

PRAXIS

#16

Circulation: 61

August 21, 1987

Editor's typewriter. Panasonic

IT'S BEVIS & BOWEN!

Yes, PRAXIS' first game has come to an end and Derwood Bowen and Jeff Bevis have shared a two-way draw. This makes them the leading players of the hobby, each with one-half PRAXIS POINT.

Lets get right to the two questions so I don't have to write so much of this myself next time. They aren't as good as the ones three issues ago but I did my best.

1.(a) You are attending a Diplomacy tournament. At lunch, you see, one table away, a player in one of your postal games sitting with the Gamesmaster in that game. You hear the player say "Here's my orders for 85FG (your game)", and hand the GM a blue envelope. The upcoming season is crucial and you'd desperately like to know what those orders are.

Fade to evening, where you find that you and the GM have been allotted the same room at the college where the tourney is being held. GM takes off his clothes, heads for the shower, blue envelope falls out of his clothes onto the floor. If you pick it up you will find it unsealed. Do you open and read the orders?

(b) You are the GM in (a) above, and leave the shower to get your shampoo, and find the player reading the orders. What is the penalty, or what do you do?

(c) same as (b), except the blue envelope the player opened didn't contain any orders at all. It was a different blue envelope, the real order envelope being safely locked away. What is the penalty, or what do you do, if you catch the player reading your hydro bill? You may assume that he breaks down and confesses that he thought it was orders.

2. You are President of the United States. Naturally you aren't as good at it as Ronnie but you just do your best. You are informed that the Soviet Union has launched an all-out nuclear attack, and that there is no doubt they have. You now have the choice of launching an all-out retaliatory strike with all that implies for the world, refusing to do so and leaving the Soviet union to dominate what's left of the world, or some half-way measure. You have a few minutes to decide. What do you do? Think fast.

I had dreams of putting this out three weeks ago to see what it'd be like to put out an early issue of PRAXIS, but the ridiculous "Demystification" article in this issue held me up immeasurably. If you think it's boring to read, look at it this way...at least you didn't have to write or type it. By the way--sub rates are up.

PRAXIS is a journal of postal Diplomacy published approximately every five weeks by Alan Stewart, 702-25 St. Mary St., Toronto, Ontario, CANADA M4Y 1R2, (416) 961-8095. Subscription rates: \$1. Canadian the issue, ten for \$8.50 ; 75c American the issue, ten for \$6.50 . Diplomacy was invented by Allan B. Calhamer, A Great Canadian.

Struggle

STANDBYS: Bob Acheson, Derwood Bowen, Steve Clark, Bruce Geryk, Melinda Ann Holley, Evans Givan, Jack McHugh, Craig Reges, Rodney Schmisser, Mark Weidmark, Doug Williams.

1986 J

ALGOMA

Spring '06 continued

The New Democratic Party regards ALGOMA as one of its safe northern seats in the September 10 election.

PACT RECEIVED WITHOUT ENTHUSIASM

The proposed draw between RUSSIA and ITALY passed 2-0.

Game: 1986J Zine: PRAXIS GM: Alan Stewart

	01	02	03	04	05	
AUSTRIA	5	4	2	0	0	
ENGLAND	5	6	6	6	6	
FRANCE	5	6	6	6	5	
GERMANY	5	3	3	4	4	
ITALY	4	5	7	9	10	DRAW
RUSSIA	6	8	9	9	9	DRAW
TURKEY	4	2	1	0	0	

- AUSTRIA: Conrad von Metzke (resigned S'04); Dave Carter (eliminated W'04)
- ENGLAND: Randolph Smyth (survived)
- FRANCE: Jim Finley (drop S'04); Matt Fleming (drop F'05); Craig Reges (survived)
- GERMANY: Chris Greaves (drop S'02); Steve Swigger (survived)
- ITALY: Jeff Bevis (draw S '06)
- RUSSIA: Derwood Bowen (draw S '06)
- TURKEY: Mark Weidmark (eliminated W'04)

OTHER GAMES

DURHAM EAST will reappear next time.

ELGIN--game opening. \$5 Canadian to Canadians, \$5 U.S. for Americans. Berch Continuation-of-campaign rule.

FORT YORK--game opening. \$5 canadian for Canadians, \$5 U.S. for Americans. Berch continuation-of-campaign rule applies.

ALGOMA End-game statements are requested for next issue

Only a page-and-a-half of typing left to do for this issue so I'll have to start rambling. In today's mail I have received a special mailing of "Life Goes On", Robert Smith's sub'zine, sans its parent 'zine Over there. The issue is devoted wholly to the Runestone Poll and LGO's showing in it, about which Robert is generally pleased, having won the sub'zine Rookie of the Year prize. But Robert is right pissed about the fact that someone gave him a zero: "I challenge you to write to me and tell me what is so terrible about LGO that it rates a zero, and how in your eyes I can improve it....So, Mr. 0, let's see if you have the guts to tell me what's so terrible with the subzine." It's funny how upset people get about a zero. I remember Dave carter reacting to one by reminding his subbers that they're entitled to get a refund of their money at any time....I remember malcolm Smith professing to ignore his poor showing in the European poll and then returning to the topic at length the next issue, noting that many of the voters couldn't have been his subbers and asking why these zero voters hated his 'zine so much anyway....PRAXIS got no zeroes, to my great surprise, actually. Surely there must be somebody out there who really hates it. Did snag one "Two" and one "Three" though. The thing to do when you get a low vote is, quite simply, to forget about it and not torment yourself trying to puzzle out who gave it to you and why....

My new Panasonic R200 is a quite reliable machine and a great value at the price, but there's one thing I forgot to check before buying it. Ribbons. The damn things cost about \$8.95 each and only seem good for about 20 pages a shot. Rats!!! Cheated again.

I would expect CARLETON to go Liberal in the September 10 election, but am by no means sure.

BLOODY SCANDINAVIAN SLAUGHTER

The proposal for a concession to FRANCE has been defeated, 1 Yes, 3 No, 2 not voting.

A concession to FRANCE has been proposed.

A concession to ITALY has been proposed.

An AUSTRIA-TURKEY draw has been proposed.

VOTE on 3 PROPOSALS.

NVR = YES

AUSTRIA	(Weidmark)	F Adr S TUR A Tri-Ven, A Vie-Boh, A Tyo-Pie (dis; ret Vie, Tri, otb).
FRANCE	(Acheson)	A Tyo ret Pie. F Nth-Den, A Edi-Nwy, F Bar S A Edi-Nwy, A Pie-Tyo, F Nwg C A Edi-Nwy, A Mun S A Pie-Tyo, A Bur-Ruh, F Tyr S ITA F Nap, F Wes S F Tyr, F Mid-Eng.
GERMANY	(Brown)	A Lvn-StP, A Mos S A Lvn-StP, F GOB-Fin, F Swe S F GOB-Fin.
ITALY	(Clark)	A Kie S FRE A Ruh-Mun (nso), F Tun S FRE F Tyr-Ion (nso), A Ven-Apu, F Nap S A Ven-Apu, A Rom S F Nap.
RUSSIA	(Coughlan)	F Bal-Ber, A Fin S A StP (dis;ann), A Nwy S A StP (dis;ann), A StP S A Nwy (dis;ann).
TURKEY	(Easton)	A Apu-Rom (dis;ann), F Ion S ITA F Tun, F Aeg-Ion, F Gre S F Aeg-Ion, A Bul-Sev, F Bla C A Bul-Sev, A Ukr S A Bul-Sev, A Tri-Ven.

WINTER '06 SUPPLY CENTRE CHART

AUSTRIA	(Weidmark)	Home (3) EVEN (or BUILD ONE depending on Autumn '06 events)
FRANCE	(Acheson)	Home, Bel, Edi, Hol, Lon, Lvp, Por, Spa, +DEN, +MUN, +NWy (13) BUILD 3.
GERMANY	(Brown)	War, +MOS, +STP, +SWE/-Ber, -Den, -Kie (4) EVEN.
ITALY	(Clark)	Nap, Rom, Tun, +KIE/-Mun, -Ven (4) REMOVE ONE.
RUSSIA	(Coughlan)	+BER/-Mos, -StP, -Nwy, -Swe (1) EVEN.
TURKEY	(Easton)	Home, Bul, Gre, Rum, Sev, +VEN (9) BUILD TWO.

GM: The next deadline is WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 1987, with the phone de adline 11:59 P.M. Tuesday night. Note that I will be away at least between September 3 and 7, for I am giving my youngest sister away in marriage on September 5. I can probably be reached at (416) 835-2280 during this period if you are desperate.

GM: The Ordinances applying to my new games will expand the availability of deadline separations, allowing them when (a) 50% of players request (b) players controlling 50% of centres request (c) the GM determines board complexity merits. Vote on the following proposition for next deadline, DO YOU WANT THE REVISED SEPARATION OF DEADLINE ORDINANCE TO APPLY FOR THE REMAINDER OF CARLETON? NVR=Yes, and unanimous consent is requires to change ordinances in mid-game.

Russia to Turkey: Let me explain it to you yet one more time. The only people who have brought outside matters into this game have been Ron Brown and yourself. Whereas last season you rambled on about how my name is "a well-respected one in the hobby" and about my zine, my "character", and how I have engaged in "slander" (perhaps you meant libel--slander is spoken) and "personal insults", I have confined my comments to your play of this particular game and parried areas you have opened up in your own press---all legitimate devices of any Diplomacy player. I challenge to come up with one "personal insult" I have "slandered" you with in this game. Now I'll respond to your press....

Russia to Turkey: Let's see you said last time...."Gary has liberally used direct quotes and paraphrasing from letters between Turkey and Russia" so you printed your entire letter. Now what if I had done that in the first place, would that have made you happy? It seems that I'm damned if I do and damned if I don't. Whatever, exposing your lies to other potential victims of your "friendship" is totally justified in any Dip game I've ever been in.

Russia to Turkey: I did love your moral: "Don't ever cross GARY COUGHLAN in a game of Diplomacy" but you drew the wrong conclusions (as usual, it seems with you Frank). I've come to notice that the stupid stabbers are always the first to scream "It's only a game.", as you have several times. This usually translates into "You're not going to hold this against me, are you?" Moves and press are two sides of the Diplomacy coin, both just as important. Press influences other players and potential standbys to the game. It points out warnings and, yes, makes the enemy pay a price for what he has done.

5

Russia to Turkey: For your information, I have never won a game. I am an alliance player and proud of that record. I am not known as a stupid stabber as you are; I don't sell an ally down the river for little or no gain as you did me, and as even you now recognize judging from your press of last season. And I have never written "to hell with you" to any player as you did me. And you complain of "personal insults".

Russia to Turkey: I brought up the Runestone Poll for one reason and one reason only. You erroneously stated that I was angry ^{with} "even the GM", Alan Stewart. Far from being angry with Alan, I said I was giving 10s both for his zine and his GMing, as I did last year when you didn't even bother to vote. He works hard and deserves those scores and I will not have someone who didn't even bother to support him after all the efforts he puts forth in our game to get away with telling the world that I am angry with him. You really don't like to be held accountable for your actions do you, Frank?

Russia to Turkey: Well that's enough press devoted to you this season. The bottom line is that you are a poor choice as an ally for anyone in this game. I learned that the hard way and if I can spare even one of them from being duped by you, I will.

Tur-Rus : I don't know, Gary--are you going to be around long enough to vote on the next draw proposal?

Tur-Ita: Friends?

Germany: Fluttering near the feet of the tiny Tsar he saw a newspaper from Turkey. He picked it up, reading with great interest the message from the Sultan to the World concerning the behaviour of the Russian leader. "Have you read this?" he demanded sternly of the little fellow. "Lies! Lies!" the little man screamed as he hopped angrily. The reluctant German leader stooped to pick up the miniscule Russian. He held him loosely in his fist, as the Gee Em had held him earlier. "You have to admit," he said calmly to the squeaking Tsar, "that you have made reference to so-called 'non-game' insults, magazine subscriptions, Runestone Polls, and players' children in your country's newspapers. What do you say to that?" "I gave him Sevastopol and he spurned it, giving it to you instead!" he screamed. "Is that not his right as the leader of a great country?" "No! No! Everyone must do exactly as I want them to or...." "Or what?" he quired. The tiny Tsar screamed in a lunatic rage: "I'll, I'll imagine that they did terrible things. That's what I'll do! That'll show them! They'll see! I'll fix them good and imagine all sorts of terrible awful things that they did to me! And I'll imagine they did worse and worse things. And I'll keep imagining and imagining until, until..." A great moo from a bovine beast drowned out the Tsar's Last Words.

Russia to France: The decision is entirely yours and I will agree with it no matter what you do. I hope you appreciated that I tried to fairly point out both the pros and cons.

Russia to Germany: Okay, Gilda, this time it should be St. Petersburg, right? I did agree with Turkey's assessment, last season, of your play in this game. He's been so liberal in telling me what's wrong with me, I wonder why he hasn't commented on your kamikaze attack on me where you totally abandoned what was, after all, a still defensible homeland in order to continue attacking the weakest power on the board for little or no gain for yourself. Perhaps he hasn't, because he sees that that has been his tactic in the past too in regard to me. My satisfaction is that neither of you will win this game. Vive le France!

An Embarrassing Episode

Like most baseball fans, one of my lifelong ambitions has been to catch a ball in the stands. I once got a finger on a home run ball hit into the cheap seats in left field in Exhibition Stadium, but it was really out of reach despite my best efforts.

In April I found myself in Yankee Stadium in New York for a game against the Kansas City Royals. Kansas City batting, third or fourth inning. Somebody lines a foul two rows back of me and eight seats to my right, setting off a mad scramble for the ball--flying beer, a woman getting hysterical, pushing and shoving, one guy grabbing another guy so his buddy could get the ball. Great stuff, and I laughed at a guy who let the ball get away from him.

I was still chuckling over the incident when WHAM! here it comes, a hard-hit foul coming, coming, coming towards me....I stood up and was ready for it. It landed about one row in front of me and two seats to my left, a guy muffed it, and I leaned back in my seat and turned my head to the left to determine where it had gone.

Suddenly I sense scrambling behind me, and as I settle back into my seat I sense somebody's hand between me and the chair. "You're sitting on it", somebody two rows back shouts. Sure enough, I missed a ball that I was actually sitting on for a split second.

I've never been so mortified.

Demystification

Germany's Fashoda Policy

by Alan Stewart

The Spectator

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1898.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

SIR H. KITCHENER returned to Omdurman from Fashoda on September 25th. He found Major Marchand, as had been reported, at Fashoda with eight French officers and one hundred and five Senegalese soldiers, and informed him of his intention to occupy the post on behalf of Egypt. Major Marchand offered no resistance, which was indeed hopeless as Sir Herbert had two thousand men with him, but positively refused to haul down his flag until he had received instructions from Paris. The Sirdar therefore took possession of Fashoda, placed garrisons at Sobat, a point further south, and at some place not named on the Bahr-el-Ghazel, and left Major Marchand there to obtain supplies as he best can and await French orders. Some disappointment appears to be felt because Major Marchand was not arrested, but he can do no harm where he is, and it is better that questions which might become international should be left to the Foreign Office. It is assumed by our Jingo friends that Lord Salisbury will prove squeezable; but the command of the main waterway of the Nile is not the kind of thing that Lord Salisbury surrenders. It is quite clear that Fashoda must be retained even at the cost of a war, but war is not a desirable thing in itself. There are men in England who forget that, and who would like to fight Russia for Pekin, France for Fashoda, and Germany for Delagoa Bay all at once. If people will keep calm we shall get quite enough, if not too much.

It is difficult to understand the real attitude of French statesmen with reference to the Upper Nile. They know they cannot have it, and their talk of forwarding reinforcements to Major Marchand is talk merely. We imagine that they hope to utilise the incident so as to gain something which will please the Colonial party, and with this view have instructed the Press to declare that France is determined to defend her "rights," with which no one is interfering. It is not a safe game. They are wearing out the patience of the British people, and though Lord Salisbury is very wisely desirous to find them pleasant means of retreat, he may be compelled, if they "bluff" too boldly, to bring discussion to a sharp issue. The Niger is not on the road to India and the Cape as the Nile is, and M. Hanotaux will find, we can only trust not too late, that it is watched in this country with very different eyes. The project of "neutralising the Nile" is nonsense. The French can ascend it now for trade, as they can ascend the Thames.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1898.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The British Government has nailed its colours to the mast in the matter of Fashoda. It has published the despatches, thus appealing to its own constituency and the whole world.

We do not see from the despatches that M. Delcassé contests the British right. He only pleads the absence of information from Major Marchand, and the injustice, by refusing to discuss, of asking him for "the impossible." Sir R. Monson, on the other hand, pleads, with mild but inflexible pertinacity, that the impossible—i.e., the order to Major Marchand to retire—is quite possible, and absolutely must be issued. So the matter stands until Major Marchand's report has been received, when doubtless a categorical answer will be returned. The answer will probably be that, in view of Major Marchand's untenable situation, but without prejudice to any rights of France, he has been instructed to move to a position nearer to his supplies, after which there may be discussion on any point that the French wish to raise. If, however, the reply is a blank refusal to move Major Marchand, the affair will become grave indeed, as it is difficult to perceive how the Egyptian Government could refrain from removing him by force. The diplomatists may, however, if they do not heat their minds by reading newspapers, discover some third course,—the more easily because grave Frenchmen perceive that minute posts upon the Upper Nile can be of no conceivable use to France, while to England they are invaluable.

We see no benefit in quoting the French papers upon this subject. The French Government is not ruled by them, and though the popular journals affect to be furious, they are clearly using the discussion as a new weapon to turn out M. Brisson, whom they hate because he has promoted the revision of the Dreyfus case. The real danger is that the statesmen of France of all Republican parties may consider the internal situation so dangerous that the losses inevitable in a great war will be less serious than the losses possible through internal commotion. Much will depend upon the temper of the Deputies, who will return to Paris on November 25th after close contact with their constituents, and who will be greatly influenced by fears of the financial crash which a war with this country will bring on France. The idea that England is "Dreyfusard" will weigh heavily; but, on the other hand, so will the Russian Emperor's recent declaration that he deprecates any war, and would like a Congress for rendering one less possible.

The Fashoda Crisis, it is sometimes said, nearly brought England and France to the brink of war in 1898. The contest was over English and French claims in the Upper Nile Valley. Probably war was never a serious threat although each nation went so far as to dust off its war contingency plans. France's plans for invasion of England required such an overblown assumption of French naval capabilities that they were an object of widespread derision even among those least tolerant of ironic self-deprecation. England's plans were old and vague.

Germany was obviously delighted to see such tension between its European rivals. The Kaiser believed that his own personal diplomacy had contributed to each country's insistence on regarding the Nile as an area of supreme national interest. In 1896 the Kaiser told his foreign secretary, Alfred von Kiderlin-Wachter, of his satisfaction over the English decision to send an expedition to occupy Dongala, a prelude to the confrontation at Fashoda: "The purpose has been achieved. England has taken action, she has compromised herself, and the flirtation with the Gallo-Russians has been disrupted. I wanted nothing more. I am satisfied."

The historical lineup of Triple Alliance versus Triple Entente may seem "natural" in retrospect but did not seem so in that period. Theophile Delcasse, French foreign minister, gave a Berlin newspaper an interview shortly after Fashoda in which he asserted that England was determined to eliminate French influence and that it was perhaps time for France and Germany to draw closer together against the overbearing English. In fact he later drew the opposite conclusion, that France's existing alliance with Russia still left it lacking in international oomph and that it was better to make concessions in Africa if they would secure an ally who could help in Alsace.

In the 1900s Germany considered various schemes to create Anglo-French tension such as surrendering its "rights" in Morocco to France. Little was ever done in this vein. Germany vacillated between a belief that Anglo-French colonial tension could always be expected to recur somehow without its assistance and the belief that its isolation and "encircling" was an established fact about which nothing could be done.

The Kaiser's pride in the efficacy of his personal diplomacy may have been misplaced but he had the right idea. In Diplomacy, immediate Anglo-French conflict over the Upper Nile Valley is unlikely. Germany's "Fashoda Opening" attempts to make real the diplomatic coup the Kaiser thought he had scored in 1896, by inciting a war between England and France using its interest in Belgium as an incentive. The optimal goal is the destruction of England in 1901. The secondary goal is allowing Germany to ally with whichever of England or France seems most promising after Spring 1901 if optimal conditions do not obtain.

Perhaps "Fashoda opening" is the wrong term, as "opening" is usually reserved for a prescribed set of Spring 1901 moves, and virtually any set of moves or indeed none at all may be consistent with this approach depending on the results of Winter 1900 communications. Such usage may suggest a priority of tactics over strategy and negotiation that experienced Diplomacy players are always at pains to deplore; nevertheless, we will eschew the term and refer instead to the "Fashoda Policy".

It may be objected that the goal set out above is hardly distinctive enough to merit its own name or detailed elaboration, since the hope of Anglo-French hostility surely lies at the back of the mind of every German diplomat in Winter 1900. Yet many Germans open negotiations passively, harbouring only that vain hope and foregoing a strategic plan for mere trifles of the moment--demilitarization of Burgundy, staking claim to Holland, delaying thoughts of alliance until the dust of 1901 has settled. The Fashoda Policy takes a more active approach, praying for the benefits and accepting the risks consequent thereupon. Players may shy away from "grand strategy" early in the belief that it will hamstring them and restrict their options, perhaps (for example) leaving them stuck with an inept ally whom they would not have chosen had they not acted precipitously in the beginning. The Fashoda Policy makes no restricting assumptions and is deigned to maximize flexibility after Spring 1901, not to limit it.

1. Initial communications--general

The desirability of writing immediately after the gamestart is received is a truism, but it should perhaps be mentioned that where an activist approach is taken it becomes essential.

2. England

The initial letter to England makes the following points:

- (a) Germany prefers an alliance with England to one with France, as France's corner position and land-based strength constitute a constant threat to the integrity of German borders;
- (b) Germany believes that it is desirable to postpone action against Russia until the situation in the West has been resolved, thereby saving England from a deadly "back-door" French naval attack while England's naval power is committed to a northern campaign;
- (c) For that reason, Germany urges that England open with F Lon-Eng, which is, after all, a simple assertion of control over waters vital to English interests, and which succeed if England conducts normal diplomatic arrangements with France (i.e., promises not to go there);
- (d) If England opens to the Channel, Germany will support an English army into Belgium in Fall 1901 to lead the assault against France; otherwise Germany cannot see the necessity of surrendering its interest there at this time.

An optional feature of this approach is an offer to move F Kie-Hol in Spring 1901 to ensure Anglo-German control of Belgium. The objection to this is that F Kie-Hol is ordinarily considered an anti-English move; even mentioning it in this way may provoke English hostility. Yet perhaps as many as one in five Englands will fail to object to it, or even encourage it. You are dealing England a lot of good cards, and a "joker" may be included early to determine whether he knows how to play. The course of Winter 1900 diplomacy may favour such a move and it may be useful to retain the option of denying any anti-English animus in the move after it is made.

The plan envisages English naval occupation of Norway in Fall 1901, suggesting certain conventional assurances to England: a German guarantee of action against Russia in the case of a St. Petersburg north coast fleet build in Fall 1901 or Scandinavian aggression in 1902; English occupation of the North Sea; German naval restriction to one fleet build in 1901, with no further fleet builds without English assent.

3. France

The initial letter to France makes the following points:

- (a) Germany prefers an alliance with France to one with England, as England's corner position and control of the North Sea give it a commanding position and opportunities for betrayal in the event of an Anglo-German alliance;
- (b) while France might prefer to delay an assault upon England until 1902 or 1903 taking advantage of its 1901 fleet build capacity after occupation of Spain and Portugal, Germany strongly prefers immediate action towards quick resolution of the West and pre-emption of Russian intervention if co-operative action is to be undertaken at all;
- (c) consequently if France opens F Bre-Eng in Spring 1901 Germany will support French A Pic into Belgium in Fall 1901 if demanded in compensation for the build foregone in Spain or Portugal;
- (d) Germany points out that although the prospects of the alliance will be furthered if two German fleets can be built in 1901, yet deterrence of Russian and Italian adventurism will almost certainly require one German army build;
- (e) consequently if France is unwilling to open to the Channel, the alliance may proceed with F Bre-Mid, A Par-Gas, A Mar-Spa in Spring 1901, but Germany will take Belgium in the fall, allowing it to build two fleets in preparation for the 1902 assault;
- (f) the stability and offensive power of the Anglo-French alliance will be maximized if occupied England can be demilitarized after its pacification; consequently France will receive all three English centres, with German spoils consisting of Belgium (to be transferred at a later date) and occupation of Norway and Sweden once England is eliminated, allowing some type of permanent North Sea standoff (F Yks-Nth, F Den-Nth; F Eng-Nth, F Den-Nth);
- (g) In the event that these plans are not agreeable, demilitarization of Burgundy will be acceptable as a minimum gesture of goodwill;

4. Russia

- (a) Germany envisages co-operation based on each power's concentration on its separate sphere;

- 9
- (b) Germany has no objection to Russian occupation of Scandinavia as a means of controlling the English threat so long as Russia will pull its weight toward this end by demilitarization of Prussia, Livonia and Silesia, a guarantee against builds on the South coast of St. Petersburg, and a move of Army Moscow into St. Petersburg in Spring 1901. Such a move will guarantee Russo-German co-operation and safety for Russia on its western flank.

5. Italy

- (a) Italy should notify Germany if it intends to occupy Piedmont so that Germany may put itself in a position to maximize possibilities of co-operation in Fall 1901;
- (b) Italian occupation of Tyrolia is not desired; if it occurs, Munich will be defended in fall 1901 with sufficient forces to ensure its protection;

II THE INTERMEDIATE PHASE

Communications will be received from the other powers and may now be assessed. Letters written with any promptness after the game start will show no knowledge of German intentions as outlined. The initial letters of England and France will now be compared to determine which power is preferable as an ally. The response to these opening letters will merely contain repeated assurances of goodwill and recommend careful consideration of the plan set out in Germany's opening letter.

Neither England nor France should be asked to confirm its intention to open to the Channel, nor should any further demands for such a move be made. Such insistence may lead to the suspicion that you intend to tip the other power off to any Channel plans that may be revealed, and that you are more concerned about precipitating Anglo-French war than in consummating an alliance (which is quite true, of course).

The advisability of such a tip must be weighed. The one factor that plays almost no part in these deliberations is the actual content of any indications that either England or France may have given you. The purpose at this stage is the alteration of other powers' plans rather than the transmittal of correct information.

The experience of the other players must be considered. An experienced France is likely to be repelled to be told, "England says in his opening letter that he is definitely going to the channel"--an unlikely occurrence.

Initial responses to your offer must be considered. If England and France both signal assent to your offer, any tip-off is unnecessary. If one does, a direct tip is probably undesirable as you may end up allied with the one who agrees and a tip of the other power might be produced to your embarrassment after spring 1901. It hurts you little if your ally's move to the channel succeeds although this is not, of course, desired). If neither agrees, some sort of tip off of non-existent intentions must be considered. Subtlety will usually be in order. France may be told that England does not seem interested in a Russian attack and has indicated that he will follow an aggressive policy. England may be told that Burgundy has been demilitarized and France intends to have two units on Belgium after spring. If either power has been inactive in negotiations, he may be told that the other power "is thinking of" going to the channel because of his silence, and you may give the other power the indication that the non-writing power has in fact been active in his negotiations with you.

A power may insist that GERMANY commit herself as openly as ENGLAND or FRANCE commits itself by a Channel move. If England insists on a German move to Burgundy, and seems sincerely willing to move to the Channel upon receipt of such an assurance, such assurance can be given by return of post. If England looks like a better ally, the move into Burgundy can be attempted with some hope of success; if France looks like a better ally, the move need not be made, and England will be left holding the bag after the Spring and will be in no position to take effective action in response to Germany's deception, even assuming that it cannot be explained away; if the situation is uncertain, you may inform France in advance that you are making the move and ask for a stand-off.

Any comparable French demand, such as for F Kie-Hol, can be handled in like manner.

Some diplomats may shy away from approaches like the Fashoda Policy under the belief that the deception implies by dual or multiple offers of alliance may be discovered to the disadvantage of Germany. Yet the element of deception is unlikely to be discovered at all, more unlikely to be discovered before Spring 1901, may not be resented if discovered as conflicting alliance offers are not unusual at this stage.

10
III 1901 SITUATIONS

(a) The Ideal Situation

The ideal Spring 1901 results of the Fashoda Policy might look something like this:

ENGLAND F Lon-Eng, A Lvp-Edi, F Edi-Nth
FRANCE F Bre-Eng, A Par-Pic, A Mar-Spa
GERMANY F Kie-Hol, A Mun-Ruh, A Ber-Kie
RUSSIA A Mos-StP.

In this hypothetical situation, diplomacy might proceed as follows:

(i) England

You confirm your alliance agreement and offer him support for F Nth C A Edi-Bel, the only means by which he may be assured a build.

(ii) France

You confirm your alliance arrangement, but declare that progress will be more readily assured if Germany takes Belgium to allow it to build two fleets. You proceed to take Belgium.

(iii) Russia

You remind Russia of your friendship as indicated by F Kie-Hol and request that he move A StP-Nwy to ensure that England does not get a build.

At its simplest, the Fashoda Policy may be looked at as a scheme whereby you promise Belgium to England, promise Belgium to France, get them to go to war with each other to win it, and ensure that you get it yourself.

(b) 1985CG

The ideal situation will rarely obtain, so we may look at some ordinary variants of it, from actual games.

1985CG--Copland (Excelsior)

GM: Bruce McIntyre

Spring 1901

ENGLAND (Arsenault) F Lon-Eng, F Edi-th, A Lvp-Yor.
FRANCE (Schilling) A Par-Pic, A Mar-Spa, F Bre-MAO.
GERMANY (Stewart) F Kie-Hol, A Ber-Kie, A Mun-Ruh. RUSSIA (McGonigle) A Mos-StP.

Fall 1901

ENGLAND (Arsenault) F Eng-Bel, F Nth S F Eng-Bel, A Yor H.
FRANCE (Schilling) A Pic-Bre, F Mid-Por, A Spa H.
GERMANY (Stewart) F Hol S A Ruh-Bel, A Ruh-Bel, A Kie-Den
RUSSIA (McGonigle) A StP-Nwy.

The Gamesmaster's headline in fall 1901 was "IT'S A LONG WINTER ((This is an international game)) ESPECIALLY WHEN YOU HAVE NO BUILDS."

Here England has shown a willingness to back away from his war with France and not trusted Germany's offer support; France cannot build two fleets; and Germany gets only two builds. Nevertheless, one power has been effectively destroyed in 1901, and it hasn't been Germany! The fall of England cannot be doubted.

(c) 1985AD--Promenade (Cathy's Ramblings)

GM: Dan stafford

Spring 1901

ENGLAND (Crosby) F Lon-Eng, A Lvp-Wal, F Edi-Nth.
FRANCE (Holley) F Bre-Eng, A Par-Pic, A Mar-Spa.
GERMANY (Stewart) F Kie-Hol, A Mun-Ruh, A Ber-Kie.
RUSSIA (Greenlee) F Sev-Bla, A Mos-Ukr, A War-Lvn, F StP-Bot

Fall 1901

ENGLAND (Crosby) F Nth-Nwy, F Lon-Nth, A Wal-Yor,
FRANCE (Holley) A Spa-Por, F Bre-Mid, A Pic S GER A Ruh-Bel.
GERMANY (Stewart) A Ruh-Bel, F Hol S A Ruh-Bel, A Kie-Den.
RUSSIA (Greenlee) A Lvn-Swe, F Bot C A Lvn-Swe, A Ukr-Rum, F Sev-Bla, RESIGNS!

As always, there are unpleasant surprises, in this case Russia's anti-German moves in Spring 1901. Nevertheless, Spring 1901 sees England and France committed to war. France accepts Germany's claim to Belgium, made stronger by the pressing need to fight Russia, and a firm alliance is entered into. England builds F Lon, France builds F Bre, and Germany builds three units. The game will end in a draw between France, Germany, and Turkey.

(d) 1985AF--Yorktown (Tacky)

GM: Dave Anderson

Spring 1901

- ENGLAND (Crosby) F Edi-Nwg, F Lon-Nth, A Lvp-Edi.
- FRANCE (Zarse) F Bre-Mid, A Par-Gas, A Mar-Spa.
- GERMANY (Stewart) A Mun-Bur, A Ber-Kie, F Kie-Hol.
- RUSSIA (Hinton) A War-Gal, A Mos-Ukr, F StP-Bot, F Sev-Rum.

Here, everything has gone haywire. As of at least June 6, 1985, John Crosby as England in 1985AD (previous page) considered himself to have been screwed by Alan Stewart as Germany. Suddenly another gamestart is received, with the same two powers playing the same positions! not a recipe for success.

France turns down the German alliance plan and insists on going to Burgundy for protection against Italy--yes, that's what he says. England claims to be withholding any substantive decisions until Winter 1901. Russia is too concerned about his southern diplomatic position to consider a northern move. Mixed signals as the deadline approaches leads to the German incursion into B.

Even in this unpromising position--war with France, with no obvious allies (Italy not having moved to Piedmont as he was asked), substantial opportunities exist. France is offered an alliance again, with A Bur to go to Bel and France to commit himself by moving to Iri. England insists on being allowed to l and an army in Denmark as part of an alliance against both France and Russia.

Fall 1901

- ENGLAND (Crosby) F Nwg-Nwy, A Edi-Den, F Nth C A Edi-Den.
- FRANCE (Zarse) A Gas-Spa, A Spa-Por, F Mid-Iri.
- GERMANY (Stewart) A Kie-Den, A Bur-Bel, F Hol S A Bur-Bel.
- RUSSIA (Hinton) A Gal-Boh, A Ukr-Gal, F Bot-Swe, F Rum H.

Russia's aggressive move west was facilitated by an Austrian NMR in Spring 1901 which skewed eastern positions immediately. With trouble from England, Germany's position is not strong; yet, two builds have been achieved and France is now an ally. The Fashoda Policy has allowed Germany to patch up relations with France after even A Mun-Bur. That move can now be portrayed as a rational reaction to France's refusal of the original alliance plan, and when the alliance is re-offered it is gratefully accepted. England built F Lon and France F Bre and F Mar. In Spring 1902 England took the English Channel and attacked St. Petersburg unsuccessfully, France moved into the North Atlantic Ocean, and Germany took Denmark unopposed.

As the game proceeded, Germany was forced to contest a Russian move West and began to be squeezed between England and Russia. Except for Russia's fortuitously strong eastern position, German chances would have been good to excellent. The game appears to have been abandoned, no adjudication having appeared(to me at least) since February .

IV CONCLUSION

A policy of seeking advantage through deliberate incitement of war has its risks. In 1898 Lord Salisbury, the great Tory Prime Minister, was unreceptive when the great Liberal Unionist Joseph Chamberlain proposed that German alliance feelers be taken up. "The one object of the German Emperor since he has been on the throne has been to get us into war with France. I can never make up my mind whether this is part of Chamberlain's object or not" he wrote to Arthur Balfour. Yet an alliance might conceivably have been negotiated between the two powers years before had Germany been willing to provide assurances of common action against Russia as well as France . Germany had alas forgotten the lessons of Bismarckian diplomacy; the Iron Chancellor once had treaties with Rumania promising assistance in case of Russian attack, Russia promising neutrality in the case of Russian hostility with Rumania or Austria-Hungary, and with Austria-Hungary promising mutual assistance in case of Russian attack, all at the same time. In Diplomacy a German leader is called upon to learn the lessons of history. These are that Germany cannot expect to prevail thorough superiority of arms alone, that a Central Alliance is no substitute for a Western ally, and that expansion into neutral territories must be subordinated to the drive to find a western ally. The Kaiser must always keep in mind the crisis of Fashoda, when two generally friendly powers could go to the brink of war over a post that could be first occupied by a hundred or so Sengalese soldiers. The recreation of those tensions is the primary goal of German diplomacy, and there's no better time to start seeking it than the day you receive the gamestart.

The Party Line

Mark Berch:

Dear Alan Stewart,

In Steve Langley's letter, he presents some speculations as to how my WAP article came about. I don't know why he does this sort of thing in public, when he has no idea what he is talking about. "I thought that Berch had been asked by Mr. Linsey to write an article and had dashed off the idea without really thinking about it." This is hardly the first time I've had to deny the Langley-version of how I operate. The idea for WAP had come to me some time earlier. It was just one of those articles I had never gotten around to writing. When the QUAD proposal came up, it seemed like the perfect place. But if it (of Linsey) had never existed, it would have eventually be written and appeared elsewhere, probably in DW or Costaguana.

In discussing the idea, Langley goes thru a hypothetical circumstance ~~where a player has a standby and a player has a standby~~ in which "Comes 1905 and I find my units have not moved and I am perfectly happy with my 1904 orders for the season. So I save myself a stamp." Yes, that can happen. It can also happen with the conventional system, with a player perfectly happy with an all-units-hold set of orders for the following season. He too can save a stamp. He too will be charged with an NMR as the cost of saving his stamp. The situation is quite parrell.

Steve concludes this example with "If I have orders on file you have no business calling a standby, if I don't you have no business saying I do and using dated orders." WAP orders are not the same as having orders on file. If a player NMRs, he's going to be listed as such, and ~~having~~ a standby will be called, just as in any other system. But the ^{separate} question is: What do we do with the pieces? We can 1) assign them the artificial orders of all units hold, we can use SO1 neutral orders (if its SO1) we can use General Orders, and now, we can do a new plan, viz, reuse the old orders. Yes, they were written for an earlier season, but at least they were written by the player himself, which is more than can be said for the all-units-hold choice

((Well, at least that's all cleared up now. I don't believe that steve's comments about the circumstances in which your article was written are some kind of imputation that ~~demand~~ ^{demands} satisfaction; he was just explaining why he reacted to the article the way he did.))

Dick Martin:

I found the BNC non-decision disappointing. After several pages of rambling, he says that WAP is regular as long as it doesn't matter in the game. That's generous!

So what's the problem with Winter WAP? Each bright player submits 3 build orders even if he has removals to make. Nobody ever said that orders had to be legal at the time originally submitted to be eligible for WAP.

My problem with WAP is that you have to track each unit, so that A Mun-Bur may be legal one turn, but not the next (even though there's A Mun both times).

((I agree with you about Winter WAP, and that's exactly what I would do if it were allowed. And I don't see anything wrong with this, either; players will generally prefer any build to losing one through inadvertence, and all the GM need demand is some (sufficiently precise and unambiguous) indication of the player's intentions--old ones are better than nothing.))

Alan Stewart: Here's an old letter, one that arrived one day too late for #14, wasn't printed in the very hectic circumstances surrounding #15, and in #16-- well, this is #16. I'd better print it because it's a complaint about something said here and because between one thing and another, Mark has had a helluva time getting a letter printed in this 'zine. And then we'll have another Berch Continuation-of-campaign letter.

((Your last paragraph, Dick, highlights a disagreement between myself and Bruce Geryk as to how the rule is to be interpreted. In Blunt Instruments #3, Randolph Smyth asked, in a letter, what happens if a player orders A Mun-Bur, A Ruh S A Mun-Bur, A Ber-Mun (all orders succeeding) and then NMRs the subsequent season. Does the order "A Mun-Bur" apply to the new A Mun? Bruce's answer was no, because the unit was an different one; under his interpretation, "an individual unit follows its last order if possible", hence your note of the need to have to track units.))

((My interpretation is different. In PRAXIS, what is repeated is a whole set of orders, and if the former set included the order A Mun-Bur, and there is an A Mun in the subsequent season, the order applies to it. No need to track individual units around.))

((Kind of funny, isn't it--only two GMs committed to using the rule and already we disagree about its interpretation? Kind of like the Reformation--you have this One True Church of people who assert theirs is the only way, then some people break away and the first thing you know they're squabbling among themselves.))

((I am now about to get some Diet 7-Up and reread Mark Berch's original article.))

((Rereading it, I see nothing to indicate that he has taken one or the other of the two positions listed here. I'd like to hear mark's interpretation, of course, but I'm not likely to change my position even if he disagrees.))

((One last philosophical-type point. Bruce Geryk's position reminds me of the original days of the early versions of Dip, when units were numbered (Army One, Army Two, etc.) No more; the only identifying factor of a unit is its location, and if Ordinances make the Rules' suggested notation mandatory, its type.))

Chris Carrier:

Well, time for another letter. I hope more of those attitudinal surveys come in, and I really would like to see a question by question breakdown as to who voted yes-no-wimp on each of the questions. 78 is truly an, ahem, interesting score. I ran thru the test again, only the answers I used were not what I believe now (which tests out at 48) but what I used to believe ten years ago when I was 18, when I had a somewhat-deserved reputation as the town fascist. It came to only 74. I wonder in what part of the world your political peers are located?? 78 doesn't sound like an "average Canadian at heart."

I'd also like to congratulate you on your third place out of 67 zines in the 1987 Runestone Poll. However, I don't think you deserved third. I think PRAXIS deserves FIRST. As to the two zines which topped PRAXIS in the Poll, I don't know enough about BLUNT INSTRUMENTS to make a guess, but I do know your zine is far superior to the self-righteous preachiness of COSTAGUANA.

As to 1988...my preference right now is for Senator Dole of Kansas. The Democrats, as they have in three of the four presidential elections since 1972, will no doubt put up a nominee that is unelectable. The one time they did nominate someone who was electable, he was Jimmy Who? Carter, the least effective president in the history of the United States. (Consider the Democrats' 1984 rejection of an electable national hero (John Glenn) in favor of the running mate of the least effective president in history.) That leaves the Republicans...and what has George Bush done in the last six and a half years? Which brings me up to Dole...he has sponsored a constitutional amendment to require the Congress to balance the budget. Similar language is in the constitution of 26 states, including California, and 34 state legislatures have called for a constitutional convention *on this matter.*

What I would like to ask the Canadian readers of PRAXIS is this: what party are you going to vote for in your next national election, which I understand can be put off until 1989 but will probably be held in 1988? If I was a Canadian citizen I would hold my nose and vote Liberal -- even though my economic and foreign policy attitudes are quite conservative, I don't like having my private life pried into and the Conservatives sponsored legislation that restricts the right of consenting adults to view material they choose; plus, of course, the prostitution legislation discussed at length in PRAXIS.

Also heard the Canadian Parliament had a free vote on the death penalty and lost. Too bad.

Now back to the Runestone Poll. In 1985, during the height of Phase Two of the Great Postal Feud, Brux McIntyre suggested that all ballots be made public; and the next year he did exactly that. Although I disagree with Brux McIntyre in that I believe that the ballots do need to be secret, I do like the idea of publishing my own ballot as a way of making my views known and stimulating debate on the Poll and the zines ranked therein; so I hereby am including my 1987 vote in this letter, and dare you to see if you will publish it. (If chicken, please cut this letter off here or after the paragraph on the death penalty.)

COSTAGUANA: 0. I find it amazing that this turkey won both the 1986 and 1987 polls. It is filled with the sort of self-righteous sanctimony that one finds in born-again Christians and Alcoholics Anonymous members, which is not in the least surprising. The editor expresses his opinions often, which I have nothing against per se, but I find that (unlike the editor of PRAXIS) that there is no lively debate in the lettercol, which there is in the high quality zines (PRAXIS, EE, VOD, etc...) where the editor voices opinions. Instead we have internal discussion by practitioners of the sort of bleeding-heart Christianity that destroys faith more thoroughly than the most militant atheism.

DIPLOMACY DIGEST: 8. With the waning of The Feud and personal financial stridency, I let my sub to this die but I should renew it. Enough technical articles to make it a good read and enough war news to keep people like me interested.

DIPLOMACY WORLD: 0. Another turkey which came out in the top five when it deserves to be one of the bottom five. This sub I let die naturally, at issue 44 -- when it came time for 45 to roll around, I (and how many other people, I wonder??) received a typical Peerynival about how important I am because I edit DW which is essential to the survival of the hobby, blah, blah, blah...DW is so bland as to be tasteless, and Peery seems to be wasting so much money on mass mailings like the one that was mailed to the "dead subscribers" that I imagine that all the money DW raised in late 1985 has been frittered away. Larry, if I had wanted to resub to your overpriced rag I would.

15
EUROPA EXPRESS: 6. Sad to hear this folded. Enjoyed the lively debates in the lettercol. Wish it had come out more often, and stand by my 1985 opinion that the ejection of Feud material from its pages led to the death of the zine. Still,

EE was a zine I enjoyed and will miss.

GRAUSTARK: 8. Even though this zine has no lettercol, it keeps me interested with its hilarious parodies and satires, along with, once in a while, some Feud news. It plugged my Feuder Awards for 1985, issued in spring 1986 (the 1986 awards were never held as the feudlevel had fallen to the point that I felt it was unjustified).

KAISSA: 3. News & Views is worth reading, but the editor's attitude problems and the fact I have not seen an issue in several months contributes to the low rankings. (Happy to hear it finished 64th of 67.)

MAGUS: 9. Here is one I enjoy and recommend. Always good reading. Volunteers is the best part of the zine, also I like and play in the bourse. As MAGUS would be incomplete without its subzines, its subzines share in the ratings of the parent zine. I really can't put my finger on one thing in MAGUS that causes me to rank it this high, but I do feel it is justified. Deserved its finish in the top 10.

NO FIXED ADDRESS: 10. I am making the assumption that this is a legal zine for the 1987 poll, based on the fact that I may not have gotten 37 until after 1986 April 1, and we SHOULD have gotten an issue in 1987. This was the great War zine chronicling Byrne-Linsey, Hutton-Pack, and other Feuds major and minor. It deserves an honorable burial (hence the 10, and my regret that it finished 32nd of 67 -- but at least it made the top half) and will be missed. The same goes for its D-DAY subzine. (The MesaDiplomat will not be mentioned by me because it is my own work, in accordance with Runestone rules).

PRAXIS: 10. Ah, what Joy! I *love* getting this zine. While nothing can replace NFA and TNFH, this zine's discussions remind one of THE VOICE OF DOOM during its peak. (need I say more). We have an editor who clearly enjoys the debate with his sub list "the vote is overwhelming for selling sex for..PRAXIS" (as an example).

EXCELSIOR (and I had to write this one in, it should have been pretyped on the ballot, Bruce): 8. As with MAGUS, I can't say anything specifically very positive about parts of the zine -- but I do like it and look forward to it. Too bad it only finished 21st this year -- if it had been top 10 it would have won the Coughlan Award for sustained excellence (top 10 three years in a row).

((74 down to 48 in ten years? What made you see the darkness?))

((Now what can I say about your imputations against my averageness? Look, I'm no more right wing than--than--H. Asquith, the last elected Liberal Prime Minister of Britain! After all, he believed in a hereditary aristocracy, colonialism, and no votes for women too, and nobody ever called him a fascist!))

((34 states? I thought I heard Ronnie say it was 32 the other night. Anyway, a constitutional convention would be wild! Let's put everything on the table. By the way, if enough states do call for a convention, look for the liberals to prevent it by legal pettifoggery and technical challenges to the states' petitions.))

((Y our intention to vote Liberal to protect your personal privacy would be more noble if the Liberals were against prying into your private life. My understanding is that they aren't substantially more libertarian than the PCs, merely opposing these things because in a parliamentary system the constitutional function of the Opposition is to oppose.))

((The death penalty campaign collapsed because it had no capable, prominent parliamentary spokesmen. Its leading proponent was a right-wing ya oo from eastern Ontario. With Mulroney an abolitionist, and all leading media and liberal elite opinion against killing, the movement just kind of collapsed in the final days before the vote.))

((I couldn't publish my votes because I don't remember them. About your votes.... Excelsior is quite a 'zine at its best and when it appears and will be back in the Top Ten, now that Bruce McIntyre has triumphantly assumed the job of the person who previously fired him, if it resumes reliable publication. Diplomacy Digest is one of my favourites: I have all back issues. I suspect its lower-than-usual position this year was due to fewer issues than usual this last year and a higher than usual percentage of personal-story material. Mark is famously prickly about comments like this if they aren't accurate but people vote based on what they remember about the 'zine in the last year, even if it isn't what actually happened. No Fixed Address was of course a hobby classic in its prime, but I don't think I gave it a "10" this year. Magus I have previously mentioned as being on my list of top three zines of the year. Kaissa I miss; it's a notoriously prickly 'zine and I was in the middle of a controversy with Elmer when it breathed its last (or most recent). Elmer's article on the state of the hobby, documenting the alarming decrease in gamestarts in recent years, was a minor masterpiece of the kind he could be counted on to produce now and then, although his views on some hobby matters are really off the wall. Graustark is another classic; John Boardman rarely gets his due as one of the best writers in the hobby and his GMing skills are well known. Europa Express was an all-time classic to such a degree that it didn't get the praise it deserved upon its fold because most publishers don't like to "gush" about the merits of a 'zine. Diplomacy World I have only started getting recently. It is much better than I expected it to be. It could be edited more tightly. Yet onbalance I think Larry has done a fantastic job reviving it. I don't think it's worth a "10" considering its price--"8" maybe?))

((Costaguana--well, at least Conrad knows where his zero came from now. In discussing your comments about Costa, I want all to keep in mind that I selected it as best 'zine of the last year, gave it a "10", and think it deserved to win the Poll. Nevertheless, your complaints about it struck a responsive chord. The problem with Costaguana is that Conrad is simply too nice a guy, too determined to encourage everybody he comes in contact with. Every new 'zine that appears is the greatest (in some sense) ever to appear in the hobby; every custodian and spear carrier around has done the most fantastic job that can be imagined. You can't get him to argue with you in the letter column. I sometimes think it would be funny if some novice subbed to Costa, got to know Conrad, maybe talked to him on the phone, became a friend, and then started to write letters for the column about how Hitler really wasn't such a bad guy and how his economic achievements are unfairly undervalued. Would Conrad give him a hard time, or would he deflect his comments with some noncommittal musings about how there must be something good in the heart of every man, no matter how much evil he commits?))

((Conrad wasn't always like this. I cherish some DD excerpts of his vicious, ripping reviews of new 'zines in the old days. I must note that two issues ago, Conrad really ripped into Dick Martin for his Runestone Poll zero request, suggesting that there were three explanations for his activity, one of which was psychosis. Can't get much tougher than that!))

((By the way I should note that Conrad has, every issue, something incredibly flattering to say about PRAXIS to the point where I find it embarrassing. Not only that, people have begun to write in to tell him he's getting out of control. But it's things like this that explain why Conrad is so widely loved as well as respected, and plugs like Conrad gives are appreciated when they come from someone like Conrad whose judgment I respect. So if Costaguana has defects, they are the defects of its qualities.))

((By the way, Chris, Conrad isn't a "born-again Christian"--he is/was an unbeliever who published the Christianity letters after some of his subbers started the discussion I find it ironic that Costaguana has become the hobby's Christianity-forum 'zine, while I have become the Hobby Pornographic Press Custodian.))

Is There Any Other Place You'd Rather Be?

With only two pages left, I have the choice of covering the upcoming Ontario election or the Runestone Poll and its attendant controversies. I choose the election, as it will be over by the next issue, while the RP will still be alive.

An election has been called for September 10 in Ontario.

In 1943, Colonel George Drew was elected Premier of Ontario for the Progressive Conservative Party, Ontario's equivalent of the English Conservative Party. Why "Progressive Conservative"? In about 1940, during a bleak period for the federal party, it wooed and won John Bracken, Premier of Manitoba, as its leader. Bracken's provincial party was the Progressives, a prairie populist type of outfit, and Bracken insisted that "Progressive" be added to the party name in order to weaken the big-business, rich man associations that the party had at that time. It is part of the schooling of every young Progressive Conservative to learn arguments by which to deny that the term is an oxymoron.

The party defeated in 1943 was the Liberals, who had been in power since about 1934, originally under a colourful Elgin County resident by the name of Mitch Hepburn. Mitch was a man who enjoyed life to the full, a hard drinker with many mistresses who consumed himself in feuds with the leadership of his own federal party. By 1943 he had retired but his legacy lived on. For twenty or more years the provincial liberals lived under the curse of Hepburn.

George Drew went on to become an unsuccessful federal leader and turned the provincial leadership over to Leslie Frost. It was said of Leslie Frost that he ran the province of Ontario from the barber chair in Lindsay, his home town, a small burg in Eastern Ontario. The image of Frost as a simple, homey, average guy was a powerful one in the Ontario of the 1950s. Frost liked to do things like announcing major policy decisions in the Legislature by reading off the back of an envelope, thereby conveying the impression that governance was not a matter of controversial choices or ideological battle but a simple matter of administration that could be handled by anyone with a little common sense.

To lead the Progressive Conservatives in the 1960s, the party turned to John Robarts, an imposing figure of a man, a corporate lawyer with a dominating presence and gravelly voice. Robarts was a hard-drinking, wenching "man's man" and thus did very well in the man's world of politics. The average Ontarian knew nothing of his real personality in a time when the press did not report the personal foibles of politicians. After retiring, Robarts suffered a stroke which impaired his walking and talking ability; not wishing to live if he could no longer be a looming presence, he blew the back of his head away with a hunting rifle in the shower in his home. Don't know what his young wife, who was in the house at the time, thought of that.

During the fifties and sixties, neither the Liberals nor the socialist/social democratic CCF (co-operative Commonwealth federation) ever came close to turfing the Tories out of office. The Tories offered nonideological, businesslike, competent government, showing willingness to enact just as much social reform as society had to have at any given time but never more than it could take. Their appeal was primarily to small-town and its conservative Protestant values. Small-town Ontario hated Toronto like upstate New York voters hate New York city, like downstate Illinois voters hate Chicago. The Tories always gave the impression of hating Toronto too, although they always won the city massively. A neat trick, if you can pull it off.

For the seventies, Robarts handed over the reign to a bland, plumpish Brampton lawyer named Bill Davis. Davis won a solid majority in the 1971 election by mounting Ontario's first America-style packaged media campaign. "Ontario--Is There Any Other Place You'd Rather Be?" Most people considered the Vietnam War, the 60s ghetto riots in adjacent Detroit and Buffalo, and answered "Come, to think of it, no."

Bill Davis ran into a lot of trouble in his first term, not so much because he did anything much different from his predecessors, as because Ontario was changing, becoming more urbanized and less WASPish, and politics was changing with it. Davis reorganized some of Ontario's counties into something called "Regional Government" following very successful precedents in the United States. Regional Government was what all the experts recommended in urban planning. Only one problem. The people despised it. They hated the increased taxation that always seemed to follow the addition of a modernized upper tier of government and they hated the obliteration of historic names, traditions and institutions.

In 1975, Bill Davis' Tories fought the Liberals under Bob Nixon, son of the last Liberal Premier, and Stephen Lewis, a hypersmart, aggressive, articulate leader of the New democratic Party, a reorganized version of the previously managed CCF. The Tories were trailing in the polls and seemed to headed to defeat until the first televised leaders' debate, when Bob Nixon made the grievous mistake of going after Premier Davis so aggressively as to seem outright disrespectful. You didn't yell at or insult the Premier of the province on television. Not in Ontario, anyway. The Tories won a minority government in 1975, and followed it up with another in 1977. From 1975 to 1981 they cleverly played the two opposition parties against each other, accepting their reforms (such as rent control, which is destroying Toronto's housing stock just as it has every where else) but enhancing their reputation as "good managers" in the process.

By 1981, the Tories had been in power in Ontario for thirty-eight years. That's a long time. The Tories had governed Ontario for longer than Enver Hoxha had ruled Albania. The whole party, Bill Davis first and foremost, was obsessed with not breaking "the streak", not being responsible for the end of the dynasty. Bill Davis parlayed his relaxed, dignified, cool, always-in-control style into one last majority government in 1981.

The next four years were the years of right-wing revolt within the party. The right wing didn't like it when Bill Davis bought minority interest in an oil company, or when he extended "human rights" protection, or when he got into bed with Pierre Trudeau over constitutional reform. I recall well a report by a committee of the party's campus wing that set off a well-publicized grassroots revolt over amendments to the Human Rights Code in the early '80s. If you were to read it, you might find that the attitudes displayed therein and the style of writing was very familiar to you from somewhere....

Not that the revolt hurt Bill Davis to any extent. He controlled the party machinery too thoroughly and his popular appeal was too great. He was devastated to find, when he considered running for the federal party leadership in the early '80s, that he could never win because a substantial section of the party hated his guts. He was Nelson Rockefeller, and suddenly the party seemed to be full of Goldwaters.

In 1984, he committed the party to a highly controversial policy of funding for Roman Catholic separate schools (the party, being Protestant-backed, had always opposed this idea vehemently), dithered about whether to run again, and retired. The race was on. Three establishment-type liberal/moderate/progressive Tories ran against Frank Miller, former treasurer, a former used car dealer and resort operator, not really exceptionally conservative himself (if he was, Bill Davis would never have made him Treasurer) who inherited the support of the Party's burgeoning right wing by default. Frank won, in a predictably bitter convention. He took a thirty-point lead in the public opinion polls into the campaign. He acquired an image of complacency and arrogance by refusing to debate, made a few gaffes. A man known for his liking of loud plaid jackets, a man who failed to convey the image of dominating competence that his predecessors had always conveyed, he--sob!--his campaign collapsed like a punctured balloon in the last two weeks of the campaign. The Tories won 52 seats, the Liberals 48, and the NDP 25. Ten years before that would have been enough to hold on in a majority government. But the Opposition parties didn't like Frank Miller and had seen the Tories manage minority governments very successfully in the 1970s. They dumped the Tories, the NDP signing a historic "accord" committing themselves to support Liberal leader David Peterson, a nondescript businessman who had seemed on the way out of politics in humiliation at the beginning of the campaign.

Now he has become the most popular political leader in Ontario after losing weight, donning contact lenses, showing off his pretty actress wife, and adopting the cool middle-of-the-road Bill Davis style in all its fullness. Larry Grossman, inheritor of the Tories' pragmatic, moderate tradition, is leader. And the Tories seem, to quote a recent Globe & Mail headline reporting a public opinion poll, to be "headed for oblivion". Recent poll findings: Liberals 48%, NDP 31%, Tories 21%. Here's another one: Liberals 54%, NDP 27%, Tories 17%. That's very much like imagining the republicans at, say, 35% in the election of 1988. There are now 130 seats. I think the Tories will recover somewhat. Their historic base can't shrink that fast. Their traditionally overpowering organization hasn't collapsed completely. There was a televised leaders' debate Monday and Peterson was generally considered to have performed poorly. Some people expect the Liberals to win 100 seats. Mark Weidmark gives his local Tory MP, one of the safest Tories in the province, only a 50-50 chance of holding on. I say: L 77, NDP 27, PC 26.

DOCTOR CARLOS PEDEGRAL ANALYZES THE HANDWRITING OF STEVE CLARK

((Last year, Steve Clark won a free handwriting analysis by acclaimed graphologist Dr. Carlos Pedegral in a subscription-drive contest. I note that Steve also won the German Diplomacy set in the Runestone Poll contest too, so I herewith dub him Steve "Horseshoes" Clark. Here is Dr. pedegral's analysis of a handwriting sample provided by Steve.))

DEAR READER:

THANK YOU FOR RESPONDING TO THE HANDWRITING ANALYSIS OFFER THIS COMPUTER PRINTED-ANALYSIS OF YOUR HANDWRITING HAS BEEN PREPARED BY A TEAM TRAINED AND SUPERVISED BY GRAPHOLOGIST CARLOS PEDEGRAL.

HERE IS THE RESULT OF YOUR ANALYSIS, WHICH IS CONFIDENTIAL, OF COURSE. THE FOLLOWING PARAGRAPHS DESCRIBE THE DOMINANT CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUR PERSONALITY AS REFLECTED BY YOUR HANDWRITING.

RESPECT

YOU POSSESS A HIGHLY DEVELOPED SENSE OF RESPECT: RESPECT FOR SOCIETY, FOR INSTITUTIONS, FOR HUMAN BEINGS AND, OF COURSE, FOR YOURSELF. YOU KNOW HOW TO ELEVATE EVEN THE MOST MENIAL UNDERTAKING.

THE COURTESY AND INTEREST YOU DEMONSTRATE TO THOSE WHO ASSOCIATE WITH YOU MAKE YOUR COMPANY UNFORGETTABLE. YOUR CONCEPTS OF LIFE, OF PEOPLE AND OF THINGS HELP THOSE WHO SHARE YOUR LIFE TO IMPROVE THEMSELVES, TO RESPECT OTHERS...AND THEMSELVES AS WELL.

BUT AN ACUTE SENSE OF RESPECT CARRIES WITH IT THE DANGER OF TIMIDITY. DO NOT ALLOW YOUR SENSE OF RESPECT TO TRANSLATE ITSELF INTO AN EXCESSIVE DELICACY WHEN DEALING WITH OTHERS.

TENDENCY TOWARDS DISCOURAGEMENT

YOU TEND TO BE SOMEWHAT EASILY DISCOURAGED AND SOMETIMES YOU ARE AT THE MERCY OF YOUR MOODS. THIS DOES YOU HARM IN BOTH YOUR PERSONAL AND YOUR PROFESSIONAL LIFE.

IT MAY SEEM TO YOU THAT YOUR ANXIETY IS TOO GREAT AT TIMES FOR YOU TO DOMINATE IT. BEAR IN MIND THAT ANXIETY NEED NOT BE FOUGHT HEAD ON. RATHER THAN WISHING YOU COULD MAKE IT DISAPPEAR ALTOGETHER, CHANNEL YOUR ANXIETY IN A CONSTRUCTIVE DIRECTION. YOU WILL BE ON THE ROAD TO MASTERING YOUR MOODINESS AND AVOIDING THE TRAP OF DISCOURAGEMENT.

(THE CONCEPTS DESCRIBED IN THIS CHARACTERISTIC MAY NOT COMPLETELY CORRESPOND TO YOUR REAL PERSONALITY AND ONLY REFLECT YOUR EMOTIONAL STATE AT THE TIME YOU WROTE YOUR HANDWRITING SAMPLE.)

INTENSE

YOU HAVE AN INTENSITY THAT MAKES YOU WANT TO ACT RATHER THAN TO OBSERVE. YOU FEEL UNEASY IF YOU ARE SITTING ON THE SIDELINES. ONCE YOU DO PARTICIPATE, YOU ARE ACTIVE, EAGER AND TIMELESS.

EVEN THOUGH YOUR INTENSITY IS SOMETIMES USED IN SELF-DEFENSE, IT IS A FORM OF AGGRESSIVENESS. NEVERTHELESS, IT CAN HELP YOU TO ACHIEVE SUCCESS IF YOU USE IT IN THE RIGHT WAY.

YOU NEED TO RESERVE IT FOR CRUCIAL MOMENTS WHEN IT CAN BE MOST BENEFICIAL TO YOU. THE HONESTY OF PRINCIPLES THAT USUALLY ACCOMPANIES INTENSITY SHOULD NOT BE MAINTAINED AT THE EXPENSE OF LOVE, UNDERSTANDING AND TOLERANCE. IN THE LONG RUN, LOVE AND TOLERANCE ARE MORE POWERFUL THAN FORCE.

INTUITIVE-RATIONAL INTELLIGENCE

YOUR INTELLIGENCE IS INTUITIVE-RATIONAL. YOU REASON OUT THINGS, PROBLEMS AND SITUATIONS, BUT YOUR DECISIONS ARE NOT PURELY CEREBRAL.

INTUITION PLAYS AN IMPORTANT ROLE IN YOUR ANALYSES AND REASONINGS AND OFTEN THIS IS WHAT DETERMINES YOUR DECISION IN THE END.

SENSE OF RESPONSIBILITY

YOU ARE THE TYPE OF PERSON WHO ASPIRES TO BE SOMEONE, EVEN IF YOU ARE NOT QUITE SURE HOW TO GO ABOUT IT OR WHAT THIS IDEAL SOMEONE OUGHT TO BE.

WHEN YOU ACCEPT A MISSION OR A JOB, YOU CARRY IT OUT WITH THE UTMOST RELIABILITY, ALWAYS PERFORMING YOUR DUTIES UNTIL THE VERY END.

PLATONIC LOVE

SPIRITUAL LIFE IS CLEARLY MORE IMPORTANT TO YOU THAN MATERIAL LIFE. ON THE EMOTIONAL LEVEL, YOUR THOUGHTS AND ACTIONS LEAD YOU STRAIGHT TO A PLATONIC CONCEPT OF LOVE.

FOR YOU, SEX IS NOT AN ESSENTIAL FACTOR IN LOVE; YOU TEND TO PLACE MORE IMPORTANCE ON THE MIND. AND IN THIS, YOU ARE PROBABLY CLOSER TO REAL LOVE.

SELF-CONTROL

UNDER TRYING CIRCUMSTANCES, YOU MANAGE TO MAINTAIN YOUR SELF-CONTROL BECAUSE OF YOUR CAPACITY TO KEEP IMPULSES FROM GETTING THE BETTER OF YOU.

YOU JUDGE EVENTS ACCURATELY, BUT YOU MUST TAKE CARE NOT TO FALL INTO AUTHORITARIANISM.

WELL-DEFINED PERSONALITY

YOU ARE VERY INDIVIDUALISTIC. YOU HAVE A DEFINITE PERSONALITY WITH CHARACTERISTICS PECULIAR TO YOURSELF, ESPECIALLY A GREAT ABILITY TO REACT.

YOU DON'T ALLOW YOURSELF TO BE GUIDED BY THE OPINIONS OF OTHERS, FOR YOU EXPECT MORE OF YOURSELF THAN OF PEOPLE AROUND YOU.

CULTURED

YOU ARE A CULTURED PERSON, ABLE TO SYNTHESIZE A WIDE RANGE OF KNOWLEDGE. THE IDEAS AND POINTS OF VIEW THAT TAKE SHAPE AS A RESULT OF THIS CAPACITY FOR SYNTHESIS MAY SOMETIMES BE PECULIAR, BUT THEY ARE OFTEN CORRECT. YOU MAKE INTERESTING COMPANY, AND OTHERS FEEL ENRICHED BY YOUR CONVERSATION.

YOU SHOULD TRY TO FIND TIME FOR INTELLECTUAL PURSUITS, PREFERABLY IN AREAS THAT HAVE NOT BEEN GREATLY EMPLOYED.

20
DR. CARLOS PEDREGAL ANALYZES STEVE CLARK--CONTINUED

WORK CAPACITY

DECISION, ENERGY AND A CAPACITY FOR WORK ARE UNHISTORABLE CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUR PERSONALITY. YOU ARE AN ACTIVE AND EFFICIENT PERSON, CAPABLE OF ATTAINING THE GOALS YOU SET FOR YOURSELF.

WILLPOWER

YOU CAN DEVELOP YOUR WILLPOWER. YOU CAN STRENGTHEN YOUR DETERMINATION AND ENERGY. BUT BEWARE, AGGRESSIVENESS IS NOT FAR OFF, AND THAT IS THE DANGER FOR YOU.

THE ABOVE ARE THE FUNDAMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUR PERSONALITY ACCORDING TO YOUR HANDWRITING. AN ANALYSIS OF THE COMBINATION OF THESE CHARACTERISTICS WAS CARRIED OUT IN ORDER TO DETERMINE THE PRESENCE OF SPECIFIC TENDENCIES OF BEHAVIOR. IN YOUR CASE IT DID NOT REVEAL ANY PARTICULARLY EXAGGERATED TENDENCY.

I HOPE YOU HAVE FOUND THIS ANALYSIS INTERESTING AND THAT IT WILL BE PROFITABLE TO YOU.

WE ARE ALL AWARE OF HOW DIFFICULT IT IS TO GET TO KNOW OURSELVES. BEFORE YOU MAKE A DEFINITIVE JUDGMENT ON THE RESULTS OF THIS ANALYSIS, LET YOUR FAMILY OR CLOSE FRIENDS READ IT. THE OPINION WE HAVE OF OURSELVES FREQUENTLY DOES NOT CORRESPOND TO THE REALITY. WE ARE GENERALLY EITHER TOO SELF-INDULGENT OR TOO CRITICAL OF OURSELVES. AND VERY OFTEN, EVEN CLEAR CONTRADICTIONS ARE INHERENT IN US.

THANKING YOU FOR YOUR CONFIDENCE, I AM,

SINCERELY YOURS,

CARLOS PEDREGAL

((There it is, Steve. Is this you, or is this you? Confirm or deny.))

++++
More on the Ontario election--Ron Brown reports that Liberal signs are blooming like poppies in formerly Conservative Kanata...Tory organizers report in today's Globe & Mail that the fact that there are almost zero Conservative signs around Toronto is due to a deliberate strategy of withholding them until after the leaders' debate. Uh, huh, right, we all believe that....The Tories are desperate for candidates. An old friend of mine and sometime Dip player is a PC riding executive president, and when I kiddingly offered to run, he told me quite deadpan that he could guarantee me the nomination plus a couple hundred bucks a week during the campaign if I ran. They eventually chose a very shy, nervous young engineer who ran purely out of duty to the party....

Bobby Acheson is thinking of recommending that the Canadian Diplomacy Organization disband due to its inactivity...I quite disagree, as I rather like the way the CDO conducts itself right now...if Bobby mounts his campaign, he may even provoke me into running for CDO Co-ordinator myself, although I don't like the title.. "President" would be a lot better if "Generalissimo" is unacceptable to the masses....

I have to save my extended Runestone Poll commentary, but I can throw in a few remarks....One of Dick Martin's complaints has been about the preference matrix's effects on the Poll. Under these circumstances it would have been nice if Dick's 'zine had been helped by the matrix. But no, it operated to screw him but good...My recollection is that Retaliation was third in the modified mean table, but really got hit in the preference matrix....If it'll make Dick feel better he's welcome to claim the third-place position for Retal....I certainly won't object....

Gary Coughlan wishes to have it pointed out that he did not wish for Europa Express included in this year's poll, not wishing to occupy a slot that might have gone to someone who was publishing for the whole year and working hard on it...Duly noted.... PRAXIS's overall vote profile was, upon examination, not all that impressive. PRAXIS and THE CANADIAN DIPLOMAT got the same number of votes, but more people gave TCD a "10" or "9" for example, than PRAXIS....That's almost enough to make me stop publishing right here and now...Interesting to compare the vote profiles of various 'zines. PRAXIS' profile is a "skyscraper", Excelsior's a cathedral, Retal's a ski jump, Over there's an office block....