

BLOOD AND IRON

Number 9/10. October 23, 1972. Blood and Iron is devoted to multi-player "conflict simulations," especially Diplomacy variants. Subscriptions \$8/\$1, sample issue 15¢ from the editor-publisher, Lew Pulsipher, 329 Twin Towers, Albion, Michigan 49224. BI is affiliated with the Michigan Organized Wargamers and its games are guaranteed by that group. This is Orion Press Publication #28.

1972.9h

1937 attacks: All by Germany -- in Aus, 10-3 vs. USA, D; in Rhi, 10-5 vs. FRA, X; in Ger, 7-3 vs. FRA, --.

	Al	Au	Ba	Br	Cz	Fr	Ge	It	Po	Rh	Ro	Ru	US
USA (Campion)									7	2			
FRA (Hendry)	C						3						
BRI (Caton)		2				4	U+7		1	2	2	U	
RUS (Eynon)			C	U+2			U+4						
GER (Birsan)		10	C		C		7		6	5	5		

Bri places U in Russia, Russia places U in Britain and Germany.

Edi Birsan's address is now: c/o Pat Verteramo, RD 5 Box 6 Bridge St. Hopewell Jct., NY 12533.

No press. Deadline for 1938 placements is November 11 at noon.

1972.77h

	Al	Au	Ba	Br	Cz	Fr	Ge	It	Po	Rh	Ro	Ru	US
USA (Darbyshire)									2				
FRA (McHoull)	2				2								
BRI (Lipson)		2			3				3				
RUS (Van De Graaf)			6										
GER (Roseman)		5								7			

The first standby for this game is Barry Eynon.

No press. The deadline for 1935 attacks is November 11 at noon.

@ @ @

This issue will count as two issues for subscription purposes because of its unusual size. This is the first and probably the last BI over 12 pages in length. A number of subscriptions expire with this issue; players' whose subs have expired should resub immediately; those who do not will be dropped, of course. The mailing roster for BI (North America only) follows:

Joe Antosiak, 3637 Arden Ave., Brookfield, Ill. 60513 T
David Ayres, 2214 E 3rd Spokane, Wash. 99202 21
The Avalon Hill Co. 4517 Harford Rd, Baltimore, Md 21214 C
Her Barents, 157 State St. Zeeland MI 49464 T
Edi Birsan, c/o Pat Verteramo RD 5 Box 6 Bridge St. Hopewell Jct NY T
John Boardman, 234 East 19th St Brooklyn NY 11226 T
Paul Bond, PO Box 6477 College Station, TX 77840 T
John Boyer, 117 Garland Dr Carlisle PA 17013 T
Rick Brooks, RR 1 Box 167 Fremont, Ind 46737 17
Walt Buchanan, RR 3 Lebanon, Ind. 46052 T
Martin C Campion, History Dept. KSC Pittsburg, Kansas 66762 9
John Caton, 2704 *I* St. Vancouver, Wash. 98663 10

I have decided to print all comments first and then make my own comments. I have tried to correct spelling errors, and have numbered paragraphs (or renumbered them), but have made no other changes.

Lawrence Wm. Peery, Box 8416, San Diego, Calif. 92192 (this letter is addressed to Fred Winter as well as to me)

1. The following constitutes my response to your comments in Blood and Iron #7 and #8 and the editorial in Carbon 13 #31. I trust you will both publish them; without editing or censorship, in your magazines, or make sure that every person who received a copy of those magazines also receives a copy of them. I say, "I trust", because some people are often unable to take what they dish out in the way of criticism; Boardman refused to print any of my factual rebuttals to his lies and slander in Graustark in the days when I thought it was possible to reason with him; Pete Weber even refused to print my comments in response to his lies (Lies are what others called them, not I; I never saw them) in Smut, even when asked by others to do so; and not least, John Beshara and Chris Schleicher refused to print in Waxir or Atlantis my White Paper. So, there is no guarantee that as a common courtesy you will reprint my comments. If you do not, however, I will, along with some others. That isn't a threat, it's a promise. I am glad you said the things you did because it gives me an excellent excuse to say some things I've wanted to say for along time. It also gives me an excuse to lay aside my role as "Good guy" and "Sacred cow" and let fly with all the muck and mud I can, just as others, such as you two, seem to be doing these days. Apparently my White Paper failed to calm things down and instead things got hotter and the feuds more bitter. So be it. I've never stooped to using profanity in letters but in this case it seems justified. I'm coming down to your level. Here goes.

2. First, I also hope that Von Metzke, with whatever help he can get, will be able to handle the Boardman Numbers. This is a large responsibility and a large job. I hope he can handle it. It is too bad that one of the organizations in Diplomacy could not assume such a function as it seems a natural one for a group. However, I am sure the TDA would object if IDA did and that, perhaps, IDA would if TDA did. So, there you have it, petty childishness that prevents anything from being done.

3. That seems a good place to start with your "The IDA," petty childishness. Rarely, and I've read a lot of stuff, have I seen such a large case of sour grapes as you demonstrated in your comments. I am sure your article will appear in Diplomacy Review, in fact I am writing John Boyer to make sure he does publish it. As for your letter "helping to overcome the long delay before the next issue of DR." is that really what you had in mind? Or were you just trying to raise some muck? Create a little fuss? Get yourself some publicity? It seems so to me. You think there is a long delay to the next DR? What was the delay between Waxir 3 and 4? DR is promised 6 times per year, every two months. In two issues we aren't doing too bad. I think Boyer is doing a hell of a good job. That's for the record.

4. "Where is IDA going?" you asked. I'm going to tell you. It isn't going anywhere right now because people, like you, aren't willing to help it go anywhere. The proposed constitution has sat for weeks because nobody wanted to send it to the members for ratification. That problem is solved because I am going to run it off and send it out at my expense. No noble motives there, I just want it approved so we can have an election so I can get out. Frankly, comments like

yours, few as they are when compared with the many favorable ones I've gotten (Strange, how one rotten apple can ruin the taste of the whole barrel), make me wonder why I've done it, or if anyone appreciates it. Sometimes I think not. The Handbook is stymied because nobody wants to do the work. You see, many of the Council members, like Rod Walker, who wanted to make policy, who had an idea for a Replacement Players Registry, but didn't want to do any work, are sitting on their asses waiting to see who is going to start a project; so they can criticize it. This applies to the membership as well. Have you written any of the committee chairmen or regional secretaries, or any of the officers (who are also committee chairmen and offered to help? Have you volunteered to do anything? Probably not, although I don't know. But, obviously, you are willing to sit back on your ass and criticize. Well, Mr. Pulsipher, if you can do better why didn't you or why don't you run for office? There are two open under the new constitution: President and Editor. With your big head and your big mouth you would be fine for either. Until you do decide to do something, get off my back. I have work to do.

5. So what if the IDA wants to recruit lots of warm bodies? They are better than dead wood. Have we said we represent the Dippydom group at large? I haven't said that and I don't think any other officer has. We haven't claimed to be hosting a "world championship Diplomacy tournament," in which only Americans, for all practical purposes, can play. Typically egocentric. No wonder the French hate us.

6. Who, among the members, have we forgot? You seem to forget that once an organization is loosely formed (very loosely), with title and officers, it is not automatically ready to become a functioning organization. We have to get organized, we have to decide what we want to do, what we can do, what we are able to do, and who is to do it. That takes time, lots of time. This we are doing. We are trying to get a constitution approved so we can begin doing things. We are kicking the ideas for projects around with members and non-members. The Council has gone through four or five issues of its own publications discussing what and how to do things. We can't very well lead the masses until we know what we are doing ourselves. Can we?

7. If the nonmembers are not involved then why, at the Chicago meeting, did 25 or more members have a chance to say what they thought about the major issue being discussed, as well as others? For more than 3 hours we had everyone on the firing line to hear what they had to say about the IDA/PDA relationship. It was a good discussion. Others got the chance to volunteer to help on special task forces; some were drafted if they didn't volunteer. What you do not seem to realize is that this is the first postal group to even attempt to work democratically. That takes double the time because we have to use the mail and we have to find a consensus before we move. So instead of days, it takes months. I wouldn't be surprised if it takes IDA 2 or 3 years to get off the ground properly. I'm not even sure it will, but at least I know we tried. Until such a person as a rich Uncle John comes along to underwrite our phone bills or pay our postage costs we have to work that way. You don't seem to realize that the members of the Council all have great responsibilities in other areas of Diplomacy, gaming, and their personal life. You can't expect them to spend all their time on IDA affairs, especially when they see what happens to those who do spend too much time on them. I've been attacked for doing just that and I know how untrue it is, how do you think the other

Council members feel?

8. Don't you think it is nice to have a group that doesn't spend all its time and energy talking? Frankly, there is enough hot air in Diplomacy, including yours, without the IDA adding to it. We want to work, not spend our time talking and gossiping. John Boyer, the Editor, and Steve Bell, the membership secretary, have done just that: worked, not talked. They are to be commended for it. Would that other Council members had done the same.

9. From your comments you want Diplomacy Review to be a gossip sheet devoted to Diplomacy gossip. Simplified, but that is what you want. Well, I don't happen to agree with you that that is what the magazine should be, although I don't rule out that such a publication would be useful and entertaining. What fun to read all the dirt and rumors that idle minds can dream up. I can't say what Diplomacy Review will become. I don't know, but I think for only having had 2 issues out it's quite a zine, far better than I had hoped.

10. As for other projects: Ask Rod Walker about the Replacement Players Registry, ask Elliot Lipson about the Consultants Program, ask Edi Birsan about the Ombudsman and his duties, ask Walt Buchanan, John Boyer, and Len Lakofka about the Handbook. Those are their jobs and responsibilities (or were) and the credit, and blame, goes to them. If you want to know what goes on in the Council you should read the Council publications, they are available for a stamped, self-addressed envelope. We don't wash our linen in public, as some do.

11. Any member can volunteer to serve on a committee but until we have a constitution any formal committees are merely so much hot air.

12. But, I do agree with you that the members need to be kept informed of what is going on in the committees and when the committee reports are in they will be in the Diplomacy Review. That was one of the first things John Boyer suggested and the Council agreed on. So, maybe Mr. Pulsipher, if you took the time to ask Boyer, or Buchanan, or even me, you might know what is going on and that not all your fears are justified.

13. IDA isn't a Peery dominated group. Frankly, if it were it wouldn't be drifting the way it is. But, I don't intend to dominate the IDA, regardless of what you think. I've bent over backward to avoid any possibility of being a Dictator (what some people think is another matter). So, the thing has drifted. My role as prime mover in the foundation process (read chief clerk and typist) is almost over. Now we need a competent executive who can make things move. That isn't me. We need strong leadership now, if IDA is to work. I don't know who will provide it, I don't know if the ego centric people on the Council will accept it, or if the members are ready for it. But I do know it is needed and will have to be provided if IDA is going to function at all, let alone accomplish anything. Well, Mr. Pulsipher, I'm stepping aside, so I hope you'll run for President, because then I can sit back and criticize you, and won't that be fun? Every idea you have I can shoot down because I didn't think of it.

14. Frankly, as far as I am concerned IDA is being run, for now, for its members and the novices, and then the community at large, not to please John Boardman, or anybody else. If the nonmembers want to use IDA as a publicity media, they should pay for it. Surely if they want our endorsement that bad, they can afford 31 or 32 to join? And if they don't want to be affiliated with us they can't want our publicity very bad. I don't know why your magazines were mentioned (\$10) in the last issue. I would be guessing but I think

is because of space limitations or because they were misplaced. Loyer is a very good worker and I know he wouldn't omit anybody deliberately. So put that bit of paranoia aside.

15. I'm glad you want to know exactly what IDA is doing. So do I! Perhaps you would like to run for editor, as well as President? I'm sure you could do a better job. Perhaps you can become the IDA's own Ann Landers or Dear Abby.

16. Please don't tell me about your problems with your Regional Secretary, Len Lakofka. Your problems are with Len Lakofka, who happens to be your Regional Secretary. I realise you and he have a feud as old as Christianity but don't drag it, or your inability to get along, into IDA matters. You could always come to me, as we said, but you haven't, you know.

17. I think that what you propose for the Diplomacy Review has merit, however. Unfortunately, it would mean one hell of a lot of work and I don't think the current editor is capable of it. Just putting out the magazine, as is, is one hell of a job. What you want requires another major effort and a lot of expense. If you are serious about your proposal why don't you subject it to a vote of the Council? They might agree. Or, you could run for President, or Editor, on a platform to turn the Diplomacy Review into a gossip sheet. Then you would be put in charge (one of the Council policies is to make people do what they propose; it eliminates a lot of work for other people which is caused by people too lazy to do it themselves). We would put you in charge of the type of zine you suggest. Frankly, I think it would be a good idea and if you send such a proposal (as well as a suggestion on how to finance it) I'll be glad to present it to the Council and make sure they hear your idea. Fair enough?

18. Now, for Master Winter's comments. I met Master Winter at the Chicago DIPCON. He told me then that "I think I need a feud with somebody big in Diplomacy to get my name known." I didn't realise then that he had me in mind for his victim.

19. Like a lot of other people Master Winter seems to equate IDA with me. That is unfortunate and it is one of the reasons I am not going to be a candidate for reelection. You seem to suffer from the same problem, Mr. Pulsipher.

20. As for my views on the Winter "editorial." Winter was anti-organizational before he met me, yet apparently he belongs to a fraternity (or at least lives in one) which is a real contradiction. By attacking IDA he wanted publicity since he certainly knows nothing of the real issues involved. By attacking me he wanted a feud. Well, he's got one, at least for one issue. He wrote me and got an immediate response when he wanted to know what all my publications would cost for a subscription. I told him around \$75 (which if you consider that people do order #30, #40, #50 and more in TTT or IDA materials at a time is not unreasonable) which would include about 200 back issues of different magazines, hundreds of pages of stuff. As you mentioned I do put out a lot of zines, last year over 200, and more than 1,0000 pages of materials. So, maybe \$75 isn't such a high price (remember, he asked!), especially when you consider that Buchanan is suggesting a \$10 or \$20 fee as a reasonable gamefee! Apparently, that threw him. I did explain that I was cutting down my work load and didn't want to trade with more zines, I was trading with at least 40 now and didn't need more. He also seems to think I have some obligation as President of IDA to trade my zines with him. Bullshit and horsefeathers, as Mr. Lakofka would say. I have no such obligation. As a footnote, he wrote me, when he got my response, and told me if I wouldn't trade with him he was going to attack me

in an editorial. Well, he did do that.

21. Although Winter's editorial is "primarily on the International Diplomacy Organization," most of it is spent in attacking me. He says we are dangerous because we are trying to do something ~~for~~ to Diplomacy, without saying what. Again, bullshit and horsefeathers.

22. What evidence points to the fact that I am not doing any good for IDA as its president? No evidence, as he well knows. This is more Boardman rumor mongering in the worse way. He should be ashamed (but won't be because anyone so childish as to write such drivel in the first place is incapable of shame!) but probably isn't. I have really never seen anything which got me so mad. Just plain mad. Boardman's nonsense I dismiss as the idle workings of a troubled mind but this was silly. I've never seen a bigger pack of lies with no foundation. He knows nothing about anything yet presumes to tell us all about everything.

23. What does John Boardman's Gming (which, in my limited experience isn't so hot!) or his critical opinions (read radical rantings and ravings!) have to do with his ability to critique my ability as a GM or IDA President? Boardman hasn't had the guts to send me his magazine since issue 249 and he knows that in any court of law he would be found guilty of slander and libel for the things he has said about me. I give them no credence because they are nonsense. I know it and the people who know me know it. As for the others: If they are so silly as to believe such trivia, too bad. He certainly doesn't know whether I pay my debts, which is none of his business anyway. Boardman has acted as John Beshara's mouthpiece so that Beshara's silver tongue could remain lily pure and undefiled. Again, bullshit and horsefeathers. Within days of DIPCON and our mutual pledge to put aside the quarrel (with many, many witnesses), etc. he was busy writing letters attacking me to one and all. Even his so-called "friends" sent me copies of them so I could see his drivel. I pay no more credence to them than to what Boardman says. Neither can be any more objective about me or IDA than they can be about the Vietnamese war or the Arabs and the Jews. Objectivity and rationality are beyond both and if Winter uses Boardman as a reference and authority he is no better.

24. He uses his misinformation to make alot of silly judgements and then goes on to urge people to quit IDA. Well, anybody who can support or understand such logic should quit IDA. I don't know of anybody who has, which says something about his nonsense.

25. His nonsense. That is what it is, nonsense. You got your reaction, Winter, now print it. You got your feud and I'm sure you are going to play it for all it is worth. You may get a few more readers and a little more attention. I hope it is worth it. You'll get no more from me. I don't want to play in your sandbox anymore.

26. Now, back to Pulsipher's comments. I have not been criticized from all sides, as you say. I have discussed openly the criticism I get from Roll. This is more than most GMs would have done. I have taken steps to correct the situation and solve the problems. I have not coped out, as some GMs are doing. In the process I have had dozens, no, scores of letters from my players (not trading partners) supporting my judgement.

27. Your comments on my sub fees are correct. Thank you for that.

28. Thank you, also, for not equalizing me with IDA. I am happy to see Buchanan and Birsan get your praise. They deserve it. I'm willing to take the blame because, as Truman said, "The buck stops here," referring to the desk of the President. The President of any group is responsible for what everyone in the organization does

or does not do. So, I am responsible for what the Council has and hasn't done, for what I have and haven't done, and for what the members have and haven't done. Therefore, I apologize to all who read them for them. No matter how much responsibility I assume I cannot do everything that needs to be done, nor can the Council, nor can the members alone. We have to work together. Something you don't understand.

29. I will say this. I have done the very best I could with what I had to work with. It wasn't perfect but please remember, in justice that nobody, including Bob Johnson another constant critic, would run against me when I asked them to.

30. I have sacrificed much, and asked for nothing in return. I have not complained about the cost to my other activities, to my personal interests. And, after all that, if this is what you think of my attempts, and this is what you have to offer us, Mr. Pulsipher, you can rot in hell until it freezes over. I sincerely hope you do run for President.

31. Finally, as for Blood and Iron #8, I agree that we do not need an official rating system. I have seen none that are satisfactory to me. I tend to agree with Brooks comments in the last Hoosier Archives. Nor am I wild about the Diplomacy "championship" idea.

32. I hope you find the God of Diplomacy you seek to run the IDA who is all knowing and all perfect and who never makes mistakes. It wasn't Beshara, it wasn't Walker, and it isn't me. Maybe you can fill the bill.

33. Now, as for the Johnny Awards.

34. Again, you are good at shooting off your mouth but short on facts. Don't you ever check with the sources or subject before you start hitting that damn typewriter of yours? God, the inability of publishers to assume responsibility for what they print amazes me.

35. Nominations were open to every Diplomacy publisher who wanted to make them. Only about six or eight did. The ballots for voting went to every postal Diplomacy publisher and gamesmaster (I hope). More than 50 got them, more than 25 came back. For the record, Walt Buchanan has all the ballots, tally sheets, etc. Also, for the record, the results were published in the XENOGOGIC given out at Chicago. ((Oop -- this sentence should precede the last)) They are available to anyone who wants to see them.

36. Most of the big name GMS returned their ballots, except Boardman and Schleicher.

37. What was wrong with TTT (Peery) commissioning an artist to do the certificate? Are you mad because you didn't think of it, or because you weren't commissioned? Another round of sour grapes, I think. Unfortunately, as others have told me in mentioning your comments in letters, you appear to dislike every idea you didn't think of. I noticed it in #7 and in #8. You don't seem to like anything. Poor fellow.

38. As for the categories. Of course they weren't perfect. What first effort is. I used as many as I could think of (and others suggested). Sure there were duplications but so what! Obviously, the thing has potential or why did half of all GMS take part? Why did the Council of the IDA agree to take it over? If I was egotripping or empire building why did I give it up?? Why was I afraid at Chicago to mention that I got 3 awards myself? HMMMMMMMM.

39. Hopefully, the thing will be better next year but for a first effort I think it is well. Buchanan and Walker got the most awards.

and they deserved them. So, Mr. Pulsipher, you can take your criticisms and go to hell with them.

40. It wasn't a slapdash effort. It took alot of time and money and letter writing to get the response I did. The results, at Chicago, were good and I think those who were there (and those who weren't) will agree that the awards are a good thing. Sorry you didn't think of it?

41. Finally, one last blast, Mr. Pulsipher, and Mr. Winter too. Both of you had better put up or shut up. Until then, as I said, get off my back, because I'm going to walk right over you on my way out of Diplomacy since that seems to be what you want. No doubt you both can do a better job. If you can't well, I just might die laughing watching you try and I can't think of a better way to go.

Pred Winter, 640 North Henry St, Madison, Wis. 53703.

I'd like to thank Lewis for publishing my editorial without my permission. It, perhaps better than anything that I could have said (SIC) exemplified the disregard that Organizations and their members have for the individual's rights in Diplomacy. Since so many seem to be ignorant that the President of a club is supposed to be representative of the direction of that club and its best leader, I doubt if I could convince you. At any rate, if Perry (SIC) is the best that IDA can offer, I'll have to say no thanks this time. Also, I would like to say without hesitation that as mentioned in CARBON 13 #32, I will cease publishing these "Editorials" of mine simply because I don't have the space to waste on them any more because of the fact that I am now running 12 games. Those who don't agree with me no doubt will have to learn the hard way that first, an organization cannot have power unless the individual members surrender power, and that second it is a tendency (SIC) that once power gets a foothold, it tends to grow and that power corrupts. If that is what you want for Diplomacy, fine, not me. Certainly argument can go on forever, and I neither have the time nor resources to pursue it since no one will win. All I hope to do is to make CARBON 13 one of the best Diplomacy journals around and perhaps in a private capacity make my views known. Oh well, my work calls...

Mark Weidmark, 528 Park Crescent, Pickering, Ontario CANADA.

1. To begin with, for a change, I think I find myself in almost total agreement with you....in most points, which is indeed uncommon, since I was just beginning to hate your guts.

2. Now, to take this step by step, I'd like to comment on your comments on what the average member gets from IDA. To tell the truth, up to this point, he hasn't been getting much but talk. But why? All these projects in IDA have been put forth, but what's being done? Plain and simple, not much. But before we continue to criticize IDA, and in criticizing it, you place the big burden upon the officers, what has the average member done to deserve anything. The general attitude to date has been "I paid my buck and now I want something." The officers paid their buck, and now they're being demanded upon, to give, time and money, to satisfy the average member who is unwilling to share in the tolls. Out of all the members, I was the only one who volunteered to join the membership committee. Recently, our total personal staff increased to three, big deal!

3. So, the members aren't coming and helping. I think now, we are finally facing up to this fact, and are settling down to do the work ourselves. The only problem with this is....even if the few members don't mind doing all the work....what if they do a simple thing like go on a holiday. That whole branch of the IDA falls down. Before you can expect miracles, you've got to pitch in. Since few have, we're just starting to gain speed on our own. Things are starting to get done, but the final results are not yet here.

4. This initial year, is the year of getting organized. You likely don't know it, but council is still voting on procedures for the running of IDA. The reason you don't know it is the time lag in the two months between issues. Just as in any organization and/or gov't.... there is red tape. ((Editor's note. The "...." are not excisions, but punctuation used by Mark)) Eventually, this will be smoothed out, and things will come and go faster, but procedure is just being established this year, and things are resultantly slow. Concerning the content of IDA, here, I'm in total agreement with you. All your ideas are good. But....what you should have done was to go to your regional secretary. If you get no response from him, which you don't know about, since you didn't try....go to the (one of) higher officers, and state your case. Your idea will go from there, to be proposed by your membership secretary to the council, which will vote on the matter, and depending on the outcome of the vote, your suggestion will be carried out. If, you don't get action from the membership secretary, you should complain to the ombudsman, and don't vote for him if he goes up for re-election or other office. For example, if you voted for L. Lakofka last election, and you now can't get action from him, you know, you know you should have voted for me, and you won't vote for him next election. If the officer is completely negligent from his duties, then you can try to get the council to impeach him through a higher officer, or equal for that matter. I'm not sure on the policy for ousting very poor officers, and I don't think that it has been discussed to date, but certainly some provision can be made. In the case of a regional secretary, I think it would be the duty of the members of to (SIC) un-elect an officer, provided they have someone to take over. Repeat, this has not been decided upon, or even talked about, but it will have to be. It's a touchy subject, and what I say on this subject is my own opinion. The reason it hasn't been talked about to date is that there has been no cause to talk about it, but possibly this discussion here will rise (SIC) to more comment and a decision.

5. In reply to your question: "But why limit the 'zine listing to IDA members (and as a digression -- why weren't BLOOD AND IRON and SUPERNOVA listed, even though I sent John Boyer the necessary information before he made his special appeal to publishers)?" The reason for this is simple, though possibly not obvious. The organization is called the Interantional DIPLOMACY Organization (SIC). Until further debate has been made, it is yet undecided what is a variant? You yourself discussed this when you discussed the Johnny Awards. Where do you draw the line as far as variants are concerned, or do you even allow them to be concerned with IDA who's organization had nothing to do with variants. Certainly, were John Boardman a member (just an example), we wouldn't go around commending FREDONIA, because it's a zine which deals with only AH games, which IDA has nothing to do with. I too, am in the same boat, as I sent in an ad for THUNDERBIRD and its games, but it couldn't be included....so you're not alone. Oh, and you might say,...why not include variant.

information? Well, it just so happens there are some people who don't like variants, so you have to ask, does the membership want variant info, and this isn't determined so you can't put it in.

6. Concerning your proposition for disposal of regional secretaries, I think I have outlined some of their duties in previous lines. Basically, I feel that they represent a medium between the members and the high officers. Certainly, you can't expect the President or VP to answer all questions, and literally do everything. Also, they give the council a larger membership, which prevents things that have happened in the past (ie TDA). If you read the copy of MARCUS that I send to you everytime I publish, then you'd know, that I'm planning to establish on my election as Canadian Regional Secretary (Should I win) a sub zine to IDA's DR which will contain matters of local (well, Canadian) interest, that there's no room for in DR...or of little interest to non-Canadian members. Such a publication is not the obligation of the regional secretary....but I feel it will spark greater participation from my fellow region members, and will generally improve the quality of IDA membership. This by the way, will be out of my own pocket, so you aren't missing anything you deserve.

7. Finally, and this is where I'm in disagreement with you and others don't like the way people are complaining about individuals, and somehow connecting them and trying to represent these people as being IDA. What Larry Peery or Len Lakofka do outside of IDA is totally irrelevant to IDA. Complaining about Len's poor gamesmastering (be it poor) is something different from IDA. If you want to complain about Len's poor quality as an IDA officer (be it poor), then complain about that, and don't complain about his GMing and then try to link it with IDA. How Len Lakofka GM's has nothing to do with his other activities in IDA. Besides, may I point out that if you didn't like him, why did you vote him into office? Here, in this point, you seem to be contradicting yourself. You attack Len Lakofka for something irrelevant to IDA, connect it with IDA, and then attack Winter who did the same thing in more detail. I have to assume that your Lakofka comments were something off topic.

8. Anyways, since you read CARBON 13, you will see my attack of Winter's association of Peery with IDA.

9. Concerning the DIPLOMACY WORLD CHAMPIONSHIP TOURNAMENT Larry Peery goes on record as saying that if the variations of the 1971 rulebook are made known, and John Beshara, is relieved from the position as sole arbitrator of dispute, then he would move that the IDA sanction the championship. Here, I, no matter what happens, will not vote in favor of such a sanction! (I have a council vote as Temp. Can. Reg. Sec.). I agree with you here again.... and say that a championship in Diplomacy is impossible. Where one game is the deciding factor as to whether you play any more....idiocy. You can't become world champion by winning two game! Thus, the winner of the two games is not a champion. Further, where does the rest of the world come in? It says world championship, but in the world can an Australian play with a 2½ week deadline? No.... it's not worldwide, nor is it a championship. What is is, is a tournament, the winner of who will be the one of the better players in the tournament. Nobody is going to tell me the winner is the best player in the world, and have me agree with it....so I vote NO!

*

((Mark included a comment concerning new members of committees, apparently as an afterthought which he may not want published.

Edi Birsan, 48-20 39 St., Long Island City, NY 11104.

1. Boardman beat you to the supply center chart concept for Origins. He has already published a complete game listing for 72.7h using the points per year concept only. I think his method is more pleasing to the eye than yours and easier on the GM. Although it requires constant recording of game points. I think we will find that there is such a great variation in points in the 39-40 period as to make the chart useless. But, I guess we'll have to run charts on 30 or so games before we agree on the obvious.
2. So far we have two rating systems in Origins: Arena and B&I. My system was explained back in Arena 3 and is a combination of credits for winning and for points scored. A win with 20 points at the end of the game will earn you 1.20 points. A loss with 20 points at the end of the game will award you 0.20 points. Draws do not divide the 1.00 win point. Players are divided into classes as scores are averaged. I've changed the class structures to reflect multiples of 5. You are only rated into a new class when you have played all the countries one additional time. This way, there will be no advantage given to the player who always takes Russia and he will be forced to stay in one class until his expanded game field allows him to move into the next class. This will also protect the players who get stuck with the USA. The system allows for mixing in all games of Origins but I'll probably split it into the versions to make life easier.
3. The concept of 'World Championship' makes me ill. I don't believe we can refine the concept of achievement in Diplomacy down to a consensus point where such a determination can be made. Instead, we will have, and probably do now, a period of 'Masters' and 'Novices'. Reputations and assessments of skills will grow and fall with constant argumentation over the quality of this or that 'Master'. (most of which is fun -- the debate, that is). The present poll being closed in Arena will back up the fact that the... (I should say will establish the fact)... that the victory criterion for placement in their tourney is not within the majority opinion of the players. In fact their idea of win or draw as the top values (the Win Only Philosophy) is shared by about 17% of the population with an equal number of players holding diametrically opposite values and a good mixing in between. I will not support or join the farce, nor will I advise the IDA to condone such nonsense.
4. As for Winter: he is a professional child in my eyes. Which distorts my vision considerably in his case. Therefore I will cop out and restrain myself like a good little martyr and let everyone else rip him apart.
5. As for your comments on IDA. I like the suggestions you made for the Custom column. It was designed by me to let everyone know how much trouble I was causing and getting into. It was also designed to be the one place where GM's and players can get a glimpse of how things go on around the hobby and the accepted and advised 'customs' and responsibilities and rights of players/GM's. Of course I will list every unique 'case'; that's part of the job. On some of the repetitive problems a small note may be made to clue everyone in.
6. As for the matter of giving the names and dates etc. I must confess that the omission was deliberate. The reason being that I did not wish to hurt the players or the GM's involved by bad publicity. But, I'll change the policy to allow for follow up with other 'zines;

although I will refrain from naming players involved in cases where games in progress will be unduly affected by the public announcement of the players involved in a dispute. In a recent case one player managed to gain a decision by which another player has lost 2 builds. Now, if I were to reveal that person, the game may be altered decisively. I do not wish to become the 8th player in a game which I cannot win; nor would such an open policy encourage players to use the office of the Ombudsman to their benefit, so in those cases I will hold off.

7. (Just to counter some bad mouthing of Peery on the money question after I took over DI I received \$5 from Larry to cover additional costs which I estimated at 51¢ an issue from him. He has also stated that he will add to the original five as I 'bill him'.)

*

Walt Buchanan, RR 3, Lebanon, Ind. 46052.

Couldn't help but noticing your comments re IDA in your pubs. The problem is finding people with the time to get things done. You are a member. Besides criticizing, are you willing to take on a job? The Handbook Project could certainly use your help and would be a boon to the hobby. Also there is an election coming up. Why not run for office? IDA is what we themembers make it. That's where its real difference with TDA lies.

*

Lew here. All of the above except the last letter were submitted specifically for publication, although Birsan and Weidmark gave me the option to cut parts out. All but the last were received on the same day. And all have been typed with a bad batch of correction fluid. My comments (typed the next day, actually) follow:

This is being done at home during a short fall break. I do not have DR 2 with me. I see that I left many misspellings above, but that's the breaks.

My letter is a result of an inquiry to Peery, believe it or not. I did indeed go to an officer before writing the letter. I wrote as follows: "I'm wondering if there will be any forum for members of IDA to speak out. So far, it seems that participation, except through committees, is not only not encouraged but is impossible." This was written before I found that people could not even get onto committees (Massar). Peery replied (in full):

Any IDA member may speak through his Regional Secretary if he wishes something brought to the Council, or directly to one of the officers, or, he is welcome to write a letter on the subject for the next DR. Certainly we want all the members to make their views known.

You might wish to suggest something on this to be included in the Constitution when it goes to the members for their comments.

And so I wrote the letter. I have made no proposal to the Council because it seems to be unnecessary. In large part John Boyer determines the content of DR; if any individual should, he is the one, since he does more work than any other officer (except perhaps the President). My suggestion does not involve a massive change, Mr. Peery. Rather, I suggested a change in priorities from articles to information (and opinion, such as your White Paper, which was far longer than it needed to be -- I do not suggest that we let people run off at the mouth for two pages saying what could be said in 2/3 of a page, if not less). This does not require a new 'zine,

just a decision by the Editor, who is certainly capable of accomplishing the new objective, even if you don't think so. Boyer has done a fine job, which is no more than what I expected, even though you didn't; I simply think he is doing the wrong job.

Before I continue, let me note that I will, if I can find time, write a follow-up to my original letter and submit it to John, asking him to print it as well as the first, or to withdraw the first. Obviously, relatively incidental points have been jumped on by some while my primary point has been ignored.

My contention that IDA is nothing more to its members than DR has been taken as a criticism of the officers. It is meant to be a statement of fact, nothing more, and I note that not even Mr. Peery denies that it is true. I am not particularly concerned that IDA had done very little outside DR. In fact, I wouldn't care if IDA never becomes more than DR, so long as DR itself is worthwhile. When IDA was first being formed I asked, in a letter in Costaguana, what a Diplomacy organization could do that could not just as well or better be done by individuals, and no one seemed to know. About the only thing I can see is that an organization can facilitate the dissemination of information. Especially now that Erewhon seems to be gone, there is no organ in Dippydom for the thorough dissemination of information, and even if there were, it probably could not quickly attain a large circulation: people seem more willing to join an organization than to sub to a 'zine. But as for sanctioning a ratings system, or a world championship tournament, or some such regulatory role like this, an organization is usually useless: too many people prefer to avoid regulation in Diplomacy, and I, at least, agree with them. An organization may be used to legitimize the efforts of an individual, such as PDC's support for Rod Walker and myself in finding homes for orphan games, but this support is not necessary so long as enough individuals agree to accept the individual's actions. Thus Von Metzke intends to find homes for orphans without PDC support, and I may soon do the same with orphan variants, since PDC seems to be dead. Possibly it will become traditional that the person who assigns game numbers will be responsible for orphans. Or possibly some other organization will undertake support of these projects. An organization is not needed, however. I have enough respect for the average Diplomacy player and gamesmaster to believe that we can accomplish whatever we wish by mutual consent, without needing an organization. Or if we do need an organization, it will be for dissemination of information so that we can discuss projects more easily.

But that has little to do with my main point, which concerns DR. Not only will the members of IDA benefit from as much information as they can get, they will also be more likely to participate in IDA if they can find out what is going on. Buchanan, Peery, and Weidmark all point out that the members are not participating; but what about Massar, who wanted to participate but was not allowed to for some reason which is still not generally known? What about the people who joined recently, and so far as we know, have only receive DR 2? They hardly know that the Handbook and Replacement Players Registry projects exist, if they know at all, and they certainly have no one to write to for information except their RS. So if they have enough interest to ask about what's happening, even without the stimulation they might have been given by more information in DR, they still have to waste their time and the officers'

time asking about things that should be covered in DR. What is a 'zine but a method of mass communication? So use it! Save the officers some work -- let them submit one statement to DR instead of writing the same things over and over in letters. Let's avoid forcing new members to spend 4 months just finding out what's going on.

Peery mentions the "masses". IDA is already split into "office and "masses" I am of the masses and intend to remain so. I hope that we can eliminate this split, but in order to do so, the officers have to give the masses a chance to participate. Peery says the officers have to decide where we're going before they lead the masses. NO! Let the masses participate in the discussion. Isn't it possible that a member, who does not want to become an officer, will have something worthwhile to contribute? I don't want to be led by an officer clique any more than you wanted to be led by the TDA Board, Mr. Peery, Mr. Buchanan, and all you others who resisted Beshara. But that's what is coming. We, of the masses, do not even know if we can express an opinion until we ask an officer, and we cannot participate in discussions and decision making when we don't know what's going on! Like it or not, IDA is supposed to be democratic. Are we going to be democratic in the spirit of the word, giving everyone an opportunity to participate, or are we going to follow the usual "democratic" institution, with elected leaders and following, ignorant sheep?

Let me summarize: in my opinion IDA members will be best served by a DR which gives first priority to information, not articles; the organization will also be best served because people who have information will be more likely to become involved, and the officers will be saved a certain amount of work. My doubts about the value of an unlimited-objective, or all-encompassing, Diplomacy organization, and my views concerning the officers and how well they are doing their jobs, are not of themselves the question at hand.

I am not stupid enough to want to be an officer, which is not to say that all officers are stupid. But I know that when no one else will do the work, the officer either must put up or get out. I have no intention of working for a concept I have little faith in. Some may want to be officers because they do have faith, or because they get an egoboost this way, or for some other reason. I am not averse to working -- I am an officer in the Michigan Organized Wargamers, and I have taken the responsibility for assigning variant numbers and finding homes for orphan variants. But I'm not about to ~~spend~~ time and energy on something which I don't value. I'm certainly not going to run for President or Editor in order to change any single facet of IDA. I am not going to run because I know that no one else will do the work of either of those officers, and I'm not willing to "put up". I know I'd have to get out, so why begin in the first place. It is extremely naive to believe that anyone can become an officer and then find other people to work. Anyone who enters an office with such expectations is a burden to the club. Maybe Mr. Peery expected that other people, or at least other officers, would do some work. They have not, apparently, and while this probably isn't Peery's fault, he's stuck with the situation. He seems to be wise enough to see that it's time to get out, since putting up would cost him more, and has cost him more, than he cares to give. But I have little sympathy for him. He could not

have really expected anything else to happen. Peery got his experience in IDA; I just happened to get mine earlier (in DDW if that means anything to any of you).

Now to the letters. Numbers in parentheses indicate paragraphs I am referring to.

I see that I am on page 15 already, so I'll try to keep this short. (1) How could you reply to Weber without seeing what he said? I am one of those who suggested that he should print your letter, but apparently he thought he could find better material for his readers. I am doing my readers a disservice by printing your seven page letter, which should have been closer to three. I made the mistake of not limiting comments, and so I must pay. It is unfortunate that you lack the courtesy to keep your comments at a reasonable length, and to confine them to what I have said instead of covering everything you think I or one of you critics may have said at some time. I do not blame Beshara or Schleicher for not printing your White Paper; I think it was a waste of space. I can't imagine how you think that might have helped to "calm" things. You have not stooped to my level, you have gone far below it.

(3) You seem to be the only one who completely missed what I was trying to say. Two months is a long delay, so far as I'm concerned. A rather simple explanation, but that's the way it is. TDA and Wazir have nothing to do with it. If I had wanted to "raise some muck," I certainly could have done a better job, rest assured.

(4) I am not one of the fans of the Handbook idea. DR can provide much of the information which novices need. Articles on play are available in Hoosier Archives. I think it was more fun to learn to play from scratch, even though I took some hard knocks for lack of PTF experience, than it would have been to read a lot of articles. It was certainly more satisfying. I have already mentioned running for office. But you are the one with the big head and big mouth, Peery. I took a page and a half to give my say; you took seven, and never got around to answering. But please don't run again. If you aren't willing to do the job, there's no sense in running. Maybe the job is more than anyone should be willing to do, and if so, goodbye IDA.

(5,6,7,8,9) I don't think you've understood what I said at all. perhaps you should reread it. I do not accept the assertion that IDA can or will take 2 or 3 years to become well-organized and functioning because of its nature. If it takes more than a year (and even that is a long time), it is because some officers have not done the job they were elected to do, and instead of resigning, just served as dead weight. MOW is just a year old from the time the group was first organized, yet we have completed our organization, have instituted a number of activities, and have provided a system for picking up orphan MOW games without cost or delay to the players. Yet we are not unlike IDA. We are smaller (40 members), and we can meet PTF occasionally, but we never get any business done when we do, strangely enough. And we do not have elections. But elections are long past in IDA as well. I guess this is just a matter of opinion, you think it should take 2 or 3 years, while I think it should take less than 1.

(10) This information should all have been in DR 2. Now do you begin to see what I mean? Ditto (11,12)

(13) Huh? I made no statement concerning Peery and IDA, domination or otherwise. My quarrel with you lies in what you do outside IDA. I do not know what you do in IDA, and I have not

criticized your actions as IDA President. Do not use me as a symbol for all your critics, please. I have given you the chance to blast anyone you've ever agreed with this time, but next time, if there is one, stick to what I have said. Also, I am limiting you to 1½ pages, or 6 if you print them yourself and send me 60 copies. Other people are limited to one page. I want to end this discussion and get back to the games.

(13) still. What else can the members do but follow the leader. They're too ignorant to do anything else. "Every idea you have I can shoot down because I didn't think of it." How exemplary!

(14) So it's IDA for the IDA, even when this means limiting the information given to the members? And frankly, I think the 'zine listing was much more important than a number of the articles in the issue. I also thought that John said he'd listed all that he'd received. Oh, well. When John replies to my letter, I expect I'll find out why. That's why I asked.

(16) Either you are speaking from complete ignorance, or you are a great liar. Lakofka and I certainly don't love each other, but neither are we feuding. Until this summer we corresponded fairly regularly (I have been acquainted with him for almost four years). I believe he once nominated me for IFW Vice President, though I am not sure -- pretty strange thing for a feuder to do, no? And of course, I did write to you, didn't I? But as I have pointed out, my real business is with Boyer, not with the Council.

(17) I have covered. I do not see where you get these ideas? What I proposed is certainly not so far-reaching as you seem to assume. "Gossip sheet" seems to indicate a willful distortion of what I tried to suggest. I am not suggesting that we open DR to every rumor about Peery's life, or Boardman's, or anyone's. I suggest that we include information which is not open to interpretation, and, as far as room allows, that we open DR to short opinion-idea articles from officers and members.

(18-25) Funny, I thought I'd said that Peery and IDA are not the same thing, yet in 19 Peery accuses me of saying that they are, and yet in 28 he thanks me for saying that they aren't. Did you read what I said before you wrote your reply? It looks like I'm going to have to consider sending this to Beshara so that he can get his cracks in if he wishes. Boardman already receives it. Recent issues have been sent to Peery and Winter because I wanted to give them a chance to respond, rather than letting fly one-sidedly. Too bad more people don't work that way. Did Winter send Peery CARBON 13 containing his editorial? I wonder...

(26) The only player opinions I know of, those of the players in DI and that of one player I know who happened to mention your GMing, are all unfavorable. Your critics from all sides include Roll, Buchanan, players in DI, Boardman and Beshara of course, Birsan implicit in his action in the DI case, and me. This includes Buchanan, who at least used to be one of your staunchest supporters. What do you call "all sides"?

(28) YOU are the one who does not seem to understand. I do not blame you for s present state. I don't blame anyone. I do not think the President is responsible for what happens in the organization. There is no need to apologize for that. It is likely that no one (at least, no one in his right mind) could do much better than you have, and for all I know, not much worse. You have been defeated by circumstances. I do not blame you for not accomplishing something as IDA President, but then again, I don't have much sympathy for you: you asked for it.

(33-39) I am aware of all the facts you parade before me. They do not change my mind. The inability of Larry Peery to read what's in front of his face amazes me. I am still of the opinion that it was a slapdash effort. I cannot believe that you spent much time on the Johnny Awards, because you omitted elementary things like definitions, like eliminating the obvious duplication that I mentioned before; I am not of the opinion that the gamesmasters speak for Dippydom, and especially not half of them. I wonder, did you ask some people to make suggestions concerning improved categories, or some better method of distribution than mailing to all GM's? Why not suggest that some organization take care of the entire matter? You would still have had to do most if not all the work, but you might have obtained some help and suggestions that you didn't have. You might have obtained a much wider distribution. True, you might have had to wait a bit. But this would have been better than magnanimously taking the responsibility for speaking in behalf of the postal Diplomacy community. You again missed my point. I do not care that you commissioned the artist, I care that you commissioned him in behalf of the postal Diplomacy community. As a member of the community, I resent God-of-Diplomacy ~~Big-head~~ Larry Peery's actions. It was an insult to try to make Peery project number whatever into an action of the postal community, and a farce. I knew all that you have said, and it does not change my mind. I hope that is perfectly clear.

(41) I'm shaking in my boots. When I first heard of Peery, he seemed to be an asset to the Diplomacy community. ~~Almost~~ since Veritas Vincit, when I first came into contact with Peery, my respect for him has been decreasing. This letter destroys the last vestiges of that self-respect. We have no need for a wounded paranoid child in Dippydom, Larry, ~~and I'm glad~~ to hear that you're leaving. It will probably be best for all of us.

October is Be Kind To Herb Barents Month.

I'd best interject hear that I'm sorry about the typing this issue. I am not used to typing 20 pages in a few days, and the correction fluid I have here at home is almost useless.

Now for Winter. My actions have no reflection on IDA, any more than Peery's. You have an extremely oversimplified and naive view of organizations, it seems to me. It is too bad you did not bother to join IDA to find out what it was doing before you started shooting. I prefer to look at an organization as a member before I say anything about it.

I had second thoughts about publishing your editorial, but decided that by criticizing your position without reprinting the editorial I would be in greater disregard of your "rights" than if I didn't. I don't like one-sided discussions -- they serve no purpose.

Weidmark. (2) I think I have made it clear that IDA's inactivity is not the issue here. How many people could not volunteer for the membership committee because they didn't know, and don't know, that it exists?

(4) Note that while I didn't go to my RS, because I didn't want to waste time, I did write to Peery. But, again, this is a question for the Editor, not the council. Also, I think it might be a good idea to let the members know what's going on. I am beginning to repeat myself, I know, but that seems to be the only

Fred Davis Jr. 5307 Carriage Ct Baltimore, Md 21229 T
 Emmett Darbyshire, 858 #B Walnut St Carpinteria Cal. 93013 14
 Barry Eynon, 1318 So Quad, 600 E Madison, Ann Arbor, MI 48104 9
 John Hendry, 17 Price Rd. Peabody, Mass. 01960 10
 Raymond E Heuer, 102-42 Jamaica Ave. Richmond Hill NY 11418 16
 S K Howard, 494 Pleasant St Apt. 1 Gardner Mass 01440 18
 Richard Hull 4720 Cloyne Apt 2 Oxnard, Calif. 93030 21
 Michael Hyduke, 573 Arthur St. Hazleton PA 18201 Waiting list (5)
 Tom Keller, 317 East 12th St. New Albany Ind 47150 14
 Steve Langs, 7711 So Quad, 600 E Madison, Ann Arbor, MI 48104 12
 Elliot Lipson, HDQS US Army Material Command, ATTN: AMCSA-BC
 (Maj. Elliot S Lipson) Washington DC 20315 18
 Rick Loomis, 8149 E Thomas Rd. Scottsdale, Ariz. 85251 T
 Stephen Marsland, 78 Genesee, Greene NY 13778 9
 Jame Massar, 127 N Emmons St, Dannemora NY 12929 T
 Bob Matthews, RR 1 Ludington, MI 49431 10
 John McCallum PO Box 52, Ralston, Alberta, CANADA T
 Paul McHoull, 28 White Oak Blvd. Toronto 590 Ontario CANADA 22
 John McKeon, 88-00 Shore Front Pkwy, Rockaway NY 11693 12
 Don Miller, 12315 Judson Rd., Wheaton Md 20906 T
 Hal Naus, 1011 Barrett Ave. Chula Vista Calif 92011 T
 Andy Phillips, 128 Oliver St. Daly City Calif 94014 17
 Todd Roseman, 69 H St. Chula Vista Calif 92010 22
 Dean Schwass, RR 1 Ludington, MI 49431 14
 David Sleight, 2547 Ala Wai Blvd Honolulu, Hawaii 96815 15
 Tim Tilson, 200 W 9th Ave. Sault Ste Marie, MI 49783 10
 John Van De Graaf, 37343 Glenbrook, Mt. Clemens, MI 48043 14
 Dick Vedder 1450 N Cherry Ln Tucson, Ariz 85719 T
 Mark Weidmark, 528 Park Crescent, Pickering, Ontario CANADA T
 Paul Wood, 24613 Harmon Ct, St Clair Shores, MI 48080 T
 Stan Wrobel, 7 Poland Village Blvd. Poland, Ohio 44514 T

* * *

New Miller Number:

1972Xt, Middle Earth Diplomacy IV . Tim Tilson (Voice of the North).
Angmar-Herb Barents, Arnor-Barry Eynon, Gondor-Bob Matthews,
Harad-Lewis Pulsipher, Mordor-John Van De Graaf, Rhovanion-Paul
Wood.

@ @ @

way to get the message across.

(5) Variant 'zines are included in the listing -- Thermopolae and Thunderbird (under "un-named") for example. I also know that John is interested in carrying variant information in DR. I am beginning to think that variant fans must go their own way, though, in view of the massive indifference most of the gamesmasters and name players show toward them. Part of this is lack of information.

(7) I was NOT complaining about Lakofka's poor gamesmastering. I pointed out that he would not write me even concerning a matter for which he has accepted a fee, and for which IFW has accepted a fee. If this is true, why should I bother to write about IDA, which should not be as important to Lakofka, as he is merely an elected official? The distinction is clear. I agree that complaining about Lakofka's ability to GM would not be relevant. But that's not what I was doing. By the way, why do you assume that I voted for Lakofka, or that I somehow had some magic ability to make or break him in the election? The events I mentioned did not occur until after the election. Or are you just waxing rhetorical?

NEW VARIANTS

Gline 9-Man Game by Bob Gline. Available for nothing from Grendel Press, PO Box 5742, San Diego, Calif. 92102. This is not really a new variant, but the resurrection of an old one, designed in 1965. Regular rules are used, but the board is changed to include the new Great Powers Persia and the Barbary States, and 11 more centers. Most of the regular board is left as is -- Bul so is eliminated, Corsica and Crete are centers, and there is a canal in southern Russia. The two new countries create a boxlike arrangement with three countries on each outer edge and three in the middle (the Central Powers). Conrad Von Metzke states that the additional countries result in a game in which all countries except one have equal opportunities, and that one is only slightly inferior. There is at least one game open in Costaguana, and possibly two. Six are already signed up for the first. Press will be unlimited, no fees will be charged, and players are to be asked to comment on aspects of playability. There will also be a regular column by the designer accompanying the play of the game.

Southeast Asia '56 by James Massar. Available from James Massar, 127 N Emmons St., Danmora, NY 12929. Regular rules are used with a completely new board. There is a winter season at the start of the game to allow for initial builds in home centers. Seven nations in Southeast Asia have it out in a hypothetical setting in which the great powers decide not to interfere in the area after the French have pulled out. Powers are N Vietnam, S Vietnam, Burma, Malaysia, Philippines, Indonesia, Thailand. There are a total of 38 centers. A game is open in one of James's 'zines; his usual fee schedule is a sub to the 'zine (\$1 per year plus 8¢ per issue), and possibly a refundable \$1 position deposit.

Hyborian Age Diplomacy by Gary Gyges. 15¢ from Lew Pulsipher. The game is loosely based on the period in the Hyborian Age after Robert E. Howard's hero Conan has passed out of the world. There are five players as well as a large number of neutral armed centers. Rule changes include two-space moves for fleets, and double armies which also move two spaces. Powers are Aquilonia, Stygia, Turan, Nemedia, and a Federation of smaller states south of Aquilonia and Nemedia. One game is open in Supernova for the same fee as for a game in Blood and Iron, except sub is 7/¢. Two are signed up.

Nine Power Variant Diplomacy (2nd Edition) by Fred Winter. This second edition is so much changed from the first that I have decided to cover the game again. As before, the new powers are Sweden and Spain. There is also a Swiss army, and a Belgian army which only defends the border between Bel and Ruh. 15 new centers are added. There are some peculiarities in economics, such as a double supply center in Paris. If a player owns Switzerland or Belgium long enough, he may build in it. Units may not be disbanded if a retreat route is available. A convoy is disrupted even by an unsuccessful attack on a convoying fleet. Victory criterion is a majority of units AND no enemy units in the home country. In order to draw, all drawing players (at least 2/3 of all units) must order all their units to hold. If one of the countries which is supposed to participate in the draw refuses, those whose units held go into civil disorder. All such units in neutral countries are removed, as well as all fleets. As before, no player may be completely eliminated. In this edition

the rules make it difficult to obtain a draw with less than all nine players, but at least it is theoretically possible. I have not heard of a better solution for avoiding draws than this, anyway. The printing for the second edition is much better than for the first. Rules are \$4 from winter (address with his letter). Gamers in CARBON 13 is \$6.

o o o

Birsan. Are you saying that approximately 17% of the players think that winning is not the outcome which represents the most skillful play? That's all the TDA tourney does. Given one game rather than a series, what other criterion could be used? I don't see how the win only philosophy comes into play.

I definitely agree that names should not be given when the game could be influenced.

o o o

New openings:

Fellwaidar. Burt Labella, 106 Elm St., Saco, Maine 04072. There are openings in one Youngtown Variant game in this new line, as well as openings for a number of regular games. Fee is \$5. Tom Elter will be GM for some of the regular games. Four week deadlines will be used.

Lane Marinello, 916 Market St. Dabab III, 60115 has openings for all rulebook versions of Origins of WWII, including blind games, secret diplomacy games, etc. for \$1.50 game fee. Unfortunately one cannot be assured of playing the version he wishes -- one can make two choices, but one of these is not assured. I'd guess that these will be computer games, but there is no indication. Marinello also GM's Nuclear Destruction games for 15c a turn.

Lewis Fulsipher
129 Twin Towers
Albion, Michigan 49224

Return requested.



THIRD CLASS

RICHARD HULL
4720 CLOYNE AVE.
OXNARD, CALIF 93030

THIRD CLASS