

THE INCOMPLETE REGISTER

RESULTS ISSUE: 2018 FAAN AWARDS



A listzine published by Nic Farey
3342 Cape Cod Drive, Las Vegas
NV 89122

fareynic@gmail.com

The man who admitted he did not vote in the FAAn awards

Lies, Damned Lies and Statistics

By Nic Farey

The following is a complete voting breakdown of ballots submitted for the 2018 FAAn awards (for work published in 2017).

78 ballots were received. No entire ballots were rejected for any reason. Three individual votes were rejected, two for lack of citation, of which the voters were notified but did not respond, and one for being out of category, for which the voter was notified but declined to make any change. None of these three would have changed any category winners.

Thanks to: Firstly, all who participated, particularly those who also engaged in awareness efforts; to **Jerry Kaufman** for agreeing to present the awards at the Corflu banquet, and to the Lifetime Achievement Award deliberation panel: **John Bangsund, Claire Brialey, Andy Hooper, Murray Moore, Milt Stevens, Wolf von Witting** and **Ted White**. *Very* special thanks to **Bill Burns** for unstinting encouragement, solid advice and continued support.

At the request of heir apparent Michael Dobson I'll be staying on as awards administrator for the 2019 Corflu, and following the vote breakdowns you'll find some remarks on how the awards might be modified (again). As always, private and public discussion is welcomed.

2018 FAAn Awards: Winners

GENZINE:

BEAM (edited by Nic Farey and Ulrika O'Brien)

PERZINE:

Vibrator (edited by Graham Charnock)

SPECIAL PUBLICATION:

Same Planet, Different World (Jacqueline Monahan, TAFF Trip report)

FANWRITER:

RANDY BYERS

FANARTIST:

STEVE STILES

LETTERHACK (HARRY WARNER, JR. MEMORIAL AWARD):

TIE: ROBERT LICHTMAN, MILT STEVENS

COVER:

Rubber Crab 8 (Graham West)

ONLINE ACTIVITY:

efanzines.com (Bill Burns)

LIFETIME ACHIEVEMENT AWARD:

BRUCE GILLESPIE

NUMBER ONE FAN FACE:

JACQUELINE MONAHAN

Methodology: First place votes in each category were awarded 5 points, 2nd place 3 points and third place 1 point, contributing to the overall total.

GENZINE VOTES: (67 ballots)

TITLE (Editor(s))	1st	2nd	3rd	TOTAL
BEAM (Nic Farey, Ulrika O'Brien)	24	2	9	135
BANANA WINGS (Claire Brialey, Mark Plummer)	15	7	5	101
CHUNGA (Randy Byers, Andy Hooper, Carl Juarez)	9	10	3	78
RUBBER CRAB (Graham James)	2	13	1	50
PABLO LENNIS (John Thiel)	8	1		43
SF COMMENTARY (Bruce Gillespie)	3	3	5	29
ASKANCE (John Purcell)	2	2	1	19
IONISPHERE (John Thiel)		5	1	16
CHALLENGER (Guy Lillian III)	2	1	1	14
INCA (Rob Jackson)		4	1	13
RAUCOUS CAUCUS (Pat Charnock)	1	1	3	11
FADEAWAY (Bob Jennings)	1		1	6
THE NATIONAL FANTASY FAN (George Phillies)		1	3	6
JOURNEY PLANET (Bacon, Garcia <i>et al</i>)		2		6
SURPRISING STORIES (John Thiel)		1	2	5
COUNTERCLOCK (Wolf von Witting)		1	2	5
LITTLEBROOK (Jerry Kaufman, Suzle Tompkins)		1	1	4
ETHEL THE AARDVARK (Edward McArdle)		1		3
CYBERCOZEN (Leybl Botwinik)			1	1
CLAIMS DEPARTMENT (Chris Garcia)			1	1

PERZINE VOTES: (57 ballots)

TITLE (Editor)	1st	2nd	3rd	TOTAL
VIBRATOR (Graham Charnock)	21	8	4	133
FLAG (Andy Hooper)	8	7	5	66
THE WHITE NOTEBOOKS (Pete Young)	3	4	5	34
THE PDF DRAGON (John Thiel)	4	1		23
ANSIBLE (Dave Langford)	3	2	2	20
iOTA (Leigh Edmonds)	2	3	1	20
OPUNTIA (Dale Speirs)	3	1		16
ALEXIAD (Joseph & Lisa Major)	2	1	2	15
NOWHERE FAN (Christina Lake)	1	3	1	15
RANDOM JOTTINGS (Michael Dobson)	2	1	1	14
ASKEW (John Purcell)	1	2	2	13
RAT SASS (Taral Wayne)	2		1	11
THE ZINE DUMP (Guy Lillian III)	1	1	1	9
ENTER AT YOUR OWN RISK (Chuck Connor)	1	1	1	9
SPARTACUS (Guy Lillian III)	1		2	7
MY BACK PAGES (Rich Lynch)		2		6
LOFGEORNOST (Fred Lerner)	1		1	6
mdp (Mark Plummer)	1		1	6
THE INCOMPLEAT REGISTER (Nic Farey)		1	1	4

ONE-SHOT/SPECIAL VOTES (56 ballots)

TITLE	1st	2nd	3rd	TOTAL
SAME PLANET, DIFFERENT WORLD (Jacqueline Monahan)	39	6		213
THE ROSE MOTEL (William Breiding)	15	5	1	91
IS THERE A DOCTOR IN THE HOUSE? (Taral Wayne)	2		2	12
TAFF TRIP REPORT ANTHOLOGY (ed. Dave Langford)			1	1
THE FRANK ARNOLD PAPERS (ed. Rob Hansen)			1	1

FANWRITER VOTES (59 ballots)

	1st	2nd	3rd	TOTAL
RANDY BYERS	12	5	2	77
CLAIRE BRIALEY	8	3	1	50
JACQUELINE MONAHAN	8	2	2	48
MARK PLUMMER	5	4	4	41
JOHN THIEL	7			35
NIC FAREY	2	2	5	21
TARAL WAYNE	1	3	1	15
JOE NAPOLITANO	1	3		14
PAT CHARNOCK	1	2	3	14
ANDY HOOPER	1	2	3	14
SIMON OUNSLEY	2	1	2	13
CURT PHILLIPS	2			10
GUY LILLIAN III	1	1	1	9
WILLIAM BREIDING	1	1	1	9
JOHN HARDIN	1	1		8
GRAHAM CHARNOCK		2	2	8
BRUCE GILLESPIE		2	1	7
DAVE LANGFORD	1			5
ARTHUR D HLAVATY	1			5
SANDRA BOND	1			5
LLOYD PENNEY	1			5
PAUL OLDROYD	1			5
JOSEPH MAJOR	1			5
ULRIKA O'BRIEN		1	1	4
JOHN HERTZ		1	1	4
JOHN PURCELL			4	4
ROY KETTLE		1		3
RICH LYNCH		1		3
PETE YOUNG		1		3
GEOFF RYMAN		1		3

FANWRITER VOTES *continued*

	1st	2nd	3rd	TOTAL
CAROLINE MULLAN		1		3
MICHAEL DOBSON		1		3
DEREK McCAW		1		3
STEVEN SILVER			1	1
JIM MOWATT			1	1
JOHN D BERRY			1	1
ROBERT LICHTMAN			1	1
LEYBL BOTWINIK			1	1
CHRISTINA LAKE			1	1
ROY HESSINGER			1	1
LEIGH EDMONDS			1	1

FANARTIST VOTES (45 ballots)

	1st	2nd	3rd	TOTAL
STEVE STILES	27	8		159
BRAD FOSTER	5	15	3	73
RAMOS FUMES	4	1		23
ULRIKA O'BRIEN	3			15
TARAL WAYNE	1	2	4	15
RAY NELSON	1	1	4	12
BOB VEON	1	2		11
DITMAR		3	2	11
ANGELA K SCOTT		3	1	10
ALAN WHITE	2			10
ALEXIS GILLILAND	1		2	7
HARRY BELL		1	4	7
TEDDY HARVIA		1	2	5
CRAIG SMITH		1	2	5
SUE MASON		1	2	5
DENNY E MARSHALL		1	1	4

FANARTIST VOTES (continued)

	1st	2nd	3rd	TOTAL
GRAHAM WEST		1		3
VENETIA JACKSON		1		3
KURT ERICHSEN		1		3
MAUREEN STARKEY			2	2
AL SIROIS			1	1

HARRY WARNER, JR. AWARD FOR BEST LETTERHACK (42 ballots)

	1st	2nd	3rd	TOTAL
ROBERT LICHTMAN	8	2	5	51
MILT STEVENS	7	5	1	51
JOHN THIEL	6		1	31
LLOYD PENNEY	4	2	1	27
DAVID REDD	3	4		27
PAUL SKELTON	3	3	3	27
MARK PLUMMER	4		2	22
BOB JENNINGS		6	1	19
JOHN PURCELL	1	3	5	19
JERRY KAUFMAN	1	3	4	18
LEIGH EDMONDS	2	2	1	17
JOSEPH NICHOLAS	1	2	1	12
NIC FAREY	2			10
MURRAY MOORE		1	3	6
JOHN NIELSEN-HALL		2		6
JOE NAPOLITANO		1	2	5
PHILIP TURNER		1	1	4
GREGORY BENFORD		1	1	4
RAY PALM		1		3
DAVE HAREN		1		3

HARRY WARNER, JR. AWARD FOR BEST LETTERHACK (continued)

	1st	2nd	3rd	TOTAL
CHARLES LEVI		1		3
WILLIAM BREIDING			1	1
STEVE JEFFERY			1	1
BRAD FOSTER			1	1
CHUCK CONNOR			1	1
TARAL WAYNE			1	1

FANZINE COVER VOTES (38 ballots)

ISSUE (Artist(s)/creator(s))	1st	2nd	3rd	TOTAL
<i>RUBBER CRAB 8</i> (Graham West)	10	3	1	60
<i>BEAM 12</i> (Steve Stiles)	5	2	5	36
<i>CHUNGA 25</i> (Sue Mason)	3			15
<i>iOTA 13</i> (Ditmar)	2	1	2	15
<i>VIBRATOR 45</i> (Steve Stiles)	2	1	1	14
<i>INCA 13</i> (Steve Stiles)	2	1		13
<i>SF COMMENTARY 95</i> (Ditmar)	2	1		13
<i>VIBRATOR 46</i> (Taral Wayne)	1	2	1	12
<i>VIBRATOR 42</i> (Graham Charnock, Bill Burns)	1	2	1	12
<i>BANANA WINGS 67 bacover</i> (Brad Foster)	2			10
<i>ENTER AT YOUR OWN RISK 6</i> (Chuck Connor)	1	1		8
<i>RAUCOUS CAUCUS 5</i> (Brad Foster)		2	1	7
<i>BEAM 11</i> (Teddy Harvia)		2		6
<i>VIBRATOR 41</i> (Steve Stiles)	1		1	6
<i>JOURNEY PLANET 36</i> (Hilary Bliss-Pearlman)	1			5
<i>THE RELUCTANT FAMULUS 112</i> (Uncredited)	1			5
<i>PABLO LENNIS May 2017</i> (Morris Scott Dollens)	1			5

FANZINE COVER VOTES (continued)

ISSUE (Artist(s)/creator(s))	1st	2nd	3rd	TOTAL
<i>PABLO LENNIS September 2017</i> (Uncredited)	1			5
<i>BANANA WINGS 66</i> (Steve Stiles)		1	2	5
<i>ASKANCE 42</i> (Tara Wayne)	1			5
<i>VIBRATOR 37</i> (Steve Stiles)	1			5
<i>VIBRATOR 44</i> (Steve Stiles)		1	1	4
<i>SF COMMENTARY 94</i> (Steve Stiles)		1	1	4
<i>ASKANCE 39</i> (A B Kynock)		1		3
<i>JOURNEY PLANET 33</i> (Michael Carroll)		1		3
<i>PABLO LENNIS March 2017</i> (David Grzszkiewicz)		1		3
<i>THE RELUCTANT FAMULUS 115</i> (Kurt Erichsen)		1		3
<i>ERIC THE MOLE 6</i> (Brad Foster)			2	2
<i>ASKANCE 40</i> (Brad Foster)			2	2
<i>IONISPHERE 8</i> (Uncredited)			1	1
<i>PABLO LENNIS February 2017</i> (Oldsay)			1	1
<i>ASKANCE 41</i> (Craig Smith)			1	1
<i>ASKEW 18</i> (Steve Stiles)			1	1

ONLINE ACTIVITY VOTES (38 ballots)

	1st	2nd	3rd	TOTAL
efanzines.com (Bill Burns)	11	6	5	78
RANDY BYERS (Livejournal/Dreamwidth)	9	2	2	53
file770.com (Mike Glycer)	5	4	1	38
Ansible news (Dave Langford)	3	4	2	31
fiawol.org.uk (Rob Hansen)	2	7	2	30
fanac.org (Siclari <i>et al</i>)	2	4	3	25
taff.org.uk (Dave Langford)	1	3	2	16
fancylopedia.org (Mark Olson)		2	4	10

ONLINE ACTIVITY VOTES (continued)

	1st	2nd	3rd	TOTAL
GRAHAM CHARNOCK (cartilegeworld, social media)	1		2	7
Corflu.org (Bill Burns)	1		1	6
LILIAN EDWARDS (social media)	1			5
JOHN PURCELL (social media)	1			5
Rusty Hevelin collection, University of Iowa	1			5
GRAHAM JAMES (social media)		1		3
ISFDB (Al von Ruff)		1		3
gostak.org.uk (Greg Pickersgill)		1		3
ANDY HOOPER (ebay, social media)		1		3

VOTER LIST

James Bacon	Graham James	Carrie Root
John D Berry	Bob Jennings	Paul Skelton
Claire Brialey	Joud Kashgari	Daniel Slaten
Bill Burns	Arnie Katz	Spike
Jack Calvert	Jerry Kaufman	Peter Spinella
R Graeme Cameron	Gene E Kelly	Steve Stiles
Ross Chamberlain	Joan Kelly	Geri Sullivan
Graham Charnock	Roy Kettle	James Taylor
Pat Charnock	Christina Lake	John Thiel
Teresa Cochran	Carla Langston	Kelly Thiel
Catherine Crockett	Mike McInerney	Nancy Thomas
Michael Dobson	Don Miller	R-Laurraine Tutihasi
Brenda Dupont	Jacqueline Monahan	Ken Vaden
Leigh Edmonds	Mia Monahan	Bob Veon
Jennifer Farey	Mike Monahan	Jason Walker
Nic Farey	Joe Napolitano	Jennifer Walker
Bryan Follins	Simon Ounsley	Alan White
Lorraine Forbes	Lloyd Penney	DeDee White
Aileen Forman	Yvonne Penney	Pete Young
Craig Glassner	Curt Phillips	
Susie Greene	Craig Pilks	
John Hardin	Donald Pitchford	
John Hertz	Mark Plummer	
Roy Hessinger	John Polselli	
Colin Hinz	Fran Prokop	
Andy Hooper	Regina Prokop	
Kim Huett	John Purcell	
Mindy Hutchings	April Reckling	
Rob Jackson	Andy Robson	

NUMBER ONE FAN FACE TALLY

“Number One Fan Face” is an additional award first given in 1998 and eleven times since. Recent years have determined the award by aggregating votes or points received in all categories of the FAAn awards, and I’ve followed this method with a little modification. In past tallies, a co-edited fanzine has had its total divided between co-editors, which I always thought was a bit unfair and not to say daft. Totals for such zines eg *Banana Wings* are here given in their entirety to each co-editor. This also applies in one case to a collaborative fanzine cover.

Ah, you may observe, but what about those zines that did *not* have consistent co-editors throughout 2017 (the easiest example being *BEAM*, and the most egregious being *Journey Planet*). In these cases I used a formula to determine the points totals given to an individual, which is $(p) \times (i/t)$, where (p) is the number of points given to the zine, (i) is the number of issues co-edited by the individual and (t) is the total number of issues in 2017.

The legend in the following table, in case it isn’t obvious: GZ (Genzine), PZ (Perzine), SP (Special Publication), FW (Fanwriter), FA (Fanartist), HW (Harry Warner, Jr. letterhack award), C (Fanzine Cover), OA (Online Activity).

NAME	GZ	PZ	SP	FW	FA	HW	C	OA	TOTAL
JACQUELINE MONAHAN			213	48					261
STEVE STILES					159		88		247
RANDY BYERS	78			77				53	208
NIC FAREY	135	4		21		10			170
MARK PLUMMER	101	6		41		22			169
JOHN THIEL	64	23		35		31			163
ANDY HOOPER	78	66		14				3	161
GRAHAM CHARNOCK		133		8			12	7	160
CLAIRE BRIALEY	101			50					151
WILLIAM BREIDING			91	9		1			101
BILL BURNS							12	84	96
BRAD FOSTER					73	1	21		95
ULRIKA O'BRIEN	67.5			4	15				86.5
CARL JUAREZ	78								78
DAVE LANGFORD		20	1	5				47	73
TARAL WAYNE		11	12	15	15	1	17		71
GRAHAM WEST					3		60		63

NUMBER ONE FAN FACE TALLY (continued)

NAME	GZ	PZ	SP	FW	FA	HW	C	OA	TOTAL
OLDSAY							1		1
PADRAIG O'MEALOID	1								1
ROY HESSINGER				1					1
STEVE JEFFERY						1			1
VINCE DOCHERTY	1								1

THE INCOMPLEAT RESPONSE (Letters of comment)

John Hertz writes:

"I protest separating Fanwriter and Correspondent (or if you must, "letterhack"); I protest separating Genzine and Perzine; I protest separating Fanartist and Cover. Fanwriting is fanwriting. Fanzines are fanzines. Fanart is fanart.

I protest "spreading the 'boo". These awards are for the best - as each voter sees it. Not "It's Buggins' turn".

I protest "voting for oneself is rather not-done". Contumely be hanged.

I protest the term "snail mail", undeserved and arrogant.

Nic responds: It seems almost churlish to answer you at greater length than your declarative statements, and yet...

Protest all you like, but the FAAn award categories (and the separations that you detest) are quite established by this point, but see later editorial re: Cover award. Your statement that "These awards are for the best - as each voter sees it", is one I fully agree with, yet the bracketing remarks to that make no sense at all. "Spreading the 'boo" (a fundamental tenet of the awards) is achieved by wide voter participation, since "as each voter sees it" will vary considerably. There's no lockstep or collusion between the *complete* set of voters to manage any kind of "Buggins' turn" about it. You're obviously thinking of the now-defunct Nova awards (ahem), or consider that herding cats is an easy proposition.

I'll continue to maintain that self-voting is contrary to the spirit of the awards, yet I will equally acknowledge that a valid vote is a valid vote. There were a number of voters who considered that they and/or their own work was the best thing since Stormy Daniels, and their votes were properly recorded as such (see notes on the three rejected votes up front).

I never thought anyone might be so offended by the term "snail mail", but I suppose if anyone would, it'd be you...

Leigh Edmonds writes:

I tend to agree with Nic that fanzines are artifacts. However, like all artifacts, they were created to serve a purpose, and, in the case of traditional fanzines, that was communication between fans. Like the fan funds, fanzines as we understood them are threatened by the new communications technologies which suit lots of people but which I find too ephemeral. Because a fanzine is a mode of communication that results in an artifact it is something that has a physical presence, you can hold it in your hand and file it away for later enjoyment. I guess the other

thing about fanzines is that, delivered by the postal service or out of the printer, they are read in a different way to writing on the screen and this means that they are internalized differently to screen based text. Having come to this conclusion, the question then becomes how to spread around the egoboo that is the currency of fandom. Just looking at the number of fnz that turn up on efanazines I don't think we are in any danger of running out of things to read and lavish a bit of egoboo on. If I were in Nic's shoes I'd be tempted to define a fanzine as a package of information fixed in time by its being made concrete in printed form or as a fixed format file such as a pdf. Fanzines are, in this way, artifacts of record expressing a time, a place and a culture. (I have to add that in my travels through the academy I'm beginning to find academics who will, one of these days, build their academic reputations on the question of 'Who Sawed Courtney's Boat' or social and cultural readings of the Staple Wars. You have been warned!)

By the way Nic, I was sorta bemused to read your list of potential FAANs nominations and see that you've put my iOTA in among the perzines. 'That's an odd place to put it,' I thought, but then I can't think of how else to describe it, being more or less a reprint fanzine with some commentary written by me. In any event, there are many more interesting fnz around than my effort so the point is, to wear out another word, academic.

Nic responds: I'll address the issue here about the categorization of *iOta*. One voter at least termed it a perzine, and I think that logic, as you state above, was that the sole "qualifying content" is your own commentary. On reflection, I can see how this is bonkers. A majority of the voters who favored *iOta* with their attention considered it a genzine, and those who did were people who know whereof they speak. The decision based on "qualifying content" (ie first published in the calendar year under consideration) was based on a blinkered application of the category definition. Other zines have included reprint material as part of their offerings, and this doesn't change their nature, it's merely the case that reprint work, of itself, isn't eligible for a given year's award under the "first published" stricture. By the simple "multiple contributor" test, *iOta* is clearly a genzine, and will be listed as such in future. You define a fanzine (for our purposes) as "a package of information fixed in time by its being made concrete in printed form or a fixed format file such as a pdf". That, my friend, is getting nicked in perpetuity as the perfect definition of a fanzine for the purposes of the FAAn awards. I had tried to be pithy with the use of the phrase "fanzine-as-artifact", which many of us understood but some didn't, and you've encapsulated it perfectly.

Andy Hooper writes:

I was happy to have THE INCOMPLEAT REGISTER to jog my memory, but voted for a title not listed there. If it or something similar is undertaken for 2018-2019, I'd like to see FAPA zines included.

Nic responds: You and others have expressed their appreciation for the existence of *TIR*, for which my thanks. It is a rather balls-aching project, and inevitably "incompleat", but I believe the experience of compiling the 2017 version, and useful comments thereon, will help to make the next iteration better for it. Regarding apazines, see my following editorial discussion points on that topic and others, to which I'm sure you can usefully contribute. It's possible, perhaps likely, that an interim issue of *TIR* might appear before the end of the year in furtherance of these discussions.

THAT'S NOT TOO MANY (Postscript & discussion points)

My first go as FAAn awards administrator has certainly been instructive. Fundamentally the awards are “just a bit of fun” in the sense that any egoboo poll is, but also they seem to have acquired more import among a certain crowd as a “trufan” antidote to the Hugos. I got flamed over at *File770* for admittedly cack-handedly pointing out that that Hugo nominees were barely represented in the FAAn voting, but the point is that the recognition flows from the definition of “fanzine”.

It seems that the Hugo definition has become overly broad, and to an extent backwards. Bill Burns (I think) has observed that “fan” now simply means “non-professional” in Hugo terms, and therefore “fanwriting” in that sense defines a “fanzine” as any venue where it appears. “Fanart” is any (theoretically non-professional) endeavor which might have been seen by fans, anywhere, anytime. By contrast, I’ve hewed to a definition of “fanzine” as well-described by Leigh Edmonds above: “a package of information fixed in time by its being made concrete in printed form or a fixed format file such as a pdf”. No apologies for repeating that again. It therefore follows that fanwriting as we understand it is work which has appeared in a qualifying fanzine in the qualifying timeframe, likewise fanart and locs.

To summarize, then: for the continued purpose of the FAAn awards, a “fanzine” is an artifact as described above. “Fanwriting” and “fanart” is work which has first appeared in a qualifying fanzine (available in the calendar year under consideration), and loccers are identified as having their contributions published in a qualifying fanzine.

Breaking It All Down

The split of “best fanzine” into its current three categories was instituted for the 2012 awards, during the admirable tenure of Andy Hooper as administrator. I’ve always seen this as being quite in the *spirit* of the awards of strewing the ‘boo, and I always intended to maintain it, except I’ve kept to what I saw as an originalist narrow definition of the “special publication” category, which for a few years had morphed into “best single issue” as what I regarded as a sop to the so-called “Rule of LAWS”, and if you don’t know what that is, consider yourself blessed.

Most of the definitions have been, like porn, “we know what it is when we see it”, but my own feeling is that we’re more or less adhering to the Pareto principle (80/20 rule) in separating genzines from perzines. There were certainly ishes in 2017 which skirted the boundaries. *Banana Wings* had a perzine ish, *Vibrator* came close to genzine territory on several occasions, but ultimately we’re left with perhaps an impressionistic “feel” of which category a zine falls into. That, and the creators’ self-identification, of course.

The death of “the usual”

In days of old, when faneds were bold, we could simply define a fanzine as a publication available for “the usual”, which is to say trade, contribution, letter of comment or editorial whim (or at a pinch, cash). Nowadays the majority (though demonstrably not all) zines are available via efanzines. That arguably decreases the need for reader engagement, but also suggests that we need a different benchmark for how we qualify a zine for the awards. Andy Hooper raises the point that he’d like to see FAPA zines included in the listings, but I’m inclined to demur there, in part at least. Publications listed for the awards ought to be “generally available” in the sense that anyone with the desire to peruse an ish should be able to do so. Some apazines eg *Purrsonal Mewsings*, *Rat Sass*, *Lofgeornost*, *Vanamonde* are widely distributed, and in some cases

published online in addition to their APA distys, certainly meeting a “generally available” standard.

Cut!

Let’s just say that the FAAns are for excellence in fanzine work, so why do we have a “Best Website” award? Magister Burns was given special acknowledgement in 2004 for his sterling work on the efanzines website, and in my opinion should have been left at that. However, the category of “Best Website” was added in 2008, and has been won by efanzines ever since. That isn’t the primary reason I’d like to drop the category, however. If we consider the FAAns to be about fanzines, then we should concentrate on those core values and not tack on something that isn’t really a fit with the rest of the awards. I’ll also note that this category attracted less than half of the voters this year, which may be in part due to some ennui that “efanzines is going to win it”, despite the addition this year of the nebulous “online activity” qualifier. There were a number of voters who engaged with this, but I’m bound to observe that Randy Byers’ output had a great deal to do with that, not something that’s going to be repeated. I therefore propose, and strongly advocate, that this category be dropped for 2019.

Speaking of low participation, the “Best Cover” category also attracted less than half of the voters this year. In part, it was considered that the category was instituted to belay the conception that the Fanartist award had become a “lifetime achievement” recognition, and that particularly good individual work from the previous year could be better specifically honored. I’ll contend that with the availability of *The Incomplete Register* there’s less likelihood of someone scooping votes in this or any other category simply from name recognition. There’s an argument to be made that a cover award can also be judged on design aspects, photoshopping and other skills which have not always been considered as “fanart” per se (eg Craig Smith), but I see no reason why such efforts couldn’t be considered in the fanartist category. I propose the dropping of the “Best Cover” category for 2019.

Turn and Face the Strange

“#1 Fan Face” has not always been awarded (since its inception in 1998) but has typically been an aggregation of points/votes accrued. It occurred to me in looking at the tallies that the undoubtedly worthy top two were nevertheless represented in just two categories each, whereas others had a broader spectrum of fanac. I considered that a simple multiplier, using the number of categories in which an individual was represented might better represent the “faceness” of that person. If this algorithm ($p \times n$, where p is number of points, n is number of categories in which votes were recorded) had been applied, the result is embarrassing:

Top five: 1. Nic Farey (680); 2. Mark Plummer (676); 3. John Thiel (652); 4. Andy Hooper (644); 5. Randy Byers (624). There might be better ways to factor this, given that a single vote in a given category would increase the multiplier. However, one might consider that broadness of fanac could be usefully recognized in this way, given that the top three “faces” were winners in separate categories, yet the top four when applying the multiplier were not.

As always, public and private discussion is welcomed and encouraged.

Nic Farey, April 2018