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“After reviewing the Constitution and the rules we must follow, the administration team determined those works/persons were not eligible.”
– Dave McCarty’s much-repeated statement on the 2023 Hugo Awards

A Vanilla Villain's Variant Villanelle by Trish E. Matson

It’s wrong to allege we were mere censors’ tools;
If you knew all the facts, you’d condone our behavior.
I grok Chinese fans, and was their White Savior.
I maintain the Committee just followed the rules.

We guarded our fellows by serving as footstools!
The Committee’s allowed to use our discretion,
so we bowed to preempt any Chinese repression.
It’s wrong to allege we were mere censors’ tools.

To dodge any offense, we looked hard for cesspools.
So what, if we glitched on some searchable facts?
Our Ineligible rulings were protective acts;
I maintain the Committee just followed the rules.

I knew we’d be hearing some protesting mewls,
so I massaged data while dragging things out,
and blamed lots of factors for the info-drought.
It’s wrong to allege we were mere censors’ tools.

Those who’ve assailed us are ignorant fools;
My Facebook inquirers, I rightly rejected,
except for Neil Gaiman; the ONLY affected.
I maintain the Committee just followed the rules.

So sorry I / we had to bury some jewels.
I’d have liked to give Weimer some facetime to vent,
But I’d have said that we ruled just the way that we meant.
It’s wrong to allege we were mere censors’ tools.
I maintain the Committee just followed the rules.
Resolved, that it is the spirit of the World Science Fiction Society Business Meeting to stand for the values of fair treatment, transparency, and openness in all dealings with the World Science Fiction Society and the Hugo Awards;

Therefore, we must stand together and condemn the actions taken by the Hugo Award Administration Subcommittee of the 2023 Chengdu Worldcon, along with the 2023 Chengdu Worldcon Committee, in regard to the management of the 2023 Hugo Awards, including the decision to disqualify rightful nominees without clear explanation, removing rightfully-cast votes, as well as releasing clearly wrong nomination data, all of which is contrary to the spirit of the awards and decades of administrative precedent.

We call on the members of the Chairs, the Committee, the Hugo Administrator, team of the 2023 Chengdu Worldcon, and any official continuing entities rising out of it, to:

- provide all information on the decision-making process
- accept full responsibility for their actions
- issue an official apology for the damage their actions have caused the individuals excluded from the ballot, the Hugo Awards’ reputation, and the Worldcon community in general
- recuse themselves from all future World Science Fiction Society committees and organisations

(Note: If you would like to be a co-signer of this resolution, contact us at JourneyPlanet@gmail.com)
Other articles in this issue are discussing how to reform the Hugo Awards going forward so that this debacle never happens again. What I want to talk about is the folks already harmed, and how we as a community can make amends.

Merriam-Webster defines “amends” as “compensation for a loss or injury.”

At the time of writing, those who were wrongfully disqualified from the Hugo Awards have been identified, acknowledged, and offered spots on panels in Glasgow. Xiran Jay Zhao also received an extension of eligibility for the Astounding Award.

Is this really “amends”? While Zhao may or may not feel compensated for missing out in 2023, it seems to me that being a panelist is something the other disqualified nominees would be welcomed for anyways. I’ve been a Worldcon panelist several times myself, and it never had anything to do with being a Hugo nominee.

So if we truly want to make amends, what can we do?

Many have pointed out that a revote, were it logistically possible, would be unduly influenced by sympathy for those who were unfairly excluded the first time around. I agree with that, but I don’t agree with what seems to be the general consensus: if the nuclear option isn’t available, then we're off the hook. While we can’t undo what has happened, there is so much more we could be doing as a community to show our remorse.

Some are quite simple. How about an invitation to the Losers Party in Glasgow? That’s something special that they may have missed out on in Chengdu, and something that the Glasgow concom could rather easily make happen.

Or how about Worldcon membership for life? I imagine this would involve some sort of resolution passed by the Business Meeting to make it official, but it’s something that the next few concoms could put into action on their own.

Or, as suggested by Ash Charlton, how about an actual Hugo? “Rather than take anything away from the Hugo Winners of 2023, who, you never know, may have won in any case, I think a special award should be created for the writers who missed out. I don’t like the phrase ‘Honorary Hugo’ as it sounds like it’s not a real one, but something like an ‘Amends Hugo’, or ‘Special 2023 Hugo’ means it could still go on this writer’s resume and would recognise the injustice done. We definitely owe them something, and this would go some way to making restitution.”

The Worldcon convention committee does have the option to award a “Special Committee Award”, sometimes informally referred to as “Special Hugos” as they are not official Hugos.

Perhaps Sara Felix could be commissioned to create special tiaras? Or George R. R. Martin could be convinced to award another round of “Alfies”?

If you like one or more of these ideas, or have one of your own, please contact Journey Planet at journeyplanetsubmissions@gmail.com or comment on this article on File 770. If there seems to be enough support, I will personally contact and work with the entity who can make things happen. I would love it if something more can be done for these folks in our community who were treated so outrageously.
Since the end of the World Science Fiction Convention in Chengdu, I have been thinking about what new things we have brought to the World Science Fiction Convention. The “we” in this case probably has many meanings depending on who I am. But there is no doubt that Chengdu is making a difference.

It seems that the World Science Fiction Convention and the Hugo Awards are changing and changing a lot. In the face of such change we may be overwhelmed, we may not know what to do, but we should always think of the words: There is no escape!

I had the pleasure of reading some historical information about the World Science Fiction Convention. These materials reminded me that a nearly 100-year-old science fiction convention should have the ability to renew itself and that science fiction fans, who are the main body of the convention, should be involved in this renewal.

I therefore offer some of my comments in this proposal, which is divided into nine parts:

The first is a desire to clarify the rights of members. A science fiction convention is a convention built by science fiction fans, participated in by science fiction fans, and enjoyed by science fiction fans, and there should be more clarity about who is a member and what members get.

The second is a proposal regarding financial issues. I have seen some abnormalities in the financial report, so it should be clarified that the organising committee should take financial responsibility, especially the financial transparency, openness, and honesty. This in turn raises the issue of sponsorship, and based on the experience of recent years, a more detailed specification would make such sponsorship more open.

The issue of the change of venue for the World Science Fiction Convention has attracted a great deal of attention over the past year. I cautiously argued that changes should be made with full input from the membership, and made some suggestions about the process and limitations of changing the venue based on accessibility and scheduling considerations. There are further restrictions on the choice of venue, including an emphasis on its ability to host World Science Fiction Convention events.

It is worrying that there is some discord in the face of a situation where a World Science Fiction Convention is truly "going global". I believe that we should not restrict the holding of World Science Fiction Conventions around the world with slogans that are not universally applicable, and therefore suggest that bids should not be cancelled for no reason, and that every region should be guaranteed full participation in the bidding process. Unfair competition in the bidding process is a concern, and although it has not arisen yet, it is necessary to prevent it through some provisions.

Similarly, a fair clause to prevent unfair competition in the Hugo Awards was proposed, which could promote fairness and impartiality of the Hugo Awards and prevent them from being influenced by publishing companies and nepotism.

In addition, a resolution calling for an investigation and review of the high-profile issue of the Chengdu Worldcon Brand Promotion Centre is at least a start to solving the problem.

As a Chinese sci-fi fan, I would also like to see more Chinese sci-fi enthusiasts participate in the WSC, so this proposal includes a Chinese section and a proposal to translate the charter.
似乎世界科幻大会和雨果奖正在改变而且改变了很多。现在也是一个改变的时代。面对这样的变化我们可能会不知所措，可能会无所适从，然而总应想到那句话：
不能逃避！
后来我有幸读到世界科幻大会的一些历史资料。这些资料提醒我：近百年历史的科幻大会应该具备更新自身的能力，而且作为其主体的科幻迷应该参与其中。
因此我在这份提案提出我的一些意见，它分为九个部分：
首先是希望澄清会员的权利。科幻大会是科幻迷建设、科幻迷参与、科幻迷享有的大会，而谁是会员、会员可以得到什么，应该更加明确。
其次是有关财务问题的提案。我看到财务报告中出现的一些现象，因此应当明确组委会应当担负的财务责任，特别是财务上的透明公开、清正廉洁。这其中又提出了赞助问题，在近几年经验的基础上，更详细的规范将让这种赞助更加开放。
世界科幻大会更改会期会址的问题，在过去一年引发广泛关注。我谨慎地提出，更改会期应当充分采纳会员意见，并基于交通便利和行程安排的考虑对更改会期会址的流程和限制提出一些建议。进一步地还有一些对会址选定的限制，包括强调其举办世界科幻大会活动的能力。
令人担忧的是，在面对世界科幻大会真正地“走向世界”的形势时，出现了一些并不和谐的声音。我以为不应用一些并不普遍适用的口号限制世界科幻大会在世界各地举行，因此提出不应无故取消申办资格，保障每个地区都充分参与到申办中。
申办过程中的不公平竞争令人忧虑，尽管还未真正出现，但有必要通过一些条款对其进行预防。同样，雨果奖中防止不正当竞争的公平条款也提出了，这能够促进雨果奖公平公正，防止其受出版公司和裙带关系的影响。
另外，针对引人注目的世界科幻大会推广中心（成都）的问题，一份决议案提出要求进行调查、审议，这至少是解决问题的开始。
作为中国科幻迷，我亦希望更多中国科幻爱好者参与到世界科幻大会中，因此这份提案包含了中文部分，还提出翻译宪章的建议。

This is a proposal for a series of proposals. The formal proposal that may eventually be submitted may be several separate proposals.
这是一个系列提案的建议。最终可能提交的正式提案可能是独立的几个提案。
Part 1: Membership correction on its definition and rights

Moved, To amend Section 1.5: Memberships. the WSFS Constitution to replace the existing identification of membership by striking out and inserting words as follows:

Section 1.5: Memberships

1.5.1: Each Worldcon shall offer WSFS memberships and attending supplements.

1.5.2: The rights of WSFS members of a Worldcon shall include the following rights:

1.5.2.1: the right to nominate and vote for the Hugo Award in the current year and the next following year and the right to vote for the Hugo Award in the current year;

1.5.2.2: the right to apply for financial openness, receive financial reports and cast doubts on finance of the current Worldcon or NASFiC Committee, all future selected Worldcon orNASFiC Committees, the two immediately preceding Worldcon Committees, and the Committees of any NASFiCs held in the previous two years;

1.5.2.3: the right to receive periodic progress reports from the current Worldcon committee;

1.5.2.4: the right to attend the Business Meeting, submit non-privileged new business reports and agenda items, vote for business reports and other reports; but the rights to attend the Business Meeting and vote are only available if the membership is added with an attending supplement;

1.5.2.5: the right to receive all of its generally distributed publications, including progress reports, newsletters, financial reports, Hugo Award messages, Business Meeting agendas, Business Meeting minutes and other relevant publications;

1.5.2.6: and other rights considered appropriate by the current Worldcon committee.

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

1.5.4: Members of WSFS who cast a site-selection ballot with the required fee shall be supporting members of the selected Worldcon. These members should be called Worldcon support members. Voters have the right to purchase a WSFS membership supplement in the selected Worldcon within ninety (90) days of its selection, for an additional fee set by its committee. This additional fee shall not be greater than the difference between the WSFS member and Worldcon supporting member fees and shall not exceed 25% of the site selection voting fee. However, if there is no additional fee between the WSFS membership and the Worldcon support membership, Worldcon support members shall become WSFS members of the selected Worldcon automatically.

1.5.5: Voters have the right to purchase an attending supplement in the selected Worldcon within ninety (90) days of its selection, for an additional fee set by its committee. This fee must not exceed four (4) times the site-selection fee and must not exceed the price of an attending supplement for new members.

1.5.6: The Worldcon Committee shall make provision for persons to become supporting WSFS members for no more than one hundred and twenty-five percent (125%) of the site-selection fee, or such higher amount as has been approved by the Business Meeting, until a cutoff date no earlier than ninety (9045) days before their Worldcon.

1.5.7: Other memberships and fees shall be at the discretion of the Worldcon Committee. However, the Committee shall ensure that such memberships include, as a minimum, the benefits of WSFS membership as set out in clause 1.5.2 above, except for reasons of age, civil capacity, and ability to attend.

1.5.8: No convention committee shall sell a membership that includes any WSFS voting rights for less than the cost of the Supporting Membership required by Article 4 in the selection of that convention.

1.5.9: No convention committee shall sell a membership, an attendance ticket or similar qualifications in other names that is available to persons of the age of majority at the time of the convention (as defined by the laws of the country and other jurisdictions where the convention is being held), that allows attendance and full participation for the entire duration of the convention and that does not include all WSFS voting rights. Should no law of the country and other jurisdictions where the convention is being held define an age of majority, the convention shall consider all persons 18 years of age or older as being of age of majority.

1.5.10: No convention shall terminate the sale of supporting memberships prior to the close of site selection.

1.5.11: WSFS memberships held by natural persons may not be transferred, except that, in case of death of a natural person holding a WSFS membership, it may be transferred to the estate of the decedent.
At the same time, the Chinese translation or the Chinese version should be amended by striking out and inserting words as follows:

同时，相应的中文条款（或可被视为中文的翻译版本）通过以下的删除（使用删除线）和补充（使用字下划线）条款修订：

第1.5节：会员资格

1.5.1：世界科幻大会应提供支持会员和参会附加资格两大类。

1.5.2：世界科幻大会支持会员能够收到大会分发的所有出版物。世界科幻协会会员资格得包括以下权利：

1.5.2.1：当年和下一年雨果奖的提名权，及当年雨果奖的投票权；

1.5.2.2：对本届世界大会或NASFiC委员会、今后所有入选的世界大会或NASFiC委员会、前两届世界大会委员会以及前两年举行的任何NASFiC委员会的财务状况申请财务公开、接收财务报告并就其财务状况和报告提出质疑的权利；

1.5.2.3：收到本届世界大会委员会的定期进度报告的权利；

1.5.2.4：出席事务会议，提交非特权性的新事务报告和议程项目，对事务会议和其他报告进行表决的权利；

1.5.2.5：收到大会分发的所有出版物，包括进度报告、通讯、财务报告、雨果奖信息、事务会议议程、事务会议记录和其他相关出版物的权利；

1.5.2.6：以及本届世界大会委员会认为适当的其他权利。

1.5.3：世界科幻大会参会附加资格除了享有WSFS会员的权利以外，还包括参加世界科幻大会和WSFS所召开的事务会议的权利。

1.5.4：按规定缴纳费用并参与大会选址投票的WSFS会员，应自动成为当选城市所举办的世界科幻大会的支持性会员，即世界科幻大会支持会员。根据投票者在选定世界大会后九十（90）天内购买该世界科幻大会的WSFS会员资格，额外费用由其委员会确定。这一额外费用不得高于WSFS会员与Worldcon支持会员费用之间的差额，且不得超过选址投票费的25%。但是，如果WSFS会员与世界科幻大会支持会员之间没有额外费用差额，世界科幻大会支持会员应自动成为当选世界科幻大会的WSFS会员。

1.5.5：投票者有权在为期90天的投票时间内，有权将自己的会员升级为参会附加资格，但需支付组委会设定的额外费用。此费用不得超过选址投票费用的4倍，也不得超过选址投票费与当届参会附加资格费之间的差额。

1.5.6：世界科幻大会组委会应设定，成为WSFS会员的费用不超过选址投票费的1.25倍，也不超过大会事务会议批准的金额。且会员资格付费应于当届世界科幻大会开幕前四十五（45）天截止。

1.5.7：其他会员资格和费用由当届世界科幻大会组委会自行决定。然而，委员会应确保此类会员资格至少包括上文第1.5.2条规定的WSFS会员的权益，但因年龄、民事行为能力等原因造成的会员资格除外。

1.5.8：在大会选址投票期间，大会组委会不得以低于条款4所要求的支持会员资格的价格，出售任何包含WSFS投票权的会员资格。

1.5.9：大会组委会不得在大会召开期间，出售除WSFS投票权以外不含WSFS会员权益的、适用于成年人（成年年龄由该国法律或大会所在的司法管辖区规定）的会员资格，可出席大会。
Commentary:

It should be noted that the current articles fail to make clear the distinction between the rights of supporting members, World Science Fiction Society members, tickets, and so on. This caused serious confusion at the most recent World Science Fiction Convention. Clarifying the rights of World Science Fiction Society members will help science fiction fans recognize their rights, strengthen the understanding that World Science Fiction Conventions are based on the support of their science fiction fans, and further increase participation.

This proposal begins with the requirement that a World Science Fiction Convention must have World Science Fiction Society membership with full rights as its basis for participation and fees. In response to the current reference to the sole right of World Science Fiction Society members to have access to publication materials, other necessary rights are added, covering Business Meetings, progress reports, financial reports, and so on. The wording of Supporting Membership creates confusion in the current version, which the proposal modifies and suggests limiting it to those members who pay a fee in the Site Selection Ballot.

The proposal is prudent to make rate additions. With respect to this section, the proponents respectfully seek your better opinion.

The proposal also clarifies that the sale of qualifications that do not include the right to membership in the WSFS, at the door or otherwise, is prohibited. This is based on the fact that at the most recent World Science Fiction Convention there was ambiguity regarding WSFS membership rights, and that so-called tickets to the convention affected the sale of WSFS memberships and science fiction fans were not informed of those rights.

Part 2: Finance correction

 Moved, To amend Section 2.8 and 2.9 the WSFS Constitution, remove Section 2.8 and 2.9 of the former chapter and reformulate them into new articles. Replace the current requirements for financial disclosure and financial reporting with an overarching requirement for financial accountability by striking out and inserting words as follows:

Section 2.8: Financial Openness. Any member of WSFS shall have the right, under reasonable conditions, to examine the financial records and books of account of the current Worldcon or NASFiC Committee, all future selected Worldcon or NASFiC Committees, the two immediately preceding Worldcon Committees, and the Committees of any NASFiCs held in the previous two years.

Section 2.9: Financial Reports.
2.9.1: Each future selected Worldcon or NASFiC Committee shall submit an annual financial report, including a statement of income and expenses, to each WSFS Business Meeting after the Committee's selection.

2.9.2: Each Worldcon or NASFiC Committee shall submit a report on its cumulative surplus/loss at the next Business Meeting after its convention.

2.9.3: Each Worldcon or NASFiC Committee should dispose of surplus funds remaining after accounts are settled for its convention for the benefit of WSFS as a whole.

2.9.4: In the event of a surplus, the Worldcon or NASFiC Committee, or any alternative organizational entity established to oversee and disburse that surplus, shall file annual financial reports regarding the disbursement of that surplus at each year's Business Meeting, until the surplus is totally expended or an amount equal to the original surplus has been disbursed.

2.9.5: All financial reports shall include the convention's name, mailing address and other contact information, including the name of the person certifying and submitting the report and, if applicable, the name of the convention's parent organization, its tax-exempt status, the location of incorporation, its address, website, email and other contact information, and the names and titles of its current officers.

Section 2.8: Financial Responsibility.

2.8.1: It is the unshrinkable responsibility and obligation of the World Science Fiction Convention Committee to keep the finances of the World Science Fiction Convention open, transparent, clean, and sustainable.

2.8.2: The Worldcon committee shall make full use of the funds it receives to organise Worldcon. Sources of funding could include membership fees, financial or other forms of sponsorship from governments, corporations or other organisations, donations from members in the name of individual natural persons, and pass-through funds under the current system.

2.8.3: The Worldcon organising committee can obtain sponsorship from corporations, governments, or other organisations to run the event.

2.8.3.1: Sponsorship means funds, in-kind goods (ownership or right to use), human resources, services, etc., provided by organisations other than the World Science Fiction Society, the Committee of the current World Science Fiction Convention, including governmental and non-governmental organisations and enterprises, or by WSFS members in the form of non-membership fees and donations in the name of individual natural persons, except in the following cases:

- Goods, services, usage rights, etc., purchased or rent by the committee in the form of market transactions, such shall be considered as expenses of the committee;
- Volunteer services provided by volunteers of the Congress in the form of no demand for labour remuneration, but if the volunteer services are organised or provided by a third party other than the committee and individual members, such shall still be considered as sponsorship;

2.8.3.2: Sponsorship shall be limited to activities that promote the Worldcon. The use of sponsorship for the financial or other benefit of members of the organising committee is prohibited.

2.8.4: In the event that a sponsored event uses the trademarks, brands or other related intellectual property rights of the current World Science Fiction Convention, the WSFS and the Hugo Awards, it is the responsibility and obligation of the current committee to supervise the proper use of the trademarks, brands or other related intellectual property rights in the sponsored event, and to provide clarification to the Mark Protection Committee and to the WSFS members regarding the use.

2.8.5: The committee shall strictly prohibit non-transparency, corruption, malfeasance and other illegal practices in the financial field. The committee has the responsibility and duty to protect the trademarks, brands or other related intellectual property rights of the current World Science Fiction Convention, the WSFS and the Hugo Awards from improper activities.

2.8.6: Each Worldcon or NASFiC Committee should dispose of surplus funds remaining after accounts are settled for its convention for the benefit of WSFS as a whole.

2.8.7: Financial Openness

2.8.7.1: Any member of WSFS shall have the right, under reasonable conditions, to examine the financial records and books of account of the current Worldcon or NASFiC Committee, all future selected Worldcon or NASFiC Committees, the two immediately preceding Worldcon Committees, and the Committees of any NASFiCs held in the previous two years.

2.8.7.2: When receiving the request, the committee should respond in no more than 20 working days, offering possible reports and necessary illustrations. If not, the progress of the development of the relevant records, books and financial report, and the time at which those can be made public shall be indicated, or reasonable access to get the materials shall be provided.
2.8.7.3 The two immediately preceding Worldcon Committees, and the Committees of any NASFiCs shall be proactive in financial disclosure beyond responding to WSFS member requests. Such openness shall be made through financial reports to the Business Meeting, newsletters, periodic progress reports or other feasible means.

2.8.7.4 Financial openness should ensure that it is fair, transparent, complete and, as far as possible, adapted to the comprehension of ordinary people who do not have specialised knowledge.

2.8.8 Financial Reports

2.8.8.1 Each future selected Worldcon or NASFiC Committee shall submit an annual financial report, including a statement of income and expenses, to each WSFS Business Meeting after the Committee's selection.

2.8.8.2: Each Worldcon or NASFiC Committee shall submit a report on its cumulative surplus/loss at the next Business Meeting after its convention.

2.8.8.3: All financial reports submitted to the Business Meeting may be distributed to WSFS members at the same time as the publications of the Worldcon.

2.8.8.4: The cumulative surplus/loss should include:
- the surplus in the existence of the committee from all sources like membership fees, financial or other forms of sponsorship from governments, corporations or other organisations, donations from members in the name of individual natural persons, and pass-through funds under the current system;
- the loss for the running for bidding, preparation and organisation, which happens in the existence of the committee;
- the sponsorship from governments, corporations or other organisations, which are not gifted to the committee directly but are spent in other ways relevant to the convention;
- other necessary surplus/loss considered by the committee.

2.8.8.5: In the event of a surplus, the Worldcon or NASFiC Committee, or any alternative organisational entity established to oversee and disburse that surplus, shall file annual financial reports regarding the disbursement of that surplus at each year's Business Meeting, until the surplus is totally expended or an amount equal to the original surplus has been disbursed. The Worldcon or NASFiC Committee shall not be dissolved or cease to exist before the surplus has been disbursed.

2.8.8.6: All financial reports shall include the convention's name, mailing address and other contact information, including the name of the person certifying and submitting the report and, if applicable, the name of the convention's parent organisation, its tax-exempt status, the location of incorporation, its address, website, email and other contact information, and the names and titles of its current officers.

2.8.8.7: All financial reports shall be responsible for its openness, transparency, accuracy and professionalism.

2.8.8.8: WSFS members should have the right to question the financial report at the Business Meeting and ask for an explanation from the committee members. WSFS members have the right to request a vote on the financial report at the Business Meeting if sufficient evidence is provided as a complete proposal. If the vote is not passed, the committee is deemed to have failed in its financial responsibilities and shall be required to provide a correct, transparent and professional financial report and have it passed at the Business Meeting.

At the same time, the Chinese translation or the Chinese version should be amended by striking out and inserting words as follows:

同时，相应的中文条款（或可被视为中文的翻译版本）通过以下的删除（使用删除线）和补充（使用字下划线）条款修订：

第2.8节：财务责任

2.8.1：保持世界科幻大会财务的公开、透明、廉洁和可持续是世界科幻大会组委会不可推卸的责任和义务。

2.8.2：世界科幻大会组委会得充分利用其获得的资金组织世界科幻大会的活动。资金来源可以包括收取的会员会费，从政府、企业或非政府组织处获得的资金赞助或其他形式赞助，会员以自然人个人名义提供的捐赠，和在现行体系下的传递基金等。

2.8.3：世界科幻大会组委会可以从企业、政府或其他组织获得活动赞助。
2.8.3.1：赞助是指由世界科幻协会、当届世界科幻大会组委会以外的组织机构，包括政府、非政府组织、企业提供的，或世界科幻协会会员以非会员费和个人名义捐赠形式提供的资金、实物（所有权或使用权）、人力资源、服务等，但以下情形除外：
组委会以市场交易形式购买或租赁的、于组委会活动的开支。

2.8.3.2：赞助应仅限于促进世界科幻大会的活动。禁止利用赞助为组委会成员谋取经济利益或其他不当利益。

2.8.4：赞助中使用本届世界科幻大会、WSFS和雨果奖的商标、品牌或其他相关知识产权的，当届组委会有责任和义务促使在活动中的合理使用，并就使用情况向品牌保护委员会和WSFS会员进行说明。

2.8.5：组委会得在财务领域出现不透明、腐败和渎职行为。组委会有责任和义务保护本届世界科幻大会、WSFS和雨果奖的商标、品牌或其他相关知识产权不受侵害。

2.8.6：为了WSFS整体利益，每一届世界科幻大会或北美科幻大会组委会应正确处理大会账户结算后剩下的资金。

2.8.7：财务公开

2.8.7.1：WSFS的任何会员有权在合理条件下，查阅前五届（当届以及前两届）世界科幻大会（世界科幻大会或北美科幻大会）组委会的财务记录和账簿。

2.8.7.2：收到申请后，相应委员会应在不超过 20 个工作日内做出答复，提供可能的报告和必要的说明。如果不能提供相应报告或说明，应说明相应财务记录的编制进度和可以公开的时间，或提供获取相应材料的合理途径。

2.8.7.3：前五届（当届以及前两届）世界科幻大会（世界科幻大会或北美科幻大会）组委会应在回应 WSFS 成员的要求之外，主动公开财务状况。这种公开应通过提交给事务会议的财务报告、通讯、定期进度报告或其他可行方式进行。

2.8.7.4：财务公开应确保其公正、透明、完整，并尽可能适应不具备专业知识的普通人的理解能力。

2.8.8：财务报告

2.8.8.1：每个未来入选的世界大会或 NASFiC 委员会应在选址投票公布之日起向世界科幻协会的每次事务会议提交年度财务报告，包括收入和支出表。

2.8.8.2：每个世界大会或 NASFiC 委员会应在其大会结束后的下次事务会议上提交累计盈亏报告。

2.8.8.3：所有提交给事务会议的财务报告都应作为会议出版物分发给WSFS会员。

2.8.8.4：累计盈余/亏损应包括：

- 委员会存在期间从各种来源获得的盈余，如会员费，政府、公司或其他组织的资金赞助或其他形式的赞助，会员以自然人个人名义提供的捐款，以及现行制度下的转移资金等；
- 委员会存在期间发生的投标、筹备和组织活动的开支；
- 政府、公司或其他组织未直接赠送给委员会使用，而由这些机构自行用于与大会有关的活动或其他方面的开支；
- 委员会认为必要的其他盈余/损失。

2.8.8.5：如果出现盈余，世界科幻大会或北美科幻大会组委会，或是监督和支付该盈余而设立的任何其他组织实体，应在每年的大会事务会议上提交有关该盈余支付的年度财务报告，直至盈余已全部支出或已支出相当于原始盈余的金额。在盈余已全部支出或已支出相当于原始盈余的金额前，组委会不得解散或停止存在。
2.8.8.6: 财务报告应包括大会的名称、邮寄地址，以及包括证明人和提交报告人姓名在内的其他联系信息。如果条件允许，提供大会上级组织的名称、免税状态、公司的所在地、地址、网站、电子邮件和其他联系信息，以及现任负责人的姓名和头衔。

2.8.8.7: 所有财务报告应对其公开性、透明度、准确性和专业性负责。

2.8.8.8: WSFS 会员应有权在会员大会上质询财务报告，并要求委员会成员做出解释。如果以完整提案的形式提供充分证据，WSFS 会员有权要求在事务会议上对财务报告进行表决。如果表决未通过，则视为委员会未能履行其财务责任，得责成其重新提供正确、透明和专业的财务报告，并在事务会议上获得表决通过。

Commentary:
It is clear that financial accountability is an important responsibility that the organising committee should fulfil. It is rather unfortunate that the current Constitution does not provide clear guidance and requirements in this regard, but merely sets out requirements for financial disclosure and financial reporting. The addition of an anti-corruption provision would encourage the organising committee of each congress to fully discharge this responsibility.

At the same time, the proposal calls for the development of third-party sponsorship to be recognised. Reasonable and appropriate sponsorship has the potential to promote the development of World Science Fiction Conventions, reduce financial pressure, lower the cost of attendance for members, and ultimately promote more science fiction fans to participate in World Science Fiction Conventions. However, adherence to the core qualities of a convention’s fan body and fan hosting should remain a necessary guideline for sponsorship. The proposal calls for a prudent approach to sponsorship that enhances transparency and regulation.

For financial disclosure, which is an important way to promote financial probity, the proposal suggests more feasible ways to make financial disclosure accessible to members and to recognise the need for financial disclosure. A set deadline for response will facilitate the organising committee to be able to properly discharge this responsibility. The time limit for this provision is modelled on China’s experience with government disclosure, for example in Chengdu, where requests for government disclosure must be responded to by the relevant unit within 20 working days.

The responsibility for financial reporting is also refined in the proposal, which calls for further refinement of the coverage of financial reporting, particularly third-party sponsorships that may be overlooked by the organising committee, and proposes that members’ oversight of the financial situation be strengthened through a Business Meeting.

Part 3: Business Meeting
第三部分: 事务会议

Moved, To amend Article 5 – Powers of the Business Meeting the WSFS Constitution to replace the current provisions of Business Meeting by striking out and inserting words as follows:

提出以下动议: 对世界科幻协会会章第五(5)条“会员资格”进行修订，通过以下的删除（使用删除线）和补充（使用下划线）条款修订有关事务会议的条款

In Section 5.1: WSFS Business Meetings

Inserting:
**5.1.7: Availability of the Business Meetings.** The current Worldcon Committee shall offer appropriate agenda and place to hold the Business Meeting offline. The time of the Business Meeting cannot be in conflict with other major Worldcon agendas, such as the Opening Ceremony, Hugo Awards Ceremony, Panels with Guests of Honours, and major events. The location of the Business Meeting cannot be more than 1.5 kilometres from the main conference venue.

**5.1.8: Virtual and online meetings.** Each session of the Business Meeting shall provide access via the Internet so that members of the World Science Fiction Association may participate and vote in the Business Meeting online. The online Business Meeting shall provide for live video and audio streaming of the meeting, voice speakers, a vote-counting system and other necessary facilities. The specific operating procedures for online Business Meetings shall be specified in the Standing Rules for the Governance of the Business Meeting. Within 60 days after the conclusion of each Business Meeting, the General Assembly Business Meeting staff shall submit to the WSFS membership a video recording of the entire Business Meeting.

**Section 5.4: Minutes.** Each Business Meeting shall take minutes.

- **5.4.1:** The minutes shall include the main agenda of the Business Meeting, the debates and speeches of the members, the results of the voting ballots, and other elements as necessary. The minutes shall also include a list of all members attending each meeting, the adjudicator and staff of the Business Meeting and the signatures of those who prepared the minutes.
- **5.4.2:** Within sixty (60) days after the end of each Worldcon, the Business Meeting staff shall send a copy of the minutes to the next Worldcon Committee and the WSFS members.
- **5.4.3:** The minutes shall ensure a faithful and accurate account of the conduct of the Business Meeting and shall not be subject to arbitrary deletions, deliberate distortions or manipulations of the results of voting.

At the same time, the Chinese translation or the Chinese version should be amended by striking out and inserting words as follows:

同时，相应的中文条款（或可被视为中文的翻译版本）通过以下的删除（使用删除线）和补充（使用字下划线）条款修订:

在第5.1节：WSFS事务会议，新增

- **5.1.7:** 事务会议通达性。当届世界科幻大会应提供合适的时间和地点在世界科幻大会期间通过线下举办事务会议。事务会议的时间不能同世界科幻大会的其他主要活动和议程，如开闭幕式、雨果奖颁奖典礼、有重要嘉宾（如荣誉嘉宾）参加的活动等冲突。事务会议的地点距世界科幻大会主要场馆的直线距离不得超过1.5公里。

新增:

- **5.1.8:** 互联网的线上事务会议。每届事务会议得提供通过互联网途径访问的渠道，以使世界科幻协会会员可以通过线上方式参加事务会议并进行表决。线上的事务会议应提供对会议现场的视频音频直播，语音发言和表决计票系统等必要的设施。线上事务会议具体的操作规程应由事务会议现行规则具体规定。在每次事务会议结束后，大会事务会议工作人员应在60天内向WSFS会员提交事务会议的全程录音录像。

新增:

第5.4节：会议纪要。每届事务会议都应制订会议纪要。

- **5.4.1:** 事务会议纪要应包括事务会议中的主要议程，会员的辩论和发言，表决投票的结果，以及其他必要的内容。纪要还应附录每一次会议的全体参会会员名单，事务会议的审裁官和工作人员，并附录制定纪要的人员的签名。
- **5.4.2:** 在每届世界科幻大会结束后的60天内，大会事务会议工作人员应将事务会议纪要的副本发送给下一届世界科幻大会组委会和WSFS会员。
- **5.4.3:** 会议纪要应保证忠实、准确地记载了事务会议的过程，不得随意删减，蓄意扭曲或篡改表决结果。
Commentary:
More and more members have realised that more members should have the opportunity to join the Business Meeting. By setting convenience on time and place, it could come true. Minutes should be considered as a significant part of the Business Meeting. As a record, these could raise the awareness of responsibility to history. A new proposal could make the minutes more available to the members and increase the accuracy.

述评：
越来越多的会员已经深刻认识到有必要让更多会员有机会参与到事务会议中，通过对会议在时间和地点的便利性上提出新要求，希望这一愿望成真。会议纪要应当被视为事务会议的重要组成部分。作为对事务会议的记录，它将激发会员和事务会议工作人员的历史责任感。新的提案呼吁了提高会议纪要的获取性和保证其准确无误。

Part 4: Responsibility of the Worldcon Committees
第四部分 组委会责任

Moved, To amend Article 2 – Powers and Duties of Worldcon Committees the WSFS Constitution to replace the current provisions of the powers and duties of Worldcon Committees by striking out and inserting words as follows:

Article 2 – Powers and Duties of Worldcon Committees

Section 2.1: Duties. The Worldcon shall be held annually. A Worldcon Committee shall be formed for each Worldcon. Each Worldcon Committee shall, by this Constitution, provide to promote the development of WSFS, Worldcon and Hugo Award for:

(1) holding the current Worldcon at the promised date and in the promised location,
(2) administering the Hugo Awards,
(3) administering any future Worldcon or NASFiC site selection required, and
(4) holding a WSFS Business Meeting, and
(5) other necessary duties considered by the committee.

Section 2.X: Worldcon at the Promised Date and Time.

2.X.1: A Worldcon shall be held at the promised place and time.

2.X.2: However, if the committee would like to change the promised place or time, the change could be considered legal only because of the following situations:

(1) From the command or the request of the local administration or the provider of the location without the subjective fault of the committee;
(2) Force majeure: an event which must be unforeseeable, external, and irresistible and generally covers natural disasters, such as hurricanes, tornadoes, earthquakes, and epidemics, as well as human actions, such as armed conflict.

2.X.3: Duty to inform in advance.

2.X.3.1: The Committee is obliged to give advance notice of changes. The committee shall give 45 days' notice of any change of venue or time before the official completion of the change, which shall be published and sent to all members. The notice shall be made officially and delivered to the members in 3 days.

2.X.3.2: Members could have the right to disagree or cast inquiries. The committee should respond to these inquiries in fewer than 7 days.

2.X.3.3: If more than two-thirds of the members of the General Assembly formally object to a change of time or venue using a signed email, letter, etc., to the Committee in 30 days, the Committee's proposal for a change of venue and time shall be deemed null and void, and the Committee may be deemed to be in a state of incapacity.

2.X.3.4: When announcing proposed changes, the Committee shall clearly and emphatically inform members of their right to make inquiries and objections to the proposed changes and provide clear channels for doing so. Formal objections received shall be counted, and the result of the count shall
be announced in a separate official notice at the end of 30 days, whether the two-thirds limit has been reached.

2.X.4: The Committee shall inform the members of the potential change in time and place within the 120-day-earlier preferred range of the promised time. Any changes announced fewer than 120 days prior to the start of the promised Worldcon will be deemed to be an Incapacity of Committee.

2.X.5: The time of the change cannot be more than 120 days before or more than 120 days after the original time.

2.X.6: The location of the change cannot be more than 30 kilometres in a straight line from the original location.

2.X.7: Once such changes have been announced, the Committee must allow refunds for any type of membership. Unless the member has nominated or voted for the Hugo Award, WSFS members shall also be able to be refunded.

2.X.8: No additional fees or restrictions may be placed on the repurchase of membership for members who have been refunded under 2.X.7.

2.X.9: Location and time changes can be made only once. A change to either the address or the time, or both, is considered a single change. A second change proposed by the Committee after the single change, for whatever reason, will be deemed to be an Incapacity of Committees.

2.X.10: Changes in time and place must be signalled in a clear and conspicuous manner on the official website of the current Worldcon, in newsletters and publications made available to the membership, and such notices may not be withdrawn before the end of the Congress.

2.X.11: The committee is obliged to state in the notification exactly what caused the adjustment and a clear response plan. Changes in the venue contract must be listed together with the new contract documents. If the negotiation of the contract details has not been completed at the time of announcing the change, it must be completed, and the complete contract documents provided within 30 working days.

Section 2.6: Incapacity of Committees

2.6.1: The incapacity of a Worldcon committee could be defined as the following situations:

1. being unable to hold the Worldcon at the promised time and place without an adjustment under the rules in Article 2.X,
2. losing the committee members, which has led to the disability of the committee, or the existing members have no ability to running the committee,
3. other possible situations which led to the incapacity of the Committee

2.6.2: With sites being selected two (2) years in advance, there are at least two selected current or future Worldcon Committees at all times. If one of these should be unable to perform its duties, the other selected current or future Worldcon Committee shall determine what action to take, by consulting the Business Meeting or by mail poll of WSFS if there is sufficient time, or by decision of the Committee if there is not sufficient time. Where a site and Committee are chosen by a Business Meeting or Worldcon Committee pursuant to this section, they are not restricted by exclusion zone or other qualifications.

At the same time, the Chinese translation or the Chinese version should be amended by striking out and inserting words as follows:

同时，相应的中文条款（或可被视为中文的翻译版本）通过以下的删除（使用删除线）和补充（使用字下划线）条款修订：

第2条- 世界科幻大会组委会的权力和职责和权力

第2.1节：职责

世界科幻大会应每年举办一次。每届世界科幻大会应形成组委会。每届世界科幻大会组委会应根据本章程规定以促进世界科幻协会、雨果奖和世界科幻大会的发展为目的：

(1) 在承诺的时间和地点举办世界科幻大会；
(2) 管理雨果奖；
(3) 管理未来世界科幻大会或北美科幻大会选址；
(4) 召开事务会议；
(5) 履行其他其认为有必要的职责。

第2.X节：按承诺时间和地点举办世界科幻大会

2.X.1: 世界科幻大会得在组委会承诺的时间和地点举行。

2.X.2: 但是，如果组委会希望更改地点或时间，只有在以下原因下，变更才被视为合规：
(1) 当地行政部门或地点提供方的命令或要求，且组委会无主观过错；
(2) 不可抗力：必须是不可预见，不可抗拒的外部事件，一般包括自然灾害，如飓风、龙卷风、地震和流行病，以及人为行为，如武装冲突。

2. X. 3: 提前通知的义务。

2. X. 3.1: 组委会有提前通知变更的义务。组委会须在正式完成地点或时间变更的45天前发出通知，且应在3天内正式发布并送达全部会员。

2. X. 3.2: 会员有权提出异议或询问。委员会应在收到询问的7天内答复。

2. X. 3.3: 如大会三分之二以上的会员通过有署名的电子邮件、信件等方式向组委会正式提出反对意见，组委会的地点和时间变更提议视为无效，且可认为组委会无法履职。

2. X. 3.4: 委员会在宣布拟议的变更通知时，应明确、清晰、有力地告知会员有权对修改建议提出质疑和异议，并提供明确畅通的质疑和异议渠道。收到的正式反对意见应进行统计，无论是否超过了会员总数的三分之二，统计结果都应在30天后以单独的正式通知形式宣布。

2. X. 4: 委员会应在承诺时间的120天首选范围内通知成员可能更改的时间和地点。任何在承诺的世界大会开始前120天内宣布的变更将被视为委员会无法履职。

2. X. 5: 更改的时间不能在原定的时间120天前或120天后。

2. X. 6: 更改的地点距原地点的距离不能超过30公里。

2. X. 7: 一旦宣布此类变更，委员会必须允许任何类型的会员退费。除非会员已对雨果奖进行提名或投票，否则WSFS会员也可退款。

2. X. 8: 对于根据2. X. 7条款退款的会员，在其重新购买会员资格时不得收取额外费用或设置任何限制。

2. X. 9: 地点和时间只能更改一次。单独对地址或时间的变更，或两者同时的变更，均视为一次变更。无论出于何种原因，委员会在单次变更后提出的第二次变更将被视为委员会无法履职。

2. X. 10: 时间和地点的变更必须在本届世界大会的官方网站、通讯和向会员提供的出版物中以明确和醒目的方式予以通知，且在大会结束前不得撤销此类通知。

2. X. 11: 委员会有义务在通知中说明调整的确切原因和明确的应对计划。场地合同的变更必须与新的合同文件一起列出。如果在宣布变更时尚未完成合同细节的谈判，则必须在30个工作日内完成谈判并提供完整的合同文件。

第2.6节：组委会无法履行职责

2. 6. 1: 世界科幻大会组委会的无法履职定义为以下情况：
(1) 无法在约定的时间和地点举办世界大会，且不能根据第2. X 条的规定进行变更；
(2) 失去组委会成员导致委员会瘫痪，或现有成员没有能力管理委员会；
(3) 其他已经导致组委会无法履职的情形。
2.6.2: 由于大会举办地会提前两年进行选址投票，因此始终有两届大会组委会在筹备会议。
如果其中一个组委会不能履行其职责，另一个大会组委会应确定应对方法：
（1）如果有足够的信息，通过咨询大会事务会议或通过WSFS邮件投票来确定；
（2）如果没有足够的时间，则由组委会决定。如果未来大会举办地及其组委会是依据本节选择的，则不受资质和区域规则限制。

Part 5: New Procedures in Future Worldcon Selection
第五部分 世界科幻大会选址的新程序要求

Moved, To amend Article 4 – Future Worldcon Selection the WSFS Constitution to replace the current provisions of the powers and duties of Worldcon Committees by striking out and inserting words as follows:
提出以下动议：对世界科幻协会会章第2条“世界科幻大会组委会的权力和职责”进行修订，通过以下的删除（使用删除线）和补充（使用字下划线）条款修订有关条款

Section 4.5: Tallying
4.5.5: If a site wins, but the site does not have a corresponding bidding committee, it is treated as a " None of the Above " win.
4.5.56: If "None of the Above" wins, or if two or more bids are tied for first place at the end of tallying, the duty of site selection shall devolve on the Business Meeting of the current Worldcon. If the Business Meeting is unable to decide by the end of the Worldcon, the Committee for the following Worldcon shall make the selection without undue delay.
4.5.67: When a site and Committee are chosen by a Business Meeting or Worldcon Committee following a win by "None of the Above," they are not restricted by exclusion zone or other qualifications.
4.5.78: Where a site and Committee are chosen by a Business Meeting or Worldcon Committee following a tie in tallying, they must select one of the tied bids.

Section 4.6: Bid Eligibility
4.6.1: A bidding committee should be an unincorporated society.
4.6.2: The bidding committee shall fully ensure its ability to bid for and hold the Worldcon and to fulfil its responsibilities.
4.6.3: To be eligible for site selection, a bidding committee must file the following documents with the Committee that will administer the voting:
(1) an announcement of intent to bid, which includes the intended date of the Worldcon, the exact address of the venue, the conditions of hosting and other necessary information;
(2) adequate evidence of an agreement with its proposed site's facilities, such as a conditional contract or a letter of agreement;
(3) the rules under which the Worldcon Committee will operate, including a specification of the term of office of their chief executive officer or officers and the conditions and procedures for the selection and replacement of such officer or officers.
4.6.24: The bidding committee must supply written copies of these documents to any member of WSFS on request.
4.6.35: For a bid to be allowed on the printed ballot, the bidding committee must file the documents specified above no later than 180 days prior to the official opening of the administering convention.
4.6.56: To be eligible as a write-in, the bidding committee must file the documents specified above by the close of the voting.
4.6.67: If no bids meet these qualifications, the selection shall proceed as though "None of the Above" had won.
4.6.8: The committee of the current World Science Fiction Convention, which is responsible for administering the ballot, may not disqualify a bidding committee for any reason other than a violation of Articles 4.6, 4.7, or 4.9. The Business Meeting shall also not discuss and vote on the disqualification of any bidding committee for any reason other than violation of Articles 4.6, 4.7, or 4.9 of the World Science Fiction Association.
4.6.9: A site shall not qualify or become an official site without its corresponding bidding committee.

Section 4.7: Site Eligibility
4.7.1: A site shall be ineligible if it is within five hundred (500) miles or eight hundred (800) kilometres of the site at which selection occurs.
4.7.1: The site shall be in a position to host the Worldcon committed to by the bidding committee at the time the bidding committee submits the Bid Documents in Section 4.6.3.
If the conference venue used by the bidding committee has not yet completed construction or is not in a condition to host the Worldcon at the time of submission of the bidding documents, it shall reach the acceptance condition of
being ready to host the convention or ready to set up the exhibition 75 days prior to the expected date of the Worldcon. The supporting documents shall be provided by the venue provider or the construction provider at the time of submission of the bidding documents, or the Bidding Venue shall fail to qualify:

4.7.2: A site shall not be located within five hundred (500) miles or eight hundred (800) kilometres of the site of the current Worldcon.

Section 4.9: Bid Discipline

4.9.1: The committee of the current Worldcon shall ensure that the bidding and counting of votes is fair and equitable and that it complies with the World Science Fiction Society Constitution and the laws and regulations of the place where the convention is to be held.

4.9.2: It is prohibited to sabotage the selection or obstruct the free voting of members for the site during the bidding period by means of violence, threats, deception, bribery, falsification of documents, or misrepresentation of the number of votes.

4.9.3: It is prohibited to disrupt the bidding committees’ presentations during the Worldcon by means of violence, threats, deception, bribery, or falsification of documents. The committee of the current Worldcon shall not create obstacles to the conduct of and participation in the presentations.

4.9.4: In the event of a violation of section 4.9, where the facts are clearly established, resulting in the selection of a site not being able to proceed, the selection of a site being invalid, or the results being untrue, the bidding committee involved shall be disqualified by the Business Meeting of the current Worldcon.

4.9.5: If conditions for a re-election exist, a re-election shall first be organised and managed by the committee of the current Worldcon in the event that the counting of votes is disrupted by a violation of section 4.9. If conditions for a re-election do not exist, the duty of site selection shall devolve on the Business Meeting of the current Worldcon. If the Business Meeting is unable to decide by the end of the Worldcon, the Committee for the following Worldcon shall make the selection without undue delay.

Section 4.10: No Site Selection

4.10.1: "No Site Selection" shall be considered only in the following cases:

(1) There is no eligible bidding committee for the members to vote on;
(2) "None of the above" wins the site selection ballot;
(3) The Site Ballot is spoiled in violation of Section 4.9 and there is no eligible bidding Committee;

4.10.2: In the event of a situation under subsection 4.10.1, the duty of site selection shall transfer to the Business Meeting of the current Worldcon. If the Business Meeting is unable to decide by the end of the Worldcon, the Committee for the following Worldcon shall make the selection without undue delay.

4.10.3: The Business Meeting of the current Worldcon and the Committee for the following Worldcon shall make the selection in the following order with full consideration:

(1) Selection of the site of the next Worldcon;
(2) Selection of the site of the current Worldcon;
(3) The site the Bidding Committee now eligible but not in the year of site selection;
(4) Sites that have hosted a World Science Fiction Convention in the past five years and whose committees are still in operation;
(5) Do not host a World Science Fiction Convention, i.e., "no site."

At the same time, the Chinese translation or the Chinese version should be amended by striking out and inserting words as follows:

同时，相应的中文条款（或可被视为中文的翻译版本）通过以下的删除（使用删除线）和补充（使用字下划线）条款修订：

第4.5节：统计

4.5.5：如果一个选址获胜，但该选址并无对应的世界科幻大会申办委员会，则按照“以上均不”获胜处理。

4.5.56：如果“以上均不”获胜，或者在计票结束时两个或多个选址并列第一名，则选址职责应由当届世界科幻大会的事务会议决定。如果事务会议无法在世界科幻大会结束时做出决定，则下届世界科幻大会组委会应做出选择而不得无故拖延。

4.5.67：如果申办的选址和组委会是在当届事务会议或世界科幻大会组委会在“以上均不”结果中选出的，则不必考虑区域规则限制和其他条件。

4.5.78：如果事务会议或世界科幻大会组委会在选择申办地及其委员会时出现计数平局的话，则必须选择并列中的其中一个。

第4.6节：申办资格
4.6.1：申办委员会应当是一个非公司制的协会。
4.6.2：申办委员会应充分确保其申办和举办世界科幻大会、履行其职责的能力。
4.6.13：要获得申办资格，申办委员会必须向管理投票的委员会提交以下文件：
（1）申办意向声明，包括意向举办日期，举办场馆的具体地址、承保条件和其他必要信息；
（2）与拟定的会议场馆达成协议的证明材料，例如合同或协议书；
（3）申办委员会章程，包括主席团任期、选择和更换主席团成员的条件规则等；
（4）证明申办委员会符合4.6.1条款的相关证明材料；
（5）其他申办委员会认为有必要的文件。
4.6.24：申办委员会必须要求向WVSFS的任一会员提供这些文件的书面副本。
4.6.25：为了能够在印刷选票上成为申办选项，申办委员会必须在当届世界科幻大会开幕前180天内提交上述文件。
4.6.46：要获得提名资格，申办委员会必须在投票结束前提交上述文件。
4.6.57：如果没有符合这些资格的申办地，那么将按照“以上都不选”获胜的情况继续进行选择。
4.6.8：负责管理投票的当届世界科幻大会组委会不得以任何理由取消某一申办委员会的资格，除非申办委员会违反4.6、4.7或4.9条款。世界科幻协会事务会议也不得以违反4.6、4.7或4.9条款以外的理由对任一申办委员会的申办资格进行讨论和表决。
4.6.9：一个选址没有其对应的申办委员会，不应获得申办资格或成为正式选址。

第4.7节：场地地址资格
4.7.1：申办场地应在申办委员会提交4.6.3条款中的申办文件时具备举办申办委员会承诺的世界科幻大会的能力。申办场地所使用的会议场馆如果尚未完成建设或在提交申办文件时尚不具备举办世界科幻大会的条件，则应在预计的举办日75天前达到可举办大会或可布展的验收条件，并在提交申办文件时提供由场馆方或建设方提供的证明材料，否则该申办地不合格。
4.7.2：申办地不得位于当届世界科幻大会举办地的五百（500）英里或八百（800）公里范围内。如果申办地位于当届世界科幻大会举办地的五百（500）英里或八百（800）公里范围内，则该申办地不合格。

第4.9节：申办纪律
4.9.1：当届世界科幻大会组委会应保证申办和计票的公平公正，保证其符合世界科幻协会章程和大会举办地法律法规。
4.9.2：禁止在申办期间以暴力、威胁、欺骗、贿赂、伪造文件、虚报票数等手段破坏评选或者妨害会员自由投票选址。
4.9.3：禁止在世界科幻大会期间以暴力、威胁、欺骗、贿赂、伪造文件等手段破坏申办委员会的展示活动。当届世界科幻大会组委会不得为展示活动的进行和参与设置障碍。
4.9.4：出现违反4.9条款的情形，事实认定清楚，造成选址无法进行、选址无效或结果不真实的，对涉事的申办委员会由当届世界科幻大会事务会议取消其申办资格。
4.9.5：如果具备重新投票条件，在计票被违反4.9条款的情形破坏时应首先由当届世界科幻大会组委会组织和管理重新投票。如果不具备重新投票的条件的，由当届世界科幻协会事务会议决定。事务会议不能在世界科幻大会结束时决定的，由下一届世界科幻大会组委会作出选择，不得无故拖延。

第4.10节：无选址
Part 6: Newsletter and Progress Report

Section 2.Y: Newsletter, publication and progress report

2.Y.1: In order to promote the brand and the transparency of Worldcon and the Hugo Award, a Worldcon committee shall make the necessary newsletter and progress report.

2.Y.2: Progress report is a pattern to deliver the information of a Worldcon.

2.Y.2.1: In order to make the members learn the progress of a Worldcon, the committee shall have the responsibility to write and deliver the progress reports.

2.Y.2.2: Progress report shall be made and delivered at least each season (each four months).

2.Y.2.3: Progress report shall not ask members for additional fees for its writing.

2.Y.2.4: Worldcon must offer the option to receive a paper progress report regardless of that member’s selection for other publications. Should they choose to include other material (such as an addressed envelope and stamp or International Reply Coupon), they may charge a reasonable fee for such materials.

2.Y.2.5: Progress reports shall include the following contents:

1. Introductions of the current Worldcon, its date and site;
2. Necessary help and instructions on travelling documents for foreign members;
3. Fees and payment method for memberships;
4. Deadlines and instructions for Hugo Award, Business Meeting and site selection;
5. Instructions on volunteer service;
6. Constitution of the World Science Fiction Society;
7. Contact details with the committee, including at least the email address, phone number and mailing address;
8. Other necessary messages considered by the committee.

2.Y.2.6: Each progress report shall reserve space or pages for future Worldcons and bidding committees to help their promotion. The promotion shall be free and the future committees and bidding committees shall not be charged.

At the same time, the Chinese translation or the Chinese version should be amended by striking out and inserting words as follows:

Journey Planet 82
同时，相应的中文条款（或可被视为中文的翻译版本）通过以下的删除（使用删除线）和补充（使用字下划线）条款修订：

第 2.Y 节：通讯、出版物与进度报告。

2.Y.1: 为提升世界科幻大会和雨果奖的品牌知名度和透明度，世界科幻大会组委会应制作必要的新闻通讯和进展报告。

2.Y.2: 进展报告是传递世界大会信息的一种模式。

2.Y.2.1: 为了让会员了解世界科幻大会的进展情况，组委会有责任撰写并递送进展报告。

2.Y.2.2: 应至少每季度（每四个月）撰写和递送一次进展报告。

2.Y.2.3: 进度报告的撰写不得要求会员支付额外费用。

2.Y.2.4: 无论会员是否选择其他出版物，必须提供接收纸质进展报告的选择。如果会员选择附带其他材料（如带地址的信封和邮票或国际回执券），可以对这些材料收取合理的费用。

2.Y.2.5: 进展报告应包括以下内容：

(1) 介绍本届世界大会及其日期和地点；
(2) 对外国会员旅行证件的必要帮助说明；
(3) 会员费及支付方式；
(4) 雨果奖、商务会议和会址选择的截止日期和说明；
(5) 志愿者服务说明；
(6) 世界科幻协会章程；
(7) 与委员会的联系方式，至少包括电子邮件地址、电话号码和通信地址；
(8) 委员会认为必要的其他信息。
2.Y.2.6: 每份进展报告应为未来的世界科幻大会和申办委员会预留版面，以帮助其宣传。宣传是免费的，不得向接下来的世界科幻大会组委会和申办委员会收取任何费用。

Part 7: Fairness in the Hugo Awards
第七部分：雨果奖公平性
Moved, To amend Section 3.13: Exclusions. the WSFS Constitution to replace the current provisions of the powers and duties of Worldcon Committees by striking out and inserting words as follows:
提出以下动议：对世界科幻协会会章第2条“世界科幻大会组委会的权力和职责”进行修订，通过以下的删除（使用删除线）和补充（使用字下划线）条款修订有关条款

Section 3.13: Exclusions.
3.13.1: No member of the current Worldcon Committee or any publications closely connected with a member of the Committee shall be eligible for an Award. However, should the Committee delegate all authority under this Article to a Subcommittee whose decisions are irrevocable by the Worldcon Committee, then this exclusion shall apply to members of the Subcommittee only.
3.13.2: The closely connection includes:
(1) The author is a close relative of one or more members of the Committee, i.e. a direct blood relative and a collateral relative up to the third degree of consanguinity.
(2) The author has close social ties with one or more members of the Committee in the field of publication, including the fact that a member of the Committee is the author or editor-in-charge of the work under consideration, the principal person in charge of the organisation in which the work under consideration is published or distributed, or the editor-in-chief of the library or series to which the work under consideration belongs;
(3) Other relationships that can be substantiated by sufficient information
3.13.3: Works, authors and the Committee should actively recuse themselves. The nomination shall be deleted.

At the same time, the Chinese translation or the Chinese version should be amended by striking out and inserting words as follows:
同时，相应的中文条款（或可被视为中文的翻译版本）通过以下的删除（使用删除线）和补充（使用字下划线）条款修订：

第3.13节：排除

3.13.1: 本届世界科幻大会组委会的任何成员，或与组委会成员有密切联系的任何出版物均无权获奖。但是，如果组委会将本条规定的所有权力委托给一个小组委员会，且该小组委员会的决定世界科幻大会组委会不可撤销，则该排除仅适用于小组委员会成员。
3.13.2: 密切联系应包括：
(1) 作者是委员会一位或多位成员的近亲，即直系血亲和三代以内旁系血亲。
(2) 作者与委员会的一名或多名成员在出版领域有密切的社会关系，包括委员会的一名成员是所审议作品的作者或责任编辑、所审议作品出版或发行机构的主要负责人或所审议作品所属图书馆或丛书的主编；
(3) 有充分信息证明的其他关系。
3.13.3: 作品、作家和委员会成员应主动回避。涉密切联系的提名应当被取消。

Part 8: The Chengdu Worldcon Brand Promotion Centre
第八部分：世界科幻大会（成都）品牌推广中心

WHEREAS the Chengdu Worldcon Brand Promotion Centre (CWBPC) was established by the Chengdu Worldcon Committee; and
WHEREAS the Chengdu Worldcon Brand Promotion Centre held the foundation ceremony during the closing ceremony of the Chengdu Worldcon; and
WHEREAS CWBPC declared that it was agreed by the members of the Brand Protection Committee in Chengdu; and
WHEREAS according to the minutes of the Brand Protection Committee, there was no discussion on the necessity and feasibility of the establishment of the CWBPC, the purpose of its establishment, the scope of its work, the composition of its personnel, etc., and no guiding opinions or resolutions were made; and
WHEREAS the constitution does not stipulate that the terms of reference of the organising committee of a World Science Fiction Convention include the establishment of a branding centre or similar body; and
WHEREAS there is little historical precedent for the establishment of a branding centre or similar body; and
WHEREAS CWBPC only declared its purpose of “promoting the brand of the Worldcon” via some media, without an official announcement which included its purpose, rules, members and so on; and
WHEREAS the name of CWBPC caused doubts on intellectual property and its relationship with the WSFS for it didn’t clarify its “promotion” on whether Chengdu Worldcon or the total Worldcons;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:
Chengdu Worldcon committee shall send a member to attend the Business Meeting in Glasgow2024 and Seattle2025 to explain and answer the questions about CWBPC, and the member shall clarify its purpose, work, members and financial records; and
Chengdu Worldcon shall prove the CWBPC is still running by an official announcement in no more than 15 days, which includes the financial records, activity records and its necessity of the CWBPC; and
BPC shall discuss, evaluate, and vote on the relationship of WSFS, BPC and Hugo Award with CWBPC during its next meeting; and
BPC shall clarify its support on CWBPC after its next meeting, especially explaining “the CWBPC has been approved by the members of BPC in Chengdu”; and
Business Meeting shall set up an individual committee to clarify the facts of CWBPC, the requirements of the individual committee (IC) are as follows:

(1) There shall be at least three members in the IC, and only one member could be invited from the Chengdu Worldcon committee, only one member could be invited from the BPC;
(2) IC shall make an investigation report in no more than 90 days, which includes the process of the founding of the CWBPC, its activities, its financial records and its relationship with Chengdu Worldcon, Worldcon, WSFS, and BPC;
(3) IC need to give its independent advice on the development of the CWBPC;
(4) Other work if IC agrees its necessity

鉴于:
世界科幻大会（成都）品牌推广中心（CWBPC）由成都世界科幻大会组委会成立;
CWBPC在成都世界科幻大会闭幕仪式上举行了成立仪式;
CWBPC声称其成立获得了在成都的品牌保护委员会成员的同意;
根据品牌保护委员会会议记录，未就CWBPC成立的必要性、可行性，成立宗旨，工作范围，人员组成等进行讨论，也未作出指导性意见或决议;
现行会章未规定一届世界科幻大会的组委会的工作职权包含成立品牌推广中心或类似机构;
成立品牌推广中心或类似机构在历史上几乎无先例可循;
CWBPC仅通过媒体声称其目的是“为了强化全球科幻社群的交流，促进世界科幻大会品牌的推广“，而没有一份关于其宗旨、规则、成员等的正式声明文件;
世界科幻大会（成都）品牌推广中心的名称不能解释其是推广“成都世界科幻大会”还是“世界科幻大会”，造成了其知识产权、与世界科幻协会关系等的疑惑;

兹决议:
责成成都世界科幻大会组委会派员参加2024年格拉斯哥和2025年西雅图世博会的商务会议，解释和回答有关CWBPC的问题，该成员应明确CWBPC的宗旨、工作、成员和财务记录;
责成成都世界科幻大会委员会在不超过15天内以官方公告的形式证明CWBPC仍在运行，公告内容包括CWBPC的财务记录、活动记录及其必要性;
品牌保护委员会得在下次会议上讨论、评估和表决 WSFS、BPC、雨果奖与 CWBPC 的关系;
品牌保护委员会得在下次会议后澄清其对 CWBPC 的支持，特别是要说明 "CWBPC 已得到在成都的品牌保护委员会成员的批准";
事务会议得成立一个独立委员会对CWBPC进行调查，该独立委员会（IC）的要求如下:

(1) 委员会至少有三名成员，且成都世界科幻大会组委会和品牌保护委员会最多仅能有一人参加;
（2）委员会应在不超过90天的时间内作出调查报告，内容包括世界科幻大会（成都）品牌推广中心的成立过程、活动情况、财务记录以及其与成都世界科幻大会、世界科幻大会、世界科幻协会、品牌保护委员会的关系；
（3）对CWBPC的发展提出独立意见；
（4）该委员会认为有必要的其他工作。

Part 9: Translation and Multi-language
第九部分：翻译与语言多样性
WHEREAS The only existing valid text of this Constitution is its English version, the only existing working language in Business Meeting is English; and
WHEREAS the World Science Fiction Convention 2023 was held in Chengdu, China; and
WHEREAS the Chengdu Worldcon Brand Promotion Centre (CWBPC) was announced at the 2023 Worldcon; and
WHEREAS CWBPC was announced as an institution which works on the promotion of Worldcon in Asia with the use of non-English languages; and
WHEREAS Chinese was widely used in the activities and the Business Meeting in 2023 Worldcon; and
WHEREAS A Chinese translation was finished in the 2023 Worldcon by the staff of the Chengdu Committee and widely quoted in the 2023 Business Meeting; and
WHEREAS Chinese works have been nominated and awarded in the former Hugo Awards; and
WHEREAS There are already non-English-speaking countries bidding for and hosting World Science Fiction Conventions; and
WHEREAS the Constitution could be regarded as the basis of the Worldcon and the Hugo Award;
BE IT RESOLVED THAT:
On the basis of the translation of the Chengdu Worldcon, CWBPC shall translate the constitution within 180 days and submit it to the Business Meeting in Seattle 2025 as a proposal;
CWBPC shall send a member to the Business Meeting in Seattle 2025 to explain and answer the questions on the translation;
If CWBPC doesn't have the ability to work on the translation, the Business Meeting can set up a committee with at least 3 Chinese members to work on the translation, the requirements shall be equal to CWBPC, but the deadline could be extended.

鉴于：
本《章程》现有的唯一有效文本是英文版，商务会议中现有的唯一工作语言是英文：2023年世界科幻大会已在中国成都举行；
世界科幻大会品牌推广中心（成都）（CWBPC）已在2023年世界科幻大会上宣布成立，作为在亚洲使用非英语语言推广世界科幻大会的机构；
中文在2023年世界大会的活动和商务会议中被广泛使用；
成都委员会的工作人员在2023年世界科幻大会上完成了中文翻译，并在2023年商务会议上被广泛引用；
中文作品已经在雨果奖中被提名和获奖；
已经有非英语国家申办和主办世界科幻大会；
《章程》可以被视为世界大会和雨果奖的基础；

兹决议：
在成都世界科幻大会的中文翻译基础上，责成CWBPC在180日内完成《章程》的中文翻译并将其作为提案提交给2025年西雅图世界科幻大会事务会议；
责成CWBPC在2025年西雅图世界科幻大会事务会议上派出一名成员翻译进行解释并回答问题；
如CWBPC不具备进行工作的能力，事务会议可以组建一个包含五名以上中国成员的委员会进行翻译工作，要求如上，但期限可适当放宽。

Explanation of the Short Title of These Proposals:
The proposal used to have an offensive title. It has now been changed.
From the New World is a science fiction novel by Japanese sci-fi author Yusuke Kishi, and one of my favourites.
Now that we've encountered a "From the New World" sci-fi convention, action must be taken. The series of motions under this proposal first originated from such a reflection and sought to review the experience of previous World Science Fiction Conventions. Hopefully, the World Science Fiction Convention will be better, much better.

提案曾经有一个富有攻击性的标题。现在已经改掉了。
《来自新世界》是日本科幻作家贵志祐介的科幻小说，也是我最喜欢的一部作品。
现在我们真的遇到了来自新世界的科幻大会，必须行动起来了。本提案下一系列的动议首先发轫于这样的思考，并设法检视了以往世界科幻大会的经验。
希望世界科幻大会能更加完善，更好些。
Boosters for the Rockets: A Formal Pastoral Care Procedure for Hugo Finalists by Alasdair Stuart

In the briar patch of ironies that has accreted around Worldcon, one of the biggest is that the convention’s structure and culture have evolved into a shape that often presents as punishing Hugo finalists at an event partially intended to celebrate them. This happens, in my experience, across three axes:

• Emotional: Being a finalist is both a tremendous honour and akin to being shoved on stage in front of a live audience, naked, for months. The ambient pressure of being ‘on’ is a constant stressor, as is the frequent discourse about whatever issues the convention is dealing with and the sense of being ‘assessed’ by your peers. The unofficial rule, introduced to me by Olav Rokne of Hugo Book Club, that no one should have a take about a finalist for the first week post announcement, speaks to this.

• Psychological: I’ll happily put my cards on the table here. My finalist experiences have varied from okay to wildly negative and the result is an erosion of trust in both the support structures of the convention and the awards themselves. These issues pre-date the frankly astounding moral bankruptcy of the 2023 Chengdu awards team, but being profiled by them is the most recent and egregious example of the failures of care finalists have often had to deal with over the last few years.

• Temporal: Finalists attending digitally have the most asked of them and frequently are given the least in return. Discon III’s last minute hour-long delay is a good example of this. It inconvenienced people on site but meant those attending online were, in the UK at least, required to be awake between 2 and 6am.

Nothing has to be this way. Better still, there are support structures already in place to ensure nothing is this way. All we have to do is enhance and support them.

Existing Resources

Hugo Liaison
This is the single most important step made in finalist pastoral care in the last decade. The formalisation of Hugo Liaison as an increasingly default part of Worldcon has done wonders for speed of communication, fostering of community, and solving problems. They’re key to this proposal.

Online Finalist Community
This has gone through various iterations, and has now stabilised as a formal, rolling Discord server open all year round. Established by Cora Buhlert and Gideon Marcus, this Discord has always been a useful community but truly came into its own as the multi-spectrum failure of care perpetrated by the Chengdu team became apparent. At present, this Discord has a dedicated section for the year’s finalists and a larger community for previous finalists as well.

Required Resources
A 2-3 person Hugo finalist documentation team, intended to spread out the considerable workload of the Hugo Liaison.

A breakout space in the convention venue designated for finalists.

Stage 1: Pre Planning

• The Buhlert/Marcus Discord server is formalised as a part of the Hugo finalist process. The Hugo Liaison and team for the year are given admin privileges.
• Documentation is assembled to be sent to finalists including:
  ◦ a schedule of when they’ll be given more information (the obvious model here is a Kickstarter and the cycle of updates), a breakdown of what materials they will receive, what’s expected of them and when, and advice from previous finalists and winners. An expression of interest form asking for volunteers to help mentor people if needed.

Stage 2: Convention

• An onsite breakout space for finalists running the length of the con. There’s precedent for this: SFWA’s member suite at most US cons and the Green Room LonCon 2014. It’s smart, it works, and it takes the edge off the reception for folks who are on site, breaks the ice, and helps lower anxiety.

• The same thing for online only finalists. Even if it’s regularly scheduled, MEMBERS ONLY, hour long zooms will help. I’ve been a geographically distant finalist a lot and it’s an alienating, often deeply depressing experience. It doesn’t have to be. It shouldn’t have to be. This is how we can change that.

The next stage is where we break new ground.

Stage 3: Post-Awards

• Drinks in the Breakout Suite on site and an online event for finalists post-award ceremony. The Loser’s Party is a can of worms no one wants, or needs, to re-open but something can be done for both finalist groups with relatively minimal outlay and time. The fact a formal reception of sorts is already on the way to being the default speaks to this.

• A discretionary amount paid to offsite finalists to help them celebrate. It doesn’t have to be much, but every finalist deserves cake. The good will of even offering this would be astronomical.

• The convention pledges, in writing, to provide the long list no later than one week after the end of the awards ceremony. This is a drastic reduction from the 90-day limit, but the Chengdu team’s use of that time limit as armour for their incompetence has fatally damaged the credibility of the 90 day window. The work of rebuilding trust in the Hugos will take years. This is one of the places it can be seen to quickly and publicly.

• The breakout spaces continue for two weeks past the release of the stats. If it helps, view this as an online equivalent of the Dead Dog Party and one that may not be well attended. But the Hugos have a long tail, and finalists, especially those who haven’t won, will view having a space to process their feelings, kindly. Again, this is a drop in the bucket of goodwill that needs to be won back post-Chengdu. But it’s a good start.

• After Action Report. Once the online spaces are closed, the volunteers complete a Google survey, anonymized if needed, which offers feedback on any positive/negative comments, and is sent to the Hugo Liaison for the next convention.

• The Discord remains as it is: an ongoing year-round community. This can serve as a second line for finalists to ‘fall back’ to once the online space closes.

Costs

• Construction, editing, and publication of a finalist advice pack. This is an initial investment of time which will establish a baseline of documentation that can, and will, be updated every year. This requires a standing digital archive that is handed over and, crucially, updated, every year. This cannot be the sort of accreted non-wisdom that means the phrase ‘Huckster’s Avenue’ is still in Worldcon planning documentation in 2024.

• On-site suite hire (possible it could be folded into rooms already booked?)
• Volunteer time for online Zooms
• Good will support for the Discord
• Public thanks for all staff involved, delivered in the Closing Ceremony and in writing.

Conclusion

None of the endemic failures of care that have happened to finalists in the last ten years needed to happen. None of them need to happen again and there’s already a clear groundswell of motivation to ensure that. The superb communication protocols Glasgow 2024 employs embody this beautifully.

With this proposal we can combine and enhance existing structures to form a foundation to make the contemporary Hugo experience what it’s always been viewed as and, in practice, often has not been: an honour for those chosen and a shining asset and vital part of that year’s Worldcon. The structures are there. The solutions are there. All we have to do is combine them, strap those boosters to the rockets, and take off.
I went to my first Worldcon when I was 17. I’d been to my first science fiction convention when I was 14. From a tiny advertisement in one of the science fiction magazines, I saw the ad for the World Science Fiction Convention coming to my town. I was over the moon to find out there was a “world” version of the SF conventions!

I still love the idea of fans from across the globe gathering to celebrate the genre with programs, panels, events, parties, friendships made and renewed at our annual convention and the Hugo Awards!

I’ve chaired a Worldcon, vice-chaired one, chair-advised a few times, been a Division Head, along with being involved with the Hugo Awards multiple times.

When the 2023 Hugo Awards scandal hit, I shared the outrage so many fans felt at the unfolding disastrous responses launched on the internet. We simply cannot move forward by putting a bandaid on the problem and hoping that we are not hit with a future crisis. Bold reforms need to be made. Below I outline several problems along with proposed solutions. My original ideas were modified after speaking with a couple of Hugo-winning professionals, several past and future Worldcon chairs, and some fans that care deeply.

The solutions below are not set in stone and very open to being modified. That said, efforts to weaken them will not be welcome. I think a consensus needs to be developed to make multiple changes to better the World Science Fiction Society. The Society needs to take action to be trustworthy, transparent, and inclusive of all parts of the community.

What will be welcome are suggestions to improve the solutions and add others to the mix. I, after getting feedback from original advisors and the readers of Journey Planet, will file final versions to be on the agenda for the Business Meeting in Glasgow. I’m looking for a broad series of improvements to be voted on as a complete package. Even if someone has qualms about parts of the solutions, a willingness to find consensus in the proposals will, I believe, create a chance at wide, effective reform.
Solutions for a Clearer, Friendlier, Trustworthy WSFS and Hugo Awards

1. Problem: There is no official voice of the World Science Fiction Society.

   We cannot have a future incident where a prior year’s Hugo Administrator, Chair of the Mark Protection committee, or any other staff member is acting or even appearing to act on behalf of the Society. There needs to be a designated date for the official handover of power. While there is a handoff at closing ceremonies, this is truly only for show, and a hard demarcation of power is not established.

Solution: There needs to be an official hand off on a specific date. Possible dates are: the official close of a Worldcon; December 31st in the year a Worldcon is held; January 1 of the year following; or January 31st (or whenever Hugo nominations close), as that date marks the end of the activity of a member of the Society from the prior year.

   All staff of each Worldcon should be put under a duty to not speak about or on behalf of the Society, and all communications should professionally be handled by the committee in charge of the next Worldcon.
   Enforcing the duty won’t be easy, but it should still be known and in place. It would be good if the inside view of last year’s Hugo Administration Subcommittee’s emails weren’t just in journalists’ hands, but also available to the Society on demand from the committee in charge.
   The primary value of this change is to not have half-cocked idiots or evil doers enraging, insulting, and harming the community.

2. Problem: There is no licensing agreement between a Worldcon and the Society to use the servicemarks for Worldcon and the Hugo Awards.

   Ridiculous. Fraught with peril and legally stupid.

Solution: Under the current rules, when a bid files to be on the ballot, the bidder must provide several things, including: proof of a contract showing they have the facilities to hold a Worldcon, and evidence that they have rules in place to replace the Chair if needed. They take on the constitutional requirement to hold a Business Meeting, see to site selection, and administer the Hugo Awards.

   Part of getting on the ballot needs to be the mandatory condition of an executed licensing agreement. Spoiler alert: the mechanism of agreeing to particular behaviors/obligations in order to be validly on the ballot will be used for other solutions suggested in this document.

3. Problem: Hugo Administrators use their own private software that no one else can see the code or test the software.

   Horrible that this has been allowed to happen four times!

Solution: As part of getting on the ballot, a Worldcon bid must agree to use the Society’s standard Hugo software. This software will be publicly viewable and testable. Chris Rose’s Hugo counting software appears to be set for use by the next several Worldcons. His software is available to examine on Github. He has invited testing and asked for datasets.¹

   Software needs change over time as technological advances are made. To enable the software to be alive and improvable, a standing committee could be formed that evaluates and sets out the official software for each year. Such a committee might be created like the Mark Protection Committee: each Worldcon appoints a member of the committee. I’d add that the members of the committee should then select a few others to be members of this committee. Year to year adjustments may be made, and all without the business meeting’s slow two years to change model. Use of the Society’s counting software would be mandatory.
4. **Problem**: The Hugo awards do not need another scandal. Let's bring sunshine to dark places. The Constitution as currently written allows for a Hugo Subcommittee, but delegating all authority over the Hugos to it is not mandatory.

**Solution**: The least invasive change is to remain with the Worldcon in charge of creating the Hugo Administration Subcommittee. This should be mandatory, as currently the creation of such a subcommittee is not mandatory. Each Worldcon must name a Hugo Administration Subcommittee with all authority delegated to it.

Further, each subcommittee must include oversight members that are NOT appointed by the Worldcon. Independent members of the committee who are selected by outside bodies guarantees a high degree of transparency. This will allow honest eyes inside the Hugo Administration Subcommittee. I suggest five oversight members. For example, I'd ask SFWA and ASFA to appoint representatives to the independent oversight. The creators honored each year by the Hugo Awards deserve to have a level of involvement that ensures the Hugo Awards retain integrity.

I am wide open to a mechanism for selecting oversight members. This method must be rigorous in adding other voices from the worldwide community of fans. There can be no failure in diversity.

5. **Problem**: I just want to go on vacation, see/make friends, attend programs and events, etc. I do not want to go to a business meeting several hours every morning.

It is almost like some people designed it to be inconvenient so you didn’t drop in and mess up the “fun”.

“Hey wait, what do you mean they are sending that item to a committee for study...is it going to come up again?”

Well, Virginia there is a good chance the answer is no.

**Solution**: This conversation is too big for this space, but an effort has to be made to make the Business Meeting less of an intrusive time-suck that dissuades involvement. Maybe require anything sent to a committee for study to report back the next year, and if suggested changes are not acceptable to the maker of the motion, then it goes up for vote unaltered? We should be better than simply killing things in a subcommittee.

I’ve seen proposals floated in recent months to have the Business Meeting pass changes the first year, but rather than the current model of next year’s meeting passing it again, we have the Society as a whole vote on it. One hopes this would be done electronically. The involvement of the Society as a whole appeals to me. What does not appeal are suggestions for sunset provisions or re-ratification votes a few years after passing. These maneuvers always smack of a sneaky second bite at the apple of killing an idea after the spotlight is off an issue.

**Summary**: If future Worldcons do not comply with a final version of the solutions to problems 1-4 then their license and authority to carry out constitutionally-required acts will be pulled and conducted by the next seated Worldcon.

I’m open to suggestions to improve the proposed solutions, but they must still provide the transparency and required behavior that will make all members of the community confident of the World Science Fiction Society acting well and without scandal.

Changes Needed for the Hugo Awards Process by Trish E. Matson

The travesties of the 2023 Hugo Awards presented at the 2023 Chengdu Worldcon must not be repeated. Procedural and structural reforms must be made to restore the high reputation that the Hugo Awards have earned throughout the decades, which was damaged so severely by the Hugo Awards Subcommittee's pre-emptive censorship of creators and their apparent discarding of many legitimate votes. For thorough and effective reforms, the changes need to be taken along short-term, mid-range and long-term vectors.

Short-Term Measures
In the short term, the 2024 Worldcon team has already taken several necessary steps toward reform. Committee members involved in the 2023 disgrace will not be involved in the 2024 Hugo Awards process; Nicholas Whyte is now leading the Hugo Awards Administration Subcommittee team, along with Kathryn Duval, Cassidy, and Laura Martins. While I'm not familiar with the rest of the team, I have a great deal of respect for Whyte. Additionally, administrators have stated that the 2024 Long List with its nominations data will be released immediately after the Hugo Awards ceremony, rather than waiting out the deadline for several months. All of this is reassuring for the short term.

Mid-Range Actions
However, this is far from sufficient for ensuring the integrity of the awards for the future. As reliable as the current administrators seem to be, there is no guarantee that the 2025 team and future administrators will be trustworthy. Many people had great respect for Dave McCarty and his cronies on the 2023 team; indeed, McCarty still has vociferous defenders who claim that McCarty's actions were forced by the Chengdu site selection itself, or he was sending coded hostage messages through his actions, or other ridiculous excuses. Since the administration changes every year, it's obvious that we can no longer just rely on Good People being chosen for it every year, and for them to do the right things.

It's clear to me, and to many other people, that the Hugo Awards must add independent auditors to the awards process for both trust and accountability. No further opportunities for vote manipulations can be allowed. That has to happen throughout the process; the auditors need to be able to see votes as they come in, not be presented with a summary after the fact. If that means the votes have to go to the auditors first, and then forwarded to the Hugo Awards Administration Subcommittee, that's fine. Furthermore, the tabulation also needs to be done via open source software or commercially available products; no more secret, personal, proprietary processes for vote-counting can be allowed – that's just ASKING for trouble.

In addition, since fear of censorship and retribution from authoritarian governments (and a vaguely worded bylaw observing the need to follow local laws) have been cited as “justification” for censorship by the 2023 Hugo Awards Administration Subcommittee, any fan communities who submit Worldcon bids must include pledges to abide by freedom of speech, expression, and identity. Works and creators must never again be declared ineligible due to the ideas expressed or the personal selves or life choices of the creators; eligibility should rest solely upon the stated qualifications of the individual category.

Moreover, since national, state, and local governments can turn repressive, and circumstances can change quickly for the host of a winning bid, the World Science Fiction Society must have mechanisms for either enforcing anti-censorship bid pledges or declaring the Hugo Awards invalid for that year. It would be preferable to be able to do that in a timely fashion rather than waiting for World Science Fiction Society Business Meetings at the relevant or following Worldcons to take such actions. This would have to be addressed as a separate long-term reform.
I don’t know how to find the most suitable independent auditors or tabulation software, but the 2024 Business Meetings absolutely could and should put together a study committee to determine options for that, to be reported on within 10 months after the Glasgow Worldcon and hopefully voted on within the next two years. However, amendments phrasing an anti-censorship pledge for Worldcon bidders and empowering WSFS Business meetings to declare censored Hugo Awards invalid may certainly be proposed and passed for the first time in 2024 and validated at the 2025 Worldcon, if there is sufficient will for these reforms.

Long-Term Goals

I’ve seen some people calling for the complete detachment of the Hugo Awards from the geographically peripatetic Worldcons, but I think this is unnecessary and ill-advised. The reforms I’ve proposed above should work to safeguard the integrity of the Awards, whereas detaching them, embedded as they are in the reason for even having Worldcons, would create tremendous controversy and undermine both the Hugos and Worldcon itself.

However, there is certainly more that can and should be done to reform the Hugo Awards and Worldcons. The Hugo Awards are not actually very well known throughout the entire speculative fiction community. Out of a world of fans, only a few thousand people each year vote for them. Part of this is because Worldcon is relatively obscure. It’s not drawing nearly enough young people to replace the ranks of leaders who are aging out after years of worthy service. Although improvements in diversity have been made, more is needed.

It’s hard to get involved. People who try can become discouraged because of entrenched territorialism, plus the necessity to be on-site for a lot of volunteer activities, including having a voice in governance. For anyone who wants to get involved in changing how things are done at Worldcons, it can be a shock to learn that the only way to do that is to show up in person, often on different continents, two years in a row, for days, to vote at the time-consuming WSFS Business Meetings – and giving up a lot of other Worldcon activities for that participation.

Fortunately, there is already movement toward the possibility of broadening WSFS decision-making with online involvement. In December, Nicholas Whyte announced\(^1\) that the Glasgow 2024 Worldcon is planning a consultative (nonbinding) online vote about two proposed changes to the Hugo Awards, which would add two categories. This will also act to test the feasibility of adding an online component to the structure of making WSFS amendments, which currently only happens at Worldcon Business Meetings.

The proposed changes are to add two new Hugo Award categories: the Best Independent Short Film Award and the Best Independent Feature Film Award. Whyte said this proposal will be put online for feedback between the close of Hugo voting and the beginning of Worldcon. I certainly plan to vote on it, both to express my opinion and to express support for adding an online component to the structure of making WSFS amendments.

I think trying to move to online-only voting (with no onsite steps) would be far too drastic a change to the WSFS amendment process for now. But adding an online voting component, either between two Business Meetings, or possibly eventually replacing one of them, absolutely seems appropriate to me, as it would increase generational, economic, and geographic diversity. Diluting the dominance of the old-fans network will help increase respect and trust for the Hugo Awards worldwide.

\(^1\): [https://glasgow2024.org/blog/2023/12/consultative-vote-on-hugo-rule-changes/]
The following are suggestions that I have written about elsewhere, in my File 770 columns, and on social media, in the past few months. Anyone reading this may consider it an open source for whatever actions or amendments may be proposed at the Glasgow Worldcon Business Meeting.

I do believe that the individual Worldcon Convention Committees should be permanently separated from the administration of the Hugo Awards. A separate administrative body should handle the nominations, voting tabulations, and distribution of the awards.

The World Science Fiction Society Convention Constitution should be amended to clearly state that the Hugo Awards need not be distributed at a Worldcon and can be given out at a separate ceremony or venue if circumstances dictate. This is also a safeguard in case future Worldcons are suspended or ended.

Additionally, any committee bidding on a Worldcon should sign a legal and binding document stating that they will abide by the United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Furthermore, no local, state, or federal authority should have any right to interfere with the running or functions of said conventions. Any violation of these requirements would result in sanctions, such as the nullification of any awards and honors given and/or a permanent suspension of the given country to host a Worldcon.

While I realize that these options may not be popular or even feasible for some conrunners or fans to accept, I caution them that to take no action at all will result in the extinction of a treasured and valuable piece of literary history.
The Hugo Awards Crisis Deepens: Where We Stand and How to Save the Awards by Nerds of a Feather, Flock Together

Originally published on Nerds of a Feather, Flock Together, February 18, 2024. Footnotes containing links have been added by the Journey Planet Editors to maintain Nerds of a Feather’s original intent.

Previously Nerds of a Feather, Flock Together issued a joint statement of concern about the administration of the 2023 Hugo Awards and the inexplicable disqualification of several nominees, including our Editor Paul Weimer.

In light of recent revelations, we are going to each make an individual statement, which you can find below. The reasons for this are simple: this is arguably the worst crisis of confidence the awards have ever faced – worse, even, than Puppygate. As such, this crisis necessitates a strong response.

This is not a collective statement that we all agreed on. Rather, what follows are our individual reactions – points of which are shared broadly across our editorial and creative teams, but which also highlight the different perspectives and concerns that each of us, as individuals, want to address. We each take responsibility for our own views and words.

The G – As I see it, here are the main points of crisis:

• According to emails obtained by Jason Sanford and Chris M. Barkley, the administrative team overseeing the 2023 Hugo Awards made eligibility decisions based on whether the works – or nominees – might potentially be seen as “politically sensitive” by Chinese authorities.

• There is no evidence of direct intervention by Chinese authorities, but rather the individuals appear to have taken it upon themselves to proactively censor the awards shortlist. Information is still coming out, so this may change – but it is how things look as of right now.

• The administrative committee allegedly collected information on nominees to determine whether or not they were politically sensitive. These “political dossiers” were then allegedly used to make the eligibility decisions; members of the Chinese diaspora were disproportionately (though not exclusively) targeted for political review. Our own editor Paul Weimer appears to have been targeted for traveling to Tibet – which he in fact did not...
do (he went to Nepal).

• The leaked emails show that the administrative committee made other questionable decisions, not least of which to disqualify ballots they decided were part of a “slate.” If true, this would be deeply problematic as administrators are not supposed to eliminate ballots. These efforts appear to have disproportionately affected Chinese-language nominees in the fiction categories.

• Vote tabulation has also come under scrutiny after Camestros Felapton and others noted discrepancies in the nominating statistics. Author Mary Robinette Kowal revealed on Bluesky that vote tabulation is accomplished through proprietary software; its author – administrator Dave McCarty – allegedly refuses to share the code with others, making it impossible to verify results.

  *The lack of transparency and ability to verify results, according to Kowal, predates Chengdu Worldcon. While there is no specific reason to doubt previous years’ results, we can no longer just trust that previous awards were administered according to WSFS guidelines and ethical principles.

To read further, please see:

*Report by Sanford and Barkley,¹ which focuses primarily on the disqualifications.

*Report by Zionius² that focuses on the exclusion of Chinese-language works in the fiction categories

*In-depth summaries with commentary by Cora Buhlert,³ Camestros Felapton,⁴ Aidan Moher,⁵ and John Scalzi.⁶

There are two sets of problems here: (a) the proximate issue of what was done in 2023 and (b) what this reveals or illuminates about the the cartel of self-proclaimed "SMOFs" (secret masters of fandom) who treat the Hugos – and Worldcon more broadly – as their birthright, playground and personal fiefdom. The Hugo Awards are supposed to be democratic in nature and process; the behavior of the self-proclaimed "SMOFs" is fundamentally anti-democratic – and this is by no means confined to Chengdu Worldcon.

Now here are my suggestions for how to rebuild trust in the Hugo Awards:

1. No one involved in the administration of the 2023 Hugo Awards, or who assisted in the collection of political evidence, can ever be allowed to have any role in administering the awards ever again.

2. Vote tabulation must be performed in a transparent manner using software that multiple people have access to for purposes of validation.

3. All tabulations must be independently audited for purposes of verification.

4. Individual Cons should no longer administer the Hugo Awards – this should be done by an independent, rotating committee.

5. All decisions by said committee must be audited; all disqualified nominees must be notified and given time to appeal.

Failure to implement these or similar guardrails going forward will render the Hugo Awards irreparably damaged.
**Vance K** – From the jump, I want to acknowledge Paul Weimer in this situation. Not only is he a valued and dedicated editorial colleague here at Nerds of a Feather, Flock Together, but he is a tireless advocate for the very best of the science fiction and fantasy community. Paul’s output is prodigious – not only for this site but for several other outlets – and it is broadly dedicated to elevating exciting voices and talents, and celebrating their work. I am biased, certainly, but Paul represents the best of fandom, and is the kind of writer you hope to see hoisting a Hugo Award statue because the goddamn Hugo Awards are fan awards, and a vibrant community needs engaged, passionate fans like Paul to grow and thrive.

He has comported himself with tremendous dignity throughout this deeply undignified situation. So here’s to Paul.

Since the Sanford and Barkley reporting came to light, I have read many diverse insights from members of the SF/F community that have highlighted the various different ways in which this scandal eclipses anything about a genre, or an award, or a convention. Members of the Chinese diaspora, Chinese fans and writers, creators who were recognized for their work and now have a long shadow cast over that recognition, individuals who had political dossiers compiled on them by awards administrators – awards administrators! – and creators across the globe who did not get the recognition that they earned by being wrongly excluded from the Hugo ballot are all experiencing different ramifications from these revelations. I see in that variety, and the depth of the hurt that people are experiencing, confirmation that the damage done here is profound, wide-ranging and potentially irreparable.

This is not the online bickering of a cloistered fandom. This is a situation where Americans and Canadians voluntarily stepped up to do the work of silencing creators on behalf of a repressive authoritarian state with an appalling human rights record…and for what?! To have a fun party?

It turns my stomach.

I echo the calls for change stated here by my colleagues, but I don’t know how that change happens. I don’t know what the collaboration and teamwork looks like that will be necessary to bury this shameful circumstance in the past and ensure it cannot possibly happen again. But let’s figure it out.

---

**Arturo** – The recently revealed conduct of the 2023 Worldcon administrators is unacceptable, all the more so because the celebration of the Hugos is supposed to be led by people who love science fiction. It was precisely science fiction which taught each generation for the past century how to identify and resist totalitarian dystopias, which makes this incident a disgraceful betrayal of the literary tradition of which this award is supposed to be the crown jewel – and against the writers, editors, artists, readers, collectors, gamers, and various other enthusiasts who seek in science fiction
How dare Dave McCarty maintain a position of prominence in the fan community when he clearly hasn’t taken to heart the lessons of the genre? Which science fiction fan worth their Orwell, their Bradbury, their Huxley, would willingly submit themself, not even to a threat of repression, but to the mere imagined shadow of a threat? Which science fiction fan who ever dreamed of joining a community of peer minds would choose to supplant the many voices of that community, the voices praising the stories that most spoke to their hearts, and deny the hardworking creators of those stories the public honor they deserve? Which science fiction fan aware of the centuries-long battle between the pen and the sword would take the sword’s side?

It’s no coincidence that so many of our heroes hold truth as one of the highest causes to fight for. This is the genre that immortalized the courageous truth-tellers Clark Kent and Tintin and Sarah Jane Smith and April O’Neil and Gordon Krantz and Isaac Leibowitz. What Dave McCarty has defiled is not only the mechanics of a contest, but the very values that inspire this art. Truth is the first duty, to quote Captain Picard. I don’t know what science fiction Dave McCarty likes, but he somehow missed the most important message repeated across every masterpiece.

The nature of the offense is multiple: it shows blatant disregard for the will of Hugo voters, for the hopes of Chinese fans, for the agency of local Chengdu committee members, for the effort of authors, for the legacy and prestige of the Hugo Awards, and for the universal human obligation to oppose tyrannical regimes. On a personal level, the moral character of my colleague and friend Paul Weimer as a Best Fan Writer candidate – and of the Nerds of a Feather team as a Best Fanzine candidate – were insulted by what amounts to a hunt for kompromat. To quote Batman: that is the weapon of the enemy. The voices of artists who imagine better worlds deserve better than being suppressed by fear of the Chinese Communist Party, let alone by copying the same tactics of the Chinese Communist Party.

There’s no point in expecting a proper apology. Dave McCarty seems incapable of realizing the wrongness of his choices. I don’t know enough about the procedures of Worldcon logistics to offer any coherent proposal on vote tallying methods, but any remedy to this shame must begin by banning Dave McCarty and his co-conspirators from membership in any future Worldcon.

Adri – I write this statement from a position of great privilege.

I am privileged to be a part of this fandom. I am privileged to be inundated every year with amazing books and stories, thanks to all the people who go into writing and publishing them (often for very little recognition). I am privileged to have been part of an award nominated and award winning team here at Nerds of a Feather, and to get to see the work this team puts in every day to bring the best SF criticism, reflection and analysis to the wider world.

I am also privileged, in my professional life, to have worked with some of the most dedicated activists, researchers and advocates, working alongside them to help make the world a marginally better place. I have spent time with people who have spent decades in exile, who make travel plans around the countries they can and can’t go, who occasionally drop offline for a while and re-emerge having been at the police station, and who don’t let any of that stop them from doing what they believe to be the right thing for their communities. I am privileged enough that, when I think of my professional history with China and its neighbours, and what that might mean for my future travel plans, the worst case scenario I seriously think about is a rejected visa. I am privileged enough that I wouldn’t lose the ability to connect with family or close friends as a result of that scenario.

I am privileged enough that my first reaction, on finding out that a small group of American and Canadian Worldcon admin had compiled dossiers about the geopolitical leanings of potential Worldcon finalists, my emotional reaction was “and they didn’t notice me?” That’s a poor reaction, unworthy of the seriousness of political profiling, and I make no excuses for it – but I think it’s emblematic of this whole sorry mess, that most of us are privileged enough to be splashing around in the shallow end of state oppression and censorship. That doesn’t make it less valid to be furious that we are in this situation, of course! If anything, it’s even more infuriating that the Hugo awards have been kicked into the mud by a
few North Americans who thought it would be fine to LARP as secret police while running an award they claim to care about.

As always, the victims of this fandom garbage fire are disproportionately folks of colour, and particularly Chinese and Chinese diaspora creators. The scrutiny on Chinese and Chinese diaspora writers writing in English, or putting their art out to Western audiences, seems to have been higher, and its implications — both practical and emotional — much more serious.

Even more seriously: the decision to cancel an undisclosed number of votes due to allegations of “slating.” The idea of cancelling ballots was previously so anathema to Hugo administrators that in 2016, then-administrator Dave McCarty allowed a slew of racist, homophobic, fascist content on the ballot across multiple categories under the Rabid Puppies because the alternative was unthinkable. This “valiant protection of the soul of the Hugo awards” caused a large number of Chinese works to be removed from the ballot, and their authors denied the ability to compete on their home turf. To say these creators, and the fans who nominated them, deserved better is like saying the ocean is a bit wet: nobody involved in making the decisions that took this honour away from them (without apology!) is fit to be part of this community.

It’s difficult to see where the Hugo awards go from here in repairing the damage done. From a Western fandom perspective, I echo The G’s recommendations above. More broadly? It’s a privilege to be part of a global SF/F community full of talent, passion and diverse perspectives, and it’s time for WSFS to shape up and be worthy of that community — not the other way around.

**Chris Garcia** — The Hugos were damaged. A team entrusted with the task of administering the awards failed fandom in the worst way possible.

For the last 12 years, I have been lucky enough to have a Hugo trophy living in my home. When people in fandom think of me, it’s almost always in relationship to the Hugos. The trophy came with me during the evacuations when our house was threatened by fires less than half-a-mile away. The Hugo Awards means so much to me personally. I love them, the history they represent, the joy they bring.

And so, this blatant disregard for the integrity of the award is like being slapped in the face. Dave McCarty and his team chose a path that led fandom into a new, dangerous territory. We can no longer feel like the processes we relied on will be faithfully executed because of the incredibly poor judgment of the team. Many choices they made were ill-considered, both in the lead up to the nomination announcements, and up through today. McCarty’s refusal even to apologize is magnified by either his inability, or simple refusal, to deliver the actual statistics the community has relied on for decades.

We can’t let this happen again, and we must fix as much of the harm done as we fortify the systems the Hugo Awards rely upon moving forward.

First, the Hugo subcommittee from 2023 should turn over raw voting data to an outside auditor tasked with producing a true set of results. Second, the Mark Protection Committee must remove all representation for the Chengdu WorldCon as well as any seated member who served in a senior capacity at the Chengdu WorldCon. Third, we must begin the search for an outside group to annually administer the awards, or at the very least serve as auditors of the Hugo results on a permanent basis. Finally, the Chengdu team must make formal apologies to each and every person in fandom for failing them so thoroughly, and specifically to those individuals they wronged most directly. I know that last one is incredibly unlikely to happen, but we must demand it because it speaks to the very heart of the problem.
Paul – For years, the word “Hugo Award finalist” or “Hugo Award Winner” has meant something to readers. Some of my earliest steps into fandom was reading copies of Locus to find who was nominated and who won, and then reading those winners. The Hugos have taken a strong hit in terms of reliability, credibility, prestige and their value to the community. I may be one of the Ineligibles, but the damage this has done goes far beyond me; it goes to all of Science Fiction fandom, and the wider community of readers. As noted by others, this especially hits marginalized readers and members of fandom.

In recent years, those marginalized writers, readers and fans (and fans and readers outside of the US and UK) have started to find a voice in fandom and in science fiction in general after too many years of being muted, ignored, belittled, and forgotten. The inexcusable actions of the Chengdu team mar and weaken those efforts for readers and fans alike. It's time for the WSFS to work toward the global inclusive community of readers, writers and fans that it has long given lip service to being in its very name.

Alex – I will admit to the readership point-blank that I am not a neutral observer of all this. I voted for Winnipeg for 2023’s WorldCon specifically to deny it to the People's Republic of China, and afterwards wrote a piece for Warped Factor decrying the decision. I tried to start a social media campaign, which I called #GeeksAgainstGenocide which never got off the ground, to boycott the convention specifically over human rights abuses in the People’s Republic. I reiterate the question I asked in that previous piece: if bids for Israel and Russia led to boycotts, why wasn’t the bid for the People's Republic treated likewise?

The other thoughts that ring through my mind: supremacists find common cause with supremacists, and that petty tyranny flourishes under autocracy. We have talked about how the far right in the Western world wants to deny the very existence of objective truth. Here, we are being denied even a right to figure out what happened with the various disqualifications, including of our very own Paul Weimer.
The People's Republic has put so much effort into censoring fandom before. Why did anyone think that this would not happen to our fandom? I would like to highlight one particular quote from the [cited] article:

In a strange twist, the very fandom communities the CCP is most concerned about may also be the ones that are unexpectedly helping to spread its political agenda. A recently published study from researchers at Concordia University and York University, conducted between January 2020 and October 2021, looked at the way danmei fans online interacted with the CCP's restrictions. They found that in the absence of clarity around many of the restrictions, the fans themselves, through a mix of speculation and “accusatory reporting” — that is, reporting or threatening to report each other to authorities for perceived transgressions — were doing a more efficient job policing themselves than the government ever could. In essence, the fans who tried to conduct their subversive fandoms within the parameters of the regime “strengthened the political authority’s practice and narrative.”

As to why I think the Party may have chosen to prevent WorldCon authorities from rewarding certain stories (many involving social justice) and certain authors (outspoken about social justice), I’m reminded of how that government has apparently never allowed the release of the 2017 South Korean film A Taxi Driver. That film is about the Gwangju Uprising in 1980, a revolt against the authoritarian government of Chun Doo-hwan, which had recently taken power in a coup d’etat. Chun was a right-wing dictator backed by the United States. You would think that the Communist Party would like to use this to slander South Korea and the United States, but no. It was banned, likely because it shows the people daring to resist a tyrannical government.

If Dave McCarty made decisions that disproportionally targeted Chinese citizens and ethnic Chinese in the diaspora, this served the Communist Party's goals. It is a convergence of the bigotry of supremacism. The People's Republic knows that Western civil rights activism — and fiction — have inspired social movements elsewhere. Recall the famous Ursula K. Le Guin quote: "We live in capitalism. Its power seems inescapable. So did the divine right of kings. Any human power can be resisted and changed by human beings. Resistance and change often begin in art, and very often in our art, the art of words.”

The Party knows this. That is why they have, for example, censored time travel fiction. That is because such fiction, like many other types in the greater SF/F sphere, is about how this world can be different. They are afraid of fiction like ours, which shows that the People's Republic was not inevitable, that the laws of history did not require it, or its censorship. As George Orwell said: "Every nationalist is haunted by the belief that the past can be altered.”

This should be a wake-up call to SF/F fans the world over: we must commit to humanity, all humanity, everywhere. We must be willing to stand up for the rights of Uyghurs and Tibetans and Ukrainians and Palestinians and the marginalized peoples of the West equally, as they are all equally human. SF/F shows us that our world is not inevitable, and that bigotry is not inevitable. We must not appease those who espouse it.

If we want to commit to this, I have a somewhat out-there proposal: have a WorldCon in Kyiv, safety permitting, to have an SF/F version of the Second International Congress for the Defense of Culture, a writer's convention held in Madrid in 1937 for writers who opposed fascism — held while that city was being shelled by fascists in a bitter civil war. I hope it would be held in a city at peace, in a free Ukraine, in a world that had learned the lessons of the abandonment of the Spanish Republic to fascism and had sought to keep Ukraine free. It would be a commitment by our genre to uphold freedom everywhere, for everyone, for Uyghurstan and Palestine and Tibet and Kashmir and every other place like them, even in allegedly "free" countries.

We in the SF/F community must hold to the promise of our genre, and keep to heart the words of the great American abolitionist William Lloyd Garrison: "So perish all compromises with tyranny!"

1: http://www.nerds-feather.com/2024/02/the-hugo-awards-crisis-deepens-where-we.html
2: http://www.nerds-feather.com/2024/01/statement-on-irregularities-and.html
4: https://zionius.wordpress.com/2024/02/15/2023-hugo-awards-censorship-analysis/
5: http://corabuhlert.com/2024/02/15/the-2023-hugo-nomination-scandal-gets-worse/
6: https://camestrosfelapton.wordpress.com/2024/02/16/hugo-2023-here-is-what-i-think-happened/
7: https://astrolabe.aidanmoher.com/astrolabe-36-panic-at-the-hugos-2023-controversy/
8: https://whatever.scalzi.com/2024/02/15/the-2023-hugo-fraud-and-where-we-go-from-here/
11: https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/1461448221113923
12: https://www.orwellfoundation.com/the-orwell-foundation/orwell/essays-and-other-works/notes-on-nationalism/
13: https://sandydgreen.wordpress.com/2014/02/05/1937-writers-conference-writers-making-a-difference/
Systems that rely on being people-strong and not process-strong can last a long while
without incident, until a situation arises that causes those same people to fail in their duties
and responsibilities or interpret those duties and responsibilities in a way that ultimately is
harmful to the system.
So it is with the Hugo Awards and Worldcon, as proven by the events of the 2023
Chengdu Worldcon.
I take it as an axiom that the Hugo Awards and Worldcon have had, in the language
of my dayjob, a system breakdown leading to a nonconformity. That system must be
reformed or further nonconformities will occur. I take it as a second axiom that it is
desirable that further nonconformities are not desirable.
In the words of Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov, i.e., Vladimir Lenin, I am here to propose
What is to Be Done.
I propose that the system be fortified and improved in a variety of ways. What we
have seen as a result of the 2023 Worldcon is a systemic breakdown. A single “patch” will
leave Worldcon and the Hugos vulnerable to that patch being worked around,
countermanded, ignored or otherwise proven insufficient in preventing a future system
breakdown. However, I am not an anarchist; I believe that Worldcon and the Hugo Awards
are important and worthy of saving.

Step One: Locking the Barn Door
I am well aware of the very loose structure of Worldcons in general. Nevertheless,
given the shocking behavior and actions of those involved, I would like any and all future
Worldcon bids to pledge that the individuals involved in the 2023 Hugo Awards are not
permitted to be part of their bid in any capacity. I am aware of the small world of “SMOFs”
and the limited nature of the tribal knowledge of running cons. However, if, for example,
Dave McCarty were to be part of any future Worldcon bid, how could I, or anyone, trust a
single thing that he does? And this mistrust is present in any capacity, even if he were not
near the actual administration of the award itself.
In keeping with that, and getting to the root of the previous Worldcons’ mistake, I
would want any future Worldcons to pledge that they will uphold freedom of speech,
expression, and identity (on all axes). This should be written into the Constitution. Works
and creators should have their eligibility determined only by the WSFS Constitution, not by
perceived or real censorship from local government authorities or influence from outside
organizations.
In cases where government censorship threatens the Hugo Awards, there should be
a “kill switch.” Tainted results are worse than no results at all. There are multiple winners of
the 2023 Hugo Awards that basically consider themselves not to be winners. When things
have broken so badly that multiple winners have stepped back and renounced this honor,
you have a serious problem that needs to be addressed. Confidence and reliability in the
nominations, finalists, and tabulation of the votes has to be reestablished.

Step Two: Trust but Verify
Like the Oscars, I think it is time to employ an outside agency to tabulate
nominations and finalists. While I recognize that this will cost money, having an outside
auditor do the actual tabulation of nominations and final votes will show the world that
the Hugo Awards and Worldcon are serious about reliability and confidence in the results.
The upfront and forthright response from Glasgow when they announced the finalists was
good. That, too, should be a standard written into the Constitution. The loose rules of the
Constitution in reporting Hugo nominations, finalists, and other information were
deliberately exploited by the Chengdu Worldcon. That’s a system breakdown; the
Constitution must be amended to stop that from occurring. That, and an independent
auditor, will completely restore confidence after what happened in 2023.
I understand that there are some who would object to employing an independent
auditor, as opposed to “double checking” the work, but honestly, after the 2023 awards, I’d
rather have an unbiased third party do it at this stage.
Step Three: Building Strength

When I first joined Worldcon, I was shocked as to how few nominations are required to get on the ballot. This was, of course, exploited some years ago by the Sad and Rabid Puppies, and efforts were put in place to make such slating more difficult. By and large, those efforts did solve that problem, but they did not address the overall problem: Worldcon, paradoxically, is too small. It costs a lot of effort and money to participate in Worldcon, and when we take into account things like the Business Meeting, it takes a lot of time as well.

Efforts need to be made to broaden the Worldcon Electorate and to improve the Business Meeting.

For the size of the science fiction readership, a few thousand voters is an astonishingly small number. While numbers for the sake of numbers is not an overall good, a larger and more interesting electorate is good for science fiction. Worldcon should take steps to make virtual participation easier and more attractive, including participation in nomination and voting. Even in this day and age, the Hugo Awards appears as a secret clubhouse; if you don’t expend enormous effort or have someone “already in the know,” you won’t ever get there from here. Worldcons should be engaging with and reaching out to the community. It can and has been done—Helsinki comes to mind. This should be the norm, not the exception. Cities that are hosting Worldcon should be engaged with. These are the World Science Fiction Awards and the World Science Fiction Convention. This is a Big Deal.

And that brings me to the Business Meeting. Right now the Business Meeting is a small, clannish, and relatively obscure part of a Worldcon. For a body that basically makes Worldcons and the Hugo Awards possible, it is, frankly, a body that does not reflect the 21st century, its norms, or needs. It was one thing when Worldcons were less than 1500 people. Now, Worldcon attendance is routinely triple or quadruple that number; and like it or not, Worldcon and the Hugo Awards have had “greatness thrust upon them.” I’ve seen the arguments that Worldcon and the Hugo Awards don’t have any responsibility or any need to respond to a larger electorate or a larger remit, but the fact of the matter is, for the wide range of SFF readers and the general public, the Hugo Awards are a cornerstone of science fiction. Worldcon, the Hugos, and the Business Meeting may not WANT that mantle, but they have that mantle.

And it’s high time to start acting like it.

A Business Meeting that basically is Robert Rules of Order: The Role-Playing Game might be well and fine in a world where the Hugo Awards don’t truly matter, but the thing is, the Hugo Awards DO matter. Careers and publishing lives were harmed by what happened in Chengdu. And a Business Meeting that purposely and deliberately makes it difficult for change and growth to occur is a Business Meeting that is holding Worldcon, the Hugo Awards, and science fiction back.

To this end, the organization of the Business Meeting should incentivize and improve attendance and participation. This would, I propose, include a virtual component as well as physical attendance. Worldcon is in Glasgow this year. A fan who cannot get to Glasgow should not have their ideas go unheard because of it.

I think that the two years “King Log” approach to any changes to Worldcon and the Hugos is a brake that perhaps has had its time. However, a Business Meeting that allowed virtual participation would help make “King Log” less of a problem. Consider, a fan from, say, York going to their first Worldcon in Glasgow this year. Even if they have a great idea, attend the Business Meeting, and propose a resolution, if they can’t afford to go to the 2025 Worldcon in Seattle, they will subsequently be unable to follow through on their proposal.

As a result, the proposals and changes that happen to the Hugo Awards and Worldcons are, in practice, restricted to a cadre of dedicated con-goers who can afford to go to Worldcons in far flung locations and have the time and desire to play Robert’s Rules of Order: The Role-Playing Game in order to have any changes done. This fundamentally and practically puts the administration of Worldcons and the Hugo Awards in the hands of a small Oligarchy. As evidenced in the 2023 Worldcon and Hugo Awards, that Oligarchy has failed in its duties.

There is much more to be done besides all of this, but these changes would provide a foundation to help create an inclusive, dynamic, diverse Worldcon that avoids the pitfalls and problems that have tarnished its reputation.
I don’t have a solution for fixing the Hugos, but the Hugos are definitely important to the larger picture of the Worldcon. As someone who is working towards a bid for Texas in 2031 I have thoughts.

I have been thinking a lot about how I personally would run a Worldcon. And while we have had some stellar conventions in the past, I do think there are things that every chair makes a priority with their Worldcon, and I am starting to try and figure that out for myself. It is hard. Determining what I want to focus on – or at least highlight besides art – is quite challenging for me because there are so many worthy areas of a Worldcon. But I find myself drawn to supporting the community that we already have.

Because of this, all of my suggestions revolve around community – lifting up and celebrating my friends and making Worldcon an interesting event, which really is what I think is every chair’s goal.

I think Esther had very similar goals, as one of the slogans for Glasgow 2024 is “People make Glasgow”. After spending so much of my time and energy with the Glasgow team, I think I have taken it onboard as a personal mantra for my work in fandom as a whole.

I think a lot of the con runners I talk to are as sick as I am of the “It has always been done this way” approach. I see a lot of the recent chairs moving away from this thought process, and this is one of my main goals as well.

Planning for a Worldcon

As a conrunner, we have Smofcon every year as a place to share ideas and discuss convention running. I have been going for a number of years, and I would love to see a much larger, more open discussion with the community as to how a convention is run. I have heard a number of people say that SMOFs don’t listen. I know this isn’t true for us all, as we can’t be everything to everyone, but I think we need more transparency in conrunning – especially in how a Worldcon is run. Selfishly, I want to talk to experts who have worked on these things in the past and also get ideas from other industries and areas of convention runners. As a prospective conchair I want to share my expertise but also hear things from other conventions and conrunners who have differing expertise. My idea is this: make it more of a community online rather than a convention every year. Have a podcast or video series about a topic, then take it to Discord to discuss so we can get multiple viewpoints. I think we have the same panels at Smofcon every year, and I know I have been on the same panels about the same topics at Smofcon every year. For me it is how to fix an art show, how to make a good website, how to deal with social media crisis, how to create publications, etc. But I am not entirely sure that things change after these panels, as it is a small audience who attend regularly listening and participating. Some years I leave energized with new ideas but it doesn’t always lead to significant changes.

For example I did a panel at Smofcon about Publications and where it was headed. One of the panel members presented data about the pickup of souvenir books and pocket programs at their local convention. His data showed that the pocket program pickup has been declining steadily since 2011 when they started to track it. We have tried to maintain these numbers for Worldcon but it is much harder with the change in committees each year. Publications is a large budget line especially since the paper costs have fluctuated so much in the past few years. So being able to get a better read on the amount needed to print is crucial. Because of the ridiculous paper costs in 2022, we switched the pocket program to digital, which was in itself a controversial decision. This was the first time I was on a panel with this Smofcon member and the reason I go. The idea of the convention going to other locations each year should get new people on the panels, but I feel like there are still the same people on the panels which doesn’t lead to change. While this was a good interaction for me, I would like more people to participate and really discuss conrunning.

At that same Smofcon, I was on a panel about art shows. A lot of what I was hearing was the same stuff I have heard in the past. But it sparked conversations after the convention
with art show runners that helped me to think outside the box of what a typical art show looks like and how to draw different artists to show at a con. There are limitations in our model which makes this difficult, but I think there is a way to tweak the art show model to make it more lucrative for artists in the future. Those conversations outside of one weekend help so much. Furry conventions have huge and prosperous art shows and hopefully taking the discussion online would bring more conversation from other groups that we don’t hear from as much.

These two interactions are what I want to see in the discussions within the larger community. How do we do sponsorship better? How do we handle social media where we don’t burn out our volunteers? How do we get staff that represent the members we want at our convention? And the age old question: how do we get new and excited volunteers to our convention?

**Working together**

As I talk to conchairs, I learn a lot from their approaches to current problems at conventions. When I am working on a convention, I don’t always get all sides of the story, but I think talking to the chairs and hearing how they would solve a problem helps my own problem solving skills. Not to say my way of doing things would fix the problem but hearing multiple perspectives helps to plan.

But also there are a lot of continuing problems or challenges in running cons. And I feel, as do other chairs I talk to, that some of these problems can be solved as a team wanting to make it easier for other chairs and conventions in the future.

For Texas we have already started to talk to chairs of other cons to generate solutions. Every year we seem to reinvent the wheel on software. I know people have tried to solve this in the past, and there have been systems which have carried on for a few years. Or like in the case of Grenadine the cost of the software made it unusable for conventions going forward. There are always good intentions for the newest model to last a while, but Texas and others are in a good position this far out to work on something that might serve a number of years going forward.

This is what I mean by collaborating and discussion among chairs. There is always a risk with a traveling convention that you do all the work and not win the bid. But I think my goal in fandom is not only to run a good convention but also to leave my own mark on fandom and hopefully make it a little better than before I started.

These two things are just a few of ideas I have. I want to do all the things, but mostly I want to find people like me to work on conventions that we believe in. And that isn’t always easy. But I am willing to try and to bring my energy to the table. Hopefully there are others that are willing too.
In my job, which involves a 300-ton piece of machinery, made of steel and glass, I have had to effect repairs on the go, as one might say. I have often used a type of black and yellow duct tape, my go-to, to fix flooring, seats, doors, and panels. In non-emergency but dangerous situations, a tripping relay was held in, doors were forced open, and what mostly did it was a bit o’tape. One time, a piece of equipment was playing up, and I used some manual adjustment to try and effect an improvement. This fixed it, but a while later the equipment started playing up again, and when I applied my attention to it, sadly I broke it. When a plaintive, imploring voice down a crackling line asked what happened…I said I gave it a gentle tap. Fucked it though.

So let's not totally fuck this up, right. The Hugo Awards are incredible, and last year, it really got fucked up. People — eligible nominees — were excluded, the figures stank, and there’s been no apology or explanation. I have no faith in the process that was undertaken last year, nor in those involved, and I am appalled by behaviours since.

Here are the proposals that I am currently working on. I have already had some input, and the next phase is to get the constitutional wording right. It is also important that future potential chairs, especially, think these proposals through. To me right now, the views of people like Esther, Kathy, Joyce, and Marguerite and Sara (who all contributed here) are vital.

- **Independent oversight of the Hugo Process**
  We pay for accountants, and we pay for advertising. We need to pay for oversight. It is a £1.2 million pound event. Let's cost it. Figure out how to do this. This would include a whistleblower mechanism where the independent overseer/verifier can inform the community that there is an issue via the Mark Protection Committee (MPC). Also included would be a Constitutional amendment requiring the Worldcon Committee contract with an independent firm to monitor and audit the Hugo nominations and voting. This contract with the independent firm would need to be submitted as part of a Worldcon bid paperwork.

- **Chair the Worldcon or be on the MPC**
  The concept that one member of the MPC could authorise Hugo use, and also be the person who could authorise the use of the Hugo to themselves seems utterly incredible. I have yet to ascertain if this is allowed, but something occurred in Chengdu, decisions were made to do "Hugo" things, one person said the MPC approved it, but then another MPC member said they were totally unaware. Chairs should not be on the MPC; they have representatives, and only the committee can approve usage. Furthermore, this process should be minuted, noted, and communicated.

- **All MPC/WIP meetings should be fully recorded, and all minutes should be made available.**
  It is appalling that four hours and forty minutes of an MPC meeting dealing with the censure of individuals who have acted badly is not recorded. Disappeared like lies in the wind. Complicity in hiding the truth from members of WSFS is unacceptable. But it is not just hiding the truth, it is also enabling this behaviour that is wrong. This cannot occur. No silencing of the MPC/WIP. Decisions and meeting minutes need to be communicated in matters of censure, or other areas of concern, to all members.

*Any current MPC/WIP should resign and seek re-election*

Whether they do it voluntarily, or by a vote in the Business Meeting, all should step down and seek re-election. Indeed, there are many who I respect who I think should seek reelection to the committee. Self-respect and decency calls for it; they know this. Also this would ensure that bad or incompetent actors are removed.

*International representation is key – MPC/WIP should not have more than 14% of its membership from one country*
This would be a six year plan, where incrementally increasing international representation occurs, starting (if this were to pass), with no more than 49% for any one country and then to 32% and then to 14%. Fans could welcome this and work towards it. There could also be scope for the MPC to bring on officers to learn, to take it on board so that not all recruitment occurs in the Business Meeting which is hard to access for many members. Let’s allow for international recruitment.

I shall be at Glasgow 2024. I shall be at the Business Meeting, and I shall work between now and then to refine, prepare, and in some cases, adjust, merge, or step in behind with similar proposals.
Change is inevitable. It can be planned for or unexpected, desired or dreaded, and it can even be overlooked, but it will always be there. To bastardise Heraclitus, no fan can attend the same convention twice.

The key, then, is to plan for it. Even as a member (or attendee), you’ll have lived another year; the convention may be in a new location, new people will be involved, and new things will have arisen to discuss.

As an organiser, things are even more complicated. You are responsible for deciding the direction your convention will go, on top of building the team and convincing them to go along with you!

Everyone will have their own methods; this is only the way I’m currently thinking about it.

In my line of work, we often have to work out a plan to get from where we are to where we want to be. That means we have to have an honest look at where we currently are. These are some of the points that I see from my perspective, all horribly generalised:

• We’re a group of fans who are passionate about our interest(s).

• People who join more than one year are trying to revisit whatever spark it was that drew them in.

• As people spend longer in the community, or helping organise, the more ownership they tend to feel around the convention.

• People who volunteer really like volunteering, to see things get done or to make something special happen or to be recognised for their efforts. Usually a mix.

• As a side effect of the above few points, it means that people want to keep volunteering, which is great in some ways but can be counterproductive in others: our volunteers “already know” what needs doing, so things aren’t written down and shared, plus there is often limited space for someone new to come in or for something new to be tried.

• We tend to be of a size — and tend to cater to certain expectations — that bring us to financial difficulties. We are too big and too demanding for truly small venues, but don’t have the membership where we can reduce membership fees and rely on scale to cover our costs.

• The overarching framework is deliberately slow to change. It has been built over decades, changing (and sometimes re-changing) bits incrementally.

• Bidding cycles are getting longer, and drawing more long-term energy. They also, understandably, tend to focus on their own goals. Even where volunteers overlap, there tends to be limited coordination or discussion between the bids.

This is only a fraction of the current state, and a true analysis would need a much broader pool of observations than just my own to draw from!

Next step, then, is to decide where we want to be. This is even more personal, as every chair or potential chair needs to steer their own ship. Sometimes, chairs’ visions will overlap and coordination is possible. Sometimes, they’re entirely contradictory! We can only do our best.

Again, all views my own:

• I want to include as many people acting in good faith as possible. The point about scale above means that we tend to have expensive memberships and supplements. For us, it’s worth it, but it’s still objectively a large sum in one go for many.

• The WSFS rule limiting the ratio between WSFS membership and attending supplement
price means that we have to keep WSFS high in order to keep attending supplements at a price that's likely to cover our costs. We can't lower WSFS memberships to allow for a more worldwide or socioeconomically-spread body.

- I feel that the costs and time-load of volunteering, especially at committee level or across several years, means that we are losing the energy and voices of other fans. I don't know that we'll ever get to being truly cost-neutral, but there are plenty of people who would make amazing contributions if they had the time / money / ways in to get into leadership or advisory positions.

- On that last, it's not enough to simply have an open door -- we have to actively show that we are welcoming and would like new people to come in. A new person turning up at a family reunion or a gathering of long-time friends is always likely to feel that they're intruding to some degree or another, after all, unless they are actively included.

- I would like closer ties between *all* bidders, and preferably with seated conventions as well. Those of us who've thrown our hat in the ring have a chance to share plans and build processes and create (or find) tools across multiple years that could help bring consistency and efficiency to certain aspects. Newer bidders may have “wild” ideas that actually work much better than what we've been doing, so we should listen as well as share our experiences.

- I think there are commonalities among all Worldcons and all fans, but the specifics can and will and should change depending on location, passion, and team.

- I definitely *don't* want to turn Worldcon into a slick corporation-style operation or a massive media con on the scale of San Diego Comic Con, but I do think there are things we can learn from other stable, long-running organisations. Some from newer or shorter-lived orgs, too, frankly.

Again, this is just the beginning -- now we have to get from one to the other. So what could that look like?

- We tend to reward scrappiness and people pushing beyond their limits, but this is not healthy or sustainable. This means smaller scope for roles, more volunteers, and more organisational back end, which means we need a more robust “recruitment” focus as part of our volunteer support.

- Almost everyone finds documentation a waste of time until they need it. We should institutionally be much better about writing and sharing information between teams, internally and externally.

- I would love to un-peg the attending supplement price from the WSFS price, so that we can open WSFS membership to more fans around the world. At the very least, I'd like to increase the ratio between the two.

- I want to see more big ideas. Yes, there are things I look forward to in each Worldcon I attend. Yes, there are friends from decades ago whom I’m delighted to see. Those alone do not make a sustainable event. What are the programme items, who are the guests, which big events do people get excited about and tell their friends? Or, better, get excited about and immediately start planning for the next con? Volunteering to make it happen? Volunteering at their local or regional con, now that they know these exist? We need a framework that supports us, without us being thoughtlessly strangled by regulations. (Thoughtfully bound is different.)

- Sara Felix (Texas in 2031) and I have already started talking about where our aims overlap, where we might talk to other bidders, and where we can jointly start shaping the future. I’m hoping to extend this informal network further.

- If we had more or different funding, we could invest in our people and make it less onerous to take on leadership positions. As good as people we've had are, we're unintentionally excluding countless other possibilities.

- We also tend to reward longevity with “promotions” or “reappointments” without really considering the skills needed or thinking of succession planning. Some volunteers are amazing at getting things done but are too hands-on to manage teams. Others have great vision and aim but need help with the day-to-day organisational tasks. We're lucky in that we can build our organisation around the people we have, rather than pre-defining our structure and needing to find perfect matches. Let's use that strength better and make
sure that we’re leaving space for growth / not overworking individuals.

- Most of all, I hope to be honest and brave enough to admit when something’s not working and it needs to change again.

I’ll change the topic now (though of course I haven’t really):

I have been lucky enough to inherit a lovely small garden from the prior owner of my house. This past year, I’ve been nervous to change much. I wanted to see what grew naturally, wildly. Now, though, I have a much better sense of what happens: where minimal tending is the right thing, and beautiful new shoots arise; where I need to add plants for variation, or cover, or for the local community of pollinators; where I need to prune heavily in order to focus stronger growth in the core areas; and where it all starts to fit together toward my ideal garden – and where my ideal garden has changed based on what has bloomed. If I can do that for the convention(s) I love, and if I can articulate it in a way to convince people to join me, I’ll consider my efforts well-spent.
Enditorial by James Bacon

"Are these Athenian Role Players lads, are they the sorta bureaucratic administrators version of a toxic Spartans, or is it a bit Yes Minister?"

The Hugo Awards are amazing, but they went badly astray last year. When something goes astray, you apologise. For a travesty such as this, well, one would expect the fans responsible to resign, to apologise, explain, even to say, I messed up. But there has been none of that. With no reflection, no acceptance, only silent denial, there can be no healing.

The community is at a strange point. Having been privileged enough to go to two US conventions this year, I can tell you, the response there is not at all like it is in Ireland and the UK. Here there is anger. This is not some political game, where opponents agree to disagree, when something as cherished and important as the Hugos are corrupted, it is important that correct action is taken, and seen to be taken.

Those involved with corrupting the Awards and excluding finalists (and all the other malarkey) will probably never hold positions of authority again, you would hope. Yet it is unclear whether in the US that will happen. I have no comprehension of it. Self respect would suggest one steps away, not wait until you are asked.

Those who were complicit in hiding appalling behaviours at the time and since need to carefully consider their involvement.

"Come along and you can help make that happen," said Mick O'Connor when I was 15 and he was enticing me to join the Irish Science Fiction Association. This was his challenge to me when I expressed my desire to increase focus on comics at cons. What I didn’t realise was this was already present; comics were intertwined with the SF scene in Ireland thirty five years ago, and Octocon attracted many comic professionals.

"You should" is such an easy thing to say. All of this is a hobby and a passion, and it seems that telling others what they should do is actually no solution at all. It’s not the help that is needed. It’s not the support that is required. Sometimes a piece of direct advice is welcomed but the "you should" approach can seem very selfish, especially as we see fans and events peak and wane.

We are at a strange time in fandom. I have always thought it was an egalitarian community, one that looks after those less fortunate. At my first Octocon, I got a cheap membership because I was a teenager. There were good people who went to cons on the dole. Other fans would buy them a pint. I knew a fan who would spend their money on meagre amounts of food, books and candles – seriously. The difference between the US and Ireland, when it comes to social responsibility, is vast. In North America, it was such a struggle to get discounted rates, but Patty Wells listened when I was in Montreal, and even though I had been shot down with my proposals at the Business Meeting and, well, called "pernicious" (although I also had the outreach idea) I have watched on as fandom has collectively recognised that some fans need our help. And indeed, Londcon 3 had a young person rate, based on the National Rail under-26 concept, as well as instalment plans and a family rate.

Then Tammy Coxen came up with the FANtastic Detroit Fund, bringing underrepresented fans to the NASFIC, which worked so well that Dublin 2019 stole that idea, welcoming a diversity that is vital to the survival of cons. We also had the Irish First Worldcon rate, attracting new members. I never heard a complaint. Indeed the opposite: fans willingly gave their cash towards the bursaries.

I think, if there was a way, in the space between notional and dream, that we could have an Ultimate Fan Test and everyone who passes this test gets in free. Now the weird thing about the Ultimate Fan Test is the person who’s doing the test sets the test so... because they know their fandom and what makes them a fan...right. It could be as simple as the long list of all the books they’ve read, or the trilogy they’ve read 600 times, all the fanfic they’ve written, the hours played board games, naming all of the robins, all the gopher hours or sitting saying not much, shock surprise brain. Our people, in free, if they cannot afford it.

In 2005, a really well-known fan, active all their life, could not afford to go to the Glasgow Worldcon. They snuck in – just to look around, say hello and see it all. I was gutted, as was anyone I mentioned this to. There was surprise and discomfort. It was an easy
problem to solve....

This motivated me. That should not happen.

What Patty undertook in Reno, Steve and Alice built on, as did others, and Tammy attached a rocket to it. Dublin had First and Irish memberships, ignoring the border and allowing self-identification, and at Glasgow, Esther and Marguerite set out even clearer efforts to help underrepresented fans attend. This has all been fabulous. Glasgow has been caring, imaginative and inclusive and it’s something to be proud of. I hope they are proud of the superb ways of helping our people that they have embraced.

Realistically, there is a harsh negativity in fandom that I do not understand. I am not interested in hearing "what is best" for fans who are strapped. I do not care if you are older like me or on a pension. If you are privileged, and can afford it, what is wrong with you?

Fans are not gaming systems or stealing from us. Christ, don't you realise that we are the villains when a fan with years of service and support has to ghost because of the expense of attending? That is wrong.

We are not profiteers, we are not a soulless heartless business. We are a SF con. Let's share the con as best we can with our people, the lovers, the dreamers, the fans.

Sure, we need to look at this broadly to be fully inclusive, and we can do more.

Worldcon is a break-even affair, and that is hard, but one can bake anything into the budget, and helping people who need help should be a priority. Reduced rates, even free membership, is mostly a cost neutral exercise, in the overall picture.

We get that, We love libraries, we love recycling, we love outreach and giving away books, we love the passion for Science Fiction. Fandom has welcomed hundreds of people for the first time, as well as those who were underrepresented or facing real-life challenges. Let’s continue that and build on that. It is something to be proud of, to cherish and to improve. I am certain we can do more, and I am certain people who are underrepresented can add more to this than I can.

Our members, our prospective members, our people can work out what is best for them. They are good people. Our people.

Fandom is a great community, but I do not want it to turn into a selfish, right wing capitalist-driven club, where it is priced out of affordability for those who we want to see at the con.

Treating everyone equally is not actually fair; it is not equitable. When it comes to personal finances, I recognise that we cannot move from equitable solutions to a place of inequity, as that is beyond us and our remit. So let’s support and help those who need it, let’s make these amazing egalitarian events equitable.

Let’s empower more fans to feel welcomed. The cost is only money, passion, commitment, energy, excitement, and enthusiasm.* Their contribution is priceless.

Next issues of Journey Planet include Workers Rights in SF, LGBTQ in Comics, Dracula and interesting SFnal and Fantastical Food.

Thanks for your support and time and for reading this. Letters of comment are welcome (journeyplanetsubmissions@gmail.com)

* that is 3 of my 6 E's there -
Of late, I’ve been looking at zines from the 1960s, 70s, and 80s. I’ve decided I need to give a bunch of my collection to the good folks at the Internet Archive, and thus, I’ve been going through to pack and ship. It’s incredible what folks were doing back then in stencil and mimeo, and thus when I approached the layout for this issue, I decided to go with a black and white aesthetic for the interior. Much of the art came from two places – a large packet of fan art from the 1990s and early 2000s from Henry Welch, or from Dover Clip Art, whose books I’ve been collecting for ages.

I also wanted to focus on some individuals who are no longer with us, but whose work I’ve always greatly admired. Joe Mayhew was a genius, and his cartoons are some of the best of their time and place, though he had passed before I started zining myself. Terry Jeeves and I had communicated for early issues of *The Drink Tank*, and I have always loved his stuff so much. William Rotsler...well, he’s Bill Rotsler. I’m glad we’ve still got Alexis Gilliland with us, though I think this might be his first appearance in *Journey Planet*!

I also want to thank Espana Sheriff, K8, and my darling wife Vanessa for sending art. We’d love to have some from you too! Please send it to journeyplanetsubmissions@gmail.com or journeyplanet@gmail.com.