



BUSHWACKER

VOL. 18, No. 4

(Circulation: 75)

APRIL 1989

This is the 207th consecutive issue of BUSHWACKER, a Postal Diplomacy* zine dedicated to the play and reporting of Variant games, hobby news, and whatever else I feel like writing about. Your Editor is: Fred C. Davis, Jr., 3210-K Wheaton Way, Ellicott City, Md. 21043. Phone: (301) 461-1885. Phone calls accepted between 12 Noon and 9:30 pm, Eastern Time, except between 5:30 and 6:30 p.m., which is our usual dinner hour. We prefer receiving your orders by mail, but please phone promptly if you see an adjudication error.

*Diplomacy is a registered trademark for a game invented by Allan B. Calhamer, and Copyright by the Avalon Hill Game Co. of Baltimore, Md. "Bushwacker" is the name of my comic strip character, created when I was back in the 6th grade, a few hundred years ago. That's his picture on the masthead.

* * * * *

GAME FEES: \$9.00 Flat Fee for newcomers. \$8.00 for current readers. STANDBY FEES: \$5.00 for newcomers. \$4.00 for everyone else. Note that a standby signs up for a specific game of his choice. For your money, you receive copies of the rules/maps for your game(s) and BUSH for the duration of your game, providing you don't drop out. Players and standbys don't have to worry about their subs expiring. Mensa Diplomacy SIG members receive an additional \$1.00 discount on these fees. However, he who NME's twice in a row is out of his game, and BUSH stops coming unless you decide to sign up for another game or subscribe.

SUBSCRIPTIONS for non-players are 12 issues for \$6.00. OVERSEAS SUBS are \$8.00 for 12 issues, by sea mail. SAMPLE copies are 50¢. We also TRADE with many other zines on an all-for-all basis.

This issue contains reports on VACATION DIP III (1985E rm39), CHARACTER DIP (1987AF rm49) and ATLANTICA III (1988AR oa01).

* * * * *

WE HAVE A FEW THINGS of interest in this issue. One is the Ballot for the Runestone Poll, which is separate from the zine for easy use. All instructions on its use, and on the Diplomacy Alliance Against Heart Disease fund raiser, will be found on the forms. Note the Alliance form letter is printed on the back of the ballot, so you can send both directly to Bruce Linsey. Remember that you have to vote for zines in even numbers. In the British Zine Poll, you can use decimals to one place, which makes it easier, since you might feel that one zine should be rated 8.1 and another 8.2. Since we can't do that in the Runestone Poll, it's a good idea to write your votes down in pencil first, in case you want to change any up or down. FYI, the median vote score in the 1988 Poll was about 6.5. As they say in Chicago, "Vote early and often."

Another item is my offering of rules for "Gunboat II" (rb59) for those Gunboat Postal games which specifically bar the use of Press releases for negotiation. My review of the various gunboat games did not uncover any where Press was specifically banned, so I felt we needed this new category for that type of game. Of course, you could then say that all FTF games are "Gunboat II," since there's no negotiation in them! Detailed information has been sent to the various MNC's and Variant Bank Custodians round the globe.

WE ALSO WANT TO SUGGEST SOME VARIANT GAMES for our next game opening. Looks like we will be able to offer a new game soon, so here are some suggestions.

1. Seeing Is Believing (rd21/07), by Eric Brosius. This is a new design. The heart of the rules are these: "2. When reporting the results of a move, the GM never reports the orders submitted, but only the resulting position. Players may disclose their orders to one another, but need not tell the truth.
3. After a Spring or Fall move, the GM lists all dislodged units, but does not list their legal retreat areas.... If the retreat chosen is not legal, the dislodged unit is annihilated..."
"This variant gives players more latitude in negotiations. If a move fails, you may be able to deny making it. If my stab fails, you may not know, and I can try again later."
2. Suicidal Dip (rs42/07), by Michael Hopcroft. This is somewhat like "Giveaway Checkers." You try to lose your SC's. The first player to be eliminated is the winner. Dislodged units must retreat on the board if there is an available space, and players must build new units if the Regular rules require a Build. Voted draws or concessions are not permitted.
This is certainly something different. The complete rules were recently printed in LORD OF HOSTS; therefore, I haven't reprinted them here, but the above description is sufficient for an understanding of the game.
3. Ancient Empires III (ac10/07), by John Lipscomb & Fred Davis. Game starts in 264 B.C., when the First Punic War began. Includes six Mediterranean Powers plus Seleucus (Persia). I recently discovered a flaw in the rules, which could keep the Persians out of the Med., and have corrected this by adding a new rule, to wit:
"13. Any Power owning Syria may build Fleets there, if it is vacant. (The main reason for this is to enable Seleucus to get a F into the Med more easily. Otherwise, she is too isolated from the rest of the board.)"

So, I'd enjoy testing this revised version.

I mention these because I'd rather run a game which has not previously been played in BUSH. However, I'd agree to running another "Character Dip" game if there were a demand for it. Or, for something smaller, I could offer a 5-man game called "Utrecht III" (hc08). This scenario begins in 1739, and parallels the War of the Austrian Succession. There are several Neutral Powers, which are controlled by the placing of Influence Points. However, the game involves quite a bit of paperwork for all parties.

Speaking of five-player games, anyone want to play "Five Italies-The Kathy Byrne Variant" (ug12)? Everybody gets to play Italy! So, Italy can't lose.

I'll keep an Opening List for all of these. Just send me your choices rated in a 1, 2, 3 order, and we'll see if any of them fill. Or, if there's something else you'd like to try, let me know.

I'm not going to offer Gunboat, since everyone else and his brother seems to be offering Gunboat games these days. However, for the record, here are the Rules for...

→ GUNBOAT II (rb59/07)

This title and Catalog No. will be used for those Postal Gunboat games where the players are anonymous and NO press is permitted. Thus, players cannot negotiate via their press. Their only method of indicating interest in an alliance will be by the nature of their moves, such as supporting the unit of another Power into a space.

CHARACTER DIP - 1987AF rev49WINTER 1906ENGLISH AND FRENCH INCREASE THEIR CHARACTERS.

NOTE: A question was raised about the Russian 2F Aegean's attack on Con. The Austrian 1A Con is a Cutter of Support (per Card #15), so the question is shouldn't that have cut the (S) of the Turkish 1F Ankara for the English 3F Bulgaria? If the Turkish (S) were cut, the Russian double-strength F would have taken Con. My answer is "No," because of the Austrian NMR. I realize that this isn't spelled out in the rules. NMR's can affect different characteristics differently. A Double-strength unit would still remain at Double strength in Holding during an NMR, but the act of Cutting Support is an active step, which I do not see as functioning during an NMR.

In reviewing the 20 Characteristic cards, I believe the Cutter is the only one that's affected by an NMR, since the rest, except the Double-strength ones, all require a specific order by the owner to go into effect. I'll have to add something to the Rules to cover this. So, the Fall 1906 reports stands as published.

If all players would identify every unit by its Card No. with every order, as some of you have been doing, it would make it easier for the GM, as then the Character of each unit would immediately be clear.

		<u>Current Strength</u>
ENGLAND (Baty):	Build 7A London, 7F Edi. 6F	13 (+2)
	St. Pete now 8A (per Card #6)	
FRANCE (Acheson):	Build 5A Paris, 4F Marseille.	9 (+2)(Was 1 short)
	Defer third Build. Will remain 1 short.	
AUSTRIA (Suchard):	Remove 3A dislodged from Rome, 9A Vienna.	10 (-3)(Was 1 unit short in 1906)
	2Amp Venice (R) to Trieste.	
RUSSIA (Bargender):	No change	1 (-1)(1 annihilated)
TURKEY (Cheek):	No change	1 (—)

PRESS:

FRANCE to England: Out of long-standing respect for our alliance, the Government of France will refuse our build in Brest.

AUSTRIA to World: Oops!

GM's Note: As some of the players were informed, The Austrian Fall 1906 orders went astray, as they were mailed in the college's internal mail system mailbox, instead of in Uncle Sam's. I heard from Jeff by phone about 3 days after the deadline, but after BUSHWACKER was already in the mail.

WE HAVE TWO DRAW PROPOSALS:

1. An English-French two-way Draw.
2. An Austrian-English-French three-way Draw.

Please vote separately for each Proposal. Everyone is reminded that since this is the second vote, the House Rules provide that anyone who fails to vote will be counted as voting "YES".

Characteristics for the new units will be included in the reports going to their respective builders. DEADLINE for SPRING 1907 orders and VOTES on the Draw proposals will be MONDAY, May 1, 1989, since April 30th is a Sunday. The Telephone deadline is Sunday, April 30th, at 8:00 p.m., not 9:00 p.m., Eastern Time.

* * * * *

ATLANTICA III - 1988AR ca01

JULY 1870

CONFEDERATES RETURN TO BATTLE LINE. GERMANY STABS FRANCE. BRITISH AND CANADIAN FLEETS BATTLE FOR CONTROL OF NORTH AND MID-ATLANTIC OCEAN. YANKS MARCHING THROUGH DIXIE. ITALIANS MEET MOROCCANS FEZ TO FEZ, MOVE TO PROTECT PIEDMONT.

ENGLAND (Wilson): F Liverpool-Irish Sea. F Norway-North Sea. F Norwegian Sea-Hebrides. F Iceland-North Atlantic. F Gof Cadiz-MAO.
(5)
FRANCE (Galt): F MAO-Azores. F Spain(sc)-Portugal. F Ireland (H). A Picardy-Belgium. A Mars-Burgundy.
(5)
GERMANY (Kilmer): A Kiel-Ruhr. A Munich-Burgundy. A Belgium (S) A Mun-Burgundy.
(7) F Berlin-Baltic Sea. F Sweden (H). F Holland-North Sea. F South Atlantic-Canary Is.
ITALY (Kendter): F Western Med-G of Lions. A Rome board F Tyrr. Sea, A/F Tyrr Sea-Western Med, A disembarks Morocco. A Venice-Piedmont. F Greece-Ionian. A Austria-Yugoslavia.
(6)
CANADA (S. Smith): F Montreal(sc)-G of St. Lawrence. F Halifax-Grand Banks. F Greenland-North Atlantic. F Arctic Ocean (S) F Greenland-NAO.
(6) F Atlantis-MAO. A Ohio (H).
U.S.A. (R. Brown): A Chicago (H). F LA (H). A Wild West-Missouri. A Ky.-Term.
(10) (9 units) A Maryland-Richmond. F Richmond-N.C. F New York-West Atlantic. F's Boston & Philadelphia (S) F N.Y.-West Atlantic.
C.S.A. (Palter): F Bermuda-Charleston. F G of Mexico (S) F Bermuda-Jacksonville.
(3) F Cuba-Caribbean Sea.

My thanks to Robert Cheek for submitting back-up orders for CSA. Dan Palter phoned his orders in after reporting that he'd faxed orders to his office, but it appears that his secretary didn't forward them to me.

PRESS:

PHILADELPHIA: The government of the USA extends congratulations to the fragment of the British Empire to the north, but warns it will not tolerate this unwarranted and belligerent occupation of Ohio by foreign troops.

FRANCE to Germany: Sorry if I'm wrong, but I couldn't take the chance.

DEADLINE for AUGUST 1870 moves will be MONDAY, May 1, 1989, since April 30th falls on a Sunday. Telephone deadline will be on the Sunday night at 8:00 p.m., not 9:00 p.m., Eastern Time.

* * * * *

NOTES AND COMMENTS:

I know that there have been times in the past when an army has been defeated by the jawbone of an ass, but this must be the first time that a country has been brought to its knees by two grapes!

Isn't it interesting that the various States and cities only pass legislation against ownership of assault weapons after some of their kids or police officers are massacred in a hail of lead? One of the swiftest turnabouts occurred in Alexandria, Va. On Monday the mayor mumbled inanities about certain rights. On Tuesday, a drug-crazed addict killed one of his best officers with a semi-automatic in a project shootout. On Wednesday, the mayor called for a ban on such weapons, and asked for permission to immediately evict all drug dealers from the projects. Perhaps if we could arrange one such shootout in a schoolyard in every State, we'd get needed gun legislation. Why do the politicians have to see red blood pouring out of kids before they'll act?

FALL 1916 Revisited. There was a question raised about my interpretation of the legality of the Turkish F Tyrr Sea participating in the dislodgement of a fellow Turkish unit in Gulf of Lyon. However, I explained my reasoning of this to the protester. I am not changing my ruling, but I will consider the situation again if and when I rewrite the Vacation Dip rules.

In my opinion, there is a real need to revise some of the game's rules. One thing I plan to change is that no Event Cards would be issued to those players who no longer possessed either units or Supply Centers. They could remain in the game, in hopes of having another country giving them a new unit, but would not receive any more cards until such new units were created. This opinion is shared by another person involved in this game. The Event Cards definitely give the minor powers too much power. Theoretically, with the play of 6 or 7 Event Cards every year, this game could last forever. That's why a 1920 deadline was established.

Anyway, no one has objected to our playing both Winter 1916 and Spring 1917 together.

		Current Strength	
		SG's	Vac Units
AUSTRIA (Reges):	No room to build. 1 unit short.	1 (—)	2 (-1)
ENGLAND (Chang):	Build A London. (1 annihilated)	10 (—)	1
FRANCE (B.Wilson):	Play Card #76 to create French VA in Persia!	0 (—)	1 (+1)
GERMANY (Young):	Build A Berlin. (1 annihilated)	10 (—)	0
ITALY (Bargender):	No room to build. 1 unit short.	3 (—)	0 (-1)
RUSSIA (Cheek):	No change	0 (—)	1
TURKEY (Kenny):	No change	16 (—)	0

SPRING 1917

TURKS INVEST IN BOHEMIAN LIFESTYLE. GERMANS HIT UKRAINIAN BREADBASKET. ENGLISH TRY FOR PIEDMONT, WESTERN MKD, BUT WIPED OUT IN CALABRIA. RUSS RAISE NEW FLEET. ITALY IN ROME.

AUSTRIA (Reges): VA Silesia (S) GERMAN A Prussia (NSO). VF Portugal-Spain(sc). (1) (2 units)

ENGLAND (Chang): A Brest-Gascony. A London-Brest. F Eng Chan (C) A London-Brest. (10)(11 units) A Iceland-I Liverpool. F Hebrides (C) A Iceland-Ipl. F NRO (S) F MAO. F MAO Frozen (H). F Spain(sc)-Western Med. A Mars-Piedmont. F America (H). VF Calabria-Tyrr /d/, Annihilated. Plays Card #9 to order RUSSIAN VF NAfrica to (S) ENGLISH F Spain(sc)-Western Med.

GERMANY (Young): Plays Event Card #35 to convert F Norwegian Sea to A/F. A/F Norwegian (10)(10 units) Sea-North Sea. A Burgundy-Marseilles. A Munich-Tyrol. A Bohemia (S) A Mun-Tyrol /d/, (Annihilated). A Berlin-Munich. A Warsaw-Ukraine. A Moscow (S) A Warsaw-Ukraine. A Prussia-Warsaw. A Livonia (S) A Pru-Warsaw. A Siberia (S) A Moscow.

FRANCE (B.Wilson): VA Persia-Armenia. (0) (1 unit)

ITALY (Bargender): A Tuscany-Rome. F Naples (S) A Tus-Rome. (3) (2 units)

RUSSIA (Cheek): Plays Card #39 to create new VF in Sardinia. VF NAfrica (S) TURKISH (0) (now 2 units) F Tunis-Western Med. Per English play of Card #9, VF NAF is ordered to (S) ENGLISH F Spain(sc)-Western Med.

TURKEY (Kenny): F Venice-Apulias. F Sicily-Calabria. F's Ionian and Tyrr (S) F Sicily-Calabria. F Tunis-Western Med. F G of Lyon (S) F Tunis-Western Med. (16)(16 units) A Galicia-Bohemia. A Vienna (S) A Gal-Bohemia. A Tyrol (S) A Gal-Boh. A Trieste (S) A Tyrol. A Budapest (S) A Vienna. A Rumania-Galicia. A Ukraine (S) A Rum-Galicia. A Sev (S) A Ukraine. F Black Sea (S) A Sev. A Armenia (S) A Sev. (cont.)

PRESS:

TURKEY to France: Someone pulled a hell of a stunt! I was surprised. How about 1920?

TURKEY to Russia: Only four sea provinces away from St. Pete, and they are the furthest four I've ever seen.

TEHERAN: A hoard of Russian refugees fleeing from the revolutionary anti-German violence in Mother Russia arrived here this season. There were armed by emigre French exporters, and have announced that, in gratitude, they will operate under the Tricolor.

BERLIN: I propose a concession to all survivors in this game, including France and Russia, because Turkey needs Russia and we need Austria and Italy.

ANKARA: Abdul Henri Kisingdad returned to the Porte recently after peace talks in Geneva stalled. When asked what happened, the ace diplomat replied "Vi don't know vat happened. Zum wun zrough ze vench in der gears." ((As long as it wasn't a wench! - F.C.D.))

So, we have a proposal for a Draw including all 7 players. Call that Proposition #1. There's also a proposal for a 5-way Draw including A-E-G-I-T, in short, all countries still owning Supply Centers. Call that Proposition #2. Please vote on both with your next set of orders. Hey, isn't it about time for the Yanks to land and end this war?

DEADLINE for FALL 1917 orders and Votes will be Monday, May 1, 1989. Phone deadline is Sunday, April 30th, at 8:00 p.m. Eastern Time. (Not 9 p.m.)

* * * * *

THE FEUD IS OVER?

Bruce Linsey has sent a letter to most hobby publishers announcing that he will cease responding to any and all attacks on him "until at least the end of 1989." In this way, Bruce hopes that the current feuds will die down, and publishers can get back to the business of running Postal games of Diplomacy and other games, which was the original idea of our hobby. He invites others to join him in this new policy.

Bruce also extends the following invitation to all hobby members: "If you have any questions about anything you hear or read pertaining to me, by all means let me know and I'll be pleased to give you the best answer I can."

Let's hope this works out.

ON A RELATED SUBJECT...

Those of you who read REBEL/HIGH INERTIA will have seen my letter in H.I. in which I attempted to dispassionately explain the legal, traditional and historical backgrounds relating to the transfer of a hobby service from one custodian to another, with emphasis on how this relates to the Miller No. Custodian. This letter was written on Feb. 5, 1989, long before the appearance of Bruce's letter cited above. In the same spirit in which Bruce wrote his letter, I am willing to call a moratorium on further discussion in print on the relative merits of competing MNC's for, say, the next six months, providing that others will do the same. Wouldn't it be nice if all the feuds ended?

(This does not apply to anything which may be in the "pipeline" in certain zines, but only to material to be written on or after April 3, 1989).

* * * * *

Here's another brand-new variant, from Eric Brosius, which could be played in BUSH:

March 17, 1989

Dear Fred,

Here's another variant. It comes from the map of Atlantica you printed (with the hidden province of Atlantis). The simpler a variant is in conception the more I like it; this is pretty simple.

Corner Diplomacy (rb 61/07)

Eric Brosius
41 Hayward St., Milford, MA. 01757

This variant uses the standard map and rules for Diplomacy, with one exception:

1. Where any three areas on the regular map meet, the junction is called a **corner**. Examples of corners are [Iri/Mid/Nat], [Bel/Bur/Pic], and [Aeg/Gre/Ion]. A unit in any area of the regular map may move to any adjacent corner. Thus a fleet in Eas may move to [Aeg/Eas/Ion], [Aeg/Eas/Smy], and [Eas/Smy/Syr] as well as to Ion, Aeg, Smy, or Syr. Corners may be supported or retreated into and out of just like regular areas.
2. Corners can hold either armies or fleets, but armies may not enter sea areas from corners and fleets may enter only corners which border sea areas. Armies may be convoyed into any corner which touches land, but fleets in corners may not convoy. (This is no real restriction; no convoy route uses a corner as an essential link). Corners do not block fleet movement between coastal provinces; F Kie-Hol is still legal despite the presence of [Hel/Hol/Kie].
3. (Provinces with two coasts) The corners adjacent to Bul are [Bul/Gre/Ser], [Bul/Rum/Ser], [Bla/Bul(ec)/Rum], [Bla/Bul(ec)/Con], [Aeg/Bul(sc)/Con], and [Aeg/Bul(sc)/Gre]. The corners adjacent to Stp are [Bar/Nwy/Stp(nc)], [Bot/Fin/Stp(sc)], [Bot/Lvn/Stp(sc)], [Fin/Nwy/Stp], and [Lvn/Mos/Stp]. Those adjacent to Spa are [Gas/Mar/Spa], [Mid/Por/Spa(sc)], [Mid/Por/Spa(nc)], [Gas/Mid/Spa(nc)], [Lyo/Mar/Spa(sc)], [Lyo/Spa(sc)/Wes], and [Mid/Spa(sc)/Wes]. Fleets may move between a coast and corners adjacent to that coast only.
4. Corners are not supply centers.
5. Movement to Switzerland is illegal, but five corners are adjacent to Switzerland: [Bur/Mar/Swi], [Bur/Mun/Swi], [Mun/Swi/Tyo], [Pie/Swi/Tyo], and [Mar/Pie/Swi]. No corners border the board edge.

Comments:

I believe corners will be used only occasionally. They never speed movement between regular areas, and units in corners have fewer movement options than units in regular areas. They do not even lengthen defensive lines. Corners will come into play primarily when more supports are needed to break a stalemate line or units wish to avoid annihilation. They should provide a more fluid game without changing the rules drastically. I suppose I should avoid suggesting "Corner Corner Diplomacy", where the corners have corners, and so forth.

/s/ Eric

VARIANT GAME OPENINGS IN BRITAIN

There is a superb service in Britain called WHITE PAPER, which lists all known postal variant game openings in the U.K. First the games are listed in alphabetical order, and then all zines carrying variants or relating to the subject of variants are also shown alphabetically. The one thing not shown is the deadline frequency of such zines. However, many U.K. zines are on monthly or 5-week deadlines, so it would be at least theoretically possible to participate in some of their games. In addition, some zines are running International games on longer deadlines.

WHITE PAPER is published by Richard Jackson, the UKVB Custodian, 10 Stanshalls Dr., Felton, Bristol BS18 7UW; and Andy Bate, the new UK MNC, 4 Channel Rd., Clevedon BS21 7DR, both in ENGLAND. In addition, the MNC zine TAKE A LOOK (equivalent to our ALPHA & OMEGA), formerly produced by the outgoing MNC, Martin Lewis, will now be incorporated, putting all U.K. variant info in the same place. The combined zine will probably have a new name, but you can use WHITE PAPER if you write for a sample copy.

If you're really hooked on variants, this one is recommended.

* * * * *

THE AVALON HILL GAME BOX FLYER continues to draw a "flood of inquiries" to Larry Peery's P.O. Box, which is given as the central contact point for the Postal hobby. While you would expect the A-H flyer to bring inquiries from other English-speaking countries, Larry was surprised to receive notes from countries as far apart as Austria and Zimbabwe!

I've also received a copy of the new Waddington's flyer which appears in the Dip sets sold in Canada. Bilingual, of course. If anyone needs a French flyer, ask Doug W. Williams for a copy. He, as CDO Chairman, is point man for the Canadian flyer.
Acheson

I remain the point man for Diplomacy inquiries coming from Mensa members. We have 44 active members in the Diplomacy SIG right now. We've had over 150 people brought into the Postal hobby through the SIG over the years. Many have dropped out, but some are now simply in the mainstream and have dropped their SIG memberships.

BUSHWACKER MAILING CODE: (P) = Player or Standby. (T) = Trade. (C) = Complimentary copy. (SUB) = Subscription copy. (S) = Sample copy.

#

BUSHWACKER
c/o Fred C. Davis, Jr.
3210-K Wheaton Way
Ellicott City, Md. 21043
U.S.A.

FIRST CLASS MAIL

Three Selected Topics in Power Politics
from the Viewpoint of a Diplomacy Player
by Allan B. Calhamer
February, 1989

THE SANDWICH

The Strongest Power and the Weakest Powers Allied against the
Intermediate Powers

From time to time in a game of Diplomacy the strongest power and the weakest powers find themselves in alliance against an alliance of intermediate powers. The intermediate powers ally against the strongest power to keep that power from running away with the game.

The weakest powers might be expected to join that alliance, but frequently they do not. This result is due sometimes to a tendency on the part of the intermediate powers to prefer to knock the weak powers out, rather than allying with them; because they do not wish to deal with so many different views in council, because they believe the combined total of pieces would be better coordinated if they were in fewer hands, and because they believe they can still pick up a small, quick profit without jeopardizing the common effort against the dominant threat.

The weak powers in turn have divided motives. They lose if the dominant power wins, but they also lose if they get knocked out by the intermediate powers. In this position they may be willing to run the risk of dealing with the dominant power.

The dominant power, in turn, may find that there is no useful negotiation he can conduct with the middle powers, so he may as well turn to the little powers. The battle is frequently close between the dominant power and the intermediate powers; the alliance may outnumber the big power by a little, but its pieces are seldom so efficiently placed as those of the single power. In this close situation, even a one-unit power might be able to toss in a key support. The big power may as well spend his time soliciting this support. The little power may be willing to give it just to be doing something. I consider this diplomatic effort by the little power to be an important element of good play.

A real life example of this situation might be found in the Near East, where Israel is conceded to be the strongest power, and Jordan and Lebanon the weakest. The remaining Moslem countries in the immediate vicinity formed combinations against Israel of which Jordan was at least a nominal member, and fought several unsuccessful wars against Israel.

At the same time, rumors circulated that members of the combination wanted to divide Jordan among themselves. This situation led me to suspect that Israel and Jordan might ally, or, if that result proved impossible, Israel might just unilaterally guarantee the territorial integrity of Jordan.

As it happens, things did not develop quite that openly. On the occasion of the last Arab-Israeli war, Jordan did not appear to act until a few days had passed and it seemed clear that Israel had won. Then Jordan lobbed a couple of artillery shells across the river into Israel, an act that received banner headline publicity. Some might have thought it curious that Jordan waited until the war was over, and then entered feebly on the losing side. I recall one citizen snorting, "Hussein blew it!"

However, nothing had ever seemed to happen to Jordan as a consequence of this action. Eventually, it occurs to the observer that the shells might have been lobbed into a carefully specified place by pre-arrangement with Israel, so that Jordan could give the impression that it had fought alongside the intermediate powers, without offending Israel, which Jordan might have had to rely on to keep the intermediate powers from carving Jordan up.

Some object that developments in the Near East are determined by ideology rather than policy. However, recently it has been revealed that, during this period, Hussein held three secret meetings with the Israeli Prime Minister, two, if I recall correctly, with Meir and one with Rabin. It seems much more likely that they discussed policy than ideology.

It should be mentioned in this connection that ideology can be manipulated to a degree in the interests of policy. It used to be the case that, in every village in Egypt, there was a single radio, in the center of town, always tuned to the government station. All day, every day, it broadcast government propaganda. As long as it suited Egypt to broadcast the most intense anti-Israeli propaganda, that is what the Egyptians would hear, but once the government had concluded an arrangement with Israel, this propaganda could be greatly muted, and, over a period of time, the whole national impression of Israel could be eased down to a lower level of antagonism.

It should also have been logical for Israel to attempt to develop some similar relationship with Lebanon. As in a game of Diplomacy, we can only guess what arrangements may actually have been made, from what we know of the developments. It appears from events that Lebanon was so divided that it was difficult to deal with the country as a whole. An arrangement with the government might have ended up in practice as an arrangement with the Christian faction only, and in practice Israel seems to have an arrangement with that faction, while one of the intermediate powers has occupied part of Lebanon.

Eventually, the sandwich disappeared altogether because of the arrangement made between Israel and Egypt. This arrangement, of course, was made at the behest of the United States, which contributed a huge sum of money to facilitate the agreement. Various other outside threats also affect the situation; threats from both Russia and Iran have been perceived.

The magnitude of the Israeli-Egyptian agreement might be indicated ^{by the way} by noting that the population of Egypt exceeds the combined populations of Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Libya. The population of Iran is close to that of Egypt.

MINING THE HARBOR

Versus Aerial Bombing in Viet Nam

The Diplomacy player wants to make parallel comparisons between different strategies. There is some question whether that type of comparison was ever made between the choices of mining the harbor of Haiphong or aerial bombing of North Viet Nam.

There is even some question whether these two alternatives were treated as alternative at all. Many people, asked about the matter, seemed to confuse the two, raising objections to the bombing which did not logically apply to mining the harbor.

The United States ~~only~~ mined the harbor ^{only} very late in the war, along with an intensified bombing campaign, as if the two choices were somehow necessarily linked. When the North Viet Namese then agreed to begin negotiations, ^{commentators} ~~they~~ attributed this decision to the intensified bombing, even though, for all we know, it might have been brought about by the mining of the harbor, even in the absence of any aerial bombing.

The mining was done in a single air raid; if I understand rightly, there were no losses on that single raid. The aerial bombing was done incessantly on a daily basis, and of course there were losses from time to time, which must add up as the bombing goes on and on. The mere operating cost of many raids, exclusive of losses, must be many times the cost of a single raid.

The mining stopped the inflow of supplies to North Viet Nam completely, since the sea captains refused to attempt to enter the mined harbor. Thus the mining was one hundred per cent perfect in attaining the objective of stopping the flow of supplies. Aerial bombing never came close to that effectiveness. The Ho Chi Minh Trail was in fact a wide network of trails, which operated like a continuous pipeline. There did not seem to be any especially important points on it to hit; one point was like another, and no single point was of especially high value. It was claimed that, in many cases, the bombs cost a lot more than the targets; ten thousand dollar bombs were dropped on thatch huts

or jungle trails. The mines, on the other hand, in all likelihood did not cost nearly as much as the ships that they were barring from the harbor.

Inasmuch as the ships did not attempt to enter the harbor, there appear to have been no casualties at all from the mining operation, either friendly or enemy; not so much as a ship's cat. It is a remarkable military operation that is one hundred per cent effective at achieving its objective, without accepting any losses, and without even inflicting any casualties on the enemy. Even the peaceniks should have been able to approve of such an operation!

The danger of hitting the wrong objective by mistake seems to be infinitely less in a mining operation than in aerial bombing. Aerial bombing necessarily killed or injured many civilians, and on at least one occasion a hospital was hit by mistake.

Occasionally someone has replied to this argument with the statement that the aerial bombing destroyed every bridge in North Viet Nam, as if this result were a valuable accomplishment in itself. If, however, the purpose is to stop the movement of supplies, obviously the mining of the harbor was far superior, since all the ships stopped coming in altogether. After the mere destruction of all the bridges, the ships still came in, unloaded, ^{and} went back for another trip, while the supplies still moved into the Ho Chi Minh Trail in a continuous pipeline. Doubtless the movement of supplies was slowed up by the destruction of the bridges, but why prefer to slow it up when you could stop it altogether?

Aerial bombing of Haiphong harbor might have been attempted, but that would have involved attacking whatever flag was in the harbor which would be diplomatically less desirable than just keeping those ships out from the start. Instead of losing a ship, the foreign power just wastes a trip with it, which does not seem like a big complaint.

Supposedly, Nixon held off on the mining of the harbor for fear of Chinese reaction.

Apparently he held off for years while he painstakingly established diplomatic relations with China, so that he could bring the matter up. This approach seems to have been unduly fastidious under the circumstances.

The mining of the harbor could have been done the first thing off the bat, before five hundred thousand American troops had been sent to South Viet Nam, and before the air bases had been established in Thailand and the carrier-based bombing of the North had begun. One need only ask which course of action would have been more threatening to China. The mines would just lie there, in Haiphong harbor. The likelihood that they would move against China is a total absurdity.

Not so the use of the five hundred thousand men, or the bombing planes from Thailand, or the carrier-based bombers. The planes could have been disposed against China at a word; and the men could have threatened China if they had moved into North Viet Nam. It was apparently for this very reason that the troops were not allowed to enter North Viet Nam. The Chinese had demonstrated in Korea that they were willing to enter the war in such a situation. As in Korea, there was solid Communist territory from the battleline all the way to Murmansk, and too great an advance would risk bringing another, more powerful Communist country into the action; so it was necessary to hold up at some point. It was then impossible to win the war, since the enemy always had a territorial base to retire to. Thus the war could not end except by negotiation, or by giving it up. Experience in Korea showed that negotiation could go on practically forever.

Incidentally, the argument was frequently aired in the United

States that it was necessary to move into Cambodia, because otherwise the Communists could use it as a sanctuary to repair to during action in Viet Nam, putting our troops at a serious disadvantage. The identical argument applied to North Viet Nam as well, but was hardly ever aired, obviously for fear of bringing China into the war.

Since mining the harbor would have been almost totally non-threatening toward China, the likelihood of China responding by entering was logically very small.

There remains the possibility that the Chinese would have entered anyway, in response to mining the harbor, even though it wouldn't have been quite logical. The Diplomacy player knows that you have to consider this possibility. If diplomatic relations had existed, it would have been easy to explain the alternatives, to show that mining was non-threatening. Without diplomatic relations, the problem admittedly required more of a shot in the dark. Even so, though, the mining of the harbor required a negligible commitment, compared to the landing of troops.

There is also the possibility that the American troops were sent there, not principally to fight the Viet Cong, or North Viet Nam at all, but principally to be there first in case the Chinese were considering a sweep into that part of the world. This possibility might explain why the American army was committed into a guerrilla war, although it has never been particularly good against guerrillas, and has little experience against them, and does not seem to be well organized to deal with them. Reportedly the generals were determined to maintain the Army as a field army prepared to meet another field army, and consequently were unwilling to retrain it for optimum performance against guerrillas.

If, however, that was the real reasoning, it seems to have resulted in taking on far too much immediate disadvantage for the sake of contingencies calculated too far ahead.

I suppose the case shows the advantage of maintaining diplomatic communication, through which China could have been

~~sounded out~~

sounded out right at the start. However, there is little to indicate that America nearly understood the extreme advantage of mining the harbor, as against the alternatives undertaken.