

This is the all-purpose fanzine of Samuel Edward Konkin III, published irregularly (semi-monthly, approximately) for exchange with other Science Fiction fanzines, locs, artwork, filks and other fannish and sercon material, and for the following Amateur Press Associations: *LASFAPA*, *Frefanzine*, *APA-cleareth!*, *Alarums & Excursions*, and any others the editor is invited to join. *cleareth!* is available only for trade, letter-of-comment, art, fanwriting, or in APA. All correspondence should be sent thusly: New Libertarian Enterprises, P.O. Box 1748, Long Beach, CA 90801, Personal: SEK3.



Illustration by S.C. McIntosh

This issue is Number 19 (of Volume II) and is intended primarily for *Alarums & Excursions 19* (February 8, 1977). Next issue: *Star Wars and Strange Horizons* for APA-V 23 and LASFAPA 5.

HELL, NO, GYGAX!

It's just possible that E. Gary Gygax knows nothing of the article published in the last *Dragon* (as I write this) concerning female characters in D&D. If so, I apologize for taking his name in vain, and urge him to take greater care in monitoring what appears under an imprimatur so closely associated with him.

No apologies to the editor of that offending *Dragon*, Timothy J. Kask, or the author. The trio are being dealt with in effigy on the superb cover Sandy McIntosh drew for this issue. The characters are most of my current female characters. In order, from left, they are as follows:

- *Lynli*, Dwarf, fighter-thief, currently 3rd/4th, holding one of her magic swords; originally neutral converted by artifact to Lawful. (All these characters are still under the old, one-dimensional alignment/morality system.)

- *Irulan Jessica*, formerly a Neutral Bene Gesserit (i.e., anti-magic-cleric/courtesan) converted by artifact to Law and hence now Orange Catholic Cleric/Damsel, currently 3rd/4th level. From a far future variant of Earth's timeline (give or take a spice dream), she knows such archaic terms as "male chauvinist pig."

- *Cymra*, druid, Breton, currently second-level, Neutral.

- *Hippolyta Beta*, Amazon fighter (18[83] strength!), *beta* (second) in line for Amazon Queen, Neutral, "Hippolyta, Minotaur-Slayer" for her single-handed downing of the caricature-male beast with but bow and arrows. Currently fifth level, has +2 chainmail and three magic swords, two of which she got by deliberately taking alignment shock, then moving them into a conversion device. She is presently checking out the rest of the world (worlds) where being "manly" is not a sign of weakness, stupidity, or foppishness. Also has high Charisma and good wisdom, though low intelligence roll. (Presently, my favorite character, fast friend of *Allysyn*, and could not exist under Lakofka rules!)

- *Allysyn*, Wiccan (based on Harness Neutral Cleric), originally from twentieth-century Earth, third level as both Cleric and Magic-User. Wolfskin coat becomes part of her when she polymorphs, of course. Fairly hip, considers men outside Wicca to be hunks of meat, and usually catches passes made at her friend Hippolyta Beta (before the males get stomped). Fast friend of Hippolyta, rationalizes it (she's very Neutral) as needing a good, strong, loyal fighter. She's just acquired a brazier of fire elementals.

Frankly, I have no desire to have any of these ladies ruled out of order. All of them rolled Charisma, not Beauty, and all rolled full strength. I think there are a lot of other D&Ders out there who don't like people changing the rules in mid-stream on them either—and hardly as an improvement.

Basically, I have two complaints to Gygax, Kask and Len Lakofka. First, women were portrayed in illustrations right from Book I as character types. Obviously, it was going to be assumed they arose from the same die rolls and in the same categories as males. Nothing was ever said to the contrary. Like most players, I assume, I run a roughly equal number of characters of each gender (and I roll gender of "Monster" 50-50 "odd or even"). Thus, half

of all my characters both in playing and in *Dungeon* are excluded from the "straight Gygax" universe? So be it.

Now, if some major *improvement* were behind this massive change in the rules, I could be accused of hide-bound conservatism. My second complaint is that not only are the changes no improvement, they cause an unnecessary constriction of possibilities and deliberately inject sexist assumptions where none were before—even though the game functioned well without the sexism, and even though others had already taken care of the inherent sexism of some classic fantasy for simulation purposes without making the whole game sexist.

What are the changes that Len Lakofka advocates in *The Dragon*, Vol. I, No. 3, October 1976, "Notes on *Women & Magic*"? First, "Beauty" is substituted for Charisma. Thus, in one stroke are female characters eliminated from "leadership." How, for example, could a paladin woman now come about? With "Beauty," women characters, including Thieves and Fighters get charm spells—but men do not have any in return.

As an aside, I'll note that the *Damsel* class I created had similar spells—Wiles—but they were an *addition*, an expansion of possibilities for those who wished to use excellent *Charisma* characters, not a *constriction* of original possibilities. And existing categories such as Thieves and Fighters were not affected.

Another question: why can Chaotic clerics use "Beauty," but not Lawful or Neutral clerics? Why does "Beauty" contribute to disorder, and even if it is entropic, why should Neutrals not "swing both ways"? And considering that Clerical miracles differ according to whether the Cleric is Good or Evil, and not Lawful or Chaotic since Gygax introduced his "four-way" system, why bring back a special difference for Clerics on Law/Chaos grounds?

There is no basis in any fantasy series that anyone would be interested in simulating in the "Lakofka System." The Lakofka System violates the original rules and makes many, if not half, of existing characters incompatible with the new rules. The Lakofka System contains arbitrary elements, in no way consistent with the established Gygax alignment—or anything remotely near. The Lakofka System constricts possibilities in D&D, rather than expanding them. And finally, the system is unnecessarily offensive to most players. Maybe we could introduce *Iron Dream* (by Norman Spinrad) rules, and restrict roles according to racial status?

There's no choice, really, at least for me. Since I would be restricted even if I accepted the new Lakofka Female Rules, I lose nothing by restricting myself from it. And thus I do. Consider this a warning: *my worlds and characters are not compatible with Dungeons and Dragons as currently defined by Gary Gygax, Tim Kask, and Len Lakofka*. "Beauty" Characters need not apply.

On to more positive matters.

LAWFUL DEMONS

As I started work on *Wargrypt*, my first dungeon using the new Orthogonal Alignment/Morality system (see *A&E 17, Clear Ether!*), I immediately ran into a problem. How can Lawful/Evil Clerics and Mages Summon or Gate in Chaotic/Evil Demons? Obviously, they couldn't. Clearly Lawful Demons are needed. I have worked out a series of Types of Lawful Demons analogous to the types in *Eldritch Wizardry*. However, rather than run the data buried in the middle of this issue, I am turning them over to Sandy McIntosh for illustrations to go with them and will run "Lawful Demons" as a separate zine next issue, for "clipping and saving" (or "xeroxing and saving"). Stay tuned.

ORTHOGONAL ALIGNMENT-MORALITY (Update)

The system seems to have caught on in Southern California. Long Beach is going over, and several LASFS D&Ders have expressed interest in incorporating it in their "New Generation" Dungeons. Now, if I can just win over Lee . . .

I am planning a Symposium (not quite as formal as it sounds) on "Law vs Chaos: From Greek Mythology to Michael Moorcock" which will be open to SFALB, Mythopeic fans, Fantasy fen, ATS, D&Ders, and any other fen in the area. It will be held last Saturday in February, so send me a self-addressed, stamped postcard or envelope and I'll notify you of the time and place.

TERRA SUPRA and WARGRYPT

Terra Supra will still be available for those running the old "linear alignment" system, and will eventually be used for an "Armageddon" scenario, with the Beast whose hit points are 666, Four Horsemen, and lost of high-level stuff.

Hopeful, by the time you read this, *Wargrypt* will be open for action. So far I have done overlords, so this is my first "Underground." But, as usual with me, it will have the touch of grandeur. For starters, there will be a War between Law/Evil and Chaos/Evil armies (with auxiliary clerics and mages), a section of Neutral/Amoral "She Who Must Be Obeyed" (*Ayasha*, cf. H. Rider Haggard) cultists (tropical Druids, sort of), and the other alignment/morality group selling arms or whatever to either side—or neither side. Demogorgon and Astaroth, Demon Prince of Chaos and Demon Princess of Law will be around (down deep in the bowels of this almost-extinct volcano), and watch out who you invoke!

I'll probably have a basic story-line written up for the issue after next but sections will be added and subtracted as the action proceeds.

Wargrypt is bullish on adventure—and bearish on mercy. A Civil War of Evil—A Clash of Alignments—A Struggle for Demonic Supremacy? All of the above!

EN GARDE AT THE RIPOSTE OFFICE Alarums & Excursions 16

Sean Cleary Interesting price list. Actually, prices should vary with supply and demand in each world. Steve McIntosh puts a very high price on swords in his iron-poor Lankmar, which is as it should be.

Alarums & Excursions 17

Glenn F. Blacow Very interested in Priestess of Diana. I am working on a Cult of Ayasha: Jungle Druid, Neutral/Amoral, as a variation on "Neutral Cleric."

Me Arioch is only one of the Lords of Chaos, of course. I knew I had it wrong as soon as I started the next book in the series, but it was too late to correct . . .

Alarums & Excursions 18

Lee Gold I don't think I confuse Law with Bureaucracy. I exempted Natural Law from Law-as-alignment. I'm just saying Law is anti-entropic and has no moral content out of context. Some Lawful actions are Good, some are Evil. ¶ I would not say "Good-Neutral-Evil" but "Good-Amoral-Evil." You don't consider your eight-fold playable, and I tend to agree, but I think D&D players I know can just handle the two-dimensional system. Well, testing will tell. I hope you decide to run some characters in *Wargrypt*.

John Boardman Bye, John. Catch you in the next fannish wargame craze.

Chris Pettus Thank you for your alignment system. I'll keep it in mind should my characters run into yours in a compatible dungeon. My Third Generation characters will refrain from entering your world; and I assume your characters will avoid *Wargrypt* for fear of insanity. OK?

Robert Sacks Thanks for backing me up on Irish anarchy. ¶ "Objectivist vampire" was an in-joke addressed to John Boardman. But I suppose a vampire (which is usually Lawful/Evil) could become Lawful/Good and adopt Objectivism as his religion—er, philosophy. He would then derive his ethics according to the nature of vampire from a selfish viewpoint, rather than according to the nature of man. Obviously, the ethics of an Objectivist vampire would differ from those of an Objectivist human . . . which was the basis of humour at Ayn Rand's expense in New York (at least) around 1970. (And I think everyone else is getting bored at this point.) ¶ Your statement "On Alignment" completely ignores the question of why should Law be identified with Good? You know, I cannot think of a single case in fantasy or mythology which does so!

Nicholas Shapero Now you've done it! Harry Andruschak will never appear in *A&E!* (*in joke*) ¶ "Be I for Law or Chaos," Nick? Well, actually, I swing both ways . . . but always Good.

Kay Jones Your Melnibonean would be Chaotic/Amoral, and that's how I'd designate Ja'ala in *Wargrypt*. She would oscillate between Good and Evil according to her latest act—which is exactly the way you play her. She's not a player character but a wandering monster? Well, why don't you roll up a Melnibonean for *Wargrypt*? Yes, there'll be Condensed Demon-Swords (like *Stormbringer*) for possible use.

Mark Swanson Tax collectors are Thieves (Evil); those who return tax money to the victims are Good and not thieves but Restitution Agents, "Anti-Thieves," Private Eyes, whatever. Robin Hood had other problems, like robbing from King John's Isolationist Statists to support Richard's Imperialist Statists. But we could discuss this better in *Frefanzine*, say? ¶ Estimates I have heard was 800 years of attempted conquest, followed by a mass implant of Protestant statists to Ireland so somebody would pay taxes and follow orders. I suggest this discussion also move to *Frefanzine*.

Hartley Patterson Thanks for the egoboo. ¶ I'm afraid, at least at first, I'm going to be pretty obvious about the "House Rules" on alignment/morality in *Wargrypt*. ¶ Swords could be any of the nine positions. ¶ Hear, hear on Irish anarchy!

Neil Smith Forget it! No way you can directly put fallen angels in D&D—they're way off the end of the scale. (See my write-up on *Eldila* back in *A&E 12*, *Clear Ether! 10*, for an attempt to use Lewis' approximation to bring them even close.) Nevertheless, there's no reason we can't use some of the names you introduced for the Lawful Demon Princes (see my next *CE!* in *A&E*).

Sean Cleary I don't understand why you think Neutrals do not have a full range of moral possibilities. As I emphasized, in my system they have the biggest range of all. Dianists were Neutral/Amoral, I thought, but if you prefer to have them (or a sect of them) Neutral/Good, sure, they could be paladins. — That's a silly argument from what's in "most people's minds." Did the fact that most people once thought human sacrifice was all right make it so? ¶ Two or three of the symbols were from material on which *Illuminatus!* was based, but as I said fairly clearly, my main influence was Michael Moorcock's *Elric* series.

Bill Seligman OK, I'm game. How can one be not "Purposeful" but both "Good" and "Lawful?"

David Friedman Not another fan with that name! ¶ Neutra≠ Amoral! Please!

Peter Francis John Lesran Cerrato Fair enough, although the character can always throw *Detect Evil* (i.e., *Detect Morality*) or *Detect Alignment*. I'm sure more ideas will be coming in as *Wargrypt* gets some action; stay tuned. And don't forget to pub *your data*, too.

Charles McGrew You're right, it's not. This time, it's Moorcock!

Steve McIntosh Parenthetically, hi. Suppose for the sake of argument, you want to simulate a story, see how Character would interact with other types of Characters, deal with a certain plot-line, and so on? It all depends on whose gored ox is being simulated. ¶ I am Fair Witness to Steve's OrcCon report—well, *laissez faire* witness, anyway.

Ken Scher Right on! Spells should be divided up on entropic lines. Instead of stasis bolts, how about Magnetic Field? ¶ I don't think Chaotic Spells would be more powerful; the *Spell Strength* should be determined by the caster's current standing with the Lords of Law or the Lords of Chaos. And he might be able to raise it by upping the ante: "Arioch, blood and souls if you aid me now!" ¶ Only major difference I have with your view is that I put most clerics on a Good/Evil line so they aren't concerned with entropy—that's why they're mostly Neutral. But even here, I could go along with entropy restrictions on Lawful and Chaotic clerics. Note that a *Good* party would want both Lawful and Chaotic mages along, though their spells may very well interfere. Or an all-Lawful party may have problems because the Good cleric can't Cure Wounds since his god is miffed with the Law/Evil cleric giving someone the "Finger" during battle. Oh, the possibilities! — Hey, why don't you classify all the spells by entropy and pub them—I'll be glad to have someone else do it (all the work, that is).

