

Foolhardy - #6

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: Jack McHugh, Mark Nelson, Fred Davis, Vince Lutterbie, W. Andrew York, Hal Dace, Don Del Grande, Andy Lischett, Rex Martin, Bruce Reiff, Adrian Appleyard, Stven Carlberg, James Nelson, Stephen Glasgow, Per Westling, Larry Peery, John Caruso, David Hood. Next Foolhardy deadline: May 16, 1993.

The Concept:

(HAL DACE) I don't mind the small print - I'm pleased to see it working, since I'm about to try it in SAPC. Zine production is expensive - and white space costs just as much as text, so the difficulty is trying to tread a balance between economic viability of a zine and how you really would like it to look. (Oh yes - and I like the postage stamps)

(MARK NELSON) Your new format was most readable. Of course I'm not old so I didn't have any trouble reading them funny small letters. Not yet anyway.

McHugh is correct to point out that there are two Nelsons over here and only one McHugh over where you are. Which side of the Atlantic got the best deal? I shudder to think! Praise be to the ghods: There is only one Jack McHugh!!!

(JACK MCHUGH): Who lets this Sullivan guy have access to postage anyway? By the way, yo, Crazie Markie, I still don't have my sub to Sullivan's rag yet. Don, we can discuss the 2 cent scandal at the hobby meeting at AtlantiCon this year--Robert needs a new scandal to keep him busy.

The Name:

(JACK MCHUGH): There goes Jawn again. In one paragraph he calls me "Attack" McHugh then he says the zine is named after me. Guess those brain cells are dying off faster than Kathy and I thought.

Census:

(FRED DAVIS) As I said in Diplomag, I believe that many of the Canadian players were not counted because you did not receive mailing lists from either The Canadian Diplomat or Excelsior. There may be some Canadians who receive no other zines. You did not say whether you'd received a copy of the CDO Membership List. I've asked Cal White to send you one, if he had not already done so, so you could check for "missing" Canadians on that list.

I also fear that some of the Canadian decline is because there have not been many sales outlets in Canada selling the game since the old

Waddington's sets were exhausted. We do depend on New Blood. I hope that Avalon Hill is now making sure that the new Diplomacy sets are widely available in Canada.

{*I'm sure the lack of response I got from Canadian zines caused some sort of undercount, but I didn't get a response from Excelsior or The Canadian Diplomat last time, either. This year I went so far as to send out a second request to publishers that hadn't responded by the end of November. In the 1992 Census, I did have a copy of the 1991 CDO Membership List, provided by Cal. Cal did not send me any such list this time, which I assumed to mean he didn't compile one. My guess is there was a Canadian undercount of around 15, which would make the Canadian drop only 20% (less than it was, but still the biggest drop of any region).}*}

(W. ANDREW YORK) The PDO Census was excellent. The only improvement I can see would be listing Email, phone and or/fax numbers if available. Oh, that and adding the pubbers name for the contributing zines. That way it would be easy for someone to write to one of the pubbers (look up the name in the listing). Presently, they would have to look elsewhere to find that information.

{*I'm working on an informal fax/Email directory of sorts - mainly consisting of publishers and other international hobby bigwigs. I'll let you know when it is available.*}

(MARK NELSON) I haven't received a copy of your census. If you mail me a copy then I'll comment on it.
{*Sent you one a few days ago, along with the x-matrix.*}

(DON DEL GRANDE) I always keep the latest **PDO Census** handy, as there's always somebody whose address I can't find despite digging through hundreds of zines. (Even if the person has moved, chances are that whatever I sent would be forwarded.)

(ANDY LISCHETT) A suggestion for the next Census: perhaps put an asterisk by new names and addresses. When I get the Census I search for potential face-to-face players to add to my list, and it would be easier to check a few asterisks rather than all 700.

{*I haven't compared this Census to the previous one name by name, but I'm doing new stuff each time, so maybe next time I'll do one symbol for*

"old name, new address" and another for "new name".}

(FRED DAVIS) I was very delighted to get the Cross-matrix of who gets what zines. At first, I had a hard time reading the zines' names, until I realized they were printed vertically. You might want to include an "instruction guide" of a sentence or two in future copies.

Had I known that you were going to produce such a cross-matrix, I would have sent you my complete mailing list for Diplomag. What I sent you, of course, was the SIG Membership List, plus the four people who were playing in the Atlantica IV game therein who were not Mensa members. I also send "Official" copies to two American Mensa officers, to the BNC and MNC, to David Hood and to the Hobby Archivist (Larry Peery). I also trade Diplomag with about five other zines, including two overseas. This would substantially increase the number of names listed for Diplomag.

I've taken my copy of the Cross-matrix and added on all the names of the people who get Diplomag who weren't listed (excluding Overseas pubbers, of course). I won't bother giving you this now, since it matters only to me, really, but next year, I must remember to give you my complete Mailing List.

I was also surprised at the number of people who receive only one or two Dipzines. I was also surprised to see how few people see as many zines as I do. Even BNC Behnen and Archivist Peery receive fewer zines than me! (I thought everyone was supposed to send them copies). It's a good thing I'm retired, and have time to read all the zines I get. Now you know why I can find the time to play in only 2 or 3 games at a time! I'm always busy reading.

Perhaps other people have done what I've done, and not list people like the BNC and the Archivist on their Mailing Lists. You might want to make a comment next year to the effect that for the cross-matrix purpose, pubbers ought to add an auxiliary list of such people on their lists when sending them to you. Of course, there's no point in including copies sent to friends and relatives outside of the hobby.

Thank you for letting me sound off on these minor points. Keep up the good work.

{That's the real point of the cross-matrix, letting us see what the average hobby member does. I, too, was surprised by the number of Dipsters who only get one or two zines. Those names should be targeted by new pubbers as potential subscribers...and by the hobby at large as people who might like to get more involved, but are out of the mainstream.}

(ADRIAN APPLEYARD) Could you send me a copy?

{Sent you one a few days ago, along with a copy of the x-matrix.}

(STEPHEN GLASGOW) What does it take to get into the Census? Actual play in a game during that year? Some of the names I sent in were not included. Perhaps the addresses were out-of-date. In my part of Ohio, I see postal gaming of all sorts increasing, not declining as the Census indicated. I've dragged many of my friends in for a trial, and they liked PBM enough to stay.

{I only included those names on your list that you indicated were currently receiving your zine. The rest, I believe, you said had received samples during the year.}

(LARRY PEERY) I can't remember if I wrote you about the Census and

Matrix, so this may be repetitive, but then repetition is the essence of Peeriblah, don't you think?

The Census was well done. The Matrix was most interesting.

In general I think it confirms that the hobby's infrastructure is far more delicate than we ever thought. It appears to me that there are only a relative handful of pubbers/players who constitute the core of the hobby and have a real over-view of what is going on in it.

I checked the list of people who voted for WD and, alas, my suspicions are confirmed, regarding the Zine Poll. At least one person mentioned getting the zine and I suspect he confused it with DW. Not an impossibility, especially for a novice. I've never heard of him and don't know where he got the zine. More interestingly there were indications of a certain block of people who voted or said they read WD who as far as I know have no way of getting it except second or third hand. Now, I could accept that one or two people might be getting WD under such circumstances, but not five from the same area and hobby block. No way. I would bet dollars to donuts that this is where WD's low ratings came from. Now, I may be wrong about all this, but I don't think so. In fact, I believe I am correct. That's a turn-off right there. Maybe I am being Peerinoid, and in fact, I probably am, but I don't think so.

What it all really shows is that we badly need to expand the number of people in the hobby to flush out this kind of thing. As I said at DipCon last year, "We have dropped, in numbers, below what I consider to be 'critical mass,' and that could be deadly."

{Larry, what "list of people who voted" are you referring to? I'm lost.}

(DAVID HOOD) Looked well-done to me. How do I get a copy of the cross-matrix thing? Obviously, the issue here is the lack of novices. I think novice recruitment is something every hobbyist has got to work on - by turning friends on to Dip, taking new people to Cons, etc.

{I sent you the x-matrix a few days ago.}

Computers:

(HAL DACE) On Mark Nelson's opinions of Email, I'm not playing Email games at the moment, and it's unlikely that I will in the coming year - not on the Judges anyway. I appreciate the value of Email as a communications medium (without it you wouldn't have this LoC) but the rampant turbopreachism of Email play is very demanding on time if you want to play Email games well, and that time is what I simply don't & won't have this year. As a medium for contact and communications however, and a tool for drawing geographically distant hobbies together, it is unbeatable.

{I prefer Email as a means of quick and reliable communication, as opposed to a place to play Dip. I do play in a few games on CompuServe, and GM there, but that's as far as I'll go. I prefer the pace of PBM games...at least at this stage in life.}

(ADRIAN APPLEYARD) I've had my little say.

(JOHN CARUSO) It seems to me that people have no problem asking me to make "illegal" copies of programs I've spent good money on - and offer me nothing back in return. Not even postage or free diskettes. But when I ask - I'm being a thief. I was given the impression by all of you that sharing software is commonplace. If it's not - that's fine too. Just tell

me. Don't sit on your high horses calling someone (you've misinformed already) a thief, when all he is doing is asking for that which you told him is totally acceptable.

{Be careful throwing around phrases like "you" and "all of you" - you've obviously discussed this with some people, but not everyone. Not me, for example.}

(JACK MCHUGH) Stop whining Jawn! I told you to get off your rear end and come to my house and I'll get you the software. If you think I'm going to hand deliver software to you on you because you are too LAZY to leave Norristown for the 30 minute drive to Upper Darby than you are even more senile than Kathy says you are! I also told you little Tommie Swider would help you too but you're too LAZY to drive 40 minutes to his house in South Jersey. You make me sick.

Custodians:

(MARK NELSON) I agree with Don Del Grande that a useful hobby service would be for someone to record game starts/ends of multi-player non dip/variant games. The main use would be to help prospective GMs discover if anyone has run a particular game before, where it was run and what the players thought about the game. For more complex games it would mean that there wasn't wasted effort trying to work out how to run them by post if you could track down a set of postal rules used before. Doug points out that some games have different postal rules and asks is there any point in collecting data for these games. But surely that is exactly the point?

Yes a good idea. But is anyone interested in recording these details? Why doesn't Don record the details? Then we can call them Don Del Grande numbers!

{I'll take this opportunity to announce that, since I feel Don has fallen down on the job, I am appointing myself DDGMN(uc). Send cash only, please.}

I wish that, when end-game reports of variants are published in zines, the players would comment on what they feel the strengths and/or weaknesses of the variant are. It would make it easier to update and modify variants. It's not enough to say "hmm, Brazil was the only nation not included in any draw after this variant was played three times, so Brazil must be too weak." I see some of these comments here and there, but usually its just "Mike was a good ally" or something similar.}

(STEPHEN GLASGOW) I use a 100-mile minimum distance between players. I figure anyone who would drive that far to collaborate with another player would also pay high long-distance phone bills to achieve the same result. So state and are code could be the same or different, I don't care. Just to my US map shows a one-inch gap between towns.

Peter Sullivan's 8-point guide hits right on the mark, but he left off some practical tips. (1) Don't wait until your deadline to start an issue. Spread the load by doing some of the prep work early. (2) Measure the hours to produce each issue, and set aside that much time for the next issue. So now Peter's Guide can become the Ten Commandments!

(PER WESTLING) If I would have followed Peter's 8-point guide I would have folded long ago!

Don suggests the MNC(uc) should give numbers for non-variants. Is

he aware that Lee Kendter, Jr. has started to give these non-variants NAVB numbers? Eg Postal 1830 is yr35 and Snowball Fighting is yr02.

It is natural for variant banks to collect all kinds of rules for zeen based games, making these available more or less in public domain. A question regarding MNs - have these been used for anything ever? As an ever-increasing fraction (maybe a majority) of variant games are played electronically I think we can just ignore both the MNC and MNC(uc).

Dipcon:

(DON DEL GRANDE) Is the East region eligible to host DipCon in 1994? I thought it was West and South (the East-South line on the Atlantic coast being the VA-NC border), but I can't find my copy of the new regions which has the eligible regions on it. If it is the South and East in 1994, choosing an East site means the South (which, at the moment (as far as I know), pretty much means Dixiecon) has to wait until 1997.

There's nothing wrong with "potential sites bidding against each other for the right to hold (World Dip Con), just as they do for the SF Worldcon" - if, just as they do at Worldcon, you get a substantial number of people from outside the local area. If DipCon is held at a large con in 1995, you run the risk of having a disproportionate number of players from that area casting the vote. Also, WDC is supposed to be in France in 1995; how many North Americans are planning on going?

(JAMES NELSON) Will World DipCon ever be sorted? In the short term the answer is a big NO. At the moment we seem to be indulged in circular arguments. We cannot sort out the simple things in life.

Of course the biggest controversy concerning WDC is how the next site is determined. The (somewhat dubious) practice of the current holders voting for the next site (as per DipCon) is totally inappropriate for WDC. Why? The attendees are not going to attend, will have very little knowledge of the proposed sites (as they'll be in foreign places they've probably never been to) and there are the logistic problems of, for instance, an American group putting forward their bid for WDC in a foreign country, France for instance.

Don Del Grande's second idea is a very workable and practical suggestion. Having a "World DipCon membership fee" will enable those who are interested in the concept to participate whilst allowing those people who are not interested not to be hassled to vote in this or that particular way.

Originally I thought it would be a good idea to weight the vote in any vote on where WDC should be. The rationale behind this was that locals would be the ones (by and large) attending the event and hence they should have a more persuasive sway over the voting. Subsequently I decided this was redundant, as by implication local people are more likely to vote and hence the weighting is inherent.

I'd second what my brother said. There is nothing wrong with proposed sites bidding against each other. I cannot see anyone objecting to this: North Americans are used to this concept due to the format of DipCon rotations whilst all the rest of us are more easy going than you guys...

(PER WESTLING) To Don: Yes, letting previous year's DipCon attendees decide the site is a good method. I had the impression that good

reachability (= airport close) has been important in deciding location. Therefore foreign visitors should be able to get to it without much trouble.

(JOHN CARUSO) The object of the NA DipCon Charter is to see that no group or area monopolizes DipCon. That's one difference World DipCon and the NA DipCon have.

There are a few ideas I had years ago regarding World DipCon - but the Brits didn't like them because they wanted World DipCon to be their baby. So instead of yearly World DipCon's and a charter we have the Brits telling the world what to do (sort of like what happened between the 1500's and early 1900's).

Mark Nelson is correct, however, in that if WDC selected NA in 1995 to host WDC, we (NA) do not have a method of selecting the best site. However, I still think we in NA have a better idea of which is the better site - than a group from overseas. Here's an example of the kind of thing that may and does happen here. Suppose WDC selects AvalonCon in Camp Hill to host 1993 WDC. Uh oh. AvalonCon decided to go to Baltimore this year. Do we force the WDC to go to Camp Hill, go with AvalonCon, or do we select another site? An argument can be made to skip WDC in 1993. After all - the site selected no longer exists. And what if AvalonCon decides to not hold a Con in 1993 - rarely a last minute thing, but it could happen. That's another reason why the yearly WDC made more sense than every other year. Plus - every different national group would love to host their own WDC more often than once every 12 years.

(DAVID HOOD) There's nothing wrong with AtlantiCon or AvalonCon for DipCon 1994 except that it's not in the rotation scheme. As I understand it, the Southern and Western regions are eligible for '94 - but it couldn't be in California again. So I suppose a Seattle bid would be in order. Votes for AtlantiCon/AvalonCon are in order, they just wouldn't be counted as full votes (I forgot the percentage). Those two will be fully eligible for '95 though, as Southern and Eastern regions will be up (unless I have figured this out wrong).

Lack of New Zines:

(HAL DACE) As a new publisher who started publishing as a new Hobby member, I find this discussion interesting. I think the single most important reason that people are not starting new zines is intimidation - my introductions to Postal Dip Zines were Diplomacy World and The Mouth of Sauron. Generally, people are introduced to a hobby apparently full of shiny, jargon-laden zines, and it can be difficult for many people to see themselves as capable of producing them. I don't know that finance is a big deterrent - the cost of production didn't really occur to me until I mailed an issue! I'm not sure how to combat the problem - once again, a balance must be struck between being 'novice-friendly' and allowing meaningful discussion without cocooning novices from the Greater Hobby. I think I'll have more to say under Novice Zines
{We could always start the "Novice Publisher Support System". Anyone who expresses an interest in publishing would be sent the worst zines money can buy from all over the world. Then they'd say, "Geez, I can do better than that!" and dive head-first into publishing. Later on, we'd let them see the rest of the hobby's zines. Moooohahaha!}

(MARK NELSON) Jack claims that "If there was really as much of a movement towards E-mail as people think, subzines would be taking off."

I don't really want to say this, but he's talking complete rubbish isn't he?

Why should the number of subzines increase just because the number of people who have access to email has increased?

{He means that its easy for him to do his subzine, compile it at the last minute, and Email it to me right before I go to press. When you're dealing with an anal-retentive like me, 5 minutes late may as well be 5 days late!}

(ADRIAN APPLEYARD) Established zines must give every support to new zines. Of the North American zines I've seen, I've seen very few plugs for new zines. Maybe I'm subbing to the wrong zines.

In Australia, most editors go out of their way to provide something for new zines, like joining a game or writing an article.

{As far as I've seen, most North American pubbers (myself included) plug every new zine I see, and sub or trade for most of them - at least on a trial basis!}

(JAMES NELSON) As a zine editor I would, to some extent, disagree with what McHugh said about subzines. I think a qualification is necessary before Jack's statement becomes worthwhile. As a publisher running a subzine would be hassle (extra cost, extra stress, etc) only if the contents of the subzine were the same as what I was doing. However a subzine who's contents were different and providing something I could not (or would not) offer would always be an extra welcome dimension to the zine. So having qualified Jack's comment I would agree that subzines which are identical to the main zine in contents and style can be a pain.

{It's hard for Jack to know what a "typical" subzine editor goes through. When he sends me his subzine, and I complain that it is too long (as I sometimes do), he just ignores me.}

(PER WESTLING) Some hobbies have great problems with cost. In Sweden it's acceptable, with an issue like Foolhardy #5 costing somewhere around \$1.50 - \$2 including postage. But in Norway it is expensive. Take The Backstabber as an example - 30 A4 pages stapled in the corner, mailed to Sweden. This zeen cost over \$4! Of this about 40% is postage! As an effect Norway has 1 (or maybe 2) active postal gaming zeens while Sweden has close to 15!

To Jack (hoping not to regret I said that): I am interested in having one or more subzeens. The only thing in that type appearing in my zeen is Shawn Derrick's roving Globetrotter.

{Why is it so expensive in Norway? Is photocopying that expensive?}

Polls & Awards:

(MARK NELSON) I have to disagree with John Caruso, in that renaming the Koning Award the Holley Award makes no sense whatsoever: it defeats the original purpose of naming the Player Award the Koning Award.

I guess Jack doesn't support any baseball/football teams. After all, it would be *really* *tough* to choose amongst teams!

(REX MARTIN) Speaking of "Awards & Polls", I just recently received the flyer from David McCrumb calling for nominations for the annual

Diplomacy awards. Having been involved in the hobby for some years, having a small hand in encouraging the Walker Award, and having just completed a new edition to the game, I'd a couple of nominations ready and waiting. Let me share them.

First - for the Don Miller Award, I can think of no better recipient this year than Cal White. As editor of Northern Flame, as a member of the group who helped put together the PBM flyer for the new edition of the game, and as a prime mover in obtaining material (and likely writing some) for me to use in the upcoming new "Gamer's Guide to Diplomacy", Cal has served far above the call of duty. And had a few unworthy stones slung at him. I'd love to see Cal's efforts at spreading the play of Dip (not only in Canada but worldwide) recognized.

Next - for the Rod Walker Award, I nominate (no false modesty here) the two-part report on the postal game "Leviathan" (1988HW) which appeared in the pages of The General (Vol. 27, Nos. 4 and 5) penned by Gary Behnen and myself. It was particularly well done, I thought, and certainly brought a lot of comment from both Dip players and casual readers. With the likes of Fassio, Holley, Quinn, Caruso, and such, it was an entertaining, and informative, read. Hopefully, it boosted the postal play of the game a bit. In any case, Gary deserves a lot of credit for being more than just a fine player. (I will dispense with sending a copy of the rather lengthy piece, trusting all to have seen it already. If you wish, however, I can do so).

Finally - for the John Koning Award, I nominate Greg Geyer. Although Greg does not play postally, he is quite active on the PBEM circuit. This past year he won two PBEM matches outright, and was a member of the infamous draw in the GEnie "Magnificent 7" Championship Game (and has been invited to play in the 1993 Email championship already). Despite the fact that his Turkey stabbed my Italy in the back in that game, he is a talented player. He also attends FTF tournaments throughout the Mid-Atlantic Region, and took fourth place this year at the AvalonCon tournament. In short, despite having his roots elsewhere than in classic postal play, Greg is one of the finest gamers around, in my humble opinion. And he has been so for some years, with little recognition from the "mainstream" postal hobby. (By-the-way, my article on the "Mag7" PBEM game should see print in The General later this year; hopefully it will generate as much interest and recognition for the players as did the "Leviathan" piece.)

I have no nomination for the Melinda Holley Award. Sorry, but I find it a rather pointless award. No condemnation for the intent of the committee or past winners is intended by this statement. Certainly, in any such endeavour to recognize excellence, some awards simply fade away (look to the Hugos, Tonys, Oscars, Edgers, or any other such concerning popular culture). It's time to let the "Holley" award do so as a wrong turning in the process of rewarding the best in our sub-hobby.

(STVEN CARLBERG) I agree with Peter Sullivan that a GM who doesn't publish timely game results doesn't deserve votes for good GMing. Reliability and accuracy are the cornerstones of good GM work, without which all the bells and whistles in the world are plain useless. (Although, I must admit, having the GM publish a map of the game is *my* favorite whistle).

What distinction do you want made between "GM" and "publisher" for polling purposes?

{I'm not sure..I'll retract my complaint, since I can't think of a way to

defend it presently.}

(JAMES NELSON) There is a great myth being spread around about polls that the people who vote in them are dumb. We are told that the voters cannot distinguish between placings. This is utter bull. If I can understand placings, then why not the average voter? By and large most zines normally come within a fairly narrow band of scores: on an average vote can you tell me the quality difference between a zine which gets a 6.5 and one with a 7.0? I think we could only state quality differences between a 9.0 and a 3.0 but what about a 9.0 and a 7.5?

We are also told that pubbers who get a crap result will get disheartened and fold messily. I am sorry to say this but some zines do deserve the result they get. There are some very bad Zines out there. Do we honestly expect ourselves to have to watch what we say and do just to keep a few people happy? Does this mean that people such as Phil Reynolds believe that we should never give a zine a bad review as by implication this leads to other people thinking the same which will result in a poor Runestone result? Maybe we should just wear rose-tinted spectacles at all time and say everything is rosy and sweet smelling in the garden.

It is often the case that editors who have had a poor result can explain the reason themselves: they know the zine is late, that their GMing has been poor recently, etc. Let us give editors a bit more credit rather than just assuming that those who do badly are sad individuals who will go off crying to Mummy at the first sound of criticism. Whilst I am not saying that a few such individuals do not exist, by and large they do not.

I finished 30th out of thirty-two zines in the Zine Poll with an average vote of 6.09 (or something like that). I thought my result was reasonable. Like was not treated with like. My turnaround has been less than normal this year (i.e. only three issues, not five). But there were good points within my results. Something like 85% of my results were between 5-7. OK, not many people think the zine is outstanding but correspondingly not many thought it was totally crap. On the preference matrix a slight improvement could result in me beating around half the zines on it which would lead to a significant increase in my placing. Am I going to dropout out of the hobby and go crying home to Mummy? No!!! Am I going to strive to improve my position and claw my way up the results? YES!!!

On the whole Polls are positive rather than negative. Even with a poor result (such as mine) you could find good things. But when all is said and done crap zines deserve to be treated as such. Would you ban the newspapers reporting that Seattle finished 2-14 last season and were totally dreadful in all aspects of the game? I think not...

As to the method of the Poll there is only one supreme method. The preference matrix. Kevin's comments are right on, the pref. matrix sorts out problems such as the voters having different opinions on what kind of zine should be awarded a particular vote. Iain Bowen has come up with a nifty little way of ridding the poll of grudge votes as well. Something like all votes not within three S.D.s of the mean being discarded. It was explained to me at the North Yorks HobbyMeet when the results were read out but the exact details are not at hand.

To reiterate what I said above let's credit voters with some intelligence. To suggest that they cannot differentiate between gaming zines, chat zines, service zines, etc, is doing them a great dis-service. They obviously must appreciate different aspects to these zines as otherwise they would not get them. But let us just remember, these voters

make decisions every day of their life, that's right, every day, so let's us credit them with being able to doing something as simple as placing zines in order. Hey, it might not be easy, it might be difficult to separate two zines, but this is not a problem: list them together, give them the same vote!

(STEPHEN GLASGOW) I like the various polls for the same reason I like Zine Register - to see what zines other people like and to see how they like mine. I recently started subbing/trading with four new zines because of ZR reviews. Once I get a few copies, I'll form my own opinion. Since I can't afford to get every zine published, I look at polls for good leads.

(JOHN CARUSO) I disagree with Peter Sullivan. How few errors a GM makes is not 1/2 as important as how the errors are handled. A GM who makes 1 error a year and screws up the correction is worse than a GM who makes 10 errors a year but corrects them properly and consistently.

(JACK MCHUGH): I found Kevin Brown's and Mark Nelson's counter arguments to for the Runestone Poll rather weak. Kevin basically seems to feel that being 61st on a 63 zine list is "inclusive". I've got a better word--insulting. If subbers want to "send a message to the publisher", there is a better way Kevin. It is called a letter. A low vote tells a pubber nothing accept some people don't like him. How does that help?

Kevin mentions in three different places that including everyone doesn't split the hobby. I don't think so Kevin, see Garret Schenck's *Zine Attack* for more on that score.

Markie just agrees a lot with what Phil says but says "that's not a reason for dismissing the Poll." Yeah, right. The Poll does bring out the worst, Crazed One, as you say, since no one should sub to zines they don't like, yet people do get low votes.

Novice Zines:

(W. ANDREW YORK) I think I need to clarify my thought. I do agree that novices should play each other first. That's why one person collects the names and when he has seven, farms the NOVICE game out to a volunteer GM/zine. A person could use the Novice Service up to three times (three novice only games) in, hopefully, three different zines. This would allow the person to become familiar with the game with other newcomers; while, giving his some exposure to the greater hobby through the three zines he would be receiving. I think this way the new blood won't be isolated from the hobby in a "Novice Zine"; but, introduced into the mainstream while allowing some protection by having him play in a novice game only.

{So, who out there wants to volunteer to be the Novice Coordinator?}

(HAL DACE) I have reservations about the idea of novice zines. There is certainly a case for giving novices a gentle introduction to Dipdom, but I think that 'novice-only' zines can be plagued with problems, most of which have already been mentioned in this column. Perhaps if establishment zines who have the space could run a regular 'novice-column', which could provide a service similar to Novice Packs, or provide introductory background to current issues. I think the presence of novice zines tends to stratify the hobby and encourage people to play only at their own level. I think I learnt more from being beaten by

players who were better than I was, and wiping out worse players, than I would have by playing with other novices.

(STVEN CARLBERG) Personally, I think it's better for novices to, as you put it, "jump into the pool and play with the sharks." That's how I did it and it worked out fine. However, if some novices feel they would *prefer* to play with other novices, that's fine, too. But it would be a big mistake for anyone to attempt to *limit* novices to playing in all-novice games.

(JAMES NELSON) A novice zine in principle is a good thing. For one it allows a central point of entry into the hobby. Novices can play games against novices which some may find easier. They can ask silly questions without the risk of being laughed at. They can be provided with all basic hobbynews (not all zines contain such material).

However the fundamental principle is that a novice zine will only work if the right person is in charge. In the UK we have had, are having, a bad experience with Danny Collman, editor of Springboard. His attitude is all wrong and what is worse is that he is dogmatically inflexible and is not prepared to compromise on any issue.

Who makes a good novice supervisor? It is difficult to state what attributes are necessary but it is easier to point to specific people and say "he would be a good person." The most suitable candidate in NA is Cal White. However we then have the problem of someone who already edits a zine and is involved in other projects so Cal is a bad choice. Ideally we need an ex-editor who has been active in the hobby since he folded his zine. An unknown is a gamble. We lost.

(PER WESTLING) A good solution to the novice problem is to have novice games in established zeens. This way the novices get to feel around in that zeen before joining the sharks (as you put it Doug). This has been done in my own zeen and in eg. Dipsomania.

Old Dirty Laundry:

(MARK NELSON) It isn't surprising that topics discussed back in the grand ole days of House Of Lords (agh, sweet memory) are still being discussed today. After all some issues, such as rating systems, have no right answers whilst other issues (Hobby Polls for instance) are always with us. Finally Foolhardy is a talking shop, someone may make a suggestion about a new hobby service and read the discussion but in the end they are unlikely to actually set it up. If I had time I'd produce an index to which subjects were discussed by whom in HoL/Foolhardy. Not too sure if there would be a demand for it (or what the point would be) but it's an excellent excuse to get the zines out of the attic and read them!

Ratings & Scoring Systems:

(MARK NELSON) Topics repeat themselves, such as rating systems because there are no right answers. Don writes that "I one 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.)" On the other hand I am quite happy to see a player with one win and a no-result beating two good, non-win, results. Wins are much rarer in UK tournament games than in the States, hence I am inclined to value them more than a

collection of draws. Why are wins rarer in British games? An interesting question!

I don't rate a 16 center SURVIVAL in front of any DRAW. I'm guided, as ever, by the Kinzett Principle that any WIN is better than any DRAW is better than any SURVIVAL which is better than any ELIMINATION.

(DON DEL GRANDE) I'll consider your system for the next DipCon - we'll declare you the winner, and you pay us a large cash prize. That is what you meant, isn't it?

{Poor Don, so close yet so far away...}

The Future:

(HAL DACE) Looks rosy down here 8-)

{What, are you looking to start a feud or something?}

PDORA/Zine Register:

(MARK NELSON) I couldn't get to sleep last night. Thanx for running that PDO material from Garret.

(JAMES NELSON) Nice to see Garrett and John settle their differences. Hurrah to such people!

(JOHN CARUSO) We have since been informed by Garret Schenck (copy of the letter enclosed) that "ZR is a zine", not a service. Therefore - it should have received a negative rating not a neutral. Zines get a negative rating. Thanks for clearing the whole thing up Garret.

(JACK MCHUGH): I found Garret's whining rather amusing. Because he doesn't like how PDORA is run he expects Doug to immediately change how it works. That's a hoot considering how stubborn Garret is to changing anything, and I mean ANYTHING, in his publications.

Attracting New Blood:

(MARK NELSON) Dick Martin makes some good points about DipCon and running Diplomacy games by hand, but I don't agree with him that the advent of computer games such as Nintendo necessarily means the end of the Diplomacy hobby. It might mean the end of the Diplomacy hobby as we know it, but not the end of the hobby. After all there were people in the 1970's who claimed that the advent of computer moderated PBM would kill interest in postal diplomacy, has it? No.

As the huge interest in Diplomacy over the Internet network shows, there is a demand for Diplomacy. The demand is so great that there are not sufficient GMs to run games, which is one reason for the existence of the Judge Program (another is that the Program is far more efficient than any human GM).

It's difficult to get figures on the number of players playing over internet since there are games which aren't played on any of the on-line Judges. But just considering those on-line Judges there are probably more people playing over internet than in the North American snail mail hobby: If the North American snail mail hobby could tap into that resource then your recruitment problems would be over.

Someone with internet linkage should start posting details of FTF tournaments and games.

I hope to be able to provide you with details on how long the average UK Hobby member remains in the Hobby by next issue. I've worked out the results, I'm just checking them at present. The figures have to be taken with a pinch of salt because from experience we know that the Diplomacy hobby has two types of member: People who drop out and leave very quickly (a few months) and people who stay in for a long time.

From memory I think that the figures show that 50% of the hobby drop out after 26 months. I'll get back to you on this.

{I've often felt that, eventually, the interactive TV market will allow 7 people all over the country to sit down and play a game of Dip together using real time. However, even this doesn't necessarily mean the end of the PBM hobby.}

(DON DEL GRANDE) Whether or not the PBM flyer generates a wave of new blood depends on whether or not its put into the regular Dip boxes. Is the deluxe set that big of a seller?

You don't have to "buy" JUDGE; it's available for free from a Usenet site. Then again, I've never seen it run on anything other than a UNIX machine. JUDGE not only adjudicates the moves, but it automatically E-Mails the results to the players as well.

(STVEN CARLBERG) "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," says David Hood.

I would like to bring up the question of how quickly *would* we really like the Diplomacy hobby to grow? I am not at all happy with the presumption that "bigger" equals "better". A convention that allows me to play three games of Diplomacy with 18 different people is plenty big enough. I don't need or want to be crowded into a hotel with 300 other Dip players. I also think the number of people playing the game by mail these days is sufficient to keep the element of variety in our play of the game even if the hobby never attracted one single additional novice. Just what benefits do these people banging the drum for hobby expansion think are supposed to accrue from a flood of new hobbyists? I'd really like a serious answer to this question.

{If you assume that an influx of new hobby members also results in the creation of enough new zines to handle the growth, what possible harm can it do? If those assumptions are wrong, I'm not sure what lots of new members will do.}

Diplomacy Federation:

(MARK NELSON) David Hood claims that "publicity to the outside world will really only be effective if done under an organizational fabric".

But he offers no justification of this statement that he pulls out of thin air and we have to ask; is this really the case? The answer is no.

Do you require an organization to publicize your local dip tournament in your local media? Do the organizers of DipCon require a national organization to get a mention in The General? Do you need a national organization to send flyers to local Universities and local Gaming clubs? Do you need an organization to have your con publicized at other conventions? No. No. No. NO.

A national organization *might* be able to help organize local publicity, but its existence isn't necessary for that local publicity. A national organization *might* be able to get national publicity, but that's about all.

From reading various dipzines and talking to various American hobby members it seems to me that one of the main problems with DipCon is that there has been a lack of publicity for it in the non diplomacy-press. Is this justification for forming a national organization, or is it justification for asking if it isn't time that thought should be given to running a DipCon that attempts to attract non-hobby members?

For example let's consider CanCon. A convention which is based at a University. Did the organizers of CanCon consider plugging their Con with the local University Dip Soc? Did they consider plugging it at any of the Canadian Universities? Did they consider getting the local Student Union Paper to run an article on the forthcoming convention? We don't know the answers to all these questions, but we know the answer to the first one because when *I* contacted someone at the aforementioned dip society in July 1992 it was the first they had heard about it.

Is this justification for setting up a national organization? No. If the CanCon organizers aren't interested in attracting more people to their con (who knows, their present number of attendees might be stretching them) then that's their decision. If they are interested, then do they need a national organization or do they need to get off their butts and do some work?

I would be interested to learn what a national organization could do to plug DixieCon that David can't (or won't?) do himself.

David points out that there are many people who know about Diplomacy but don't about the diplomacy hobby, could a national organization attract these people to the hobby? The answer is that the existence of a national organization has little relevance to the question.

The best way to attract people into the hobby is to attract them when they first discover the game: that means a flyer in the gamebox. Do we need a national organization to get a flyer in the gamebox? This won't attract those that already have the game, but if your targeting everyone that buys the game (I believe that 5000-6000 copies of Diplomacy are sold a year in North America) do you need to target people who already have the game but don't know about the hobby?

No matter. Many of them will buy the "Gamer's Guide To Diplomacy". Do we need to have a national organization to get publicity about the postal hobby into GGTD? Many of them will read The General. Do we need a national organization to publicize the hobby in The General? Many of them play diplomacy over internet (or compuserve). Do we need a national organization to publicize the hobby over internet or over compuserve? Is there anything which we need a national organisation for?

There's been some talk recently in the UK about setting up some kind of "informal organization". An informal organization that will achieve nothing that can be achieved without its formation except for one thing: increasing the egoboo and egos of those involved in setting it up.

David says that "He also shows his non-gamer bias when he says that nobody will come into the Dip Hobby to win a tournament championship." I'm not too sure what my alleged "non-gamer bias" has to do with anything, perhaps it's only purpose is to divert attention away from the distinct lack of arguments showing a need for a national

organization coming from Chapel Hill? Who knows. Something that I do know is that David is misrepresenting what I was commenting upon.

Now non hobby members may well attend a local dip convention in order to win the tournament. I don't, I have never, I will never, disagree with this statement. However I don't believe that non hobby members will flock to a local convention because that Tournament is part of some greater Tournament Ranking System (something along the lines of Don Del Grande's system, or the Australian system for example).

Has anyone joined the hobby because of the existence of Don Del Grande's International Rating System?

I believe that the existence of a North American Team Tournament will have very little, if any, effect on the recruitment of new members into the North American Hobby.

Doug's comments about the lack of outside promotion of Dip are good. Doug asks: "Could a Federation of some kind handle this kind of publicity?" Why not ask: "Could this be done now without the formation of a Federation?" Does it require a Federation to get publicity for a con in local papers, or does it require a committee member to do some work?

(JAMES NELSON) A Diplomacy Federation. Yeehh! And rules and a constitution. Yeehh! And we can get David Hood to draw them up. Yeehh! And we can all get legalistic and (knowing the bad reputation of NAs in this matter) start threatening legal action for acts in breach of the constitution. Can you imagine what would have happened during the Great Feud if there had a hobby organization with a written constitution? I perish the thought. And what is wrong with the current American hobby structure? What is wrong with an informal organization? It seems to have worked with DipCon and the new Deluxe Diplomacy set. Why change something when it is not broken?

(DAVID HOOD) Would this really be all that much work? Here's what I envision:

(a) Responsibility for keeping a current listing of all Dip events that agree to send results for tabulation by the Federation, to use for statistics as well as to build up a central mailing list for future publicity needs.

(b) Send press releases to national and regional media regarding upcoming cons, con champs, and any other "hooks" that could result in a story.

(c) Offer assistance to con hosts in publicizing their events, both by direct mail to known Dippers and by ads in gaming publications, etc.

(d) Be responsible for contacting all gaming tournaments in North America to offer to run a Dip event, and enlist a Dip hobbyist to put it on. There is no reason to have a Con without a Dip tournament.

(e) Be available as a contact person for the media or other interested parties, as well as Avalon Hill.

There may be a great many other things that can be done, but I'm not talking about taking over or duplicating existing services. The big reason for this is to show an organized facade to the outside world.

Oh, one thing I forgot. The Federation could do the North American Team Tournament idea I posed last time, as well as do postal ratings.

(JACK MCHUGH): David says in *Foolhardy* #3, after his comments on setting up a new Dip Federation "Comments, anyone?" Taking David at his word, I made some comments. David begins his reply to my

comments in *Foolhardy* #5 by saying "Shut up, Jack! Seriously, McJack is way off base here."

Tell me David, is this how the democratic process will work in this new federation? People will be asked to comment but in reality you'll want toadying? Oh, I see, you really didn't mean "Comments anyone?" You meant "I want my adoring fans/toadies to send in comments agreeing with my brilliant ideas. Dissenters need not bother, in fact, just shut up if you dare disagree with me."

Seriously David, just what scoring system are you using for this "federation" of yours? Was it subject to public discussion and decision or is this more federation democracy at work?

Actually I'd like to see a federation become a body less consider with scoring systems, which David seems to go bonkers over, and more to the point try and provide a forum for all who play the game, by whatever medium they choose. I know we have Dip World, but I want a place for FTF gamers, PBEM gamers, INTERNET gamers who are different from other PBEM gamers since they don't pay for PBEM access like the rest do, PBM players, International players, etc., etc..

Doug asks rhetorically last issue, "a Federation couldn't **hurt**, could it" in gaining publicity? Yes it could Doug, just like a poorly run con could hurt Diplomacy. A poorly run Federation is worse than no federation at all.

The Age of Laser Printers:

(HAL DACE) IMHO, editors should produce a zine with whatever medium they are most comfortable, and have available. I'm certainly not going to stop using Ventura because it's noble or more fannish or whatever. My production time is limited so I prefer to use what time I have available in writing than laying out -I like using DTP and it looks a damn side better than my handwriting. I disagree with Mark Nelson if he is trying to associate the technology used in producing the zine with its quality. It's true that most DTP zines won't be equal to the 'great' zines of yesteryear, but I think this has more to do with the nature of the hobby than who uses what printer.

(STEPHEN GLASGOW) To Kevin Brown: I put in plenty of work and creative effort doing my zine on the pc. As Cal White does, I have fun using software that otherwise I have little use for. I didn't invest big money for my zine, it's equipment I needed for my career as a consultant. It's great that my hobby interests coincide with my work. The best part about using a pc is that I can compose some pages ahead of deadline, but easily make changes at publishing time.

Zine Register:

(JACK MCHUGH) Garret is quite understandably upset by what he sees are Mark Nelson's mistakes. Although I sympathized with Garret at the beginning of his letter I soon tired of his victim mentality. The constant whining saps my patience for Garret's argument.

Garret attempts to portray himself as the victim of some type of a "conspiracy" (highlights in the original.) Of course, using typical Schenck tactics, we don't get an out and out accusation rather we get his usual insinuation. Garret brings it up and then dismisses this possibility, after having planted the seed in your mind, by noting that he doesn't

believe it. Well, then why bring it up at all?

In fact Garret is so upset he expects Doug (I am the one who does most the editing in YZOZ, despite Garret's attempt to belittle my contributions --- if you have any complaints about the content of YZOZ, Garret or anyone else, you really should talk to me) to suppress Mark's comments and insinuates that because he printed the information Mark gave him he is endorsing it. In fact, Garret even goes so far as to hold Doug responsible for what Bruce McIntyre prints in his zine *Excelsior*. Wow, guess Doug really is in charge of the hobby, eh?

I find it rather amusing that Garret whines about how nobody contacted him, but he continues to talk about me and around me rather than to me. Apparently Garret considers me some sort of appendage to Doug; how flattering. Gee, wonder why I don't like Garret, kids? I only mention Garret in my subzine when he does something noteworthy, like come out with an issue of *Zine Register*. (Of course, if I don't mention Garret's "service" then I'd be accused of ignoring him!)

For the record, I think for myself and, as I have stated on numerous occasions *ad nauseam*, Doug has made no attempt to control over what I write. That isn't to say I wouldn't listen to him, I would, but he has never attempted to control what I write about anyone, including himself. The only time Doug makes any comments is to the size (i.e. number of pages) of my writing and, considering he bears all the cost of the various zines/subzines we do together, completely understandable.

Finally, I also find all this rather strange for a man who said that "there is a special place in hobby Hell" for me because I didn't participate in Garret's celebrity roast of myself in *Upstart*. I poke a little fun at Garret and he's all bent out of shape. Lighten up, Garret.

(MARK NELSON) The only problem you have with running Garret's letter in both YZOZ *and* Foolhardy is that I *expect* you to run my reply in both zines.

First of all I would like to apologize and admit that I made a mistake. Yes, I made a mistake when I claimed that Garret had "cut all overseas trades". As we now know Garret cut all overseas trades but two.

Garret claims that he did not cut *any* overseas trades. All I can say is that with every previous Custodian going back several years I used to mail the publisher of TZR every issue of my zine and they used to send me TZR in return. This is known, in England, as a trade. I no longer receive TZR in return for my zine. This is known, in England, as having your trade cut. Maybe fanzine terminology is different where Garret comes from, I know not.

I am not alone, I know that Iain Bowen did not receive an issue of TZR and believed that his trade was cut. There are others as well, Tom Nash traded TZR with several overseas pubbers. Did Garret not wonder why these former trades had not continue sending him their zines? Did he make an attempt to continue with Tom's trades? Was he at all interested in covering this part of the hobby in his version of TZR?

For my part the reason why I didn't send Garret any of my zines was because I never received #18 of TZR. I can't speak for anyone else, although I suspect the reason why other editors didn't trade with Garret was because they never received their copies of #18. I assumed that I would get sent the next issue of TZR, that Tom would pass my name and address onto the next Custodian. Even if didn't (his drop from active fanac was hardly smooth) I assumed that the new editor of TZR would have the courtesy and common sense to send out ZR Info Sheets to

pubbers listed in the previous issue: I hadn't assumed that someone like Garret would become the new pubber.

Finally I suggested to Garret that I would like to trade with TZR. What was his response? There was no response. Was the response of a custodian who claims that "I have never turned away any foreign trades"?

Garret claims that "it's not the proper role of ZR to focus attention on foreign zines (there are, for instance British and German "ZRs" and those are listed in ZR, thanks to Pete Gaughan)". Obviously Garret and myself have differing opinions on how what TZR is used for, Garret believes that it's main point is to push forward his own zine. Garret doesn't want to help that section of the American Hobby that *is* interested in finding out about overseas zines.

Garret points out that several zines, including some international ones, have printed his adds for ZR #20. Indeed this is the case. This is a good point. So good that no one could argue with it. Zines have, in fact, printed adds for TZR from issue #20...

What issue was that again? I think I missed the number.

Issue *20*. And what, pray tell, was the first issue of TZR that Garret produced? Was it issue 20? No. Was it, in fact, issue 19? Did any zines, I wonder, carry adds for issue 19? Where are the overseas zines that carried adds for TZR #19? Why does Garret not trot out their names? Why this attention on #20, the *second* issue that Garret pubbed? Has he forgotten the first issue, #19? Surely it can't have been that long ago?

Garret goes on, and on, about the fact that *since* issue 20 overseas subs have been allowed. I know they have, Garret showed no interest in trading so I had to sub. But what happened with issue 19?

We only have Iain Bowen's word for what happened, but I believe it is easily checked. Iain tells me that when his trade for TZR was cut he sent an ISE order via Pete Gaughan (I assume). Iain tells me that Pete Gaughan told Iain (...) that Garret had refused this subscription. All we need do is to ask Pete Gaughan to confirm this. If he backs up Garret's story that no ISE order was sent from Iain then I will apologize for some of my comments. If he backs up Iain's story that he tried to sub to TZR but his order was cast aside... what then I wonder from Garret?

Garret's only response to this is to question my honesty, as if I would make up what other hobby members say. Telling lies to hobby members, and telling lies about hobby members may be something that Garret is familiar with; but that tells us far more about Garret and his approach to the hobby then it does about me. I have only reported what Iain told me.

Garret questions my honesty? I will accept an apology.

Garret states I have never written him. I have written twice to Garret. His first response to me was, and I quote his entire letter, "fuck you asshole". Does this sound to you like a person who is interested in discussing what has happened, someone who is interested in finding some common ground and sorting out problems? Or does it sound like someone who will tolerate no dissent to the official party line?

Garret claims that there was "a general lack of communication". Yes, on Garret's part. I tried to engage in a private discussion with him to find out what was really happening. All I got were personal insults, suggestions about my personal honesty and silence. If there is one person in this affair who has not been interested in communication it has been Garret.

Garret complains that his views were misrepresented, that he should have been contacted before you published comments about him to confirm

their truth. I do not notice such calm and rational behavior in any of the three issues of TZR that Garret published. Why can't Garret undertake in TZR what he expects other publishers to undertake about himself? I don't know. Is there a reason for this duplicity in policy? I don't know. Is there a reason why Garret has remained uncommunicative? I don't know. Is there a reason why Garret has used his position as ZR custodian to attack his enemies? I don't know. Is there a reason why Garret has used TZR to push forward his own zine? I don't know. Does Garret have any idea what the word "ethics" means? I don't know.

(ADRIAN APPLEYARD) From a disinterested, outside, non-biased, and most probably ignorant, point of view, it looks like Garret is getting the "rough end of the pineapple" from most quarters.

(STEPHEN GLASGOW) As I said before, I like Zine Register, I think Garret did a good job. I also agree with Jack McHugh's comments about what constitutes a good review.

(JOHN CARUSO) Garret Schenck's trade policy isn't as liberal as he'd lead you all to believe. I sent him a copy of PDOZD upon request and asked to set up a trade. He told me thanks (sucker) for the ZD - no trade and I'd have to buy the ZR if I wanted it from him - or failing that, to use a type of "Iran-Contra backchannel to get a copy" of ZR. Hmm! Isn't that what he denied he did to Mark Nelson?

(JACK MCHUGH): Garret made it quite clear, as I recall, that when he took over the ZR he would not be covering overseas zines as Tom Nash had. Nash's not handing over the subber list provided a useful excuse to cut all overseas trades. While I believe that one could make an argument that it is too expensive to trade with overseas subbers, I don't think Garret made any argument at all. He just cut them off without any argument at all.

I also recall Iain Bowen telling me at DixieCon in 1992 that he got the impression from Pete Gaughan that Garret didn't want to trade or even have any subbers overseas. I also got that impression as this was just before Garret's second ZR came out and Garret barely mentioned the overseas hobby in his first ZR and that was grudgingly at that, especially compared to his attentions to the United and Railway sub-hobbies.

I don't know why Garret simply doesn't say he doesn't like trading with people overseas since he has correctly pointed out that the UK subbers do have their version of ZR, *Mission From God*. For some reason Garret wants to cut down the ZR's contact with the overseas hobby but not acknowledge it publicly.

By the way Doug, I think that the letters from Pete Sullivan, James Nelson, John Caruso, David Hood, Cal White and Garret Schenck in *Foolhardy #4* prove that this is anti-McHugh zine if it is anti-anyone. Therefore I think if I can take the heat then Garret should stop whining about his treatment in this zine. After all I don't recall a category called Garret Schenck where he got trashed!

New Diplomacy Flyer/Gamer's Guide:

(REX MARTIN) I have enclosed a copy of our recently-printed flyer announcing the new edition of the game and, on the reverse, some of the other multi-player games. Thought you might be interested. Now that

"Deluxe" Diplomacy is done, my next chore with regard to it is to put together the new "Gamer's Guide", a 60-page issue to be released this summer and intended to supplant the old, aged Guide (most of which was incorporated into the new rulebook). I hope to have articles both about the play of the game, and about the vast hobby that has grown up around it. As mentioned above, Cal White - along with the likes of Gary Behnen and David Hood - is helping me obtain material. Let this also serve as my invitation to your other readers to submit material for my editorial consideration. Deadline would be the end of May, for I hope to see the thing premiered at AvalonCon in early August.

(ADRIAN APPLEYARD) The local producers of Diplomacy have yet to agree to include a flyer on the PBM hobby. Out of interests sake, I'll try to send you a copy of the proposed flyer for Australia designed by my brother, Paul, and others. Once we get it into the game, I expect a large-ish influx of novice and veteran players.

(STEPHEN GLASGOW) I think the game box flyer is the best thing to happen to the postal hobby since I joined (less than a decade ago). Good work, Cal, David, and Gary! I already received a phone call from someone who bought the new edition game, called one of the contacts, called me from a list of pubbers, and subscribed to War Fair!

{I have also had a new subber come to Maniac's Paradise by way of the flyer. That happened a lot faster than I thought it would!}

(DAVID HOOD) I have already received several inquiries from the flyer, which is surprising to me. Also, Avalon Hill has promised to make the flyers available to Con hosts, which is a great idea.

Jack McHugh:

(JOHN CARUSO) Right or wrong, accurate or inaccurate as Jack might be, and in the case of the Gamebox Flyer/Handout Package/Gamer's Guide he missed the whole target, there is no need for Cal White's rude, vulgar response. Jack had to get his info from the few people who'd tell him anything - Cal not being one of them. True, Jack misreported most of what he had. But had the 5 of us (yes - me included) known more or published more - Jack's inaccuracies may not have occurred. But like I say - right or wrong - its as much our fault that Jack misreported as it is Jack's.

I feel Cal owes Jack an apology for the vulgar remarks directed at Jack. Remarks such as Cal's have no place in this hobby.

There would have been plenty of time to discuss the Gamer's Guide had info been made public in July/August instead of January.

My experiences have taught me that people respond favorably to open discussions that include them, and negatively when things are done by a handful of people in a backroom, private, sneakily.

(JACK MCHUGH): I will not answer Cal since I can't do so without making him, me or the both of us look bad. All I will say is that before anyone reacts they should ask themselves if their reaction would be the same if I said what Cal said about me in the last issue.

Orphan Games:

(STVEN CARLBERG) I would like to present the apparently unorthodox viewpoint that many orphan games should simply be left to die.

It is my personal experience that has led me to this conclusion. A few years ago, blessed with plenty of free time and a fresh enthusiasm for Diplomacy, I signed up for a dozen games or so and eagerly anticipated the arrival of the game reports. Quite a few of these turned out to be in zines that folded: Megalomaniac, Diplomacy Downs, Been there, Done That, California Acres, etc.

A couple of years later, with my life in such a timecrunch that I had virtually stopped signing up for games and had actually NMR'ed a couple of times, Eric Ozog took over the Orphan "Service" with lots of fresh enthusiasm - and all my old games, which at this point I would really have preferred not to have to schedule, suddenly started back up in four or five different zines. Nobody asked me if I wanted the games top be revived and nobody asked me whether the newly appointed GM was acceptable to me. I was simply advised that the games had been rehoused, whether I liked it or not, and left with one meager choice: to play or not to play.

In one game, only two of the players from the original venue (one of whom had come on in the first place as a standby) agreed to play in the new zine. The GM called new players for four positions and "continued the game" - actually a different game entirely. Is this dumb, or what?

What I'm suggesting is that the administrator of this presumed "service" would do well to ask at least a couple of questions of the players in a game before rehousing it: (1) Do you want to continue this game? (If owners of less than half the dots on the board care to continue, why bother?) (2) Which of these suggested GMs would be acceptable to you? - and list three or four possibilities.

Getting Into Dip:

(HAL DACE) The scary thing is this: Most of the contributors to this section owned Dip sets at around the time I was being born!

(ADRIAN APPLEYARD) I was reading a "Phantom" comic one day when I was about 13, when I saw an ad for The Missing Tiger - a local PBM company (well, not exactly local, they were based in Tasmania). I joined a game of theirs, and subscribed to their house zine.

Apart from news on the professional PBM companies and on their own games, they ran Diplomacy games. After about a year, I asked about this Diplomacy thing, and was pointed in the direction of Andrew England's Beowulf. From there to Victoriana, The Envoy, and a few others which have since folded, to being Games Editor of Doublethink. Doublethink folded and I started PC to take over its games and openings, issue 10 of which you hold in your hot little hands.

(PER WESTLING) I played my first game ftf at one of the weekly club sessions in the local University Game Club. Then I played games at cons and by e-mail/billboards (BBS). In 1988 I saw the flier in a friends Avalon Hill box - this wasn't my box - informing about Diplomacy World.

This and Gamer's Guide made me interested so I sent a letter to DW (Larry Peery) and the rest is history...Hopefully the new flier and the new Gamer's Guide will attract a lot of new blood. I would wish that somewhere there was a possibility for people outside the North American hobby that do buy AH's box to get info as well. What would the contacts do if they got a letter from abroad?

Foreign Zines:

(PER WESTLING) When I started my zine there were no Swedish zines so it was natural for me to go English and trade with several. As the local hobby started to grow I cut back on my international ones and recently I've gone below 10. I am always trying to contact new and exotic places, eg Italy, Finland (!), Balticum, South Africa, Brazil, Chech (or however this is called). That's one of my hobbies - collecting zeens from as many different countries as possible!

Services We Need/Don't Need:

(PER WESTLING) "Omnibudsman" says Jack. Was that an intentional slip? BTW, "Ombudsman" is one of the few words that has been exported from Swedish to English. Smörgåsbord being another. That's 2 to 2000...

John Caruso's Introductory Package:

(MARK NELSON) I don't think that there's any point listing current PBEM openings in John Caruso's introductory package. Over Internet, at least, these change too rapidly for any such listing to be accurate. A couple of contact email addresses should suffice.

(REX MARTIN) Moving on to the Caruso flyer attached, I think it fine. While there are refinements and improvements I might envision to "jazz it up", it serves well enough to get the information out to those who respond to the postal advert on the back of the rulebook. Hell, if someone is concerned about the appearance of this, what is their reaction going to be when they obtain copies of *some* of the amateur zines put out by our fellow hobbyists. However, if the committee cares to do so, surely they can download the stuff and get somebody with QuarkXPress or one of the other desktop systems to neaten it up and give it a "professional" lustre. Only takes a couple of hours or so if working in b/w with a laser-printer available. But, in my view, it is much more important to insure timely and useful news of the hobby for the newcomers than to dazzle them with our stylish look. Otherwise, they are sure to be disappointed and the whole effort has become self-defeating. From me, a round of applause for John Caruso and his "Introductory Publication". It's a thankless job it seems, and I'm glad someone with the ability has taken on the responsibility. I'll be most interested in seeing the final result. And in meeting some of the new players it will hopefully encourage to join our ranks, at least to try their hands at a game or two. I've already referred a few folk to the regional contacts. I'd love to hear what the total response has been, even after the new game being out but a couple of months.

As for the postal flyer itself, I am still trying to get a few thousand individual sheets printed (trying to get anything onto the busy schedule around here is a nightmare at times). When available, I will send a few hundred out to each of the "Contact" people for them to disseminate as they wish. And myself shove them into all the letters I get about Dip. And send them out to our distributors, and to all the conventions we attend. Indeed, I'd love to see one posted on the bulletin board of every game store on the continent. With a wide-enough spread, how can we expect anything but to lure in every would-be lonely player in two countries?

(BRUCE REIFF) I noticed you didn't list me as the Supernova contact in the last Foolhardy. I've received about 4 requests in the last 6 months and I actually sent them all out - within two weeks! However, I've got a large supply here that I'd gladly send to anyone who will continue to pass them out. How about mentioning this [in Foolhardy] and I'll see who bites. I'll still do it if no one wants to, but I bet we can get a couple of volunteers. {Actually, that was a copy of a page of the introductory package supplied by John Caruso. John, are you now listing Bruce in there?}

Deluxe Diplomacy:

(W. ANDREW YORK) Haven't seen it, bought it, or whatever. It isn't on any of the shelves in the local stores, though that isn't surprising considering the local gaming establishments. I've seen the pbm flyer (in NF) and liked that quite a bit. Most likely, I'll just order the rulebook in the next month and pick up a copy of the game at Origins next summer.

(MARK NELSON) I haven't seen Deluxe diplomacy but there have been several very bad reviews distributed over the network: it's too expensive and there's nothing new in it worth having!

(DON DEL GRANDE) I got a free copy of Deluxe Diplomacy for being one of the people listed on the PBM flyer. (I would have bought one anyway). The \$55 price tag is a bit steep, considering that there isn't really *that* much in it that isn't in the regular edition that costs half as much (Sure, we make a big deal about wooden blocks - but does the average gamer, especially one who's used to cardboard counters?)

(REX MARTIN) Moving on, finally, I see that you have heard some "negative" comments about the new edition. Perhaps, when I've more time, I'll share some of the ones I've gotten. (Gamers are a vocal lot, and given to venting their spleen in print). Maybe share some of the many compliments we have also had. Be all that as it may, any such publication is a matter of compromise. There are several things that I wish I'd had a free hand with in the final product. And there are some decisions about the product (such as the preliminary advertising that so annoyed one Randy Cox, or the price mentioned by several) in which the designer and developer simply have no hand. And, of course, there are the many facets (such as the flag stickers, the new mapboard art, etc.) on which I did make the final decision. But, the most lasting judgement of my effort for the gnomes that run the front office is whether the new edition shows a healthy profit (as it should in any business). By that barometer of success, Deluxe Diplomacy is doing fairly well, for the initial lift to our wholesalers was quite hefty. Given the usual mark-up that \$55 represents, AH is pleased thus far. (And maybe I'll get another raise). But I would hope that it is also a "critical" success with the hobby at large (rather than those unwashed masses who have just bought it and are not yet showing up in our postal or tournament games). So, I'll be intrigued to see what your correspondents have to say about it.

(DAVID HOOD) I just wrote a review of this for DW #69. The bottom line is that it is a very good product that is somewhat overpriced.

Inactive Subscribers:

(FRED DAVIS) I have always been very happy to have so-called "inactive subscribers" in my zines, Bushwacker and Diplomag. For one thing, they help to "pay the freight" on the cost of producing the zine. Anyone who just subscribes and takes no active part saves me money, since there are no letters I have to respond to, or special notices I'd have to send out to players whenever there's an adjudication error in a game. For another, my ego is pleased that there are people out there who enjoy reading my deathless prose. I'd be happy to have more constant readers, which would be my term for inactive subscribers. I've had a couple such readers for over 15 years.

I, myself, as my Diplomacy activities run down as I grow older, plan to continue to sub to many hobby zines just for the reading material. Unless one is running only a warehouse zine, I can't understand why any pubber would want to eliminate such readers. They may plug our zine to others by word of mouth or by passing on copies, and, who knows, you may receive an item from them from time to time!

(VINCE LUTTERBIE) Lots of people like to feel involved or test the waters. When my zine was a regular zine (not flyers as it is now), I really didn't care if people were inactive. Occasionally, I'd drop them a note to see if they were still interested in the zine, or even alive. If I didn't get a response, I'd drop them after a while. This was my right as the zine was free. Once or twice, I'd get a letter requesting the zine again - no problem, they were welcome. You never know, one of these people could blossom into a major force in your zine later. They're probably just waiting for something to trip their trigger and get them interested enough to get involved.

(W. ANDREW YORK) Inactive subbers, I don't see a problem with that. In a solely warehouse zine, I can see where that could be a problem. However, in RW I do have some material that is interesting to read whether you play Dip or not (granted some issues have more than others). Thus, I don't have a problem with it and have a couple subbers who don't even want to show on the mailing list - they get it solely to read. There are a number of zines I sub to that I only read and don't play in (though I'm usually on the standby list, if needed).

(HAL DACE) To tell the truth (which I made clear in the new SAPC (out soon)), I am truly pissed off with most of my subbers/players. I lose money on every issue of my zine, since the sub cost is less than the production cost, and I don't need people who aren't interested in contribution. I prefer to give away zines for free in exchange for something of interest (a copy of Foolhardy for example 8-), than to get a few bucks which get sucked into the Xeroxes anyway.

(MARK NELSON) Can you hear the sound of falling trees in a forest when no-one is there? Does it even exist? I don't know. I know that I can hear the sound of deadwood falling from my mailing list as I clear it out.

Since I don't charge a "realistic" price for the zines I produce I see no reason to subsidize the dead wood.

(DON DEL GRANDE) Being an "inactive subscriber" to a number of zines (Rebel, for example), I hope nobody minds. Actually, I don't care

how much people participate in Lemon Curry, especially after my numerous attempts at starting a letter column.

(ADRIAN APPLEYARD) I don't like 'em. But, if they stay in credit, I tolerate them. I'm up to about 40 subbers now, and at around 50 I think I'll trim the fat. This includes non-contributing trades...

(STVEN CARLBERG) "Inactive subscribers"? Hey, if somebody wants to send money for my zine, I'll send the zine. What the heck. Participation in the fun is encouraged but certainly not required. Inactivity is more likely from a publisher trading to get the zine than from somebody paying to get it, though.

(STEPHEN GLASGOW) On one hand, inactive subscribers who continue to send sub fees must like my zine enough to continue. Why reject a potential positive poll vote? On the other hand, if there is no participation over a long period, my zine must not be interesting enough. On the whole, I'd prefer NOT to have uninvolved subscribers (doesn't apply to trades). The stack I fold and mail is tall enough already. I haven't faced this situation, yet.

(PER WESTLING) I find these boring, or rather frustrating. Regardless what one does they never react. The only thing one hears from them is when they (sometimes) renew subscriptions. Fanzees are more or less like APAs - the idea is to interact with others in the letter column (or play games). But as their subscription in part pays for freebies/trades I don't really mind deadwood. One good thing with having many subscribers, and preferably if you're part of a publishing team, is that this gives you the option of offset printing, giving superior quality to xeroxing and lowered cost per issue. But to do this I would have to double the circulation, and the extra time to post those 70 extras isn't worth it...

You Control the Hobby Awards:

(VINCE LUTTERBIE) No insult intended for "Her Highness" but we could probably do without the Melinda Ann Holley Award for Mega Hobby participation. However, some people who do lots of standby work and produce prodigious amounts of press and letters might disagree. I think it might be best to have all people who participate in the Hobby Awards as voters to decide which will be retained and which deleted. This could be done by proposing new awards to the committee and having a ballot published having 2/3 "yes" placing it in next year's awards list. Likewise it would take a 2/3 "no" vote to have one removed once established. Whatta ya think?

(MARK NELSON) The only change I'd make is to eliminate the Melinda Hobby Pointless Award.

(DON DEL GRANDE) If I'm in charge of the Hobby Awards, I have three annual awards: an award for outstanding service, an award for literary effort (limited to a single non-fiction hobby-related article or publication), and an open Hall of Fame (which was started a few years ago, but I can remember only two of the four initial inductees, Calhamer and Boardman).

(STEPHEN GLASGOW) I nominated a few people, but have little to compare them against. What did previous recipients do to merit these awards? Perhaps the nomination forms should indicate the magnitude of contribution required to be a serious contender. Would an Award go unawarded if no candidate was worthy? Or is it always bestowed, even if all nominees are below some standard? How about a new hobby service, one that publishes a short bio of every award recipient and that person's relevant achievements.

For Next Time:

- 1) (From new BNC Vince Lutterbie) How would you improve the BNC position?
- 2) (from Per Westling) How do you define "fannishness", and what do you think of it?
- 3) What is your favorite variant (to play and/or GM), and what is your least favorite? And why? Is there a particular topic, time period, or event you'd like to see a variant based on that has been ignored so far? Is there a particular variant you'd like to see updated or revised?

Next Foolhardy Deadline - May 16, 1993