

ting any changes. Terry's account of how he did it pretty well sets out how I did it.

For my own part I would like to see a minimum of three candidates to forestall ties. I would make one correction here in Terry's article. Bill Dowers and I did end up in a tie but Bill did not decline the trip because of lack of funds in the TAFF treasury. Len Moffatt, when he contacted me, said there was enough in the treasury to send us both (and there was ...just barely). Bill declined for personal reasons which left a nice nest egg for the next race.

Jan Finder speaks sarcastically about making prospective candidates take an oath of poverty and I thoroughly agree with the need for sarcasm on that point. TAFF is not and never has been a charity designed to send some poor (but true) fan to a convention he (or she) could not otherwise afford. I also get somewhat nauseous when I hear someone announce that he is going to run for TAFF rather like a politician seeking office. Uh-uh. You don't run for TAFF. Somebody will nominate you if they think you deserve it.

§ Oops. You caught me in a typo. I had intended to backspace and put hyphens under those quotation marks, to turn the phrase "not much" into a quasi-quote. Substituting 'imply' for 'say' would've made my intent more clear. Mea culpa... It makes sense to set a minimum number of candidates. In a sense, Terry's statement that "there can be an unlimited number of candidates as long as there are at least two" could be said to meet that standard. If one accepts the notion of Hold Over Funds as being a third candidate. (Of course, if one accepted that concept, then one would have to admit that a single candidate, plus Hold Over Funds, would satisfy Terry's requirement--and I don't think that's what he meant.) Finding three candidates for each race--flesh-n-blood candidates, that is--might be difficult some years. So much depends on who's already announced that they're going to stand. ¶ As far as non-existing Poverty Rule is concerned, I've seen it brought up in a number of races, and have thought all along that it wasn't valid. To be sure, an individual voter might decide to choose one of two otherwise-equal candidates because of financial standings, but there's nothing in the rules that makes impoverishment a requirement for candidacy. Voting preferences, though, are hardly Rules, and it's irritating when they are presented as if they were Law. To me it indicates a need for a set of rules to be published and disseminated, so that such Unstated Regulations--which often contradict each other--are eliminated. §§

ETHEL LINDSAY -- 69 Barry Road, Carnoustie, Angus, DD7 7QQ, Scotland UK. Rcvd. Feb. 11, '85

On the whole I agree with those who say that as TAFF has survived so long best not to tinker with it. Much more publicity about its history seems the greatest need.

I suppose the thing that shocked me most was finding out that Terry Hughes and Peter Roberts had both been paying for their own hotel rooms! Considering the Convention finances these days this seems very mean.

You are asking for past delegates to write---

My time was back in 1962 and I spent 31 days in the USA thus using up my holiday time for the whole year. I was given my air ticket to N.York which practically cleared out the Fund at this end. I myself bought a £99 ticket for unlimited Greyhound Bus travel. That took quite a bit of saving on my part and the amount of personal money I took with me was £40. When I reached N.York I was met by Don and Elsie Wollheim who drove me to the Lupoffs who had offered their hospitality. Dick Eney offered to drive me to Chicago and to pay for my food on the way. The Con Committee paid for my hotel room; and whenever I appeared in any eating-place there was some fan who insisted on paying for my food. In Chicago, Ron Ellik as the previous TAFF delegate was able to give me 30 dollars from his end of the Fund. I went by Greyhound to Los Angeles where I stayed at the home of Len Moffatt -- to San Francisco where my host was Dick Ellington --back by Greyhound where I finished my stay with the Wollheims, and Elsie drove me to the airport.

You'll notice that I never had to pay for rooms at all -- could not have afforded it. Whenever I was in the company of fans (most of the time I was) they paid for my food. In L.A. I was gifted a book of tickets for Disneyland. I recall a typical episode from there. I was with a group of about 10 who phoned Bjo Trimble to ask if they could come visit. Yes, said Bjo, meal will cost you a dollar each -- except Ethel of course. As the TAFF delegate I was treated by everyone as an honored guest and I know that we in turn treated Wally Weber -- the next delegate -- in the same way.

Every day I kept notes and used this to write my TAFF Report. I financed it myself. Sold it for 7/6d or one dollar and all proceeds to TAFF.

As the administrator I kept a notebook and a receipt book. Every donation received a receipt and note of thanks. I put out flyers with publicity news. I sent out a sheet asking people to order their copy of the Report (I've enclosed that, found one left). All the Reports sold; I ran off 250. I have a solitary, precious copy left. I was involved with other TAFF administrators for many years afterwards. That involvement is long past now, of course, but I would feel duty bound to help in any way if asked to do so.

I can't think of anything in my life that gave me more joy than my trip as TAFF delegate.

§ The amount of tinkering to be done to TAFF shouldn't be much and lies mainly in the areas of defining terms. As is obvious from the various comments made about TAFF, here as well in other places, there are

many areas which could use some clarification. The requirements each candidate must meet (and none of this "We Know What Is Meant" stuff: If it's "known" what's really intended by certain terms, then that fuller description can be used, not a vaguer, less-restrictive-sounding one. What duties and obligations are to be assumed by the winner(s). Which expenses will be covered by the Fund, and which may be covered if the Fund's assets are hefty enough. Until things are set down on paper somewhere so fans can refer to something concrete, confusions are unavoidable. ¶ Nowadays the Fund's assets are in much better shape than they were when you won. Various expenses paid out of your own purse are able to be covered by TAFF itself. It seems only fair to me, to let the Fund cover items such as publishing expenses, postage, and phone calls, as long as the treasury is in robust condition. §§

Lest you get the impression that this issue of ETILE is a duplicate of the last one, here are some new voices to enter the discussion. Staying on the same side of the Atlantic for a while, here are a couple of views from two other Britfen...

PAUL "SKEL" SKELTON -- 25 Bowland Close, Offerton,
Stockport, Cheshire, SK2 5NW
U.K. January 22, 1985

Nothing really constructive, just observations. Take Dave Lanford and his 'similar sized voting pool'. If you take the races you published figures for and ignore the 84/85 campaign, which was, I'm sure you will admit, somewhat anomalous (and also ignore 1971 in order to give an equal number of UK/US races) we come up with averages of 85 (UK) as against 102 (US) which, all things considered, is pretty close. Close enough for fanwriting, wouldn't you say? Yes, in any single race the sending country tends to outvote the receiver, but overall, the two pools are reasonably similar.

My problem is, that I either agree with what various people say in ETILE, or I disagree. I don't really have anything new to add. Other than this....

I have the feeling that ETILE is going to be ignored by the people who ought to be paying most attention to it. I get a distinct feeling of 'TAFF-Behind Closed Doors', and that the people who ought to be listening to the widest range of input they can possibly get are really only going to listen to what they want to hear, whereupon they will go away and secretly work out what's best for us. I would love a truly open TAFF. Yes, all power must reside in the administrators, and rightly so, but I'd like to see them explain every decision they make, by way of accepting that TAFF belongs to Fandom. TAFF is entrusted to the administrators. The power is entrusted to the administrators. When they use it, they cannot be sanctioned, but they should explain. They should say -- "hey Fandom, here's how I'm using the powers

you entrusted to me." Fandom in general shouldn't be able to override their decisions, but it should be able to pass judgement on them. It just seems to me that TAFF is a trust, and one should be accountable for the way one administers, uses, or abuses a trust. Nobody is trying to take away the power of the TAFF administrators to conduct TAFF business, nor question their right to so do. One is merely trying to remind them that they hold this power, this responsibility, on trust from Fandom in general.

§ While 84/85 was an anomaly in many regards, by casting off its totals, along with 1971's (which was also anomalous in many of its aspects), you then narrow the number of races from which you draw your averages to those which include the three lowest-drawing, as far as number of ballots cast, in all of TAFF history. In order to make averages meaningful, you have to include the 'anomalous years' along with all the rest--high and low alike. Next to 84/85, 1971 drew the largest number of voters in the 12 races I have figures for. ¶ [As an interesting sidelight, I should mention that the 1971 European total of 181 was the first time your side of the Pond outballoted North America. (According to LOCUS #89, dated July '71) As the winner was a German fan, Mario Bosnyak, it can be assumed a hefty part of that European count came from countries outside the U.K. In reporting the figures for 72/73 and 74, the count was broken down into European (66 and 36, respectively) and U.K. (27 and 79, respectively). After that year, no differentiation was made between sources of the European vote. ¶ I wish I had the figures for voting prior to 1971, but I've heard that they also fluctuated widely, depending on the popularity of the candidates and/or the enthusiasm of the administrators. ¶ The new North American Administrators seemingly intend to open a discussion on TAFF via more "official" channels. I suggest you request a copy of TAFFLUVIA (S.A.S.E., if possible) from Patrick and Teresa Nielsen Hayden, 75 Fairview #2B, New York, NY 10040, USA. I consider the first issue definitely a step in the right direction. I have no idea if any overseas distribution is being planned, but I gather a meeting/panel on TAFF will be held during Eastercon. §§

TERRY JEEVES -- 230 Bannerdale Rd., Sheffield, S11
9FE U.K. January 22, 1985

I've been a bit reluctant to get into this TAFF argument because I don't feel that I can really contribute anything useful, but since you have been so thoughtful as to include me in the distribution, the least I can do is let you know my views...even if they are not worth much. Here goes.

1. TAFF is a worthy cause, one of fandom's best ideas and worthy of perpetuation...but, sadly, like most such institutions, from time to time arguments crop up. If Club (even Government)

and Society rules can't prevent arguments, we can't really expect TAFF to avoid 'em.

2. In the past, TAFF's loosely worded... 'the candidate should be someone fairly well known on both sides of the Atlantic' was ample. We all knew what it meant...and played by it. However, several things happened. TAFF lacked publicity. I recall that one year I proposed that at our annual Con each candidate should be given a five minute programme spot to put his (or her) case. The idea was turned down, and the con...like most others...paid lip service to TAFF by donating £x to its kitty...which didn't help new fen to appreciate what TAFF was...or who the candidates were or what they were like. So we need publicity...not only of TAFF, but of the candidates.
3. Some TAFF candidates have taken the money...and never have been heard of again after their trip. No Trip Report...no fanzines...just GAFIA. We can't avoid this, but surely, one criteria might be that a candidate should have been around awhile (which the well known rule should cover).
4. I blushingly admit that for two or three years now, I haven't voted in TAFF. One year because I (honest!) never got a voting form... and by the time I knew it was 'on', it was too late. Other times, the candidates were either unknown...or not to my taste (it happens).

Out of all this waffle emerges my suggestion that we give more publicity to the TAFF idea. MORE publicity to the candidates (a platform doesn't say much) and our conventions should give some programme space to plugging the whole shebang...a five minute explanation plus five minutes by each candidate shouldn't take more than half an hour on any Con programme...and would help TAFF immensely. Candidates should...as keeps surfacing...be fairly well known on both sides of the Atlantic, have been in fandom for several years ...and dare I suggest??? Have shown that they are capable of producing a Trip Report afterwards. Heck, on my own two privately financed trips I produced Reports both times. Incidentally, one was partly financed by First Fandom, and the other came out of my lump sum retirement money. Despite one contributor's comment that the flight can be done for around \$350... cheapest I've seen (other than an airport-haunting sojourn after last minute stand by) is about £400... add on £50 travel and hotel at this end, your travel and hotel over in the USA, and I can't see it being done for under a thousand quid...and like you, I for one can't afford to save that money.

Maybe the answer to that Trip Report would be to withhold £x or \$x and only pay this out on issuance of a Trip Report?

Sorry I can't be more use than that...but it is of little use in talking about what has happened in the past or what was decided...and using that as a rule for today. Let's say we need:

Publicity for TAFF and Candidates

A Candidate known to both Pond sides.

A Candidate who has been around a while and who can produce a trip report.

§ Somewhere along the line "the candidate should be someone fairly well known on both sides of the Atlantic" was reworded (at least on the TAFF ballots) into "the candidate should be a well-known fan", which is subject to a much broader interpretation than the original wording. I think the ballot should be altered to reflect that point. ¶¶ Giving exposure to the candidates at conventions seems a marvelous idea. Even for cons which the candidates themselves can't attend, it should be fairly easy to come up with some worthy person to represent them. And it would, of course, help immensely to acquaint newer fen with TAFF and its ideals. ¶¶ Lately, the Worldcons have shown a tendency to make any contribution they may decide on contingent on the production of a Trip Report. I think that was an overdue idea. If it becomes a permanent fixture, it might help in encouraging the issuance of Reports to allot a sum from the Fund (again, assuming it remains healthy enough to do so) to help defray publishing costs. Distribution should be covered by asking for an extra amount for postage, but as long as the cash is there, printing costs--which can be considerable these days --could be covered by the Fund. ¶¶ Thanks for the address of Jones and Bulmer. §§

Moving on westward across the Atlantic, in fact all the way across the continent, let's continue with yet another New Voice...

DAVID BRATMAN -- PO Box 662, Los Altos, CA 94022
January 11, 1985

I realize it's the day after the scheduled issue of ETILE TWO, but it's also a few days after I heard the results of the current TAFF race, and now that that's over with, I feel freer to turn to more theoretical matters. I have no idea how you will want to organize the sub-topics of discussion, so let me just throw out a few thoughts that were sparked by your commentary:

1. A certain amount of inconsistency is inherent in any organization whose administrators are 3 to 6 thousand miles apart, and which has a complete staffing turnover every three years.

2. A few well-chosen rules might be a good idea, but a heavy weight of them, in an attempt to insure consistency and fairness, is asking for trouble (and requires a court system much tougher than "the court of fannish opinion" to enforce).

3. Since TAFF, like virtually everything else in fandom, is strictly run by volunteer labor, finding a

permanent Administrator or even a Teller who is actually able to do the job may be more difficult than getting good work out of the present Administrator system. Therefore I am opposed to changing that aspect of the system.

4. I don't know if the Eastercon schedule is as firmly set as the US Worldcon/NASFIC schedule is, but even if the date is only approximate, it should be possible to set permanent nomination & voting closing dates. This would solve the problem which prevented the nomination of Martha Beck. Therefore this is one change I would like to see.

5. Even if we do nothing, TAFF will probably survive. It is one of the few formal fanzine institutions, apart from certain cons, which has enough momentum to do so.

I agree that a "heavy weight" of rules would not be beneficial. However, defining the terms used in the current TAFF rules, as well as reprinting the ones not on the ballot (even if it would require a re-writing of the ballot itself) shouldn't entail the production of a ton of paperwork. I doubt if more than two pages would be needed to cover all the bases. If Easter, of course, is a variable holiday, but the dates fall within an established range, so there shouldn't be any reason not to set firm dates for all TAFF deadlines. I really don't understand why that hasn't been done before. Any year where a variance would be called for would be known far enough ahead that announcements could be made at least a year in advance. §§

NEIL WEST -- 5309 Clark St. Chicago, IL 60640
January 31, 1985

Many sorts of possible changes have been described, but I haven't noticed the question "What's the smallest effective change which could be made? I suggest that a new copy of the instruction sheet/ballot might be it.

Not leaving things unspoken seems to be one of the keys. The interested TAFF winners could probably write the new ballot most likely to be widely acceptable, and preserve the apostolic succession of Administrators.

I Couldn't ask for anything more to the point than that. Congratulations. You've won the award for the most concise LoC of the Issue. §§

GREGG TREND -- 16594 Edinborough, Detroit, MI 48219
February 25, 1985

Two things are important as far as appearances of propriety for TAFF: (1) a proper accounting of monies, both in the British Isles treasury and US treasury before and AFTER each TAFF race; (2) other than the usual voting fee contributions, each larger contribution should be FULLY accounted for both by name of individual(s) and/or organization and/or event making

the donation. For two years I was treasurer of a mundane non-profit educational fund/foundation locally, and I was required to do this, not only for tax purposes but to indicate to the members and supporters exactly what degree of solvency the fund was at and that all contributors (particularly larger ones) should receive their due credit. The fanzine in-groupish world should not set itself apart from these easy to maintain impressions of record keeping. Trust and honesty cannot be simply subsumed.

For as long as I can remember (and I have voted in TAFF since I first knew about it, c. 1959, except for a period of gaffiation c. 1966-1977) the purpose of TAFF has seemed to me to be about communication between slightly different fanzine cultures, separated by the Atlantic. Even in this day of cut-rate airfares and times when the dollar gains widely in value over European currencies there is not THAT much physical contact between US and Anglo/European fan. Because this face-to-face contact is still lacking, the main source of information about both fanzine cultures lies (for good or naught) on the printed page. That's why (with the few odd exceptions in the past which you have noted) candidates, on both sides, have been, in the main, fanzine fans (or who were at one time active as such: even Robert Madle and the late Don Ford fell into that category). After all, the receiving side would be presumed to be interested in somebody they were 'familiar' with, even if it was only a paper persona. I always thought you had to be someone whose work (in whatever field of fanac) was KNOWN to the receiving side to even logically put your name forth as a candidate.

It does make sense that the general fanzine public -- those who might be reading FILE 7/0 for important fanzine news (and deadlines)? -- should be apprized of deadlines as important as those for valid candidacies for TAFF. Filing deadlines should be announced in easily available forums (SF fan news publications and fliers or posters at all major cons) well in advance (months rather than weeks) of such deadlines.

I enjoy meeting (even briefly) Britifans I've only read about (I think I talked to Dave Langford for two minutes at Noreascon 2). I would enjoy reading interesting trip reports, too (perhaps this SHOULD be a necessary condition of winning the race -- after all, while personal memories are nice, they are only meaningful to the TAFF winner). Since the winner has shared in the largesse of Fandom as a whole, it would be fitting for a Trip Report to be shared with the people who sent him/her over there and with those who didn't get to share in those experiences, or even meet the winner.

Fans at cons who contribute to the Fund at auction or by buying items whose monies gained go straight to TAFF should be apprized of the fact that \$1 and a reference will buy them a vote, if they care to fill out the form. Checking references can be a chore, but

perhaps membership in a local club or in SF cons before the cut-off date should be enough. Fandom was once a very small world. Until even 15-16 years ago, con and fanzine fans, with crossovers, probably never numbered more than 1,000 -- now it's at least a dozen times that. A fan should be known personally, or on paper, to the fannish name or club he/she uses as a reference on the ballot. How to police this with the huge increase in voting is up to the administrators. After all, they are the final validators of the voters and the voting.

§ It seems to me that if it is so essential that a fan be known to the 'other side', then candidacy should be restricted to only those so known. As the ballot now stands, though, being known to the other side is not a requirement. While a good case can be made for restricting candidacy to only fanzine fans (and to only those fanzine fans who send their material across the sea), if the aim of TAFF is, indeed, to foster communication between our fannish subcultures, then by ignoring those fans, from either side of the pond, who are well known and popular to their respective 'side' as in-person 'persona' rather than on-paper personalities, we ignore the bulk of the people who make up that other fannish culture. I'm sure there are fans in Britain and in Europe who are charming and delightful and who could more than ably represent those overseas fandoms to those in another country. After all, except for a few dozen fans, how well-known is any overseas fan to those on the opposite shore? Be that as it may, however, I still feel that it is essential that the ballot reflect what is required, and if, indeed, only fanzine fans are suitable as candidates, then the ballot should so state. ¶ I also think there should be some sort of requirement for a Trip Report to be done by the winners after they've taken their trips. How that could possibly be enforced, however, is beyond me. ¶ If references aren't checked for voters with whom the administrator is unacquainted, then I can't understand why listing references should be required. §

ERIC MAYER -- 1771 Ridge Road East, Rochester, NY
14622. January 17, 1985

I won't have any trouble being concise this time since I contributed last time most of what I had to contribute -- i.e. pointing out I knew nothing about TAFF! It looks to me like there is a general sentiment in favor of written guidelines. It would also appear that most would want the guidelines to prohibit a show of administrator bias and prohibit releasing voting totals before the vote is complete.

I would think there should be some indication of what a TAFF winner is entitled to, also. Rob Hansen mentions travel expenses after the con. I had been under the impression that only expenses to and from the

con were included.

The idea of an accounting doesn't seem popular but even in the letters there's evidence that one might be necessary. For instance, Terry Hughes reports that he left the fund with enough money for three trips while Rob says his trip took half the fund. Inflation? Diminution in the fund? Without an occasional update, who knows?

I have to say, it might be better to keep the idea of a TAFF committee formed of past winners strictly informal -- that is, just make it known that a TAFF winner ought to get in touch with some of his predecessors and that they'll help. Certainly, whoever wins is going to take the advice of whoever they know best or respect the most -- not necessarily a good thing, but something that would likely happen, formal committee or not.

Terry Hughes' report was daunting. One thing that struck me was his paying for TAFF reports, etc., out of his own pocket. I have to say that's a big item, especially in a year like this when over 500 people voted. That's over \$100 just for one report to the electorate and it doesn't seem right to saddle the winners with that, especially as candidates never know how many fans will vote in any given year. (As for the cost of 500 Trip Reports...I shudder to think of it.)

§ Guidelines can't actually 'prohibit' anything. The best they can accomplish is to inform a new Administrator (as well as the electorate and Fandom at large) just what it is that's expected of them, which duties are expected to be done (and some indication of their timing), as well as what's optional. As it is, there's nothing in black-and-white to help anyone really understand the workings of TAFF, whether it's the Administrator or only a curious neofan (or some other fan who's simply never bothered to delve into the subject). ¶ Most TAFF winners are expected to take a tour of the fannish centers in the country they're visiting. The Fund assumes internal travel expenses for that part of the trip, as well as expenses at the con which serves as the highlight of the trip. (Often a portion of the travel expenses is offset by rides given to the TAFF winner by fans who are going by car.) ¶ The difference in figures you refer to is because Rob was writing of the balance in the U.K. treasury -- it's the sending country which foots the airfare. ¶ TAFF reports aren't always sent out to each voter. Normally they appear in a newszine as part of its reportage, or as a separate rider. TAFF Trip Reports haven't been treated as a necessity in recent years, and never were intended to cover only the electorate even when they did appear. They were done as Fund Raisers, with either all proceeds or just the profits (depending on the financial standing of the editor) going to TAFF. 250-300 copies

seemed to be the usual print run. I also should point out that each Administrator covers only the portion of the Fund on their side of the Atlantic. British Administrators Inform the British voters, and the U.S. Administrator does the same (or ought to). §§

ERIC LINDSAY -- P.O. Box 42, Lyneham, ACT, 2602,
AUSTRALIA. Dec. 10, '84 [Rcvd. 1/16]

I must admit to being disappointed that so many recipients of fan funds have not subsequently produced extensive trip reports. Indeed, many seem to have almost disappeared, if my memory is any guide.

I generally agree with your comments, but don't really have any sensible suggestions to make regarding worthwhile changes. As long as fandom remains an anarchy (as I hope it will), then it is hard to produce workable long term committees. At least the present system leaves an unreliable administrator in position for only two years.

I certainly can't see why administrators can't make more information available to newszine editors; there seems little reason not to, since one letter (with carbon copies) once a month would cover that task.

§ At first I was going to say that a once-a-month 'release' to newszines would be a bit much. Especially when the more 'fannish' newszines are produced on a schedule much less frequent. However, there are numerous newszines -- SFC, LOCUS, FILE 770, and UNCLE DICK'S don't have the market all to themselves. Various clubs and regional fandoms have newszines, too, and would most likely appreciate being kept posted on matters of national fannish interest. Howsomever, I doubt if matters move quite swiftly enough in TAFF or the other fan funds to warrant that frequent of an updating schedule. §§

JAN HOWARD FINDER -- 164 Williamsburg Court, Albany,
NY 12203. January 27, 1985

As I indicated there are some easy reforms which would make things run more smoothly, but I doubt they'll be agreed to. A smooth running organization is anathema to Faaanishness.

1. Set up dates for the beginning and end of nominations. 2. Set up dates for the beginning and end of voting. This is not radical, just some common sense. If the administrators only get one nominee, then he or she wins automatically, or write in rules which state that the race will be voided and the other side has the chance the following year to host the election. The extending of deadlines makes the term "deadline" stupid. So either follow them or admit them to being elastic and confusing and fraudulent. 3. Since many of the persons who wrote in seem to feel a "means test" should be part of the guidelines, the administrators should be honest and say so. Have each nominee send in a copy of his or

her 1040 (or foreign equivalent) along with his or her \$5. Anyone over the poverty level is disqualified, or if they win don't get any money from the fund. All they would get is the honor of winning.

There was talk of running the ballots and other info through the Worldcon program book & PR's. Hmm, this might allow in all sorts of non-Faaanish riff-raff. Set up some sort of screening, so that their money is good, but they can't vote.

On a more serious note, how about allowing a fan to nominate ONLY ONCE in any fan fund. Now this will either kill off the fund in a few years or force the nominators and interested fan to go out and find NEW fan to vote and become involved. This could make things really interesting. Check your past ballots. The same people nominate each time. Spread the task around.

How about making it a requirement that the winner has to attend at least 5 cons more than 500 miles from their home over each year they are an administrator? Just how many cons do the winners get to?

How about not providing any more funds than the air fare to the winner. Then have them provide the administrators with receipts for other expenses. Then, as they actually do something for the fund, they get money back. Doing a trip report could be worth, say, \$500. \$50 for each con they attend further than 500 miles from their home. (Yes, this would put the UK winner in a bind. Say a hundred mile radius in that case.) Let the winner "earn" their expenses after the trip.

If being a fanzine fan is the goal in choosing a nominee, then use the criteria for the Hugo in determining eligibility. If you haven't published, you can't run.

Actually I doubt if anything will change. Faaans have too high an entropy to become more organized and consistent. This has been amusing.

§ Your first two points are quite valid, and are something I hope will be incorporated into TAFF. 'Automatic wins' and 'means tests' make me shudder. (And yes, I know you were being sarcastic on the latter 'suggestion'.) ¶¶ Barring a nominator from nominating again would seem to penalize those fans who stick with fandom, rather than pop up and drop out, nova-like, after awhile. Perhaps making it a no-no for a person to nominate in the following year's race -- or the following one from his/her country -- would help in broadening the pool of nominators. Really, though, I don't think much of putting limits on nominators. ¶¶ Reimbursing a winner for expenses would mean that only well-off fans could run. Though I tend to sympathize with the notion of encouraging activities like producing Trip Reports and convention attendance, there must be a simpler solution than that. §§

not thousands) to go to a convention where they will see and interact only with other fanzine fen. (And, no, I'm not referring to a special interest convention like Corflu, but gatherings which attract a variety of fans, like Disclave, Midwestcon, Mini-con, and Westercon.) Are they really 'attending' a convention, or are they merely using the con site as a handy meeting spot where they continue discussing issues and personalities covered in their zines? Now it goes without saying (or ought to) that people, being people, gravitate toward the familiar. Surely everyone who attends a convention does so in order to interact with his or her friends. Or even friendly acquaintances. Does this mean that the creation of sub-groups is unavoidable? I know some fans which almost seem to specialize in drawing in new people to Fandom. Their philosophy apparently runs along the lines of 'The More the Merrier'. Others seem to restrict themselves to a small, almost insular group and avoid dealing with newcomers as much as possible (I have more than slight tendencies in that direction myself).

It was during the first wave of Trekkies coming into fannish enclaves that I entered Fandom. Successive waves of large numbers of 'media' fans have changed many of the traditional underpinnings of Fandom. Where once the mere idea of a thousand-person convention was mind-blowing, we now have worldcons which attract numbers approaching the ten-thousand mark. Regional and other smaller conventions grow in, if not individual attendance levels, in sheer number of events. To some of the fans who have been around for eons, this was a terrible thing; to others, it was gleesome. Yet regardless of how the increase in numbers was regarded, the flow continues to mount.

Because of that growth, some splintering effect seems almost inevitable. It is, quite literally, impossible to know each and every fan nowadays, where once it was well within the realm of possibility to be familiar with at least the names of everyone in Fandom. It becomes more and more difficult to define a 'Fan', for that matter. Not that that was ever an easy thing to define....

I suppose each of us has his or her own idea of just what Fandom is, and it's also likely than hardly anyone's definition is in complete accord with any other's. Back

when I used to join Worldcons, I made it a practice to scan the list of members, as they appeared in the Progress Reports, and note which names I recognized. As the years went by, I became familiar with a growing number of them. However, it also became apparent that the percentage of people I knew, or had even heard of, was dropping. I had been part of that first influx of fans; now I was being overwhelmed by the succeeding waves. For me, Worldcons became irrelevant. I could continue to meet those I wanted to meet at handier, more affordable, sites, so I quit joining them. Obviously the Worldcons continued to grow without my support, and equally obviously a large number of fellow fanzine and convention fans don't agree with my feelings about Worldcons. They continue to attend because 'everyone else' does. Other fans dropped out from that circuit before I did.

Yet we all remain fans, consider ourselves part of Fandom, and participate in fannish activities to varying degrees. Apas began to proliferate (to the point that even they became splintered more and more into non-overlapping groups). Fanzines sent out to a large segment of fandom began to decline in number. There are only a small handful of genzines left today. Fandom has simply grown too large, too fractionalized, for a fan to afford to cover a significant portion of its members. (That doesn't prevent some fans from trying, of course...)

A new breed of zine began appearing: the deliberately 'ensmalled' zine which was sent to (generally) a hundred, more-or-less, fans. Many of these were 'ensmalled' in page count, as well as copies-per-issue. They could be viewed as a self-defense, of sorts, by the old-line fanzine fans against the hordes of newfen who didn't share the same roots. Of course this practice was also taken up by new fans themselves, and there exists now a situation where the fmz fans don't know of everyone who is covered by that label. What's the next step? A further ensmallment? While this 'ensmall-ing' has had some laudable effects -- the re-awakening of interest in publishing by a number of long-time fans who had all-but gefiated is one -- it also leads to a furtherance of the fractionalizing. Few of these zines share identical mailing lists. There's overlap, of course, but in a case where 100 names are used, eventually you'll reach a point where no one on one particular list is known to another who is on yet

[illegible]

Jan Howard Finner
164 Williamsburg Ct.
Albany, NY 18203