

**MINUTES OF THE 2009 WSFS BUSINESS MEETING  
ANTICIPATION, THE 2009 WORLDCON  
Friday August 7, Saturday August 8, and Sunday August 9, 2009  
Including Business Passed On from Denvention 3**

All meetings were held in room 518BC of the Palais des Congrès, Montreal, Quebec, Canada. The head table officers were:

Presiding Officer:	Kevin Standlee
Deputy	Tim Illingworth
Timekeeper:	Jared Dashoff
Secretary:	Linda Deneroff
Videographer	Lisa Hayes

*[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. These minutes are complete and accurate to the best of my knowledge, based on contemporaneous notes and verified against the video. 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 usually 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 counted “serpentine” vote is held.

The Chairman advised the members that the meeting is being recorded at his direction per Standing Rule 1.6, and that other members may make their own recordings and distribute them at their discretion.

## **Preliminary Business Meeting, Friday, August 7, 2009**

The meeting was called to order at 10:10 a.m. The business meeting staff consisted of Kevin Standlee, Chairman; Tim Illingworth, Deputy Chairman; Linda Deneroff, Secretary, Jared Dashoff, Timekeeper; and Lisa Hayes, Videographer.

### **1. COMMITTEE REPORTS** **1.1 Mark Protection Committee** **(Including Nominations for MPC)**

The report of the Mark Protection Committee (“MPC”) is attached and incorporated into these minutes. The Hugo Awards committee is a subcommittee of the Mark Protection Committee, and at the MPC meeting on Thursday, August 6, the report of the Hugo Award Marketing Committee was ratified, adopted and incorporated into the MPC report. There was no financial statement in the MPC report, but the treasurer reported that there is approximately \$8,300 in its account, thanks mostly to Denvention, which donated an amount above that required.

The most significant accomplishment this year is through the Hugo Awards Marketing Committee, which launched a contest to design an official logo for the Hugo Awards. There were 390 entries from 24 countries, and the winner will be announced at this year’s Hugo Awards. SCIFI donated \$500 to the winner as a prize; the MPC funded production of an engraved crystal trophy; and Neil Gaiman donated several signed books for the winner, who was unable to attend Anticipation.

There are no motions from the MPC at this time at this time.

The current members of the Mark Protection Committee are:

- **Elected 2006, term ending in 2009:** Scott Dennis (Central), Donald Eastlake III (East), Ruth Sachter (West);
- **Elected 2007, term ending in 2010:** Ben Yalow (East), Kevin Standlee (West), Tim Illingworth (RotW);
- **Elected 2008, term ending in 2011:** Stephen Boucher (RoTW), Mark Olson (East), Linda Deneroff (West).
- **Worldcon Representatives:** Nippon 2007 - Bob Macintosh; Archon 31, the 9th NASFiC – Steve Norris; Denvention 3 – Kent Bloom; Anticipation – Adrienne Seel; Aussiecon 4 – Mark Linneman.

The terms of Scott Dennis, (Central) Don Eastlake (East), and Ruth Sachter (West) have expired. Due to zone residency restrictions, we can elect at most one person from the Western zone, three from the Central zone, one person from the Eastern zone, and three people from the Rest of the World, but not more than three people overall. (Write-in votes are allowed, but write-in candidates must submit their

consent to election by the close of balloting.) Without objection, the incumbent members of the MPC were nominated, and there were no other nominations. With nominations closed, the nominees have till 5 p.m. today to make written acceptances. The election will be held on Saturday.

## **1.2 Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee**

The Nitpicking and Flyspecking Committee members are Don Eastlake, Tim Illingworth, Pat McMurray and Kevin Standlee. Their report is attached, as well as those Resolutions and Rulings of Continuing Effect passed at Denvention are attached and incorporated into these minutes.

## **1.3 Worldcon Runners Guide Editorial Committee**

The Worldcon Runners' Guide Editorial Committee members are Bill Taylor (Chair), Sharon Sbarsky and any others appointed by the Chair of the committee. Their report is attached and incorporated into these minutes. The committee was reappointed under its existing charter and members. They have asked for guidance on a privacy policy, copyright notices, and creative commons copyright. Without objection, these items have been referred back to the committee with the instruction that they craft a specific set of recommendations for the business meeting to consider. The business meeting also instructed the Worldcon Runners Guide Editorial Committee to make their document as generally available and accessible as possible.

## **1.4 Hugo Eligibility Rest of the World (HEROW) Committee**

Members of this committee are: Vincent Docherty (Chair), Todd Dashoff, , Paul Haggerty, Colin Harris, Tim Illingworth, Saul Jaffe, Perriane Lurie, Jim Mann, Mark Olson, Kevin Standlee, Gayle Surrette, and Ben Yalow. Their report is attached and incorporated into these minutes. The "We Need Another Hero" resolution to continue the committee was adopted, and those wishing to join this committee were instructed to see the Business Meeting Chairman after the meeting. The second motion, "This Year's Model," extending eligibility for works originally published outside the U.S." was also adopted without objection. Kevin Maroney asked how broadly WSFS defines "outside the U.S." The Chair replied that this is left to the Hugo Administrators. Vince Docherty announced his resignation from the committee.

## **1.5 Formalization of Long List Entries (FOLLE) Committee**

The FOLLE Committee members are Mark Olson (Chair), Vincent Docherty, Dave Grubbs, Colin Harris, Richard Lynch, Craig Miller, Joe Siclari, and Kevin Standlee. Their report is attached and hereby incorporated into these minutes. The committee is still working on Nippon's total membership numbers because they do not yet know what these numbers represent, and they are trying to be careful. The

committee does not want to publish numbers and then revise them, because that causes confusion.

There were two proposed changes to Long List, but the committee concluded there was not sufficient evidence to warrant a change. The committee tries, whenever possible, to rely on contemporary written documentation. There is also a project underway to understand the details of early Hugo awards, which will probably lead to a lot of footnotes in the documentation. They have discovered some interesting things, such as one Hugo award that appeared in three different publications, each with a different title (which will be documented with a footnote). Ben Yalow asked if there were an electronic address to wish questions could be referred. Mr. Olson responded that there is one, but did not have it readily available, but it's probably on the WSFS website.

Rich Lynch pointed out that the report as presented did not represent a consensus of the committee membership, and he proposed two amendments. The first one was to strike the last bullet in the report entirely. Mr. Lynch argued that that the fourth bullet item seems to leave open the possibility (and it has already happened and been corrected) that some of the early Hugo Awards could be reclassified as non-Hugo Awards. An example of this is the one for Forest Ackerman. We should not leave the door open for reclassification of any of the early Hugo Awards. Mr. Olson said the committee has no desire to un-Hugo any award and explained that when the error was made regarding Mr. Ackerman's Hugo Award, the error was corrected. Unfortunately, this took several months to correct, but it was never the intention to change the status of that award. Mr. Lynch responded that it's a matter of oversight. It took too long and required extraordinary proof to make the correction to a change that should not have been made in the first place. Kent Bloom noted that if we're going to have the committee, we should not insist that the committee bring all its debates and decisions to the business meeting. If we want to freeze the Long List in its current form, we should dismiss the committee. It's done very good work, and if it's done, then it's done. If it's not done, we should not be second-guessing it. The amendment to strike the bullet failed to garner enough votes and did not pass.

Rick Lynch also made a motion (slightly modified by David Maroney) that any changes to the Hugo Awards Long List that are not unanimously approved by the committee be reported to the business meeting for its approval. Ben Yalow reported that there are conflicting documents all over the place, and they need to be resolved, but the last thing the Business Meeting needs is dueling documents arguments, but if this motion passes, that's exactly what will happen. Ms. Kathryn Cramer said if it took a year to correct something, then something needs to be done. There needs to be a mechanism for fixing mistakes quickly, and on the other hand, if there is some real question, there does need to be oversight to avoid embarrassments. Winton Mathews thought "unanimous" is ridiculous because if one person votes against something, the issue would be forwarded to the Business Meeting. The Chair pointed out that the method of unanimous consent only means that if no one objects, the item is adopted unanimously. Rick Kovalcik suggested

abandoning this amendment and making it a standing rule. Don Eastlake then moved to suspend the rules to allow a second order amendment on this amendment. However, Mr. Eastlake's motion failed to garner the two-thirds vote required to suspend the rules, so the second-order amendment could not be introduced. Regarding the original amendment, Kent Bloom felt that the motion was entirely unnecessary since anything a committee of the business meeting is subject to review and can always be brought to the attention of the business meeting by a single member in the form of a motion to change or modify. Upon a vote of the business meeting, the motion to amend the motion to continue the committee failed, and the committee was continued with its current membership for another year without any changes to its instructions.

Colin Harris suggested collating and publishing the rules of procedures of voting on the WSFS website. He felt that not many people know what the decision-making processes are for the various committees, which ones need unanimity, which ones have quorums. He proposed a motion to collate and publish the rules and procedures that govern the WSFS committees on the WSFS website. This item will be further discussed in new business.

## **2. WORLDCON REPORTS**

### **2.1 Past Worldcons & NASFiC**

The Chairman of the Business Meeting commended all the Worldcon committees for having submitted these documents in machine readable form to the Business Meeting Secretary in sufficient time for her to collate them together into a single document and make them available in advance of the Business Meeting.

#### **2.1.1 Millennium Philcon (2001)**

The report of the Millennium Philcon is attached. It has not yet disposed of its surplus, and therefore this is not its final report. Todd Dashoff reported there is no set schedule for preparing a final report to WSFS.

#### **2.1.2 LACon IV (2006)**

The report of LACon IV is attached. It has not yet disposed of its surplus, and therefore this is not its final report.

#### **2.1.3. Nippon (2007)**

Nippon 2007 reported a loss last year, so they have met all their requirements and have nothing further to report. Hiroaki Inoue, the Nippon chair, reported that they are in the process of filling in minus balances and could not yet give out the correct report. The Chair pointed out that, having lost money, Nippon has submitted a final report and is not required to file any further reports, though they may do so if they wish.

#### **2.1.4 Archon 31, the 9th NASFiC (2007)**

The final report of Archon 31 is attached. They reported a loss and have met all their requirements. No further reporting is required.

#### **2.1.5 Denvention 3 (2008)**

The report of Denvention 3 is attached. They do not know how much their total surplus will be, but they intend to distribute the remainder of their balance before the next Worldcon.

### **2.2. Seated Worldcons & NASFiC**

#### **2.2.1 Anticipation**

The report of Anticipation is attached. The Business Meeting Chair would not accept any questions regarding their finances at this time, saying "It isn't fair."

#### **2.2.2 Aussiecon 4**

The report of Aussiecon 4 is attached. There will be an opportunity for Question Time at Sunday's meeting.

### **3. BUSINESS PASSED ON FROM DENVENTION 3**

The following constitutional amendments were approved at Denvention 3 and passed on to Anticipation for ratification. If ratified, they will become part of the Constitution at the conclusion of Anticipation. The Preliminary Business Meeting may not pass or reject constitutional amendments awaiting ratification, but must set debate time limits for their consideration at the Main Business Meeting.

#### **3.1 Short Title: Marking Peter Weston's Contribution**

*Moved*, to amend Section 3.5 of the WSFS Constitution to reflect the contribution of Peter Weston in refining the current design of the Hugo Award trophy while continuing to recognize the efforts of the original designers, by adding words as follows:

**Section 3.5: Name and Design.** The Hugo Award shall continue to be standardized on the rocket ship design of Jack McKnight and Ben Jason as refined by Peter Weston. 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.

**Debate time was set as 1 minute.**

## 3.2 Short Title: One Fewer Award

*[Secretary: There is obviously a complex interaction between this motion and that at 3.3. If both motions are ratified the Secretary will resolve the texts so as to maintain the sense of both motions. Specifically, the ratification of item 3.3 does **not** restore constitution Section 3.3.11.]*

*Moved*, to amend the WSFS Constitution for the purpose of eliminating the Best Semiprozine category while preventing works that currently qualify as semiprozines from competing in the Best Fanzine category by ~~striking out~~ and adding words as follows:

1. Strike out Subsection 3.3.11, Best Semiprozine:

~~**3.3.11: 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. Amend Subsection 3.3.12 to include a definition of works formerly considered semiprozines, making them ineligible for Best Fanzine:

**3.3.12: 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 meets no more than one (1) 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.

Any publication may declare itself ineligible for this category for a particular year.

3. Strike out references to semiprozine in sections 3.3.13 and 3.3.14:

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

**3.3.14: 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.

**Debate Time was set as 30 minutes.**

### **3.3 Short Title: Making the Web Eligible**

*[Secretary: There is obviously a complex interaction between this motion and that at 3.2. If both motions are ratified the Secretary will resolve the texts so as to maintain the sense of both motions. Specifically, the ratification of item 3.3 does not restore Constitution section 3.3.11]*

*Moved:* To amend Sec 3.3 to clarify the eligibility of works published in electronic or other non-print forms by ~~striking out~~ and adding words as follows:

Amend 3.3.5 as follows:

**3.3.5: 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 or which has been substantially modified during the previous calendar year, and which is either non-fiction or, if fictional, is noteworthy primarily for aspects other than the fictional text, and which is not eligible in any other category.

Amend 3.3.8 as follows:

**3.3.8: Best Editor Short Form.** The editor of at least four (4) anthologies, collections or magazine issues (or their equivalent in other media) primarily devoted to science fiction and / or fantasy, at least one of which was published in the previous calendar year.

Amend 3.3.11 as follows:

**3.3.11: 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 (or the equivalent in other media), 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 (1,000) 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.

Amend 3.3.12 as follows:

**3.3.12: 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 (or the equivalent in other media), at least one (1) of which appeared in the previous calendar year, and which does not qualify as a semiprozine.

**Debate time was set as 10 minutes.**

### **3.4 Short Title: Short Title Best Graphic Story**

*Moved to amend the WSFS Constitution by adding the following:*

**3.3.X: Best Graphic Story.** Any science fiction or fantasy story told in graphic form appearing for the first time in the previous calendar year.

*Provided that this category shall be automatically repealed unless ratified by the 2012 Business Meeting.*

**Debate time set was as 15 minutes.**

## 4. NEW BUSINESS

### 4.1. Resolutions

#### 4.1.1 Extending Eligibility

Items under this heading may be voted upon and final action taken by the Preliminary Business Meeting.

*Moved:* To extend for one year the eligibility of *The Seven Beauties of Science Fiction* by Istvan Csicsery-Ronay, published on 26 November 2008 by Wesleyan University Press, based on limited availability, as authorized by Section 3.4.

Proposed by: Farah Mendlesohn

Seconded by: Niall Harrison

This resolution extends eligibility for the Hugo Award under Section 3.4; therefore, it requires a three-fourths vote.

#### **Commentary:**

1) *The Seven Beauties of Science Fiction* had an official publication date in late 2008, but it was not widely distributed until 2009. Review copies were not sent out until 2009.

2) The book did not arrive either to those who ordered copies, or those who were sent review copies, until late January 2009. The very first review came out on February 14, 2009 at a blog called The Feminist Review (<http://feministreview.blogspot.com>), and the first review in a science fiction venue was at Strange Horizons on March 30, 2009.

3) Furthermore because this is a non-fiction book the majority of its notice can be expected to be in the critical journals, and these have a three-month time-lag. Reviews are due from the *Journal of the Fantastic in the Arts*, *Science Fiction Studies*, *New York Review of Science Fiction*, *Extrapolation*, and *Foundation*, but none of these came out until spring 2009 because all these journals are on schedules that run from every second month to every fourth month.

Debate time was set at 5 minutes. Requires three-fourths vote.

#### **Discussion:**

The maker of the motion was not present. Cheryl Morgan spoke in favor, feeling that the book deserved recognition. No one else spoke. Without objection, the resolution passed, and the eligibility of this specific work was extended for one year.

#### **4.1.2 Short Title: Promoting Worldcon**

*Resolved*, That WSFS convention committees (Worldcons and NASFiCs) are encouraged to be more proactive in marketing their conventions, including having a prominent and positive presence at Dragon\*Con, Comic-Con International, and other major events of a similar nature such as the Chicago and New York Comic Cons; and for non North American Worldcons, similar events where there is potential to attract new book readers to Worldcon.

*Resolved*, That WSFS convention committees are encouraged to market their conventions to younger book readers who may not be aware of the existence of their conventions by organizing book giveaways and other targeted marketing within their local area.

Proposed by: James Bacon, Vincent Docherty

Debate time was set at 5 minutes

#### **Discussion:**

Mr. Bacon felt we need to out-reach to book-reading fans. This has been tried in the U.K. and been successful in attracting new fans to NatCon. The chair pointed out that this is a resolution and has no binding effect on Worldcon committees. It does not, and cannot, order them to do this, but the resolution would go into the Resolutions of Continuing Effect maintained by the Nitpicking and Flyspecking Committee. Kent Bloom pointed out that while this is a laudable goal, we cannot ask Worldcons to do this if they do not already have the resources. Kathryn Cramer said, as a parent who takes children to conventions, a lot of conventions are “child unfriendly” and fandom would be better served if leftover Worldcon funds were given to smaller conventions for childcare services and/or children’s programming so parents can introduce their children to conventions. Charles Barkley said we ought to at least *try* to go to ComiCon, Dragon\*Con and other venues and promote our significance and cultural history. Debate was extended by one minute, and Mark Olson said that while reasonable people may disagree as to whether this motion accomplishes the intended goals, no one disagrees on the goals. However, let’s not get into the business of putting more advice in the rules. Vince Docherty felt this is an eminently achievable goal.

The affirmative was in the majority, the resolution passed, and the Nitpicking and Flyspecking Committee was reminded to put this into its report of continuing resolutions.

#### **4.1.3 Short Title: A Committee on Committees**

*Moved*, to instruct the NP&FSC to review the governance and operation of all business meeting committees and include the results of this review in its next report.

While the above motion was new business, the Chair felt that this was an appropriate time to discuss it. The motion made by Colin Harris and seconded by Perianne Lurie. Hearing no objections, the motion was adopted by acclamation and without discussion.

## **4.2 Standing Rules Amendments**

*Items under this heading may be voted upon and final action taken by the Preliminary Business Meeting. Standing rules amendments take effect at the conclusion of the 2009 Business Meeting unless given earlier effect by specific provision and a two-thirds vote. In all amendments, new text is shown in underline type and stricken text is shown in ~~strikethru type~~.*

No items were brought before the Business Meeting.

## **4.3 Constitutional Amendments**

*Items under this heading have not yet received first passage, and will become part of the constitution only if passed at Anticipation and ratified at Aussiecon 4. The Preliminary Business Meeting may amend items under this heading, set debate time limits, refer them to committee, and take other action as permitted under the Standing Rules.*

### **4.3.1 Short Title: Youth Memberships**

*Moved,* To require WSFS conventions to sell discounted memberships to younger persons, by adding text as follows:

1. Amend subsection 1.5.7:

**1.5.7:** Other memberships and fees shall be at the discretion of the Worldcon Committee except as provided in section 1.A.

2. Inserting the following new section after existing section 1.5:

#### **Section 1.A: Youth Memberships.**

**1.A.1:** Notwithstanding any of the other provisions in section 1.5, Worldcons shall provide for discounted attending memberships for younger persons, as provided in the following sections.

**1.A.1.1: Young Adult.** Ages: Between 18 and 25. Maximum price: 50% of an unrestricted attending membership. Membership rights: All attending membership rights including voting.

**1.A.1.2: Teen.** Ages: Between 13 and 17. Maximum price: 25% of an unrestricted attending membership. Membership rights: All attending membership rights including voting.

1.A.1.3: Youth. Ages: Between 7 and 12. Maximum price: 20% of an unrestricted attending membership. Membership rights: Right to attend (possibly with restrictions on when and where), but not voting rights.

1.A.1.4: Child. Ages: Less than 7. Maximum price: Free with an accompanying paying Adult or Young Adult member. Membership rights: Attendance in the custody of a paying Adult or Young Adult, but not voting rights.

1.A.2: All ages referenced in this subsection are the age of the person as of the first day of the convention.

1.A.3: All ranges of ages are inclusive.

1.A.4: The percentages specified in this section are to be applied to the undiscounted basic attending membership price of the convention at all times.

1.A.5: Conventions may sell memberships to these classes of persons at costs lower than those specified in this section.

1.A.6: Memberships purchased under the provisions of this section may be transferred to any other person who would otherwise meet the age criteria for that membership.

1.A.7: A person may buy a membership at a higher (less discounted) level than the one for which s/he would otherwise be qualified. A person who does so shall have the membership rights for the class s/he purchases.

3. Include the following provision following Section 1.A:

*Provided that Section 1.A shall apply only to conventions selected in and after the year following the ratification of this amendment. This provision shall be included in the text of the Constitution until the end of the fourth Worldcon after its ratification, and thereafter shall automatically be removed from the Constitution.*

Moved by: James Bacon, Vincent Docherty

### **Objection to Consideration:**

Perianne Lurie made a motion to object to consideration of this motion, which was seconded. A two-thirds vote *against* consideration of this motion was required. There were 22 votes in favor of consideration; 30 were opposed. Since there was less than a two-thirds vote in opposition, the objection to consideration failed.

**Discussion:**

The Chair pointed out that the only thing in order at this time is technical discussion, amendments to the motion and setting the time limit, not substantive debate.

Jared Dashoff moved to amend by substitution, converting this motion from a constitutional amendment to a resolution:

*Resolved*, that future WSFS conventions shall sell discounted memberships to younger persons in the schedule shown in Item 1.A [Youth Memberships, see above in these minutes].

Debate time was set at 10 minutes, including five minutes for debate on this motion to convert the amendment to a resolution.

Mr. Dashoff the Younger said that he realized some Worldcons might not be able to afford to offer a youth membership, which is why he would prefer this be a resolution. The vote to amend this motion by substitution passed.

The provision as to when the motion would take effect goes away because the motion is now a resolution. Debate time was set at ten minutes.

Mr. Kent Bloom then proposed an amendment to the resolution, moving that the words “at all times” be struck and the words “at the door” be substituted in Section 1.A.4 of the resolution, arguing that there are too many classes of memberships to try to do this prior to the convention. Mr. Dashoff the Elder felt that since this was a resolution, we did not need to fiddle with the bells and whistles. Additionally, pre-registrations are far cheaper than at-the-door memberships. Jane Carnall felt that offering reduced memberships would be just as complicated at the door.

Leslie Turek suggested defeating this particular amendment and then creating a new amendment that would strike out all information above to remove the specifics and let each Worldcon figure out how to handle reduced memberships, foreshadowing another resolution. The motion to strike out “at all times” and substitute “at the door” failed and the amendment was not carried.

The question then to be considered was the resolution, which does not need to be voted on again next year. Ms. Linda Ross-Mansfield asked if voting rights are affected. The Chair explained that voting rights are addressed in the resolution. The young adult and teen memberships would have all WSFS voting rights, but youth and child memberships would not have voting rights.

Ms. Turek proposed to strike everything after the word “persons” so that the motion would now read:

*Resolved*, that the business meeting recommends that future WSFS conventions sell discounted memberships to younger persons.

Ms. Turek added that because this is a resolution, it was inappropriate to get into administrative details. It's up to the Worldcon committees to decide the best way to implement the resolution. Lincoln Kliman spoke against striking everything in the resolution on the floor and foreshadowed another amendment to remove the percentages only and keeping the voting rights as outlined in the original amendment.

All time on this motion expired, including the underlying resolution. The vote on Ms. Turek's motion to amend passed and the resolution was accordingly amended. (Mr. Kliman's foreshadowed amendment was therefore moot.) With all debate time expired, the vote was taken on the final version of the resolution and it carried. The Nitpicking and Flyspecking committee was directed to put this in with its resolutions of continuing effect, to which Tim Illingworth said, "At least it's short." Mr. Bacon then thanked the head table for its assistance in creating his constitutional amendment.

#### **4.3.3 Short Title: Female Hugo Award Nominees**

*Moved*, to amend the WSFS Constitution by inserting the following into the end of Section 3.8:

**3.8.n** If in the written fiction categories, no selected nominee has a female author or co-author, the highest nominee with a female author or co-author shall also be listed, provided that the nominee would appear on the list required by Section 3.11.4

The above amendment was a new piece of business handed in late. The consideration of this motion was objected to, and a two-thirds vote was necessary to suppress the motion. In response to a technical question about the effect of the proposal, the Chair explained that an objection to consideration has to be considered without debate or any further consideration of the motion, so he couldn't address any questions about the proposal. Substantially more than two-thirds objected to consideration, and the motion was killed without debate.

## **5. SITE SELECTION BUSINESS**

The chair reiterated that all items under this section are scheduled for Sunday, including question time for seated Worldcons, announcement of site selection business and presentations.

## **6. QUESTIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The chair announced that there would be a recess at the first natural break in the meeting during the Sunday meeting, but no earlier than 11 a.m., for the Worldcon Chairs' photo opportunity.

Kathryn Cramer asked if people might vote by proxy or in advance at Saturday's Main Business Meeting since there are those who are scheduled against the meeting. The answer is no: you must be present when the vote is called in order to vote on WSFS business.

The meeting adjourned at 12:13 p.m.

## **Business Meeting, Saturday, August 8, 2009**

The meeting was called to order at 10:06 a.m. The business meeting staff consisted of Kevin Standlee, Chairman; Tim Illingworth, Deputy Chairman; Linda Deneroff, Secretary, Jared Dashoff, Timekeeper; and Lisa Hayes, Videographer.

### **1. COMMITTEE REPORTS**

#### **1.1 Mark Protection Committee**

The incumbents, Scott Dennis (Central), Donald Eastlake III (East), and Ruth Sachter (West), accepted nominations in writing for new three-year terms on the Mark Protection Committee without violating zone residency restrictions. At the suggestion of the Chair, the rules were suspended and the nominees were re-elected by unanimous consent.

#### **1.2 Other Committees**

The Chair announced his intention to appoint members to the other WSFS subcommittees at the Sunday business meeting and asked that anyone wishing to serve on such committees see the chair after the Saturday meeting.

### **2. WORLDCON REPORTS**

All Worldcon reports were received at the preliminary business meeting and were dealt with at that meeting.

### **3. BUSINESS PASSED ON FROM DENVENTION 3**

*The following Constitutional Amendments were approved at Denvention 3 and passed on to Anticipation for ratification. If ratified, they become part of the Constitution at the conclusion of Anticipation.*

#### **3.1 Short Title: Marking Peter Weston's Contribution**

*Moved*, to amend Section 3.5 of the WSFS Constitution to reflect the contribution of Peter Weston in refining the current design of the Hugo Award trophy while continuing to recognize the efforts of the original designers, by adding words as follows:

**Section 3.5: Name and Design.** The Hugo Award shall continue to be standardized on the rocket ship design of Jack McKnight and Ben Jason as refined by Peter Weston. 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.

**Discussion time: 1 minute.**

This amendment adds the name Peter Weston to Section 3.5, recognizing his work as the refiner of the current design of the Hugo Award. The constitutional amendment was ratified by unanimous consent without debate. [*Secretary: This must be a first!*]

**3.2 Short Title: One Fewer Award**

[*Secretary: There is obviously a complex interaction between this motion and that at 3.3. If both motions are ratified the Secretary will resolve the texts so as to maintain the sense of both motions. Specifically, the ratification of item 3.3 does **not** restore constitution Section 3.3.11.*]

*Moved*, to amend the WSFS Constitution for the purpose of eliminating the Best Semiprozine category while preventing works that currently qualify as semiprozines from competing in the Best Fanzine category by ~~striking out~~ and adding words as follows:

1. Strike out Subsection 3.3.11, Best Semiprozine:

~~**3.3.11: 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. Amend Subsection 3.3.12 to include a definition of works formerly considered semiprozines, making them ineligible for Best Fanzine:

**3.3.12: 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~~ meets no

more than one (1) 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.

Any publication may declare itself ineligible for this category for a particular year.

3. Strike out references to semiprozine in sections 3.3.13 and 3.3.14:

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

**3.3.14: 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.

**Discussion time: 30 minutes.**

The maker of the motion was Chris Barkley; it was seconded by Ben Yalow. Mr. Barkley said they felt the category needed to be overhauled, but it was never their intention to dishonor Charles N. Brown or Locus Magazine. He argued that whether the semiprozine Hugo is eliminated or kept, it needs to be changed.

Mark Olson asked whether we want to fix the category or destroy it. He proposed that it be fixed and that the solution is more competition, and that the item amendment on the agenda would show this.

Mr. Yalow said that in a strong Hugo category it is an honor just to be nominated. In strong categories, even brilliant works might not get nominated because there are other even more brilliant works. He did not feel this to be true in Best Semiprozine category. We want a category that will have many strong candidates.

Jo Rhett agreed with Mr. Barkley, that the category needs to be changed. But this is not change; this amendment would eliminate the category for at least two years and penalize the semiprozines. This is not the way to solve the problem. No one in the semiprozine category has ever been nominated in the long form/short form editor categories; this is the category for unpaid editors. There is no way that *Clarkesworld* or *Weird Tales* can seriously compete against the vast distribution

systems of the major professional magazines. Let's implement change before eliminating the category.

David Hartwell spoke against the amendment. He favored the category at its inception and apologized for not helping shape the contour of the award. He agreed with the need for reform, but argued that it should be done in a way that would not deprive anyone of being nominated while it was being modified.

Lew Wolkoff noted that some of the arguments about abolishing the semiprozine are somewhat similar to the arguments made regarding the dramatic presentation Hugo. We did not eliminate the Dramatic Presentation Hugo for two years while we were fixing it. We figured out how to solve the problem and addressed it. We should do the same for the Semiprozine Hugo.

Mr. Yalow added that he would propose an amendment that this amendment would go into effect in three years, provided it is ratified by the business committee at that time. That would give the business committee a chance to fix the category. If it cannot be fixed in two years, then the amendment would take effect. Mr. Olson objected on the grounds that the motion was impermissible since only one Worldcon would vote on the amendment. The chair ruled that Mr. Yalow was adding a provision to the constitutional amendment:

*Provided That this amendment shall take effect at the conclusion of the third Worldcon following its ratification, provided that the Business Meeting of that third Worldcon re-ratifies it.*

The motion to add this provision was seconded by Perianne Lurie, and the chair ruled that it would constitute a lesser change since it would amend the active ratification by postponing its effect.

### **3.2.1 Provision to Modify the Amendment**

**Discussion time: 5 minutes.**

Rick Katze asked if changes were made to this amendment in the third year, would it take only one business meeting to ratify those changes. The chair ruled that only changes of a lesser scope would be allowed. Other, different constitutional amendments may be made in the intervening years that might strike out this "sword of Damocles" over the Constitution.

Mr. Hartwell spoke in opposition. The original amendment has already been discussed. We need to consider revisions to the category. Dan Kimmel spoke in favor, believing this amendment solves the problem with the original amendment and allows us to focus on the real issue. Priscilla Olson spoke against the revision to the amendment, feeling that we will only have this discussion again in three years, and do we need to waste the time.

Mr. Wolkoff said it is human nature (and fannish nature as well) to avoid fixing a problem unless we must. This amendment uses the Sword of Damocles to make it

more likely that the problem will be fixed. Mr. Rhett appreciated the proposal, but pointed out that this will make the 2012 site selection a political matter for the people involved and influence how they vote for that year's Worldcon. Mr. Yalow closed by saying that the two-year provision will give the business meeting time to fix the problem with the semiprozine category correctly. The amendment to add the provision to the pending amendment passed 59 to 43, and the provision was added.

Discussion returned to the original amendment with the new provision added. Kent Bloom noted that in the entire history of the semiprozine category, only four magazines have won, and three of those four were professional magazines whose editors were paid. Only small circulation professional magazines are going to win this category. The original intent was to move some professional magazines out of the amateur category, and we've succeed in doing that, but we've made a mess of it.

Kathryn Cramer spoke regarding the impact on the fanzine category. Some semiprozines are only eligible by a hair and if the semiprozine category is abolished, they would be able to return to the fanzine category with minor modifications to their magazine. The last thing the fanzine category needs is the elimination of the semiprozine category, and the impact on fanzines must also be taken into account.

Susan De Guardiola has, for 15 years, listened to the argument that the semiprozine category is broken, and suggested it may take more than a sword of Damocles to fix it. While it is possible for the semiprozines to change their print run, change their circulation, etc., to qualify for the fanzine category, she has more respect for the editors of semiprozines than to think they would squeeze themselves into the fanzine category just to get a Hugo. Should they do this, she believed, the memberships of the Worldcon would not reward such activity. Further, the fanzine category would change if the next amendment to allow electronic media were ratified.

Warren Buff, in spite of voting for the amendment to the amendment, spoke against removing the category and would instead prefer to see the category become more robust. There have been 12 repeated nominations in the past decade in the semiprozine category, which is pretty comparable with the number of repeats in the fanzine categories. (The range is 10-15.)

Dr. Lurie argued that the category is broken, has been so for a long time and that it needs to be fixed. Reducing circulation just to get into the fanzine category will only hurt those magazines economically. Therefore she is not concerned with semiprozines beating up on the fanzines. This amendment will force us to fix the problem.

Colin Harris said the category has had one strong repeat winner. It has had roughly the same number of nominees over the last decade. We had two new nominees this year. We had had our slap on the back of the head, and there is at least one website

trying to raise the profile of alternate works. The supporters of the semiprozine are now aware of their need to contribute to the process of change. He argued that we have achieved our objective and urged people to vote against the amendment.

René Walling said perception is reality. The category was considered weak; the people who campaigned this year have made it stronger. He suggested the amendment be passed in order to make the category even stronger.

Seth Breidbart pointed out that the category has not been properly implemented any time in the last decade. It specifically says, “any generally available non professional publication.” How many nominees have told the IRS they are nonprofessional? We need some experience actually interpreting the category the way it was written before we can determine whether or not to remove it.

Chris Barkley closed the discussion in favor of the amendment. He is pleased that we all agree the category needs to be changed and has every confidence that over the next two years we will find a solution to the problem. He also encouraged everyone to continue to come to the business meeting and urge others to do so as well.

Cheryl Morgan addressed some of the issues raised about fanzines and qualifications. She pointed out that some magazines voluntarily removed themselves from the fanzine category because they were doing particularly well and did not want to hurt the fanzine community. Dave Langford took *Ansible* out of the fanzine category for that reason. Ms. Morgan did it when she wanted to pay people for *Emerald City*, because even though she paid contributors, she was still eligible in the fanzine category. Others remove their magazines from the fanzine category because they have ambitions to move it into the semiprozine category without having to compete with full-time professionals because they feel they could not compete in the professional category. That makes the semiprozine category a valuable thing to have. The semiprozines editors could also compete in the Best Editor categories, if they wish.

Stu Segal felt magazines deserve Hugos. Approving the amendment without a solution may mean we will never have a solution. We should find a modification before we eliminate the category.

Lastly, Bob Nielsen said the strength of the category is the strength of the winners, and he would love to be a winner in that category and is against the amendment.

After discussion, the vote to ratify the amendment with the new provision failed 32 to 73.

### **3.2.2 New Committee on Semiprozines**

Chris Barkley moved to create a new committee to discuss how to fix the semiprozine. The motion was seconded by many people.

*Moved*, To create a Committee on Semiprozines to study the Semiprozine Hugo Award category and prepare recommendations for modification for the improvement of this category.

**Discussion time: 10 minutes.**

Mr. Barkley asked anyone who is interested in fixing the semiprozine category to help prepare the “sausage and bacon” for the category (and the vegetarians can bring tofu). Those who wish to be on the committee should be prepared to spend time working on it. Mr. Breidbart proposed an amendment to the effect that the committee’s charge be to consider the restructuring of the semiprozine and related Hugos and to prepare recommendations for improvement of the categories. Without objection the amendment was accepted.

Mr. Olson proposed modifying the motion further to require that any proposals be made public at least 30 days before the Worldcon at which they would be considered.

An unidentified member spoke against the amendment noting that it does not specify under what media the discussion would take place thirty days before the convention, and where the discussion would be publicized.

Mr. Wolkoff asked whether the 30-day count begins from the start of the convention or the start of the business meeting. The chair ruled that the 30 days begins from the start of the convention.

After discussion, the vote to amend the creation of a new committee by requiring a 30-day discussion period prior to the convention carried.

The final motion to be voted upon is as follows:

*Moved*, To create a Committee on Semiprozines to study the Semiprozine Hugo Award category and related categories and prepare recommendations for modification for the improvement of the categories, provided that any proposals be made public at least 30 days before the Worldcon at which they would be considered.

The motion to close debate was adopted without objection.

The motion to create a new committee was also adopted without objection.

The chair chose Chris Barkley to initially chair the new committee, with further appointments to be announced at the Sunday meeting. Mr. Barkley will also have the authority to further expand the committee at his discretion.

The secretary was then directed to put information on how to sign up for the SMOFs email list into the minutes. (*Note: See the Sunday minutes for these instructions.*)

### 3.3 Short Title: Making the Web Eligible

*[Secretary: There is obviously a complex interaction between this motion and that at 3.2. If both motions are ratified the Secretary will resolve the texts so as to maintain the sense of both motions. Specifically, the ratification of item 3.3 does not restore constitution section 3.3.11]*

*Moved:* To amend Sec 3.3 to clarify the eligibility of works published in electronic or other non-print forms by ~~striking out~~ and adding words as follows:

Amend 3.3.5 as follows:

3.3.5: 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 or which has been substantially modified during the previous calendar year, and which is either non-fiction or, if fictional, is noteworthy primarily for aspects other than the fictional text, and which is not eligible in any other category.

Amend 3.3.8 as follows:

3.3.8: Best Editor Short Form. The editor of at least four (4) anthologies, collections or magazine issues (or their equivalent in other media) primarily devoted to science fiction and / or fantasy, at least one of which was published in the previous calendar year.

Amend 3.3.11 as follows:

3.3.11: 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 (or the equivalent in other media), 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 (1,000) 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.

Amend 3.3.12 as follows:

3.3.12: 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 (or the equivalent in other media), at least one (1) of which appeared in the previous calendar year, and which does not qualify as a semiprozine.

**Discussion time: 10 minutes.**

**Discussion:**

The makers of this motion were Ben Yalow and Susan De Guardiola. Mr. Yalow spoke first. He argued that electronic media is not new anymore. Words is words. It doesn't matter whether it's printed on paper or on screen. However, a couple of categories had restrictions. It's hard to argue that something that is not a book should fall in Best Related Book. This amendment would change the title to make it clear that we are giving the Hugos for content.

### **3.3.1 Modifying the Ratification of the Amendment**

Kathryn Cramer spoke against the amendment, specifically the portion regarding semiprozine content, contending that it should be referred to the newly created semiprozine committee since additional criteria needs to be added to define what constitutes a semiprozine in electronic form. In print, it would have been a limit of 10,000 copies, but that restriction doesn't apply in electronic format. She moved to modify the amendment so that Section 3.3.11 would not be ratified if the rest of the amendment were ratified. The chair ruled that it would be a lesser change since it would narrow the scope of ratification.

Mark Olson felt this modification of the amendment detracted from the original motion. He also suggested referring the entire amendment to the semiprozine committee since it is intimately tied to it (but did not actually make such a motion).

A motion to close debate on narrowing the scope of ratification by removing Section 3.3.11 from the original amendment was made and carried. The motion to amend the ratification by striking the changes to Section 3.3.11 failed. The changes as originally detailed remained in the pending constitutional amendment.

Debate resumed on the original amendment without any changes. Perianne Lurie suggested an amendment to clarify the words "average press run of at least 1,000 copies per issue" for the semiprozine, but the chair was unable to determine if this would be a greater or lesser change and recommended against attempting to amend the ratification in this fashion.

### **3.3.2 Modifying the Ratification Again**

Lew Wolkoff proposed another revision to Section 3.3.5 to remove the language "...or which has been substantially modified during the previous calendar year,..." as well as "...which is not eligible in any other category..." from the amendment and wished to insert "(or their equivalent in other media)" into the amendment in order to make this section consistent with the rest of the motion. The chair ruled that this would be a greater change and would require re-ratification.

[*Secretary's Note: As reworded by Mr. Wolkoff, Section 3.3.5 would read:*

*3.3.5: 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 (or their equivalent in other media) during the previous calendar year~~ (or their equivalent in other media) during the previous calendar year ~~or which has been substantially modified during the previous calendar year,~~ and which is either non-fiction or, if fictional, is noteworthy primarily for aspects other than the fictional text, ~~and which is not eligible in any other category.~~]*

The ruling of the Chair that this was a greater change was appealed, but the appeal was not seconded, and therefore the Chair's ruling stood.

Should Mr. Wolkoff's amendment pass, it would require that the entire amended proposal be ratified at next year's Worldcon. Mr. Dashoff the Elder suggested removing the additional text as Mr. Wolkoff proposed, but leaving the stricken text as it appears in the original amendment (i.e., "in book form") and not including the additional phrase "(or their equivalent in other media)".

Tom Veal favored the amendment precisely because it expanded the scope of the motion and would require an additional ratification next year. He felt a lot of technical clean up of the language was required, which could be accomplished by this delay. The chair ruled that, because this is a greater change, Mr. Wolkoff's revision would kill the ratification of this amendment and pass, first time only, a new constitutional amendment that would then be sent on to next year's Worldcon for ratification.

Lisa Hayes argued that the web today is a critically important part of science fiction today and felt we need a much more comprehensive look at the entire Hugo award base based on that fact. She felt the semiprozine committee should make its recommendations first as a basis to make radical changes to all the Hugo categories because the web is very pervasive in all categories.

A motion to extend debate on the revision failed to garner a two-thirds vote; Mr. Wolkoff's amendment failed; and a motion to extend debate on the original ratification also failed in a vote. Don Eastlake asked to suspend the rules to ratify each section separately, and that vote failed as well.

On a vote by show of hands, the original amendment was ratified.

### **3.4 Short Title: Short Title Best Graphic Story**

*Moved* to amend the WSFS Constitution by adding the following:

3.3.X: Best Graphic Story. Any science fiction or fantasy story told in graphic form appearing for the first time in the previous calendar year.

*Provided that this category shall be automatically repealed unless ratified by the 2012 Business Meeting.*

**Discussion time: 15 minutes.**

The provision in italics is a sunset clause. If the 2012 Worldcon does not take action to repeal the sunset clause, the category would be automatically removed from the constitution. It would be a single vote and not require a second ratification. The motion does not specify media. The chair was not prepared to rule on the question of whether a lesser change could be made in 2012; such a question is in the jurisdiction of the 2012 business meeting.

Chris Barkley was the maker of this motion. He felt this category was overdue and believed this category will be strong enough to survive a 2012 vote. Web-based material is implied in the text.

René Walling reported that for this year's "experimental" Best Graphic Story, the nominating and the voting were healthy, the voting was competitive, and the nominees were all strong.

Mark Olson felt that this is a bad amendment that ought to fail, but added that the only way we are going to find out is to pass it, give it a couple of years and judge it then. With debate closed, the amendment to the Constitution with the sunset clause was ratified by a vote by show of hands. If the 2012 business meeting does not take action, it will automatically be stricken. However, re-ratification of the amendment will not automatically be on the 2012 agenda; someone will have to make a motion to re-ratify the amendment, probably in the form of a motion to strike out the proviso. A motion to strike out the proviso at the 2012 business meeting would not be an ordinary constitutional amendment requiring ratification in a subsequent year, but would take effect immediately.

## **4. New Business**

### **4.1 Resolutions**

Seth Breidbart asked to suspend the rules in order to allow the introduction of a motion that "it is a sense of the business meeting that the Hugo administrators should enforce the nonprofessional clause in the wording of the definition of semiprozine." The motion to Suspend the Rules (2/3 required) and allow the introduction of new business passed 42 in favor and 17 opposed.

*Resolved*, that it is the sense of the business meeting that the Hugo administrators should enforce the nonprofessional clause in the wording of the definition of semiprozine.

The motion was seconded.

**Discussion time: 10 minute.**

**Discussion:**

Mr. Breidbart argued that since there is a problem with the semiprozine Hugo; it is equally clear that abolishing it is not what ought to be done. But he would like to have some experience with a semiprozine administered as it is defined in order to determine if further changes are necessary or desirable.

Mark Olson said this motion is flawed on two grounds: the first is a misunderstanding of what the word means. When the word “professional” was put in the constitution, it meant “pro zine,” and nonprofessional meant “non paying work for fiction.” Changing the wording should be done as a constitutional amendment because it’s a substantive change. Secondly, this motion is advising the Hugo Administrator to make an arbitrary judgment call.

Kathryn Cramer pointed out that by adding electronic media to Hugo eligibility, a better delineation between semi-professional and professional becomes crucial or very commercial entities would become eligible for the Semiprozine Hugo.

Ben Yalow said we know what professional meant when the semiprozine was written into the constitution: under 10,000 copies. We do not currently have a definition of professional because when we changed the Best Editor category, it removed the definition of professional and left it up to the voters. Therefore, it is up to the voters to decide; we as a business meeting said this when we changed the Best Editor category.

Dan Kimmel took issue with the idea that “when we did this thirty years ago, that’s what we meant.” He argued that when Supreme Court Justice Hugo Black would hear that type of argument, he would hold up the Constitution and ask “Where is it here?” If it’s not in writing, it doesn’t exist.

John Pomeranz agreed there is a problem, but agreed with Mr. Olson that the motion was an inappropriate solution. There is a need in constitutional analysis to interpret, and what was being asking here is who should interpret the word “professional.” We have a reasonable proxy of what we mean by professional in the existing language of the constitution, and the Semiprofessional Hugo Committee should address this further. But we don’t want to trump the voters.

Susan DeGuardiola pointed out that that a sense for the business meeting of a definition that is not shared with the general public is unfair and an inappropriate way to go about things. For all the debate on the word professional, a constitution

criterion for professional of “at least half the income of any one person” has been ignored by the Hugo administrators.

Cheryl Morgan agreed that there is confusion as to the meaning of the word professional and therefore it would be unfair of the business meeting to require next year’s Hugo Administrator to enforce something when it’s unclear what is to be enforced. And since we’re unsure of what the word means, if we pass this it could be seen as another attempt to remove certain magazines from the semiprofessional category.

Seth Breidbart closed by reiterating that the wording needs perfection, including the definition of professional. There are many definitions, but we can also ask each magazine whether it considers itself professional. If they publicly respond that theirs is a nonprofessional publication, we should accept that answer.

With debate closed, the motion to adopt this resolution failed on a vote by show of hands.

## **5. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 12:24 p.m.

## **Site Selection Business Meeting, Sunday, August 9, 2009**

The meeting was called to order at 10:11 a.m. The business meeting staff consisted of Kevin Standlee, Chairman; Tim Illingworth, Deputy Chairman; Linda Deneroff, Secretary, Jared Dashoff, Timekeeper; and Lisa Hayes, Videographer.

### **5. Site Selection Business**

#### **5.1 Report of the 2010 NASFiC and 2011 Worldcon Site Selections & presentation by winners**

Glenn Glazer, the site selection administrator, announced that Worldcon counting and NASFiC counting were done in parallel in two separate rooms. The entire process took one half-hour.

##### **5.1.1 Report of the 2010 NASFiC & presentation**

Site selection administrator, Glenn Glazer, certified the winner of the 2010 NASFiC as Raleigh, North Carolina, with 241 votes out of 276 cast and 3 invalid submissions. (See Appendix A at the conclusion of these minutes for the breakdown of voting.) Without objection, the administrator was ordered to destroy the site selection ballots for the NASFiC.

Warren Buff announced that the tenth occasional NASFiC will be called ReConstruction, to be held August 5-8, 2010, in Raleigh, North Carolina. The convention will be held in the Raleigh Convention Center, and the hotels will be the Marriott City Center and the Downtown Raleigh Sheraton. The guests of honor will be Eric Flint, Brad Foster, and Juanita Coulson. Toni Weisskopf will be the Toastmaster. The membership prices on the progress report will be good through the end of 2009. Warren thanked everyone who has helped the bid as well as the site selection administrator and staff, and announced his executive staff.

##### **5.1.2 Report of the 2011 Worldcon & presentation**

Site selection administrator, Glenn Glazer, certified the winner of the 2011 Worldcon as Reno, Nevada, with 650 votes out of 763 cast and 21 invalid submissions. (See Appendix B for the entire breakdown of voting.) Without objection, the administrator and the tellers were commended.

The chair commended the site selection administrator and the tellers for their due diligence and without objection instructed the site selection administrator to destroy all site selection ballots for the Worldcon.

Patty Wells announced that the 2011 Worldcon will be called Renovation, to be held August 17-21, 2011. The guests of honor will be Ellen Asher, Tim Powers, Boris Vallejo, and Charles N. Brown. The convention will be held at the Reno

Sparks Convention Center, and the hotels will be the Atlantis Hotel and the Peppermill. The membership prices on the progress report will be good through 30 April 2010. Patty thanked everyone who has helped the bid as well as the Reno Facilities and Tourist Board, and announced her executive staff.

### **5.1.3 Pass-Along Funds Presentation**

At the conclusion of the site selection results, the chair of Denvention 3, Kent Bloom, made a presentation. He explained that former Worldcons have an informal agreement that surplus funds be, at least partially, passed along to currently seated Worldcons. Denvention 3 received \$57,500 in pass-along funds from previous Worldcons, and in turn Denvention 3 had so far passed along \$40,000, split between Anticipation and Aussiecon 4. Mr. Bloom then announced that at this time Denvention 3 was giving an additional \$20,000 of pass-along funds to Renovation.

## **5.2 Question Time for the Seated Worldcon**

### **5.2.1 Aussiecon 4 (2010)**

Stephen Boucher spoke on behalf of Aussiecon 4. He did not make a presentation but, instead, answered questions.

- Hotel reservations will begin to be accepted probably around the time Progress Report 2 goes out, either late 2009 or early 2010.
- Melbourne's public transportation is arguably one of the best in the world, and there is a stop near the convention centre. Public transport runs till about 1 in the morning.
- The inner city tram network has handicapped access within the downtown area. The convention centre is brand new and has some of the best disabled access of any Worldcon site.
- Slaughtering of Englishmen will be confined to the cricket pitch.
- Hotel rates vary from the low \$100s to the low \$200s range, but the rates are not final. Currently, the rate at the main hotel will be approximately \$230 Australian. There is no tax added. Currently conversion is \$.83 U.S. to \$1.00 Australian. That's a very high rate; usually the rate is more around \$.72 to \$.75, so do not assume that \$.83 will be the exchange rate next year.
- The weather will depend on one's definition of "cold."
- The party site has not yet been determined; it will be the place that offers best corkage rate. There will be shoulder rates at the con rate for approximately one week.

- Tours are being arranged, and some flyers are available. The convention is not sponsoring any tours officially, but will put information on the website as the information is made available.
- Airline deals have not yet been planned. Currently group rates are higher than just those booked individually. Airline fares were currently under \$1,000.
- The NZ Natcon (New Zealand) will be held the weekend prior to Aussiecon. The two conventions are cooperating on distributing information.

### **5.3 Presentations by future Worldcon bids**

#### **5.3.1. Presentation by Chicago in 2012**

David McCarty spoke on behalf of the Chicago in 2012 bid. The facilities will be the Hyatt Regency Chicago, formerly the site of the three previous Worldcons in Chicago, and the convention will take place entirely within that hotel. The convention will be held on the traditional Labor Day weekend because hotel rates will be much lower (\$145 per night for single/double/triple/quad). There will be a single room large enough for the Hugos and the masquerade; the main ballroom in the Hyatt Regency seats 2700 people. There is adjacent space for the masquerade green room. Since 2000, the hotel underwent an \$80 million renovation. There are no new elevators, and the ones there have not been renovated. However, they are exceedingly large relative to most hotels. The biggest problem presented by the elevators in the past was not understanding the issue with getting to parties early enough. The bid has all the currently existing function space committed, with a promise not to tear any of that space down.

## **6. Other Business**

### **6.1 Announcements**

#### **6.1.1 Special Announcement**

Chris Barkley announced the formation of the Committee for Reconstruction of the Semiprozine as authorized by the Business Meeting on Saturday, consisting of approximately 26 people, including Chris Barkley, Temporary Hugo Czar (chairman); Amelia Beamer (Locus Magazine); D. Fratzs (Locus Magazine); Kirsten Gong-Wong (Locus Magazine); Bart Leib, Cross Genres; Katy Holt (Crossed Genres); David Hartwell (NY Review of Science Fiction), Kathryn D. Cramer (NY Review of Science Fiction); Kevin J. Malrone (NY Review of Science Fiction); Lincoln Kilman; Mark Olson; Katie Rask; Lew Wolkoff; Ben Yalow; Perianne Lurie; Seth Breidbart; Tim Illingworth; Cheryl Morgan; Joni Dashoff; Jared Dashoff; Dave McCarty; Warren Buff; Peter De Weerd; Susan De

Guardiola; and Paul D. Dolenac. Mr. Barkley said that someone named Stephen Colbert had also signed up, but he was uncertain if that was someone with the same name as the actor who was actually signing up, or a joke. The chair noted the appointments and confirmed that the charge to the committee authorized the czar to supplement and manage the membership of the committee at his discretion.

### **6.1.2 How to Join SMOFs Email List**

At the Saturday meeting, the committee was instructed to provide information on how to join the SMOFs email list:

- Go to: <http://lists.sflovers.org>
- Click on the link: SMOFs
- Fill out form to join the mailing list (your name and email address).

If you believe the list administrator will not know who you are, please email [smofs-owners@lists.sflovers.org](mailto:smofs-owners@lists.sflovers.org) and to let them know you were a member of Anticipation. Local law would not permit, nor was there unanimous consent, to permit the secretary to provide the names and email addresses of the business meeting attendees to the list owner, Sharon Sbarsky. Those interested in joining the list were instructed to speak with Ms. Sbarsky.

## **6.2 Committee Appointments**

All committees, unless otherwise stated, have the authority to augment and manage their membership at their own discretion.

### **6.2.1 Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee**

The Chairman of the World Science Fiction Convention Business Meeting appointed Donald Eastlake III, Tim Illingworth, and Kevin Standlee as members of the Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee. The committee will decide among itself who the nominal leader is for this purpose.

### **6.2.2 Worldcon Runners' Guide Editorial Committee**

The Chairman of the WSFS BM reappointed Bill Taylor (chair) and Sharon Sbarsky as members of the Worldcon Runners' Guide Editorial Committee.

### **6.2.3 Hugo Eligibility Rest of the World (HEROW) Committee**

The Chairman of the WSFS BM appointed Tim Illingworth (chair), Todd Dashoff, Paul Haggerty, Colin Harris, Saul Jaffe, Perianne Lurie, Jim Mann, Mark Olson, Kevin Standlee, Gayle Surette, Ben Yalow and Cheryl Morgan as members of the Hugo Eligibility Rest of the World (HEROW) Committee. At his request, Vince Docherty was not reappointed.

#### **6.2.4 Formalization of Long List Entries (FOLLE) Committee**

The Chairman of the WSFS BM reappointed Mark Olson (chair), Dave Grubbs, Colin Harris, Richard Lynch, Craig Miller, Joe Siclari and Kevin Standlee, with the additions of Kent Bloom and Ben Yalow, as members of the Formalization of Long List Entries (FOLLE) Committee.

#### **6.2.5 Mark Protection Committee**

Although the elected members cannot appoint proxies or representatives, Worldcon and NASFiC appointees serve at the pleasure of their appointing committees. That means they can appoint anybody and change their appointees at any time.

Renovation (Reno) appointed Ian Stockdale as its representative to the Mark Protection Committee; ReConstruction appointed Dina Krause as its representative.

#### **6.3 Former Worldcon Chairs Photo Session (not before 11 a.m.)**

The former Worldcon chairs photo session will be taken when the meeting is adjourned. A meeting of the Mark Protection Committee will be held after the photo session.

### **7. Adjournment**

After a request for unanimous consent failed, a motion was made to adjourn *sine die* in the memory of Charles N. Brown for the conclusion of this meeting, which passed on a vote by show of hands. Therefore, the business meeting of the 67<sup>th</sup> World Science Fiction Convention adjourned *sine die* in the memory of Charles N. Brown at 11:09 a.m.

Linda Deneroff, Secretary  
Kevin Standlee, Chairman  
2009 WSFS Business Meeting

**MINUTES OF THE 2009 WSFS BUSINESS MEETING  
ANTICIPATION, THE 2009 WORLDCON  
Friday August 7, Saturday August 8, and Sunday August 9, 2009  
Including Business Passed On from Denvention 3**

**APPENDIX A  
Site Selection Results for 2010 NASFiC**

<b>NASFiC</b>	<b>Mail-In</b>	<b>Thursday</b>	<b>Friday</b>	<b>Saturday</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b><i>Raleigh</i></b>	<b>26</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>241</b>
Pasadena	5		5	9	19
None of the Above				1	1
Durham		1			1
Peggy Rae's House			1		1
Ridgecrest, CA	1				1
Xerps	2				2
<b>Total Valid Ballots</b>					<b>266</b>
Invalid			1	2	3
<b>Total Ballots With Preference</b>					<b>269</b>
<b>Needed to Elect (Majority)</b>					<b>135</b>
No Preference	1	2		4	7
<b>Total Ballots</b>					<b>276</b>

**APPENDIX B**  
**Site Selection Results for 2011 Worldcon**

<b>Worldcon</b>	<b>Mail-In</b>	<b>Thursday</b>	<b>Friday</b>	<b>Saturday</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Reno</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>650</b>
Aberdeen Proving Ground	1		4	6	11
Seattle		1	5	4	10
Minneapolis in '73	1	2	1		4
Fordlandia		2		1	3
Xerps	2		1		3
Peggy Rae's House		1		1	2
Someplace in North Dakota	2				2
Baltimore Convention Center				1	1
Barrow Point, Alaska				1	1
Boston Mountains		1			1
Casa de Fruta				1	1
Chernobyl in 2011	1				1
Dave's Condo				1	1
DC in 2011		1			1
Gnawbone, IN				1	1
Hollister		1			1
Lichtenstein				1	1
Mustang Ranch	1				1
New Caprica	1				1
No Dams! / Pas Barrages!		1			1
Ridgecrest, CA	1				1
Rottnest Island			1		1
San Jose		1			1
The Lizard People	1				1
Winnemucca			1		1
Z'Ha'Dum in 2259			1		1
Moon				1	1
None of the Above		5	2	8	15
<b>Total Valid Ballots</b>					<b>720</b>
Invalid		5	3	13	21
<b>Total Ballots With Preference</b>					<b>741</b>
<b>Needed to Elect (Majority)</b>					<b>371</b>
No Preference	4	2	4	12	22
<b>Total Ballots</b>					<b>763</b>