

The World Science Fiction Society

Minutes of the Business Meeting 1997

The World Science Fiction Society (WSFS) Business Meeting at LoneStarCon 2, the 1997 Worldcon, consisted of one preliminary meeting and two main meetings. All the meetings were held in the VIP Room of the Henry B. Gonzales Convention Center, San Antonio, Texas, USA. The podium staff for all meetings were: Donald E. Eastlake III, Presiding Officer; Kevin Standlee, Secretary; and Zanne Labonville, Timekeeper.

Preliminary Business Meeting - Friday, August 29, 1997

The meeting was called to order at 10:15 AM.

The Official Papers as distributed in the LSC2 Souvenir Book were noted to contain the following typographical error: The word "Not" should appear before "more" in section 2.2.13 of the WSFS Constitution.

2.6.1.4 Financial Report by Intersection (1995)

Vince Docherty asked that this item be considered early because he had to leave. There being no objection, he presented Intersection's financial report (see appendix). Intersection reports a nominal surplus of £12,896.20 on gross revenue of £374,616.75, and currently has £7,485.73 cash in hand. Intersection, in keeping with standard European practice, is not paying membership reimbursements to volunteers, staff, committee, or program participants, but has allocated and/or already paid approximately £4,000 in pass-along funds to the 1997, 1998, and 1999 Worldcons (L.A.con III has declined its "share" of pass-along funds in favor of the 1999 Worldcon.)

1. Business Passed On from L.A.con III

(Items 1.1 through 1.11 were given first passage at L.A.con III, and would become part of the WSFS Constitution if ratified. The explanations in italics are those published in the LoneStarCon 2 Souvenir Book. Here and elsewhere, the numbers assigned to motions are those used in the printed agenda. "BPO" stands for "Business Passed On", and refers to the item number in the LSC2 Souvenir Book. Deletions are shown in ~~striketru type~~ and additions in underline type. Votes by show of hands were not counted; they were used in place of voice votes. When a counted vote was deemed necessary, the "serpentine" method was used. Using this method, all people voting on one side stand, then count off across each row and back down the next row in a back-and-forth fashion. After all of the people voting on one side have voted, then the other side's voters stand and the process repeats. This method allows everyone to see who is voting and tends to assure a faster and more accurate count than other methods of counting heads.)

1.1. Calling a Spade a Spade and Not a Shovel (BPO Item 1)

MOVED, to amend the WSFS Constitution as follows:

1.5.2: Voters have the right to convert to attending membership in the selected Worldcon within ninety (90) days of its selection, for an additional fee set by its Committee. This fee must not exceed two (2) times the ~~voting fee~~ site-selection fee and not exceed the difference between the ~~voting fee~~ site-selection fee and the fee for new attending members.

3.1: ...and turn over those funds to the winning Committee before the end of the current Worldcon. ~~The minimum voting fee can be modified for a particular year by unanimous agreement of the current Worldcon Committee and all bidding committees who have filed before the deadline.~~ The site-selection voting totals shall be announced at the Business Meeting ...

3.2: ~~Voting shall be limited to WSFS members who have paid at least twenty U.S. dollars (\$20.00) or equivalent towards membership in the Worldcon whose site is being selected.~~ "No Preference" ballots may be cast by corporations, associations, and other non-human or artificial entities. ...

3.3: ... The ~~minimum fee in force~~ supporting membership rate shall be listed on all site-selection ballots.

3.8.3: The proposed NASFiC ~~voting fee~~ supporting membership rate can be set by unanimous agreement of the prospective candidates that file with the administering Committee.

3.8.4: If "None of the Above" wins, or if no eligible bid files by the deadline, then no NASFiC shall be held and all ~~voting fees~~ supporting membership payments collected for the NASFiC site selection shall be refunded by the administering convention without undue delay.

This motion would recast all references to the site-selection "voting fee" in terms of a "site-selection fee" or a "supporting membership" in the selected convention. (The same change appears in Items 2 and 5.) It proposes no other changes in current practice.

The default debate time was 20 minutes; 4, 2, and 1 minutes also proposed; **2 minutes** was selected on a show of hands. (In debate-time assignment, unless there was unanimous consent to select a time, the method of filling blanks was used, with the longest time being put to a vote first, the first value to receive a majority being selected.)

1.2. Median of the Track (BPO Item 2)

MOVED, to amend the WSFS Constitution as follows:

3.1: ... and turn over those funds to the winning Committee before the end of the current Worldcon. ~~The minimum voting fee can be modified for a particular year by unanimous agreement of the current Worldcon Committee and all bidding committees who have filed before the deadline.~~ The site-selection voting totals shall be announced at the Business Meeting ...

3.x: Voting shall be limited to WSFS members who have purchased at least a supporting membership in the Worldcon whose site is being selected. The supporting membership rate shall be set by unanimous agreement of the current Worldcon

Committee and all bidding committees who have filed before the ballot deadline. If agreement is not reached, the default fee shall be the median (middle value) of the US dollar fees used in the previous three (3) Worldcon site selections.

~~3.2: Voting shall be limited to WSFS members who have paid at least twenty U.S. dollars (\$20.00) or equivalent towards membership in the Worldcon whose site is being selected.~~ "No Preference" ballots may be cast by corporations, associations, and other non-human or artificial entities. ...

This motion would change the default site-selection voting fee from the current \$20 to the median of the actual voting fees in the previous three years, allowing the amount to change over time without the necessity of a Constitutional amendment.

(Item 1.2 adopts the "supporting membership rate" language of Item 1.1, and the portions common to both motions have been edited to have identical wording. If Item 1.1 should fail to be ratified, the language of Item 1.2 would presumably revert to the current "voting fee" terminology.)

Mr. Sacks proposed an amendment to modify the last sentence of proposed 3.x as follows (additional material in *italic underline type*):

... If agreement is not reached, the default fee shall be the median (middle value) of the US dollar fees used in the previous three (3) Worldcon site selections, or US\$20 (twenty US dollars) more than the lowest of the three, whichever is less.

Mr. Epstein inquired of the Chair as to whether this amendment would be a "lesser change" as contemplated by the WSFS Constitution. The Chair ruled that it would be a "lesser change." Mr. Illingworth **appealed** this ruling. The appeal was then debated. (The Secretary, in keeping with the instructions of the parliamentary authority, has attempted to give a short precis of each speaker's argument and the side the speaker favored.)

Chair: The goal of the original motion is to raise the default voting fee - the amendment could not exceed this change.

Mr. Pelz (opposing chair's ruling): While it would be a lesser change of the fee, it would be a greater change of complexity.

Mr. Yalow (favoring chair's ruling): The result would be a lesser fee change.

Mr. Olson (favoring): Complexity of the wording shouldn't be a factor in determining scope of change.

Mr. Ratti (inquiry): Are we debating the ruling, or the rule?

(Chair: the ruling.)

Mr. Breidbart (opposing): A negative site selection fee could be less than \$20.

The appeal was then put to a vote, and the chair's ruling was **sustained** on a show of hands, confirming that it is the *effect* of a change, not the *complexity* of its wording, that determines the scope of the change.

The amendment was then debated.

Mr. Sacks (favoring amendment): This will dampen swings in the fee.

Mr. Olson (opposing amendment): Motion sufficiently protects the fee without this

amendment.

Mr. Wolkoff (favoring): The amendment does not increase the complexity of the voting fee.

Mr. Illingworth (opposing): An abnormally low fee could lead to unwanted results.

Mr. Sacks (favoring): The purpose of the amendment is to prevent several consecutive high-fee years from having an inflationary effect on the fee.

Mr. Yalow (opposing): Adding additional complexity to the rule increases the danger of errors by mis-administration.

Ms. Ross-Mansfield (opposing): Amendment does not reflect economic reality.

Mr. Breidbart (opposing): The amendment probably does not have any real effect.

The amendment was then put to a vote and **failed** on a show of hands.

The default debate time was 20 minutes; 10, 8, 7, 5, and 1 minutes also proposed; **8 minutes** was selected on a show of hands.

1.3. Let the NASFiC Administrator Administrate (BPO Item 3)

MOVED, to amend Section 3.8.3 of the WSFS Constitution as follows:

3.8.3: The proposed NASFiC voting fee can be set by unanimous agreement of ~~the prospective candidates that file with the administering Committee~~ the administering Committee and all bidding committees who have filed before the ballot deadline.

This motion would give the Committee administering a NASFiC selection a say in setting the voting fee, as is already true for Worldcon selection. (The new language copies that in Sec. 3.1.)

The default debate time was 6 minutes; 4, 3, and 2 minutes also proposed; **4 minutes** was selected on a show of hands.

1.4 Short Title: Tally-Ho! (BPO Item 4)

MOVED, to amend the WSFS Constitution as follows:

3.1: ... Voting shall be by mail or ballot cast at the current Worldcon with run-off ballot as described in Section ~~2.9~~ 3.4. ...

3.4.3: "None of the Above" shall be treated as a bid for tallying ~~and shall be the equivalent of "No Award" with respect to Section 2.9.~~ ...

3.4.4: ... If no eligible bid achieves a majority on the first round of tallying, then on the second round all ballots for ineligible bids shall be redistributed to their first eligible choices, ~~and tallying shall proceed according to normal preferential ballot procedures.~~ If no majority is then obtained, the bid which places last in the tallying shall be eliminated and the ballots listing it as highest remaining preference shall be redistributed on the basis of those ballots' highest remaining preference, except that "None of the Above" shall never be eliminated. This process shall be repeated until a majority-vote winner is obtained.

This motion would define the site-selection ballot-counting procedure directly, rather than with reference to the Hugo procedure. Substantively, it would yield a runoff against "None of the Above" without requiring a separate count, but any votes lower than "None of the Above" would become meaningless.

Mr. Beach moved to amend the addition to 3.4.4 as follows:

... If no majority is then obtained, the bid which places last in the tallying shall be eliminated and the ballots listing it as highest remaining preference shall be redistributed on the basis of those ballots" highest remaining preference, except that "None of the Above" shall never be eliminated. This process shall be repeated until a majority-vote winner is obtained.

The Chair ruled this amendment would be a "greater change" and that if it passed, the main motion would have to be re-ratified next year. Mr. Beach **appealed** this ruling. The appeal was then debated.

Chair: Amendment appears to be a change to the "Magic Runoff" formula already in the constitution, which makes this a greater change.

Mr. Illingworth (opposing ruling): This would merely change the system to a "straight fight."

Mr. Sacks (favoring ruling): Change would eliminate chance of running NOTA against the field of candidates.

Mr. Beach (opposing): We've never needed the "Magic Runoff." Striking it from the motion would have no practical effect.

Mr. Yalow (favoring): Under mathematically possible votes, the change could have a substantive effect.

Mr. Breidbart (favoring): The direction of the change is different, not the amount.

The Chair's ruling was **sustained** on a show of hands: the proposed amendment *is* a "greater change."

The amendment was then debated.

Mr. Beach (favoring amendment): The phrase in question was "slipped in" while the maker of the original motion [Mr. Beach] was off the floor. If it ever affected an election, it would lead to phenomenal second-guessing.

Mr. Olson (opposing amendment): Favors making it easier for "None of the Above" to win.

Mr. Flynn (favoring): Amendment allows one to choose "next-best" preference after "None of the Above," which is the current state of affairs. Rejecting amendment takes away this ability.

Mr. Sacks (opposing): Sees no reason to select "best of a bad lot."

Mr. Olson then moved to refer this motion to a committee (Illingworth, Breidbart, Flynn, Beach, Standlee later appointed by Chair) to report tomorrow. The motion to **refer to committee** then passed on a show of hands.

1.5. An Alligator Sandwich (BPO Item 5)

MOVED, to amend the WSFS Constitution as follows:

Renumber Section 1.5.5 as Section 1.8.2 (and renumber existing 1.8 as 1.8.1):

~~1.5.5~~ **1.8.2:** Any member of the Society shall have the right, under reasonable conditions, to examine the financial records and books of account of the current Worldcon Committee, all future selected Worldcon Committees, and the two

immediately preceding Worldcon Committees.

Replace the remainder of Section 1.5 with the following new sections:

1.5.1: Each Worldcon shall offer supporting and attending memberships.

1.5.2: The rights of supporting members of a Worldcon include the right to receive all of its generally distributed publications.

1.5.3: The rights of attending members of a Worldcon include the rights of supporting members plus the right of general attendance at said Worldcon and at the WSFS Business Meeting held thereat.

1.5.4: Members of WSFS who cast a site-selection ballot with the required fee shall be supporting members of the selected Worldcon.

1.5.5: Voters have the right to convert to attending membership in the selected Worldcon within ninety (90) days of its selection, for an additional fee set by its committee. This fee must not exceed two (2) times the site-selection fee and must not exceed the difference between the site-selection fee and the fee for new attending members.

1.5.6: The Worldcon Committee shall make provision for persons to become supporting members for no more than one hundred and twenty-five percent (125%) of the site-selection fee, or such higher amount as has been approved by the Business Meeting, until a cutoff date no earlier than ninety (90) days before their Worldcon.

1.5.7: Other memberships and fees shall be at the discretion of the Worldcon Committee.

This motion is primarily a rearrangement of the existing text for easier comprehension. However, it incorporates a change of "voting fee" to "site-selection fee" as in Item 1, and Sec. 1.5.1 is new. (If Item 1 is ratified, Sec. 1.5.4 here should really be recast, since Item 1 says that people who pay the fee are supporting members, whether or not they cast ballots.)

[The Secretary notes that he will attempt to follow Standing Rule 21 regarding indicating revisions as best as he can, although revisions such as this present certain challenges. The most straightforward way to represent the above is to strikethru all of the subsections of 1.5 and show the above as all new text. The Secretary expects that the person responsible for laying out the Buccaneer Progress Reports will be most displeased with the SR21 requirements.]

The default debate time was 20 minutes; 10, 9, 6, 5, 2, and 1 minutes also proposed; **5 minutes** was selected on a show of hands.

1.6. It's a Worldcon, Dammit (BPO item 6)

MOVED, to amend the WSFS Constitution as follows:

3.6: A site outside North America is eligible for selection in any year. A site within North America is eligible for selection if it is within the appropriate region, as defined below. The North American regions shall rotate in the order Western, Central, Eastern region. A site shall be ineligible if it is within sixty (60) miles of the site at which selection occurs.

~~3.6~~ **3.7:** To ensure equitable distribution of sites, North America sites within North America, it is divided into three (3) regions as follows: ...

~~3.7:~~ Worldcon sites shall rotate in the order Western, Central, Eastern region. A site shall be ineligible if it is within sixty (60) miles of the site at which selection occurs.

~~3.8:~~ A Worldcon site outside of North America may be selected by a majority vote at any Worldcon. In the event of such outside Worldcon being selected, there shall be a NASFiC in the region whose turn it would have normally been, to be held in the same year as the overseas Worldcon, with rotation skipping that region the following year. If the selected Worldcon site is not in North America, there shall be a NASFiC in the North American region eligible that year. Selection of the NASFiC shall be by the identical procedure to the Worldcon selection except as provided below or elsewhere in this Constitution: ...

To quote the maker, this motion would change the Worldcon "from being a North American convention which occasionally happens elsewhere to being a worldwide convention with special provisions for North America." It proposes no change in current practice.

The default debate time was 20 minutes; 8, 5, 4 and 2 minutes also proposed; **5 minutes** was selected on a show of hands.

1.7. Which Deadline? (BPO Item 7)

MOVED, to amend the WSFS Constitution as follows:

3.1: ... The minimum voting fee can be modified for a particular year by unanimous agreement of the current Worldcon Committee and all bidding committees who have filed before the ballot deadline. ...

3.8.4: If "None of the Above" wins, or if no eligible bid files by the deadline for the printed ballot, then no NASFiC shall be held and ~~all~~ any voting fees collected for the NASFiC site selection shall be refunded by the administering convention without undue delay.

This motion would specify that the "deadlines" referred to in the indicated sections are those for the printed ballot (since Sec. 3.5 now mentions two different deadlines). (This change has also been incorporated in Items 1, 2, and 3.) It would also make clear that no NASFiC election is to be held if no bidders file in time for the printed ballot. If Item 1 is ratified, "voting fees" here would become "supporting membership payments".

The default debate time was 6 minutes; 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1 minutes also proposed; **2 minutes** was selected on a show of hands.

1.8. Date Restrictions for the NASFiC (BPO Item 8)

MOVED, to amend the WSFS Constitution by adding the following to Section 3.8.2:

3.8.2: ... A NASFiC shall not be held on any of the dates that the Worldcon for that year is being held, based upon the dates specified in the Worldcon filing papers.

This motion would forbid holding a NASFiC opposite the Worldcon (or at least opposite the Worldcon's originally scheduled dates). It would not affect the site selection for the 1999 NASFiC.

Mr. Sacks moved to refer this motion to a committee (M. Olson, Sacks, Eastlake, Beach, Flynn, Illingworth, Standlee later appointed by Chair) to work on the wording of the motion and report tomorrow. The motion to **refer to committee** then passed on a show of hands.

1.9. Best Related Book (BPO Item 9)

MOVED, to replace Section 2.2.5 of the WSFS Constitution as follows:

~~**2.2.5: Best Non-Fiction Book.** Any non-fictional work whose subject is the field of science fiction, fantasy, or fandom appearing for the first time in book form during the previous calendar year.~~

Best Related Book. Any work whose subject is related to the field of science fiction, fantasy, or fandom, appearing for the first time in book form during the previous calendar year, and which is either non-fiction or, if fictional, is noteworthy primarily for aspects other than the fictional text.

This motion would widen the scope of the Best Non-Fiction Book Hugo (a) by including books that are "related to", rather than "whose subject is", SF, fantasy, or fandom; (b) by including books that are fictional, as long as they have significant aspects other than the fictional text (e.g., fictionalized art books such as Dinotopia); (c) by renaming the category.

Mr. Jaffe moved to amend the motion as follows:

2.2.5: Best Related Book Work. Any work whose subject is related to the field of science fiction, fantasy, or fandom, appearing for the first time in book form during the previous calendar year, and which is either non-fiction or, if fictional, is noteworthy primarily for aspects other than the fictional text.

The Chair ruled this amendment would be a "greater change" and that if it passed, the main motion would have to be re-ratified next year. The amendment was then debated.

Mr. Jaffe (favoring amendment): New technology is changing forms of work; the category definition should be broadened.

Mr. Mathews (opposing amendment): This change would bring the category into conflict with Best Dramatic Presentation.

Ms. Turek (inquiry): Do the definitions of other categories limit any of them to book form? (Chair: No.)

Ms. Lurie (favoring): Amendment allows recognition of "oddball" works, such as science columns.

Mr. Wolkoff (opposing): If adopted, this category would subsume all of the other categories.

Mr. Russell (favoring): This is meant to be a catch-all category anyway.

Mr. Flynn (opposing): Let's finish the "Best Related" change now and do the "book versus work" change separately.

Mr. Sacks (favoring): [Displayed copy of a graphic novel as "book form."]

Mr. Daugherty (opposing): [Secretary unable to ascertain point of argument.]

Mr. Olson (inquiry): Could this motion be introduced as a new amendment under new business? *Chair:* Yes.

Without objection, the amendment was **withdrawn** with the intent of introducing it independently later.

The default debate time was 20 minutes; 10, 5, 4, 3 and 2 minutes also proposed; **5 minutes** was selected on a show of hands.

1.10. Defining Residency Requirements (BPO Item 10)

MOVED, to amend the third sentence of Section 4.4 of the WSFS Constitution as follows:

4.4: ... Of the nine elected members, no more than three may be residing, at the time of election they are elected, in any single North American region, as defined in Section 3.6. ...

PROVIDED THAT upon ratification of this amendment, Standing Rule 13 shall be repealed:

~~**Rule 13: Mark Protection Committee; Regional Residency Requirements.** In interpreting the regional residence requirements for Mark Protection Committee nominations and elections, members of the committee shall represent their region of residence at the time of their election for their entire term.~~

This motion would clarify an ambiguity in wording now addressed by Standing Rule 13. It would have no substantive effect.

The default debate time was 6 minutes; 2 and 1 minutes also proposed; **1 minute** was selected on a show of hands.

1.11. Rules About Rules (BPO Item 11)

MOVED, to amend the WSFS Constitution by adding the following new section to Article V (probably after current Section 5.4):

5.x: Standing Rules for the Governance of the Business Meeting and related activities may be adopted or amended by a majority vote at any Business Meeting.

Amendments to Standing Rules shall take effect at the close of the Worldcon where they are adopted; this rule may be suspended by a two-thirds (2/3) vote.

PROVIDED THAT upon ratification of this amendment, Standing Rule 33 shall be repealed:

~~**Rule 33: Standing Rules.** Standing Rules for the Governance of the Business Meeting and related activities may be adopted or amended by a majority vote at any Business Meeting. Amendments to Standing Rules shall take effect at the close of the Worldcon where they are adopted.~~

This motion would place the authority for the Standing Rules in the Constitution rather than in the Standing Rules themselves. It would make no other change in current practice.

Mr. Illingworth moved to amend by specifying that the authority be placed in Article IV rather than Article V. A short debate followed, which appeared to primarily be concerned with the merits of the main motion rather than which article to which it should be assigned. The amendment to move it to Article IV **failed** on a show of hands.

The default debate time was 20 minutes; 30, 10, 5, 2 and 1 minutes also proposed; **2 minutes** was selected on a show of hands.

2. Committee Reports

2.1. Report of the Nitpicking and Flyspecking Committee (BPO Item 13)

The committee indicated that it would report on Sunday.

2.2. Report of the Worldcon Runners' Guide Editorial Committee (BPO Item 14)

Mr. Pavlac, Chairman of the committee, reported (see appendix). The current edition of the guide is now 166 pages, and is available on the web at [Non-working URL removed].

The committee was commended and **continued** by unanimous consent.

2.3. Report of the Constitutional Revision Working Group (BPO Item 16)

Mr. Standlee reported that the CRWG had taken no action and, inasmuch as Mr. Illingworth's motions appear to be accomplishing the same task as the CRWG had in mind, the group recommends it not be continued. On a motion by Mr. Bloom, the CRWG was thanked and **discharged** on a voice vote.

2.4. Report of the WSFS Mark Protection Committee (BPO Item 12)

Mr. Bloom reported on the actions taken by the MPC, and answered questions.

- 2.4.1. Motion to Transfer NASFiC to CSFA

A letter from the Continental Science Fiction Association offering to purchase the NASFiC service mark from WSFS was determined to be beyond the MPC's charge and was referred to the Business Meeting. After some discussion, it was determined that the following motion (signed by Jill Eastlake and two other unreadable signatures) was in order as an outgrowth of the letter:

Short Title: Sell the NASFiC

MOVED, To amend the WSFS Constitution by striking all references to the NASFiC.

PROVIDED THAT any NASFiC selected or NASFiC representative to the Mark Protection Committee seated at the time this amendment goes into effect shall continue under the old provisions of the WSFS Constitution;

FURTHER PROVIDED THAT the NASFiC service mark be transferred to

the Continental Science Fiction Association of MFW&SFA, Inc., under reasonable terms to be negotiated by the Mark Protection committee.

Mr. Olson objected to consideration; there being more than two-thirds against consideration, item 2.4.1 was **killed**.

The meeting **recessed** at 11:29 AM and **reconvened** at 11:34 AM.

- 2.4.2. Nominations for Elected Members of the Mark Protection Committee

Nominations were called for, and received for the following: Donald Eastlake III (Eastern), Scott Dennis (Central), Paul Dormer (Non-North American), Kent Bloom (declined nomination), Ruth Sachter (Western), Bruce Pelz (declined nomination), Linda Ross-Mansfield (Central). The Secretary announced a deadline of 6 PM for the receipt of acceptances.

2.5. Report of Special Committee on Extending Dramatic Presentation Eligibility to Entire Seasons (BPO Item 15)

Ms. Sbarsky, Chair of the committee, reported that no action had been taken, and requested that the committee be continued. By unanimous consent, this committee was **continued** to 1998, Ms. Sbarsky was authorized to appoint members to the committee at her discretion, and the Business Meeting advised the Committee that it expects a report at the 1998 Business Meeting.

2.6. Worldcon Reports (BPO Item 17)

- 2.6.1 Financial Reports from Seated and Past Worldcons
 - 2.6.1.1. MagiCon (1992).
Mr. Olson gave an oral report on activities of FANAC, MagiCon's parent corporation. MagiCon failed to produce a financial report.
 - 2.6.1.2. ConFrancisco (1993)
Mr. Standlee presented ConFrancisco's final financial report (see appendix). ConFrancisco has now accounted for all of its Worldcon-related income, and has no further reporting responsibilities to WSFS.
 - 2.6.1.3. ConAdian (1994)
Ms. Ross-Mansfield stated that this report will be presented at a later meeting.
 - 2.6.1.4. Intersection (1995)
Presented earlier in the meeting.
 - 2.6.1.5. L.A.con III (1996)
Mr. Glycer presented a financial report (see appendix) and answered questions. L.A.con III's gross surplus was \$223,669.54 on income of \$738,696.64.

Mr. O'Shea asked if membership reimbursements have been sent to non-US members. Yes; contact Mr. Glycer if there have been any problems.

A question was raised regarding a post-con expenditure labeled "Transferred to SCIFI." Mr. Glycer agreed that the \$62,172.40 on this line remains "reportable;" along with the "Surplus remaining" of \$5,103.85, L.A.con III/SCIFI's "Balance Reportable to WSFS" is \$67,276.25

- 2.6.1.6. LoneStarCon 2 (1997)
A financial report, current through 31 July 1997, was provided (see appendix).
- 2.6.1.7. Bucconeer (1998)
A financial report, current through 17 August 1997, was provided (see appendix).
- 2.6.1.8 Aussiecon Three (1999)
Will be presented at a later meeting.

2.7. Report of the "Obit or Dictum" Committee

This motion was first presented at the 1996 Business Meeting and was repeatedly referred back to its maker, Mr. Pelz. He produced a report (see appendix) and spoke of the "serious" side of the resolution, which substantially urged anyone who might be commemorated in WSFS Publications not to die between July 1 and September 10 in order to accommodate publication deadlines.

On a motion by Mr. Sacks, the rules were suspended and this motion, with all attached business, was **postponed indefinitely**.

3. New Business Submitted to LoneStarCon 2

(The explanations in italics accompanying some motions are those submitted by the makers of the motions. In the motions themselves, capitalization and formatting have been regularized, and the Secretary has, when appropriate, recast them into the strikethru/underline format.)

3.1. WSFS-Sponsored Publications (BPO Item 18)

MOVED, to amend the WSFS Constitution by adding the following section to Article IV:

4.x: The Business Meeting may create or recognize sponsored publications that further the purposes of the Business Meeting or the Society. Status as a WSFS-sponsored publication shall continue until revoked. These publications may report to the Business Meeting, accept corporate aegis, and provide for their own organization and continuation, provided that changes to the organization of publications created by the Business Meeting must be reported. The Business Meeting may instruct and reorganize created publications, alter created publications into recognized publications, or appoint an officer or committee to restart a sponsored publication that has died.

PROVIDED THAT initially the created publications are "Resolutions of Continuing Effect" and "The Worldcon Runners" Guide" (formerly committees of the Business Meeting) and the recognized publications are "W.O.O.F." and "APA: WSFS".

[submitted by Robert E. Sacks, Covert Beach, Robert J. MacIntosh, Samuel C. Pierce, B. Shirley Avery, A. Martin Gear, Michael Mason, Tim Illingworth, Linda Ross-Mansfield, Glen A. Boettcher, Mike VandeBunt, David A. Cantor, Martin Hoare, Ann A. Broomhead, Oz Fontecchio, Judith C. Bemis, Lew Wolkoff, Sara Paul, Larry Ruh, Richard S. Russell, and Victoria A. Smith]

[The Secretary of the 1996 Business Meeting (Mr. Flynn) notes that the use of italics for emphasis (as with "created" above) appears nowhere in the present text of the Constitution.]

Sponsors" argument: The temporary committee structure does not adequately provide for continuing work; it also does not provide for not-for-profit tax-exempt funding. At the same time, the independent APAs do not have access to the Business Meeting.

Mr. Illingworth objected to consideration; there being more than two-thirds against consideration, item 3.1 was **killed**.

3.2. Master in Our Own House (BPO Item 19)

MOVED, to amend the WSFS Constitution as follows:

4.1: ... Meetings shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of (in descending order of precedence) the WSFS Constitution; the Standing Rules; such other rules as may be published in advance by the current Committee (which rules may be suspended by the Business Meeting by the same procedure as a Standing Rule); the customs and usages of WSFS (including the resolutions and rulings of continuing effect); and *Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised*. ...

[submitted by Robert E. Sacks, Bob Matthews, Covert Beach, Robert J. MacIntosh, Samuel C. Pierce, A. Martin Gear, Michael Mason, Robert L. Hillis, Brian L. Burley, Elizabeth L. Gross, Ross Pavlac, Martin Hoare, Ann A. Broomhead, Lew Wolkoff, Richard S. Russell, and Victoria A. Smith]

Sponsors" argument: It has been asserted that Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised takes precedence over the customs of the Society. The Standing Rules Working Group has debated whether the Society usages on friendly amendment, objection to consideration, the taking and correcting of minutes, and the independence of Worldcon Committees are correct under the parliamentary authority. It is time to decide who is to be the Master and who the Servant.

Mr. Illingworth objected to consideration; there being less than two-thirds against consideration, the **objection failed**.

The default debate time was 6 minutes; 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1 minutes also proposed; **5 minutes** was selected on a show of hands.

3.3. Committee Responsibility

MOVED, to amend the WSFS Constitution by striking out Sections 1.4 (second sentence), 1.5.5, 1.7, 1.8, 3.9, 3.10, 4.2 and 5.6, and inserting the following new

Article between Articles 1 and 2: *[Text in brackets, including this text, is explanatory and not substantive.]*

Article A - Powers and Duties of Worldcon Committees

Section A.1: Duties. Each Worldcon Committee shall, in accordance with this Constitution,

1: administer the Hugo Awards,

2: administer any future Worldcon or NASFiC site selection required, and

3: hold a WSFS Business Meeting. *[New text]*

Section A.2: Marks. Every Worldcon and NASFiC Committee shall include the following notice in each of its publications: "World Science Fiction Society", "WSFS", "World Science Fiction Convention", "Worldcon", "NASFiC", and "Hugo Award" are service marks of the World Science Fiction Society, an unincorporated literary society. *[Old Section 1.7, with a reference to NASFiCs added]*

Section A.3: Official Representative. Each future selected Worldcon Committee shall designate an official representative to the Business Meeting to answer questions about their Worldcon. *[Old Section 4.2, unchanged]*

Section A.4: Distribution of Rules. The current Worldcon Committee shall print copies of the WSFS Constitution, together with an explanation of proposed changes approved but not yet ratified, and copies of the Standing Rules. The Committee shall distribute these documents to all WSFS members at a point between nine and three months prior to the Worldcon, and shall also distribute them to all WSFS members in attendance at the Worldcon upon registration. *[Old Section 5.6, reworded]*

Section A.5: Bid Presentations. Each Worldcon Committee shall provide a reasonable opportunity for *bona fide* bidding committees for the Worldcon to be selected the following year to make presentations. *[Old Section 3.9, slightly reworded]*

Section A.6: Incapacity of Committees. With sites being selected three (3) years in advance, there are at least three selected current or future Worldcon Committees at all times. If one of these should be unable to perform its duties, the other selected current or future Worldcon Committee whose site is closer to the site of the one unable to perform its duties shall determine what action to take, by consulting the Business Meeting or by mail poll of WSFS if there is sufficient time, or by decision of the Committee if there is not sufficient time. *[Old Section 3.10, with "closest" corrected to "closer"]*

Section A.7: Membership Pass-along. Within ninety (90) days after a Worldcon, the administering Committee shall, except where prohibited by local law, forward its best information as to the names and postal addresses of all of its Worldcon members to the Committee of the next Worldcon. *[Old Section 1.4 (second sentence), unchanged]*

Section A.8: Financial Openness. Any member of WSFS shall have the right, under reasonable conditions, to examine the financial records and books of account of the current Worldcon Committee, all future selected Worldcon Committees, and the two immediately preceding Worldcon Committees. *[Old Section 1.5.5/1.8.2, unchanged]*

Section A.9: Financial Reports.

A.9.1: Each future selected Worldcon Committee shall submit an annual financial

report, including a statement of income and expenses, to each WSFS Business Meeting after the Committee's selection.

A.9.2: Each Worldcon Committee shall submit a report on its cumulative surplus/loss at the next Business Meeting after its Worldcon.

A.9.3: Each Worldcon Committee should dispose of surplus funds remaining after accounts are settled for the current Worldcon for the benefit of WSFS as a whole.

A.9.4: In the event of a surplus, the Worldcon Committee, or any alternative organizational entity established to oversee and disburse that surplus, shall file annual financial reports regarding the disbursement of that surplus at each year's Business Meeting, until the surplus is totally expended or an amount equal to the original surplus has been disbursed. [Old Section 1.8/1.8.1, reworded]

*[Motions 3.3 through 3.7 submitted by Tim Illingworth; seconded by Kevin Standlee]
Sponsors' argument: In the Constitution, a lot of text has grown up defining what Committees may, may not, and should do. This gathers all that text into one place, and breaks up some of the more unwieldy paragraphs for greater readability. The only new text is Section A.1, which defines what a lot of us believe anyway, plus the words 'future selected' in A.9.1. Section 5.6 has been reworded from passive to active voice.*

Mr. Flynn inquired whether A.1(2). would make a substantive change in Worldcons' administrative authority regarding site selection. The Chair ruled that it would not.

After some discussion Mr. Yalow moved to refer this motion to a committee (Illingworth, Beach later appointed by Chair) to report tomorrow. The motion to **refer to committee** then passed on a show of hands.

Although the meeting had not completed a "first pass" through all submitted business, the scheduled adjournment time had arrived and there was no consensus for remaining later. The Preliminary Business Meeting **adjourned** at 11:58 AM.

First Main Business Meeting - Saturday, August 30, 1997

The meeting was called to order at 10:12 AM.

The agenda was slightly rearranged by unanimous consent.

2.4.2. Elections for Elected Members of the Mark Protection Committee

The nominees were Scott Dennis, Paul Dormer, Donald Eastlake III, Linda Ross-Mansfield, and Ruth Sachter. Ballots were distributed, and the Chair appointed Mr. Louie and Mr. Illingworth as tellers. After a wait for late arrivals, the polls were closed, and the tellers proceeded to count the ballots.

2.6.1 Financial Reports from Seated and Past Worldcons

- 2.6.1.3. ConAdian (1994)
Ms. Ross-Mansfield presented a financial report

- 2.6.1.8 Aussiecon Three (1999)
Mr. Boucher presented a financial report

1. Business Passed On from L.A.con III

(See the Preliminary Business Meeting minutes for the text of the motions.)

1.1. Calling a Spade a Spade and Not a Shovel (BPO Item 1)

Mr. Sacks inquired whether this motion represents any substantive change in practice. The Chair said that he did not believe it does.

Item 1.1 was **ratified** on a show of hands.

1.2. Median of the Track (BPO Item 2)

Several members requested explanation of the meaning of the default in this rule. The Chair explained those situations where the default would apply and gave examples. The motion was then debated.

Mr. Sacks (opposing ratification): The median of the past three years is too volatile.

Mr. Feldbaum (opposing): The formula is complicated; besides, the Business Meeting should periodically review the default voting fee, rather than leaving it up to a calculation.

Mr. Beach (favoring ratification): The formula is not complex. There are more than enough "site selection geeks" around to calculate it.

Ms. Ross-Mansfield (inquiry): Can the bids and the administering Worldcon still set a different amount? *Chair:* Yes.

Item 1.2 was **ratified** on a show of hands.

1.3. Let the NASFiC Administrator Administrate (BPO Item 3)

Item 1.3 was **ratified** on a show of hands.

1.4 Short Title: Tally-Ho! (BPO Item 4)

The motion, along with a pending amendment, were referred to a committee at the Preliminary Business Meeting. The committee reported that there are three main options:

- "None of the Above" can be eliminated ("Tally-Ho," with the amendment; would require an additional year's ratification because it is a greater change).
- "None of the Above" cannot be eliminated ("Tally-Ho," as passed on from L.A.con III; would *not* require an additional year's ratification).
- Current system, including the "Magic Runoff" between "None of the Above" and the preliminary winner (effect is to reject ratification of "Tally-Ho" in any form).

Because this is a three-cornered discussion, debaters were asked whether they favored option 1, 2, or 3, rather than favoring or opposing ratification of the main motion.

Mr. Beach (favoring option 1): Option 2 thwarts the will of the voters.

Mr. Sacks (favoring option 2): Option 2 preserves equivalence with in-person voting for preferential balloting.

Mr. Olson (favoring option 3): Option 3 preserves "None of the Above" without pushing people to vote disingenuously. Preserves the uniformity with the Hugo rules.

Mr. Russell (1): This is the easiest to administer, and easiest for voters to understand.

Mr. Epstein (2): Votes ranked lower than "No Preference" should be counted, rather than ignored as under any of the alternatives.

Mr. Wolkoff (1): We should adopt the system that is easiest for the voters to understand.

Mr. Bloom (2): "None of the Above" should not be used as a "protest" vote. A non-eliminatable NOTA solves the concern that if it is everyone's second choice, it should win the election.

Mr. Beach (3): Worldcon site selection voters cannot select "no convention" (equivalent to "hold over funds" in fan fund elections) - NOTA serves the appropriate role here.

Mr. Ruh (1): Oppose option 2, because we don't really "know" a voter's true feelings when s/he votes NOTA.

Mr. Sacks (2): Option 1 removes NOTA from the voters' true vocabulary because it is usually the first candidate eliminated.

Mr. Layton (3): [Secretary did not hear member's point.]

Mr. Russell (1): NOTA is actually "None of the *Below*."

Ms. Lieberman (3): The status quo is a reasonable compromise.

Mr. Daugherty (1): We should choose the simplest system, for the voters' benefit.

Mr. Carruthers (2): Should it not actually read "None of These Sites," inasmuch as the Business Meeting can then choose a site if NOTA wins?

Ms. Olson (3): Voters have a legitimate reason for voting NOTA and should be taken into account.

On a motion by Ms. Lurie, **debate was closed** (andgt;2/3 vote) and the options voted on.

Option Votes 1:14 2:6 3:39

39 being a majority of the 59 total votes cast, the Chair ruled that Item 1.4 had **failed of ratification**.

2.4.2. Elections for Elected Members of the Mark Protection Committee

The tellers presented their report at this time.

	First Seat			Second Seat		Third Seat	
Dennis	12	12	15	28	29	-	-
Dormer	5	-	-	6	-	9	-
Eastlake	20	23	29	-	-	-	-
Ross-Mansfield	11	11	13	13	14	21	23

Sachter	9	11	-	10	13	27	33
Total	57	57	57	57	56	57	56
Needed to Elect	29	29	29	29	28	29	28

Thus, **Mr. Eastlake, Mr. Dennis, and Ms. Sachter were elected for three-year terms.**

Mr. Olson moved to thank Mr. Bloom for his years of service as MPC Chairman; this motion of thanks was **adopted by acclamation and applause.**

1.5. An Alligator Sandwich (BPO Item 5)

There was a short discussion of apparent minor logical contradictions in the text that do not seem to have any practical effect. Item 1.5 was **ratified** on a show of hands.

1.6. It's a Worldcon, Dammit (BPO item 6)

Mr. Epstein (opposing ratification): We should be honest about the cultural background of Worldcon.

Item 1.6 was **ratified** on a show of hands.

1.7. Which Deadline? (BPO Item 7)

Item 1.7 was **ratified** on a show of hands.

1.8. Date Restrictions for the NASFiC (BPO Item 8)

There having been some discussion of how to word this motion to preclude obviously absurd results, it was referred to a committee at the Preliminary Business Meeting. The committee recommended the following amendment by substitution (the stricken text is the motion passed on from L.A.con III):

3.8.2: ... ~~A NASFiC shall not be held on any of the dates that the Worldcon for that year is being held, based upon the dates specified in the Worldcon filing papers.~~ NASFiC Committees shall make all reasonable efforts to avoid conflicts with Worldcon dates.

The chair ruled the motion to amend by substitution was a "lesser change." The amendment was then debated.

Mr. Sacks (favoring amendment): This is a statement of WSFS's intent, rather than an attempt to apply a technical solution.

Ms. Norwood (inquiry): Would this stop any committee from filing a NASFiC bid that conflicted with a Worldcon's dates. *Chair:* No.

Mr. Mason (favoring): This is sufficient, and simpler than the original wording.

Mr. Bloom (opposing substitute): Sanctions are available under the original wording, but not

under the substitute.

Ms. Olson (favoring): The substitute is simpler, and thus better.

Debate was closed by unanimous consent. The amendment by substitution **passed** by a show of hands.

The overall proposal (which consisted of the just-substituted wording) was then debated.

Mr. Sacks (favoring ratification): As long as WSFS continues to sanction NASFiCs, we should avoid conflicts between NASFiCs and Worldcons.

Mr. O'Shea (opposing ratification): We should not write vague rules into the constitution. Let the voters make the choice.

Mr. Stein (favoring): NASFiCs shouldn't compete with Worldcon. People should be able to go to both.

Item 1.8, as amended, was **ratified** on a show of hands.

1.9. Best Related Book (BPO Item 9)

Mr. Wolkoff: This solution is more flawed than the existing wording, and cheapens the Hugo Award.

Mr. Wolkoff moved to refer the motion to a committee, to report back next year. The motion to refer was then debated.

Mr. Sacks (opposing referral): This would cause the ratification to fail, would it not? *Chair*: Yes, because a constitutional amendment must be passed and ratified in consecutive years: if referred to committee, the motion would have to start the entire process over again.

Mr. Epstein (favoring referral): [Secretary did not record argument.]

Mr. Olson (opposing referral): [Secretary did not record argument.]

The motion to refer failed on a show of hands.

Item 1.9 was **ratified** 26-17, on a "serpentine" vote.

The meeting **recessed** at 11:20 AM and **reconvened** at 11:27 AM. 1.10.

Defining Residency Requirements (BPO Item 10)

Item 1.10 was **ratified** on a show of hands.

1.11. Rules About Rules (BPO Item 11)

Mr. Sacks (opposing ratification): There is no need for this motion. It is harmful, in that it adds a suspendable rule to the constitution.

Item 1.11 was **ratified** on a show of hands.

2. Committee Reports

All remaining committee reports will be heard tomorrow.

3. New Business Submitted to LoneStarCon 2

(See the Preliminary Business Meeting minutes for the text of the motions.)

3.1. WSFS-Sponsored Publications (BPO Item 18)

This motion was killed by objection to consideration at the Preliminary Business Meeting. In response to an inquiry, the Chair ruled that the Business Meeting could create "recognized publications" (as contemplated in the original motion) by resolution.

3.2. Master in Our Own House (BPO Item 19)

Mr. Sacks (favoring passage): We have lots of customs that should not be overridden.

Mr. Russell (opposing passage): Apprehensive about ill-defined way in which the proposal is worded.

Mr. Olson (favoring): We will behave this way, and the rules should reflect our practice. The specifics can be clarified at the ratification stage.

Mr. Illingworth (opposing): It is dangerous to pass such a motion without firm knowledge that we will fix it, or even if it can be fixed.

Mr. Illingworth then moved to create a Customs andamp; Usages Committee and refer the motion to it, the committee to report back next year. At the request of Mr. Olson, and there being no objection, the committee to which the motion would be referred was changed to the existing Nitpicking andamp; Flyspecking Committee. After a brief debate (the details of which the Secretary did not manage to record), the motion to refer **failed** on a show of hands.

Item 3.2 **passed** 21-14, on a "serpentine" vote.

3.3. Committee Responsibility

After the debate at the Preliminary Business Meeting as to the effect of the wording in A.1, the motion was referred to a committee, which proposed the following substitute wording (words in *italic underline* type are new):

Section A.1: Duties. Each Worldcon Committee shall, in accordance with this Constitution, provide for

1: administering the Hugo Awards,

2: administering any future Worldcon or NASFiC site selection required, and

3: holding a WSFS Business Meeting.*[New text]*

Mr. Flynn (inquiry): Does this motion give Worldcons any new powers? *Chair:* No.

The committee's proposed changes **passed** on a show of hands.

The default debate time was 20 minutes; 12, 8, 5 and 1 minutes also proposed; **5 minutes** was selected on a show of hands.

Mr. Sacks (inquiry): Are there any substantive changes to current rules in the motion?

Mr. Illingworth: One minor change, as indicated in the explanatory text.

Item 3.3 **passed** on a show of hands.

3.4. Mark Protection Committee Clarifications

MOVED: to amend the WSFS Constitution by striking out Sections 4.4 and 4.5, and inserting the following in Article I:

Section 1.9: The Mark Protection Committee.

1.9.1: There shall be a Mark Protection Committee of WSFS, which shall be responsible for registration and protection of the marks used by or under the authority of WSFS.

1.9.2: The Mark Protection Committee shall submit to the Business Meeting at each Worldcon a report of its activities since the previous Worldcon, including a statement of income and expense.

1.9.3: The Mark Protection Committee shall hold a meeting at each Worldcon after the end of the Business Meeting, at a time and place announced at the Business Meeting.

1.9.4: The Mark Protection Committee shall determine and elect its own officers.

Section 1.10: Membership of the Mark Protection Committee.

1.10.1: The Mark Protection Committee shall consist of:

1: one (1) member appointed to serve at the pleasure of each future selected Worldcon Committee and each of the two (2) immediately preceding Worldcon Committees,

2: one (1) non-voting member appointed to serve at the pleasure of each future selected NASFiC Committee and for each Committee of a NASFiC held in the previous two years, and

3: nine (9) members elected three (3) each year to staggered three-year terms by the Business Meeting.

1.10.2: No more than three elected members may represent any single North American region, as defined in Section 3.6. Each elected member shall represent the region (if any) in which the member resided at the time they were elected.

1.10.3: Newly elected members take their seats, and the term of office ends for elected and appointed members whose terms expire that year, at the end of the Business Meeting.

1.10.4: If vacancies occur in elected memberships in the Committee, the remainder of the position's term may be filled by the Business Meeting, and until then temporarily filled by the Committee.

Sponsors' argument: This motion makes no substantive changes. It moves the definitions from the Business Meeting Article to the WSFS Article and improves the readability. Section 1.10.2 is substantially rewritten.

The default debate time was 20 minutes; 9 and 5 minutes also proposed; **5 minutes** was selected on a show of hands.

Mr. Epstein moved to amend by restricting the number of non-North American MPC members as follows:

1.10.2: No more than three elected members may represent any single North American region, as defined in Section 3.6. *Not more than seven elected members may represent non-North American locations.* Each elected member shall represent the region (if any) in which the member resided at the time they were elected.

Mr. Epstein's amendment failed for lack of a second.

Mr. Illingworth moved to amend 1.10.1(2) to give NASFiC representatives voting rights, as follows:

2: one (1) ~~non-voting~~ member appointed to serve at the pleasure of each future selected NASFiC Committee and for each Committee of a NASFiC held in the previous two years, and

Mr. Illingworth's amendment was then debated.

Mr. Illingworth (favoring amendment): This should be done, because it treats NASFiCs equally with Worldcons.

Mr. Epstein (opposing amendment): This should *not* be done, because it treats NASFiCs equally with Worldcons.

Mr. Sacks (favoring): [Secretary missed this one.]

The amendment **passed** on a show of hands. The main motion was then debated.

Mr. Epstein (opposing passage): Why do we have all this stuff? It is a waste of the Business Meeting's time.

Mr. Sacks (favoring passage): Because we have confused our rules over the years, and Mr. Illingworth is attempting to clarify them.

Item 3.4 **passed** on a show of hands.

The First Main Business Meeting **adjourned** at 11:53 AM.

Second Main Business Meeting - Sunday, August 31, 1997

The meeting was called to order at 10:10 AM. This is the "site-selection meeting" as defined in the Standing Rules. 0. Site-Selection Business

Site-Selection Administrator Kent Bloom gave both election reports. Counting of both sets of ballots took 1 hour and 30 minutes.

0.1. Report of the 2000 Worldcon Site Selection and Presentation by the Winner

There were 1467 valid ballots, 2 invalid, and 2 Hugo ballots. Chicago wins with 1293 out of 1396 ballots expressing a preference. (Details in appendix.) On a motion by Mr. Bloom (passed by show of hands), the ballots were ordered destroyed.

Tom Veal, Chair of *Chicon 2000*, gave a short presentation and answered questions. The convention's dates will be Thursday, 31 August through Monday, 4 September 2000. The

Guests of Honor will be Ben Bova, Bob Eggleton, Jim Baen, and Bob and Anne Passovoy. Toastmaster will be Harry Turtledove. PR 0 will be available at the convention's table in the Exhibit Hall. 0.2. Report of the 1999 NASFiC Site Selection and Presentation by the Winner

There were 491 valid ballots. After 3 rounds of balloting, the winner was CONucopia (Anaheim). (Details in appendix.) On a motion by Mr. Bloom (passed by show of hands), the ballots were ordered destroyed.

Christian McGuire will chair *CONucopia*. The convention's dates will be Thursday, 26 August through Sunday, 29 August, 1999 (*not* Labor Day Weekend). The Guests of Honor will be Jerry Pournelle and Dick and Nicki Lynch. 1. Business Passed On from L.A.con III

All Business Passed On was dealt with at the First Main Business Meeting

2. Committee Reports

2.1. Report of the Nitpicking and Flyspecking Committee (BPO Item 13)

There was no objection to the Chairman of the NPFSC, Mr. Eastlake, presenting the report while also presiding over the meeting.

The Committee presented a report (see appendix) covering the years 1993, 1995, and 1996. The report for 1994 is missing, but the committee expects to find it by next year. (The machine-readable form of the reports for years prior to 1993 have vanished, although paper copies still exist in the committee's records.)

Without objection, the committee was continued, Mr. Standlee and Mr. Illingworth were added to the committee, and the committee was charged with codifying the "customs and usages of WSFS" in light of the pending constitutional amendment which refers to such matters. 2.4. Report of the WSFS Mark Protection Committee (BPO Item 12)

A written report was submitted (see appendix). The newly-constituted MPC will meet on Monday, September 1, at 11 AM in the WSFS Office in the Convention Center. Mr. Sacks was appointed as Conucopia's representative to the MPC.

3. New Business Submitted to LoneStarCon 2 (Before Deadline)

Motions not listed here were dealt with at prior meetings.

3.5. Polishing the Hugos

MOVED, to amend the WSFS Constitution by striking out Article II and inserting the following:

[Formatting note: Because this is a complete rewrite of the entire article, the Secretary has decided to leave off the "new text" underling in order to make it a little easier to read.]

Article II - Hugo Awards

Section 2.1: Introduction. Selection of the Hugo Awards shall be made as provided in this Article.

Section 2.2: General.

2.2.1: Unless otherwise specified, Hugo Awards are given in the various categories for work in the field of science fiction or fantasy appearing for the first time during the previous calendar year.

2.2.2: A work originally appearing in a language other than English shall also be eligible for the year in which it is first issued in English translation. A work, once it has appeared in English, may thus be eligible only once.

2.2.3: Publication date, or cover date in the case of a dated periodical, takes precedence over copyright date.

2.2.4: Works appearing in a series are eligible as individual works, but the series as a whole is not eligible. However, a work appearing in a number of parts shall be eligible for the year of the final part.

2.2.5: An author may withdraw a version of a work from consideration if the author feels that the version is not representative of what that author wrote.

2.2.6: The Worldcon Committee may relocate a story into a more appropriate category if it feels that it is necessary, provided that the length of the story is within the lesser of five thousand (5,000) words or twenty percent (20%) of the new category limits.

2.2.7: The Worldcon Committee is responsible for all matters concerning the Awards.

Section 2.3: Categories.

2.3.1: Best Novel. A science fiction or fantasy story of forty thousand (40,000) words or more.

2.3.2: Best Novella. A science fiction or fantasy story of between seventeen thousand five hundred (17,500) and forty thousand (40,000) words.

2.3.3: Best Novelette. A science fiction or fantasy story of between seven thousand five hundred (7,500) and seventeen thousand five hundred (17,500) words.

2.3.4: Best Short Story. A science fiction or fantasy story of less than seven thousand five hundred (7,500) words.

2.3.5: Best Related Book. Any work whose subject is related to the field of science fiction, fantasy, or fandom, appearing for the first time in book form during the previous calendar year, and which is either non-fiction or, if fictional, is noteworthy primarily for aspects other than the fictional text.

2.3.6: Best Dramatic Presentation. Any production in any medium of dramatized science fiction, fantasy or related subjects which has been publicly presented for the first time in its present dramatic form during the previous calendar year.

2.3.7: Best Professional Editor. The editor of any professional publication devoted primarily to science fiction or fantasy during the previous calendar year. A professional publication is one which had an average press run of at least ten thousand (10,000) copies per issue.

2.3.8: Best Professional Artist. An illustrator whose work has appeared in a professional publication in the field of science fiction or fantasy during the previous calendar year.

2.3.9: Best Semiprozine. Any generally available non-professional publication devoted to science fiction or fantasy which by the close of the previous calendar year has published four (4) or more issues, at least one (1) of which appeared in the previous calendar year, and which in the previous calendar year met at least two (2) of the following criteria:

- 1: had an average press run of at least one thousand (1000) copies per issue,
- 2: paid its contributors and/or staff in other than copies of the publication,
- 3: provided at least half the income of any one person,
- 4: had at least fifteen percent (15%) of its total space occupied by advertising,
- 5: announced itself to be a semiprozine.

2.3.10: Best Fanzine. Any generally available non-professional publication devoted to science fiction, fantasy, or related subjects which by the close of the previous calendar year has published four (4) or more issues, at least one (1) of which appeared in the previous calendar year, and which does not qualify as a semiprozine.

2.3.11: Best Fan Writer. Any person whose writing has appeared in semiprozines or fanzines or in generally available electronic media during the previous calendar year.

2.3.12: Best Fan Artist. An artist or cartoonist whose work has appeared through publication in semiprozines or fanzines or through other public display during the previous calendar year. Any person whose name appears on the final Hugo Awards ballot for a given year under the Professional Artist category shall not be eligible in the Fan Artist category for that year.

2.3.13: Additional Category. Not more than one special category may be created by the current Worldcon Committee with nomination and voting to be the same as for the permanent categories. The Worldcon Committee is not required to create any such category; such action by a Worldcon Committee should be under exceptional circumstances only; and the special category created by one Worldcon Committee shall not be binding on following Committees. Awards created under this paragraph shall be considered to be Hugo Awards.

Section 2.4: Extended Eligibility. In the event that a potential Hugo Award nominee receives extremely limited distribution in the year of its first publication or presentation, its eligibility may be extended for an additional year by a three-fourths (3/4) vote of the intervening Business Meeting of WSFS.

Section 2.5: Name and Design. The Hugo Award shall continue to be standardized on the rocket ship design of Jack McKnight and Ben Jason. Each Worldcon Committee may select its own choice of base design. The name (Hugo Award) and the design shall not be extended to any other award.

Section 2.6: "No Award". At the discretion of an individual Worldcon Committee, if the lack of nominations or final votes in a specific category shows a marked lack of interest in that category on the part of the voters, the Award in that category shall be canceled for that year.

Section 2.7: Nominations.

2.7.1: The Worldcon Committee shall conduct a poll to select the nominees for the final Award voting. Each member of either the administering or the immediately preceding Worldcon as of January 31 of the current calendar year shall be allowed to

make up to five (5) equally weighted nominations in every category.

2.7.2: The Committee shall include with each nomination ballot a copy of Article II of the WSFS Constitution.

2.7.3: Nominations shall be solicited only for the Hugo Awards and the John W. Campbell Award for Best New Writer.

Section 2.8: Tallying of Nominations.

2.8.1: Except as provided below, the final Award ballots shall list in each category the five eligible nominees receiving the most nominations. If there is a tie including fifth place, all the tied eligible nominees shall be listed.

2.8.2: The Worldcon Committee shall determine the eligibility of nominees and assignment to the proper category of nominees nominated in more than one category.

2.8.3: Any nominations for "No Award" shall be disregarded.

2.8.4: If a nominee appears on a nomination ballot more than once in any one category, only one nomination shall be counted in that category.

2.8.5: No nominee shall appear on the final Award ballot if it received fewer nominations than five percent (5%) of the number of ballots listing one or more nominations in that category, except that the first three eligible nominees, including any ties, shall always be listed.

Section 2.9: Notification and Acceptance. Worldcon Committees shall use reasonable efforts to notify the nominees, or in the case of deceased or incapacitated persons, their heirs, assigns, or legal guardians, in each category prior to the release of such information. Each nominee shall be asked at that time to either accept or decline the nomination. If the nominee declines nomination, that nominee shall not appear on the final ballot.

Section 2.10: Voting.

2.10.1: Final Award voting shall be by mail, with ballots sent only to WSFS members. Final Award ballots shall include name, signature, address, and membership-number spaces to be filled in by the voter.

2.10.2: Final Award ballots shall list only the Hugo Awards and the John W. Campbell Award for Best New Writer.

2.10.3: "No Award" shall be listed in each category of Hugo Award on the final ballot.

2.10.4: The Committee shall, on or with the final ballot, designate, for each nominee in the printed fiction categories, one or more books, anthologies, or magazines in which the nominee appeared (including the book publisher or magazine issue date(s)).

2.10.5: Voters shall indicate the order of their preference for the nominees in each category.

Section 2.11: Tallying of Votes.

2.11.1: In each category, votes shall first be tallied by the voter's first choices. If no majority is then obtained, the nominee who places last in the initial tallying shall be eliminated and the ballots listing it as first choice shall be redistributed on the basis of those ballots' second choices. This process shall be repeated until a majority-vote winner is obtained.

2.11.2: No Award shall be given whenever the total number of valid ballots cast for a

specific category (excluding those cast for "No Award" in first place) is less than twenty-five percent (25%) of the total number of final Award ballots received.

2.11.3: After a tentative winner is determined, then unless "No Award" shall be the winner, the following additional test shall be made. If the number of ballots preferring "No Award" to the tentative winner is greater than the number of ballots preferring the tentative winner to "No Award", then "No Award" shall be declared the winner of the election.

2.11.4: The complete numerical vote totals, including all preliminary tallies for first, second, ... places, shall be made public by the Worldcon Committee within ninety (90) days after the Worldcon. During the same period the nomination voting totals shall also be published, including in each category the vote counts for at least the fifteen highest vote-getters and any other candidate receiving a number of votes equal to at least five percent (5%) of the nomination ballots cast in that category.

Section 2.12: Exclusions. No member of the current Worldcon Committee nor any publications closely connected with a member of the Committee shall be eligible for an Award. However, should the Committee delegate all authority under this Article to a Subcommittee whose decisions are irrevocable by the Worldcon Committee, then this exclusion shall apply to members of the Subcommittee only.

Section 2.13: Retrospective Hugos. A Worldcon held 50, 75, or 100 years after a Worldcon at which no Hugos were presented may conduct nominations and elections for Hugos which would have been presented at that previous Worldcon. Procedures shall be as for the current Hugos. Categories receiving insufficient numbers of nominations may be dropped. Once retrospective Hugos have been awarded for a Worldcon, no other Worldcon shall present retrospective Hugos for that Worldcon.

Sponsors' argument: This amendment tidies up the wording of the Hugo Awards somewhat. It takes the general list of principles now in the Best Novel definition and creates a new section from them, with the statement of general responsibility added and a new definition of the eligibility of series constructed from the old versions. As far as we can tell, the only effect is to extend the double eligibility of non-English works to all Hugos instead of just the written fiction categories. The author has tidied up Sections 2.6 to 2.11: it is the sponsors' belief that they now reflect what is intended by the current wording.

Inquiry: Would Novel still be eligible if serialized? Yes.

Inquiry: Does the new 2.2.4 wording apply to Dramatic Presentation? Yes. (It does not attempt to define what a "work" is, however.)

Mr. Sacks moved to refer the motion to a committee to report back next year. The motion to refer was then debated.

Ms. Lurie (opposed to referral): It is unclear what a committee would accomplish.

Mr. Jenks (opposed): Inaction on this is wasteful.

Mr. Olson (favoring referral): The text is unclear. We can afford to wait a year.

Mr. Russell (opposed): Concerns that this isn't a technical correction can be dealt with at the

ratification stage next year, just like the "Master In Our Own House" amendment we passed yesterday.

Mr. Sacks (favoring): If there is nothing new in the motion, there is no need to rush to judgment, and a year's wait will do no harm.

Ms. Bemis (inquiry): Could the motion be passed, and a committee be appointed afterwards to look into potential ambiguities? *Chair:* Yes.

Mr. Beach (opposed): We've finally brought some of the muddled wording of the existing Hugo rules to light.

Mr. Olson (favoring): Baffled by idea of a "technical clarifications" amendment that does not clarify.

Debate on the motion to refer was closed (>2/3 vote). The motion to refer **failed** on a vote by show of hands. The motion was then open for debate, but apparently all of the issues had already been raised during the debate on the motion to refer.

Item 3.5 **passed** on a show of hands.

3.5.1. Hugo Polishing Committee

There was no objection to the Chair appointing a committee (Mr. Illingworth; he has authority to augment the committee by anyone he wishes) to review various potential ambiguities in the just-passed "Polishing the Hugos" constitutional amendment.

Mr. Wolkoff (inquiry): Could the committee listed at item 5.1.1 be combined with this. *Chair:* Yes.

Mr. Wolkoff then modified his motion at 5.1.1 to refer to Mr. Illingworth's committee.

Mr. Sacks then moved to combine Mr. Illingworth's committee with the existing committee to study Best Dramatic Presentation. This proved controversial, and debate followed.

Mr. Olson (opposing merging committees): The BDP debate is very likely irresolvable and should not be combined with technical discussions that probably are resolvable.

Mr. Russell (favoring merging committees): If BDP is ever going to be fixed, this is the time for it.

Mr. Feldbaum (opposing): [Secretary missed this one.]

Ms. Morgan (favoring): This would allow the combined committee to work out the conflicts between the various proposals.

Ms. Ross-Mansfield (inquiry): Could we order the committees to act "jointly?" *Chair:* It is unclear what the effect of such instructions would be.

Ms. Sbarsky (opposing): It would not be prudent to combine committees, but cooperation between them is possible.

The motion to merge the two committees **failed** on a show of hands.

3.6. Eligibility

MOVED, to amend the WSFS Constitution by striking out Section 3.5 and inserting the following:

Section 3.5: Bid Eligibility.

3.5.1: To be eligible for site selection, a bidding committee must file the following documents with the Committee that will administer the voting: (1) an announcement of intent to bid; (2) adequate evidence of an agreement with its proposed site's facilities, such as a conditional contract or a letter of agreement; (3) the rules under which the Worldcon Committee will operate, including a specification of the term of office of their chief executive officer or officers and the conditions and procedures for the selection and replacement of such officer or officers.

3.5.2: The bidding committee must supply written copies of these documents to any member of WSFS on request.

3.5.3: For a bid to be allowed on the printed ballot, the bidding committee must file the documents specified above no later than 180 days prior to the official opening of the administering convention.

3.5.4: To be eligible as a write-in, the bidding committee must file the documents specified above by the close of the voting.

3.5.5: If no bids meet these qualifications, the selection shall proceed as though "None of the Above" had won.

Sponsors' argument: This motion makes no changes to practice. It improves the readability of the section. It requires the announcement of intent to bid to be written.

Item 3.6 **passed** by show of hands.

3.7. Yet More Business

MOVED, to amend the WSFS Constitution by striking out Sections 4.1, 4.3 and 5.5, and inserting the following:

Article IV - Powers of the Business Meeting

Section 4.1: WSFS Business Meetings.

4.1.1: Business Meetings of WSFS shall be held at advertised times at each Worldcon.

4.1.2: The current Worldcon Committee shall provide the Presiding Officer and Staff for each Meeting.

4.1.3: The Business Meeting may adopt Standing Rules for its own governance.

4.1.4: Meetings shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of (in descending order of precedence) the WSFS Constitution; the Standing Rules; such other rules as may be published in advance by the current Committee (which rules may be suspended by the Business Meeting by the same procedure as a Standing Rule); and the current edition of *Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised*.

4.1.5: The quorum for the Business Meeting shall be twelve members of the Society physically present.

Section 4.2: Continuation of Committees. Except as otherwise provided in this Constitution, any committee or other position created by a Business Meeting shall lapse at the end of the next following Business Meeting that does not vote to continue it.

Section 4.3: Constitutional Pass-along. Within two (2) months after the end of each Worldcon, the Business Meeting staff shall send a copy of all changes to the Constitution and Standing Rules, and all items awaiting ratification, to the next Worldcon Committee.

Sponsors' argument: This, again, makes no change to current practice. It gathers the remaining references to the Business Meeting into one Article and breaks up the text of Section 4.1 for readability.

Item 3.7 **passed** by show of hands.

Question Time would ordinarily fall at this point in the agenda. Mr. Olson moved to suspend the rules and take up new business submitted after deadline but allowed on the agenda by the Presiding Officer. There being no objection, the remaining new business was addressed.

5. New Business Submitted to LoneStarCon 2 (After Deadline)

5.1 Not Just Books

MOVED, To amend Section 2.2.5 of the WSFS Constitution as follows:

2.2.5: Best Related ~~Book~~ Work. Any work whose subject is related to the field of science fiction, fantasy, or fandom, appearing for the first time ~~in book form~~ during the previous calendar year, and which is either non-fiction or, if fictional, is noteworthy primarily for aspects other than the fictional ~~text~~ content.

[Submitted by: Saul Jaffe, Seconded by: Mark Olson]

Mr. Jaffe (favoring passage): Changes in publishing industry are driving this. Concerns over "facetious" nominees are baseless; trust the voters.

Mr. Wolkoff moved to amend by expanding the change as follows:

2.2.5: Best Related ~~Book~~ Work. Any work whose subject is related to the field of science fiction, fantasy, or fandom, ~~appearing published~~ for the first time ~~in book form~~ during the previous calendar year, and which is either non-fiction or, if fictional, is noteworthy primarily for aspects other than the fictional ~~text~~ content.

Mr. Daugherty (opposing amendment): [Garble.]

Mr. Flynn (inquiry): Will the Chair rule on the effect of the amendment. *Chair:* No, he won't.

Mr. Wolkoff (favoring amendment): [More garble.]

Mr. Beach moved to close debate on all pending motions; this passed (>2/3) and debate was closed.

The amendment **failed** on a show of hands.

Item 5.1 as submitted **passed** on a show of hands.

5.2 Take Five

MOVED, To amend Standing Rule 14 as follows:

Rule 14: Debate Time Limits; Main Motions. Debate on all motions ~~of less than fifty (50) words shall be limited to six (6) five (5) minutes. Debate on all other motions shall be limited to twenty (20) minutes. ...~~

[Submitted by Mark Olson, Dennis Caswell, Tim Illingworth, Kent Bloom, Chris Cooper, Judith Bemis, Lew Wolkoff, Priscilla Olson, Winton Matthews, and several unreadable squiggles. The Secretary suggests that all persons signing motions also print their names if they want their names to appear in the official record.]

The default debate time limit (six minutes) applied to this motion.

Mr. Olson (favoring passage): Many of us are growing tired of playing games with the debate time limits at the Preliminary Business Meeting.

Mr. Bloom moved to amend by substitution, broadening the scope of the change:

Rule 14: Debate Time Limits; Main Motions. ~~Debate on all motions of less than fifty (50) words shall be limited to six (6) minutes. Debate on all other motions shall be limited to twenty (20) minutes. ...~~

(This would eliminate all references to debate time limits, and would allow the defaults in the parliamentary authority to take precedence.) Debate proceeded on the amendment.

Mr. Bloom (favoring amendment): It serves no purpose to have specific time limits. We have plenty of rules to limit debate already.

Mr. Sacks (opposing amendment): People keep their comments short because they know debate time is limited.

Mr. Jenks (favoring): Anyone can move to call the question.

Mr. Ruh (opposing): Unlimited debate time leads to unlimited debate. Time limits keep the debate on track.

Mr. Russell (favoring): The Chair already has the right to call upon the meeting to end the debate.

Mr. Standlee: I move the Previous Question.

Mr. Standlee's motion (which was made in the "unqualified" form and thus applied only to the amendment) passed (>2/3), which ended the debate on the substitute. The amendment then **failed** on a vote by show of hands.

Mr. Russell then moved to amend by substitution, so that the motion would read:

Rule 14: Debate Time Limits; Main Motions. ~~Debate on all motions of less than fifty (50) words shall be limited to six (6) minutes. Debate on all other motions shall be limited to twenty (20) minutes.~~ The Presiding Officer shall designate the default debate time for agendized motions. ...

The amendment by substitution **passed** 32-16.

Item 5.2 as amended **passed** by a show of hands. It is an amendment to the Standing Rules, and thus goes into effect at the end of this Business Meeting.

[The Secretary believes the word "agendized" above was not the intent of the motion; from the nature of the debate, it appears that the actual intent was for the Presiding Officer to set the default debate time for all main motions, regardless of whether they are on the agenda or not. The Secretary has thus modified "agendized" to "main." In addition, the Secretary has split Rule 14 into two pieces, making appropriate grammatical changes.]

5.2 Modify Criteria for Best Professional Editor

MOVED, To amend Section 2.2.7 of the WSFS Constitution as follows:

2.2.7: Best Professional Editor. The editor of any professional publication devoted primarily to science fiction or fantasy during the previous calendar year. A professional publication is one which ~~had an~~ met at least one of the following criteria during the previous calendar year: (1) average press run of at least ten thousand (10,000) copies per issue, or (2) a distribution of at least 100,000 copies during the previous calendar year.

[Submitted by: Ken Jenks. No seconder's name on submission]

Several people objected to consideration [the Secretary neglected to record which person was recognized by the Chair to actually make the objection]; there being more than two-thirds against consideration, item 5.2 was **killed**.

5.3 Best E-zine Amendment

MOVED, To amend Section 2.2 of the WSFS Constitution by adding an additional Hugo Award category as follows after existing Section 2.2.10:

2.2.x: Best E-zine. Any generally available publication devoted to science fiction or fantasy published electronically which by the close of the previous calendar year as met either of the following criteria: (1) has been available on the Internet for at least one (1) month, or (2) has been distributed on portable media (floppy disk, CD-ROM or other) with more than one hundred (100) copies.

[Submitted by: Ken Jenks. No seconder's name on submission]

Several people objected to consideration [the Secretary neglected to record which person was recognized by the Chair to actually make the objection]; there being more than two-thirds against consideration, item 5.3 was **killed**.

4. Question Time

4.1. Bucconeer (1998 Worldcon)

Covert Beach, President of Bucconeer's parent corporation (Peggy Rae Pavlat is Chair of the convention) gave a short presentation and answered questions. The Secretary elected not to record the questions and answers except insofar as they affect the Business Meeting.

Bucconeer has put their Business Meeting in the Events division under Kent Bloom, and the meeting will be chaired by Tim Illingworth.

4.2. Aussiecon Three (1999 Worldcon)

Stephen Boucher made a short presentation and answered questions. The Aussiecon Three Business Meeting will be chaired by Jack Herman.

4.3. Bidders for 2001

There was insufficient meeting time remaining to provide optional Question Time for 2001 Worldcon bidders.

By unanimous consent, the Secretary was granted relief from absolute compliance with Standing Rule 21, due to the nature of the revisions passed at this meeting.

The Business Meeting adjourned *sine die* at 11:52 AM.

Disposition of Business

- Constitutional Amendments Ratified (Second Year Approval)
BPO Items 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8 (as amended), 9, 10, and 11 (agenda items 1.1, 1.2, ... etc.) were ratified and are now part of the WSFS Constitution. These changes have been made as indicated.
- Constitutional Amendments Failed of Ratification
BPO Item 4 failed of ratification.
- Constitutional Amendments Passed (First Year Approval)
Proposed Constitutional amendments 3.2, 3.3 (as amended), 3.4 (as amended), 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, and 5.1 received first passage, and are passed on to Bucconeer for ratification. A committee consisting of Tim Illingworth and such other persons as he may think appropriate to include was formed to study the wording of 3.5 and report back with any suggested changes to next year's Business Meeting. The Secretary will include these items under section 1 of the Business Passed On to Bucconeer, putting those items which generated the most substantive debate first.
- Constitutional Amendments Defeated
Proposed Constitutional amendments 2.4.1, 3.1, 5.2, and 5.3 were defeated (all by objections to consideration).
- Standing Rules Changes
As a consequence of items 1.10 and 1.11 passing, Standing Rules 13 and 33 were repealed. Substantial changes were made to Standing Rule 14. Because of the nature of the change to SR 14, and because of the gap in the numbering created by repealing SR 13, the Secretary has split SR 14 into two pieces, with the new wording passed at LSC2 in new SR 13, and most of the remaining text of SR 14 remaining in SR 14. (While not absolutely necessary in a technical sense, this avoids having to renumber all of the "downstream" standing rules.) The Secretary slightly changed the wording

in the remainder of rule 14 to handle the fact that the first sentence was referring to a predecessor phrase that isn't there anymore.

- Other Items on Agenda
 - The following special committees were continued or created (the number in parenthesis is the agenda item number from this year out of which the business arose):
 - Nitpicking and Flyspecking Committee (2.1) (Membership was expanded and additional matters were referred to it.)
 - Worldcon Runners' Guide Editorial Committee (2.2)
 - Extending Dramatic Presentation Eligibility to Entire Seasons (2.5)
 - Hugo Polishing (3.5) (Will be included with ratification of this item.)
 - The following special committees were discharged or otherwise not continued:
 - Constitutional Revision Working Group (2.3) Obit or Dictum (2.7)

Outline Agenda for 1998

- Committee Reports
 - Mark Protection Committee
Nominations and Elections to MPC
 - Nitpicking and Flyspecking Committee
 - Worldcon Runners' Guide Editorial Committee
 - Extending Dramatic Presentation Eligibility to Entire Seasons
- Worldcon Reports
 - Past Worldcons
 - Magicon (1992)
 - ConAdian (1994)
 - Intersection (1995)
 - L.A.con III (1996)
 - LoneStarCon 2 (1997)
 - Reports of Seated Worldcons and NASFiCs
 - Buconeer (1998)
 - Conucopia (1999 NASFiC)
 - Aussiecon Three (1999 Worldcon)
 - Chicon 2000 (2000)
- Business Passed On from LoneStarCon 2
 - Master in Our Own House (LSC2 agenda item 3.2)
 - Polishing the Hugos (3.5), including Report of the Hugo Polishing Committee (3.5.1)
 - Not Just Books (5.1)
 - Committee Responsibility (3.3)
 - Mark Protection Committee Clarifications (3.4)
 - Eligibility (3.6)
 - Yet More Business (3.7)
- New Business

- Site-Selection Business
 - Report of the 2001 Site Selection and Presentation by Winner
 - Presentation by Bidders for 2002 Worldcon (time permitting)

Attendance List

Including the podium staff, the attendance lists were signed by 81 people on Friday, 62 on Saturday, and 54 on Sunday. A total of 109 signed one or more attendance lists or are otherwise known to have been present. (For comparison, there were 134 in 1996, 90 in 1995, and 239 in 1994.) In the list below, the numbers following each name indicate the meetings at which the person is recorded as being present (1 = Friday, 2 = Saturday, 3 = Sunday).

Gary P Agin (1), Brian P Alexander (2), Dave Anderson (2), Lynn Anderson (2), Ted Atwood (2), Kevin G Austin (23), B Shirley Avery (1), Covert Beach (123), Judith C Bemis (123), Leroy F Berven (123), Kent Bloom (123), Stephen Boucher (13), Seth Breidbart (13), George S Brickner (3), Ann A Broomhead (2), Stephen Burroughs (1), Johnny Carruthers (123), Chris Cooper (3), Mike Cothran (2), Todd Dashoff (12), James Daugherty (123), John Day (3), Steven Desjardins (1), Martin E Deutsch (12), Vincent Docherty (1), Paul G Dolenac (2), Paul Dormer (123), Fred Duarte Jr (13), Donald E Eastlake III (123), James Echols (2), Chris Edwards (1), Louis Epstein (123), Judith Eudaly (1), Mike Fisher (1), George Flynn (123), Jace Foss (12), Pam Fremon (1), Douglas Friauf (13), Deb Geisler (1), Mike Glycer (1), Steve Gold (123), Gary Greenbaum (1), Stephen J Grosko (123), Larry Hancock (1), Lisa Hertel (2), Martin Hoare (13), David Hungerford (1), Tim Illingworth (123), Saul Jaffe (123), Athena Jarvis (1), Peter Jarvis (23), Becky Kaplowitz (13), Ira Kaplowitz (13), Rick Katze (123), Michael D Kennedy (123), 'Zanne Labonville (123), Alexis Layton (13), Danny Lieberman (1), Paula Lieberman (12), Gary Louie (12), Perrienne Lurie (13), Robert Macintosh (13), Michael Mason (123), Winton Matthews (123), Warren Mayer (1), Christian McGuire (3), Karen Meschke (13), Rick Moen (1), Cheryl Morgan (123), Beth Moursund (123), Chris O'Shea (1), Frank Olbris (2), Gene Olmstead (2), Mark Olson (123), Priscilla Olson (12), Sara M Paul (2), Maria Pavlac (1), Ross Pavlac (1), Bruce Pelz (1), Sam Pierce (23), Michael Pins (123), John Pomeranz (3), Pat Porter (12), David Ratti (123), Mark Richards (123), Linda Ross-Mansfield (123), Larry Ruh (123), Richard S Russell (123), Ruth Sachter (123), Robert E Sacks (123), Sharon Sbarsky (123), Ben Schilling (123), Michael Siladi (3), Henry Allen Smith (2), Richard Smith (3), Victoria A Smith (123), Ken Smookler (1), Jack Speer (1), Kevin Standlee (123), Keith Stokes (1), Will Strang (1), Tim Szczesuil (13), Don A Timm (12), Leslie Turek (1), Alex Von Thorn (2), Susan Wheeler (2), Lew Wolkoff (123), Richard Wright (2), Ben Yalow (1).

Kevin Standlee WSFS Business Meeting Secretary 28 October 1997

Revised 23 January 1998

[HTMLised by Pat McMurray January 2000]

"World Science Fiction Society", "WSFS", "World Science Fiction Convention", "Worldcon", "NASFiC", and "Hugo Award" are service marks of the World Science Fiction Society, an unincorporated literary society.

Appendix 1: Worldcon Financial Reports The financial reports were submitted in paper form only and are not part of the electronic copy.

Appendix 2: Committee Reports Committee reports were submitted in paper form only and are not part of the electronic copy.

Pat McMurray pat@cookydemon.co.uk

Last Update: January 2000