

THE INCOMPLETE REGISTER:

LATE NIGHT FINAL: AUGUST 2018



Published by Nic Farey
(New address)
2657 Rungsted Street,
Las Vegas NV 89142
fareynic@gmail.com

The man who admitted he had not co-edited an issue of 'Journey Planet'

Everything Must Go!

By Nic Farey

Concluding my work as FAAn awards administrator for Corflu 35, I wanted to do a “wrap-up” ish of *TIR*, both to print some locs received, and also to convey a couple of apologies. This is because, contrary to the statement in the results issue, I won't be administering the awards for Corflu 36 after all.

Post-C35, a discussion about policy and method for 2019 revealed that there were a couple of major sticking points between how chair **Mike Dobson** would like to work things and how I would. Given my belief that the award admin, essentially a member of staff, should defer to the wishes of the organizer(s), we concluded (extremely civilly) that it would be better for me to step aside, as I felt unable to enact aspects of policy with which I profoundly disagreed. The incoming admin is **Curt Phillips**, and I wish him and Mike well in their efforts.

Apology #1: While the numbers in the results issue were accurate, an error crept into the voter roll, with the shameful omission of one name: **Robert Lichtman!** (Of all people!) Thanks to eagle-eyed psephologist **Claire Brialey** for pointing out the discrepancy between the number of the names and the number of the votes.

Apology #2: The Lifetime Achievement Award is not, strictly speaking, a FAAn Award, but I had taken point by convening a deliberating panel, thanked in the results issue. The actual presentation of the LAA, however, turned into an example of multiple ball-dropping, for which I assume my

share of blame, having failed to follow up properly once the recipient had been determined. Thanks are due to **Jerry Kaufman** for being alert to the situation, and to **Andy Hooper** for taking on the LAA presentation at the last second.

The Incompleat Response: Letters of comment

Graham Charnock

Thanks Nic, [the results issue] is welcome and very instructive [...]

I agree that the Website award should be ditched, and I note Bill Burns in his acceptance speech (?) displayed a certain bemusement in reminding people that 'other websites' existed. Everyone knows and acknowledges Bill's contribution to this aspect of fandom but we don't need to be reminded of it year after year.

I was gratified that a lot of best cover votes went to *Vibrator*, and more specifically to **Steve Stiles**. Perhaps the biggest regret I have about ditching the fanzine (not many) is that it closed off an avenue for Steve's covers. And your taxi articles, of course.

I have mixed feelings about ditching the best cover. This year **Graham West**, a non-fan, won it, and **Graham James** derived a degree of egoboo (I think) for featuring it in his underestimated *Rubber Crab*. I like that that can happen in fandom. I also agree that **Craig Smith** should receive more respect as a fanartist, but that is down to personal opinion.

Fan Face has always seemed a suspect category in my view, based as it is on a slightly artificial aggregation of scores. And, as in your case, it has little to do with the physical beauty of the recipient. Although I acknowledge Jacq is one hot chick.

Jerry Kaufman

Leigh's definition sounded great the first time I read it, but on second reading I think it still misses the mark unless it's restricted in use somehow. It doesn't distinguish a fanzine from other "packets of information" like professional magazines, books, posters, and so forth.

"Best Cover" gives recognition not just to a single piece of artwork - it also gives recognition to how a fanzine editor combines the art with any additional work the editor chooses, like typography. I suppose, though, that the voters didn't look at the category that way.

Your thoughts on #1 Fan Face brought me back to my usual creb about the effects of giving points to votes based on the order in which the nominees are listed on the ballots. Using a multiplier like you considered gives a result exaggerating the results. I wondered what the results would look like if we went the other way and deflated the vote totals, assigning only one point to each person, zine, etc nominated.

Using your spreadsheets in two categories, Genzine and Fanwriter, I got the following numbers: *Beam* -35; *Banana Wings* - 27; *Chunga* - 22; *Rubber Crab* - 16; and *Pablo Lennis* - 9. *SF Commentary* got 11, so it would have replaced *Pablo Lennis* in the top five. Otherwise, my method gave the same order of finalists as the multiple point method.

For Fanwriter, my results were **Randy Byers** - 19; **Claire Brialey** - 12; **Jacqueline Monahan** - 12; **Mark Plummer** - 13; **John Thiel** 7; **Nic Farey** - 9. A little different from the multiple point system, as Mark would have finished slightly above Jacq and Claire (now a tie), and your good self would have finished above John.

I didn't take the time to try this on other categories, but I can see that **Steve Stiles** and **Brad Foster** would still have led the Fanartist category, with everyone else far behind.

I see a couple of advantages to my system, given that the results are so similar to the multiple point system.

One is that the bookkeeping should be a lot simpler. The administrator just has to note the number of times any nominee appears on any ballots.

Another is that it would deflate the points to numbers that reflect the real participation in, and importance of, the FAAn Awards. I think the high point counts we see with the current system makes it look like a lot more people participate than really do (despite the fact that you show the actual numbers of ballots that had votes in each category) and also makes the awards look much more authoritative than they actually are.

That second advantage may not be advantageous in everyone's eyes; I think it's a nice little egoboost but of little value when one sees the decrease in numbers of zines published or people involved in the hobby. But I am jaundiced.

Lloyd Penney

I've got the copy of *The Incomplete Register: 2018 FAAn Awards* results issue that I picked up at the Toronto Corflu. Many thanks for all your work on these issues [...]

The convention itself seemed a little rushed in its preparation, but was still a lot of fun, and a great way to see old friends again. I suspect that will be my very last Corflu unless there are efforts to hold it here again. Kudos to all the award winners, and especially to **Bruce Gillespie**, editing in the fanzine mines for a long time indeed. I remember the expected grousing afterwards... who thought *that* crappy zine was the best, and that cover was shit, and who do they think *they* are, winning that... The grousing came from the usual sources, and I think it was about that time I decided to part with the convention, and go home. I did hear some grousing about the fact some of the people connected with the N3F were voted for, like **George Phillies** and **John Thiel**. I guess we like the fact that we have our own little awards, but only the Right People should be connected with it, and some people shouldn't be on the Voter List.

The letter column...the only thing I will say about **John Hertz'** loc is that I don't much like the term 'snail mail' either, and I use the more neutral term 'paper mail'. Some bemoan the imminent death of fanzines, but I still have plenty of fanzines to respond to, and locs to write. I will attempt to better my number of published locs in the lists you published, but I will attempt a better quality of writing. As I saw, high response numbers don't necessarily mean lots of votes for the Warner award.

I don't nominate for the Hugos anymore, and I do not recognize most of the names and titles that are in the running for the silver rockets. They may discover the FAAn Awards for fanzines, fan writers and fan artists, and they may invite their own Hugo nominators and friends in to take these over for their own devices, and with 78 ballots received, they could overwhelm our own numbers, if they were so inclined.

The discussion will continue, and that will keep this community strong, even if they might try to throttle each other in print. That's a good thing, and thanks for keeping the discussion going. [...]

WAHF: Ulrika O'Brien ("I'm sure this was a horrorshow of a job to do..."); **Bruce Gillespie** ("I'm very grateful to have the results"); **Eric Lindsay** ("It was interesting to read the comments by those more involved with fandom").

The Incomplete Afterthoughts

By Nic Farey

I'd like to thank all correspondents for their plaudits, and thank others who remarked elsewhere that *TIR* had proved useful; thanks also to faneds who published my letters on the topic and thus helped promote the awards, and not least to those who contributed to discussion on how the policy and method might be further improved.

My remarks in the lead editorial noting differences between myself and Corflu 36 chair **Mike Dobson** are sort-of-intentionally vague. I feel that the number of people with a deep interest in the minutiae of the FAAn awards is quite limited, a small subset of those who participate. It is to those few to whom I'll address further comment, to explain why this title is being retired.

The major sticking point was whether withdrawal from consideration would be allowed, and following on from that, whether the categories might be reorganized and/or added to *as a means of achieving that goal*. The emphasis there is important, since I have no fundamental objection to category-tinkering *per se*, having advocated, for example, for the dropping of the online category, consistent with my belief that the awards are for *Fanzine* activity specifically. In a much earlier discussion, published in **Rob Jackson's Inca**, I had proposed a method by which withdrawal would be allowed, but after persuasive arguments from various sources I came to concur with the contention that all votes should count, with the only stricture being the calendar (eligible work from the year preceding the issue of the awards).

Having described *TIR* as a "quasi-official" Corflu publication, containing as it did voting instructions and ballot form as well as being a "voters' guide", it would be inappropriate to continue to independently produce listings which would not necessarily reflect current policy in terms of category definition, and, most importantly, whether anyone who has requested to withdraw from consideration would even be listed. At best, this could cause confusion among existing and potential voters, and at worst could be viewed as antagonism, sour grapes perhaps, an attitude which I do not wish to convey since, as Mike would also assure you, the regime change has been quite free of any animus.

I offered to hand over the *TIR*-in-progress to incoming administrator **Curt Phillips**, who declined to assume the reins on the basis of time constraints.

There are, I will point out, other sources of *aides de memoire* for FAAn award voters: a browse of *efanzines.com* is the obvious starting point, but also **Andy Hooper's** "Fanzine Countdown" in *Flag*, and **Guy Lillian's The Zine Dump**. N3F publications include zine reviews, as does the less-frequent *BEAM*.

My thanks, again, to all participants in the awards, at whatever level of engagement. Long may they continue.