

GRAUSTARK

the oldest bulletin of postal Diplomacy

200

With moves and press releases
for postal Diplomacy games
1967U, 1968CH, 1968CL, 1969BI, 1969BW, & WWI-C

3 January 1970

25¢

TWO HUNDREDTH ISSUE

Dedicated to John Beshara, outstanding proponent and player of Diplomacy in the New York area, genial host and welcome guest.

CONTENTS

POSTAL DIPLOMACY GAMES	Moves	Press Releases
1967U.....	2.....	24
1968CH.....	37.....	24, 37
1968CI.....	3
1968CL.....	2.....
1968BI.....	3.....	37
1969BW.....	4.....	4
WWI-C	37.....
The Ministry of Miscellany.....	7, 24, 36
The Four and One Half Kingdoms.....	5
Book Review (Chronicles - News of the Past; The Hornblower Companion; Mission: Third Force; Coup d'Etat, a Practical Handbook).....	9
QUIZ: Department of Unhistory - II.....	11
The Diplomatic Pouch (Letters to the Editor).....	14
John Beshara.....	34	Hal Naus.....23
Allan B. Calhamer.....	14	George A. Patton.....18
Patrick Condray.....	18	George Phillies.....33
Gary Gyax.....	35	Phil Pritchard.....20
David Johnston.....	14	Ron Salcedo.....21
Brian Libby.....	32	Christopher Schleicher..17
Bill Linden.....	22	Rod Walker.....14
John McCallum.....	21
Roster of GRAUSTARK Games Begun since 1 January 1967.....	25
Subscription Expirations.....	26
Completed Postal Diplomacy Games - VIII.....	27
(1965Q, 1966Q, 1966M, 1967V, 1968G)
A Case for the Triple Alliance, by "General Cicelya Toetruck"....	39

All contents are by the Gamesmaster, Editor, and Publisher, John Boardman, unless otherwise indicated. GRAUSTARK, a bulletin of postal Diplomacy, is published on alternate Saturdays by John Boardman, 234 East 19th Street, Brooklyn, N. Y. 11226, USA. Subscriptions are 10 issues for \$1.00. The price of this special issue is 25¢.

1967U

"Fall 1926"

ITALIAN FLEET SEIZES MARSEILLES.

In the "Spring 1926" moves reported in the last issue of GRAU-STARK, the Italian move "F Adr holds" was incorrectly reported as "A Alb holds". This did not change the adjudications.

GERMANY (M. Miller): No moves received. A Arm, A Sev, A Ukr, A War, A Gal, A Pru, F Bar, F Ska, F North Sea, F Bel, A Mun, A Norway, A St.P, F Kie, & F North Atlantic hold.

ITALY (Clark): F Lyo-Mar; F Ion-Eas; F Apu-Ion; F Tun S F Apu-Ion; A Gre-Bul; A Ser & A Rum S A Gre-Bul; A Bud S A Rum; A Alb-Gre; A Ven-Pie; F Tyr-Wes; F Eng, A Tus, A Tyr, & F Adr hold.

RUSSIA (G. Heap): No move received. A Smy holds.

TURKEY (Beshara): F Aeg-Gre; A B 1 S F Aeg-Gre; F Bla S A Bul.

Underlined moves are not possible. Even though the Turkish A Bul was attacked and dislodged, the attack came from Greece and this did not cut the support that army gave into Greece. Thus, the Turkish move F Aeg-Gre, with one support, succeeds, defeating the Italian move A Alb-Gre. Turkey retreats A Bul-Con. The High Combatant Powers now control the following supply centers:

GERMANY: Bel, Ber, Den, Edi, Hol, Kie, Mos, Mun, Nor, Par, St.P, Sev, Swe, War. (14)

ITALY: Bre, Bud, Bul, Liv, Lon, Mar, Nap, Por, Rum, Rom, Ser, Spa, Tri, Tun, Ven, Vie. (16)

RUSSIA: Smy. (1)

TURKEY: Ank, Con, Gre. (3)

The deadline for "Spring 1927" moves is NOON, 17 JANUARY 1970.

In the absence of any German moves, the Gamesmaster removes the furthest German unit, the fleet in the Barents Sea. Italy has one build, which should be mailed in with the "Spring 1927" moves. Other players may make their "Spring 1927" moves conditional on the Italian build. Frank Clark should send in this build at once.

Since two players missed moves, these stand-by players should send in "Spring 1927" moves as indicated:

GERMANY: Terry Kuch, 7554 Spring Lake Dr., Bethesda, Md. 20034

RUSSIA: Hal Naus, 1011 Barrett Ave., Chula Vista, Calif. 92010

1968CL

"Spring 1910"

TURKS READY FINAL ASSAULT

FRANCE (Ward): No moves received. A Lon & F Wal hold.

ITALY (Comber): F Mid-Iri; F North Atlantic S F Mid-Iri; F Por-Mid; A Gas-Bre; A Par S A Gas-Bre; A Bur-Pic; A Bel S A Bur-Pic; A Ven holds.

RUSSIA (Schleicher): No moves received. F North Sea, F Den, F Norwegian Sea, A Norway, F Swe, F St.P(n.c.), & A Mos hold.

TURKEY (Beshara): F Edi S RUSSIAN A Norway-Cly; F Eng-Lon; A Kie-Hol; A Ber-Kie; A Mun S A Ber-Kie; A Con-Bul; A Ser-Tri; F Adr S A Ser-Tri; F Smy-Aeg; F North Africa-Wes; A Tyr-Boh; A Sil-Ber; A Pru-War; A Ukr-War; F Tyr, F Ion, & A Sev hold.

Underlined moves are not possible. The deadline for "Fall 1910" moves is NOON, SATURDAY 17 JANUARY 1970.

1969BI

"Spring 1904"

AUSTRO-ITALIAN ALLIANCE PARTITIONS TURKISH EMPIRE

ENGLAND (G. Heap): No moves received. A Edi, F Bar, A St.P, F Swe, F Den, & F Lon hold.

FRANCE (Gletty): F Norwegian Sea-North Atlantic; A Pic-Bre; A Bur S GERMAN A Mun; A Mar-Pie; F Mid-Spa(s.c.).

GERMANY (D. Johnston): F Eng-Mid; A Mun & A Bel hold; A Ruh & A Kie S A Mun.

ITALY (Berman): F Nap-Tyr; F Tun-North Africa; A Tyr-Mun; A Smy-Con; F Eas-Ion.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY (Beshara): A War-Liv; A Gal-Sil; A Rum-Sev; A Mos S A Rum-Sev; A Bud-Gal; A Bul holds; A Vie-Tyr; F Tri-Adr; F Ank S ITALIAN A Smy-Con; A Boh S ITALIAN A Tyr-Mun.

RUSSIA (Ward): No move received. A Pru holds.

TURKEY (White): F Bla-Sev.

Underlined moves are not possible. The deadline for "Fall 1904" moves is NOON, SATURDAY 17 JANUARY 1970.

Since two players missed moves, the stand-bys are asked to send in "Fall 1904" moves for these countries as follows:

ENGLAND: Charles Carey, 323 Echols House, Station #1, Charlottesville, Va. 22903

RUSSIA: Bill Linden, 83-33 Austin St., Kew Gardens, N. Y. 11415

PRESS RELEASE - 1968CI

CONSTANTINOPLE (16 Sept. 1909, SPP): Sultan Yuk expressed delight at the happenings in Europe this past Fall. Our beloved Sultan, in answering a dismayed communique from whichever corporal is now running the Yellow Scum, replied, "T. S., scum. Here I have imported all the beautiful Frenchies to my bedroom, and have the run of all the beauties of Turkey, Italy, Austria, and the Iberian. And I should worry about the 250 pound crones that pass for womanhood in Russia, or the befouled and sullied wenches that have been under Russian (argh) domination?" The Sultan was about to add more, but once again familiar pressures from his advisors led him to other matters. Palace observers noted that, contrary to expectations nine long years ago, the Sultan seems more fit and younger than ever. Numerous concubines, however, have been carried out in baskets. A just division of Europe has been achieved.

VAIL: But I wish I would have HAD to look for a way to un-be-smirch those areas that Russia controlled. Anyway - grudging congratulations Randy mah boy. Randy wins the game, but a Randy Sultan Yuk enjoys it the most.

BROOKLYN (URRP): By a narrow margin over runner-up Brenton Ver Ploeg, Randy Bytwerk was awarded the distinction of Raadpensionaris of the DDD (Diplomacy's Dangerous Dutchmen). Bytwerk will hold this distinction until a more dangerous Dutchman comes along!

1969EW

"Spring 1902"

EXPLANATION OF MOVES INTO MAJOR CAMPAIGN

ENGLAND (Lasky): A Norway-Swe; F Norwegian Sea-Bar; F North Sea-Ska; F Edi-north Sea.

FRANCE (R. Miller): F Bre-Mid; F Mar-Lyo; F Spa(s.c.)-Wes; A Por-Spa; A Par-Pic; A Bel holds.

GERMANY (Huldiner): A Kie-Ruh; A ¹ol S A Kie-Ruh; F Ber-Kie; F Den holds; A Mun-Tyr.

ITALY (Gorman): F Nap-Tyr; F Ion-Adr; A Ven-Pie; A Tun holds.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY (Kimmel): F Alb-Gre; A Bud-Rum; A Vie-Gal; A Ser S A Bud-Rum.

RUSSIA (Wile): A Rum-Ser; F Sev-Rum; A War-Gal; F Bot-Swe; F St.P (s.c.)-Fin.

TURKEY (Becker): F Smy-Aek; A Bul S RUSSIAN A Rum-Ser; A Con S A Bul; F Ank holds.

Underlined moves are not possible. The Austro-Hungarian army dislodged from Serbia must retreat to Albania, Trieste, or Budapest. The direction of this retreat is to be phoned immediately to the Gamesmaster (724-4352). The deadline for "Fall 1902" moves is 6 PM, MONDAY 12 JANUARY 1970; these moves may be made conditional on the direction of the Austro-Hungarian retreat.

VIENNA (26 Feb. 1902): A special messenger sent by the Emperor Franz Joseph to the Sultan in Constantinople returned today after a 3 month absence. But to the dismay of all, his message for the Emperor could not be delivered. During his visit to the Near East his voice changed and went up 18 octaves and is now in the inaudible range. Dr. Heinrich Ropheh, a noted specialist, was quoted as saying "climactic changes will sometimes do that".

ROME (21 Apr. 1902, Pizziola Press): The Italian Foreign Ministry announced today that it is sending a strong note of protest to an un-named Mediterranean Power regarding movements of naval forces in neutral waters without prior consultation with other powers in the area in direct contradiction to previously stated commitments. The note said, in part:

"While it is true that one sovereign state need not necessarily consult with other states regarding contemplated military and/or naval maneuvers within its own borders, such maneuvers in international waters and over neutral territories close to another state - especially one with which normal and friendly relations exist - taken without prior assurances, could be viewed as a potentially unfriendly or even as a hostile act and be treated accordingly by the offended state."

The Italian Foreign Minister instructed his ambassador to the un-named capital to deliver the note at noon today (GMT) "with the utmost cordiality, but with attention to detail, formality and courtesy."

Pressed for comment, the Italian Foreign Minister muttered, "we kicka da pasta outa da rat-bassets ifa dey crossa da line." He also made an obscene gesture.

(continued on p. 24)

THE FOUR AND A HALF KINGDOMS

The description of the history and culture of little-known countries is a popular avocation in postal Diplomacy publications these days. Since the history of the Grand Duchy of Beaucouillon was serialized in GRAUSTARKS ##123-175, the practice may have originated here. However, Beaucouillon, on the shores of the Mediterranean, is well-known and open to world trade. The Four And A Half Kingdoms, enclosed in the Balkan Massif, are much less well known; it is doubtful whether their genealogical tables appear even in the Walker Library of Improbable Nations. Because I find the Four And A Half Kingdoms infinitely more interesting than, say, the latest outposts of the Amerikan Empire of Asia, their histories will be serialized in such issues of GRAUSTARK as have space.

Strictly speaking, the term "Four And A Half Kingdoms" is a misnomer, since only one of them is called a "Kingdom". However, it is a name sanctioned by tradition for the five small sovereignties isolated high in the Balkan Massif. These states, though ethnically and ideologically diverse, have by means of their long association been considered as a unit by the few outsiders who have bothered to consider them at all.

As every specialist in the geography of the Inner Balkans is aware, the Four And A Half Kingdoms are the Kingdom of Skandalutz, the Temporary Roman Empire, the Pravoslavnician Patrimony of Polykarp, the Grand Duchy of Wogastisburg-Schlampenbüttel, and the Pundschruck People's Republic. (Technically the Grand Duchy of Wogastisburg-Schlampenbüttel is a dependency of the Holy Roman Empire, and is thus the "Half Kingdom" referred to in the region's colloquial name.) Contemporary data about the Four And A Half Kingdoms appear in the table below. Neither the area nor the population figures are given: the former because the mountainous terrain of the region makes surveying difficult, and the latter because the natives are suspicious of foreigners and unable to count sufficiently high themselves. In the last 25 years the only attempt at a census of any of the Four And A Half Kingdoms was provided by a team of Yugoslavs imported at the request of the Pundschruck government. After four months the Yugoslavs gave up and returned home; however, one of them reported that the density of the population was "unbelievably high".

Name	Capital	Principal Languages	Religion(s)	Head of State
Skandalutz	Anakhit	Skandalic, Middle English	Mother Goddess Worship	Queen Tanna Hanna CCXLV & consort
Temporary Roman Empire*	Roma Temporaria	Latin (official), Rumanian, German	Syncretic Polytheism	Sextus Licentius Nero Caesar Augustus

* - This commonly used name is a mistranslation of "Imperium Romae Temporariae", properly "the Empire of the Temporary Rome". The empire's history provides the reason for this usage.

Name	Capital	Principal Languages	Religion(s)	Head of State
Patrimony of Polykarp	Polykarpopolis	Zapadoslavian, Wendish	Polykarpian Christianity*	Patriarch Myachislav VI
Wogastisburg-Schlämpenbüttel	Wogastisburger-Neustadt	German, Polish, Breton English**	Roman Catholicism, Protestantism	Grand Duke Bardolph IV
Pundschruck	Drzunkdorp	Pundschrucki ***	Marxist-Leninist-Trotskyist-Garbulian Communism	People's Chairman Upyür Arslan****

* - Nowhere else is this recognized as Christianity.

** - Nowhere else is this recognized as English.

*** - This is a Finno-Ugrian language of uncertain affinities, most nearly related to Dzhibrish, which is spoken by 485 tribesmen on the Upper Yenisei. However, in the larger towns it is always possible to find someone who speaks Seljuk Turkish.

**** - Bayazid Otto Mircea Arpad de Dzhenurot, a waiter at the Schlag-berst Kaffeehaus in Vienna, claims to be the rightful King of Pundschruck, from which the old Royal Family was expelled in the Revolution of 1947.

The flags of the Four And A Half Kingdoms are described from data furnished by the American Vexillological Association's Committee on Insignificant Nations:

S.kandalutz - The national flag shows the new, full, and old moons in silver on a dark blue field. The King and Queen have their own standards, but these cannot be described in a family publication.

Temporary Roman Empire - The national flag shows a Roman imperial eagle with the initial of the reigning emperor on its breast. In the corners of the flag are the initials "S. P. Q. R.", and beneath the eagle, in smaller letters, are the words "Pro Tem." All charges are white on a red background. Legionary flags have the legion's Roman numeral rather than the Emperor's initial.

Fravoslavnic Patrimony of Polykarp - The flag bears the Polykarpian Triple Cross in red on a white field. The Patriarch's personal standard is white, with the Quadruple Tiara in gold above a red padlock.

Grand Duchy of Wogastisburg-Schlämpenbüttel - The national flag, indicating the two ancestral houses of the Grand Duke, is a tasteful blend of Wogastisburg vermillion and Schlämpenbüttel maroon in six alternating horizontal stripes. (This flag is said to have been designed by Grand Duke Dietbold the Delicate.) The Grand Duke's personal flag is his arms, but these have so many quarterings and sub-quarterings that no two writers have been able to agree on an exact description. There is also a naval ensign, dating from the 13th century, when the Holy Roman Emperor Fridolin the Facetious granted to Wogastisburg-Schlämpenbüttel a strip of land nine feet wide and extending 75 miles from the Grand Duchy to the Adriatic. (This grant was later revoked as a clause in the Peace of Bretigny.)

Pundschruck - The flag is the traditional standard of nine donkey tails. Since the Revolution red ribbons have been tied around them. The Pundschrucki claim their flag to be the original 9th-century battle standard of Arpad the Footpad.

THE MINISTRY OF MISCELLANY

Some changes of plan were made since VISITATION #1 was announced in GRAUSTARK #198. The heraldry publication of the Society for Creative Medievalism will be considerably larger, more elaborate, and better illustrated than had been originally planned. As a result, VISITATION #1 has dwindled into a mere announcement of this forthcoming publication. Meanwhile, any heraldry fan who is interested can get the copies of such first-draft pages as were printed by sending a stamped, self-addressed envelope to the Gamesmaster.

*

"A recent issue of a leading funeral magazine carried this news: 'What is the word in Vietnam? Hexaphene. Talk with the men in Mortuary Service in Vietnam and you will talk Hexaphene. With responsibility for treating battle casualties, complicated by elephant grass, these men rely on Hexaphene. They say, "We know what Hexaphene will do."'

"We all deplore the need for our being in Vietnam, but we are there. The men in Mortuary Service are there to perform a difficult but necessary service. We have talked with some of these men. They talk Hexaphene.

"Can you talk Hexaphene? For treating autopsy viscera, surface embalming, stillborns, routine and problem arterial embalming, routing and problem treatment of the cavities, the lower extremities...we guarantee there is a fabulous Hexaphene that will do the job better. Why be in the dark about Hexaphene? Order Hexaphene today. Unconditionally guaranteed." - Hard Times, 1 December 1969

*

This publication is not edited under the supervision of Bangs Leslie Tapscott.

*

Among other things, your friendly neighborhood Gamesmaster is a part of the works of the late James Branch Cabell. (Definition of an Intellectual: Someone who has read a Cabell book other than Jurgen.) I have an article in the current ("Summer 1969"!) issue of the Cabell Society quarterly journal Kalki entitled "The Two Cabells". The article deals with the propensity of Cabell for writing himself as a character in his own novels. Kalki is \$1.25 an issue from Paul Spencer, 665 Lotz Avenue, Oradell, N. J. (7649).

*

Yortzeit observances this month:

Jan. 3: Jack Ruby (1967)	Jan. 18: Rudyard Kipling (1936)
Jan. 4: T. S. Eliot (1965)	Jan. 21: V. I. Lenin (1924)
Jan. 8: Lord Baden-Powell (1941)	Jan. 24: Winston Churchill (196)
Jan. 17: Patrice Lumumba (1961)	Jan. 28: William Butler Yeats (Michael Quill (1966)
	Jan. 39: George III (1820)

*

"One never hears about the ninety per cent of American youth are law-abiding, clean, and studious, and don't concern themselves with war, bigotry, and human rights." - cartoon, New Yorker, 5 July 1969

*

Peter Ansoff's new address is 1824 Laurel Ridge Drive, Nashville, Tenn. 37215. New GRAUSTARK subscribers are Ritchie Dean, R. R. 283, Hillsboro, Ohio 45133; Robert Metzger, Apt. 10-F, Sharon Airport Road, Chapel Hill, N. C.; John & Mark Strella, 22 Met Medford, Mass. 02155. Larry Fong sends along the names of two Diplomacy fans. John Kuechle, 16502 Grays Bay Blvd., Wayzata, 55391 and Bob Kelso, 2350A Burch Drive, Beale AFB, Calif. 9591

*

"The flag, when it is in such condition that it is no longer a fitting emblem for display, should be destroyed in a dignified way, preferably by burning." - U. S. Flag Code

*

Dr. Terry Kuch is currently writing a book about computers. No, this is not another dreary tract about how the graph of rising IBM usage can also serve as a graph of unemployment. Kuch is interested in newspaper clippings and other stories about computer malfunctions, invasions of privacy by them, or personifications of computers by either their friends or their foes. His address is 7554 Spring Lake Drive, Bethesda, Md. 20034.

*

Marty Kirkpatrick, 320 Yale St., Nampa, Idaho 83651 is starting a new postal Diplomacy 'zine to be called Awasigpac. (That's Shoshone for "How can I tell folks around here about Diplomacy when they haven't heard of World War I yet?") Both regular and variant games will be carried; write him for further information. He also asks where he can get hold of a Jetan set. I don't believe a set has ever been manufactured commercially for this game, which was invented and first described by Edgar Rice Burroughs in his Chessmen of Mars.

*

By now, most defenders of the established order are getting a little tired of hearing our country's government, armed forces, and police referred to as "pigs". It is therefore with great regret that yet another such incident must be reported.

The man who called America a "land of pigs" was Nat S. Rogers, a Houston banker who at the time was a vice president of the American Bankers' Association. He did so before a meeting of the ABA's Mississippi branch, reported by financial columnist Pat Murphy in the New York Daily Column of 7 August 1969. In an elaborately developed metaphor, he told a tale of a "land of pigs" who developed an acorn standard and a highly developed economy. Business and labor leaders were called "porkbelly industrialists" and "the P. F. of L. and P. I. O.", while governmental leaders became "sooey politicians". All were called "greedy animals who look out for number one."

The men who went out into the streets and made the French Revolution simply echo the criticisms of the system which had been made by people within it. Where the American Bankers' Association leads, shall the Youth International Party fear to follow?

*

But some police don't mind the nickname. According to the New York Times of 8 December 1969, the Ann Arbor police department and the Washenaw County sheriff's department played on the previous day a football game charity benefit called the "Pig Bowl". The police, who won 19-0, were presented with the trophy, a pig-slopping can.

*

Yet another sovereign nation has taken its rightful place among its fellows. A barren and unnamed island off the east coast of Ireland has been purchased by a five-man board of trustees which includes Alan Ginsberg and something called Swami Vishnu-devananda. They will pay \$40,000 for this 20-acre island, which sounds high even though it does contain a 12th-century monastery. The 500-man group which plans to settle the island envisages it as a haven for love-ins, group marriages, narcotics, geodesic huts. The Augustan Society and the Vexillological Society will be informed if any kings or flags are erected.

BOOK REVIEWS

CHRONICLES - News of the Past (2 volumes; 2nd edition, Reubeni Foundation, Jerusalem, 1967)

These volumes, of which only the second is available for review, are a fascinatingly presented exercise in history and its interpretation. Each volume is a series of four-page newspapers written in contemporary journalistic style, dated at some important event in Jewish history. For example, the first paper in Volume II is headlined "Maccabee Army Liberates Jerusalem" and is dated "20 Kislev 3596" (165 B. C.), five days before the institution of the festival of Hanukah. The paper contains an account, with maps, of the battle of Emmaus, censored despatches about the continuing campaign against the Syrian Greeks, speculation about an alliance with Rome, and an article which compares Greek and Jewish philosophy from a contemporary standpoint.

Though of course the "newspapers" present a Judaocentric view of the world, other events are also covered. A military correspondent analyzes the Roman Civil War; "Worried" asks about a new heretical sect called the Nazarenes; a literary critic reviews St. Jerome's Commentaries or St. Augustine's City of God; a communist revolt is reported from 5th-century Persia. Modern readers will enjoy the fast-paced modern approach to events that are usually presented in the dusty tones of a history text. There are even advertisements; after an alliance of Jews and Persians seizes Jerusalem from the Roman Empire in 614, we see "While Persian Troops Cover the Land Let Persian Rugs Cover Your Floor". (The same issue carries word of a popular new game from India, called Nardashir. There are 16 black pieces against 16 white ones on an 8x8 board...)

Volume II contains 22 "newspapers" ranging from the Maccabean revolt through 969. ("Germans Threaten: 'We Will March on Paris!'" ; "Egyptian Capital Falls to Jewish Fatimid General"; "Otto's Son to Wed Byzantine Princess".) The previous volume deals with the period from Abraham to Nehemiah.

THE HORNBLOWER COMPANION by C. S. Forester (Little, Brown, & Co., 1964)

The first half of this book is "The Hornblower Atlas"; a series of maps in the chronological order of the adventures of Forester's famous naval hero. Numerous maps trace out his career in fine detail, including the commando raids on the French coast in 1794-5 and the treasure hunt in Marmorice Bay in 1807. To each map is appended a commentary by the author. In 1814 "the defection of Le Havre, with the encouragement of a British force, is paralleled by the defection of Bordeaux at the same moment of history; the parallel is made closer still by the undeniable fact that the Duc d'Angouleme was apparently present in the two cities simultaneously, and the student is faced with a choice between history and Hornblower".

The rest of the book is personal notes by Forester on the writing of the Hornblower saga, including the technical difficulties of writing about the hero in 1794 when everyone knows where he was going to be in 1808. The many people who have read the Hornblower novels with enjoyment will find The Hornblower Companion an unusual look into the mind that created the indomitable hero.

MISSION: THIRD FORCE by Michael Kurland (Pyramid, 1967)

This is a previous novel in the "Man from W. A. R." series, whose latest book, A Plague of Spies, was reviewed in GRAUSTARK #198. Peter Carthage heads a research and development team to a formerly French kingdom in Indo-China, whose king is trying to establish a constitutional

monarchy against the opposition of a parently Communist rebels on the one hand, and a clique of right-wing landowners on the other. (This latter group is the "third force" of the title, and of course the local CIA representative is on their side.)

Despite ideological differences, both the Communists and the "third force" see a danger to their own position if the king can manage to establish a stable democratic government and put across a program of land reform. So mysterious accretions of money and weapons benefit the rebels, and Carthage and his crew of non-governmental "military advisers" have enemies on both sides.

Kurland's fey sense of humor is not so evident here as it is in A Plague of Spies. An address in the local language begins "Ferthu Theoden hal..." and a native alcoholic beverage of treacherous potency is called gart rhandi.

COUP D'ETAT: A PRACTICAL HANDBOOK by Edward Luttwak (Fawcett, 1969)

The author observes that the coup d'etat is as important a sort of governmental change as is an election or a revolution, but has not had nearly as much study as these other two processes. He carefully distinguishes between the coup d'etat and the revolution; the former has a broad popular base and seeks to make basic changes in the system of government, while the latter attempts to preserve the existing system and merely make changes in the personnel running it. An appendix lists all coups d'etat, successful and unsuccessful, from 1945 to 1967. This list omits the revolts which placed China and Cuba under Communist governments, but includes the Czechoslovak revolution of 1948. However, only one of the revolving-door governments that afflicted Saigon in the early 1960's is considered a coup: the 1963 revolt in which President Diem and his brother were killed.

But, though one may disagree with whether some specific action was a coup or a popular revolt, there is little to cavil about when Luttwak goes into the details of organizing and carrying out a coup. Elements of the armed forces are chiefly to be relied upon, as being the only people with the training and ability to carry off a quick action and assume de facto control before the general public realizes what is up. How to recruit officers to the cause with maximum effectiveness and minimum risk, what branches and levels of the armed forces to court, and how to neutralize potential opposition, are all discussed. The author, like Machiavelli before him, has abstracted an immense amount of historical detail into a few general principles.

In undeveloped and developing countries, the army is almost the only organization in which a man can rise from the lower levels of society to high position on his own merits. (The locally dominant religion is another way, which could explain much about the new trends in the Roman Catholic Church.) Thus, to some extent, the Egypt of Nasser or the Thailand of Kittikachorn bears some resemblance to the England of Cromwell or the Serbia or Dimitrijević, and a military coup does not necessarily have the reactionary character that it would in, say, the United States or even the Dominican Republic. Syria, which Luttwak characterizes as the most thoroughly coup-governed nation, even permits as a normal part of the accepted political process the canvassing by officers of their colleagues for service in future coups.

Numerous differences between the coup and conventional or revolutionary warfare are categorized. Chief among these is the different treatment of reserve forces. Military commanders learn from their earliest days as cadets that some forces must always be held in reserve,

(continued on p. 12)

DEPARTMENT OF UNHISTORY - II

Postal Diplomacy game 1969BI is being played by the winners of several quiz contests that were held in GRAUSTARK. A new postal Diplomacy game is now in process of formation; like 1969BI, it is limited to winners of quizzes. The following quiz deals with various historical events which are not commonly found in the history books and courses because too many people find them embarrassing. The deadline for the answers is NOON, SATURDAY 31 JANUARY 1970. If more than four entries come in, the runner-up as well as the winner will qualify for a place in the new game.

1. In what American town is there a monument honoring the members of a lynch mob?
2. To which of the following organizations did Lee Harvey Oswald belong?
 - A. The Communist Party.
 - B. The Socialist Workers Party (Trotskyite).
 - C. The American Civil Liberties Union.
 - D. The Fair Play for Cuba Committee.
 - E. The KGB.
 - F. A branch of Soviet military intelligence.
 - G. The National Rifle Association.
 - H. The Society of Friends (Quakers).
3. In 1941, what future President of the United States proposed conditions for an alliance between the U. S. and Germany against Russia?
4. Besides any political beliefs, what did the following four men have in common?

A. Thomas J. "Stonewall" Jackson	C. Rev. Dallas Roquemore
B. Ernst Roehm	D. George Lincoln Rockwell
5. What two successive English monarchs were both bisexuals?
6. Which one of the following men balled Queen Victoria?

A. Benjamin Disraeli	C. Napoleon III
B. John Brown	D. Leopold I
7. What do the following British nobles have in common?

A. The Duke of Richmond	C. The Marquess of Bute
B. The Duke of St. Albans	D. The Earl of Munster
8. Identify the monarchs known by these sobriquets:

A. "Barefoot"	C. "the Caresser"
B. "Yea-and-Nay"	D. "the Sot"
9. It is generally believed that England has not been invaded since 1066. Identify four invasions of England that have taken place since that date.
10. Identify the only white man ever crowned king upon United States territory.

*

The next contest, in GRAUSTARK #201, asks you to identify a list of women by the prominent historical figures whose mistresses they were. It is called "Whose Little Girl Are You?" I suppose that, to satisfy the members of the Women's Liberation Front, an equivalent competition should be arranged under the opposite conditions, but I can't think of any names for it except Platon Zubov, Arturo de Godoy, Owen Tudor, Concini, Razumovsky, and Sickles.

*

Another forthcoming contest will name triads and ask for their identification. As an example, one triad will be "Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah". Don't send in your answer yet; wait till all nine (a triad of triads, naturally) are published.

BOOK REVIEWS (continued from p. 10)

but a coup must succeed at once or not at all, and every unit of force must be thrown into the initial effort.

Considerations after the coup are also taken into account. Should the new government announce elections, and if so, under what circumstances should they be held? How should any major powers with interests in the nation be conciliated? How should domestic factions be balanced off? In dealing with these questions, Luttwak does not take political sides. The question of whether the new regime should institute land reform is discussed, not on the basis of whether the nation needs land reform, but whether the situation justifies giving greater concessions to the peasants or to the landowners in order to retain power.

There are simulation games based on war, and on elections. However, the reviewer has seen only one based on the coup d'etat, and it seems to be a 19th-century-oriented game of limited scope. Perhaps Luttwak's book, dealing as it does with the contemporary world scene, could be made the basis for a simulation game dealing with this common but neglected method of changing governments.

THE MINISTRY OF MISCELLANY (continued from p. 8)

Richard V. Allen, the White House staff member who office sandbox was described in GRAUSTARK #199, has left his job, according to Group Research Reports (14 October 1969). He is "approximately the seventh person to leave Dr. Henry C. Kissinger's national security staff at the White House - all claiming to have no disagreements with the President's top adviser on foreign affairs."

Among Allen's other problems, his doctoral dissertation has been challenged, and he may suffer the rare punishment of being degraded from this dignity. The report doesn't say what happened to his sandbox.

*

The Christmas gift of a new typewriter, a forecast 12 pica portable, puts an experimental coloration on this issue. At least pages 10 and 12 are typed on this machine, while pages 5-9 and 11 are done on an 18-year-old Royal portable.

*

Brentano's has a new simulation game called Dynasty, which might prove of interest to Diplomacy players. It is designed for from 4 to 8 players, and deals with the administration of a land ruled by an Emperor, protected by a Great Wall in the north, and divided by several large rivers, but otherwise unidentified. Players may be Emperor, Scholar, Official, or Peasant, and play appropriate roles. One drawback is the price: \$15.00.

A review of this game might appear in a future issue, if I decide to buy it.

Meanwhile, for New York area Diplomacy players who have not yet purchased a set, Diplomacy is available at a discount price of \$7.04 from Spiegel's on the corner of Nassau and Ann Streets in lower Manhattan. Spiegel's is, as far as I know, the best place in Manhattan for toys and games at low prices and with a wide selection.

*

Diplomacy, a simulation game based on World War I, was invented by Allan B. Calhamer and is Copyright 1961 by Games Research Inc., 48 Wareham St., Boston, Mass. 02118. GRAUSTARK, the oldest postal Diplomacy bulletin, is 10 issues for \$1 from John Boardman, 234 E. 19th St., Brooklyn, N. Y. 11226. Back issues are 15 for \$1.

*

Hal Naus's A Droite A Gauche (more compactly ADAG) is, fortunately, not defunct as was reported in GRAUSTARK #199. The latest issue has just arrived. ADAG is now one of the oldest surviving Diplomacy bulletins in the field; its Gamesmaster's address is 1011 Barrett Ave., Chula Vista, Calif. 92010.

*

Apropos of nothing, you are about to get a demonstration of the new symbols on this new typewriter. I am curious to see how they reproduce on stencil. In addition to such features of the more modern machines as the "+" and the "=", it has supplementary keys for [square brackets], the degree symbol, π as in πr^2 and $4\pi r^3/3$, exponents as noted, and such mathe-

+++++

Yesterday it was so cold that a 33° Mason went down 10°.

+++++
 matical symbols as make possible solution of $ax^2 + bx + c = 0$ when $x = \frac{-b \pm (b^2 - 4ac)^{1/2}}{2a}$. However, some of these symbols seem to be an act of supererogation. There is no need for a special key for "±" when the half-spacing allows it to be represented with the "+" and "-" keys as "±". And keys for "1" and "!" do little good for reflexes accustomed to representing "1" with a small "1" and compounding "!" out of "!" and ".".

For that matter, many of the keys on a standard keyboard are not really necessary. The "ç" can be done with "c" and "/" as "ç"; likewise "\$" can be replaced by "S" + "/" = "\$". (Or, in addition, "L" + "f" = "E" for the Anglophiles.)

Comments from those fortunate few who possess Selectrics or Veri-Typers may be foregone, please.

*

As mentioned elsewhere, in the rules discussion in the letter column, the postal Diplomacy rules and rulings used in GRAUSTARK are collected in #190. This issue is available at the standard back issue rates, which are 10¢ each or 15 for \$1. Presently available back issues are 48, 51, 71, 72, 76-79, 81-83, 85-87, 90, 91, 101-115, 117-125, 127-145, 147-153, 155-157, 161, 166, 167, 170-175, 177, 183-188, 190-193, 195-199. The 28th, 39th, and 40th & last issues of RURITANIA (now merged with GRAUSTARK) are also available.

*

The Rod Walker Self-Refuting Argument reaches new heights in Numenor #57, alias Erehwon IV, #2. Read it and weep, with pity or laughter as suits your character, from its publisher at 5058 Hawley Blvd., San Diego, Misinformia 92116. In this issue, Walker claims that the U. S. atrocities in Vietnam are "isolated and atypical", by contrast presumably with massacres which he accuses the Vietnamese government of planning.

Last year, an American colonel named George Patton III caused a mild furor by sending out Christmas cards showing a heap of Vietcong bodies under the words "Peace on Earth". Commander of the 11th Armored Cavalry Regiment, he also posed with the polished skull of a guerrilla with a bullet hole above one eye. (Jack Anderson, New York Post, 17 December 1969.) The U. S. government has shown what it thinks of Patton's actions and attitudes - by promoting him to general.

Bill Linden thinks that the U. S. is in Vietnam to protect the natives against an International Communist Conspiracy. Rod Walker thinks that we are there to secure a bastion of the American Empire, a strategy which he thinks mistaken in this particular instance but valid in general.

Between the Songmy and other massacres, and the honors recently given to General Patton, we can determine a motivation for U. S. Vietnam policy which fits the observed facts much more closely - bloodlust.

THE DIPLOMATIC POUCH

Since no letter column has appeared in GRAUSTARK for several issues, the date of each letter will be printed after the writer's name and address. The order in which letters appear in this column depends solely on the order in which the editor plucks them from the letter file.

DAVID JOHNSTON, 5451 Rockwood Rd., Columbus, Ohio 43229 (13 November 1969): A few questions about WWI Diplomacy ((a variant whose rules appear in GRAUSTARK #107))...

1. Allied powers are separate for purposes of builds?

((The only modifications made in the Diplomacy rules are those that appear in #107. Thus, for purposes of builds, allied powers are separate. If in the course of a year's action Germany loses one supply center and her ally Turkey gains two, Germany must remove one unit and Turkey builds two.))

2. May allied powers invade one another, destroy or retreat units, etc? This is especially important in Russia; may the other Entente Powers invade Russia? Before "Fall 1917"?

((Allied powers may enter one another's territories. If, for example, Turkey occupies Budapest at the end of a Fall move, it is thenceforth counted as a Turkish supply center until it changes hands again. But military action against an ally is forbidden under the Diplomacy rule which renders invalid attacks on one's own pieces.))

3. Do "American" armies assume the nationality of the home supply center? May they be rebuilt if destroyed?

((American armies retain their own nationality. Usually in play I represent them as British armies, but lying on their side so as to be distinguished in a survey of the board. A new American army is landed in Brest, Liverpool, London, or Edinburgh after each "Fall" move beginning with "Fall 1917". This is without regard to any destruction of American armies that may have taken place in that game year. The only limitation is the necessity of a clear line of travel from America to the Entente Power port where the army is disembarked. If, for example, the Central Powers occupy the Mid-Atlantic and the English Channel, an American army cannot be landed in Brest.))

4. May units built because of supply center ownership be rebuilt if destroyed? While "American" armies exist which make up more units than supply centers?

((There is no change in the rules; a unit may be rebuilt if it is destroyed and its country has a home supply center free, with sufficient supply centers in that country's possession to justify the build. With regard to the Europe of 1917, America may be regarded as possessing an effectively infinite number of supply centers.))

((The opening moves of WWI-C, a game played under these rules with Johnston as the Entente Powers and David Lindsay as the Central Powers, appear elsewhere in this issue. Back issues of GRAUSTARK #107, the issue in which the rules of this variation are printed, are still available.))

ALIAN B. CALHAMER, 321 W. Calendar, LaGrange, Ill. 60525 (6 Sept. 1969): I would appreciate it if you would run the following...in GRAUSTARK:

Attention Completist Collectors: National Geographic available 1928 to date, except 1931, last 11 months of 1930, first 11 months 1932, and Jan. 1958. Total 465 issues, 37 complete years.

ROD WALKER, 5058 Hawley Blvd., San Diego, Calif. 92116 (17 August 1969): Note from your postal rules ((in GRAUSTARK #190)) that you allow change of position by convoy. You probably always have, but I had always thought that this was contrary to your "strict constructionist" view of the

rules.

Would also appreciate comments from you on the rules problem raised in Erehwon III, #10 (the one with the German, French, and Italian units). It seems to me that this is one of those discrepancies between letter and intent of the Rules.

((In the indicated situation, France has armies in Burgundy and Ruhr, Germany has armies in Munich and Silesia, and Italy has armies in Bohemia and Tyrolia. Germany knows that France and Italy are allied, and suspects that France may attack Munich with Italian support. He attempts a ploy to prevent this, which results in the following moves:

FRANCE: A Bur-Mun; A Ruh S A Bur-Mun.

GERMANY: A Mun holds; A Sil S FRENCH A Bur-Mun.

ITALY: A Boh & A Tyr S FRENCH A Bur-Mun.

In posing the problem, Walker cites the rule that "an order to move, with support, against a unit belonging to the same country as the moving or supporting unit is of no effect". He feels that this order invalidates not the French attack but the German support. I concur in this ruling; certainly supporting an attack against one's own units by a foreign power is invalid. I would therefore rule as indicated by the above underlining of invalid orders.))

(25 November 1969) I think I had better clarify something about 1969BW...First, let me mention that the NFFF Games Bureau Diplomacy Division does consider your game something other than "regular" since it (the game) does not use Koning's Rule. However, this is irrelevant to my numbering of the games.

As you know, John Koning adopted the practice of assigning the symbol "#" to any game which, in his opinion, was not a "regular" "postal" game. You may also recall that I disagreed with him on particulars of his definition, since it excluded the "Napoleonic" 5-man game (and all non-7-man games) and "telephone" games. I consider such games regular and have them in the Numenor M. P. Listing. I do not consider 1969BW to be a variant. I have, however, followed Koning's precedent in this matter, since the game is not, strictly speaking, "postal". All of the players are located in the same metropolitan area, and hence may easily carry on negotiations by telephone.

This does, however, create the problem of a system unable to differentiate between regular games which have slight irregularities and regular-looking games which are really variants. In the next Numenor, this problem will be dealt with. Games will be in three categories:

*Regular games (1969BW)

Regular games with irregularities or unusual features (less than 7 players, all players in same metro, etc. - essentially, games I rate, but which others may consider variants) (1969BW)

*Variants in regular form (use of Changing of the Guard, use of in-person play, improper procedure - such as the "games" which Brannan put Boardman into without his permission, true variants accidentally numbered, etc.) (1969BW#).

((Since John Beshara is the Gamesmaster of 1969BW, myself being only the humble printer, I'll let him comment on this matter. Since I feel that rating systems are pointless in Diplomacy, I don't care how the games are recorded for inclusion in such. But I find it rather amusing that the NFFF GB, which often seems to share the foibles of its parent organization, is ruling as variants all the games ever published in GRAUSTARK, in which the whole business of postal Diplomacy was founded. The situation commonly called "Koning's Rule" is discussed in the sample rule interpretations in GRAUSTARK #190, p. 5, Ruling 7. I follow not Koning's Rule but Calhamer's.))

Latest GRAUSTARK, as usual, full of all sorts of unhistory. Vietnam atrocity stories interesting but irrelevant. One expects any minute to

hear of GIs roasting VN babies on bayonets, or maybe sacrificing them to Yob-Haggoth. Some stories doubtless true, but others are pure fantasy. Of these latter, no amount of listing them in print, nor depositions by self-proclaimed "eye-witnesses" can turn them into reality.

((Cannibalism? Well, when the Crusaders were besieging Akko in 1099, they killed and ate Turkish prisoners. According to Harold Lamb, this was done not out of extreme famine - the Christians, after all, were the besiegers, not the besieged - but as a gesture of contempt to show that they regarded the Turks as beasts rather than men. Since American soldiers in Vietnam have the same regard towards that country's people, I would not in the least be surprised to hear rumors of cannibalism. Such rumors do not yet exist, though I have inquired in quarters most likely to credit and repeat them. But, if these stories ever get started, I do not doubt that there will be Americans ready to deny them, downgrade them, excuse them, or urge its greater use - all at once.))

In any event, the winning side in Vietnam will massacre vast numbers of presumed political opponents, so the only real question is the identity of the victims. The Vietcong extermination program will probably include merchants, planters, affluent peasants, and the intelligentsia. GRAUSTARK's position thus boils down to an affirmation of the right of the Vietnamese to commit their own genocide without outside help, with a distinct preference for the northern thugs instead of the southern ones. ((It thus agrees with the U. S. government's official position on the Indonesian massacres.))

In any event, throwing Saigon to the wolves is in our national interest and will no doubt be accomplished later next year. Whether this represents a "victory" for anyone is moot. It certainly does not represent any sort of accomplishment by America's jacquerie. It is impossible to see how public opinion can be represented by an unwashed and unlettered mob of radical bigots whose abysmal ignorance of world affairs and American foreign policy is matched only by their presumptuous and egomaniacal opinion of their own importance.

It is, on the other hand, impossible to know what public opinion is. And if we did, who cares? The public is largely mis- or uninformed - mostly through choice - and is not equipped either by training or intellect to derive clear understandings from such information as may be available to them.

((Yes, Daddy.))

Thus, handing South Vietnam to the north on a silver platter is, as GRAUSTARK claims, a victory. It is a victory for Realpolitik. The United States will have disposed of a weak and useless dependency in a manner befitting both its weakness and its uselessness. It will have a salutary moral: Uncle helps those who help themselves, and only the fit will survive. It will also be useful to us if the North Vietnamese carry out a particularly bloody purge, as an object lesson to others within the American Empire who might be tempted not to pull their own weight.

I note with a certain amount of pleasure that my arguments fail to be met head-on. The quibble about the bellicose nature of certain countries is irrelevant, of course. I might point out in passing, however, that Egyptian forces are not in the Yemen with the permission of the legally constituted sole government of that country, that of His Holiness the Imam. The so-called "republic" is merely a clumsy creature of Egyptian imperialism.

((In this respect it may be compared to the "Terijoki government" set up in Finland by the USSR in 1940, or the "Saigon government" set up in Vietnam by the US in 1956.))

In any event, my main arguments have not been touched upon - but, rather, peripheral issues of no practical importance. The only sure road to world peace is a world government. Any other plan, by definition, is a

chimera and a delusion. Effective international monopoly of force will be impossible without the cooperation of the Great Powers and other major nations. Some countries, such as France, South Africa, Egypt, and China, will be much less likely to give assent to such a project than others. They alone would serve as an effective barrier to global collective security, not to mention the reluctance of the United States and the Soviet Union to participate in such a scheme. ((For details of US opposition to a world government plan, see the Iron Mountain Report. A review and discussion of this report' by Brian Burley will appear in a future issue of GRAUSTARK.)) Therefore, there will be no international monopoly of force in the near future. Therefore, wars are inevitable.

=====
"PREDICTABLE: Acceptable. As "In these circumstances (Chicago, 1968 Democratic Convention) the behavior of any group of policemen is depressingly predictable." - The Great Society Dictionary
=====

=====
Weak nations are more likely to be attacked than strong ones. Our empire may make us a more tempting target - but if we give up our armed force, we will be almost irresistible. Russia and (by 1980) China are states of great power and vaulting imperial ambition. Can we exist as a sheep among such wolves?

CHRISTOPHER SCHLEICHER, 1535 Dartmouth Lane, Deerfield, Ill, 60015 (9-10 December 1969): I thought your piece "The Lines Were Already Drawn" ((in GRAUSTARK #198)) very good. The only part I did not like was the last, where you attacked the Hawks found in the letter column of GRAUSTARK. I would hope that their consciences shame them enough now - public censure will not help anything, it will only stir up bad feelings.

- This is
- O At
- P Great
- E Intervals
- R This
- A Appears
- T To
- I Inflamm
- O Optic
- N Nerves

((Where were these lovers of peace in 1965, when we needed them?))

The views these people have held concerning the institution of war, I hope, will be changed by the truth of what war is. The fact that these people have been misled and deceived by propaganda from our government and contemporary educational systems should not be a reason for your attacking them. Rather, they should be attacked if they don't change their views in the face of the truth, i. e., Songmy and the other nameless atrocities of war on both sides.

419

! ! ! ! !
"For all we know, a secret commando team from Paraguay is running around Viet Nam killing civilians for nefarious purposes known only to General Stroessner." - Rod Walker, Erehwon IV, #2.
! ! ! ! !

This subject brings to mind the same sort of thing that occurred before and during the American Civil War. The issue was slavery at this time, but the lines were drawn in much the same way. The difference is, that not all Southerners defended slavery until it was attacked, and the whole of Southern civilization along with slavery. The danger we face now is that attacks on Hawks may only harden their views on war if they feel that the whole of American civilization is being attacked instead of just the institution of war. (Witness the current rage of "America - love it or leave it!" signs.)

...I don't think that the Hawks of GRAUSTARK #194 should be condemned for holding the views they once held on the subject of war - after all, the majority of people once felt that way also. They should be rebuked if they still hold them after seeing the evidence of the aforementioned atrocities. Holding an opinion that you have formed by listening

to the propaganda of our government when that was the only thing available is one thing; clinging to that opinion in the face of evidence to the contrary (i. e., that we are the welcome protectors of the South Vietnamese, gallantly fighting the agents of International Communism, defending liberty, or anything else) is not only stubborn, but stupid.

I don't know, John. The whole situation is disheartening and disgusting. I'm afraid that it will only get worse, too. I hate to think of the whole country becoming divided over the issue of whether we should support our "leaders" (I don't really consider Spiro a leader, and RMN only inspires me to get sick) no matter what they do. "My country, right or wrong," sounds nice, but the whole quotation "My country right or wrong; when it's right, keep it right; when it's wrong, make it right" is much, much better.

GEORGE A. PATTON, 1841 Suffolk Rd., Columbus, Ohio 43221 (undated): I sent an entry fee to you early this year with the intention of playing in a game of Diplomacy. ((I wasn't enrolling then, as I could have told you had you let me know what the money was for.)) Since then I have discovered that I have subscribed to a magazine dedicated to the distribution of political propaganda. I was an Army Air Force pilot in W. W. II and I am sure that you can understand when I say I do not agree with your political views. I do not deny that you have a perfect right to express your views. On the other hand I am sure that you will agree that I should not be subjected to them against my will.

Therefore, please cancel my subscription to your magazine GRAUSTARK and try to make sure that your political propaganda is no longer sent to me.

((The unexpired balance of Mr. Patton's subscription has been contributed to the Vietnam Medical Aid Committee, where it may play some small part in healing the suffering caused by its original donor's beliefs.))

PATRICK CONDRAV, 55F Ridge Road, Greenbelt, Md. 20770 (undated): I don't really find it surprising that you aren't getting a lot of back talk from "Hawks" these days. You've been carrying with a dedicated line of neo-Marxist nonsense for quite a long time, and, as someone once wrote in, you are hardly likely to change. It rather surprises me that you have achieved greater or lesser backtalk as a result of the Songme or other publicity.

Your sense of chivalry in providing your own selections in lieu of backtalk must be commended.

Many a time I've prepared letters, but, knowing your love for tangential distractions, those letters get long and involved and are rarely mailed. I'm altogether as fond of free wheeling polemics as you are, and I'm not above any technique you've resorted to. It just doesn't seem worth the bother to submit a broad based polemic which can be ignored or pursued entirely along its weakest aspects. As editor you are a lousy referee!

Do atrocities by American troops give the lie forever to America's claim of moral superiority?

Face it, John, your love of the communist cause in Vietnam is not based upon an absence ((sic)) of "atrocities". Your fondness for the Bolshevik cause in Russia is not predicated upon whether or not such and such a number of Kulaks were butchered. Your contention that Russia, China, or whoever else is not out to get us is not based on whether or not a chubby fellow

then holding rank of premier once said "We will bury you."

I've read your occasional "prove-its" put in parentheses when critics mention communist mass murders. Actually you don't give a damn whether the Russian Communist Party killed 10 bandits or 20 million peasants when mopping up. You are equally indifferent to whether American and allied troops kill only armed communist soldiers caught parading in full dress uniform or if they slaughter every civilian who appears to be unfriendly.

Moral superiority? Americans do not share a rigid, common, set of moral principles. Most, in abstract terms, certainly do not favor murdering, killing, or otherwise eliminating non combatants on purpose. Under the circumstances, if for whatever reason you happen to favor an American bug out in Vietnam, incidents of American atrocities are fun to go into orgies of guilt, shame, and hysteria about.

Pro-Life? Pro-Death?

Basically I don't think you believe the good old V. C. can commit "atrocities" because by definition an act which furthers the cause of "world revolution" or whatever, or is intended to do so, is by definition moral. Thus it is evil to be a patriotic American, altogether acceptable to be a patriotic citizen of

=====
 "PATRIOTISM - Judging the merits of disputes on the basis of place of residence. Also, the capacity for increasing devotion to one's leaders and society the more outrageous their behavior." - The Great Society Dictionary
 =====

=====
 "The only government in Vietnam capable of maintaining itself without foreign assistance", however regrettable.
 =====

You are in a very fortunate position. Should you have decided as a North Viet Citizen to preach that it was, if not moral, at least acceptable, for Americans to be militant patriots, but sinful for the citizens of the DRVN to wage war I don't think life would be as much fun.

Of course you may not be a devout Marxist. (Marx said he wasn't either.) You may not be entirely enthusiastic about the form of government likely to be advanced by world revolution. You may not like governments at all. You seem to shift a bit on those things.

((I will state that I am considerably more sympathetic towards Communism than I was 15 years ago. The events that have brought about this shift have been almost entirely due to policies pursued by the United States and other governments in the name of "Anti-Communism".))

Giving you the benefit of a doubt, perhaps you share Lord Russell's contention ((as written where?)) that while it would be better all around for the Americans to run things, it is unlikely that the totalitarian regimes can be brought to heel by pacifists, so the only sensible way to avoid war is to break down the American will to fight.

His logic is unassailable. It works every time. The rules don't count, integrity is out. ((Integrity is what makes a soldier obey without question his officer's order to shoot a child. Fuck it.)) You can't, of course, win many converts by simply telling Americans that they'd better surrender because the Russians aren't going to ease up until we do. You can't come up to the strongest nation on earth and say "true, you've got more per-

sonal rights, more material possessions, etc. but those people have demonstrated a willingness to do anything it takes to advance their ideology. You haven't got a political system you can cram down the throats of an emerging nation. You haven't the stomach to shoot anyone who disagrees with you because you aren't even in the habit of agreeing with one another."

Curiously, in the one case of flagrant U. S. defiance of international law the whole fabric of falsehood and hypocrisy fall away.

Where were all the people who shout "shame, shame, immoral, imperialist" etc. etc. when Kennedy simply told the Russians to take their damned missiles out of Cuba?

((I don't know where that great moralist Patrick Condray was, but I was attending protest meetings and printing publications that said "Shame, unjust, immoral, imperialist."))

Neutral nations, annoyed allies, nations developed and underdeveloped looked at that and did everything but cheer. Some cheered. All of a sudden hardly anybody liked the Russians even a little tiny bit.

- Of course, Russia was Cuba's ally, and Cuba had no objection to the missiles, and legalistically, it was none of our damned business.

This, of course, didn't matter.

On the other hand, to assist an ally is unjust and immoral if it looks as though we are not going use all possible force or else. ((sic))

Seven hundred thousand idealistic young Japanese may stage a riot over return of Okinawa and getting rid of American bases.

Get the Russians out of Sakhalin? Are you kidding?

I believe it was Gandhi who once said that you don't go on a hunger strike against people who hate you.

((No; he advocated mass suicide for such circumstances as this. Where do you get the idea that quoting Gandhi to me will do you any good?))

Hmmm - you are back to pure pacifism on page 5 ((of GRAU-STARK #198)).

"Or merely believe that there are circumstances in which a nation may legitimately go to war."

In point of fact, such a belief is inherent in the definition of a nation state. Having a war at any particular time or place may or may not be a good idea, but, as you have often said of the late great Ho Chi's bunch, they are the only bunch in that place that can defend themselves or, how did that go - "maintain themselves without foreign intervention?" By military action right?

Additionally, if you want to pass internal laws which can under no circumstances be enforced by violence, legislation is no problem - no need for congressional or other governmental action - just write your own laws - on toilet paper.

PHIL PRITCHARD, Perkins Hall 27, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 02138 (8 December 1969): Please remove my name from your mailing list immediately! Your propaganda is becoming progressively more sickening, one sided and illogical - i. e. trash which I can get from any SDSer on the corner here at Harvard.

If you persist in bothering me with this crap, I'll have to file a complaint with the post office.

You have my permission to print this, but don't send me a copy!

((If you can't refute it, reject it.))

JOHN McCALLUM, "A" Quarters, S. E. S., Ralston, Alberta (undated): ((In GRAUSTARK #197)) you state 'Smythe, who popularized Diplomacy among several of his students including John Koning'. Surely it was the other way around. It was Koning, a science-fiction fan, with contacts among those who played in New Jersey and in the Los Angeles Science-Fiction Society, and who saw your KNOWABLE & GRAUSTARK who first heard of the game and introduced it to his instructor, Smythe. The latter was a fanatic game player who, I have no doubt, introduced Koning to many games. But Koning was the originator of the Youngstown Diplomacy fad, as I understand matters at least.

((You're most probably right. I was writing on the basis of a recollection of several years' date.))

RON SALCEDO, 78 Charles St., New Rochelle, N. Y. 10801 (27 Nov. 1969): In #194 you referred to me as a Hawk. I never said I was a Hawk, but I vaguely remember telling you I supported Wallace. This does not make me a Hawk. Wallace's position was to rely on the generals. If they thought we could win, we would try to win, not fight the stalemate war we are fighting now. If they thought we couldn't win (not a likely possibility, I grant you) we would get out. To be honest, I think we would be better off getting out than doing what we are now.

I can not justify any atrocity committed by the U. S. in Vietnam. Nobody can. But I can say that any atrocity by our side is not a tolerated tactic, as is true with the V. C. (such as using civilians as shields, killing people to frighten others into joining their side, etc.) I would also say that anyone directly responsible for these outrages should be shot. (If I know you, you'll say Nixon should be shot for keeping us over there, but I doubt if many people will take such a ridiculous statement seriously.)

((Nixon is one of the few high governmental leaders who can be unquestionably exonerated from blame for the Songmy Massacre. He held no official position at the time.))

I do not think that acts such as those at Xuangoc are sufficient grounds for a withdrawal, either. Where there is war, these things happen. Nobody likes war, but let's face it - war is a real thing and can and sometimes must not be avoided at times. What would you have done to stop Hitler (short of war) if you were in Chamberlain's shoes? Poor Neville tried everything, but his delay eventually led to a larger war with more people killed.

((I have news for you. It is not 1938, and nothing can stop World War II from breaking out. However, we still have some freedom of choice and action in this respect in Asia.))

In #196, Brenton Ver Ploeg says he enjoys reading shallow philosophies. He must have been in hysterics over your little ideas on Raffaele Minichiello's hijacking of a jet plane. You conclude that, because Nixon sees that war is sometimes a possible (or even necessary) way of doing something, he believes that you should get what you want by pointing a gun and demanding it. Such a conclusion is so stupid it's pathetic.

((Three American Presidents were assassinated during or just after wars, two of them by ex-soldiers. The only British Prime Minister ever assassinated was shot at the height of the Napoleonic war. A wave of domestic lawlessness follows every war; most of the classical "bad men" of the old West were ex-rebels who couldn't adjust to civil society. War, the greatest crime, sanctions and even sanctifies all lesser crimes.))

...GRAUSTARK is fantastic - comes regularly, excellent games,

plenty of releases, all sorts of discussions, and serials. Also, let me say that I hold no grudge against you. I hold you in high regard, although I completely disagree with you ideologically and politically.

BILL LINDEN, 83-33 Austin St., Kew Gardens, N. Y. 11415 (25 Nov. 1969): Talk about Anastasia! Someone insists that Lavrenti Beria is alive and teaching economics at NYU.

((I'll believe anything about that so-called university. Prof. Alfred de Grazia is a supporter of Velikovsky's crackpot astronomical theories, and on 24 January 1970 the National Astrological Society will hold a convention there.))

...I am astonished that you should accept unquestioned the authority of a notorious turncoat like Josephus, who deserted the Palestinian National Liberation Front for the Romans to save his neck. Anyhow, you have not explained how you can simultaneously (1) condemn Turner for refusing to admit that Christianity is non-violent (GRAUSTARK #145); (2) Condemn me for refusing to admit that Christianity is violent; (3) Assert that the Church is an Establishment Plot (master-minded by a man whom the Establishment rewarded by killing him) ((and co-opting him)) (GRAUSTARK #188)). I believe that this is technically known as "doublethink".

((I believe that this is technically known as citing sources without reading them.))

...((In answer to Allan Calhamer's quiz in #196))

1. A. ((The Illiterate Parliament was)) the Parliament summoned at Coventry in 1404 by Henry IV, so called because lawyers were barred from it. ((Considering the flimsiness of his claim on the crown, I can understand why.))

1. D. ((The Anglo-Israel Identity Society was)) a movement founded in the late 18th century by one ((Richard)) Brothers, self-styled "Nephew of God", and dedicated to the proposition that the English are descended from the Lost Tribes.

(("French anti-Semites embrace the theory because it gives them a pretext for hating the English as well as the Jews." - de Camp & Lev, Lands Beyond))

1. E. ((Bread and Cheese Christians were)) Frisian peasants who revolted against Archduke Maximilian in the late 15th century.

2. ((In what Medieval celebration was the expression "he-haw" substituted for "amen" throughout the mass?)) The Festival of the Ass.

Ok, Allan, if you're so smart

1. Identify the New Republic. ((I presume the periodical of that name is not intended.))

2. You have heard of White Russia. But what is Green Ukraine?

3. It is fashionable to scream about "pigwarmongers". But what was the Pig War?

4. Where, in modern times, was the Land of Goshen?

Speaking of soapbars, what group has been going around much later than 1966, saying "Hitler had the right idea?"

"We'll have to accept every last de facto boundary as unchangeable." Except the 17th parallel, eh?

((I know of no government that has ever regarded the 17th parallel in Vietnam as the boundary between two nations.))

What do you mean, Oswald was a self-appointed "leftist"? Since when do you have to be "appointed" to hold a political position? Who "appointed" you a leftist? Oswald was on the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, he sought Soviet citizenship - what more is needed to make someone a leftist? Of course, the only reason for

dragging in plots at all, is that you can't afford to admit that Kennedy was murdered by a maniac on your side.

...And you are the great defender of assassination. If Communists assassinate people, that is True, Right, and Good; if people assassinate Communists, that is Evil, Pernicious, and Sinful. ((You draw an interesting dichotomy there.)) I hope you choke to death on your double standards. (You will doubtless announce this as a threat of murder.)

And your claim that only the American Nazi Party and the remnants of the George Wallace Movement disagree with you ((on Vietnam policy)) is too absurd for words. Would you tell me which of these groups you accuse me of belonging to so I can sue you for slander.

((Okay, here it is. I hereby announce, to whom it may concern, that William Lee Linden's position on Vietnam is indistinguishable from that of George Wallace as far as I can see.))

(9 Dec. 1969) Kindly explain how it is that you can support Communism without condoning the Dakson Massacre, but I cannot support America without condoning the Mylai Massacre. ((There's another interesting dichotomy. I haven't heard of any perpetrator of the Dakson Massacre being publicly commended and promoted in Hawaii, as the skull-collector Col. Patton was in Washington. As for Dakson, I did not deny that it took place, but only that its authenticity is highly colored by the known bias of the sources reporting it. It is interesting what a failure of judgment people are susceptible to on the question of Communism. Men who would not believe anything printed about Jews in an anti-Jewish newspaper will believe anything printed about Communists in an anti-Communist newspaper.))

...Your condemnation of Roosevelt and the Great God Kennedy is a belated step towards something like consistency.

But they that follow after the red rag without the white and the blue, they are wise above all others, eh?

Thanks for letting us know that you are so hard up for Unfamiliar Quotations that you have to repeat them. The Burros bit has appeared before.

((Yes, but not in as much detail as it did in GRAUSTARK #198. Besides, you should know that Burros was not one of those armchair theorists, who extol the glories of war and killing from a comfortable chair a long way from the line of fire. Burros believed what he wrote about the natural superiority of the killer. On Halloween 1965 he killed himself.))

HAL BAUS, 1011 Barrett Ave., Chula Vista, Calif. 92011 (25 Nov. 1969): In answer to your comments in GRAUSTARK #194 - no, I don't consider myself a Hawk. I never have once found any justification for our being in Vietnam. (Perhaps your impression that I was a Hawk had to do with an article that was printed in Xenogogic. Actually I had written it and Larry Peery dared me to send it in, so I did and he printed it.)

I can see many good things that the Anti-Vietnam protesters are doing along with some of the bad things. Granted the Constitution gives us the right to dissent, but where dissension violates the law of the land, that I cannot see. I cannot condone the invasion of Selective Service centers and destroying documents, nor the taking over of college buildings with the express intent to violate the premises.

I was one of the many lucky ones who had the privilege to fight for my Country during the Korean Police action (Actually my only fault was that I was in the wrong place at the wrong time.

(continued on p.31)

1969BW (continued from p. 4)

Spokesman for the Foreign Office Sr. Guido Bombasta issued the Italian Government's statement from his luxurious home in Bordello, Piedmont.

CAIRO: President Gamal Abdul Nasser (blessings be upon him) today summoned the French, Norwegian, and Italian Ambassadors to explain the appearance of the French gunboats in the Mediterranean. Following the meeting no communiqués were issued. It was rumored by Reuters, dateline Israel (may Allah remove my tongue), that the gunboats were headed for Southern Italy for "refueling".

1968CH - PRESS RELEASES

HOGWASHINGTON (URRP): President Pigasus J. Pig today abandoned his plan to seat Clem K. Tamworth on the Supreme Snort. Apparently Tamworth was stuck too deeply into his trough to be raised even to the level of a bench.

Tamworth's future plans are uncertain. It is rumored that he may resume a once-successful career on the air. Old-time radio fans will remember his highly successful show, on which he appeared with a stage name created by dropping his last name and expanding the middle one - Kadiddlehopper.

VIET HAM (URRP): Vice President Spiral T. (for "Tail") Agnew today visited this outpost of empire. Plans for a visit to the fighting front, however, were canceled when nobody could find it. The Vice President will leave Viet Ham in a few hours, before the fighting rear finds him.

NEW YORK (8 May 1910, Ecben Press): Acting at the request of the National Committee to Horsewhip Bangs Leslie Tapscott, the Governor-General ordered the arrest of every Italian in New York.

1967U - PRESS RELEASE

ROME: The democratic, peace-loving (sic) Italians stand ready to ruthlessly stamp out any glimmerings of Nazism that may appear in Germany.

THE MINISTRY OF MISCELLANEOUS

Another long-missing Diplomacy 'zine turns up - International Enquirer is still coming from Cliff Ollila and Ken Fletcher in Minneapolis. But it apparently won't be for long. Next month the best Minneapolis humorists since Max Shulman will turn over this 'zine to Harry Manogg, F. O. Box 769, Kankakee, Ill. 60901.

The list of subscribers on p 26 should be expanded to include Stephen Tang and Rich Rubin, whose subscriptions run to #209.

It now appears that the American atrocities in Vietnam are not accidentally committed by overzealous individuals, but are an integral part of American policy towards the people of that unfortunate land. For documented proof of this, based on the words of American soldiers subjected to such indoctrination as well as on reports from Vietnam, just drop me a line. You will be surprised and shocked by these disclosures.

ROSTER OF GRAUSTARK GAMES BEGUN SINCE 1 JANUARY 1967

John Boardman was the Gamesmaster of each game unless otherwise indicated.

1967F - No Gamesmaster until
F11

E - Michael Aita (res S12)
John Beshara (res S13)
Hal Naus (drew F15)
F - John Boardman (out F05)
G - Sheldon Stone (out F09)
I - Donald Berman (out F11)
A - Zita Rafailovich (res S12)
David Lebling (drew F15)
R - George Skorinko (out F08)
T - Marc Friedlander (res S12)
David Lebling (drew F15)

1967U

E - Robert Maloney (out F06)
F - Richard Uhr (dro S03)
Margaret Gemignani (out F04)
G - Michael Miller
I - Frank Clark
A - James Latimer (out F07)
R - George Heap
T - John Beshara

1967V

E - David Lebling (drew F12)
F - Frank Musbach (dro S03)
Eugene Prosnitz (drew F12)
G - Mehran Thomson (drew F12)
I - Thomas Griffin (out F07)
A - Hugh Anderson (drew F12)
R - Steve Gordon (out F03)
T - Sharon Heap (drew F12)

1968G

E - Rod Walker
F - Lawrence Peery (res F05)
Derek Nelson (dro F06)
Margaret Gemignani
G - Stephen Hueston (dro F03)
John Koning (out S07)
I - Michael Childers (out F05)
A - Ivan Musicant (out F03)
R - Eugene Prosnitz
T - David Lebling (won S14)

"dro" - Dropped
"res" - Resigned

1968J

E - Hugh Anderson (won F09)
F - Robert Maloney (out F05)
G - Jack Chalker (dro F03)
Hal Naus (out S07)
I - Mehran Thomson (res F06)
Margaret Gemignani
A - James Latimer
R - Thomas Griffin (dro F01)
George Grayson (out F06)
T - Steve Gordon (dro F01)
Jerry White

1968BD - John Beshara, Gamesmaster

E - Peter Comber (drew F09)
F - Bob Komada (drew F09)
G - Bill Linden (out F05)
I - Donald Berman (drew F09)
A - Eugene Prosnitz (out F08)
R - Robert Champer (dro F05)
Bill Linden (drew F09)
T - Edi Birsan (drew F09)

1968CH

E - Bill Linden
F - Donald Berman
G - David Johnston (out F06)
I - Jerry White (out F06)
A - Terry Kuch
R - Charles Johnson (dro S05)
Edi Birsan (res S09)
George Schelz (out S10)
T - Norman McLeod (dro S05)
David Lindsay

1968CI

E - George Grayson
F - Frank Clark
G - Dick Reiter (out S06)
I - Eugene Prosnitz
A - Edi Birsan (out S05)
R - Randy Bytwerk (won F09)
T - Brenton Ver Ploeg

Games 1967U, 1968CH, 1968CL,
1969BI, and 1969BW are still
in progress.

1968CL

E - George Schelz (out F04)
 F - Robert Ward
 G - Hugh Anderson (dro S05)
 Edi Birsan (res S08)
 James Barber (out F09)
 I - Peter Comber
 A - Norman McLeod (out F03)
 R - Harry Manogg (dro F04)
 James Sanders (dro S05)
 T - John Beshara

1969BI

E - George Heap
 F - Bruce Gletty
 G - David Johnston
 I - Donald Berman
 A - John Beshara
 R - Edi Birsan (res S03)
 Robert Ward
 T - Jerry White

1969BW - John Beshara, Gamesmaster

E - Arthur Lasky
 F - Dick Miller
 G - Joseph Shuldiner
 I - Paul Gorman
 A - Jay Kimmel
 R - Richard Wile
 T - James Becker

SUBSCRIPTION EXPIRATIONS

The recent completion of 1968CI, and the approaching end of 1968CL, mean that the GRAUSTARK subscriptions of a number of readers will soon be expiring. Unless you renew your subscription, or join a new game later, the indicated issue below opposite your name will be the last one you receive. (This listing is drawn up under the assumption that 1968CL will end in GRAUSTARK #201.)

Subscriptions to GRAUSTARK are 10 issues for \$1.00. New games will be opened up in a few weeks. Do not send in game registration fees now!

200 - Reiter	201 - Schelz	206 - Salcedo
201 - Allen	Theriahult	207 - Ansoff
Beyerlein	Wells	Bytwerk
Cerney	202 - Klyver	209 - Barber
Comber	203 - Cote	Grayson
du Bose	Stein	210 - Nelson
Emdee	204 - Casey	211 - Thomson
Houck	Storella	216 - Ferris
Kirkpatrick	205 - Gygax	222 - Ver Ploeg
Manogg	Metzger	223 - Poplawski
Moseley	206 - Anderson	242 - Wagner
Phillies	Dean	

The number of the issue with which your subscription expires appears in the upper right corner of the address label of each issue.

Data on this list are accurate as of 30 December 1969.

*

"Officers are amazingly expendable. In both France and Russia many officers left their units following the respective revolutions, and yet the armies seemed to experience a sudden increase in their efficiency."
 - Edward Luttwak, Coup d'etat

COMPLETED POSTAL DIPLOMACY GAMES - VIII

In the early years of GRAUSTARK, this series attempted to give brief reviews of all postal Diplomacy games. However, with the growth of the hobby the Gamesmaster is forced to cut back to a more manageable task - a report of the games in his own bulletin alone.

Earlier issues of GRAUSTARK have carried reports of earlier games. The completed games, which appeared entirely or in part in GRAUSTARK, FREDONIA, or RURITANIA, are listed below with their winner or winners, and the issue of GRAUSTARK in which the review appeared.

- 1963A - Derek Nelson, Italy (87)
- 1963B - Bruce Pelz, Russia (87)
- 1964A - James MacKenzie, Turkey (87)
- 1964B - John Smythe, Austria-Hungary (87)
- 1965A - Charles Wells, Turkey (87)
- 1965F - Charles Wells, Turkey (144)
- 1965J - Derek Nelson, Robert Lake, & John Davey (team) (87)
- 1965L - Frank Clark & John Koning (drawn) (100)
- 1965N - John Koning, Kim & Ovilla Pattee (team) (89)
- 1966B - Jerry Pournelle, Turkey (144)
- 1966G - Donald Berman, Italy (89)
- 1966R - Donald Berman, Christopher Wagner, & Kenneth Levinson (drawn) (144)
- 1967F - Hal Naus & David Lebling (drawn) (144)

Supply center charts, included as part of the game reviews, indicate how many supply centers each power controlled at the end of the year indicated at the head of the column by its last two digits. An asterisk indicates a supply center for which, for one reason or another, a new unit could not be built.

1965Q: This game spanned a long period in the history of GRAUSTARK. It began in the 71st issue on 7 November 1965, before the custom arose of putting a player's name after his country, and in the same issue as John Smythe's letter fervently supporting the American invasion of Vietnam and damning draft resisters. It ended in #147 on 30 December 1967 with a

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>1965Q: John Boardman, GRAUSTARK</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> E - Robert Lake (dro S02) John Koning (drew F22) F - Bob Whalen (dro F15) Bill Linden (out F20) G - John Smythe (dro F12) James Latimer (out F16) I - Donald Berman (out F13) A - Derek Nelson (res F02) Kim Pattee (out S19) R - Charles Reinsel (res F05) Anders Swenson (out F07) T - Terry Kuch (drew F22) | <p>draw in "Fall 1922", with both the 0-0-Hate and Beaucaillon columns in full swing, and with an article attacking the notion which governments have, that they are playing war games with live pieces. The game even antedates Reinsel's rupture of Diplomatic relations with GRAUSTARK!</p> |
|--|--|

In this game, Derek Nelson as Austria-Hungary paid the penalty for his reputation as a strong player. His neighbors all moved in on him, and mundane pressures compounded matters by forcing him to resign from the game. He was succeeded by Kim Pattee as Nelson's compatriot Robert Lake dropped out to be succeeded as England by Pattee's neighbor John Koning.

	00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	13	14	15
E	3	4	3	4	3	3	4	5	6	8	8	10	13	16	15*	15
F	3	5	5	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	2	3*	2	2	2	2
G	3	5	6	6	7	8	9	10	10	8	9	5	3	2	1	1
I	3	4	4	5	4	5	5	5	4	3	2	1	1			
A	3	4	5	5	6	7	6	5	5	5	5	6	5	3	2	1
R	4	6	7	6	5	4	2									
T	3	4	4	4	5	4	5	6	6	7	8	9	10	11	14	15

16 17 18 19 20 21 22

E 16 16 16 17 17 17 17

F 1 1 1 1

A 1 1 1

T 16 16 16 16 17 17 17

Koning started with an England that had just been expelled from a precarious position on the continent by a very promising Russia whose armies were already cutting deeply into Austria-Hungary. From this unpromising beginning, as the supply center chart shows, he built England after a few years into a major power. By 1903 Austria-Hungary had protected her rear with an Italian alliance and counter-attacked against Russia, also hard-pressed by England in the North.

With France reeling under a German-Italian attack, Germany moved against England in 1904. Turkey attacked an Austria-Hungary busied with driving back Russia, thus setting the stage for later Ottoman triumphs at the expense of both neighbors. In the following year, Italy also attacked the Dual Monarchy.

Then Germany and England again made peace, and by 1906 their alliance had Russia and France in desperate straits. Meanwhile, Turkey had been building fleets, and in 1907 seized the mastery of the Mediterranean to begin a steady rise towards the eventual showdown. At the time it seemed that the showdown would be with Germany rather than with England. But Smythe's moves faltered while England poured armies into Russia, and Austria-Hungary sought Turkish help against the Italian invasion.

When England seized several outlying German supply centers in 1909 the game went into its final phase. The Austro-Hungarian counter-attack into Italy was taken in the rear by a Turkish attack, and the two countries who had made the finals became obvious. Austria-Hungary became an English client-state, France served in a similar role towards Turkey, and after about a decade of maneuvering the two great powers agreed on a draw. As in 1965A, Turkey was incapable of bringing sufficient naval force to bear into the Mid-Atlantic.

1966Q: This game, like 1966G, began in a desk drawer in the Brooklyn College Physics department among myself and six students. It proceeded at 2 moves per week until the end of the academic year 1965-6, and then went postal. In this form it lasted through most of the next aca-

	00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	13	14	15
E	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3								
F	3	5	6	6	9	11	11	9	10	12	12	13	9	5	2	1
G	3	5	5	5	4	2	1	1	1							
I	3	2	3	1												
A	3	5	5	6	7	6	5	6	5	2						
R	4	6	7	9	6	6	7	8	11	11	12	11	12	15*	18**	18
T	3	4	4	4	5	6	7	7	7	9	10	10	13	14	14	15

demic year.

In the South, the war began with France and Austria-Hungary successful in alliance against Italy and Turkey. Then France, ably played by Mark Sadowsky, changed sides, apparently believing Italy to be a less dangerous neighbor than the Habsburgs. France also allied with Germany against England, a relatively rare development in Diplomacy.

Alliances continued to shift in the Balkans, strengthening Russia and Turkey while sawing away at Austro-Hungarian and Italian positions. Russia and France turned on Germany, enlisting England in the alliance.

By the spring of 1907 the game could no longer be continued on its earlier basis, and went postal. The Gamesmaster accordingly resigned as Germany. Mark Sadowsky could not continue as France, so the board was swept by the two remaining original players, Michael Aita as Russia and Don Berman as Turkey.

This game illustrated in an extreme sense the strategy of allying with former enemies to pull down any power that threatens to get too strong. This strategy seems to be more common in across-the-board games than in postal games; its use here indicates that in its early phases this game partook of the across-the-board character. This was obviously because players were able to negotiate face-to-face.

Once the game went postal, this strategy failed. A Franco-Turkish alliance failed to stop Russia's advance.

1966AA: Since this game had only two substitutions, its character appeared early in play and did not subsequently change. By 1904 England, Germany, and Austria-Hungary emerged as the leading powers.

Two uncommon moves marked the opening: immediate attacks by Russia on Germany and by Italy on France. Russia failed as a forewarned Germany mobilized to resist, but England and Germany also moved in, and France soon disappeared from the game. Russia, overextended in middle Europe, was overrun by England and ceased to be a major factor in the game.

1966Q: no Gamesmaster through S07, then John Boardman

- E - Steve Jacobs (dro S08)
Conrad von Metzke (out F08)
- F - Mark Sadowsky (res S07)
James Latimer
- G - John Boardman (res S07)
Donald Miller (out F09)
- I - Larry Reinstein (out F04)
- A - Gregory Salamo (dro F09)
Michael Vaughn (out F10)
- R - Michael Aita (won F15)
- T - Donald Berman

1966AA: John Boardman, GRAUSTARK

- E - James Dygert (out F13)
- F - John Smythe (dro F03)
Michael Vaughn (out F06)
- G - James Latimer (drew F14)
- I - Michael Aita (out F08)
- A - Rod Walker (drew F14)
- R - Robert Lake (dro F03)
Charles Turner (out F14)
- T - Earl Thompson (out F14)

	00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	13	14
E	3	4	6	6	8	8	10	10	9	10	5	4	2		
F	3	5	3	1	1	1									
G	3	5	7	8	9	10	10	11	13	12	15*	16**	18**	18**	18**
I	3	5	6	7	5	2	2	1	1*						
A	3	5	5	6	7	9*	8	8	7	8	10	10	11	14	16
R	4	4	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
T	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3*	2	1	

By 1904 a system of alliances had developed: Germany, with England as a junior partner, and Austria-Hungary, with Italy as a junior party. Turkey was in a situation that seems to occur fairly often in Diplomacy: she assumes an excellent defensive posture with three units and maintains herself because potential foes are too busy fighting off major foes on another front. The long survival of Turkey in this fortress and of Russia in the sole supply center of Sevastopol were due to Austro-Hungarian concern with the German menace.

In 1904 and 1905 the northern allies overrun Italian positions in and around the western Mediterranean, England attacking by sea and Germany by land. Other Italian supply centers were ceded to Austria, still too busy with German intrusions in Tyrolia and Galicia to mop up Turkish and Russian remnants.

England missed the "Spring 1908" moves. Immediately Germany moved an adventitious North Atlantic fleet into Liverpool. This was followed by a quick German occupation of England, leading to a showdown with Austria-Hungary as the game's final phase. While Germany was cleaning up in the west, the Dual Monarchy was finally able to occupy the eastern supply centers. But, with the necessity of keeping a guard against Austria-Hungary, Germany could not free home supply centers for the builds. A draw was therefore agreed upon in 1914; even though Germany had 18 supply centers to Austria-Hungary's 16, there was no room to build the two additional units that would have given the Germans the win.

1967V: (See p. 25 for the player roster.) This game was plagued with missed moves. Here a Franco-German alliance moved on England and Russia, while Austria-Hungary invaded Italy, while Turkey protected the rear. Then, in 1903, France joined England against the growing German power, having just come under the able direction of Eugene Prosnitz. This alliance achieved a notable success in the Fall of 1904, when Germany failed to submit moves and lost 3 units.

With Russia gone and Italy going, England attacked Germany. The game developed into indissoluble alliances between England and France on the one hand and Turkey and Austria-Hungary on the other. Germany affiliated with the latter group, eventually producing a five-man draw.

	00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12
E	3	4	3	4	5	4	4	5	6	7	7	7	7
F	3	5	6	6	7	8	8	8	9	9	9	9	9
G	3	6	7	8	7	6	6*	5	3	2	2	2	2
I	3	4	3	3	2	2	2						
A	3	4	5	6	6	6	7	8	8	8	7	7	7
R	4	5	5										
T	3	5	5	7	7	8*	7	8**	8	8	9	9	9

1968G: (See p. 25 for the player roster.) Often at the beginning of a game much depends upon Austria-Hungary. Exposed on three sides, it is an excellent target for its neighbors. However, Austria-Hungary is a necessary component of any successful anti-Turkish alliance.

In this game Austria-Hungary was played by Ivan Musicant of the Bronx, whom several players thought was a hoax. This is understandable; had I not met him personally I would also have thought

	00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	13
E	3	4	5	6	6	8	6	5	4	5	5	5	5	7
F	3	5	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3
G	3	5	5	6*	4	2	1							
I	3	4	4	4	2									
A	3	4												
R	4	6	6	8	10	11	13	13	15	14	14	13	11	7
T	3	5	5	7	9	11	12	14*	13	13	13	14	15	17

him to be a hoax. His failure to keep Turkey from taking Greece in 1901 may have been the beginning of the eventual Turkish victory.

The more experienced players were not slow to see and take advantage of the Austro-Hungarian weakness, as the supply center chart shows. The other central European nations also gradually collapsed, as moves were missed or insuperable enemy combinations encountered. After a promising start, Larry Peery seemed unable to deal with Rod Walker's England, and he resigned as France.

By 1905, Turkey had complete control of the Mediterranean and the end was in sight. In an attempt to prevent this, Russia attacked in 1907. This produced a general anti-Russian alliance, directed by Turkey. Even the later adherence of France to Russia failed to halt this alliance. David Lebling as Turkey kept the game going longer than necessary so that his ally Rod Walker, playing England, might wind up with more supply centers than Eugene Prosnitz's Russia. Since the game ended on the annihilation of a couple of Russian armies in Spring 1914, giving Turkey an absolute majority, it is a moot point as to whether the Turco-English alliance actually achieved this goal.

*

Additional completed GRABSTARK games will be analyzed in a future issue.

THE DIPLOMATIC POUCH (continued from p. 23)

Now if North Korea had waited until October to start their invasion ((assuming that that is what actually happened)) then I would have been home and not in Japan, all I was waiting for that Day was September 27th. Then my two year peace time enlistment would have been up, so instead of getting on a boat and heading for San Francisco, I found myself on another excursion boat heading for Inchon. ((Walker, should that be "In Chon" or "Inch On"??))

It is not an easy thing for a person brought up in the Roman Catholic Church, who believed in the Ten Commandments, especially the one Thou shalt not kill, and then hand him a rifle and say go out and kill for the Glory of America, go out and kill because if you don't, the enemy will kill you, and invade your Country. So I forgot all the teaching that I had learned in Catholic Schools and did kill for the glory of Mother, God and Country (XXX), I went, I fought in some of the most god-forsaken weather that he could ever invent, I fought and watched many a good young man die before his time (In my Company alone we lost 260 men out of 285). To many 18, 19 year old died for something they were not sure of, to many immature soldiers had to die. (God how I hate when a politician uses the word in reference to 18 year old being given the right to vote).

If you have never fought in a battle or war, then you can

never really know the feeling that lives in you, even to this day, if there is a movie on about Korea, I still think back and remember all those friends that are still there, never to laugh nor love again nor taste the summer time. (Stole that from Joyce Kilmer.)

Hawk, I am not, I can never see the useless waste of human life that war produces. Nor the way that a soldier has to live, eating food that was mass produced in 1945, or going without a bath or shave or a clean set of clothing for days on end.

- LARRY FONG, 704 Alice St., Oakland, Calif. 94607 (26 Nov. 1969): First, I think your issue on the war-peace etc. was great and I... would only wish that some day I may become half as informed as you appear to be.

BRIAN LIBBY, Box 2122, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 21218 (1 Sept. 1969): A few days ago, I received a ((sample)) copy of GRAUSTARK.

.After my last little run-in with you, ((see GRAUSTARK #127)) I thought I had made my position regarding both you and your magazine pellucid. Apparently, however, your memory is short; or perhaps you thought that, since I am now subscribing to Erehwon and am taking a more active part in postal Diplomacy, I would cherish a free copy of that propa-ganda sheet you call a 'zine.

Therefore, allow me to reiterate my position:

I DO NOT WANT YOUR MAGAZINE! I WILL NOT PAY FOR IT, AND I DON'T WANT FREE COPIES! I DON'T EVEN WANT TO BE REMINDED OF YOUR EXISTENCE!

Finally, perhaps you would be interested in learning the fate of that thing ((GRAUSTARK #191)) you mailed me? I tore it up and threw it away without reading any more than your address, and any further material you send me will get the same treatment.

(10 December 1969): Although I normally do not reply to letters which I receive from you, I thought it best to do so this time lest you infer by my silence that I either agree with or am powerless to refute the peace-creep propa-ganda of which you are so fond.

((This was in reply for a request for an article to balance out the bias of which GRAUSTARK is so often accused. Several pro-war readers were asked if they could supply an article for this issue in support of the Songmy Massacre.))

I have neither the time nor the desire to write an "article" as you requested. But, I would be glad to give my personal views on the subject.

The Songmy massacre, as you are aware, is still clouded in mystery. Some sources - elements of the South Vietnamese government, for example, - insist that there was no incident. Others say that 100, or 300, or 500 civilians were killed. In view of these facts, and also because we generally hold to the principle that men like 1LT Calley are innocent until proven guilty, I could scarcely "defend" something which is not yet either proved or fully examined - I only know what I read in the papers.

However, my personal feelings are that there was indeed some sort of atrocity committed, that American troops did in fact kill a large number of people who were not, officially at least, VC or VC sympathizers. I cannot give serious consideration to statements like those of an Australian soldier who said that the killings were justified because even the women and children knew how to throw grenades or use rifles. Still, I think that a distinction must be made between the "German" type of war crime - premeditated massacre of civilians carried out calmly far behind the lines - and a situation in which our troops were in an area where many of them had been

killed, near a village which was known or at least suspected of harboring terrorists, and wrought up to a pitch where any incident - a single shot, a gesture, a sudden motion - would be viewed as hostile. CPT Medina, for example, relates that he instantaneously fired at a moving figure he saw from the corner of his eye, only to find out too late that it was a woman - I would not classify that incident, given the situation, as murder.

Nevertheless, I can scarcely defend a massacre! ((What kind of a patriot are you, anyhow?)) IF it is proven that such an atrocity did take place, IF LT Calley is found guilty, then he should, certainly, be hanged! Other incidents have taken place and have been punished - in a guerilla war, occasional events like this are inevitable, but that does not mean that the guilty parties should escape just punishment.

((In other words, you join the peace movement and Hanoi in demanding Calley's punishment. Apparently "Support Our Boys in Vietnam" is just a meaningless slogan to your side. Sobeit.))

Now, let us turn to another matter. I would greatly appreciate it if you would defend the continuous and deliberate massacre of hundreds of thousands of North and South Vietnamese civilians by the followers of kindly, dear-departed Uncle Ho. (By the way, how did you react when the old devil kicked the bucket? I couldn't help dancing with joy - hadn't been happier since Che Guevara got zapped!)

You could start your defense - if I may be so bold as to suggest an outline - with the annihilation of at least 50,000 peasants in the North after the commies took over. (Fifty thousand is the figure given by Bernard Fall, who can scarcely be described as an American sympathizer.) Some put the figure much higher - Hoang Van Chi, a North Vietnamese doctor decorated by Ho in 1948 for service with the Vietminh, indicated that 90,000 were killed in one province alone.

((The comment to Bill Linden about the sources for these figures is applicable here. And, even if these figures are true, why is it our business any more than the 300,000 Indonesians murdered in 1965 by anti-Communists were? Why is it only massacres by Communists that should excite the moral indignation of Americans? Why must we police Vietnam but not Indonesia? Why did we hang Alfred Rosenberg for his skull collection, and promote George Patton for his?))

Then you could turn your attention to the deliberate terrorist campaign conducted for years in the South - the massacre of village chiefs, the torture of civilians, etc.

((I have. This campaign is called "Operation Phoenix", and under it over 31,000 Vietnamese have been murdered in the past 2 years. The project is a joint operation of the American and Saigonese governments against suspected Communist village officials, and is led by American officers who are being trained for this work at Ft. Holabird, Maryland.))

Finally, perhaps you could conclude by explaining why the atrocity in Hue was justified - you are probably aware of the discovery of a mass grave containing several thousand bodies; I believe that the imaginative VC even buried some people alive! Orientals are so clever!

((These were victims of American bombings during the period in the Tet offensive when the town was under Vietnamese occupation. The bodies were buried in mass graves because other facilities for disposal were lacking. Proof will be submitted to anyone who writes for it.))

In conclusion, let me assure you that I have not the slightest

desire to (a) get into an argument with you or (b) subscribe to or receive GRAUSTARK. I'm writing this only because you asked me to - I don't care whether you print it or not, or even if you don't reply to it.

GEORGE PHILLIES, 505C/305 Memorial Drive, Cambridge, Mass. 02139. (12 December 1969): I note your repeated reference to General Tomoyuki Yamashita, the Japanese general hanged for atrocities occurring under his command. I do not, unfortunately, have the appropriate reference with me, but I have the distinct impression that Yamashita was the Japanese commander in the Philippines in '44-'45 time period. (I am probably deceived by similarity of names.) I raise this for one reason: the man in question, the Japanese commander in the Philippines, was also hung for committing atrocities, despite the fact that the troops in question (who were in Manila) were not under his command or control.

You list on page 5 ((of GRAUSTARK #198)) a series of quotes from various American Presidents on America's mission in defending freedom. There are probably similar quotes from Republican Presidents available, so I will avoid stressing the fact that these are all Democrats (I exclude Emerson, whose party I do not know), but the coincidence is at least present.

((Well, to what party did "President Emerson" belong?

((Seriously, at one time I rejected out of hand the claim that the Democratic Party is a "war party". It seemed to me purely fortuitous that the U. S. got into situations where troops were sent into battle only when Democrats held the White House. Now, after Korea and Vietnam, I'm not so sure. "Once is accident, twice is coincidence, three times is habit."

((The liberal rhetoric - for Emerson is also a liberal saint - usually seems to be translated into action with shot, shell, and casualty reports. Conservatives may promote war, urge policies that lead to war, and cheer war on when it comes. But the actual declaration of war is made by liberals.

((The 1920's marked the bankruptcy in economic terms of conservative ideals. The 1960's marked the bankruptcy in moral terms of liberal ideals. The 1970's will give the radicals their chance.))

I must, however, object to the principle of the argument. I must confess to be sympathetic to the arguments of Senator Taft, who argued against the principle of the War Crimes Trials. If nothing else, I have certain doubts about the honesty of your quote from Justice Roberts - that we would apply the same standards to ourselves. There appear to have been a decided deficiency of live SS prisoners taken in the few days after the Malmedy incident, but no one was blamed therefore.

The MIT quote from James Kain ((in GRAUSTARK #198)) is interesting - no one locally seems to have known the source, although two of the student newspapers have printed the quote without giving a source.

JOHN BESHARA, Apt. 1021, 155 W. 68th St., New York, N. Y. 10023. (6 Sept. 1969): After talking to you...concerning the following:

ENGLAND: F Den S GERMAN A Mun-Kie

GERMANY: A Mun-Kie, A Hol-Kie.

I was taken aback when you said the support was invalid. That was the FIRST time I've ever heard anyone say that.

The part you quoted from the rules (page 4):

"The exception...is that an order to move with support, against a unit belonging to the same country as the moving or supporting unit is of no effect; that is, a country may not order one of its own units to retreat."

I think this says that if there were either a German or an English army in Kiel then the support is not valid because neither country can force its own unit to retreat. It is not, in my opinion, applicable to the given situation because Kiel is vacant.

((The two German units stand each other off. If outside support were given to either, it could not cause one of them to advance against the other. Thus an order given to a German unit to move against another German unit is invalid, and any support given by any player to this attack is also invalid.))

• How would you rule in the following situation:

ENGLAND: F Den-S GERMAN: A Mu-Kie.

FRANCE: A Hol-Kie.

GERMANY: A Mun-Kie; F Bal-Den.

Is the English support valid, or has Germany's move to Denmark cut the support?

((I would rule as indicated by the underlining. The English support is invalid because it is cut. Had there been no German fleet in the Baltic, the English fleet in Denmark would have successfully supported the Germans into Kiel despite French opposition.))

• (27 Dec. 1969): wanted to contribute to your 200th...issue, but the announcement came too late for me to give any thought or time to it. A few days ago I sent an article off to Chris Schleicher entitled "The Philosophy of Winning Diplomacy", which I expect will be in his next issue due now. It is quite general and too short, but will be helpful to many players, I hope.

As I've said many times, I think you should have more material in GRAUSTARK on strategy and tactics and the rules - and now I've missed my chance!

My latest thought on the rules is: Can a player who actually owns 18 or more supply centers but has fewer than 18 units on the board because he has refused to build (and does not have a majority of the units on the board, of course), just continue with the game until such time as he is ready to end it (whatever the reasons may be)?

((Yes. There is no obligation on a player to make the builds to which he is entitled. For example, after the "1908" moves in 1968CL Christopher Schleicher declined to make two builds to which he was entitled. He did make these builds after "1909".))

A harrassed, busy John Beshara regrets he can do no more for your 200th issue than to thank you for all your kindness and for all the pleasure of being a part of GRAUSTARK. GRAUSTARK is the essence of Diplomacy and in the words of my landsman, Kahlil Gibran,

"You have walked among us a spirit, and your shadow has been a light upon our faces."

((My most humble and heartfelt thanks for these kind words. May the 300th issue of GRAUSTARK justify the hopes held by its well-wishers, and may it appear in a more peaceful world than the present winter of discontent.))

• GARY GYGAN, 330 Center St., Lake Geneva, Wisc. 53147 (1 Dec. 1969): In the comment you made after my letter in GRAUSTARK (#197) there are two points and I wish to answer both. First, you stated that "The Mosaic Law is rather up tight about people who claim to be gods." Certainly that statement is correct. And, in fact, the Greek Scriptures tell us that "there are many gods and many lords" (1 Cor. 8:5), so what the Mosaic Law warned against was false gods and those claiming to be God. Who is God? Psalm 83:16 informs us that "...Jehovah, You alone are the most High over all the earth." Also, the American Standard version of the Bible translates Deuteronomy 46:4 as "Jehovah our God is one Jehovah". While Jesus was a god (or powerful one) he neither was false nor did he claim to be Jehovah God. He re-

cognized Jehovah as his Father, his God, and clearly told his followers that "My father is greater than I." (John 14:28)

((I hadn't realized that the Arian heresy had made such headway among contemporary Protestants.))

The Mosaic Law and the other books of the Hebrew Scriptures all called attention to a coming Messiah. There are 332 distinct prophecies therein that were fulfilled by Jesus Christ, the Messiah.

As to the second point, "at least one of his disciples was a Zealot". I point out that another was a tax collector, and others were fishermen. What Jesus' disciples were formerly is not important; rather it is what they became thereafter that is meaningful. They became Christians.

Today there are relatively few Christians while Christianism numbers nearly one-third of the world's population in its ranks. It is small wonder that non-Christians confuse the two. In order to clearly tell the difference I recommend that you read any of the literature published by the Watchtower Bible and Tract Society.

((I have read two such tracts in the past decade. One of them asserted that a Catholic would be unfit to serve as President of the United States, and the other asserted in flat defiance of the obvious facts the kinship of the human race with the rest of the animal kingdom.))

THE MINISTRY OF MISCELLANY

A grievous gaffe occurs on p. 10 of this issue, in the review of Luttwak's book on coups d'etat. The second sentence should read: "He carefully distinguishes between the coup d'etat and the revolution; the latter has a broad popular base and seeks to make basic changes in the system of government, while the former attempts to preserve the existing system and merely make changes in the personnel running it."

*

The Orient Express from Paris to Istanbul passes through six countries in one of the most historically troubled parts of the world. It has thus been for decades the scene of many espionage novels. But in the New York Times of 21 December 1969, Drew Middleton examines this famous train and finds it fallen into decrepitude, with nervous men forwarding mysterious packages to agents at other stations, or women of sinister beauty out to inveigle secret documents from travelers. The only sign of the ancient romance was a bar-ful of Foreign Legionnaires in France, themselves almost as obsolete as the romance of the Orient Express.

Ah Ichabod, Ichabod!

*

"Every state commences in banditry and chaos before it becomes a State."

Who said that? Not Pareto, Mosca, or Treitschke, but Paddy Roy Bates, who forcibly ejected a pirate radio operator named O'Rahilly from an abandoned fort off the English coast and set up the Principality of Sealand. Armed with a court decree asserting that Great Britain has no control over his realm, Bates has set up his own pirate station Radio Essex, and his country now has its own flag and national anthem. The nation's independence dates from 2 September 1967.

Bates is full of plans. "A sovereign State's powers are virtually unlimited," he said. "A State can license every activity it considers proper - company registration, flags of convenience, international banking..." (Other Scenes, 1 Sept. 1969.)

FIRST WORLD WAR BREAKS OUT ONCE MORE

This two-man game is being conducted under rules published in GRAUSTARK #107, and amplified in the replies to David Johnston's letter in this issue's letter column.

ENTENTE POWERS (D. Johnston)	CENTRAL POWERS (Lindsay)
ENGLAND: F Eri-North Sea; Liv-Yor; F Lon-Eng.	GERMANY: A Mun & A Ber hold; F Kie-Hel.
FRANCE: F Bre-Pic; A Par-Bur; A Mar S A Par-Bur.	AUSTRIA-HUNGARY: A Vie-Tyr; A Bud-Ser; F Tri-Adr.
RUSSIA: F St.P-Liv; A Mos-Ukr; A War-Sil; <u>F Sev Bla.</u>	TURKEY: A Con holds; <u>F Ank-Bla</u> ; A Smy-Arm.

Underlined moves are not possible. The High Combatant Powers now control the following supply centers:

ENGLAND: Eri, Liv, Lon. (3)	GERMANY: Ber, Kie, Mun. (3)
FRANCE: Bre, Mar, Par. (3)	AUSTRIA-HUNGARY: Bud, Ser, Tri, Vie. (4)
RUSSIA: Mos, St.P, Sev, War. (4)	TURKEY: Ank, Con, Smy. (3)
Total: 10	Total: 10

Following "Fall 1914" moves Austria-Hungary builds A Vie. A flip of a coin indicates that, as of "Spring 1915", Italy joins the Central Powers.

1968CH

"Winter 1910"

ENGLAND (Lindsay): Builds A Lon. TURKEY (Lindsay): Builds F Con.

The deadline for "Spring 1911" moves is NOON, SATURDAY 17-JANUARY 1970.

CHARLESTON, D. C. (Eben Press): Bangs Leslie Tapscott is marching around the High Court carrying pictures of Chairman Mao, saying he wants to change the Constitution. The Public Prosecutor wants to change his head. The men from the - er - Institution want to take him away and free his mind instead. The Man in the Street (Boss of the Infamous Silent Majority family) expressed doubt that he has a mind to be Freed. And the Governor-General says that it's going to be all right, all right, all right.

1969BI - PRESS RELEASES

BERLIN: The Foreign Office suggested today that peace may be just another anti-German weapon in the Great War. "They know if we don't fight we can't win! But we will counter-attack with more and bigger peace until they are willing to meet at the war conference table for a just end to this truce. The boys will be in the trenches by Christmas."

TURKISH FLEET HEADQUARTERS: The trained hordes of chimpanzees failed in their effort to reach Rumania and were executed.

NORTH ATLANTIC (11 Mar. 1904): Admiral Froid announced that his men were tired of the cold and that the First Fleet was returning home to thaw out for the impending battle.

MARSEILLES (23 Mar. 1904): Scouts of the Second Army reported seeing the Italian Ambassador sneaking out of the country.

ALSACE (25 Mar. 1904): After many bottles of French wine and Munich beer, the First Army decided to support Munich instead of attacking it. After all, it was said, we got what we came after.

BREST (3 Apr. 1904): A black fleet was sighted off the coast here today. It is hoped that this fleet was heading out to sea instead of trying to land. It is, however, too early to tell.

PARIS (7 Apr. 1904): The King again called for world peace. He at least wanted peace among the western powers. He formally apologized to the English and German ambassadors for the silly conflicts which have been going on in this area.

ROMA TEMPORARIA (Kalends of May, 1904): Today the Emperor Curius Iello opened the semi-annual gladiatorial season, which will last for six months. Before a crowd of 25,000 in the Circus Minimus he threw out the first Christian, a missionary named Garius Gyges. Gyges was promptly devoured by a two-horned dilemma, which later died of internal contradictions.

DRZUNKDUMP, PUNDSCHDRUK (3 May 1904): In a brilliantly executed counter-coup, the People's Republic proclaimed last October was overthrown by General Enver After, who proclaimed the restoration of King Ger VI. The general, who spent his exile in the American state of Colorado planning the counter-revolution, is familiarly known in royalist circles as "Enver from Denver".

The King is already heading home from Vienna, where he was temporarily employed as a waiter in the Schlagoberst Coffeehouse. Huge crowds are awaiting him to acclaim his restoration, composed mainly of the same people who hailed his overthrow. People's Chairman Milan Ittili had fled to Montenegro, disguised as a Polykarpian priest, and accompanied by his secretary, Dogma Garbul.

It is believed that the King will mark the restoration of the Royal House of de Dzhenrut by creating General After a Duke, and making him Prime Minister.

WOGASTISBURGER-NEUSTADT (11 May 1904): The counter-revolution in Pundschrud has changed the picture here, and probably postponed the outbreak of war between Pundschrud and the Grand Duchy of Wogastisburg-Schlampenbüttel. Last night's meeting of the Landnacht, the Grand Duchy's parliament, broke up in confusion when news of the restoration of the de Dzhenrut dynasty arrived.

The news broke dramatically. Deputy Adolf von Thadel of the Grossherzogtümliche-Sozialistische Wogastisburger-Schlampenbüttler Bummler-Partei (GSWSB, or "Grobis") was speaking in favor of an immediate declaration of war, when a courier galloped into the chamber on muleback and handed a despatch to Chancellor Otto von Blaffmarck.

The following dialog is translated from Hänslard, the official proceedings of the Landnacht:

"VON THADEL: Our national destiny demands a declaration of war! On whom we declare war is a secondary matter, but--"

"MESSENGER: Where's the Chancellor?"

"SPEAKER: The chair recognizes a mule!"

"CHANCELLOR: That's out of order!"

"DEPUTY ROSA BUXOMBURG: It is not! He does it all the time!"

"MESSENGER: There's been a counter-revolution in Pundschrud! The King is restored."

"SPEAKER: The mule has made a motion on the floor!"

"VON THADEL: Point of ordure!"

"BUXOMBURG: I move the previous question!"

"SPEAKER: You do and you'll clean it up!"

"CHANCELLOR: Now we don't have to go to war!"

"VON THADEL: But we have to! We've already bought new muskets!"

"BUXOMBURG: Make love, not war!"

"VON THADEL: With you? I'd sooner ~~DELETED DELETED DELETED!~~"

"BUXOMBURG: Try it on the mule first, warmonger!"

At this point the Landnacht was dissolved as a public nuisance.

A CASE FOR THE TRIPLE ALLIANCE

by General Cielya Tetruck

This pseudonymous article first appeared five years ago in GRAUSTARK #41. In that interval, your editor has forgotten to whom the pseudonym belonged.

I write this article, if these few words deserve the title, in an attempt to clarify my own thoughts and to create comment as to the problems facing Austria-Hungary, Germany, and Italy. These great powers are what I prefer to call "Middle Powers". Middle Powers because they face the likelihood of a two-front war. In fact, Austria-Hungary must base her strategy on the premise that she will be required to fight the Turk in the Balkans and the Italians along the Isonzo River. So my thesis is, the Middle Powers must ally if they hope to survive, let alone win.

Let me begin by commenting on what I believe to be the situation facing each of the Middle Powers. Austria-Hungary is surrounded by a wealth of "convenient" supply centers - convenient in the sense that in order to capture the supply center it is not necessary to take a large number of provinces or seas which do not contain supply centers. Even as she is blessed with neutral supply centers, Austria-Hungary, plagued by potential enemies to the North, South, East, and West, can not consider any border safe. But her very location can be her salvation. Austria-Hungary stands watch over the Eastern Marches. She is the only Great Power positioned to thwart Turkish expansion. As long as Turkey remains a threat to Christian Europe, Italy and Russia dare not dismember the Habsburg Empire. For the Balkans to fall into the hands of Turkey would be a major setback for Italian and Russian diplomacy. If Turkey captures Greece, Bulgaria, Serbia, and Budapest, Turkey will become a "Super Power" fully capable of dealing with Russia and Italy. Therefore, it is to the best interest of both Italy and Russia to permit Austria-Hungary to exist as a buffer state, and time is all Austria needs. Given three or four years, the Austrian Empire should be powerful enough to withstand the onslaught of Italy and Russia.

Italy is confronted with a dilemma. To attack Austria-Hungary places her across the path of the expanding Turkish Empire, which by this time would be a Super-Power. In fact, Italy, when she succeeds in destroying Austria, inherits the unhappy fate of the Habsburgs. Only, the Italian player must seek a solution for stopping a Super Power, and unfortunately for Italy, the solution usually requires Italy to leave her western borders open to French incursions. But all "convenient" supply centers are to the East. For Italy to go to war with France means a rather long campaign before any supply centers are captured, and long campaigns without immediate reward are very dangerous. It goes without saying, for Italy to attempt Munich, though very flashy, is courting disaster. Perhaps Italy's best policy is to wait at least one year. If it appears that France, allied with England, will take Germany - attack France. If Turkey is being pressed by an Austro-Russian coalition and if France is being pressed by Germany, England, or both - hit Austria-Hungary. Of course the strategy will be tempered by the situation, but the above is only a generalization.

Surrounded by a host of convenient supply centers and enough potential rivals to make survival most difficult, Germany's position

is similar to Austria-Hungary's. Also like Austria, Germany has a natural enemy, France. Only if England is most inept in her foreign policy will Germany and France ally. As if Germany did not have enough troubles on her western border, she must contend with Russia in the North and to the East. Therefore, Germany's diplomacy is straightforward; she must prevent England, France, and Russia from forming an alliance. Again, like Austria-Hungary, Germany is blessed with a critical location. She is the only country that can prevent France from exploding into Central Europe - something Russia and Austria-Hungary would want to prevent at all costs. So, it would seem natural for Austria and Russia to remain on good terms with Germany until these powers had satisfactorily settled the Turkish problem.

To sum up my argument, Austria-Hungary's reflex move into the Balkans generally entangles her with Turkey and later Russia. The first four years should see Austria and Russia allied against Turkey. But these two powers could very quickly become involved over the spoils. Besides, Austria's long border with Russia would make disengagement, let alone trust, very difficult. It is not "good" policy to leave your back open to attack; therefore the Austrian player would always wonder when the Russian would break the peace. Whereas Austria's borders with Russia are long and difficult to police, her frontier with Italy can be secured with two armies and two fleets.

Even though the convenient supply centers are to the East, Italy will find it convenient to move on France. Early in the game, Austria-Hungary and Russia will be engaged in eliminating Turkey, and later each other. Therefore, the Italian player will have at least four years to gain control of the western Mediterranean and the surrounding land masses. Given the assistance of Germany, Italy should have little trouble in driving the French from Marseilles and the Iberian Peninsula. It will be necessary for Italy to protect herself against Austrian adventures, but two armies and one fleet should provide enough security. Therefore, it seems natural for Italy and Austria-Hungary to ally.

Germany's expansion into the Lowlands and her problems of defending Munich are excuse enough to cause Germany to go to war with France. Therefore, Italy and Germany have good cause to consider a coalition. And after the demise of France, the coalition would always have England to contend with. I discount the possibility of Germany and Austria-Hungary ever going to war. They just do not have the convenient supply centers to fight over. Besides, there is always Russia.

The main problem of the Middle Powers is the threat of the two-front war. If there is an alliance of the three Middle Powers, I have tried to prove that there would be no conflict over spheres of influence. I think that it is obvious that the alliance would eliminate the two-front war for Italy and Austria-Hungary. Germany would still be faced by the threat of Russia, but I have proven sufficiently that Russia can be handled by the Triple Alliance.

"If you don't like our country, why don't you go back where you came from?" - Vo Nguyen Giap