

GRAUSTARK

#437

1 June 1981

THE RULES OF POSTAL DIPLOMACY

1. The 1971 rules of across-the-board Diplomacy, as written by Allan B. Calhamer and published by Avalon-Hill Inc., will be followed as far as is practicable in postal play. These rules for the postal play of GRAUSTARK games do not propose to modify Calhamer's, and deal only with the postal aspects of Diplomacy.

2. The entry fee for GRAUSTARK games is \$15. This fee applies to all players in the United States of America, Canada, or Mexico, including people with APO, FPO, or CFPO addresses. Anyone outside this region will find it possible to participate by air mail; for players in this situation the game fee is \$40 for the first game and \$15 for each additional game. The Gamesmaster undertakes to publish a move-by-move account of the game every 3 weeks and to mail this bulletin to active players by 1st-class mail. A player's subscription shall last as long as does the game in which he or she is enrolled.

Canadian readers should remit with US currency, or by a Canadian postal money order payable in US dollars. Other foreign readers should remit by US currency, by money orders payable in US dollars, or by International Reply Coupons at the rate of 4 for \$1. With the entry, a player should send in a list of the countries he or she wishes to play in order of preference. This will be followed in the country assignment as much as is possible.

3. Subscriptions for non players are 9 issues for \$5. The single copy price is 50¢. If a player has an unexpired portion of a subscription to his or her credit when entering a game, this credit may either be applied to the game fee at the rate of \$5 for 9 issues, or it shall be held over until the game ends and then applied to subsequent issues of GRAUSTARK received by that player. Back issues of GRAUSTARK are 10 for \$1.50, as available, except for #296 & #315, which are 50¢ each. See a recent issue of GRAUSTARK for information on currently available back issues.

4. When 7 entries are received, the Gamesmaster shall organize a new game with attention to the players' country preference lists. One country will be assigned to each player, and the country assignments will be mailed to them, together with the names and addresses, and telephone numbers if known, of the other players. Players may not request to be put into the same game, and the Gamesmaster will try not to put players from the same town into the same game. The deadline for "Spring 1901" moves will be set for not less than four weeks after the country assignments are initially mailed out.

5. Any player who keeps his or her subscription current may volunteer as a standby. If an active player misses a move, the Gamesmaster shall call upon a standby to send in orders for the next move for that country and game. If the original player misses two moves in succession (including "Winter" moves), the orders of the standby for the second of these moves shall be used instead, and the standby will then take over play of that country for as long as his or her subscription remains current. No player active, eliminated, resigned, or dropped in a game may ever be a standby in that game.

6. If a player is eliminated from a game on or before "Fall 1903" moves, and he or she has not missed a move for any reason, that player is entitled to a second new game at no additional charge.

7. It is a player's responsibility to keep the Gamesmaster informed of his or her current address. If any subscriber's copy comes back in the mail, the Gamesmaster will send the reader a letter of inquiry. If this letter also comes back, or is not answered within 3 weeks, that reader shall be removed from the mailing list with no further obligation on the Gamesmaster's part.

8. Three weeks will be allowed to the players for each move, except for "Spring 1901" moves. (See Rule 4. For "Winter" moves see Rules 15 and 16.) Unless otherwise announced, GRAUSTARK deadlines will be set at noon, by local New York time, on every third Saturday. Moves may be sent by letter, postcard, telephone, telegram, hamgram, cablegram, messenger, or carrier pigeon. (Birds are not returnable if the cats are hungry.) Special delivery is not advisable, as it seldom speeds a letter and often delays it. Telephone calls are not a good idea except as a last resort on the deadline morning, as there may not be anyone here able or willing to take moves, and the game is after all postal Diplomacy. Telephone calls should not be made before 9 AM or after 11 PM New York time, or at any time on a Friday evening.

In the event of a postal strike in the United States, all pending deadlines will be postponed to the fourth Saturday after the end of the strike. If there is a postal strike in any other country, then the pending deadline of any games in which residents of that country are playing will be similarly postponed.

9. The Gamesmaster shall compare the moves sent to him, and determine which are possible and which impossible under the rules of Diplomacy. The decision of the Gamesmaster shall be final unless a rule has been specifically violated in the adjudication. In such a case the game shall be set back to the last move prior to the error of adjudication, and resumed from this point.

10. The Gamesmaster shall be responsible for his own failings, but not for those of the players or of the United States Postal "Service".

11. Although the players may make alliances among themselves, allies may not mail in their moves in the same letter or postcard. EACH MOVE SHOULD INCLUDE THE OFFICIALLY ASSIGNED GAME NUMBER ("Boardman Number"), THE NAME OF THE PLAYER'S COUNTRY, THE SEASON OF THE MOVE (as "Spring 1904"), AND THE PLAYER'S SIGNATURE. In the event that one player submits more than one set of orders for the same turn (other than for a "Winter" move or a retreat), the set with the latest postmark (if mailed) or most recently received (if phoned) will apply. It is advised that in such circumstances the player specifically indicates to the Gamesmaster that the previously submitted moves be ignored.

12. A player who sends to the Gamesmaster moves purporting to come from another player, or signed by a name other than his or her own, will be summarily dropped from all GRAUSTARK games. However, players may use such deceptions among themselves, as being in accord with accepted practices in international diplomacy. As a general rule in these matters, players may practice deception among themselves, but not against the Gamesmaster.

13. If a player anticipates that a unit of his or hers may be dislodged, it would speed the play if there were sent a conditional retreat, or an order that that unit be removed. Standing orders that any dislodged unit should not be removed if retreat is possible may be submitted.

14. If any retreats are necessary after a "Spring" move, the Gamesmaster may at his discretion either ask the player whose unit was dislodged to send the retreat to the Gamesmaster by IMMEDIATE RETURN MAIL (see Rule 16), OR, he may ask the players to send in "Fall" moves made conditional on the direction of the retreat, or removal.

15. The Gamesmaster shall follow one of the same procedures as in Rule 14 for retreats, builds, and removals necessitated by "Fall" moves, OR, he may publish in the next issue "Winter" moves for these situations. The deadline for "Winter" moves, if this latter procedure is used, shall be three weeks. For purposes of determining the date of end of the game, "Fall" shall include any necessary "Winter" moves. Players may send in conditional establishments, removals, or retreats to follow their "Fall" moves, if they desire. "Winter" builds and removals may be made conditional upon other players' "Fall" retreats or removals of dislodged units.

16. If the Gamesmaster calls for retreats, removals, or builds by immediate return mail or phone call, those orders must arrive within nine days after that issue's date of publication. Otherwise the Gamesmaster shall proceed as if the order had not come in.

17. At his discretion the Gamesmaster may, instead of publishing a "Winter" set of moves for a game in GRAUSTARK, inform all players by mail or telephone of the retreats,

builds, and removals, and set a date for the next "Spring" moves. This information may go out with, or no more than 10 days later than, the report of the previous "Fall" moves.

18. The Gamesmaster reserves the right to publish "Winter" moves ahead of the deadline if all retreats, builds, and removals have been sent to him. For this reason, no player may change a retreat, build, or removal once it is submitted. This does not apply to retreats, removals, and builds that are only conditional.

19. A player who does not send in orders during the required period creates a situation in which civil government has collapsed in that country. Such collapse will last only during the move or moves in which the player does not participate, and does not affect his or her right to make subsequent moves except as provided in Rule 5. If the missed move is a "Spring" or "Fall" move, any of the units which are dislodged are annihilated. If the missed move is a build, then that player may not establish new units until after the next subsequent "Fall" moves. If the missed move is a removal, the unit(s) will be removed by the Gamesmaster in accordance with the priorities established in the Rulebook.

20. Unless a player specifically requests otherwise, he or she may be called collect by the Gamesmaster should no moves from him or her arrive by the mail delivery of the day preceding the deadline date. The Gamesmaster is, however, not obligated to make this call.

21. If several powers or alliances are so evenly matched that no player can obtain 18 supply centers, a draw may be declared among all the surviving players under either of the following circumstances:

A. If, upon being polled by the Gamesmaster, all surviving players agree in writing upon a draw. The Gamesmaster will poll the players if requested by any one of them, or may do so upon his own initiative. An abstention is equivalent to a negative vote. If the draw is rejected, it may be offered again on each subsequent move, and players will be asked to vote again each time it is offered. A player may not give a vote which is good for more than one move at a time. The draw will be effective among all surviving players; if some players feel that others should not participate in the draw, they should first eliminate them on the board - if they can.

B. If three full game years go by, beginning with a "Spring" move and including "Winter" moves, without a piece being built, removed, or annihilated, and if no power gains or loses a net number of supply centers.

22. At the initiative of either a player or the Gamesmaster, the surviving players may be asked to vote to concede victory to one of their number. Such a concession must be unanimous from all surviving players. An abstention is equivalent to a negative vote. A player may not give a vote which is good for more than one move at a time.

23. In the event that a deadline date falls on a holiday, or if the United States Postal "Service" ceases Saturday deliveries, the Saturday deadline date will be maintained.

SAMPLE RULINGS

1. At the end of a "Spring" moves, the only retreat necessary is that of a Russian F Swe, which may move either to Fin or to Den, or be removed. The Gamesmaster may follow whichever of these alternatives seems best to him:

A. He may telephone the player of Russia on that issue's publication date, describe the situation, get the retreat, and publish it along with the "Spring" moves in the current issue.

B. He may ask the player of Russia by mail whether, and whither, he wishes to retreat the fleet. Upon receiving a reply he informs the other players by mail or telephone, and sets a deadline for "Fall" moves. If the Russian player fails to send in the retreat by 9 days after the publication date of that "Spring" move, the fleet is removed.

C. He may inform the other players, with the "Spring" moves, that they may send in alternate sets of "Fall" orders depending upon whether the Russian player orders "F Swe-Fin", "F Swe-Den", or "F Swe removed". If, for example, Russia orders "F Swe-Den", then only moves conditional upon this alternative will be published with the "Fall" moves.

2. At the end of a "Fall" move a Turkish A Alb is forced to retreat to either Tri

(which is Austro-Hungarian) or Ser, or to be removed. In the "Winter", Austria-Hungary would have two builds if it keeps control of Trieste, and one otherwise. The Austro-Hungarian "Winter" move may be submitted in the following form:

"If Turkey retreats A Alb-Ser or removes the unit, then establish F Tri & A Vie.
If Turkey retreats A Alb-Tri, then establish A Bud."

3. In "Fall 1901" England submits the following orders: "A Edi-Nwy; F Nrg-C A Edi-Nwy; F Nth-Hol. If one supply center is open build F Edi if Edinburgh is open, and otherwise build F Lon. If two supply centers are open and two builds possible, build F Edi and F Lon."

This is not only correct but highly recommended. If able players submit their moves in this fashion whenever possible, particularly towards the beginnings and endings of games where the situation on the board is relatively simple, the play can be considerably expedited. A "Fall-Winter" set of moves can be published for that game, and the next moves will be those of the following "Spring".

4. If a player submits moves but overlooks one or more units, the overlooked unit(s) will be considered at being ordered to hold. If it is dislodged it may retreat rather than being annihilated.

5. The 1971 rules establish that "Each province or body of water is a 'space'" and also that "If two units are ordered, each to the space that the other occupies, neither may move." Under the circumstances the "Coastal Crawl" is not possible. The moves "F Spa(s.c.)-Por; F Por-Spa(n.c.)" and similar moves are thus impossible.

6. Two units ordered to retreat to the same space are instead both annihilated.

7. The ordered moves: "ITALY: A Tri-Vie; A Ven-Tri; F Adr S A Ven-Tri; AUSTRIA-HUNGARY: A Bud-Tri; A Vie & A Ser S A Bud-Tri" is adjudicated as shown, with the underlined moves impossible. The Italian A Tri is dislodged. The Austro-Hungarian support delivered from Trieste is not cut because it is attacked from the space into which it is delivering support.

ERRATA

Since printing the review of Elizabeth Jenkins' The Princes in the Tower (see page 5) I have found a couple of minor errors in it. The first name of the Duke of Buckingham was Henry, not Humphrey. Dominic Mancini left London in the summer of 1483; it was in December that he wrote his account of his journey. I recall having read that when the pretender Lambert Simnel made his play in 1487, King Henry VII displayed the real Earl of Warwick, but I cannot find a reference for that right now. I may be thinking of the later pretender Perkin Warbeck, whose attempt on the throne in 1497 caused Warwick to be not only displayed but executed.

THE MINISTRY OF MISCELLANY

GRAUSTARK, the first bulletin for the postal play of Diplomacy, has been published since 1963 by John Boardman, 234 East 19th Street, Brooklyn, New York 11226; 212-693-1579. Diplomacy, a diplomatic and military simulation of World War I, was designed about 25 years ago by Allan B. Calhmer and is published by Avalon-Hill inc.

For information about playing in or subscribing to GRAUSTARK see the rules, beginning on page 1. See any recent issue for a list of the available back issues.

+

I am happy to acknowledge the assistance of Bruce Schneier in printing this issue, as my own mimeograph is temporarily indisposed.

+

As of today, the job of assigning "Boardman Numbers" to postal Diplomacy games is in the hands of Don Ditter, #12A, 910 Hope St., Stamford, Conn. 06907. This is a central registry of postal Diplomacy games. They are published in Everything by Bern Sampson, 123 6th St., Middlesex, N. J. 08846. (And I'll bet you always thought that was Rod Walker's home town!) Reviews of completed games are also published. Don asks a \$1 fee for each game which he assigns a number to, though this is not compulsory for registration.

WHO KILLED THE PRINCES IN THE TOWER?

"Truth is the daughter of Time." - Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527)

"Truth, crushed to earth, lies there." - anonymous mid-20th century cynic

It can no longer be denied that 16th-century English historians have shamelessly blackened the record and the memory of King Richard III (1452-1485; reigned 1483-1485). The Tudor dynasty that succeeded this last Plantagenet king was descended on the wrong sides of several blankets from the House of Lancaster, and so Tudor historians necessarily handled the rival House of York harshly. Their most condign denunciations were reserved for Richard III, whom the mendacious Polydore Vergil and the virtuous Thomas More both portrayed as a villain of the deepest dye, guilty of murders, slanders, and open and concealed treasons from his earliest years. (To be fair to More, he was only 7 when Henry VII seized the English throne, and he may have merely been repeating stories he heard in the household of Cardinal Morton, where he was brought up. Morton had been present at many of the major events of King Richard's reign, but he was an accomplished turncoat with a good nose for a change in the wind, and not minded to accuse himself before posterity.)

The historians of Tudor England, like those of Stalin's Russia, found it a political necessity to slander the accepted villains retroactively. Richard's scheming is made to extend back to the years when, as a precocious young war leader, he was the strong right arm of his elder brother, successively Earl of March, Duke of York, and King Edward IV. Prince Richard is supposed to have murdered the rival Lancastrians' Prince of Wales, who actually died in battle. He is accused of the murder of the imprisoned rival King Henry VI, who actually died under the orders of King Edward IV at the hands of persons unknown. He is made the sinister schemer behind the execution of his elder brother, George, Duke of Clarence. (Prince George had actually been what Prince Richard was accused of being - a conscienceless villain who was pardoned one betrayal only to engage in another. He was executed in 1478 after one villainy too many even for his easy-going elder brother King Edward. Actually, Prince Richard did not fully approve of his brother's execution, feeling with some justice that the Queen's family was behind the matter.)

It is difficult for a modern reader of history to avoid sympathy for the House of York. Under the rules by which the British crown passes in our own time, they had a better claim to the throne than did the House of Lancaster. The Lancastrian kings were either bloodthirsty warriors like Henry IV and Henry V, or suspicious weaklings like Henry VI. They were backed by the landed aristocracy of the west and north, and spent the national substance on futile attempts to conquer France, suppress the Welsh, and destroy heresy. The House of York, though it had its share of noble adherents, drew their real strength from the merchant cities of the south and east, and principally London. So well did they build that when, after a quarter century of Yorkist rule, Henry VII seized the throne, he found that he could only continue the Yorkists' economic policy. The England that became the first commercial and technological nation of the world, the England whose language is spoken today by one tenth of the human species, grew out of the victories of the House of York. For an instance of the contrary we need only look across the channel, where the crown followed a policy like that of England's Lancastrians, and kept the feudal order of society until the far worse calamity of 1789 forced revolution on a nation in which evolution was impossible.

The view of a modern reader is also drawn towards the similarities between the York brothers Edward, George, and Richard and the Kennedy brothers John, Robert and Edward. Like the Kennedys, the Yorks were tall, handsome, close-knit, high-handed, and pragmatic. Edward IV was as great a womanizer as any Kennedy, although Richard III contented himself with a mere two bastards, an almost puri-

tanical attitude for the time. (After his brother's death, he made his most famous mistress go through a public ceremony of penance, and executed her next lover, Lord Hastings.) If the York brothers were not as loyal to one another as were the Kennedy brothers, there was no law limiting an English king's tenure to eight years.

Also like the Kennedys, the "sons of York" were extremely well liked by the public. Showmanship came easily to Edward IV, and Richard III, though a more reticent person, could also act in public to good effect. London was thoroughly in love with the tall, blond, handsome Edward IV, and even backed his shorter, dark-complected brother on the throne. King Edward's natural flare for public relations was to show up in his grandson, Henry VIII, a Tudor who in manner and style was a complete Plantagenet. The first poetic work of John Skelton was a eulogy for Edward IV that shows even at five centuries' distance a real sincerity of feeling - an unusual thing in poetic eulogies. Skelton was later tutor to the young Henry VIII, and was eventually made Poet Laureate by him.

The deed for which King Richard III is best known is the alleged murder of his nephew, the rightful King Edward V, and that monarch's brother Richard, Duke of York. The crisis began on 9 April 1483, when Edward IV unexpectedly died at the age of 41, leaving the 12-year-old Edward and the 9-year-old Richard to the guardianship of their uncle, Richard Duke of Gloucester. If that was all he had left, there would have been no trouble. But he also left his wife, born Elizabeth Woodville. This lady was the widow of a Lancastrian when she secretly married Edward IV, shortly after he took the throne in 1460. This coldly calculating woman was quite sincerely loved by her hot-blooded husband, though this did not keep him from several other women. But she regarded her royal position as chiefly the means whereby to enrich her grandmother, her parents, her five brothers and seven sisters, and her two sons. Since none of them except her brother Anthony Woodville, Earl Rivers, had much ability, they were all most cordially hated for their insolence, rapacity, and haughtiness. In the course of the Wars of the Roses, her father and one brother were killed by the Lancastrians, and her son and another brother by the Yorkists. Part of the Woodvilles' rapacity involved getting rich, noble wives for their parvenu men; this reached its most ridiculous extreme in 1465 when the queen's youngest brother John Woodville, a youth of 20, was married to the Dowager Duchess of Norfolk, nearly four times his age.

With King Edward dead, the queen and her relatives flocked to London like vultures around a carcass, and proceeded to carve up the royal treasury. King Edward V was then residing at Ludlow, under the care of his dearly beloved uncle Earl Rivers. The word reached him on 14 April, and he and his entourage set out for London on the 24th. Meanwhile, nobody in the queen's party had bothered sending word of his brother's death to the Duke of Gloucester, who was then campaigning very competently against raiding Scots in the north. Word was sent to Prince Richard by Lord Hastings, the late king's pimp, who was devoted to the memory of King Edward and the body of his mistress Jane Shore. This, as it turns out, was a bad idea for Hastings. Although he was opposed to the queen's party, Hastings would not take any part in displacing Edward V from the succession. Gloucester took London on 4 May; Hastings was summarily executed on Gloucester's orders on 13 June; and Earl Rivers and the new king's half-brother got an equally summary ax on 23 June.

The Duke of Gloucester was first and foremost a soldier, and quick execution of purpose is one of the soldierly virtues. Richard's defenders do not argue that he disposed of these men without trial, and admittedly he may have had good reasons. Like his father before him, Prince Richard was probably driven into treasonous activities by the realization that he could remain alive only by taking control of England. Just as Richard Plantagenet, Duke of York, had originally been loyal to his incompetent cousin Henry VI, and had been driven into revolt by the menace posed by the queen and her favorites, so his youngest son and best

likeness Richard Plantagenet, Duke of Gloucester, was menaced by the relatives and adherents of his late brother's queen.

Prince Richard's strong right hand in all this was Humphrey Stafford, 2nd Duke of Buckingham. Buckingham carried the new king's train at the coronation of Richard III on 6 July. Yet, four months later, Buckingham was in revolt against King Richard. A month after that, he was beheaded for high treason in Salisbury. Buckingham's motivation is not hard to find. He was descended in the female line from the youngest son of King Edward III, and if Richard were dead, Buckingham would be the only adult, sane, male member of the royal family in England. This required that Buckingham successfully play off against each other Richard III and the future Henry VII. Since both men were his superior in intelligence, intrigue, and leadership ability, Buckingham's was a lost cause.

But when, in all this, did the princes in the tower die? Those who blame their death on Richard III claim that he killed them shortly after he was crowned. Those who, beginning with Sir George Buck in the early 17th century, have pointed out the flaws and lies in the Tudor accounts of King Richard, usually blame their deaths on the Earl of Richmond, the Lancastrian claimant who seized the throne in 1485.

These questions are addressed by Elizabeth Jenkins in The Princes in the Tower (Coward, McCann & Geoghegan, New York, 1978). Jenkins points out the weaknesses in the conventional case against Richard III. But on one crucial point she faults Josephine Tey, whose 1951 book The Daughter of Time is the source of the modern case for King Richard. It is Tey's claim that, despite the Tudor historians, there was no general rumor about London in the summer of 1483 that the princes were dead. But an Italian traveler, Dominic Mancini, testifies to the existence of just such a rumor. His narrative was not translated into English until 1936. Since Mancini left London in December 1483, with King Richard at the height of his power and reputation, there is no reason to doubt his account.

Furthermore, on 28 June 1483 Richard III gave the title "Duke of Norfolk" to one of his most faithful followers, John Lord Howard, who was to pay for this honor with his life on Bosworth Field. This title had been held by little Prince Richard, owing to a short-lived and (of course) unconsummated marriage with the Norfolk heiress. Under the thought of the time, a title could not be taken from a living man and bestowed on another without a public judicial process.

If the princes survived until they were murdered by Henry VII, where were they in the meantime? Jenkins shows that there is no satisfactory answer to this question. When France began to agitate the question in 1484, Richard could have produced the children, as Henry VII produced Clarence's retarded son in 1487 when Lambert Simnel claimed that identity.

Finally, the bodies of the children were discovered in 1674. They are of an age to have been killed by King Richard in 1483, rather than by King Henry in 1485 or later. Tey claims it was a couple of other people, but even in the bloody history of the Tower of London it is unlikely that any other pair of children of those ages had been secretly buried there. Jenkins goes into the evidence revealed by an examination of the remains in 1933.

The supporters of King Richard claim that King Edward's marriage had not been valid, that he had been contracted to another woman at the time. Thus, if the princes were illegitimate, King Richard did not need them dead to secure his title to the throne, while King Henry did, as he secured his title by marrying their oldest sister. This story surfaced for the first time on 22 June 1483, from a priest who was brother of the Lord Mayor of London and a strong supporter of King Richard. It was clearly an early attempt by Richard to get the princes out of the succession, before he hit upon a more direct means. More gets the name of the jilted lady wrong, and his imitators including

This is

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

1069

THE LIMITS OF HISTORICAL FICTION

"During World War I, a Berliner in Vienna remarked that the mood of people in Prussia was grave, but optimistic. He received the answer: 'Just the opposite here. We're pessimistic, but cheerful.'" - Ludwig Reiners, The Lamps Went Out in Europe

The proximate cause of World War I, with which Allan Calhmer's game of Diplomacy is concerned, was the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo on 28 June 1914 by the Bosnian tyrannicide Gavrilo Princip. This is not to say that, had Princip's amateurish and bungling plot failed, World War I would not have come. The Triple Alliance and the Entente had been spoiling for a showdown for years; if the Agadir incident hadn't done it in 1911, and if the Archduke had escaped Princip's Browning in 1914, then Germany would have meddled in the Irish crisis, or France would have sought revenge for 1871 in a squabble over coal mines in Lorraine, or an obscure colonial border clash in Africa would have been elevated into a cassus belli, and it would have come anyhow.

The most scholarly account of the Sarajevo tyrannicide is Vladimir Dedijer's The Road to Sarajevo. The most impassioned, on the Serbian side, occurs in Rebecca West's Black Lamb and Grey Falcon, while the German viewpoint is represented in Reiners' above-cited book and in Sidney Fay's Origins of the World War. In Mein Kampf, Adolf Hitler gave currency to a still-heard belief that the murdered Archduke was a great friend of the Slavic peoples, and that the Serbian government had him killed because they knew that, as Emperor, he would have instituted reforms that would have kept the South Slavs loyally in the Empire. Although Dedijer showed that this viewpoint is diametrically opposed to the truth, it is still heard.

The First Casualty, by William Powell (Lyle Stuart, 1979) purports to be a historical novel about the tyrannicide. (Powell's previous credit as an author is The Anarchist Cookbook.) This book raises serious questions about how much a historical novel can deviate from the facts. All necessarily do, but most of them are constrained into the known facts of history. For example, Robert Graves in I, Claudius and its sequel makes some rather far-fetched assumptions about the motivations and private characters of many major figures in early Roman imperial history, but he adheres faithfully to the facts as we have them. Powell's book goes clear to the other extreme about the events that transpired between the origin of the assassination plot and the outbreak of the war.

Powell's misfeasances do not merely incorporate Hitler's theory about the benevolent pro-Slav Archduke, tragically murdered by one of his beloved Slavs. Nor does he merely make the Archduke a victim of the snobs at the imperial court, who were furious about his marriage with a mere Czech countess. He fakes the date of the Archduke's marriage to make it precisely 14 years before his death. He has the Archduke coming to Sarajevo to announce his support for the Slavs' right to own land. (No such proposal was before the Empire at the time.) He gives the Archduke the formal title of "Crown Prince", which he did not possess. The obese Archduke is made to tease the wiry General Potiorek about being too fat.

The other personages are also misrepresented. Powell continually gives Sarajevo a large Magyar population which it did not have. In this book, the Mayor of Sarajevo is not a Moslem named Rahim Churchich, as he was historically, but a Magyar named, rather improbably, Sudjic. The Archduke's friend Count Harrach is made a victim also; actually no one but the Archduke and his morganatic wife were killed. Numerous names are misspelled; Prime Minister Pashich of Serbia is called "Pastich", and Major Tankosich's first name is unaccountably changed from Vojan to Neko.

Milan Ciganovich, one of the more unsavory characters of both this novel and actual history, is made a homosexual by Powell. The author apparently feels that since Ciganovich was a spy, a conspirator, a double agent, and a perjurer, he

must necessarily also be gay. And, in the book, Ciganovich is not only murdered, he is murdered in Sarajevo, in the office of the lawyer appointed to defend Princip. Actually, Ciganovich survived to swear away the life of his superior officer and benefactor Colonel Apis, at the latter's judicial murder in 1917.

The number of assassins is reduced from seven to three, to make the plot more simple as the author claims in an epilogue. Among the collaborators omitted as being uninteresting were the vacillating schoolmaster Danilo Ilich and the Moslem adventurer Mehmed Mehmedbasich, whose presence would have livened up the book considerably. Trifun Grabez is left in, though he is misspelled "Gabrez". When I found that Powell made Grabez a hulking, brainless, musclebound lout, I turned to the back of the book's jacket and, sure enough, Powell is a slender, wiry type, like Princip.

Princip's motivations are made more personal than national. His father is falsely represented as having died in an Austrian prison, and he is supposed to be a devout Orthodox Christian. The whole plot of the book is an attempt by Serbian conspirators to delay the beginning of the trial until after war is declared. Historically this was never at issue. The Archduke was killed on 28 June; war was declared on 28 July, to the accompaniment of great jubilation throughout Vienna. The trial of Princip and the others did not begin until 12 October.

Dr. Rudolf Zistler, despite Powell, was not the assassins' only attorney. To judge from his name, he might not even have been a Slav. And he did put forward, in full detail, the argument which Powell says he was prevented from making. It was Dr. Zistler's argument that Princip and the others could not have been guilty of treason against the Austro-Hungarian Empire, since Bosnia was not lawfully a part of the Empire. He was perfectly correct, although the court ignored him. Austria-Hungary, as a signatory to the 1878 Treaty of Berlin, was merely the administrator for the Turkish territory of Bosnia-Herzegovina. But in 1908 the Empire had annexed the region by military force and in flat defiance of its own law and international obligations. Rebecca West sums it up when she correctly observes "that Princip had had a legal right to be where he was in Sarajevo, and that Franz Ferdinand had had none."

Not only is Dedijer's book more accurate than Powell's, but it is also more interesting. The Yugoslav historian, himself a Bosnian who bore arms against another lawless Germanic annexation of his country, devotes the first chapter of his book to an hour-by-hour account of the Archduke's fatal visit to Bosnia. This narrative, of strict historical accuracy, is far more dramatic than anything in Powell's novel.

WHO KILLED THE PRINCES IN THE TOWER? (continued from p. 7)

Shakespeare copied him.

If left to reign, King Richard III would have probably been a good king. In his brief reign he encouraged printing and abolished duties on imported books, improved the legal system, allowing oppressed men to complain against their over-lords in court, and founded England's first postal service. We have in Richard III not the universal villain of Shakespeare, but a more tragic hero - a man who feels that by one terrible crime he can have scope to benefit his country greatly, and save it from the troubles that had already afflicted England at the accessions of previous child kings.

Jenkins does not address the question: Why is there such support for King Richard III in our own time? The Richard III Society and the White Boar Society are to be found among the popular vogue of medievalism; many of them are also active in the Society for Creative Anachronism. With the betrayal of Richard III at Bosworth Field by men he had trusted, with his death in battle, the middle ages began to come to an end in England. Richard III was the last soldier-king; Henry VII was the first statesman-king. Like Louis XI across the channel, he began to curb the arrogant nobility and unite his land into a single nation. Previous battles in the Wars of the Roses had ended with executions of the surviving losers.

No such prospect followed Roworth Field. Though it was hazardous to have Plantagenet blood under the resily Tudors, the plan was that had re-ayed England under the Plantagenets were over. When the royal tried to pass himself off as a Yorkist prince, and seize the throne in 1401, he had to import German and Irish mercenaries. Even after his defeat, there was no proscription, and Simeel finished his days as a kitchen hand in the Royal palace.

1979HF

The only move required is a French build, which is F Bre. The deadline for "Spring 1712" moves remains NOON, SATURDAY 13 JUNE 1981. Players should remember to send in, with their moves, their votes on the proposal for a draw. See Postal Diplomacy Rule 21, on page 3 of this issue.

1980HG

Following "Spring 1905" moves, France retreats A Ven-Pie. The deadline for "Fall 1905" moves remains NOON, SATURDAY 13 JUNE 1981.

A negative vote has come in on the proposal for a draw, which means that it is rejected. There continues to be misunderstanding on what is meant by a draw; hopefully the postal Diplomacy rules published in this issue have made it clear to readers.

I see that in adjudicating the "Spring 1905" moves I misread Bill Drakert's Turkish move "F Aeg-Eas" as the impossible "F Aeg-Gas". The Turkish "F Con-Aeg" therefore also succeeds.

PARIS to VIENNA: That move to Venice was cute, but it comes rather late in the game if it is meant as a serious declaration of war against us. We offered to share Italy with you 50-50, bonehead. You turned us down, and we believed you. Now we will throw you out in short order, since your fickle nature is hardly appreciated around these parts.

CONQUISTADOR IV - BARATA

I am taking this opportunity to inform the players in the Conquistador game in EMPIRE of some errors in the last (1536-1540) adjudications. The actual locations of Portuguese units are: 4407 5c; 4508 4c; 4105 1s; 4608 1c; 4912 9s. The number of resource points collected was 40, not 36, so the Portuguese Treasury is now 49. Under the terms of a loan negotiated on Nove 5 (EMPIRE #135), a 50d loan by the German Bankers to Portugal falls due on Nove 10. There is a Spanish 1c in 1928.

GRAUSTARK #437

John Boardman
11234 East 19th Street
Brooklyn, New York 11226
U.S.A.

THE RULES OF POSTAL DIPLOMACY: Page 1

IMPORTANT UPDATES FOR DIPLOMACY GAMES 1979HF & 1980HG, AND CONQUISTADOR GAME IV: Page 10

WHO KILLED THE PRINCES?: Page 3

WHY KILL THE ARCHDUKE?: Page 8

FIRST CLASS MAIL

POSTAL SERVICE
1981