

## RESPONSE TO THE SFWA BOARD REPORT July 24, 2013

My name is Theodore Beale, the Vox Day about whom you have read in blogs and tweets, about whom you talk so much in your forums and email exchanges, the notorious and legendary Vox Day of *l'affaire @sfwaaauthors*. I am a writer of color. Yes, of course, writers of color are not supposed to criticize other writers of color. As a matter of fact, writers of color are not supposed to write at all—in the way that I am writing. So strong words are being written and spoken about me, myths are being generated: I am a racist, a bigot, a white supremacist, an inflicter of hate upon my colleagues, my critics, and SFWA; also, I am a mocker of sacred ideas, a blasphemous manipulator of ideas and dogmas.

Well, I am none of those things. The fact is that gossip, rumors, myth-making, and one-sided investigative reports are not appropriate vehicles for the communication of nuances of truth, those subtle tonalities that are often the truly crucial elements in a causal chain. So it is time for the defense, for a long session in demythology.

Before I address the specific aspects of the 34-page report/complaint, I note that the SFWA Board appears to have been operating under a series of four erroneous assumptions throughout the course of this complaint process.

*Erroneous Assumption 1: That I am white.*

I am neither a racist nor a white supremacist. Moreover, I am no more white than Barack Obama, Halle Berry, or George Zimmerman. If the SFWA Board had troubled to investigate the relevant state birth registries before leaping to unwarranted and arguably racist conclusions, it would have learned that my ethnic heritage is officially White, Hispanic, and Asian. If I belong to any one race, it is *la raza cosmica* described by José Vasconcelos.

The fact of my being multiracial has not stopped members such as Steven Brust and Anne Grey from publicly labeling me a white supremacist, or prevented Carrie Cuin from informing me that she intended to deny me a place on her list of Hispanic SF/F writers. These members have concluded, incorrectly, that I am white, even though there has been at least one picture of non-white family members on my blog since 2009. There is something deeply ironic about a collection of monolingual white Americans – abetted by a white Canadian – attempting to portray a quadlingual multiracial writer of color, who studied in Japan, majored in East Asian Studies, and resides in Europe, as some sort of Stormfront white supremacist.

*Erroneous Assumption 2: That the Massachusetts state laws do not apply to the SFWA.*

The Board has adopted a complaint process that functions according to its “working policies” as part of the SFWA’s so-called “reincorporation” process. However, the SFWA to which I belong, and which the Board presently represents, is still, at the present time, a Massachusetts corporation, and as such, subject to Massachusetts law.

*Erroneous Assumption 3: That the SFWA Board is not subject to SFWA bylaws and confidentiality rules.*

The Board has accused me of violating discussion forum confidentiality rules while repeatedly reposting my own discussion forum posts, even deleted ones, without my permission. Two members of the Board have also refused to answer my questions concerning the past and present size of the membership despite the requirement of Article 5, Section 5 (c) of the SFWA bylaws and despite the President disclosing that information on the SFWA forum on June 8, 2013. However, its official responsibilities notwithstanding, the members of the Board are no less subject to the bylaws and rules than any other member.

*Erroneous Assumption 4: That I am the instigator of intra-SFWA attacks.*

The simple fact of the matter is that SFWA members such as Teresa Nielsen Hayden, John Scalzi, Steven Gould, and Nora Jemisin have been publicly attacking me, unprovoked, for years. They have personally attacked me for doing nothing more than expressing my opinions in a nationally syndicated op/ed column and on one of the most popular blogs in the SFWA. They, and dozens of other members, elected to personally and publicly attack me before I had ever even heard of most of them. It is outrageous for the Board to pretend that a single personal *response* to a personal attack, a response that is considerably less egregious than many of the attacks made against me over the years, is somehow unprofessional or less acceptable to the organization than the dozens of unprovoked personal attacks on me made by multiple SFWA members over a period of eight years.

### A.1. Improper use of SFWA channels

There are numerous flaws in the evidence presented in the report pursuant to this section, as well as an incredible omission of any evidence relating to long-time organizational practices.

A. It is false to claim I used “*the SFWAAuthors Twitter account to distribute his blog of June 13, 2013 “A black female fantasist calls for Reconciliation.”*”. I did not “distribute” anything, much less a “blog”. As per the language in the SFWA's own Twitter feed policy, I marked a single blog post for inclusion in the @sfwaaauthors Twitter account.

B. The investigator uses the terms “blog” and “blog post” interchangeably. The two are not even close to synonymous terms, and the repeated confusion of the two terms indicates that the investigator is insufficiently familiar with social media technology for his opinion to be considered credible on these matters. As of July 8, 2013, there are 12,442 *blog posts* on my two *blogs*.

C. It is false to claim: “*This also illustrates the fact that he made a conscious choice to have this particular blog post published by the SFWAAuthors Twitter feed.*” The blog post was published by me on Blogger. A very short excerpt of it appeared on Twitter as a tweet, with a link to the blog post. The blog post was not published by, or on, “the SFWAAuthors Twitter feed”, or on “the SFWAAuthors Twitter account”. Again, notice that the investigator clearly indicates that he does not understand the difference between a feed and a Twitter account, or between a Twitter tweet and a Blogger blog post.

D. The investigator correctly notes: “In an e-mail sent to the Board, Mr. Beale stated that the final paragraph of the guidelines show that “it is demonstrably false to claim that I have ever misused any SFWA platform.” However, he then improperly attempts to dispute that point by noting two irrelevant points, namely:

- “The Twitter account is maintained and managed by SFWA”
- “The Twitter handle contains “SFWA” with the permission of SFWA”

(1) As I pointed out in my original email, the @sfwaaauthors Twitter feed is not an SFWA Platform and SFWA explicitly denies that it is an SFWA Platform. “*While SFWA does maintain the @sfwaaauthors Twitter feed for the benefit of its members, ultimately the posts that appear in the feed are the responsibility of the authors of those posts, and are in no way endorsed by SFWA, nor do such posts reflect the opinions or policy of SFWA.*” SFWA openly asserts that it is not responsible for the posts, it does not endorse the posts, and the posts do not reflect its opinions or its policy. In light of this language, there is no reasonable way the @sfwaaauthors Twitter feed can be considered an SFWA platform or SFWA channel.

(2) The Twitter feed policy notwithstanding, it is also incorrect to say that the Twitter account is maintained and managed by SFWA. The account is entirely the property of Twitter, which in Section 7 of its Terms of Service declares: “*All right, title, and interest in and to the Services (excluding Content provided by users) are and will remain the exclusive property of Twitter and its licensors.*” Furthermore, the Content is defined in Section 4 of Twitter's Terms of Service in the following manner: “*All Content, whether publicly posted or privately transmitted, is the sole responsibility of the person who originated such Content.*”

Since the Services are the exclusive property of Twitter and the Content of the relevant tweet is the copyrighted property of me, the person who originated it, SFWA has no legitimate claim to either. Therefore, the Board cannot credibly claim that either the @sfwaaauthors Twitter feed or the @sfwaaauthors Twitter account are an “SFWA platform” or an “SFWA channel”. Nor can the tweet in question be considered the misuse of a channel, because Twitter expressly permits offensive Content in its Terms of Service: “*You understand that by using the Services, you may be exposed to Content that might be offensive, harmful, inaccurate or otherwise inappropriate, or in some cases, postings that have been mislabeled or are otherwise deceptive.*”

(3) The fact that the Twitter handle @sfwaaauthors contains the letters “SFWA”, with or without the permission of SFWA, is irrelevant, as demonstrated by the Twitter accounts @sfwasabi, @sfwafascists, @sfwater,

and @sfwashington.

- (4) The change in the organization's social media policy on June 25, 2013, pertaining to “all of SFWA's social media outlets” demonstrates that the SFWA Board is aware it cannot claim @sfwauthors to have been an official SFWA space two weeks before that date. It also proves that SFWA policy prior to June 25, 2013 did not permit suspension or expulsion for “egregious or repeated abuse of the feeds.”

E. Furthermore, the charge of misuse of an SFWA channel is specious, because, if even @sfwauthors were determined to be an official SFWA channel, it singles out a member whose actions are demonstrably well within the established boundaries of normal membership behavior in SFWA spaces. Out of respect for discussion forum confidentiality, I am only including links to the examples provided from the SFWA discussion forums.

- (1) Providing a link to a personal attack on a member in an SFWA space. As noted above, this is the correct interpretation of the charge against me as there was no attack on a member in the actual tweet; the only personal attack was located in the Blogger post. There are many more examples of these links to attacks on members to be found; the 16 examples provided are merely among the most recent. In some cases, multiple members linked to the same attack as one member quoted another. Please note in particular that one of these links to an attack on an SFWA member was made in an SFWA space by a current Board member, Steven Gould, on June 9, 2013.

Jeff Hecht

[sff.private.sfwalounge Article:180162](http://sff.private.sfwalounge.com/entry/180162) Fri 18 Jan 2013 07:45:57p

Sean Wallace

<http://www.sfwalounge.com/forum/index.php?topic/5118-a-librarians-response-to-current-events/#entry43421>

<http://www.sfwalounge.com/forum/index.php?topic/4690-issue-201/page-3#entry37081>

<http://www.sfwalounge.com/forum/index.php?topic/4883-issue-202/page-15#entry41193>

Kate Kligman

<http://www.sfwalounge.com/forum/index.php?topic/4883-issue-202/page-8#entry40432>

Mary Kowal

<http://www.sfwalounge.com/forum/index.php?topic/4883-issue-202/page-13#entry40863>

Samantha Henderson

<http://www.sfwalounge.com/forum/index.php?topic/4883-issue-202/page-14#entry40878>

Steven Saus

<http://www.sfwalounge.com/forum/index.php?topic/4883-issue-202/page-15#entry41225>

<http://www.sfwalounge.com/forum/index.php?topic/5094-worrisome-trends/page-6#entry42897>

Michael Capobianco

<http://www.sfwalounge.com/forum/index.php?topic/5093-n-k-jemisins-goh-speechpro/#entry42136>

Liz Argall

<http://www.sfwalounge.com/forum/index.php?topic/5000-does-the-sfwalounge-have-a-commitment-to-diversity/page-13#entry42121>

Robert J. Howe

<http://www.sfwalounge.com/forum/index.php?topic/5000-does-the-sfwalounge-have-a-commitment-to-diversity/page-13#entry42127>

Jason Sanford

<http://www.sfwalounge.com/forum/index.php?topic/5000-does-the-sfwalounge-have-a-commitment-to-diversity/page-14#entry42194>

<http://www.sfwalounge.com/forum/index.php?topic/5094-worrisome-trends/page-6#entry42898>

Steven Gould

<http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/5000-does-the-sfw-have-a-commitment-to-diversity/page-14#entry42201>

Amal El-Mohtar

<http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/5103-who-has-been-expelled-from-what/#entry43152>

- (2) The frequency of personal attacks on SFWA members in official SFWA spaces. Back in 2007, Teresa Nielsen Hayden complained about the considerable quantity of personal attacks that took place in official SFWA channels. She wrote: “The kind of flaming loudmouthed crap that’s S.O.P. in the private SFWA area doesn’t just repulse run-of-the-mill SFWAns. It takes out the best: the ones who think and care and work the hardest.” (See: [http://www.antipope.org/charlie/blog-static/2007/11/sfw\\_attempts\\_to\\_commit\\_public.html#comment-12244](http://www.antipope.org/charlie/blog-static/2007/11/sfw_attempts_to_commit_public.html#comment-12244)). More recent admissions of the frequency with which SFWA members attack other members in official SFWA spaces are documented below:

- <http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4690-issue-201/page-4#entry37214>
- <http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4690-issue-201/page-6#entry37543>
- <http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4690-issue-201/page-6#entry37551>
- <http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4690-issue-201/page-8#entry37827>
- <http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4690-issue-201/page-8#entry37881>
- <http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4690-issue-201/page-9#entry37952>
- <http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4883-issue-202/page-9#entry40551>
- <http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4945-is-sff-broken/page-8#entry45905>
- <http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4945-is-sff-broken/page-8#entry45916> (reference to Kowal’s comment)
- <http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/5151-more-perspectives-and-please-be-civil/page-2#entry44602>
- <http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/5151-more-perspectives-and-please-be-civil/page-3#entry44759>
- <http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/5151-more-perspectives-and-please-be-civil/page-5#entry44869>
- <http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/5151-more-perspectives-and-please-be-civil/#entry44133>
- <http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/5265-trolling-ignoring-logic-and-dismissing-facts/#entry46904>
- <http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4945-is-sff-broken/page-2#entry45148>
- <http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4945-is-sff-broken/page-18#entry46757>

- (3) Personal attacks on SFWA members in official SFWA spaces. A number of members have improperly described the complaint against me as a personal attack on an SFWA member in an official SFWA space, but as I have already demonstrated, this is not an accurate description. However, there are a considerable quantity of personal attacks on SFWA members to be found in the SFWA discussion forums, both on [sfwa.org](http://sfwa.org) and [sff.net](http://sff.net). As evidence of the fact that these personal attacks are so common as to be

considered normal membership behavior, I note the following 71 posts by various members.

While the severity of the attacks varies from minor to serious enough to have caused members to quit the organization, they are all personal attacks which, due to where they took place, clearly violate the policy more directly and egregiously than merely linking to a blog post via a Twitter feed. Note that several of these attacks are either protested by other members or admitted by the member who made the attack. Please also note that no less than four of these direct violations of SFWA policy were committed by members of the present SFWA Board: Steven Gould, Rachel Swirsky, Lee Martindale, and Jim Fiscus.

Athena Andreadis

<http://www.sfwaweb.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4883-issue-202/page-2#entry40198>

Liz Argall

<http://www.sfwaweb.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4883-issue-202/page-3#entry40248>

<http://www.sfwaweb.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4883-issue-202/page-4#entry40252>

<http://www.sfwaweb.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4883-issue-202/page-5#entry40278>

<http://www.sfwaweb.org/forum/index.php?/topic/5000-does-the-sfwaweb-have-a-commitment-to-diversity/page-5#entry41319>

<http://www.sfwaweb.org/forum/index.php?/topic/5000-does-the-sfwaweb-have-a-commitment-to-diversity/page-5#entry41376> (response by member)

<http://www.sfwaweb.org/forum/index.php?/topic/5000-does-the-sfwaweb-have-a-commitment-to-diversity/page-5#entry41395>

<http://www.sfwaweb.org/forum/index.php?/topic/5000-does-the-sfwaweb-have-a-commitment-to-diversity/page-14#entry42421>

<http://www.sfwaweb.org/forum/index.php?/topic/5094-worrisome-trends/page-4#entry42822>

William Barton

<http://www.sfwaweb.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4945-is-sff-broken/page-2#entry44767> (admission of attack)

Andrew Burt

sff.private.sfwaweb.lounge, article 124156, Tue 16 May 2006 01:54:12a

Steve Carper

sff.private.sfwaweb.lounge, article 124138, Mon 15 May 2006 09:43:17p

Gregory Norman Bossert

<http://www.sfwaweb.org/forum/index.php?/topic/5094-worrisome-trends/page-3#entry42779>

Carrie Cuin

<http://www.sfwaweb.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4690-issue-201/page-5#entry37475>

<http://www.sfwaweb.org/forum/index.php?/topic/5000-does-the-sfwaweb-have-a-commitment-to-diversity/page-10#entry41727>

<http://www.sfwaweb.org/forum/index.php?/topic/5151-more-perspectives-and-please-be-civil/page-7#entry45064>

Amal El-Mohtar

<http://www.sfwaweb.org/forum/index.php?/topic/5118-a-librarians-response-to-current-events/#entry43699>

<http://www.sfwaweb.org/forum/index.php?/topic/5103-who-has-been-expelled-from-what/#entry43152>

Jim Fiscus

<http://www.sfwaweb.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4945-is-sff-broken/page-18#entry46687>

<http://www.sfwaweb.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4945-is-sff-broken/page-18#entry46690> (accusation of attack)

<http://www.sfwaweb.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4945-is-sff-broken/page-18#entry46696> (admission of attack)

Diana Pharoah Francis

<http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4397-questions-for-candidates/page-5#entry30762>

Steven Gould

<http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/5000-does-the-sfw-have-a-commitment-to-diversity/page-14#entry42177>

<http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/5000-does-the-sfw-have-a-commitment-to-diversity/page-14#entry42184> (response from Pournelle)

Sarah Grey

<http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/5151-more-perspectives-and-please-be-civil/#entry44174>

Jim Hines

<http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4397-questions-for-candidates/page-19#entry31925>

<http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/5000-does-the-sfw-have-a-commitment-to-diversity/page-12#entry41902>

Keffy Kehrli

<http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4883-issue-202/page-2#entry40186>

<http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4883-issue-202/page-2#entry40194>

Kate Kligman

<http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4883-issue-202/page-5#entry40291>

Lee Martindale

<http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4397-questions-for-candidates/page-7#entry30876>

<http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4397-questions-for-candidates/page-19#entry31930>

David Moles

<http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/5094-worrisome-trends/page-4#entry42824>

T.L. Morganfield

<http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4397-questions-for-candidates/page-7#entry30885>

<http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4690-issue-201/page-3#entry36738> (edited)

<http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4690-issue-201/page-4#entry37232>

<http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4690-issue-201/page-7#entry37738>

<http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4883-issue-202/page-8#entry40439>

Jason Sanford

<http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/5094-worrisome-trends/page-3#entry42791>

<http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/5094-worrisome-trends/page-3#entry42815> (admission of attack)

<http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/5094-worrisome-trends/page-4#entry42842>

Steven Saus

<http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/5094-worrisome-trends/page-5#entry42869>

<http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/5094-worrisome-trends/page-6#entry42910>

Catherine Shaffer

<http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4397-questions-for-candidates/page-5#entry30719>

<http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4883-issue-202/page-10#entry40558>

Cory Skerry

<http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4883-issue-202/page-2#entry40188>

<http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4883-issue-202/page-3#entry40232>

Allen Steele  
[sffa.private.sffa.lounge](http://www.sffa.org/forum/index.php?topic/180173), article:180173, Sat 19 Jan 2013 12:25:37p

Charles Stross  
<http://www.sffa.org/forum/index.php?topic/5094-worrisome-trends/page-2#entry42734>  
<http://www.sffa.org/forum/index.php?topic/5094-worrisome-trends/page-3#entry42785>

Rachel Swirsky  
<http://www.sffa.org/forum/index.php?topic/4883-issue-202/page-6#entry40345>  
<http://www.sffa.org/forum/index.php?topic/4883-issue-202/page-7#entry40375> (admission of attack)

Elise Tobler  
<http://www.sffa.org/forum/index.php?topic/4690-issue-201/page-7#entry37721>

Unknown, removed by Cat Rambo, moderator  
<http://www.sffa.org/forum/index.php?topic/5089-how-about-sffa-pledging-to-match-these-contributions/page-2#entry43943>

Wendy Wagner  
<http://www.sffa.org/forum/index.php?topic/4883-issue-202/page-2#entry40191>

Sean Wallace  
<http://www.sffa.org/forum/index.php?topic/4397-questions-for-candidates/page-5#entry30745>  
<http://www.sffa.org/forum/index.php?topic/4397-questions-for-candidates/page-5#entry30763>  
<http://www.sffa.org/forum/index.php?topic/4690-issue-201/page-8#entry37824>  
<http://www.sffa.org/forum/index.php?topic/4690-issue-201/page-8#entry37888> (admission of attack)  
<http://www.sffa.org/forum/index.php?topic/4883-issue-202/page-12#entry40785>  
<http://www.sffa.org/forum/index.php?topic/4883-issue-202/page-13#entry40789>  
<http://www.sffa.org/forum/index.php?topic/4883-issue-202/page-13#entry40793>

Damien Walter  
<http://www.sffa.org/forum/index.php?topic/5094-worrisome-trends/page-5#entry42854>

Bud Webster  
<http://www.sffa.org/forum/index.php?topic/4690-issue-201/page-3#entry37209> (edited)  
<http://www.sffa.org/forum/index.php?topic/4690-issue-201/page-4#entry37215> (admission re 37209)  
<http://www.sffa.org/forum/index.php?topic/5094-worrisome-trends/page-5#entry42851>  
<http://www.sffa.org/forum/index.php?topic/5094-worrisome-trends/page-5#entry42859>  
<http://www.sffa.org/forum/index.php?topic/5094-worrisome-trends/page-5#entry42874>  
<http://www.sffa.org/forum/index.php?topic/5094-worrisome-trends/page-6#entry42896>  
<http://www.sffa.org/forum/index.php?topic/5094-worrisome-trends/page-7#entry42927>

Django Wexler  
<http://www.sffa.org/forum/index.php?topic/5094-worrisome-trends/page-4#entry42834>

F. In summary, the channel does not belong to SFWA, the Content did not belong to SFWA, the content was deemed permissible by the channel owner, and the personal attack contained in the blog post to which the tweet linked was fully in line with previous personal attacks made by dozens of other members of the organization in official SFWA spaces. Therefore it is incorrect to claim that an official SFWA channel was misused via the marking for inclusion of the blog post of June 13, 2013 in the @sffaauthors Twitter feed.

## A.2. Publication of confidential SFWA material

I have not published any confidential SFWA material since the one time I was warned and sanctioned for doing so. In fact, the charge in this section contains the information that exonerates me concerning the same charge. Johnson correctly points this out: *"The phrase "abusive behavior" is, in fact, an automatically-generated heading for the message sent to Mr. Beale."*

That is true. The phrase was contained in an email sent to me, and while I did incorrectly believe they were Ms Rambo's own words, I also knew it could not possibly be covered by SFWA discussion forum confidentiality rules because the phrase was contained in an email delivered to my inbox. Johnson's logic is incorrect and "this example" cannot possibly suggest "that despite an earlier warning and sanction he has shown little respect for the confidentiality of SFWA material" for the obvious reason that the automatically-generated heading was not covered by any SFWA confidentiality rules.

I unreservedly deny that I have violated any SFWA confidentiality rules. I have not reposted any discussion form posts and I have not released any information provided to me by the office of the SFWA Ombudsman. None of the information that I have published on my blog is subject to any expectation of confidentiality, including the SFWA Board Report. At no point in time did I agree to keep the Board's communications with me confidential, nor was I ever asked to do so.

### A. Violation of SFWA discussion forum confidentiality rules by Matthew Johnson

Ironically, in light of the accusation in this section, it is the Canadian Regional Director who has repeatedly violated discussion forum confidentiality. The SFWA Forum expressly states:

*"The SFWA discussion forums are for SFWA members only, and all posts made here are confidential. Material may not be re-posted outside these forums without the explicit permission of their authors"*

In spite of these clear guidelines, Matthew Johnson repeatedly re-posted my posts on the SFWA discussion forums without my permission. I note that there is no Board exception to discussion forum confidentiality and the fact that he re-posted my posts in the course of the Board's complaint process is not an excuse for violating confidentiality. Nor did the complaint process give him any reason to violate confidentiality by providing quotes and screen captures, as he could have utilized the method I have used in my response to the complaint and simply provided links to the relevant discussion forum posts.

Mr. Johnson's violations of discussion forum confidentiality include:

- (1) Screen captures. Mr. Johnson provided eight screen caps of my discussion forum posts without permission. See Fig A.6, Fig A.8, Fig A.10, Fig A.12, A.14, A.25, Fig C.6, and C.13 in Appendix III.
- (2) Quotes. Mr. Johnson quoted a moderator-deleted post without my permission in section C.2..
- (3) An admission that he sought permission from other members without seeking to obtain mine.

### B. False claims of nonexistent SFWA confidentiality rules by Matthew Johnson

In an email dated July 4, 2013, Mr. Johnson falsely asserted that the Board Report fell under "SFWA confidentiality rules": *"Please find attached the Board investigator's report. This report and all contents not publicly available fall under SFWA confidentiality rules and may not be publicly disclosed."*

I asked him via email the same day: "Are there truly any published "SFWA confidentiality rules" beyond those posted in the SFWA Forum? If so, please provide me with a copy of them and explain how they are relevant to unsolicited emails."

In an email dated July 5, 2013, Mr. Johnson replied: *"As mentioned in our previous correspondence, the report contains material from the SFWA Discussion Forums which therefore may not be distributed outside of SFWA. As well, portions of the report contain material forwarded by the Ombudsman and therefore fall under the requirement that communications with that office be kept confidential."*

To which I replied via email that same day: "Thank you for the link to the OPPM. However, as I'm sure you are already aware, your response is not a straightforward answer concerning the existence of the purported "confidentiality rules". As you were unable to provide me with any published "SFWA confidentiality rules", I shall henceforth assume they do not exist and therefore cannot apply to the report. Furthermore, it is now readily apparent that the Board has knowingly misconstrued the discussion forum rules. The forum very clearly states:

*"The SFWA discussion forums are for SFWA members only, and all posts made here are confidential. Material may not be re-posted outside these forums without the explicit permission of their authors."*

"I have attached a screencap as evidence. Neither I, nor, I suspect, any of the other members, granted permission for their posts to be reposted in a report which has already been distributed outside the forum. There is no special exception for the Board. I therefore have no choice but to lodge a complaint concerning the Board's blatant violation of the discussion forum confidentiality rules. As for the material supposedly forwarded by the Ombudsman, I have received no information from that office and therefore cannot possibly be considered bound by rules related to any such communications."

I note two things concerning Mr. Johnson's emails to me.

- I was incorrect to believe that Mr. Johnson did not receive permission from other members to re-post their forum postings in his report. I was informed that Mr. Johnson did receive permission from at least two of the members concerned. However, the fact that Mr. Johnson obtained their permission to re-post their forum postings proves that he knew he was also obligated to obtain my permission to re-post my forum postings, permission he neither requested nor received.
- By including information forwarded by the Ombudsman in the Board Report, Mr. Johnson, by his own admission, violated "the requirement that communications with that office be kept confidential" in addition to his numerous violations of discussion forum confidentiality.

#### C. False claims of nonexistent SFWA confidentiality rules by Steven Gould

On July 4, 2013, I wrote the following email to Steven Gould and Rachel Swirsky, the President and Vice-president of the organization.

*Dear SFWA officers*

*I received an unsolicited email from the Canadian Region Director, Matthew Johnson, today, in which he referred to "SFWA confidentiality rules". I have six questions concerning his email:*

- 1. Can you please inform me where in the bylaws these "confidentiality rules" can be found?*
- 2. Is it a violation of "SFWA confidentiality rules" to provide a copy of the report to my attorney?*
- 3. Who was the nameless "Board-appointed investigator" who authored the report?*
- 4. Why was the "investigative report" entirely prosecutorial in nature and totally lacking in all exculpatory evidence?*
- 5. There are specific claims concerning various members in Appendix III-2 Fig. X-11 and Fig. X-12 . Why was I not provided with the evidence supporting those claims? The appendix included no copies of emails or screen caps of Forum messages concerning these purported calls for expulsion.*
- 6. What are the "current protocols" to which Mr. Johnson refers?*

*Please be advised that if I do not receive satisfactory answers to these questions within 24 hours, I shall be forced to assume that Mr. Johnson was inventing nonexistent "confidentiality rules" and will therefore consider myself free to release the information to the public.*

*Sincerely,  
T. Beale*

Mr. Gould responded in his email of July 6, 2013

Dear Mr. Beale,

Here are the answers to your questions. Please address future questions and responses on this matter to Matthew Johnson.

*1. Can you please inform me where in the bylaws these "confidentiality rules" can be found?*

This report contains posts from online Forums, and private emails sent to the Board in conjunction with the investigation. Just as our Member Discussion Forums and our printed Directory and The Forum are subject to Board policies regarding limited access, so is this report, both for your own protection and for others.

*2. Is it a violation of "SFWA confidentiality rules" to provide a copy of the report to my attorney?*

No.

*3. Who was the nameless "Board-appointed investigator" who authored the report?*

Matthew Johnson is the Board-appointed investigator. His name is on the title page of the report.

*4. Why was the "investigative report" entirely prosecutorial in nature and totally lacking in all exculpatory evidence?*

This report is the complaint. You are having an opportunity to present exculpatory evidence and you are being given as much time as our protocols gave the Board-appointed investigator.

*5. There are specific claims concerning various members in Appendix III-2 Fig. X-11 and Fig. X-12 . Why was I not provided with the evidence supporting those claims? The appendix included no copies of emails or screen caps of Forum messages concerning these purported calls for expulsion.*

These are listed for context and the Board will be considering these, but they are irrelevant to the substance of the complaint and shared in confidence with the Board.

*6. What are the "current protocols" to which Mr. Johnson refers?*

Our current protocols are counsel-advised steps for a consistent complaint process that derives from our Bylaws and our Operations, Policies, and Procedures Manual.

*Please be advised that if I do not receive satisfactory answers to these questions within 24 hours, I shall be forced to assume that Mr. Johnson was inventing nonexistent "confidentiality rules" and will therefore consider myself free to release the information to the public.*

Please be advised that such an action will be added to the material of the complaint and considered by the Board in its deliberations.

Sincerely,

Steven Gould  
President  
Science Fiction and Fantasy Writers of America

I note five things concerning Mr. Gould's emails to me:

- Mr. Gould admits the report is prosecutorial in nature rather than comprehensive, as required by Section VII (4) of the SFWA OPPM. *"The Board investigator shall, within 14 days of his or her appointment, present to the Board a comprehensive report on the alleged incident(s)."* He even

- described the report as being identical to the complaint.
- Mr. Gould admits that the statements by members, and by extension, presumably the statements by non-members, are “irrelevant to the substance of the complaint”.
  - Mr. Gould was unable to provide any written evidence for the existence of the “SFWA confidentiality rules” that Mr. Johnson claimed were pertinent to what Mr. Gould described as the Board Report/Complaint.
  - Mr. Gould threatened to add the violation of nonexistent confidentiality to the material of the complaint.
  - Mr. Gould also referred to nonexistent “professional confidentiality” in his July 9, 2013 announcement entitled “On Confidentiality and Board Deliberations”.

D. Revoked access to the SFWA discussion forums by Steven Gould

On July 10, 2013, I received the following email from Mr. Gould

*Dear Mr. Beale,*

*Effective immediately, I have directed our webmaster to remove your access to the SFWA discussion boards for repeated violations of of the SFWA Discussion Forum Guidelines, specifically:*

*“Reading privileges will not ordinarily be curtailed. However, posting forum messages outside the forums without permission can lead to losing reading privileges.”*

*Steven Gould  
President  
Science Fiction and Fantasy Writers of America*

I deny that I posted forum messages outside the forums at any time after June 13, 2013. I note that I posted only information that Mr. Johnson had already re-posted outside the forum, in many cases without permission. Mr. Gould's action was unilateral, unjustified, and an abuse of his office.

### A.3. Harassment

For reasons that have been explained above, Mr. Johnson is incorrect and the @sfwaaauthors Twitter account is not analogous to the SFWA discussion forums. Mr. Johnson also incorrectly claims that there are three elements to be considered with regards to harassment: *“The question, then, is whether the blog post of Thursday, June 13 published through the SFWAAuthors account made it impossible for “all persons who participate in SFWA programs and activities do so in an atmosphere free of all forms of harassment, exploitation, or intimidation.” There are three elements to consider: whether Beale made personal attacks against other members in SFWA-controlled spaces, whether he created a hostile environment through his use of rhetoric and imagery associated with known racist movements, and whether he published threats against other members on the blog through his use of the SFWAAuthors Twitter feed.”*

Mr. Johnson leaves out the most important element of harassment, which is that it is repeated. Dictionary.com defines harassment: “noun: the act or an instance of harassing, or disturbing, pestering, or troubling repeatedly”. The four elements that therefore must be considered in this regard are answered as follows:

1. The first element does not apply. I clearly did not make *“personal attacks against other members in SFWA-controlled spaces”*. I made one response to a personal attack in a Blogger-controlled space.
2. The second element does not apply. I did not create *“a hostile environment through... use of rhetoric and imagery associated with known racist movements”*. It is both absurd and offensive for Mr. Johnson to attempt to manufacture nonexistent connections and rhetorical associations between a person of color and “known racist movements” such as Stormfront. His attempt to do so is far more indicative of a creation of a hostile environment than anything of which I am accused; I note that based on his report, Mr. Johnson, a presumably white male, is observably far more familiar with these known racist movements than I am.
3. The third element does not apply. I did not publish any threats against other members on my blog or via my use of the @sfwaaauthors twitter feed.
4. The fourth element does not apply. There was no repetition of any personal attack against any SFWA member via the Twitter account or a genuine official SFWA space.

With regards to the repetitive element of harassment, it should be kept in mind that prior to my blog post of June 13, 2013, I had referred to Ms Jemisin precisely once, in a post entitled “McRapey and McRacist react to criticism” on April 15, 2013. Contrast with this the fact that Ms Jemisin publicly attacked me several times on her own blog and on Twitter, over a five-year period ranging from September 11, 2008 to June 18th, 2013. As a matter of fact, I was completely unaware of Ms Jemisin's existence until sometime in 2011.

To the extent that any harassment can be said to have taken place, it is clear that Ms Jemisin has been harrassing me rather than the other way around.

### A.3.1. Personal attacks

Mr. Johnson brings up four personal attacks on SFWA members in the blog post, but he fails to mention that all four personal attacks were, in fact, responses to personal attacks on me made by those members. In the first example, he even selectively edits my statements, presumably in order to hide the fact that they were obviously responses to personal attacks.

1. "... Theresa Nielsen Hayden is dumb". The relevant quote is: "Theresa Nielsen Hayden is dumb enough to have claimed a prominent Game blogger with three Billboard-charting club hits "is not acquainted with actual women."
2. "... the fat frog that is Nielsen Hayden". The relevant quote, in full, is: "Granted, Spacebunny [my wife] and the fat frog that is Nielsen Hayden don't look as if they belong to the same phylum, let alone the same species, so perhaps the key word is not "women, but "actual" in the sense of "grotesquely malformed". (See: [https://si0.twimg.com/profile\\_images/188396807/SBWorkout.jpg](https://si0.twimg.com/profile_images/188396807/SBWorkout.jpg) and [http://farm2.staticflickr.com/1163/602423809\\_6fdb37e856.jpg](http://farm2.staticflickr.com/1163/602423809_6fdb37e856.jpg))
3. "... we simply do not view her [Jemisin] as being fully civilized for the obvious historical reason that she is not". This is not a personal attack, or even an attack of any kind, it is a macrosocietal observation. Whether it is true or not can be debated, but it cannot reasonably be considered a personal attack when it applies to literally millions of other individuals. Moreover, it is an intrinsically non-racist position, as it postulates that human cultures require approximately the same amount of time to transition from full savagery to full civilization.
4. "... whites defend their lives and their property from people, like her [Jemisin], who are half-savages engaged in attacking white people". It was Jemisin, not me, who publicly identified herself with those who were endangering others and were therefore putting themselves at risk from the so-called "Stand Your Ground" laws in Florida and Texas. She wrote:

*"Right now there are laws in places like Florida and Texas which are intended to make it essentially legal for white people to just shoot people like me, without consequence, as long as they feel threatened by my presence." (See: <http://nkjemisin.com/2013/06/continuum-goh-speech/>)*

In addition to demonstrating that it was Jemisin who identified herself as a criminal attacker, her claim was also false, as studies have revealed that although the original purpose of the laws was to permit white Americans to defend themselves from physical attack, it is in fact African-Americans who disproportionately benefit from those laws because African-Americans are the primary targets of the African-American criminals with whom Ms Jemisin identified herself. (See: "Blacks benefit from Florida 'Stand Your Ground' law at disproportionate rate" <http://dailycaller.com/2013/07/16/blacks-benefit-from-florida-stand-your-ground-law-at-disproportionate-rate/>)

Mr. Johnson also claims that I "engaged in personal attacks on members on the SFWA discussion Forums". I note that 1) Mr. Johnson again violated SFWA discussion forum confidentiality by re-posting a post deleted by the moderators without my permission, 2) the example he provided was, again, a response to a provocation by an SFWA member, and 3) that a single example cannot possibly serve as evidence of multiple "attacks on members".

### A.3.2. Use of rhetoric and imagery associated with known hate groups

This section is simply stupid and should be embarrassing to every member of the SFWA Board who voted to include it in the report. I deny it and demand a personal apology and public retraction from the Canadian Regional Director. I know nothing of Stormfront, have no affiliations or connections to any race-based political action group, and, on the basis of my ethnic heritage, would probably be more welcomed by the National Council of La Raza than by any white supremacist organization.

Moreover, Mr. Johnson's reasoning could be used much more successfully to indict Ms Jemisin herself. In addition to the copious anti-white rantings one can find on her blog and Twitter account, former SFWA member Will Shetterly has pointed out that she subscribes to an explicitly racist philosophy: *"Jemisin's version of anti-racism comes from Derrick Bell's 'racial realism', which got its current name, Critical Race Theory (aka CRT), from his protégé, Kimberlé Crenshaw. Bell came of age in the civil rights era, but unlike Martin Luther King and Malcolm X, his understanding of power never grew broader than race. Bell's racial realism was effectively a secular take on the Nation of Islam's approach to race, complete with an insistence that all whites are racist.... If you check Twitter, Jemisin is out of the closet regarding CRT."* (See: <http://shetterly.blogspot.com/2013/07/on-vox-day-and-n-k-jemisin-feuding.html>)

To give one example, months before her Australian speech in which she falsely attacked me as “a self-described misogynist, racist, anti-Semite, and a few other flavors of asshole”, Ms Jemisin declared the following in exchange with Mr. Shetterly on Twitter: “If you recognize racism as a system intended to elevate and support whites over others... no, it [racism against white people does not and] can't [exist]. (See <https://twitter.com/nkjemisin/status/320177125640531968>).

### A.3.2. Rape threat against SFWA member by blog commenter

1. There was no rape threat. The suggestion that Ms Jemisin needed to “run a train” was entirely in keeping with the Urban Dictionary's description of “run a train” as “group of men having sexual intercourse with one woman serially”. Mr. Johnson's interpretive error appears to be the result of confusing the subject of the sentence with the object. If someone, in this case Ms Jemisin, is running a train, then obviously she is in control of the situation and thereby consenting to it. Given the clear implication of control and consent, any possibility of rape is precluded. The Canadian Regional Director is wrong to say *“run a train' is clearly a rape threat”*, because, in this context, it is simply a means of saying the individual concerned is too uptight and is in need of considerable sexual release.
2. Even if a blog commenter did make a rape threat against an SFWA member, and even if I am incorrectly held to have “published” that threat, I cannot be held responsible for any threat or comment made by any blog commenter, as per 47 U.S.C. § 230. Section 230(c)(1), which provides immunity from liability for providers and users of an “interactive computer service” who publish information provided by others.

### A.3.4. Threats of harassment and mischief against SFWA and members

In this section, the Canadian Regional Director again openly admits to violating SFWA discussion forum confidentiality. He writes: *“This investigation has found two threats of harassment and mischief against SFWA and members made by Mr. Beale in a SFWA-controlled space, both in a post later removed by moderators from the online Forums.”* In response to his two assertions:

1. Mr. Johnson's first assertion of a threat is false. A legal settlement is not extortion. In the past, I have been offered, and accepted, legal settlements ranging from \$7,500.00 to more than \$200,000.00. As members of the organization and the SFWA Board have openly discussed violating my legal rights under Massachusetts and California state law, it is perfectly legitimate for me to discuss some of the legal remedies available to me should the Board elect to do violate them and cause me to incur material financial damages.
2. Mr. Johnson's second assertion of a threat is false. My detailed and public criticism of Mr. Johnson's scurrilous and observably flawed “comprehensive report” has, as promised, already been more difficult for SFWA than my previous participation in the SFWA discussion forums, but it is neither harassment nor mischief.

## B. Continuing pattern of actions prejudicial to SFWA

I first note that Mr. Johnson correctly notes that the actions to which he refers in this section “*did not occur in SFWA-controlled spaces or in ways that directly violate SFWA bylaws and policies.*” I therefore call to the Board's attention that none of the actions referred to in sections B and C of the report are relevant to the substance of the complaint or are subject to any disciplinary action by the SFWA Board or the SFWA membership.

Nevertheless, I will address each of the sub-sections in detail, as my response will document further examples of false and malicious statements by the Canadian Regional Director and other SFWA members.

### B.1. Attacks on members

I note that this section examines “attacks and threats which were made in his blog and other public space” which therefore renders them outside the purview of the SFWA Board. In the interest of clarity, I will also point out that I am not accused of making any of the so-called “threats” documented in this section.

#### B.1.1. Personal attacks

Mr. Johnson details five personal attacks by me on members of the organization and attempts to hold me responsible for a sixth, which is a blog comment he claims I published. In response, I note the following:

1. Each of the five so-called “attacks” is actually a response to a previous attack by the SFWA member. I am providing direct quotes to personal attacks made by those members, all of which are direct quotes and most of which were made long before any of my responses. Links to all of these quoted personal attacks can be provided upon request.
  1. I have consistently referred to John Scalzi as McRapey following his satirical post of October 25, 2012, in which he declared: “I’m a rapist. I’m one of those men who likes to force myself on women without their consent or desire and then batter them sexually.” In my defense, I claim both satire, as I did nothing more than pretend to take Mr. Scalzi at his word, and provocation, as the three-time SFWA President has repeatedly and publicly made personal attacks on me over an eight-year period, beginning on March 1, 2005. Some of Mr. Scalzi's personal attacks on me include, but are not limited to:
    - (1) “a jackass, and a fairly ignorant jackass at that” (<http://nielsenhayden.com/electrolite/archives/006122.html#75601>)
    - (2) “his political jackassery” (ibid.)
    - (3) “of all the dumbassery Beale may be rightly accused of” (<http://nielsenhayden.com/electrolite/archives/006122.html#75636>)
    - (4) “chucklehead” (ibid.)
    - (5) “We may also equally and more simply posit that Vox has his head up his ass on this matter” (<http://nielsenhayden.com/electrolite/archives/006122.html#75912>)
    - (6) “the lunatic fringe” (<http://nielsenhayden.com/electrolite/archives/006122.html#75914>)
    - (7) “the willfully stupid” (ibid.)
    - (8) “your head is pretty far up your ass” (<http://nielsenhayden.com/electrolite/archives/006122.html#75924>)
    - (9) “when I call you the "lunatic fringe" I am discussing your hypoxic opinion” (ibid.)
    - (10) “I know quite a few devout followers of Christ who would also think you have your head up your ass regarding your opinion” (ibid.)
    - (11) “I’m also happy to say he's got his head up his ass” (<http://nielsenhayden.com/electrolite/archives/006122.html#75933>)
    - (12) “I’m happy to grant that in other subjects, he may not exhibit such profound sphincto-cranial tendencies” (ibid.)
    - (13) “there's a definite head-ass conjunction on his part” (ibid.)
    - (14) “a fascinating example of sphincto-cranial interaction” (ibid.)
    - (15) “You're a "lunatic fringe"... because you hold a position that is clearly intellectually indefensible, yet appear to give it the same weight as fact.” (ibid.)

- (16) "You'll just be feeding his persecution complex. Lots of writers are jerkwads."  
(<http://nielsenhayden.com/electrolite/archives/006122.html#75941>)
- (17) "his misogynistic jerk-like tendencies"  
(<http://nielsenhayden.com/electrolite/archives/006122.html#75945>)
- (18) "Vox Day... may yet one day regret his sphincto-cranial position" (ibid.)
- (19) "His position isn't right or left; it's just stupid and sexist." (ibid.)
- (20) "Nothing he's written here suggests either sophistication or a sense of irony. The question was whether he was a garden-variety jerk or something else entirely. Looks like he's in the "something else" camp." (<http://nielsenhayden.com/electrolite/archives/006122.html#75948>)
- (21) "To restate: Your thesis is wrong *and* you lack the rhetorical skills to present your thesis in a coherent fashion. Your latter-day attempt to brush off your sexist and ignorant statement as sarcasm is baldly transparent as backtracking; even if it were true, it shows that your use of such devices is appallingly clumsy. Again one wonders how you got your columnist gig, or, alternately, if anyone bothers to edit you, as you so clearly need."  
(<http://nielsenhayden.com/electrolite/archives/006122.html#75958>)
- (22) "you have settled into the "bad writer" excuse for your dumbass and sexist statement." (ibid.)
- (23) "we're back to you having (to put another spin on use my new favorite phrase) a sphincto-cranial event of monumental proportions" (ibid.)
- (24) "To massacre Voltaire's sentiment, Vox may have indefensibly stupid opinions, but I for one would fight for the right for him to be an SFWA member with indefensibly stupid opinions. Lord knows he wouldn't be the first, or the last."  
(<http://nielsenhayden.com/electrolite/archives/006122.html#76006>)
- (25) "Poor, deluded Vox." (<http://nielsenhayden.com/electrolite/archives/006122.html#76032>)
- (26) "Silly Tracina. Expecting a *logical* argument from Vox. If he couldn't try to change the subject, he wouldn't be able to argue at all."  
(<http://nielsenhayden.com/electrolite/archives/006122.html#76034>)
- (27) "Either Vox meant what he wrote, in which case he deserves his thumping on the grounds he's a sexist pig. Or he didn't mean what he wrote, in which case he deserves a thumping on the grounds he's an unfathomably poor writer. Either way he deserves a thumping, and a thumping is what he's getting." (<http://nielsenhayden.com/electrolite/archives/006122.html#76062>)
- (28) "Now, run back to your comment monkeys and declare victory, Vox. I'm sure they'll pat down your fur for you." (ibid.)
- (29) "I should check to see if one of the gibbering follow monkeys of that Racist Sexist Homophobic Dipshit who has an adorable mancrush on me has smeared a turd all over one of my comment threads." (<http://whatever.scalzi.com/2013/01/31/troll-report-active-with-increasing-chance-of-stupid/>)
- (30) "And of course, this is his prerogative; if it makes him feel better about himself and pumps up his social status with his clutch of equally insecure racist sexist homophobic dipshit admirers, then by all means he can spout as much garbage about me as he likes." (ibid.)
- (31) "The pathology of it is pretty standard elementary-school taunting dynamic, which is to call me a name they think is clever (top of the hit parade at the moment is "McRapey," because the main Racist Sexist Homophobic Dipshit apparently believed [this](#) was real, and once it was explained to him what satire was, had to rather embarrassingly suggest he was doing satire too *so there*, which, again: *adorable*), followed by generally unimaginative insults regarding my work/position/status, followed by rah-rah plumping for their beloved leader." (ibid.)
- (32) "Also, as a general rule, I've been recently avoiding having the primary racist sexist homophobic dipshit's name in the comment threads, mostly because at this point I just prefer not to have it about, and also because I find "racist sexist homophobic dipshit" is more than adequate at this point in terms of reference. However, to avoid silliness, you may call him by name if you like. I still prefer not have links to his site, however. It's a hygiene thing."  
(<http://whatever.scalzi.com/2013/01/31/troll-report-active-with-increasing-chance-of-stupid/#comment-431974>)
- (33) "If his existence is validated by this particular post, we should all reflect on what sad and wan existence it is. Beyond that, this, post, once written, obviates the need to have to write anything else about this person (or his follow monkeys) again. So there's that."  
(<http://whatever.scalzi.com/2013/01/31/troll-report-active-with-increasing-chance-of-stupid/#comment-431974>)

- stupid/#comment-432250)
- (34) “My language isn’t particularly abusive. He is in fact a racist and a sexist and a homophobe. The dipshit part accurately describes his personality as far as I can tell. If he doesn’t wish to be described as a racist sexist homophobic dipshit, he can work on not being those things. Let’s just say I won’t be holding my breath on that. As for the idea that the psycho-sexual fixation flows the other way: AH HA HA HA HA HAH HA. Dude, if I’m gonna do a man, it ain’t gonna be that pathetic ball of issues. I don’t do pity fucks.” (<http://whatever.scalzi.com/2013/01/31/troll-report-active-with-increasing-chance-of-stupid/#comment-432614>)
- (35) “No. The racist sexist homophobic dipshit in question most certainly did appear to believe I was actually outing myself as a rapist, and then frantically backtracked when people pointed out his error, re-establishing that he’s a racist dipshit in the process.” (<http://whatever.scalzi.com/2013/01/31/troll-report-active-with-increasing-chance-of-stupid/#comment-432799>)
- (36) “I mean, I get that the racist sexist homophobic dipshit feels *bad* about being revealed to be a credulous unsophisticate in front of all his gibbering follow monkeys.” (ibid.)
- (37) “Beyond this, the trolls are the gibbering follow monkeys who show up at the site, not the racist sexist homophobic dipshit himself, who at least has the presence of mind to realize he lost his commenting privileges here some time ago and doesn’t darken my door. I’m sure that the racist sexist homophobic dipshit *is* having a good laugh about the fact I have to deal with the brain-dead little cretins who detach from his site and show up here. He’s just the sort of self-aggrandizing tool to confuse my irritation at having to deal with his play pals with some estimation of his own self-worth. This is what you do when you’re an asshole, as he clearly is.” (<http://whatever.scalzi.com/2013/01/31/troll-report-active-with-increasing-chance-of-stupid/#comment-432799>)
- (38) “@scalzi Christ, this whole thing is crackers, but huge respect for turning it into a positive. Can I email you about it for a journo thing? @davidmbarnett Sure. My e-mail is on my site under “Contact Information” in the sidebar.” (<https://twitter.com/davidmbarnett/status/297830195077988353>)
- (39) “Troll’s comments prompt author to pledge charity donation for every insult. ‘Racist Sexist Homophobic Dipshit’ will cue rewards for civil rights and LGBT groups by attacking John Scalzi. Heavy troll ... John Scalzi has an unusual defence against his troll.” (<http://www.guardian.co.uk/books/2013/feb/05/trolls-prompt-author-charity-donation>)
- (40) “there’s a Racist Sexist Homophobic Dipshit out there on the InterWeebs” (underline indicates a link to: [http://rationalwiki.org/wiki/Theodore\\_Beale](http://rationalwiki.org/wiki/Theodore_Beale)) (<http://whatever.scalzi.com/2013/02/02/solving-my-racist-sexist-homophobic-dipshit-problem/>)
- (41) “I don’t want to have to *read* the Racist Sexist Homophobic Dipshit’s site” (ibid.)
- (42) “even if the Racist Sexist Homophobic Dipshit never mentioned me again” (ibid.)
- (43) “But believe me, the racist sexist homophobic dipshit in question will know.” (<http://whatever.scalzi.com/2013/02/02/solving-my-racist-sexist-homophobic-dipshit-problem/#comment-433514>)
- (44) “And there’s nothing passive aggressive about what I’m doing to him now. I’m aggressively using his racist sexist homophobic nature to promote causes he almost certainly hates.” (<http://whatever.scalzi.com/2013/02/02/solving-my-racist-sexist-homophobic-dipshit-problem/#comment-433557>)
- (45) As noted before, there’s very little I could do one way or another that wouldn’t play into his delusions of grandeur and his desire to be seen as opposing me in some way; the fellow has an infinite capacity for “HA HA HA THIS IS GOING EXACTLY AS I PLANNED.” (<http://whatever.scalzi.com/2013/02/02/solving-my-racist-sexist-homophobic-dipshit-problem/#comment-433582>)
- (46) “This dipshit is going to drag my name through crap no matter whether I ignore him or not.” (<http://whatever.scalzi.com/2013/02/02/solving-my-racist-sexist-homophobic-dipshit-problem/#comment-433675>)
- (47) “The trolls are the gibbering monkey followers of his that wash up on the site. You should still not feed them. The Racist Sexist Homophobic Dipshit doesn’t troll the site; he does all his nonsense from a distance.” (<http://whatever.scalzi.com/2013/02/02/solving-my-racist-sexist-homophobic-dipshit-problem/#comment-433696>)

- (48) “Of all the things the Racist Sexist Homophobic Dipshit in question is, my “tormenter” is definitely not one of them.” (<http://whatever.scalzi.com/2013/02/02/solving-my-racist-sexist-homophobic-dipshit-problem/#comment-433803>)
- (49) “At this point I’m done pretending to be nice to the dipshit in question.” (<http://whatever.scalzi.com/2013/02/02/solving-my-racist-sexist-homophobic-dipshit-problem/#comment-433808>)
- (50) “Robert, are you trying to give the fellow a race on the dipshit front, or is that just an unintentional side effect of your bad logic here? I’m not going to dispute that giving the dude a slot was not one of my best ideas, to put it mildly, but that doesn’t change the fact you’re engaging in something akin to victim-blaming. One Big Idea slot given doesn’t mean I should just accept this dipshit’s calumny as my just desserts, and you’re being a bit of a truculent dick to suggest so.” (<http://whatever.scalzi.com/2013/02/02/solving-my-racist-sexist-homophobic-dipshit-problem/#comment-433888>)
- (51) “It should be fairly obvious that *this* is what I am saying about him, and to him. It should likewise be fairly obvious that I don’t give a damn what anyone else thinks as regards the appropriate way to deal with this dipshit.” (<http://whatever.scalzi.com/2013/02/02/solving-my-racist-sexist-homophobic-dipshit-problem/#comment-434008>)
- (52) “I’m aware that the Racist Sexist Homophobic Dipshit in question would like me to treat him with any sort of seriousness, and it irritates both him and his gibbering monkey followers that I don’t, I don’t care. I don’t refer to the dipshit by name because it *amuses* me to call him Racist Sexist Homophobic Dipshit;” (ibid.)
- (53) “Obviously, the dipshit is going to do as he pleases.... So let the dipshit max it out; I’ll pay my share gladly.” (<http://whatever.scalzi.com/2013/02/02/solving-my-racist-sexist-homophobic-dipshit-problem/#comment-434076>)
- (54) “Aside from the fact that that would be far more effort than I would want to invest in this dipshit, if I recall correctly he lives in Italy, which would make any of that difficult to arrange.” (<http://whatever.scalzi.com/2013/02/02/solving-my-racist-sexist-homophobic-dipshit-problem/#comment-434199>)
- (55) “Once again: I don’t *care* how the racist, sexist, homophobic dipshit in question responds to it.” (<http://whatever.scalzi.com/2013/02/02/solving-my-racist-sexist-homophobic-dipshit-problem/#comment-434479>)
- (56) “Guys, let’s not try to analyze him here. Dipshittery happens for all sorts of reasons; on this end, we only have to worry about the results.” (<http://whatever.scalzi.com/2013/02/02/solving-my-racist-sexist-homophobic-dipshit-problem/#comment-434551>)
- (57) “Deleted because I don’t have patience for VD’s special brand of complete nonsense on this topic. Stay in your own pit of manstink, would you, Vox? There’s a lad – JS” (<http://whatever.scalzi.com/2012/08/17/your-second-thought-for-the-day/#comment-353892>)
- (58) “sociopathic assbag” (<http://whatever.scalzi.com/2012/08/17/your-second-thought-for-the-day/>)
- (59) “I’m sure “Waaaaah! Scalzi deleted my comments on his personal site and said I was a sexist assbag!” will prompt a rush of members to demand my removal.” (<http://whatever.scalzi.com/2012/08/17/your-second-thought-for-the-day/#comment-353914>)
- (60) “Too late. VD’s tribe of sexist assbags came in a little late for that.” (ibid.)
2. With regards to Nora Jemisin, I claim provocation. I have not frequently referred to Nora Jemisin in any way, and was in fact largely unaware of her existence until April 15, 2013, when one of my commenters mentioned her response on Twitter to a critical piece he had written about her and John Scalzi. A little reading of her site not only revealed the unusual extent of her anti-white racism, but the fact that she had publicly slandered me and other SFWA members, as “out-of-the-closet racists” nearly five years ago.
- (1) “There’s been a lot of theorizing about the dearth by fans of color too, but I’m not sure if anyone in influential/gatekeeper position is listening. This thread convinced me that SFWA doesn’t care about the problem. Other organizations do, but they don’t have SFWA’s clout. It doesn’t help that there are a lot more out-of-the-closet racists out there than just Vox Day — Larry Niven recently made some pretty heinous comments....” (<http://nkjemisin.com/2008/09/too-late-for-sf/#comment-121>)
- (2) “It’s that tolerance that disturbs me — that willingness for the SF community to welcome all comers, even if they’re frothing hatemongers, and not just tolerate them: give them awards, put

- them on decision-making teams.” (ibid.)
- (3) “Now, to put this in context: the membership of SFWA also recently voted in a new president. There were two candidates — one of whom was a self-described misogynist, racist, anti-Semite, and a few other flavors of asshole.” (<http://nkjemisin.com/2013/06/continuum-goh-speech/>)
  - (4) “Unlike the ten percent, these people do not overtly hate me, or people like me.” (ibid.)
3. With regards to the claim that I accused Nora Jemisin of plagiarism, I deny it entirely. I was not asserting or otherwise implying that the award-winning Ms Jemisin was subliterate or that she did not write the books with her name on them, I was merely mimicking her literary style, specifically her habit of frequently using asterisks to denote subchapters.
  4. With regards to Amal el-Mohtar, I claim that the rhetorical comparison is entirely legitimate. The Egyptian cleric Sami Abu Al-Ala has publicly called for the ethnic cleansing of Egypt, while el-Mohtar has publicly called for an ideological cleansing of SFWA of views she personally deems “hateful, harmful,” and “dehumanizing”.
  5. With regards to James Enge, I claim provocation as well as a legitimate description of his actions.
    - (1) I was informed by knowledgeable sources that Mr. Enge lobbied to have me removed from the roster of Black Gate's regular bloggers in 2008. (<http://www.blackgate.com/2012/12/27/sff-corruption-part-i/#comment-19008>)
    - (2) “The bad news is that Theo, the newest addition to the Black Gate group-blog, is also the odious Vox Day.” (<http://jamesenge.com/2008/12/08/bad-news-good-news/>)
    - (3) “On balance, I decided Black Gate means more to me than Pox Verpulae or whatever his real name is.” (<http://jamesenge.com/2008/12/10/the-bloggy-bloggy-gate/>)
    - (4) “Some people, for instance, drum up ridiculous controversies in the hope that people will pay attention to them and their work. Despicable, really, but whole careers have been founded on this kind of rage-baiting.” (<http://www.blackgate.com/2012/12/27/sff-corruption-part-i/#comment-18970>)
    - (5) “It has led to Black Gate and Pox Vapuli/Beale to part company, as I understand it.” (<http://james-nicoll.livejournal.com/4125679.html?thread=77584111#t77584111>)
  6. With regard to Teresa Nielsen Hayden, I claim satire, I deny responsibility, and I claim provocation.
    - (1) I claim satire because the comment I reposted was written from the perspective of “a Sonoran desert toad”. The full quote that Mr. Johnson failed to present was: “I would point out that licking \*me\* brings on a state of euphoria and a series of pleasant hallucinations, while licking Ms. Nielson would cause spastic uncontrolled vomiting and give you herpes.”
    - (2) I deny responsibility since I did not write the original comment.
    - (3) I claim provocation in response to the following public attacks on me by Ms Nielsen Hayden:
      1. “It's really, really obvious that VD is not acquainted with actual women. I don't just mean sexual relations. I mean he's had little or no social interaction of any sort.” (<http://nielsenhayden.com/electrolite/archives/006122.html#76168>)
      2. “VD fears and dislikes women” (ibid.)
      3. “a third-rate intellect” (<http://nielsenhayden.com/electrolite/archives/006122.html#76250>)
      4. “a tad unbalanced” (ibid.)
      5. “a generally unpleasant fellow” (ibid.)
      6. “Given your stated opinions on women, I'd love to see you take on the RWA. Bring a friend so there'll be someone to take charge of the remains.” ([http://www.antipope.org/charlie/blog-static/2007/11/sfwa\\_attempts\\_to\\_commit\\_public.html#comment-12114](http://www.antipope.org/charlie/blog-static/2007/11/sfwa_attempts_to_commit_public.html#comment-12114))
      7. “Anybody here in favor of turning Vox Day over to SFWA's female members? I'd pay money to watch.” (ibid.)
      8. “Good heavens. Did you imagine you were worth arguing with? You aren't.” ([http://www.antipope.org/charlie/blog-static/2007/11/sfwa\\_attempts\\_to\\_commit\\_public.html#comment-12155](http://www.antipope.org/charlie/blog-static/2007/11/sfwa_attempts_to_commit_public.html#comment-12155))
      9. “Vox Day's true opinion of women has always been clear to me: he's terrified of them.”

([http://www.antipope.org/charlie/blog-static/2007/11/sfwa\\_attempts\\_to\\_commit\\_public.html#comment-12243](http://www.antipope.org/charlie/blog-static/2007/11/sfwa_attempts_to_commit_public.html#comment-12243))

10. "He is a wuss." (ibid.)
  11. "You're also a singularly inept sockpuppet, O Bane/Vox/Theeeeeedore." (ibid.)
  12. "out-of-the-closet racist" (<http://nkjemisin.com/2008/09/too-late-for-sf/#comment-119>)
  13. "obviously unbalanced" (ibid.)
  14. "been known to put in a good word for the Nazis" (ibid.)
  15. "Vox Day is unbalanced. His SFWA candidacy is a symptom, not a practical undertaking." (<https://twitter.com/tnielsenhayden/status/323597546125672448>)
2. I have been publicly granted permission from Mr. Scalzi to refer to him in any manner I see fit and therefore no references to him, however derogatory, can be held against me.
    - "That being the case, let him mention me as much as he likes, in any manner he likes." (See <http://whatever.scalzi.com/2013/02/02/solving-my-racist-sexist-homophobic-dipshit-problem/#comment-433582>)
    - "And each time he posts an entry that invokes me, one way or another, that's another fiver into the pot. That's 200 opportunities this year for him to prompt a contribution! I hope he takes advantage of all of them." See: <http://whatever.scalzi.com/2013/02/02/solving-my-racist-sexist-homophobic-dipshit-problem/>)
  3. The responses to personal attacks on me that I have made are well within the limits of acceptable and professional behavior by SFWA members, as evidenced by the dozens of personal attacks in the SFWA discussion forums by the 33 SFWA members documented above, as well as by the following examples of public statements made by SFWA members outside SFWA spaces:
    - "I take it you think Cory should instead have taken his arguments to the private SFWA area on SFF Net, a toxic morass where he could have been pointlessly abused at great length by the whole pack of gargoyles: Jerry Pournelle, Andrew Burt, Bud Webster, Will Sanders, et cetera et al.: a stunningly unattractive proposition." - Teresa Nielsen Hayden (See: [http://www.antipope.org/charlie/blog-static/2007/11/sfwa\\_attempts\\_to\\_commit\\_public.html#comment-12244](http://www.antipope.org/charlie/blog-static/2007/11/sfwa_attempts_to_commit_public.html#comment-12244))
    - "I am not privy to his thinking, but our dear president and executive have voted to reinstate the old piracy committee, with Andrew Burt to chair it, under the new name of the SFWA copyright committee. To say that this is a fuckwitted decision is an understatement. Under Dr Burt, the new copyright committee will almost inevitably devolve into a reincarnation of the old piracy committee. If I thought it'd do any good I'd be resigning in protest right now; only the expense of a life membership purchased a couple of years ago is restraining me right now. Clearly the current executive of SFWA is making damaging decisions and ignoring input from committees it appointed, and in view of this I call on SFWA president Mike Capobianco and the rest of the SFWA executive — including Andrew Burt — to resign immediately." - Charles Stross (See: [http://www.antipope.org/charlie/blog-static/2007/11/sfwa\\_attempts\\_to\\_commit\\_public](http://www.antipope.org/charlie/blog-static/2007/11/sfwa_attempts_to_commit_public))
    - "Dear Twelve Rabid Weasels of SFWA, please shut the fuck up. I know you value your freedom of speech. Good on you. However there are 1788 other members of SFWA who also value their freedom of speech and manage to exercise it without being raging assholes.... Please quit. And by "quit" I mean, please quit SFWA in a huff. Please quit noisily and complaining about how SFWA is censoring you for asking you to stop using hate speech." - Mary Robinette Kowal (See: <http://www.maryrobinettekowal.com/journal/dear-twelve-rabid-weasels-of-sfwa-please-shut-the-fuck-up/>)
    - "Hey, to publishers and their defenders who say that: Fuck you. Fuck you for asserting that the author has shouldered no risk, when she's invested the time, opportunity cost and material outlay required to create a manuscript. Fuck you for asserting the the author sees no risk to her own career.... Fuck you for lightly passing over the risk that the author has if the book fails.... Yes, to all of that, "fuck you," is probably the politest thing to say in response." - John Scalzi (See: <http://whatever.scalzi.com/2013/03/10/new-writers-ebook-publishers-and-the-power-to-negotiate/>)
    - "Heinlein's work is one of the reasons why SFF has spent years calling itself progressive, and utterly refusing to listen to complaints about the racism embedded in the genre's bones. That

resistance is one of the things that's made my career a greater struggle than a white author's might be. The reason I read FF in the first place was because, when I first got active in SFF fandom and tentatively complained about some stuff that bothered me in the first Heinlein works I'd read, Heinlein fans yelled at me that he wasn't racist or sexist, and Farnham's Freehold was the proof of that. After I read that book I realized two things: a) that Heinlein was racist as \*fuck\*, and b) most of science fiction fandom was too." - Nora Jemisin (See: <http://nkjemisin.com/2012/09/things-people-need-to-understand-issue-223-2/>)

- "Does this mean we can't make fun of Vox Day (Or VD as I like to call him) for his distressing use irrational arguments? Of course we can. It's like finding one of those dishes of leftovers in the back of the refrigerator that is busy creating it's own little ecosystem. You comment on it, you drop it in the trash, and you don't swallow it." - Steve Gould (See: <http://nielsenhayden.com/electrolite/archives/006122.html#75922>)
- "Racist Takes Dump in SFWA Twitter Stream: News at 11 The background: former SFWA presidential candidate Theodore Beale is known for rather over-the-top screeds. To this day, I can't figure out if he actually believes the stuff he writes, or if he's doing some sort of whiny white male supremacist performance art." - Jim Hines (See: <http://www.jimchines.com/2013/06/racist-takes-dump-in-sfwa-twitter-stream-news-at-11/>)
- "Pournelle (noun): Term for a well-known author who complains things were better "back in the day" when jerks could act with impunity." - Jason Sanford @jasonsanford 26 Jun. "I'd be nice if people RT'd last tweet. I'd love Pournelle to become a meme. Not that real Pournelle'd understand memes if they bit his butt." - Jason Sanford @jasonsanford 26 Jun
- "An underreported aspect of being around for a long time: the horror of watching your once-admired elders turn into blithering nincompoops." - Patrick Nielsen Hayden (See: <https://twitter.com/pnh/status/340787331067940864>)
- "I think the ongoing and increasing sublimation of the private space of consciousness into public netspace is profoundly pernicious.... I'm also opposed to the increasing presence in our organization of webscabs, who post their creations on the net for free. A scab is someone who works for less than union wages or on non-union terms; more broadly, a scab is someone who feathers his own nest and advances his own career by undercutting the efforts of his fellow workers to gain better pay and working conditions for all. Webscabs claim they're just posting their books for free in an attempt to market and publicize them, but to my mind they're undercutting those of us who aren't giving it away for free and are trying to get publishers to pay a better wage for our hard work. Since more and more of SFWA is built around such electronically mediated networking and connection based venues, and more and more of our membership at least tacitly blesses the webscabs (despite the fact that they are rotting our organization from within)...." - Howard V. Hendrix (See: <http://sfwa.livejournal.com/10039.html>)

### B.1.2. Threats by commenters

My response to the section on the threats by commenters is to note that on July 16, 2013, I was informed that the SFWA Board had found my complaint concerning direct and implicit threats made against me by multiple members to be “without merit” and dismissed it for “insufficient grounds”. In addition to this, as I have already noted above, I cannot be considered responsible for any threat or comment made by any blog commenter as per 47 U.S.C. § 230. Section 230(c)(1). Nor can I be considered responsible for any threat or comment made by a blog commenter on a blog I do not control.

### B.2. Attacks on the reputation and integrity of the organization

I have certainly “made statements on numerous platforms, including but not limited to his blog, that can be seen as attacks on the reputation and integrity of SFWA.” I am very far from alone in this, as many SFWA members have done so as well; some have even quit the organization in disgust at the lack of integrity shown by SFWA. I note that one need not present any evidence at all for one to honestly express one's opinion in good faith. None of the SFWA members quoted below presented any evidence, and yet they are not being prosecuted by the SFWA Board for their very similar opinions concerning the "dreadful" aspect of the SFWA's awards.

#### 1. Attacks on the reputation and integrity of SFWA by other members

- “As a member of SFWA's BoD, I can say that we have no input in who goes on these juries. Which is a shame in this case, since I already knew about this bozo and would have made some noise. But I agree with David Moles: SFWA didn't make this appointment. That said, I also don't hold a lot of truck with the Nebulas (Ray Feist has called them glorified bowling trophies). Or any other awards, for that matter. But I think I will make some noise now, since I don't want him to show his face in this sort of position again.”  
- Derryl Murphy, March 2, 2005
- "Funny thing is, the Hugos are the cleanest major award in American SF. The Nebs are *dreadful*."  
- Teresa Nielsen Hayden, March 11, 2005
- "The Nebulas are one of the two major awards in literary science fiction, but their luster has dimmed over the last several years; they are no longer the equal to the Hugos in terms of relevance and timeliness, and their nomination process leaves them open to accusations of nomination via logrolling rather than literary quality."  
- John Scalzi, former SFWA president, 2007 platform
- "Getting back to the nebulas: log-rolling is indeed a problem. In fact, it's encouraged by the structure of the nebula process. The only excuse for the process that I can see is that too much eligible fiction is published in any given year for the jury to read it all, so some sort of pre-filtering is necessary, and the way the pre-filtering evolved within the nebula process just happened to end up FUBARed beyond all recursive acronymisation."  
- Charles Stross, SFWA member, November 30, 2007
- "For the 2009 ballot, SFWA members could see how many nominations each story received in the lead-up to the ballot selection. I really liked this because it allowed members to know which stories were gaining attention. If a story was surging in the tally, many members would go out of their way to read and consider it. However, there was a downside to having a public tally--logrolling. People could see who supported each story. Because of this, it was claimed some SFWA members pledged to vote for different people's stories if those people voted for their own tales. Now, I personally thought this practice was rarer than people stated, but it was still a concern."  
- Jason Sanford, SFWA member, February 20, 2012
- "I have served on Neb juries too. And the Election Committee. I used to be a member of SFWA. Trust me on this, I have never been as pressured and log-rolled for a nomination as I have been by male authors. Right down to almost in person physical arm twisting. Women hardly did anything at all, other than send their works to me. And everyone does it."  
- C. Foxessa, ex-SFWA member, December 29, 2012
- “I left because Scalzi issued an edict declaring that nobody could get a lifetime membership without an invitation-- i.e., the approval of John Scalzi-- and that the cost was raised to more than sixty years' dues. This was shortly after he and other officers had enjoyed vacations paid for out of members' dues. I know nothing about Beale, but if he can create an outfit worse than what Scalzi has turned

SFWA into, he possesses supernatural abilities.”

- Matthew Joseph Harrington, former SFWA member, December 31, 2012

- "I thought SFWA would be my 'union' capable of enhancing or protecting my interests. It's not really been so. At least in my very limited experience. Especially not when I stumbled across an e-mail exchange between several SFWA members who were essentially discussing ways to turf my chances on the Nebula, Hugo, and Campbell ballots in 2012. Why should I pay money to remain a member of an organization that seems (too often?) to be infested with personalities who explicitly want to hurt my career? Or at least want to blunt my opportunities?"

- Brad Torgenson, SFWA member, July 9, 2013

## 2. Accusations of corruption and unfair business practices

It is necessary to Matthew Johnson's accusation that I thrice misrepresented DaveT's comments and "knowingly distorted evidence in support of those accusations." There are three components to his accusation:

1) The first charge of misrepresentation is false. I did not misrepresent anyone as a current member of SFWA who was not a current member. I didn't say anything at all about DaveT's membership status as of December 2012, and I even provided a link to the comment where he made it clear that he quit the organization sometime around 2003. It would have been more precise to describe him as "a former SFWA Bulletin editor who quit the organization" than "an SFWA insider", but it was not misrepresenting the man to describe him as precisely what he was, an SFWA insider who edited the official SFWA magazine for three years and knows considerably more about the organization than most of its members.

2) The second charge of misrepresentation is false. I did not misrepresent DaveT as an authoritative source of evidence for my accusation. Johnson is straight out lying here. He claims: "(since the accusations related directly to the 2012 Nebulas, and Dave T. said he had not been a member since 2003)". However, the greater part of my accusation and the subsequent discussion concerned the 2002 Best Novel award given to Catharine Asaro for *The Quantum Rose*; in addition to the post at Black Gate prominently featuring the cover of that novel, there is also a debate about between the possible connection of that award to the popularity which led to her being elected to SFWA office around the same time

I also denied making accusations about the 2012 Nebulas in the very comment thread quoted by Mr. Johnson.

Jo Walton: *"I am not a member of SFWA and never have been. I think that disposes of your accusations of my logrolling for a Nebula."*

Theo: *"I never made any such accusation."*

More importantly, Johnson ignores the way I specifically stated that my accusations primarily relate to the period between 2000 and 2010 in my original post, the very time period during which DaveT was the editor of the Bulletin.

*"One of the things that rapidly became obvious to anyone who attempted to participate honestly in the system between 2000 and 2010 was that the Nebula Award is, first and foremost, a means for various small groups of people to shamelessly and dishonestly promote the works of themselves and their friends."*

3) The third charge of misrepresentation is false. I did not "misrepresent Dave T's comments in order to provide support for an otherwise unsubstantiated attack on the reputation and integrity of SFWA." Here is where Johnson's blatant dishonesty becomes impossible to deny. He knowingly misrepresents DaveT's reminder about the possibility of a simple statistical explanation for Tor's many awards as a disagreement with my overall point. Johnson writes of DaveT:

*"he did not agree with Beale's overall point about the Nebula process (and by extension SFWA) being corrupt...."*

That is totally false, as DaveT clearly did agree with and substantiate my overall point:

***"I have merely concurred with Theo that there are shenanigans going on re the Nebs voting process that I think are deplorable. There are cliques who stick together (as in most organizations), and some of them even go so far as to purposely avoid voting for certain types of SF they don't like (i.e. the perceived Analog \_stereotypical\_ story, for but one example).... I personally got fed up with the cliques, in-fighting, nastiness, politics, and all the rest of it, which is why I resigned my Bulletin editorship in 2002 and let my membership lapse a year or so later." [Emphasis added]***

What was Johnson's basis for claiming DaveT disagreed with me? Fig. B.30 showed the full text of DaveT's comment.

*"If nearly 25% of all Nebs recs since 1986 were from Tor, then this means that just over 75% of the Nebs recs since 1986 were not from Tor. Now, take into account that Tor is the largest SF book publisher in the United States and it's not too much of a stretch to imagine that a fair number of their books might just earn a Neb rec. I bought a red car some years ago. A friend was quick to point out that statistics showed that more red cars get into accidents than any other color. To which I replied, "Maybe there are just more red cars on the road." To wit, maybe there's just more Tor books to nominate from, and they must be doing something right re quality and sales for them to be the leading SF book publisher in the country (if not the world). Just a thought."*

This is obviously not proof of DaveT failing to agree with my overall point. In fact, it's not even a disagreement with me! I myself brought up the possibility that Tor is simply a very good publisher, in addition to some observations, such as:

- "the unusually heavy involvement of its authors in the awards process"
- "their representation in the organization's offices"
- "the confirmed logrolling in the recent past"
- "how many of those award-winning books neither seem to sell particularly well nor be especially well-regarded by Amazon reviewers"

In fact, the only area of potential disagreement between DaveT and I was that DaveT believes Tor is not cheating, but merely "has an active and successful marketing and networking strategy", whereas, on the basis of my experience in the music industry, I am less than entirely certain that Tor Books has never gamed various awards and bestseller lists.

The only person who "knowingly distorted evidence in support of... accusations" here is Matthew Johnson. By now, it should be abundantly clear that on the basis of his intentional misrepresentations and demonstrably false accusations, Matthew Johnson, the current Canadian Regional Director and SFWA Board member, is considerably more harmful to SFWA's reputation and integrity than I am.

### B.3. Effects of Beale's continued membership on SFWA

The Canadian Regional Director claims there is evidence to suggest that following his recent actions Beale's continued membership in SFWA will serve to alienate many current members as well as discouraging currently qualified writers from joining. He cites nine comments from current members and one example of an outgoing Board member's announcement of his intention of letting his membership lapse as evidence of the former and ten comments from prospective members as evidence of the latter. My response to Mr. Johnson's claim is in four parts:

1. The Board took no action when more members were actually quitting and protesting over previous member actions. To give one example, even though John Scalzi publicly apologized and took responsibility for the Bulletin affair that led to the multiple members resigning, including the Editor of the SFWA Bulletin, the SFWA Board did not take any action against him.

"In fact, SFWA didn't do anything that might be considered its legitimate interest, but continuously stuck its nose in things where it had no interest, such as disputes between distributors and Amazon. This is when I let SFWA lapse and decided never to renew again."

- former SFWA member Sarah Hoyt

"I am a SFWA member who has decided to not renew. I found SFWA to be too insular and not helpful to my career. I don't expect you'll agree with my point of view, but I recently published my opinion on my site."

- former SFWA member Ron Vitale

"Mary Robinette Kowal, self-described professional puppeteer and part time writer, is very upset with some of the drama going on in SFWA at present. I sympathize with the aggravation. I spent years in SFWA, and stopped renewing, because of the endless drama and little accomplishment."

- former SFWA member Michael Z. Williamson

"It began with issue #200 of the *Bulletin*—all right, #199 if we want to get technical.... I am leaving you, not for someone else, or for another group, but for me. I am leaving you because your publication and certain members have made me feel unwanted and unwelcome more than once. I have grown uncomfortable speaking my mind in the forum because based on prior incidents, someone may likely tell me I'm being silly for feeling the way I do. No one should make another feel that way. SFWA, I loved you, but part of this dialogue concerning respect must contain my respect for myself. That's why I have to go."

- former SFWA member Elise C. Tobler

"It got so bad that our editor, Jean Rabe, resigned, not just as editor but as a member of SFWA. And for the record, I hired her as my assistant on the Stellar Guild line of books 5 minutes later."

- SFWA Member Mike Resnick

2. The Board cannot reasonably hold me responsible for the actions of other members, much less the hypothetical future actions of other members and prospective members.
  - "So you're to be punished for the choices that aspiring writers who might someday qualify for SFWA membership might hypothetically make when their initial moment of decision arrives? This gives new meaning to the word "daft.""
  - SFWA Member and former SFWA Board Member
3. There is evidence to suggest that disciplinary actions administered by the SFWA Board to me will serve to alienate many current members as well as discouraging currently qualified writers from joining.
  - "In my opinion, the Board of the SFWA is acting in a hypocritical manner. The report of evidence against you is thin and lacking. Frankly, the report shows outrageous bias and revels in subjectivity. I'm not happy with the SFWA's handling of this matter, and I'm disturbed that they stripped you of your access to the private forums. I will be even more disappointed in the Board if they vote to revoke your membership. It's clear that you've been attacked by members of the organization, and it's clear that you've attacked members of the

organization. That said, the Board should not hold you accountable because they disagree with you while applauding others because they share similar opinions. If board members want to be known as rational people capable of making objective decisions they should act like rational people and make objective decisions. The SFWA is currently fostering a dangerous environment, in my opinion. Many young writers are fearful of expressing their opinions because they're worried about current members of the SFWA blacklisting their opportunities.... I am not a member of the SFWA, but I have been considering joining the organization. The way this issue is handled will have a huge impact on my final decision.”

- Prospective SFWA member

- “As a small-time author who has been published years ago and working on a couple of pieces right now, I'd rather be water-boarded than have to join this crew of small-minded @sshats. I could get more encouragement and different points of view in one of the local watering holes. To be specific, count me as an author who beholds this low-brow spectacle as ample evidence of SFWA's uselessness.”  
- Prospective SFWA member
- The ridiculous witch hunt against Vox Day puts the nail in the coffin: I'm not interested in joining a writers' organization with an outdated model and childish members who are obviously more concerned with politically-correct one-upmanship than with helping up-and-coming writers.”  
- Prospective SFWA member
- “I think it's fairly likely that I'll be eligible for SFWA membership within the year. However, if the SFWA engages in witchhunts to find and expel thought criminals, I have no interest in ever joining.”  
- Prospective SFWA member
- “I've finished a novel or two, and gotten a very friendly rejection letter from Baen for one of them (one of those "here's what's wrong with your book" lists that proves the poor slush-reader made it all the way to the end of the book). At the moment, I'm more into computer programming than writing, but if I ever try the other again, I will not join the SFWA due to their passable imitation of castrated Nazis.”  
- Prospective SFWA member
- “I'm a writer of speculative fiction. I will never join the SFWA if Vox Day is expelled from the organization based on the nonsense in this 34-page report.”  
- Prospective SFWA member
- “If there were an organization that could help me with the practical application of finishing books, preparing same for submission so that I don't get a rejection, that would be nice. However, the SFWA appears to be an organization dedicated to anything but helping writers; therefore, I don't see any reason for me to consider SFWA in my future.”  
- Prospective SFWA member
- “I recently qualified for SFWA and won't be joining. The insanity over the bulletin, Mr. Resnick's alleged, non-existent sexism, and the chain mail bikini hysteria, is what actually dissuaded me from joining. Forcing a member out because of his reactionary politics only reaffirms my decision. And I am a so-called 'leftie!'”  
- Prospective SFWA member
- “I've only learned of your blog after a friend sent me the SFWA "report" but I've been unable to find any justification whatsoever for expelling you from the organization, or for any other action beyond suspending your use of the Twitter feed. While I think some of your comments were over the line, some of your political positions are nuts and your use of spiteful nicknames for your detractors is asinine, if those are grounds for forcing members out, they ought to start with Scalzi. AN AUTHORS' ORGANIZATION OUGHT TO BE IN THE BUSINESS OF EMPOWERING AUTHORS TO SPEAK THEIR MINDS, NOT CENSORING THEM! When was "I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it" replaced by "I disapprove of what you say, so you must suffer?" I expect that sort of idiocy from the general populace, but I'd have hoped people who make their living through speech might understand the importance of allowing honest dissent, even if they find a particular sentiment abhorrent. I feel like a coward for sending this anonymously, but I am convinced that I would otherwise substantially harm my chances of finding a traditional publisher. And you know what? That sucks. It sucks that an organization which ought to be focused on promoting authors' rights and careers would torpedo a young writer's aspirations because he had the gall to point out that they are doing the opposite. It sucks that an organization which ought to be at the forefront of defending speech and promoting art is instead primarily concerned with political ass-hattery and manufactured outrage. It sucks that an organization which ought to be in the business of impartially promoting the best work of its members is instead in the business of enforcing ideological purity.”  
- Prospective SFWA member

- “I don't think they realize how many of us they're pissing off yet.”  
-SFWA Member
- “The twitter feed policy was clear, in my opinion. Going beyond the boundaries of that policy is, in my opinion, cause for concern. Especially given that no one smells like roses. There have been personal attacks bandied about for years, many of which have demonstrably gone through official SFWA channels. And again, I'm concerned that the evidence report against Beale held third party comments against him. At the end of the day, I found the evidence report against him lacking.... In fact, I found the evidence report itself egregious. It shocked me, because I honestly expected more.”  
- SFWA Member
- “Recently the SFWA, a professional organization, has invested significant resources policing what is essentially a personal dispute between two members. It is not clear what interest the SFWA has in the dispute. Certainly an SFWA twitter account was used. But the offending tweet was removed and disclaimers given (and the wisdom of the open megaphone policy reconsidered). That seems to have ended the SFWA's concern in the matter. There is no need for all members of such a large organization to get along. If there are legal issues, let the legal process work. Meanwhile, complaints against other members, especially those who threatened physical violence, appear to have been given short shrift in the recent board vote. And there was a profanity-laced blog written by a board member telling members who disagreed to leave and exulting in oppressing the minority (the minority being of course the true "other"). Above all, there is an appalling lack of irony. For instance, the ban on mentioning Theodore Beale in the forums as though his name spelled Lord Voldemort. Or failure to consider what science fiction novels say about banning people who disagree. Meanwhile there is irony in the true sense of the word -- where onlookers understand the situation far differently than the actors. Here, there is all the appearance of personal animus by some and of bias by other members of the board, as shown by public comments made about the defendant or about the complaint prior to deciding the case. The process does not have the appearance of fairness. And that is important if the board intends to take the unprecedented step of removing an active member. I hope cooler heads will prevail.”  
- SFWA Member
- “[W]hile I do not agree with many of your positions socially or politically, nor even much of your platform when you ran for office, I also think that this entire Twitter/Facebook/Blog/Discussion Forums witch hunt against you is outrageous.... I find the current process to be abhorrent.”  
- SFWA Member and former SFWA Board Member

4. The opinions of members and non-members are not germane to the subject of the complaint.

Steven Gould, in his email of July 5, 2013, copied to Rachel Swirsky and Matthew Johnson, declared that the collected statements of members in the report “are irrelevant to the substance of the complaint.”

5. The Board does not know how to calculate the net effect of my membership on the organization.

While some members have threatened to quit other members, such as Charles Stross, have genuinely renewed and upgraded their memberships due to my membership. “I should add that the matter of Mr Beale's membership of SFWA is encouraging me to retaliate in the only appropriate way -- by upgrading to lifetime membership.” Other longtime members have observed the positive effects of increased member engagement as a direct result of my involvement with the organization. These contradictory effects render useless any subjective metric such as the one that Mr. Johnson has suggested. However, it should be relatively easy to determine the effect my membership has had on the organization by simply comparing the number of members when I first joined to the number on June 12, 2013, and comparing them to the current number of members. I accordingly emailed Mr. Johnson to request the membership numbers on , but was informed as follows on July 16, 2013:

*“The membership numbers in the online directory represent our best data. We do not track membership numbers by specific dates.”*

However, I noted that Article V, Section 5 (c) of the SFWA bylaws, which requires the Secretary shall “maintain membership lists, including the status of each membership and shall keep such records in such manner that information is always readily available.” So, I brought the bylaws to Mr. Johnson's attention while also emailing

the Secretary and requesting the membership information again. He replied on July 19, 2013:

*“The membership numbers in the online directory represent our best data. We do not track membership numbers by specific dates. I note that you have misrepresented my answer to your last request on your blog. Failure to correct this will be considered in reviewing your response. As previously instructed, all further correspondence in this matter should be directed to me.”*

After receiving this response, I was examining the discussion forums, and I noticed that on June 8, 2013, three different membership numbers were mentioned.

- 1,516 members: (See: <http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/5000-does-the-sfw-a-have-a-commitment-to-diversity/page-13#entry42128>)
- 1,808 total members: (See: <http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/5000-does-the-sfw-a-have-a-commitment-to-diversity/page-13#entry42139>)
- 1,329 Active members: (See: <http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/5000-does-the-sfw-a-have-a-commitment-to-diversity/page-14#entry42149>)

I therefore wrote to Mr. Johnson on July 20, 2013 as follows:

*“I am writing to you to request information concerning the number of members in the organization. I have reason to believe your previous answer was inaccurate in light of this post from the SFWA forum: <http://www.sfw.org/forum/index.php?/topic/5000-does-the-sfw-a-have-a-commitment-to-diversity/page-14#entry42149>. I would appreciate it if you would provide me with the number of Current Lifetime Active/Active/Active-Family members as of January 1, 1996, June 12, 2013, and July 15, 2013.”*

On July 23, 2013, Mr. Johnson wrote:

*“The membership figure in the forum post you linked to was arrived at by a manual count of data from the member directory and reflects only the membership totals at that time. We do not track membership numbers by specific dates.”*

In addition to appearing to violate the SFWA bylaws, I note that if the SFWA Board does not track membership numbers by specific dates, it cannot reasonably claim that my membership has had a negative effect on the size of the organization.

### **C.1.1 Archiving Forum material for later publication**

I archived the SFWA discussion forums because I correctly anticipated that someone in the organization would attempt to render my defense more difficult by denying me access to the forums. On July 10, 2013, Steven Gould informed me that he had, unilaterally, and without any cause or due process, ordered my access to the forums revoked.

*Dear Mr. Beale,*

*Effective immediately, I have directed our webmaster to remove your access to the SFWA discussion boards for repeated violations of the SFWA Discussion Forum Guidelines, specifically:*

***Reading privileges will not ordinarily be curtailed. However, posting forum messages outside the forums without permission can lead to losing reading privileges.***

*Steven Gould  
President  
Science Fiction and Fantasy Writers of America*

I note, again, that it was Matthew Johnson who posted forum messages outside the forums. I did not do so; I posted nothing more than an unsolicited report that was not protected by any reasonable expectation of confidentiality. The Board could have quite reasonably requested my agreement to keep the report confidential before sending it to me just as it could have asked for my permission to re-post my discussion forum posts. It chose not to do so, but instead elected to appeal to nonexistent “SFWA confidentiality rules” and imaginary “professional confidentiality”.

### **C.1.2 Refusal to abide by bylaws and Board sanctions**

It is false to claim that I have refused to abide by the SFWA bylaws. Indeed, to date, I assert that I have observably abided by them, and by the confidentiality rules, more closely than the SFWA Board itself. Nor, obviously, have I refused to abide by any of the sanctions to which SFWA has subjected me. I have accepted warnings, the removal of my blog from the @sfwaauthors Twitter feed without complaint, and the auto-moderation that amounted to an effective bar on my commenting in the discussion forums without complaint. I note that the one action about which I have complained, the denial of my access to the discussion forums, was not a Board sanction, but rather, a unilateral action by Mr. Gould.

As for the observable conflict between the bylaws and the Board-declared value of a lifetime membership, it is readily apparent that the latter action, being the more recent, must be taken into account. However, given the way in which the bylaws appear to be in conflict with the governing state law, I very much doubt it will be necessary to resolve the previous conflict. Pursuant to which, I note the following pair of forum posts for the Board's benefit:

- <http://www.sfwaweb.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4397-questions-for-candidates/page-12#entry31116>
- <http://www.sfwaweb.org/forum/index.php?/topic/4397-questions-for-candidates/page-17#entry31432>

### **C.2. Threats of nuisance litigation**

I have done nothing more than assure my fellow members of my intention to stand upon my legal rights according to Massachusetts state law and the organizational bylaws. Legal recourse cannot possibly be considered “nuisance litigation” if the SFWA Board seeks to deprive me of my rights and privileges as a member of the organization without due process, is responsible for causing me to incur material financial damages, or selectively enforces rules against me while ignoring more egregious behavior from other members of the organization because their ideological views are more compatible with the various members of the Board.

**Appendix I: Inclusion of blog comments**

I could post hundreds of similar blog comments made by the commenters of other SFWA member blogs to illustrate that the behavior of the various commenters on my blog is well within the bounds of acceptable public discourse for SFWA, but instead, I shall content myself with reminding the Board of Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act. Neither I nor any other SFWA member can be held responsible for any threat or comment made by any blog commenter, as per 47 U.S.C. § 230. Section 230(c)(1), which provides immunity from liability for providers and users of an "interactive computer service" who publish information provided by others. The fact that I am not a publisher, but merely one of many users of Blogger's interactive computer service, only strengthens that immunity.

## RESPONSE 1: Demand for the abandonment of the complaint process

The complaint process as followed by the SFWA Board was flawed in two ways. First, the Working Policies established in the OPPM require “a comprehensive report”. However, by the admission of Steven Gould, the report was not comprehensive, but was a prosecutorial document that contained very little of the copious amount of exculpatory evidence available. The report by the Canadian Regional Director was, in fact, declared to be synonymous with the complaint in an email from Steven Gould dated July 6, 2013 and quoted above.

Second, the motion to move the complaint process forward was brought by Steven Gould, whose personal prejudice against me has been a matter of public record since March 5, 2005. I note the following four public statements from Mr. Gould concerning me:

1. “The Nebula award has long been known as the award give to writers by writers. (I almost said 'peers' but this really opens a can-o-worms.) So, politics, beliefs, and even flaming prejudices have nothing to do with it. What are the qualifications for voting on the awards in general and, in particular, serving on the jury itself? That you be a published writer. Says nothing about whether you're a loony-toon with a frighteningly poor grasp of logic and facts. Or even a writer with different literary tastes. The hope is that a work selected despite the wide range of beliefs and tastes of it's selectors will truly be an exceptional work. Does this mean we can't make fun of Vox Day (Or VD as I like to call him) for his distressing use irrational arguments? Of course we can. It's like finding one of those dishes of leftovers in the back of the refrigerator that is busy creating it's own little ecosystem. You comment on it, you drop it in the trash, and you don't swallow it.”  
- Steven Gould, March 5, 2005 (<http://nielsenhayden.com/electrolite/archives/006122.html#75922>)
2. “What language is this guy speaking? Is he from this dimension? He said woman Can't hack the physics but he said that this doesn't mean he's saying women 'can't' do physics. Laura gives him a defintion of what 'hack' means. He comes back with a different definition as if it somehow refutes the original point but his definition still comes down to saying 'Women can't do physics.' It's like his arguments only go back to the last post he's responding to. He's totally out of context on the entire discussion. It's like he can't hold the entire argument in his head or he can't even remember what the original argument was. Why are we wasting so much time on this guy? When they came up with the phrase 'kneejerk' reactionary, they were thinking of him. I know Laura is expending as much energy as she is because she's both that hard SF writer and a professional engineer who had run into this attitude her entire career (though probably expressed without quite the lack of rationality we see here) and because we have two daughters who have to go into a future populated with wingnuts like VD. Our attitudes toward the roles of any human in our society is a worthy topic of rational discussion. Guess what this isn't.”  
-Steven Gould, March 5, 2005 (<http://nielsenhayden.com/electrolite/archives/006122.html#75965>)
3. Vox Day: *"I do find it more than a little ironic that the very people who entered the fray making personal attacks are such delicate flowers about enduring them in return. People disagree with me. Fine. People think it's appropriate to attack me, and not my ideas. Also fine. But it seems a little much for people to expect to be able to do so without taking any return fire."*

~~~~~

Hmmmm. Listen to another series of overwritten, not-on-topic responses or wax the cat?

Hear kitty, kitty....

- Steven Gould, March 6, 2005 (<http://nielsenhayden.com/electrolite/archives/006122.html#76008>)

4. “Lots of people calling for the expulsion of this guy. With reason. <http://t.co/0d4mmJc4LU>”  
- Steven Gould, June 13, 2013 (<https://twitter.com/StevenGould/status/345224318969589762>)

As additional evidence of Mr. Gould's prejudice, I note the following retweets:

- N. K. Jemisin @nkjemisin 13 Jun For people who are wondering, I have not seen VD/TB/assorted disease's post about me. Not planning to; I got books to write. Unlike him.  
-Retweeted by Steven Gould
- Hal Duncan @Hal\_Duncan 13 Jun @Antihippy Yeah, the thing is, he's not just trying to grab attention with

blogrants. He's co-opting SFWA structures as a platform 4 abuse.

-Retweeted by Steven Gould

- Jenny Thurman @jennygadget 17 Jun My thoughts Beale's hateful actions, @SFWA's responsibility, and the "free speech" arguments, as a librarian: <http://jennyslibrary.wordpress.com/2013/06/17/open-letter-to-sfwa/> ...  
-Retweeted by Steven Gould
- P Nielsen Hayden @pnh 18 Jun @Kalyr Dead on. It's no good to be angry all the time. It's also no good to be blind to the occasions when anger is appropriate.  
-Retweeted by Steven Gould

Mr. Gould's personal prejudice against me is clear and long-standing. He also took a prejudicial position concerning the June 13, 2013 tweet prior to the beginning of the complaint process. As a result of these two prejudicial factors, Mr. Gould had a clear responsibility to recuse himself from that process. Because he did not recuse himself, but instead personally brought the motion to continue the process, the complaint process is fatally tainted and must be brought to an immediate end.

- "No member should vote on a question in which he has a direct personal or pecuniary interest not common to other members of the organization." (Robert's Rules, 11th ed., p. 407.)
- "Recusal normally occurs when a director has a conflict of interest or prejudice concerning a particular matter."  
(Davis-Stirling.com, Recusal Defined)

I also note that in his email of July 5, 2013, Mr. Gould declared his intention to have the board take the opinions of other members into consideration as part of the complaint process despite admitting that "they are irrelevant to the substance of the complaint". He also threatened to hold me accountable for violating nonexistent confidentiality rules he could not cite when asked. Moreover, the long-time prejudice of the Board and various members of the organization has been so readily observable that some members even predicted that the Board would attempt to expel me prior to my actions of June 13, 2013.

- "The in-group candidate Steve Gould trounced Beale, 444 to 46, but totalitarian political systems cannot tolerate dissent and I'm sure they wanted to all be happy going into the magic weekend. I'm surprised they even counted Beale's votes, and I'm sure they will expel him in the near future."  
- SFWA Member Lou Antonelli, May 18, 2013 (<http://louantonelli.blogspot.com/2013/05/nebulous-thinking.html>)

**RESPONSE 2: Demand for recusals**

Matthew Johnson appropriately recused himself from the vote on the continuation of the complaint process. Due to their documented personal prejudice against me, I demand the recusal of the following SFWA Board members from the ongoing complaint process:

- Steven Gould
- Lee Martindale

Due to their documented past violations similar to the one with which I am charged, I demand the recusal of the following SFWA Board members from the ongoing complaint process:

- Jim Fiscus
- Steven Gould
- Lee Martindale
- Rachel Swirsky

**CONCLUSION**

The evidence is clear. Because I have not acted in a manner any different than dozens of other members, and because I did not attack a fellow member in an official SFWA space, I have not engaged in ongoing and deliberate efforts to disrupt SFWA's mission, have not used SFWA resources and venues made available to me as a member to promulgate a climate that is counterproductive to that mission, and have not acted to undermine the credibility of the organization both among the membership and the general public.

To the extent that anyone's actions have undermined the credibility of the organization, both among the membership and the general public, it is the Board's initial endorsement of the Canadian Regional Director's incomplete, one-sided, inaccurate, deceitful, and potentially defamatory report. I hope that in the interest of sparing the organization further public embarrassment, the Board will bring this complaint process to an immediate end with no sanctions beyond those already imposed, and restore my full access to the SFWA discussion forums as a Lifetime Active member in good standing.