

Foolhardy - #5

Just \$1 An Issue!

Foolhardy - A zine dedicated to the open discussion of any topic relating to the Diplomacy hobby. Published six times a year by **Douglas Kent, 54 West Cherry St. #211, Rahway, NJ 07065**. Also available on CompuServe [73567,1414]. Subscriptions are \$1 an issue in the US and Canada, or \$2 an issue overseas. Trades are not always accepted, but if you're interested ask away - if I don't already get your zine I'll consider it.

Letters in this issue: Garret Schenck, Fred Davis, Dick Martin, David Hood, Paul Kenny, W. Andrew York, Peter Sullivan, Don Del Grande, Pete Gaughan, Buz Eddy, John Caruso, Larry Peery, Kevin Brown, Cal White, Mark Nelson, Jack McHugh. Next Foolhardy deadline: March 15, 1993.

The Concept:

(PETER SULLIVAN) Of course, both James Nelson and myself have missed the real question, which is "Why is Jack McHugh?"

(DON DEL GRANDE) We can call the "two cents scandal" investigation off. Certainly, it costs you more than two cents for each envelope, doesn't it?

{There you go, off on one of your irrelevant tangents.}

(KEVIN BROWN) Who me? Write a controversial subzine? Get real!

(JACK MCHUGH) Don't listen to Crier Phil's suggestion of using his size format. His zine is almost unreadable without a magnifying glass. I like Foolhardy's large print.

As for James Nelson's comments, well, I mean he's a Nelson, need I say more?

{Too late to stop me from using some of Phil's format suggestions!}

{Two quick production notes for you readers. First of all, I've reduced the font a bit to keep the zine down in size. I've also slightly widened the columns, and put a line down each page to keep them apart. Second, I originally planned to do this zine every "2 or 3 months". This issue is the first one that was three months behind the previous one, and I really feel it was just too long a lag. So, from this point on Foolhardy is officially a bimonthly zine.}

The Name:

(JOHN CARUSO) I just thought of something. You name this zine after Jack McHugh.

Census:

(LARRY PEERY) I don't know if you have the time or inclination but one thing that would be interesting would be to see a cross matrix of who gets what zines. List all the zines down one side and all the names across the other. Then we could compare all kinds of things and see exactly what factions do exist (based on that one criteria, of course). Oh well...

{As you by now know, I've done this very thing. Did you find the cross-matrix at all worthwhile or interesting?}

Computers:

(DON DEL GRANDE) "No one has offered (John Caruso) the programs (he) needs to enter the 21st Century...(and he) can't afford them". Does John expect someone to send him a free copy of WordPerfect? There's a word for that: "stealing". Then again, some "big" software companies are releasing cheap, scaled-down versions of their programs. (For example, "Lotus-1-2-3 For Home" and "Quattro Pro Special Edition").

{I was wondering when someone would bother pointing out that John is openly asking for people to pirate software.}

(JOHN CARUSO) I've received two offers of help. We have Jack "Attack" McHugh - who calls people names and trashes their efforts. And Eric Brosius who offered typesetting help. If only someone would send me an updated 1st Choice program (or Word Perfect).

{Hey John, while you're at it why don't you ask for photocopies of \$100 bills?}

(MARK NELSON) I agree with Jack that email games are over rated. It's a different form of diplomacy, just as postal diplomacy is different ftf. The best email players are just as good as the best postal players, but the overall standard of play is lower in the email world.

I personally prefer email to snail mail. But then I log on about 4 hours a day, 6 days a week and so I can deal with email diplomacy as and when it arrives. If I were logging on just to reply to mail and just once a day I probably wouldn't enjoy it as much. As it is I find email to be much more frantic than the postal game. (In my email game it's up to Winter 1904 and I have already sent 90 letters!)

Custodians:

(PETER SULLIVAN) As the British OGRE (Orphan Games RE-houser), I've got an interest and some insight into the psychology of "messy folds".

They key point is that most messy folds come about because an editor can't or won't face up to the fact that they have folded. All it takes is for the current rush at work to pass over, for the house to be fully redecorated

and the cat to stop needing all those trips to the vet, and they'll be getting another issue out, maybe even next week. One of the biggest problems for an Orphan Games chappie is breaking through the self-justification and rationalization.

Your friendly neighborhood OGR's 8-point guide to Avoiding Messy Folds:

(1) Try not to get over-committed. If you feel you've reached your limit, close your lists and refuse all pleas to re-open them until you are back to a level you feel comfortable with. Remember, you are not doing your players a favor by starting games you won't finish.

(2) If you are the sort of person who's going to take umbrage at being the target of a feud, then avoid getting involved. (This does not apply if your name is Jack McHugh, but please pick your victims carefully). You might get so cheesed off with the whole thing that you drop out. Despite what the participants say, you can be neutral in a feud if you choose to be.

(3) If you use a computer, do not become so dependant on it that you can't produce at least an emergency games-only issue without it. In particular, keep paper back-ups of your mailing list.

(4) Whilst no-one's in this to make money, don't let your losses get so great you can't sustain them. This might be \$15 an issue for a college student, or \$100+ for someone in a well-paid job.

(5) Keep your files in some sort of order. If you can just stick everything in a large manila envelope addressed to "The New GM" it becomes much easier to fold tidily than if you have to search through half the house to find everything.

(6) Be in a position where you can refund all outstanding subs at any time. If this means having a separate account for sub money, then do that.

(7) Have at least one hobby friend who will tell you (confidentially) when you've screwed up badly, and whose advice you respect and will accept. And finally:

(8) Always have enough points in your plan.
*{How about a list of points describing how to realize that it's time for a publisher to officially announce a fold? As you mention, **that** seems to be a real problem, too. Then again, as you have announced that you are passing on the British OGR position to someone else, maybe a list of points describing when it is time to pass a hobby office on.}*

(DON DEL GRANDE) There is something that the MNC(uc) can do that will not only end the "schism" but provide a service that some people may find just as necessary as the BNC and MNC: switch to "multi-player PBM games other than Diplomacy variants" - for example, 1830, Kremlin, and Civilization, none of which are Dip variants in any wild stretch of the imagination. Call them the Sacks numbers (didn't Robert "create" the MNC(uc) office?) or the Martin numbers (wasn't it Julie Martin that gave MNC(uc) numbers to some of the above-mentioned games?).

There is a problem with the "area code" method of determining "closeness"; some area code zones are much, *much* bigger than others. For example, in California, the 707 zone runs 250 miles along the coast, while four players within a 30-mile radius circle can have area codes of 707, 415, 408, and 510. The best way might be to have the BNC maintain a database of ZIP codes and post office locations, and use those to determine how close players are.

{I remember Julie did sent me Miller(uc) Numbers for my first Kremlin

and Civilization games, but I never knew what to do with them, or why she gave them to me in the first place. It seemed to me that, since houserules for those games differ dramatically between one zine and the next, a registration number didn't really mean anything.

As for ZIP codes, doesn't that seem like an awful lot of work for the BNC? My point remains: the Area Code rule is pointless - it doesn't really lessen the chance of players knowing each other, doesn't take into account Email communications, and its cheaper for me to call players outside my area code than to call those in my area code but miles away anyway.}

Dipcon:

(DON DEL GRANDE) I agree with Phil Reynolds about Chapel Hill in 1994; the only other feasible possibility would have been if ORIGINS was in the south, but it will be in San Jose in 1994. (And as I am on the 1993 DIPCON committee, let me make clear that I am not going to hold "San Francisco is out of the question for this Florida boy" against Phil; after all, my cross-country DIPCON attendance record is not exactly 100%. True, I travelled 12,000 miles (each way) to get to WORLD DIP CON this year, but *somebody* had to represent our hobby....)

"The host country should select...the best available site within its country". How - by letting the attendees of the previous year's DIPCON do it? What if there are a lot of local attendees who aren't in "the hobby" and don't want to see it being held 3000 miles away? (Maybe if we limited the vote to persons who attended, say, two of the last four DIPCONs, or paid a "WORLD DIP CON membership fee" that would be deducted from the tournament fee if they attended - large enough to prevent ballot box stuffing but not too large to cause any hardship.)
{What's wrong with AvalonCon or AtlantiCon for DipCon in 1994? Did I miss something? Of course, now that they're apparently going to both be in MD, making the choice would be interesting.}

(MARK NELSON) I can remember John Caruso saying that WDC should be yearly years ago and wondering if there was the demand for a yearly event. Several years down the line everyone agrees that WDC should be yearly: what do you know, John was right all the time! WDC will go yearly from 1994.

John writes that "the host country should select what it think is the best available site within its country". Two comments. In practice how would the host country decide where WDC would be? Suppose it was decided that WDC would go to North America in 1995: How would the North American Hobby decide where to hold the event?

Secondly, one could apply almost everything that John writes about WDC to DipCon. Instead of each DipCon choosing where the next DipCon will be, shouldn't the region holding the con decide where the con will go? His comments about "a handful of people who won't show" apply to the DipCon vote as well!

I see nothing wrong with having potential sites bidding against each other for the right to hold the con, just as they do for the SF World Con.

Lack of New Zines:

(PAUL KENNY) I agree with the statement, (whoever made it), that one big reason for a lack of new zines is that it is intimidating for someone to

come out with a zine and have this feeling they are competing with other more established zines. Like the rag that I do is ugly and plain, but that is because I don't care if I ever win a poll or award for prettiest zine or whatever. I don't own a laser-jet or ink-jet and I'm not about to shell out money for that type of equipment just for a zine hobby. And these zines are time consuming. I can see why people have sudden folds.

As for my experience with pubbing, I actually never wanted to be a publisher. I was sort of happy doing a subzine. But Tom [Swider] just started to change on me. When I started running games, I had to schedule my deadlines around his deadlines. Well, halfway through the two games I was running in "Standard Deviation" he got real inconsistent on the turnaround, either sending his zine out a month late, or coming out once every two weeks, or miss sending the zine out to a couple of players in the games that I was running. So I started sending "Standard Deviation" out to the players by flyer. Then I didn't need to have similar deadlines as the ones in CIA. Well, if I was going to be sending out "SD" as a flyer, I thought I may as well do my own zine. Also, while "SD" appeared in CIA, there was a ban on regular Dip. So, when I started my own zine, I gave it a new name, Absolute!, and finally ran a regular Diplomacy game.

I retained "SD" as a variant column. However, it was also still appearing in CIA. CIA always had a bigger subscription base than ABS/"SD". At least until "SD" was nudged out of CIA.

There was a time when I was looking for a zine that would take on "SD", but the only one who even said yes was Brad Wilson in Vertigo. It never panned out.

I try to publish for as cheap as I can. I know that if publishing for me ever gets real expensive, I would probably find something else to do.

One of the biggest obstacles a new zine has is the small mailing list. I still have a hard time with it, because it becomes difficult to fill and games and find standbys.

Ironically, Absolute! now has a subzine called "Steve's Spot". It's written by Steve Cameron, a new Dipper who looks very promising in this hobby.

{Although I have no solution, that has always been my least favorite aspect to any poll - it suggests that zines are in "competition" with each other. A little competition is fun, but you don't want to discourage new pubbers who can only afford/handle a 6 page, dot-matrix Dipzine.}

(W. ANDREW YORK) Regarding new zines, I don't really see why having a single person selected as "an advice giver" is needed. All pubbers should do is make themselves available to answer questions and give advice. When I started up, I bounced a lot of ideas off of Fred Davis (who was the spark that started RW). I also solicited comments from Pete Gaughan, Cal White, and a few others.

Their feedback, if only a few words, was invaluable to me. I've been asked a few questions by newer publishers, and I always try to make the time to give them honest answers to their questions. On second thought, letting all new pubbers know that there is at least one source of information available isn't so bad; just as long as it doesn't become the only source of advice.

{My only problem with that is, it seems to me that a potential publisher should ask publishers he or she respects. If the potential pubber doesn't know and/or respect the "Advice Giver", what good does the advice do?}

(DON DEL GRANDE) Yes, GOOOOOOLLLLLLLLLL! (What a Latin

American soccer announcer says whenever somebody scores - there's no "A" as "GOL" is Spanish) is strictly a United zine.

(JOHN CARUSO) Today's word of mouth advice may be sound, but how many people does it truly get to? How many perspective publishers shy away without asking for advice? And the fastest way for a zine to grow isn't thru pretty graphics, or a lively letter column or many articles. The fastest way to grow is - GAME OPENINGS!

{However, game openings are also the easiest way to get too big, too fast...besides giving Flapper a subzine!}

(MARK NELSON) I agree with John Caruso that it costs a great deal more to pub a zine today than it did in the past. Xerox is more expensive than mimeograph! In the UK, at least, postage hasn't reason by very much since I started pubbing in March 1985. Postage is only a fraction of the total cost.

If I get sent a sample copy of a zine I always write the editor a letter commenting on the zine and pointing out ways in which the zine could improve. I only offer a trade though if I am interested in the zine and if I write a review I write a honest review. I don't usually bother reviewing first issues: They are almost always complete and utter rubbish and the second issue is almost always a vast improvement. I like to wait for a few issues before reviewing them.

(JACK MCHUGH) If there were really as much of a movement toward E-mail as people think, subzines would be taking off. The only reason I can do such a large subzine in *Maniac's Paradise* is because of the fact that I can send the subzine to you via email in WordPerfect format so that it is ready to print. If it weren't for that I would never be able to run games in it due to your four week deadlines.

Subzines, in my six and a half years in the hobby, go through phases, just like zines. Right now I don't know too many publishers interested in subzines. Certainly they aren't interested in any subzine as large as *...And the Horse You Rode In On!*

I have only had two or three other offers to do a subzine. The basic problem with most offers is either the zine doesn't come out very often or the publisher wants to restrict my size (and I can certainly understand the latter.)

Another problem with subzines is the hassle they generate for the pubber. They are a pain to add to the zine, increase cost and, if they have any view point at all or result in a sub increase, will most likely piss off a subscriber or two who will whine to the pubber.

Look at *Dipadeedoodah!*, Phil says he wants subzines/columnists but he continually holds off till he has more time or money. It is tough to do a subzine if you aren't sure you'll even reach print. How would anyone want to spend a few hours writing a column or doing a game only to have it bumped?

{Want to find out? Just let Mara know - she'll make sure Horse doesn't get in next time!}

Polls & Awards:

(DICK MARTIN) To Wallace Nicoll -- the only mailing list I put you on was to the successor to the zeen you were trading for. Seemed reasonable to me. Are there any in particular you'd like to get on? Let me know,

and I'll see what I can do.

(PETER SULLIVAN) On the GM Poll, I would have said that an important part of being a good GM is the ability to actually cut the mustard and get the game reports out. If it's not arriving in my mailbox at something like the stated intervals (be they 3-weekly, 6-weekly or whatever), then the GM is not performing up to the standards which he set himself. This is at least as important as how accurate the adjudication is, or how many colours the map uses. Or is that not what you're saying?

{Yes, that is what I'm saying. It seems to me there should be more of a distinction between "GM" and "publisher" in the Runestone.}

(DON DEL GRANDE) "The Marco Poll is better (than the Runestone Poll)"...to paraphrase Ronald Reagan, "Here we go again". Both "rating polls" (Runestone) and "Popularity Polls" (Marco) have their problems. Runestone's main problem: there's no real basis for comparing different voters' numbers. Is an "average" zine a "9", a "7", or a "5"? As for the Marco Poll, in fact all zines are ranked - any zine not listed received zero points and tied for last place in the poll. How good is a zine if none of the voters thought it was one of the five best?

Perhaps some combination of the methods - instead of giving each zine you are familiar with a 0-10 rating, or voting for the best (or "best five in order") zines, you can give each zine a rating of 2, 1, or no rating. (Note that a zine that you feel does not deserve a 1 does not get a "zero", but instead gets "no rating" along with the zines you were not familiar with enough to rate.) Either add up the ratings, count the number of "2" ratings, or determine the average rating.

As a member of the PDORA funds committee, I once specifically asked for PDORA money to go to the Hobby Awards. This was because one year, the ballot was written to look like a donation towards the awards was *mandatory* in order to vote. As this changes the awards from "hobby" to "hobby members who could afford to pay the donation", I felt this defeated the purpose of having an open vote. I don't mind if the Awards Committee begs and pleads for user donations (with reasons for doing so), as long as it's made clear that it's not a requirement for voting.

(JOHN CARUSO) So David McCrumb thinks the awards are a good thing. No kidding! I mean, he only runs the things now. What's he going to say - "They suck!"? Actually, I must concur with David. However, as many readers point out, there are flaws. A clearing committee member should not be allowed to be listed on the final ballot. I'd rather decide upon 1 of 3 quality choices, then have 2 joke choices added. It might not be a bad idea to limit writing nominees to articles instead of zine issues. After all, it's supposed to be a written piece, not a publication. And as much as I love and respect Melinda, the MAH Award does her a disservice and the award is totally unnecessary. Rename the Koning Award the Holley. That makes much more sense.

If people want a publishing award, create the Boardman Award. Now there's a man deserving of that kind of recognition. GMing award - why not the Beyerlein Award, revered by many as the best GM ever. Quantity award is just plain dumb!

(KEVIN BROWN) I like the Runestone Poll. I like the Marco Poll too. I even like the Hobby Favorites Poll. But the Runestone Poll is clearly superior in determining what the hobby's favorite zine is. I had Phil

Reynolds' ranting in mind when I was writing my article for The Roar of the Crowd, but I will happily address Phil's specific points from last issue.

Perhaps Eric Brosius will as well.

1: Best/Worst or Favorite/Least Favorite. Phil is splitting semantical hairs here for no apparent reason. Since the Poll offers no objective criteria as to what makes a zine best or worst, the votes reflect the opinions of the voters, i.e. their favorites.

2: Different types of zines are also compared in other polls, albeit using different scoring methods. Every zine is different from every other zine in some way, Phil seems to want to arbitrarily label each zine to avoid what he would deem an unfair comparison.

3: Negative voting is neither encouraged nor discouraged by the scoring method. Also, a low vote (or several low votes) may serve as a message to the publisher that his readers want some changes in the zine.

4: All zines being ranked is a good thing, not a bad one. With all zines being ranked you avoid the snobbery that is implied by the Marco Poll, i.e. these zines got votes and thus are an important part of the hobby the rest are irrelevant. By including all zines the Poll becomes an instrument of inclusion, making the new pubber feel like a part of things, while the Marco and Hobby Favorites are exclusionary, leaving people out altogether rather than trying to bring the whole hobby together.

5: I agree. The length of the polling period is hardly justification for doing away with the poll altogether, however.

6: This objection has nothing to do with the poll itself, but rather with the attitudes of a few publishers in the hobby. The Marco and Hobby Favorites Polls are subject to the same attitudes and thus the same objection.

7: The preference matrix serves to diminish the effects of the difference in voting methodology among voters. With the preference matrix, a voter who gives his favorite zine a 7 will not damage that zine's chance of winning as much as he might otherwise because in direct matchup with other zines it will win thus improving the score. The preference matrix works on the same basis as the Marco and Hobby Favorites Polls in that it awards more points to the zine with the higher vote (thus more favorite) without regard to the actual point difference in the votes. If Phil is trying to say that awarding points in order of preference is bad, he is contradicting his support of the other polls.

8: Whether or not it has lost credibility is a matter of opinion. However, it still has greater credibility than the Marco or Hobby Favorites Polls, which is why it's Runestone Poll rankings that are almost always quoted in zine reviews.

9: How does the Runestone Poll do this more than any other poll, except in its greater acceptance? If the Marco Poll were the predominant poll it would have the same effect. 10: Dividing the hobby into included and not included is a lot more divisive than anything the Runestone Poll does. If any poll divides the hobby, it's the elitist ones like the Marco and Hobby Favorites.

Only a true anal retentive like Phil would try to make out the poll to be something other than a popularity contest.

As for John Caruso's points: Submission of the sub list will accomplish nothing. A publisher fearing a low vote from a subber can easily leave that subber's name off of the list submitted to the pollster. Since the days of the big feud are over, the 10% thing is probably not needed anymore. I doubt if Eric will eliminate it, however.

(MARK NELSON) Some comments on Phil's letter re the Runestone Poll.

"(1) Voters are asked to determine what's best and worst." I presume means just like in any other Poll? The zines that I like best go at the top of my ballot and the zines that I like least at the bottom. The zines which are truly dreadful? I don't usually sub/trade with those!

"(2) Hard to compare gaming zines and service zines, timely warehouses and relaxed fanzines." I've never found it hard! I don't think that Service zines should be in the Poll, but that's another issue.

"(3) Negative voting encouraged..." True, but on its own I don't consider that reason not to support the Poll.

"(4) All zines are ranked..." I presume Phil means just like in Sports. Zines near the bottom are almost always zines that could be improved! After all, it's readers are saying that they think that most other zines are better!

"(5) voting period is too long" In the UK we have a 3-month voting period which strikes me as being ideal if you want to give every zine a chance to plug the Poll before the deadline.

"(6) It is too political..." You mean people like Phil write letters about it 8-) Again I don't see this as a problem. In previous years the Poll has been Political because of who was running it rather than anything to do with the Poll itself.

"(7) The scoring formula used is questionable, especially the Preference factor." I presume Phil means just like any other Hobby Poll, like the one he runs himself! I believe that the Preference Factor is the best part of the Poll. (There are some technical considerations as well, but I won't go into that here. See my forthcoming series of articles: The Zine Poll Parts I-VII to appear in Lepanto 4-Ever (plug).)

"(8) It has lost credibility..." For a Poll that has lost credibility it gathers an awfully large number of votes. More than anyone other Hobby Poll in North America I believe. So if the Runestone Poll has lost credibility what are we to make of the other Polls? I believe that Phil's own Poll may have even got a double-figure number of voters, fancy that.

"(9) It brings out the worst in hobbyists..." Maybe, maybe not. It certainly brings out a pouring of letters from upset and outraged of Florida 8-)

"(10) It divides the hobby..."... NOT!

Re The Marco Poll. As I understand it all zines that receive more than the minimum number of votes *are* ranked. If there were sufficient voters then every zine in the Hobby would be ranked. Since it ranks almost all of the zines the Marco Poll suffers from many of the faults of the Runestone Poll you would have thought that many of the people who complain about the Runestone Poll would complain about the Marco Poll. Strange that they seem to forget that the Marco Poll ranks zines.

I remember the fuss that was quicked up by a small minority of hobby members the year when BruX extended the deadline of the Poll (I didn't think he should have extended the deadline, but that's another matter...). This was also the year when the deadline for the Marco Poll was also extended. You know, I don't recall any of the people who complained about the Runestone Poll extensions complaining about the Marco Poll extension. Strange that. But then as we all knew the argument about the Runestone Poll wasn't dictated by how to run the Poll so much as who was running the Poll.

"No goofy formulas". I don't think that Average Votes are that goofy, but then I have a degree in Mathematics!

Different Polls measure different things. I personally dislike

mechanisms which are purely Popularity based. Take the simple example of Phil's Poll. A zine might come second on every ballot, but not win because it didn't come first on any. Should everyone's 2nd favorite zine not win the Poll because it's no-one's first? Food for thought. (In Phil's Poll this couldn't happen exactly as described since you only vote for one zine, but you can see what I am getting at.)

I've always been in favor of people running different Polls using different systems to measure different things. I see no reason why there should only be ONE POLL.

Phil, why do you think low-rated zines are low-rated? Could it be, in fact, that not many people like them? Would you want to encourage people to subscribe to a zine that even most of its readers dislike?

Some of the People who voted for John's zine in the RP may have been people who read someone else's copy. I vote for a large number of zines in the RP and I am not always on the mailing list for the zines that I vote for. I don't see why I shouldn't vote for zines that Iain Bowen/Pete Sullivan/James Nelson sub/trade with provided that I read them. I've never been on the mailing list for CCC yet I have almost every copy, I don't see why I shouldn't vote for it.

Also some of those voters might have been who were on the mailing list at some stage in the year but are no longer on it.

Not surprisingly I am not in favor of only people on lists that the editors send to the Pollster being allowed to vote for that zine. Besides meaning that people, like myself, can't vote for zines that they read it enables a crafty editor to cut off certain people from voting for him.

Suppose I subbed to Upstart. Garret might think that I would give him a low mark. In order to prevent me voting for Upstart he accidentally "forgets" to include my name on the list of the subbers he mails to the Custodian. No, allowing editors to send in a list of approved voters moves us out of the frying pan and into the fire!

I disagree with Doug's comments on the GMing Poll. I don't see the GMing Poll as saying how could a GM is at providing an error-free service but as saying how good a games service they provide. If a publisher folds or has delays they that is reason for them to be pummeled down the Poll.

(JACK MCHUGH) I don't mind fun polls and awards, like Phil Reynold's Hobby Favorites Awards, or positive awards, like the Pete Gaughan's Marco Poll, but I strongly dislike most other hobby awards. I thought Phil gave excellent reasons in last issue of *Foolhardy*. I'm glad to see that more and more people are starting to realize that awards that force us to choose among zines are worse than no polls at all.

The worst part is when pubbers, doing zines that I pay good money for, get all worked up over their Poll results. At the same time other pubbers are so paranoid they whine in advance about their poor results all being do to "feuding" votes. One particularly nasty man even went so far as to insinuate I was in such a conspiracy in the Runestone Poll, even though I haven't voted in it since 1988!

I fail to see how driving people out of publishing and allowing other people to let their paranoia run away with them is helping the hobby.

Not to mention all the boring stats letters the Runestone Poll, alone, generates. As if a sample base of eight people really is worth a damn anyway.

As for the Hobby Awards, I suppose they are better than the

Runestone Poll, but it is obviously dominated by ass-kissing types with no hobby enemies. Ooops, just blew my shot for an award this year with that statement --- oh well. The committee is also picked by who? The chair I guess.

Novice Zines:

(W. ANDREW YORK) Regarding a novice zine, I don't particularly like it. As you mentioned, it tends to be the sole conduit of new blood into the hobby; not necessarily the best things to do. If anything, something akin to the Orphan Service could be a solution. One person collects the names of novices and when a game is filled, it is handed off to a zine and GM. This will tend to scatter the novices throughout the hobby and let them see other gaming styles. I would set a limit of three games through the Novice Service (in three separate zines to give the new player a variety of experiences).

{Do you think its is better for novices to play each other at first, or to jump into the pool and play with the sharks?}

(CAL WHITE) I think that the hobby needs a novice zine very much. Diplomacy can be a very intimidating game and we don't want to scare people off before they even try it. Having a Tyromania, or its like around, means that a novice can start on level ground, at least for his or her first game. At the other end of the scale, a novice gam can weed out the people who aren't suited for the postal game.

The first zine I came across that ran these kind of games exclusively was Len Lakofka's Liaisons Dangereuse. Len ran dozens of games to completion and I don't remember there being any trouble with the concept.

The trouble the Brits are having with Springboard stems from publisher Danny Collman's antipathy toward the rest of the hobby. He's sort of the British version of the TurboPhreak and basically refuses to admit that the hobby is more than just gaming. He infects the novices with this attitude by giving negative reviews to zines which don't meet his standards. That doesn't detract from the novice zine concept, it just means that you have to be careful who runs the games.

(MARK NELSON) Experience in the UK suggests that novice-only zines are a good idea but they only work well if the right person is running them. The problem isn't running the novice zine well so much as pushing the novices out into the wider hobby. The person that runs the novice zine controls the flux of novices into the hobby. That's a political job, which zines to review, how to review them, which zines to recommend...

Old Dirty Laundry:

(DICK MARTIN) Funny thing, James. Eventually all conversations here will go back to square 1. That's fine for the reader, but not so great for the pubber (who has to slog over the same old issues over and over).

{And, as you can see, some of the same issues you slogged over are still being slogged over.}

Ratings & Scoring Systems:

(DON DEL GRANDE) You know, if we modify Larry Cronin's system

slightly so that a win is worth 32, a 2-way draw 16, then 11, 8, 6, 5, and 4, plus SC counts, and add a further rule that all wins are considered to have 18 SCs, we could use it at DIPCON - like we did in 1989. I know I was not the first to use "SC counts plus X points to the winner or divided in a draw"; for example, Marycon in 1984 used such a system, although X was 3400 (actually, X was 34, but each SC was worth 0.01) so SC counts were nothing more than a tie-breaker. David Hood uses X=60; Melinda Holley uses X=100; at Pacificon, I use X=32 (with the further restriction that all wins count 18 SCs, to prevent the tournament being decided by a 20-center win beating a 19-center win).

I'm glad to see I am not alone in treating all wins equally (besides Mark Nelson, I know Robert Sacks does so as well), although I for one feel that there are conditions under which two draws is better than a win and an elimination. (Otherwise, the player who played two games well could lose to someone who played only one game well but got lucky). A win and an elimination *should* beat a draw and a survival, though.

Speaking of Scoring Systems, I am working on the changing the scoring system for DIPCON 1993, and could use some suggestions. There are some requirements: (1) best two games count; (2) a 16-center survival is worth more than a 1-center 5-way draw (but not necessarily a 1-center 4-way draw); (3) a win and an elimination does not beat all combinations of two 2-way draws, but does beat any combination of a draw and a survival; (4) all wins count the same.

As a FTF Diplomacy tournament director, I discovered that a lot of people entered the tournament just to play Diplomacy, and a number got mad when I tried to enforce even the tiniest of "tournament rules". As for "sanctioning of official tournaments" on a national level, this is done in Australia with their "Bismarck Cup"; however, the rating system gives so many points to the national championship tournament winner that he/she is most likely to win the cup as well. (This was also a problem with my International system when it started; rating tournaments based solely on size gave much too much of an advantage to the largest tournament, Manorcon).

{I think the scoring system should be to declare me the tournament winner, including the paying of a large cash prize. Who comes in under me, and in what order they finish, doesn't much matter.}

(MARK NELSON) One problem with the Cronin system you described was that a 19 center win beats a 18 center win. I don't think this is right. Who cares how many centers you have if you win the game? A win is a win is a win!

I don't like the n-way + sc formula myself as I don't believe the number of players in the draw has any importance.

Another simple rating system. I can't remember who invented it, but it was in the mid 1970's: WIN=100, DRAW=32/n where n = n-way draw + 2 pts per sc.

The Future:

(CAL WHITE) I hope the future won't be as bleak as the picture that phil paints. I trust that the new PBM flyer in the gamebox will result in another "wave" of new blood, or at least a trickle. It seems as if the hobby is waking from its self-satisfied torpor and will actually be capable of doing some self-promotion.

{I certainly hope we get another wave of new blood. Judging by those

Census numbers, we could use it!}

PDORA/Zine Register:

*{Editor's note - the following is an **Explanatory Note** from Garret Schenck, and the text of a letter he sent to John Caruso dated 4/16/92, in response to a letter John Caruso sent Garret on 4/12/92. Following that is a response from John, which he wrote back in May for me to print should I ever print Garret's letter. John's **original** letter appeared in Foolhardy #2. Confusing enough for you? I'm glad to see Garret has reconsidered his position on having nothing to do with Foolhardy, and perhaps we'll see his comments on other topics in the future. Then again, perhaps not! For those of you who have told me you skip over anything dealing with Kent/Schenck/Caruso arguments, feel free to skip ahead to page 11.}*

(GARRET SCHENCK) Doug Kent recently requested that I grant him permission to publish a letter I sent John Caruso on April 16, 1992, answering a letter from John to me dated April 12, 1992. I have agreed to grant the permission, conditional on Doug publishing this explanatory note along with the letter. The note is not to be published unless published jointly with my 4/16/92 letter *(which appears below)*.

This letter was a private communication responding to a private communication from John Caruso. It was not intended for publication, though had John published it I wouldn't have complained -- if I had wished that it never see print I would have put a "NOT FOR PRINT" label on it. John sent a copy of the letter to Doug, and last summer Doug requested (properly, I believe) my permission to publish it in the zine then called Painful Rectal Itch (now Foolhardy). At the time I was in no mind to cooperate with Doug in a venture that I felt would end up being an anti-Schenck feud zine (and in my humble opinion the verdict is still out on that score), **and** I was concerned that my remarks contained therein, especially my comments regarding the BNC's request for \$270 in PDORA money, would be misinterpreted.

Since April event have made me even more reluctant that these private thoughts be made public. Specifically, the BNC, Gary "Greedy" Behnen, is under substantial attack from some parts of the hobby for a "lackluster" job on the Boardman Numbers. ***In no way do I associate myself with these attacks.*** In my opinion, whether or not the BN's come out every month or every three months, or even every year, it is not worth making life difficult for the BNC. I'm waiting for a number from Gary, have been waiting for a while, and I'm sure many other publishers are too.

Big deal. Gary's not going anywhere in a big hurry, and eventually he'll release both numbers and game ending information in Everything. Diplomacy games take, on average, probably two years to play out. If you have to wait a month or three, so what.

I have heard that the BNC is a killer job. As someone who has labored with one of the most difficult jobs in the entire hobby for the past 16 months, I sympathize with Gary very much. The last thing the BNC, or any hobby custodian, needs in unfair attacks and pressure from loudmouths who would be unable to perform competently under even half the workload of a job like the BNC. I support Gary in his attempt to do his job, as I supported Don Williams when he too was attacked for a less than sterling performance on the numbers.

In all the ink that's been spilled on PDORA's decision to refuse funding for Zine Register in the 1991 auction, very little has been made of

the BNC's rather large request of \$270. I was attacked right and left for the stink I made about PDORA refusing funding, and, as John Caruso did, for my exceedingly humongous request for \$400, but from all sides came a curious silence concerning this overly generous bequest to the BNC. Does the hobby really think the BNC, no matter who runs the thing, is worth \$270 per year, while ZR is worth zilch? I note that Eric Ozog says that only about 40 Boardman numbers have been issued this year. That's about \$7 per number, folks...

This is not an attack on the BNC. It is an attack on the procedures that PDORA used to dole out the moolah from the 1991 auction, and the **inequity** and **unfairness** that the procedure caused. To the best of my knowledge this procedure has not been changed for this year's auction. It should have been.

I never received an answer from John Caruso to this 4/16/92 letter, unless the announcement of John's Grass Roots "Zine Directory" can serve as such. Although Doug Kent has been in possession of a copy of my letter since at least the early summer, he has never provided the names of even one copy shop in Brooklyn where I could xerox for half the cost of laser printing, let alone "100's."

*{I never said you could get it done for **half the cost** - I challenge you to produce a letter or publication where I did. All I said was that you could save money. However, since you asked, here's one for you: **Staples**, 9319 5th Avenue, Brooklyn. I believe that's in Bay Ridge. As long as you make over 50 copies per original, they charge 3 cents per side, including collation. There is **no** additional charge for doing two sides on one page. Since you said (including toner and paper) it costs you 7 cents per side, that's almost a **60% savings**. They have three stores in Manhattan as well - although I'm not sure if they do copying at those locations. Satisfied?}*

(GARRET SCHENCK) [to John Caruso, 4/16/92] I disagree that my "blast" of PDORA is more unfortunate than the fact that you and the committee stiffed me during the 1991 auction. You (and Doug Kent too, I would point out, though his "open response" was far uglier and far more gratuitous, since, as you point out, he had nothing official to do with the decision to cut off funding) are engaged in a form of "blame the victim" here. Remember, when you stab someone and they holler, you'd better rush to find some convenient rationale justifying your aggression in the first place.

The fact that Linsey received funding in the past, or that you sent Lisa a copy of Upstart #1 proves very little. I fail to see the bearing either has on this case. I believe I have thanked you for helping Lisa with her Christmas present, but unfortunately that doesn't reduce my anger over this PDORA/ZR mess.

As far as I know you did not forward the full details to your committee. All you gave them was the amount I requested, my "service", and my name. Perhaps it would have been better if you had. That would be one of my "constructive" proposals for Doug - to provide the committee with as many details as possible concerning the requests.

If you ask me, \$270 for the BNC is much farther out of line than \$400 for ZR. If we're talking *greedy* here, let's look no farther than Mr. Greedy himself! Jack McHugh, a friend of yours and of Doug Kent, has pointed out that the BNC can dispense the numbers for the cost of maybe 100 postcards each year - \$19.00. That leaves \$250...for what? You tell me.

Doug recently sent me the PDORA flyer you sent to your

committee (sometime in December I believe), which outlined the requests, and how you rated them. I will not pretend that I am not exceedingly disappointed (in you specifically) for your rating of Zine Register as "neutral". You claimed you made these assessments on "whether a service is able to charge (enough) [of] a fee or receive other such reimbursements such as stamps and sub costs." Do I have to point out that I send Pubber Info Sheets, *for free* -- that participation in ZR is *free* for any publisher. Perhaps I should have made my request on that, rather than servicing my trades. But then, what about the BNC? Yes, he or she distributes the numbers, *for free*, but you know as well as I do that Gary (and every other BNC, to my knowledge) *sells Everything*. The current price is one buck, I believe. (In fact, Gary was so anxious to "sell" Everything that he asked me to deemphasize his service and only list it in the back of ZR, with the "Hobby Custodians" section, which I did. Just what *are* we getting for that \$270!?) For that matter, why did the MNC and MNC/uc receive your "favorable" rating -- both of them charge for their zines. The NAVB charges for maps and rules. As far as I can tell, only the Orphan custodian and the Hobby Awards don't charge a penny for their services. In short, I think your "ratings" were complete bullshit, and your stated rationales cut from similar cloth.

I have no way of knowing whether a "favorable" rating would have made any difference -- and I doubt whether you do either. For instance your giving Zine Register a "neutral" rating meant that my service would need to get three yeses from your committee. A "favorable" would have meant that Zine Register would have required only two yeses. That's a big difference. But your "rating" may have had an even larger effect that your office's ability to set the way the votes would go. While you claim to have avoided stacking the deck with "John Caruso yes-men", several members of the committee are as close to you as anybody else in the hobby. Let's be honest here, John! You live in the same town as Arnawoodian -- and you were employed by him (or something). A "favorable" rating from you might very well have made the difference. As the committee chair you were very much more than just the guy who gathers money and signs checks.

In answer to your "expenses" paragraph, I would remind you that I stated rather clearly in my Pubber Info Sheet letter (thanks, by the way, for providing details re:Suicide Squeeze) that before taking on the job I fully expected to lose money on Zine Register. My pockets are deep enough to cover any expected losses on ZR or Upstart (a good thing, that!). Moreover, in my letter to you and Fisher last summer, which I had every reason to believe would be taken into consideration by you and your committee, I finished off my summary of my \$400 request by saying (and I quote in case you've misplaced that earlier letter): "I recognize that funds are limited and that this full amount will be difficult (if not impossible) to provide, but I want the Directors of PDORA and the PDORA Disbursement Committee to recognize that the need definitely exists." This was a clear signal that I would have been happy to receive less (indeed, *far* less) than what I was asking for. As I said in my Pubber Info Sheet letter, I would have been happy with 50 or 100 bucks -- indeed, that's all I expected. I just didn't expect zippo.

The expense of recycled paper is a bogus issue, and if you look at my request letter of last august (the one I quote from above), you'll see that the stuff costs me \$8-9 a ream (500 sheets). Normal bleached white paper made from virgin fiber costs \$3-4 a ream. So the recycled costs maybe one penny per sheet more than "regular". For a 64 digest page ZR, that's

16 cents per copy. Whoop-de-doo. For 100 ZR trade copies, that saves me \$16.00 -- enough, maybe, to send out about 80 BNC postcards.

The laser printer, on the other hand, *is* expensive. But not nearly so much more expensive than xerox copying as you and Doug seem to feel. For one thing, I have been unable to find a really cheap copy shop in NYC. Doug suggests that there are "100's" of copy shops in Brooklyn where I could get my copying done for half the price. Well, Dougie my boy, *show me!* I used to work at Instant Copy in Manhattan, and we were one of the cheapest places around -- but the cost of getting maybe 100 copies from one original was probably 6 cents or 7 cents a side. I'm always hearing about people getting cheap copies (like 3 cents a side, that sort of thing) in other parts of the country, but copies in NYC, like everything else in NYC, are a lot more expensive than other places. For instance I just called Kinko's Copy Shop on E. 12th St. in Manhattan. Kinko's is a national chain, and one I often hear about when people are talking about bargain basement prices. Their price for double sided copies is 6 cents a side for the first 100 copies or each original, 3 cents a copy after the first 100. I really doubt that Doug could find me a much better deal than this, though he is of course welcome to try. Note that this would be on normal, bleached white, virgin fiber paper -- my guess is even if I was able to get my recycled paper to run on their high-speed machines I would get no break because I was bringing in my own paper. (I've worked in two copy shops, and we always regarded people bringing in their own paper as dangerous troublemakers out to wreck our machines, and our productivity!)

I have probably printed 125 copies of ZR #19. With the exception of the first batch of 75, these have been in batches of 10 or 15. I would really be unwilling to go to a place like Kinko's and ask for 150 copies of something that I has no real idea how many I'd sell (the orders for ZR, as you might expect, come in drips and drabs). Anyway, you figure it out, John -- using Kinko's pricing structure I could take a major risk on unloading all 150 Zine Registers -- and save 1 cent per side on the whole job (i.e. 5 cents versus 6 cents). That's not worth it, given the risk, I think.

My guess is that my laser printer toner and other consumables costs me about 7 cents per side. I get to print just what I need, when I need it, on the paper that I want it on. Furthermore, the quality of my output is far better than if I were to print it on a copy machine. I figure that I can get away with type that's at least 1/2 point smaller by printing on the laser printer as opposed to xeroxing. In other words, for the same legibility, I'd have to go to at least 8.5 pt. type instead of the 8 pt. type I used. I'd have had to increase the leading (line spacing) from 8.5 pt. to 9 pt. The combination of these two effects would have increased the size of the zine by roughly 10 percent - from 64 pages to 68 or 72. This would have eaten into any savings achieved by printing at a place like Kinko's.

(And as you know I was blasted for the tiny type I used. I wonder how much it would cost Dougie to print 325K+ characters [the size of ZR #19] using his ample margins and generous type specs? ZR #19 too verbose? Okay, then how much would it have cost him to print even one half of the information in ZR #19 if formatted the way Maniac's Paradise is?)

Even if I could have saved as much as 33% on my printing (which I sincerely doubt, John), that would have cut my estimated losses on trades to maybe \$175. Big deal, so fund the \$175 then! I reiterate the point I made in the Pubber Info Sheet request letter -- "no matter how small ZR conceivably gets, it's still going to be a major money drain on whoever

publishes it." Your several suggestions, to have half-year trades, or to charge traders a reduced price, are clearly unworkable, and as you've been a publisher in the hobby, you should know they are unworkable. I was blasted for raising the price to \$2.50, and \$.50 won't make a difference. Besides, that's tantamount to asking novices and newcomers to subsidize publishers trade copies -- an appalling suggestion. I would rather do it the other way round, which is why I applied to PDORA in the first place.

We'll see about the advertising. I'm keeping my fingers crossed. Of course I haven't been in the hobby as long as you have, John, so I don't have the wealth of experience in these matters that you do, but I think there's a chance we could bring some people who in fact *are* interested in writing and reading what others write through this as in one of the major science fiction mags. Remember our roots! Anyway, who knows how many people need to respond to an ad to make it worth it? A lot of money changes hands in this hobby. Spending a little outside of ourselves might open things up. Remember that new people *do* spread the word -- there can be a snowball effect. Besides, if PDORA didn't want to fund the advertising (and as far as I know you didn't break my \$400 request down in *any* way for your committee), there was still the \$250 (or \$175, or \$100, whatever) I was planning to lose on ZR.

(If you pay for 50 ZRs [my way \$120, your way \$95, maybe] I'll be happy to hand them out on any street corner in NYC [well, almost any street corner!]. I'll even print them on bleached white paper if you want. Just send me the bucks...)

John, your proposals lack vision. If we want to expand the hobby, bring in new people, the hobby as a whole should help with that effort. It will cost money. PDORA funding \$270 for the BNC doesn't really help the hobby all that much. Most people really don't give a damn about the numbers. As far as I know there's not even anybody doing player ratings on the basis of results reported in the (non-existent) Everything which you can still purchase, maybe, for a dollar.

Essentially, though, that's beside the point. I do not begrudge PDORA funding the BNC. But it should have funded ZR too. Can't you see that? You tell me John -- why is \$270 for the BNC the epitome of reasonableness, while \$400 for ZR is a "very wild, high request", "exhorbinant" and "unusually high". Pardon my confusion. I suppose I could put out ZR on postcards, now that's a thought!

"The kind of stuff [I] pulled". All I did was complain about the shabby treatment I received from you and your committee. More than a few hobby members had asked me what I thought about this. This was not an issue that was just going to disappear on its own, John! What would you have suggested I do -- remain quiet? Pretend all was peaches and cream with me, that I thought PDORA squandering \$270 of the hobby's resources on some dry as dust Boardman numbers and utterly stinging a project that helps novices find zines and games was the right thing, nay, the only thing to do? Pretend that you didn't use the name of my service in your advertising last summer -- and then when you turned around and say, "oh, so sorry, I guess now I'm 'neutral' about ZR" -- that it doesn't annoy the hell out of me? Sorry, I was just not up to that. It does annoy me. And I feel I am owed an apology from you rather than this "blame the victim" crap I've gotten instead.

I'm not asking you or Doug to overturn the committee's decision. I'm well aware that what's done is done. But please don't attack me for voicing my discontent with the way PDORA has been run, either! I do think publishers need to support hobby services. But if PDORA is unable

to do the right thing, than publishers should bypass PDORA and send their support directly to those services in need. Acts have consequences, as I'm sure you are well aware. Did you really think, John, that you could rule my request "neutral" and watch as your committee neglected to fund ZR, and that this would not wind up wounding PDORA in some way? Even if I didn't raise a peep people would wonder what the hack was going on!

You can ask Doug to put in a passionate comment on behalf of ZR funding all you want. Considering the support Doug has demonstrated for my hobby projects in the past, this could make all the difference (!). But barring a major "shake-up" and pretty much complete overhaul of PDORA (which I'm not proposing, and certainly do not expect) I will not be requesting funds from PDORA for ZR in the coming year, and I will not be supporting PDORA either. As you note, that's my choice. Having been slapped down once, I find I'm curiously unwilling to offer up my other cheek for another blow.

I do accept that my request for \$400 was on the high side, and perhaps *part* of the reason my request was denied, the other request that was pretty much in the same ballpark notwithstanding. I did not understand exactly how PDORA worked -- if I did I might very well have modified my request. I had thought the committee would see my "qualifying" statements, and the reasons for my expected losses, and realize that I'd be satisfied with less than I was asking for. I don't really blame you for not conveying your "apprehension" over the size of my request. What I *do* blame you for, is your lack of support for, and "neutral" rating of, my service in your directions to your committee. That was a frankly incomprehensible act, an unfair act, a shameful act. The lack of any clear and rational justification for your "rating" has deeply wounded our friendship. I simply do not understand why you did not attempt to explain this "stab in the back" anywhere in your two page letter to me.

Lastly, I do agree whole-heartedly with you that Doug's decision to "intervene" in this matter was a terrible mistake, though rather typical, really, of him. As Phil Reynolds might have said, Doug seems to have a hard-on where I am concerned. Nowhere did I suggest that Doug had anything to do with decisions made by you and your committee. I think he would be wise to drop the matter, as his continued attacks on me will likely further damage PDORA.

(JOHN CARUSO) The PDORA is not in existence to solely sponsor, support and provide a blank check to the Garret Schenck's of the world. The ZR is a worthwhile service. However, it is a service that charges for the product, thus, it received a neutral rating. Neutral rating meaning its worthwhile but should and is capable of charging enough to balance its budget.

The contents of the ZR and its overall purpose are irrelevant. ZR is an item that does not have to go out to people for free. Its like the Yellow Pages. For a business listing in the Yellow Pages, you pay. Its included in your phone bill. If you want an ad - you pay extra, separately.

ZR does not have to trade to get its info. Garret sends out info sheets. So why trade? Maybe to show a greater debt so he can ask for and receive even more money. A trade with ZR is not necessary, and the trade partner stands the risk of getting a negative review if Garret dislikes your zine or the current two issues.

But a lot of the BNC's cost is trades too! If you feel the BNC's job is

essential, and most people do, then the BNC has to trade to get game info and keep privy on the game info. The ZR doesn't need to be privy on game info. Still, the BNC's yearly request from the auction, until this year, has been less than Garret's request for 50 trades, twice a year. The BNC trades with over 100 zines, big and small 2-4 times a year if that's how often Everything comes out. That's at least twice as many issues which most people deem necessary, compared to ZR's trades.

ZR is traded (at a \$250 loss to ZR account) because Garret wants to lose \$250. He could just as easily trade it to every pubber for a \$500-600 a year loss. And do you know who he wants to pay for his loss? Not Garret himself, not those who purchase ZR, but the sole support for this deficit - he wants to be from PDORA. He wants a blank check so he can allege any deficit he desires, even if its an unprovable deficit, and receive a blank check from the PDORA. Failing to get his blank check, he plans to squawk and squeal (like a stuffed pig) about how he didn't get funded because of political or personal reasons. Both excuses are utter bullshit. Garret received no money because the committee decided his request didn't warrant it. The committee's reasons notwithstanding. There is just no reason any service that charges for its product should have to request even \$200, the BNC included.

My suggestion to Garret is - find ways to reduce your red ink. Request funding for your 100 or so info flyers. Don't count on other people to pay for your trades. If the Zine Bank is a sister project, request money separately for that. And drop the advertising request (or drop the idea totally). Dropping the ad request would have lowered your need by \$150.

Garret's runaway spending habits need to be addressed. Like our Republican-led country, Garret spares no cost when it comes to expense.

You know, Garret's squealing reminds me of the man who built a beautiful carriage, the best in the land. He spared no cost to build and trim it. All the while the man fed the horse he had bought to pull it a handful of hay and oats a day. When the man put the horse in place to pull the wagon, the horse didn't have the strength. So the man went back to the person who sold him the horse and complained that he was sold a poor one.

{While I have some comments I could make in response to Garret, I think I've said [more than] enough in the past, both here and in other zines. Now that Garret has gotten his "day in the court of public opinion", by responding to John's letter, I prefer to let the whole thing die down. An entire auction has come and gone since this fiasco took place. There are only three things I want to point out. First, in reference to Garret's "John Caruso yes-men" claim, Steve Arnawoodian has publically revealed that he voted Yes for ZR funding. With that in mind, I'd say the "yes-men" argument goes right out the window. Second, I have made it a point in the 1992 PDORA auction to give the committee any expense breakdown provided by those requesting funding. I think Garret is right about that being a necessary step in the funding process.}

Attracting New Blood:

(DICK MARTIN) What would most help the Dip hobby to get new blood? Thousands of people have said it before me, but holding DipCon at a big con is the best way. This notion of people going anywhere to get to DipCon may have been fine when Dipdom was healthier, but nowadays

you have to bring the con to the people. AvalonCon would be the ideal choice -- great site, good time of year, wonderful con, and well run. Besides, nobody has more power over the future of Dip than Avalon Hill. Think about it. Dipdom can't afford anymore twenty person affairs in KC or the frozen north.

But then, I think Dipdom is already dead. Dip's a great game, and changes the way one plays all other games, but The Hobby is pushing up daisies. Why bother with Dip when there's Nintendo? This Judge adjudicating program sounds appropriately lifeless. Dip should be run by real people between real people. Maybe a GM program will ensure accuracy, but it stifles creativity. Give me Del Grande any day (shudder). Creating the program sounds like something of a challenge, but using it to play...nah.

{I've often considered buying Judge or one of the other adjudication programs, but in the end I never do. I'd rather feel truly involved in the game and make an occasional error than have a perfect adjudication every time but have no idea what's going on in any of the games.}

As for the hobby pushing up daisies, I have hope that the new Diplomacy set will help breathe new life into our community. We'll see.}

(JOHN CARUSO) I reiterate. The best, cost effective ways are (in no particular order) a flyer in the game box, ads in The General, one page flyers/handouts at cons and hobby stores.

(JACK MCHUGH) David Hood said in the last issue that "House cons are great fun but not good for novice recruitment." Perhaps, but I'd like to see some figures to back up that statement. I would make the argument that cons, in general, aren't very good for novice recruitment. However, I don't know if my statement is true either.

Mark Nelson said he was attempting to figure out the differences in various censi (1988, 1990, 1993) and figure out what happened to the people in them, hobbywide. How long does the average hobbyist stay in the hobby? How many do we recruit a year? I think Mark's on to something. I'd like to also see us try and figure out where we're getting our new players from so that we can decide what is working, vis-a-vis recruiting, and what is not.

The flyer in the box is a fine idea; but I'd just like to have some hard facts before anybody, myself included, starts making statements on what the best recruiting methods are or are not.

Stven Carlberg's idea on *Games* magazine is excellent. I also believe that *The General's* classified ads is a great place to go as well for new comers. Perhaps someone could get PDORA money to run an ad in every issue for the entire hobby?

{If someone wants to apply for funding for such a campaign, get in touch with me this Spring when the auction starts up again.}

Diplomacy Federation:

(DAVID HOOD) Shut up Jack! Seriously, McJack is way off-base here. John Caruso convinced me, as he did the others, that he would make a better contact for the gamebox flyer. No one is falling down on their jobs (yet).

Mark Nelson's letter essentially argues that I could do these things better myself then through a Federation. Well, who said I wanted to run the Federation? Second, he is wrong. Publicity to the outside world will really only be effective if done under an organizational fabric. He also

shows his non-gamer bias when he says that nobody will come into the Dip hobby to win a tournament championship.

Hobby promotion involves both attracting new people to the game and attracting Dip players to our hobby. Both of these are important. Much of what I propose for the Federation is to do the latter - it's amazing how many people I run into that know of or even own Diplomacy but do not know what our hobby has to offer.

We may or may not need all the details Stephen Dorneman proposed. It's worth talking about it Foolhardy, at least.

Jack misses the point here (as usual...) when I say "sanction" FTF tournaments, I don't mean to say there's anything wrong with tournaments outside the system. The Federation would not have to be exclusive in any way. Jack, nobody needs your approval to start a Federation, that's true, and you don't have to participate if you don't want to. But in my opinion, and hopefully that of others as well, the Hobby will not grow as quickly as we would like it to without an organization doing publicity, forming new tournaments, and the like.

One new idea that Jim Yerkey and I have come up with is the North American Team Tournament, or NATT. Hopefully all the Dip tournaments will sign on. The idea is to encourage more turnout at the events by increasing the competition. Each zine can sponsor a team, the members of which will earn points for their teams based upon their performance at NATT events. A zine/team will be crowned NATT champion every year. I'd appreciate feedback from Foolhardy readers, particularly those who run Dip tournaments.

{The fact remains, as you said last issue - there is not enough outside promotion of Dip. Con organizers should have press releases available to send to local papers, and should send press releases to the local papers of Con winners. Someone should probably send out press releases for the Hobby Awards, Polls, etc. Papers are always looking for local items of interest, even if they don't understand what they're really all about. The more the Diplomacy hobby is mentioned outside of our zines, the better chance Dip players will connect with the hobby and get involved. Could a Federation of some kind handle this kind of publicity? Probably - considering the lack of outside publicity the hobby has, a Federation couldn't hurt, could it?}

There also seems to be a need for a central coordination point between the FTF, PBM, PBEM, and International segments of the hobby. Perhaps Diplomacy World and the proposed Federation could fill that need?}

(PETER SULLIVAN) I think Stephen Dorneman hits the nail on the head when he talks about setting up a non-profit organization. If we are going to have a Diplomacy Federation, then we need to go all the way. Personally, I'm not sure the American hobby needs it. You already have Diplomacy World, which, through the sterling efforts of David Hood and his predecessors, has become a *de facto* hobby fulcrum. Fundamentally, I am a tad afraid of anything much more powerful, since there would always be a risk that any Federation could be used (abused?) by someone to try and tell me how to run my zine, and (by cutting off my access to hobby services) punish me for non-compliance.

{I'd imagine that, for any Federation to receive hobbywide acceptance, it would require checks and balances to keep that sort of thing from happening. Obviously, though, you can't please everyone all the time.}

(BUZ EDDY) I hope most of your readers have had a chance to pursue Maelstrom #9 by this point, which I hope might add another dimension to the "organization" discussion. I, of course, am of the opinion that trying to "organize" a support system for the game of Diplomacy is not really a useful pastime. The attempts and failures over the past thirty years suggest that while services might have a certain continuity organizations do not.

The other opinion that I developed is that since postal Diplomacy appeals to an apparent small minority of Diplomacy players (based on 6000-7000 set sales per year) that effective Diplomacy support should provide services to club and tournament players. There also was a four point outline that perhaps a Diplomacy support service could be constituted with registry, ratings, features and entertainment.

I am certainly interested in any reflections about what would best promote the growth of Diplomacy. In 1967 I participated in my first such discussion with Doug Beyerlein, and have been working with elements of that ever since.

If anyone is interested in trying to determine if this "registry" based concept is useful, what I need most is FTF results. Tournaments, house cons, club, or local games. Old results or current, any data that you might be able to provide would be helpful. The registry system is constructed so that data is maintained in integral parts and can be processed and reprocessed as units. What I need is the date and place of the game, name and address of GM, or organizer, or reporter, and the player's name, address, country played and result (Win, Draw, Loss).

The W,D,L reporting reflects my own bias toward how Diplomacy should be played, of course, but it also allows the most simple of record maintenance.

If you can and would get your hands on any FTF results I would be glad to record, rate and sign back a report. I am firmly convinced that Diplomacy is the finest board game ever composed, and should join the world class of games. Please help me determine whether this registry concept would be helpful in helping our game achieve the prominence it deserves.

{Buz can be contacted at 7500 212th St. SW, #205, Edmonds, WA 98026}.

(JACK MCHUGH) I think Mark Nelson asks an excellent question, namely, do we want a bigger hobby? One of the great things, I think, about the hobby is the fact that it is so clubby. It has that feeling of a big extended family. I don't think the chess or scifi hobbies feel like that anymore; they are just too big.

I ran into this at PACS (Philadelphia Area Computer Society) Atari meeting once about two years ago. I asked a guy leading our rather small --- twenty people --- Atari meeting, if he had an IBM, why he wasn't at the IBM meeting. He said because the IBM meeting had so many people, like several hundred, they had to move it into a large auditorium. My Atari friend liked the fact that our meeting was so small we all knew each other and could chat easily, rather than having to raise our hands and yell across a large room, with each other. Bigger isn't always better.

Stven Carlberg also made some correct observations about all the work it takes to set up a Diplomacy Federation. It sounds great but most of it is drudgery unless one is really into that sort of thing. We need someone willing to do the hard work it takes in building and keeping up membership lists and I don't see anyone willing to do such work.

Mark Nelson asks "Why can't David do that now?" in regards to a Federation Novice Packet. I ask why can't anyone do the stuff David has suggested for a Diplomatic Federation. It all comes down to how much time and effort one is willing to put in. If Larry Peery, for example, did this kind of thing, rather than simply drone on about himself, I'd take his Institute of Diplomatic Studies seriously. Instead Larry puts out 50 pages of Peeriblah and claims its a "service." To who? Larry's incredible ego? I'd hate to see David's idea degenerate into that.

The Age of Laser Printers:

(DON DEL GRANDE) The biggest advantage I found in using a computer to edit my zine is the ability to create page sizes first and add the text to fit, as opposed to typing and then having the copier reduce the pages to some unreadable size so it would fit on the reduced page.

{Actually, I do it the opposite way. I do my zine, then try to get it to fit by playing with margins, type sizes, etc etc. Still, that's better (and easier) than just reducing on the copy machine.}

(KEVIN BROWN) This letter is being done on my typewriter so you can see how much better it looks. Mark Nelson's comment about detachment from the zine sums up how I feel about the switch from typewriter to computer. Somehow it doesn't feel like I'm actually doing the work on the zine when it's done on computer. Maybe the feeling wears off, after all I did 39 issues on a typewriter and only 7 on computer so far.

(CAL WHITE) And what, Jack, pray, tell me, is wrong with playing with format a la Northern Flame and Excelsior? A large part of the fun of publishing for me is to enjoy this neat software on my computer. If I don't care if I have everything down on a template that I merely fill in with words and pictures every issue, why the hell should you? The time I care to put into my zine is my own to spend and I'm not about to match it with your idea of how to do things.

(MARK NELSON) I was not surprised that David Hood was unable to understand my previous comments about mimeograph, that would go against the turbophreak grain. (I don't have the relevant copy of Foolhardy in front of me so this is from memory...) I don't disagree that the average diplomacy zine looks a lot better today than it did, 25, 20, 15, even 10 years ago. But what I do think is that if you compare the *best* mimeo zines or the *best* spirit-duplicated zines to the zines of today then those *best* zines still stand-out. That very few-people have used the technology available at their fingertips to produce products that are, for want of a better phrase, "works of art". Davis is unhappy that dtp zines have been unable to reach the heights that previous zines have been able to reach. He doesn't want to be reminded of this fact because it doesn't fit into his official sanctioned hobby. It's a difference of opinion. I would like to see zines rising to the challenge and aspiring to increase their standards, David would not. A monthly dip-zine, with a map and a modicum of writing may be David idea of heaven; but it isn't mine.

(NOT that I am saying that there is anything wrong with David's approach, if that's where his interests lay then that's what he should look for but to suggest that editors can't learn from the old zines and strive to improve upon them is... rather childish.)

``And it's so much easier to read zines done by DTP'. I wonder if

David has ever seen one of the *great* mimeo zines. I suspect not.

(JACK MCHUGH) The biggest problem I have with laser printers regarding my subzine, ...*And the Horse You Rode In On!* is that you have one and I don't. Thus I really can't test print any of my pages. WordPerfect does have a view page command, but it still isn't the same as seeing it on paper as it doesn't do a great job with all the font sizes.

Zine Register:

(GARRET SCHENCK) In Foolhardy #3, Mark Nelson apparently says I "cut all overseas trades." I did no such thing. From the time I took over Zine Register from Tom Nash in the early summer of 1991 to my publishing of ZR #19 in late October 1991, I received copies from exactly two overseas publishers: Pete Sullivan (C'est Magnifique) and Thomas Franke (Diplomat). These were the only overseas trades I had for ZR #19 and #20. Both of them received copies of those two issues.

Also, Tom Nash only bothered to send me sub money and a sub list for ZR sometime in January or February of this year. Mark Nelson's name was not on that list. Tom never sent me a list of ZR traders, either domestic or international. Essentially all I received from Tom was the blessing to use the ZR name. If Mark wanted to trade with ZR it was certainly within his power to contact me. (Note that my "takeover" of ZR was announced, with considerable fanfare, in ZR #18. My one page "The New Zine Register Vision Thing" in that issue of ZR said, in part, "I am going to continue Tom's very liberal trading policy - if you've been trading with Tom's ZR please transfer your trade to me, effective immediately." Ball in Mr. Nelson's court, wouldn't you say?)

Mark is also incorrect when he says that he can't purchase ZR directly from me. As you now know, and have acknowledged to me in your letter of 10/12/92, the price for overseas issues is \$4.00. I have sold numerous copies of ZR to overseas purchasers. I have also sold Zine Bank packets to overseas purchasers.

Mark's characterization of my "feelings" about what constitutes the "hobby" are completely absurd, though typical of the "anti-Turbo" crap that has been heaped upon me. But since they're his opinions, he's welcome to them. But his "leaps of faith," from what he believes are my opinions to what he states, as fact, are my *policies*, are hateful, hurtful, and untruthful.

Mark Nelson has *never* written me. He has *never* sent me a copy of his zine. I have *never* written Mark Nelson, or communicated with him in any manner. He's got a lot of fucking nerve saying the things he says about the service I have provided with Zine register.

You will apparently be publishing a second salvo from Mark Nelson in Foolhardy #4. Mark claims he discussed the sorry state of affairs (i.e., my "refusal" to send ZR's overseas -- he makes them sound like some kind of "strategic commodity" we can't afford to let the Russkies ahold of!) with Iain Bowen, another person whom I have *never* had any contact with.

Again, for the record, I *never* told Iain any of the glop that Mark Nelson attributes, via Iain, to me. The idea that I would force overseas purchasers to pull a sort of Iran-Contra backchannel to get a copy of my "precious" Zine Register is laughable and absurd.

It's hard to imagine how Mark Nelson (and, if Mark can be believed, Iain Bowen) got the truth so completely confused. If I was more paranoid than I am, I'd suspect a *conspiracy*, but I suspect it was a matter of

massive confusion engendered by the vast distances of the Atlantic Ocean, a general lack of communication, and an obvious willingness to believe the worst.

I am a little less charitable, however, concerning your repeated use of this highly questionable letter to *slander* my good name and the hard work I have put in on Zine Register. You repeated Mark Nelson's ugly accusations in at least three zines (Maniac's Paradise, Your Zine of Zines, and Excelsior), aside from publishing it in Foolhardy. Not *once* did you contact me to see if there was any truth to Mark's comments. It's one thing to publish untruthful feud letters in Foolhardy -- at least there the readers know what they're getting. It's another thing to duplicate these erroneous comments around the hobby, especially without attribution. Mark's errors of fact become your errors of ethics.

Again, we have differences of opinion about a lot of things, in and out of the hobby. It is highly doubtful that we will ever again enjoy talking with each other on the telephone, or making speculative plans to pull a "fake of a fake." But we should be able to grant the other the respect that we would prefer and expect to be granted to ourselves. What has gone on in the past between us is unfortunate, and cannot now be fixed. But there needs to be closure on this history, and both of us need to move forward.

Doug, for well over a year now you have allowed the zines that you publish to focus on me to a degree that is, I believe, unhealthy -- not only for your publishing efforts (or mine for that matter), but for the hobby as a whole. While I have hardly been blameless in this matter, I think it's fair to say that you and Jack have retaliated out of proportion considering the scale of my "provocations." I haven't seen Maniac's Paradise for several months now, but for at least a year not a single issue went by without pages of attacks against me in Jack's subzine, in Jack's "cartoon page," in your columns, in YZOZ, etc. Isn't it time we put a stop to this?

Both of us put in many hours on this hobby, and I believe that both of us, in our own way, put the best interests of the hobby frontmost. What possible benefit would accrue the hobby if you or I finally got so disgusted with all the bullshit that we threw up our hands and split?

I had hoped that cutting contact with you, by ending out trading arrangement between Upstart and Maniac's Paradise, and foregoing receiving Foolhardy, would help to heal our troubled relationship. But I guess the hobby is too small, or our egos too big, for us to hide from each other. (Certainly the hobby is small enough, eh?!) So I guess we're stuck with each other. Are you enjoying the present state of affairs? Because I'm not. I have lots of (hobby) things I should be doing instead of responding to your attacks. Like some damned ZR info sheets which have to go out "real soon now." Likewise, I'm sure you could find other, more profitable ways to spend *your* time. Please think about it.

A kinder, gentler hobby for our new president?
{Briefly, I'll address a few of your points. As you have now acknowledged since you wrote this letter, I never mentioned Mark Nelson's comments in Excelsior, nor did I mention them in any zine other than the three I publish. In only one zine, Your Zine of Zines, did I fail to attribute his quote. As I've told you, a correction will be printed in the next YZOZ. A grand total of five people who get YZOZ do not get either Foolhardy or Maniac's Paradise, so only those five people haven't seen me attribute the quote to Mark Nelson (and that five includes you).

As for the content of MP, anything Jack says or does is up to Jack - I do not censor him. I don't think I've focused on you to an "unhealthy

degree", and since you haven't seen the zine in quite a few months I don't value your opinion on that topic too much. As I've written to you in our exchange of letters, I have plenty to do without your involvement, and I really think you are overestimating your level of importance in my hobby participation. I think Conrad von Metzke gave a good response to your criticisms in Costaguana #223 - I imagine you had an easier time believing it when Conrad said it than when I say it. Now that you've passed on ZR to Pete, there's really nothing you do that I have any contact with, so unless you want to keep rehashing old stuff, or are planning to participate in this zine of "proto-feud material" (as you've called it), then I can't see us crossing paths too often. You are more than welcome to join us here - as a publisher and player, you *are* a valued and important part of the hobby. Your opinion is at least as valid as anyone else's.

Finally, I'd like to take this opportunity to dispute, *again*, your attack in Zine Register #21 that I should have printed a letter from you in Foolhardy #4. You sent me a letter, responding to Your Zine of Zines. Your letter did *not* mention or refer to Foolhardy, and you had *specifically* stated previously that you had *no interest* in Foolhardy, and *never* wanted to see another issue of it. With all of that *indisputable* evidence at hand, *why* would I print that letter in Foolhardy? Yet you refuse to accept my explanation, instead saying that this was the "test" that "proves" that Foolhardy is nothing but an anti-Garret feud zine. I think this example, above all others, shows your occasionally paranoid mindset when it comes to me, and helps explain why some of the trouble between us ever got as far as it did.}

(MARK NELSON) Phil writes that Garret should "leave out the personal attacks on certain people" and not "leave out the personal attacks". Does this mean that he thinks that there should be personal attacks on some people? And if so, who? Name Names! 8-)

(JACK MCHUGH) I have to admit I thought I'd never see it, but I saw Garret recently apologized to Richard Weiss in the latest issue of Zero Sum for Garret's rather vicious review in the latest Zine Register. I'm glad to see Garret is mellowing out and showing some class. If he had been a little more open-minded after his first attempt at the ZR we might have avoided a lot of unpleasantness.

I've already said alot, probably too much, about Garret's time at the ZR but I want to make one last attempt (since I know Garret will get this issue) to explain what I think a good review ought to do.

A reviewer has a dual responsibility to both his audience and his subject. To his audience a reviewer owes his honest opinion of the subject and his reasons for his opinion. In addition, he also owes it to his reader to point out the major points of interest in the zine, regardless of what the reviewer may think of them.

To his subject the reviewer must be fair enough to make clear his own biases and tastes. When in doubt about the facts the reviewer should give the subject the benefit of the doubt or say nothing.

No one wants to read milquetoast reviews nor does anyone wish to read a bunch of reviews with the compassion of a rabid pit bull. To review zines is not always an easy or appreciated task. If one is too harsh, your attacked for being "mean"; if one is not harsh enough, you're "boring."

The *last* thing a reviewer should *ever* do is compare the subject to his own work. At best this is seen as vain and a *faux pau*, at worst, it

destroys a reviewer's creditability as he cannot be seen, either by his subject or reader, as unbiased, but rather as a competitor. No one is interested in reading a reviewer with an axe to grind. Why should they? At that point a reviewer becomes boring and predictable.

By the same token a reviewer should be true to his own tastes and not be swayed by friendship or personality. Nothing is more annoying to a reader than to have a reviewer toadying to an obvious hobby friend while flaying a hobby enemy for the same sin.

The rewards of doing a good review are worth the time it takes to write a good review. My best reviews tend to get mixed reviews. Some people think I was too hard, others too soft. However, the best compliment a reviewer can get, and should strive for, is the accolade "You were fair."

The International Hobby:

(PETER SULLIVAN) I don't think that a truly international Hobby is possible, or even desirable. What we do have, and should encourage, is crossover *between* hobbies, a different thing altogether. When I write to Foolhardy, I am functioning as a (semi-detached) member of the American hobby, and I adjust what I write accordingly. It's the chance to immerse myself into a different hobby "culture" which appeals, not the chance to read John Caruso (or even Jack McHugh). The one thing which might change all of this, as Jack McHugh says, is the growth in e-mail.

Game Reporting:

(DON DEL GRANDE) There's a problem with the "double-underlining" method of reporting a dislodged unit; in some cases (my copy of Foolhardy #4, for example), the lines tend to "blend" into one and it's not easy to tell them apart.

{You're showing your age, Don!}

New Diplomacy Flyer/Gamer's Guide:

(PETE GAUGHAN) McFlap is a real spout-off artist (his comments on the box flyer made me call David Hood to find out just what the hell was going on).

{See, I knew he was good for something!}

(JOHN CARUSO) Cal, David and Gary are responsible for that albatross. Not me. I wish them luck.

(KEVIN BROWN) Obviously I disagree with Caruso. The flyer is an advertisement in as much as its intended to bring people into the hobby. The Flyer should not be used to advertise particular zines.

{As John will clarify below, he was referring to the response mailing, not the flyer itself.}

(JOHN CARUSO) Enclosed please find a copy of both the opening page and the service listing page *{of the new introductory package to be sent to people who respond to the new game box flyer}*. If you have the space, please print them in Foolhardy. If you don't have the space, maybe a quick summary by you, as an uninvolved neutral party, will communicate the message it carries. *{Foolhardy readers will find copies of John's two pages at the end of this issue.}*

Let me correct the Jack McHugh misinformation network - I AM NOT NOW AND NEVER WAS DOING THE GAME BOX FLYER. What I am creating is the mailing that will go to those who get the game box flyer and write back to Dipdom for an introductory package on the PBM hobby. At the present, the package is to contain the opening page, a service listing page, a game opening page or 2, a fff con page or 2 and a discount coupon page. The game opening page(s) will contain the current PBM and PBEM game openings. Hopefully I'll be able to have the current Pontevedria handy. If not, I'll have to create my own opening listing. My preference is Pontevedria, of course. The FTF con page(s) will cover major gaming conventions, house cons and everything in between. That is as long as the info is provided to me or I am able to locate it in various zines. I could use all the help I am able to get here. The coupon page will list discount coupons for the new hobbyist to snip and mail in, following any directions on the coupons, of course. Discounts may be sub discounts or free game starts, free issues of zines or discounts of service publications. So far, the coupon donators include MOD, ZR, PDOZD, DW, Northern Flame.

Cal White put together the game box flyer in October. He was to have sent me a copy of it, but as of November 22 I have received nothing from him.

I will accept coupon offers from anyone who GM's or publishes. The coupon may be for a free issue, free game start, or a reduced price. I am offering them in 1 and 2 year blocks and recommend you only commit to 1 year at a time. You have the option of being listed in 25%, 50%, or 100% of the packages for the 1st year. And if you want, you may design your own fancy coupon. But please, make it no bigger than 1/4 page, preferable 1/8 page or smaller.

I am opening my work up to public domain. I would like to hear your opinions, here in Foolhardy or directly. We have until Spring (April-May) to create a final product. Since this is a package that hopefully will effect Dipdom in a positive way, I am eager to get your ideas. Whether good or critical. But if its critical, don't pull a Jack McHugh on me. I want a constructive counter idea. If there is anything you think needs to be added or deleted from the package, please write and tell me.

Jack McHugh seems to think that given my "complete computer illiteracy", that I should not do this package. For starters, I am not a complete illiterate on a computer. Novice yes, but not an illiterate. I do however have over 13 years of publishing experience. And I even know how to use my spell check, something Jack has yet to master on his computer.

A few of you (Jack included) have told me you think good graphics are necessary. I disagree, but will include them anyway. Nothing gaudy mind you. Just some cute graphics to make things look a bit fancier.

For those of you who would like to know, we are expecting a few hundred requests for packages from the game box flyer. Yes Jack, hundreds!

To correct more misinformation out of the mouth of Ballistic Jack - David Hood, Cal White and Gary Behnen did not "dump" anything on me. I sort of popped up on them in September and convinced them to let me do the package.

As some of you know and others will find out, I am an anarchist at heart, but when something is done for the good of Dipdom, and requires cooperation, I think everyone should have a chance to voice their feelings.

I don't function as the lone ranger or sneakily in the shadows. Everything with me is up front and public. I'm a team player. So talk to me. You have my attention.

Maybe I am a "dope" like Ballistic Jack says. Maybe I have bit off more than I can chew. Maybe I will be opening myself up to every Cal, David and Jackie who wants to criticize me or take advantage of me. But I think that Dipdom should have a say in what is supposed to help Dipdom. I'm only trying to do what's in the best interest of Dipdom.

Oh, for the record, I do work when I volunteer. I don't sit back and let the computer use me. I use the machine, as it should be.

(CAL WHITE) Just where the hell does McHugh get his information? Not only is John Caruso **NOT** doing the gamebox flyer, he was **NEVER** the person who was going to do it. I did not disappear when the work was to be done; I **DID** the work and the flyer has been written, accepted by Avalon Hill, printed up and will appear as the back page of the 1992 Rulebook. The only connection John Caruso had with the initial work was when I phoned him up and asked him if he would like to be a part of the 5 man committee who would have their addresses listed on the Rulebook flyer. He agreed and volunteered to help provide material that would be sent out to novices (although he has since expressed concerns that he may have offered to do too much).

{It seems to me that the biggest break we got with this new set is the placement of the flyer on the back page of the rulebook. There's hardly a more noticeable place to put it, and we're sure to pick up a bunch of new players from that. Even if people don't write in immediately, they'll see the ad every time they get the rules out, and eventually many will get in contact.}

Jack McHugh:

(CAL WHITE) I have to honestly admit that I am extremely fucking pissed off at Jack McHugh for much of his material in Foolhardy #4. He wrote "Despite all the big talk by the David Hoods and Cal Whites of this hobby, when it comes time to do any work, they disappear."

Bullshit.

Since DipCon in Kansas City, where Rex Martin explained what he wanted us (the hobby) to do, I have done the following:

* Set up the five man committee which will handle all novice requests that come in through the gamebox flyer. This meant many long distance phone calls (and the resultant cost) talking to David Hood, Gary Behnen, John Caruso and Don Del Grande (who will, along with myself, form the panel).

* John and myself have figured out, for the most part, what will be sent to novices who make an inquiry (I've offered discounts on NF gamefees for the coupon sheet).

* When all that was done, I wrote up the gamebox flyer by AH's Oct. 31 deadline and cleared it with Rex Martin.

* David and myself worked on the Avalon Hill Gamer's Guide to Diplomacy. I wrote up a proposed Table of Contents and discussed it with David, Rex, and Gary Behnen before it was accepted (almost) as is.

* In the next month or so, I will be writing up a couple of articles to match blanks on the Table of Contents.

As for David, he has been digging through old Diplomacy World's and other archive material trying to find quality articles for inclusion in the Gamer's Guide and has sent me a large quantity of photocopied material for inspection.

I suppose this is what McHugh calls disappearing.

I don't know if I'm understanding my feelings right now but I want to make it very clear that I am extremely angry with Jack right now and I demand a formal apology. If it isn't forthcoming then I will terminate any friendship he and I have left and he will no longer be welcome in Northern Flame (he isn't in any games) and I will refund his sub monies.

{My only regret with this whole new Deluxe Dip thing has been there really wasn't enough time to get an open discussion of the flyer. Perhaps someone might have had a good idea for something to be included, or a valid reason for keeping something off the flyer. The decision to have five people's names on it instead of one has both pros and cons, and perhaps it would have been nice to discuss this. However, with the time constraints Avalon Hill gave it would have been difficult to do anything but leave people with the feeling that their input was offered but ignored. Now that I've seen the flyer in Northern Flame, I have to admit it looks pretty good. Now, if the game sells, we'll have to see what the response is from the public at large.}

Getting Into Dip:

(FRED DAVIS) I was introduced to the Postal Diplomacy hobby before I ever owned a copy of the game. A fellow Mensan, who was playing in the very first Mensa game in Terry Kuch's Thulcandra, showed me his map and explained the principles. I went out at once and ordered a copy, which took several days to arrive, as no one in Baltimore was then selling the game (in 1968).

I became a standby in that Mensa game, and soon took over the position of an NMRing England. I then learned the name and address of Rod Walker, and it was through his mentoring that I started playing in a variant game in one of his zines. However, it was nearly two years later before I played in my first FTF game in a private home in a Washington suburb.

(W. ANDREW YORK) I was playing Dip for about six months (maybe more) before I bought a game. Yes, I actually played using a single conference map I got from somewhere.

(PETER SULLIVAN) I bought my first game of Diplomacy in about 1978, at the tender age of 11. At that time, the British set was sold by Philmar (now Gibsons). I discovered the postal hobby some years later through a flyer picked up at an FRP games show, and joined my first postal game in late 1983. So make that a 5-year gap. I don't recall there being any box flyer in my set, although I may be wrong on that.

(DON DEL GRANDE) I got my Diplomacy set in 1978 (at a half-off sale) and joined the PBM gaming hobby in mid-1979 (although I started my first PBM Dip game in early 1980). I assume that most people kept the first Dip set they bought, even after the box corners are covered with tape and the map is ready to fall apart.

(JOHN CARUSO) I got involved in PBM Dip about 2-3 months after getting the game. I saw an ad in The General, and the rest is history.

(KEVIN BROWN) I got my first Diplomacy set in 1976 as a birthday gift. I joined the hobby in late 1982 and began my first game in 1983.

Somehow the flyer in my first set must have gotten misplaced or something (hey, I was only 10). I found out about the hobby Mensa, and my first game was a Mensa game.

(CAL WHITE) I started playing postal Diplomacy within weeks of buying the game. I had been playing it with some friends in high school but didn't know about the postal hobby until I got my own copy and saw the PBM flyer. I wrote to John Leeder, publisher of Arrakis, and was in a novice game within weeks. This was in late 1974.

{I'm surprised how many people in this hobby were introduced to the game at a young age - 13 or under. Yet, I imagine many people think of it as a gift only for adults. Let's get some of these new Dip sets in the hands of youngsters!}

(MARK NELSON) I became involved in the play-by-mail hobby *before* I owned a copy of the game and *before* I had ever played it. In fact I started publishing my own zine before I had ever played a game. I entered postal diplomacy fandom (via the role playing hobby) in the Summer of 1985 (I published my first zine in March 1985). I can't remember when I got a copy of the rules (I only got them because I was interested in playing in a diplomacy vt called SONG OF THE NIGHT) but I didn't own a set until the Summer of 1988 when I bought a copy of the 1966 set.

(JACK MCHUGH) I was playing Diplomacy for several years face-to-face before I bothered getting into the pbm hobby. As soon as I decided to get into the pbm hobby I went out and bought a copy of Diplomacy.

Foreign Zines:

(FRED DAVIS) I have been subbing or trading with foreign zines ever since the days of Don Turnbull's Albion, the first British Dipzine. At times, when I was publishing Bushwacker, I had as many as six or seven Overseas trades from the U.K. and Germany. I still sub or trade with three British zines and one from Germany - the latter being Thomas Franke's Diplomat, which is mostly in English. I believe it's important to maintain relations with diplomats in other countries.

On my trips to England and the Continent over the years, I've managed to meet several of these people, mainly at hobby meets in a Central London pub. I recommend that anyone going abroad, especially to England, make an effort to meet some of our overseas counterparts.

(W, ANDREW YORK) Yes, I actively look for foreign zines to trade with and subscribe to. Currently, I receive three British zines and one Australian. I've received a number of other samples, and sent out a slew of RW's to many overseas readers.

I enjoy reading about the other countries' hobbies, meeting people from elsewhere and just plain enjoying the entire worldwide Dip hobby. Of course, the looks on the faces of the post office workers when I receive registered letters from New Zealand and express mail from Brazil is almost priceless.

(PETER SULLIVAN) I see about 11 overseas zines, all North American. Let's see: Buckeye Rails Gazette, CCC, Costaguana, Diplomag,

Disoriented Express, Foolhardy, Heroes of Olympus, Lemon Curry, Maniac's Paradise, Pedro in the Rain Forest, Zine Register. A distinctly eclectic selection, but then this is the result of 6 years of picking up odd trades here and there.

(DON DEL GRANDE) I read a number of overseas zines, mainly to keep tabs on happenings (both in and out of the hobby) in those countries.

(JOHN CARUSO) Yes, I used to sub and trade with a few. However, there isn't much in foreign zines that interests me anymore. There isn't much in American zines that interests me either. I miss the good reading zines.

(KEVIN BROWN) No. I've not seen a foreign zine that interests me. In truth I have seen very few foreign zines.

(CAL WHITE) I don't currently subscribe to any "foreign" zines, but I do trade with a handful, all European. Of these, the three best are Green Goblin (John Breakwell), Now Eat the Rabbit (William Whyte) and Y Draig Goch (Iain Bowen). I especially prefer the Brit zines as their hobby attitude seems to be more in line with mine than most American zines. Please note that this isn't a putdown of the American hobby, just an observation that the two hobbies are different.

(MARK NELSON) Yes, I subscribe/trade/read with many foreign zines. I currently trade with: 10 American Zines, 2 Australian Zines, 2 Canadian Zines, 1 French Zine, 2 German Zines, 1 zine from New Zealand, 1 zine from South Africa and 1 zine from Sweden.

This lists excludes those zines that I sub to and those zines which I see via third parties.

Since my main interest is in the social side of the diplomacy hobby (the dreaded f***** word) I'm interested in reading the best zines regardless of their point of origin. Seeing zines from outside your own country is a way of broadening your horizons. If, like me, you think that NORTHERN FLAME is an *excellent* zine then why not find the nearest British zine to NORTHERN FLAME, the nearest Australian zine to it? I also enjoy writing to interesting people and seeing what they are doing, exchanging views and correspondence.

From a fanzine point of view it's good to widen your horizons, see what others are doing, get new views and opinions. I think the fanzines I produce today are better than the ones of yesteryear, and part of the reason for that is because of the international angle. The new ideas/style I've gained from people like, to only name people who contributed to Foolhardy #4, Phil Reynolds, Eric Brosius, Andrew York, Adrian Appleyard, John Caruso, Dave McCrumb, ol'e David Hood and even Jack McHugh. All good people. Well most of them anyway...

(JACK MCHUGH) I get two foreign zines, The Mark Nelson Experience and Y Draig Goch. Both of these are from the UK. I'm not usually real crazy about overseas zines because they are difficult to write to. I used to get a few others but it is hard to play in them because of the time lapse.

Services We Need/Don't Need:

(FRED DAVIS) I think we could do without the "MNC under the

Covenant" post. It merely duplicates the work of the real Miller Number Custodian, and confuses the issue by using a separate numbering system for Variant games. The MNC publishes the results of his number assignments and game endings in Alpha & Omega about once every three months. To the best of my knowledge, the MNC(uc) hasn't published an issue of Lord of Hosts in the past two years.

The best new service would be the one described in Foolhardy #4 of making sure that people writing to the central Diplomacy P.O. Box receive copies of Diplomacy World, Pontevedria (game openings), and a list of Dipzine publishers in prompt response to their inquiries. They should also be informed that they may purchase copies of the Zine Register, the Gamers' Guide and Supernova (the novice package) at a reasonable price. *{I don't know what we will call that service, but as you've read John Caruso and the other four "Committee" members will be coordinating that. One service down!}*

(W. ANDREW YORK) I don't feel any service should be eliminated. Each performs a function that is valuable to the hobby in one form or another. As for a new service, either the "Novice Service" I mentioned above or a "Convention Flyer" akin to Phil's Pontevedria.

(JOHN CARUSO) What services should be eliminated - any duplicate services. They should find a way to combine. What new services? Maybe Computer Desktop Advisor.

(KEVIN BROWN) I'll go along with everyone else and say the MNC(uc) should be eliminated. The need for the MNC(uc) has passed, let's end the schism until the next feud. As far as new services, how about one specifically for giving advice to and answering questions from new and prospective publishers? The Publishing Information Director could also solicit and publish articles about publishing (maybe even doing the Diplomacy Digest thing and reprinting such articles from past zines), handle distribution of the publishers handbook and keep it up to date, serve as a contact point for players looking for new zines and/or new zines looking for players, and just generally give guidance to new publishers as needed.

(CAL WHITE) The hobby "service" I think we could most get along without are the Miller Numbers. Not that they're harmful. They aren't that I can see (the various schisms aside), but I don't see the point. The only reason I can see for a universal numbering system is to make games easier to rate and I don't know of anyone rating variants, nor of any reasonable way to do it.

Aside from the system of Hobby Contacts that I'm helping set up right now, the main service the postal hobby needs right now is for a few dedicated individuals to work at actively **seeking out** new blood. There have been many ways suggested of doing this (my favorite is the idea of writing to as many University and high school gaming clubs as we can find), but they all take hard behind-the-scenes work. Unfortunately, there isn't a lot of hobby ego-boo involved, so we may never have this service implemented.

(JACK MCHUGH) The only hobby services that I think are essential are some kind of Orphan Service and the Omnibudsmen Service. It is nice to have a Novice Packet, a Zine/Games Register and some type of

Boardman/Miller Number service, but they aren't essential.

I can't really think of any other service we currently need.

Hobby Archivists:

(FRED DAVIS) At present, I know of two "Hobby Archivists." The official Hobby Archives are maintained by Larry Peery in San Diego. He is supposed to receive a copy of every North American zine for his files. He also receives some overseas zines. I'm also told that Elmer Hinton, Jr., of Nashua, NH maintains a private zine collection which he calls the "Granite State Archives."

Some of the oldest Dipzines, 1964-1978, are still in the custody of Walter Buchanan of Lebanon, Indiana in what are called the "Hoosier Archives." In his introduction to The Encyclopedia of Diplomacy Zines, Jim Meinel writes that all three of these sources were most helpful to him in his research. There are also other people who maintain large private collections. Some of them are listed on Page xi of the Encyclopedia. Mark Berch had one of the largest private zine collections, but he seems to have left the hobby.

I recently asked Larry Peery if he were still maintaining the Hobby Archives. It's too soon for him to have replied. I know that the Official Archives also contains some plaques, trophies and various whatnots from our past.

(W. ANDREW YORK) I guess the closest to a hobby archivist is Larry Peery. I do keep everything sent to me (correspondence as well as every zine).

(PETER SULLIVAN) I remember there being a spat of some kind in Costaguana in 1986 between Larry Peery and Elmer Hinton about who was the official archivist (Mark Berch was involved as well, I think). Now that Elmer has apparently left the hobby, I guess this leaves Larry - although Larry's attitude has always been, as far as I know, that he will maintain and add to the Archives, but doesn't have the time to do much else (e.g. publish collections of archive material, something Diplomacy Digest does/did anyway). Why not contact the man himself for the full story?

(DON DEL GRANDE) I assume there are a few people who still have zines from twenty years ago (who is it that has the "Hoosier Archives"?); I have most of the zines I have received, beginning in 1979. What I intend to do with a handful of zines that only published 10 issues or so and disappeared without a trace is anybody's guess, although I have a nearly-complete set of John Boardman's "Dungeons & Christians" from Empire.

If anybody has a copy of issue 220 of John Boardman's Empire (published in late 1985), or whatever issue in that period has the sixth installment of "Dungeons & Christians", could you make me a copy (for which you will be reimbursed, of course)?

(JOHN CARUSO) Larry Peery forwarded his stuff a few years ago. I forget to who. I believe its someone on the west coast, possibly Jim Meinel.

(LARRY PEERY) I have a stack of Dip zines 170 feet high - something

close to 35,000 copies; excluding thousands more back Diplomacy World's and my stuff. I've been trying to sort it since Labor Day - slow going. See my comments in World Diplomacy. I'll take advice on what to do with it, but the final decision is mine.

(KEVIN BROWN) I am unaware of any archives or archivists. I keep all the zines I get, just on the off chance that a complete set of It's a Trap's might be valuable some day.
{*\$5 going once...\$5 going twice...*}

(CAL WHITE) I haven't really kept track of who could be considered an archivist or not. I know Larry Peery and Mark Berch have a huge amount of old zines, but I don't know what happened to Walt Buchanan's old Hoosier Archives. To the best of my knowledge, there is no one place that has a complete, or as close as possible, set of all hobby publications. As for my old zines, I have a virtually complete set of zines from the mid-70s and I have filed everything I've received since getting back into the hobby in '87.

(MARK NELSON) What is a hobby archive? If it is a collection of zines which is announced as being a hobby archive then I guess that there are two archives in North America: Walt Buchanan's and Larry Peery's.

To me a Hobby Archive is a collection of fanzines which are open to anyone to pop in and browse through. Doesn't matter how big, or how small the collection is. The important thing is that the collection is open. It also helps if the Archivist has a listing of what's in the Archive and if he has read most of the zines in the Archive.

Archives are not things which 99% of the hobby are interested. They are only of interest to people who are interested in the history of the hobby: the zines that have produced and the people that produced them. If all you want to do is to play games, or if you think that the past is not of interest and that modern technology means that new zines are better than ever then archives won't hold any interest for you...

Personally I love reading old zines, seeing what was happening in the Hobby 5, 10, 15 years ago. It's surprising how often the same problem reappears, or events repeat some ancient event. If you want to understand why certain people do what they do, then it sometimes helps to know what they did in the past.

I'd guess that most of the Foolhardy readers appreciate the Archive concept, I'd guess most of the non-trading MP readers don't.

I've kept as near to 100% as matters of all the zines that I have been mailed. (There are two issues of a particularly role-playing fanzine that I no longer have.) I've also added fanzines from many different people to my collection. I'm particularly "proud" (although pride isn't really the right concept) of the fact that I have about 1000 issues of fanzines produced in North America in my collection: Probable the largest such collection outside of North America.

OK. I admit it. I'm a particularly sad person who enjoys collecting fanzines... 8-(

The main problem with Archives is where to store the zines. What will happen to the Peery collection when Larry dies? The Ghods forgive that they should be willed out and

recycled as paper! (I understand that a North American University has expressed an interest in obtaining Waly Buchanan's collection: is this true?)

I keep most of my correspondence, although I throw away orders for the games that I am running. I've even kept all the letters I've received about games that I have played in, although I may throw those away at some stage. At the moment I am not pressed for space so I try and keep everything. At some future date I'll have to start throwing zines/correspondence away...

(JACK MCHUGH) I know a few people who keep old zines (Dick Martin, Mark Nelson) just because they want to. Then there is Larry "Hobby Martyr" Peery who acts like we should bow at the alter of Peeriblah because he keeps back zines. I don't think we need a hobby archivist and I throw away my old zines and letters every few months, if I didn't I'd be buried in them.

For Next Time:

- 1) The **1993 PDO Census** was released this month. Any comments on it or the information it contained?
- 2) **Deluxe Diplomacy** hit the stands in December, 1992. I've heard a few surprisingly negative reviews. Have you seen it? Bought it? If so, what's **your** opinion?
- 3) If you are a publisher, what do you do with and how do you feel about "inactive subscribers". By this I mean people who subscribe to your zine, play in no games, and never contribute letters or anything else?
- 4) We've had some discussions about the Hobby Awards here over the past few issues. You have just been given full power over them. Do you eliminate, add, or change any of the awards? If so, what will you do exactly?

Next Foolhardy Deadline - March 15, 1993