



— Special Hotel Agreement Issue —

ARTICLES

- 2 Convention Agreement

COMMITTEE CHRONICLE

- 5 GULP Meeting / February 26, 1988
Services Division
- 7 APA:89 / March 20, 1988
Films, Membership Figures, The Hynes, The Program Book, The Art Showcase, Insignia, Program GULP Comments, Children's Programming, Second Floor Comments
- 12 MCFI Meeting / March 30, 1988
- 14 GULP Meeting / April 6, 1988
WSFS and Art Show Division
- 16 Current Committee List

LETTERS

- 18 *Hugo Administration*
- 19 *Art Show*
- 19 *Facilities Division*
- 20 *Extravaganzas Division*
- 21 *Whither the Worldcon*

The Mad 3 Party — more than you ever wanted to know about running a Worldcon — is published by Noreascon 3, Box 46, MIT Branch PO, Cambridge MA 02139. Editor and source of all uncredited writing: Leslie Turek. Copying by Al Kent. Logo by Wendy Snow-Lang.

The subscription price is \$1 per issue for up to 10 issues. The regular subscription price covers surface shipment outside North America; please add \$1 per issue for air mail. Free copies go to newszines, Worldcon bids and committees, the committee and staff of Noreascon 3, and significant contributors.

Copyright © 1988 by Massachusetts Convention Fandom, Inc. (MCFI); All Rights Reserved. "Noreascon" is a service mark of MCFI. "Boskone" is a service mark of the New England Science Fiction Association, Inc. "Worldcon", "World Science Fiction Convention", "WSFS", "World Science Fiction Society", "Hugo Award", "Science Fiction Achievement Award", and "NASFIC" are service marks of the World Science Fiction Society.

We are pleased to announce that Noreascon 3 now has a signed agreement with the Sheraton-Boston Hotel! We're running nearly the entire agreement starting on page 2 of this issue. (The only parts omitted are various sections of excessive legalese.)

Things are progressing on the Hynes front, also. About 20 committee members participated in an extensive tour of the nearly-completed facility on April 23. A report on that tour and the Division Heads meeting that followed will be in the next issue.

Fannish Tax-Exemption News

Joe Siclari sends good news about the South Florida SF Society:

We are legitimate! Recognized by the IRS. It went to Washington, as you know. But we finally got it. So there is at least some precedent after Archon for a SF organization to gain non-profit status as a literary/educational organization.

Index to New/Current Issues Discussed

We thought it might be helpful to include an index to some of the topics currently under discussion and the pages where they're mentioned in this issue.

<i>Subject</i>	<i>Pages</i>
Masquerade on video	20-21
Art Show size, rates, schedule, etc.	15-16
Art Showcase	9, 16, 19
Hugo bases, Special Hugo category	14
PR 4 contents	12
Program Book contents	5, 8
Hotel room assignment	19
Handicapped access	6
Children's services	6, 11
Staff lounge	7
People mover	7
Profit disposal	13-14, 22

Lost Members

The following list gives members whose PR 3s bounced from the addresses we have for them. If you have their new address, please let us know.

- Alyson L. Abramowitz, Nepean, Ontario
- Miriam and Bob Benson, New York NY
- Theresa Berger, Hoboken NJ
- David Chaplin, Ottawa, Ontario
- Lisa Cox, Chatsworth CA
- Mary Kay Jackson, Lansing MI
- Don Levey, Waltham MA
- D. Lites, Kansas City MO
- Barry C. Marin, East Orange NJ

Lyn Saunders, Ottawa, Ontario
 Bill Seligman, Brooklyn NY
 Nick Smith, Brooklyn NY
 Nancy J. Stone, Saint John, NB
 Shinsuke Takeuchi, Yokohama, Japan

— LT

Convention Agreement

AGREEMENT made this 14th day of April, 1988, by and among Massachusetts Convention Fandom, Inc., a non-profit Massachusetts corporation having a principal place of business at 504 Medford Street, Somerville, Massachusetts (hereinafter referred to as "MCF"); and Sheraton Boston Corporation, a Massachusetts corporation having a principal place of business at 39 Dalton Street, Boston, Massachusetts, 02199 (hereinafter referred to as "Sheraton");

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, by virtue of a letter dated January 21, 1985, a copy of which is attached hereto as *Exhibit 1*, Sheraton, subject to subsequent agreement on certain specific other details, agreed to host the 47th Annual World Science Fiction Convention at its hotel known as the Sheraton Boston Hotel & Towers, 39 Dalton Street, Boston, Massachusetts (the "Hotel"), to be held during Labor Day Weekend, 1989 (the "Convention"); and

[Legalese deleted.]

WHEREAS, MCF and Sheraton have agreed to all of the material terms and conditions pursuant to which Sheraton will make available various of the Hotel's facilities in connection with the Convention and pursuant to which MCF will use such facilities, and both parties desire to set forth those terms and conditions herein, intending to be bound hereby, notwithstanding the intention of the parties to agree to such ancillary and incidental provisions to this Agreement which may be necessary to host the Convention;

NOW, THEREFORE, for good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which are hereby acknowledged, the parties hereto enter into this CONVENTION AGREEMENT and agree as follows:

1. *Guest Room Availability; Room Reservations; Etc.*

1.01 *Availability of Rooms.* Subject to paragraph 1.02 hereof, Sheraton agrees to make available at the Hotel for Convention guests, members and attendees (individually, a "Convention Participant" and collectively, the "Convention Participants") up to the number of guest rooms (the "Blocked Rooms"), for the nights indicated, as set forth in *Exhibit 2* attached hereto.

1.02 *Reservations.* Sheraton will accept reservations for Blocked Rooms as forwarded by MCF or its designated agents until 11:59 p.m. on July 31, 1989. Thereafter, the Blocked Rooms which have not been reserved will be released and reservations will be available to Convention Participants who contact the Hotel and identify themselves as such on a space available basis. After the Block Rooms are released reservations may be made for Rooms by Convention Participants in the same manner as other customers of the Hotel, except Convention Participants must identify themselves as Convention Participants. All room reservations accompanied (or followed, up until 6:00 p.m.

Boston time of the first night for which the reservation is made) by at least one night's cash deposit or guaranteed by a major credit card will be held until the latest "check-out-time" then in effect at the Hotel (or at least until 1:00 p.m.) of the day immediately following the stated reservation date; otherwise, rooms will be held only until 6:00 p.m. Boston time of the day for which the reservation was made.

1.03 *Room Rates and Parking Charges.* No later than December 1, 1988, Sheraton shall advise MCF in writing of the expected per night parking charges and in/out parking charges, if any, applicable to Convention Participants who are registered at the Hotel. The Room Rates actually charged during the convention shall not exceed the lowest rate offered by the Sheraton for weekend specials *during the rate season* which includes Labor Day weekend, 1989. In any event, the Room Rates charged per night will be initially determined by August 15, 1988. Said Rates may be lowered at any time prior to the Convention by Agreement or automatically by the lowering of the rate for said weekend specials, but shall not be increased beyond the Rates determined on August 15, 1988. All Rates will be subject to applicable taxes at rates then in effect.

1.04 *Responsibility for Payment.* Convention Participants will be responsible for their own room bills and charges incurred at the Hotel, unless otherwise authorized in writing by MCF to be charged to the Master Account of MCF to be established upon the acceptance of this Agreement by Sheraton (the "Master Account"). MCF shall provide Sheraton with a list of individuals by 11:59 P.M., Boston time on July 31, 1989, who may charge to the Master Account. MCF shall not be responsible for charges incurred by persons who are not included on the foregoing list. No charges may be made to the Master Account before August 25, 1989 and the Master Account shall be paid in full by MCF on or before October 6, 1989. MCF will pay all undisputed charges on or before October 6, 1989, and any disputed charges will be paid by MCF as they are settled.

1.05 *Room Locations.* To the extent reasonably possible, Sheraton will block Convention Participants into Blocked Rooms which are in contiguous areas away from non-Convention Participants, and will cooperate in restricting blocked areas to Convention Participants only. MCF will provide each Convention Participant with a color coded badge identifying that person as a Convention Participant, and will instruct and to the extent reasonably possible enforce such instruction that all Convention Participants wear their badges while on Hotel premises during the Convention. MCF will provide Sheraton with sample badges on or before July 31, 1989. One or more floors of the North Tower will be designated as the Committee floors. MCF shall provide Sheraton with the names of the committee members, not to exceed 200, requesting rooms on the Committee floors.

2. *Function Rooms*

Sheraton will make available to MCF the use of the Hotel function rooms, at the indicated times, as set forth in *Exhibit 3* attached hereto, at no direct charge to MCF. In addition, the Board Room shall be reserved for MCF's use, with no direct charge to MCF, from 8:00 p.m. on August 30, 1989, through midnight on September 4, 1989. Sheraton shall not book or reserve the Board Room to

anyone other than MCF during that period or unreasonably withhold or delay its consent to MCF's use of the Board Room during the foregoing times.

3. *Additional Covenants of Sheraton*

In addition to its other obligations herewith, Sheraton hereby covenants and agrees that it will:

(a) Provide sound systems and up to all of its microphones for Hotel function rooms for a per microphone/per day charge, the use of which may be allocated by MCF among the various function rooms. Sheraton will not charge MCF for the use of its sound system and will provide MCF, by June 1, 1989, with a complete schedule of electrical, telephone, and other incidental charges that will be in effect during the Convention. The charges incurred will be included on the Master Account.

(b) Not schedule or authorize any construction or remodeling to be performed at the Hotel which might (or is calculated to) materially interfere with the Convention or Convention Participants' use of the Hotel (other than work of an emergency nature).

(c) Insofar as is reasonably possible, keep all of its elevators and escalators serving areas where Convention activities are scheduled in full operation on a twenty-four hour basis throughout the Convention. The elevators, other than Towers elevators, shall not be programmed to prevent them from stopping on or answering calls from any floor on which there are scheduled Convention activities. Sheraton further agrees that it will use all reasonable efforts to keep all of its fire alarms in good, working condition as required by applicable local, state and federal laws.

(d) Not restrict or prevent any Convention Participant(s) from using any of the Hotel's guest facilities, including, but not limited to, its restaurants, bars and lobby areas; provided, however, Sheraton may restrict access to any of its facilities when Convention Participants are creating a disturbance (but only while such disturbance is ongoing or appears reasonably certain to resume) or are not properly and reasonably attired in accordance with previously announced and generally applicable rules of the Hotel.

(e) Upon request, consent to which shall not be unreasonably withheld or delayed, and during normal business hours, permit MCF use of the Hotel's main freight elevator, main loading dock and South Tower loading dock in a manner that will minimize interference, to the extent practical, with Sheraton's use of same.

(f) Permit MCF to post signs of a temporary nature on the second, third and fifth floors of the Hotel so long as they are professional in appearance. MCF shall remove such signs at the conclusion of the Convention. The posting of such signs shall not disfigure or otherwise injure the Hotel and will not be so placed as to obscure existing signs and directories without permission of the Hotel.

(g) Permit blind, visually handicapped or otherwise disabled Convention Participants to have and utilize Companion Animals as defined under the applicable local, state and/or Federal Statute.

4. *Convention Security*

4.01 *Security Plan.* MCF at its own expense will provide a responsible and professional third party security agency to augment the security within the Hotel for the Convention in accordance with the Security Plan attached hereto as *Exhibit 4* (the "Security Plan"). The Security

Agency employed by MCF will jointly coordinate its activity with the in-house Hotel security force. From the date hereof until the commencement of the Convention, Sheraton and MCF shall cooperate with each other in modifying the Security Plan as reasonably necessary consistent with changes in planned Convention activities. Sheraton and MCF agree that Exhibit "4" shall be amended from time to time so that the security needs of the parties are reasonably reflected by said Amendments. Any modification (or proposed modification) of the Security Plan by Sheraton and MCF shall relate only to Hotel use and activities, and not to use of the Hynes Auditorium, as MCF shall have the right to modify the existing security plan as it relates solely to the Hynes Auditorium without the Sheraton's consent. Neither MCF nor Sheraton shall unreasonably withhold their consent to changes, modifications or reallocations of uniformed guard coverage that properly and reasonably reflect material changes in MCF's use and scheduling of the Convention activities at the Hotel.

4.02 *Restricted Access to Certain Function Rooms.* MCF may reasonably control access to the corridor between the Hotel's Grand Ballroom and Republic Ballroom and certain other Hotel corridors as set forth in the Security Plan, but such control at all times shall be coordinated with Sheraton and shall not create any compromise of life safety requirements for the area.

4.03 *Handling Complaints.* Sheraton agrees that complaints of a behavioral nature, such as noise, strange appearance or behavior, will be referred to designated representatives of MCF for handling. Designated representatives of MCF for this purpose will be identified to Sheraton ten days prior to commencement of the Convention and such persons shall be available to Sheraton at all times during the period of the Convention. Any acts of violence or which otherwise pose a real and immediate threat of damage to the Hotel, or the person or property of others, may be dealt with immediately by Sheraton's security staff; Sheraton will notify any of the aforesaid designated representatives prior to taking any such action, or as soon thereafter as is possible. Convention Participants shall not be prohibited from congregating in common areas of the Hotel, so long as they are not in violation of fire codes and regulations, actually impeding traffic, or so noisy as to actually disturb Hotel guests outside of designated open party areas.

5. *Limitation on MCF's Liability*

5.01 *Security Deposit.* Upon the execution of this Convention Agreement MCF will deposit \$5,000.00 (the "Security Deposit") with Sheraton. This Security Deposit will be held in MCF's Master Account to cover damages or other expenses, including but not limited to those expenses incurred by MCF for use of Sheraton's agents, servants, employees or independent contractors, and any balance remaining thereafter may be applied by Sheraton to cover other charges incurred by MCF.

5.02 *Pre-Convention Inspection and Determination of Damage.* [Description of procedures to ascertain damage to the hotel.]

5.03 *Liability of MCF for Damage to Convention Areas and Insurance Coverage.*

(a) MCF shall be liable for the cost of repairing in a good and workmanlike manner any damages as, and to the extent, provided in Section 5.02 hereof and such liability shall not be limited to the amount of the Security Deposit. MCF shall in no event be liable for damage to sleeping rooms, or the furniture or fixtures contained therein, other than those rented by it. The parties agree to assist and cooperate with each other in any investigation of any Convention Participants causing (or suspected to have caused) damage to the Hotel.

(b) The parties agree that MCF is not a guarantor or insurer of the acts of Convention Participants, and the participation of any Convention Participant in the Convention does not make that person an agent, servant, employee or independent contractor of MCF for any purpose. Except as may be otherwise provided herein, MCF assumes no liability or responsibility for any individual Convention Participants of any kind or for any purpose, including, but not limited to, room charges and damage to or destruction or loss of Hotel property.

(c) MCF shall provide on or before August 1, 1989 Sheraton with evidence of (i) full insurance coverage on all exhibit material and equipment that is the property of MCF which is introduced onto Sheraton's premises, (ii) general liability insurance, (including contractual liability coverage) with limits of at least \$3,000,000.00 combined single limit for bodily injury and property damage combined, which insurance coverage shall name MCF, Sheraton Boston Corporation, The Sheraton Corporation and ITT Corp. as additional insureds as their interests may appear ("the Indemnities"), and (iii) Workers Compensation Insurance, if necessary, will be provided in the amounts required by the applicable statute of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

(d) MCF agrees to protect, defend and indemnify and save harmless the Indemnities against all claims, losses or damage, to person or property, solely arising out of or caused by MCF's installation, removal, maintenance, occupancy or use of the hotel or any part thereof, during the Convention. MCF *does not* agree to defend or indemnify the Sheraton for the negligence of the Indemnities, or its agents, servants, employees, independent contractors, assignees or heirs; nor does MCF agree to defend or indemnify the Sheraton for the acts of any Non-Convention participants.

6. *[Legalese deleted.]*

7. *Miscellaneous*

7.01 *Complimentary Rooms for MCF.* MCF shall be given one complimentary room-night credit for every fifty (50) room-nights rented to Convention Participants. Credits may be used to obtain free rooms for MCF at the rate of one credit for a single, double/twin, or executive parlor room; two credits for a suite; three credits for a two bedroom suite; and four credits for the President's or Governor's suite or any one of the large fifth floor hospital-ity suites. MCF shall also be permitted to choose from the available Tower Luxury Rooms for its Guests of Honor. In addition, Sheraton shall provide MCF with a two (2) bedroom regular suite in the North Tower without charge.

[The remaining clauses of the agreement contain various legal provisions pertaining to remedies, arbitration of disputes, addresses for notices, binding effect, prior agreements, severability, governing law, sealed instrument, etc.]

[The agreement was signed by Mark Olson, President of MCFI, and by the Managing Director of the Sheraton-Boston Hotel; both signatures were notarized.]

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 was the original letter of agreement from the Sheraton, dated 21 January 1985.

Exhibit 2: Blocked Rooms

<i>For the Night of:</i>	<i>No. of Rooms:</i>
28 August, 1989	50
29	100
30	350
31	800
1 September, 1989	1000
2	1000
3	975
4	500
5	75

Exhibit 3: Function Room Availability

<i>Date</i>	<i>Function Room</i> <i>(see key below)</i>	<i>Times</i>
26 Aug. 1989	1	8:00 a.m.—midnight
27	1	A
28	1	A
	2 and 3	5:00 p.m.—midnight
29	1-3	A
30	1-3	A
	4-14	8:00 a.m.—midnight
	15	noon—midnight
	16	6:00 p.m.—midnight
	17-19	2:00 p.m.—midnight
31	1-19	A
	20	8:00 p.m.—midnight
1 Sept. 1989	1-20	
2	1-20	A
3	1-20	A
4	1-20	A
5	17	midnight—noon
	1-4, and 7	A
6	1-3	A

Function Room/Time Key

<i>Designation</i>	<i>Designation</i>
<i>From Table</i>	<i>From Table</i>
<i>Description</i>	<i>Description</i>
1 Hampton Room	13 Constitution Room
2 Berkley Room	14 Constitution Foyer
3 Fairfax Room	15 Republic Room
4 Clarendon Room	16 Beacon Room
5 Dalton Room	17 Grand Ballroom
6 Exeter Room	18 Independence Room
7 Gardner Room	19 Independence Balcony
8 Conference Room	20 Fifth floor function space
9 Jefferson Room	A Midnight—midnight
10 Kent Room	
11 Liberty Room	

Exhibit 4 was the security plan discussed in *M3P #21*.

GULP Meeting

Date: February 26, 1988
 Topic: The Services Division
 Notes by: Leslie Turek

Attending were Jim and Laurie Mann, Mark Olson, Leslie Turek, Jim Hudson, Don Eastlake, George Flynn, Mike DiGenio, Pam Fremon, Sue Lichauco, Jane Wagner, Paula Lieberman, Sharon Sbarsky, Ann Broomhead, Bill and Barry Lehrman, and Ellen Franklin.

Laurie began by explaining that the Services Division included three types of areas: Publications, Member Services, and Internal Services. She handed out a list of the areas with a brief description of each.

Publications

Publications accounts for the bulk of the division budget. It is already underway; we have been publishing Progress Reports and *The Mad 3 Party*.

Program Book

We plan to have a future discussion of what should go in the Program Book. Jim H. suggested that someone survey the last ten or so PBs, counting the column inches devoted to each subject. Jane said that Constellation got lots of ads, and had to find extra material to balance the ads. Mark wondered how ads could be profitable with that approach.

Leslie was heretical and suggested that we consider not publishing a PB at all, since it generally has to go to press too early to contain real convention information, and few people read it at the con anyway. If it's going to be a memory book, we could publish it afterward, with pictures.

Laurie liked the type of souvenir book that Conspiracy produced, with articles about the guests and about science fiction, rather than the convention itself. She also liked the idea of having articles in various languages.

Computer Nets for Publicity

Mark wondered how things were working out with the computer nets, and how much we should do there. It does cost us something to use many of the networks. We've gotten one *M3P* loc over Usenet; most messages are CoAs. It's hard to estimate how many people we could reach. Does this make members without network access second-class citizens? Jim H. thought if we had to cut back we should concentrate on CompuServe, since it's one of the biggest and seems to have a large membership from the sf community.

Computer Net for Committee Communications

We originally wanted to do this, but may not be able to afford it. Mark thought we should continue to try to find a way to do it cheaply. Many of the committee have access to computers with modems at home or at work, so all we need to do is provide a central machine — maybe a used PC/XT?

Photography

Services would like to do some photography at the con to provide pictures for post-con publications. Other divisions also have photography needs. Extravaganzas is thinking about taking slides for use in the closing ceremonies; Second Floor is thinking about having a real-

time photo exhibit. Should we try to coordinate these efforts and/or provide some on-call photographers within Services? Don pointed out that Technical had plans to do fast slide developing at the convention for Extravaganzas. For publications, we would probably want to take *lots* of black and white pictures, and decide which to print after the convention. For exhibits, we need prints; one-hour processing might be cheaper than taking Polaroids.

Audio/Visual Taping

Previously, we had decided to concentrate our taping on the big events (Extravaganzas) and not make an attempt to record the entire convention. The type of video reporting done at ConFederation will probably be too expensive for us to undertake.

Miscellaneous Publications

Leslie pointed out that there is usually a plethora of smaller publications at the con, either because the information couldn't be ready in time for the Program Book, it would be of interest only to a subset of the people, or it needs to be handed out near the place it will be used. Some examples might be: Masquerade program, film notes and schedule, Hucksters' Room directory, Art Show procedures, WSFS business meeting agenda, Exhibit notes, information about Program Participants, Awards ceremony program, etc. Would there be an advantage in trying to coordinate all of this stuff?

Mark mentioned some of the problems at Boskone, where each area handled its own. When they did the pick-up at the printers, no one knew the whole list of what was expected and some things got left behind and had to be picked up by a special run later. Jim H. pointed out that we might be able to use a bulk order to get special quantity discounts. Also, a production coordinator could help people find the cheapest printer, use economical formats, etc.

We have been looking into ways of having copying available to us at the con. One idea might be to rent a high-volume copier for the month before the con and use it to produce all of this stuff. The printing costs we save could help pay for the rental (estimated at \$2000). We would then have the copier at the con. The problem with this scenario is that one breakdown over Labor Day weekend could really mess us up.

Another idea would be to strike a deal with Copy Cop across the street from the Sheraton. We guarantee them all our pre-con business if they will agree to stay open over the weekend and do our at-con work at high priority.

Mark asked if it was cheaper to produce a separate handout or put something in the Program Book. Jim H. calculated that for something intended for all members, it would be cheaper to put it in the Program Book.

A few other points: We should have typewriters and Macs at the con to handle last-minute document needs. Have an overhead projector at the Business Meeting to display relevant portions of the Program Book for people who forgot to bring theirs?

In response to a suggestion that we hire someone to do a lot of this dogwork, Don pointed out that we would have a problem having "employees" due to the Hynes's and Sheraton's requirement for us to carry workman's compensation insurance. We could use contractors or temp workers paid through an agency.

Member Services

Handicapped Access

We have received the Electrical Eggs booklet from Samanda Jeude, which gives a lot of suggestions for how to handle access for the handicapped at sf conventions. We hope that we can locate out-of-area volunteers to do a lot of this, although we will have to provide a local liaison to collect hotel information, etc.

Possible formats for publications are audio tape, floppy disk (for people who have readers), braille, and large print. Floppy disk is easy; we have already made disks of our Progress Reports available. Audio tape takes volunteer time, and braille is difficult. Large print should be easy on the Mac.

Mark reiterated that we have to collect data on the numbers of people expected with different types of needs. Perhaps we can start by getting some information from ConFederation.

We believe the Hynes will be good for the mobility-impaired. There are special elevators for handicapped access, and entrances have been designed with no stairs. We still don't know about the Sheraton side of the connection. When things are completed, we will explore to find recommended routes. If time and money permit, it would be nice to provide a taped tour of the con, or a braille map.

The Sheraton does have handicapped-equipped sleeping rooms, and we will attempt to block people with such needs into the Sheraton.

For hearing-impaired, we will try to have signing for the main events, and perhaps have volunteers on beeper for other situations. We will definitely have reserved seating and space for wheelchairs.

It may not be necessary to give out ID buttons to the handicapped members. If we clearly mark the reserved seating areas, we assume most fans can be trusted to not take advantage of them unless they need to.

A related issue is language assistance. We should try to find some volunteer translators willing to be on beeper for emergencies. (This will probably be Information's responsibility.) Also, some Yugoslavian fans have asked us to try to locate cheap accommodations, since they aren't allowed to bring much hard currency out of the country. (A new category: the currency-impaired?)

As a side issue, Don referred to the comp rooms we will get at the outlying hotels. We could consider inviting people to write to us telling us how they would advance SF or enhance the convention if we gave them one of those rooms.

Finally, we talked about the committee. Many workers get their feet and legs wiped out working in a convention center with concrete flooring. Although we can't run a first aid area (due to liability problems), we can have equipment available, such as wheelchairs, crutches, and ace bandages. We should encourage people to wear padded shoes, or at least foam inserts, and try to get carpeting or foam pads for the areas where people have to stand a lot. Don said that the Hynes may operate a first aid station as part of our rental.

Babysitting and Dragonslair

Programming for kids around ten and up will be handled by the Program division. Services will set up babysitting and Dragonslair for the younger kids. There was much discussion of what was needed by various age groups. Babysitting will be for kids around 6 weeks to 3 years old, perhaps with older kids at night. It should probably be upstairs in a suite, where it's quieter and bath-rooms are easily available.

Dragonslair can be downstairs in one or more function rooms. It's for kids from 4 or 5 to 8 or 9, who are too young to wander around the convention without their parents. If we have the resources, we may want to split up Dragonslair into areas for different age groups: "nursery school" age (about 3-5) and older kids (6-9). We could use the Beacon or Liberty complex, each of which has a number of small connecting rooms. The different groups could share equipment and materials, etc.

Sharon said that we currently have 43 kids' admissions, plus an unknown number of kids who have full memberships. This indicates that we will have over 100 kids by the time of the convention (although many of them will spend a lot of their time with their parents rather than in Dragonslair).

Paula suggested that Dragonslair specify some hours when adults are invited to come and mix with the kids. Barry said we should allow flexibility in the age guidelines, as some of the older kids might enjoy playing with the younger ones. We could ask the parents to put in some time helping out. This is a natural area to be run by someone from out of the Boston area.

Because of the large number of member kids, we are leaning toward *not* opening babysitting to non-member kids. This also means we won't have to handle money in babysitting, since babysitting is free to member kids. We will have fines, however, for people who don't pick up their kids at closing time or who don't provide them with food.

We should supply lists of other local babysitting sources. We will need this anyway for sick kids, whom we can't deal with in babysitting.

At registration, we could provide stickers to put on the back of kids' badges with the parents' names and hotel room numbers (in case the kids get lost).

Off-Site Events

We originally thought we might rent some off-site location, such as a museum, for a party on one night of the convention. Now, finances don't seem to allow this. But we should still try to set up liaison with some of these facilities, to try to get discounts for our members, etc. Some might be interested in a cooperative event where we might be able to provide a speaker from the convention. Someone suggested renting the Prudential viewing area for the fancy pre-Hugo reception that Extravaganzas has been considering.

Internal Services

Office

Jim and Laurie suggested deferring discussion of the office operations and how we will handle at-con communications.

Committee Den/Lounge

Laurie proposed having a Committee Den in a hotel sleeping room, and a Staff Lounge in the Hynes. There was much discussion about the different functions of these two areas. Jim H. listed three requirements:

- We need a place to get food quickly when we're working and have little time.
- We need a place to sit down and take a short break while working.
- We need a place for a quiet committee gathering in the evenings.

Jim H. suggested that we use the lounge in the Hynes for the first two functions, and a suite in the hotel for the last. The hotel suite could be open only in the evening, leaving it available during the day as a place for private committee meetings, etc. Don thought we would have access to the Hynes lounge during setup and teardown days.

Should we open the staff lounge to gophers? People didn't want to be elitist, but were worried about how many people the room could handle. We estimated that we would have several hundred staff members. Room 300 in the Hynes, which is being proposed for the staff lounge, is fairly large, but would have comfortable seating for only about 50 people. It looks like it will have a private kitchen, so may not be under the control of the Hynes concessionaire.

Should we open the staff lounge to program participants? There was some feeling that we shouldn't (with the exception of our GoHs), since that might make it a less relaxing area.

Mark asked people to discuss the Den Mother concept. At some conventions, the Den Mother has been given the power to pull people off the floor when they are deemed to have been working too hard. Should this be our model? People generally felt that this function should be filled by the person's direct supervisor and immediate co-workers. We should try to avoid putting so much pressure on people that they freak out. However, some people create their own stress. The Den should provide food and a sympathetic ear (the traditional "bartender" role).

There will be other hanging-out areas for the committee. People will be allowed to gather in the Office area, where coffee will probably be available in the morning. There may be a gopher hole for people willing to be on-call. This led us to a discussion of People Mover.

People Mover

Mark and Jim H. both felt that the way gophers were handled at Noreascon Two did not really work. It's just not reasonable for a central area to try to schedule all gopher needs, in detail, in advance. Some people don't show up, other people are recruited directly by the area, needs change, etc. On the other hand, we also can't expect each area to be able to do all of its own recruiting.

There are different types of gophers. Some like to get associated with a particular area, and then work continuously for that area; others like to work a little bit for a lot of different areas. Some know in advance what they want to do and just show up there; others are newcomers who aren't sure what they'd enjoy. Some like to be scheduled in advance; others like to just show up and help when they have some time free. We should set up a system that accommodates all of these different work styles.

One model for how People Mover might work is to get general information from the areas as to the types of jobs they expect to have and roughly when they will occur, and then send out a general mailing to volunteers describing these jobs. People could be invited to either

- a) Select an area to work in. In this case the People Mover would pass their names on to the area, and the area could deal with them directly, or
- b) Just come to the gopher hole whenever they want to work and choose from whatever needs help at that time.

If the People Mover is in a highly visible area, they can post current job needs and try to recruit people in heavy periods.

In the past we've used People Mover to get people to sign releases and to track names of helpers for membership refunds, etc. If we decentralize, we need to set up other mechanisms to do this.

Logistics

Logistics also has issues relating to centralization vs. decentralization and how detailed we should be about pre-planning and record-keeping. Jim M. has written to Logistics head George Mitchell outlining some of the issues to think about.

We can let areas do more of their own moving things about, but will need to provide them with handcarts (and make sure they eventually get back to Logistics). Some things can be unloaded from the truck directly to the appropriate area, rather than being taken to a central Logistics room and then moved out again later. Perhaps Logistics should help with hucksters' move-in as they did at Noreascon Two.

We need to think about security of equipment, such as the projection equipment. We may need to have several lockable division offices scattered around the Hynes as places to store things.

Don pointed out that Noreascon Two used the decorator as a drayage company. Convention members who wanted to ship stuff to the convention could ship it to the decorator, who stored it and brought it to the con. This cost about \$19 per hundred pounds, and was billed to the shipper.

Mark said he was more worried about getting stuff back from the con than getting stuff there.

Excerpts from APA:89

March 20, 1988

(Please understand that these pieces were originally written for an internal committee publication and may not be as polished as work intended for broader circulation. They are the personal opinions of the individual contributors, not official committee policy.)

Films

[The following is taken from the minutes of the January 11 Extravaganzas Division meeting on the subject of the film program. — LT]

Bill Carton and Kath Horne led off the discussion of the evening's topic. Kath visualizes three film tracks; one of which would be for kids [or families]. They felt we

should have strong films before and after big events to spread out the crowds.

The Kids' Track: Kath thinks the small kids' track would be a good thing to have in the daytime (say, till 6 pm). It wouldn't necessarily show kiddie films, but rather films that kids and families can enjoy. Suford supported this, saying Alice doesn't like the grade-B horror films most cons show for kids, and Suford doesn't like to have her watch them.

Times: We'll have Films in the Sheraton Grand Ballroom, probably also in Republic, and we can use the Hynes auditorium when it's not in use. A phone call to Don revealed that N3 has Republic from noon on Wednesday to midnight on Monday; Grand from 2 pm on Wednesday to noon on Tuesday; and the Hynes from 8 am on Thursday through Monday. With this in mind, our first-pass film schedule turned out as:

Wednesday	6pm—midnight	
Thursday	noon—2am	small track
	6pm—midnight	big track
Friday	10am—midnight	small track
	noon—3am	big track
	noon—6pm	kids' track

[Sat and Sun repeat Friday's schedule]

Monday noon—4pm

[Closedown times are approximate.] Not counting any super-special showings in the Hynes (something on the magnitude of a blockbuster premiere) or the post-Hugos *Dramatic Presentation* winner showing, that comes up to about 133 hours. Bill said that 130 hours, at the standard rerun ratio of 1.6, would allow for about 40 different features.

Tech: We don't know yet whether we'll be required to have a Stagehand (unionist). We may need someone for large slide shows. Film racks would be very helpful. We should be able to build them. We can have a Films Logistics room, such as Commonwealth.

Content: Kath and Bill plan to run the Hugo nominees a few times so everyone can see them. They will get the best-quality films that their budget permits, and have as many shorts as possible. Kath would also like to have Kiley [John Kiley does live organ accompaniment to silent movies].

We've had a request for *The Wizard of Oz*, which opened in '39. We felt that '39 was a very good film year, and we'd like to show some "anniversary" films, if possible. A *film history* subtrack, showing how the filmmaker's art developed, could be very interesting. This could show how things have been "stolen" for recent films, remakes, etc. We could have contests to spot such things. Another subtrack possibility is *film music*.

Close: Bill and Kath were appropriated \$200 for a startup budget. They will start to contact the rental markets and further develop their "tracks" proposals.

Membership Figures

Sharon Sbarsky:

	Jan	Mar
Total memberships and admissions	2479	2540
Attending	2213	2270
Supporting	222	224

Children's Admissions	44	46
Members that need PR 1 & 3		6

George Flynn:

In response to Mark's request in the last apa, I did some research on at-the-door memberships at recent Worldcons. This is based on a quick search through old newszines; no doubt it could be refined by further research, but probably not changed significantly. Some Worldcons never released precise numbers anyway, as will be apparent from the numbers.

Year	Worldcon	Total Prereg	Attndg. Prereg	At-the-Door Full	At-the-Door Daily
1978	Iguanacon	4200	2900	900	900
1979	Seacon '79	4126	2193	365	556
1980	Noreascon II	5447	4199	711	1060
1981	Denvention II	4529	2657	472	663
1982	Chicon IV	5000	3525	750	
1983	ConStellation	5500	4873	695	1048
1984	L.A.con II	6740	5823	—2542 total—	
1985	Aussiecon II	2199	1255	135	188
1986	ConFederation	5400	4800	1200	
1987	Conspiracy	4953	4250	280	1303

(Sorry, in general there isn't sufficient data to distinguish the preregistered "Attending" and "Supporting" members.) To sum up: Except for Denvention (in a relatively isolated area), no North American Worldcon of the past decade has had less than 500 full at-the-door members, and most have been well above that figure. Those with daily memberships have also all had over 500, usually over 1000; a daily should probably be figured as one-third of a full membership, which is the typical price ratio. If we have daily memberships, and barring a drastic economic downturn (in which case everything's up in the air), I think the equivalent of 1000 full at-the-door memberships is a conservative projection; 500 is a virtual certainty.

The Hynes (by George Flynn)

Presidents' Day weekend I decided to attend the AAAS meeting at the Hynes and Sheraton. Perhaps the thing about the Hynes that struck me most strongly was the magnitude of the distances within it: from the main entrance (off the Prudential plaza) to the entrance of Hall B was close to a 3-minute walk (even with no crowds), and of course that's just on the first floor; Jim Hudson was quite right about this.

The Program Book (by Pam Fremon)

The program book should be something *fun* to read, either during or after the convention. Make it a souvenir item. Leave various pages blank or partially blank for people to record their impressions of the con items as the con goes along. Unfortunately, the soft binding would not be suitable for mounting snapshots. However, on the wild side, the program book could be constructed (and bound) like a scrapbook, so fen really *could* insert their precious momentos. Put in a pocket for bid flyers, etc. I know this idea is very strange and not very sedate, but I think it would be a lot of fun to have (it's the type of thing that as an attendee I would like to have).

The Art Showcase

Pam Fremon:

I'm not entirely certain, but I lean towards supporting the Showcase. It could be breathtaking, and I think is probably worth taking a chance on. But don't put it at the front of the Art Show; put it at the back so people have to pass through the show to get it. Only selected *pieces* should be in the Showcase, and the *jury* should select them. How about **NO** awards for the Showcase? It seems to me that being there is recognition enough; I don't see a need to do a "best of the best" award.

Dave and Claire Anderson:

The Showcase is looking less plausible. Claire is against it because (1) we won't have an opportunity to pre-test and debug it, (2) it violates KISS (Keep It Simple, Stupid), (3) it would be difficult to administer, (4) based on Boskone experience what artists promise they will put on a panel won't jibe with what they actually bring, and (5) placing the most spectacular art in one area hurts the overall show, and the attendees will perceive the show as being divided into "good" and "bad" sections. Dave hasn't made up his mind yet, but has found more potential problems each time he has thought about it.

Insignia (by Mark Olson)

I hope that N3's various departments will refrain from generating their own insignia. I've never like the idea that an area should create badges or T-shirts or ranks to set itself apart from the rest of the con. I'm aware of the reason — it builds morale within the department and makes people feel a part of something special.

That's just the problem. It sets the area apart from other areas and orients it towards looking out for itself rather than for the whole convention.

Over the next 6–8 months, we'll be evolving the minimum necessary set of badges and ribbons to make the convention work. Please don't elaborate things further. (Note: this is not aimed at the necessary insignia related to function; just to special benefits for particular areas.)

Program GULP Comments

Peggy Rae Pavlat:

The discussions of "too much programming" [at the Program Division GULP meeting] do not address the real question. Which is, I believe, how much programming will be "needed" by the attendees of the convention.

There are several problems with only presenting three or four items even during peak periods of programming. First, those items have to be of "some interest" to many, many people. Second, there are very few truly new/innovative items which will attract that large a crowd. Third is the cost of the lost Opportunity. This concept comes from Economic theory and raises the issue of what doesn't happen because of the decision which was made. For example, you can have a discussion of Cordwainer Smith's works which will be fascinating to one percent of the attendees. This type of very specialized program item at regional conferences is nearly impossible unless at least 1000 attendees are expected (i.e., the same one percent of 500 is only five attendees).

[Discussion of how many people might attend programming, concluding that for a 6000-person convention, we might expect as many as 1800 people to be potentially

interested in the program at any one time.]

There are many options available. One program item in a 2000-person ballroom would hold all of these people, so would two items each in 1000-person ballrooms, if that high a proportion of the attendees were interested in just those few items which were offered at that time. The drawback here will be evident to anyone who clearly remembers the difference between lecture classes of 1000 students in a large hall versus 100-person classes, or even better, classes where there were only 20 to 40 students where interactions could take place orally between students and teachers as well as among the students.

If the opinion develops that programming is likely to be more enjoyable for the attendees when seminar-type events are scheduled, then a serious look must be taken at how many program items must be offered to "absorb" the 1800 potential program attendees at peak hours. The potential attendance at other hours for each day must also be projected and planned for.

Given an 1800 potential peak attendance, there might be one 1000-person program item, one 300-person program item, three 100-person program items, and several less-than-100-person items (figure autographs as one of these), such as most authors' readings/An Hour with XXX. That adds up to about 1800 attendees and is about eight items during the same time period.

On the other hand, figuring a maximum of eight program items (including any autographs and authors' readings during that time) during the peak period from 1 to 4 p.m. on Saturday and Sunday; perhaps six items on Friday afternoon during these same hours and Saturday and Sunday mornings at 11 and noon, and less than that (let's say four items) Thursday afternoon, Friday morning, and Monday morning gives us about 150 items.

If the decision is made to provide programming "during the dinner hour" and during some parts of the evening/night, and at 9 a.m. or 10 a.m., this number may go up to 250 program items. I'm not sure from where the figure of ten tracks for ten hours per day comes from, but it sure feels to me like more work than it's worth.

More people "need" programming during the afternoon than need it at 9 a.m., or 10 or 11 even. (I have major qualms about scheduling anything before 9 a.m. not because I don't think there would be an audience — about 30 people would be *real* happy to have something interesting to do — but because the convention staff needs not to have to be functional early enough in the morning to successfully pull off an 8 a.m. program item, and most program participants prefer later in the day.) Unless there is compelling reason, my philosophy is to begin at 10 a.m. with a few items and then add a few more at 11 a.m. and peak at 1 p.m. and sustain that peak until 4 p.m.

[This schedule disagrees somewhat with the actual attendance at program items that was projected from the ConFederation room manager forms (see M3P #19). That data showed that program attendance peaked strongly at 11 a.m., dipped at noon, then went back up to about the 11 a.m. level from 1 p.m. to 4 or 5 p.m. Those forms also indicated an over-all program attendance of somewhere between 10% and 15% of the attendees, rather than the 30% that Peggy Rae postulates here. — LT]

Whether larger events are scheduled in the late afternoon is again a matter of philosophy. It seems to me that most of us wind down in the late afternoon, and the large lecture format appears to be more acceptable at this hour — more of us are happy to be talked at in a format where we don't need to respond.

We might look at when people tend to arrive at the Worldcon. My hypothesis is that a large percentage of the "old timers" arrive by late afternoon on Thursday. Those people who have been to one or two previous Worldcons will arrive on Thursday or Friday or early Saturday and those people for whom this is their first Worldcon will generally not begin arriving until Friday. Many of the first-time attendees will not arrive until Saturday, and, if one-day memberships are permitted, a significant number of first-time attendees will arrive on Sunday in the late morning. Many first-timers will commute to the convention. This means that many of them won't be on site from late evening until 10 a.m.

Some inferences may be drawn from this: The "How to Enjoy Your First Convention" will more likely reach its intended audience if it is scheduled for Saturday (or at least Friday) rather than on Thursday. Shows like "The Decline and Fall of Practically Everyone" can safely be scheduled for Thursday night when the "old timers" will be there, but the first-timers won't be lost in a sea of unknown names.

I'll turn now to developing the program items. I too dislike the "concept" of having "tracks" of programming. However, I could never find another useful way to conceptualize the scheduling of the program. I totally agree with Priscilla and Ben that people's imaginations should not be confined within their Track (and I know of no Worldcon which has done so).

The traditional method used by Worldcons for developing program ideas and selecting program participants for these items has been for the programming staff to come up with ideas, to have asked others for ideas, and then figure out who would be good on a particular program item. The potential participants have then been written to and asked if they were willing to be on at the particular time(s) which the programming staff have selected for them.

Using the questionnaires was an attempt to break out of the traditional method (which some of us had seen not work again and again). There are certainly problems with sending out questionnaires and asking people to fill them out and send them back. For one thing, it takes a lot of work to develop the items from which the potential program participants may choose. (The questionnaires which I have used included space for people to write in their suggestions (which were often super ideas and appeared on the final program).) Second, the potential program participant had to take a half hour or so to go through the questionnaire and check off items of interest. Then remember to mail the response. There was then a tremendous amount of work which needed to be done to consolidate, reproduce, distribute, and digest the responses.

The benefit of using the questionnaires was finding some fantasy writers who are real/hard scientists in their mundane life and happy to be given a chance to participate in hard-science programming, and some folks who knew about Chinese mythology and lots of other neat stuff

which we would have had a hard time finding out about without the questionnaires.

Would I use questionnaires again? Yes. Do I think there are other good ways to select program participants for particular items? Yes.

There are many known problems with having the programming staff decide who to ask for which program items and the potential program participant responding to these suggestions. First, it puts the person asked in the position of having to decide if the presented item(s) are the "best" which are likely to be selected for that person. Second, it locks in the program staff to their "decisions" reasonably early (it's awkward to write back and figure out a way to say something polite when what is meant is that we came up with better people to be on that item). Third, when it comes time to actually do the scheduling (and the re-adjusting the schedule) (and the re-re-adjusting the schedule) of the entire program, the decisions which were made months previously have a way of narrowing even further the already-strict parameters within which one may schedule an entire Worldcon.

If the program staff truly wishes to get even with an obnoxious little-known pro, the best way to accomplish this is to grant his/her wish to have an hour-long autograph session. The kind thing to do is *not* to give the almost-up-and-coming pro (or well-known fan) an autograph slot. Instead, find this person's strength and incorporate it into the closest-fitting program item. Those fans who want autographs of their favorite not-yet-well-known person are good at attending program items to get these autographs. It's awful for the pro to sit there for an hour (or even half an hour) and have only two or three people (or none or one person) ask for an autograph!

I certainly agree that requiring programming to use absolutely everyone who wishes to be on the program adds unneeded constraints on an area which already has more constraints than needed.

The question is usually raised as to whether a letter/memo should go to each member of SFWA asking the SFWA member to participate in the program. The convention may wish, if there is time, energy, and money, to send some kind of letter to SFWA, ASFA, and the similar poetry group. However, I'd strongly recommend against inviting all members of any of these groups to be on the program. A short time reading any of these directories brings the not otherwise obvious knowledge that many of the names will be unrecognized by almost all of the attendees.

The issue of when to begin contacting potential program participants was raised in the APA. Attempts to contact folks within the science fiction field for N3 before Nolacon will probably bring more confusion than anything else. People's plans don't seem to begin solidifying until after the first of the year of that Worldcon, so contacting them before that date may increase the total work for everyone.

On the other hand, people outside the traditional science fiction field can be contacted profitably within the next couple of months (e.g., hard science lecturers, academic groups, etc.).

Chip Hitchcock:

I would argue strongly that we should go further than picking our ideas of the best program participants and inviting them to be on the program; we ought to be able to solicit ideas on a non-committed basis. My general impression is that most participants on most items couldn't care less — and that a lot of participants are bored stiff with what they're asked to be on (e.g., the next person to ask Cherryh onto a panel about designing believable aliens should ask long-distance).

We ought to be able to do a book *about* the program for less than \$1.50 per book; it should be about the same size and cost as a PR unless the "precis" is anything but. A good precis is also a good way to get people to come to a panel of unknowns, as titles don't give any guidance whether something will be interesting (next issue I'll write up a Wiscon, where I spent more time in programs than I had spent altogether in the past year or more). We should be encouraging trustable committee and friends to review potential panelists — a lot of good writers are poor-to-dreadful speakers.

Children's Programming*Pam Fremon:*

I think children's programming is a great idea. If the ages run from about 9 to 13, it would be worthwhile. I was about 9 when I started on Chicago's Field Museum of Natural History's wonderful museum discovery tours. Go "behind the scenes" at the Art Show and other places. [Adults would like this too, hint hint, appropriate persons.] Get some of the authors who've written books they may have read to come discuss these books with them. Discussion groups on what makes a good story, happy vs. unhappy endings, the stock characters of fantasy (unicorns, dragons, etc.) It doesn't have to be open all the time, but a few hours in the morning and a few hours in the afternoon could go a long way.

Jim Hudson:

Here are my comments about what I think we should offer to the various ages of kids.

1. Babysitting Ages infant to 3. Basically, free play with a nap area. Professional childcare personnel, essentially running a day care center. Most of the emphasis on care (diapers, food, etc.). Controlled drop off and pickup. A convenience to the parents attending the convention, rather than a convention for the kids. Part of our services to members.
2. Dragon'sLair Ages 4–8, approximately. Directed crafts, films, etc. Run by convention staff, with some SF emphasis. Controlled drop off and pickup (kid can not just leave on her own). Games, costumes, etc. A convention for the kids. Could be considered a service, could be considered a special interest group.
3. Kids' Programming Ages 9–up. A program track designed to be interesting to kids (which also makes it interesting to many adults). More participatory than standard program. Open to all, but with kids getting priority. Many items initiated, or at least brainstormed, with kids coming to the convention. A *part* of the convention for kids.

I've used convention babysitting. It's not wonderful, and not an environment I'd like Ariel in regularly, but serves the need for a convention (my standards are higher for real playgroups or day care). I haven't spent much time at Dragon'sLair at Boskone (yet: we will by N3) but the kids seem to like it. And I was on the team (me, Eric Pavlat, Peter Hudson, Chris Casper) that ran the one good Worldcon example of Kids' Programming I know of — ConStellation — and participated in the track at Confetti that had some good items.

For babysitting, you offer a service. For Dragon's Lair, you have to convince the parents that this is where they want their kids to be. For Kids' programming, you need to convince the kids.

Items that worked at Kids' Programming at Constellation: Designing and constructing a comic book (Kondo, the monster building) with people from Marvel helping the process [I still have my copy]; brain dissection . . . [Jim seems to have run out of time here — LT]

Second Floor Comments (by Chip Hitchcock)

Town criers are a cute idea but indoors they're likely simply to add to already-excessive noise — they work well outdoors. Somebody needs to find out just how well all the advanced technology promised by the Hynes works, and whether we have some eager beaver to do a video Pocket Program (I always like this — it's useful to be able to grasp what's going on right now without fumbling with masses of paper, and at a reasonable speed you can carry a lot of information.)

I would argue strenuously that nothing that can be prepared ahead belongs in the *newsletter*; the obsession with non-news was one of the larger defects of the Conspiracy newsletter. Experience suggests that there will be plenty to go in the newsletter without padding.

I would certainly approve of letting entertainers self-fund (pass hat, sell tapes). I really doubt that entertainers will help much with crowd control unless we invest in substantial sound systems for them (which would in turn make them much less flexible) — I would guess that the listenable capacity of such anywhere that it will divert a flow would be 1–200 people, which doesn't seem likely to help. . . .

Carpeting may be nice, but is likely to be a sink since we may be limited to decorator carpeting at \$10 per square yard.

Exhibits could probably be made entirely out of Balticon hangings; I plan to rent some anyway for the art show, as they are cut to a template and look (and fit) a lot better than the basic pegboard style. They fit very nicely around a standard pillar, and enough exist (from the Connie art show) to handle almost any demand we can come up with.

I very much doubt that a book of the Hugo nominees would be worth publishing — the problem is less permissions than getting it printed and distributed before it's obsolete. (In fact, it wouldn't hit committee labor so badly, as it would have to be ready several months beforehand.) A Faces book would be interesting — and a good way to blow a lot of money, since we probably wouldn't sell many at \$15 (which might not even be break-even at 500 pages — usable halftones aren't cheap).

MCFI Meeting

Date: March 30, 1988
Notes by: Jim Mann

Next Meeting: The next meeting will be on Wednesday May 4, at 7:30.

Treasurer's Report: Ann Broomhead distributed the Mar. 31 report (which will appear in the next issue of M3P).

Secretary's Report: Jim Mann said that we have been receiving letters that are distributed to several areas and which require replies from several areas. In all such cases, we have to coordinate our replies. In some cases, only one reply, incorporating all areas' responses, should be written. In others, we may send multiple replies, but they should be consistent.

Preregistration Report: Sharon Sbarsky said that we've received about 20 more memberships since the last apa, about a half-dozen or so of these at Lunacon.

Let her know if you are going to a convention. She'll prepare a packet for you. We can get M3P subscriptions, CoAs, and so forth, as well as answer questions. Even if you are only willing to staff a table for an hour or so, it is still a good thing to do.

GULP: Jim Hudson said that the next GULP meeting would be on April 6. The Art Show and WSFS Division will be GULPed.

Publications: PR 3 is out.

Greg Thokar said that the contents of PR 4 (due out in June) are very sketchy. He wants to get updates from the divisions. He is also getting a note on handicapped facility access from Facilities. He is looking for volunteers to write other things. He is also looking for a theme. Mark Olson noted that we'll have better schedules that we can publish by then. For example, we can say when Huckster and Art Show mailings will be going out.

Greg said that we'll have at least seven pages of ads. Mark told Greg to squeeze the text if he could. Money saved now could be used later. Mark also said that the PR would include a brief summary of the survey in PR 3, and that more details would be published in M3P.

Jim H. suggested an article saying that "the Hynes is real" and describing what's going on there.

Greg said that ads are due by May 15. He plans to go to press by mid-June and be in the mail by late June or early July.

Australian Ad: Greg said the ad for the Australian program book was about ready. He asked how he should round the rates for Australian dollars. Mark said to round to a multiple of \$5, down \$1 or up \$4.

Questionnaire: Pam Fremon said that we've received 185 questionnaires so far, which is about 7% of the total sent out. They're coming in at about 1-2 per day.

Mad 3 Party: Leslie Turek said that issue 25 had been printed by Al Kent. Unfortunately, he left most of the copies in his office when he went out of town, and, since he won't be back till after postage rates increase, it will cost a bit more to mail it.

Nolacon: Mark noted that we've put in for a suite at the Marriott. We'll discuss whether we want it in one of the next two meetings (which gives us time to cancel it if we decide we don't need it).

The Hotel Situation: Don Eastlake said that nothing much has changed. The Sheraton lawyers passed it to their management, who are still doddling. Significant chunks of the final contract will appear in a future M3P. *[The contract was signed on April 14 and appears on page 2 of this issue.]*

Sue Lichauco then presented Don with a package. She said the contents might help us get around hotel corkage problems. It contained a bottle of "Sheraton Hotel Reserve Wine," available from local store for 2 bottles for \$5 and well worth the cost.

Nameless Division Report: Fred Isaacs said that Kelly Persons will be working on Exhibits. Cindy Gold will head the Huckster Room.

He then summarized the division meeting held at Lunacon. Briefly, the topics discussed included:

Budgeting. Copies of a first-pass budget were passed out. They made some comparisons between this and the Confederation budget. Caution was needed here since the Confederation categories differ somewhat from ours.

Internal Communications. A division apa was proposed.

Mixing Area. There was lots of speculation on what noise levels at the Hynes would be like. Furniture rentals were also discussed. We might consider using risers to provide some seating. Someone suggested setting up a written pun contest using bulletin boards; people could vote for their favorites by affixing stickers to them.

Information. We should consider having volunteer translators on call via beeper.

Registration. Everyone liked the Boskone badges. *[Laminated clip-on badges.]*

Rogues' Gallery. There was general agreement that Christine Valada's offer (to do VIP photos) was a good thing, but some points need to be clarified.

Chocolate Hugos. Priscilla Olson, on hearing this idea, suggested selling small ones at members sales. Many people agreed.

Extravaganzas Division: Ellen Franklin reported that Jill Eastlake was in Europe. She and Jill were trying to arrange their schedules so that one of them would be in this country at all times, but this might not be easy.

She said that Freeman, a large supplier of tradeshows, will soon be in the Boston area. She'll pass the address on to Don and Fred.

Extravaganzas continues to have planning meetings. These meetings are open to anyone interested. They've had lots of good ideas, and are now looking at how to execute them. They're goals are to 1) focus on tighter definitions and 2) put together a proposal to bring back to MCFI as a whole.

She said that Masquerade probably merits its own GULP.

Extravaganzas is reaching a state where joint meetings with Program may be necessary to work out some details.

Ellen also noted that Hasbro has a bunch of exhibit stuff they're getting rid of. We should look into trying to get some of it. Several people noted that it may be worth

renting storage space if it is stuff we will use at con.

Facilities Division: Don announced that Sue Hammond had been appointed to run the Staff Lounge in the Hynes. Facilities and Services met and agreed that Facilities would handle this, though they would coordinate with Services (which is handling Den).

Facilities met a couple of times. At Boskone, they discussed contract and liaison issues. (Does the liaison for outlying hotels need a moped?)

In their March 2 meeting, they mostly discussed budget stuff. Don didn't see why we thought his division's budget was so big. It's less than half of our projected income. *[It also includes the Hynes rental cost.]*

They're looking into facts/figures for a possible banquet in the Hynes. (It could be up to 2200 people.) They're also looking into the party situation. They have some questions for the Hynes, but the Hynes isn't returning phone calls.

The Facilities Division will be meeting at Nolacon opposite the Masquerade. Don said that the meeting should be over in time to go see the final walkthrough of the winners. Several people asked him why they needed an 8-hour meeting.

They've been talking with some convention services companies to get quotes. Deborah Snyder has gotten some info on tables, chairs, etc. Don has gotten similar information from Concept Convention Services, which is offering rates comparable to those for N2. The current quote they have for bulk ice deliveries is only 10% higher than that for N2.

ConFiction: Don received a letter from Kees van Toorn thanking us for our handling of the ConFiction PR mailing.

Parties at Conventions: Mark proposed putting aside \$100 for a Disclave party. Paula Lieberman was worried about what it would look like if we spend money when we say we're broke. Pam said we should get a bar of chocolate for the party. Ben Yalow said we should only spend \$50. Our small bid parties were only \$50. Sharon said we should also hold a party at Westercon. Hearing no objections other than Paula's, Mark said we'll plan a party at Disclave and tentatively one at Westercon.

WSFS and Art Show Division: George said that recent *Mad 3 Parties* and apas have discussed WSFS and Art Show. Dave Anderson said that he has copies of the Nolacon art show information.

Program Division: Priscilla announced that Saul Jaffee will run Program Technical and Tony Lewis will be in charge of Young Adult program.

In order to reduce the number of confused pros, we won't send out information/letters till after Nolacon.

Ben said that he has been meeting with people all over the country. He is also receiving lots of electronic mail. Ben also said that the track (Priscilla: "don't call them tracks") designers were in place. There were 12 tracks (or whatever) at Boskone. There may be up to 20 at Noreascon.

People should write down program ideas. Mark noted that Program may want to leave copies of their Division apas in the clubhouse to stimulate ideas from others.

Services Division: Jim said that Laurie Mann had met with Andi Shechter to discuss handicapped services. Laurie is evaluating several offers we have to run handicapped services.

Bill Jensen will be a shift supervisor at con.

We are awaiting quotes on the program book. We are also trying to figure out how much ad income we'll make.

Budget Update: Mark said that it is a big job to put the whole thing together. He said the budget he is trying to put together is "medium rare": not the most conservative possible budget and not the best guess, but somewhere in between. He is assuming 6,000 members.

Fred asked what the rule for Huckster rates would be. Should it make money? Should it break even? Should it be in line with other Worldcons? Chip Hitchcock said that N2 worked to break even. Rick asked if we factor the lawyer costs into huckster rates. Mark said the case is complicated. We have three numbers to look at:

- A rate equal to the marginal cost of the facility.
- A rate equal to the marginal cost of the facility plus overhead.
- The going rate.

Paula said that, given our current costs, rates may be much higher than \$100. Jim M. noted that if our rates are too high we won't be able to put together the kind of Huckster room we want, so that we may have to subsidize it.

Jim H. noted that non-membership income only accounts for 20% of our income. Mark said, however, that given our tight finances \$30,000 may make the difference. George said that membership was about 75% of N2's income.

Mark said that the expense budget is now 700 lines on his spreadsheet. It is a baseline budget: N2 plus any changes we've already discussed. He hopes the baseline is low, so that we can add more. However, unless we have a surplus, we can't add anything new without cutting something old.

Profit Disposal: Mark reviewed the topic that had been raised a bit last time: a way to distribute some fraction of our profits to the next *n* Worldcons, who would then do the same with their profits. For most Worldcons, most income comes in too late to count on. This proposal can help with that problem. It would be desirable if future bidding groups would join with us in this plan.

Tony asked if the funds would be unrestricted. Mark said yes. Gary Feldbaum says that tax laws may force us to earmark the funds, but we can ask the Worldcon what they'd like us to earmark them for. Rick said that we may have to limit ourselves to US cons. Mark said that we would give funds to the next *n* "eligible" Worldcons, meaning that we only give money to those we can without hurting our tax-exempt status. We have to work out the details as to what we are and aren't allowed to do.

Ben said we may want to start *n* with the Worldcon two years out, not the next one, since much budgeting is already done by the time we've closed our books. Chip didn't agree. Many budget areas are such that they can be added late. Jim H. agreed with Chip. We'll know 3-4 months after N3 if we have the money, even if we haven't closed the books yet.

Tony said he was concerned with bids being even more extravagant if they know that extra money is coming in. He'd like to have some discretionary powers here, and not automatically give it to all Worldcons. Jim H. said that if Tony's discretionary rule were in place, we would run the risk of getting little or no money. Mark said that he was fed up with the way some fans behaved during the Connie bailout, forever debating whether Connie "deserved" to be helped. He doesn't want to see that here. Ben said this if this is to be a consistent future policy, it can't be discretionary. George also was against it being discretionary; he also doesn't want to spend future meetings debating who should and who shouldn't get money.

Chip asked what conditions would be imposed on future Worldcons? Mark said that we'd ask them to pass on at least the same amount of money (not necessarily the same percentage of profits).

Tony noted that in many ways this is a return to the old tradition of pass-on funds.

Don returned to the issue of whether we can only give money to US, not-for-profit groups. He doesn't think it matters. Part of our charter is to promote SF, and we can give money to anyone as part of that. George said that this point is consistent with the WSFS constitution.

Chip asked if we should get written commitments from other groups. Mark said that he wanted to do this even if we have to do it alone.

Jim H. said that he was worried that someone will bring it up as an amendment to the WSFS Constitution. Mark said he wasn't worried; WSFS politics are such that it will certainly fail.

There were no objections to pursuing this policy. Mark will talk to some of the upcoming Worldcon bidding groups to see if they wish to join us in this plan.

We adjourned at 9:50.

GULP Meeting

Date: April 6, 1988
 Topic: The WSFS and Art Show Division
 Notes by: Leslie Turek

Attending were George Flynn (Division Head), Claire and Dave Anderson (Art Show Heads), Mark Olson, Leslie Turek, Jim Hudson, Pam Fremon, Paula Lieberman, and Sharon Sbarsky. Before the meeting started, Paula displayed the Hugo nomination ballot she had just received from Nolacon.

WSFS

George had prepared a number of questions to discuss under the WSFS heading.

Hugo Bases

George had previously brought up the question of whether we should try to obtain special (artist-designed) Hugo bases. He thought we should do this only if someone could work closely with the artist to make sure we got a quality result. So far, no one has volunteered a specific suggestion and been willing to carry it out, so we will probably go with fairly standard bases. Jim pointed out that even with standard bases, we should do some research to find a source of nice ones.

Special Category

Should we have a special Hugo category? Nolacon is trying a category called "Other Forms" but there wasn't a lot of enthusiasm among the group for repeating it (although we agreed we should watch it and see what gets nominated in that category). Dave threatened to nominate the new IRS tax form and Mark proposed the category, "Best New Work by a Dead Author."

Getting more serious, we discussed the only category that had been seriously proposed for N3 so far, something for Young Adult (YA) Literature. Paula felt that the category wasn't well defined, and that there were already other awards for YA literature. Jim said that there are other awards for novels and movies, too, but that doesn't stop us from giving Hugos for SF novels and movies.

It was mentioned that many people are not familiar with the works in that category and therefore were not qualified to nominate. This might lead to a problem like that of the fan categories, where some unqualified people nominate and vote, and only a small number of nominations are needed to get on the final ballot.

We also discussed the educational function of such a category. Claire felt it might serve to get kids into reading good stuff when they're young. Leslie pointed out that some people make a point of finding and reading the Hugo nominees, even if they don't have much time for reading SF in general.

George asked what people would nominate if this category existed this year. Mark suggested that we ask the whole committee to either hand in nomination ballots or state that they felt unqualified to do so, just to try to get a handle on how such a category might work in practice.

To solve the definition problem noted above, Claire volunteered to try to find the American Library Association definitions for YA literature.

A more general question was asked about whether it was a good thing to install any new category. Leslie felt that this option had been given to Worldcon committees so that categories could be experimented with before being brought up as permanent categories in amendments to the WSFS Constitution. Those that work well could be made official later; others could be dropped.

Sharon suggested that if we approve this category, we should announce it in the next Progress Report, so that people could start noticing works that would be appropriate to nominate. Leslie thought we should wait and see how Nolacon's special category worked, but Sharon pointed out that we will have at least seen the list of nominees by then.

Schedule

George proposed to distribute nomination ballots in PR 5 at the end of the year, with a nomination deadline of March 15 or 30. The final ballots would go out a month later, with a final deadline of July 15. The month gap because we need to wait for all the ballots to arrive, then contact the nominees to give them a chance to decline, then print the final ballots.

If there are any eligibility decisions to be made, George will bring them up to the committee as soon as they become obvious; they don't have to wait until the nomination deadline. George confirmed that only MCFI members will

be ineligible to be nominated; others who have been appointed to positions on the convention committee will still be eligible for the Hugo.

It was noted that we should state in PR 4 when we expect the nomination ballots to go out, so that people can contact us if they fail to get theirs. It was also noted that we will know who the nominees are in mid-April, so the Extravaganza division can start getting together whatever nominee-related materials they will need for the award ceremony.

The final ballot mailing will include Hugo ballots, site-selection ballots, and possibly bidder advertising and a bidder comparison chart. The first mailing can go bulk rate, but anything sent out after early May will have to go first class to give people adequate time to respond.

There was some talk of placing a nomination ballot in other Worldcon Progress Reports as a sort of advertisement for Noreascon 3. In looking at Confiction's mailing list, it appears there's not as much overlap in membership between Worldcons as one might expect.

There was some talk about the scheduling of the business meeting, but no serious move to change it from the usual morning time (although hopefully not as early as Conspiracy originally proposed — 9 am).

Art Show

The Art Show discussion was based on the Art Show writeup that appeared in *M3P* #25.

Size

We are currently planning the size of the show to be about 300 4' x 6' panels — about the same as Noreascon 2 and about twice the size of the largest Boskone show. We have material to build 200 panels locally, and have access to about 300 more from Baltimore. Leslie mentioned that we will need panel space for exhibits, also.

Reasons for not making the show even bigger are:

1. People won't have time to see it all. (Some disputed this point, saying that people would manage to see what they want to see.)
2. It will take too long to set up the show and to handle sales.
3. Sales per artist may be diminished.

We can reconsider this if our membership appears to be greater or there's more demand for space than we anticipate. Claire came up with an initial estimate for 250 panels using the artists she knows from Boskone or recent Worldcons.

For N2, the deadline for Art Show entries was August 1; perhaps this time we should make the deadline earlier, since we expect to fill up earlier.

Rates

We can't set the rates for a while yet, but we could talk about the philosophy of how we will set the rates. We talked about three indicators:

- Looking at rates of past Worldcons.
- Looking at rates as a percentage of sales.
- Looking at rates as covering our actual costs.

Mark asked to see a table of rates charged by previous Worldcons in APA:89. It will be hard to compare because many Worldcons charged a flat rate plus a percentage of sales, whereas we plan to charge only a flat rate. Also,

panel size has varied somewhat. But we can make a rough comparison of rates if we also try to collect some figures on the average sales per panel. For example, if a convention charges \$25 per panel plus 10% of sales, and the average sales are \$300 per panel, the equivalent flat-rate cost of the panel is \$55.

If we collect sales per panel figures, we can also look at the total art show fees as a percentage of sales. Mark felt it would be nice if our flat rate came out to 12%–13% of the gross sales, with a maximum of 15%. Jim said that regionals have been in this range, but Worldcon practice has been more like 15%–20%.

Mark pointed out that the Hynes space rental alone will cost us something like \$15–\$20 per panel. If our other actual costs are similar to Boskone (\$35–\$50 per panel) we get a total marginal cost to us of \$50–\$70 per panel. This doesn't include convention overhead, which Mark felt we should not include.

We need to gather all of this data before we make a final decision on panel fees.

Print Shop

The Print Shop at Boskone charged \$5 per piece, which came out to about the same income per panel as the regular show. It was about the same amount of work as the regular art show, but was spread out more evenly throughout the convention, needing only 2 staff people most times.

The print shop should have a separate exit or a different kind of receipt, since we don't want people to be able to bring out original art on print shop receipts.

At some recent conventions, ASFA has run the print shop as a fundraiser. Given what our costs will be, it's hard to see how it could be run as a money-making proposition at N3. We should probably plan on running it ourselves.

Schedule

The current tentative plan is to have no Saturday auctions. Closeout will be around 4 pm Sunday, with sales 6–9 on Sunday and 11–2 on Monday. We will follow our usual practice of allowing many written bids to keep the auctions short. We could have about an hour auction on Sunday and 2 more hours on Monday.

There was much discussion of how to fit in the Sunday auction. With the above schedule, it would either be during dinner or during the Masquerade. Perhaps we shouldn't have any Sunday auction; just the one on Monday. Someone suggested holding a Sunday auction during the Masquerade judging intermission — talk about a captive audience!

We considered the option of closing the show earlier on Sunday (say at noon), and having a late afternoon auction. Many people felt that left too few art show open hours overall.

We discussed posting an auction schedule as soon as possible after closeout, so that people will know approximately what time their pieces will come up. This is particularly important on Monday, when people may have other time constraints, such as checking out of hotels. Dave wanted to wait and post the schedule on Monday morning, to allow people time on Sunday night to make special requests. But with the spread-out hotel situation, others felt that people bidding on a particular piece would like to

know Sunday night what time they would need to be at the auction on Monday. The consensus was to do the schedule on Sunday night.

Jim requested that the auction(s) be scheduled to start a few minutes *after* the show opens so that potential bidders would have a chance to see what artwork they have already bought by written bid (and so be able to figure what they can spend at the auction).

We talked about ways to keep the auction from getting too long. One idea was to have a minimum price to get into auction (in the range of \$35–\$50). If a piece starts with a minimum of \$1, it might only be bid up to \$8 when the written bid sheet is filled. We could add another bid sheet in such cases.

Showcase and/or Special Exhibit(s)

Dave and Claire are currently leaning against the idea of a Showcase section of the show (as described in *M3P #25*), although they are willing to reconsider if anyone wants to argue in favor of it. No one at the meeting did. Basically, they feel that it would be adding a lot of work to an already work-intensive area, and would be somewhat risky since we haven't had a chance to experiment with the idea elsewhere.

Chip spoke in favor of doing a special exhibit of previously-sold good artwork that is now in private collections. The artwork would not be for sale and we would not charge the exhibitor. We would pay for the hanging space, shipping, and insurance. The consensus was that we would consider doing this if we could find an enthusiastic volunteer willing to organize it. We could tie this into our GoHs by exhibiting Ballantine cover art.

Finding art in private collections could be tricky. It would not be ethical to go through an art appraiser for leads, unless the appraiser first asked the owners for permission to release their names.

Pam mentioned again the suggestion to set up an exhibit of touchable art for the visually handicapped.

Space Allocation

Many attendees judge an art show by the quality of the art they find there. What can we do to keep the level of art high, and still be fair to the artists who want to enter? If we consider the quality of art, how can we find out about new people we haven't seen before?

To answer the last question first, ways suggested for learning about unknown artists included asking contacts in other parts of the country and taking notes at conventions we attend (especially Nolacon).

Dave suggested that we generally limit artists to 2 panels, expanding this to 3 by special request for artists we know to be popular. We should limit complete unknowns (artists new to SF cons) to 1 panel. We should also start limiting people to 1 panel when the show is near to selling out, to allow more people the chance to get in. The art show directors should make some effort to encourage popular artists to get their reservations in before the show fills up. (By popular, we include amateurs with good reasonably-priced artwork, as well as big-name pros showing cover art.)

A side issue that was noted was problems with agents. Sometimes artists and agents don't communicate very well, and artists get entered in a show without their knowledge. (Or else, the artist and the agent both make

separate reservations.) We will require the artist's signature on the entry form, and the artists should indicate whether the sales check should go to themselves or their agents.

Mail-in Art

Mailed-in art is a real problem. We would need a place to receive it, must unpack and check for breakage, repack and bring to the show, and hang it ourselves. Part of this could be solved by using a drayage company as we did at Noreascon 2. Then after the show, we must unhang it, pack it well enough to transport back from the show, pack it carefully, and ship it back to the artist.

We talked about banning mailed-in art entirely, charging a lot for the service, allowing it only with special permission, and/or limiting it by size or type. For example, limiting it to matted artwork under a certain size considerably eases the packing problem, eliminates glass breakage, etc. Another solution would be allow artists to mail artwork in, but require them to designate someone to pick it up at the end of the show. An almost-serious option was to limit mailed-in artwork to art with a minimum bid of \$1. It would almost certainly sell, and if it didn't, we could pay the artist the \$1 to save the trouble of sending it back.

Must Artists be Members of the Convention?

This was a philosophical question with no clear resolution. There are apparently a few local artists who enter the Boskone Art Show, but are not fans and don't attend the convention. Also, mail-in artists usually won't be attending. On the other hand, if we have a limited amount of space, should we give preference to our members?

One problem if artists need not be members is how to get them into the show. We definitely don't want another kind of badge. A lot of this depends on the location of the art show. If it is in Hall D, as we hope, we might be able to use the separate entrance to the Sheraton as a way artists can check in. If it is upstairs in the Ballroom, that wouldn't be an option.

Current N3 Committee List

The following table lists the various areas that are currently within each division, and gives the people who have been appointed so far. New appointments or position changes since the last issue are given in boldface. Additional areas will be added as planning continues; please feel free to tell us what's missing.

Officers

Chairman — Mark Olson

Chairman's Staff — Jim Hudson, Leslie Turek

Corporate Counsel — Rick Katze

Treasurer — Ann Broomhead

Deputy — Dave Cantor

Staff — Wendell Ing

Secretary — Jim Mann

Mail Room — Pam Fremon

Program Division

Division Heads — Priscilla Olson and Ben Yalow

Division Staff — Merle and Aron Insinga, Tim Szczesuil

Ideas and Advice — Tony Lewis

Creative Consultant — Paula Lieberman

SF and Fantasy Program – Tom Whitmore
 Fan Program – Patrick and Teresa Nielsen Hayden
 Academic – Liz Gross
 Science – Alan Bostick
 Workshops/Discussion Groups/Readings –
 Joni Dashoff

YA Program – Tony Lewis

Autograph Sessions –
 Special Interest Groups – **Todd Dashoff**
 VIP and GoH Liaison – Willie Siros
 Program Operations – Pat Mueller and Dennis Virzi
 Green Room – Fred Duarte
 Technical – Saul Jaffee
 Pocket Program –

Extravaganzas Division

Division Heads – Jill Eastlake and Ellen Franklin
 Area-Level Planning Team – Deryl and Rod Burr,
 Bill Carton, Kath Horne, Georgine and Mike Symes,
 Suford Lewis, Paula Lieberman, Pam Fremon

Nameless Division

Division Heads – Fred Isaacs and Peggy Rae Pavlat
Meeting Minutes – Nancy Atherton
 Staff – Chris Callahan, Richard Dutcher,
 Bruce Farr, Jane Hawkins, Dan Hoey,
 Ray Hoover, Dick Roepke, Cat Slusser
Technical Liaison – Wendy Lindboe

Preregistration – Sharon Sbarsky
 At-Con Registration – Ruth Sachter
 Information Subdivision – Debbie Notkin
 Information Desks –
 Newsletter –
 Press Relations –
 Freebie Racks and Bulletin Boards –
 Sign Planning –
 Mixing Area –
 Special Interest Group Tables –
 (includes bidders' tables and site-selection area)
 Filking –
 Passing Fancies (Hall Events) – Sue Lichauco
 Assistant – Bill Lehrman
 Exhibits – Carolyn Sayre
Assistant – Kelly Persons
 Hucksters' Room – Cindy Gold

WSFS and Art Show Division

Division Head – George Flynn
 Art Show – Claire and Dave Anderson
 Sales – Gay Ellen Dennett
 Technical – Chip Hitchcock
 Staff – Yoel Attiya, Joe Mayhew, Walter Miles,
 Shirley Avery, Martin Deutsch, Tom Schaad
 Business Meeting – Donald Eastlake
 Staff – Bruce Pelz
 Hugo Procurement – Greg Thokar

Facilities Division

Division Director – Donald E. Eastlake III
 Assistant – Theresa A. Renner
 Deputy Division Director – Andi Shechter
 Assistant – Anton Chernoff
 Staff – David Bratman, Kris Brown, Gary Feldbaum,

Katie Filipowicz, Candy LaRue, Malcolm Meluch,
 Bill Perkins, Naomi Ronis, Larry Ruh,
 John Sapienza, Deborah Snyder, **Rick Katze**

Contracts, etc. – Donald E. Eastlake III
 Technical Services – Rob Spence
 Deputy – Nigel Conliffe
 Staff – Monty Wells, Peggy Orrill, Andy Robinson,
Colin Lanzl, Sally Martin, Scott Robinson

Sleeping Room Allocation – Debbie King
 Function Room Allocation – Alexis Layton
 Sheraton-Boston Liaison – **Bob Lidral**
 Back Bay Hilton Liaison –
 Boston Park Plaza Liaison – Pat Vandenberg
 Other Hotels Liaison – Al Kent
 Hynes Liaison – Joe Rico
 Security Planning –
 Facility Operations – Bobbi Armbruster
 Assistant – Mike DiGenio, Dennis Miller
Staff Lounge – Sue Hammond

Services Division

Division Heads – Laurie and Jim Mann
 Assistant – Jane Wagner
 Staff – **Bill Jensen**

Publications Areas:

Progress Reports – Greg Thokar
 PR Advertising – Rick Katze
 Program Book – Greg Thokar
 Mad 3 Party – Leslie Turek
 GoH Book Liaison (if any) –
 Computer Nets –
 Committee Newsletter –
Member Services Areas:
 Handicapped Services –
 Dragonslair (Children's Activities) –
 Babysitting –
 Off-Site Events (if any) –
 Official Airline/Travel Agent Liaison (if any) –

Internal Services Areas:

Office – Debbie King
 Staff – Larry Gelfand
 Logistics – George Mitchell
 Consultant – Mike DiGenio
 People Mover –
 Sign Production –
 Committee Den –
 Gopher Hole –
 Insurance – Rich Ferree
 Photography –

Letters

[We try to print as many of the letters we receive as we can. The opinions expressed in this column are the opinions of the letter-writers and of the editor, not necessarily those of MCFI or Noreascon 3. — LT]

Hugo Administration

- Alan Bostick, Pasadena CA:

I read through George Flynn's Hugo administration piece with considerable interest. On the whole, I don't have much to say to it except "Well done!" There are a couple of small points I'd like to comment on.

George writes, *A Worldcon committee is entitled to delegate all authority over the Hugos to a subcommittee "whose decisions shall be irrevocable," but there's no reason to do this unless it's desired to make someone on the committee eligible for a Hugo.* Looking over the committee roster, I see the names of people one might reasonably expect to be nominated for a Hugo, because they have been nominated in the past. I'm referring to the Nielsen Haydens, who have received nominations individually and together as Best Fan Writer and for publishing the Best Fanzine. I don't know whether or not they expect to be particularly active in fanzine publishing this year if they are also busy with their areas in the Programming Division. If they are active in fanzines, they stand a good chance of being nominated, if they are eligible. They cannot be eligible unless a Hugo administration subcommittee is formed. I therefore urge that such a subcommittee be formed, subject to the desires of Patrick and Teresa Nielsen Hayden themselves.

[The "committee" referred to by the WSFS Constitution is the legal entity that controls the convention (MCFI, in this case), rather than the looser meaning of "committee," which is everyone working on the convention. Patrick and Teresa have a position on the convention staff, but are not voting members of MCFI, and thus would still be eligible for the Hugo even if we didn't set up a Hugo administration subcommittee. — LT]

My other comment is about George's remarks on eligibility and dating, and specifically the legitimacy of committee fudging on publication date. *Another sort of year-of-eligibility problem arose last year, George writes, when Conspiracy allowed "The Winter Market" on the ballot, even though it had first appeared in the November 1985 Vancouver magazine, on the grounds that it "received limited distribution . . . in 1985, but 1986 was the first year in which it received general distribution." . . . it's very dubious that a Worldcon committee has the right to do this sort of thing, when the Constitution explicitly grants this right to the WSFS Business Meeting. Whatever you think on this point, the best way to head off such a problem would be to keep an eye out for technically-1987 works that few people have seen, and implement the rule (for the first time) by making a motion at the '88 Business Meeting to extend their eligibility.*

If this is indeed the best way to handle the problem under the current rules, then in my opinion the rules ought to be changed. Unless such a motion names explicitly everything that was published in 1987 for which small initial distribution might raise eligibility questions, such a mo-

tion would run the twin risks of (1) possibly appearing as an endorsement or recommendation for an award (why make such a point if the meeting attendees didn't think the story was good?), and (2) leaving out the story or motion picture that, come nomination time (after the meeting which could authorize its eligibility), the nominators decide is worth considering. In amplification of the second problem, what about stuff that appears in limited distribution between the Worldcon and the end of the year? Does the following year's convention committee lack the authority to make it eligible?

[There may be some confusion here. If something appears in limited distribution in late 1988, say, it's eligible in 1989 anyway; people then have another 8 months to discover it and apply (at the 1989 Worldcon) for an exemption to make it eligible in 1990. — George Flynn]

Perhaps the Business Meeting can exercise its prerogative by delegating it, passing a resolution lending its authority to the committees or the Hugo subcommittees. This resolution could either give the committees broad leeway of judgment, or delineate specific rules for allowing inclusion. But this raises the question of whether this authority properly belongs with the business meeting at all. If specific rules are made up, why not include them explicitly in the Hugo sections of the Constitution? For that matter, why shouldn't the Constitution vest this power in the convention committees in the first place?

[If the Constitution clearly vests a particular power in the Business Meeting, then it can not be generally transferred to another body, such as the current Worldcon committee, by a standing resolution, since that would be, in effect, amending the Constitution without following the proper procedure. However, a particular Business Meeting could probably assign its authority to the Worldcon Committee, or some other group, by designating it as a committee of the Business Meeting with full authority. — Donald Eastlake]

My basic discontent with this situation is that the Business Meeting is institutionally ill-suited for dealing effectively with the problem if it arises; the convention committee is. At risk of generating yet another round of constitutional wrangling, I suggest the rules be changed. It probably would be lots easier for the Business Meeting to explicitly delegate its constitutional authority — which would only take a resolution, unless I am mistaken — than to change the Constitution yet again. The only question would be, *can* the Business Meeting delegate this authority?

[You are probably right that if it were necessary to make frequent exceptions to the Hugo eligibility timing, it would be better for the con committee to handle it instead of bogging down the Business Meeting. — Donald Eastlake]

[Don has covered the legalities, but history may be more instructive. The history of the WSFS Constitution is in large part the invention of rules to prevent the repetition of dubious actions by past Worldcon committees. In this case, the year-of-eligibility rule was made inflexible around the time when the same book appeared on the Hugo ballot two years in a row (it was The Moon Is a Harsh Mistress, and it won the second time). For many years no exceptions were permitted; then this tiny loophole was added, but it was deliberately made hard to invoke. Business

Meetings tend not to trust the discretion of Worldcon committees . . . perhaps with good reason.

— *George Flynn*]

Art Show

• Tom Schaad, Arlington VA:

Paul Abekis apparently sees the Art Show as primarily an art sales mechanism for the artists and fan buyers. I agree that sales are an important part of the show — the opportunity to sell their work is what draws many of the artists to exhibit — but I think you were on the mark with your comment that the art show's first function is to provide the artists with an opportunity to exhibit their original work to fans who want to see it. In the artists' discussions I participated in at Boskone 24 [25?], one of the principal topics was the quality of the hangings and light in the show and their effect on the presentation of the work. The artists were all extremely concerned with getting the best possible surroundings for viewing their art. That doesn't mean that you ignore the art sales aspect of the show, but it does mean that art sales is only one of the things you take into consideration when putting it together.

I have to admit that I am uncomfortable with the idea of a juried section to the art show. Deciding who will be the judges, determining how much work an artist could hang in the juried section, making those decisions before the show, getting the work hung and then dealing with the arguments that would inevitably result from the decisions offsets, to my mind, any possible benefit in terms of enhanced quality of the exhibit. I am not saying that you could not set up one or more special exhibit areas — a special section to exhibit the work of the Hugo nominees is something that would be appropriate at a Worldcon art show, for example. You could have a section of the show set aside for artists to bring in their own hangings and lighting (with certain standards) to show their work the way they want people to see it. The fact is that a Worldcon art show is one of the few places where you have the space, money, and manpower to try some new approaches in presentation without jeopardizing the entire show. Often approaches tried out for the first time at a Worldcon show end up finding their way into the regional shows.

I do disagree with the contention that having special exhibits would discourage "Joe Phan" from looking for "no-name" artists. The current size of Worldcon art shows already requires that a fan spend a significant amount of time in the show if they want to see all the work on display. More than once I have found myself suffering from "sensory overload" after around 100 panels of art and have had to take a break. Having special exhibit areas within the show — or in a separate room — merely provides fans with some additional choices on how to spend their time. The fan who only wants to see the "name" artist can do so, and the fan who wants to see all the art will take the necessary time.

Facilities Division

• Alan Bostick, Pasadena CA:

I first have a brief question, although it may be one it is too early to answer. The Facilities Division has the function of "Technical Services," i.e. sound, light, electrical, video, construction, etc. Does this mean that Facilities is responsible for making sure that the slide projector

or VCR or whatever is set up in the function room for a particular program item, and the Program Division is responsible for informing Facilities that such-and-such equipment is needed at such-and-such a time? Or will Facilities (or even Logistics in the Services Division) maintain an inventory of such equipment, leaving Program with the responsibility that it is ready for the program item?

[The details of this have not been decided yet, but it will more likely be similar to the second option you describe. Program will have its own technical person who will work with convention technical to see that the Program Division's needs are met. — LT]

In the section "Assigning People to Hotels," it is written, *Leslie [Turek] thought [hotel room assignment] should be pretty much first-come, first-served, with some exceptions for handicapped and people working on the convention. When the initial hotel information goes out, and we get back a whole rush of reservations at once, she thought we should give preference to people who had joined the convention early (low membership numbers).* I disagree. I **Strongly** disagree. One good reason not to do this is the case of Aaron Aar and Zetta Zypt, who happen to buy memberships at the same time, as well as have their reservation cards received by the committee in the same batch of mail. Aaron, because of alphabetical order, has a lower membership number than Zetta. It happens that on the day their reservation cards are processed, the hotel they both wanted filled up. Aaron has a lower membership number than Zetta, so he's in, and she's out.

But beyond that unlikely situation, I have strong philosophical objections to the notion of rewarding people with low party — er, membership numbers. I understand the need to encourage people to join the convention as soon as possible in order to aid financial and other planning. I don't think it is appropriate to reward early joiners in this manner. One's hotel accommodations can have a strong impact on the quality of one's experience at a convention. Giving early joiners preferential treatment in hotel room assignment is favoritism on the same order as reserving quality seating at the Hugos or the Masquerade for them. I would criticize strongly any committee that implemented such a policy without having made it public in the bidding process, and I would vote against such a committee in the bidding if they did make it public.

Here is an alternative idea: When the reservations cards go out with PR 5, let the membership know that all such cards received back by such-and-such a date (say, two months after the PR goes out; precisely when is unimportant) will be entered into a lottery and assigned a randomly selected priority number. At that time, assignments will be made on the basis of this priority number and the member's preferences. Any reservation cards arriving after the cutoff date will be processed on a first-come, first-serve basis and fit into whatever is available.

[First, let me say that I agree with you that one's hotel accommodations can have a strong impact on the quality of one's experience at a convention. If they didn't, this wouldn't be an issue. Let me also say that there are some on the committee who agree with you that assignments should be made on a random basis, and the question is still under discussion.

My original suggestion (which turns out not to be practical) was to avoid the whole problem by simply releasing hotel information very early and letting people select their hotel as they joined the Worldcon, if they wished to. This would have the exactly same effect in terms of giving early joiners preference. Unfortunately, we cannot do this since many of the hotels are unwilling to quote rates this far before the convention. Even if we have a lottery in January, we will be giving preference to the people who joined before January over those who will be joining after.

Whatever we do, some group of people will be disappointed. It's certainly politically easier to do this by random selection, because then the committee takes no responsibility for the results. I just happen to think that it is more fair to give preference to the early joiners.

I agree with you that it's always better to announce such policies in advance. But, unfortunately, we don't always manage to foresee the need for some policies early enough to do so. — LT]

(Alan again:) Don [Eastlake] currently expects that the Hynes will shut down for a few hours overnight to allow for cleaning, etc., and so we don't have to staff it all night. A possible closing time might be 3 am, and Don suggested opening it at 10 am. A number of people thought that 10 am was too late, especially for the mixing and information area. 8:30 and 9:00 were discussed as alternatives. This was referred to the Second Floor Division to determine when the area could be staffed. I agree that 10:00 am is too late to open up the mixing area. I was assuming that programming would begin at about 10:00; it is clearly desirable to have the "public" areas where people can mingle open well before the program starts. As to the staffing question, it should be borne in mind that the staffing needed to open up the area to the public is not necessarily the same as the staffing needed to be fully operational. For example, we could let people in at 8 or 8:30, but not open the Information desk until 9 or later.

*The Sheraton sleeping floors will also shut down after about 3 am. I suggest that this and the shutdown of the Hynes be announced to the membership early and often. Put it in all the progress reports, the program book, the pocket program, and in every issue of the convention newsletter, not to mention letting it be known through such means as *File 770*. There will be a certain segment of the membership we won't be able to reach, even if we tattoo it on their foreheads, but we should make the effort, in my opinion.*

I got burned by this very issue at L.A.con II. I went up to the sleeping floors in search of a cigarette machine (there being none available in the lobby or on the program floors) at a ridiculous hour of the morning, and was apprehended by a hotel security guard, who gave me the third degree, and in doing so told me that the sleeping floors were off-limits to non-guests (I was staying with my grandfather, a mile from the hotel). To this day, I have no idea of whether this was actual hotel policy, agreed to by the committee, or just a guard throwing his weight around. If people know they don't belong somewhere after hours, they have a better chance of not being there.

[By shut down, Don meant that big, advertised, open parties would probably have to close. This does not mean that individuals would be barred from going into the hotel. We have made it clear to the hotel that convention

members will need access to the hotel sleeping floors at all hours, and the hotel has agreed to this. The only people who might legitimately be challenged by guards are people who are neither convention members or hotel guests (unless accompanied by hotel guests). — LT]

Extravaganzas Division

• Alan Bostick, Pasadena CA:

I find the idea of having a GoH Talk Show as one of the Extravaganzas to have an insidious appeal to me, especially the idea of patterning it after "Late Night with David Letterman." If you do it that way, be sure to include a stupid pet trick and the ever-popular Top Ten List: "From our home office in Hagerstown, Maryland, here are the Top Ten Reasons To Become An L. Ron Hubbard Writer of the Future. Number ten: Simone Welch has great legs. Number nine: Lots of free food and booze at their parties. Number eight: Earn extra cash by selling your free copies of *Mission Earth* to used book stores . . ."

If that doesn't have the needed stfnal POW!, I don't know what does.

• Allan D. Burrows, Mississauga Ontario:

On the subject of the masquerade, I have had a few thoughts. It seems that the greatest problem you face is exposing as many people as possible to as many costumers as possible. (This is not to say that costumers are not people, you understand.) I understand from the letters in this issue [#24] that costumers enjoy being applauded by a live audience. If this problem can be gotten past, then one way to show many costumes to lots of fans would be to show them on TV.

Having reflected on this, I suggest the following plan. First, try to get the cheapest facilities you can, but try also to get an experienced camera crew. I saw the masquerade at ConFederation on video and it suffered I think by the crew not having experience. (As I understand, they got the local college to do the job as a project. Try a local cable station; you might offer them exclusive rights to sell a feed to other local networks if they need incentive.) Set up stages to tape each costume in advance, starting Friday or Saturday morning as the costumes are ready to be presented (thus giving those who need to fix or prepare things at the con a bit more time. Won't *that* go over well!). You'd have the costumes judged during the taping, (thus giving *the judges* all day, too!), and while they make up their minds (and some extra awards for spiff costumes that don't quite make it otherwise), the TV crew can edit together the taped costumes in sequence. (They'd actually just arrange them so that they can be shown easily during the show that evening; the stentor or host or whatever would have a live TV show, with live presentations, and just the actual costume presentations on tape.) The winners would then be notified before the show so that they can be in costume if they wish when they pick up their prizes.

At the time of the show, all the costume tapes would be shown in the most flattering and interest-holding sequence. The host would announce the costumes from a stage large enough for the winners to crowd on in costume, while a small "studio audience" watched on a projection TV or two. Awards would be presented at the end of the show, so everybody keeps watching.

The show can be shown live in as many places at the con as possible; the various hotel systems, the consuite, etc. The winners would have their live applause, the audience would avoid the crowds, and everybody would get a "front row seat." (Those not at the live presentation could even have a bheer while they watch.) Finally, tapes of the show can be sold as souvenirs.

[This is a video variant of an earlier idea we had, which was to do the extended judging as you describe, and then a presentation of the winners only in a carefully-rehearsed live show in the evening. The main points against it seem to be the desire of the costumers for a large live audience, and the extra time and space it would take. (Keep in mind that the staff and the judges might not want to devote a whole day to the masquerade.)

Adding video adds to the expense, and it's also not clear to me whether the quality of video (even more professionally done) would be good enough to do justice to the costumes.

As to using local cable companies, there's another variant of that idea below. — LT]

• Alan Bostick, Pasadena CA:

My suggestion is that the committee consider selling broadcast rights to the Big Events like the Hugos and the Masquerade to some cable, or even broadcast TV, network. The masquerade, especially, strikes me as being particularly telegenic. There are some obvious complications involved, not the least of which would be making sure that the broadcast took place *after* the convention, so that HBO subscribers wouldn't get for free what congoers had to pay for. The advantages of this arrangement as I see it would be two-fold. First, this might turn out to be a fairly reliable source of income for Noreascon and future Worldcons. Secondly, the availability of top-quality video equipment operated by experienced professionals would enhance the convention's ability to pipe the Events live through the hotels for the benefit of the congoers who can't or won't attend the events in person.

There are of course considerable disadvantages and negative considerations involved. First of all, one may legitimately ask the question of whether doing this would push the convention, and the Worldcon as an institution, in a direction that we as concerned congoers and con-runners might feel is inappropriate or undesirable. It is explicit commercialism. Secondly, it probably would cut into the sale of videotapes as mementos of the convention, for why should Jophan order a tape at the con when he can program his VCR to record the same thing next week? (But do these sales generally recover the cost of the video equipment for the closed-circuit broadcast of the events in the hotels? That is, is the overall video program of a Worldcon a source or sink of funds?) Thirdly, in order for this to be successful, the Events would have to be run in a telegenic manner, which may put undesirable constraints on them as events. Broadcasters don't like events that run perennially overtime (although this could be dealt with through post-production editing), and the National Television aspect of the masquerade may well serve as an inhibition to new costumers and children's presentations.

I have not thought carefully about the idea, and I cannot say that I advocate it. I do believe, however, that it is an idea that warrants thoughtful consideration. Even if it is rejected, the process of doing so will help us decide just

what kind of Worldcon we want, and why we want it.

[I think you've pointed out enough problems that it seems clear to me that this would be a bad idea, even assuming that some large commercial group would be interested (which I tend to doubt). But let me add a few more drawbacks.

First, as soon as we deal with a profit-making concern, we have to worry about whether the convention's over-all tax-exempt status will be endangered. Also consider the participants; if money is being made, won't they be entitled to a portion of it? What about costumes based on copyrighted works — would we need to pay royalties to the copyright holders?

We must also consider the advertising aspects. Even if broadcast after the convention, it would have the effect of exposing the Worldcon to a huge number of possible future attendees. Even if only a small percentage decide to come the following year, it could be a very large number. I don't think we can absorb a large group of newcomers without severe dislocations.

I think ConFederation has been the only Worldcon to date to do large-scale realtime video broadcast, along with sales of souvenir tapes to members. The cost of video work is given in the ConFederation budget as Broadcasting, \$8522.29, and Videotape Preparation, \$14,223.44. Unfortunately, the videotape sales income is not broken out separately. But if you compare the total sales income (\$33,871.03) with the costs of the separate sales items (Commemorative book, \$5600, Merchandise, \$11,760, along with the videotape preparation mentioned above), it appears that the sales table as a whole made a profit only in the vicinity of \$2000. My guess is that videotaping is much more of a money sink than a source of money. — LT]

• Sheila Strickland, Baker LA:

The costumers' comments about not trying to reinvent the wheel are good; but I have the uneasy feeling that the wheel in question is not now perfectly round.

Whither the Worldcon_____

• Tom Schaad, Arlington VA:

I was interested in the comments from Paul Abelkis. The discussion on the perks offered to gofers gives me a chance to comment on what I see as one of the trends in fandom. Anyone who worked on conventions ten years ago and who still works on them today can tell you how much things have changed. Conventions have gotten larger, programming more varied, and the amount of work required to plan and run the convention has expanded tremendously. It's not a matter of disdain for the neo, as Paul infers, it's just that many area and department heads don't have the time for a lot of casual conversation during the convention because they are too busy making sure things work. The result, unfortunately, has been that the gopher often no longer gets the kind of personal feedback from the people he is helping that was the rule at cons a few years ago. The perks offered at some regionals and the Worldcons are an attempt to make sure that something is done to recognize the contribution that the gofers make to a con. Without their volunteer labor things just don't get done, no matter how well you plan.

I agree that any attempt to place restrictions on Worldcon bidding expenditures is essentially unenforceable. I'm involved for the first time on a bid and am learning just how much work and expense is involved in presenting it to fandom. As your figures in *M3P #15* show, the costs of the bids are rising, especially with the change from the two- to a three-year lead time on voting. Bids are now actively campaigning for a longer period of time, at a greater cost in order to reach potential voters and establish credibility. Those years that have competing bids will usually spend even more in their effort to keep up with or ahead of the competition. The failure of one bid to match another in the number of parties, number of ads, etc., can result in a loss of the bid's credibility in fandom. As a result you have a tendency to see an upward spiral in spending when bids are competing seriously for a Worldcon. The policy of a bid on how they fund the bid and what their approach is to reimbursement is as much a part of a bid's makeup as their membership, supporters and convention facilities. If that policy is important to a voter, as it apparently is to Paul, he or she can always ask the members of the bid what their position is in those areas before voting. After all, that's the main reason the bids throw the parties, to tell fandom everything they want to know about the bid before they cast their votes.

Finally, Paul's concern that the profits from the Worldcons be channeled to benefit all fandom is a valid one. You commented on the problems of budgeting for the Worldcon, with a large piece of the income coming in very close to the convention and therefore difficult to predict; a responsible budget cannot assume there will be a lot of last-minute at-the-door registrations. At Boskone 25, I got involved in several conversations in which a possible solution to this Catch-22 situation (responsible Worldcon budgeting will normally result in significant profits) was discussed. If a cash-flow problem often exists in the months before a Worldcon, why not use a portion of the profits from previous Worldcons to ease the way? For example, a Worldcon committee could pledge that they would distribute a specific percentage (50%–90%?) of whatever profit it made from that Worldcon equally to the next two or three Worldcons. This distribution would have to be made in time for the money to be effectively used by the recipients (six months after close of con?), especially the next Worldcon. In this way a committee would not be unjustly accused of profiteering as a result of

prudent budgeting, while the money paid by fans to attend the Worldcon would go to benefit fandom. There are undoubtedly potential problems that would have to be addressed (like what if one Worldcon accepts this distribution of funds but decides to retain its profits), but I think the basic idea has a lot of merit. The appeal of the idea is that it insures that money generated by the Worldcon is spent on the Worldcon either this year or in future years.

[We were involved in those discussions, also, and support this idea. (See grant application in M3P #25 and minutes of the March 30 MCFI meeting in this issue.)
— LT]

- Lloyd Penney, Toronto Ontario:

While I may not necessarily agree with some of the things [Paul Abelkis] said, I certainly do agree with his opening observations of the stratification of fandom . . . book fans, media fans, gaming fans, comics fans, con fans, fanzine fans, etc., etc., etc., and any number of subdivisions in each area. This balkanization hurts the community of fandom at large, and is responsible for the explosion of specialty cons, such as mediacons, Elfquest cons, weapons conventions, dark fantasy cons, etc. If there was something to bind together fans to a greater degree, the result would much more powerful than each small group alone. Our prejudices towards people with different interests must stop . . . but neither do I advocate a United Fandom (perhaps a contradiction in terms).

[I don't see a contradiction. I think the specialized conventions, for example, are a good thing, because fandom has grown so large and we don't really want to try to handle a 12,000-person Worldcon. What we'd prefer not to see are the "prejudices" you refer to. Deciding that a particular con doesn't have the resources to support activities for a particular sub-fandom is not at all the same as feeling that the people in that sub-fandom are somehow "less worthy." — LT]

- Allan D. Burrows, Mississauga Ontario:

I read with particular interest Paul Abelkis's letter. The gentlefan sounds like rather a loud-mouthed idealist. I cannot believe that he himself believes that he knows everything he is talking about, and still he speaks his mind. In short, he is a fan after my own heart. Well that he made points to be addressed, and well addressed they were.

The Mad 3 Party #26

Massachusetts Convention Fandom, Inc.
Box 46, MIT Branch PO
Cambridge MA 02139

FIRST CLASS MAIL