

Feudesse

The Crusading Journal of Berch Burning, Davis Damning,
Linsey Lynching and Walker Running Over October, 1984

The South Coast Clique: Ad Hoc Conspiracy or Operational Illuminatus?

SCC keeps power in hands of three

Mark, Fred and Rod, 1981-82

Mark Berch, Fred Davis and Rod Walker have made many positive contributions to the postal Diplomacy hobby for many years. Mark has published Diplomacy Digest for a very long time and worked very hard on DipCon XV, including developing a scoring system, writing the contract with the host convention and publishing a newsletter and souvineer booklet. Fred has worked hard to GM variants timely, fairly and responsibility in his postal Dipzine, and has made many suggestions to correct what he sees as problems in Dipdom. Rod has published several issues of Diplomacy World (a labor of, but also a job full of unwelcome drudgery, I'm sure), working hard to solicit contributions from a wide range of hobbyists (including me).

But Mark, Fred and Rod have a dark side.

I'll try to give it to you straight.

This dark side was revealed to me when I became a member of the 1983-84 Dipcon Administrative Committee and the working papers of the previous committees were forwarded to me for review. For several years the committee papers have been preserved to provide some guidance to later committees. Mark Berch himself wrote that he wished to provide a written record of what he was doing so that later committees had a guide.

DEMYSIFYING THE SCC

Everything you ever wanted to know about the most powerful regulatory agency in the state, and the three men who control it.

What I read in the 1981-82 committee papers shocked me.

The elected members of the committee were Herb Barents, Mark Berch and Fred Davis. However, almost all of the correspondence is from Berch, Davis and Walker. Although unelected, Rod was privy to every aspect of the committee's deliberations and made detailed suggestions on how to run the DipCon society meeting (actually, to use his word, how to "stage-manage" the meeting). There was a discussion about formally admitting Rod as an "ex officio" member of the committee but ultimately it was agreed that this might not be acceptable to outsiders. Therefore, not only would Rod not be adopted as a member, but courtesy copies of letters to him would be "blind copies," i.e., a "c.c." notation would be included on the letter listing recipients but Rod's name would be deliberately omitted, in order to conceal his participation. Rod was, in fact, very active, especially in regard to managing the meeting. And very close management indeed was deemed to be required.

Feudesse is published on an occasional basis and is available for \$1 per copy from Ed Wrobel, PO Box 3463, Arlington, VA 22203. Commentary on the material herein is welcomed. Original articles satirizing Dipdom's many follies are solicited.

More on the South Coast clique

Mark, Fred and Rod had very strong opinions about how the Dipcon money was to be divided, what amendments should be added to the constitution, where the next Dipcons were to be held and who would sit on the next committee. It appears they viewed the DipCon Society not as a body that should make decisions but merely as a potential obstacle to the effectuation of their plans.

Mark insisted that there be no discussion at the meeting of how the funds were to be distributed. Yet, a way was found to funnel money to Rod. In Rod's words...

It had not occurred to me until I read Fred's letter that Pontevedria is in fact a Hobby service. Please be advised, therefore, that I will request the DipCon Committee consider granting funds for Pont. This constitutes an "official" request.

(The following year no Dipcon funds were allocated to Rod's Pontevedria and he protested loudly. In one year public funding of Pontevedria had gone from an innovation to an irrevocable right!)

The committee's amendments were to be given every procedural advantage, and those of others were to be discouraged.

Fred: A good ploy would be to require that all amendments be submitted 14 days in advance.

Mark: Yes, "14 days prior" sounds right.

There was much discussion of who should serve on the next committee. It was suggested that Fred and/or Mark run for re-election even though they did not wish to serve another term. The idea was for them to resign later and appoint their own successor, so as to ensure that the Society did not elect the "wrong" persons.

Rod: But that's the way to go if Mark doesn't really want to serve... get the committee re-elected and then, later, replace Mark.

Fred: Perhaps we could get some successors lined up in advance.

Eventually it was decided that too high a profile might be too risky.

Mark: How do you think it will look if Herb gets up and sez, in effect, "I was elected in 1980, then in 1981 we all re-elected ourselves, then in 1982 we're amending the constitution so that I don't run again in 1982 either."

They'd have to go outside "the family."

Mark: I'd rather have Kathy Byrne or John Caruso as New Yorkers.

Still, this was difficult for one committee member to accept.

Fred: As you know, I only half facetiously suggested that the New York metro area be made a separate Hobby region.

Mark, Fred and Rod were also very interested in the sites of future DipCons. The west coast was not favored by Fred or Rod since "it's the kiss of death" and "no one but Californians shows up." New York was also out

Fred: I agree, we should try to "pack the house" with delegates who will support Detroit in '83 and Chicago in '84, to make sure the con doesn't

go to New York either of those years.

Of course, there was a small difficulty with directing future DipCons to acceptable sites.

Mark: The problem here, as I see it, is that the constitution makes it very difficult to not go to the west coast in 1984.

But resourceful Fred came up with a solution...

Fred: I'd suggest that we promote Detroit for the 1983 DipCon and Chicago for 1984. If we can amend the DipCon Charter, we can approve both of these bids at the same time.

Throughout the letters, concern is continually expressed about the messiness of the democratic process...

Rod: I do want to reiterate for the umpteenth time my suggestion that the DipCon Society meeting needs good floor management.

...and how to get around it...

Rod: Please arrange to recognize me first on the floor....If you can arrange for some person other than myself to be recognized first and to make that motion, so much the better....We should have a couple of allies, aside from myself, on the floor. This will have to be well stage-managed.... We can have some prearranged person for Herb to recognize to make that motion.... As parliamentarian I will advise you that he is out of order, of course.
Mark: We will also need a summary cum soft sell to go along with it.

...without looking too bad--

Rod: ...having us on opposite sides of something might not be a bad idea in terms of public relations...since we four are going to be seen working in tandem and/or agreement a lot of the time.

Sadly, they were not above "playing hardball" with individuals who were particularly troublesome.

Fred: There is a postal player in Texas (not a publisher) who is preparing a dossier on Sacks, so I sent him copies of some of this material. This person, whom I'm not at liberty to name, expects to start publishing his own zine in, perhaps, six months, and one of his features will be an expose on Sacks. If you have any particularly juicy items (his, plus your replies) that you'd like included in this expose, if you'll send me material, I can photocopy it here free, send the copies to him, and return the originals to you, if you're interested.

There can be little doubt about what went on here. These men knew what they wanted and they intended to get it. If the DipCon society meeting stood in the way, it could be stage-managed. If the constitution stood in the way, it could be amended. If an individual stood in the way, he could be smeared. Fortunately, even with these elaborate plans, they did not achieve all their goals.

This is old news to the people who have read the DipCon papers from 81-82. Why bring it up now, two years later? Because Mark, Fred and Rod continue to take active parts

in the affairs of Dipdom and you have a right to know whether you can trust them. Rod, in fact, was elected to the 84-85 committee (this time by ballot). Mark has much to say about alleged indiscretions by the former Boardman Number Custodian. And Fred has repropoed his scheme for permitting postal ballots at the DipCon Society meeting, stating that he will work closely with the committee (hopefully not in an ex officio capacity!) Ironically, Fred responded in Bushwacker to charges of toadyism by asserting that he was his own man and that "When better plots are hatched, Fred Davis will be in there helping to hatch them!" I suspect this statement was meant "only half facetiously." It gives one pause to wonder what plots Fred is hatching currently and how the postal balloting will be used to facilitate those plots. This proposal was voted down at this year's Dipcon Society meeting (perhaps there was inadequate stage management?) and is viewed by some as a play by certain publishers to establish a mechanism allowing them to exert undue influence on the voting. How much easier it will be to "pack" a meeting by mail! You don't even need floor allies-- or any warm bodies at all. In reading over the back issues of John Michalski's The Brutus Bulletin I won in the PDO auction, I came across a fascinating tidbit. In the mid-July, 1980 issue, Bill Becker writes in his DipCon review: "Herb Barents was elected chairman of something or other but I didn't get that all straight as I had lucked into a conversation with Allan Calhamer. Herb is quite capable I'm sure, but there was one disturbing thing I recall and that was a comment I overheard Fred Davis make that Herb would be the next chairman, as if it were decided long before the vote. SCANDALOUS! I don't know, maybe it's nothing." Then again, maybe the 81-82 papers are only the tip of an iceberg.

As for me, I have no intention of ever buying a used car from the South Coast Clique. Much less voting them into a position of trust.

HOBBYSLUR

This may well be the last instalment of this benighted column. It seems that our parent, Bruce Linsey's effort of the same name in Voice of Doom may be discontinued-- along with the rest of the appropriately initialed VD. It may be too soon to tell if this is a simple hoax-- patterned after the Politesse hoax which Bruce so greatly admired. So please do not begin your celebrations just yet. If it is indeed true, we may owe our thanks to Bill Highfield. Could it be that the storm of criticism that followed Bruce's torpedoing of the ex-naval Highfield led to Bruce's exit from the ranks of the Hobby's scandal mongerers? Too soon to tell. One thing is for certain: Bruce's nominally last issue was accomplished in the usual Bruxian style-- obese and tasteless. To support his assumption that Politesse folded, Bruce selectively quotes from the "last" issue, conveniently omitting mention of the sections calling for articles for the next issue. Verry clever, Brucie! And he demolishes my criticism of Fred Davis' racial analysis of venereal disease in North Dakota by citing none other than Steve "Woody" Arnawoodian. It seems that Woody used the epithet "nigger" in a letter to Bruce and I must condemn Arnawoodian if I am to condemn Davis. Fair enough-- consider yourself condemned, Woody. May I say, however, that I find Woody's obscenity rather less dangerous than Fred's attempt to persuade through pseudo-science. Woody may be no less offensive (even his friends admit that!) but a little learning in the hands of a demagogue like Fred...While Woody may lack the initiative to allow himself to be roused to join the lynch mob, Fred would be home writing the tracts that inspired the leaders. (Um, before Mark writes to ask which tracts Fred wrote where and when, and which lynch mobs they inspired on what dates and how can we look into the minds of the leaders and know what inspired them, I will confess to a touch of hyperbole here.) Bruce also takes me to task for reading "both my mind and Bill's in one sentence." Not so, B, just taking a simple inference based on the facts. Does it make sense to accept B's explanation that to protect himself from a murderous lunatic he had to do the one thing sure to provoke the man to murder?

The Past Repeats

Over the past 20 years, Dipdom has experienced repeated cycles of change. Dipdom fluctuates over time between periods of elite guidance and brutal anarchy. The renowned theorist, Professor Robert "Dr. Bob" Olsen of the Kansas Geo-sociology Board, provides us in the following two pages with a cogent analysis of the methods of elite guidance, drawn from the chapter "How the Junta Rules" from the 1982 edition of his text on the structures and fault lines of the postal Diplomacy hobby, What's All This About Squashed Bugs? In this cover article, I would like to discuss the context of Dr. Bob's comments.

Sometimes the transition between Juntas contains a long period of anarchy, such as the several years that transpired between the passing of the Walker-von Metzke Junta of the late 70's and the rise of the Berch-Linsey Junta of recent times. During these periods of anarchy, the diplomatic rabble rears its ugly head and propogates the radical and disruptive notions of "democracy" and "player's rights." At other times, however, the passage from one regime to another comes in the form of a coup, leaving no period of anarchaic transition. This was clearly the casewhen the IDA Junta of Buchanan-Walker overthrew the TDA Junta of Beshra-Boardman in the mid 70's.

Lacking a coup, a Junta can either disintegrate from internal dissen-tion, or can be overthrown by revolutionary foment. The longest periods of anarchy come from the former, because in the latter revolutionary leaders often lead Dipdom into a new period of Junta-rule almost as quickly as do leaders of a palace coup. Dipdom today is somewhere between a pre-revolution-ary and post-revolutionary situation.

The current situation, while clearly in the revolutionary paradigm, is still unsettled. Surprisingly, the revolutionary forces are being led by the powerful Kathy Byrne who, while possessing one of the strongest follow-ings in the history of Dipdom, has never before shown any interest in using that power against the hobby's ruling forces. Ironically, Kathy's personal friendship with similar powerful but reticent figures -- formost among them the legendary Steve "Woody" Arnawoodian -- led the Junta to launch a self-destructive pre-emptive strike against what they saw as a gathering revolutionary power center, thus themselves creating and radicalizing just such a power center.

The exact outcome of the ongoing upheavals is difficult to predict. Should the Junta be overthrown, will Kathy establish a new ruling elite, or will she return to her old power base in the mysterious Existential Crepuscular Cognoscenti, leaving Dipdom in anarchaic disarray? But looking back at the beginnings and progress so far of the current cycle of change, there are a number of lessens to be learned. One should act cautiously in establishing initial alliances in the postal Diplomacy hobby, and one should not support blindly the actions of the current powers that be, for the mandate of heaven can change. One must always remain sensitive to the rhythm of the dialectic of Dipdom. But given the uncertainties of today, it is worthwhile turning back the clock just a bit to learn more about effective elite rule. In the article that follows, Dr. Bob will make everything perfectly clear.

MEGADIP 101: HOW THE JUNTA RULES

by Bob Olsen

An essential feature of the Megadiplomatic art, as it relates to perpetuating the rule of the Dip world's junta, is the question of security. Sadly, the fuzzy-minded, bleeding-heart laws of this great land of ours preclude the firm measures (breaking down of doors late at night by steely-visaged goons, mysterious disappearances of troublemaking 'dissidents', fires of unknown origin shutting down zines printing embarrassing or inconvenient items) that would otherwise be most effective. Therefore, our betters have devised a series of security measures, obstructionist tactics, and fallback positions of such Byzantine complexity that even most FENSA members can only gasp in slack-jawed amazement. It is my intent here to explain how the system operates.

Let's say, just hypothetically, that a certain hobbyist--let's call him Joseph K.--has made critical comments about a member of the Junta. Farfetched, I know. At this point emergency calls would go out and the midnight oil would burn most brightly in the homes of A, the Junta's "Enforcer", and B, the Junta's "Mouthpiece". Coincidentally, no doubt, the hapless Joseph K. would start to be deluged by nasty letters from Junta member A, while at the same time B might begin to bombard him with mock-analytical, self-contradictory, idiotic gibberish. All of these letters--an irrational or hysterical person might term them "hate mail"--would of course be explicitly labelled "Off-the-Record".

K., being a troublemaker as well as a malcontent, now makes the mistake of mentioning this illuminating correspondence to some other thorn-among-the-flowers. Joseph K. is finished! The Junta strikes! For not only were the attacks Off-the-Record, but word of the very existence of this material was also Off-the-Record, and the very act of mentioning the existence of the letters was a violation of their secrecy! K. is finished, ruined. Ignominiously he drops out of Dipdom, never to return. But the work of our leaders is never done, and more yet remains. K. has revealed the existence of the security system, and not only must he be run out of Dipdom, but his grave must be (figuratively, no doubt) spat upon. Therefore the Enforcer continues to refer disparagingly to K. for years afterward, attempting, if opportunity offers, to interfere with his livelihood or personal life by any means necessary (Hell hath no fury like a Junta scorned!). Meanwhile the Mouthpiece, in his role as self-appointed Historian of the hobby, publishes an objective account of the dispute, emphasizing that Joseph K. was worthless scum.

Occasionally this efficient arrangement can go wrong: K. fails to allow himself to be driven out, or he's got too many friends who stick by him, or the charges against him are so idiotic and preposterous that only Junta members (who will believe anything if another Junta member tells it to them) will believe them? A backlash develops. The self-styled hobby elite is in trouble. What then?

Because these are the very best people Dipdom has to offer (as each has told the others so many times), contingency plans for even this emergency have been made. Depending as they do on the apathy

and credulity of Dippers everywhere, these plans have never yet been known to fail. They consist of a series of fallback positions, obscurantist tactics, and verbal obfuscations so daunting in their labyrinthine complexity as to thwart the intellect of an Einstein.

Let's say, for example, that certain embarrassing letters penned by the Enforcer and the Mouthpiece come to light. A series of barriers are then erected, much as some years ago the French police placed barricades around the Bastille. In order, these fallback positions are:

1. The letters never existed.
2. OK, so they do exist, but they don't say what K. says they say.
3. OK, so they do say that, but they don't mean it.
4. OK, so they do mean that, but Joseph K. has violated the confidentiality of private correspondence. Boy, we're really bummed about it too.
5. This is a private matter between Joseph K. and the Enforcer and it's nobody's business but theirs, so let the Enforcer deal with him as he sees fit.
6. The Junta's actions were justified by the situation; none of your business what it was.
7. You can't know what Junta members A and B were thinking; you're not a mind reader. Just because a campaign of six months' duration came to a completely predictable conclusion doesn't mean we intended it that way.
8. A and B were speaking hypothetically/rhetorically/theoretically/probabilistically when they blasted K.
9. You can't know what Junta member A/B was thinking; you're not a mind reader. Just because we did the same thing to Robert A. and John M. doesn't mean we intended it that way.
10. Junta spear-carrier Z agrees with A.
11. Joseph K. must have some sort of mental problem to contradict the Enforcer.
12. No matter how many witnesses there are to the contrary, the word of any Junta member is to be believed implicitly. Have we ever lied to you?
13. The letters never existed.
14. It's all Kathy Byrne's fault.

Thus we see that while the practice of hiding behind Off-the-Record labels is the wellspring of Junta power, the obscurantism of the security system is the glue that keeps the organization strong. Until troublemaking aggregations like "Solidarity" realize this central fact and either bow down to their masters, or change morally to the point where they feel free to adopt similar methods (a possibility explored by the rock group "Devo" in their documentary "The Truth About De-Evolution") only one group, the Junta, can claim the honor of being known as the Megadippers Supreme, and the right to destroy anyone who gets in their way.

Non-Not for Print!!!

Dear FeuEd,

9/11/84

The first issue of Feudesse was outstanding, nearly without flaw except for Rod Walker's letter, which was a mere rehash of what he wrote to No Fixed Address. Fortunately you managed to liven it up a bit...

Before your term "DipConGate" becomes adopted as standard, I would like to promote my own expression. I think the so-called "Dipcon letters" should be referred to as the "Hexagon Papers"--in my opinion the best triple-entendre of my career, connoting as it does in dreaded enumeration the following:

1. Hexagon board-wargaming
2. Our ruling junta, the In Six
3. The historic Pentagon Papers case.

The latter strikes me as much more relevant to the present issue than Watergate; after all, there was no break-in, even by the notorious Robert Sacks, who was foiled by the ceaseless vigilance and immovable rigor of the Committee.

Actually, I'm not sure what you mean by "wrong-doing" in this connection. Aside from a concerted assault on the bounds of good taste, I don't see that the Committee did anything "wrong". It would indeed seem that they spent an inordinate amount of time planning how to get themselves re-elected, and how to stymie Robert Sacks (a somewhat similar personality, but as far as I know incapable of the sort of Byzantine conniving we see here), and in general how to get the most out of the power-drug. The lesson of the Hexagon Papers is the same as that of their pentagonal forbears; what really happens in the corridors of power? What do our 'leaders' really think of us?

Doesn't it seem odd that over two years after that particular Committee discharged what were supposed to be its real duties, there are still matters in its working papers some people consider embarrassing? This whole notion that people who supposedly took the job as representatives of the great mass of Dippers somehow constitute an elite with secrets to be kept from the Great Unwashed strikes me as strange. There are no North Vietnamese, no Soviets here. This whole off-the-record dodge has been abused by certain people to an incredible degree. The Hexagon Papers give a clear impression of ~~some~~ some people who were having just a dandy old time playing Machiavellian megadip behind the scenes, never dreaming that their ruminations about who had to be corraled or given enough rope, or who was hysterical or irrational, would someday face candid evaluation.

Maybe some of our present problems have their roots here. Since Hexagon times, various of the principals have gone on to wield power--of a highly negative sort--in deciding who shall--or more specifically shall not--be Boardman Number Custodian, and whether House of Lords has an "acceptable" subber policy. And yet, and yet, Committee members in other years have avoided this sort of hubris. I wonder why.

By the way, does the 1984 Committee have any secret papers we should know about?

In polifeudesse,
Bob Olsen



Dear Ed:

10 Sept 84

I have tried, rather dilligently I thought, to mend fences. Apparently you would prefer to feud. That's really too bad, since you seem otherwise like a nice sort. We could have had rather an interesting friendship intra-hobby, assuming that we might share other interests as well. Too bad we never got to explore those. It appears that a nasty feud is what you want, instead. You may be rather disappointed in my response.

"I appreciate your decision to stop hitting Kathy". How you got the notion that I was hitting her is beyond me. I have had one disagreement with Kathy over something she did as BNC, and it was of rather a minor sort. She thought it was major, and unfortunately I engaged in some ill-tempered rhetoric over it which she has my apology for. However, it was so nice (and convenient) of you to ignore totally the numerous times I have defended and backed Kathy, particularly in VOICE OF DOOM, but also in MURD'RING MINISTERS. Negative details seem to appeal to you, don't they? Sorry you can't pick up on the positive ones with equal facility. I could never bring myself to hate people quite so easily and with quite so much relish as you seem to do.

Your letter mentions Linsey and other topics. I really regret that I cannot discuss these matters with you. I would very much like to be forthright and candid with you, but you seem incapable of respecting the confidential nature of confidential communications. I therefore cannot ever discuss third parties with you if it involves information which should not be spread all over the hobby.

I wish to refer the matter of my NFP letter and of my right of reply in POLITESSE to an ombudsman. The best procedure is for you to suggest a reasonable number of names (say, 3-6) of individuals who would be acceptable in that role. If any one of them is also acceptable to me, then we have a mutually agreeable choice and we can go from there. John Caruso maintains a list of people who are willing to serve in that capacity in case you can't think of any names off-hand.

(It is, by the way, a long-established principle of copyright law that a manuscript letter belongs to the sender and to his estate. That is why, for instance, a considerable body of Tolkien letters in this country have never seen print; the estate won't agree to it. True, the physical letter is one question, but the contents of the letter remain the property of the sender, and you have already violated my rights by unauthorized quotation from that letter. Hence my demand that it be returned.)

Please send the initial list of your choices for ombudsman at your earliest convenience. I hope we will need to go through only one list, and it might be helpful if you avoid naming people you know I won't find acceptable. This seems to be the only way to resolve fairly a dispute on which we are not going to agree. I feel confident that you will pursue your feud with me by whatever other fair or foul means may be put at your disposal. I don't feel I ~~deserve~~ deserve the sort of persecution you seem determined to inflict, but it seems obvious that people with any brains or powers of discernment will instantly see the inherent pettiness of what you are doing. Too bad you can't see it.

Sincerely,



(Ed: I did not print your NFP letter. I merely said that you had threatened me and called me a "backstabbing ingrate." It's beyond me how you can cast such insults and then assert your "rights" so piously. You try to hide behind the NFP label. On Kathy, you had written in NSWG that she did not have the intelligence to understand the PBEM issue. As I wrote, I am glad you decided to stop writing such things about her. What is this ombudsman supposed to decide? Who has been nastier? And what sanctions would he impose? This is not a Dip game where the choice is "a" or "b." --But from reading the DipCon papers, I get the impression that you "play" life just like Dip.)

Dear Ed Wrobel,

FOR PRINT

Ex 10-3-84

I was somewhat disappointed by the September Feudesse. Ken Peel's essay was marvelous, very witty and vastly entertaining.

When I turn, however, to your comments about me, I see unsubstantiated allegations, vague charges, and innuendo.

For example, you say, "It is convenient for Mark and Rod to stand up for freedom of the press when it serves their interests but to assert a right to privacy when they wish to conceal a conspiracy or a piece of vicious hate mail." What vicious hate mail? Please substantiate this. What am I alleged to have done here? Was this a piece of vicious hate mail that I wrote, and if so, when and to whom? And if it was written by someone else, who wrote it to whom and when, and when did I try to ~~conceal~~ conceal it?

Similarly, you write, "For example, Mark ~~regularly~~ regularly reprints other people's material ~~in~~ in Diplomacy Digest without asking for permission, altho several people have recently protested that they do not wish to be associated with his zine." What have people protested? "Altho" what? Get specific here. There have been a tiny handful of people who have told me that they do not want their material reprinted in Diplomacy Digest. I have never reprinted any of their material. I will in fact go further than that. In the 7+ years that I have been running Diplomacy Digest, I have reprinted hundreds of items. NOT ONCE has any writer ever objected to the fact that I had ~~reprinted~~ reprinted his material. And by objected, I mean either someone who told me in advance that he didn't want his material reprinted, and then I reprinted it anyway, or someone whose material was reprinted, and then they wrote me later, protesting the fact that I had reprinted what they wrote. This has NEVER happened. So what, specifically, is this all about? Who specifically has been harmed or has protested my reprinting of their material? Don't be vague, be specific.

And then there is that wonderful word you floated out in responding to my letter: "Wrong-doing" Ah, yes, what a delicious piece of innuendo. It sounds so terrible, and yet, its impossible to respond to, because there is no specific allegation here to refute. The same goes for your word "conspiracy".

I will tell you, I have a very low opinion of the practice of just hurling forth accusations and innuendo, without any specifics. I realize that this is just the first issue of Feudesse, but I hope that this does not become a regular feature at the zine.

(Ed.: I hope this issue meets your requirements for specificity. It seems that you want it both ways, though. Last issue you sought to conceal the specifics by attempting to quash discussion of your portion of the DipCon papers. But that's exactly where the specifics are set forth. The hate mail was Rod's contribution, not yours. Perhaps the word "conspiracy" is too strong a characterization for a co-ordinated effort by several men to dictate their whims to the "ignorant masses." After all, who says these decisions should not be made by Mark Berch, Fred Davis and Rod Walker? That nasty crack about reprint protestations referred to quotes by Byrne, Caruso and Sacks you took from House of Lords. It was gratuitous and I offer my apologies. I had hoped to solicit some explanation of the Dipcon papers from you, Fred and Rod before I printed the article beginning on the front page of this issue. Now that many of the specifics are out, I still hope each of you will explain. Dipdom deserves at least that much.)

FRED C. DAVIS, JR.
1427 CLAIRIDGE ROAD
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND 21207

September 17, 1984

Ed:

You sure know how to hurt people. You apparently don't understand that for most people, Postal Diplomacy is supposed to be a fun hobby, not a crusade to force everyone to meet a certain pre-ordained moral standard. If you don't like the idea of a fun hobby, perhaps you are in the wrong hobby. *Diplomacy is just a game!*

Thank God this game is over, with the 5-way draw approved. Your protest is printed on Pg. 2.

I do not intend to respond further to your scandal sheet. I do not recall that the Postal hobby has appointed you to be judge and jury for any investigation into the ~~conduct~~ of the 1982 DipCon.

Needless to say, you are not welcome to be a player in any future games here in BUSHWACKER.

*Sincerely,
Fred Davis*

Perhaps someday, when you are alone with your conscience in the dark of the night, you will suddenly realize how many people you have hurt with your insensate needling and character assassinations in FEUDSSE and elsewhere.

(ED.: I would feel bad that I had hurt you if I did not recall how glibly you labeled an entire race profligate, how gleefully you volunteered to help create a "dossier" on someone you did not like and how disdainfully you planned to bend the DipCon constitution and the Society to your will. My conscience is clear. How could yours be the same?)

I suppose you had a great deal of "fun" doing these things and it's rude of me to be a wet blanket about it and spoil your fun hobby. Apparently it's all a game to you.

No one has appointed me judge and jury and I have not acted as such. I am just another dreg-of-the-earth who takes offense at your elitism. I believe that the power to make decisions such as where the next DipCons will be held should not be concentrated in a small committee of 3 (especially so if one of them isn't even elected). Your actions on the committee show that you believe otherwise. Now you are re-proposing a scheme to permit voting by mail at the society meeting. You ridiculed the Dallas meeting in Bushwacker because it was not large enough to be "democratic" in your view. It did include more than three voters, however. Excuse me, but I just cannot reconcile your new-found devotion to democracy with your track record. Am I missing something?)

Ed Wrobel
Politesse Editor

Dear Editor:

I have a bit of shocking news for you. Perhaps you'd better sit down.

As a new Warthog devotee and Polipix Editor, I have found some horrible news out here on the west coast. It is quite shocking and horrible, not to mention hurtful, obnoxious, sinister, destructive, dreadful, foul, rotten, putred, mean, wretched, pathetic, grievous, deplorable, woeful, evil, nefarious, reprehensible, wicked, repugnant, abominable (not snowman), abhorrent, revolting, repulsive, disgusting, odious, detestable, accursed, diabolical, devilish, vicious, and down-right nastily unhealthy.

It has come to my attention that Dale City is relatively close to our nation's capital. And the Washington Redskins football team resides, interestingly enough, in Washington D.C. They have nicknamed the offensive line the "Hogs", which is obviously shortened from Warthogs. An off shoot of Dale City, I'm sure.

This past month, the Washington Redskin Warthogs lost a game to the evil San Francisco team. Losing is nothing new to us Warthogs. But--- at this "game" in San Francisco, there was obviously a death threat (see photo below). This should not be confused with any Bruce Linsey death threat. In fact, I specifically asked the people in the grandstands if they knew Bruce Linsey and they did not. Or so they claimed. I checked the entire stadium and found none of the known Bruce Linsey adversaries. Not one of the hundreds of people who have put out a contract on Linsey were within 40 miles of Candlestick Park.

So I am left to believe that this Warthog death threat was aimed at the Washington Redskin Warthogs. Apparently it scared them enough to lose 37 - 27.

I now nominate myself to be death threat guardian for the entire hobby. I will number all death threats and track their progress. Do note the camera readiness below.

Thank you for your support. I am, Sincerely yours,

Doug Brown



(Ed.: You will refrain from submitting such obscene photos in the future. This one is being printed in the public interest but we will not make it a practice to depict our hog brothers in a decapitated and apple-stuffed state. Shameful. It is easy to see that you are a novice to megaDiplomacy so I will only gently remind you that we have "custodians," not "guardians." Oh, there may be a hatchet man or two around but we won't name any names, like Bruce or Mark or even Ed. There are many, many very old men in this hobby who have put in years at shaping DipDom to their liking and a mere whippersnapper like you isn't going to come along and snatch a coveted custodianship just like that. Pay your dues and don't call us, we'll call you...)

From Bruce Poppe

In re Feudesse: not bad, though I'll manage to do without it in the future. (FENSA, hunh? Hee, hee!) (Good stuff.) any how, the real compelling reason to get Politesse is HavaGame. The rest is icing on the HavaGame cake.

(ed: Our correspondent holds high office in Maryland MENSA-- Diplomacy Special Interest Group.)

From Conrad Minshall

I don't think I'll be requiring Politesse anymore. But I would like Feudesse. (ed: one man's meat...)

This summer, the last time I checked, photocopying in austin went as low as 2½¢ per page (\$1.25 minimum). Considering the size of DC metroplex...perhaps you're getting ripped off? (ed: Hey, this ain't no cow town! DC is right up there near Boston and San Fran in terms of cost of living. I've been to a dozen places near home and work looking for a better deal. They start here at 10¢/page for no minimum and go down with quantity. There are a lot of quickie offset places and it's about the same as photocopying if you can sell a hundred copies. I asked Greg Ellis of Austin about the 2½¢; he pays 15¢! But he said the lower price is available on sale with cheap paper. There's no justice; anybody know any gamers in DC with photocopying privileges?)

I don't know how you can stand Peel-- his novice package is the best stuff I've seen in a 'zine. Why aren't you jealous? (ed: This is a quasi-socialistic organization, remember? We all pull together for the good of the group, free of personal rivalries and jealousies, committed to WARTHOG, and WARTHOG alone. But easy on the compliments, okay? Ken is already talking about taking "Best Writer" in the Players' Poll.)

It sure would be nice if there were just one skeptical inquirer, just one publisher digging into the Linsey/Byrne feud w/o heavily slanting the issue one way or the other. Yes, wouldn't that be nice? (ed: Great idea! A Byrne/Linsey Feud Custodian! I'll bet Doug Brown would like that job. Bruce has called me up a couple times, trying to recruit me and pointing out what a great guy he is for not printing anything about a certain female person's drinking habits. Of course, he has no compunctions about spreading such tales via telephonic device (easier to deny later, I suppose, no messy evidence around). I have my own disagreements with Bruce but I really think he did Highfield dirty and I don't believe his explanation. On Kathy, he should never have come out with that allegation about her threatening to declare his games irregular. This was an attack on the integrity of a Hobby institution and he had no proof to back it up. Moreover, it's ridiculous! If Kathy had tried to declare his games irregular, it would have caused an incredible uproar and perhaps destroyed the BNs altogether. Kathy has put in months as BNC. Does it make sense that she would then do something that might destroy the very institution she worked to preserve? Of course, we cannot read Bruce's mind...but we can apply rational analysis and draw inferences. We know that Bruce wrote in VD that he thought the BNs were unimportant. Presumably he wouldn't mind if they were destroyed, along with one of his longtime enemies...)

Some of your Linsey humor is funny-- but much of it seems to only thinly hide strong feelings

and thus falls flat. (ed: Well, you really know how to hurt a person. Perhaps someday, when you are alone with your conscience in the dark of the night, you will suddenly realize how many people you have hurt with your insensate needling...oh, excuse me, what I meant to say is, yes, despite Bruce's continual protestations to the contrary, I do strongly object to his megaDiplomatic tactics, to the point of feeling a touch of nausea whenever I happen to glance at the initials BL or VoD. But the really serious part of your comment deals with flat humor. I guess the show of feeling spoils the humor by imparting too serious a tone? Or are you a closet Doomee? See Brad Wilson's letter about the relish.)

From Brad Wilson

Ignore Olsen's pontificating against superior authority. Bob's a natural-born troublemaker. In this case, he's looking to exploit you with his bad jokes. Take strong action against his whining and carping, but since he is on the Light Side, (ed: Where'd he get the nickname "Pudge" if he's light?) be nice. If you don't act soon, he'll plague you with letters like he does "Muffin" Byrne. And that's a fate almost as bad as getting letters from Walker!!

On Walker: Since I don't get DW, and don't intend to-- costs too much for what you get-- I did not see the offending plug/review of Erewhon. However, it strikes me as blatant self-hornblowing and an awfully clumsy move by a usually suave operator. But of course, it all comes down to intent. If Rod really was starting a series, and just happened to choose his own zine, then we may fault him for a serious error of judgement (i.e., choosing his own zine) but he's innocent of malice/self-promotion/conflict-of-interest. If, as you seem to imply with your "why wasn't it labeled a series" remark, Rod deliberately set out to promote himself to a captive audience, then we can prove a blatant attempt at self-promotion that calls into question Rod's impartiality as DW editor and his fitness to continue as editor (or "custodian" if that suits someone better.)

Rod's attempt to point out the "ineffectiveness" of the article (your word) is disingenuous, of course, as you say. If I try to shoot you and my gun doesn't work, the malice of intent remains. And you neatly destroy Rod's economic argument, also accurately, if with a bit too much relish. (ed: Agreed. I've made an effort to hold the relish some this issue. What can I say? I had him by the balls and I couldn't resist squeezing. In truth, I was outraged by his apparent attempt to pull the wool over the eyes of my readers. We may not be upper-crust, west coast intellectuals with a love for opera and extensive knowledge of the bible, but Rod's feces smells the same as anybody's.)

What it comes down to is how fast we're willing to question Rod's motives for the Erewhon plug. It was at the least just stupid and at worst total self-aggrandizement. I'm not sure I'd jump to your assumption (I'm not saying you "jumped" to it) that Rod's motives were suspect; but if they were, then you're absolutely right to take him severely to task. But, as I said, Rod could have avoided the whole ugly incident by using better judgement. See what a little thinking can do for us humans? (ed: I don't place as much importance as you do on whether this was the start of a series or not. I just think Rod insulted us by making a big deal out of how Dip World is a Hobby service and how we should support it-- and then turning right around and using this public service to promote his private wares.)

As for Dipcon 81-82 and Berch, I've not seen those letters. But I strongly disagree with any effort to keep those letters quiet or secret. (ed: Hear, hear!! This correspondence is a record of the work of the committee and DipDom should not be prevented from examining that record.) Nowhere in the Charter does it say that the DipCon committee is to act as some type of Star Chamber, isolated, incommunicado, and behind closed doors. Apparently, as you and others have said in the past, there's something a little hot in those letters. If it's relevant to today's hobby, as you imply, then there should be a totally free, open and vigorous discussion of those letters. Now how about printing that stuff?

(ed: continued after the Brux t-shirt offer a few pages hence)

SPECIAL OFFER!!!

FOR A LIMITED TIME ONLY!!!

TO MY FELLOW MEMBERS OF DIPDOM'S ELITE:

You all know me. My name is Quark L. Berch. Many of you may know me from my zine, Diplomacy Indigestion. Many of you may know me from the many letters I have written to Diplomacy zines to support Bruce Linsey's positions. Many of you may know me from my articles for Diplomacy World. And one or two of you may even have encountered me in my game. To all I give greetings.

As most of you know, I have been retained by Mr. Bruce Linsey to defend him against sundry scurrilous accusations made against him. These accusations have come from certain mentally-unbalanced elements of the hobby, including, but not limited to, crooked GM's, thieving publishers, short loud women who snarl in sharp New York accents, the next Jack Masters and the next Jack Masters after him, unethical publishers who have refused my right of 40-page reply, vicious nasty Boardman Number Custodians who won't do things our way, and others whose marked mental deterioration has been a source of grave concern to us all. I would like to state publically at this time that I believe every single word of what Mr. Linsey has said in his own defense, except for those times when he has admitted to what he has been accused of. Obviously, those confessions must have been coerced, and they don't count.

But I have asked myself, what can I do for Bruce, other than putting my own reputation, which is nearly as unsullied as his, on the line? Is there not some act of faith which will prove my total sincerity despite what might be read in the Hexagon Papers?

At last I have come up with something, and I want you to understand that this proof of my faith and sincerity is the highest accolade I can give my friend and client, Bruce Linsey.

I believe in Brux. And I know that you agree with me, since otherwise you'll soon be run out of the hobby. It is for this reason that I am offering you, for a limited time only, a FREE "I believe in Brux" T-shirt. I expect no payment of any kind for these shirts; they are my tribute to Brux. All I want from you is a regular-size SASE (those ordering "Xtra-large" please use a legal size envelope). In return you will receive, absolutely FREE, an "I believe in Brux" T-shirt, and it will be worth every penny you pay for it too. These shirts are available with a variety of inspirational messages (see order form), or you may compose your own message of support for Brux. Please limit the message to 15 words total, or if your name is Berch, to 50,000 words not including footnotes.

In addition, the first 100 Dippers to take advantage of this offer will receive, in the same envelope, "The Collected Death Threats of William S. Highfield, John H. Masters, Kathleen Byrne, John Caruso and God Only Knows Who Else" absolutely free!!! So don't hesitate! Fill out that form and send it in today!

**" I BELIEVE IN BRUX" T-SHIRT
ORDER FORM**

Size:

- Small
- Medium
- Large
- Xtra-Large

MESSAGE DESIRED (check only one)

- "No matter what the evidence...I believe in Brux"
- "I believe in Brux because Brux believes in Berch"
- "Any number of witnesses can't be right...I believe in Brux"
- "Keep Dipdom dirty...I believe in Brux"
- "I believe in Brux...and communist robots from the planet
Gorgon"
- "Destroy a hobbyist today...I believe in Brux"
- "I'll believe anything...so I believe in Brux"
- "I believe in Brux...1984's Minister of Truth"
- "The In-Six: love them or be destroyed. I believe in Brux!"
- "Have you busted a novice today? I believe in Brux"
- "Tretick lives! I believe in Brux!"
- _____ (your message)

Send this form to:
Quark L. Berch
Nail 'er Place
Alexandria VA

nonNotForPrint (continued, with Brad Wilson)

The satire of Walker in SK was vicious, biting, incisive, and funny. Is your middle name Swift?? In short, it was what good satire should be. Hope Rod sees it that way. (Want to try your hand at Brux next?) (ed: No way! Linsey plays for keeps.)

The satire of Davis wasn't quite as good, but then he's harder to lampoon, not being as visible, colorful, verbose and pompous as Walker.

From Steve Hutton

Add me to the list of people who didn't know if you folded or not. (ed: You sly social climber, you! OK-- Mark Berch, Steve Hutton, Bruce Linsey. At least you didn't ask for a refund.) Your LatinBashing was brilliant. Why did you have to beat me into print? (ed: I'm very good at satirizing dead languages. It just occurred to me how appropriate it is that Latin is the epitaphical language-of-choice for Hobby Old Farts (oops-- too much rehsih!) and too gross a word construction!) Your "confidential" play seemed very cheap. (ed: It had very limited distribution and, thus, was quite inexpensive. And it was straight from the donkeys' mouths.) Also, in Feudess, you seemed very pissed off personally. Why? And, will you get better soon? (ed: Maybe this issue will help answer your questions. Are you not a little annoyed to be treated so dreggishly by the Committee of 1/2/3?)

THE LAW OF BERCH

translated from the Berchian by Bob Olsen

Bruce Linsey is my shepherd; I shall not think.
He maketh me to walk the path of controversy, for controversy's
sake.
He smiteth the evil ones, the un-believers,
The Leeder Poll winners, the Boardman Number Custodians, the women;
He destroyeth mine enemies; and better yet,
He telleth me that my every word is correct and brilliant,
Though I be the veriest lackwit.
I getteth my jollies watching him destroy the innocents;
With mighty blows he disrupteth the personal lives.
He teacheth me new ways to save on long-distance phone calls;
He relateth fascinating lore of mysterious death threats;
Yet he exacteth tribute from me, his obedient servant.
I must exalt the sacred holy word of Bruce Linsey above that of any
number of other people,
Yea, though they be ten, or ten score, or ten million in number.
I convert my zine to his good work of slander;
My hypocrisy and moral cowardice stand revealed before the
multitudes;
I work my pretend-lawyer phony jerkoff miracles in his name;
My verbal obfuscations rise like holy incense at his altar.
And though my pedantic fatuities know no end, I shall not fear,
Because Bruce Linsey and I run this hobby,
And anybody who gets in our way shall surely go the way of
Highfield,
And Masters, and Arnett, and all the rest.
And though we have to destroy Dipdom in order to save it,
Yet will there always be those who will worship us;
For according to the prophet Barnum,
One of those is born every minute.
For which I give thanks, in the name of Bruce Linsey,
Novicebuster, BNCbuster, friendbuster,
Hobbybuster.
Amen.

nonNotForPrint (continued)

From Scott Hanson

I'm really proud of myself. I really am out of touch with the
Dip hobby-- or at least the worst parts of it. 90% of Feudesse was about stuff
I didn't know about. (ed: The South Coast Clique depends on ignorance and
apathy to accomplish its vital work.) But, hey, keep sending it. If I'm going
to read personal attacks, they may as well be witty and well written... (ed:
It seems that any criticism of any kind gets labeled a "personal attack." I
think the work of the committee bears some scrutiny. And Davis, Linsey and
Walker deserve a few knocks for their various nasties.)

ESSE PUBLICATIONS, LTD.
Arlington, Virginia

My dear aspiring writer,

Thank you so much for taking the time to pour your hopes, dreams, blood, sweat and tears into a little envelope and entrusting them to the tender ministrations of the United States Postal Service. You really are very foolish.

You see, we here at Esse receive literally millions of submissions every month from large, amorphous, slow-witted creatures, such as yourself, who could hardly tell a Poderkagg from a Pontoonia, and could never possibly pen anything worth one moment's of our time. And those that we do not receive are, to coin a geopolitical fantasy, "lost in the mail," a convenient fate which we also reserve for particularly ingratiuous pieces of correspondence. We cannot really tell you whether your own missive was classified such until you alledge that you sent something, at which point it will be too late...

In view of the above, and the fact that you failed to include a von Metzke method SASP, we are unable to return your mss. unto you, de gustibus tuiff tookus. However, in concert with our long-established, traditional and intractable policy of the past 18 years, at least, we are forwarding your piece to our sister organization, Pandemonium Publications, for rejection, under separate cover.

Sincerely yours,

In self-importance,



Edward Wrobel
Head Honcho

cc: Kenneth Peel
Figurative Head

Pandemonium Publications

THE VOICE OF DOOM TRIVIA TEST

by Bob Olsen

Many fascinating tidbits await the reader of back issues of Voice of Doom. Admittedly, it's a rather depressing task to see all the people who have been discarded in the Quest for Controversy, and yet, there's a certain repellent fascination as well. Hobby Old Guard types will know the answers to these relatively easy questions. Do you?

1. Bruce Linsey: "I haven't offered any 'documented proof' of my side of the _____ story because there is none. The stuff he and I differ on took place in conversations, making it impossible to prove." Q: Who in the world can Bruce be talking about here?

2. Bruce Linsey: "I have had occasion recently to discover that _____ can be very generous and caring toward someone she likes. Consider the BRUX-_____ feud over. Permanently." Q: Again, who in the world?

3. How many player resignations occurred in VOD as a result of the "Black Hole Affair"? Which players resigned, from which games?

4. Mark Berch: "If he didn't like you, he would just start making up stories about you. He was extremely generous in distributing samples--he specialized in getting the addresses of people new to the hobby, and deluging them with sample copies. These people heard the charges--but not the denials, particularly if they got only 2 or 3 zines--which is not uncommon." Who is Mark talking about here? Hint: despite appearances it is not Bruce Linsey.

5. Bruce Linsey: "_____ may or may not hold your secrets in confidence, he may invent 'quotes' or stories about you if he chooses, and...things that he says about other people are not necessarily the truth...blatant disregard for the most minimal standard of ethics." Bruce was not writing an autobiography here; to whom was he referring?

6. Who was the first person ever attacked in Voice of Doom?

7. What former Boardman Number Custodian was attacked by Bruce Linsey for offering (the game was never played) to guest GM in a zine Linsey did not approve of?

8. Bruce Linsey: "I do not recommend that anyone do business with _____ as I consider him dishonest. Details available upon request." (Note: the 'details' are to be found in question 1). Again, who's the subject? (This is an easy one!)

9. Match the snippet of constructive criticism in column A with the fortunate recipient in column B.

A.

"senile-sounding nut...totally lacking upstairs"

"either desperate, or stupid, or both"

"thief"

"guilty of lying about me"

"meanness and viciousness"

B.

Bernie Oaklyn

Kathy Byrne

John Caruso

Richard Kovalcik

John Boardman

10. Who was the first person to refer to killing people ('death threat') in VOD?

11. Who said, "Do everything Alex tells ya, or I'll kill ya, OK?"

12. How many consecutive Boardman Number Custodians have been blasted, at one time or another, by Bruce Linsey?

13. Which of the following zines has not been subjected to "constructive criticism" by Bruce Linsey because of lateness:

- a) Retaliation
- b) North Sealth West George
- c) Erehwon

(ed: It is my understanding that the winners receive a free subscription to Voice of Doom.) (Don't peek!)

1. Bob Arnett
2. Kathy Byrne
3. 4: Dave Barker and Jack Masters (Black Hole); Kathy Byrne and Dave White (Dog Star)
4. Bernie Oaklyn
5. Bob Arnett
6. Bernie Oaklyn
7. Don Ditter
8. Bob Arnett
9. nut=Boardman
stupid=Kovalcik
thief=Oaklyn
guilty=Caruso
meanness=Byrne
10. John Kelley
11. Bill Highfield
12. 3: Kendler, Diter, Byrne
13. c

Key to Trivia Test

This is a subzine publication, dedicated to discussing material which appears in the parent zine, Feudesse. The editor of content in this fine publication will be none other than John Caruso.

I wish to thank Ed Wrobel for allowing Feudette to appear here in his journal of excellence, Feudesse. I'm proud to be a part of the team Ed.

In the 1st issue, many interesting matters were brought up, matters of which a great deal of importance lies. Things like postage due mail, and whether or not one should accept and pay for items which are postage due. That also brings us to the problem of who should be ultimately responsible to pay for such a breach of confidentiality. Logic dictates that the sender should reimburse the recipient. But aha! This is diplomacy, and when one is dealing in such intricate matters, one must remember the GOLDEN AGE RULE. That is, logic goes out the window, and that you, as the average hobbyist has no right to expect reimbursement from such people who are so famous, as Mark Berch or Bruce Linsey, or as busy as these people are. Note, I'm not inferring that Mark or Bruce send postage due material, nor am I trying to suggest that they wouldn't offer reimbursement, quite the contrary, Mark once reimbursed me 2¢ (or was it 3¢) of a postage due letter that he had sent to me. Its just that they are 2 of the most recognizable names that one can lump together (in a BLIND LOCKSTEP), or that can be easily equated to as very busy, and that they're famous.

This also brings up another area of importance. Sub balances. Suppose a zine runs 80¢ an issue, and a subber only has a 20¢ balance. Is the publisher obliged to send the entire issue, even tho the subber may not reimburse him, and he is losing money on the issue already, at the 80¢ price? Or should the subber send an additional 60¢? Again, we come to the GOLDEN-AGE RULE, which states- if you owe a big shot an issue, (you know, a Mark Berch or Bruce Linsey type- for an example), you are obliged to follow whatever policy it is that they tell you must be followed. If you send the entire issue, they assume you are being generous, and say nothing more of it. However, should you send only part of the zine, you will be labelled all sorts of good names, and demands will made upon your life and a lien placed on your wages, until such time that you 'give for free' the entire issue of the zine, that the 'biggie' was not entitled to.

Another important issue brought up in the last Feudesse deals with whether it is ethical practice to reprint your own phone bill to prove that you did indeed make a phone call. Especially when you're being challenged to have never made the phone call in the 1st place. The GOLDEN AGE RULE also covers this, and states- a person can not prove that someone didn't break into his house while he was at work and make the phonecall, or that the person isn't working in cahoots with the phone company to place an extra call on the phone bill, in order to win his point, even if the alleged call were to cost over \$100.

There are many important issues raised in Feudesse #1, but we do not wish to 'wear you out' with this memorabilia, all at once.

However, there was one other issue of great importance, and that being the Dipcongate, Ad. Com. DipCon papers. The Charter of the DipCon Society states that the Committee is only doing the work of preparing the Dipcon between the Dipcons. They are the chosen members, by the Society, to do the work for the Dipcon and the Society, and as such, are answerable to the Society, at large. I do not feel a persons right to know can be denied, especially if the person(s) have selected those who are doing the work for them. There is, (or should I say shouldn't be), any reason to keep secretive,

matters pertaining to the organizing of the DipCon for the constituents to enjoy. And if the people wish to know what is going on, or what went on, the information should be readily available to them.

Once again, it appears that Mark Berch is up to his proverbial ears in an other Dipcon, important issue. And no, it is not because he's so short either. However, I'm sure that Mark will agree with both Ed and I on this one, and realize that DipCon data is hobbywide material, and should not be restricted by superfluous, and artificial labels of confidentiality, where none should exist. Everyone has a right to know just how Dipcon should be run, and how it was run, if for no other reason, to learn something new. A broadening of horizons if you will.

I have a great deal more to discuss, and will do so in future issues of Feudette. But for now, I'll be signing off. I have to reread the Dipcon papers, so I can broaden my horizons, and be better prepared for the upcoming discussions on the do's and don't's for setting up a successful DipCon.

Bye for now. Take care.....

PS: I refuse to give you my boss's name, address or phone number. Can I still receive Feudesse and send a subzine to Feudesse for publication?

(ed: Sorry, John, but for security reasons, we must have a sound method of persuasion available for each reader.)

Feudesse

Ed Whobel
PO Box 3463
Arlington, VA 22203