

EXCITEMENT CITY UNLIMITED

#9

May 10th, 1988

Circulation 86

Support AIDS Research

This is another thin issue, I'm afraid. This time last week I was in Britain for the first time in over two years to attend my grandfather's funeral. Although the occasion could have been better, it was good to have all the family in one place at the same time.

During my brief runaround, I noticed a couple of changes. The Guardian is in a strange new format, however I did like the look of the new Independent which combines the rather straight-laced news-gathering approach of the old Times with a little of the Guardian's progressive stance. This means I like Derek Caws' favourite newspaper. Where did my street cred go?

I tried to drag Derek out of bed at midnight but I lost his phone number and directory inquiries couldn't help me. I chatted briefly with John Marsden, Richard Walkerdine and Iain Bowen who I managed to cajole into joining the Downfall game. See what I do for you people in my time off. Iain also supplied me with Pete Doubleday's current Australian address, which is: 71/22 Wardua Street, Kirribilli, Sydney NSW. However his job didn't work out so he'll be returning to Britain.

I think we had the last laugh over Misha Mazda. We went to a local workshop to have a radio and speakers put in the car. After initially inspecting the dashboard, the guy remarked "Did you know you already have speakers in this car?" Since Misha was transferred from a Manhattan dealership, we suspect that it had a full stereo system installed originally. They probably took out the radio/cassette player and forgot to remove the speakers. They are easily overlooked. After all, we've been using the car for a couple of months and we didn't notice them!

There is now an International Subscription Exchange between North America and Australia, courtesy of myself and Andrew England. Any Americans who want to subscribe to Australian zines (Michael Hopcroft? Bob Gossage?) can simply send a cheque to me. Likewise Australains who want to send money to North America need only send their dough to Andrew England.

In response to one inquiry, I have received my grade for the "Money & Capital Markets" course. I got an "A".

EXCITEMENT CITY UNLIMITED is published by Simon Billenness and Barbara Passoff, but only one of them does the typing. Can you guess which one? They live at: 630 Victory Blvd. Apt 6F, Staten Island, NY 10301, USA. I know it's late because I had to look that up. ECU costs you 75¢ if you live in North or South America. All others pay \$1 to receive this airmail. Live simply so that others may simply live.

EXCITORIAL: WHAT'S NEXT FOR WORLD DIP CON?

It's only two months to the first World Dip Con in Birmingham. However before it takes place, some thought has to be paid to the next World Dip Con. There are two crucial questions; when will the next World Dip Con be held, and where?

The question of when the next World Dip Con will be held should really be left to the Europeans. The whole point of hosting World Dip Con is to provide an opportunity for as many hobbyists as possible to cross the Atlantic. I'm not sure whether Europeans would prefer to come over to America in 1989 or 1990. Maybe they'll want to come over straight away. Maybe they'll prefer to save up for a year longer. My point is that, if we want to attract enough people from abroad to make the con truly international, we ought to allow foreign hobbyists choose the most convenient time.

On the other hand, the question of where the con will take place ought to be left to North Americans to decide. The vast majority of European hobbyists know nothing about the North American Diplomacy convention circuit, so they could not make an informed choice. Therefore it makes sense to leave the question of location to the Americans, though I hope a suitable con can be found on the East coast!

The next problem is how are these decisions going to be made. The traditional (and most convenient) way of choosing the site for future conventions is to hold a meeting at the previous convention. If this is good enough for Dipcon, then it should be all right for World Dip Con. Unfortunately there is the problem that there will not be enough North Americans at World Dip Con in Birmingham to make a broad-based decision on where the con should be held.

I propose the following, if rather elaborate, procedure.

1) Dipcon '88 (Texas)

The traditional hobby meeting ought to discuss where World Dip Con could be held in 1989 or 1990. Conventions could make bids for either date in the same way they make bids for Dipcon. The meeting could then decide whether any of the bids are suitable and pick provisional sites for either year.

2) World Dip Con '88 (Birmingham)

Two weeks later at World Dip Con, a hobby meeting could be held to determine whether the next WDC ought to be held in 1989 or 1990. The meeting could then ratify whatever site was approved at Dipcon. However it could also delegate the final decision to another North American con. For instance, if the WDC meeting decides to hold the next con in 1990, the decision could be finalised at Dipcon in 1989. Just a thought...

We need somebody to chair the above two meetings. Since I was responsible for this whole mess in the first place, in my unofficial capacity of World Dip Con deviser, I suggest that Larry Peery act as chairperson. Larry is the ideal choice since he edits that hobby behemoth Diplomacy World. However the most pressing reason for pressganging him is that, as far as I know, he will be the only person to attend both conventions.

I would like to hear what people think of the above procedure. There will be another issue of ECU before Dipcon and World Dip Con, so I hope the details of the decision-making can be thrashed out. Here's to the future!

THE GAMES

WILLIAM RUFUS DEVANE KING

AUTUMN 1909

MILLER# 1986Bcn05

Barbary Jake Walters

a lib-alg, a tun s a lib-alg, f wms-mor, f por-spasc, f bre-eng, f nao-wao

France Jeff Hoffman

a bur-bel

Germany Mike Pustilnik

a mos-sev, a ukrs a mos-sev, a lvn-mos, a gal-rum, a tri holds, a ven s a tri,
a vie s a tri, a tyr-pie, a mun-bur, a ruh s a mun-bur, a sil-war, f eng-bel,
f den-nth, f nwg holds, f lon-eng

Italy Robert Acheson

f rom holds, a alb-tri, f adr s a alb-tri, a mar s a spa, a spa s a mar,

Persia John Crosby

a egy-eth, f sms-egy, f araec-ade, a alg-tun, a con holds, f smy-aeg,
f ant-wao, f ion-wms

Russia Bob Gossage

a bud s a rum, a ser s a bud, a bul s a rum, a rum s a bud, f bla-sev

Retreats Persian a alg-waf/sah/otb, French a bur-pic/par/gas/otb

A: 0: ~~don~~ OUT!

B: 7: mor,alg, can, por, lpl, bre +tun build one

F: 1: par build one or no change

G: 18: kie, mun, ber, bel, vie, den, nwy, hol, edi, stp, pie, swe, tri, ven,
~~war~~, lon, war, +sev, +mos build three

I: 6: rom, nap, cor, gre, spa +mar build one

P: 9: ara, jor, ara, eth, egy, ~~yan~~, smy, cre, ank +con build one or two

R: 4: ~~nos~~, ~~sey~~, rum, bud, ser, bul remove one

No Press I see you're the strong, silent types.

GAMENOTES

Bob Gossage is now the player of record for Russia. I hope you enjoy you three free issues.

To John Crosby: I double checked your orders and you definitely built f araec and you specified it as araec in your moves. Cut and dried, I'm afraid.

DEADLINE: Saturday, June 11th 1988

ANDNOWFORSOMETHINGNOTENTIRELYDIFFERENTANDNOWFORSOMETHINGNOTENTIRELYDIFFERENTANDN

independent deadline games

artichoke hearts: Cline 9 Person Diplomacy, Miller# 1988Ucn1209
Autumn 1901

braised celery: Downfall (Definitive)
Starting. See after waiting lists

spectreman: Railway Rivals, Map K. Round 3, I think. My files are chaotic...

attack of the killer tomatoes: Railway Rivals, Map N. Starting

Standbys are always welcome for the above games. You know the details.
If you don't read the blurb at the bottom of the waiting lists.

WAITING LISTS

(actually filled one this issue, shock, horror...)

Stab: Derwood Bowen, Glenn Petroski, Brad Wilson, Michael Gonsalves

Stab is an interesting hidden movement version of Diplomacy. Only contested moves are reported. Players have to keep track of their own units and guess about the whereabouts of their opponents'. This is not a game for paranoids! Player identities are common knowledge though - this isn't Gunboat! No gamefee, Rules available on request. Three needed.

Railway Rivals: Mark Nelson, Andrew England, Paul Gardner
Map T (Middle Earth) GM: Brian Longstaff. 2 wanted

Railway Rushes: Paul Gardner, Doug Brown
Map I (Ireland) GM: Brian Longstaff. 3 wanted. This is a RR variant playtest.

International Diplomacy: David Stone (Trinidad), Edward Ainsworth (UK),
Ron Cameron (USA), John Piggott (UK)

With Laurence Cronin and John Cain dropping form this one, I've decided to give up with a "Seven Nations" game. Again no gamefee. GM will be either Mark Nelson or Bob Gossage depending on who sends me their houserules first. Time to crack the whip, methinks...

Standbys: Cline 9: Jake Walters, Paul Gardner
International Dip: Bill Young, Martin Kloosterman, Robert Acheson,
Michael Gonsalves
All Purpose: Doug Brown, Mark Lilleleht, Mike Pustilnik

Standbys are always actively solicited. If you sign up as a standby, you receive one free issue straight away. If you submit standby orders which are used, you receive three further free issues. Roll up!

~~GERYKSUCKSTHEBIGONEGERYKSUCKSTHEBIGONEGERYKSUCKSTHEBIGONEGERYKSUCKSTHEBIGONEGERY~~

gamestart braised celery definitive downfall

Cathy Ozog, in the latest Cathy's Ramblings, said she would like to play this game "someday". Oh ye of little faith! Signed up are:

Doug Brown "Doubting" Cathy Ozog
Rod Walker Richard Biddle
Iain Bowen Mark Lilleleht
Doug Rowling Paul Gardner

I need preference lists from Richard Biddle, Mark Lilleleht and Paul Gardner. If any of you wants off, let me know immediately. I intend to start as soon as I hear form Richard, Mark and Paul. I assume you all have the rules. If not, scream now. This game will be GMed by yours truly, heh, heh, heh... To make up numbers this is now an international game run outside the zine to 6-7 week deadlines.

~~THATWASTHELASTBADBOYREFERENCEEVERINECUFROMNOWONTHATWASTHELASTBADBAYREFERENCEINEC~~

PLAYLIST: Smiths, Meat is Murder, Louder Than Bombs; REM, Fables of the Reconstruction, Murrmur; U2, The Joshua Tree; Robert Cray Band, Strong Persuader; The The, Infected; Jesus & Mary Chain, Darklands

REASONS TO BE VEGETARIAN

I've been meaning to write this article since issue one. The following is not a comprehensive appreciation of the advantages of eating vegetarian because I simply have not had time to plan and research the piece properly. However, I hope it will give you a brief overview of the reasons why Barbara and I went vegetarian and have remained so.

1) Moral Reasons. "Is it right that animals have to suffer and die for your diet?"

Most people have an overly romantic view of farming. The pressure on farmers to cut costs and increase production has led to the increasing use of factory farming. The beef, chicken, veal and lamb which you put on your plate is more and more unlikely to have come from animals which have been allowed to graze outside naturally. Instead factory farm animals are immobilised in pens or with chains. It is cheaper to keep these animals in darkness, standing in their own filth than to pay for lighting and cleaning. Many suffer from constant ailments and it is routine to feed the animals a continual diet of antibiotics. All this is done to creatures who can feel pain just as acutely as we can. If you are upset about animal experimentation or cruelty to pets, I can't see how you can justify eating meat.

2) Health Reasons. "We are not made to eat meat."

Here's a quick quiz for you. Is our digestive system designed for a flesh diet, a plant diet or a mixture of flesh and plants? I suspect most of you think that we best digest an omnivorous diet of both meat and vegetables. Well, you are wrong. Contrary to popular belief our digestive system is most similar to the digestive systems of pure herbivores. Many of our current dietary problems could be greatly alleviated with a vegetarian diet. Here are a couple of examples.

a) cholesterol.

Cholesterol is found principally in animal fats. Apart from cuts of meat, it is also found in dairy products and eggs. The body finds it difficult to excrete cholesterol and it is often found clogging the arteries which carry blood from the heart. Clogged arteries can lead to strokes and heart disease.

b) fibre.

Dietary fibre is defined as the skeletal remains of plant cells which are not digested by our bodies' enzymes. It has been suggested that a high fibre diet can help reduce cholesterol levels. Fibre certainly aids digestion and helps prevent digestive disorders ranging from diabetes to cancer in the colon. In addition I've yet to come across a vegetarian with constipation...

c) calcium.

Meat-centred diets are prone to be too high in protein. Some studies have concluded that a high-protein diet may make it more difficult for the body to absorb calcium, leading to a greater risk of osteoporosis (weakening of the bones). What's worse, simply taking more calcium (in the form of supplements) may not help.

d) calories.

Most Americans consume too many calories. I'm sure the same is true of most Europeans and Australians as well. Meat and animal products tend to be higher in fat. Vegetables tend to be higher in fibre and carbohydrates. Which do you think would be better to eat if you want to lose weight or stay slim?

e) food poisoning.

Food poisoning has become an increasing problem. Factory farming has contributed to this situation by increasing the number of slaughtered animals which are sick or diseased. Some of you may remember a recent "60 Minutes" where about a third of chickens were estimated to be infected with salmonella. Meat is far more likely to poison you than plant foods. You get botulism from beef not broccoli.

When I point out the food poisoning argument to meat eaters, a common retort is that vegetables are routinely sprayed by pesticides. This is true and the worrying thing is that it will be 10 to 20 years before we know the true health risks of pesticides. However since livestock consumes tremendous amounts of grass and grain treated with chemicals, pesticide residues concentrate in their tissues. Consequently pesticides are more likely to be found in meat, fish and poultry than plant foods. Moreover you can rinse fruit but how do you flush out a steak?

3) Ecological Reasons.

Meat production is extremely wasteful. To obtain 1 pound of beef, cows are fed on average 16 pounds of grain and soy. Lifestock other than cattle are a little more efficient. Pigs consume 6, turkeys 4 and chickens 3 pounds of grain and soy to produce 1 pound of meat. Meanwhile it is estimated that one-third of the cropland of the US is losing topsoil faster than it is being replaced naturally. Eventually this strip-mining of cropland will result in soil exhaustion and higher food prices. Eating meat is the nutritional equivalent of driving a gas-guzzling car. If you are concerned about the environment, it would make sense to avoid doing both.

4) Pocketbook Reasons.

One of the reasons Barbara and I took up vegetarianism in our poor college years was because it was a cheap way to eat. It cannot be denied that it is easier on the chequebook to centre your meals around tofu, beans or broccoli instead of beef or chicken. You could spend the spare money on entertainment, padding out your savings or simply buying better quality food. It's like giving up cigarettes; not only will you feel healthier, but you'll also suddenly find more money in your pocket.

5) Empowerment. "Don't just sit there. Do something constructive."

You want to change the world? Why not start by changing your own life? By avoiding meat Barbara and I are acting to promote our beliefs in a simple and effective way. I've read an estimate that the average person eats two cows a year, which means we've saved four cows altogether so far. By joining the growing ranks of vegetarians, we are helping to change the world. For instance a recent Vegetarian Times reports that a couple of slaughter houses were closed down in Britain due to declining meat consumption. As consumers we do wield considerable power. Even if I have an unproductive day at work, I have the satisfaction of knowing that at least I stood up for what I believe by not eating meat.

~~MEATISMURDERMEATISMURDERMEATISMURDERMEATISMURDERMEATISMURDERMEATISMURDERMAETISMU~~

Readlist: A lot of the arguments and facts for this article were cribbed from "Diet For a Small Planet" by Frances Moore Lappé (Ballantine). It's a fascinating mixture of arguments, facts and, more importantly, delicious recipes! I highly recommend it anyone curious about vegetarianism.

LETTUCE

((First up this issue: Doctor Who..))

Brian Longstaff As for Michael Hopcroft's comments on the Doctor, I liked Colin
Sheffield, UK Baker, and putting them in order of preference: Tom Baker 9,
William Hartnell 9, Patrick Troughton 8, Colin Baker 7,
Jon Pertwee 6, Peter Davidson 6, Sylvester McCoy 5. At the end of Tom's series,
I thought he'd perfectly captured the alien and inaccessible qualities of the
first Doctor. I disagree with Michael's comments; Peter Davidson's Doctor, to me,
seemed too human and totally ineffectual. Sylvester McCoy is not an actor, even
of comedy. His personal idea of eccentricity, when interviewed just prior to
taking up the part, was to pull faces at the camera.

Finally, Dr Who is changed in format, but not for US markets. It is now a
children's show, and makes no concession for adults. Blame Michael Grade of the
BBC. He never did like Science Fiction.

Carol Naylor The response to my inadvertent contribution on Dr Who certainly
Essex, UK surprised me. However, I've done some checking around since and
I think the series is probably generally regarded as terminal.
The best episodes were those that had been screened when I wrote to you. Since
then they've been pretty disappointing. Even the plots are rather divisive and
leave a lot unexplained. The good news is that Bonnie Langford screamed her last
just before Xmas although, sadly, they didn't actually kill her off. The bad news
is that viewing figures are about a quarter of what they used to be in the good
ole days of Tom Baker and don't look like going up. If anything they're dropping
even lower. It's a shame that the new series didn't live up to its initial promise.
I was a sceptic regarding McCoy but he won me over. It's the rest of the input
that turned me off.

((I'd rank the Doctors like this: Tom Baker 9, Patrick Troughton 8, Peter
Davison 8, Jon Pertwee 8, William Hartnell 7, Colin Baker 5, Sylvester
McCoy 4. Tom Baker was clearly the best Doctor. At times charming, at
times coldly alien, Tom could redeem the lousiest script and the worst
made-up aliens. Peter Davison did have the handicap of youth but he was
capable of some powerful moments of anger (check out his lambasting of
Plantagenant in "Frontios"). Colin Baker tends to garner a sympathy vote
after his unfair dismissal, but this masks the fact that his portrayal
was wildly over the top and lacking in depth. Sylvester is a dank piece
of unprepossessing pond scum. He simply has no presence, no range of
acting, nothing except a silly slapstick style. Brian is right about
the series turning into a children's programme. Last season every story
(especially "Delta and the Bannermen - an all-time low) was extremely
juvenile and, with the exception of "Dragonfire", we've already wiped the
lot. Oh well, at least there's still Star Trek: The Next Generation to
look forward to.))

Carol Naylor Update on stuff that will hopefully cross the Atlantic to you
shortly: The Vision: BBC film starring Dirk Bogarde and Lee
Remick. Apart from the fact that such a pairing is almost guaranteed success
(forgive the bias but they're two of my favourite actors) these two really click.
The plot concerns the as-yet uncontrolled potential of satellite TV, popular in
the States but still new in Europe, making the point that it and its audience
are easily manipulated and questioning the motives of those who want such control.
Without giving too much away, the field is dominated by the sinister "People's
Channel" who wish to mould public opinion by presenting "News With Meaning".

Needless to say that they also have a few hidden meanings that they would also like to impress on their audience (and if I say that these fictional backers are American Evangelical TV, you can guess what they are.) Frighteningly, their motives for doing so are all too convincing and highly persuasive with the result that the film has provoked more comment and discussion than any documentary on the subject might. I found it compelling since it not only raised such topical questions but put them in disturbingly real settings: at one stage the station executives are considering possible anchormen for their programme and casually assess (accurately) and then dismiss the style of Terry Wogan (the British Johnny Carson). Furthermore the film refuses to compromise at the end by allowing good to triumph over evil; it won't let the audience off the hook that easily. Interestingly the film was made for TV by the BBC but received a theatre screening during the London Film Festival in November so that it may be eligible for some film awards. It was screened here on BBC2 in January and will doubtless be sold to PBS on the strength of its cast if nothing else. I was impressed that the BBC (a rival to the People's Channel in the film) relaxed enough to allow a little self-criticism and parody to creep into the script. In fact the BBC has been inviting audience input on their programmes quite a bit recently. Perhaps Glasnost is catching?

Other stuff to look out for includes Little Dorritt which has received generally good reviews. It's the adaptation of the Dickens' classic but you don't have to be heavily into Dickens to enjoy it. You do however have to have a fair bit of stamina since the running time is 6 hours. It is actually split up into two nights of three hours each but that's still a long time if your bum goes to sleep after twenty minutes! White Mischief might be worth seeing if you're a total anarchist who enjoys seeing the debauched Upper Classes get their due. If, on the other hand, you're an American who found the Jewel in the Crown, A Passage to India and Heat and Dust romantic and adorable nostalgic you may be a little disillusioned. Why is it that most successful British films only seem to succeed by emphasising their "Britishness" or rather the eccentricity of their subject?

((I'll certainly look out for The Vision because it sounds interesting. Now that we have HBO and Showtime on cable, we're not watching all that much PBS any more. I'm currently looking out for the The Wicker Man which I hear is a stylish mixture of the occult and Edward Woodward.))

mark lew i am not at all embarrassed by the "fashion" section in bz38 and i thought your characterisation of it as "embarrassing" was a bit snooty. i'm surprised to learn that i'm "unfamiliar" with the animal rights topic. i doubt there is more a.r. activism anywhere else than there is here in berkeley, and i've been watching it pretty carefully. but if there's anything i haven't been exposed to, please pass it on.

actually i don't think a.r was really the topic of the piece. it was a continuation of the ongoing "fashion" section which is about angst and zeitgeist and culture and the nature of society and that sort of stuff. i think you're taking it as if it were under the "gossip" heading. more in bz39.

it was no coincidence that the geryk letter made #39. read the lead-in again. the man deserves to be treated with respect.

((You're right. I was snooty and I apologise. I think the problem is that I don't share your premise that altruism is impossible. Therefore I objected to your depiction of animal rights activists as insecure "marginal psyches".

I don't feel that I owe Bruce Geryk any respect at all. He's shown me no consideration and his "arguments" are just transparent attempts to make himself look good at the expense of other people. Since I don't intend to waste any further space on him in ECU, I'll argue this further in a letter to benzene.)

Brad Wilson benzene is the premier U.S. political zine. No doubt about it.
Philly, USA

Perhaps the distinguished Dr. Boardman would care to tell us who he'd like for President? I don't like people who don't vote in primaries and complain about the government. I complain about the government, but I at least do my part to stop particularly objectionable dingbats from reaching office. Of course it doesn't always work. I didn't vote for Gov. Casey (the Walter Mondale of Pa) but he won anyway. //

I don't think the non-voters are on the fringes of the political spectrum. I think the loony left and the reactionary right vote. What doesn't vote is the group of brain-dead dullards who watch soap operas, read the National Enquirer and drink Bud Lite. Since this group is increasing at a rapid pace as our schools continue to produce barely-educated teens who think Dante is a spaghetti sauce, can't find Florida on the map and use English like it's a foreign language, it's no wonder that turnout's decreasing. No one ever lost an election overestimating the stupidity of the U.S. electorate.

Paul Gardner An old view of mine is that U.S. voter apathy is a product of Vermont, USA having a negative attitude about government. That negativity is, in my opinion, a product of ignorance: ie something missing in our educations.

((Did you two swap notes or something? I'm not sure if I buy the argument that low voter turnout is due to a bad education system. After all, I suspect the US educational system (particularly the universities) is superior to that of Britain, where election turnout is higher. The reason may be that the US electorate has become more fragmented both by race and by occupation thus making it more likely that groups are left out of the coalition-building process. There certainly is a negative attitude toward politicians and government but this may be due to the corruption and ineptitude of the past few administrations. Who has faith in any Presidential aspirant these days? I'm not surprised that many don't bother to go to the booth to vote for the least worst candidate.

Mind you, if I did have a vote I'd probably register Democratic just to weed out some of the dross like Brad does.))

John Piggott The problem for Americans, of course, is that the offices of Essex, UK Chief Executive and Head of State (in British terms, Prime Minister and Queen, though neither comparison is exact) are combined, and it is virtually impossible to find the qualities needed for both inside one person. No doubt many Americans find Reagan unsatisfactory: quite possibly he is not a good chief executive - although it is quite common for politicians, especially the incumbent's opponents, to exaggerate the power that individual office-holders possess to influence events - but for the basically ceremonial role of Head of State he is excellent, and that's what we foreigners are interested in. Indeed, the talents needed for this job are such that an actor or film star must seem the ideal candidate. (Those who rail about 'Bedtime for Bonzo' should be aware of the logical alternative: the star of 'Dirty Harry'!) The only other American Head of State to command the same respect during my lifetime was Eisenhower - successful WWII general, and all that. Not coincidentally Eisenhower also incurred criticism for his 'laziness' in administration.

Paul Gardner Speaking of the President's office specifically, people who compare Martin Luther King to recent presidents are off base. The president is an executive-essentially, chief bureaucrat. King was a moral/religious leader. King would not have made a good president and a president should not be asked to be a moral/religious leader. (One of my chief quarrels with Reagan is he's too damn moralistic.) It looks like Bush/Dukakis in November, which is not a slate to get your pulse up, but either man will do a reasonable job - Dukakis, especially, is capable of being a very good exec. (president).

((I think John has a good point about the dual nature of the Presidency. I suspect that most Americans have had enough of a figurehead like Reagan and they would prefer that their next president be more of a hands-on manager. This would explain the poor showing of Kemp and Robertson, both of whom tried to inherit Reagan's moralistic mantle.

The strong showing of Jackson at the other end of the political spectrum would seem to disprove this thesis somewhat. Perhaps while conservatives grew complaisant and supported Bush, stalwart liberals and left-wingers, smarting from two terms of Reagan, were more stirred up to vote for a candidate who promised to reverse the last few years. Jesse Jackson was certainly positioned beautifully to ride that groundswell.

In any case it appears that Dukakis has sewn up with the Democratic nomination with a style which exudes sound, legalistic management. It should be interesting to see how mileage he gets out of attacking the excesses of the Reagan years. Bush already sounds defensive which is ominous for the Republicans.))

mark lew scott ((hanson)) shows more acuity when he points out that dukakis has yet to demonstrate that he is qualified to be president, though to state that he is "utterly unqualified" is perhaps a bit of an overstatement. it amuses me that dukakis has claimed responsibility for his state's economy because i'm certain that four months from now he'll be telling us that the less vigorous economies of ohio, pennsylvania, louisiana, etc., are not due to those states' democratic governors but to our republican president. even if gov. dukakis could take credit for reducing unemployment in mass. (my guess is that it went down in spite of him), to halve a 6% unemployment rate is less of an accomplishment than to reduce unemployment by even $\frac{1}{2}\%$ in a place like, say, louisiana. louisiana's 13% unemployment rate indicates an actual lack of jobs there, whereas massachusetts' 6% rate indicates that there are as many jobs as workers and the problem there is just a matter of coordinating the two. dukakis has shown a remarkable aptitude for directing investment into his state and even to the regions of his choice, but the next president's task will not be to woo wealth away from the other states (or even from other countries) but to increase the total wealth for everyone. // dukakis has shown himself to be a governmental tinkerer. while it is comforting to keep in mind that the country is not likely to go straight to hell with an efficient tinkerer at the helm, i'm sufficiently optimistic to believe that we deserve better.

but i digress. dukakis's qualifications are arguable. far less defensible is your astonishing assertion that "the duke is acceptable, electable and we need a democrat in the white house." with the sole exception of the discredited gary hart, dukakis is the least electable of the eight original democratic candidates (and no i haven't forgotten jesse jackson). dukakis's success in the primary is due to his superior fundraising ability and his capacity to play his opponents against each other -- neither of which are relevant in a general election.

it is difficult to imagine a democrat of equal success and popularity who is more strategically (demographically, politically) ill-suited to win a majority in the electoral college than is michael dukakis. i would be very interested in the scenario you imagine in which dukakis is electable; i have yet to come up with a plausible one. more specifically, give me a list of the states which you think might give dukakis a majority. i see about 100 votes he has no chance of winning and another 100 which he has less than 5% chance to win. that means he needs to take almost all of the rest, most of which are evenly split and promise to be bitterly contested. bush can secure california -- not an unlikely event -- dukakis would be virtually forced to take illinois, pennsylvania, new york, michigan, ohio, and new jersey, which strikes me as just a little too much wishful thinking. for unlike gephardt, gore, and jackson respectively, dukakis shows no signs whatsoever of the ability to gain support among independents, get republicans to vote democratic, or get significant amounts of non-voters to the polls.

((I must admit that I my knowledge of American electoral demographics is not as extensive as yours, but I don't agree that Dukakis is ill-suited politically to win in November. For starters, he has the advantage of a general liberal and Democratic resurgence as evinced in the 1986 Senatorial elections. Although you view the Duke as a liberal, I suspect most voters view him as more of a moderate. I don't see him losing his core constituency in the autumn. Already he is emphasising such issues as competence, opposition to the contras and even crime as well as railing against Reagan's murky, opportunistic foreign policy and some of his sleazier members of the administration. All this should help him stake out the middle ground.

If Dukakis is so unelectable as you claim, why does he lead marginally in opinion polls? One survey showed that a Dukakis/Jackson ticket would beat Bush! This was a bit unfair because Bush is bound to choose a regionally complementary vice-presidential nominee (like Alexander, Thompson or that Californian governor whose name I can't spell...) which should help boost him somewhat.

If elected, I don't think that Dukakis would make a brilliant president, but I can't see him being all that bad either. What sort of president do you think Bush would make?))

Brad Wilson Perhaps the reason why you like U.S./Canadian conservatives more ((than British conservatives)) is that the class-bias for parties isn't so pronounced here? Or that we have more intellectually interesting conservatives?

I find European leftists more interesting than our home-grown crowd, if only because they're usually more up-front about their policies. Someone like Dukakis is pretty close to a socialist, but he'd never agree to the use of the term. On the other hand, I find Kinnock, say, or Egon Bahr a lot more entertaining and/or scary (because men of their views are regarded as responsible members of the policy-making process.) And Ted Kennedy is tiresome beyond belief. The Democratic convention is usually a bit soporific for me.

What American conservatives need now is a leader with Reagan's communication skills, Kemp's dedication to innovative ideas, Goldwater's steadfast support of the U.S. military and Haig's knowledge of foreign affairs. Hmmm... Bill Bennett? Trent Lott? Mrs Thatcher?

((You're right in thinking that I find the British class system very tiresome though I must admit I am fascinated by Jesse Jackson's attempt to bring questions of class into U.S. politics. I don't know if you and Alan Stewart are typical of North American conservatives but you're more interesting to debate than your typical British Thatcherite. The Tories over the past few years, have taken on a very self-centred, anti-intellectual stance.

Nice to see you tipping Trent Lott for future advancement. If he's that good I can see I'll have to send a contribution to his Democratic opponent for the Louisiana Senate seat...))

ANDFOROURNEXTTRICKANDFOROURNEXTTRICKANDFOROURNEXTTRICKANDFOROURNEXTTRICKANDFOROU

That's it for this issue, folks. Due to reasons unforeseen (see the front cover) this issue has been shorter than I planned. Hopefully next time I'll manage a rip-roaring sixteen page issue. That's right - as large as the smallest Costaguana. I already have held over some Brad Wilson comments on civil disobedience and a fascinating letter from Linda Courtemanche replying to last issue's editorial. Be there or square. Meat is Murder.

FROM

Simon Billenness & Barbara Passoff
630 Victory Blvd. Apt. 6F
Staten Island, NY 10301
United States of America



Your credit is: TRADE

You need to send more dough: yes/no

It's charisma

■ A gerbil named **Ken**, campaigning on a platform of free beer and soft toilet paper, beat five other candidates to become president of the Student Union at the University of East Anglia in Norwich, England. Ken's owner, chemistry student **Julian Campbell**, 21, said he entered his pet as a joke and was amazed that the rodent won the job, which pays \$94.50 a week.

Larry Peery

Box 8416

San Diego, CA 92102-0416

DEADLINE: Saturday, June 11th 1988