The Mad 3 Party

Number 30

November 1988

— *Special All-Number Issue* —

Noreascon 3 work has picked up its tempo now that Nolacon is past and we are the next Worldcon in line. Suddenly people outside the committee are starting to think about what they want to do at N3, and letters are beginning to stream in. We are working on improving our procedures for handling letters from groups and individuals who have requests that overlap multiple convention areas. The Program Division has also been busy putting out an initial mailing to over 450 potential program participants, asking them their preferences concerning the Noreascon 3 program.

One of the main activities in October has been preparing text for Progress Report 5, our first big PR since PR 1 was published nearly two years ago. One division doing a lot of work for PR 5 is the Facilities Division, which has the responsibility for collecting detailed information from each of the 14 (!) hotels we are dealing with. The division has been collecting raw data using a four-page questionnaire, and is now compiling it into comparison tables, maps, and short descriptions of the key features of each hotel.

PR 5 is planned to go to press in November, be mailed just after Christmas, and should reach our members sometime in January.

Membership Prediction Contest

At the last MCFI committee meeting, we decided to have a contest to try to predict the number of memberships Noreascon 3 will have. (We had a similar contest for Noreascon 2 — George Flynn was the winner of that one.) All members of Noreascon 3, including committee and guests, are invited to enter. The specific challenge is to guess the number of *attending* memberships we will have when advance registration closes in July. This includes all attending memberships, including any complementary memberships to guests, but does not include supporting memberships or children's admissions. The deadline for entry is January 1, 1989. The winner is the person who comes the closest to the correct number. The prize will be your choice of up to $25 worth of Noreascon 3 souvenir items. To help you with your predictions, the latest preregistration report follows.

Preregistration Report

	Apr	Jun	Jul	Oct 15
Total	2572	2608	2748	3496
Attending	2307	2340	2469	3197
Supporting	218	221	227	237
Children	47	47	52	62

New Committee Appointments

Nameless Division:
    Exhibits Staff — Selina Lovett
    Mixing Area — Jane Hawkins
    Press Relations — Richard Brandt

Program Division:
    Division Staff — Rick Foss, Mike Glyer, Janice Gelb
    Green Room Staff — Karen Meschke, Debbie
       Hodgkinson
    Showcases — Michael Gilbert
    SFWA Liaison — Craig Shaw Gardner
    ASFA Liaison — Bob Eggleton

Extravaganzas Division:
    Thursday Party — Paula Lieberman
    Friday Night Event — Pam Fremon
    Hugo Ceremony — Jill Eastlake
    Masquerade — Suford Lewis
    Closing Ceremony — Ellen Franklin
    Boxboro Party — Steve Boheim, Anne Norton
    Food Functions — Ellen Franklin
    Films — Bill Carton
    Technical Liaison — Deryl and Rod Burr

Change of Address:
    Dick and Nicki Lynch,
    PO Box 1270, Germantown MD 20874

Misplaced Members

The following members had their PR 3 or PR 4 bounce. If anyone has a good current address for any of them, please let us know.

    Howard Anderson, Waltham MA
    David Chaplin, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada
    R. Caitlin Cormier, Coral Gables FL
    Lisa Cox, Chatsworth CA
    John DeTreville, San Francisco CA
    Asenath Hammond, Tarzana CA
    Delia Huse, Waltham MA
    Barry C. Marin, East Orange NJ
    Michael McClary, Ann Arbor MI
    Christina McDonald, East Hartford CT
    Garrett Scott-Miller, Fort Bragg NC
    Nancy J. Stone, Saint John NB Canada
    Tadd Torborg, Nashua NH
    Edmund A. and Laura Vitale, Brooklyn NY

Nolacon Attendance Report

[This report was received from Mary R. Wismer, Nolacon Membership Director, and is dated Oct. 1, 1988.]

The following report is a preliminary tally of attendance figures at Nolacon II. Still missing from my records is an accurate count of the pre-registration membership who actually attended the con, and the pre-registration membership who did not attend. The reason for this is that the sign-up sheet for pre-registration is missing as of this date.

1. Unofficial count taken at the convention on Sept. 4, 1988 for pre-registration attendance was 4,108.

2. Total monies taken in at the door for membership was $60,733.50.

3. Number of records in the database was 6,724 (This includes pre-supporters, supporters, attending and one-days, plus some complementary memberships. Also included are some deleted records and some du-

plications. Total number of complementary memberships issued by John Guidry are not included in this number as accurate records were not kept at the convention.)

Total count for memberships at any level taken in at the door was 1,116. This included:

370 full attending memberships @ $100.
 51 full attending memberships @ $75.
 70 two-day memberships @ $50.
580 one-day memberships and/or children's full attending memberships @ $25.

The following are some daily membership breakdowns:

Total Memberships (all levels):

Thursday	347	$31,680.00
Friday	200	$12,608.50
Saturday	397	$12,150.00
Sunday	142	$ 3,650.00
Monday	30	$ 645.00

One-Day Memberships Only: (Total 582)

Thursday	11	Sunday	134
Friday	61	Monday	31
Saturday	345		

Two- and Three-Day Memberships Only: (Total 121)

Thursday & Friday	2
Thursday, Friday & Saturday	5
Friday & Saturday	26
Friday, Saturday & Sunday	16
Saturday & Sunday	30
Saturday, Sunday & Monday	30
Sunday & Monday	8

We processed 18 conversions from either Pre-supporting to Attending or Supporting to Attending. This figure is also preliminary as the sign-up sheet for conversions is also missing.

We processed 12 lost badges for a total money figure of $235.00.

Noreascon 3 Questionnaire Results
by Jim Hudson

This is an initial report on the results of the Noreascon 3 questionnaire. The questionnaire was sent out with PR 3 in March 1988 (and later mailings) to 2572 members of the Worldcon. A total of 267 usable responses were received by June 1, 1988, the closing date. Therefore, the raw response rate was 10.4%.

Pam Fremon and Davey Snyder designed the questionnaire, logged the responses, and did an initial analysis of the data. Jim Hudson took the forms in July, entered them onto a PC, and analyzed the results using the *Systat* statistical package.

The dataset is available to qualified researchers interested in the fan population. Names and other identifying information have been removed from the dataset. It can be provided on 5 1/4" or 3 1/2" diskettes (you supply the media) in fixed-record ASCII, Systat dataset, Lotus 1-2-3 worksheets, or a Lotus .WKS file on a Mac disk

Characteristics of the Sample

The sample is a self-selected group of early joiners of the 1989 Worldcon, and no special efforts (second mailings, followup calls, etc.) were made to increase the response rate. These factors make it likely that the responses here are *not* representative of the overall population who will attend the 1989 Worldcon.

At this point, the sample appears to be similar to the *current* Noreascon 3 membership in the only variable we can measure: it has a similar Zip-code distribution. However, we know from past Worldcons (including Noreascon II) that the actual attendance is, on average, younger and less widely distributed than the early joiners. For example, there are more actual attendees from the immediate area of the convention.

While this can not be tested with the existing data, I believe that the responses are reasonably representative of the current Noreascon 3 membership, which largely includes those who vote on site selection or join early. However, it provides less information on the 80% or so who join later, especially the majority who join in the last 6 months or at the door.

With that caveat, this survey still presents the best information we have on what convention members will *do* at the Worldcon. It may be crooked (in formal terms, "biased"), but it's the only game in town. Read it carefully, and make your own estimates of how things would be different if we'd been able to survey the actual population of Worldcon members.

Descriptive Results

Pages 5–7 show the basic results of the survey. The questions typically asked the respondent to rate an item on a 1–5 scale. Respondents were instructed to leave a blank if they had no knowledge of an area. On this scale, 1 typically meant "This item does not belong at a Worldcon" while 5 meant something like "I know I'll spend much of my time there" or "Essential to me."

The areas with the most 5's (over 30%) were:

Pocket Program	92%
Daily newsletter	80%
Hucksters' room	76%
Program Book	68%
Hugos	64%
Masquerade	63%
Progress Reports	60%
Art Show	60%
Freebie table	60%
Con Suite	56%
Studio Film Premiere/Presentation	52%
Restaurant Guide	50%
Convention information desk	46%
Art Exhibits	43%
Meet the VIPs party	42%
Guest of Honor speeches	38%
Film previews/new releases	36%
Opening ceremony	35%
Bulletin boards	30%

The pattern of areas with 4's and 5's is similar, as you can see by inspecting the tables. The top four items in combined high scores are Hucksters', Pocket Program, Daily Newsletter, and Art Show - all with over 90% finding them very useful.

The areas with the most 1's (4% or more saying the item should *not* be at the con) were:

Scavenger Hunt*	20%
War gaming*	11%
Trivia Bowl*	8%
Regency/Heyer Tea	7%
Dance	6%
Pun Contest	6%
Official Travel Agent*	6%
Official Airline	4%
Author Roast	4%
Fan Cabaret	4%
Board gaming*	4%
D&D*	4%

Items marked with * have more "1"s than "5"s; a lot of people are negative, and there are few aficionados.

The second table shows all the items which did not fit this format. Basically, you say that the convention can start at 9 or 10 am, and should continue until midnight or later; on average, you attend about 10 program items during the Worldcon, and buy books, art, jewelry, and buttons in the Hucksters' room.

Most of you *don't* like the idea of a black-tie Hugo reception at any price; you *do* go to parties, and you'd like most of the convention to be non-smoking. Among the early joiners who responded, nearly 40% work on the convention (a lot higher than the rule of thumb of "10% of attendees"). On average, you've been to 4 other Worldcons, including 2 in the last 5 years, and you'll stay at the con hotels. You're split between travel by car and plane and, on average, about 35 years old.

About 2/3 of the respondents answered questions on "How long should the Masquerade last?" and "How long should the Hugo ceremony last?" When we entered these data, we took the higher value if people gave a range, so these results are a reasonable approximation to the *maximum* length these people will accept. We did not do anything with comments like "as long as necessary," "as short as possible," or "don't have one."

Given that view of the data, it appears that most of you will accept a Masquerade of up to 2 1/2 or 3 hours, and a Hugo ceremony of up to 1 1/2 or 2 hours.

Where you'll spend most of your time

Question 70 of the survey asked you to "Please list the numbers of the areas at which you expect to spend most of your time at the convention." People responded with everything from blanks to 25 items, and some added categories such as "parties" or "working on the convention." Some were also confused by the fact that we had major sections (e.g., III. ONE-SHOTS), minor sections (e.g. 23. Award ceremonies), and detailed items (e.g. 23.3 Campbell Award). We got some answers at all levels, and did not try to combine them. Here are the items that were mentioned frequently as places where people would spend most of their time:

Main Program	163
(includes 113 for individual types)	
Hucksters' Room	142
Art Show	122
Films and/or video	103
(includes 49 for individual types)	
Masquerade	69

Hugo awards	46
(includes 21 for awards in general)	
Con suite	43
Art exhibits	33
Filksinging	28
NASA/Space exhibit	25
Fan Programming	24
Author readings	24
Art auction	24
Discussion groups	23

Fringe Fandom

This dataset can be used to look at some of the theories that have been raised about fringe fandoms. For example, one hypothesis is that fringe fans are *only* interested in their specific areas; the alternative is "We're all fringe fans" who may be interested in X, but also in Y, Z, or whatever. We analyzed this by defining a set of "fan types" based on answers. The list includes:

Gamer	"4" or "5" on Board, Computer, or War gaming or on D&D
Filk	"5" on Fan Cabaret, Filk Concert, Filk workshop, or Filksinging
Worker	2 or more hours worked per day, on average
Faan	"5" on Fanzine room, Repro room, or Fan history exhibit
Media	Buy media items in Hucksters' or "5" on Animation
Costume	"5" on costume workshop, Masquerade photo area, or Masquerade video tapes
Program	15 or more hours of program at the con
Neo	No previous Worldcons
ConFan	5 or more previous Worldcons

These aren't perfect; they are only surrogates at best. But it's interesting to look at whether "Gamers," for example, are also Costumers, Media fans, or convention workers.

Table 3 on page 6 shows the results. Here, each column is a subpopulation (for example, all "Gamers"). Each row shows the participation of that subpopulation in each of the "fringe" areas. For example, 34.4% of all Costumers are also Filkers; this compares to 29.2% of the population as a whole.

As best we can tell, for the early joiners, there is a lot of evidence of multiple participation in "fringe" activities and little evidence of concentration in a single "fringe." *Based only on these data, I would have to conclude that fringe interests exist, but fringe fandom does not.* That is, if you look along a row, there is relatively little variation in the participation.

The big differences include:

• Relatively few neos are con workers.
• Neos (those who haven't been to a Worldcon) participate less in all areas.
• Long-term fans are less likely to go to many Program items.

These are trivial; the dominant pattern is that your interest in a particular fringe seems to be independent of whether you're interested in any of the other fringes.

That's a surprising result, so we looked at the data in some other ways. First, we looked at the number of fringe fandoms of interest to each of you. That is, we summed the number of fringe areas for each respondent. The result is shown below.

# of "fringe" areas	% of sample
0	16.1%
1	33.4%
2	27.0%
3	16.1%
4	3.7%
5	2.6%
6	1.1%

If there were real "fringe fandoms" in this population, we'd see a lot of zeros and ones (say 80% or more), and little else. As it is, we see a much broader spread of interests, closer to what we'd expect if these were independently distributed in the population (a declining exponential distribution).

For a third view, let's define a "polarized area" as one that has a lot of people who are passionate about it ("5"), and a lot who don't care ("2" or "3"). There should be relatively few who are moderately interested ("4"). Here are the items which most fit this rule:

	2–3	4	5
Banquet	59.5	9.7	21.7
Dance	55.4	8.6	25.5
Masquerade Photo	51.7	11.6	27.0
Meet the VIPs	35.6	18.7	42.3

Note that none of these are the traditional "fringe" areas.

The fourth view looks at those who said something does not belong at a Worldcon. We took the areas with the highest fraction of "1" responses, and looked at them against the "fringe" interests above. There were only a few cases where people interested in X were especially positive or negative about item Y (and none of these were statistically significant). Here are the interesting ones.

• Neos were generally unwilling to say something "doesn't belong."
• Gamers were less negative about games (surprise!).
• Confans, who'd been to many Worldcons, were more negative than others.
• Fans who go to a lot of program items were less negative about the Dance, Fan Cabaret, Pun Contest, and Heyer Tea than average.
• Faanish fans were more negative than average about everything except the Fan Cabaret.

None of these seem to be any big deal. While there are some differences, in general these early joiners show a lot of evidence of fringe *interests*, but very little evidence of fringe *fandom*.

That's the extent of our analysis for now. People who want to do more analysis are welcome to request the dataset.

TABLE 1: BASIC STATISTICS

	Sample Size	No Knowledge	Don't Like	Not Interested	Neutral	Interested	Very Important
PROGRAM							
Author Lunches	267	4.9%	0.4%	28.8%	40.4%	24.0%	1.5%
Author readings	267	1.1%	1.5%	18.0%	26.2%	43.8%	9.4%
Author roast	267	2.6%	4.1%	31.5%	31.5%	24.7%	5.6%
Autograph sessions	267	1.1%	1.5%	31.5%	26.2%	23.2%	16.5%
Children's programming	267	8.2%	2.6%	70.8%	7.5%	6.7%	4.1%
Discussion groups	267	3.7%	0.0%	11.6%	34.8%	36.7%	13.1%
Fan programming	267	7.1%	0.4%	24.0%	28.1%	31.1%	9.4%
Films/video							
Animation	267	3.0%	1.5%	19.5%	27.3%	34.1%	14.6%
Classics	267	1.5%	0.7%	8.6%	26.6%	43.4%	19.1%
Previews/new releases	267	1.5%	0.7%	6.7%	11.6%	43.4%	36.0%
Recent features	267	2.2%	1.9%	11.6%	27.0%	43.1%	14.2%
Shorts	267	3.4%	1.1%	14.6%	30.0%	35.6%	15.4%
Main Program							
Art programming	267	1.5%	1.1%	15.0%	24.7%	33.0%	24.7%
Fantasy	267	1.5%	1.1%	11.6%	27.7%	42.3%	15.7%
Genre SF	267	3.4%	0.0%	4.9%	19.9%	47.6%	24.3%
Science	267	1.5%	0.4%	9.7%	29.2%	40.1%	19.1%
SF personalities	267	1.9%	0.4%	9.7%	28.5%	44.2%	15.4%
Space	267	0.7%	0.0%	10.1%	22.8%	45.3%	21.0%
Writing and publishing	267	0.7%	1.1%	28.1%	22.8%	26.6%	20.6%
Scavenger Hunt	267	1.9%	20.2%	54.7%	14.6%	5.6%	3.0%
Trivia Bowl	267	2.6%	7.9%	53.6%	24.3%	9.4%	2.2%
Workshops							
Art	267	2.2%	1.5%	53.6%	20.2%	17.6%	4.9%
Costuming	267	2.6%	1.9%	50.9%	18.7%	15.7%	10.1%
Filksinging	267	3.4%	2.6%	59.2%	17.2%	11.6%	6.0%
Writing	267	3.0%	0.7%	45.3%	23.2%	21.0%	6.7%
Other	267	70.0%	1.1%	15.0%	4.1%	2.6%	7.1%
EXHIBITS							
Art auction	267	1.1%	0.7%	17.2%	29.6%	31.5%	19.9%
Art/craft demonstrations	267	0.7%	2.2%	13.1%	33.0%	39.0%	12.0%
Art exhibits	267	1.1%	0.4%	4.1%	7.9%	42.7%	43.8%
Art show	267	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%	4.9%	33.3%	59.9%
Book/publishing exhibit	267	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	22.5%	52.4%	18.0%
Fan history room	267	1.9%	0.4%	26.6%	28.8%	33.0%	9.4%
Hucksters' Room	267	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	22.5%	76.0%
NASA/Space exhibit	267	0.7%	0.4%	3.4%	15.7%	55.8%	24.0%
Print shop (art prints)	267	0.0%	1.1%	13.5%	29.2%	44.6%	11.6%
Reading Room	267	6.0%	3.4%	27.3%	39.7%	18.4%	5.2%
ONE-SHOTS							
Award Ceremonies							
Big Heart Award	267	14.2%	2.2%	21.0%	28.8%	19.9%	13.9%
Campbell award	267	5.6%	0.7%	11.2%	28.8%	24.0%	29.6%
First Fandom awards	267	9.4%	1.1%	23.6%	27.0%	20.2%	18.7%
Hugo awards	267	1.5%	0.0%	6.0%	10.1%	18.0%	64.4%
Other	267	86.5%	1.1%	3.0%	4.9%	1.9%	2.6%
Banquet	267	5.6%	3.4%	27.7%	31.8%	9.7%	21.7%
Closing ceremony	267	3.0%	0.4%	20.2%	39.0%	17.6%	19.9%
Dance	267	4.9%	5.6%	23.6%	31.8%	8.6%	25.5%
Fan Cabaret	267	9.0%	4.1%	25.5%	34.8%	12.4%	14.2%
Filk concert	267	3.7%	2.2%	37.1%	25.1%	13.9%	18.0%
Gripe session	267	4.1%	2.2%	29.6%	34.5%	12.7%	16.9%
Guest of Honor speeches	267	2.6%	0.0%	4.9%	21.3%	33.7%	37.5%
Masquerade	267	1.1%	0.7%	6.7%	7.1%	21.0%	63.3%
Photo area	267	7.9%	1.9%	30.0%	21.7%	11.6%	27.0%
Meet the VIPs party	267	3.4%	0.0%	7.9%	27.7%	18.7%	42.3%
Opening ceremony	267	2.6%	0.4%	13.1%	24.7%	24.3%	34.8%
Pun contest	267	5.2%	6.4%	32.6%	25.1%	17.2%	13.5%
Regency/Heyer tea	267	9.0%	6.7%	40.1%	24.7%	8.6%	10.9%
Studio Film premiere/presentation	267	6.0%	1.1%	4.5%	15.8%	20.3%	52.3%
MEMBER SERVICES							
Babysitting	267	2.6%	1.5%	83.1%	3.0%	3.7%	6.0%
Bulletin Board	267	0.7%	0.0%	7.9%	26.6%	34.5%	30.3%
Con Suite	267	2.6%	0.4%	4.5%	10.9%	25.8%	55.8%
Convention information desk	267	1.1%	0.4%	0.4%	10.9%	40.8%	46.4%
Daily newsletter	267	0.4%	0.0%	0.7%	3.0%	16.1%	79.8%
Fannish tourist information	267	0.7%	0.0%	15.0%	18.7%	30.3%	35.2%
Freebie table	267	0.4%	0.0%	3.0%	11.6%	25.1%	59.9%
Handicapped services	267	1.9%	0.7%	82.8%	6.4%	3.0%	5.2%
In-city museum information	267	0.7%	1.5%	28.5%	28.1%	27.7%	13.5%
Local tourist information	267	0.7%	1.5%	29.2%	23.6%	27.7%	17.2%
Message board	267	1.1%	0.0%	10.5%	25.1%	33.3%	30.0%

TABLE 1: BASIC STATISTICS

	Sample Size	No Knowledge	Don't Like	Not Interested	Neutral	Interested	Very Important
Official airline	267	1.9%	4.5%	49.4%	25.5%	12.7%	6.0%
Official travel agent	267	1.5%	6.4%	51.3%	25.8%	9.7%	5.2%
Pocket program	267	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%	5.2%	92.1%
Repro room	267	10.5%	1.5%	32.2%	31.5%	18.7%	5.6%
Restaurant guide	267	0.4%	0.0%	11.2%	9.7%	28.5%	50.2%
Ride-matching service	267	3.0%	0.7%	71.2%	17.6%	4.9%	2.6%
Roommate-matching service	267	1.9%	1.9%	78.7%	12.0%	2.2%	3.4%
SOUVENIRS							
Film notes	267	3.0%	1.9%	24.0%	31.8%	20.2%	19.1%
Program book	267	0.4%	0.0%	2.2%	9.4%	20.2%	67.8%
Program participants' bios	267	0.7%	0.0%	10.9%	32.2%	30.0%	26.2%
Progress reports	267	1.9%	0.0%	4.5%	10.5%	23.6%	59.6%
Sales items							
Guest of honor book	267	2.2%	0.7%	18.7%	31.5%	25.1%	21.7%
Memory book (mostly photos)	267	1.1%	1.1%	21.3%	31.1%	27.0%	18.4%
Proceedings (mostly text)	267	3.0%	1.1%	31.8%	39.3%	18.0%	6.7%
Sweatshirt	267	0.7%	1.5%	26.6%	37.1%	21.0%	13.1%
Tote bag	267	0.7%	1.9%	37.1%	35.6%	16.5%	8.2%
T-shirt	267	0.4%	0.7%	16.1%	28.1%	27.0%	27.7%
Video tapes							
GoH presentations	267	3.0%	1.9%	59.9%	27.0%	5.6%	2.6%
Hugo ceremony	267	2.6%	1.9%	56.9%	27.7%	7.1%	3.7%
Masquerade	267	1.9%	1.5%	41.2%	27.3%	12.4%	15.7%
Other	267	67.4%	1.1%	20.2%	4.9%	4.1%	2.2%
SPECIAL INTERESTS							
Board gaming	267	1.1%	4.9%	65.2%	21.0%	7.1%	0.7%
Computer gaming	267	1.1%	3.7%	60.7%	22.1%	12.0%	0.4%
D&D	267	1.5%	4.9%	68.2%	16.9%	6.0%	2.6%
Fanzine room	267	1.9%	0.7%	37.1%	32.2%	22.8%	5.2%
Filksinging	267	1.5%	1.9%	44.2%	21.0%	18.0%	13.5%
Radio soundtrack room	267	6.7%	1.9%	47.9%	32.6%	10.5%	0.4%
War gaming	267	2.2%	11.2%	68.5%	11.6%	4.9%	1.5%
Other	267	82.8%	0.0%	5.2%	1.5%	3.4%	7.1%

TABLE 3: "FRINGE FANDOM" PARTICIPATION

	ALL	GAMER	COSTUME	WORKER	FILK	FAANISH	MEDIA	NEO	PROGRAM	CONFAN
GAMER	18.0	0.0	22.2	22.2	30.8	18.6	22.7	14.3	25.5	17.4
COSTUME	33.7	41.7	0.0	36.4	39.7	25.6	46.4	32.1	29.4	36.7
WORKER	37.1	45.8	40.0	0.0	37.2	46.5	37.1	17.9	37.3	48.0
FILK	29.2	50.0	34.4	29.3	0.0	39.5	38.1	21.4	37.3	31.6
FANNISH	16.1	16.7	12.2	20.2	21.8	0.0	18.6	21.4	27.5	12.2
MEDIA	36.3	45.8	50.0	36.4	47.4	41.9	0.0	17.9	49.0	33.7
NEO	10.5	8.3	10.0	5.1	7.7	14.0	5.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
PROGRAM	19.1	27.1	16.7	19.2	24.4	32.6	25.8	0.0	0.0	13.3
CONFAN	36.7	35.4	40.0	47.5	39.7	27.9	34.0	0.0	25.5	0.0

TABLE 2: OTHER QUESTIONS

OTHER QUESTIONS

		No Answer	9am	10am	11am	noon	later
Earliest time for program item	265	0.8%	43.0%	41.1%	12.8%	2.3%	0.0%

		6pm	8pm	9pm	10pm	midnight	later
Time likely to leave at night	262	3.4%	3.4%	6.1%	17.2%	25.6%	44.3%

		0	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	Over 20
# of program items attended	175	2.3%	16.6%	34.3%	17.7%	17.7%	11.4%

	Maximum	32	Median	10
	Mean	11.9	Std Dev	7.2

Percent who buy in Hucksters Room

New books	266	77.1%
Cheap used books	264	60.2%
Collectible books	264	37.1%
Art	263	51.7%
Jewelry	263	48.7%
Media items	261	28.4%
Buttons	263	42.6%
Other	261	33.0%

		No answer	$10	$25	$50	$100	Won't Go
Willing to pay for Black Tie Hugo Reception	255	1.2%	20.4%	14.5%	2.0%	0.4%	61.6%

Go to parties (% yes)	243	81.9%

Should be no smoking (% yes)

Con Suite	264	74.2%
Discussion Group rooms	264	76.5%
Film rooms	264	86.0%
Hucksters' room	264	78.8%
Large program rooms	264	67.0%
Open spaces	264	41.7%
Small program rooms	264	90.5%
Everywhere	264	52.7%
Nowhere	264	4.5%

		0	1-2	3-4	5-6	7+	
Hours worked per day	266	62.4%	8.3%	12.8%	5.3%	11.3%	

		0	1	2-4	5-9	10-14	15+
Previous worldcons attended	265	10.6%	17.4%	35.1%	26.0%	7.5%	3.0%

	Maximum	30	Median	3
	Mean	4.3	Std Dev	4.1

		0	1	2	3	4	5
Worldcons attended in last 5 years	264	20.8%	19.7%	20.5%	18.9%	14.0%	6.1%

Will stay at Con hotels (% yes)	259	91.9%

		Car	Plane	Train	Bus	Transit
Mode of travel to Con	265	42.3%	46.0%	4.2%	3.4%	4.2%

		No answer	15-22	23-34	35-49	50+
Age	260	0.8%	3.1%	41.9%	42.3%	11.9%

		Up to 1 hour	1-2 hours	2-3 hours	3-4 hours	Over 4 4 hours
Maximum length of Masquerade	173	3.5%	31.2%	51.4%	10.4%	3.5%

	Maximum	6	Median	3 hours
	Mean	2.7	Std Dev	0.9

		Up to 1 hour	1-2 hours	2-3 hours	3-4 hours	Over 4 4 hours
Maximum Length of Hugos	163	19.6%	60.1%	19.0%	1.2%	0.0%

	Maximum	4	Median	2 hours
	Mean	1.9	Std Dev	0.7

Hugo Voting: Let's Look at the Record
by George Flynn

I am often amazed by the kinds of misinformation that people believe about Hugo voting figures. Just an example: One widely distributed report on this year's nominations said, "There were 122 ballots with best fanzine nominations (29%, a high number)." The 122 was in fact the number of fanzines nominated, not the number of people nominating; but where did the idea come from that 29% would be "a high number"? (As we shall see, 45% would be typical.) This idea that hardly anyone votes on the fan Hugos is perhaps the most widespread of the misconceptions I alluded to.

As Mike Glyer pointed out in a recent *File 770*, it's just ten years since full Hugo voting counts began to be routinely released. (Mike and I sponsored the rule that now requires this publication.) The numbers come out every year, but not many people wade through them to see what they all *mean*. After ten years, though, we should have enough data to do some useful analysis: that's what this article is intended to provide. The numbers that follow mostly come from the annual tabulations in the newszines, with some exceptions that I'll note.

How many people vote on the Hugos? Table 1 gives the number of nominating and final ballots each year, along with the numbers of site-selection ballots for comparison. (In this and all the tables, the "year" is that in

Table 1 — Number of Ballots

Year	Hugo Ballots		Site-Selection
	Nominating	Final	Ballots
1978	540	1246	1154
1979	467	1160	920
1980	563	1788	1549
1981	454	1247	1680
1982	648	1071	1119
1983	660	1322	729
1984	513	1467	1368
1985	222	443	527
1986	568	1267	1863 ('88)
			1276 ('89)
1987	567	990	1373
1988	418	1178	1455

which the voting takes place, not the year of the works being voted on.) With the exception of 1985 (Aussiecon II), the numbers seem remarkably constant — more so than the Worldcon membership itself; this suggests that there is a fairly stable population of Hugo-voters. Other than Aussiecon, the most notable extremes are the high final vote in 1980 (when Noreascon II made a special effort to get ballots to last-minute joiners), and the low votes in 1987 (final) and 1988 (nominating) presumably due to late distribution of ballots.

What fraction of the Worldcon membership votes? Well, here are the best numbers I have for the final full (voting) membership of the Worldcons covered here:

1978	5100	1984	7000+
1979	4491	1985	2334
1980	6158	1986	6600
1981	5001	1987	5233
1982	5750	1988	5000+
1983	6200		

Some of these numbers are obviously more accurate than others. You can do the arithmetic yourself, but it looks as if on the average about 10% of the total membership nominate, while about 20—25% cast final ballots. One problem with these figures is that a lot of the final membership joins too late to vote or (especially) nominate. In general good statistics don't exist for Worldcon membership figures as of the voting deadlines; for what it's worth, in 1980 I estimated that 17% of the then-eligible voters nominated, 37% cast final ballots (but as already noted, the latter figure was probably higher than average).

Explanation of category tables: The next few tables give assorted statistics for individual Hugo categories. Since the Aussiecon (1985) vote was so much lower than all the other years, I've divided the results into "Aussiecon" and "Other"; rather than giving the numbers for every year, for "Other" I simply list the range (high and low bounds) and the average. With regard to Hugo categories, note that the Non-Fiction Book category first appeared on the ballot in 1980; what was the "Fanzine" category in 1978—83 was divided in 1984 into "Semiprozine" and "Fanzine," so separate tabulations for the two periods are given for these categories.

How many nominations does it take to get on the Hugo ballot? Table 2 gives the minimum nominating vote by category, arranged as described in the preceding paragraph. That is to say, the lowest-ranking nominee to actu-

Table 2 — Minimum Nominating Vote

Category	Aussiecon	Other	
		Range	Average
Novel	26	25—96	56
Novella	21	16—58	41
Novelette	15	13—43	32
Short Story	9	11—42	27
Non-Fiction Book	16	13—32	20
Prof. Editor	20	29—111	66
Prof. Artist	16	24—49	38
Dramatic Pres.	40	8—119	54
Fanzine (78—83)	—	15—70	37
Semiprozine (84—88)	9	15—33	25
Fanzine (84—88)	7	14 30	22
Fan Writer	8	10—32	21
Fan Artist	10	14—32	22
Campbell Award	7	11—54	19

ally make the final ballot, say for Best Novel, has gotten as few as 25 nominations (1978) and as many as 96 (1983), with a non-Aussiecon average of 56. It is depressing to see how few nominations it takes to get on the ballot, with the average under 26 in six categories; it's a wonder that bloc voting doesn't happen more often. (Curiously, the low end of the "Other" range in nearly every case is from 1978, although the total nominating vote wasn't particularly low that year. This is probably because since 1982 there has been a rule requiring nominees to receive at least 5% of the nominating ballots in their category in order to appear on the final ballot.) The variation between categories — and years — is largely a function of the number of likely nominees: there are only a few well-known editors, so the vote in that category is concentrated and the minimum-vote-to-nominate consistently

high. Similarly. Dramatic Presentation usually has a high minimum — except in 1978, when *Star Wars* blew everything else away — because in most years there are only a few *good* SF movies. In the fiction categories, the vote typically gets more and more scattered as you go to shorter lengths: short stories get almost as few nominations as fanzines.

How about the high end of the nominating range? Table 2 gave the figures for the lowest-ranking nominees in each category; in Table 3 are the corresponding numbers for the highest-ranking nominees. As you might

Table 3 — Maximum Nominating Vote

Category	Aussiecon	Other	
		Range	Average
Novel	41	90–189	130
Novella	50	62–182	92
Novelette	23	42–88	56
Short Story	17	33–87	52
Non-Fiction Book	23	44–121	69
Prof. Editor	54	92–240	149
Prof. Artist	43	55–188	113
Dramatic Pres.	75	137–338	227
Fanzine (78–83)	—	53–159	95
Semiprozine (84–88)	70	121–190	158
Fanzine (84–88)	28	21–84	54
Fan Writer	24	27–66	49
Fan Artist	29	23–99	59
Campbell Award	32	31–123	60

expect, the Dramatic Presentation nominee with the most votes nearly always beats out anything in the other categories (the single exception was 1979, when "The Persistence of Vision" outscored *Superman*). The single nominee with the most votes (338) was of course *Star Wars* in 1978 — and even that received less than 2/3 of the *total* nominating ballots. As you might surmise from that datum, the votes cast in individual categories are always appreciably lower than the overall total; the next few tables will give details.

How many people make nominations in each category? Unfortunately, these numbers haven't been published every year; the data I have at hand are only for 1980, 1983, and 1985–87. Table 4 gives the number of nominating ballots cast by category, for those years only. This time the lowest numbers in most categories were for 1987;

Table 4 — Nominating Ballots by Category

Category	Aussiecon	Other (Partial)	
		Range	Average
Novel	158	475–606	514
Novella	112	208–309	274
Novelette	106	242–353	306
Short Story	116	281–404	340
Non-Fiction Book	109	192–304	228
Prof. Editor	133	257–439	356
Prof. Artist	133	317–439	386
Dramatic Pres.	175	344–528	419
Fanzine (80–83)	—	318–364	341
Semiprozine (85–87)	109	252–259	256
Fanzine (85–87)	94	265–269	267
Fan Writer	85	199–238	216
Fan Artist	83	147–283	225
Campbell Award	78	201–288	236

I don't know if that indicates a trend (to greater compartmentalization of voting?) or just some difference in the British voters. Novel nearly always gets the most nominations, and one of the fan categories usually gets the least.

The raw numbers are interesting, but it may be more useful to consider the numbers of nominating ballots in each category as percentages of the *total* nominating vote (see Table 1); these percentages are given in Table 5.

Table 5 — Nominating Percentages by Category

Category	Aussiecon	Other (Partial)	
		Range	Average
Novel	71	84–92	87
Novella	50	37–55	49
Novelette	48	43–62	52
Short Story	52	50–66	58
Non-Fiction Book	49	33–54	39
Prof. Editor	60	45–78	60
Prof. Artist	60	56–73	65
Dramatic Pres.	79	61–80	71
Fanzine (80–83)	—	55–56	56
Semiprozine (85–87)	49	44–46	45
Fanzine (85–87)	42	47–47	47
Fan Writer	38	30–42	37
Fan Artist	37	26–50	37
Campbell Award	35	35–51	40

While several categories consistently fall below 50%, for these years none has gone below 25%: the lowest is 26% for Fan Artist in 1987. In particular, the numbers for Fanzine demonstrate the point I made in the first paragraph: nearly as many people nominate fanzines as nominate in the short-fiction categories. (As we'll see below, even the low-vote categories get appreciably higher voting percentages on the final ballots.) In nearly all categories the Aussiecon percentages are within the range for other Worldcons, so Aussiecon was typical at least in relative terms. Curiously, Noreascon 2 (1980) had the highest percentages in all categories but two (Novel and Dramatic); I have no idea why. The lowest figures were again mostly for 1987; the data suggest a downward trend in most categories, but we don't have enough years to be sure of this.

(Note that the Hugo rules say a category can be cancelled "if the lack of nominations or final votes . . . shows a marked lack of interest in that category on the part of the voters"; however, there's no definition of what this means quantitatively. I believe the last time a category was dropped for lack of interest was Dramatic Presentation in 1966 — the last year before *Star Trek*.)

How many people vote in each category on the final ballot? Here we *do* have numbers for every year over the 1978–88 period. Table 6 gives the final-ballot vote by category (corresponding to Table 4 for the nominating ballots), and Table 7 the final-ballot percentages (corresponding to Table 5 for the nominating ballots). In the absolute counts, 1980 was again highest in nearly every category and 1979 lowest, corresponding to the total-ballot figures. In the percentages, Aussiecon is again typical, and there is no clear-cut evidence of any trend over time (though either 1987 or 1988 is lowest in 7 of the 9 non-fiction categories). Among the categories, Dramatic Presentation nearly always has the highest vote — practically *everyone* votes for it — and Novel is usually second: in 1987, however, Novel got 914 votes and Dramatic only 901. But even the

Table 6 — Final Ballots by Category

Category	Aussiecon	Other Range	Average
Novel	395	914–1532	1159
Novella	355	732–1253	984
Novelette	349	775–1320	974
Short Story	345	740–1228	956
Non-Fiction Book	313	745–1406	955
Prof. Editor	358	750–1524	1059
Prof. Artist	330	729–1357	1027
Dramatic Pres.	413	901–1702	1211
Fanzine (78–83)	—	842–1088	932
Semiprozine (84–88)	325	787–1179	972
Fanzine (84–88)	284	634– 956	774
Fan Writer	284	635– 962	780
Fan Artist	287	552–1030	818
Campbell Award	291	563–1255	904

Table 7 — Final-Ballot Percentages by Category

Category	Aussiecon	Other Range	Average
Novel	89	86–94	91
Novella	80	70–87	78
Novelette	79	70–84	77
Short Story	78	69–84	75
Non-Fiction Book	71	69–79	74
Prof. Editor	81	72–92	83
Prof. Artist	74	74–86	81
Dramatic Pres.	93	91–98	95
Fanzine (78–83)	—	61–79	72
Semiprozine (84–88)	73	78–80	79
Fanzine (84–88)	64	60–65	63
Fan Writer	64	49–73	62
Fan Artist	65	55–75	64
Campbell Award	66	57–83	70

Table 8
% Voting "No Award" Above Last Place (1980)

Category	%	Category	%
Novel	24	Dramatic Pres.	42
Novella	23	Fanzine	30
Novelette	18	Fan Writer	35
Short Story	23	Fan Artist	25
Non-Fiction Book	18	Campbell Award	21
Prof. Editor	20	Gandalf Award	21
Prof. Artist	17		

"No Award" came in higher than last place for Dramatic (it beat *The Black Hole*). Otherwise only about a quarter of the voters in a typical category used "No Award."

How completely do people fill out their ballots? Again from 1980. Table 9 gives the percentages of people voting in each category who filled in 1, 2, 3 . . . lines on the ballot. (In most categories there were 6 lines — 5 nominees plus "No Award" — but four categories had 6 nominees.)

Table 9 — Percent Voting for n Places (1980)

Category	n = 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Novel	13	13	17	11	30	15	
Novella	22	16	15	8	25	14	
Novelette	17	13	15	12	8	21	13
Short Story	19	16	15	10	26	14	
Non-Fiction Book	17	15	19	10	26	14	
Prof. Editor	15	14	15	9	32	15	
Prof. Artist	18	12	15	9	31	15	
Dramatic Pres.	16	12	15	12	25	20	
Fanzine	28	19	17	7	15	15	
Fan Writer	31	17	15	5	16	15	
Fan Artist	29	15	16	8	4	16	13
Campbell Award	28	22	17	8	3	13	9
Gandalf Award	13	10	13	12	8	29	15

lowest-ranking categories usually get votes on well over half of the final ballots (the only number below 50% being Fan Writer in 1980); whether all these people are really qualified to vote on these categories is another matter. Oh. in case you were wondering, this year's "Other Forms" category got 965 votes (82%). That's about all I can get from the overall 1978–88 data. I pulled a few other interesting numbers out of the 1980 count. and I might as well include them here. How typical they are. I can't say with any assurance (I'd need the raw data to calculate them for other years).

How many people use the "No Award" option? There are those who are quite fond of using "No Award": indeed. I know some people who vote it not only above things they dislike. but above anything they're unfamiliar with. Nevertheless. on the whole it gets very little use. Indeed, in the entire history of the Hugos. "No Award" has won only five times (Dramatic in 1959/63/71/77. New Author in 1959). Time was when you could count on Dramatic Presentation getting a high "No Award" vote. but that's almost vanished in the era of blockbuster SF films since *Star Wars*. Most years (including 1988) "No Award" comes in last in every category; it did come close to wi: ng Best Fanzine in 1986. but that was the result of a concerted campaign. Anyway. Table 8 gives the 1980 figures. for the percentage of voters in each category who voted "No Award" ahead of *anything* else. The figure for Dramatic was relatively high. but 1980 was the last year

In a typical category 15–20% of the voters (more in the fan categories) cast "bullet" votes for only one nominee. thus throwing away their vote if that nominee failed to win. (How much of this was due to failure to understand the preferential voting system?) At the other extreme. typically 35–45% filled out their ballots completely: voting for either 5 or 6 out of 6 nominees is equivalent. since leaving one line blank is the same as voting it last. (When one line *was* left blank. about 90% of the time it was "No Award.") The average ballot had about 3 lines voted in each category. and the nominees that received votes on the most ballots were usually those that won — though even the winners received votes on less than 80% of the ballots voted in their categories. Whether out of ignorance or apathy. many voters thus fail to have as much effect on the results as they are entitled to.

[If we figure that people tend to not vote for items they are unfamiliar with. this would seem to imply that things that are more widely-known are more likely to win. Not a very surprising result. — LT]

And what factors govern the course of the final voting? Yes. we'd all like to know *that*. However. that question goes beyond the scope of this article. into the hazy borderland between psychology and literary criticism. Certainly there are fascinating insights to be gleaned from an analysis of the Hugo voting figures: but it's not easy to draw any useful generalizations from them. (The analysis in the 10/88 *Locus* makes a stab at it. distinguishing between "convergent" and "divergent" victories. But all

that says is that some nominees tend to inherit the support of the nominees eliminated early, and some don't.) Perhaps one could define sub-genres, styles, whatever, and try to measure the relative support over time ... (this is left as an exercise for the reader). In any case, voting counts of any kind are interesting, in that they're about as close as one can come to direct measurement of how people think.

Appendix — Site-Selection Voting

While I was working on the above article, Bruce Pelz asked me if I could compile a tabulation of site-selection voting figures. Well, the two subjects go together well, so I decided to publish them together. In this case I've included the actual voting counts, since the size of the vote depends a lot on how many (and which) candidates are running, and the quantity of data is tractable; besides, it's a handy reference to have in one place. (The latter is also true of the Hugo voting counts, but it'd take the whole issue to publish them.)

The present site-selection system, with both mail and at-convention balloting, has been in effect since 1972; before that the voting was done only at the Business Meeting (with a couple of exceptions for overseas cons). As in the Hugo article, the years listed below indicate when the *voting* took place; note that until 1986 the voting was for the Worldcon two years in the future. During the '70's the numbers released were somewhat spotty, so I'll start by discussing each year separately.

1972 (Los Angeles): 109 mail, 147 at-con ballots; total 256. At the last minute New York withdrew, and Washington was declared the unanimous winner; no voting counts were released.

1973 (Toronto): Melbourne 330, Los Angeles 45; total 375. (If separate mail and at-con figures were announced, I can't find them. Here and for the next few years, I don't have any numbers for No Preference, write-ins, etc., so the "totals" are probably low.)

1974 (Washington):

| | 1st ballot | | | 2nd ballot |
	mail	at-con	total	
Kansas City	226	92	318	424
New Orleans	117	78	195	253
Columbus	43	89	132	
	386	259	645	

This was the only time in the mail-ballot era that a second ballot has been required to determine the winner.

1975 (Melbourne): Orlando 298, New York 111, Washington 91, Philadelphia 28; total 528. I don't have the mail/at-con breakdown, except that the great majority of the votes were of course by mail.

1976 (Kansas City):

	mail	at-con	total
Phoenix	145	388	533
Los Angeles	100	360	460
	245	748	993

1977 (Miami Beach): 884 votes cast. Brighton overwhelmingly defeated New Orleans, vote made unanimous without revealing vote counts.

1978 (Phoenix): Boston defeated Baltimore, but the breakdown wasn't released; the "No Preference" votes were announced as for the hoax bid of Flushing. Here's what *was* released:

	mail	at-con	total
Boston or Baltimore	379	584	963
"Flushing"	40	21	61
invalid	125	5	130
	544	610	1154

(The invalid ballots mostly lacked the voting fee; there haven't been anywhere near as many invalid ballots in any later year.) *[This may have been due to the fact that the 1978 ballots failed to mention that a voting fee was required. — LT]*

From 1979 on complete voting counts have been released, and since 1980 the WSFS Constitution has required their publication. In the tables that follow, the totals for "No Preference," "None of the Above," write-ins, and (sometimes) void ballots have been combined into a single "other" line to save space; they're usually negligible except when there's an unopposed bid. No further commentary should be necessary.

	mail	at-con	total
1979 (Brighton):			
Denver	275	178	453
Seattle	172	148	320
Los Angeles	85	45	130
other	16	1	17
	548	372	920
1980 (Boston):			
Chicago	539	479	1018
Detroit	228	182	410
other	80	41	121
	847	702	1549
1981 (Denver):			
Baltimore	432	484	916
Australia	266	257	523
Scandinavia	89	100	189
other	32	20	52
	819	861	1680
1982 (Chicago):			
Los Angeles	406	508	914
other	95	110	205
	501	618	1119
1983 (Baltimore):			
Melbourne	285	357	642
other	61	26	87
	346	383	729
1984 (Los Angeles):			
Atlanta	298	491	749
Philadelphia	116	185	301
New York	96	146	242
other	10	26	36
	520	848	1368
1985 (Melbourne):			
Brighton	145	262	407
Phoenix	88	14	102
other	8	10	18
	241	286	527

1986 (Atlanta). for 1988:

New Orleans	269	643	912
"Bermuda Triangle"	189	236	425
Cincinnati	100	149	249
St. Louis	83	110	193
other	30	54	84
	671	1192	1863

1986 (Atlanta). for 1989:

Boston	426	652	1078
other	83	115	198
	509	767	1276

1987 (Brighton):

The Hague	98	712	810
Los Angeles	128	402	530
other	6	27	33
	232	1141	1373

1988 (New Orleans):

Chicago	335	882	1217
Sydney	75	123	198
other	7	33	40
	417	1038	1455

And next year the candidates are (in alphabetical order) Orlando and Washington. A heavy vote is expected . . .

Excerpts from APA:89

Issue 100 / September 18. 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.)

Ideas from Nolacon

By Pam Fremon:

Oh my ghod. now it's OUR turn . . .

Andy Cowan suggested that the gripe session be split into a session for the attendees and one for the staff. Many of the procedural things aren't of interest to the attendees but are important to the staff. and might be of some use if anyone. such as a future Worldcon. is jotting them down.

Someone suggested eliminating the end-of-con gripe session and replacing it with short daily sessions. where people could say what they were enjoying (so we could add more of it. if possible) and what we were doing wrong (so we still might have time to correct it).

Someone suggested this as a program item for Boskone 27. but it would work just as well for N3: Have a Holland pre-visit item. Teach a little (not much) conversational Dutch, with handouts. Get stuff from the Dutch tourist bureau (they might fund it all). Work with the ConFiction committee on it. It would be more of a panorama than a serious learning experience. though remember. not everyone in the Netherlands speaks English as well as Kees does. (I've been there.)

It came up at the gripe session that the electronic message board in the Sheraton was never corrected because once the hotel had the program information keyed in. they refused to change it and wouldn't let the Nolacon committee change it. either. It points to our own need to be sure that we and the Hynes are clear on the particulars of their electronic message system.

By Paula Lieberman:

There was a leading critic from Moscow at Nolacon. and a leading sf person from Shanghai. People from Soviet bloc countries must be invited well in advance and have arrangements made for their food and lodging and expenses while in the United States (apparently their travel to and from is not an issue). Visas. etc.. must also be arranged. If private sponsors could be found for Soviet bloc visitors. I would be a whole lot happier than if the Worldcon as an entity provides the requisite support. The number of attendees from Japan could increase to 30 for N3.

There was no reception in the art show for the artists. which was a disappointment for publishers. Apparently the Artists' Reception at Boskone is very valuable to the publishers and editors as a place to find and talk to artists for business dealings.

By Mark Olson:

Nolacon notes from the Green Notebook:

Include a listing of foreign clubs in the Program Book. Get ConSpiracy. ConFiction. and Perth people to help.

Mark our mailings "dated material enclosed."

If the daily newsletter is printed off-site. do it in batches so that the first. say. 1000 copies can be distributed while the rest are being printed.

Include a list of program items sorted by participant in the pocket program.

In PR 5 include a list of when and where info not in PR 5 will be available.

ConFiction has a very nice Agent's handout. We should consider duplicating it.

Make certain that Canadian provinces are listed on badges. Canadians don't like to be listed as just "Canada." This may apply to other large countries. too.

Have a large map of the Hucksters' Room at each entrance to the room.

Program Participants *(by Ben Yalow)*

In planning for N3. we can consider the following Nolacon statistics (mostly from the newsletter). Attendance — 5100+; number of program items — 391; number of program participants — 492; maximum number of items in any scheduled starting time — 16; program hours — 10am–6pm. These counts include discussion groups. readings. and autograph sessions.

A number of things can be deduced from this data. Major items that their program didn't have that we hope to do include evening/night program. a significant science program in other than space. art program. YA program. and a significantly expanded fan program. All of these will require adding program items. probably at least 100+ over the Nolacon list.

In order to add program items. we will need to add more program participants. Nolacon's numbers would seem to indicate about 1.25 participants per item. However. I expect that we'll need to add fewer than that to their count. They've already included a lot of the single-author items that boost the persons needed per item. I suspect the ratio is closer to 1 per 1. This implies that to add

100+ program items, we probably need to add about 100 persons, giving a total of 600+ program participants for the sort of program we are expected to produce and hoping to have.

The current N3 program budget calls for 450 participants. I would request authorization to increase the number of participants to 600 (including 50 staff members not charged to avoid double counting). This would require an increase of 100 reimbursements @ $50, for a total of $5000. As always, this money needs to be budgeted, but would be repaid only if N3 can afford it.

Progress Reports *(by Greg Thokar)*

PR 4 Mailing: Thanks to those who helped to mail out PR 4: Bill L., Ann, Jill, Don, Wendell, Kelly, Monty, Dave C., Paula, Mark, Dave O'Heare (from Canada), Rich, Sarah, Dave A., Claire, Mike, Debbie, Pam, Sharon, Leslie, Aron, George, and Rick.

Overseas Mailing: We should consider sending the Hugo nomination ballot out early to the overseas members. If sent by airmail, it can be mailed at the same time as PR 5 is bulk-mailed in this country. If sent by surface mail, it should be mailed by early October with an explanation that they should wait till at least January 1989 before returning it.

A number of overseas members complained at Nolacon about their second-class status in receiving mailings.

PR 5 Format: Mark talked with me at the August NESFA meeting about a possible PR 5 format. Basically do it as a fan's trip to the Worldcon, from the time they reach their hotel (how to find information, registration, their friends), to what to see (program, art show, huckster room. . . .), where to find food, parties, etc., to closing ceremonies.

Hynes Meeting *(by Joe Rico)*

This is the report of a conversation with Paula K. Quamo, our Event Coordinator with the Hynes. Ms. Quamo seems to be enthusiastic about us. She appreciated all of the info we've been giving her. Please keep it coming. Paula was employed by the Sheraton during the infamous Boskone. She understands we are a different group, but being extra cooperative with her can't hurt us. I will break down our conversation by topics.

Security: First Security handles the Hynes Convention Center. The Hynes Convention Center Authority Police basically acts in a supervisory role. How much security we will be required to have will depend on negotiations between us and the Hynes in our resume. I do know that one guard per hall will be required after hours.

Fire: The reason the fire watch is still at Hynes events is that the alarm system of the Hynes is not hooked up to the Boston Fire Department. When this is taken care of, we will not need a fire watch. (Possibly by December 1988.) Ms. Quamo insists that untreated wood is not allowed by fire marshals. Who, she said, have "closed down exhibits" that didn't produce a flame test on demand.

Smoking: Since the Hynes is a public hall in the People's Republic of Masschusetts, smoking is prohibited in all public areas (defined as all the exhibit halls, the ballroom, the corridors, and the rest rooms). We can set a policy for smoking in the small meeting rooms.

Cleaning: We will be charged 2.5 cents per square foot for all corridor space in our exhibit halls. This is a daily charge. In addition, there will be a complete cleaning of the halls prior to and after our convention. The cleaning will be handled by Ogden Allied.

Stage: All setup of the Hynes stage must be done by Hynes workers or stagehand union members, not us.

Set-Up and Tear-Down Access: We will have to set up a system with Hynes Security. They want names, and for us to issue badges to show who can and cannot enter the auditorium after hours.

Division Heads Meeting

Date:			September 18, 1988
Notes by:		Leslie Turek

The meeting was called to order around 11:30 am at Jim Hudson and Ellen Franklin's, after a potluck brunch with lots of good food. Fred Isaacs brought Ben Yalow from the airport; also attending were Jim and Laurie Mann, Leslie Turek, Mark and Priscilla Olson, George Flynn, Ann Broomhead, and Don and Jill Eastlake.

Registration: Mark asked that we discuss the question of how to handle special-area registration. Should there be separate lines for program participants, artists, hucksters, etc., where they would both register and get their special materials, or should everyone go through one general registration line and later get their special area materials separately? These two approaches were referred to as "parallel" and "serial," respectively. Mark estimated that out of 5000 pre-registrants, about 250 would be hucksters, 400 artists, 1000 program participants (counting spouses), 500 staff or volunteers, and some number of handicapped. In addition, we probably have to handle 1000 new registrations. Jim H. observed that people in the special categories would more likely register early in the convention.

Leslie pointed out that in our past discussions of this point, we concluded that the program participant category was the only one we really needed to do something special for, since otherwise they had no incentive to let us know that they had arrived. We can depend on artists and hucksters finding their way to the art show and hucksters' room, even without special registration. Jim H. said that we would need a way that these groups could get to their areas before having to register for the convention. Both areas would have an entrance from the Sheraton, so they won't need to go through the Hynes to check in.

Staff and volunteers tend to arrive early in the week, so Mark suggested that we try to open registration early to catch people as they arrive and prevent the buildup of lines. We did this at Noreascon 2 and it worked well; it makes people feel a part of the convention. Also, having lots of people with badges walking around makes our presence felt on area businesses. To save money-handling hassles, we could limit this early registration to people who have pre-registered.

Whatever we do, we must have a type of badge that can be made up in advance and doesn't take a lot of space to store. Having to make up badges at the convention would really slow things down.

Laurie argued for the parallel system, since it cuts down the number of places people have to go to check in.

Jim M. said that parallel systems always fail because there is confusion over which line to get into if people are in more than one category, or if they have family members with them. Laurie suggested putting a code on people's mailing labels, or setting up a priority system. Jim H. pointed out that Atlanta tried that and it failed. Others agreed that it's hard to make such a system work, and maybe not worth the effort.

Jim H. and Leslie brought up the question of staffing. The registration area needs to be open for long hours — essentially whenever the Hynes is open — so that people who arrive early or late can get into the convention. We need a registration system that can scale back to fewer workers. Having separate lines for all the areas is hard to scale back. If we go with the serial system, each area has the option of telling people to go to the actual area to check in, or having an "outpost" at registration during the busy hours. If they don't have enough volunteers to staff the outpost at any given time, they can cut back with no harm done.

Priscilla felt that we need to have parallel registration for program participants so they wouldn't have to wait in two lines. She felt that the only way we could ensure that they would check into the program table is if they had to in order to get their convention badge. If they got their badge at general registration and were told to go stand in another line, she figures that many of them will just not bother.

We talked a little about the actual process of registration. Most people felt that we should not have the traditional "packets" because stuffing packets takes a lot of effort. We need to give each registrant their badge and a program book, and then direct them to an area where official handouts are available for them to take.

We discussed two options of recording people: crossing them off on a list, or asking them to give us a "quickie form." The "quickie form" would contain their name and address, and would be sent with their final progress report. There would also be an option to fill out a form at the convention, for those who forget their quickie. Taking a quickie form is quicker and less mistake-prone. Lists could be made to work, but we would need to have multiple copies — one for each station.

At this point we returned to the question of program participants' registration. Jim H. wondered if having the program staff register program participants would result in *longer* lines for them, since they would have to handle as many as 1000 people, counting program participants and spouses/family. Some of the earlier discussion was repeated, leading to some creative suggestions for getting program participants to report to the Green Room (e.g., have their hotel room keys there; give them a poison and have the antidote in the Green Room; etc.).

Mark summarized the results of our discussion:

- Open registration as early as Monday or Tuesday for staff and other pre-registered early arrivals.
- Send everybody through a single registration.
- Have staff on hand from Program and Handicapped Services to facilitate registration for program participants and handicapped. (In some cases, this may involve having runners pick up badges for them without

having to wait in line.)

- Other areas (art show, hucksters, masquerade) may have outposts near information to provide information to their participants as space and staffing allows.
- Try to keep personalized stuff minimal at general registration.

Priscilla thought we should do something special for program participants. She suggested chimes and a small burst of confetti. Someone else suggested we carry the pros to the Green Room in a sedan chair.

Badge technology. Mark said that he thought we should reconsider our decision to go with laminated badges. He had heard that there was a counterfeiting problem at Nolacon. Ben confirmed that he had seen a number of confiscated counterfeit badges. These were not perfect matches, but some security guards don't look too carefully. At $100 per membership, it would be worth our while to try to come up with some type of badge less easily counterfeited.

Ellen showed a sample badge, which consisted of a heavy-duty soft plastic card holder that could be attached with a string around the neck, bulldog clip, or pin. The stated cost was high (57 cents each in quantities over 1000), but might be negotiable. For a few cents more, we could have a logo printed on the plastic.

It was decided that we should continue looking for a non-laminated badge system.

Questions that need answers. Mark asked people to bring up questions they had that needed answers from other divisions.

Joe Rico has had a meeting with the Hynes (see page 13 for his report).

Extravaganzas would like to know what sort of stage configurations are possible.

Don figured that the daily cleaning costs work out to $3700 per hall, or about $16,000 total. There will be other cleaning charges we don't know about yet. Our budget of $20,000 still seems reasonable (or if not reasonable, at least close to what it will actually cost).

The hucksters' room would like to get our layout approved as quickly as possible so that we can start having people select tables. Freeman should be able to give us a quick initial reading and will take care of dealing with the fire marshal. Mark suggested we hold back at least 10% of the tables until we get a final approval. Layouts for other exhibit halls will also need to be approved as we develop them. People who have worked with the Boston fire people before felt that they generally have a good attitude, but it's always possible to run into arbitrary rulings.

The ban on untreated wood could cause problems for exhibits. We should try to find a place that will fireproof wood.

Exhibits would also like to know if Freeman can supply display cases. Don suggested that interested parties should take a look through the Freeman warehouse. We are also still looking for comfortable seating for the mixing area.

Do we have to worry about the fire-proofedness of things people bring: artists' backdrops, hucksters' setups, film exhibits, etc.? Ellen said that fire codes usually distinguish between "furniture" and "exhibits," where furniture consists of small, easily movable items. Usually the fire

restrictions on furniture are not as severe.

We listed all of the convention areas that have a need to serve food or drink: staff lounge. green room. con suite. banquet. Boxboro party. Hugo reception. Degler suite. Meet the Program Participants. other parties. It would be best to negotiate all of these events together to try to get the best deal. Unfortunately. food is one of those areas that we want to try to keep flexible until we have a better idea of what our income will be.

We want to get them to close the concession stand in the hucksters' room. but open the one in the mixing area. We'd like to try to influence the type of food sold. Ben volunteered to do a writeup on how to convince the concessionaire to sell good food based on past sf convention experience.

We need to know more about where we will need to use union labor. Possibilities include logistics, projectionists. stage setup. slide projectors (?). sound. huckster move-in. Ellen said that most shows use a labor management company to deal with the unions. Fred wondered if we should think about hiring a consultant. Even if this doesn't save us money, it might reduce the uncertainty. Ellen will look into this. In the meantime. we should start by talking to Freeman.

We still need more information about what technical equipment will be installed in the Hynes, and what we will need to bring in.

Break. At this point. we decided we needed a break. during which yummy garlic bread was produced. After the break. we reconvened in the back yard.

Appointments. We have been having difficulty keeping the committee list (in its various forms) up to date. so Mark has designed a form designed to record committee appointments. Leslie pointed out that the list of people who should get copies should also include *M3P*.

Rick Katze has been appointed area head for Government Liaison (keys to the city. proclamations. etc.) and will be Timekeeper for the WSFS Business Meeting.

Tony Lewis will coordinate sponsorships. He will suggest policies and follow up on them. He will work with all the divisions. Tony is also working with Kees van Toorn to develop a guide for foreign visitors to the U.S.

Program. Program is about to send a mailing to potential program participants. Is there anything they should include from other divisions? Second floor would like to mention the mixing area Kaffeeklatsches. Kathei Logue will be running these. Jane Hawkins has definitely agreed to do the mixing area.

Program also verified that Extravaganzas would not be using the auditorium on Friday and Saturday afternoon. so they could schedule big-name science speakers there.

It was noted that it will be hard to program opposite the Sunday brunch banquet. since many pros will attend. We need to think about ticket distribution for the banquet.

New program staff are Mike Glyer. Rick Foss. Edie Stern. Karen Meschke. Debbie Hodgkinson. Doug Faunt will be Information staff.

PR 5. Mark asked people to put effort into PR 5 to sell the convention. We should try to plan ahead for appropriate artwork.

Technical. We discussed technical a bit. We should schedule a Gulp meeting on this that Rob Spence can attend. We discussed what technical might include and how it might coordinate with the divisions. but no decisions were made.

We briefly discussed at-con communications. Lynx is looking into radios. cellular phones. beepers. mailboxes. heralds. runners. etc. We still don't know much about the Hynes phone situation. Laurie thinks we should have a good internal newsletter.

At-Con Issues. Should we have at-con division heads' meetings? It was useful at N2. We had them at lunchtime so people could eat. (Mornings needed to be free so we could get our divisions going. Also. Leslie usually met with the hotel in the morning and could report what was happening.)

Once-a-day gripe sessions have been suggested. These could be after the division heads' meetings.

Budgets. What do we need to decide now as far as budgeting? Ben asked for approval for more program participants (currently planned at 450). but was convinced this could wait another month.

Hotel Allocation. Mark was worried that we would have a hotel room rush similar to the hucksters' table rush. We should make special arrangements for foreigners so they don't get penalized by the mail situation. We need to work hard on getting hotel rates and information for PR 5. The hotels should have a chance to comment on the write-ups we do of them. So far one affinity group has responded.

The meeting collapsed of exhaustion sometime in midafternoon. in spite of a small list of topics that we never managed to get to.

MCFI Meeting

Date: September 27. 1988
Notes by: Jim Mann

The meeting was called to order at 7:34 pm.

Chairman: Mark Olson noted that there were appointment forms at the front of the room. Division and area heads should use these to notify the Secretary. Prereg.. and *Mad 3 Party* of new appointments. He announced one appointment of his own: Tony Lewis will be in charge of sponsorships.

Meeting Schedule: The next meeting will be on October 26 and the following one will be on November 30 (both Wednesdays) at 7:30 pm.

MCFI Business: George Flynn said that we had received a DUFF report from Jerry Kaufman. so we've donated $50 to DUFF. George also said that ConFiction wants him to handle Hugo balloting for them. He would like to use Box 46 as the address. *[There were no objections. However. after later discussion at this and the next meeting. George decided to turn down the job because of concerns that* Mad 3 Party *and other local publications would have to be ineligible.]*

Treasurer: Ann Broomhead said that the books don't quite balance yet after Nolacon. The difference is small.

Secretary: Jim Mann reminded everyone that the files are open for all to see. Just ask when there is a meeting of some sort at his place, call him to arrange a time to come over, or ask him to bring in the piece or file you'd like to see. He also usually carries the last few week's worth of mail around with him.

Preregistration: Sharon Sbarsky said that we are at 2453 and counting. The mailing that is coming up on Thursday will be a 710-piece mailing. At Nolacon we got 373 new attending members or conversions. We have already sold 126 Hucksters' tables. All the *M3P*s we took to Nolacon were sold. George noted that we are 55% ahead of Noreascon 2 compared to where they were at the corresponding time.

Mark noted that we've gotten lots of members from Japan, and Tony will be looking into getting us a Japanese agent.

Deborah Snyder asked about the prereg pool. When do we close it? Jim Hudson said that N2's closed the first of the year. Leslie Turek volunteered to open it to all via *M3P*. [See page 1.]

Mad 3 Party: *M3P* and Leslie finished 4th and 3rd in Hugo voting, respectively. [Cheers.] Some people have told Leslie that she should insist on drug testing for the winner, to see if there was any trace of corflu in her blood. We got lots of subscriptions at Nolacon. We have run out of issue 28 and are reprinting it. Chip Hitchcock has volunteered to copy issue 29.

Letters that Cross Boundaries: Leslie presented a sample letter from a special interest group that requested a number of things, each of which is handled by a different area. She said we would be getting a lot of letters of this sort, and need to establish a procedure for handling them. The mailroom (Pam Fremon) makes sure that the letter gets to everyone that should see it, and a list of all the recipients appears in the upper-right corner. But how do we keep track of who is responding to it?

Alexis Layton said that Pam could indicate on the letter who should be the primary respondent. Fred Isaacs said in this case it should be Program, since this is a special interest group. Leslie noted that there are two ways to handle this type of thing:

- Have one person collect the answers and respond to the entire letter.
- Have each of the concerned areas respond separately. This could be a bit of a free-for-all.

Priscilla Olson noted that this one is even trickier than some others might be since special interest groups are run from Philadelphia, and therefore it is a bit harder for them to coordinate things. Rick Katze suggested we create a new department to be in charge of these things. Andi Shechter said we don't have the people to create a new area. Jim M. said that he (as Secretary) and Pam (as mailroom) could work this out. Pam does most of this now. Jim could work with her on it, designating lead respondents and following up on it.

Jim also noted that for some kinds of letters, it is okay to have multiple responses. For example, for info requests that also ask for Art Show or Huckster info, Jim has been sending flyers and, if needed, letters, and saying "Art Show/Huckster Room will contact you with the info you want from their areas."

George said that for N2 it was also done by agreement between the mailroom and the secretary. Of course, they were both the same person then (George).

Mark said that copies of responses should be sent to other interested areas as well as files.

It was agreed that Jim's proposed method would be used. Mark noted that the lead respondent should address all questions somehow, even if they just say "so-and-so" will get back to you later on this. It's important not to let them think we've just ignored their questions.

Progress Report 4 Mailing: Sharon noted that the PR 4 mailing would take place on Thursday, 9/29. Mark said that we had to have more printed. We originally ordered 3200; we now have 3450 members, so we reprinted 500 using Xerox and staples. When those are gone, it should be late enough that new members can just wait for PR 5.

Sharon said that there will be a mailing work session every Wednesday on which there is a meeting. She also said that there are plans to give out PRs 1 and 5 to members who join at Boskone, in order to save mailing costs.

Progress Report 5: Pat Vandenberg read a report from Greg Thokar. Greg said that he plans to organize the PR in the "fan's walk-through of the convention" as Mark suggested. Mark explained what this meant. The report will be organized in such a way that articles appear in the order that a fan might perform the described activities at the con. For example, it could start with "How to Get Here," followed by "Registering," then "Hucksters' Room" and so forth.

Greg said that he wanted PR text by the Business Meeting. There was some incredulity about this, since the NESFA Business Meeting was only five days away and the PR deadline had previously been announced as Nov. 1. It was decided that we should get things to Greg as soon as possible. [Note: When Greg wrote his report, he was under the impression the Business Meeting was a week later than it actually was.]

Greg [via Pat] then mentioned the Program Book. Joan Vinge will do a writeup on Andre Norton. Greg asked for permission to talk to the guests to ask for autobiographical material. Mark said that's fine, but he should tell Willie Siros (our GoH liaison) that he is going to be talking to them.

Rick asked whether NESFA or MCFI would be doing the GoH book(s). Mark said that Services would be making a proposal on this at some future meeting.

Nolacon:

Parties: Mark reported on the parties. We had a suite. On Thursday night we had a closed party. On Friday night the NESFA party was held in the suite. On Saturday, we lent the suite to ConFiction, who threw a Dutch party, with lots of Heineken. Mark liked this.

Meanwhile, Laurie had discovered that the publishers had not managed to organize their traditional Hugo losers' party. She therefore suggested that we run it in our suite. Debbie Notkin thought this was a good idea also. She said it would gain us lots of "goodwill points." (Leslie seemed surprised that the phrase she had added to the fannish vocabulary had spread so far.) It turned out well and is becoming a tradition, since ConFiction has expressed a desire to host the party at Noreascon 3. Mark said this

would be a good tradition, because fans and pros have been drifting apart over the last few years.

On Monday we had a closed party that turned into the convention dead-dog party. Don said that when he stopped by early Tuesday morning, six people (none of them ours) were there, talking quietly. Someone noted that Laurie reported finding those same six a bit later and they helped her clean up the suite.

Business Meeting: Don said that nothing much of note happened at the Business Meeting. Things that were passed last year were ratified. A motion was passed on for Noreascon ratification, forbidding a zone from being skipped two rotations in a row. Don doesn't think this will pass. Also, years ago a motion was passed that WSFS should be incorporated. (This hasn't been done yet.) A motion to rescind this motion failed, 43-44.

Leslie said that in a review of Worldcon finances, Con-Federation, in the person of Jim Gilpatrick, stated that he didn't have a statement with him since it had already been published in *M3P*. Leslie then offered the appropriate pages of *M3P* for entry into the official record. Fred noted that this was his reworking of the ConFeddie report, not their own version.

Extravaganzas: Since Ariel wanted to go home soon, the Extravaganzas report was moved up in the agenda. Ellen Franklin reported that she and Jill Eastlake had met over the weekend. Some plans had changed or been refined. They have dropped the idea of a black-tie event before the Hugos. They will put a lot of effort into a brunch. She said that Mike Symes had brought along a sample video to show us, so we could see what Club Degler would be like. [This was shown later in the meeting.] She reviewed the organizational changes. [See New Appointments on page 2.] She also said that Nolacon convinced them that there is a place for a Meet-the-VIPs event.

Back to Nolacon:

Membership Table: Sharon reported that the membership table had operated from 1 to 6 every day and from 11 to 6 on Monday.

Closing Ceremonies: Mark said that Closing Ceremonies started late. They had a very nice jazz band, which performed a traditional jazz funeral for the convention. They made a few remarks. They didn't have a gavel to pass on; they used a bottle of Tabasco sauce instead.

Miscellaneous Comments: A number of people made assorted comments about Nolacon. Sharon said that the remainder of the Nolacon books had arrived at her place, COD, from the Marriott. She didn't know if Nolacon just forgot about them or what. Paula Lieberman said there was no feeding frenzy in the Green Room perhaps because it was upstairs. Andi said the Green Room should have been much closer to the major program areas. Tony said the best program item was on the plane coming back: there were 35 fans, editors, etc. on the plane. Suford said that we gained lots of goodwill points by walking around and talking to the Masqueraders.

Priscilla said that people have great expectations of us. She also said that we have to remember that we are putting on a show for the attendees. We should clean up after the fact, but expedite things in real time. Mark reminded people of the Greek concept of hubris. Ben Yalow pointed out that the Gods of Dumb Luck helped Nolacon

turn into a better con than it deserved to be. He reminded us that these same Gods could decide to work against us. George said that John Guidry is looking forward to N3. Gay Ellen Dennett said she discovered hell. She also discovered how not to run Art Show Sales. Andi said that Program seemed to be running mostly on time (several shouts of "They did??"). She attributed this to the experience of the panelists, not to anything Nolacon managed to do.

Club Degler: At this point, Mike Symes played the Club Degler video he had prepared as a demo. It ran for about 20 minutes and contained pieces by such diverse people as Tangerine Dream (a quiet video centered around the Grand Canyon), Weird Al Yankovich (a Devo parody), and PeeWee Herman. After the video, Mike answered questions. Mark asked that discussion on the actual merits of Club Degler be put off till next month, since neither Jill nor Ellen was here.

Pat asked how long this would run for. Mike said for 3 or 4 hours on 3 nights. Rick asked if the final mix would be similar to the mix we saw. Mike said he'd like it to contain more silly stuff. He also said that he envisioned there being about 15 minutes worth of "danceable" music per hour. Fred asked if we can do this all legally, obtaining the correct permissions. Mike said that part of the proposal involved hiring a VJ who had a license. Priscilla asked if there was any real reason it had to run three nights instead of one. Mike said they'd always pictured three nights, but other than that there was no real reason. Rick asked about the technical setup. Mike said there would be one or two projection TVs.

Logistics: George and Andrea Mitchell were visiting, and had an early morning plane to catch. Therefore, we moved the logistics report up in the agenda. Jim M. reminded people that a logistics form had appeared in the last apa. Others would be available. George M. emphasized that people should fill these forms out, to give him an idea of what is needed. He also told people that they could call him with questions or comments.

Facilities Division: Don said that he had sent a letter to the Hynes with some of the questions we were trying to have resolved. They promised to have a reply by the day after the meeting.

Howard Johnson's didn't want to quote a rate below the Sheraton, but didn't feel they'd get much use at a higher rate. Therefore, they aren't part of our block now. Don summarized rates we have received. We still have about 3225 rooms committed, not counting the Colonnade. We're trying to talk the Lafayette into giving us lower rates. Andi said the division is working on hotel descriptions/tables for PR 5.

Art Show: Deborah Snyder said that she and Dave and Claire Anderson had been talking about putting together an exhibit of artwork already owned. Should it center around some theme? Fred noted that the Ballantines had offered to help put together an exhibit. Dave and Claire said they would follow that up also.

WSFS: George said that it's official that DC and Orlando are the 1992 bids people will be voting on at N2. Both have submitted their bylaws as required; both sets of bylaws look familiar. Chip is doing a survey of the bidders and is looking for good questions to include. George said that we will announce the winner as soon as the votes are

in. Someone suggested we could put a board outside and update it every five minutes. Leslie noted that at the Democratic National Convention a group of VIPs formed a procession to go inform the nominee that it was him. She suggested we do the same. Jim M. said that we could place the DC and Orlando rooms across the hall from one another. They'd all thus be in suspense till the last possible minute.

Hugos: George asked for comments on the proposed base design Greg had included in the last apa. Ben said that big bases are bad. Tony noted that we could volunteer to ship the Hugos home for the winner.

George noted that the WSFS Constitution says that committee members are ineligible for Hugos. In this context, "committee" means MCFI. Leslie agreed that *M3P* shouldn't be eligible in 1989. Even if we formed a special Hugo committee, we're paying for *M3P*.

George said that the Hugo nomination ballot would be included in PR 5. There would be a separate air-mail mailing to overseas members. We've not yet decided whether to do a special mailing to members who join after PR 5 goes out.

We will announce the final tallies as soon as the Hugos are announced. Priscilla said that in Brighton they had a listing available right after the ceremonies. Tony and Rick asked if we were going to send ballots to the major fanzines. George had no plans to do this unless they asked.

Special Hugo: George said that we received only eight responses on the proposed YA special Hugo. Only three made nominations and two others suggested a career award. Monty's idea for a "second chance" Hugo received only two responses, one calling it a bad idea. The default is thus that, unless we have any specific proposals, there will be no special Hugo. No one made any such motion.

Program Division: Priscilla said that they would be sending an invitational letter out to perhaps 500 people. Aron Insinga is working on a questionnaire which he will be typesetting to fit on one page.

Ben said that the primary areas in which they don't have a full set of people for this mailing are Science and Space, Art, YA (for which they only have a limited number), and Academic (for which they have essentially nothing at this point). They're holding a number of slots back. They are going to need more. Priscilla said that they are trying to invite all those who write in.

Ben said he's been making a bit of progress on Super Science Friday. They're trying for a big science program on Friday afternoon, with some big-name science speakers. This includes two Nobel Laureates. One [Rosalyn Yalow, Ben's mother] was easy to get. The other is Sheldon Glashow. It will be nice if the media's first notice of us is "Nobel Laureates address science fiction convention" instead of "SciFi Freaks invade Boston." Priscilla said they will try to improve on even Tony's N2 science programming. They are still looking for some biology types. Ben suggested this be written up in PR 5, since people are making plans on when to arrive. Sue Lichauco said she is now at Brandeis and could try to get help there. Priscilla asked her to look into the idea of getting academic credits for people who come to the con.

Priscilla said that many of the people who did the last-minute work on the Nolacon program are now working for our Program Division.

Nameless Division: Fred listed new appointments: Jane Hawkins as subdivision head for the mixing area, and Richard Brandt as Press Relations. Earlier in the month they had met with Sharon about the prereg computer problems. The disk is now somewhat emptier. At this point, Mark reviewed the proposal he had in the last apa, for allowing Sharon to upgrade to an AT at Sharon's expense. He said the purpose of getting it down in writing is not as a legal contract. If we need a contract with one of our area heads, we're beyond help. We're putting it in writing so that we all know what we're agreeing to. [There were no objections to this proposal.]

Fred said that Registration had been discussed at the division heads' meeting. [See page 13.] We plan a serial setup: register, then go elsewhere (art show, hucksters, etc.) if you need to. Program will have an outpost there. This allows flexibility. We will be open extra hours since we want to have a secure perimeter. Mark said that we also plan to open earlier than is traditional.

Tony asked if we will have a sales table there. Fred said that if we have the first-floor area, there's no problem since there is plenty of room. Dave C. said we must have Info outside of Registration. Fred said an Info outpost is planned. Rick noted that the meeting minutes said there would be no packets. Leslie said that's correct: we hand them badge and program book; they pick up everything else themselves. Pat asked why were looking at alternates to laminated badges. Fred said there were lots of forgeries at Nolacon. Lamination is not unique. We have to give this some thought.

Services: Jim M. said that Laurie and Jim H. had both talked to Electrical Eggs at Nolacon. A letter to them will go out this week.

Garber Travel is our travel agent. Laurie and Jim will look into whether our official airlines will give us the discount when we fly to other cons (such as Smofcon later this year).

Debbie King noted she had office supply forms at the front of the room. People were encouraged to take one and fill it out.

Miscellaneous: Tony is putting together a brochure on avoiding culture shock for foreign fans. He will be sending it for comment to our agents and a few other foreign fans. Sometime in 1989 we'll send it to all foreign members.

Alex asked if Information was going to pursue getting Boston guidebooks. Fred said only if we can give them away, since they don't want to handle money. Leslie said that they could try to locate a source of inexpensive books that we could sell at our sales table.

At this point, with Jill not being here, we looked for someone to make the traditional proposal. The best was Ann's: "Moved to ignore that fact that I've absconded with the bank account and that we dissolve the committee."

The meeting adjourned at 10:25 pm.

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 Categories

● Richard Brandt, El Paso TX:

There's a massive flaw with Monty Wells' suggestion for a "Sorry-We-Didn't-Give-You-One-When-You-Really-Deserved-It" Award: What on earth makes him think the readers' judgment is any better now than it was back when the works in question were first "overlooked"? Frankly, the results of the Hugo tally year-by-year are not encouraging. This reeks of John Shirley's suggestion that special Nebulas be retroactively awarded to the stories that "everyone knows" *should* have won. These awards just measure the opinions of one batch of voters up against another's, and you'll always have *someone* convinced the wrong book lost. His suggestions for limiting the enormous pool of potential nominees aren't very helpful. The winner of this year's Best Novel Nebula didn't even make the Hugo ballot; you can argue the case for many superior novels and stories which only made the ballot for one of the awards, or made neither. So, please, let's avoid the assumption that we're all somehow better qualified than the bozos who voted ten years ago.

Meet-the-Pros Party

● J. R. Madden, Baton Rouge, LA:

Surprisingly, I thought the Meet-the-VIPs party at Nolacon turned out quite well even though there was no one in charge during the event! VIPs were identified, generally, by the red ribbons on their badges. Most fans eventually figured this out. Red-ribboned folks were given drink chits for complimentary beverages by roving hostesses (the two Harlequins); this provided a reason for them to attend! The lower-class folks such as myself had to pay for our reasonably priced drinks at the plentiful cash bars. A very sensible arrangement suitable to the purpose of the event, i.e., "meet people," rather than "grab all the free food you can." The room at the Meet-the-VIPs party was not too crowded. The Guests stayed long enough to meet folks and then drifted off. The event sort of eased up to speed, ran a while, and then wound gently down. I liked it.

Mixing Area

● David M. Axler, Philadelphia PA 19104

While I've no objection to things like "filking, informal workshops, storytelling, and suchlike other things," they don't belong in the mixing area. They not only make noise, thus preventing conversation among the mixees, but they often attract individuals who want surrounding conversations to be taken somewhere else. Activities like these need their own spaces.

[The mixing area is a very large exhibit hall, which will be broken up into many different spaces for different activities. Buffer items, like exhibits, will be used to separate noisy and quiet areas. We plan to have plenty of room for people to just sit and talk without being involved in any of these activities. — LT]

Reader's Room

● Richard Brandt, El Paso TX:

Lloyd Penney's suggestion to include copies of the magazines (or anthologies, I might add) with nominated stories is one of those that strikes one as brilliantly obvious as soon as you hear it. Of course, it will be too late to help anyone decide what to vote for by then, but it's still a worthwhile endeavor, just to let readers see the kind of work that's being considered. A further suggestion: Provide reading copies of the Hugo-nominated fanzines and semiprozines, as well as "fanthologies" or other zines where nominated fanwriters and fanartists are prominently featured. Acquainting Worldcon members with the fan award nominees has been a thorny and apparently unresolvable issue; ideas like putting together a fanthology of work by all the nominees or mailing out copies of nominated zines to every member are patently impractical. Nolacon following Maia Cowan's suggestion to list the addresses of the nominees (sorry, Leslie) was a step in the right direction. Fanzines can always be on display in a fanzine room or fan lounge (At Lone Star Con, zine editors were required to donate a reading copy of every zine they put up for sale), but such rooms are primarily places of worship for the converted. Placing nominated fanzines in a more generally accessible area would help more Worldcon attendees understand something about these strange creatures that take up space on their ballot.

Art Show

● David M. Axler, Philadelphia PA 19104

One area you seem to have skipped is a display of cover and/or interior art related to the works of the GoHs. For Norton, that's a fair amount of stuff, but it would still be interesting. A display of classic covers from Ballantine books would also be fun to see.

Another notion: What about inviting all the Hugo nominees to do a "set-piece" — an illo of a scene from one of Norton's works in a fixed size (small, most likely, due to time constraints). If all the nominees (fan and pro) contributed, this notion has definite potential . . . especially if the pieces were then to be auctioned off for a good fannish cause.

Hucksters' Room

● David M. Axler, Philadelphia PA 19104

As an occasional cigarette user who can sympathize with those hucksters that dread spending six long days in a non-smoking room, I certainly approve the notion that, if the Hynes permits, there will be a smoking area in the Hucksters' Room. However, *please* rethink the notion that such an area will also allow the burning of incense and similar substances. Their aromas cling to fabric much more strongly than that of cigarettes, and merchandise in other booths will, in effect, be contaminated. For those selling clothing or related items, this will be a definite drawback.

Program Book

● J. R. Madden, Baton Rouge LA:

What do we call the "program" book?

In his listing of possible Program Book Contents, Greg Thokar did not seem to include the one item which would justify the name of the book: a program. Of course, he

may have taken that as a given, yet I do not think that should be the case. This year's Nolacon had a souvenir book (several, in fact, but the one that came with your membership is the one to which I refer) and a program book. Some folks used the terms "program book" and "pocket program" when talking about these volumes. If the program book does not contain a program, then it really should not be called a program book. If it is a souvenir volume, then let us refer to it as such.

The program book should be separate from the souvenir volume, since that permits the program to be printed much later than the souvenir volume. Thereby, it stands a much better chance of being accurate and useful to the convention membership.

[We plan to follow the practice of most recent Worldcons, and publish both a "pocket program" that contains the actual program and a souvenir "program book." Although we agree with you that these names may not make sense, they are the names people are used to, and we probably won't try to change the terminology. — LT]

● David M. Axler, Philadelphia PA:

Several of the potential items listed could, I think, be better placed elsewhere. In specific, I'd keep maps out of the primary program book, and instead generate them in an easy-to-carry form — possibly on the back of the pocket program.

Also, putting the weapons policy in the program book seems a near-futile idea, as most folks don't thoroughly read the book till the con is over (I save mine for the plane, for instance). I'd suggest doing the following: 1) Reprint the weapons policy in the last couple of PRs, especially the one that'll be closest in time to the convention; 2) Post it in an extremely visible fashion at the registration area(s); and 3) Include a half-page repro'd copy of it in every registration packet.

[Registration packet? What registration packets? Seriously, in an attempt to save labor, we don't plan to try to stuff 6000–8000 packets with pieces of paper. Maybe we should have a special section of the program book highlighted for information that it would be useful to read while you're still at the convention. I agree that the maps should be with the pocket program, but could appear in the program book in addition. — LT]

Badges

● J. R. Madden, Baton Rouge, LA:

About the pin-style versus clip-style comments of Lloyd Penney: Cost of pin-style (early estimate that luckily fell through at the last minute): $20,000; cost of clip-style actually employed: $1500. I would hope that, should you opt for pin-style badges, you would be able to get a lower cost than Nolacon's initial cost response.

The clip-style badge employed at Nolacon was one of the right things that they did (though not intentionally). The clip-style badge is less damaging to fabric and more secure; the clip seems to hold better than a pin, which usually unsnaps sometime during the weekend. The clip design used in New Orleans was adjustable, allowing for different configurations depending on whether you hooked it to breast pocket or collar. It was certainly easier to put on and take off. The design of the badge was colorful and attractive; a pin badge, the plastic part, is usually only one color, though the paper part can have color printing. Most

importantly, the clip badge was a secure unit. Normally the pin badge requires the addition of tape to attach the paper insert permanently to the plastic frame.

At the convention, I heard no one "complain bitterly" about the clip-style badges. Some did not like it because it was not "traditional"; some had to think a bit (a struggle, I know) to figure out how to wear it on a T-shirt. I found it to be an improvement, not necessarily vast, over the pin-style design. It was certainly easier to wear than that heavy lump of plastic Conspiracy had used in '87! I would strongly urge you to consider going with the clip-style design in '89.

[We need to distinguish between the style of attachment (pin vs. clip) and the style of the badge itself (molded plastic vs. laminate). I expect that the price difference you cite is more due to the badge style than the attachment style (although $10,000 seems rather high even for the molded plastic badges). One disadvantage to the Nolacon laminated badge (mentioned on page 14) was the ease of counterfeiting. — LT]

Childcare

● J. R. Madden, Baton Rouge, LA:

I have not seen much in M3P about childcare/children's programming for Noreascon 3. Have you made any plans at this time other than the policy of Children's Memberships entitling the child to either babysitting or children's programming? Will babysitting be done by professional, licensed childcare givers? What will be the applicable age ranges for babysitting and children's programming? What hours will each area be in operation? Most parents would really like to know these things and others so they can start planning accordingly.

When the Nolacon concom did not express interest in setting up childcare for the con, my wife and I, on the concom's behalf, tried to arrange for a professional agency to do the job. When the information sheet went out with the Hugo and site-selection ballots, we received very little response from the membership, about a dozen application forms. Of course, the cost of the service was high by some folks' standards but was less than babysitters arranged for by the concierges of the two main hotels. The concom was unable to provide much of a subsidy as had been done in '86 by the Atlanta convention, and this kept the cost to the parents up.

I would appreciate hearing your thoughts on this issue. Personally, I think some folks did not come to New Orleans because there was not quality childcare available. Fans with children would like to attend Worldcon, but only if their children can be assured of a safe and fun place to spend the day.

[There will be three levels of children's activities at N3: Babysitting, Dragonslair, and Young Adult (YA) Programming.

Babysitting is for kids under 6 or 7, although kids up to about age 10 are welcome in the evening hours, after Dragonslair closes. It will be open most days from 9 am until midnight, with a two-hour close from 5 to 7pm for a dinner break. Those kids with full memberships or with children's admissions will be provided for at no additional charge. Other children may be admitted on a space-available basis at the same rates the professional babysitters will charge us — probably about $6 per hour.

Dragonslair is planned activities for those kids who are too old for babysitting but too young to enjoy most of the program. It will include things like a kids' art show, costume making, construction projects, and so forth. It will be open in the morning and afternoon, Friday through Monday.

The YA Programming track is aiming at items that will be of interest to the 9–15-year-old convention attendees. We expect that most of these items will interest older people also. In case of a space crunch, we will give preferential seating to the YAs as defined above. — LT]

Site Rotation

● Richard Brandt, El Paso TX:

Amongst all this discussion of Europe being guaranteed its own zone or not, is the occasional mention of Australia "sharing" its own zone with the West Coast. It's worth noting that this zone also would include Asia, which is no longer a troubling but safely distant prospect. Yes, the Sleeping Giant has awakened: The first bid I've seen announced for 1997 is Hong Kong, apparently being fronted by the Japanese. This strikes me at first blush as one of those most dangerous of bids, one which stands a strong chance of winning on the strength of being a Neat Idea, rather on the strength of a good facility and a capable committee. However, since I understand the Japanese are running 10,000-member cons, I'm inclined to give them the benefit of the doubt awaiting further information.

Seed Money

● Mary K. Maulucci, Pleasant Valley NY:

One matter I wish to comment on is SCIFI's and WAI's replies to MCFI's requests for grants. I agree that the two organizations missed the mark completely. In fact, I believe that your article in *M3P #28* states the true situation both clearly and concisely. I suggest that SCIFI and WAI be sent copies of this article, omitting the other organization's letter in each case: we don't want to offend anyone. If the situation is clarified a bit more for these organizations, perhaps they will reconsider their positions.

[Our original grant application did discuss these issues in some detail. And both groups do get free copies of The Mad 3 Party *so should have seen all the discussion on the subject. Keep in mind that these groups have run Worldcons and presumably understand the situation we're describing. It's just that they seem to have a different philosophy for how to deal with it.*

There is hope for change in the future, however. Several of the upcoming conventions and/or bidding groups have agreed to support our proposal for passing on seed money to future conventions. See the letter from the Discon III bidding committee, below. — LT]

● John Sapienza (Secretary, Discon III Committee):

I'd like to follow up our conversation at Nolacon concerning Noreascon's proposal to pass along part of its profits to subsequent Worldcons. Our bid committee discussed this and like it so much that we've adopted the following resolution as D3 policy:

On Distributing Profits. Discon III, Inc., believes that the net profit of a Worldcon should be passed along to future Worldcons in an organized way. Should we win the right to hold the 1992 Worldcon, after payment of all our costs we will offer at least half of our net profit to be even-

ly divided among the three Worldcon committees following ours (1993, 1994, and 1995).

The grant will be conditioned upon each accepting committee undertaking to pass along at least half of their net profit, if any, to their successor Worldcon committees in a similar way. This offer will be limited to Worldcon committees that have received section 501(c)(3) status from the IRS. This is required by federal law because Discon III, Inc., has applied for and expects to receive 501(c)(3) status, and a condition for receiving that status is that the organization's funds upon liquidation must be distributed to other 501(c)(3) organizations.

I realize that you have not formally adopted a motion on this, but thought you'd be interested in our thoughts. I look forward to seeing the details of how you handle the process within the complexity of the U.S. tax laws.

[We welcome Discon III's participation in this plan.

Although it may not be possible for 501(c)(3) organizations to make unrestricted grants to non-501(c)(3) organizations, it certainly should be possible to make directed grants for specific activities that are in furtherance of the donating organization's approved goals. — LT]

Whither the Worldcon

● Paul Abelkis, Portland ME:

Nolacon was an interesting Worldcon. Though I had a great time, it was not due for the most part to the con itself being enjoyable. Will you be talking more about it in a future *M3P*?

[As a past Worldcon chair, with perhaps a better appreciation than most of just how much work is involved, I must admit to a certain reluctance to dissect recent Worldcons in gory detail. I realize this is very unfannish of me. — LT]

My main comment would be a combined response to *Locus* and Nolacon. The comment in *Locus #332* regarding a Superman expo, stating that "simple fannish enthusiasm (in running cons) is no longer enough: business-minded pros will have to step in. Will SF gatherings become strictly the province of CPAs?" really bothered me. Even though part of an article reporting news, it seems to me to be editorial comment of a fairly strong variety. Needless to say, I disagree with this assessment. I think cons failing in general is only par for the course. With *so many* cons occurring now in even one weekend, the failure of one or two a year is only to be expected. I *don't* believe this should ever be the case with Worldcons. Smaller cons often lack a concom with much con-running experience: the Worldcon can draw on the entire fan community. If it doesn't it has only its own concom to blame.

[But doesn't the original comment refer to financial failures? And it's much harder to financially plan for a Worldcon than a regional partly because it's just so much bigger, and partly because, for the city involved, it's essentially a one-shot with little or no past history to build on. — LT]

The Worldcon is the one time a year fan politics should be put aside; this in general does occur. Unfortunately, there are on occasion Worldcon committees too proud to ask for assistance (or who do so only when it's too late). This only ruins the Worldcon for all of fandom (as well as souring hotel relations in the future). You now have your own example of fan politics interfering with the

Worldcon. namely LA's and Atlanta's rejections of your proposals. Their reasons for turning you down were silly at best, while your "turnover" proposal had every mark of (finally!) sanity about it. It's too bad pettiness has again reared its ugly head.

I think it's funny that the *Locus* I received today (#333) echoed 90% of my sentiments regarding Nolacon. saying that "It was the most disorganized . . . Worldcon ever held" and that everyone had a good time nevertheless. *Yes*. but *Locus* goes on to say that the disorganization didn't matter. "except for those trying to find program items." This is certainly not a minor thing. nor is it the only way in which Nolacon was disorganized. Hardly.

Just a quick listing. as I'm sure fannish newszines will do this far more completely . . . The #1 event of the con. the Hugos, had no manager. The Historical Costume event was completely unpromoted. and so had an attendance of about 50. Don Wollheim was never informed of his GoH *speech*. and so never made it; I understand an earlier interview was meant to serve as his speech — why then schedule both and confuse everyone? The standing exhibit room was delayed for almost the entire con and when finally opened had almost nothing in it. (Of course the space it was wasting was sorely needed elsewhere.) The Art Show had no on-site info at all (how to bid. etc.). nor was it promoted at all. I definitely hope Nolacon has no major profits. as they claimed there were no funds to mail all the PR 4s first-class. The Pocket Program was a mess; program times. participants. and descriptions were all in different places. and it all didn't matter anyway since the program ended up completely different than anything originally published. The daily newsletter was mostly full of pointless *non* news. All the GoH events were unpromoted. Important Worldcon events other than the Masquerade and films must be promoted: with so many program items at any given time. major ones can be overlooked. resulting in embarrassing situations for the GoHs and other notables.

There were other. even larger problems that everyone knows of. namely the hotels and the cons surrounding our own. 'Nuf said. In any case. my enjoyment of Nolacon resulted primarily from the city and friends. old and new. The con itself rated about a 4 (out of 10). due mainly to the last-minute program — there were some rather interesting items . . . if you could find them.

The Worldcon must never be allowed to sink to such a level again. otherwise *Locus*'s prediction might prove true. (Though I'd rather kill it altogether than allow it to be professionally run.) The only remedy is to vote intelligently. rather than based on politics. feuds. and bid parties. Unfortunately. probably 50% of the voters vote as they do in the real world. for whoever they *feel* is better. Equally bad method in either case.

The only problem with Marlene [Willauer] and Brian [Lowe's] idea in *M3P* #29. that of private foundations contributing funds to Worldcons. is that inviting *anyone* to contribute also necessitates proportionally greater influence by that contributor on the Worldcon. I don't want to see the Worldcon pulled apart by 5–10 different "supporters." Also. getting outside sources involved forces us (or would force us) to program even more "entertainment." as members brought in by these contributors would not understand the idea of an SF con as a location to entertain oneself. Too many outside forces could rip apart the very fabric of the Worldcon. I *do* agree with these same foundations supporting rising artists and writers. however. This is a safe outlet for this available money. so long as no creative constraints are placed on these creative people.

I'm glad to see that Europeans are endowed with an ability to notice and point out American fandom's petty infighting. (Not that nonAmerican fans don't squabble.) I do think that they. however. tend to be more united and seriously egalitarian. Thanks. Kees and Krsto! Maybe we *can* learn something . . .

FIRST CLASS MAIL