I had to drastically edit your 10+ page letter, as I'm sure you're sad to see. The valuable comments you made about How You Did It, in regards to the period of your own TAFF administration, will be done up as a separate publication, perhaps accompanying ETLE (not this issue! It'll be overweight as it is!), perhaps to be joined with other TAFF administrators' "How I Did It" reports. If I could get enough of them, they could serve as a valuable document to pass along to future winners... ¶¶Do I understand you to be saying that unless you have won TAFF you cannot know enough to run it? That's what it sounds like. ¶¶Later in your letter you mention other suggestions for altering TAFF which have been made in recent years. I would assume the persons who made those suggestions is operating on the same level of information that I have been--namely rumors and gossip seldom put into print. I wanted to change that situation and let as much of fandom as I could reach have their say. ¶¶

The people who made the suggestions of last issue were left anonymous as their ideas were expressed in conversation prior to ETTLE's conception. It's the ideas which are offered for discussion (note they were not formal proposals, but offered as kick-off points for an ongoing airing of opinions/concepts of what TAFF is, can be, and/or should be), not the Name or Rep of the person I last heard it/them from. ¶¶ DUFF does, as you say, have more similarities to TAFF than differences, but the subject now is TAFF because it is that Fund which is currently in the fan-public's eye. I've voted more often for TAFF than for DUFF, though I've tried to balance my donations between the two. Where you got the notion I was more involved with DUFF is beyond me. ¶¶ I also don't see the need of a Formal Panel, but do feel that Former Administrators should have a means to offer on-going advice to future winners. It's the people who need help the worst, too often, who are the last to ask for it. How I did it articles would be of great help in indicating areas which must be covered by In-coming Administrators--some of which would not occur to those who are convinced that they know it all. ¶¶ I have no firm opinion on the matter of a Teller. However, I would like to ask what it was about the suggestion that makes you think that such a person would not be voted on? ¶¶ The "professionals" you refer to that are paid by Worldcon Committees don't "handle" or "manage" any cash. They simply review the books of the Committee and issue opinions, for legal purposes, on their value as accurate record-keeping (note the statement made by the Accountant who went over Constellation's books!). Many fans manage business, as well as home or volunteer group, accounts. Some people can handle it well, some people can't. There are many fans I love dearly who I would never trust to handle a fan fund adequately. Most people simply never consider that the person they vote for in a TAFF race would also have to operate the Fund thereafter. ¶¶ TAFF was the Fund involved in each of the "Rumors" I listed. ¶¶ The "precarious" position comment refers from a tendency some fans have of protesting any discussion of TAFF on the basis that to do so will somehow "kill" it; either by turning off prospective participants or drying up sources of revenue. I find that notion ridiculous, which is why I phrased it the way I did. Any organization which cannot stand to be examined or discussed is sick. I do not believe TAFF is in that sort of shape. ¶¶ The only financial figures I've seen were printed by British Administrators, and they showed the Fund to be extremely healthy. ¶¶ When Confusion decided to donate to TAFF (and DUFF), they did so on their own--no contact from the Administrator. Same goes for Joni Stopa's fund-raising at Wilcon and, my "Poker Trolling", and the auctioneering done by many people (including Scrivner and Hevelin and Glicksohn, and Passovoy) has been on their own urging. TAFF Administrators, in the main at least, don't even acknowledge this work--much less ask for it to be done. ¶¶ I'm not sure if a yearly re-

port on TAFF finances is sufficient. However I do think that some sort of report is needed. Yearly is better than nothing at all. ¶¶ The only thing that is "checked" by the "balance" of having two Administrators is the undue influence of one side over the other. Complaints are made by some Administrators about the lack of communication or work on the part of their opposite number. What happens if two such fans wind up as co-Administrators? While it is Fannish to expect the Best from someone, it is Common Sense to realize that you're not going to see it all that often. TAFF needs more safeguards against negligence or uncaring Administration. ¶¶ Even "ultra-cheap" fares are beyond the reach of many fans' budgets. For some fans the only way they could afford such a trip would be to give up all fanac for an indefinite period so as to save their coppers. That doesn't make sense--give up your hobby in order to enjoy one week or so of fanac? ¶¶ It's one reason 1978 was my last Worldcon--they're priced beyond my means. One Worldcon would use up all the cash I would spend in attending 3 or 4 small, fan-nish regional conventions.) ¶¶ I'm one of those who favor the Regional-Con Circuit to the Worldcon trip. There are small and medium-sized conventions going on every weekend, practically every weekend of the year. In the summertime, when most UK-to-US trips are made, one can select from a list of several each weekend. A larger--or at least equal--number of fans can be met in far more ideal circumstances at Regionals, as well as the likelihood that a TAFF delegate would be more of a Featured Person, rather than pitted against the Stars of Prodom and Fandom as at Worldcon, at more intimate gatherings. Worldcons are Big Circuses now, not fannish gathering places. ¶¶ Qualifications for candidates should be listed, clearly and concisely, on the ballot so all fans are aware of them. As it stands now, no mention of International Activity is made, nor has it been for far over a decade. Each voter uses their own criteria for casting a ballot, but if their "standards" aren't approved by some fans, then change the ballot. ¶¶

While not technically a previous TAFF winner, we next hear from a fan who's won two honors from Fandom, the receiver of the "WAW With The Crew In 52" fund and a repeat of that successful endeavor in 1962. The 52 Fund led directly to the formation of TAFF...

WALT WILLIS -- 32 Warren Road, Donaghadee, NI
BT 21OPD U.K. November 24, 1984

I believe that most administrative disasters are due to divided powers and responsibilities, and that TAFF has survived for 30 years (and FAPA much longer) because power and responsibility are congruent and clearly allocated to specified individuals. So while I agree with many of your suggestions and see no harm in anyone giving advice to TAFF administrators, I think it would be potentially disastrous

to set up anything in the nature of an authority over and against the administrators--who should of course continue to be the most recent TAFF winners, as logic, common sense, and practicality all dictate. I have seen nothing in the remote or recent past to cause me to doubt that.

I not only do not believe it would be a good thing to set up an Authority over TAFF Administrators, I do not think it would be possible. It's not the removal of power that is sought in discussing TAFF reforms, but an increase in communication between current and past administrators. Rules have been lost, aims altered, mistakes made--and mostly, I think, because of lack of advice from Old Hands. An ignorant administration is as dangerous as an ignorant electorate.

Another point of view is given from one of the Founding Fathers of TAFF...

CHUCK HARRIS -- 32 Lake Crescent, Daventry, Northants
NN11 5EB U.K. December 13, 1984

Thank you for ETTLE ONE. If only you'd contacted me before I could have saved you no end of trouble. When TAFF was founded in 1953 by Brumer, Clarke, Shorrocks, Willis, Jeeves, Slater, Bentcliffe, Harris, and Fred Brown, they formulated a set of rules to cover the organisation. Although this was solely a British invention, we tried to strike a balance so that fans on both sides of the Atlantic would have an equal say. This was the most difficult thing of all. Both sides have to participate. If only one side makes decisions the other side will lose interest and drop out. It was, and is, essential that British fandom, with its much smaller numbers isn't swamped and disregarded by the sheer mass of US fandom.

These rules were published in Ken Slater's con-report zine called CONsomme. I don't have a copy in my files but believe me I am straining every nerve to obtain one.

Fortunately, in my own fanzine SWAN SONG No. 1 I had the good sense to quote two of these rules. The first rule of TAFF is "You can nominate anyone you like, but it should be someone fairly well-known to both British and American fandom."

The other rule was/voter qualification: "they should contribute 2/6d or 50c and should have been active in fandom to the extent of having subscribed to or contributed to at least one fanzine or joined a fan-club or organisation." That one was reprinted from the October '53 HYPHEN. The first rule is direct from CONsomme.

I reject any idea of a permanent teller. The idea of TAFF is that you get the reward...the trip...and then you do the work...the write-up and administration. If they want help they can always consult the past administration and founder members.

TAFF is not some ailing dishonest organisation. It's a fine thriving thing that has financed almost thirty trips to and fro across the Atlantic. What the hell is the point of meddling and killing it. Precisely what have you ever contributed or done for TAFF?

§§The handful of "histories" of TAFF that have been run in this country--mostly in Worldcon Program Books--attribute TAFF's founding to Walt Willis and Don Ford. It's nice to learn that those "histories" were in error on that point. I hope it will be corrected in future articles. ¶¶"If only one side makes the decisions the other side will lose interest and drop out." I like that quote. It's too true for words. ¶¶The "rules" of TAFF that you list have been altered through the years. Several versions have come out since the mid-fifties (see Harry Warner, Jr.'s letter following), and it seems to be as hard to get hold of them over here as it is to find copies of CONsomme over there ¶¶I've seen the phrase "Founder Members" a couple of times in recent weeks. I'm curious--what are these people 'members' of? TAFF isn't set up like a club of any sort. ¶¶"Meddling and killing" TAFF is not my goal. Airing open discussions about its condition--particularly here in the States where it is not run as openly as in Britain--is my intent. ¶¶I've contributed to every TAFF race since 1974, voted 3-5 times (most times any of the candidates were acceptable to me so no choice was made by ballot), and have supported various fans' candidacies in my zines. May I ask what you've done in the same area since 1957? §§

Seemingly most former administrators who responded share Willis's view that things work as they are. Yet, from these comments, it is evident that much depends on which side of the Atlantic you are from. As stated in ETTLE ONE, on the whole, the British side has enjoyed open and informative administration. Terry Hughes seems to feel that TAFF's financial soundness is based on the actions of the Administrators. Roy Tackett seems to feel that recent Administrators have been somewhat lax in certain areas.

In RAFFLES 9, Larry Carmody writes: "I'm sure that there have been very conscientious TAFF administrators in the past, but there have also been others who, for whatever reasons, have not done the best job possible. ----- comes immediately [to mind?] as an administrator who should have done much more than he did to promote TAFF. More than a few times I heard him mutter to himself, "I really should do something," and then not do anything at all. "Just lazy," he said more than once. But he admitted as much to anybody who asked."

Larry's comments about the actions (or lack of them) by one administrator contrast a bit strongly with those of Ethel Lindsay and Terry Hughes (I will print the full run-down of his Administration that he included RealSoonNow).

A letter from current British Administrator Rob Hansen (not in response to ETTLE ONE) gives this view of How Things Work...

ROB HANSEN -- 9A Greenleaf Road, East Ham, London,
E6 1DX (Written October 17, 1984)

You seem to be labouring under a number of misapprehensions over how TAFF operates with regard to the money given to winners. In my case my air fare came out of TAFF UK funds (and took about 50% of them) while money to cover my hotel bill, meals, and land travel came from US funds. I was given a few hundred dollars expense money and returned the surplus to the US fund before flying back (money for private purchases, admission to Disneyland, and the like came from my own pocket, of course). Interestingly, 50% of the US TAFF money I spent was needed to cover the hotel bill (expensive room rates you have over there). In a year when funds are low TAFF would cover what it could, which I take to be, in ascending order of priority, food, internal travel, hotel bill, and air fare with the winner stumping up the rest. In the case of an unusually long trip (such as the 2 months Peter Roberts was over there) the winner has traditionally paid for all the expenses beyond those of the first few weeks out of his own pocket so as not to unduly deplete the TAFF coffers.

Oddly enough your suggestions viz-a-viz a "steering committee" to establish set rules and guidelines for TAFF administrators etc., are similar to thoughts I've had on all this myself and have, to some extent, already followed up on. I had to do some research into TAFF in connection with a history of British fandom that I was writing (and which is now slated to appear in the next two issues of Joe D Siclari's FANHISTORICA) and as such I got to learn all about the previous occasion, in the late-50s, when TAFF became the burning fannish issue of the day and also that the fund once did have a set of clearly enumerated rules. Some of these are incorporated in the ballot form but others appear to have dropped between the cracks somewhere along the line. It has always been my intention not only to re-instate a clearly listed table of rules but also to tighten them up some so as to lessen the scope for abuse that currently exists. By this I mean the possibility of 'buying' a race, a possibility that a number of people believe became a reality in one race more than a decade back (and not without a certain amount of supporting circumstantial evidence). While this possibility cannot be eliminated entirely it is possible to make it a lot more difficult for someone to get away with this sort of stunt. Having already

discussed some of my ideas with previous administrators both here and while I was in the US I've met with cautiously favourable reaction, and as soon as the identity of the next US TAFF winner is known, I'll discuss these matters with him/them and suggest that they consult with previous US TAFF administrators before coming over for the '85 Eastercon. Then, hopefully, we'll have the opportunity to compare notes, hammer out a mutually acceptable set of rules and guidelines, and publish the results. What I've been doing is a bit less formal than your proposed "steering committee" but should achieve the same effect.

(In a letter dated November 22, 1984--again not to this zine) When it comes to the trip itself most of the arrangements are left up to the TAFF winner who is expected to book all travel and make his own arrangements about accomodation while over the water. This usually means deciding those cities you'd like to visit and getting in touch with those local fans who knew you. In my own case I got in touch with fans I knew in San Francisco, New York, and Washington. I would've stayed with someone in Los Angeles as well but since my only contact with L.A. fandom had been an exchange of fanzines with Marty Cantor I didn't know any of them well enough to impose on them, tho' I did arrange with Lucy Huntzinger for her to meet me at LAX. All those I stayed with were people I'd either corresponded with at some time or previously met - again the usual way for a TAFF winner to do things. Avedon arranged my hotel booking and got money to me - all that is required of a TAFF administrator. Since, as I say, I didn't know anyone in L.A. well enough to ask them to put me up I flew into the city on the first day of the con and relied on making a contact there who would give me a lift to San Francisco afterwards...and I did.

Also not in response to ETTLE ONE, but germane to the issue, is this snippet from the just-past US Administrator...

AVEDON CAROL -- 4409 Woodfield Road, Kensington, MD
20895. October 24, 1984

Jackie seems to be under the mistaken notion that TAFF winners have something to say in an official capacity about TAFF. You are incorrect. It is the job of the TAFF winner to go to the other country and answer questions about interesting fans in the sender country, and come home and convey as much information as possible, preferably in writing, about interesting fans in the host country and the trip in general.

Administrators seem to have differing notions about what TAFF is, how it works, and what duties are expected from an Administrator. Is it any wonder that voters and contributors are confused?

Terry Hughes feels that Administrators can ask for help--if they feel they need it. I can think of few fans who lack the self-

confidence to believe that they would require "help" from anyone. This is the main reason I personally support the establishment of a set of guidelines--preferably authored by previous administrators--which could be passed on to each TAFF winner (if not candidate) upon their acceptance of the honor. As it stands now, a mediocre Administrator can pass on flawed perceptions of How Things Work to the new hands, which then can be incorporated into the "traditional" Rules because of Precedent. Misconceptions and oversights can be given to those who clearly deserve precise information. Terry, I don't think you should wait to be asked; advice should be offered and offered as soon after the results are known as you can. Ethel, I don't think information on how you handled TAFF matters during your tenure could possibly be so out-dated as to be completely useless to a person new to the job. Roy, you say the work is "not much". Could you be more specific? Would you? To all previous Administrators: if I volunteer to stencil, print, and make available to future winners of TAFF a compodium of How I Did It articles/overviews, would you cooperate in the venture? (Terry Hughes is excused: he's furnished more than enough detail...) I realize this would entail some hard memory flogging on the part of long-ago Administrators, but I feel it could be of value to those future winners Too Proud to ask outright for aid. You've won TAFF, you've reaped its rewards of egoboo, and performed the dogwork to keep it going while it was in your hands. Would you be willing to do One More Thing?

If varying perceptions of TAFF are found among past and present Administrators, it is not surprising to find even more variance within fandom in general. Even among the *coff* older fans in our midst, opinions and attitudes vary widely.

HARRY WARNER, JR. -- 423 Summit Ave., Hagerstown, MD 21740. November 20, 1984

I'm not sure I should comment on TAFF matters. In recent years I've not contributed to fan travel funds, I haven't been attending cons where trip winners make their official appearance, and I haven't offered hospitality to any of the United States-bound winners.

About my failure to help financially with the fund drives: several years ago, I made a contribution to one of them and asked for a copy of the trip report that was being offered to those who gave a specific amount at that particular time. I never received

the report and this prejudiced me against continuing to support the drives more than it should have done. (It wasn't lost in the mails. I had a note from the distributor that a copy would be sent to me some time later and that was the last I heard about it.) The failure of most trippers to write extended reports on their adventures in the years that followed and my failure to go to cons helped to persuade me that there was no point in supporting fund drives that had ceased to have any real relevance for my role in fandom.

I'm sure the greatest amount of criticism for your new venture will come from those who are anti-organization, who believe that fandom should be completely informal, and who will argue that TAFF and DUFF have survived through their very lack of red tape and official rules. Maybe fund drives don't need by-laws and minutely spelled out procedures but I agree with your stand that they have gone too far in the direction of unorganization in recent years.

A couple of matters occurred to me that you don't mention but may have thought about. Does anyone know if these considerable sums apparently held by TAFF on both sides of the Atlantic are kept in interest-paying securities until needed? If the estimates you quote are accurate, it should be possible to realize another hundred bucks or two annually from short-term Certificates of Deposit for the bulk of the money and from interest-paying checking accounts for the remainder. Another idea related to this apparent healthy financial status of TAFF: has anyone considered an arrangement to reimburse TAFF winners who publish lengthy trip reports for some of their publishing expenses from TAFF funds after the reports are actually circulated? Maybe there would be more reports if the writers knew they would make a smaller dent in their own bank accounts for their investments in paper and ink and stencils.

If you're interested in collecting information of rules under which TAFF has operated, I can suggest some sources but can't provide copies, thanks to the chaotic condition of my fanzine collection. By the time I found the particular publications involved, TAFF and DUFF winners would be teleporting via matter transmitters across the oceans. I think Bruce Pelz offers a Xeroxing service from his enormous fanzine collection which is neatly sorted out. The new rules which Ken Bulmer and Bob Madle set up were published in an issue of STEAM in 1958. Another set of rules, somewhat different, compiled by Madle and Ron Bennett, were published in the 23rd issue of GAMBIT. Ron Ellik published a TAFF flier dated January 1962 which contained a considerable amount of information on TAFF as it then existed. The February 24, 1960 issue of FANAC contained results of a poll in which fans expressed opinions on some of the same matters brought up by ETILE. The 29th issue of ORION contained an article by Bruce Burn which summarized TAFF's history up to

the early 1960s. My fan history notes fail to specify which issue of Hyphen contains the rules Willis established when he was administrator.

One other notion which seems so obvious there must be something wrong with it or it would have become standard practice: couldn't TAFF ballots be distributed with a progress report of the con which the next winner will attend? Admittedly, this would lessen fanzine fandom's voice in the voting. But if large cons are supporting TAFF with substantial sums, maybe all their members should have the right to help select candidates.

§§I think your comment about why you haven't given to TAFF in recent years points out how easy it is to offend someone through an oversight, as well as being an indication of how important the Trip Report can be to fanzine fans. You're not alone in ignoring the fund because of past lapses--I've heard similar stories from fans in person--but that only points out the importance of carry-through on the part of administrators. Much harm has been and can be done in the future because of slips on the part of one person. Is it right that a 30+-year fannish institution be blamed for the mistake of a single fan? It doesn't seem so to me, but I also have no suggestion which would help prevent problems like the one you had. I don't feel TAFF needs tight strictures as much as a well-functioning pipeline between previous and current administrations so that the form of TAFF remains intact despite individual lapses. I don't think enough data has been given out on TAFF finances for me to comment on the possibility of interest-bearing accounts. Readers?? I thank you for that list of TAFF-related zines. I wrote to Pelz after you sent this, but so far, no answer. I think Progress Reports would seem to be one means to distribute ballots more widely, but I'm not sure if only the Worldcon's should be used. Not all fans interested in TAFF attend Worldcons, and not all who attend Worldcon care a fig about TAFF. §§

MARTY HELGESEN -- 11 Lawrence Avenue, Malverne, NY 11565. November 22, 1984

I have no strong feelings about TAFF, but the points you raise in ETTLE ONE make sense to me. The only objection I can see being raised is "If it ain't broke, don't fix it," but apparently many people think it is "broke" or at least starting to crack.

One additional suggestion about the distribution of ballots is to try to frank them through apas as well as genzines.

§§Sorry about forgetting to reset the margins above. *blush* I've been hearing reports of the unhealthy state of TAFF ever since I've been in fandom. I think to distribute ballots through apas would make sense to me. Many dormant or semi-dormant fans seem to hide out in them nowadays; their interest might be rekindled.

BUCK COULSON -- 2677W-500N, Hartford City, IN 47348
November 22, 1984

To be honest, I haven't thought much about TAFF in recent years. Some of the candidates I didn't know, and most of the ones I did know I was indifferent to.

Do I really care about it? I suppose the answer is that at present, no, I don't. But I used to, and possibly I will again in the future, so I'll comment.

I'm not sure you can codify Tradition, or that it's a good idea. If the winners themselves don't care about perpetuating it, then why bother? However, in general, the idea of a permanent Teller sounds okay. Let him/her be in charge of everything, if you do it; bank account, formulating the ballot, distributing it to candidates only, specifying deadlines, counting ballots, and notifying the fan press of the results.

I'm against interim reports on voting.

Let the candidates themselves handle the business of circulating ballots, both to the press and the public. (If they won't do that much, then you can be sure you won't get a report afterwards.) The Teller merely checks incoming ballots and throws out any that don't correspond to the form he/she set up; he's not required to ship them out initially. Final report should go to each voter, plus the fan press, which does not mean LOCUS exclusively.

§§As I said to Harry, it doesn't seem right for TAFF to be made to suffer because one person goofed (or even 2 or 3). Let an administration or two slip up and (considering the shortness of Fannish Memory) in a couple of years fans will be saying, "TAFF? What the dickens is that?"--come to think of it, I've already heard that comment more than once... The idea of handing ballot distribution to candidates or their supporters (as I've heard others suggest) makes more than a bit of sense. Who else should care as much about the matter? I'm of two minds on the Teller suggestion. While I can see several good points to the idea, I can see a few against it, too. Several long-lived apas use the concept, and it seems to work well in those instances. §§

DAVE LOCKE -- 6828 Alpine Avenue, Apt. 4, Cincinnati, OH 45236. January 4, 1985

I'm in favor of letting fan fund supporters know what the mechanics are so that their attention can be focused on the races themselves. In other words, making the funds understood, insofar as what is expected of the various participants, so that there is less likelihood of people being compromised in a reinvent-the-wheel situation and less likelihood of dumb fuckups through ignorance of unstated ethics and unstated purpose as regard the institution. Something which sets down what is required of the candidate and the administrator. In framing guidelines, there are many questions for consideration. A candidate would ask

'what is expected of me; what is my part, financially, in the expenses that I would incur on this trip?' An administrator, looking at fund coffers in a year when they might be low, would wonder if anything should be carried forward to the next race or all funds disbursed to the winner of the present race. Should "details of voting...be kept secret" until after the deadline, or would it be best to have tallies circulated at least to the candidates and nominators? In a year when funding was flush, obviously the trip and the convention and the return trip should be covered by fund monies, but what are the guidelines on how much else should be covered? While it's obviously unethical for an administrator to actively interfere in a fan travel fund race, how shall 'impartiality' be defined when it is only human that an administrator might have a preference? How frequently should financial reports be published -- not should they be published, but how often should they be published? Guidelines -- not specific step-by-step laws, but guidelines, to help ease the way and provide for the continuity.

The winner, going in, wants to know how it works so he/she can be better prepared; the administrator, dealing with a subsequent winner, wants to know what's expected of him/her in disbursing the monies; the rest of us want to know how disbursement works rather than waiting around to find out each time -- and these days not finding out at all. Yes, we're all free-wheelers and cosmic minds and trufans here, but when one of us wins the honor he/she wins responsibility for being a good administrator and the institution should provide a guideline on what that means so that the people who support the institution know it as well as does the administrator.

Who sets the guidelines is a separate matter. Deciding who decides is the stage where most good thrusts die and fail to be more than just rising to an immediate need. You can cut through that stage if the choice of deciding who decides is considered obvious. In this situation, it will only be obvious if the proposal is to utilize the people who have had fan-fund administration experience. You are then reaching into the institution to find the answer rather than attempting to impose one from outside. If fans who have been through the institution are called upon to establish whatever guidelines they think necessary, and they accept suggestions or input for their consideration, I'm certain that whatever comes out is going to be liveable and, more importantly, that it will make the institution better understood by all fans.

§§Who decides who the decision-makers should be is almost as ancient a query as who shall guard the guardians. I think it goes without saying that unless the guidelines come from the past and current administrators themselves, all we're doing here is whistling in the wind. I only ask that fandom's many voices be heard; the action on suggestions or input

must (and should) be taken by Others. No single "Authority" exists over TAFF, nor, really, should need to. Fandom, Itself, should be enough. §§

Besides the suggestions/comments from the preceding fans, some additional material came in from newer (and not-so-new) folks.

SHERYL BIRKHEAD -- 23629 Woodfield Rd., Gaithersburg, MD 20879. [Rcvd.] Nov. 23, 1984

I KNOW something is going on about TAFF from the articles in *HOLLIER THAN THOU*, but for the life of me I don't know what--and I suddenly realize I am unaware of TAFF's actual status. I guess I kinda thought it was a fund that was turned over to the winner--but now that you mention it....

Is there an invested nucleus to the fund or is the whole amount turned over to each new winner, regardless of the actual costs run up? Would it be possible to generate such a nucleus? Say, take a specified percentage of the "take" for a certain number of years and only skim off the income from that as working capital?

Is there any group under whose aegis the fund is run? I never thought about it. I don't advocate more items in the Worldcon pot, but putting that into their hands would make it possible to have results of current status show up in progress reports.

Not to make filthy lucre the goal, but if there is a known income from a portion of the fund, it would be possible to pay someone to handle it. True, it would not be much, but that MIGHT be a possibility.

I understand the fact that some winners may return home burned out--that's a thing I don't have any solution for. Having several supporters might help. In this case a Nominator/supporter would have some sort of tangible responsibility to the candidate and to the fund (that would need to be spelled out, of course). Perhaps that would help take some of the pressure off the winner and insure the trip report.

Being on the coat tails of the Worldcon might make it easier to get ballots sent out (but I will admit that they'd go to a lot of people who won't be voting--or at least not as informed voters)--well in advance of any deadline. I'm not pushing that idea; merely thinking of existing formats/organizations with a widespread audience.

One other suggestion might be a voted-on (say) 3-member panel to oversee the fund--with responsibilities rotating upwards each year for the the 3 years--i.e. Chairman your last year in office, Assistant the year before that, assistant Assistant the first year. That way you would learn as you went and no one person would get nailed with too much work. That would only be for the handling of voting and nominations--and perhaps the Report.

Having the fund be part of the Worldcon would bring the exposure, but it might not be to the "right" group--that was the only thing I could think of.

§§You're not alone in being unaware of TAFF's actual status. Once someone's been in fandom for more than a few years--and I don't think it's important which area of fandom one participates--it is known that TAFF exists, and that it's a good idea... but that's about it. Supposedly the ballot carries all the data that's needed--but as I think we've all seen by now; that ain't so, Meyer. I shudder at the notion that Worldcon would have a hand in the running of TAFF. They'd either give it short shrift or ignore it completely. TAFF has no elements of a "Big Show" to it, and appeals to too few fans to 'count' for much in con-coms' eyes. I like the idea of having TAFF candidate's nominators' assigned specific duties--it might make more people think a bit before they raise their hand to second a person's candidacy. §§

AL CURRY -- 4015 Allston St. #2A, Cincinnati, OH 45209. [Rcvd] November 27, 1984

A bit of nettle for your ETILE, here.

As you mention in the body of your zine, the present twisted skein involving TAFF is hardly the first in the history of fan funds, but I must say that it could well be one of the most damaging. While I have only been involved in fandom for about ten years or so, I think the current difficulties are among the ugliest I've seen.

Were I totally new to fandom, and were I, for the first time, considering involvement in some fashion, with one of the fan funds, the on-going soap opera of politics, in-fighting, apparent favoritism, and manipulation would be more than enough to put me right off my oysters.

Why should Steve and Ro (Cosmos & Chaos) put themselves out by performing for a fund if they have no assurance of the fairness of the proceedings? Why should Fan Q. Public drop his/her hard-earned coppers into a pot if there are questions about the administration of that fund?

Regarding the current situation, I doubt that there is anything to be done. Fandom is hardly conducive to security, in spite of rather substantial sums that circulate through the environs. However, that does not mean we have to be so handicapped in the future.

As you probably recall from our kitchen table discussions at your and Dave's apartment, I support the idea of fan fund committees made up of previous winners.

Pick a number...any number.. I don't care. Five... seven. They would enter the committee immediately following their tour of duty. As each new committee

member entered the lists, the one with the most time onboard would be bumped off the end of the bench... probably with great rejoicing on the part of the bumpee.

This would preclude a lot of the problems we're seeing now because the committee would police itself. While it is possible to have an occasional administrator who would abuse the position, it is highly unlikely that you would have an abusing majority on an administration committee composed of five or seven or more individuals.

Another consideration is the whimsical nature of the rules and regulations.

Perhaps I am being naive, but it would seem to be a fairly straightforward proposition to set up the rules...the period for nomination will be XXX long...the period for balloting will be XXX long...an accounting of monies collected and balloting results will be given within XXX of the end of balloting.

The period for nomination and balloting should be closed on the short side, in other words, no less than XXX long, but open on the long side, depending on a majority vote of the committee. After all, extenuating circumstances do come up on any number of occasions.

Let's face a few realities here, shall we? Fandom and fan funds have long since passed the days when a few hardcore people got together to raise a bit of pocket money. The idea that there should be no accounting of the fan funds is as laughable as no accounting for a Worldcon.

We're hardly a nursery school here. We should be realistic enough to know that some of our members may be less able to resist temptations than others (he said, displaying uncommon generosity).

And finally, to those who maintain that the fan funds are just peachy keen the way they are, I can only say that I personally prefer the tale about the three bears and the little blonde kid.

§§No doubt that I lean toward the committee approach, though my concept is a lot more loosely organized than that of others. However, no matter what structure such a group would have, it must be assumed by themselves, and assumed willingly, or it won't work. I lean toward the one about the three pigs and the Big Bad Wolf, myself... §§

CESAR I. RAMOS -- Apartado Postal 4129, San Juan, PR 00905. November 30, 1984

I support the idea of a set of guidelines for fan fund administrators. As they stand now, they are subject to individual interpretation and thus can easily fall into conflictive arguments.

What should they consist of? Mainly of what should be expected of the administrators (written and explained as simply as possible and as briefly) and when. Aside

of the already written rules on the ballot the "traditional" rules should also be written and clarified. Regular and frequent financial reports should be made on both sides of the Atlantic as an improvement to the current 'rules' for the fund. Administrators may have preference for a candidate, but he/she must remain neutral during the campaign period; I don't think this neutrality should be extended all the way to the TAFF report, though, that should be left to the discrimination of the administrator.

Some suggestions:

The nominations deadline should be either permanently fixed or open. That it can be extended, kept, or disregarded on the administrators whim is objectionable.

It should be established that for there to be a 'race' at least two candidates have to be on the ballot or it must be established that if there is only one candidate for a specific race it will be an 'automatic win'.

Details of voting will be kept secret: this should be clarified. I don't think the vote standings should be revealed during the race. Final voting results are fine.

I'm not supporting the idea of having a Teller. I would prefer the current status of the administrator to continue. The TAFF winner should be in charge of the Fund.

§§To assume a Presidential tone: now there you go ~~again~~; making too much sense to be a Neo, even if at the present time you're so 'famous'. ¶¶Put things on paper, put them out so fans can see them, and then let everyone go on and do their 'jobs'. Makes a lot of sense to me. ¶¶However, I could never support the idea of allowing 'Automatic' wins. It's either two or more candidates (and a pair, which have run in a couple of races for TAFF, counts as "one") or no race. Automatic "Hold Over Funds", if you will...

MIKE SINCLAIR -- 1241 Cherokee Road #4, Louisville, KY 40204. November 27, 1984

Perhaps the problems lie with having persons who have won the award to have to administer the program. Some guidelines are probably very necessary. I would tend to favour a committee at the national level to set up the guidelines and then to appoint a "trustee" arrangement to carry out the annual aspects of the award.

Maybe the last five recipients could meet and appoint a group of trustees.

I realize this all rather tentative, but you did ask for suggestions and I hate to write in "legal" style.

At NASFIC in 1985--maybe a business meeting could be set up for the next Worldcon in Atlanta in 86. Un-

fortunately, there is no United States equivalent to the B.S.F.A. -- a bit overdue, but not likely.

§§Arranging a meeting of the previous 'X' number of recipients might cause an unknown number of problems. By mail, such a thing could be workable, and to be really fair, those on both sides of the Atlantic must be involved. If the US sets up its own rules for TAFF, and the UK sets up its own, to my mind the entire idea of TAFF would be erased. It should be (IMHO) an entirety, with, perhaps, a separate 'flavor/flavour' on each side of the ocean. ¶¶Any such 'committee' or Board of Trustees, or whatever eventually evolves, should be composed of at least the previous six recipients (3 from each side of the Atlantic) plus the current administrators. §§

-MARC ORTLIEB -- GPO Box 2708X, Melbourne, VIC 3001 AUSTRALIA. December 12, 1984

Thanks for the copy of EITLE ONE. I think, what with the recent TAFF brouhaha, it's a timely zine. I'd far rather see discussions like this out in the open than festering away in personal correspondence, or in limited circulation zines. (Mind you, I guess that EITLE itself will have a limited circulation in terms of actual and potential TAFF voters, but what the hell.)

While I liked your breakdown of the TAFF administrators' responsibilities, I think you have missed one aspect that can take up a lot of time - that of fund raising. Perhaps it isn't as important a part of TAFF Administration, as it doesn't cost all that much to fly from North America to Europe nowadays, but I know, from my stint as acting DUFF administrator, that a major concern was making sure that auctions were being run at as many Australian conventions as was possible, and that there was a steady flow of auctionable material. In this respect, the Fund relied very much on other workers, and contributors, who sent in material for auctions. The Fund raising aspect involves piles of boxes of auctionables cluttering up the house, and hassling people who drive to conventions into taking them. It is also the responsibility of the Administrator to keep a high profile, in order to keep up interest in the Fund. I don't think it's that easy a job, if done properly. (Of course, it is a very easy job to do if done shoddily.)

One problem with getting nomination dates and voting details widely disseminated is that fandom itself is diverse, and that there is no longer any one newszine that reaches all fans. True, there are several good ones, like FILE 770, but I think that, whichever newsletters one hits, there are going to be people who complain because the one they get doesn't list the information. I do agree that there should be a regular TAFF newszine, devoted to keeping voters informed, but that depends on the financial status of the Fund, and the time that the Administrator has for such things. The other problem with informing people is that some newszines don't keep to a regular schedule.

\$\$"Limited circulation in terms of actual or potential TAFF voters..." *Coff* Well, ETTLE ONE had 250 copies printed (well, that's what I set the mimeo's counter for...but we've been Having Troubles with it lately, and I guess I got about 240-245 yield) with roughly 220 copies circulated. That's more than last years' vote count, but less than half of this years', and still nowhere near the 'potential' #s of TAFF voters...\$\$Hardly any of the 'fannish' gen- or newszines have circulations beyond 400 or thereabouts, so covering everyone who might vote, or has voted in the past, by means of a fmz is well-nigh impossible. (Maybe if I hit the State Lottery...) Of those zines which are sent overseas, perhaps 15-35 might be sent to the U.K, another dozen or so/the Antipodes--word-of-mouth and/or con publicity is absolutely necessary. \$\$See earlier comments by me and others regarding fundraising. Here in the US such matters seem to be left in the Hands of the Fates, when it comes to TAFF. The greatest amount of fundraising activity is on the part of current and previous DUFF winners, who seem most willing to cooperate with raising cash for TAFF as well. \$\$I agree that a TAFF Newszine should be done--to be distributed to previous voters, known contributors, and to interested news-genzines. To build interest for one here in the States seems to be difficult, though. \$\$

LEAH ZELDES -- 21961 Parklawn, Oak Park, MI 48237
[Rcvd.] December 9, 1984

Suggestions for secret fan fund ballots (a la Science Fiction Oral History Assn.): a two-part ballot -- you vote on Part 1, cut it off and seal it in an envelope. Fill out Part 2 with your name, address, and other voting information. Put Part 2, the sealed envelope, and your voting fee in another envelope and send it to the Administrators. The Administrator then separates the two parts, holding the sealed envelope until after the deadline, when they are opened and counted all at once.

\$\$Well that seems like a sinfully easy and effective way to guarantee that no one, not even the Administrator, will be aware of the vote-count until the balloting period is finished. In case of doubt on the part of the Administrator about a voter's qualifications, the sealed envelope could be kept with the signature portion until such qualifications are cleared up. Sounds far too sensible for TAFF (oops, my cynicism creeps out every once in a while). \$\$

ERIC MAYER -- 1771 Ridge Road East, Rochester, NY 14622. December 5, 1984

I'm glad to see someone is finally making an effort to bring something positive out of the current mess. I have to admit I can only look at TAFF through the eyes of an outsider. As you must know, during the past years I've kept a low profile to fandom, writing mainly for my own small circulation fanzine, oh-

serving the goings-on in Fandom at large carefully, but with only rare comment. It has been only in the past year, with the kids growing and the job situation more settled, that I've decided to stretch out a bit, write for other editors, comment on things fannish, and even take a look at the workings of TAFF. I've been surprised at what I've seen.

Perhaps fans who have been actively involved for a long time have come to take TAFF for granted. It's the only explanation I can see for the haphazard and careless manner in which it seems to be run. I had never imagined that the only rules were the ones on the ballot. Since it's obvious that fans do not agree on what those rules actually mean, you might well say there are no rules at all. This, in regards to a fund containing thousands of dollars, is simply ludicrous, unless you subscribe to the theory that fans are for some reason less prone to temptation than mundanes. Given fans' childish behavior in personal disputes and other matters, it hardly seems possible that fans are superior in the isolated matter of monetary temptation.

It has been put to me, though, that there are not great sums involved so as to necessitate accountings and such annoyances. When I look at recent TAFF winners, and see fans who are capable of expending hundreds of dollars publishing and who, like as not, have hopped the Atlantic on their own before or after their TAFF trip, I can understand this attitude. But as someone who has been on a plane only once, when my present employer paid to fly me up to Rochester for an interview, I cannot accept it.

An accounting is not meant to interfere with the current administrator's trip, or impose undue burdens. It is meant to insure future trips by enabling Fandom to keep tabs on the state of the held over funds. If it were simply a matter of handing over a lump sum to each winner to spend there would be no need for an accounting. But, as I understand it, TAFF makes use of a continuing fund, which contains not only money for the current trip, but also for future trips.

I see no need for complex accounting, but the administrator should let Fandom know what shape the fund is in. I would hate to think that TAFF winners would have to fret over using funds for legitimate reasons in order to make a good financial showing to Fandom. It might be better, rather than worrying over more than a rudimentary accounting, to simply award a certain sum, based on airfares and the total amount in the fund. The adoption of some sort of guidelines, even of a very loose variety, might well attract more, and more varied, candidates. A while back I spoke to a fan friend of mine and pointed out that he was an ideal TAFF candidate. Someone I would even - ulp - go to a con to meet ...if absolutely necessary of course! He replied simply that it wasn't possible. He would, of course, have to buy his wife a ticket as he wouldn't leave her behind, and he would have no money for travel anyway,

once he arrived at his destination. Now this all may be true, but after discussing this I realized that I, at least, had not the slightest idea of what a TAFF winner was entitled to. One plane ticket, as my friend seemed to imply? I have not always kept a high profile in Fandom, but you'd think after I participated for more than a dozen years, that, if the thing were fairly run, I'd have some idea about what winning TAFF entailed. Please don't tell me it's because I didn't speak to the right people in person, or go to cons where it might have been talked about. TAFF was to allow fans to meet who could not have done so otherwise. Information on TAFF has to be equally available to everyone in fandom for participation to be equal. How can anyone decide to run if all he knows of TAFF's rewards and responsibilities is what's on the back of the ballot?

Maybe this is part of the reason TAFF seems to have become such an incestuous affair, with the same group of close acquaintances to all appearances passing it around. Most fans are afraid to get involved because they don't know what TAFF entails, but can see the high burnout rate among TAFF winners. (Which I feel is more likely due to the rigors of fanning to the extent where you can win TAFF, over years, rather than the "rigorous" responsibilities of TAFF itself.)

Maybe I'm just mundanely conservative, but I sense a reluctance on the part of some fans to accept what to me is an inescapable fact - with the gift of funds comes responsibility. The proposition has been advanced that as soon as a fan accepts this gift from Fandom, becomes finally the administrator, he or she shucks off all responsibility. The Administrator is King, and the King can do no wrong. There runs through this attitude a kind of arrogance, an idea on the part of certain fans that they deserve their trips, they don't have to account to the hoi polloi, it is up to them to run things their way.

Whatever the actuality is, TAFF's present set up, with its word of mouth rules, whimsical deadlines, biased and arrogant Administrators, mystery funding, makes it seem an invitation-only party. If one is not among the inner circle there is no way to know even the simplest facts about TAFF. Is it any wonder that fans have had to be recruited just to give the appearance of there being a race? Most fans feel that they, somehow, do not qualify, and even if they feel they do, they have no idea of what they might be letting themselves in for if they do run.

A question: under the current "system", what happens if an Administrator doesn't fill any responsibilities, just spends all the dough and takes an accounting job? I realize the myth states that TAFF winners, as the chosen representatives of fandom, must be perfect in all ways, but I've seen little evidence of that lately.

\$\$"Great sums" is a relative term--U.S. deficit, in the 3 trillion \$ range; Worldcon profits, in the

\$200,000 range; TAFF coffers, in the \$5,000 range. Still, to some fans, that's a lot of money. Having been in financial straits for a goodly portion of my fannish life, I sympathize with the notion that anyone who says that "any fan can afford International travel" is speaking nonsense. Even if a fan gives up all other fanac, such trips can cause a massive strain on many fans' budgets. Needless to say, you aren't alone in being a fan who really has no idea of how the fan funds actually operate. We need this information to be far more widely disseminated.

CY CHAUVIN -- 14248 Wilfred, Detroit, MI 48213
November 25, 1984

Most of your reforms for TAFF seem sensible, but I don't know how you could get anyone to put them into effect, except through peer pressure. Perhaps convention committees and other groups could attach strings to their contributions ("We'll give you money, but only if you make certain reforms, such as issuing financial statements twice a year"). Or you could vote for candidates who promise reforms.

Fans that strictly go to conventions may have a hard time winning TAFF unless their names and reputations have become known some way in England and Europe. People in the U.S. who are sending a TAFF delegate overseas may vote for a friend or someone they think someone in Europe would like to meet, but the fans overseas are also voting for the ones they know or those they would like to meet--and usually they only know of fanzine-active fans.

Actually, if pressed, I would have to admit that I think TAFF ought to go. All it does is cause controversy and sour arguments. As Greg Pickersgill has pointed out, anyone who really wants to make a transatlantic trip can do so (DUFF is another case). Round trip airfare from Detroit to England via Toronto is only \$350. Anyone who seriously saves can afford this. As far as other aspects of TAFF go--the popularity contest and "Representative of Fandom" bits--I really think we could do better without them. Fandom is at best an egalitarian society, and setting people up, handing out fan awards, taking egoboo polls & etc. is simply not worth it if it causes continuous controversy. But I hardly expect anyone to listen to me since there are a number of fans who seem to thrive on controversy.

\$\$What is a "peer" in regards to TAFF? My "Income" is \$325 a month SSI Disability. Can you really suggest that I can save enough for a trip to Britain without giving up all the rest of fanac which makes fandom worth being in? And for a period of years? Not all fans have well-paying jobs. Eliminate the things you mention--fan funds, polls, etc., and the contentous fans among us would still manage to find something to fight about. The way you dress, the color of paper used for your fanzine, the cons you do or don't attend. Egalitarian society? Hal! \$\$

While I used to be quite involved with the fan funds, I've sort of drifted away. Some thoughts, which could apply to any fan fund:

1. There is no reason why a complete accounting of the past fund shouldn't/couldn't be published in the Program Book of the Worldcon. Yes, I realize that this is a free page or more when you consider there are several funds, but there is no reason the size of type couldn't be chosen to accommodate this. It should also list the assets of the funds. Of course I'm not sure that the persons running the funds wish this sort of info spread around.

2. Giving thanks for work done is unfaaanish. It is expected of True Faaans that anything done is not to be recognized, unless you are one of the really important faaans. But then again this is their God-given Right!

3. The idea of some standardized times for nominations and voting is anathema to chaos. The idea of allowing some practical sense to penetrate the secret workings of the fan funds is terrible.

4. Putting out the ballots so that they could be handed out at Worldcons along with the other stuff one picks up when registering is too practical a thought. Why try to reach lots of people when you can keep it a secret?

5. I think one should keep a running total of votes. That way True Faaans would know if someone not worthy of the trip is in front and they then can go out and get him or her. This is true faaaanish style.

6. One thing you should make clear to prospective candidates. They must take an oath of poverty. If you have a steady job and can afford not to have to beg in order to get to a con, then you are too rich to go on these trips. While it's not written down, poverty is a main consideration. After all, a True Faaan doesn't concern him/herself with such things as money. All one needs is enough to get out fanzines.

7. If a prospective candidate doesn't publish (having published isn't good enough). After all, it's the what have you done for me lately attitude which prevails) don't even consider running. You aren't a True Faaan and hence not worthy of the honor!

8. It helps if you live in a town with a large faaaanish population. This helps in getting the votes you need. Besides, it is expected that you will then help someone from your town win in a later race.

Jackie, I think you are whistling in the wind. Bringing order to the fan funds is faaaanishly unreasonable. You will be castigated for even thinking that.

It is in your head. I hope you won't be beaten around it too much.

Boy, and here I thought I was angry. Careful, Jan, you're going to destroy the notion that each-n-e-vry fan is tickled pink with the current set-up of the fan funds.

That's the bulk of the commentary. Also Heard From were: IRVIN KOCH, FRANK DENTON ["ETTL is an oasis of serenity in the squabble that seems to have surrounded this institution of late."] MARTHA BECK, NEIL REST, ARTHUR HLAVATY, VINCE CLARKE [The words "well known and popular" ... treat the USA as one entity. [Nor] do they distinguish between 'Convention' fans and 'fanzine' fans, for the simple reason that only fanzine fans are likely to be known on both sides of the Atlantic.], ARTHUR THOMSON, PAUL SKELTON, and a half-dozen others who gave encouragement in person, but who hesitated to set their reactions on paper.

Too many letters wanted to discuss matters outside the scope of this zine's topic. To those who might feel resentment over having their remarks edited out or reduced to a WAHF, may I suggest that you publish your thoughts in your own zine, with your own efforts and cash? I have no quarrel with those who do this, that's what fanzines are for -- or at least one of their purposes. But I stated very clearly that ETTLE would not serve as a feud forum, and feud or feud-like comments will not run in its pages. I shall also do my best to cut out names of any fan which is included in a negative manner. ETTLE exists (at the moment, at least) as a forum to air opinions and put forth suggestions regarding the future structure of TAFF, as well as comments on the matter of whether such changes are needed at all. It seems best to this editor to keep such discussion above the personal level so that specific issues, not personalities surrounding those issues, are debated. If it's other matters you wish to write about, do so in another forum or in a personal letter. My resources are limited, but I'll do my best to respond -- though I may not be as prompt as I should be.

As you will note, this issue is running too long to be sent at the one-ounce First Class Rate. I am therefore including Terry Hughes comments on how he handled his end of TAFF during his tenure as Administrator. I hope other former TAFF Administrators will note Terry's wordage, and use it as a guide toward putting similar remembrances down on paper. ETTLE is being sent to as many past
(Continued on back page)

BY TERRY HUGHES

Terry Hughes won TAFF in 1979 and took his trip to Seacon, the Worldcon held in Brighton, England that August. He surrendered his duties to Stu Shiffman, who won in 1980 for a trip over Easter of 1981.

Perhaps now is a good time to go into some detail on how I operated TAFF when it was (partially) within my power and at the same time stress those elements of the present structure I feel are worthwhile.

The work of being TAFF administrator starts well before the actual TAFF trip. One of the strengths of the present system is that when a new person wins TAFF he or she receives information and suggestions from the outgoing administrator on the same side of the Atlantic. The winner then gets in contact with the other administrator (or vice-versa) who has already been through one TAFF race as administrator and thus is an old hand. The newcomer further benefits from the fact that the next race will be from across the ocean so the bulk of the work falls on the shoulders of the other administrator. This gives the greenhorn a year in which to gain experience before he or she has to be the one to run most of the show. This is a very sound system.

Roy Tackett gave me the good news of my victory and passed along words of advice and the North American TAFF treasury. I got in touch with Peter Roberts about what had to be done about setting things up for the next TAFF race (the one to the US).

One of the first administrative tasks I undertook was to write to the Noreascon II committee to see what support they would be willing to give TAFF. In particular I wanted to see if they would supply the European TAFF winner with a free room during the convention. This was a big concern to me because at Suncon I learned from Peter Roberts that he was paying for his own because the convention had not given him a free room. I was shocked! I had assumed that the convention always provided the TAFF winner (and the DUFF winner too) with a free room. I learned that this was only the case on occasion--it depended on the concom. Because of this, when I assumed the mantle of TAFF administrator I wanted to see what I could do. So I wrote to the Boston concom to plant the idea of giving the TAFF winner a free room which I suggested could be one of the free rooms the worldcon hotel normally gives to the concom.

I got a reply from Leslie Turek, The Noreascon II chairman, thanking me for writing early so that it could be considered before things got too firmly scheduled and before the pressures of putting on a worldcon got too great. Leslie was most obliging and generously offered the TAFF winner a free room in an overflow hotel as well as agreeing to my request for free space in the program book for TAFF. All my dealings with Leslie and the Noreascon II folks were most pleasant and I found them very helpful and generous.

The chairman also offered me a half-page ad in Progress Report 4 which I used to briefly explain TAFF and to say a bit about the two TAFF candidates as well as mentioning that ballots could be obtained from me. (The publication schedule was such that this really didn't allow for much impact on voting but it should have made some folks aware of TAFF.) Noreascon II gave a full page of the Program Book to TAFF and even though the deadline for copy was just a couple of weeks after the election I was able to get in the page of information.

I had already requested and received photographs from the candidates (Jim Barker and Dave Langford) ahead of time so that the con attendees would know what the winner looked like so they could speak to him. So I spent half the space giving an introduction to the winner (Dave Langford) and used the other half to describe TAFF including the two main purposes for which it was founded [1...to promote increased contact between the two fandoms on each side of the Atlantic Ocean and 2...to honor those fans who voters feel have worked towards this goal and who are well known to both fandoms] along with a list of all TAFF winners up to and including Dave. I also mentioned that there would be a TAFF auction at the con and that information would be available at the con about the next TAFF race (to send a North American fan to the 1981 British Easter-con).

I was fortunate to have a con-chairman like Leslie Turek to deal with. Not all TAFF administrators are so lucky. I don't know if all TAFF administrators take this step but I assume so. However, asking won't do any good if the concom is not receptive to the idea. It doesn't always work. (For instance, I did not get a free room at Seacon.)

The time frame for the next TAFF race/^{was}compressed because my TAFF trip was to Seacon (the Worldcon was in Britain that year) which was not held on the traditional Eastercon date. This difference of several months played havoc with normal balloting scheduling. In the TAFF race the administrators must establish a voting period so that the winner can be determined with sufficient time for him or her to get the necessary paper work (passports) done and to take advantage of APEX fares (which require purchase of a ticket well before the trip) and make other reservations, all of which require time to plan out a schedule for arrival and departure and everything in between. The basic prin-

ciple is to supply the winner with adequate time to do these things.

I distributed ballots to newszines and various North American faneds who I thought might publish in time to distribute ballots to their readers. Even though I did not publish an issue of my own fanzine in this period I did mail out the ballot with a covering sheet to all non-Europeans on my mailing list.

When the voting deadline was reached, Peter Roberts and I exchanged vote total information and we each published the results (I published a list of votes cast in categories of North America, Europe, and the grand total and I listed the names of those who sent eligible ballots to me. (Unfortunately I didn't find a copy of this in my TAFF files which means it is in one of my boxes of fanzines and papers.)

After Dave Langford won TAFF, I began consulting with him about the next North American race. Just as Peter Roberts (with my agreement and input) set the dates for the European race Dave had just won, I (with Dave's agreement and input) set the dates for the next race and got the ball rolling. The exact date of the flyer I distributed to newszine editors and other interested parties isn't recorded, but it must have been in June 1980. I also sent it to potential candidates who had written to me for information (whose letters I had answered prior to doing the flyer) and to those I had heard rumored to be considering running. As you can see this flyer set out the nomination period of one month, a period I feel is adequate since most TAFF candidates would have already tentatively lined up backers if they were serious about running. It's hard to imagine someone waiting until the last minute to get nominators since it is a necessary and well known requirement. (I assume my own case is typical in that I had people in both the US and the UK urging me to run for close to a year before I decided to and once I had reached my decision there were lots of potential nominators to choose from.) In the flyer I set out four requirements for a nominee and also pointed out that generally candidates were fans well known on both sides of the Atlantic. I also gave the dates for voting.

In addition, I indicated that TAFF ballots would be available at the 1980 Boston Worldcon. I decided on this last point in order to boost the total number of eligible (and knowledgable) votes cast. I also wanted to do this because ballot distribution by fanzine is not always reliable (many things can come up to interfere with publication schedules). Normally I consider ballot distribution within their home country to be a responsibility of the candidates. They are, after all, the ones seeking votes. However this time I wanted to give an extra push. The results were not what I had hoped for (fewer people voted than in the previous North American race) and

I still can't figure out why. (In addition to having ballots available at the DUFF/TAFF table with someone there to collect voting fees and ballots, I also gave each candidate (Gary Farber and Stu Shiffman) a bundle of ballots that they could distribute. If my memory serves me right, I also distributed ballots at that years' Philcon.)

Once all the nominees were in (only two out of the six who had expressed interest) I made up ballots and distributed master copies to the European TAFF administrator, the candidates, newszines, and faneds. Other ballots were mailed to those who had sent votes to me in the last election and to those groups who had made donations above a certain level.

After Stu Shiffman had won, I did another TAFF NEWS flyer which gave the results as well as votes broken down into North American, European, and total. I again listed everyone who had sent in an eligible ballot to me and, since Dave Langford had airmailed me his voting list (I waited for it because one vote was in doubt until he made a decision), I also listed those who sent eligible ballots to him. Again this was done promptly. After speaking with Dave on the phone and getting his results, I gave each candidate a call that same day to announce the results.

By the way, in each election I dealt with the margin of victory was great enough that disqualified ballots would not have made a difference except for final vote totals.

At the conventions I attended I appeared on TAFF panels, worked auctions, and spoke about TAFF with anyone who was interested, etc. Talking TAFF comes with the job.

In terms of financial matters, I operated in the following way. When I got the TAFF money from Roy Tackett, I put my winner's allotment into my savings account. The remainder I put into (what was then) a high-interest savings account that could only be withdrawn from or deposited to on a quarterly basis. Roy continued to forward TAFF checks sent to him. I assumed he had responded to donors, but in most cases I also wrote notes of thanks along with an encouragement to donate again in subsequent years. (When I turned things over to Stu Shiffman, I forwarded such checks to him in the same manner. I also tried to send thank-you notes to donors and told them I had forwarded the checks and said that future correspondence should be with him.) Since several checks were made out to TAFF and not to me or Roy, I opened a regular savings account in the name of TAFF and myself. Quarterly I would make transfers to the high-interest account. When I received a donation directly (as was the case after my election became known) I tried to send a personal note of thanks within two weeks. Sometimes it ended up taking more like a month. When I was on my TAFF trip the delay was (naturally) even greater. I always encouraged the donors to do so again in the future. There may have been some I failed to thank

TAFF NEWS

Nominations for the 1981 Trans-Atlantic Fan Fund delegate will be accepted from July 15th, 1980 through August 15th, 1980. The requirements for a nominee are as follows:

- (1) Since this TAFF trip will be to the 1981 British Eastercon (Yorcon), the nominee must be a North American fan.
- (2) Each nominee must have five (5) nominators: three (3) from North America and two (2) from Europe. No more than 5 nominators will be accepted.
- (3) Each nominee must submit a platform of not more than 100 words to be printed on the TAFF ballot along with the list of nominators. (This platform should be written by a nominator or a nominee but must be submitted by the nominee.)
- (4) Each nominee must promise, barring acts of God, to attend the 1981 British Eastercon if elected and post a \$5.00 good-faith bond. This bond is non-refundable and considered a donation to TAFF.

Ballots for the TAFF contest will be prepared as soon as possible after the closing date for nominations and distributed. Ballots will be available at the 1980 Worldcon in Boston. Fanzine editors are encouraged to distribute these ballots with their fanzines.

The voting period will be from August 22nd, 1980 through December 1st, 1980. Instructions and qualifications for voting will be contained on the ballots.

Generally the nominees running for TAFF delegate are fans well known on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean. There is no limit on the number of nominees on a ballot except that there must be at least two. While most of the time there are three nominees on a ballot, there have been as many as seven in one race.

NOMINEES SHOULD SEND THE LIST OF THEIR NOMINATORS, A COPY OF THEIR PLATFORMS, AND THE \$5.00 GOOD-FAITH BONDS TO THE NORTH AMERICAN TAFF ADMINISTRATOR:

Terry Hughes
6205 Wilson Blvd., #102
Falls Church, Virginia 22044
USA

If you have any questions, please contact Terry Hughes.

This is being distributed to newszine editors and interested parties. Your help in publicizing this information would be greatly appreciated. Thanks!

TAFF
NEWS

STU SHIFFMAN WINS TAFF!!!

The 1980/81 Trans-Atlantic Fan Fund contest to select a North American fan to be sent to the 1981 British Eastercon has come to an end with Stu Shiffman winning in the voting in both North America and Europe. Gary Farber came in second, with Hold Over Funds a distant third and no write-in votes. The actual totals are as shown below:

	<u>North America</u>	<u>Europe</u>	<u>Total</u>
Stu Shiffman	42	38	80
Gary Farber	36	7	43
Hold Over Funds	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>
	80	45	125

Ballots received by North American Administrator: Clifton Amsbury, Marie L. Bartlett, John D. Berry, Alan L. Bostick, David Bratman, C. W. "Ned" Brooks, Jr., Seth Breidbart, Larry Carmody, Avedon Carol, Cy Chauvin, David Clark, Rich Coad, Eli Cohen, Hank Davis, Richard Davis, Lea M. Day, Al deBettencourt, Jr., Frank Denton, Michael Dobson, Lise Eisenberg, Gary Farber, Moshe Feder, Jan Howard Finder, Kenneth W. Fletcher, Terry L. Floyd, George Flynn, Donald Franson, Gilbert Galer, Mike Glicksohn, Seth Goldberg, Jeanne Gomoll, Patrick Nielsen Hayden, Teresa Nielsen Hayden, Chip Hitchcock, Norman Hollyn, Marilyn J. Holt, Denys Howard, Doug Hoylman, Ken Josenhans, Gayle A. Kaplan, Linda K. Karrh, Jerry Kaufman, Jay Kinney, Owen K. Laurion, Hope Leibowitz, Rebecca Lesses, Anne Laurie Logan, Hank Luttrell, Lesleigh M. Luttrell, Richard F. McAllister, John Millard, Craig Miller, Teresa Minambres, Bruce E. Pelz, D. Potter, Pat Potts, Kennedy "Kipy" Poyser, Sarah S. Prince, Sue-Rae Rosenfeld, Ron Salomon, Kate Schaefer, Andi Shechter, Joyce Scribner, Stu Shiffman, Richard H. E. Smith II, Frank M. Sobolewski, Becky Bennett Thomson, John Thomson, Suzanne V. Tompkins, Bruce Townley, David L. Travis, Gregg T. Trend, Anna Vargo, Tamara A. Vining, Michael Walsh, Taral Wayne, George H. Wells, Michael A. Willis, Walter K. Willis, Benjamin M. Yalow, and that makes 80.

Ballots received by European Administrator: Michael Ashley, Chris Atkinson, Jim Barker, Harry Bell, Eric Bentcliffe, Allen Boyd-Newton, Geoff Cox, Alan Dorey, Paul Dormer, Malcolm Edwards, Graham England, Colin Fine, Rune Forsgren, Mike Glycer, Roelof Goudriaan, Steven J. Green, Eve Harvey, John Harvey, Steev Higgins, Martin Hoare, Coral Jackson, Rob Jackson, Graham James, Phil James, Naveed Khan, Paul Kincaid, Pete Lyon, Peter Mabey, Ian Maule, Janice Maule, Chris Morgan, Pauline Morgan, Joseph Nicholas, Darroll Pardoe, Andy Porter, David Pringle, Rochelle Reynolds, Peter Roberts, Bob Shaw (real one), Norman Shorrocks, Peter Singleton, Brian Smith, Kevin Smith, Roger Waddington, Peter Weston and that makes 45.

Stu Shiffman is now the North American Administrator for TAFF and all US\$ denominated donations should be made out to him, and not to tired old Terry Hughes who concludes his duties with this report (except for that damned TAFF report I'm still working on).

If you voted but do not find your name on either list on the other side then you are one of those persons whose ballots either arrived too late or was otherwise invalidated. If your name was misspelled then you have sloppy handwriting.

The next TAFF race will bring a European fan to a North American worldcon so if you are interested in being a candidate (or if you are interested in being a candidate in the next TAFF race which sends a North American fan to an Eastercon) please contact the current TAFF Administrators, whose names and addresses are:

Stu Shiffman
19 Broadway Terrace
#1D
New York, New York 10040
United States

Dave Langford
22 Northumberland Ave.
Reading,
Berkshire RG2 7PW
United Kingdom

These two fine gentlemen will issue information concerning dates and qualifications. They can answer any question you may have about the Trans-Atlantic Fan Fund.

* * * * *

In closing I want to extend my thanks to the following people for their extraordinary aid to TAFF: Joyce Scrivner, Jan Howard Finder, Joni Stopa and the other Wilcon folks, Bruce Pelz and the other Westercon folks, Leslie Turek and the other Noreascon II folks, and Rusty Hevelin.

+ Terry Hughes +

Next issue may employ a segmented format, to keep various areas of TAFF (e.g. nomination periods, balloting procedure & wordage, funding, administrative duties, qualifications for Candidates, nominators, voters, etc., as well as good ole Misc.) separate. I would like to get this material/input into the hands of whatever past and current administrators that may possibly meet during Eastercon as early as possible, to perhaps serve as food for thought or grist for their mills.

Thanks to those who wrote, especially to those who kept ~~to the topic~~ it brief, and I hope to hear from you again SOON -- as well as from those of you who have been holding back from joining in the discussion. TAFF needs the aid of every fan who's willing to pitch in. To my knowledge, there's not a single non-fan on ETTLE's mailing list.

~~~~~

ETTLE TWO  
JACKIE CAUSGROVE  
6828 ALPINE AVE. #4  
CINCINNATI, OH 45236  
U.S.A.



FIRST CLASS MAIL

Lee Hoffman  
3335 Harbor Blvd.  
Port Charlotte FL 33952