

THE  
ZINE  
FAN



Volume One/Number One

December, 1974

This is the first issue of THE ZINE FAN, operating organ of the Ad Hoc Committee for New Fan Awards (Moshe Feder, Linda Bushyager, Mike Glycer, Bill Bowers, Harry Warner, Jr., Donn Brazier, Michael Glicksohn, Sam Long, Jeff Smith, Don D'Annassa and Darroll Pardoe). For the moment, it is available only at the committee's discretion. This issue is published for the committee by Moshe Feder of 142-34 Booth Memorial Ave. Flushing, New York 11355. Print run: 75. Panacea Press Publication number 11.

[illegible]

As I begin typing it is Sunday, November 24. I've spent a good part of the day in the process of borrowing this typewriter — since it has an elite font, it uses space more economically — from a generous friend, Lou Stathis. As usual, I am already behind my self-determined schedule. (I have already sent out one postcard promising that this would be in the mail tomorrow. Something which now seems patently impossible.) There are a number of reasons for that, but the happiest is simply the volume of mail I've already received in response to my DNQ open letter. From a total of about 65 copies distributed I have received approximately 25 responses, most of it very quickly and almost all of it quite lengthy and detailed. I am now certain that although, as many of you noted, a great deal remains to be worked out, the first FAANs (or their equivalent under another name) will be awarded some time in 1975.

This first issue of THE ZINE FAN is intended to start the process of turning my tentative proposal into actual awards that a body of distinguished fen will receive sometime next summer. Towards that end, we will be beginning an ongoing, open-ended dialectic using the editing techniques developed by one of our committee members, Donn Brazier, for use in his exemplar of letterzines, TITLE. The body of this and future issues of TZF will be the letters of comment you write, broken down by subject and then re-synthesized to present the readers of this journal with wide-ranging and comprehensive discussion of every relevant issue. It cannot be said, at this time, whether THE ZINE FAN will become a permanent fixture of the FAAN award process — that will be up to the first administrative committee after it is chosen (by whatever means, see XXI below) — but I believe it will surely prove of value in the Ad Hoc Committee's business at hand, the formulation of our new awards. In the future, responsibility for editing and publishing TZF will rotate among willing committee members. Linda Bushyager has already volunteered to publish #2 and I hope that other committee members will soon step forward so that Linda and I are not prevented by the time-consuming chore of producing a bureaucratic letterzine, from keeping up our statuses as active fen in the non-fanpolitical realm of our avocation. (I hope that wasn't too prolix and pompous for you, Barry!)

Those of you who cared to look for it would have detected some uneasiness on my part in my open letter about the powers I proposed giving a self-appointed committee in the establishing and operation of an awards process. Some of you (see XX below) feel that a fifteen-member committee is too large — unnecessarily large for efficient operation. It was my concern that sincethis body would not only be charged with running the awards once they were established but with setting them up (in every detail) in the first place



that it was imperative that it be large enough to comprise the full spectrum of fanzine-fannish opinion. In other words, although I thought it desirable, I did not then believe that it would be practical to allow all 75 of us to participate as voting decision makers rather than as mere onlooking advisors.

In the light of those doubts and that uneasiness, I am pleased to announce that the concerned, enthusiastic and speedy response to my letter has convinced me that broad participation in the rule-drafting part of the founding of our awards is possible and practical. It is now my intention that the readership of THE ZINE FAN act in a "legislative" capacity — so that our decisions are reached with a maximum amount of pooled brainpower — and that the Ad Hoc Committee serve primarily in an executive or implemental capacity — so that the application of the rules to individual cases can be prompt and efficient.

You are all invited to vote on the questions that will be decided through THE ZINE FAN. You may all make motions for our consideration. If most of you choose not to, be aware that it is also my intention that the committee reserve the right to ignore a non-significant response to a call for a vote on an issue, or even to dispense with the "legislature" altogether if it doesn't work as intended.

This is necessary as a pragmatic safeguard to insure that this deconcentration of power remains meaningful and does not become a hindrance to our purpose. Therefore, the votes of the larger "committee of the whole" will only be considered valid if at least 30 of the 60 non-committee recipients of THE ZINE FAN have participated. I have chosen 30 as the minimum acceptable because it is twice the number of committee members and half the total non-committee TZF readership. If we cannot achieve and maintain at least that level of participation (i.e., a minimum total, including committee participation, of 45 votes) on a given issue, then there is no advantage in not letting the committee alone decide that issue. It is my hope that in matters where meaningful participation occurs, the committee will consider itself to be bound by the decision of the larger body. And that, even in matters where there is insufficient interest to generate a binding quantity of votes, the committee will at least give due consideration and weight to the voted opinion of those who have responded.

Again, I must note that my "intentions" are not binding on my fellow committee members (although I'd like to think that as the originator of this ~~pipe dream~~ project my opinions would not be without weight). They may choose to ignore the suggestion or even to criticize it as more trouble than it's worth, inefficient, sure to slow us up and obsessively and unduly anti-elitist. But I don't think they will, because, if it works, this plan is the fairest until committee elections (or formal appointment by some other means) are a reality. Of course, should all this prove unrealistic and unwieldy — if participation were consistently too low and hence non-binding — it would be our right and duty to return to the decision-making procedures I originally proposed.

In practical terms: You are all invited to comment on everything and anything that appears in TZF. You can vote on those decisions the editor/publisher of that issue lists as formal motions ready to be voted on. You may include your votes in your LoC (Right at the beginning, please!) or, if you aren't locking right away or at all, you may vote by postcard. I hope you will all participate, thereby proving that my penchant for democracy is not foolish.

By the way, I hope that none of you that commented on the question of committee size construed any of the above as an admission on my part that a fifteen-member committee is too large. I think still that a large committee will prove useful if for no other reason than the large amount of work these awards are going to generate. I believe that some of you have yet to grasp the magnitude of what's involved. But more of this later. Let me explain now that what follows are your LoCs on my open letter, edited by subject as coherently as I could manage in a fashion that I hope you will find helpful. Typing each letter up on stencil as soon as it arrived would have been faster, but a lot more confusing. I did consider making Ray Nelson's letter the single exception and printing it in its entirety because it is a complete and detailed counter proposal. I decided not to because it is too similar to my version to make this useful. But I have quoted from it extensively.



Don D'Amassa:: "Glad to see you didn't let the fan awards idea die. As I mentioned before, I think the idea is very worthwhile and am more than willing to help in any way you might suggest. Unfortunately, the very nature of setting up something like this (particularly on the rapid schedule you envisage) requires direction from a single location during the planning stages, and since you started the whole thing, you are obviously it. Congratulations." [Thank you. Uh, no. Er, well, yes and no. Of course it's natural for me to be more enthusiastic and concerned about this than anyone else. And I do intend to make my suggestions in very positive terms, as I have on the two previous pages; that's my prerogative as initiator. It's also natural for me to coordinate our efforts and I'm going to try to. But I don't think I can "direct" things because I'm not omniscient and I'm not well-known enough. (This is partly my own fault. Although I've put out a pretty successful one-shot, put on a faanish play and been a member of two apas during the last year or two, my genzine hasn't come out in all that time.) That's why my first efforts were to enlist the aid of prominent and distinguished fanzine fans. PLEASE NOTE: All the rest of my editorial comments in the middle of or between letter segments will be in square brackets and not otherwise identified. My longer comments at the end of each subject section will be in the same form as everyone else's letters. My name, followed by what I have to say enclosed in quotes.-MF]

Roy Tackett:: "Moshe, I was involved rather deeply with George Willick's attempt to create a fan achievement award some dozen years ago. The flack we took over it was incredible. It got so bad that George finally dropped the whole idea and gafiated.

"I do think, though, that we planted the seed that led to the fan Hugos.

"I dunno, Moshe. The Hugos certainly go to the big circulation zines these days, but it wasn't always such and probably won't continue that way. What you're saying, in effect, is that fandom, and its subgroupings, have gotten so large that the normal fanzine, whatever that is, doesn't have a chance any more. Maybe so, maybe not.

"Anyway, your idea is interesting and, having been once to the wars, I wish you luck and will watch with interest. Keep me posted."

Darroll Pardoe:: "Thanks for sending me your circular on fanzine awards. As it happens, I've been reflecting myself lately on the subject of Hugo fan awards and their inadequacies, and on the many faults of the indigenous British fanzine award (the NOVA), so your publication came at an opportune time. Perhaps you're right that now is the time to act on this subject: so many threads seem to be drawing together.

"As I see it, the basic problem is one of acceptance: getting the fan population to see the proposed fanzine awards as a good thing worth supporting. Once upon a time fan publishing was the elite group-activity of fandom around which all else centred. Now this is not so true; there are more conventions and a lot more fans to whom fanzine publishing is not the centre around which their fanning revolves. There are also a lot more specialised interests within fandom (the extreme example being the Trekkies) and people interested in these minority groups may not be in touch to any great extent with the general fan-publishing scene.

"But fan publishing is still a well-defined world of its own; most fan (and especially faan) publishers are in touch with a good number of other fan publishers and trade with them. It is this group which we must interest in the new fan awards; they are after all the people who will be voting and who will desire for their fanzine to win an award. The outsiders, convention fans and so on, may be interested, but the awards are largely not for them.

"The trouble with the fan Hugos nowadays is that so many of the voters are not fans (in the old publishing-in-group sense) and don't have much idea what they're voting for. The proposed awards will solve that problem, and the awards will be that much more valuable. An award by one's peers is more meaningful, somehow."



Mike Glicksohn::"Basically, I'm enthusiastic about the idea of a set of peer-group fan-nish awards. Whatever drawbacks exist in establishing such a system, and they are numerous, it can't help but be an improvement over what we have now. When you get down to it, what you've suggested is to supplement the existing popularity contest with a second popularity contest, but at least it's one in which potentially the voters are better qualified to vote and that can't help but be an improvement."

Eric Lindsay::"In general, I would be entirely in favor of awards made by a peer group, rather than those with the money for a membership of a well-publicised con. . . .

"Perhaps it is an elitist attitude, but I have enjoyed my own brief time in fandom, and am happy to have been accepted by the people you mention such as Linda, Donn, Mike Glicksohn, Bill Bowers and Mike Glycer. Last year, after Torcon, I was a guest at the homes of Linda, Donn and Bill, and was able to talk at length with both the Mikes. Part of the pleasure of fandom is that, although we had never met previously, we were, through fanzines, known to each other. To be able to say that you are a fan and because of this be accepted into others homes is a great thing, and one that I would hate to see slowly destroyed because of things like sudden expansion leading to an influx of rip-off artists. . . . Perhaps the institution of purely fan awards would promote an insular attitude among fans that would be harmful, but we can hope that such will not be the case. . . I am with you all the way."

Harry Warner, Jr.::". . . In general I like the plan very much, and it comes closer to the kind of awards system that I'd wistfully been imagining than I could reasonably have dared to hope! So if all that follows seems like nitpicking and complaining, it isn't meant that way. I'm sure you want this kind of comments rather than eighty-seven different ways of saying that I like the idea. I'm particularly intrigued with the notion of getting the program started in time for presenting the first batch in 1975, an ideal year in the sense that most North American fans won't be able to see any awards presented at the worldcon."

Dave Gorman::"Got your comments on an active fanzine fans award, and although I haven't had time to digest all your comments, and disagree with many of your comments about professional fanzines, etc., I do agree that such an award is needed badly — and now is the time to start discussion and process for establishing the award." [Right! Thanks for volunteering for the committee. Your name would be up there in the colophon now if your co-editor, Jeff Smith, hadn't beaten you to it. I hope you're finding this interesting!]

Leslie Luttrell::"Both Hank and I find the idea interesting, but we are not sure how practical it is. Certainly we have a number of objections to your plans as outlined in your proposal. . . . I really am a bit skeptical about the [FAAN awards] but I hope that . . . you will keep us informed of your progress."

Alexis Gilliland::"A first impression is that you are making altogether too much trouble for yourself. Beneath Feder's faanish front lurks an incipient Bureaucrat! . . . About all the FAAN award is likely to do is dilute the value of the fan Hugo in case a Trekkie or Apefan should win. Otherwise, it should predict the Hugos with reasonable accuracy if it is carried out as you suggest. So Tim Kirk gets two awards instead of one. Is it worth the effort? Myself, I think not, but of course, I'm not doing it, either." [Hmmm, I don't think the FAANs will predict the Hugos, and if they do occasionally, so what. Why that bother us anymore than the NEBULAS predicting the HUGOs "bothers" the pros. It's interesting that you mention Tim Kirk. Even if you like his work as much as I do, you'll have to admit that his winning the Hugo this year was more on past reputation, convention art show art and a very few fanzine appearances (like the cover of ALGOL). At the present level of his fanart activity in fanzines I doubt that Tim could win a FAAN, or even be eligible for nomination.]

William Rotsler::"I read your DNQ [Interesting how many people assumed that was its title, but it didn't have a title because it wasn't a fanzine, it was a letter.] and it sounds fine to me. Actually, the system is quite like that of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences . . . where craft nominates craft and then everyone votes on all."



Peter Roberts:"There are, I believe, two approaches to these awards — or rather the rules for them. The first is to have very simple rules which allow the voters to use their common sense; the award committee can then pass judgment on the voting, sorting out any problems concerning eligibility and so on. This is roughly the way that fanzine polls are carried out — certainly it's the way I've handled the CHECKPOINT UK Fan Poll over the last few years. The other way, which you seem to be adopting, is to compose fairly complex rules for voting so that they'll be fugghead-proof right at the outset; this has the advantage of leaving the committee less work and fewer problems after the voting has actually ended.

"I'm rather in favor of simple rules and considerable responsibility for the committee. [So am I, and I have been assuming that a strong committee which would have final say in all matters subject to interpretation is a necessity. My position on rule-complexity is somewhere between the two you describe. I don't believe the kind of ultra-simple rules you suggest are practical. They would lead to confusion and an impossible position for the committee. On the other hand, I don't believe that the rules I've been proposing are the ultimate in complexity either — they certainly do not leave the committee with that much less work. I might be willing to try an ultra-simplistic approach, if we didn't have the example of the Hugo before us. But since we do, and since it is my intention in all this to supplement the Hugos with fan awards that avoid the Hugo's pitfalls, I don't think we'd be solving anything by adopting a structure as simple and undetailed as the Hugo's, although even that is more detailed than the sort of "rule" you propose immediately after the close of this editorial comment.] Thus I think the first category should read: 1.1 — Best Single Issue of a Fanzine. Just that. A more complex formula could be worked out for the guidance of the committee (i.e., just what exactly a fanzine is) and this could be published and available in advance to those interested (to prevent too many arguments afterwards!) [Yes, fine, but as long as you're going to provide detailed definitions for the committee's use, why not see to it that everyone understands the ground rules from the start. That seems to me to be the best way to avoid post-vote arguments, and to prevent people from wasting their votes on non-eligible nominees.]

"If, however, complex rules are favoured, then they might as well be fairly rigid and uncompromising; there's no need for euphemisms when ruling out "Star Trek" zines, for example — just say that "Star Trek" zines are ineligible. (Or why not rule out any fanzine devoted to a single subject — that gets rid of Tolkein stuff too.) [That's an interesting approach that hadn't occurred to me. I fear, however, that it might prove too non-selective a prohibition. Comments everyone?]

Dick Eney:"I first reacted against the FAAN awards a set up and I think you still have too many categories. However, reading your open letter carefully, I see there are a lot of merits in the plan I missed.

"The main objection I had in an operational sense was that there were too many of the things. I was thinking of an award like the Gandalf or the Campbell Award or, possibly, the Big Heart: something which was presented in parallel to the Hugo. Of course, a large number of categories would not only parallel but compete with the Hugo, causing conflict and probably ruling the awards out of the Worldcon banquet; presenting it at a Regional disposes of this objection, but still leaves us with too many. [I have never wanted the FAANs to be presented at the worldcon banquet. The presentation ceremony is too long already and, despite the excitement inherent in announcing the winners of anything, surprisingly boring. If the FAANs are ever given at a Worldcon, it will be in a separate ceremony at a gathering of fanzine fans like that arranged by Jodie Offutt at Discon. (Which I, curse it, managed to accidentally miss.)]

". . . Even if I'm wrong in the event, I think you should cut down the categories. It will be embarrassing to start off with several No Awards for lack of worthy candidates, while it's easy to increase the number afterward if there really is enough material to support a finer division of a category. [True, true, but I don't agree that we're likely to start off with so many "no awards" and I won't mind a bit if we do. Anyway, most of the sentiment on this seems to be running in the other direction. See XXII below.] Suggested categories: Best Fanzine, Best Fanwriter, Best Fan Artist. I feel so ambiguous



6] about "Best Letterhack" that I'd better reserve judgment on that. . . . [Overall] there are a couple of passages that I think need reworking, though you've done so good a job that I'm only making minor points."

Terry Jeeves:". . .Without wishing to alter your categories in any way, I would point out that all of them suffer from the inevitable — i.e., the fanzine which has the largest circulation in sheer numbers is likely to hog the votes simply because if it is any good at all it will corner a similar percentage of the votes [as a similarly good zine with a smaller circulation] Zine A with 1000 going out may be inferior to Zine B with a circulation of 100. Which is likely to get the most votes? To make any system viable, this problem needs solving. An offshoot of this is that (again, inevitably) Stateside entries will completely outweigh any from other countries. What chance would ERG, stand against, say, LOCUS? At the most, only 100 copies go Stateside; LOCUS could snow me under in a number count. NOW I AM NOT comparing the two zines. I am NOT howling unfair to no USA fen. I simply wish to point out that if we want THE BEST ITEM, then we can't get it by simply counting votes. GHU knows how you can separate quantity from quality, but this is the hub of the problem. Obviously the overseas problem could be solved by a parallel series of awards, but this is costly and a bad solution anyway." [It can't be denied that the size of a zine's circulation will always have some effect in almost any awards process. The FAANs however, are designed to minimize this effect without going the jury route. Although, come to think of it, that is what we have, in a way. The nominating peers act as a kind of jury, much less likely to be influenced by a zine's circulation because all nominating peers will almost certainly be familiar with the work of most potential nominees. The way to reduce the effects of circulation size is to have a knowledgeable electorate, and that's what we'll have. It's interesting that you use LOCUS as an example, since it's not yet clear that it would be eligible for nomination. In any case, you are missing an important point in your exposition of the problem. British and other overseas fen will have the same nominating and voting privileges as American fen (as in TAFF and DUFF) and as in the fanfunds, their influence would balance that of fen here. After all, to use your example, isn't ERG seen by more fen in Britain than LOCUS is? Another point here is the effect of having separate best editor and best single issue awards. I believe that they will also serve to help make quality more important than quantity, whether we mean quantity in terms of circulation or in terms of the number of issues published.]

Donn Brazier::"Terrific job! Now, with the compliment out the way let's get to the nitty...."

Moshe Feder::"Yes indeed Donn, and thank you. This section has been intended to give all of you an overview of the response I got and to orient you for the more specific discussion that follows. I had intended to make some more detailed comments at this point, but I seem to have said most of what I wanted to say in my comments above. In what follows I'm going to try to keep my interruptions to a minimum, let the letters speak for themselves and reserve my comments to the end of each section."

## II WHAT IS A FANZINE?

Donn Brazier::"Award 1.1. Of all the awards, I feel this is the most troublesome spot to define and limit. How do we really tell if the editor makes or hopes to make a profit? Just from accepting advertisements on a regular basis? If that is the way to tell, then it ought to be so stated in the rule."

Mike Glicksohn::"I'd like to see part of the definition of a fanzine be related to the non-acceptance of professional advertising. It's impossible for an outside committee to know whether or not any publication is published in hopes of a profit or if it makes a profit. Only the editor knows that, and he/she may not be talking. But the external indications given by running professional ads and paying for contributions are things that can be used, despite requiring the honest assistance of the faneds as well. (How does the committee know if faned A pays for contributions unless faned A says so or unless every fan active in the fanzine field tells the committee whenever he/she gets paid for something? Paid advertising ought to be a little easier to spot, though. And a fanzine that publishes a list of ad rates isn't a fanzine any more in my eyes.)"



Ray Nelson::"Item 1.1, as it stands (without the anti-Trek clause), includes the phrase "and/or fans." It does not say what a fan is. A fan of what? It is so non-exclusive as to open the door to comic book fans, rock fans, and western fans. (Maybe that doesn't worry you.) It is so non-exclusive it opens the doors to Lawrence Welk fans, football fans and stamp collectors. (I'll bet that does worry you.)

"It seems to me the rules will prove unworkable unless the definitions are much clearer, and are made in a positive rather than a negative way. Let me see how I can phrase it.

#### "THE GILDED BEANIE AWARDS

1.1 Best Single Issue of a Fanzine: For the purposes of this award, a fan is defined as an amateur critic, commentator, reviewer or reporter of the genre of professional magazine and book science fiction, or a reporter, critic, commentator or reviewer of the genre of amateur science fiction.

Better yet,

Best Single Issue of a Fanzine: For the purposes of the Gilded Beanie Award a fan is defined as an amateur critic, commentator, reviewer, satirist, illustrator or reporter of the genre of

Let me try again.

Preamble: The microcosm of science-fiction fandom has grown so large and diverse that it is no longer possible for one person to know all other members of it, or to read all other members' publications. The type of amateur activity that originally made up the bulk of what was called "fanac" is in danger of being overshadowed by the actions of semi-professionals, fans of more or less related genres and people generally unaware of and indifferent to the "fannish" customs and traditions. The Gilded Beanie Awards Committee has therefore been formed to give special recognition to those who, with more courage than good sense, continue to publish in the Grand Old Way.

No criticism is implied to the other subfandoms and fringe-fandoms that have grown up in our midst; indeed, we believe that there should be special awards similar to the Gilded Beanie awards for each and every one of them. This award, however, is for fannish fans only.

For our purposes a fannish fan is defined as an amateur in the genre of science fiction, a critic, commentator, publisher, reviewer, humorist, artist or reporter working on a non-profit, non-paying publication devoted to commentary on professional magazine and book science fiction, or to humorous reportage of the doings of amateur and professional science fiction personalities.

A faanish fanzine is defined, for our purposes, as an amateur, non-profit publication devoted to publishing the work of fannish fans.

Best Single Issue of a Fannish Fanzine: This award is given for the best issue of a fannish fanzine as defined above, whether part of a series or a one-shot, published during the previous calendar year."

[Ray then goes on for three more pages, detailing his proposal in much the same fashion I did. His comments in later sections of this issue are therefore sometimes in the form of a section from a set of rules.]

Linda Bushyager::[All of Linda's comments in this TZF are paraphrases, rather than actual quotes, based on some highly condensed notes by me taken during a phone conversation with her.] "I don't like the current definitions and think they should be made narrower. The phrase 'fannish doings' is too broad, as is the word 'fantasy' in this context. If the rules are non-definitive or have only broad definitions we will end up with the same problems as the Hugos. I think that the sort of preamble or introduction Ray Nelson is proposing is a good idea. I'd like to exclude things like Conan and Oz,



and move in the direction of science fantasy, as opposed to non-scientific "fantasy" adventure like Tarzan and Robin Hood. For the award description in the fanzine categories I suggest something like 'an amateur magazine about written SF or literary SF fandom.' I don't see anything wrong with accidental profits and I would strike the phrase 'or indeed making one' from your definition."

Jeff Smith::"1.1, There are fanzines that make profits without being at all semi-professional. YANDRO occasionally does. Darrel Schweitzer's PROCRASTINATION always did. The fact that a fanzine does make a profit does not mean anything, really."

Harry Warner, Jr.::"1.1, Fine, except eventually the question will arise: is a fanzine permanently barred from eligibility to receive an award because it used to pay for art or prose, but didn't do so in a particularly good recent issue?" [Probably not.]

Terry Jeeves::"Ref.1.1, What IS a fanzine? Accept that the more qualifications you lay down, the more loopholes you create. Therefore, accept loopholes (fans won't vote for anyone they think isn't entitled) and just rule out broadly...i.e., A fanzine is one which is NOT the supplier of its publisher's living, nor is it handled by a paid editor or publisher. If a fanzine editor makes his living from his magazine derived income... then he is not eligible as a fanzine nominee. Similarly, anyone whose living is made from art may not be nominated. Try that yardstick against the recent arguments and little margin for argument is left."

Moshe Feder::"It is going to be difficult to determine whether certain fanzines should be eligible for the FAANs. Or, rather, it will be difficult to get general agreement about such eligibility. I suspect most of us have pretty definite ideas (even if we can't verbalize them) and would easily be able to say whether a given zine was eligible or not in our opinion. What we need is a common standard, both for the committee's use and for the use of nominees and nominators. I agree with Mike and Donn that acceptance of advertising is one standard that we can all agree on and that can be objectively determined. (Mike uses the phrase "professional ads," meaning, I suppose, to allow fan ads. I agree that this is a nice idea, but wonder what we will then do about fan operated businesses that advertise in fanzines. \*Sigh\* I guess this is another area where the committee will have to use its judgment.) I agree too that it will be hard for a committee to know if a zine is making a profit. Some editors will help by admitting it, or (As Geis has admitted his intention of making a profit and living off his zine.) announcing it publicly for their own reasons. At least this will definitely eliminate some candidates and some controversy. In some problem cases, however, it's going to come down to a judgment and ruling by the committee. That's why I continue to stress that the committee must be chosen and must operate in a way that will keep it universally respected. I don't see anything wrong with an occasional profit and the phrase "or indeed making one" that I used last time was meant to apply to zines that are making a regular profit and are clearly profanzines, although their publishers won't admit it. I think that the key thing here has got to be intent; partly as it is manifested through the presence of ads or the paying of contributors, but mostly as it is perceived by the committee in the content and public operation of the magazine. I like Ray's preamble very much and I agree with Linda that we ought to use it or something like it to clarify our position. I intend to make some motions in this whole area later in the issue.

### III BEST SINGLE ISSUE

Dick Eney::"Best Single Issue and Best Fan Editor come close to conflicting although not really in competition with one another. Best Fanzine would, to be sure, squeeze out personalzines unless they were very uncommon indeed; but recognizing Best Fan Writers for writing in both their own and other's fanmags would offset that."

Mike Glicksohn::"I'd be surprised if Best Issue and Best Faned went to two different people, just because the smaller zines of a multi-zine editor won't be familiar to most voters and therefore won't influence the voting."

Leslie Luttrell::"I don't like the idea of giving an award for Best Single Issue of a



Fanzine. I realize that you wish to allow one-shots to compete for this award as well as regularly appearing fanzines, and I certainly have no objection to this, but it would be easy to write the rules so that one-shots are eligible. [But the effect wouldn't be the same because one-shots would then have to compete with a year's run of other zines rather than single issue. Anyway, the one-shot problem is only a tertiary reason why I favor a Best Single Issue/Best Fanned structure to a Best Zine structure.] By making it Best Single Issue, I think you are unfairly weighting the award towards fanzines which appear the least frequently. It would be unlikely that the readers of a frequent fanzine such as YANDRO would be able to agree on what issue was best in a certain year, while any FANGLE readers who wanted to nominate that fanzine would have no such problem." [This has the look of perceptive and insightful thinking and I'll concede that you just might be right — although only experience will show for sure. Nevertheless, I think this criticism misses the point. By its nature, a Best Issue award is obviously intended to go to a really outstanding product. (Something like the last issue of ENERGUMEN, for example.) If YANDRO, say, were to put out such an issue, I don't think its readers would have any trouble recognizing and agreeing about it. The real force of your argument is in the implication that because this structure might be a disadvantage to quality zines that happened to come out regularly, such zines would go unrecognized. This is not true, because such zines would be the ones most likely to win in the Best Fan Editor category. In discussing this issue, I think we all must keep in mind that it is the Best Editor award that replaces a Best Fanzine category (just as the Hugo Best pro editor category replaces the best prozine category) and that the Best Issue award is something separate and new which takes the place of nothing else. If this is made clear, I believe that the Best Issue and Best Editor awards will not go to the same person in most years. And this is also why I cannot approve of Linda Bushyager's suggestion that we retrain the Best Editor category but replace Best Single Issue with Best Fanzine. Such an arrangement would truly be redundant.]

#### IV BEST FAN EDITOR

Mike Glicksohn::"Best Fanned is a nice idea, but how does the guy who publishes for the apas compete against the big circulation genzine publisher? [He doesn't. Though, I dunno, if all the members of a medium sized or large apa nominated and voted for a single member he could well make the ballot or even win. In any event, it was never my intention (nor am I sure it would be possible) for a fanned to win on apac alone.] I doubt that the nominators or the voters for these awards will be substantially better qualified than many of the current nominators and voters for the Hugos. I think that's a fact we're going to have to learn to live with." [Not me. You may be right about voters, since they'll be voting in all categories and its possible that some will vote even where they really aren't qualified to make a judgment. But our nominators will, I think, be significantly more qualified than those for the Hugos. That's the point of a peer award.]

Leslie Luttrell::"I appreciate that your Best Fan Editor category is meant to remedy this [aforementioned (see above, section III)] unfairness, but I really doubt that you will get fans used to the idea of picking one issue of a fanzine to vote for, rather than one fanzine. Certainly the Best Editor doesn't necessarily put out the Best Fanzine, so I don't think these awards would always go to the same person. For that matter, by making a Best Editor category, I think you are introducing some prejudice towards editors who put out fanzines by themselves, since people will usually not be able to distinguish between the work of co-editors of the same fanzine."

Jeff Smith::"I haven't a solution, but I can pose a problem here, in the way of co-edited zines. Starting in 1975 we will have BLIND FAITH edited by Jeff Smith and Dave Gorman, GORBETT edited by Dave Gorman and KYBEN edited by Jeff Smith. Should our plans and hopes be realized, and BF turn out to be an excellent fanzine, good enough to be nominated, people would have to nominate one or the other of us. So people look at KY and GB, and hypothetically, decide they like KY better, and vote for me. Suppose Dave had done most of the work on BF, the zine really being voted for and nobody could tell? People may have been wanting just to award one of the editors of BF, and picked the wrong one. That's very confusing, but I think it gets its meaning across. Perhaps the solution is to make teams eligible, so that people could nominate me, or Dave, or both, in which



final case only BF could be considered when stacking us up against the competition." [You and Leslie are right to bring up this point which I (ironically, considering that until the issue now in production my genzine was coedited) neglected. I think your solution is best, and so does Ray Nelson, as you can see from the following quote from his Golden Beanie rules.]

Ray Nelson::"Best Fan Editor: This award is given for total fannish publishing output during the previous year, and is awarded either to an individual editor, a couple, or a small group working as a team."

Moshe Feder::"It ought to be apparent by now that I am strongly in favor of a Best Single Issue/Best Fan Editor structure in preference to all others so far proposed. I am convinced that this is the best way to be fairest to editor/ publishers of every kind of fanzine and I urge the readership and the rest of the committee to allow the concept to be tested in use. I think that arguments that fen will have trouble adjusting to the different point of view required by this structure are nonsense. If we followed that kind of reasoning we wouldn't be attempting this project at all. So let's give these new awards the chance to be better in every way than the Hugos."

#### V BEST FAN WRITER

Mike Glicksohn::"I'd be against restricting Fan Writer to material published in someone else's fanzine. I see no justification for it. I can't off hand think of anyone who is a really great writer in his own fanzine but writes for no one else, but it might easily happen, and fan writing is fan writing, regardless of where it is found."

Harry Warner, Jr.::"Maybe I'm overlooking some obvious reason why you did it this way, but I don't see why the fanwriter award can't cover material published in the writer's own fanzine. Currently, the Coulsons would probably be the only severe sufferers from such a rule outside the people who specialize in apas. But in the past, there have quite a few very fine fan writers who have saved their best work for their own publications: Laney, Tucker, and the Irish John Berry come immediately to mind."

Jeff Smith::"You are eliminating people like Don Thompson and Don Markstein, excellent writers who publish their own material themselves rather than farm it out to various other editors. Of course, if we include them we definitely appear to be making non-editing writers second-class citizens — but how many non-editing writers are there? Three? Four? Everybody has at least a personalzine these days.//I see no reason to deliberately exclude writers of amateur fiction. Any fanfic writer who gets enough votes to win deserves to win."

Tom Digby::"Is 1.3 intended to exclude writers who work almost exclusively in personalzines or apas? It looks that way. No matter how good a writer a personalzine publisher is, if he is lousy on layout, choice of artwork (if he uses any), etc., he won't have much chance because he is forced to compete not on writing alone [since he wouldn't be eligible for Best Fan Writer] but in all those other categories [as a fan editor]. If the intent is to keep an editor from walking away with the writer award on the basis of a few editorials in a zine that people are voting for because it looks nice, perhaps some other way can be found. Excluding apas may not be necessary — if it's not widely enough circulated, people won't know about it to vote for it. But if you can say that the editor award is basically for the manipulation/selecting of other people's writing/art, and the writing award is for creating articles, etc. that might do it. Excluding fiction may be a problem, too. Why not just assume that fiction won't win too often unless it is really outstandingly good, in which case it may deserve it. It looks like you're trying to have it that if you could've sold it to say, F&SF it isn't eligible, but if all you could sell it to is SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN it is. This looks like a real can of worms."

Donn Brazier::"Award 1.3: I personally would allow the nominators and the voters to weight the type of writing in importance; thus I would not specify nonfiction. I would be very broad here. I think fan fiction is getting enough black eyes as it is, and I



might consider voting for a fiction writer. By eliminating fiction you knock out quite a few fanzine editors who like and print fiction. [No. There would be no effect on the eligibility of the editors or the zines. Only the stories would not be eligible for consideration. Even the writers would be, as long as they wrote some non-fiction, too.] What is wrong with fiction in a science-fiction fandom??? If the fiction appears in SF fanzines (not comix, trek, etc.) I insist (uh, suggest) it should be part of the fan writer's business."

Bruce D. Arthurs::"Paragraph 1.3: In the latest GODLESS, I included a piece of fiction by Rich Bartucci called "The Phosphor-Bronze Cockroach," which is a parody of Harry Harrison's Stainless Steel Rat stories and is funny as hell. It's gotten great reaction from the locs I've received so far, but under para 1.3 his story couldn't be considered if someone wanted to nominate him for Best Fan Writer (and if Rich manages to stay in fandom, I think that's a definite possibility in a year or two). How about amending it to include fiction that is parodying or satirizing real fiction? (Even my mother liked "The Phosphor-Bronze Cockroach" and she once almost kicked me out of the house because of all the SF "garbage" I was reading, back when I was living at home.)" [I didn't mean to seem to exclude parody or satire and I would support language in the final version that made clear the eligibility of that kind of material.]

Don D'Amassa::"I think you're correct that some differentiation must be made between sercon and fannish writers. This may mean, as you suggest, adding an additional category for Best Criticism or something of that nature."

Mike Glicksohn::"It seems a shame to lump reviewers, writers of fannish humor and critics in the same award, but without proliferating the awards to the point of ridiculousness, I think we'll have to live with that. If a small personalzine has to run against a big genzine, I guess the writers can compete amongst themselves. It reduces the entire system to a matter of personal taste in creative efforts, but I don't see how any other workable system could be used."

Moshe Feder::"I restricted Best Fan Writer to writing that appears in zines other than one's own because I strongly believe that editorial writing is a key part of editing, and that editorial writing is different from other writing, if only because it involves a special kind of self-judgmental ability. (As I have learned from my "pro" experience, it is a rare author indeed who can judge his own stuff correctly.) I think also that a writer who writes only for his own fanzine is just not a fanwriter in the true sense. He hasn't had the guts and/or generosity and/or egotism to submit to someone else's zine and he shouldn't be rewarded with those who have. However, I must admit that I am impressed by Harry's citations from fanhistory and Tom's insightful point regarding personal and apa zines. I can't help but be aware that many fans choose to write only for their own publications (I myself never contributed to someone else's zine, although I was asked a few times, until this year.) and many of these fans are good, nominatable writers. And it is certainly not my intention to restrict the chances of apa and personal zine fanwriter/editors, as should be apparent from my comments regarding the Best Fan Editor category in my open letter. It is obvious to me, too, that most of you do not share my own view of what being an editor is all about. So, assuming the votes on this point are in line with the opinions expressed in the letters I have quoted from above, I am willing to yield on this point. I am not, however, ready to capitulate on the fan fiction issue. I am aware that amateur SF has had a place in fanzines from the earliest days onward, but most fanzines these days do not include amateur fiction (It tends to be found more often in someone's first zine or in crudzines.) and I believe this is because those interested in writing and reading fan fiction have become a sub-fandom unto themselves. Considering the real difference between fiction and nonfiction (You don't see the pros giving an award for nonfiction, although many of them write it.) I think it would be most appropriate if the fiction fans gave their own awards. I agree with what Ray says in his preamble (see page 7) and Harry says in XX below about mainstream fanzine fandom vs. all others and I really believe that we'd be undermining our own purpose if we insist upon including the products of as many sub and fringe fandoms as possible in our awards process and then expect the voters to pick the diamonds from the glass. I do trust our voters, they are us, but we won't be doing ourselves any



favor if we follow in the Hugo's wake and try to be all things to all fans by irresponsibly deciding to "leave it to the voters." If the writers of fan fiction are that good, there's always the Hugo for them to win! I say again, there's no reason to go to all this trouble creating new awards if they're not really going to be new. I have no interest in creating more Hugos under another name. There is something else to be considered here, too. Even if I were willing to yield on the point I've just been making, it would mean defining nominators and nominees separately, that is, differently — something I would consider most unfortunate. Under the provisions of my original proposal, in which nominators and nominees are defined (rather neatly, I thought) simultaneously, making fan fiction eligible would have made fans who write only fiction eligible to nominate in the Best Fan Writer category, the members of which are, for the most part, writers of nonfiction. This would abrogate the concept of peer nomination that is such a key element and virtue of my proposal. Furthermore, because so many (perhaps most) of today's fan fiction writers are Star Trek fans, Perry Rhodan fans (Yes, there are P.R. zines and soon, the first P.R. convention in the U.S., now in the planning stage.), Borroughs fans etc., to make fan fiction eligible would be to make it that much more difficult to accomplish one of the most important purposes of the FAANs. And I don't believe that this problem can be solved by differentiating the different kinds of fan fiction. It would be more difficult to separate fringe fan/subfan fanfic from true SF fandom fanfic than it is to separate the nonfiction writing of those groups — and we're already having trouble with that! This is an important issue and I'm going to call for a vote on it later in this issue."

## VI BEST ARTISTS

Dick Eney:"Splitting Best Artist into Serious and Humorous is dubious indeed. What, to look no further, do you do with the artists who are much too careful and polished not to be considered Serious, but also so witty and /or inventive that their best work is at once thoughtful and more amusing than a bale of comic cartoons? [I think you're confusing style and content.] Think of Tim Kirk and Alicia Austin, just off hand. (Perhaps my real objection should be to the antithesis you imply between being serious and being humorous: "Sometimes I tell you in jest what I would have you perceive in earnest", as Tom Paine said.)"

Lesleigh Luttrell:"I'm not sure I like the idea of having two art awards. Certainly there are a number of fanartists who do most of their work in only one of these two categories, but there are also quite a few, such as James Shull, who do beautiful work under both headings, and I suspect that they would have great difficulty winning an award in either category. However, I would certainly bow to the opinion of the fanartists themselves in this matter. But it does seem a little odd to have two art awards (serious and humorous) and yet only one writing award. [I consider that there are at least two writing awards: Best Writer and Best Letter Writer. In addition, the Best Editor award is to some extent also a recognition of writing ability. (Or at least it was under my original provisions, now in dispute.)]

Terry Jeeves:"I applaud your choice of [awards], especially the distinction between the two kinds of fan artist — as having done, and still doing both types, I like to see their distinction being noticed."

Sandra Miesel:"The division of the art category into serious and humorous is fine as it stands. Don't overqualify it. "Humor" does not require captions of dialog balloons. It's good to restrict the fanartist category to actual fanzine art instead of adding on art show art as the Hugos do, since the entire set of awards is keyed to fanzine work. (And I say this as one who only does art for the shows.)" [And lovely stuff it is, too.]

Don D'Ammassa:"I agree that there should be a differentiation in the art category between serious art and cartoon, but I would leave the standards up to the individual nominators rather than try to make an arbitrary distinction based on the presence of word balloons or some such." [My position precisely.]

NEWS FLASH: Peter Roberts has joined those already listed in the colophon as a member  
\* \* \* of the committee. \* \* \* \* \*



Peter Roberts::"Looking at that short list of items on the back page, I'm also in favor of dividing the fan-artist categories simply with 'humorous' and 'serious' as the criteria; captions are no guideline at all — Mike Gilbert uses them in his serious work, whilst plenty of fannish cartoons are devoid of them."

## VII BEST LoCSMITH

Harry Warner::"1.6: This caught me by surprise. I am not conceited enough to think I write the best locs but I probably write the most locs and honesty compels me to assume that my name would come to a lot of minds immediately just because locs and I are associated in fannish lore in much the same way as a bell and dog's saliva in Pavlov's experiments. But if I'm on this planning group, I could disqualify myself from contention in this category [Oh no you don't.] to prevent any suspicions that it was created just to increase my chances of being an early winner." [Really, Harry, whether you like it or not, you are already a legend ("The Mimeo Man", for example, has three references to you; one by name, one by work, and one by hometown and each one drew a laugh.) and no one attributes base motives to such figures.]

Mike Glicksohn::"A letterhack isn't someone who has had one or two letters published. I'd think a minimum of maybe ten would be a better description. [You're taking my label for the category too literally.] It doesn't take very long to get ten letters published, and sometimes it shows both talent and interest, the two items I'd consider necessary for anyone to be eligible to participate in these awards."

Eric Lindsay::"On locs, I'd consider that two locs should be required for nomination and voting, but would concede that one loc, if good enough, should be enuf for the award itself. For Pete's sake, two published locs a year is not particularly exclusive when it is all considered — if poor locs they may well only take a half hour a year." [Since it was my original idea (not mentioned in my letter) to require not just two locs, but two locs published in different zines as the minimum activity acceptable for nominators in this category (On the principle that nominators in a peer system must be qualified, and the ability to satisfy two different faneds would be a fair test of qualification. And also because there are some locwriters who will be published by their friends and no one else.) and yet I do see some virtue in the arguments of those who favor a one-loc minimum, I would consider the alternative you are supporting as an excellent moderate position.]

Jeff Smith::"I agree with Linda on the one-loc eligibility. But how about a time period? How about the fan who had one letter published in 1966? Is he still eligible? (I guess if he's been reading fanzines since 1966 he might as well be...). [But how do we know he's been reading those zines? No, from their inception the FAANs have stressed activity, and in line with that, and with the rules for the other categories, the fan you postulate would not be eligible in the LoC category. Only fans who have had published LoCs in the previous calendar year would be allowed to nominate.]

Dick Eney::"Here's that 'Letterhack' thing again. You know, you may be right. Yet I just don't feel comfortable putting LoCs on a par with the other categories. (And that's what it would amount to: tacitly saying that they deserve the same award because they are of about the same importance.)"

Lesleigh Littrell::"Of course, the Best Letterhack would constitute another writing award, but I am opposed to having this category at all. I certainly appreciate the fact that letter hacks contribute a lot to fanzines, how many of us would publish without the thought that we will get letters of comment in return? [This fact, was my primary motive on this question and I think it outweighs all your other arguments.] But I think you will have great difficulty administering this award. After all, it is a very common practice for fan editors to turn letters of comment which they think are especially good into articles. And I know that at least Hank and I have done the opposite, turning articles which were mainly reponses to material that had appeared in a previous issue into letters of comment, and I suspect other editors have done the same. [I have, or that is, Barry and I did, and I hope Peter Roberts has forgiven us by now.] I think



that letterhacks, most of whom also write articles, etc. for fanzines and/or are editors themselves (and artists) can best be honored in the fanwriter category. If this category is primarily to expand the number of eligible nominators, I think this can better be done by allowing anyone who has had a LoC published to nominate in the Best Fanzine category."

Tom Digby:"1.6 looks OK, but defining "letter of comment" vs. "article" or "review" may be a potential problem area, depending on how the zine is edited. [How about, if it appears in the lettercol it's a loc, if it appears elsewhere in the zine it is (unless specifically labeled otherwise) either an article or an editorial, depending upon authorship.] Are you requiring that letters be published in the zine they are commenting on, or will publication in any zine the commentee is likely to see (like apa disty comments, which can be considered LoCs published in the letter-writer's zine, instead of in the commented-on zine) count? [A LoC is a LoC, whatever its content. If one writes a LoC to zine B that also happens to comment on zine A, I don't see how that makes it any less a true LoC. So except for the apa case you cite, I really can't see the problem you mention coming up. I would say that disty or mailing comments in apas would have to be considered fanwriting rather than locs since they are published in the author's own zine. (Except maybe in the case of rotating apas like TAPS, in which the "zines" are in the form of letters.) But I can see the logic of the other position and I am willing to be convinced that substantively, mc's are LoCs and should be counted as such.]

### VIII ALTERNATIVE CATEGORIES

Jeff Smith:"It might also be worthwhile to consider the much talked about Best Article award. Charging two dollars instead of one for voting would cover the cost of special publication of the articles nominated, if need be. The publication could be handled fairly easily and fairly quickly by having different committee members stencilling the articles for one person (or more, in a large fan area) to run off." [I think this idea is definitely worth considering — but not until the awards are fully established.]

Sam Long:"Fanart: I think a "best cover" category would/might be a good idea."

Terry Jeeves:"By all means have a cover art award."

Don D'Amassa:"Best cover art? No."

Ray Nelson:"I am willing to listen to reason on my decision to base most of the awards on a single item rather than an overall output, but feel we should try to raise the standards of quality instead of mere quantity. It's difficult for me to read all the zines I get now, but I could sure use some more really memorable ones." [I'm not sure that I agree with Ray, but I think his position is one we must reckon with. I print this particular quote here because both the proposed cover art and single article awards are the kind that stress quality rather than quantity.]

### IX DEFINITION OF NOMINATORS AND VOTERS

Dick Eney:"You haven't made it clear just by referring to Section I what the qualifications for nominating or voting are. I know what you mean from reading the rest of the zine, not from what the rules say." [It's funny, I thought I had been quite clear (although perhaps not really explicit), but your comment and those of others made to me in person, force me to concede that I wasn't. I think that in the final version, where saving space won't be important, I will move to adopt Ray's abundantly plain, if somewhat repetitive, style in this matter. (See below.)]

Terry Jeeves:"Not so happy (if I read your intentions aright) on having nominations only by peers — i.e., only faneds nominate zines, artists (comic) nominate artists (comic) [No, artists could cross-nominate.] and so on. It is basically a good idea — who is better qualified to choose? The catch is who is eligible and how do you decide? Does one published sheet make one a faned? Can someone like Pete Weston nominate, he hasn't published in over a year, and so on. If I draw a pin man, does that qualify me



as a comic artist?? If you draw up a clear line in each case, OK, but I fancy the eligibility problem is the tough one here."

Mike Glicksohn::"The major difficulty I foresee in such a system of awards is the matter of rules for eligibility for voting, nominating and being nominated. If the categories are clearly stated, deciding who is eligible to be nominated shouldn't be a major problem. But how much makes a person eligible? Is a single hilarious cartoon sufficient? Does one loc qualify you as a letterhack? Is one issue of a fanzine enough to be best fanned? These things should be discussed and stated clearly beforehand."

"The same questions come up in the nominating area. Does publishing one two-page apazine with a twenty copy circulation qualify you to nominate for best fanzine editor? Does one published cartoon make you a valid art category nominator? Or do we set certain limits needed before you can nominate? And what if the committee isn't sure of your qualifications? How do you establish credentials? List your appearances in fanzines? What if the committee doesn't have the small apa mailing that's been your only place of appearance?"

Tom Digby::"2.2, OK in principle, but who checks credentials?"

Darroll Pardoe::"I assume the committee will scrutinise the credentials of all voters. This'd be all right, I think, because the standing of any voter would be well known from the fact that he'd have to be in print somewhere. There's not much scope for argument; if an excluded would-be voter could produce evidence that he had actually written for/drawn for/published a fmz his vote could be allowed. I suppose disallowed votes would have to be returned with the proviso that the voter had two weeks (say) to produce evidence of his standing."

Sam Long::"Nominations: Will we require that each nominator present "credentials" as it were to show his competence to nominate? I mean, like a note as to his zine, for zine/faned; the place-of-printing of an LoC of his for letter hack; similarly for artist. For instance, I could nominate under all the categories because I: 1)publish a fanzine, QWERTYUIOP (covering zine/faned); 2)have written for another fanzine, MOEBIUS TRIP number such-and-such (covering fanwriter); have published art in my own zines (for fanartist); and have had LoCs published in such-and-such zines (TITLE, etc.) (for letterhack). Now it's likely that the committee will know this [No comment]; but lesser-known fans, or hoaxfans, might try to nominate in categories that they oughtn't if we don't have some form of control there. . . . I dare say our ad hoc committee, or any committee, would have access to a large enough fanzine collection to check out most claims. Linda, Donn, Mikes Glyer and Sohn of Glick, and Harry Warner among them must receive almost all the fanzines worth the name in North Atlantic fandom."

"Perhaps we should have competence-to-vote blocks on the final ballot too; e.g., a block for nominators to check and a line for other fans to show what fanac they've done."

Bruce Arthurs::"Oddly enough, I find that I'm eligible to vote in all the categories you listed, even the fanartist, since I've had two or three fillos and illos printed in the last year. Here's a thought: what about the faneditor who uses his own art only in his own zine? Does a doodle like over in the margin [A little rocket which I won't try to reproduce here.] make a person qualified to vote in the fanartist category?" [This is another case that shows why I attempted to rule out self-published material in the best writer category. There is no simple solution.]

Lesleigh Luttrell::"As far as eligibility of nominators is concerned, I think you may have some difficulty determining who is and is not eligible. I suppose you could require them to submit as credentials copies of the fanzines they have appeared in, as FAPA does, but this would be an awful lot of trouble. I suspect the only workable system would be something like the TAFF/DUFF system of having the fan who thinks their name may not be known to the committee give another fan's name as reference. [That's just what I had in mind.] I have no objections to requiring nominators to be potentially eligible nominees in those categories they nominate in. . . . I'm not really sure why you do not allow nominators to nominate themselves. I know that this is not consid-



ered quite the thing to do in our culture, but I don't see anything really wrong with it. [Subjectivity that is not unavoidable.] Especially not if you allow people to nominate more than one person or fanzine in each category."

Ray Nelson::[What follows is, once again, an excerpt from Ray's Golden Beanie rules.] "The nominators in each category will be fannish fans, as defined in the preamble. [See II above.] Not eligible as nominators will be science-fiction professionals, defined as anyone who, during the year under consideration, received payment from any professional publisher for professionally published fiction or non-fiction in the science fiction genre. Not eligible as nominators will be inactive fans, defined as anyone whose work, during the year under consideration, has not appeared in any fannish fanzine.

"The nominees will be similarly restricted to fannish fans who are neither professionals nor inactive fans.

"Nominators may not nominate themselves or their own fanzines, couples may not nominate each other, and non-existent or "hoax" personalities may not be either nominators or nominees, though pen-names are allowed where the true names are known.

"All those eligible for nomination as Best Fan Editor may nominate for Best Fan Editor and for Best Single Issue.

"All those eligible for nomination as Best Fan Writer may nominate for Best Fan Writer and Best Single Issue." [Etc., etc., etc.]

Moshe Feder::"I'm still quite far from being able to make a comprehensive statement on this whole complex question of eligibility to nominate and vote. One thing I do feel, as I implied in my comment to Bruce, is that in a peer system we can not rely on self-accreditation. This seems to be a lot more obvious in the case of artwork (i.e., the danger that anyone with access to a duper could publish his own doodles and declare himself an artist) than it is in the case of writing (perhaps because writing is a more common skill), as the difference between the comments on this area and the area of the Best Writer award show. But it would be illogical and discriminatory to rule out self-published material in the art categories but not in the writer categories (although we do seem close to agreement that self-published material not be disallowed in the latter case). So let's have some more comment on this. How can we recognize that someone is not really an artist or writer or editor in a peer sense, until another person makes it so by accepting his art or writing for publication or sending him a LoC or trade for his zine? I hate to say it, but is a guild system the answer? Is what we need an Academy of Fannish Arts and Sciences, a fannish SFWA? I hope not!"

#### X SHOULD THERE BE OPEN NOMINATION FOR BEST ISSUE?

Harry Warner, Jr.::"I think I would feel more comfortable if 2.4 were changed to permit only fanzine editors to nominate for the best single issue of a fanzine, but that's not a big issue."

Mike Glicksohn::"Voting credentials are another touchy area. Should you go to the Any-one-Can-Vote route? Is the vote of a fan who's had one cartoon published by a friend to be considered equivalent to that of Harry Warner where choosing the best fanzine is concerned? Obviously not, yet the larger base of votes is a good thing. If only faneds vote for fanzines, is that going to produce any less subjective an award than letting anyone who's supported a fanzine in on the final say? Probably not. And trying to define standards by which to determine the eligibility of voters in each category would drive the committee nuts and overwork them to the point of gaffiation. I don't like it, but I guess your plan is the only workable one."

Eric Lindsay::"The unrestricted nominations for best fanzine seems a good idea."

Moshe Feder::"I still think my original proposal for openness here is good, but if we open best writer to self-published stuff, I'd be inclined to balance that liberal move



with a conservative move like restricting nominating privileges in the Best Single Issue category to fan editors."

#### XI SHOULD EDITORS NOMINATE FOR BEST WRITER?

Tom Digby::"2.5, Personalzine publishers too, or just editors whose zines consist mainly of material other than their own." [It doesn't matter, since even if we do decide that personalzine pubbers are fanwriters rather than faneditors, they'd be able to nominate in what would then be their own category.]

Eric Lindsay::"On faneds nominating writers but not the reverse, it seems fair to me, since I find it hard to think of a faned who doesn't also write a lot of material, often for other fanzines at that (which would make said person eligible)."

Lesleigh Luttrell::"I certainly agree that fan editors should be eligible to nominate in the writer category."

#### XII NOMINATION LIMITS

Bruce Arthurs::"Paragraph 2.1: How many nominations can a person make in each category?"

Ben Indick::"I would immediately say that I consider it unfair that any jury member should not be allowed to nominate his own work, in as many categories as he desires. Indeed, each nominating person should hand in a list of at least five nominations. From the total list, those nominations which received the most votes can be chosen as finalists. There are a tremendous number of fanzines, and in this way there will be less chance of slighting any. Also, prohibiting an editor from nominating himself may be interpreted as prohibiting him from nominating material which has appeared in his (her) own zine. I do not think the poll would become a medium of self-aggrandizement, so long as he also named other zines." [It's not self-aggrandizement I'm worried about, I'm simply interested in making the FAANs the best determiner of objective quality they can be, and allowing self-nomination is contrary to that aim insofar as it is expressed in the concept of peer nomination.]

Donn Brazier::"In [the] nomination [section] there might have to be a 2.8. To make the nomination list workable there ought to be a maximum number of names in each category — what if a hundred fans named 100 different things in each category? The listing alone would take pages. How about 25 maximum, the top 25 in frequency of nomination? I pick 25 because I think the egoboo value is greater than say top 5 — and also because it gives the voter more choice. [Too much choice, in my opinion. So much choice that it almost makes all the preceding carefully-defined peer nomination meaningless.] I never liked to have my choice limited to five — or even two, for PRESIDENT OF THE USA! [Too many names on the final ballot would make it very hard to end up with a winner supported by a majority. (Even with an Australian ballot, a 25-name list would be very troublesome and time-consuming. Can you imagine having to list 25 fans in order of preference in each category! In six categories? That's 150 names!)]

Linda Bushyager::"I suggest we allow each nominator to name two fen in each category and then list a maximum of five in each category on the final ballot — except that if in a close or tie situation six or seven names bunched up at the top the committee could enlarge the final-ballot listing, or if only two or three names were very far ahead of the other nominees, the listing could be shortened."

Moshe Feder::"Limits, both minimal and maximal, on nominations and listed finalists was one of the few areas I meant to discuss in my open letter and didn't. Setting the limits too high will both increase our work load and work to defeat our purposes. At this point, I agree with Linda's suggestion, with the added specification that the one, two, or possibly, three names each person could list would be weighted equally and not be given in order of preference. If someone has a clear preference, they ought to list that single name alone. The two or three-name option is intended for those who like two potential nominees equally. I'll call for a vote on this so we can get rolling.]



### XIII NOMINATION PERIOD

Terry Jeeves::"Your period is OK, but here again, a bit limiting on overseas fen, as zines often take two months to get here, which doesn't leave much leeway."

Eric Lindsay::"I have some quibbles about the short period of time for nomination and voting, especially considering the horrible service to overseas fen provided by the post office (I posted you a fanzine this morning — expect it in three months! It was faster when they were using sailing ships.), but I agree that such a thing needs to get underway as soon as possible, and arguing by mail from overseas is a dead end in any case."

Harry Warner, Jr.::"At 2.1 we come to what seems to me to be the only major faw in your proposal. You don't make it clear in these nominations statements, but I assume you're thinking of a system similar to the Hugo or Oscar method, where only a few people or things that get the most nominations are listed on the final ballot. If so, the whole structure as now set up would militate against winners anywhere except in North America. Nowadays, it takes at least two months for most fanzines to arrive from the British isles and three months would be a fair average for Australian fanzines. I received at the end of September two fanzines from Mae Strelkov which she mailed in Argentina in late April and early May. I assume that things work the same in the opposite direction. So anything published toward the end of the year would have little chance of nomination for the best single issue category and an exceptional article or illustration in it would suffer a sharp decline in chances, if published far from North America, and North American publications issued late in the year wouldn't pick up sufficient support from other continents. A side effect might be a tendency for most fans to wait until the last minute to nominate, to give fanzines a chance to arrive from far away, causing some fans to fail to do it after all and a late rush of tabulation work for the teller. I can see only two ways to avoid these problems: avowedly and deliberately limit the whole awards project to North American fans and fanzines, or set a different year for fanzines published on other continents, running perhaps from October 1 to September 30, so they'll have time to reach North America during the nomination period. This wouldn't help fans on other continents who want to nominate, but realistically, most of the participation will be North American, anyway."

Moshe Feder::"The problem Harry, Eric and Terry describe is a serious one. Since we want the FANs to be definitive awards, excluding foreign zines and fans is unacceptable and the problem must be solved. We might allow non-North American zines published late in the year to be eligible for nomination a second time a year later than usual if they were not nominated the first time (presumably possibly because of mail lag). But this only solves the problem in one direction, doesn't deal with articles or art or letters that could not be considered by nominators for other awards and would add confusion and an unfair advantage for foreign zines. Harry's suggestion is better, but it is still only a one-way solution and it too adds the confusion of inconsistency. I would like to suggest for our consideration the possibility of carrying Harry's idea one step further by putting the eligibility year three months out of phase with the calendar year for all fanzines, no matter what their geographical origin. This has the advantage of simplicity, even-handedness and effectiveness. It would work fine (except for the possibility of memory and enthusiasm-loss difficulties) if there were such a thing in fandom as a verifiable official date of publication. The eligible dates could be from Oct. through Sept. and then there would be three months for delivery to the readers. Unfortunately, as we will see in the section immediately following, date verification is going to be a problem even without this complicating addition to its importance. I would welcome further discussion of this foreign-zine problem. How important do you think it is? What can be done about it?"

### XIV DATE VERIFICATION

Don D'Amassa::"I see some difficulty in determining eligibility for nominees and nominators, primarily because most fanzines are undated, and the logistic problem. Assuming you require the nominator to provide credentials on his ballot, such as "loc to GRANNY #3," "article in PLACEBO 4," etc., you will not only have to check the fanzine to see if such



actually did appear, you will have to make certain that the fanzine appeared during the appropriate calendar year. The same problem arises with regard to appearances of items being nominated. Frankly, I'm not even certain which of my own fanzines appeared in which year, and probably couldn't reconstruct all of them, particularly those that appeared in December or January. The solution would be to have all fanzines dated, but I don't see how you would see that."

Harry Warner, Jr.: "The other matter may be even more dreadful as a source of controversy; how do you decide when something was published? Assume, as one example, that a Pennsylvania fan takes a batch of copies of the new issue of his fanzine to the Phillycon in the middle of December and sells several dozen of them there, but doesn't get around to mailing out the bulk of that edition until just after the first of the year. Is that counted as publication in 1974 or 1975? The same situation could arise with a fanzine that is distributed partly via an apa and partly by individual mailing, like Mike Glicksohn's XENIUM. Another example of how this could be a headache: the fan who wants to nominate won't know for sure whether some fanzines were published before or after the first of the year in the case of third class publications which often don't contain a postmark and may take two or three weeks or even longer to go from the East Coast to the West Coast. There would hardly be time for the committee to publish a list of which year-end publications are eligible and get it widely distributed until the nominating was well under way. [Even if it were possible to compile such a list, and I'm not sure it is.] The rough and ready solution to this problem would be simply to disregard nominations for single issue awards which are found to have been published after the first of the year, but how would you know if something published too late influenced a nominator's decision in the other categories? [There is no system in which that is possible.] The problem might be mitigated by substituting "generally received" for "published" but there would still be complications and I don't know how it can be worked out to everyone's satisfaction."

Moshe Feder: "The problem of publication date is another very difficult one for which we may be forced to accept a less than ideal solution simply because no ideal solution exists. It is obvious that the simple fact of a fanzine's having been reproduced and collated is not sufficient to make it published. Reception by readers is what counts. On a theoretical basis, we might consider that a fanzine is published when 60% of its eventual readership has received it. Practically speaking, we have no way of knowing. One thing we are going to find ourselves doing, I think, is to go by when a majority of the committee received a zine. It would be possible to "cheat" by sending the first fifteen copies to the committee, but there would be little point to this since you're not going to get nominated if a lot more than 15 don't receive your zine. Some people will notice and remember that a zine arrived after New Year's day and at least as many people will assume that as assume it arrived before, among those who didn't notice and aren't sure. All in all, this is an area that will have to be subject to the committee's discretion on a case by case basis. I wonder, though, the Hugos have a similar, if somewhat simpler problem, and they ignore it completely. Knowing that most people are aware of the rules, they simply assume that if a zine has gotten sufficient votes to achieve nomination it was probably published during the year in question. Although it sacrifices some perfection, I think we too will have to go this route for the sake of practicality. In the case of nominator's credentials on the other hand, when there is any doubt, the applicant can present evidence — the burden of proof being on him — and the committee can decide accordingly. Let's have some further discussion of this. In the meantime, may I humbly suggest that everyone start keeping a log of the fanzines they receive, NOW!"

#### XV VOTING PERIOD

Harry Warner, Jr.: "3.1: Are you allowing enough time between the closing of nominations and final voting? It will take a few days to do the tabulating and publicize the results and unless someone undertakes to do a lot of airmailing overseas, or someone in the United Kingdom and Australia begins publishing a regular newszine, it will be particularly hard for those distant fans to learn the lists of nominees promptly." [See XXVI.]

Tom Digby: "Just two weeks to count nominations, prepare ballots, and send them back out? And are the dates postmarks or dates received? [I'd be liberal and go with postmarks.]



Unless you are expecting discussion back and forth in various zines during the 'campaign' (like the 'who I'm supporting for Hugos' articles that show up every year) you may want a short voting deadline so people won't have time to put their ballots aside and forget them. Also, this would give more time for vote-counting and preparing the trophies."

Donn Brazier::"Nominations and Voting dates. Wish we could compress this. If the SASE idea is accepted (and I vote for it), the process could be shortened at least to two months nominating, one month thinking and two months voting. That would be all over, then, by June 1. Conceivable that the one month thinking could be eliminated (included in the two months time for voting), so that the whole thing could be over by May 1. Then early conventions could be prepared and set for the presentations. Not only gives the con people more time, but gets the awards over long before the Hugo voting confusion possibility."

Moshe Feder::"I don't think it's possible to know how much time is necessary for counting nomination ballots, printing final ballots etc. until we actually try it. We also have to time things so that most people who want to vote will do so in time, without stretching things out too long. Can anyone tell us how long it takes to tabulate nominations, prepare final ballots and count final-ballot votes in the Hugo process? In any case, ultimately we are going to have to use our own best judgment here and I think the schedule I outlined last time is as good a start as any."

#### XVI TABULATION: PLURALITY VS. AUSTRALIAN BALLOT

Tom Digby::"3.3, I'd prefer the system of first, second, third etc. choices like for Hugos. For one thing, "splitting the vote" is more of a possibility with your system." [I'm not sure what you mean by "splitting the vote", unless you're referring to the increased likelihood that a candidate with less than an absolute majority of the vote can win. I, personally, find that perfectly acceptable compared to the distortions inherent in the Australian-ballot system.]

Lesleigh Luttrell::"I also do not see why you do not use the Australian ballot system, unless you wish to encourage ties. Australian ballot really isn't that difficult to count, [That's not what I'm afraid of.] and I think it would provide a more accurate reflection of second, third, etc. place in each category than does straight balloting."

Donn Brazier::"Voting 3.4, also allied with 3.6 next page, 'most votes' — what if one category has Joe Fan with 54 and Alice Fan with 53 and hardly anyone else voted for? Could they not be ties? In other words, virtual voting-equals rather than exact-vote winner?? If the votes ran JF 34, AF 33, XY 32, DF30 etc. then JF would be picked as winner. [I consider this unfair, inconsistent and ~~completely unacceptable~~ self-defeating, and I'm dead set against it. I'd prefer an Australian ballot to this.]

Ray Nelson::"The winner in each category shall be that nominee who receives the most votes in that category. . . . In case of a tie, the administrator [See XXIII.] will cast the deciding vote." [An interesting idea, but another that I'm against.]

#### XVII PRESENTATION

Tom Digby::"The problem is that there seems to be no good place (if you want a place) other than the Worldcon to announce the winners. Regionals may lead to a dull ceremony with no winners present and for the majority may be like mailing out an announcement. One possibility might be to have a committee member chosen in each major fan center to announce the awards there as nearly simultaneously as possible — perhaps at simultaneous parties (less formal than banquets and cheaper) or at the nearest practical club meeting (assuming news travels slowly enough that most others won't hear the results for a week or so, so each announcement will be fresh for its audience). Or perhaps, since these are fanzine awards, let the winner of each category decide how to announce it. But I'd vote for just mailing it to the voters, with perhaps telegrams to the winners so they hear it first and the telegram makes it "special." "



William Rotsler::"Why not make the awards at the Worldcon? Otherwise, you'd just be mailing the people the awards and part of the fun of getting one is having people see you get it and congratulate you, etc."

Sam Long::"Perhaps one of these days we can give the FAANs out at Worldcons; but I think you're well advised to start on the regional cons, especially the better-known ones."

Harry Warner, Jr.::"I don't think a final decision on 4.2 can be made until you get some reaction from con sponsors. Fan politics are bound to enter the situation, and a few influential people in the regional cons are bound to oppose the whole idea as detracting from the Hugos strongly enough to make one or more regional cons out of bounds. Just guessing, I would imagine that the Midwestcon would be the best opportunity of presenting the awards the first year [or two?], and a rotation system could be worked out later after reaction boils up and settles down and we see where we're welcome and where we aren't."

Donn Brazier::"4.7 too late by third weekend in August. Was this done to make certain of a regional convention? [Well, Bubonicon and DeepSouthcon are both late in August.] If not, let's push that date further away from the Worldcon. Atleast a month earlier."

Tom Digby::"4.2: Sounds nice, but will probably result in very few winners being present to accept (probably the result of 4.1). I wouldn't be surprised if often there are no winners present. I wonder if you should either go ahead and do it at Worldcon but before the Hugo banquet, or else skip presentation ceremonies altogether and mail out the announcement to the voters. Special banquets might have the problem in that only fans living in the city they are held in will show up unless you start your own convention series around them."

Ray Nelson::"Each presentation will be made, if possible, at the science-fiction convention, regional or local, located the closest to the recipient's home and held during the calendar year following the voting, but not later than January 1 of the following year. If there is reason to believe the recipient will not attend any convention where the award can be made, the award will be mailed. No attempt at restriction to North America or rotation will be made."

"[One of the] two provisions I am most eager to press [is] the presentation of the awards at conventions chosen only for their proximity to the recipients home. (This is a sore point tome as an ex-European fan.)"

Moshe Feder::"There is some logic in presenting the FAANs by mail — fandom is undeniably a postal hobby. But I agree with Bill that part of the fun of winning an award is the excitement and inherent egoboo of a fancy presentation ceremony. On the other hand, Tom's points about the unlikelyhood of many winners being present at a single, given regional cannot be ignored. For the moment, therefore, I am leaning towards Ray's approach. However, presentation is the last stage of the awards process and I think that since we do have some time, we should use it to hear other opinions before a vote is called."

### XVIII REGIONS

Tom Digby::"If you insist on presenting awards at regionals, why not rotate among several name series of cons (like Midwestcon, Westercon, etc.) with provisions for a substitute if a con is not held or is combined with a Worldcon? Otherwise, I'd say "regions as defined in the Worldcon rotation rules".

Dick Eney::"You never said why you didn't take the obvious solution for defining the regions: just incorporate the Worldcon Rules' definition, which we can expect everybody to know or be able to find out; but that really is a quibble, since you indicated that it would be ironed out later." [The reason I didn't take the "obvious solution" is that it is not at all obvious to me. The worldcon rotation rules are o.k., but they may not be right for our purposes. For example, the realities of fanzine fandom may make having an Eastern region less sensible than having both a North East-Midlantic and a Southern region. Or we may want to consider giving England and/or Australia a regular place in the rotation.



Most importantly, I did not want to compromise our independence by official reference to a pre-existing body over which we have no control and to which we have no formal relation.]

Bruce Arthurs::"Paragraph 4.2: The different regions will have to be defined. Emotionally, because I was raised in the Southwest, I think of "East" as anything east of the Mississippi River, and Midwest as between the Rockies and the Miss. In actuality, it ain't so simple. If a "South" region is needed, we could simply use Meade Frierson's ten-state Southern Fandom Confederation group. (And Markstein's con [See below.] would be a good place to give them out.)"

Donn Brazier::"Yes, I would have a Southern Region as the region is active (Frierson, Koch et al with the Confederation)."

Eric Lindsay::"Keeping the awards generally in North America makes sense to me, since most fans are there."

Linda Bushyager::"I think rotating the presentation site is a good idea, but would prefer to leave it unofficial and up to the committee, to give them the most freedom. On 4.5, I think we should provide for a lengthening of the nomination and voting periods as well as a shortening."

## XIX PUBLICITY

Harry Warner, Jr.::"I think it's essential to be totally honest in the initial general publicity about the new awards, emphasizing that they're meant to give fanzine fandom its just deserts because of dissatisfaction with the direction the fan Hugos have been taking, thus forestalling any complaints that we're secretly trying to freeze out Trekkies, Borroughs fans and so on."

Donn Brazier::"Much preliminary notice by all fanzines will have to be put into the works almost immediately to get this thing going by January 1. Already my own TITLE, for instance, which is to be mailed in November, is filled up and collated; I could only get the news into the issue to be mailed in December. Maybe highly interested faneds could send out a special to all their readers." [I think it's obvious by now that we're not going to be able to start quite so early as January 1. However, I do feel sure that if we are able to resolve at least those issues relating to nominations (including eligibility) by TZF #2, we could open nominations in early or mid February — which, with our flexible schedule, would be no great setback.]

Ray Nelson::"All fan editors submitting nominations agree to publish and distribute to their mailing lists a nomination blank and a copy of the rules some time between Jan. 1 and March 1. This may be done as part of a regular issue of their fanzine."

Tom Digby::"Maybe announcements of opening of nominations could be on a chain-letter basis — 'pass this on to three or four people you think would qualify' — or otherwise make some arrangements for an inner core of zine producers to circulate it??"

Ben Indick::"Since there are so many zines, it might be advisable, if some benefactor could be found, to reprint a zine composed of the finalists in each category, to be sold to defray costs, and give the voters a chance to sample everything. After all, few fans see all the zines, outside of LOCUS and the redoubtable Irwin Koch. You mention collecting a fee for voting, which would cover costs; I would say make it a bit larger to include this offset-zine of all entries. The zine itself would be a collectors item of sorts." [This sounds fine, until you begin to think about how representative work could be chosen to stand for a whole year's output by an artist, writer or loccer. And how the hell this could be applied to best editor or single issue is beyond me! No, I think Jeff Smith's variant of this idea as it might be applied to a future best article award (See VIII.) stands up better under scrutiny. Still, Ben, you make a good point. One thing we can do would be to ask nominees to provide a list of their appearances (or zines published) in the previous year which could be distributed with the final ballot.]



Harry Warner, Jr.: "One other point I should have brought out sooner, which might or might not be a good one from the propaganda standpoint: why not pledge from the outset full disclosure of the exact count in the final voting? There has been considerable grumbling over the way most worldcon committees have refused to tell exactly how many votes each nominee received. Matter of fact, after each year's awards are presented, it might be good to publish also the number of nominations received by each individual and fanzine that got nominated; you wouldn't want to announce that before final voting, though, because it could affect the way people voted." [I support the concept of full disclosure.]

## XX OTHER FANDOMS

Ray Nelson: "Moshe, it looks like you are impaled on the proverbial horns of a dilemma; unless you exclude from consideration for the Gilded Beanie those zines 'primarily devoted to televised science-fiction and fantasy' you will not succeed in your avowed aim of keeping out the 'undestrables' (Trekkies, Apes, etc.), but if you do include such a provision, you can't help but look like a 'closed-minded conservative.'"

"Worse yet, even if you do include the exclusion clause, Trekkies and Apes can easily evade it since both Star Trek stories and Apes stories are published in book, magazine and comic book forms. Not only that, but you place yourself in the position of having to define such terms as 'primarily' and 'fanzine.'"

Harry Warner, Jr.: "I don't think 'not primarily devoted to televised science fiction or fantasy' would be sufficient to achieve what we obviously want to do, because comics fandom is also quite strong and might start moving in. Maybe someone could think of a satisfactory term for what I keep referring to stupidly as 'mainstream fandom' and put it right into the rules. 'Mainstream fandom' is a sort of contradiction in terms because so many people use mainstream as an antonym to fantasy, but you probably know what I mean by it: the fandom that is left when all the subfandoms are subtracted. [That's a circular definition, Harry, since 'subfandom' only has meaning in relation to a clearly defined main-fandom. But yes, I do know what you mean. I think we could define it historically — but then, that's your field.] I think it would be a good idea to be blunt and honest about the awards in all publicity from the outset, making it plain in prominent places that they have been created by what I call mainstream fans for mainstream fans, so there would be no cries of foul if it becomes necessary later to eject monster fans, ape fans and other subfans from the party."

Tom Digby: "Hmmm. Perhaps a good definition of a 'fanzine' is 'Any zine which would be considered by most fans to be part of the main body of what is known to most science fiction fans as "science fiction fandom" [Talk about circular definitions!!] and which is operated on a primarily non-monetary basis (little or no advertising or contributions, most copies given for considerations other than payment of money). Zines which are primarily to publicize a specific cause are not included in this definition.' This would exclude the Apezines and Trekzines, plus the semi-pro zines, without excluding any specific topic. Any place a rule says "seems to be" would be up to the Committee to judge."

Sam Long: "How to keep the awards mainstream and not siphon them off Trekwise and Apewise etc. is another vexing question. At present, I think your [proposed] clause about not "associated with TV series" is the best answer. Perhaps we ought to say '...in case of a dispute as to whether a zine is eligible, the ruling of a majority of the committee shall be final...'"

Sandra Miesel: "Discon may have marked the high-tide of the trekkie threat to the Hugos but they could use their memberships in Discon to nominate at Aussiecon. The situation last year simply reflects trufan apathy on nominating. But was it really so much worse than the nominations of [certain others] in past years? The trekkies ought to have their own awards at their own giant conventions instead of trying to give their awards at our conventions." [Right on!]

Bruce Arthurs: "I don't think 'Apefandom' will ever be too large, since the TV series has already been canceled (as of January). In fact, the largest Ape influence left around



are all those toys based on PotAthat the manufacturers were convinced to make this year. Any apeters that come out of those will be so young, I think, that their parents probably don't even allow them to cross the street themselves, much less attend conventions."

Ray Nelson: "With [my] setup we limit the fanzines eligible to compete to those dealing with 'professional magazine and book science fiction, or to humorous reportage of the doings of amateur and professional science fiction personalities.' Trekkies and Apes will not be able to enter the race unless it is with issues limited to the magazine and book manifestations of their genres, and I think we can live with that. Also, the insertion of the word 'humorous' rules out serconzines [Something I don't want to do.], and no chinks are left for slipping in fan fiction. The word 'fantasy' is left out purposely, because fantasy fandom is rapidly developing into almost 'another fandom' and should soon be ready to award its own people."

Don D'Amassa: "You raise an interesting problem with regard to STAR TREK fanzines. I don't know if your particular method of excluding them is the best, but I agree completely that they should be excluded, along with the SCA, Apefandom and similar sub-genres. If this makes me an elitist, so be it. I don't notice SFWA rushing to admit comic-strip writers to their membership."

Jeff Smith: "I would nix the idea of pre-ruling against television fans. (As might be obvious already, I think the fewer the rules the better.) If we do appear to be being taken over, then the board of directors should carefully consider an exclusion law."

Donn Brazier: "I am optimistic that only the fanzine freaks will hear about this in such a degree that they will actively nominate and vote. . . . I wouldn't limit the fanzines by tacking on the TV qualification. Let the nominators and voters eliminate such a zine by their action." [As long as trekkies, apes etc. are eligible to nominate, we can't depend on nominators to exclude fringe/sub fandom fanzines.]

Mike Glicksohn: "I'm against restricting the content matter of fanzines: leaving the definition general may allow block voting by Trekkies or Apers, or some other splinter group, but the drawbacks of eliminating them through the definition are worse." [Look, I don't want to restrict the content of fmzs anymore than you do, and I haven't. The trekkies or whoever can write whatever they want to in their fanzines, they just won't be eligible for the FAANs that's all, because the FAANs are for mainstream fans. If an Ape or Trekkie wants to participate in the FAANs, all he has to do is publish a mainstream SF-fannish fanzine, or write an article for one or write a loc to one. If the subfandomites think their zines should win awards, they should create their own awards.]

Darroll Pardoe: "The exclusion of 'fmz devoted to televised SF or fantasy' I don't like: if a Trekkie zine was good enough to win the most votes of what will after all be the hard core of fan publishers, then why shouldn't it win? It'd deserve to." [Yes, with you I agree absolutely, because you make the critical distinction — you assume that the nominators and voters would be hard core fen. If they were, and they chose a Trekzine to win, then, indeed, it would deserve it. But that's the problem here, making subfan material eligible without letting all the subfandom, non-hard-core fen in as potential nominators and voters. They outnumber us tremendously, and once let in could insure that only non-hard-core, non-mainstream, fringe/sub fans and fanzines could win. We went over similar ground in section V. The essence of my position as I type this page is that I am willing to let anything be nominatable, but I am NOT willing to let just anyone nominate or vote. That's what qualified-peer nomination is all about.]

Bruce Arthurs: "Re your comment on p.6 about televised SF: LEAVE IT OUT! Just because there hasn't been an outstanding Star Trek zine (that I've seen, at least) doesn't mean there never will be one worthy of consideration for an award. And suppose some other, more challenging TV series hits the tube someday, with enough to it that a great fanzine could come out of it? (Don't hold your breath, but . . .) It's the principle that counts in this. [Yes, and the principle is that even a moderately popular TV show is seen by more people in one evening than ever read all but the rarest best-sellers, and SF has none in that class. The TV audience just isn't as intelligent, literate or SF-knowledgable as



the fans of written SF are. Most of them are also receivers rather than transmitters, they go to conventions to be entertained, not to contribute, and, in the same way, they are a lot less likely to ever become a publishing fandom, let alone produce good zines. The exceptions are the ones who could have become real SF fans but didn't (perhaps because today's public prefers the passivity of TV-watching to the effort and involvement of reading?). In any case there will always be some — but a significant number, mind you — televi-diots who will discover SF on TV and then discover fandom who will want to vote for the fanzines and fans of their favorite show. As I've already made clear, and as I'm getting tired of saying, I think these people have to be excluded, even if material about the programs they watch (comics they read, movies they go to, trashy series they buy etc.) is not.]

## XXI FAAN vs. HUGO

Harry Warner, Jr.: "I don't see any particular reason for trying to get the new awards handed out in time to influence Hugo voting: the whole point of them is that we're no longer able to cope with the growth of subfandoms and fringe-fans; otherwise we would try to control the Hugo fan awards and wouldn't be forced to invent new ones."

Donn Brazier: "It shouldn't look like the main idea is to get a jump on the Hugos (which I don't think it is, but others might so think)." [Right. My only concern is that by seeing that our awards are announced and presented first, we secure for them the maximum impact (which, as new awards, they are sorely going to need) by keeping them from being in any way anti-climactic. (The Hugos, on the other hand, will not, I think, suffer by being presented after the FAANs; they already have their prestige.)]

Ruth Berman: "I think you should push [the FAANs] in terms of supplementing the Hugos, not being in any way 'better.' After all, what it's likely to come down to is a more accurate popularity poll, if it works." [Well, I think the FAANs are "better," but then, that's only natural. Seriously, though, they are meant as supplementary and companion awards (See the first two paragraphs of my open letter.) and not as a replacement.]

## XXII COMMITTEE SIZE

Lesleigh Luttrell: "I think you are making your administrative committee much too big. All other objections aside, a committee of 15 fans could easily include most of the top nominees in every category. After all, there really aren't all that many of us fanzine fans left. And I think it would be pretty unwieldy. For one thing, it is almost impossible to count ballots unless all the tellers live in the same area. I suppose you could have a large committee with only one or two official tellers, and the others mainly as advisors, but that seems a little silly. I would suggest a much smaller committee, say five people." [You've got to remember that the committee will also be acting as judges, so the more representative the committee is of fanzine fandom as a whole, the better. And it's easier to make a large committee representative than a small one.//I've been assuming that there would be one single, central teller, but there's really no reason you couldn't have a few, each in a different region, as long as you know you can trust them, what's the difference.//In general, I think I have already described my ideas in this area back on the first two pages. I must admit, though, that you make a good point about potential nominees on the committee. I'm starting to think we may have to compromise and allow committee members to remain eligible for nomination, rather than give up any chance of having a distinguished committee.]

Bruce Arthurs: "Why do you need fifteen people on the committee? More people means more breakdowns in communications, problems with coordination, etc. On the other hand, it does insure that if one person quits or gaffes, it won't be a fatal blow to the committee structure, as it might be with only say, three people. Personally, I don't think I'd feel comfortable with more than five or six people, tops."[\*Sigh\*]

Ray Nelson: "The administrator will normally be the only officer of the Gilded Beanie Awards Committee. He will be responsible for turning over to his successor an accounting of the distribution of the fan awards fund [See XXVIII.], and will be prepared to open



his account books for investigation to any past holder of the office. [Now this is a refreshingly different approach — even if I wouldn't vote for it. Comments?]

"I am modeling the office of Administrator on that of an apa OE. Experience has shown me that if you want to get things done, one single person can succeed where huge committees fail. And I think it's only sporting that one year's winner be another year's administrator, even though I suppose we ought to add that the same person cannot be winner in any category for two years in succession. And of course, TAFF winners are supposed to publish, as a kind of quid pro quo, a con report. This isn't, in other words, an unprecedented and unreasonable demand."

Moshe Feder::"As much as I like Ray's idea in some ways, I just don't have the chutzpah or the clout to handle this as a one-man project (not to speak of the time). I think Ray will concede that the size of the project alone necessitates a committee of some kind, at least in these foundational stages. Later, perhaps, some other system can be adopted — that will be up to the voters."

### XXIII COMMITTEE COMPOSITION AND ELECTION

Lesleigh Luttrell::"If you want to elect the committee, I guess the balloting would have to be done with the balloting for the awards, or you would be unlikely to get many people voting on it. Since members of the committee would not be eligible for the awards [As I said, we may have to change that.] and I suspect you will find most of the fans interested in being on the committee would also be fans you would expect to be nominated, it would not be fair to have too large a committee, or too long terms for the committee members. I think you might reconsider the idea of inviting the winners of the awards to serve on the committee the next year since they would be less likely to be unhappy at not having a chance at the award the next year." [Yes, I will have to consider that. Although I do think that an elected committee has special virtues not obtainable with any other system, I can't help but recognize the many complications an election will entail. If the majority of the founders feel that idealism must bow to practicality here, I don't think I'd fight a move to adopt Ray's system.]

Darroll Pardoe::"The committee (15 is maybe a little too big?) should be made up by place, since a rotation system is to be operated. The idea that the committee include representatives from each area of the rotation seems to be a natural follow-up to a rotation scheme. The alternative, committee representation by craft wouldn't work, because so many people would be eligible in more than one category. The place where one lives is obvious enough, and you can't very well be in two places at once, but one fan could quite easily be a publisher, artist, writer and LoCer, all at once, which makes nonsense of the craft system."

Donn Brazier::"I think a committee based on award categories would be most workable for the different ideas to be evolved. I don't think geography has much to do with it. [What we need are] Some faneds of perhaps different types (gen, pers, news, etc.), non-ed writers, artists, letterhacks, maybe a couple of people with club affiliations of active status (NFFF, etc.)."

Don D'Amassa::"One possible method of rotating the committee that you didn't mention was having local clubs rotate the membership. For example, LASFS could sponsor the entire project (from the point of view of the paperwork) one year, NESFA another, WSFA another, and other local groups in similar fashion. Conceivably, final ballots could include a vote on which bidding club would sponsor the awards the following year." [This is a fresh and original approach, but I can't go along with it. For one thing, this would return us to the Hugo system in which fandom is forced to choose a group rather than individuals. For another, I don't think there is sufficient overlap between fanzine fandom and club fandom to make this idea appropriate (or of interest to the clubs.)]

Harry Warner, Jr.::"After the first committee of administrators is chosen somehow (and I heartily agree with the idea of having only a few terms expire each year), why couldn't the replacements be elected by all the fans who get nominated each year." [An interesting variant worthy of consideration, Harry, sort of an electoral college system half-way between the Nelson/Luttrell proposal and mine. HMMMMMM.]



Tom Digby::"On consecutive terms -- let the short-term, first-members have second terms but put the limit into effect later."

Linda Bushyager::"I'm not convinced that election is the best way to choose committee members. I would prefer, for example, a system in which the existing committee chooses among volunteers (having solicited them, if necessary) to fill spaces that will be opening up. Unlike you, Moshe, I have no paranoid fears that this would lead to the perpetuation of cliques on the committee, I don't believe that there are any cliques in fandom with more than five fans in them."

Ray Nelson::"The administrator of the first year's awards will be the president of the Gilded Beanie Awards Committee. Thereafter, this post will be offered to the fans nominated for Best Fan Editor, beginning with the winner and going down the list in order of voters' preference. If nobody in this category is willing to accept the honorary position, it should then be offered to the winner of [the Best Single Issue Award], that category's runners-up, [the Best Fan Writer category] winner, then runners-up, [the Best Fan Artist category] winner, then runners-up and so on. If the low man in the Letterhack category refuses the honor, the presentations will be discontinued."

#### XXIV SPECIAL AWARDS

Don D'Amassa::"I see no particular reason for a special committee award, but don't feel too strongly on that matter and could probably be convinced otherwise."

Jeff Smith::"There should be a potential committee award, also provision for a special voter's award for rare occasions."

Sam Long::"Should the committee be empowered to give a FAAN on its own? I think it should be permitted, but the circumstances should be extraordinary. Chesley Bonestell's Hugo this year was well-deserved, but not strictly legal."

Harry Warner, Jr.::"I definitely like the idea of a committee empowered to make awards of its own. Why couldn't it be required to make one retroactive award each year to some outstanding fan of the past (excluding anyone who has ever received a Hugo, in order to spread the egoboo as rapidly as possible) and authorized to make one other award if desired each year, to cover any special situation? For instance, if some fan is ever fool enough to bring up to date the fanzine index, he probably wouldn't win in any of the regular categories and could be honored this way."

#### XXV ELIGIBILITY OF NON-AMATEURS

Sam Long::"Nominees who appear only in non-eligible zines? No."

Don D'Amassa::"I don't believe people whose work appeared exclusively in semi-pro fanzines should be eligible. By that reasoning, Rotsler could get best non-fiction writing on the basis of an interview in VERTEX."

Harry Warner, Jr.::"One [matter] is bound to be a hot potato and I think it should be settled by inclusion of a provision in the rules covering it: whether professionals are eligible to receive these fan awards for non-paid fanzine contributions or for their own fanzines, and what constitutes a professional if they aren't eligible." [I believe that genuine, un-paid fan pieces by pros should be eligible, since the people in question are functioning in a fan capacity when they write such pieces. I have no intention of disallowing stuff like that in Bloch's The Eighth Stage of Fandom, and as far as I know, it's the precise kind of thing you've just described. I don't see why a person's being a pro should make any difference, if he's a fan he's a fan, no matter how he makes his living. (Jeezus, Harry, even you are a professional writer, after all.) I'm certainly not going to admit that a pro is necessarily a better fan writer for that fact and therefore has an unfair advantage of some kind for which we must disqualify him. And the same goes for fanzines. I think this is one of the areas in which we can leave it to the voters to weigh the issues in each case and decide for themselves.]



Ray Nelson::"Not eligible as nominators will be science-fiction professionals, defined as anyone who, during the year under consideration, received payment from any professional publisher for professionally published fiction or non-fiction in the science-fiction genre." [Well, I've just explained what I think about this viewpoint, but I will add here that I think Ray's plan would exclude too many fanzine fans who manage to write and sell two or three stories a year. Curiously, Ray himself is one of these people, and so are Bruce Arthurs, Juanita Coulson, Alpajpuri, Hank Davis (My fingers are crossed, BAP!), Mike Glicksohn, Dan Steffan (we mustn't forget the artists, Ray!) and maybe even me.]

Jeff Smith::"I do not agree with your proposal that a publisher of an amateur zine be denied any privileges because he also publishes a semi-pro zine."

Darroll Pardoe::"I don't like the suggestion that fans who publish both fanzines and semi-prozines should be excluded in any way, even partly. If someone publishes a fmz which is eligible, the fact that he also produces another which isn't shouldn't be relevant in any way."

Moshe Feder::"I have already made my position on the eligibility of material by pros. I will add that I don't think material by anyone, fan or pro, in a pro or semi-pro publication should be eligible. On the question of committee membership for those who publish both fan and semi-pro zines: My original idea was that a purely amateur committee would be more in keeping with the nature of the awards. However, upon further consideration, I find my position inconsistent (considering what I've said about the fan-writing of pros, for example) and I now agree with Jeff and Darroll."

#### XXVI FUNDING, EXPENSES, ETC.

Darroll Pardoe::"I have some qualms about how many people would stump up \$1 to vote. At least with TAFF and DUFF the money goes to what is a recognizably charitable object, but would people feel the same about an award? Are there other sources of income which which could be tapped so that the voting fee could be reduced or perhaps eliminated altogether? Maybe the paying should be done at the nominating, not the final voting."

Sandra Miesel::"Your zeal for the new awards project is commendable. I agree with the basic ideas, just as I indicated at Midwestcon. The only stumbling block would be getting enough people to participate to make the voting worthwhile. I wonder if you could get that needed cooperation if the voter is asked to put up \$1 for the privilege. Perhaps you could raise some endowment funds first by auctions or whatever with the provision that if the project folds the funds raised would be donated to TAFF or whatever."

Don D'Amassa::"I suspect that requiring a SASE with nominations is the best course. I also see no reason why the \$1 final voting fee should not be acceptable. In addition to financing the whole project fairly painlessly, it will help to discourage those with only a peripheral interest." [That's what I thought too, but I think we ought to have some more discussion of the point raised by Sandra and Darroll. I've come to think that taking the money at the nomination stage will make more sense. Perhaps, however, just for this year, if we haven't decided yet, we will hold off until the finals.]

Donn Brazier::"SASE for both nominating and electing is a good idea and ought to be essential in making a nomination or a vote qualified. It will make the distribution more positive, it will take the expense away from the committee, and it will insure good intentions and eliminate any special stapling/addressing etc. connected with a reporting 'fanzine.' All faneds will automatically receive notice as fast as the US mail will allow and will then be able to rush the listings into print as fast (or if) they desire."

Moshe Feder::"I think the SASE plan is efficient and it will be cheap and easy for the committee. I also like it because it carries through my philosophy of direct contact between the voters and the committee. I should have mentioned it in the section on publicity: I think the use of direct mail to reach potential voters in a controlled fashion is the answer to many of our problems. I said something to this effect in my open



letter, but later I had some doubts about the financial feasibility of such a plan. Finally, I realized that the use of bulk mail made the idea feasible — it might even be possible to get the lower rates obtainable by non-profit organizations as the Minnesota SF Society, for example, has done. Of course, even at those rates some money will be needed. Certainly auctions, special issues and one-shots are among the possibilities; and who knows, mayhap some generous worldconcomm will donate some of their surplus to us."

## XXVII WHAT DO WE CALL IT?

Linda Bushyager::"Your idea of calling the new awards FAANs isn't a bad one, except for that final 'n.' I don't like having it stand for 'numerator,' — 'notices', 'nominations', 'notables' or even having the 'n' not stand for anything (but be added to ease pronunciation at the end of an abbreviation standing for Fanzine Achievement Awards), would be better. (It's too bad 'Nova' and 'Nebula' have already been used...)"

Eric Lindsay::"FAANs seems a reasonable choice of name, but this view is subject to rapid change should someone come up with a name I like better — at the moment, I can't."

Don D'Amassa::"'FAANs' is a terrible name. 'Egoboos' are better, but not much. Damned if I can think of anything better tho."

Peter Roberts::"I'm strongly in favour of calling the things THE EGOBOO AWARDS (John Berry and Ted White willing), since that's the obvious title for them." [That's pretty much the way I feel about it too. Calling them the Egoboos was one of the earliest suggestions way back when all this started at Midwestcon. We ended up putting the idea aside because the word had already been used as the name of a poll run through a fanzine. But it is the most appropriate name because egoboo is what it's all about. I also liked it because it would allow us to draw on that fannish masterpiece The Enchanted Duplicator for the concept of Bu birds and their eggs, Egg O'Bu, for the design of the award, which could be in the form of those lovely, polished mineral 'eggs'. A pedestal with a rounded depression for holding them could be provided and the name of the winner could be engraved on the stone. Thus, name and award would be one total concept. Comments?]

Lesleigh Luttrell::"First of all, we don't much care for the name FAAN. I realize that this is a provisional name, but I would certainly like to see it changed, perhaps to be named after some prominent fan (I wouldn't object to reviving the name PONG [Neither would Don Markstein, as we're going to see later.], although I suppose others might) or after some fannish symbol, such as a Beanie."

Harry Warner, Jr.::"I can't think of any fully satisfactory name for the awards, either. If you wanted to go along with the custom of giving them a name associated with people, one possibility would be the WAWards: Willis is certainly to fandom what Gernsback was to prodom, and more besides." [Some people would consider such a comparison an insult, such is historical revisionism. Anyway, I don't think it's practical, possible, or politic to pick one fan out for such an honor, there are too many whose claims are equally good. It might be better to pick the name of some deceased worthy, but happily for fandom, most of the truly great names are still with us. No, I think a non-commemorative name will work out better.]

Sandra Miesel::"If these awards are to be analogous to the Nebulas, they should have some sort of general name, not be named after a person."

Terry Jeeves::"Title: 'The Slan' or how about, since we hang around the by-liners, calling the awards 'the Satellites'?"

Bruce Arthurs::"You might call them 'the Comets,' after the very first fanzine, Ray Palmer's 1930 THE COMET. Or you might borrow a trick from the Hugos and use the founder's name itself: call them the 'Rays' or the 'Palmers.' [I don't think R.P. enjoys universal recognition as the founder of fanzine fandom. And even if you could prove his right to that title, I'm not sure we'd want to use him.] Or combine sounds from both his names and call them the 'Rapes.' (Sorry, I couldn't resist.) Other BNFs whose names might do



as a title: Tuckers, Speers, Laneys, Burbees, Deglers, ~~Feders~~ [Aw, gee...] and others. [Hmmm, The Feders, The Feders!, . . . The Feders! . . . THE FEDERS. Sure, why not, let's see, I could claim it stands for . . . Fanzine Exceptional Design and Excellence Rewards, yes, that's not bad. Ah, I can see it all now . . . .] Or how about the various fan-nish ghods?: Roscoe, Ghu, FooFoo, Ignatz...Herbie? 'Roscoes' sounds pretty good to my ear. How would you like to win a Roscoe? Sounds a lot better than winning a Duper or a Typo. Yeh, put my vote in for Roscoe. Or Rapes. (If the latter, would that make the committee members Rapists?)"

Tom Digby::"For a name, assuming the award has to have a name at all (The Award Without a Name??), why not put that up for a vote on the first award ballot? You could make that a 'category' this one time only, with nominations and voting, plus maybe additional nominations from the committee. This saves committee effort and argument, and lets the voters feel that they are having more participation."

## XXVIII DESIGN

Harry Warner, Jr.::"I feel that the physical awards should be reasonably inexpensive, and preferably, unbreakable, to simplify shipment since the lower attendance at regional cons will force the committee to ship more trophies than normally occurs for the Hugo awards."

Lesleigh Luttrell::"I'm sure you must realize that it is quite expensive to give trophies, such as the Hugos, and can cause a great deal of difficulty if you have a special design in mind, as the Torcon's problems demonstrated. I would suggest that if this award is ever actually given, it should take the form of a plaque, or more appropriate, a certificate drawn by some fan artist. I'm sure the winners would be just as honored, and it would save a lot of time and trouble, as well as minimizing the expense of giving the award. You might even be able to persuade the convention at which the awards are to be presented to stand the cost of printing the certificates."

Sam Long::"The Award? A beanie of some sort, of course."

Don D'Amassa::"The design might ultimately hinge on the final decision about the name. [Yes, of course.] Economics might make miniature duplicators a bit out of reach. A bronzed beanie or somesuch might be the best idea."

Sandra Miesel::"I suggest the form be a plaque inscribed with a beanie — this would keep the costs down since trophy shops will engrave any design."

Ray Nelson::"The award will consist of one sixth of the fund collected from each voter disbursed by the current administrator, together with a certificate displaying the nature of the award and a picture, by Ray Nelson, of the original Beanie Boy. In the event that any category is voted 'No Award', the fund will still be divided equally among the remaining winners."

"[One of] the two provisions I am most eager to press [is] . . . the inclusion in the awards of at least a little hard cash."

Terry Jeeves::"Possible style of award: silver (or gold) star encapsulated in clear plastic, name plate on plinth. Cheap in quantity since only plaques differ." [This short description is accompanied in Terry's letter by a rough sketch showing the star floating in a clear block of plastic with approximately the proportions of a cube of sugar except that it's squared off (and larger, of course) mounted on a contrasting-colored base with slanting sides. I'm too out of practice on hand stenciling art to be able to show it here.]

Tom Digby::"Design? How about a miniature hecto? Could be a slab of slightly purple plastic mounted on a wood plaque — fairly cheap to produce. Or I've heard that there are engravers who will do pictures, etc., on plaques fairly cheap."

Dick Eney::"Let me throw out a Wild Ass Notion for the actual awards. I hope you put in those suggestions about minature dupers and gilded beanies just to Sicken and Disgust all



Right Thinking Fans, but what about something that can actually be worn? A pendant, like those goodies Sherna Burley makes — perhaps a medallion. Dress at cons is now free enough in style for such a thing to be accepted, the cost and problems of handling would be greatly reduced compared to those of a Hugo, and I suspect that it'd be easier to find a source for something about the size of....oh let's say the size of one's palm. And think what it would do for the ego to have an award that could be shown off at a party without the risk of impaling somebody!" [When I first read this part of your letter, Dick, my reaction was negative, I assumed that most fans would find such a "medal" too ostentatious (as I do). But I've mentioned the idea to a few people and most of the reaction has been surprisingly positive. I personally still prefer a trophy, that's what an award means to me. But we will have to give your idea serious consideration.]

Linda Bushyager::"I think that there are a number of possibilities that are equally good: a gilded beanie, a medallion, something embedded in plastic. What's important to me is that it be a real object, if you know what I mean, and not a plain plaque."

Moshe Feder::"I'd love to have a sculpture based on the scene (as drawn by Ross Chamberlain) in which Jophan reaches the top of the tower and discovers the enchanted duplicator. But I don't think that will ever be possible. I realize that we may not be able to have a trophy for the first year and may have to settle for an engraved plaque (perhaps with the aforementioned illo?). But should the awards be a success, I'd insist upon having a real, holdable, displayable trophy in the second year."

#### XXIX RETIRED FANS

Linda Bushyager::"Somehow dragging old and tired fan into participation is not consistent with our stress on current activity. It might be nice, though, to give them awards, as a sort of hall of fame."

Don D'Amassa::"I see no reason why old, inactive fans should have any special role in the process."

Eric Lindsay::"The idea that well-known but now non-active fans should be given a role to play seems silly — who can make a fan do anything?"

Ah, you're so right, Eric. And that takes care of the discussion of my open letter. It's taken more time and more stencils than I thought it would, but I felt that it was important that everyone be heard and that you all be given a clear picture of the response to my proposal. It would seem, despite some dissent, that we are in business. I hope the response to this and future issues of TZF are as voluminous and thoughtful.

Bruce Arthurs opened his letter, of which you've already read pieces above, with a description of a plan Don Markstein announced in TANDSTIKKERZEITUNG 8 for a new, faanish convention at which fan awards called PONGS are going to be given. I wrote to Don and told him that we seemed to have simultaneously invented something and that maybe we could coordinate our efforts. Don sent a postcard:

Don Markstein::"You know what they say about great minds. I'm sending you STIKKER #8 so you can see just what I'm trying to do. But it may not be there for a few days, so—

"Awards are secondary to my idea. Frankly, I'm more interested in the con. There should be awards at it, I suppose, so we're going to have awards. They must be called Pongs, tho — you'll recall the Pongs of NYcon, I'm sure. Be nice if we could merge the two ideas — real nice — if only so I wouldn't have to bother with the damned things.

"Actually, come to think of it, I don't insist on the name "Pongs." Just that I think it would be very appropriate. If you think the World Faan Convention would be a nice place to give your awards, I don't give a damn what you call them. Write back after you read STIKKER, if you want to follow this up."

Well, he sent me his fanzine, but all that arrived was the back page, stamped with "damaged



by Post Office machinery." Not even an apology. So I sent the page back to Don with a stamp, figuring its condition would be more eloquent than I could be, and in short order a received a complete 20 page (ten sheet) copy.

Don's discussion of his proposal opens with a review of all the familiar complaints about the worldcon and an explanation of them. He seems to feel that we are going to have to learn to live with the new situation, but wait, let me have him tell you:

Don Markstein [From TANDSTIKKERZEITUNG 8]: "The solution, then, is obvious. But it's not a solution that the Worldcon can make use of. No, I'm afraid that convention is done for. We might as well resign ourselves to the fact that it's simply going to get bigger and bigger until it gets like the Shriners or the VFW (and some of the people that go to it rival those groups in at least one respect — obnoxiousness). For the solution is to eliminate the science fiction programming — just as we've eliminated the science fiction content of the best fanzines many years since.

"So I propose the Ultimate Solution to the problem — the World Faan Convention.

"I'm serious about holding this con. I may not be serious about anything else related to it, but I am dead serious when I say that there's going to be one. It'll be July 11-13, 1975 (thus falling neatly between the Westercon and the BYOBcon), at the Monteleone Hotel, second block of Royal Street, New Orleans. The committee is Don Markstein (honcho), Faruk von Turk (assistant honcho), Rick Norwood (merchant and moneychanger), John Guidry (films), Doug Wirth, Justin Winston and Harry G. Purvis. Membership is \$5.

"One problem that might occur to you is what kind of program is this thing going to have? A very low key one. Subject matter will be much like the subject matter of this fanzine — anything and everything, with only minor, if any, attention to SF. Clarence Laughlin's talk on fantasy art went over very well at the last New Orleans DeepSouthCon, so I'm thinking of asking him to speak on Victorian architecture. I may have a trivia contest, but only because they're a lot of fun, even if they do concern SF. Faan Achievement Awards (Pongs) will be given in various categories, such as 'best editor of a fanzine,' 'best fan article,' 'best fan fiction,' 'best fan cartooning,' 'best serious fan art,' and possibly 'best professional writer.'

"Another problem is what kind of publicity do we want? Not a listing in IF, to be sure! Not even if there were still such things as listings in IF. Not a listing in LOCUS either, a much more present danger. I thought of making the criterion repro, like seeking publicity in mimeod and dittoed zines but not in offset ones. But any policy that would allow me to advertise in THE ALIEN CRITIC but not accept a plug in DON-O-SAUR is not a policy I want for the World Faan Convention.

"So the criterion is distribution. If you publish a zine most of the copies of which are given out free, as to trades, contributors, club members etc., then I'd appreciate a plug. If, however, more than half the copies of your zine are paid for, then I'd appreciate it if you simply wouldn't mention this con. I mean, I like ALGOL, I really do, but I'd just as soon not have 50 million people whose only connection with fandom is that they read that zine, show up.

"If everything goes right, this will be a nice, fun get-together for fanzine fandom, that is, us 'hard core' fans who have been intermingling and socializing with one another for years with or without cons. It's an in-group, sure, but an open one. I've never heard of anybody who wanted in being denied access (with one possible exception in the 1940s). Trouble is, we simply can't assimilate as many people as you find at a Worldcon that fast and still keep our identity. So anybody that shows up for the World Faan Con is welcome, but I'll be a lot happier if things can be arranged so that most of those who find out about it are already part of our community. . . .

". . . I am desperate for immediate feedback on this idea. Tho the Monteleone is devoid of reservations for either sleeping rooms or convention space on that weekend as of this afternoon, there's no telling what tomorrow will bring. I want to have some idea of how



many rooms to block and what kind of facilities will be needed. So write."

Those of you who wish to (and you might mention you saw it here) can send your comments to Donald D. Markstein, P.O.Box 53112, New Orleans, La. 70153. I would like to have your comments on how to deal with Don's wish to have awards at his con for the next issue of THE ZINE FAN. Personally, I agree with what Don has to say, and I think his convention is a good idea (I was considering something similar once the FAANs were established.) and sounds like fun. In future years, assuming the World Faan Con is a success (and rotates to other cities) it might be the ideal place to give out our awards (and even if it stays in New Orleans it would be a fine con for the years in which it's the turn of the Southern region). At the present, however, I'm not so sure. Although giving the FAANs at the WFC in '75 is the best way to avoid the creation of competing awards, frankly, I just don't think it's a good idea to associate our still-vulnerable plan with another that's just as chancy. If we do, and the WFC is (ghu forbid) a disaster, the FAANs could go down with it. I am tempted to say that we should take the chance and support another good idea with our own, but . . . oh, hell, it's not up to me anyway. What do you all think? [For the nonce, Don, please be aware that I support your con — and I'd love to see future issues of TANDSTIKKERZEITUNG, I really enjoyed it. ~~I think maybe I'll nominate you for it~~]

I hereby call for a vote on the following questions:

XXXI: The definition of a fanzine for the purposes of the awards shall include the following specification(s): (a) No publication publishing ads for anything other than fanzines shall be considered a fanzine for the purposes of these awards. (b) No publication which pays its contributors for articles, artwork or letters shall be considered a fanzine for the purposes of these awards. (c) No publication with more than 50% paid circulation of its total press run shall be considered a fanzine for the purposes of these awards. (d) No publication which receives distribution by a commercial distributor or is otherwise made available to bookstores, newstands and other commercial outlets shall be considered a fanzine for the purposes of these awards. [Vote for none (indicate "none" on ballot), any or all of the above.]

XXXI: Adopt Ray Nelson's language (as printed herein on page 10) to describe the Best Fan Editor category. [Vote Yes or No. (Approval of this motion shall not be construed as official adoption of the Best Fan Editor category.)]

XXXII: Shall a fan who has written only amateur (non-satirical) science fiction during a given award-year be considered a fan writer for the purposes of these awards during that award-year? [Vote Yes or No.]

XXXIII: The number of letters published required to be a nominator in the Best LoCwriter category shall be: (a) 1. (b) 2. (c) 3. (d) 4. (e) 5. (f) More than 5. The number of letters published required to be a nominee in the Best LoCwriter category shall be: (g) 1. (h) 2, in different fanzines. (i) 2, even in a single fanzine. (j) 3. [Vote for a, b, c, d, e, or f and vote for g, h, i, or j.]

XXXIV: Each nominator shall name (a) one (b) two (c) three (d) four (e) five nominees in each category in which he is eligible to nominate. [Vote for one of the above.]

Your ballot may be a LoC or just a postcard. If it's a letter, please show your votes near the top of the first page. You may skip one motion (or more) by indicating "abstain" for that category. Please feel free to comment on the motions or make one yourself (if you have qualified to do so by voting. Nonvoters may not make motions.). Send your votes not to me, but to the next Publisher.

Publisher of the next issue of THE ZINE FAN will be Linda Bushyager (1614 Evans Ave., Prospect Park, PA 19076). If you feel like helping the committee out, you can send Linda postage, SASEs or even monetary contributions (Make checks payable to Linda Bushyager.). You should also, of course, send her your LoCs on this issue and/or your votes on the above motions. Deadline for inclusion in TZF 2 is February 1, 1975.



That deadline is later than I'd like it to be, but this first issue of TZF has reached such a size that I will be forced to send most copies 3rd class (and even so, perhaps not all at once). I can't quite believe that it is this big (and I shudder to think how much bigger if I'd had to use my own typer. Thanks again Lou.). As I type these last few lines it is 3 am on the morning of Friday the 13th day of December, 1974. I'll be leaving for Philcon in 13 hours and I hope I can get some copies of this run off and collated by then. TZF has taken most of my time since the middle of last month, and though I'll miss the mail putting it out myself would bring me, I can't help but be glad someone else is doing the next issue. Now, at last, perhaps I can put out PLACEBO 5. (Pray for me.) Thank you all for your attention; I hope you've found this issue interesting. Thanks too to all of you who sent me fanzines because my open letter reminded you I hadn't gaffed. It was nice to get fannish mail again in quantity. I hope you'll understand why I haven't been able (and won't for a while yet be able) to LoC. Merry Christmas and Happy New Year to you all.

AMOFishly yours,

*Moshe Feder*  
Moshe Feder 12/13/74

\* \* \* \* \* ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! ! \* \* \* \* \*

RECIPIENTS PLEASE TAKE NOTE: IF YOU DID NOT RESPOND TO MOSHE FEDER'S OPEN LETTER, YOU MUST RESPOND TO THIS ISSUE OF TZF IF YOU WANT TO RECEIVE THE NEXT ONE! EVEN A POSTCARD WILL DO. BUT WE CANNOT AFFORD TO AND WILL NOT CARRY ANY DEADWOOD. SO PLEASE WRITE!!!

remember that the contents of this issue are dngdngdngdngdngdngdngdngdngdngdngdngdngdngdngdngdng

THE ZINE FAN  
c/o Moshe Feder  
142-34 Booth Memorial Ave.  
Flushing, NY 11355 U.S.A.

*Andy*

THIRD CLASS MAIL  
PRINTED MATTER ONLY  
RETURN POSTAGE GUARANTEED