

PASSCHENDAELE

2

Oct. 19

For those who can't read 3/4 inch Roman letter stencils, the above reads as: PASSCHENDAELE 2, oct. 19. Ah, I can hear you guys asking: "Why put fancy (?) lettering if you're going to write it down a second time, in a normal way, below?" Well, for one thing, it takes up space--very important when you're a petty bourgeois like me...also, I happen to like it, man. Finally, it might be ridiculous, so it's good enough for me. Therefore, this format threatens to become quite frequent in PASSCHENDAELE, unless I hear too many screams.

By the by, this might turn out to be a super-issue. I feel I'm just in the mood for writing one--the Liberals took a liking last Monday (uppee!!!), the Posties are back to work, I passed my mid-terms with flying colours, I've got Friday off, etc. etc. All this combines to make me happy, and when I'm happy, I jacass and jacass. Unless my brod comes in, I think this ish will be a 27-pages ish.

Now, if someone does not like super-ishes, LEMME KNOW! Also, any constructive objections and criticism to anything in this zine is invited. If you don't like something, TELL ME SO.

Now, to the usual first page junk. PASSCHENDAELE is a magazine mainly devoted to the play of postal Diplomacy games, and is currently owned and published by François Guerrier, Stanton Residence, Room 603-B, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ont. (Canada) K1N 9A7. My phone number is 1-(613)-231-5400, but, if you don't want to waste money, don't phone me--it sometimes takes a long time to reach me, thanks to the red tape you've got to go through at the reception. Anyway, never call me on Thursdays, Fridays, and Saturdays (note the changes from last ish); on the other days, call me only between 6:30PM and 7:00PM.

Postal Diplomacy games are always open to subscribers;

they start as soon as 7 persons have registered and paid their gamefee (= \$2.00). Players must maintain a subscription to PASSCHENDAELE (ie.: 3/\$1.00 NA -2¢ per page under 8 pages, +1¢ per page over 10 pages.) Cheques should be made payable to François Guerrier, but the American players might find it more useful to use international money orders, as there's an extra charge of \$0.25 on all foreign cheques.

The editor will pay \$1.00 per page of D&P-related articles, and \$0.50 for the others. Press writers will be paid at the rate of 1¢ per line or \$0.50 per page.

All subscribers are urged to join a standby list which entitles them to take over positions abandoned by the original player. Standbys who complete their position receive a credit of \$2.00. The standby list currently includes Ron Killeen, Jan Jensen, Konrad Baumeister, and Robert Acheson. C'mon guys, I'd like to get more standbys than that!

On proliferation: have you received your Nobel prize???

WHY DO I HAVE SUCH A HARD TIME PROVIDING INTERESTING LINEAR SEPARATIONS???

HEADLINES:

1. The Posties have been ordered back to work. Now, that's good news for postal Diplomacy. The sooner everything settles back to normal, the better.
2. Reinforcements:
 - a) Raymond Couture, 2185 Hogan #4, Montreal, Quebec, (Canada) H2K 2S9.
 - b) Robert Paquin, 8885 Mauriac, St.-Leonard, Quebec, (Canada) H1P 2N4.
 - c) Trevor Baillie, 5410 Garland Place, Montreal, Quebec, (Canada) H3X 1E4.
 - d) Shelley Foster, 6537-180 St., Edmonton, Alta., (Canada) T5T 2A3.

EVERYBODY IS INVITED TO SEND IN SUGGESTIONS AND LINEAR SEPARATIONS

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR:

Dear François: Just received P #1 the other day and was quite pleased. An excellent first issue. (signed: Richard Jarvinen)

Dear François: Your zine, issue #1, came today. Am pleased tt I got into t 'original 20'. Also tt you included my littl letr re capital punishment, but you shd hv stated tt it was

originally a reply to 2 letters anti-cap-pun in a NYC daily. The readers w'l be puzzled and vexed tryi to figure who I'm referr to and apparently argu with. ((Well, they do now.)) Altho your h-rules are generally OK, you cd improve them with ts flexibility note: "a full NMR w'l be checked on t record only when nothing is received or any evidence tt an effort was made to get t orders in; in cases where they came late or some accident or hardship interfered, t GM w'l count it a fractional NMR, in properts tt he sees fit and fair". And perhaps: "bld orders com late w'l be accepted if not too inconvenient, and cd be forwarded to t concerned players if t player paid to have t GM do this". In my first game, in Graustark, 1976BV, my Ger had one solidally Fr., and he was a Winnipeg teen ager; at t end of 'cl he mised his 2 blds because he'd bn called to t navy, and stationed on t Pac. coast. His orders reached NYC a day or 2 late, and his game was almost ruined, but I worked so hard to keep Eng. off him tt Fr. came out better than my Ger. But he had another lateness NMR in F'02 and so resigned. Graustark is super strict re deadlines. It marches on with t firmest, parade drill precise, unfairly tread, year after year, and so efficient tt each issue is printed and mailed within 24 hrs. after deadline.

About your worst mistake is to pay for players' press. As I told you, press is a privilege, and you're cheapeng it, reducng it to a labor! Stimulate press if you wish, yes! But to pay for it is ridiculous. ((It is??)) You cd, however, offer a \$1 prize each issue to t most interestg press, and limit each player to 6 lines per game per issue, to keep t wiseworth reading. Verbosity is banal!

Your remark "happy stabbing" needs to be replaced with something respectable, like: "Bloody noses, everyone (but no stabs, please!):"

Now, about tt cold air you Canucks are sendg down here already. Didn't you know it's only September? ((it's October now)) Must be you're punishg us for all t stuff our broadcasters radiate over t border. Sorry. (signed: Curtis L. Gibson)

HIGH COMMAND: My rules were written to ensure that everyone would clearly understand that I would remain inflexible re NMRs if the NMRing player was the only one at fault. This doesn't mean that I will always be inflexible, no matter who's responsible for the NMR; for instance, if there's a postal foul, I may decide to be generous. But, if there's no attenuating circumstance playing in favour of the offender, don't expect any pity from me--if I weakened then, the games would start to slow down and slow down (because of undue delays), and everybody would be bored and would quit. Sorry, but I think I'm going to stick to the original rules. As for the press, I'll think about your points. By Christmas, I will have reached a decision. The other players should let me know what they think about it.

Francois: There is one rule I would like to see incorporated

PASSCHENDAELE #2, October 19, 1978.

into a zine. This has to do with NMR's (rule B). Anytime a player with a) No home centers (b) less than three centers and (c) or in a position deemed hopeless by the GM, drops out of a game or NMR's, any mad-man orders sent in will be dropped into a hat, and one shall be pulled out for that position's orders. (signed: Hugh Polley)

HIGH COMMAND: I think that's a superb idea! I'll think about incorporating it into my zine's rules; around Christmas, I will publish a new "edition" of my rules, with all the good (ie: accepted) suggestions being incorporated.

François: You should (in my opinion) call standbys for any position, as sometimes that 1 center could be crucial. ((Gimme an example...))

HIGH COMMAND: I'll think about it, but chances are that the original rule will stand, with perhaps the addition Hugh suggested.

François: Your first issue looks pretty good. If it is a sign of more to come, I will look forward to receiving each issue with great anticipation. (signed: Jan Jensen)

Dear François: I just got your zine yesterday. Thanks! For a first issue it looks very impressive. (signed: Dan MacLellan)

HIGH COMMAND: My thanks go to everyone for their comments. PASSCHENDAELE will always include a LETTERS TO THE EDITOR column (as long as there will be comments), as I believe that if a reader can send me a comment, he can "suffer" to see it printed. (Besides, everyone is entitled to know what the guy "next door" thinks about the zine...)

I drink to make the others become interesting. (signed: George Nathan.)

EVERYONE SHOULD SEE "CHICK AND HONG" -- UP IN SMOKE'S "LAND TYPEERS FIND IT QUITE

Agincourt is delayed. The reason for this is that I did not receive orders from Oded Klinger yet; unless I don't receive orders soon, no results will be printed. The reason for this delay is that I feel Oded is not entirely responsible for the NMR--when PASSCHENDAELE #1 was edited, the Posties were on strike in Quebec, which obviously unfavoured Oded; furthermore, the postal services remained half-paralyzed for two weeks in Quebec (and everywhere else in Canada, for that matter...); finally, there was a general strike of nearly three days a couple of days ago. This justifies a game delay, but PASSCHENDAELE won't be delayed. Also, it is possible that the players need

PASSCHENDAELE #2, October 19, 1978.

more time to negotiate. So they'll get it. (And nobody will ever be able to blame me and say I'm too inflexible...)

NEXT DEADLINE IS: November 16, 1978. (for Spring 1901)

NEW GAME STARTS!!! It's very incredible, but seven more people have registered--that means a new game starts. Here is the alignment:

Austria: Robert Paquin (xxxxxxx), 8885 Mauriac, St.-Leonard, PQ. (Canada), HIP 2N4.

England: Robert Acheson (xxxxxxx), c/o Echo Bay Mines, Port Radium, NWT XOE OXO.

France: Trevor Baillie (FRIGATE), 5410 Garland Place, Montreal, Quebec, (Canada) H3K 1E4.

Germany: Shelley Foster, (GARFETI), 6537-180 St., Edmonton, Alta. (Canada) T5T 2A3.

Italy: Raymond Couture (xxxxxxx), 2185 Hogan #4, Montreal, Quebec (Canada), H2K 2S9.

Russia: Hugh Polley (RIxxxxx), 9912-81st Ave., Apt. 2, Edmonton, Alta. (Canada) T6E 1W6.

Turkey: James Clarke (xxxxxxx), 1609 Chappell, Windsor, Ontario (Canada) N9C 3E5.

The only thing I don't like about this game is that it isn't as well "balanced" geographically as the first one (Agincourt). Two persons come from the same city, Edmonton; two persons come from the same province (other than Alberta), Quebec. Ah well...that shouldn't affect the game too much...Bloody noses *everyone!* (satisfied, Curtis?) The name for this game is: Beda-Fomm. I don't know whether or not I should apply for a Boardman number; after all, who cares about having a Boardman number? My names are good, aren't they? I propose we stick to these names, and not bother about having a Boardman number. Those who want one can say so--if more than five persons ask for it, I'll comply and will apply for Boardman numbers...

For the persons interested, Agincourt was named after a notorious French defeat (to the English) during the Hundred Years War (I can't remember the exact date, and am too lazy to check it out...boy, even if I'm in Biology, I should review my History from time to time...); Beda-Fomm is named after the battle fought between English and Italian troops in Libya (past Benghazi and 200 miles east of Tripoli) on February 5-6-7 1941, during which the rests of the Italian Xth army were destroyed.

But, more important, the deadline for Beda-Fomm is: December 28, 1978 (in two ishes from now.) This gives you guys lots of time to negotiate. If all of you want a shorter deadline, here's what you have to do: send in orders before November 16, 1978--if everyone has Spring 01 orders by then, I'll be glad to print the results and proceed to Fall 01.

As for the All-Novices postal Diplomacy game, I'm afraid it went down the tubes. Openings to such a game will be available, but up to now, only one person has shown any real interest. In fact, I haven't heard at all from either Mark Pecenko or Frank Haika, so I must assume they are not interested. James Clarke has been geared into a regular postal Diplomacy game (Beda-Pomm), as he wanted to start playing before all. James, if you're still interested in playing in an All-Novice game, tell me. I strongly encourage all novices to join such a game.

There are openings in a third regular Diplomacy game, which will be referred to from now on as Crecy. Robert Paquin has signed up. Gamefee is still only a miserable \$2.00.

As far as variants are concerned, noone has accepted the challenge issued by Curtis L. Gibson...O'men guys...are you afraid of Curtis or something? For those whose interest might have suddenly been arised, the conditions of the challenges are listed in PASSCHENDAELE #1, page 11.

However, Curtis has accepted my challenge to a Foreknowledge Variant. He picked Germany, Italy, Russia, and Turkey.

G: A Mun S ITALIAN A Ven-Tyr; A Ber-Kie; F Kie-Hol.
I: F Nap-Ion; A Ven-Tyr; A Rom-Ven;
T: F Ank-Bla; A Con-Bul; A Smy-Con;
R: A Mos-StP; F StP-Bot; A War-Gal; F Sev-Rum;
.A: F Tri-Ven; A Vle-Gal; A Bud-Ser;
.E: F Edi-Nth; F Lon-Eng; A Lpl-Yor.
.F: F Bro-Mid; A Par-Bur; A Mar-Pie.

Press: The haughty Hapsburgs are in trouble. Intellectual Meritocracy is coming. GIRT's way to world liberty.

Then, Curtis wrote me, offering to replace this choice of countries and proposing that I get either EGA, TIA, or TIE. (Curtis further explained that this combination was too strong for me.) Curtis said that he was so confident in TIGR tt he'd allow me an "8 pt. criteria spread (24/16)." Thanks for the proposals, Curtis, but I don't think there's a need for such a spread. I am fully ready to play GIRT vs. AEF with the first one to get 18 centres winning. But, if you want, we can still play EGA vs. FIRT in addition to the one we're playing presently. Send orders in...

Curtis has also challenged me to a match of "Scotch chess". Rules are like regular, except that each turn one has more plays: Wh. 1 play, Bl. 2, Wh. 3, Bl. 4, Wh. 5, etc. By the time someone has 8 or 9 moves in a row he ought to be able to find a check-mate. When you check it becomes the other's turn. Curtis informs me that there's an en passant rule which he'll explain later.

PASSCHENDAELE #2, October 19, 1978.

Curtis, I accept your challenge. You choose the colour you want to play. If you choose to play white, you may send in orders right away. I don't promise I'll win, though. (As a matter of fact, Randolph Smyth is slowly but surely convincing me that I am not that good at chess...)

Robert Paquin has asked me to play against him in RUSSIAN CAMPAIGN. I am interested, but I'll have to familiarize myself with the rules and some procedures first--this should take about two or three weeks before I get into it. Robert, you can nonetheless choose your position and send in orders...

"The fire had been extinguished, and the firemen were pulling in their hoses and stowing their gear. A mother told her little boy, "See Joey, when the firemen are finished, they put all their toys away..."

BEDA-FOMMEEDA-FOMMEEDA-FOMMEEDA-FOMMEEDA-FOMMEEDA-FOMMEEDA-FOMMEEDA-FOMMEEDA-FOMME

CHESS COLUMN

Richard Jarvinen has written and proposed that I use algebraic notation. Anyone out there interested in seeing algebraic notation rather than mine? Personally, I prefer my notation to the algebraic notation by far, the main reason being that I don't know how to use the algebraic notation! Anyway, for now, my notation will be used.

I intend to start "rather slowly" on that chess column, for many reasons: I don't want to lose the readers (and more important, I don't want to get mixed up too soon!) and Randolph Smyth inflicted a couple of severe defeats to me (most of which were due to absolutely stupid/ridiculous/idiot errors from my part...), which shook up my "convictions". Anyway, let's proceed...

The Evans Gambit

The Evans Gambit is a very popular opening first played at New Orleans in 1849; Paul Morphy used it against Alonzo Morphy. The main secret is to rapidly capture control of the center of the board, and then to launch a very powerful attack against the opponent. Control of the centre is achieved through sacrifice.

Before saying more, here is the description of how the game turned out...

White (P. Morphy)

Black (A. Morphy)

1. P-K4
2. N-KB3
3. B-B4
4. P-QN4

- P-K4
- N-QB3
- B-B4

Here, white gives up (ie: sacrifices) a Pawn in order to gain time to form a powerful Pawn center and obtain a lead in development...B-- BxNP

5. P-B3
6. P-Q4
7. PxP
8. o
9. B-Q3

- B-B4
- PxP
- B-N3
- N-R4
- P-Q4

Though this looks quite promising, it has the disadvantage of opening up the game for White's pieces. What makes P-Q4 quite bad is the fact that Black's pieces on the Queen side (ie: its most powerful wing) are useless.

10. PxP
11. B-R3

- QxP

Obviously, now Black can't castle on the King side. I always am on the look-out for making a move that'll forbid the opponent to castle while remaining a good tactical and/or strategic move.

12. N-B3
13. P-Q5

- B-K3
- Q-Q2

Another sacrifice that Black can hardly decline...ie: 13...B-N5; 14...R-K1 c, K-Q1; 15...Q-K2 and White wins.

14. NxB
15. B-N5 c (!)
16. R-K1 c
17. R-N1

- BxQP
- QxN
- QxB
- N-K2
- Q-R3 (???)

That's one of the blunders I tend to make when I play face-to-face. The only way for Black to put up a fight would have been 17...Q-Q2.

18. RxN c
19. Q-Q5
20. RxB dbl c
21. R-B8 m

- K-B1
- Q-B5
- K-N1

Many excellent techniques are present in this archi-known game: Morphy seizes control of the center, which later gives him the opportunity to attack anything (the center gives anyone the possibility to either attack the left, the right, or the center—this possibility is never offered by the control of a wing—keep that in mind.) He also compels his opponent not to use his Queen's wing until the critical point has passed...

PASSCHENDAELE #2, October 19, 1978.

This opening having been described (and comments are invited), it is acceptable that I jacass a little bit about chess strategy in general. For this issue, however, I'll stick to the basics.

Basically, there are three stages in a game: the opening, the development, (the exploitation) and the end. Generally, about any opening will turn out to be good (except the opening for Black which consists of duplicating exactly the opponent's strategy/opening...) if the development/exploitation that follows is carried out well. But, nonetheless, an offensive opening will tend to give better results than a defensive opening (for obvious reasons: a player will get an opponent in a fork or in any other difficult situation only if he has the power to decide where and when the "battle" is going to be--in a defensive position, you are giving the opponent the initiative and the power to make such decisions.), and an opening which gives one control of the center of the board will usually give better results than any other kind of offensive openings. (As said before, control of the center gives a player the possibility to strike anywhere on the board, at his discretion, and also has the advantages of being fairly easy to defend and of usually implying the use of a good part of one's pieces; control of any other part of the board usually prevents a player from striking at the enemy's king too hard (unless the enemy has castled) and also restricts one's movement to only one part of the board...). But, everyone must remember that a good offensive opening must always be allied to a fairly good defensive system, or the opponent will have the opportunity to demolish your offensive. (eg.: if you attack the opponent's king with your queen alone in the four-moves-mate, then the queen will be taken by the king; but, if the queen is defended by the bishop, then it's check mate.)

Once you have made your opening, you must always complete it with a nice exploitation--otherwise, the enemy will take the initiative and will ultimately break through your lines. (My ideas are pretty obvious and tend to be ominous to those who know how to play, but I like to fill space with junk.) The tactical weapons of chess (for this stage of the game) include the pin, the fork, the removal of the guard, the double and discovered attacks, the queening combinations, the underpromotion, the X-ray attacks, the trapped man, and others. They all include a combination of material in order to recover more material or to expose the enemy king to easy penetration. (They are often referred to as the "meat-axe group") This is the secret of exploitation: kill more pieces than you lose, and, whenever possible, ungarnish your positions to strike hard at the king. In any case, good exploitation and penetration can only be done by experienced players--it is usually beyond novices.

It doesn't matter really how you organize the end of the game--as long as it results in check mate. But, the most elegant check mates are the ones that are performed the fastest, and that aren't performed through the queening of a pawn...

The tactical weapons of chess will be discussed in further details in the next issues of PASSCHENDAELE. I think that I've filled your ears with enough absurdities for now.

For the authentic chess lovers and maniacs, here's a problem. By the by, this problem does not relate to the above junk.

Here is the situation:

Black--B on R6; R on N5; P on B5; K on K5; P on KB2; P on KB6; P on KN3; R on R1.

White--Q on QB2; P on QN3; K on Q1; N on K4; N on K7; R on KB1; B on KB5; P on KR3; B on KR6.

White mates in four moves. I think I might start using the algebraic notation after all...

ALMOST THREEPAGESOFCHESS...ATFIRSTSIGHT, ITLOOKSOUTOFPROPORTION, BUTCONSIDERTHATTHISISHIGHTURNOUTTOBETWENTYPAGESLONG...

A neatly printed card posted over a cigarette machine in a restaurant: "Cancer cures smoking."

Curtis L. Gibson has sent more material in. I guess I can print it...

Shroud makes the dogmatics squirm

(written by George F. Will and submitted by Curtis.)

In 1968, an Israeli bulldozer uncovered a Jewish cemetery from the New Testament period. It contained a skeleton with the heel bones nailed together, the first crucifixion victim ever found. Scratches on the bones revealed that nails had been driven through his wrists, not his palms. This was another clue about a remarkable archaeological mystery.

A long linen sheet in a Turin cathedral bears the faint image of the front and back of a man laid out as in death, apparently a Jew, apparently a crucifixion victim who suffered scourging, a blow on the face, shoulder chafing from bearing a heavy burden, a gash in the side, and scalp punctures. These wounds accord with Gospel narratives of Christ's execution.

A puzzling feature of the image had been that no thumb was visible. But experiments with cadavers show that a nail driven through the wrist causes the thumb to curl into the palm. A medieval forger of relics would have depicted Christ as contemporary art did, nailed through the hands.

Rampant exploitation of bogus relics justified scepticism when the cloth was first displayed as Christ's burial shroud in Western Europe in the 14th century. But Bishop John A. T. Robinson, an eminent New Testament scholar and no stranger to scepticism (he is, after all, Church of England), believes

that the burden of proof has shifted to those who deny the shroud's authenticity.

The shroud's authenticity is better supported by science than by history. In a recent book Ian Wilson, a British journalist, offers an intriguing and reasoned, if often speculative, history of the shroud prior to 1357; after that year its history is documented. But the shroud itself became intriguing in 1898 when it was first photographed. The negative was an unexpectedly detailed positive image: the image on the linen is like a photographic negative.

A Swiss criminologist says that some pollen from the shroud's surface corresponds to pollens virtually unknown outside Palestine. Computer techniques used in mapmaking reveal that photographs of the shroud yield three-dimensional data: the intensity of the image varies with the way a cloth settles when draped over a body. Soon carbon dating will be able to date the cloth within 100 years, with only slight damage to the cloth. An ion microprobe could confirm tests that have found neither paint nor blood which could be responsible for the image on the cloth.

Jesus is, as historian Michael Grant says, "the most potent figure" in history, and Christianity is a religion based on events. Evidence that suggests the shroud's authenticity strengthens confidence in biblical narratives that comport with it. Robinson, going further, believes that authentication of the shroud would "add weight to" the presumption that the tomb was empty on the first Easter morning.

A more momentous and dubious assertion is that the image is a "snapshot" of the resurrection. Examinations of threads suggest that neither blood nor sweat nor vapors nor scorching made the image. And at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory in Pasadena, "image enhancement" techniques used on photographs from Mars indicated no "linear directionality" in the shroud image, meaning it was not painted on by hand-strokes.

One hypothesis draws an analogy between the shroud image and images formed on stone and metal by radiant energy at Hiroshima, which suggests, to some, correspondence with Gospel references to brilliant light at the moment of resurrection. But perhaps the most that can be said is that a world that has barely begun to amplify Einsteinian hypotheses about the relationship of mass and energy, should be ready to revise assumptions.

But leaving aside speculation about how the image was made, it is interesting that some people are startled or dismayed by the possibility that the cloth is Jesus' burial shroud. Why should it not be?

Jesus lived. Shrouds from that era are extant. Older archaeological artifacts have been identified with particular persons. (We have the helmet of the Athenian commander at Marathon.)

Some who are dismissive about the shroud's authenticity are not coolly empirical but hotly dogmatic. They are dismissive

not because there is no evidence for it, but because they have a doctrine against it. They understand that if it is authentic it lends credence to the Biblical record by confirming aspects of that record, details of the most consequential three days in history.

((Then, in his letter, Curtis intervenes and says:))

Many wd have only one objctn to t shroud claim, and tt is tt t Bible says X's wrappings were in two parts, separate, those of head and body. I wonder if someone later sewed them together. Or maybe there was an extra one around t head besides this full length one wch had bn inner.

P.S.: Now I see I overlooked your comments to my News Wld letter; and they make it seem unlikely you wd want to use Will's article; But one can recognize the fact of the supernatural powers demonstrated by psychic adepts, past and present, without feelg required to assign t term "God" to any of the celestial entities who preside over us. Living in a world of personal entities as well as one of causes and agencies, it is more logical to consider t hyst of all causes and agencies a person than merely a force. And if you think our "science" is superior to t ancient, you can have it. And you "demolished" only your shallow view of my pt. re t effect of t Mosaic law. You're lookg at corruption as is, not as it wd be under tt law.

HIGH COMMAND: If I read this right, you're saying that the existence of this shroud proves that Christ existed, and that therefore a celestial power (ie: God) existed and still exists. Assuming that this is your point of view, let me say that the "facts" cited in the article hardly prove anything--the only thing they prove is that someone, presumably a Jew (it's not because the pollen from the shroud's surface came from Palestine that it means the victim was a Jew...) was crucified. It is not because the victim suffered scourging, a blow in the face, shoulder chafing, etc. that it means it was Jesus! (Sentenced persons are/were treated pretty much alike--it could have been about any other sentenced brigand...) I'll concede that the image on the shroud represents quite a mystery; but it can be argued that science has not progressed enough yet to be able to explain these mysteries, and that, since science progressively explained many mysteries, it will also explain this one in a few decades...

I would be more careful than Wills is when he states and implies that artifacts have been identified with particular persons--the archeologists usually assume that a certain artifact belonged to a certain person, basing themselves upon a number of characteristics; but there is no absolute proof that the artifact belongs to that particular person. And the margin of error surely widens stupendously when it comes to identifying a shroud! A shroud is a shroud, and it is very hard to know that shroud A belonged to a certain person while shroud B belonged to another.

PASSCHENDABLE #2, October 19, 1978.

Finally, I think I missed something in your last paragraph: are you saying that, if the Mosaic law was applied, corruption would change, and not be what it is today? Corruption has always been corruption, and it is very doubtful that it will ever change. And, more important, I said that your argument was destroyed because death sentences had been pronounced much more often because "evidence" seemed to be against the convicted than because of corruption and perjury. (Thus, I said you were wrong when you said that instoring capital punishment for perjurers would eliminate the possibilities of an innocent's execution...) I'll stop here as there's enough stuff to keep us going for months...

A woman who got converted: "I'm so glad I got religion; I have an uncle I used to hate so much I vowed I'd never go to his funeral. But now, why, I'd be happy to go to it any time!"

I GUESSTHISZINEHASREALLYSTARTEDOFFREALLYWELL: ONE GAME START A MONTH

AIN'T THAT BAD AFTER ALL??

Many players have sent their bios. I guess this is as good a spot as any to print them.

Curtis L. Gibson: My pa coud be 116 yrs. old today. So you see I'm one of t' older generatn. But I havent got around to girl friends and reproductn yet. Am still rather youngish, so hope to fall in with some sweetie before the century is over. My Gr. pa Gibson came from Scotland in 1820, so we Gibsons are sort of newcomers. But on Mother's side we've bn here thousands of years, like so many French Canadians.

Hugh Polley: (Vital statistics: 29, single, ex-Maritime)
Motto-- "The successful diplomat chooses Necessity for his master, Fate for his servant, and Machiavelli for his guide."

Though learning fast I am still an amateur in Postal Diplomacy, having only taken up the hobby about eight month's ago. The first zine I subscribed to was Pol Si Fic. A very lucky choice for me as Randolph Smyth puts out a solidly regular zine, and is an excellent GM as well. ((Hey! Let me do the plugs around here!!!))

Including Agincourt, I am now in eight regular Postal diplomacy games. ((Nine now with Bada-Pomm)) The only two positions I have not played are Italy and Russia.

Brian Johnston: I am a recently turned 20 year old University of Toronto ((bee?)) student. I spent my first 18 years of life in the town of Huntsville, which is a veritable hotbed of Diplomacy. My first contact with postal Diplomacy came via

John Leedar, who was a Huntsville resident at the time (and a former French teacher!). I was a co-publisher of Arrakis with a no. of people, including its present pubber, Doug Hayward. I am in my second year in the Bachelor of Commerce program here (which, incidentally, Robert Correll is a graduate of) and finding it quite a challenging experience. My hobbies are Dip, Stamps, and interhouse sports (hockey, football, basketball, etc.) ((And what about booze??))

Randolph Smyth: I'm 25 years old, unmarried, just completed a PhD at the University of Ottawa ((hurray!!!)) and headed west (Alberta) for a "real" job within a few months. I've disgraced the hobby for over five years now, but most of my time these days is spent publishing my zine, Fol Si Fie. ((What? Apart from Diplomacy and other games, my interests include fencing, harrier ((what's that?)), and amateur theatre. All are likely to suffer in the move, though, so my entire lifestyle may change before long.

Thank you, everyone. I'd like to get more bios before November 16, 1978; c'mon, players, are you ashamed of your past?

During an evening visit, some couples decided to contrive their own version of the TV program, "The Newlywed Game". To a group question, "What meal would you like to have once a week?" the men recorded their answers, and the women attempted to match their husbands' replies. Alice's husband shocked her with his answer of hamburger. "What!" she exclaimed, having expected his answer to be T-bone steak. "We have hamburger nearly every night." "I know," retorted Dave. "I would like to have it just once a week."

SMITH-CORONA250SMITH-CORONA250SMITH-CORONA250SMITH-CORONA250

About the quiz last ish--I've decided to make a few unilateral arbitrary changes. Before saying more, however, look at what Richard Jarvinen answered:

- 1) First Postmaster General of Canada--a little-known secret and hushed up since war, as Erwin Rommel did such a terrible job, was fired and forced into exile. (to Germany, I believe.)

- 2) Baldwin (you wouldn't call me a liar for 18 years, would you?)
- 3) No idea--probably Waverley in disguise.

P.S.: re-History Quiz: you requested good answers, not correct ones!!!

Hum...What can I say? What I meant to say was correct answers; but I did say good answers...and Rick's answers are very entertaining (ie.: good), so I am tempted to give him credit for them. But I won't...because...well, you knew what I meant!

The changes I intend to make are:

- 1) Instead of giving a credit of \$2.00 to the first competitor to attain a score of 15, I'll give a credit of \$1.00 to anyone reaching the score of 15, regardless of his rank. (ie. if competitor B reaches the score of 15 in Jan. 1979, he receives the credit of \$1.00; let's assume that player A then reaches the score of 15 in March, 1979--he'll still get the credit, and so will all the other players, as long as they reach the score of 15.)
- 2) A competitor can answer a question as long as no answer has been given yet in the zone.

Now, response to this idea has been very weak. Please, participate! By next ish, if the participation has not substantially increased, I will abandon the idea.

People can still answer the last ish questions. In addition, they can also answer to the following five questions:

- 1) In what year was the American Constitution voted by the Congress? (Now, this should be quite easy for any American subscriber...)
- 2) In what year was the Canada-American Treaty of Reciprocity signed?
- 3) Who commanded the US Vth Army in Italy? (during World War II)
- 4) Who commanded the German VIIIth Army at the battle of Tannenberg and at the battle of the Masurian Lakes in 1914?
- 5) How many seats did John G. Diefenbaker have in 1956?

A wife and a husband fight. After the last fight, the husband wants to make up. She answers that she'll make up the same way the North Vietnamese do. The husband asks: "How?" She answers: "Take me to Paris!"

IF I REALLY WANT TO PRODUCE A TWENTY-SEVEN PAGES ARTICLE, I'LL HAVE TO WRITE ARTICLES.....

PLUGS DESIGNED TO BLOW UP THE PIPES OF THE MODEL

It might be unusual, but PASSCHENDAELE #2 will contain a few plugs. After all, if I want to fill up the space of a super-ish, I've got to do some ~~plugging~~ advertising...

I will restrict myself to only zines I've been receiving for a period of time long enough to allow me to appreciate them.

EGGNOG: This is the exception to my last sentence--I have never received EGGNOG, but have heard enough about it to plug it. EGGNOG is a sub-zine which is going to expand into a full zine in October 1978. (That's about now, I guess...) The zine will be edited/published by Konrad Baumeister, who's address you can easily find in PASSCHENDAELE #1, page 2.

Although I can't praise the new zine before having a sample copy in my hands, I can nonetheless say that Konrad is a good chap (he's a minor ally of mine in a game...) and that he knows the stuff, since he's been writing EGGNOG when the latter was a sub-zine. EGGNOG should turn out to be quite stable, since Konrad has been a GM long enough to know whether he likes the trade or not.

EGGNOG should also prove to be a good opportunity for the Canadian players to expand the number of Yankee (this term is not derogatory when I use it...) zines they receive. Anyway, what I recommend is that you send a buck to Konrad and then judge whether or not to pre-long the sub after the few issues you receive...

DIPLOMACY DIGEST: This zine (which usually varies between 10 to 25 pages) is edited by Mark L. Berch, 492 Naylor Place, Alexandria, VA 22304, US. As you can see, this is another American zine.

This zine is most recommended reading, and is well on the path of becoming my favourite dip-zine. To give you an idea of its excellency, DD has ranked among the three best zines of the year in John Leeder's last poll.

The zine is 100% discussion, articles, and reviews. Mark produces an interesting monthly ish, and keeps in touch with the whole hobby. The novice should learn fast the tricks of the trade while the old veterans still have something to learn every month while reading DIPLOMACY DIGEST. This zine's circulation is of about 64. Excellent stuff in it.

POL SI FIE: This zine is pubbed by Randolph Smyth, who's address can be found in PASSCHENDAELE #1.

POL SI FIE is about the best Canadian zine, and has ranked as the best established zine in John Leeder's last poll.

The zine is humouristic at times, and the reader can always feel Randolph's personal touch throughout the fourteen pages of the zine. It has very interesting and excellent Diplomacy articles, and ideal house rules (in my opinion). All kinds of variants, wargames, as well as Diplomacy games (some of which being analyzed regularly by Randolph) are present in the zine. There would also be a chess column if demand was strong enough. There is even a bridge column! So, for those who like quality and quantity in a zine, send in \$\$\$ to Randolph.

In conclusion, Randolph has never disappointed me as a GM or publisher throughout the 12 months I've been receiving the zine, even some six months ago, when Randolph could have slowed down when he broke his arm...

NON SEQUITUR: This zine, pubbed by Richard Jarvinen (address in PASSCHENDAELE #1), usually contains around 12-16 pages.

NON SEQUITUR is a good zine for anyone who loves wargames--it contains CONQUISTADOR as well as many other games. There's a fairly good chess column in it too. Finally, those who like to play Diplomacy games will also be satisfied as the rates are more than generous: \$1.50 per game only. (And I think Richard gives away the ishes for their postage costs only to those who play in a regular postal Diplomacy game...)

RUNESTONE: John Leeder doesn't really need a plug--he and his zine probably are the most well known in the entire Canadian hobby. Bluntly, anyone who doesn't receive RUNESTONE can't call himself a complete hobby diplomat.

RUNESTONE is the ideal zine for those who like zines that concentrate on press announcements, regular Diplomacy games, and Diplomacy variants, and don't like long zines with many articles. RUNESTONE is also one of the best zines for the novice.

BATOCHÉ: This zine is also pubbed by John Leeder; it is basically written in the same style than RUNESTONE, except that it tends to be shorter and is written in French. BATOCHÉ is good if you want to improve your French while enjoying Diplomacy.

ARRAKIS: This zine, the oldest in Canada, is pubbed by Doug Hayward (address in PASSCHENDAELE #1); it has about 8-12 pages, and is fairly good as far as humour is concerned. It is basically written in the same style than R and B, except that the editor does slightly more writing. ARRAKIS is recommended reading, and worth getting if you're interested in Canadian zines.

ELECTRA GLIDE BLUE: Finally, the last zine I'm gonna talk about, but not the least, is pubbed by Cal White. (Address on page 2 of PASSCHENDAELE #1.) This zine is easy to read (and short enough for those who love short zines--it has from 6-10 pages.) and his super as far as humour is concerned.

There are lots of games in it, including variants such as THE FOG OF WAR. From time to time, there's an article written by one of the subbers--and Cal always ensures that the article is of good quality re-humour or re-Diplomacy.

EGB has never been late, except lately, due to the postal strikes, and Cal has been fairly stable since he started publishing. Personal touch maniacs are likely to be satisfied.

Last year, the following notice appeared on the door of the office of the British Consulate General in Houston, Texas:

"Due to circumstances beyond our control, the Consulate will be closed July 4th."

THE AMERICAN SUBSCRIBERS SHOULD APPRECIATE THE PARAGRAPH ABOVE.....

As promised, there is a description of a game in this ish. La voici:

BATTLESHIP

This very simple game requires only a pen and a self-made "board".

The "board" consists of points--there are ten vertical columns of points (numbered from 1 to 10), which in turn form ten horizontal rows of points (lettered from A to J). Briefly, the board consists of 10x10 points.

Once you've made two such boards, all you have to do is to invite another person, who then takes one of the boards and presents you from looking at it for the rest of the game.

Then you both proceed like in the following:

- 1) you mark five continuous points (ie. which form a series) that form a horizontal or vertical line with another colour. (ie. if the points are black, then you mark them with blue) This line of points represent a battleship. Similarly, you mark 4 points (which represent a cruiser), 3 points (represent a destroyer), another 3 points (represent a submarine) and two points (represent a E-boat). These different "lines" may not intersect each other, but may be adjacent to each other, or may be side by side. (eg.: you may have A1, A2, A3, A4, A5 and B1, B2, B3, B4; you may not have A1, A2, A3, A4, A5 and A1, B1, C1, D1; you may have A1, A2, A3, A4, A5 and B1, C1, D1, E1.) It is vital that you keep the location of these marks secret.
- 2) Then, one of you starts "shooting" five projectiles on any five points of the board. After he has shot, you report the damages done to your fleet by his shots.

For instance, if your opponent shot at A1, A2, A3, A4, and A5, and that your submarine is situated at A1, B1, and C1, then you say "hit submarine at A1". If your opponent sinks one of your units (ie. hits all its points: for instance, if he shoots at A1, B1, C1, D1, and E1, and that your E-boat is on A1 and B1, then you say: E-boat sunk at A1 and B1.) If there are also other hits in the same turn, you report them as well.

3) When your opponent has recorded the hits, you shoot five projectiles at his fleet. By the way, you record on a separate paper the damages done to your fleet when your opponent shoots—a unit hit on turn a may be sunk on turn b if the other points are hit.

4) The game ends when all of one's units have been sunk.

There actually is a more complicated stage of the game, where one of the opponents says only "hit" or "not hit", or "sunk". The shooter then has to deduce what he has hit or sunk by further series of shots in the next turns. But you'd better stick to the easy game when you begin playing it. Actually, BATTLESHIP is commercially produced—you can buy it at about any wargames shop.

I'd be willing to GM such a game. Only two persons are required. The game-fee would be ridiculous: \$1.00 for 2 games of the "easy game" plus 2 games of the "advanced game". As a matter of fact, I would appreciate it very much if one such wargame would start next ish...It's very easy to play, and the gamefee is cheap...

As the Indian fishing guide and a tourist were paddling up a lake, he pointed to the far shore. "There's a boys' camp on that side of the lake, and a girls' camp over the other side," he said.

Noting the tourist's quizzical expression, he added, "The reason they put 'em that way is so everybody'd learn to swim!"

IT HINK I' M SLOWLY BUT SURELY GETTING SHORT OF IDEAS. I' LL HAVE TO QUIT TYPING SOON...HUH...

ABOUT THESE TWENTY-SEVEN PAGES...MAYBE THE ISH WILL BE ONLY TWENTY OR TWENTY-TWO PAGES

LONG...TOO BAD EH??

PASSCHENDAELE #2, October 19, 1978.

Since the beginning, the promise has been made that there would be articles on politics. There has been no screaming whatsoever against it (and two persons have even verbally approved the idea), so I'm gonna start writing.

ELECTIONS IN CANADA

This week (October 16-20) has been a week filled with elections in Canada. There has been the October 16 federal by-elections in fifteen constituencies (spreading from British Columbia to Newfoundland), the Ontario by-election in one constituency, and the general elections in Saskatchewan. I'm in the mood to expound on politics, so I'm gonna "analyse" these elections, as well as a few earlier elections.

The general trend I'm starting to discern really clearly in English Canada is that there is an extremely strong anti-Liberal, and especially anti-Trudeau, wave throughout the country, except perhaps in Quebec. Another attitude I feel is that the anti-NDP wave of (1974) 1975-1977 period is now fading slowly.

There is no doubt that Trudeau now is more unpopular than at any other point of his career (even in 1975, when he instored the wages and prices controls, he wasn't as unpopular as he is now). The indications supporting this point of view are numerous: since four months, the Liberal Party has had hard luck in the Gallup polls; also, more concretely, the Liberals of Reagan have been driven out of office in Nova Scotia (Reagan had made some good realizations; but he made the mistake of associating himself to the Trudeau leadership.); the Liberals of Campbell would also have been thrown out of office in Prince Edward Island had it not been for one seat; (and Campbell too refused to dissociate himself from Trudeau) in Manitoba, the Liberals fell from 20% of the popular vote to 12%, and fell from 3 seats in the Legislature to 1, while the Conservatives jumped from a mere 25% to over 48%, and formed a strong gov't; in British Columbia, the Liberals were reduced to one seat in the Legislature of 1975; and, this week, they made a poor standing both at the federal level and the provincial level—in Saskatchewan, the Liberals, who were associated to Trudeau, slid from the rank of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition to non-existence, as they lost all their eleven seats to the NDP and the Conservatives. In Ontario (d'Arcy McKeough's constituency), however, they made gains in the by-election, by replacing the NDP as the second strongest party in that constituency—but they did so by clearly dissociating themselves from Trudeau. (In fact, the Liberal candidate based his campaign on saying: "I don't like Trudeau that much") At the federal level, the Liberals, who were forced to associate themselves to Trudeau, were slaughtered—they lost five of their seats (out of seven). They lost Liberal fortresses such as Saint-Boniface, a Toronto constituency, and Ottawa-Centre; what's worse, they lost even though they had

PASSCHENDAELE #2, October 19, 1978.

big cannons running in these² constituencies, such as former Postmaster General Bryce Mackasey (Ottawa-Centre) and former Rector in Chief of the University of Toronto, Mr. Evans. Even in Quebec, where they had hoped to compensate for their losses elsewhere, the Liberals weren't able to blitzkrieg their opponents--the weekling *Crédit Social* was able to re-capture the constituency of Lotbinière. However, the Liberals were able to capture a Conservative seat, Saint-Hyacinthe, but then let's not forget that the Conservatives lost lots of supporters when they attacked Claude Wagner, the former super-MP of the constituency. Also, and understandably, Wagner refused to support the Conservative candidate, who in addition begun his campaign only two or three weeks before the elections...

Therefore, there definitely is a strong wave of anti-Trudeaumania sweeping the country at this hour. But let's not jump to strong conclusions too soon...even if the Liberal leader is unpopular, will people vote for Joe Clark when they'll know that their vote can overthrow the gov't (i.e., in general elections)? I hardly can imagine them voting massively for the NDP as a protestation vote! The only other alternative is the Conservatives--I don't know if the citizens will vote for a leader that is considered not to have any guts, i.e. Joe Clark. So there is the possibility that the Canadians will vote their present gov't back in, even if they don't like it very much, because they'll consider there's no other alternative. I can easily imagine a minority Trudeau gov't in 1979. There's also another factor playing in favor of Trudeau: the concept of national unity. He may come next elections and just basically say: OK, you English Canadians dislike me. But the Quebecers happen to like me; they'll massively vote for me. Now, with Levesque in power in Quebec, do you think you can afford to vote against me and thus infuriate them? This argument could attract a huge number of supporters..But, in any case, the fact remains that Trudeau does not have much political space in which to manoeuvre.

There's another question I'd like to discuss: the leadership of the Liberal Party. Recently, some Liberal dissenters have been wondering if they have the right leader, and propose to change it. My point of view is that that position won't persuade the rest of the Liberal Party, for the simple reason that there is not much of an alternative within the Liberal Party to Trudeau at the present time. The only logical candidates would be Campbell (actual Premier of PEI), MacEachen (President of the Privy Council), Jamieson (Minister of Defense), John Munroe (former Minister of Labour), Jean Chrétien (Minister of Finances), Knight Andras (President of the Treasury Board), Otto Lang (Minister of Transportation), and John Turner (former Minister of Finances). We can eliminate right off the bat Jean Chrétien, who would be the victim of the Liberal tradition of electing a French leader and then an English leader, and then a French leader, etc.

Otto Lang can be eliminated also because he's a rather poor politician--he's the only politician who possesses the art of alienating both the French and English Canadians...and the Liberals know it well. John Munroe can also be discarded since he's made it very clear he has stepped down from politics for ever. Jamieson and Andras do not master completely French, and are rather disliked in Quebec--the Liberal Party delegates wouldn't want to be sure to lose Quebec's support in return for perhaps some minor additional support in English Canada. MacEachen comes from Nova Scotia, and couldn't provide a good alternative for two reasons: he's having trouble with his own constituents (what's the use of having a leader who can't even conserve his own seat?) and he has only a minor following throughout the country. (And he's not that well known either...) He knows that, and has declared that he wouldn't participate in a race to the leadership of the Liberal Party. The ones left are Alex Campbell and John Turner. Alex Campbell would be a good leader in all points, but has the great disadvantage that he doesn't have that much influence within the Liberal Party at the federal level outside the Maritimes wing. So it would be kinda hard to imagine the Liberal federal Party accepting him as its leader. Only John Turner is left. He has a large following both within the Liberal Party and Ontario. However, he doesn't presently have a seat in the House of Commons; that's quite an handicap. (It is suggested by many facts that he pulled a big mistake when he resigned from the House of Commons--evidence suggests that he could, at one point, have overthrown Trudeau as leader of the Liberal Party, if he had had a seat.) Also, it has been proven that Turner has been selling some secrets about some of his former colleagues' "transactions"... that's bad when you want to get their support one year later. Also, it is hard to tell whether or not the Canadians would vote for the Liberal Party if Turner was its leader--they might get the feeling that the Liberals are ready to do anything just to hold on to power...and then they might vote against it even if Turner is at its head. Also, the Liberals know very well that kicking a leader out of office is bad for a party--it inevitably splits it into two roughly equal factions, and it kinda gives a bad reputation to the party. (Look at what happened to the Conservatives in 1988, after they kicked Diefenbaker out of office--they slid from 97 seats to 72 seats.) So, I would think that the population will see Trudeau as the leader of the Liberal Party in the next elections....

There's a final note I'd like to insert: the anti-NDP wave seems to have come to an end. From 1974 until 1977, the NDP had an almost continuous streak of bad luck--they slid from 31 to 16 seats in the 1974 federal elections, they were kicked out of office in British Columbia in 1975, they were kicked out of office in Manitoba in 1977, and they lost the rank of second party in the Ontario legislature in 1977 (They had held it only for about 1 1/2 years...); also, they slid from 44 to 39 seats in Saskatchewan around 1975.

PASSCHENDAELE #2, October 19, 1978.

Now, this streak of bad luck seems to have come to an end...Although the Social Credit gov't of Bill Bennett Jr. seems to be solid, it also looks like the NDP has recovered from its 1975 severe defeat, and that there no longer is a leadership crisis. Some polls were even favorable to the NDP in British Columbia. In Saskatchewan, this week, the NDP was swept back to power by passing from 39/61 seats to 44/61 seats. (By the by, it campaigned in favour of continued state welfare, state programs, the nationalization of the potassium industry, the continuation of its oil policy, and against the federal government.) Although the Lyon gov't seems to be still quite strong in Manitoba, I've heard of many screams coming from Winnipeg in the newspapers--this is good news for the NDP as it is the only alternative to the Conservatives...In Ontario, the situation seems to have stabilized for the NDP under the new Michael Cassidy leadership, and in the Maritimes, the NDP has made substantial progresses in the last Nova Scotia provincial elections. At the federal level, the NDP retained its seat of Broadview (Ontario), and almost won the Hamilton seat. Most important, it made a breakthrough in Newfoundland, by winning a seat from the Conservatives. This is very encouraging in times of Trudeau-Clark polarization...Anyway, the future will either confirm or reverse this trend...one thing is sure, though: the NDP won't win the next general federal elections...

A secretary comes into the office a morning and says to her boss: "I've got good news and bad news for you today." The boss replies: "I'm in a rag today, so I want to hear only the good news..." "OK," replied the secretary, "here are the good news: you're sure now that you aren't sterile."

I'MINSUCHAGOODMOODTHATI'MGONNAWRITEANOTHERARTICLEONPOLITICSIN THISISH, BUTFORTHEAMERICANSTHISTIME...SUBBERS, TELMESOIFYOUDON'T LIKETOHAVESOMUCHARTICLESONPOLITICSINTHEZINE...IPROMISESHEREWON'T BEANYARTICLEONPOLITICSNEXTISSUE, SOASTOGIVEYOUHETIMETOFULLYREACT

As said in the linear separator, here's another article on politics, discussing part of the international politics this time.

THE CAMP DAVID NEGOTIATIONS

As everyone probably knows by now, the US, Israel, and Egypt were able to reach a preliminary agreement at Camp David a few weeks ago.

The Camp David agreements profit mainly to three powers: the US, Israel, and Egypt.

To the US, the agreement means that it will be able to retain its alliance with Israel (which it has considered quite precious since 1948) while not damaging its new friendship with Egypt. That's a thing no President has ever been able to achieve on a long-term basis. Also, the Camp David Summit improves the American gov't's reputation internationally, and especially in Europe--the Europeans, who are dependent on Arab oil, won't criticize the US too much for conciliating Egypt and Israel, and thus surely diminishing the possibilities for a war in the Middle East...Also, another advantage for the US is that France is likely to lose influence in the Middle East as a result of the Camp David Summit. (Despite popular belief, France had a great degree of influence in Egypt, Lebanon, Syria, and Saudi Arabia since the late 60s...the Camp David agreements are likely to weaken this influence, in Egypt at least, because now Egypt is likely to tighten up ties with the US, at France's expense...) Finally, to President Carter, the Camp David Summit won't hurt politically...

To Israel, the agreements mean that from now on it will have breathing space diplomatically. Locally, Israel is no longer diplomatically isolated--with the Egyptian neutrality, the other Arab states aren't very likely to be too aggressive towards Israel. Also, thanks to the Camp David Summit, Israel sees a chance of legalizing some of its conquests--Israel has good chances of being allowed to retain the Golan heights, Jerusalem, Ci-Jordania, and perhaps even the Gaza strip (ie. if the Palestinians do not soften their attitude toward Israel.) President Sadat now seems happy to regain the Sinai, and says that since the other Arab states didn't support his negotiations with Israel, they don't deserve to get back their lost territories, and will have to negotiate with Israel if they want some of them back. This gives Israel hope to retain these territories, as, up to now, President Assad of Syria, as well as King Hussein of Jordania, have declared they would never negotiate with Israel. In addition to securing Egypt's neutrality, Israel certainly isn't hurt to see that the US will remain their ally because they made concessions to the Egyptians. Also, politically, Begin has gotten out of the tough spot in which he was--the extremists who wanted Israel to keep all its conquests are satisfied enough, since Israel is conserving almost everything; the extremists who wanted peace at any costs are also satisfied--Israel got peace, and not at very great costs?

To Egypt, the agreements mean that she gets back all the territories she lost; Sadat's position vis-a-vis the other Arabs is also strengthened, since his policy worked, while the policy of the other Arab states failed. Also, Egypt now has the "peace of mind" she desired so much--Israel, in addition to handing back its conquests on Egypt, promises not to attack it. More important, by avoiding war, Egypt finally sees a chance to stabilize her stagnant economy, to re-arm its armed forces, and to concentrate on its internal affairs, which are

in a terrible state. It is very clear that Egypt could not afford another war with Israel, and the Camp David Summit avoided it.

Now, the general situation in the Middle East is still very explosive--it is still the powder-keg of the world. Israel still has a rather provocative foreign policy towards all the Arab states--two recent events confirm this hypothesis: first of all, Israel invaded Lebanon for the second time this year, immediately after Camp David, because of Palestinian "raids". (Actually, shelling of Israeli territory from Lebanon) The Israelis have re-occupied the southern bank of the Litani river, have air bombed Palestinian camps, and have sent their naval force to bombard Beyrut, in support of the Christian Phalangists. Syria didn't like that, and so did all the other Arab states. The situation could turn out to be explosive. Secondly, the Israelis have withdrawn their promise to promote the creation of Palestinian autonomous state in the Gaza strip, taking the Palestinian hostility as an excuse. This has put tension in the Cairo-Tel Aviv relations. The Palestinians, by their continued raids on Israel, also risk to provoke a war. The Arabs are more divided among themselves than ever--and most of the Arab states still dream of unifying the Arab world to their profit. Egypt and Libya don't get along too well, for instance. Syria and Egypt don't get along well either. (More specifically, Egypt condemns Syria for its intervention into Lebanon; Syria blames Egypt for its negotiations with Israel.) In conclusion, there still is a lot to do before security be restored fully in the Middle East. (Gee...I managed to take up nearly two full pages to say what has always been evident as far as the Middle East is concerned: it's not a safe place to live in...)

A Senator said the Americans should pay
pay their taxes with a smile. Many
Americans wish they'd known that--they
sent cash.

I'D LIKE TO GET A REACTION FROM EVENY IMPORTANT SUBSCRIBER IN THIS ZINE
ABOUT THE ARTICLES ON POLITICS AND ABOUT THE IDEA OF HAVING A SUPERISH
ONCE EVERY SIX MONTHS OR SO... IS IT THUMB UP OR THUMB DOWN????????????

I don't feel I can finish this ish without including a short article on Diplomacy. After all, those who had the patience to read up to here should be "rewarded"....

ERRORS CAN PAY

The basic concept behind this article is that voluntary, well-planned, errors can pay very often.

Let me get something clear right away, though; the errors, to be worthwhile, must most of the time not include a loss of center(s)--such errors usually encourage your neighbors, especially the strong ones, to stab you. (Their reasoning will be: well, if he can't even hold on to his centers because of his stupid mistakes, then I'd rather have his centers than see that rival get them...) It is also (most of the time) preferable that such errors not include missing of a build--these weaken your country too much to balance out the profits you get out of the error(s). But, as seen later, missing of a build may sometimes be profitable.

Most of the time, an error will "pay" if you're in a difficult diplomatic position--you promised a power that you'd do something, but you don't want to do it. The "error" will allow you to make it seem as though you wanted to do as promised, but made a careless error (for which you'll be excused if the "offended" player really wants to be your ally) which blew everything up.

Take the following concrete example. Let's say you're England, and that you have the following position: F Mid, F Eng, F Iri, F Nth, F Swe, and A StP; let's assume France owns Portugal and has A's Pic, Gas, and Bur; finally, let's assume the Italian player has F Spa(sc), F Wes, F Gyn, F Ion, A Mar, and A Pic. You promised Italy you would not stand him out of Portugal, but at the same time, you made the promise to France that you'd prevent the Italian player from getting it. You're in such a position as you don't feel you can alienate one of the two neighbors. Then, the solution would be to order F Naf-Por, and leave F Mid unordered. F Naf-Por will fail since it is an impossible move and that, more important, F Naf is nonexistent. Italy won't be prevented from grabbing Portugal and probably won't hold a grudge against you if you explain why you ordered F Naf-Por; on the other hand, France will be angry at you but will pardon you quite soon, thinking that you meant F Mid-Por but that you made a careless error. So, the error is profitable in this case.

Another example in which the error would be profitable is when you're given the following situation: you are France, and have the following position--F Wes, A Mar, A Bur, A Spa; you have 5 centers, so you have a build. England wants you to help her against Germany, and asks that you build an army in either Par

PASSCHENDAELE #2, October 19, 1978.

or Bre, to attack Germany more forcefully. You don't really want to engage in a war against Germany, and you even want to get England in a war against Germany, and then to build a fleet and stab her. One good way of doing this is by ordering: build A Pic. Such a build will fail, but will make England think you meant either A Par or A Bee. She might then make the mistake of going to war against Germany. You can make an arrangement with Germany in such a way that he'll stand-off A Bur-Pic and A Mar-Bur, so that England will continue to believe that you are hostile to Germany. Then, the next winter, when England has all its units engaged against Germany, you can profit of your last Winter error and build F Bre, and then swing F Bre and F Wes against Liverpool and London. In this case yet, the error turned out to pay-off a fairly good dividend...

But, a final warning. You must always be archi-careful when you attempt to use pre-planned errors as a weapon against another country. That other country might not pardon you or try to profit of your weakness (she thinks, after all, that you make stupid errors) and attack you--then you might turn out to be in trouble. One sure thing to avoid is to make errors regularly or often. Then the other players will believe you can't play a position that well and will all jump on you, hoping that you'll make errors on their respective fronts, which will permit them to conquer you quickly.

The Free Romanian Press, published for citizens of that country exiled in England, contains this conversation between two men in Bucharest:

"How do you feel, comrade, about the law against abortions?"

"I agree with the policy of the party."

"And how about the rent increase, comrade?"

"I agree with the policy of the party."

"What is your position on the decree increasing taxes?"

"I agree with the policy of the party."

"Don't you have any opinions of your own?"

"I do. But I don't agree with them."

WELL, IGUESSI 'MCONNAHITTHESACK, AS IT IS PAST 2AM... THAT 'S THE END OF THE ZINE

Well, that's the pitch, boys. Again, I hope to get your reactions about having a super-ish once every six months or so. Make comments on all sections of the zine too, if you please... Until next ish,

FINE JIG-A-DOO!!!

John:
Thank for your note of confidence. I hope you'll enjoy
my piece.
Dravogard (but need) the "ordinary" typed pages in the job -
draw out of pages 8/9 and 17/18, think - that's the
- disadvantage of copying for back info is
- ^{frankly}

John Kelley,
PO Box 216,
Klickitat, WA 98628
United States of America