



Ask not what you can do for your rating....

LAPUTA is what I said it was last issue, sent to the same people, for the same reasons, from the same place, for the same price. However, in case you are thrilled by such things, the big difference is that this is Alcalá Publication #594. Golly....

12 Mar 75 THIS ISSUE of LAPUTA is a sort of pot-luck affair. It is to let you know some things that have happened and like that. It is therefore probably even more boring than previous issues.

Uno. We have two subscribers, by the way. Eric Verheiden and Ron Kelly. I am running 25 copies of each issue, so I do have spares in case you know anyone who is sufficiently feeble-minded to be interested.

Dos. Doug Beyerlein writes (20 Feb 75): "I have just received THE EXPONENT #10 from Richard Kovalcik in Brooklyn. His group has been running local games at their high school. These games run on deadlines of a season every other day or twice a week. In the past I have been assigning Boardman Numbers for the games, but obviously giving them local designations. The problem is that in issue #10 they ask for 13 Boardman Numbers! Thirteen games have been started since #9, and all are local. Of these 13 games, only one actually has orders for each season printed. The other 12 only give total number of supply centers owned per country per game year along with the players' names. Should all of these games be given Boardman Numbers? I would like the PDRC's opinion as soon as possible."

I replied (25 Feb 75) that I couldn't get this out to you all very quickly, but as a former BNC, my own reply was: "In the past, Conrad and I each had a rule that the entire game had to be reprinted (preferably periodically) in a journal of theoretically general distribution (that is, anybody who wanted it could get it). In the interest of completeness, and because it was seldom necessary to do so anyway, exceptions have been made. Notable among these was 1971CC, to which I assigned a number on Arnold's assurances that the entire game would be reprinted and made available. This promise was never kept, however.

\*My own feeling is that if there were one such game involved, assigning it a Number would not hurt and nobody would rate it. However, there are 9 such games. Furthermore, there is an increasing stigma (if that is the word) of "legitimacy" being attached to the Numbers, and therefore it seems to me that it is time to raise standards--or at least to enforce more rigidly the standards already set.

\*Therefore, my individual advice is to refuse to assign a number to a game for which complete game lists (names & addresses) are not available and/or for which it is clear complete game reports are not or will not be forthcoming. In the case of local games, for which you have doubts, delay assigning a Number until you are sure. In the instant cases, there is no need to assign Numbers."

Doug replied (1 Mar 75): "I agree with your solution regarding the EXPONENT games and today I wrote to the new editor...and told him the situation and I only assigned Numbers to the two new games for which there were orders for each season published. Hopefully he will understand...."

Tres. In the same sequence of letters, Doug wrote, "I am finding that I am spending too much time as Custodian. The things that I enjoy in the hobby - playing in games and writing letters - are suffering greatly because of the enormous time demands the Numbers place on me. I am willing to accept this burden only so long, or I will surely suffer a postal death. I would like to spread around the data collection responsibility to others and I ask the PDRC's help in doing so. Volunteers are needed."

I replied, "Let me pass on an idea I originally urged on Conrad. You should appoint a number of (volunteer) Assistant Custodians. These will not be Associates, but merely people who help you do your job. Each Assistant would be responsible for data collection in a number of specifically assigned 'zines' which he receives. He would maintain s.c. charts accurately and forward his results to you together with notations as to

differences between his chart and the published GM record if any. ...

"Some GM records are reliable, of course, but it is unwise to see publicly which you regard as such. A general rule that each game record is compiled by a person other than the GM is a good one. Also, in order to avoid having people you don't trust volunteering, and having the ticklish task of telling them 'no', you might approach good people individually. I'm sure each member of the PDRC would be able to help (except maybe Key, who's pretty much uninvolved in the hobby at the moment). I know I would if asked."

Doug's reply: "I am pretty sure that I will have to go to that style of operation. Right now I just wish that I had the time to sit back and look at the total picture. But with all the day-to-day things that need to be done, that just hasn't been possible so far. ... Perhaps if you PDRC people jump on this you can deal with a lot...without my direct supervision. The strange thing is that at times I am fairly confident that I can handle the whole mess alone and then at other times I really question whether the job is at all manageable. I guess that time will only tell."

IF YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS OR IDEAS ON ALL THIS, PLEASE WRITE DOUG. I'D APPRECIATE A COPY OF YOUR LETTER, BUT IT ISN'T STRICTLY NECESSARY.

Cuatro. Robert Sacks has written recently (23 Feb 75) to propose that a representative of the Miller Number Custodian be made a member of the PDRC. Specifically, he proposed Raymond Heuer, the Assistant AHC and "chief of variants ratingsmasters".

My reply (26 Feb 75) stated that under the Constitution (then being voted on), a person who was not a Ratingsmaster, or the AHC, could not be a member of the PDRC. Further, since we were (so far as I knew) exclusively concerned with regular games and ratings, I felt the arrangement would not be productive, that what we were doing would not be of interest to variant people and what they were doing would be of no interest to us.

I trust that this decision on my part is OK with the rest of you. I told Robert I would mention all this to the members. If anyone has any objections or comments, please send them along.

Cinco. I have mentioned to Walt Buchanan that I feel very pressed for time. I have my games to run, and now I'm IDA Ombudsman, and of course my job, and a very full and rewarding home life (Jim and the dogs and the puppies and the orchard and the kennel....), and I am starting to feel a pinch in my schedule. Thus far I have been able to keep up, but....

The easiest thing to give up, if I need to, will be this job. It is my intention, should that need arise, to resign in favor of Len Lakofka, who would like the job, I believe, and could certainly do a good job.

Although I have not decided to resign yet, I would like to call now for objections to my proposed disposition of the situation. If I have not received an objection by the deadline set below for comments, I will feel free to go ahead with my proposed action at any time in the future without further discussion or vote. (Of course, if I get an objection later, or it appears that circumstances have changed, I will reopen the question ...but barring that, and after the deadline, Len Lakofka will become Chairman of the PDRC in the event of my resignation.)

Seis. Since tournament games are at issue in EVERYTHING 19, let's make that the next issue we take up. Comments are requested: What is a "tournament" or "tournament game"? What makes them not rateable? What games are affected by this category?

DEADLINE for comments on all the above: Tuesday, 1 April 1975. Thanks!

&30&

OH...Randolph Bart promises a rating system. First readout only for games ended thus far this year. Second, for all completed games. Advice: if he accomplishes this, which readout qualifies him to join as a RM, the first or the second///ADVICE???