

The World Science Fiction Society

**Minutes of the Business Meeting at Interaction
Friday 5th and Saturday 6th August 2005**

Introduction

All meetings were held in the Forth Room of the Scottish Exhibition and Convention Centre. The head table officers were:

Chair: Tim Illingworth

Deputy Presiding Officer / Parliamentarian:
Donald E Eastlake III

Secretary: Pat McMurray

Timekeeper: Gary Feldbaum

[Secretary: The debates in these minutes are not word for word accurate, but every attempt has been made to represent the sense of the arguments made. UK spelling is mostly used; because that's the way I spell. Names are deliberately chosen to be the informal versions. These minutes are complete and accurate to the best of my knowledge and recollection and are based on contemporary notes. Any other comments or notes I have will be marked in this fashion. Comments thus are purely informative and do not form part of the official text of these minutes.]

Voting is done in a variety of ways in the course of the Business Meeting. The Mark Protection Committee members are elected on paper ballots, using the Australian ballot. Most voting in the course of the meeting is done by an uncounted show of hands or, less commonly, by voice vote or by acclamation. If a voice or show of hands vote appears close or if a counted vote is considered important, a numbered serpentine vote is held.]

Preliminary Business Meeting, Friday

Podium Staff:

Chair: Tim Illingworth

Deputy Presiding Officer & Parliamentarian: Donald E Eastlake III

Secretary: Pat McMurray

Timekeeper: Gary Feldbaum

Meeting was called to order at 10:15. Attendance as shown on the sign-up sheets was 60.

Coffee and edibles were provided by a grant from Noreascon IV in memory of George Flynn.

1. Committee Reports

1.1. Mark Protection Committee (Including Nominations for MPC)

Report was presented by Kevin Standlee and is attached to these minutes.

Should Saturday's Main Business Meeting run sufficiently short, the MPC meeting will be held in the Forth room immediately after, otherwise on Sunday at 11AM.

Nominations for MPC members:

Ben Yalow: Move to nominate existing committee to the extent that they agree.

The motion to suspend the rules and nominate the incumbent members was adopted by unanimous consent.

1.2. Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

Report was presented by Kevin Standlee and is attached to these minutes.

Kevin Standlee: The Committee asks unanimous consent that the Committee be continued as currently constituted.

Chair: Hearing no objection, the NP&FS Committee is continued as currently constituted.

1.3. Worldcon Runners' Guide Editorial Committee

Report was presented by Sharon Sbarsky. N4 is planning on maintaining its Committee website for use by future Worldcons and the WRG will be merged into this website.

Chair: Reappoint Sharon Sbarsky as Chair of the WRG Committee.

1.4. Hugo Eligibility Rest of the World (HEROW) Committee

Report was presented by Pat McMurray and is attached to these minutes.

Chair: Hearing no objection, the HEROW Committee is continued as currently constituted.

1.5. Formalization of Long List Entries (FOLLE) Committee

Report was received and is attached to these minutes, with the agenda.

Chair: Hearing no objection, the FOLLE Committee is continued as currently constituted.

2. Worldcon Reports

2.1 Past Worldcons

2.1.1. ConAdian (1994)

A report was received and is attached to these minutes.

Kevin Standlee, as the senior member of ConAdian's Committee present, stated that ConAdian had donated moneys to Interaction to support Events, after the preparation of this report.

2.1.2. Aussiecon Three (1999)

A final financial report was presented by Stephen Boucher and is attached to these minutes.

2.1.3. The Millennium Philcon (2001)

A report was presented by Todd Dashoff and is attached to these minutes.

2.1.4. ConJosé (2002)

A final financial report was presented by Kevin Standlee and is attached to these minutes.

2.1.5 Torcon 3 (2003)

Report were received for 2004 and 2004 and are attached to these minutes.

2.1.6 Noreascon 4 (2004)

A report was presented by Deb Geisler and is attached to these minutes.

Catering for this year's Business Meeting was provided by a grant from Noreascon 4 in memory of George Flynn.

John Pomeranz: Thank you for the coffee and cakes. Meeting: Applause

2.2. Seated Worldcons & NASFiC

2.2.1. Interaction (2005)

A report was presented by Vince Docherty and David Cooper, and is attached to these minutes.

Vince Docherty: Move that when we adjourn, we adjourn in memory of KIM Campbell. No objection, so motion was passed.

2.2.2 L.A.con IV (2006)

A report was presented by Christian McGuire and is attached to these minutes.

2.2.3 CascadiaCon (2005)

A report was presented by Pat Porter and is attached to these minutes.

2.2.4 Nippon 2007

A report was presented by Shouichi Hachiya and is attached to these minutes.

3. Business Passed On from Noreascon 4

Chair: Will set ten minute limits unless anyone objects. There were no objections.

Ben Yalow: Point of Order concerning 3.3 – This contains Standing Rules and Constitutional Amendment Changes. I believe that Standing Rules cannot be carried forward, as they are adopted at the end of the meeting. So I believe that we passed the Constitutional Amendments last year, for ratification this year; but that the Standing Rules were passed last year, but with proviso that they were in suspension until the Constitutional Amendments were passed. Therefore they should have been included in the Standing Rules.

Kent Bloom: Provisos are unfair to Secretaries. Standing Rules that are associated with Constitutional Amendments do not come into effect until the Constitutional Amendments are ratified.

Chair: I rule that Kent's interpretation is correct.

There was no objection.

3.1 Short Title: BDP: Movies and Television

Debate time is set at ten minutes.

3.2 Short Title: Keep Movin', Movin', Movin', Though They're Disapprovin'

Debate time is set at ten minutes.

3.3 Short Title: Counting Votes (and Breaking Ties)

Debate time is set at ten minutes.

4. New Business

4.1. Resolutions

4.1.1a Short Title: This Year's Model

Moved by Kevin Standlee and seconded by John Pomeranz

Kevin Standlee (For): This is not just about British books, it gives extra eligibility for other countries outside the UK. This gives extra opportunity for the majority of the nominators — who we believe to be mostly Americans — to see eligible works.

Mark Olsen (Against): Give extensions to works not voters. If we extend this proposal now, we might as well extend this proposal permanently as there will be no conditions under which this extension would not take effect. We think most of the works which would benefit are UK.

Seth Breidbart: Move to amend to extend the eligibility of all works except those published in the UK.

Chair: Can't do that – Constitution only allows us to switch on or off section 3.2.3.

Seth Breidbart: Move to amend by substituting for the main motion a motion to extend the eligibility of all individual works except those published in the UK. [*Note: Under section 3.4*] This was seconded from the floor.

Seth Breidbart (For): The next two motions cover individual works published outside the UK – this will have essentially the same effect.

Ben Yalow (Against): Point of Order – This does have a separate effect, it extends eligibility when a work is published in the US, rather than just for a separate year.

[*Note: Ben later commented on this point as follows: “The objection that I raised during the debate on Seth’s amendment changing the 3.2.3 extension to a 3.4 extension was that in stating the motion, Tim (The Chair) indicated that it would have the same effect, but exclude the UK works, which a 3.2.3 extension doesn’t permit, since it’s all or nothing. However, the 3.4 extension is only good for one year, as opposed to a 3.2.3 extension, which is good until US publication. And I wanted that difference correctly stated, which was my point of order.”*]

Chair: Vote on amending this motion from a 3.2.3 motion to a 3.4 motion – motion fails many to few. Debate then returned to the original proposal.

Patrick Neilsen Hayden (For): Much SFF of importance being published in Australia.

31 in favour, 16 against – motion fails due to not having the necessary $\frac{3}{4}$ majority.

4.1.1b Short Title: Sister Song

Patrick Neilsen Hayden: One of the best short stories of past year...
Passed.

4.1.1c: Short Title: Save the Green Planet

Ineligible since it was first screened in English in 2003. Film would have been eligible for a 2004 Hugo nomination, or for an extension to 2005.

4.1.2 Short Title: Holding on for a HEROW

Passed earlier.

4.1.3 Short Title: On with the Motley

Passed earlier.

4.1.4: Short Title: Taming the Digital Wilderness

Seconded by Robert Klein

Peter Wilkinson (For): Has proved popular when run in the past. There seem to be plenty of eligible candidate websites. There aren’t really other Hugo categories in which they can be nominated.

Ben Yalow (Against): We’ve generally appointed three classes of committees: Ongoing Works – which have been effective; Short-term Committees to look at Wordings – generally effective; longer term Committees to look at complicated issues – rotation, WSFS inc – these tend to be ineffective. What has been effective have been individuals and small groups hammering out changes, completely outside our structures.

Craig Miller (For): Every time we do the informal group thing, we then appoint a committee to consider the outcome.

Lisa Hayes (Against): Needs a larger group and a wider body of people to consider what needs doing, so against committee at this time

Ed Green (For): Committees cost us nothing, and will properly consider the costs and effects.

John Pomeranz Point of Order – anything to prevent reporting this weekend?

Chair: Only time...

Elsbeth Kovar (Against): Committees can discourage fans who aren't involved in the committee from being involved in the issue.

Vince Docherty (For): The Website Hugo having been created twice by Worldcons shows a lot of interest.

Seth Breidbart (Against): May cost us nothing, but will give us twice that benefit.

Darrel Exline (For): Could provide a point of contact for interested fans.

Glenn Glazer: Call the question, seconded.

25 in favour, 23 against.

Motion carries.

Chair: Appoint Peter Wilkinson as the Chair.

4.2. Standing Rules Amendments

4.3. Constitutional Amendments

4.3.1 Short Title: Keeping Up Appearances

Gary Feldbaum: Some Hugo administrators have gone by year appearance.

Ben Yalow: That is covered in a separate section of the Constitution and is not addressed by this amendment.

Gary Feldbaum (Point of Order): Can I have a Chair's ruling that this does not impact any other item.

Chair: This is merely tidying, does not affect anything elsewhere.

Mark Olsen (point of Inquiry): Is there any substantive content?

Chair: This is merely tidying.

Kent Bloom: Appearance is ill-defined, would prefer published.

Debate time is set at ten minutes.

4.3.2 Short Title: Best Editor Split

Don Timm: OTC

OTC fails, motion will be debated.

Debate time is set at ten minutes.

Sharon Sbarsky: Move to amend the motion by striking only the second sentence of 3.3.8 and adding 3.3.x and 3.3.y, but recasting these as definitions.

Mark Olson (Against): PNH's idea is right, but the motion is crazy and Sharon's is not much better. Move to create a committee to report back tomorrow with a new and improved motion.

Chair: Seeing no objection, charge Mark Olson with creating a committee to report back tomorrow.

4.3.3 Short Title: Site Selection Rights

Todd Dashoff: OTC
OTC passed, motion is lost

5. Site Selection Business

Will be dealt with tomorrow.

6. Adjournment

6.1. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned in memory of KIM Campbell at 11:32

Main Business Meeting, Saturday

Podium Staff:

Chair: Tim Illingworth
Deputy Chair and Parliamentarian:
Donald E Eastlake III
Secretary: Pat McMurray
Timekeeper: Gary Feldbaum

Meeting was called to order at 10:10. Attendance as shown on the sign-up sheets was 69.

Without objection, Site Selection business (normally a Special Order of Business at this time) is postponed until later in the meeting.

1. Committee Reports

1.1. Mark Protection Committee (Including Nominations for MPC)

The three retiring members were the only nominees and without objection, Lynn Anderson, Stephen Boucher, Sue Francis are declared re-elected.

The Mark Protection Committee will meet on Sunday at 11 AM in the Forth Room.

1.6 The Ad-Hoc Committee to Mess With the Wording of the Best Editor Split Proposal

Did not consider extraneous matters such as electronic publication.

Mark Linnemann: Why did you eliminate the 10,000 run?

Mark Olsen: Eliminates almost all book editors.

Priscilla Olsen: Did we consider the potential nominees?

Mark Olsen: Have included a resolution to direct Hugo administrators to publish such a list.

Rick Katze: Why only one in previous calendar year in 3.3.x?

Mark Olsen: Matches other Hugos.

Mark Olsen: 4.1.1 will apply to either motion.

Secretary: Will in fact apply even if motion fails, and also to 2006 Hugos.

4.3.2 Short Title: Best Editor Split

Kevin Standlee: Query: the question is which version of the proposal should we consider [the "one Hugo" or "two Hugo"]?

Chair: Consider the substitution first, does anyone wish to speak in favour of substituting, and is in favour of one Hugo.

Glen Glazer (In favour of one): Editors have less freedom of choice than authors and may have to work on projects not of their choosing, so that their work might be split into separate categories and they might fail of nomination in both categories.

Patrick Nielsen Hayden (In favour of two): Seems unlikely that that would really apply. Editors work on many more than four, you know. I have made a list of 44 professional

editors who work in the English language, which is not complete, all of whom would pass the four book criteria. And books have been the central core of science fiction for at least a decade.

Move to extend debate to 20 minutes

Passed without objection.

Rick Katze: (Point of Inquiry) At what time would it be in order to make a motion to say that editors cannot be nominated to both?

Chair: When we consider the main motion.

Kevin Standlee: I think it is in order to consider either while considering substitutions.

Chair: Agreed, it is in order at this point.

[Comment by Kevin Standlee: The point here is that, under our parliamentary authority, when debating between two versions of a proposal, one of which is a substitute for the other, it is in order to move amendments to either alternative. This runs somewhat counter to intuition.. Most people seem to think that you should decide the "big question" first, then deal with minor amendments; however, the proper way is to handle amendments to either alternative, then choose between the alternatives, then treat the selected alternative as the main motion.]

Rick Katze: Moved, to amend Main motion, to insert language in article 3 such that no editor can be nominated for both categories.

Paul Delan: Seconded.

Moshe Feder (Against): Best fan artist and professional artist, best short story and novel, editors deserve the same privilege.

Mark Olsen: Point of Information: Precedent in fan artist / pro artist categories.

Kevin Standlee (Against): Reject this – no such condition applies in editors.

Ben Yalow (Against): Pros can be fans if they so choose, or not if they choose not to. We should not compound a 1968 error with another one here.

Rick Katze (Favour): Pro / fan artist – make it clear to distinguish between editing categories

Craig Miller (Against): Four fiction categories.

Patrick Nielsen Hayden (Against): Pro and fan are states of mind, not being.

Amendment failed many to one.

Back to considering one Hugo substitution.

James Briggs (In favour of one): Substitution is simpler.

Priscilla Olson (In favour of two): Two may be simpler to administrate and recognizes the hard work of editors.

Moshe Feder (In favour of two): Think magazines are the heart of the field, but has evolved so that the majority of the body are the books. We need to reflect this change.

Stephen Boucher (In favour of one): After award for Best Locus and Best Buffy this looks like creating a Best Gardner Dozois and Best Book Editor – educating the public might be best first.

Linda Deneroff (In favour of two): This just seems like more of the same, giving one Hugo to an editor.

Mike Nelson (In favour of one): Support Stephen's argument.

Patrick Nielsen Hayden (In favour of two): Been trying the education route for at least a decade.

John Pomeranz (In favour of one): Difficult for the reader to understand the value of a book editors work, we should carry on trying the single amendment.

Joni Brill Dashoff (In favour of two): Splitting the Art into two, we rescinded it when it didn't work, but it was a useful experiment, let's try it again with this. Make it a real choice for real nominators.

Sharon Sbarsky (In favour of one): We also amended the wording of the Single Hugo by removing the magazine specification, which should make it clearer for nominators.

Ben Yalow (In favour of two): Clear that education isn't working, so we should go with the split, and we could delete 3.3.x next year at ratification if we wanted.

Jill Eastlake (Point of Inquiry): How do we know who's eligible?

Chair: One of the more popular category so fans seem to know.

Ed Green (In favour of one): Not sure we'll find it as easy to reverse out of this Hugo as we think.

James Stanley Daugherty (In favour of two): Best way of educating fans, is to try two categories.

Stephen Boucher (In favour of one): Not much effort to educate so far.

Kevin Standlee (In favour of two) We have found (see the Best Original Artwork category) we can easily reverse Hugo category decisions if we really need to, although it may take a couple of years to do so. This is a case where we cannot easily run a test category; we really must try some change in order to find out if it will work.

John Douglas (In favour of two): There's a sufficient number of people in both categories to make these work. Once book editors know there may be a chance to win, they will work harder at education...

Motion to substitute ("One Hugo" version) fails 39 to 20, leaving the "Two Hugo" version as the remaining main motion.

Mike Nelson: Does this motion only cover fiction works?

Mark Olsen: Yes, but we feel other editors are covered elsewhere.

Peter Wilkinson: The motion removes the current definition of professional, what about where that is referred to in other award definitions?

Chair: That becomes a matter for Hugo administrators.

Mark Olsen: We've known for some time that this professional definition was broken for at least twenty years.

Call the question moved and seconded.

Motion passes 51 to 6.

A five minute recess was called; meeting reconvened at 11:10.

2. Worldcon Reports

All business was completed at the preliminary Business Meeting.

3. Business Passed On from Noreascon 4

3.1 Short Title: BDP: Movies and Television

Craig Miller (Favour): Strictly clarification of what the original committee intended to make life easier for Hugo administrators.

Kent Bloom (Against): Makes no substantive change, and attempts to perfect the imperfectable.

Ben Yalow (Favour): This merely codifies what the original meeting intended.

John Pomeranz (Against): It was not at all clear that there was a TV / film choice.

Priscilla Olson (Favour): I think it's necessary to clarify this, and it should have been done earlier, but it's clear that administrators have in practice been splitting them into movie and TV, so we should follow the administrators.

Jarold Dashoff (Against): This still doesn't cover other forms of presentation than TV and movies – theatre, advertising, etc... You're killing everything else.

Mark Olson (Favour): Time split still governs, but gives the administrator some guidance on what to do when it's in the 20% movement zone.

John Pomeranz (Against): Will Mr Olson yield? Language is not clear to me.

Chair: Rule that “complete running time” modifies “theatrical feature / television program or other production” in 3.3.6 and 3.3.7.

Pat McMurray (Against): Legislative history exists in the form of the minutes.

Kevin Standlee (Favour): When something is vague in the Constitution, we should hard-code it, administrators often do not refer to the legislative history in practice.

Gary Feldbaum (Against): If we only want to clarify what to do in the grey zone then this may create a conflict. *Move* to substitute for the entire motion a resolution of the Business Meeting on what to do in the event of a conflict on timing.

It is the sense of the Business Meeting that if production is nominated and falls in the time zone and is a theatrical presentation it belongs automatically in the Long Form and if it is a TV program it belongs automatically in the Short Form.

Ben Yalow (Point of Order) That is not in order unless we vote down the main motion, as it is not germane.

Chair: Rule that when a motion is up for ratification it is in order to replace that amendment by a resolution of the Business Meeting, and that such substitution automatically defeats the amendment.

Ben Yalow (Against): A resolution will not be included in the ballot and may also be missed by administrators.

Beth Zipser (Favour): The language as stated in the amendment is obfuscatory and believe that the amended language will create much more confusion.

James Stanley Daugherty (Against): Language in original motions seems perfectly clear.

John Pomeranz (Favour): Given the choice of confusing the voters and confusing the administrator, the administrator is much more likely to be able to deal with these final points.

Priscilla Olson (against): Think voters are already confused, and clear language in the Constitution seems better.

Martin Easterbrook (Favour): There is a conflict between the vague desire that one should cover TV and one should cover film, and the running time issue. (Martin wished his shirt minuted: “Joss Wheedon is my master now.”)

Kevin Standlee (Against): Can't expect voters to go through all the minutes for minor details. The legislative intents of what we intended was clear, so we need to clarify.

Joni Brill Dashoff (Favour): If what we're doing is trying to rule based on minutes, the minutes will confuse voters.

Linda Deneroff (Against): The resolution and the amendment are the same, but everyone would see the amendment.

Gary Feldbaum (Favour): This language isn't clear and provides guidance to neither administrators nor voters.

Mark Olson: Move to extend debate long enough for me to answer Gary.

Passed without objection.

Mark Olson (Point of Inquiry): Could podium staff reword 3.3.6 and 3.3.7 to clarify the wording – to make the 90 minutes clearer?

Chair: Yes, we will attempt to do so.

Motion to amend is lost, return to original motion.

Motion is ratified on a vote by show of hands.

3.2 Short Title: Keep Movin', Movin', Movin', Though They're Disapprovin'

Kevin Standlee (Favour): Think this solves the problem.

Motion is ratified on a vote by show of hands.

3.3 Short Title: Counting Votes (and Breaking Ties)

Motion is ratified on a vote by show of hands.

4. New Business

4.1. Resolutions

Ben Yalow: Move to amend the first “direct” to “request”. Don't believe it's proper to direct Hugo Administrators in this way.

Mark Olson (Against): We're in charge, we can direct.

Kevin Standlee (Favour): Wouldn't want to set a precedent that a Business Meeting can set directions this way without amending the Constitution.

Amendment passes 26-22.

Motion was carried on a vote by show of hands.

4.2. Standing Rules Amendments

All business was completed at the preliminary Business Meeting.

4.3. Constitutional Amendments

4.3.1 Short Title: Keeping Up Appearances

Kevin Standlee (Favour): We have ruled that published has its meaning under copyright law, but this has been debated by some fans, so we need to clarify this issue.

Mark Olson (Against): Haven't really had time to consider this yet, and would like to think about it. Move to refer to NP&FS Committee.

Motion to refer passes so the Amendment is referred back to NP& FSC.

4.3.2 Short Title: Best Editor Split

Resolved earlier.

5. Site Selection Business

5.1. Report of the 2008 Site Selection & Presentation by Winners

Kevin Standlee: Interaction will work with our successors next year.

5.2. Reports by seated Worldcons & NASFiC

5.2.1. CascadiaCon (2005 NASFiC)

Represented by Glenn Glazer.

5.2.2 L.A.con IV (2006)

Represented by Christian McGuire.

Peter Wilkinson: What will happen to site selection for members of Interaction who are not members of L.A.con IV?

L.A.con IV already has merchant site and Paypal so voting fees will be accepted electronically, and Interaction will mail ballots, funds permitting.

5.2.3 Nippon 2007

Report was attached to minutes.

Jim Briggs: Nearest Hilton?

Nippon 2007: Tokyo City

5.3. Presentation by future Worldcon bids

5.3.1. Presentation by bidders for 2008

Denver and Chicago: Both have tables and will be happy to answer questions.

5.3.2. Presentation by bidders for years after 2008

KC2009: Another party tonight, please come talk to us.

6. Adjournment

Small correction to yesterday's report of WRG, did not mean to imply that the Noreascon 4 website and the WRG projects will be amalgamated.

MPC meeting will be held in the Forth room tomorrow at 11AM.

6.1. Adjournment *Sine Die*

Meeting adjourned *sine die* in memory of KIM Campbell at 11:58