

GRAUSTARK

202 1967U, 1968CH, 1968CL, 1969BI, 1969BW, G-II 31 January 1970

EUROPE GOEPELED BY TURKEY

1968CL

"Spring 1911"

Following "Fall 1910" moves, Italy builds fleets in Venice and Rome, France removes the fleet in Wales, and Russia removes the army in St. Petersburg.

FRANCE (Ward): F Lon. annihilated.

ITALY (Comber): F North Atlantic-Cly; A Liv S F North Atlantic-Cly; F Mid-North Atlantic; F Iri-Wal; F Rom-Nap; F Ven-Apu; A Pic S A Bel; A Bel S A Pic; A Bre & A Pie hold.

RUSSIA (Schleicher): A Norway-Den; F North Sea C A Norway-Den; F Norwegian Sea holds; F Bar-Norway; F Swe-Ska; F Den-Hel.

TURKEY (Beshara): F Eng-Lon; F Yor S F Eng-Lon; F Wes-Mid; F Tyr-Nap; F Ion-Apu; F Adr-Apu; A Boh-Tyr; A Tri S A Boh-Tyr; A Rum-Gal; A Rum-Bur; A Hol-Bel; A Kie-Hol; A Ruh S A Kie-Hol; A Pru-Ber; A Ukr, A Sev, & F Iyo hold.

Underlined moves are not possible. With the annihilation of the last French unit, Turkey has 17 units on the board to a combined total of 16 for the other two powers. With an absolute majority of units, John Beshara playing Turkey is therefore the winner.

For a review of the play of this game, see GRAUSTARK #201. The game's roster and supply center chart appear below.

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

1968CL: John Boardman, GRAUSTARK
 E - George Schelz (out FO4)
 F - Robert Ward (out S11)
 G - Hugh Anderson (dro SO5)
 Edi Birsan (res SO8)
 James Barber (out FO9)
 I - Peter Comber
 A - Norman McLeod (out FO3)
 R - Harry Manogg (dro FO4)
 James Sanders (dro SO5)
 Christopher Schleicher
 T - John Beshara (won S11)

An asterisk indicates that, for one reason or another, a player did not make a build to which he was entitled.

*

1969 BW

"Winter 1902"

SWEDEN STILL FREE!

Contrary to what was stated in GRAUSTARK #201, Sweden is not a Russian supply center, but is still unoccupied by any combatant; Following "Fall 1902" moves, Italy retreated F Tyr-Ion.

GERMANY (Shuldiner): Builds F Ber. ITALY (Gorman): Removes A Pie.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY (Kimmel): Builds * TURKEY (Becker): Builds F Smy.

F Tri.

The deadline for "Spring 1903" moves is 6 PM, MONDAY 9 FEBRUARY 1970.

NEW GAMES STILL OPEN

As announced in the last GRAUSTARK, new postal Diplomacy games are in the process of formation. The entry fee is \$4.00. For this amount you will receive every issue of GRAUSTARK until the completion of the game, and by first class mail as long as your active participation in it continues.

Two of the new games are open to all comers. A third, tentatively called "G-IV" for reasons explained in #201, is limited to newcomers to postal Diplomacy. This means people who began the play of postal Diplomacy after the beginning of 1969.

Another game, "G-V", is limited to residents of New York City. It will have a one-week deadline, by contrast with the two-week deadlines of the other games. If you are eligible, write for further details.

In recent months several postal Diplomacy and war-gaming publications have printed their mailing lists. Accordingly, this issue is going out as a sample copy of GRAUSTARK to numerous readers of other war-gaming fanzines. For the benefit of those who broke in on other war games, Diplomacy was invented by Allan R. Calhmer and is copyright 1961 by Games Research Inc., 48 Wareham St., Boston, Mass. 02118. Sets are \$8 from well-stocked department or toy & game stores, or from Games Research. Rulebooks are \$1, and maps are 5¢ each, from GRAUSTARK.

Diplomacy is based on a map of the Europe of 1914. Each player takes one of the seven major powers of the time, and alone or in alliance tries to build more fleets and armies than his rivals combined. There is no element of chance in the game. It relies chiefly on deceit, surprise, and doublecrossing, and is thus a faithful reproduction of actual international diplomacy and war.

For those of you who are interested in GRAUSTARK, but not in playing Diplomacy, non-players' subscriptions are 10 issues for \$1. On page 12 of this issue is a list of previous GRAUSTARKs which you may find particularly informative.

THE MINISTRY OF MISCELLANY

"Know, O Prince, that between the years when the barbarian hordes over-ran Rome and all its splendor, and the years of the rise of the sons of Uncle Sam, there was an age undreamed of, when shining kingdoms lay spread across the world like blue mantles beneath the stars - Italy, France, Turkey with its dark-haired women and towers of spider-haunted mystery, England, with its chivalry, Russia, that bordered on the frozen wastes of Siberia, Austria with its shadow-guarded Transylvanian tombs, Germany whose riders wore steel and gold. But the proudest kingdom of the world was Uncle Sam's, dreaming alone in the untrodden west. Hence came the despoilers, black-haired, sullen-eyed, swords in hand, thieves, reavers, slayers, with gigantic melancholies and gigantic mirth, to tread the jeweled thrones of the earth under their sandaled feet." - Nemedian Chronicles #1, Gerhard Groebner & Norman Zinkhan, Box 242, Sub P. O. #6, Saskatoon, Sask.

One of the best new postal Diplomacy 'zines bears the cumbersome title of the Limbourg Gazette, Berzerkeley Bark, & Holy Bible Crusade. (As if that weren't enough, it is mailed out with a flier for Buddy Tretick's La Guerre.) Subscription and game entry fees are the same as GRAUSTARK's, with discounts for members of some war gamers' clubs. It is published by Larry Fong, 704 Alice St., Oakland, Calif. 94607.

RUSSIAN ANABASIS ENDS AT DAMASCUS

GERMANY (M. Miller): A Norway-Liv; F Norwegian Sea & F North Atlantic C A Norway-Liv; A Smy-Ank; A Arm S A Smy-Ank; A Gal-Vie; F Ska-Norway; A Sev, A Ukr, F Hel, A Pru, F Bel, A Mun, & A St.P hold.

ITALY (Clark): F Ion-Aeg; F Eas. S. F Ion-Aeg; F Adr-Ion; F Spa(s.c.)-Por; A Tyr-Vie; A Bul-Con; A Ser-Bul; A Gre S A Ser-Bul; F Tun, F Tyr, F Wes, F Mid, A Pie, A Tus, A Bud, & A Rum hold.

RUSSIA (G. Heap): A Syr-Smy.

TURKEY (Beshara): A Con-Ank; F Bla S A Con-Ank.

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

GERMANY: Bel, Ber, Den, Edi, Hol, Kie, Liv, Mos, Mun, Nor, Par, St.P, Sev, Swe, Smy, War. (16)

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

TURKEY: Ank, Con. (2)

Without supply centers, the Russian contribution to the valiant Russo-Turkish defense effort comes to an end, and the last Russian army is removed. Germany may build 2 new units. These moves are to be sent at once to the Gamesmaster, who will send them on to the other active players. The deadline for "Spring 1928" moves is NOON, SATURDAY 14 FEBRUARY 1970.

ROME: This war must end before the Fall of 1929 before I get born!

1969Bi

"Winter 1904"

WESTERN ALLIES PREPARE TO MEET EASTERN ONSLAUGHT

ENGLAND (G. Heap): Builds F Liv.

ITALY (Berman): Builds F Rom.

FRANCE (Gletty): Removes A Bur.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY (Beshara): Builds A Vie.

GERMANY (D. Johnston): Builds A Ber.

The deadline for "Spring 1905" moves is NOON, SATURDAY 14 FEBRUARY 1970.

The Italian move "F Tyr-Swe", published in the last issue, is of course a transposition for "F Tyr-Wes".

Press releases appear on p. 5.

DIPLOMACY ACROSS THE BOARD

All Diplomacy players in the Greater New York area are invited to a Diplomacy game at my home one week from today, on Saturday 7 February at 1 PM. If you plan to come, please phone me first at OX 3-1579. I have two sets in case more than 7 people show up, as well as other simulation games such as Nuclear War, Summit, Tactics II, and Dynasty should you prefer them.

RSVP. (Refreshments Served Very Promptly.)

THE MINISTRY OF MISCELLANY

In his article on p. 10, Derek Nelson mentions a book about a future American invasion of Canada. The title of the book is The Killing Ground, and was so reported in the article. Unfortunately, I confused this with a recent off-Broadway play, Slow Dance on the Killing Ground, and put this ludicrous-sounding title to the book when typing the article.

*

Owing to a lack of entries, the deadlines on the contests in GRAUSTARKs #199 & #200 ("Royal Nicknames" and "Department of Unhistory-II") have been postponed to 28 February. If you didn't win in "That Was the Reich that Was" (#201) try one of these instead.

"Fall 1911"

FRENCH RETAIN BALKAN GAINS

ENGLAND (Linden): A Gal-Bud; A War-Gal; A Ukr-Rum; A Mos-Ukr; A Liv-Mos; A Den-Pru; F Bal C A Den-Pru; F North Atlantic-Iri; F Cly-North Atlantic; F Hel-Hol; F North-Sea-holds; F Norway-Norwegian Sea.

FRANCE (Berman): A Bel-Hol; A Pic-Bel; F Mid & F Tyr hold; A Boh-Tyr; A Tri S ENGLISH A Gal-Bud; A Ven S A Tri; A Vie S A Tri; F Apu-Adr; F Ion-Alb; F Tun-Ion; A Nap-Apu.

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY (Kuch): A Rum S TURKISH A Bud.

TURKEY (Lindsay): F Adr-Ven; F Alb-Tri; A Bud S F Alb-Tri; A Ser S F Alb-Tri; F Aeg-Ion; F Gre S F Aeg-Ion; F Bla S AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN A Rum; A Sev holds; A Arm S A Sev.

Underlined moves are not possible. France retreats F Ion-Eas. The High Combatant Powers now control the following supply centers: ENGLAND: Ber, Den, Edi, Hol, Kie, Liv, AUSTRIA-HUNGARY: Rum. (1) Lon, Mos, Nor, St. P, Swe, War. (12) TURKEY: Ank, Bud, Bul, Con, FRANCE: Bel, Bre, Mar, Mun, Nap, Par, Grē, Ser, Sev, Smy. (8) Por, Rom, Spa, Tri, Tu, Ven, Vie. (13) France may build one unit, and Turkey must remove one. The deadline for these "Winter 1911" moves is NOON, SATURDAY 14 FEBRUARY 1970.

ERIE (YPP): Turkey is still for sale to the highest bidder. Who could resist such a generous offer? Who could resist the terms?

HOGWASINGTON (United Rabble Rousing Press): President Pigasus J. Pic today held a press conference in the Beast Room of the Chester White House. A transcript follows.

Q: Harold Barnsmell, your latest nominee to the Supreme Snort, is in trouble because of a speech he once made. Could you comment on that?

P: I think we ought to find out exactly what was in that speech first.

Q: I have the complete text here. His exact words were: "Oink oink oink oink. Oink oink oink, oink oink. Oink oink oink. OINK!"

P: I see nothing whatsoever wrong with that.

Q: Is it true that in Muddle Eastern affairs you are following a pro-Arab policy?

P: Why shouldn't I? An Arab made me President.

Q: Why did you veto the Aid to Education bill?

P: With an educated constituency I couldn't get re-elected.

Q: How is work proceeding on the Cani-Ballistic Missile System?

A: I am very pleased with the progress that this program has made. Aircraft and electronic stocks have been doing very well ever since it was approved.

CHIHOGGO: Outside City Hall, Tiberius Schmutz loudly protested that Mayor Dick Tater refused a parade permit to his organization, the Brotherhood of Child Molesters and Loiterers.

"It's unfair!" he told the press. "The Mayor gave a permit to the Silent Majority Marching Band for a parade in support of the war. Why should he turn us down? After all, they kill children and we just want to fool around with them a little."

The interview ended abruptly when a 6-year-old girl and a 2-year-old cocker spaniel went by in opposite directions. Schmutz collapsed in a welter of indecision.

1969BI - PRESS RELEASES

ALEXANDROPOLIS, HOLMIA (12 Jul. 1904, Echon Press): Said Prince Protector Peter Alexander Vladimir Basil Daniel Alexis Paul VII, "King Gero is very aptly called 'the Pretender'. When he was here, he pretended to have three million zbeltniks in Switzerland."

ALEXANDROPOLIS (13 Jul. 1904, EP): Today one Ivan Nadyodensky was arrested on the charge of being a Ku Klux Klan agent. As evidence, his K fetish was cited.

ANAKHIT, SKANDALUTZ (15 Dec. 1904, URRP): Preparations are now under way for the annual Winter Solstice Festival, a ritual that has come down almost unchanged from prehistoric times. The King Consort's honor guard has been tripled, in case he tries to escape, and huge vats of barley-bier are being barrolled all over the kingdom.

The four neighboring members of the Four And A Half Kingdoms are reacting to this forthcoming revel in manners characteristic of their respective cultures. The Pravoslavnican Patrimony of Polykarp has tightly closed its borders to prevent, in the Patriarch's words, "the seduction of the loyal Polykarpian youth of this theocracy by the degenerate pagan orgies of the Skandals". The Temporary Roman Empire, which has incorporated the Skandalic Mother Goddess into its state religion of S-ncretic Polytheism, leaves its Skandalic border open as usual. Duke Anstnicht has emphasized his draconian control over the Kingdom of Fundschdruk by closing the border, but no one expects this decree to be enforced with any officiciency.

The Grand Duchy of Wogastisburg-Schlämponbüttel, which has closed the border in previous years, is trying a new experiment this year. This has reportedly been done at the behest of the new Papal Nuncio, Cardinal Iubeccierbipi, who feels that "Christianity can best be extended to the last pagan peoples of Europe if we show that we trust and respect them". Accordingly, Chancellor Otto von Blaffmarck has not closed the border with Skandalutz this year.

Needless to say, numerous subjects of the Grand Duchy have already been seen crossing the border into Skandalutz. Most of them were young men, but a considerable number of women have also gone, and a few older people of both sexes. One of the latter was an elderly man in ordinary clothing, who bears a strong resemblance to Cardinal Iubeccierbipi.

THE DIPLOMATIC POUCH

GERHARD GRAEBNER, Box 242, Sub P. O. #6, Saskatoon, Sask.: Nemedian Chronicles has not published for over 7 months, and it doesn't look too hopeful for recovery at all... The last number of NC published was #10... There is a slight possibility that NC may start publishing again. It depends on whether my co-editor, Norm Zinkhan, and the players in our games will forgive me, whether we can find a place to publish (we lost access to the Gestetner machine we were using) and whether I have the time. Most importantly, whether anyone can trust a magazine with the unfortunate record that NC has acquired.

((NC, from which a quote appears on p. 2, was an amusing and moderately well-edited publication. I hope it manages to get back into print.))

TERRY KUCH, 7554 Spring Lake Dr., Bethesda, Md. 20034: Your analysis of 1965Q ((in GRAUSTARK #200)) was good, but there are some interesting points you didn't mention:

- 1) This was, and remained for some time after, the longest (in game years) game ever played.
- 2) It may still have the record, if anybody is counting, for the longest number of game-years all 7 countries stayed alive. ((That is, 13. Who has a better?))
- 3) It was Koning's second tie in a row in GRAUSTARK; the previous tie was with Frank Clark, playing his first postal Dippy game ((1965L)). 65Q was tied with me, playing my first postal Dippy game. To add another coincidence, Clark was the one who got me interested in the game in the first place.
- 4) This game would have been won by Koning under Miller's rules, under my rules, and under Wells' rules (I think), but not under yours, nor under those used by many other Gamesmasters. When I annihilated France, Koning had temporarily a majority of the units on the board (from after the Fall moves until the Winter builds). This is one instance where the difference in rule-interpretations was not purely academic.

((In Diplomacy as played across the board, the builds and removals are part of the

Fall moves, which are not completed without them. The introduction of a separately labeled "Winter" move was made in postal Diplomacy merely to facilitate play, without the intention of establishing a third, separate season in the game year. Thus, for purposes of obtaining the necessary majority of pieces for victory, a break should not be made between the playing of the Fall moves, and the making of the builds and removals consequent upon them.))

JOHN McCALLUM, Box 52, Ralston, Alberta: On p. 15 ((of GRAUSTARK #200)) in reply to Rod Walker, you state 'But I find it rather amusing that the NFFF GB...is ruling as variants all the games over published in GRAUSTARK...' This isn't quite accurate as game 1963A, I think, I am correct in saying, had no instance of a move where any decision on Koning's Rule, one way or the other, had to be made. And it was, I think, in 1964A that you ruled in conformity with what would now be called Koning's Rule (although the expression was not then in use, Wells, who coined the phrase, not having yet discovered Diplomacy). So that these two games, at any rate, would seem to be completely regular according to Walker's ideas. Although I must say that Walker seems to be confusing himself with God on these rule questions. Every Gamesmaster is, of course, god as far as his own games are concerned; it is when he begins to think that his interpretations are binding on others as well that one starts to wonder if it is time for the men in the white coats to be called in.

Re your statement on p. 16 that the Crusaders besieging Aledo ate Turks. Were the Turks in the Levant as early as that? I didn't think the Turks were there until a century or so after 1099.

((The Seljuk Turks overran the eastern provinces of the Roman Empire in the latter third of the 11th century, and also seized Syria and Palestine from their previously Arab rulers. They had been in control of Palestine for about a generation by the time of the First Crusade.))

...Ref my letter in the Diplomatic Pouch ((in #201)). A new Ragnarok from Koning has just arrived. ((I haven't seen it yet.))

Concerning your reply to Dave Lindsay's letter ((in #201)). Schultz is still, the last time I heard, a month or so ago when he sent me an issue of Harpies, at his old address, 19159 Helen St., Detroit. And it wasn't the first, but the second, Avengers female lead that he tried to keep in the show, Diana Rigg, not Honour Blackman.

((I don't follow The Avengers too closely. I had thought that Diana Rigg had been the first female lead on that program.))

BRETON VER PLEGG, Box 273, Vail, Colo. 81657: Can't say that I concur completely with your analysis of 1968CI ((in GRAUSTARK #201)). It hardly seems to me that Russia has the game won in 1904. It came damned near being a VERY long time more than five years which Russia would have required to win. Russia's final move was, it seems to me, almost a master stroke. He analyzed completely what Gene and I would be trying, accepted that, and then acted accordingly. It was, I think, a large risk. Trieste was an example. A small change in either set of orders (Russia or Turkey & Co.) could have completely altered the outcome. I think that we were simply too unimaginative. But to give the impression that Russia's victory was a matter of slow attrition after 1904 or so is to completely misrepresent the tension that accompanied the end of 1968CI. The end was, I suggest, a complete shock to most of us. Maybe even Russia.

The only other thought I had in relation to your discussion there was the rationale behind the Italian-Turkish alliance. That first year of fighting, when I took Venice (or was it Trieste?) with Russian help, and took Naples through - I think - good thinking; was hardly stiff. The next year, of course, Gene outguessed me in the Spring. But then he decided to opt for the ultimatum I gave: A surrender now with survival guaranteed, or a fight to the death. About a year after that, he wiped out the last vestiges of my desire not to attack Russia (he was winning after all) and I moved into Austria with some success. The thing that defeated us was, more or less, time. Fleets were moving West - they just didn't get the time to arrive. I think the progress I was steadily making in Austria would have begun to tell on Russia. My lines were interior, and the pressure was showing. What is more important - there were some gaps in the Russian lines.

All in all, I didn't - and still don't - feel that I had made an error in waiting as long as I did to attack Russia. I WAS interested in making certain that I was clearly one

of the two finalists first, and that no one would change that. It was, after all, my first game - and with the problems I had getting the Russian alliance in 1901, I didn't want anything to go wrong. But you really feel that I turned against him so late in the game as to have the move be only an exercise in futility? I think not, but I may have been wrong.

((Obviously, anyone who writes a summary of a game without having been privy to the negotiations runs the risk of this sort of misinterpretation. However, the game summaries published in GRAUSTARK by the Gamesmaster are in no sense intended to be the last word. Anyone else who wants to write a summary of a GRAUSTARK game and send it in is perfectly welcome to do so.))

Lastly, I am interested in what you send out when someone asks for documented evidence on two issues: (1) That atrocities are the customary manner of the American soldier - I KNOW they are, but I want to see what you send out. And (2) the evidence that the Hue bodies are the results of an American bombing sortie or sorties. I haven't heard that before, and would be grateful for the documentation.

((US officers are instructed in the leadership of assassination and atrocity tours at Ft. Holabird, Maryland; a court case now in progress challenges the Army's right to do so. As for the Hue deaths, I have no doubt that when either side took the town, a lot of people belonging to the other were killed. Usually local people use these occasions to settle private scores, particularly when the occupying armies are ideologically motivated. But Hue was bombed by US planes when it was under Vietnamese occupation in 1968; there were so many bodies and so little organization that mass graves were the only answer to a pressing sanitary problem. For evidence on both topics I am sending out a Guardian supplement in which these facts have been summarized.))

ROD WALKER, 5058 Hawley Blvd., San Diego, Calif. 92116: GRAUSTARKs #200 and #201 arrived today ((20 January)). The former is very impressive, of course. Could not agree with your dedication more. Your political comments and "replies" to letters amusing as usual.

I might point out that the term "self-refuting" normally refers solely to the original content of the argument. Since you introduced material to which I did not refer, your categorization is as accurate as your argument. In any event, ancient whatever it was that you were trying to prove with your General Patton, I know one active General who is a dove. Now we have one example each. Big deal. Your assumption that the Patton example proves anything indicates that you know nothing of Aristotle (or don't care) and know even less about the military promotion system and like matters. But let that pass - a unique case proves nothing, of course.

((Aristotle? And to think that one letter-writer accused me of irrelevance because I invoked Emerson as a coiner of the liberal adages responsible for American involvement in other countries!))

Your review of 1966AA ((in #200)) is not strictly accurate, for which you cannot be blamed. First, Russia survived in Sevastopol because (a) there was general agreement to leave him there and (b) he was my ally. There was never any German "show-down" with Austria. From the moment of the German invasion of England - and in fact from the immediately previous move - Latimer and I were allied to draw the game. Germany could easily have won the game at almost any time, but steadfastly kept his word and allowed me to grow sufficiently large to tie. The elimination of Russia did not occur until the year in which it was agreed we were to draw.

In 1968G, I am not aware of any delaying tactic on Dave Loblin's part. He had a hard nut to crack in the Balkans. Only when Prosnitz, realizing he could not defeat Turkey, turned upon me in impotent rage as the architect of his ruin, was Turkey able to expand rapidly. I might add that I did, indeed, play a large hand in Dave's victory, first by precipitating the Russo-Turkish fight before the former was ready for it, and second by luring Russia from his strangle-hold on my home centers by the insincere promise of aid against Turkey.

In what work did the Four And A Half Kingdoms appear? ((In GRAUSTARK #200.))

On to the rules. I might preface all this by pointing out that the NFFF Games Bureau Diplomacy Division has at no time said that your games are "variants" or that it "considers" them variants. You display your typical propensity for leaping to unwarranted conclusions by so stating. I think they would fit into the "irregular" status. In any event,

don't get huffy. Starting postal Diplomacy doesn't give you any status as Supreme Judge of the Rules, you know. After all, you did not invent the basic game.

((I apparently misunderstood the distinction between "variant" and "irregular" games as the NFFFGBDD uses those terms.))

Which brings me to the man who did, Mr. Allan Calhamer. You state, anent the "Koning's Rule" situation that "I follow not Koning's Rule but Calhamer's". Not so. First, because Koning's Rule is followed in "Fall 1902" of the Sample Game. Second, because Calhamer himself has opted for Koning's Rule as being correct.

You can, of course, say that the Sample Game is not part of the Rules, despite the fact that they somehow got printed together. You can also say that Calhamer himself is not the basic authority on his own game. That is a nice quibble, but where does it lead you? ((No, where does it lead you? You're waying it, not me.))

You must, I submit, fall back on saying that you will use the Rulebook exactly as written, regardless of what Calhamer may have meant to say. That is, I believe, the position you have previously taken, and I would like you to bear it in mind as we go on.

You will remember that I have recently posed two problems within the text of the rules. First, noting that the rule on cutting support is limited by the word "province" to units occupying land areas. Second, noting that a nation may (under the rules as written) nullify an overwhelming attack on one of his own units by the simple expedient of supporting it.

In each of these instances, you have chosen to ignore the precise text of the Rulebook, and instead apply an interpretation which is not justified by the language of the rule involved. In each instance, you have agreed with my interpretation and have adopted (in my opinion) the more reasonable position in line with what was obviously the intent of the author of the Rules.

It seems to me that this position is inconsistent with your position on the Koning/Calhamer Rule, which basically opts for the precise language without reference to the intent of the author.

I would like to suggest, therefore, that you consider which of these two positions you are going to take - unless you are in favor of doublethink on the rules as on Viet Nam ((sic)).

((In the light of dubious interpretation of the text, I shall follow the interpretations traditional in GRAUSTARK and summarized in #190 until such time as Allan Calhamer brings out another edition of the Rules with these points clarified.))

NEW POSTAL DIPLOMACY GAMES

A week ago, a full board was obtained for the new game temporarily called "G-II". The deadline for "Spring 1901" moves is NOON, SATURDAY 14 FEBRUARY. Players are:
ENGLAND: Charles Wells, 3021 Washington Blvd., Cleveland, Ohio 44118; 216-932-5931
FRANCE: Ron Salcedo, 78 Charles St., New Rochelle, N. Y. 10801; 914-NE 3-7235
GERMANY: Eugene Prosnitz, 200 Clinton St., Brooklyn, N. Y. 11201; 212-UL 5-0089
ITALY: Jerry White, 4004 S. E. Pine St., Portland, Ore. 97214; 503-232-1206
AUSTRIA-HUNGARY: Sam Ferris, 210 Newberry Ave., Newberry, Mich. 49868
RUSSIA: Karl Wittman, 10 Lexington St., Newark, N. J. 07105
TURKEY: George Grayson, 621D 13th St. Terrace, Leavenworth, Kans. 66048; 913-IU 2-1703

The "Newcomers' Game", "G-IV", has also been filled. Players are:

ENGLAND: Bruce Gletty, 1004 S. 4th St., Champaign, Ill. 61820
FRANCE: Ray Heseley, 1309 Indiana N. E., Albuquerque, N. M. 87110; 505-255-5686
GERMANY: Stephen Tang, 1533 Silverwood Terrace, Los Angeles, Calif. 90026;

213-665-4004

ITALY: James Becker, 226 W. 16th St., New York, N. Y. 10011; 212-691-3006 (home) or 212-363-7280 (work)

AUSTRIA-HUNGARY: Thomas Poplawski, 18053 William St., Lansing, Ill. 60438
RUSSIA: Brian Burley, Apt. 123A, 1480 Route 46, Parsippany, N. J. 07054; 201-335-6637
TURKEY: Ray Arling, 8687 S. E. Ellis St., Portland, Ore. 97266

"Spring 1901" moves for this game are due by NOON, SATURDAY 28 FEBRUARY 1970.

This is

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

421

THE MEMORABLE AND MISCELLANY

The Gamesmaster wishes to thank Don Miller for a long and favorable review of GRAUSTARK in The Gamesletter (12315 Judson Road, Wheaton, Md. 20906).

*

GRAUSTARK would like to print reviews of the following games: Dynasty, Coup d'Etat, Risk, Summit, Confrontation, Credibility Gap. Readers are invited to try their hands.

*

New Yorkers: For a laugh, telephone 273-6500.

*

The first time travel war game has been published. It is Assassin!, and the rules are 35¢ from James Gaines, 6303 Iris Ave., Cincinnati, Ohio 45213. It is based on the old naval game of Salvo, but you can go back into time and sink the ships in the past. Admirals Medina-Sidonia, Villeneuve, and Yamamoto might have found this strategy useful.

*

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

*

January 30 seems to be a day peculiarly consecrated to history. It was the date of Franklin D. Roosevelt's birth in 1882, and of Winston Churchill's funeral in 1965. Mohandas K. Gandhi was assassinated on this date in 1948. Adolf Hitler came to power on this date in 1933.

But the most important event of a January 30 remains, after 321 years, the execution of King Charles I in 1649. This act, which followed on a thoroughly merited conviction for his oppressive reign, set the seal of blood on a division which still exists in the English speaking world between Cavalier and Roundhead, aristocrat and democrat, Tory and Whig, conservative and radical. The American Revolution and the Slaveholders' Rebellion were basically the English Civil War, fought over again on another continent, and with the same victors. To this day, much of a man's attitude towards contemporary political questions can be deduced from the way he regards the trial and execution of Charles Stuart.

This execution marked the first time in the world's history that a king had been put on trial, sentenced, and executed for his crimes like an ordinary human being. As such it marked a great step forward for human liberty.

WHOSE LITTLE GIRL ARE YOU?

This is the fourth successive GRAUSTARK in which a contest has appeared. Winners will enter game G-I without cost, as explained in GRAUSTARK #201.

Readers are asked to name the historical characters whose mistresses these women were:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Inessa Armand | 6. Katherine Schrott |
| 2. Dora Bland ("Mrs. Jordan") | 7. Lydia Smith |
| 3. Byveke | 8. Elizabeth Villiers |
| 4. Marozia | 9. Marie Walewska |
| 5. Marie Louise Murphy | 10. Rebecca West |

If more than four entries are received, the second-place winner will also be enrolled in game G-I. The deadline for entries is NOON, SATURDAY 28 FEBRUARY 1970.

As in all these contests, no one is obligated to play simply because he wins. If you just want to demonstrate your knowledge, fine

THE COLONEL J. SUTHERLAND BROWN VOLUNTEER BRIGADE

by Derek Nelson

Derek Nelson was the first Canadian member of postal Diplomacy fandom, and has maintained a lively interest in it and other war games for several years.

The place: Butte, Montana. The time: early 1920's. The man: George Pearkes, winner of the Victoria Cross (the British Empire's highest decoration for individual heroism in combat) in the Great War 1914-18; a junior officer in the tiny Canadian Army; later in 1957 to become Canadian Minister of National Defense, and today Lieutenant Governor of British Columbia

His purpose in Montana: espionage. Pearkes, dressed in civilian clothes, was a spy. He was checking the terrain, the potential opposition, and so on, for a Canadian invasion of the United States. In event of war the Lord Strathcona Horse of Calgary had been assigned objectives in south-east Montana, with the hope of drawing off American forces from the Atlantic-Great Lakes area.

The defence scheme of which Pearkes was a part is still classified information, but its general outline followed what had been the obsession of Canadian defence planners since 1783: the repulsion of an American invasion of Canada. How was Canada to defeat a neighbour fifty times more powerful in military resources alone?

The army's answer was basically the same as it had always been. Hold out until the British got here to help. This happened during numerous of the British-American political crises of the 19th century, although only twice did British troops actually have to enter combat to defeat American forces, in 1812 and during the Fenian invasions. The Rush-Bagot Treaty, which set up the famous undefended border in 1817, never had much effect upon Canadian defence planning, except where it increased our odds by keeping US warships off the Great Lakes.

Though after the Great War our military strength had declined to 3000 men, two contingency plans were drawn up to deal with the only two possible military threats that Canada faced, war with Japan, and, of course, the United States. The American plan had priority. First drawn up in 1921, it was completed in 1926, after the espionage missions to the US and similar preparations. A memorandum updating the scheme was presented to the cabinet in 1930, the work of staff officers under a certain Colonel J. Sutherland Brown.

There was a recent modern switch on this. The US Strategic Air Command, having run out of new places to try simulated bombing runs in the United States, asked and received permission from the Canadian government to operate near Naicam, Saskatchewan. A group of leftists got together and called themselves the "Colonel J. Sutherland Brown Volunteer Brigade", and set out to repel what they considered a new American invasion. The usual methods of burning American flags, civil disobedience, mouthing obscenities at US airmen, and so on were used. Thankfully, the premier of Saskatchewan had the good grace to apologize to the American ambassador for the boorishness of the "brigade".

Canada's best hope of staving off the Yankee till the redcoats came was, interestingly enough, the American military. In the '20's it had its own problems, for while 100,000 men were under arms, they were spread from Shanghai to the Caribbean, and none were in combat-ready units. The National Guard was worse off. It lacked "airplanes, tanks, combat cars, scout cars, antiaircraft guns" and even such esoteric equipment as ".50 calibre machine guns".

US defence planning was formulated in so-called "colour plans", each Great Power being assigned a colour, and the US military reaction in case of war being detailed therein. Still, only Japan was considered a serious potential enemy, in contrast to Canada's list of two major threats. Yet in 1921 both the nightmare and the delight of the US planners was the Orange Plan. (Red for Britain plus yellow for Japan.) It was based on war with Japan in such a way that Britain would be dragged in through the Anglo-Japanese Alliance. Such a fascinating line-up would necessarily include an American invasion or neutralization of Canada.

But that possibility rapidly diminished when Canadian and US pressure forced Britain to abandon its treaty with Japan. Then, when the US, Japan and Britain agreed on naval parity through the Washington Naval Conference the game was over. In 1935 Imperial (British) military planners conceded the impossibility of defending Canada against US aggression. Defence of Canada became solely a political problem.

In 1940 the British Western Hemisphere bases were given over to the United States, and in the same year FDR took Canada over militarily by "suggesting" a joint US-Canadian defence board.

So at first glance Senator Long's recent statement in the US Senate ("How does the Senator know whether a war would not break out between the United States and Canada?") would seem a rhetorical stretching of the point in defence of Louisiana oil interests. Yet the nuclear age has produced strange circumstances. All modern wars tend to be limited in one way or another. So in that sense a war between Canada and the US is possible, and Senator Long is not too far off base.

It is possible too in the political sense. Not today, perhaps, but under certain circumstances in regards to the Quebec separatists. The Pentagon has already made a study of this, a study that apparently had to be discontinued under State Department pressure after protests from the Canadian government. A science-fiction story by Ellis Portal, Slow Dance on the Killing Ground, deals with such a possibility in a horribly convincing manner.

Also, there has always been some annexationist sentiment in the United States. A US industrialist named Lamb was up here just last year urging union, and being a left-winger himself he convinced many student leftists in his audience. But those of us on the right and centre made it plain we'd rather fight than switch.

Times change . . . or maybe they don't.

DIRECTORY OF UNFAMILIAR QUOTATIONS - XV

Ever since a veteran named Robert Lee Ridenhour broke the news of the Songmy Massacre in a letter to an anti-war Senator, erstwhileawks have ruffled their feathers, clucked loudly, and run for cover like quite another fowl. Though the massacre, and the other butcheries now coming to light, are the logical consequence of Hawkish policies on Vietnam, few of that diminishing sect seem willing to defend these actions. But some supporters of the Johnson-Nixon policy have kept the faith. In keeping with its traditions of free speech, GRAUSTARK presents the other side on the Songmy Massacre.

"Exactly what did the News accomplish by printing the pictures of those dead Vietnamese aside from helping the doves and peaceniks and further destroying our national image?" - J. Kraft, letter, New York Daily News, 7 Dec. 1969

"Why all the fuss about this alleged massacre? Didn't we drop the atom bomb on Japan?" - A. Enright, ibid.

"Just a passing thought: America's freedom is the Communists' most valuable secret weapon." - John Morrissey, ibid.

"A group of former servicemen, citing what they term 'too many unanswered questions' about the alleged My Lai massacre, are petitioning Congress to drop all charges in the case.

"James A. Smith...said yesterday the group has already collected 'hundreds of signatures - so many that we haven't been able to count them all.

"The response has been overwhelming," he said." - New York Post, 12 Dec. 1969.

"You should have kept your face in your books and minded your own business. Because of you, a 23-year-old troublemaker, the U. S. faces international criticism."

"I want to tell you, you are a traitor ((sic)), a dirty boy, a Hanoi agent, a Communist, the shame of our society and I wish very soon God kills you."

"You must be a nut or a Commie. I was in World War II, saw things too, but anything goes in love and war, Johnny come lately."

"Only a Jew can be so low and stinking as to side with our enemies and denounce his buddies. You are a true representative of your repulsive race, you lousy rotten kike."

"I do not know what your motives are in bringing the charge against American soldiers for their action at My Lai, but it has hurt our effort in South Vietnam."

"The people over there all look alike. They are treacherous and thieves."

"So a bunch of people were killed in a so-called massacre in Vietnam. This should be of no concern to anyone. There was no real loss - just a bunch of worthless Asians in a part of the world that is already overcrowded!" - letters to Ronald Lee Ridenhour, New York Post, 13 December 1969.

*

"We feel Lieutenant Calley has been condemned and vilified for performance of his duties in combat." - Robert C. Lenton, Commander of American Legion Post 137, Jacksonville, Fla., and chairman of the My Lai Defense Fund Committee, New York Post, 16 January 1970

THE MINISTRY OF MISCELLANY

The Gamesmaster seems to be incapable of dealing fairly with Larry Fong. After confusing him with Leonard Lakofka in several earlier issues, I left his name out of the table of contents of GRAUSTARK #200, though he had a letter on p. 32 of that issue.

*

GRAUSTARK, the oldest bulletin of postal Diplomacy, is published on alternate Saturdays by John Boardman, 234 E. 19th St., Brooklyn, N. Y. 11226. Subscription rates are 10 issues for \$1.00. Back issues are 10¢ each or 15 for \$1.00 except for #200, an especially large commemorative issue which is 25¢. The following back issues may be of particular interest:

190: Up-to-date summary of the rules and sample rulings in postal Diplomacy as played in GRAUSTARK.

191: Brief introduction to Diplomacy for new readers.

196: The GRAUSTARK Directory; names and addresses of almost 100 GRAUSTARK readers.

199, 200, 201: Quizzes with free entries into GRAUSTARK games as prizes.

200: Special 40-page issue, with review of GRAUSTARK games.

201: Announcement of the opening of five new GRAUSTARK games, with information on how to enter. Continuation of game reviews from previous issue.

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, 190-201.

GRAUSTARK #202

John Boardman
234 E. 19th St.
Brooklyn, N. Y. 11226
USA

F I R S T C L A S S M A I L

WAR WITH CANADA?

See page 10.