



## STILL STOOD THE PROUD TOWER

"God has not been preparing the English-speaking and Teutonic peoples for a thousand years for nothing but vain and idle self-contemplation and self-admiration. No! He has made us the master organizers of the world to establish system where chaos reigned...He has made us adepts in government that we may administer government among savages and senile peoples." Senator Albert J. Beveridge, January 1900

"While from a proud tower in the town Death looks gigantically down." - Edgar Allan Poe

Barbara Tuchman drew upon Edgar Allan Poe's evocative poem "The City in the Sea" for the title of her book about the decaying aristocratic society of the era 1880-1914: The Proud Tower. Earlier, Walter Lord had entitled his similar book The Good Years - and with no sarcastic intent, either. Though Lord discusses the arrogance of government and industrial leaders of that era, he seems thoroughly convinced that "in these brief buoyant years...a spark somehow gave extra promise to life. By the light of this spark, men and women saw themxelves as heroes shaping the world, rather than victims struggling through it."

Out of this period comes the inspiration for Greg Costikyan's new game Pax Britannica (Victory Games, \$24). It is a multi-player negotiation game, in the tradition of Diplomacy, Origins of World War II, Empires of the Middle Ages, and A Mighty Fortress, all of which have been run postally in my publications. Indeed, Pax Britannica leads very naturally into Diplomacy, which simulates the First World War that was the natural outcome and climax of the era beginning in 1880. Of the seven European powers on the Diplomacy board, five are also in Pax Britannica, along with the United States of America and Japan. Austria-Hungary is played by the German player, while Turkey is neutral but may be played as an ally or anomy by the player-powers under certain circumstances.

Circumstances limit the multi-player negotiation game to the era prior to the 1930s. The future alliances of World War II were set in concrete by 1935, despite the efforts of modern "Revisionist" historians to make the Soviet Union a sort of ally of Germany. This specious notion invariably cites the German-Soviet Pact of August 1939, which was in reality an expression of the ancient Russian policy of trading space for time. The refusal of the western European democracies to make common cause with the Soviet Union against Nazi Germany is the sole cause of this pact. Press a "Revisionist" hard enough, and he will eventually admit to a belief that the world would be a happier place today if the Axis powers had won World War II. One of them, E. L. Anderson, admitted as much in the Summer 1973 issue of American Mercury. Similar sentiments are expressed by E. Gary Gygax and Terry Stafford in Victorious German Arms.

These facts are reflected in war-game design. Some World War II games such as SPI's World War II or Avalon-Hill's Third Reich have multi-player features, but in fact the historical alliances are dictated to the players by the rules and other circumstances. Games of the post-World War II period, such as Summit, Supremacy, and Cold War, try to be multi-player, but do it only by unconvincignly erecting a united western Europe, or a united South America, to be the theoretical equal of the United States and the Soviet Union.

So, for a real multi-player negotiating game, we must look at the period extending roughly from the Congress of Vienna to the Congress of Versailles. Pax Britannica does this, making its principal concern the search of the world's major empires for colonies and markets. The game's four-year game-turns begin in 1880, at which time the partition of Africa was more or less agreed upon by the European powers, but not yet accomplished. Great Britain owns India and what later became "the white Dominions", but aside from this only a few islands and coaling stations are under London's rule. France has just conquered Algiers and the southern tip of Indo-China, but has little else. The only other power to have overseas possessions

is the USA, and this is only Alaska. But everyone is r'aring to go.

Each of the 104 Areas on the polar projection world map has an economic value and a combat strength. They are linked overland, and the coastal Areas are linked as well to various of 12 Sea Areas. Some of the unowned Areas are technically independent nations (Brazil, Persia, Transvaal, etc.), and can only be entered if a random event produces "Unrest" in it. Others may be entered by any colonial power looking for glory and a fast profit. This is quite in accordance with history; one kettle of missionary stew could bring in the armies of half of Europe in those days. (And in these days, too. Those Marines in El Salvador and Ivans in Afghanistan aren't looking for cheap lays.' Well, not only for cheap lays.)

The names of the Areas use contemporary spelling, as one of the many devices which gives a period flavor to Pax Britannica. On this came board are spellings that haven't been in our geography books for decades: Kamerun, Porto Rico, Abyssinia, Turcomania, etc. (How did they ever miss "Corea" or "Owhyhee"?) A "Summary of Area, Data" appears in the middle of the rulebook, from which it may be conveniently extracted for duplication. This would be a good idea, because every player needs convenient and fast answers to the question "Where's the richest unclaimed Area that I can move in on?" Another good feature of the rules is that an index appears on every odd-numbered page. If you suldenly need to find out the exact terms of the agreement between Germany and Austria-Hungary, or what happens to defeated troops whose retreat routes are cut off, you can find the right page number quickly. Summaries of the rules on colonial status, what can move where, and what happens for every possible conflict of opposing status markers in the same Area, can be easily found, either on the Player Sheets or the Administrative Record Sheets. Duplicating large numbers of the latter should be the first task of ever new Pax Britannica owner.

Some of the richest Areas are to be found in China. There is a chance of nearly 22% that there will be Unrest in at least one Chinese Area each turn, and this will open the golden door to any nation with a merchant fleet in Chinese waters. (Merchant fleets come to nations at specific points in the game, but can be positioned where the powers choose.) It also increases the reading of a marker on a "Chinese Resentment Track", making a Chinese revolt almost every game-turn a feature of the latter half of the game. This leads to a cooperative venture against China by powers with status markers there, in the grand tradition of the Boxer Rebellion. (Lord devotes a chapter of his book to this event.)

However, the mapboard also contains a European Tension Track. While it is impossible to function as a colonial power without doing things that advance that marker, a Great War breaks out if it goes to 100, or if at least four European powers are involved in a war for colonial possessions. (In over-the-board games played at Origins XI, the Great War usually seemed to break out by the 1900 or 1904 Game-Turn.) Although no Power may send troops into the home country of another Power, the game ends with such an outbreak, and there are severe point penalties assessed against the responsible players.

In administering their colonial incomes and military outlays, players have the choice of spending their money for armed forces and the establishment of new colonies, or of turning it in for Victory Points at the end of each Game-Turn. (Money may not be held over from one Game-Turn to the next, a fact which the rules do not explicitly state but which is implicit in the Victory Point Record Phase of each Game-Turn.) There is a divisor by which each power divides the end-of-Game-Turn Treasury. This is 10 for Great Britain, which therefore has to hustle merely to stay in the same place. However, it is 3 for Russia and Japan, and only 2 for Italy - a fact which gives these powers, and especially Italy, a considerable advantage. The Italian player can grab early a few fairly good colonies in Africa and the Mediterranean area, and then sit tight and rack up Victory Points this way at the end of every Game-Turn. I am not so sure that the Italian divisor shouldn't be 3.

If war occurs, everything comes to a screeching halt until the War Sequence is run through as many times as the combatants think it useful. Staying neutral can be quite an advantage if it looks as if the combatants will knock themselves out settling the matter.

Negotiation is an important element in this game. If two Powers should, say, both place Protectorate markers in Kenya, thus possessing casus belli\* against each other, the matter can be settled amicably, traded off against advantage elsewhere in the world, or sold for cold cash. Treaties must be formally written. A "Congress of Europe" obviously modeled on the historical Berlin horse-trade of 1878, can be called to deal with the really hard cases.

As we can expect from learning that Greg Costikyan designed it, Pax Britannica is an excellent game. Not since the appearance of Source of the Nile - also a game concerned with colonial adventures - has a new game caused so much comment and interest among war-gamers. It seems applicable for postal play, and postal rules appear

elsewhere in this issue.

However, Costikyan continually makes in the rulebook various side comments about the era from 1880 to 1914, and either puts up to cause controversy, or seriously believes, that this era represented some sort of high point in human happiness, and in the ability of reasonable men to settle disputes without going to war. There are continual quotes from Rudyard Kipling, who put the imperial mentality into verse. "The White Man's Burden" and "Recessional" are quoted in full, and there are also lines from "Tommy", though "Fuzzy-Wuzzy" was unaccountably overlooked. Costikyan does not mention that "The White Man's Burden" was written by Kipling to the American nation after it conquered the Philippines not only from the Spanish but also from its own inhabitants. In Kipling's view, the United States of America was abandoning a selfish isolation from world affairs, and leaping into the effort of govern and civilize the non-white peoples. As for "Recessional", see a parody by an anonymous anti-imperial American of the turn of the century, which I have reprinted on the last page of this issue.

This

R This

To

Great Intervals

Appears

Inflame

Optic

N Herves

0 At

P

I

At the end of the rulebook, Costikyan has a "Historical Viewpoint" in which he explains his view of the world of 1880-1914, and his reasons for believing in the wisdom of the old colonial system. He rejects our modern viewpoint according to which "The 19th century 'oppressed' the underdeveloped lands, thereby introducing them to advanced medicine, education, and an improved standard of living. The 20th century 'freed' the colonies, and thereby condemned them to petty dictatorship and economic decline. Host of what people 'know' about the 19th century is wrong." This simplistic analysis overlooks the massacres that were regular features of colonial domination. The first genocide of the 20th century was committed in German Southwest Africa against the Herreros by Commissioner Heinrich Goering, father of Herman of infamous memory. The British domin- A ion in India was founded upon such things as the savage suppression of the 1857 rising, and the Amritsar Massacre of 1920. Mark Twain's attack on the "pacification" of the Phillipines was so much to the point that, about 15 years ago, it seemed equally cogent when reprinmerely with the substitution of "Vietnam" for Pacifiata, ted by "Philippines".

# 1322 Furthermore, Costikyan's analysis leaves out the clear fact that, everywhere in the world, people would rather be ruled harshly by aen of their own nationality than leniently by foreigners who constituted themselves a superior racial and social class. I do not intend to explain or defend this attitude, or to say that people "ought" not to have it. But it exists, it is likely to continue to exist, and nothing can be done about it. To take a "worst case" example, if British troops intent on reconquering the country had landed in Uganda at the height of Idi Amin's dictatorship, Amin and his victims would have united in fighting them off. Another feature of the period 1880-1914 was the gold standard. Every nation's

<sup>\* -</sup> Costikyan incorrectly makes "casi bellorum" the plural of "casus belli", legal Latin for "Occasion of War". Casus belonged to a class of Latin nouns, the Foutth Declension, which formed the plural not by replacing "-us"with "-i", but by lengthening the "u". However many casus there may have been, there was only one bellum (war), and so the possessive singulat belli does not need to be replaced by the possessive plural bellorum.

monetary unit was rigidly defined as a certain mass of gold. No proposition is so firmly demonstrated in economics as the fact that the gold standard means a society of a small number of obscenely wealthy families, ruling over a vast multitude sentenced to grinding poverty. If this was the case in the industrial nations during the 1000-1914 era, the situation in the colonies must have beggared description. Incredibly, there are still people around who want to restore these economic conditions.

Another point that Costikyan finds to admire in that era was that disputes were allegedly settled by negotiation among the major powers, rather than by war. War was regarded as a thing fit only for the repression of non-Europeans so ungrateful as to reject European rule, and not for European nations to use against one another. Yet consider the historical record. In the 30 years prior to 1880, all six of the major European Powers represented in this game had been at war with other European powers. If we include wars against non-whites, every Power in this game had been at war sometime between 1880 and 1914. Nor was the war of 1914 a historical accident, bringing to a close an era of universal peace. The era of colonial expansion convinced the European Powers that they could treat other Europeans in the same way that they had been treating Africans and Asians. France saw its colonial empire as a way of getting the economic strength by which they could revenge themselves upon Germany for the defeat of 1871. Germany saw a network of colonies and trade as the way to break British commercial supremacy. Russia saw war with Japan as a way of uniting their rickety empire against a common foe. The world-wide colonial rivalries came home to roost in 1914. We still suffer the effects of the arrogance, greed, and racism of the masters of the imperial powers of the era 1880-1914.

If you ignore Costikyan's pontifications, however, the game is a good one. It can easily be adapted to postal play, and an experiment in this begins on p. 7.

## WHAT DOES THE TITLE MEAN?

Seldom has the theory of militarism and imperialism been enunciated with such frankness as it was by Homer Lea (1876-1912). This 88-pound hunchback took a practical interest in military matters, and actually was made a major general by the Chinese when he was in his 20s. (They were facing a squeeze play by Japan and most of the European powers, and were in no position to be fussy.) On the basis of his experiences he became a strong proponent of a Sino-American alliance against Russia, a plan which was realized sixty years after his death. (I cannot avoid the impression that, somewhere in the Pentagon, is a well-thumbed set of the works of General Lea.)

Lea took for granted that imperial powers would have to dominate over other peoples of the world. He saw the status quo of his day as an Anglo-American co-dominion over the world, and saw this unofficial alliance threatened by a rising alliance among Germany, Russia, and Japan. In 1909 he wrote The Valor of Ignorance, which purported to describe the Japanese share of this conspiracy, and in 1912 was published. The Day of the Saxon, taking up the German angle. At the time his body gave up its unequal struggle with destiny, a third volume about Russia was in the works, but its manuscript did not appear among his papers - a fact on which sinister imputations have been laid. He was a vigorous foe of Feminism and of votes for women, feeling that this would make nations less "militant" - that is, less willing to enter var. He also supported military conscription, universal military training, fighting wars without bothering to declare them first, the continued existence of the world's colonial empires, and the annexation of neutral nations before someone else does it.\*

During World War II there was a vogue for Lea's writings, though his admirers failed to explain why Russia hadn't gone in with Germany and Japan. In fact, if Lea's theories about human nature, war, and the state had been correct, Russia would have joined the Axis, and the Axis would have won the war.

Even more than Kipling, Lea exemplifies the state of mind that dominated the governments of the colonial powers in the era 1880-1914. The title VALOR OF IGNORANCE therefore seems appropriate for a bulletin for the postal play of Pax Britannica.

<sup>\* -</sup> Do I have to tell you that he was a Californian?

## THE RULES OF POSTAL PAX BRITANNICA

(This is a first draft of a plan for the postal play of Greg Costikyan's game Pax Britannica, published by Victory Games. Comments from readers are welcome. Based on the experience in a trial game, for which enrollments are solicited, some of these rules may be changed later.)

1. The game fee for postal Pax Britannica is 30. This covers a subscription to THE VALOR OF IGNORANCE for as long as the game lasts. With his or her entry fee, each player should send in a list of countries in order of preference. A full board of

seven players will be organized.

2. THE VALOR OF IGNORANCE will be published every four weeks, unless the War Sequence justifies a faster publication. Publication will be on Saturdays, and deadlines for moves will be on noon of the day preceding the publication date. The gamesmaster and publisher of THE VALOR OF IGNORANCE is John Boardman, 234 East 19th Street, Brook-

lyn, N. Y. 11226; 718-693-1579 or 718-780-5180.

3. At the beginning of each move the gamesmaster will determine the Random Events, complete the Administrative Phase, and determine the activities of the Minor Powers. This information will then be sent to the players. They will then send in, on a fourweek deadline, their orders for the Movement/Status Change Phase. The gamesmaster will adjudicate the Colonial Combat Phase. Necessary Minor Power movements will be made according to the rules by the gamesmaster. The gamesmaster will then publish these results, and indicate whether casus belli are present.

4. If no casus belli occur, and no Chinese Rebellion takes place, the gamesmaster will determine Victory Points, and announce the results of the Random Events, Administrative, and Minor Powers phases of the next Game-Turn. Except during a War Sequence, the holdings and armed forces of each Power including the Minor Powers will be published

in each issue of THE VALOR OF IGNORANCE.

5. If casus belli exist after the Marker Adjustment Phase, the players will have four weeks to negotiate matters. If any player calls for a Congress of Europe, the gamesmaster shall announce this fact by personal communication, and will determine where the Congress takes place, what Powers participate, who presides, and when will be the deadline for the completion of the work of the Congress.

6. Players may sign Treaties with one another, and send them to the gamesmaster, at any time. A Treaty must be sent in in identical terms, and signed, by all participants. Any player may repudiate a Treaty at any time by so informing the gamesmaster,

who will inform the other players in the next issue of THE VALOR OF IGNORANCE.

7. If the Chinese Empire, Ottoman Empire, or Hinor Power fights without Major Power allies against one or more Major Powers, the gamesmaster will order the units of that combatant under the rules of Pax Britannica. If the Ottoman Empire or a Minor Power has more than one Major Power ally, the gamesmaster will determine which Major Power shall order those units.

8. There will be no Initiative Determination Phase, or alternation between First Instead, both Alliances will send their orders in simultaneousand Second Alliances ly. A Military Unit may in one Phase be ordered to move or to attack but not both. Attack orders will be adjudicated before move orders. Move orders rendered impossible by preceding combat resolution will not be made. Supply Determination will be determined after Attack and Movement. The European Tension Index will increase by 1 rather than 2 at the end of each War Phase.

9. Aside from Chinese Rebellion, and War declared by the Ottoman Empire, all War Phases will be adjudicated simultaneously. For example, assume that Great Britain and France are fighting over Higeria while the U.S. and Japan fight separately over Havaii. The first War Sequence Phase will have the first moves in the Anglo-French War, and also the first moves in the Japanese-American War. The second War Sequence Phase will have the second moves in each of these wars, simultaneously, and so forth.

10. Treaties which bring wars to an end are handled in the same way as other Treaties. (See Postal Rule 6.) Despite the provisions of any existing Treaty, no Power may enter a Wrr without specifically saying so.

11. The deadlines for War Sequence Phases will be two weeks apart. (This is a tentative rule, and may be modified in the course of a game if it proves to be unworkable.) Allies should send in their moves separately, or together in form of a Treaty.

12. At the end of a Mar, the gamesmaster will publish the holdings of the Powers under the new state of affairs, and then proceed with the other actions mentioned in Postal Rule 4, above.

# AND HOW, LET'S TRY IT

Effective immediately, a postal game of Pax Britannica is being organized. The first seven people to send in their entry fees, as described in the postal rules, will constitute the first game board-full. Only one postal game will be organized at present, though if the game proves workable, a second game may be organized when the first one is about half finished. If game fees arrive after the first board is filled, the checks will be returned to the people who sent them, and they will have the option of waiting to see whether a second board is organized, subscribing to THE VALOR OF IGNOR-ANCE, applying the money to one of my other postal games, or any workable combination of these options.

Players and other readers are encouraged to send in press releases with their moves. Genuine quotations from luminaries of the era will also be appreciated, particularly in the original languages if these as the Latin alphabet. There were a number of suitably outrageous quotations from that period, as many statesmen, historians, and philosophers were quite frank about what they planned to do to the non-European parts of the world, and how they planned to do it. The names of Rudyard Kipling, Theodore Roosevelt, Kaiser Wilhelm II, Admiral John Fisher, Marshal Lyautey, Admiral Togo, Senator Beveridge, and General Lea come to mind here. Movels set in the period, such as those of Rider Haggard and George Macdonald Fraser, are also worth quoting.

## THE MINISTRY OF MISCELLARY

THE VALOR OF IGNORANCE is one of three postal var-gaming publications from John Boardman, 234 East 19th Street, Brooklyn, New York 11226. Subscription rates to non-players are 9 issues for \$6. The same rate applies to GRAUSTARK, which carries postal games of Avalon-Hill's World War I negotiation game Diplomacy, and EMPIRE, which currently runs two games of SPI's Empires of the Middle Ages and one of its A Mighty Fortress. Openings in postal Diplomacy games are available at \$20; with your entry fee send in a list of countries that you'd like to play, in your order of preference.

EMPIRE is published every three weeks, and CDAUCTARK every four weeks. The next publication date is 17 August for EMPIRE, and 10 August for CRAUSTARK. This issue of THE VALOR OF IGNORANCE #1 is going as an introductory issue to all readers of CRAUSTARK and/or EMPIRE. Subsequent issues, of which #2 will appear on 24 August, will go only to players and subscribers.

Page 9 of this issue carries David E. Schwartz's review of Pax Britannica, together with an account of an over-the-board game in which he participated. Readers are invited to send in their accounts of over-the-board games they have played, with particular reference to appropriate strategies, and questions of rule interpretations which may have developed.

Mitigating or reversing the effects of imperialism can have its hazards. Just last week Senator Bradley of New Jersey proposed that a large acreage in South Dakota's Black Hills be returned to the Indians from whom it was taken about a century ago under circumstances of dubious legality. The Attorney General - the radio news stories did not specify whether it was the U.S. or the South Dakota official of that title - responded by saying that Hew Jersey ought to be given back - to the Sicilians! He also urged the abolition of professional basketball, since Senator Bradley had made a name for himself in that sport before going into politics.

# THE WHITE MAN'S BURDEN (YOU SHOULD EXCUSE THE EXPRESSION)

# by David E. Schwartz

One of the must unjustly neglected areas of vargaming is the period between the American Civil War and 1914. Although quite a number of interesting things happened then - the Franco-Prussian War, the Russo-Japanese War, the Russo-Turkish War of 1878, the Balkan Wars - and a lot more, most gamers see the period as fairly uninteresting. This does an injustice to a period which was certainly as colorful and exciting as any before or after it.

Victory Games has finally decided to do something about it. They have brought out Pax Britannica, a game of the colonial expansion of the Great Powers between 1880 and 1920, and designed by Greg Costikyan, easily one of the best and most imaginative (and most eccentric, but that's irrelevant\*) game designers around. And it's safe to say that in this game Greg has created a masterpiece which should appeal both to wargamers and Diplomacy fans alike (assuming that the two categories are not entirely

coterminous.)

First of all, the players represent the seven great colonial powers of the period - Great Britain, France, Russia, Japan, Italy, the United States and Germany. An eighth Great Power, Austria-Hungary, is in the game but is controlled by Germany under certain very strict rules. (I am not persuaded that this should be so. Outside of the policies of Franz Josef, there was no real reason Austria should not have turned to Russia as a possible ally - and if the 1908 Bosnian crisis had gone differently, it might have been so.) There are also four minor colonial powers - the Netherlands,

Belgium, Portugal, and of course, Spain.

algebra as southly by players

The rest of the world is divided into various areas which are either Independent, Undeveloped, Ottoman Empire, Chinese Empire, or Chinese Vassal. The players attempt to spread their power and influence worldwide through means of increasing levels of control. There are four levels of control a player can have: Interest, Influence, Protectorate, and Possession. The last two require the military occupation of the area. Any player may attempt to gain a Protectorate or Possession of an Undeveloped Area, but may only do so to an Independent Area owing to Unrest there or in the course of a War. Chinese Empire/Vassal areas are treated as Undeveloped Areas for Control, but interference with them will inevitably lead to an increase in the Chinese Resentment Index, which will lead to - you guessed it - the Boxer Rebellion. Ottoman Empire Areas are treated somewhat the same way, except that trying to grab them will lead to a war with the Ottomans.

The players are also constrained by facts of geography. None of the four levels of Influence or Control may be placed in an Area unless you have a Communications Link to that Area, either directly overland or via a chain of Merchant Fleets in the various sea areas. Thether or not the control will remain in an area if the Link is broken is not stated in the rules. This requirement also has the odd effect that Bolivia is usually the only area on the board which is inaccessible in most games, as its only Communications Links are to the Independent Areas of Peru, Chile, Brazil

(spelled "Brasil") and Argentina.

While military units and the actual game mechanics of warfare are simple - you only get Armies and Fleets, separated into units of 1, 3 and 10 strength points which are, unusually, not interchangeable, the mechanics of declaring war are not. To do so, you must have a casus belli (literally, a "case for war") against another player or minor power. (The U.S. gets a freebie in the Random Events Table against - who else? - Spain.) This is usually due to such events as conflicting attempts to take over an Area or, in some cases, intruding into another player's sphere of influence. There is, as mentioned, a Random Events Table which covers such things as Un-

\* - A relephant, as we all know, is a Focket Armenian large gray animal with a long nose. (DES)

rest, and also such "Headline" events as a Liberal or Conservative Victory in Britain, Pan-Slav Agitation in Russia, German Navy League Agitation, Australian pressure for Dominion, American Yellow Journalism, Boer oppression of Uitlanders, and, of course,

"Serbia defies Austria-Hungary".

There is also a "European Tensions" Index, which keeps rising during the game, assisted by both Random Events and certain actions of the players. For example, each time any power except Britain, Japan, or the US builds naval units, the Index rises. This happens even if Germany is forced to do so by the Random Event "German Navy League Agitation" (thus accurately simulating the actual situation to a frightening degree). When the Index reaches 100, the Great War breaks out, the game ends abruptly, and the player(s) who brought on the war are penalized in Victory Points. A Great War can also occur if 4 of more European Powers are at war with one another.

Overall, the game is a brilliant, balanced design. Although Great Britain starts off with an enormous lead, she has equally enormous expenses, and her Victory Point Divisor is the highest in the game. (Unused monies at the end of each turn are cashed in for Victory Points with a divisor. Thus, if Britain had 30 pounds left, its divisor being 10, it ould get only 3 VPs, while Germany with a divisor of 5 would get 6, and Italy, with a divisor of 2, would get 15.) Japan has the toughest row to hoe her only real area for expansion is China and its vassal states, and she is either going to have to cut a deal with Russia early on, or face difficulties with both Russia and China. The game, indeed, is a great learning device for seeing why the colonial politics of the late 19th Century developed the way they did. Players can even call a Congress of Europe to try and resolve their disputes!

I have a few minor quibbles with the game - why is the Russian "10" fleet in the Black Sea, not the Baltic at the start? Why was Syria left out as an Area, or for that matter Iraq/Paghdad? Why can't you "make change" for units? - but as a whole, the game hangs together brilliantly. There is even provision for a 6, 5 or even 4 player game, but this is really like playing Hamlet without the Tsar, so to speak.

As an example, let me tell you of a 7-player game I was in last week. The eventual winner was Germany, due to luck and the fact that Austria-Hungary got lucky and was able to seize Serbia and split Bulgaria with Russia. The US, which I played, had general influence all through Latin America and had even built the Panama Canal, thus coming in second. I almost went to war with Britain over Hawaii, but he caved in to my demands at the last minute, faced with unrest in Rajputana and the United Provinces. Despite this, Britain came in third, having raped the Roers and been a key partitioner of China and the Ottoman Empire. Russia and Japan were fourth and fifth, having split most of the rest of China and Korea between them. Japan picked up Sarawak as well, while Russia had some loose change in Central Asia. France came next, having gobbled up a lot of African real estate of little value in a futile attempt to gain an East-Uest path across Africa. Italy came last, having managed to seize only Tripoli, Eritrea, and Madagascar, and being booted out of its various interests by France, which precipitated a France-Italian war. And a good time was had, with various players uttering appropriate comments. (The British player quoted Kipling, and my contribution was "Unser Zukunft liegt auf dem Wasser.") The game is a treat, and I commend it to you.

# WHAT TO DO WITH THE COUNTERS

The counter tray provided by Victory Games for Pax Britannica has only 16 compartments, which can be a bit of a problem when there are so many varieties of counters to put away. Robert Sacks has compiled a table of the various types of markers, which you can check against your own set to see whether you have lost any. In addition to the counters for particular nations, there are some for general use. There are 28 Casus Belli markers, of which 22 have "?" on the reverse, and the other 6 have "Unrest". (It is impossible under the rules of Pax Britannica to have more than 6 Areas in Unrest at the same time.) There are also two Canal markers, one marker each for the Game-Turn and Phase tracks, two each for the European Tension and Chinese Resentment tracks, and three each for the Treasury Tracks. One of each set of three

has the "plus 1000" marker on the other side, to cover the unlikely situation that a Power may have more than 1000 pounds in the Treasury. There are 6 "Army-5" markers for the Chinese or Ottoman forces should those nations go to war with or against player. Powers. The others are:

	Merchant Fleets	Control Markers	Interest/ Influence	10	3	
Great Britain	10	44*	20	15	14	32
France	71 8 6	20	18	10	10	20
Germany	one 1e 71 16	15	' 18	8	10	15
Austria-Hunga	ary 0	4	5	4	1	14.
United States	solvense 8 en les	16 **	15	8	10	12
Japan	5	10	12	8	8	10
Russia	3	7	10	8	8	7
Italy	off The He	U	10	8	8	8
Belgium	8 10 12 - 19	3	3	. 0	2	11
Hetherlands	4	4 con	1 2	0	3	7,
Portugal	3	3	2	. 0	1	5
Spain	4	6	2	0	5	6
eurit bus moo						
total :	dealer 5715 on	140	117	69	80	127
Annual Control of the Control						

<sup>\* -</sup> Four of these are also Dominion markers. \*\* - Four of these are also State markers.

I have found the following distribution of counters among trays to be convenient in making access easy to a desired counter.

#### First Row:

- 2: All British and French Control markers (64)
  - 1: All British and French Control markers (04)
    2: All British and French Influence/Interest markers (38)
  - 3: All British and French 1s (52)
  - 4: All British and French 3s (24)

## Second Row:

- 1: All German, American, and Japanese Control markers (41)
- 2: All German, American, and Japanese Influence/Interest markers (45)
- 3: All German, American, and Japanese 1s (37)
- 4: All German, American, and Japanese 3s (28)

## Third Row:

- 1: All other Control markers (35)
- 2: All other Influence/Interest markers (34)
- 3: All other 1s (38)
- 4: All other 3s, and the Chinese/Ottoman 5s (34)

## Fourth Row:

- 1. All "Casus Belli" markers (28)
- 2. All other markers (32)
- 3. All Merchant Fleets (57)
- 4. All 10s (69)

Readers are invited to send in their comments on this arrangement, or to suggest others that have worked for them.

In order to keep the counters in order while transporting the game, it is useful to tape down the transparent plastic lid over the counter tray. This makes access to the counters easier than would placing them in 20 or 30 baggies.

13.22.6100311 0

#### ACCESSIONAL

As if waiting for this moment, the parody "Accessional" has been sitting in my commonplace book for 35 years. I originally found it in a collection of folksongs dealing with events in American history, of which I do not now recall the editor and publisher. Neither does the name of the author of "Accessional" appear in my records, and indeed it may have been unknown to the editor. After the victorious American campaign in the Philippines, the opponents of imperialism made themselves very scarce.

For the long-term effects of the Spanish-American War and America's embarkation on a career of imperialism, see Walter Karp's The Politics of War. For the tune to "Recessional" see various Protestant hymnals, in which it is a fixture. Admittedly, I have not frequented Protestant churches in recent decades, but it can probably be still found there. As the recent legal escapades of Sydney Biddle Barrous, the "Mayflover Madame", show, White Anglo-Saxon Protestants are utterly incapable of feeling shame about anything whatsoever.

To judge from internal evidence, "Accessional" might date anywhere from the Spanish-American War to America's declaration of war on Germany in 1917. The blanks in the "Additional" can probably be filled with the words "Kaiser Wilhelm" and "Fatherland". There was a brief diplomatic dispute between the United States and Germany at

the time of the Spanish-American War, to which the blanks may refer.

Jehovah, Lord, beneath whose smile
Our fathers fought in Freedom's name,
And wrested from the British Isle
Our country, loved, and known to fame;
Oh, gracious Lord, withhold thy hand
While we expand while we expand.

The doctrine taught by James Monroe And maintained through a hundred years, Was but a bluff; it now must go, Since we've embraced both hemispheres. Oh, Lord, extend thy helping hand. While we expand.

We've waved on high the Stripes and Stars With Liberty the glad refrain; We've licked in three successive wars Old England, Mexico, and Spain. The chip is on our shoulder set, Don't you forbet - don't you forget!

## Additional

So, \_\_\_\_\_\_, be advised Don't knock this chip off, - understard?
For if you do you'll be chastized,
And we'll annex the
We mention this with some regret,
Lest you forget - lest you forget.

115

THE VALOR OF IGNORANCE #1

John Boardman 234 East 19th Street Brocklyn, New York 11226 United States of America

FIRST CLASS MAIL

"It is difficult to believe that any large number of people really accepted this headlong painting of the map of Africa in European colours as a permanent new settlement of the world's affairs, but it is the duty of the historian to record that it was so accepted." - H. G. Wells, 1920