Phoenicia Lodge No. 58 F&AM
www.phoenicia58.org
P.O. Box 30412, Phoenix AZ 85046
The Trestleboard
Special Edition – The Masonic Fraternity
May 2020


Brethren of Phoenicia Lodge,

In your hands you hold a special edition of our Trestleboard. In operative masonry, the Trestleboard is used by the master architect to draw his designs and plans, which are then used by the laborers to construct the building, agreeable to the designs laid down for them.

The Masonic fraternity is the oldest, largest and most widely known fraternal organization in the world. Members of the Masonic fraternity come from virtually every occupation and profession, - from all stations in life. All masons meet on an equal basis as friends, regardless of income, political ideology, or religious belief. All are patriotic citizens, and all have a belief in a Supreme Being.

Respectfully presented to the members of Phoenicia Lodge No. 58 F&AM,
Bryon P Howe, PM

**Who said it:**
(Answers at the END)

1. "Courage is the first of human qualities, because it is the quality which guarantees all the others."
2. "We must hang together, gentlemen...else we shall most assuredly hang separately."
3. "It is well, I die hard, but I am not afraid to go."
4. "Man's actions are the picture book of his creeds."
5. "Life is a flame that is always burning itself out, but it catches fire again every time a child is born."

How many did you know?

**"THE OLD PAST MASTER"**
**a series of stories by Carl H. Claudy,**
**Honorary Past Grand Master of North Dakota**

WORK TO DO

"I want some Masonic work to do!" announced the newly raised Master Mason. "I don't think I should be a member of this great fraternity and stand around idle."

"That is very praiseworthy," responded the Old Past Master. "What would you like to do?"

"Well, I don't know exactly. Maybe I could help in building a new Temple. Perhaps I could do some research work and write a book. Maybe there is room for me in some great Masonic educational work."

"You aim high," answered the Old Past Master. "Such work is not always easy to find."

"It's all I have been able to find," answered the first speaker.

"That is because your eyes are not yet opened to the light," answered the Old Past Master. "Masonic work is everywhere. It lies around loose ready to be done. You find it here in lodge, at home, on the street, everywhere."

"Oh, you mean charity. Well, I give according to my pocket-book," was the answer.

"I do mean charity, but not pocketbook charity," answered the Old Past Master. "Masonic charity neither begins nor ends with money."

"I wish you would explain what you mean. I don't understand...."

"I will very gladly explain. Do you see Brother Eggleston over there?"

"The old man with the ear-horn?"

"Exactly. He is eighty-two years of age. He is very hard of hearing. He is also extremely fond of being talked to. It's a hard job to tell him anything. You have to shout. Yet Brother Eggleston always has some one talking to him at refreshment and in the anteroom.

"Just behind him is Brother Palinski. He doesn't speak very good English. He isn't very rich. He is very shy. Yet he is a member of this lodge and a good one. Have you met his acquaintance? You need not answer. I am not inquiring what you have done, but just suggesting to you that he feels more at home and more Masonic when his brethren do not let him sit alone and unspoken to, because he is foreign, different, hard to talk to.

"Jimmy is the Tiler of this lodge. He works pretty hard, does Jimmy. You and I and a hundred other fellows take off our aprons and drop them where we sit when lodge is closed. Jimmy has to gather them up and fold them neatly in the box. Jimmy has charge of the clothing and the jewels and locks up the charter in the safe. Jimmy has to be here early and leaves late. He doesn't get paid very heavily for his work. Sometimes some brother stays and helps Jimmy do his work. Jimmy is always happy when he, too, can get out in time to hop into some one's car and get taken part way home.

"Do you run an automobile? Somewhere within half a mile of you live two or three or four old Masons who find walking hard and street cars uncomfortable. They love their lodge, but they do not always come when it rains, because it is hard on their old bones to walk or take the trolley. Sometimes some brother thinks of them and calls for them and takes them home. The brother who does this rarely thinks he has done anything except afford transportation, but you have to be an old man and have a young one pay you a little attention to know how it makes their old hearts sing. I am an old man, and I know, although I have a car and a son to call for me, yet I like attention; I like to think someone doesn't think I am on the shelf. I like your asking me questions. I like to feel that I am some use to Masonry, even now.

"You give, you inform me, according to your pocketbook. You smoke I observe, very good cigars. At Roberts avenue and Upshur street is a children's hospital. In it are many little children. Some of them belong to Master Masons. Not all of their parents can get there every day or bring a toy to while away a tedious hour every time they come. The price of two of those cigars would make a Mason's child happy for a week.

"Last month there died a Mason of this lodge, who left a wife and five children. He left plenty of insurance. His wife doesn't have to go to work. She can support herself and her children very easily. No lodge action was necessary. But what a place for Masonic work! Those children now have no Daddy. They have problems only Daddy could solve. No one can jump in and become a Daddy to them, but some Mason might try to ease that awful empty feeling, with his presence and his interest.

"Wilkins, of this lodge, works at the electrical trade. He makes things with his hands; anything, everything. But mostly he makes wireless sets; a little radio apparatus that isn't expensive but is

better than can be bought for a few dollars. He puts in most of his evenings making them. The lodge supplies the material. The little sets go to the State Home for the Blind. I wonder sometimes, if the little head pieces do not speak Masonic words to those who listen to them so gratefully.

"Do you know Filbert? Poor Filbert; it's an open secret. That's Filbert, over there with the young face and the snow-white hair. He had an accident. It took a year for his strength to come back. His mind never was quite right and isn't now. He loves to come to lodge. He isn't very bright, anymore. He is just a watchman now, who used to be a bookkeeper. Filbert has an eighteen-year-old boy, putting himself through college. He has to work at odd times and nights and Sundays. He does everything he can; waits on table, cuts grass, runs errands, paints fences, anything. You might give him a job now and then; I think it would be regarded as work on your Master's Piece by the great Architect."

"Oh, I hope it would... but what you have done for me just now, I know is work on your Master's Piece!" stammered the young Mason. "Indeed, my eyes were not open, but I... I begin to see the light!"

**The Rules of the Game**
**by Carl Sagan**
Everything morally right derives from one of four sources: 1, it concerns either full perception or intelligent development of what is true; or 2, the preservation of organized society, where every man is rendered his due and all obligations are faithfully discharged; or 3, the greatness and strength of a noble, invincible spirit; or 4, order and moderation in everything said and done, whereby is temperance and self-control. **Cicero,** De Officiis, I, 5 (45-44 B.C.)

I remember the end of a long-ago perfect day in 1939—a day that powerfully influenced my thinking, a day when my parents introduced me to the wonders of the New York World's Fair. It was late, well past my bedtime. Safely perched on my father's shoulders, holding onto his ears, my mother reassuringly at my side, I turned to see the great Trylon and Perisphere, the architectural icons of the fair, illuminated in shimmering blue pastels. We were abandoning the future, the "World of Tomorrow," for the BMT subway train. As we paused to rearrange a tray around his neck. He was selling pencils. My father reached into the crumpled brown paper bag that held the remains of our lunches, withdrew an apple, and handed it to the pencil man. I let out a loud wail. I disliked apples then and had refused this both at lunch and at dinner. But I had, nevertheless, a proprietary interest in it. It was my apple, and my father had just given it away to a funny-looking stranger — who, to compound my anguish, was now glaring unsympathetically in my direction.
Although my father was a person of nearly limitless patience and tenderness, I could see he was disappointed in me. He swept me up and hugged me tight to him.

"He's a poor stiff, out of work," he said to me, too quietly for the man to hear. "He hasn't eaten all day. We have enough. We can give him an apple."

I reconsidered, stifled my sobs, took another wishful glance at the World of Tomorrow, and gratefully fell asleep in his arms.

***Moral codes that seek to regulate human behavior have been with us not only since the dawn of civilization but also among our pre-civilized, and highly social, hunter-gatherer ancestors***. And even earlier. Different societies have different codes. Many cultures say one thing and do another. In a few fortunate societies, an inspired lawgiver lays down a set of rules to live by (and more often than not claims to have been instructed by a god — without which few would follow the prescriptions). For example, the codes of Ashoka (India), Hammurabi (Babylon), Lycurgus (Sparta) and Solon (Athens), which once held sway over mighty civilizations, are today largely defunct. Perhaps they misjudged human nature and asked too much of us. Perhaps experience from one epoch or culture is not wholly applicable to another.

Surprisingly, there are today efforts - tentative but emerging - to approach the matter scientifically, i.e., experimentally. In our everyday lives, as in the momentous affairs of nations, we must decide: **What does it mean to do the right thing?** Should we help a needy stranger? How do we deal with an enemy? Should we ever take advantage of someone who treats us kindly? If hurt by a friend, or helped by an enemy, should we reciprocate in kind; or does the totality of past behavior outweigh any recent departures from the norm.

Examples: Your sister-in-law ignores your snub and invites you over for Christmas dinner. Should you accept? Shattering a four-year-long worldwide voluntary moratorium, China resumes nuclear weapons testing; should we? How much should we give to charity? Serbian soldiers systematically rape Bosnian women; should Bosnian soldiers systematically rape Serbian women? After centuries of oppression, the National Party leader F. W. de Klerk makes overtures to the African National Congress; should Nelson Mandela and the ANC have reciprocated? A coworker makes you look bad in front of the boss; should you try to get even? Should we cheat on our income tax returns? If we can get away with it? If an oil company supports a symphony orchestra or sponsors a refined TV drama, ought we to ignore its pollution of the environment? Should you cheat at cards? On a larger scale: Should we kill killers?

In making such decisions, **we are concerned not only with doing right but also with what works-what makes us and the rest of society happier and more secure.** There is a tension between what we call ethical and what we call pragmatic. If, even in the long run, ethical behavior was self-defeating, eventually we would not call it ethical, but foolish. (We might even claim to respect it but ignore it in practice.) Bearing in mind the variety and complexity of human behavior, are there any simple rules—whether we call them ethical or pragmatic—that actually work?

**How do we decide what to do?** Our responses are partly determined by our perceived self-interest. We reciprocate in kind or act contrary because we hope it will accomplish what we want. Nations assemble or blow up nuclear weapons so other countries won't trifle with them. We return good for evil because we know that we can thereby sometimes touch people's sense of justice or shame them into being nice. But sometimes we're not motivated selfishly. Some people

seem just naturally kind. We may accept aggravation from aged parents or from children, because we love them and want them to be happy, even if it is at some cost to us. Sometimes we are tough with our children and cause them a little unhappiness because we want to mold their characters and believe that the long-term results will bring them more happiness than the short-term pain.

Cases are different. Peoples and nations are different. **Knowing how to negotiate this labyrinth is part of wisdom.** But bearing in mind the variety and complexity of human behavior, are there some simple rules, whether we call them ethical or pragmatic, that actually work? Or maybe we should avoid trying to think it through and just do what feels right. But even then, how do we determine what "feels right"?

The most admired standard of behavior, in the West, at least, is the **Golden Rule**, attributed to Jesus of Nazareth. Everyone knows its formulation in the first-century Gospel of St. Matthew: Do unto others as you would have them do unto you. Almost no one follows it. When the Chinese philosopher Kung-Tzu (known as Confucius in the West) was asked in the fifth century B.C. his opinion of the Golden Rule, of repaying evil with kindness, he replied, "Then with what will you repay kindness?" Shall the poor woman who envies her neighbor's wealth give what little she has to the rich? Shall the masochist inflict pain on his neighbor? The Golden Rule takes no account of human differences. Are we really capable, after our cheek has been slapped, of turning the other cheek so it can be slapped? With a heartless adversary, isn't this just a guarantee of more suffering?

The **Silver Rule** is different: Do not do unto others what you would not have them do unto you. It also can be found worldwide, including, a generation before Jesus, in the writings of Rabbi Hillel. The most inspiring twentieth-century exemplars of the Silver Rule are Mohandas Gandhi and Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. They counseled oppressed peoples not to repay violence with violence, but not to be compliant and obedient either. Nonviolent civil disobedience was what they advocated—putting your body on the line and showing, by your willingness to be punished in defying an unjust law, the justice of your cause. They aimed at melting the hearts of their oppressors (and those who had not yet made up their minds).

King paid tribute to Gandhi as the first person in history to convert the Gold or Silver Rules into an effective instrument of social change. And Gandhi made it clear where his approach came from: "I learnt the lesson on nonviolence from my wife, when I tried to bend her to my will. Her determined resistance to my will on the one hand, and her quiet submission to the suffering of my stupidity involved on the other, ultimately made me ashamed of myself and cured me of my stupidity in thinking that I was born to rule over her."

Nonviolent civil disobedience has worked notable political change in this century—in prying India loose from British rule and stimulating the end of classic colonialism worldwide, and in providing some civil rights for African-Americans—although the threat of violence by others, however disavowed by Gandhi and King, may have also helped. The African National Congress (ANC) grew up in the Gandhian tradition. But by the 1950's it was clear that nonviolent

noncooperation was making no progress whatever with the ruling white Nationalist Party. So, in 1961 Nelson Mandela and his colleagues formed the military wing of the ANC, the Umkhonto we Sizwe, the Spear of the Nation, on the quite un-Gandhian grounds that the only thing whites understand is force. Even Gandhi had trouble reconciling the rule of nonviolence with the necessities of defense against those with less lofty rules of conduct. "I have not the qualifications for teaching the philosophy of life. I have barely qualifications for practicing the philosophy I believe. I am but a poor struggling soul yearning to be . . . wholly truthful and wholly nonviolent in thought, word and deed, but ever failing to reach the ideal.

"Repay kindness with kindness," said Confucius, "but evil with justice." This might be called the **Brass or Brazen Rule**: Do unto others as they do unto you. It is the Lex talionis, "an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth," plus "one good turn deserves another." In actual human (and chimpanzee) behavior it's a familiar standard. "If the enemy inclines toward peace, do you also incline toward peace," President Bill Clinton quoted from the Qur'an at the Israeli-Palestinian peace accords. Without having to appeal to anyone's better nature, we institute a kind of operant conditioning, rewarding them when they are nice to us and punishing them when they are not. We are not pushovers, but we're not unforgiving either. It sounds promising. Or is it true that "two wrongs don't make a right?

Of baser coinage is the **Iron Rule**: Do unto others as you like before they do it unto you. It is sometimes formulated as, "He who has the gold makes the rules," underscoring not just its departure from, but also its contempt for the Golden Rule. This is the secret maxim of many, if they can get away with it, and often the unspoken precept of the powerful.

Finally, I should mention two other rules, found throughout the living world. They explain a great deal: Suck up to those above you, and abuse those below. This is the motto of bullies and the norm in many nonhuman primate societies. It's really the Golden Rule for superiors, the Iron Rule for inferiors. Since there is no known alloy of gold and iron, we will call it the **Tin Rule** for its flexibility. The other common rule is: Give precedence in all things to close relatives and do as you like to others. This **Nepotism Rule** is known to evolutionary biologists as "kin selection."

Despite its apparent practicality, there is a fatal flaw in the Brazen Rule: unending vendetta. It hardly matters who starts the violence. Violence begets violence, and each side has reason to hate the other. "There is no way to peace," A. J. Muste said, "Peace is the way." But peace is hard, and violence is easy. Even if almost everyone is for ending the vendetta, a single act of retribution can stir it up again: A dead relative's sobbing widow and grieving children are before us. Old men and women recall atrocities from their childhoods. The reasonable part of us tries to keep the peace, but the passionate part of us cries out for vengeance. Extremists in the two warring factions can count on one another. They are allied against the rest of us, contemptuous of appeals to understanding and loving-kindness. A few hotheads can force-march a legion of more prudent and rational people to brutality and war.

Many in the West have been so mesmerized by the appalling accords with Adolf Hitler in Munich in 1938 that they are unable to distinguish cooperation and appeasement. Rather than

having to judge each gesture and approach on its own merits, we merely decide that the opponent is thoroughly evil, that all his concessions are offered in bad faith, and that force is the only thing he understands. Perhaps for Hitler this was the right judgement. But in general, it is not the right judgment, as much as I wish that the invasion of the Rhineland had been forcibly opposed. It consolidates hostility on both sides and makes conflict much more likely. In a world with nuclear weapons, uncompromising hostility carries special and very dire dangers.

Breaking out of a long series of reprisals is, I claim, very hard. There are ethnic groups who have weakened themselves to the point of extinction because they had no machinery to escape from this cycle, the Kaingang of the Brazilian highlands, for example. The warring nationalities in the former Yugoslavia, in Rwanda, and elsewhere may provide further examples. The Brazen Rule seems too unforgiving. The Iron Rule promotes the advantage of a ruthless and powerful few against the interests of everybody else. The Golden and Silver Rules seem too complacent. They systematically fail to punish cruelty and exploitation. They hope to coax people from evil to good by showing that kindness is possible. But there are sociopaths who do not much care about the feelings of others, and it is hard to imagine a Hitler or Stalin being shamed into redemption by good example. Is there a rule between the Golden and Silver on the one hand and the Brazen, Iron and Tin on the other which works better than any of them alone?

With so many different rules, how can you tell which to use, which will work? More than one rule may be operating even in the same person or nation. Are we doomed just to guess about this, or to rely on intuition, or just to parrot what we've been taught? Let us try to put aside, just for the moment, whatever rules we've been taught, and those we feel passionately—perhaps from a deeply rooted sense of justice—must be right. Suppose we seek not to confirm or deny what we have been taught but to find out what really works. **Is there a way to test competing codes of ethics**? Granting that the real world may be much more complicated than any simulation, can we explore the matter scientifically?

We're used to playing games in which somebody wins, and somebody loses. Every point made by our opponent puts us that much farther behind. "Win-lose" games seem natural, and many people are hard pressed to think of a game that isn't win-lose. In win-lose games, the losses just balance the wins. That's why they are also called "zero-sum" games. There is no ambiguity about your opponent's intentions: Within the rules of the game, he will do anything he can to defeat you.

Many children are aghast the first time they really come face to face with the "lose" side of win-lose games. On the verge of bankruptcy in Monopoly, for example, they plead for special dispensation (forgoing rents, for example), and when this is not forthcoming may, in tears, denounce the game as heartless and unfeeling-which, of course, it is. (I've seen the board overturned, hotels and "Chance" cards and metal icons spilled onto the floor in spitting anger and humiliation—and not only by children.) Within the rules of Monopoly, there's no way for players to cooperate so that all benefit. That's not how the game is designed. The same is true for boxing, football, hockey, basketball, baseball, lacrosse, tennis, racquetball, chess, all Olympic events, yacht and car racing, pinochle, potsie, and partisan politics. In none of these games is there an

opportunity to practice the Golden or Silver Rule, or even the Brazen. There is room only for the Rule of Iron and Tin. **If we revere the Golden Rule, why is it so rare in the games we teach our children?**

After a million years of intermittently warring tribes we readily enough think in zero-sum mode and treat every interaction as a contest or conflict. Nuclear war, though (and many conventional wars), economic depression and assaults on the global environment are all "lose-lose" propositions. Such vital human concerns as love, friendship, parenthood, music, art, and the pursuit of knowledge are "win-win" propositions. **Our vision is dangerously narrow if all we know is "win-lose."**

The scientific field that deals with such matters is called game theory, used in military tactics and strategy, trade policy, corporate competition, limiting environmental pollution, and plans for nuclear war. The paradigmatic game is the **Prisoner's Dilemma**. It is very much non-zero-sum. Win-win, win-lose and lose-lose outcomes all are possible. "Sacred" books carry few useful insights into strategy here. It is a wholly pragmatic game.

Imagine that you and a friend are arrested for committing a serious crime. For the purpose of the game, it doesn't matter whether either, neither, or both of you did it. What matters is that the police say they think you did. Before the two of you have any chance to compare stories or plan strategy, you are taken to separate interrogation cells. There, oblivious of your Miranda rights ("You have the right to remain silent..."), they try to make you confess. They tell you, as police sometimes do, that your friend has confessed and implicated you. (Some friend!) The police might be telling the truth. Or they might be lying. You are permitted only to plead innocent or guilty. If you're willing to say anything, what's your best tack to minimize punishment? Here are the possible outcomes:

If you deny committing the crime and (unknown to you) your friend also denies it, the case might be hard to prove. In the plea bargain, both your sentences will be very light. If you confess, and your friend does likewise, then the effort the State had to expend to solve the crime was small. In exchange you both may be given a fairly light sentence, although not so light as if you both had asserted your innocence.

But if you plead innocent, and your friend confesses, the State will ask for the maximum sentence for you and minimal punishment (maybe none) for your friend. Uh-oh. You are very vulnerable to a kind of double cross, what game theorists call "defection." So's he. So, if you and your friend "cooperate" with one another—both pleading innocent (or both pleading guilty)—you both escape the worst. Should you play it safe and guarantee no worse than a middle range of punishment by confessing? Then, if your friend pleads innocent while you plead guilty, well, too bad for him, and you might get off scot- free. When you think it through, you realize that, whatever your friend does you're better off defecting than cooperating. Maddeningly, the same holds true for your friend. But if you both defect, you are both worse off than if you had both cooperated. This is the Prisoner's Dilemma.

Now consider a repeated Prisoner's Dilemma, in which the two players go through a sequence of such games. At the end of each they figure out from their punishment how the other must have pled. They gain experience about each other's strategy (and character). Will they learn to cooperate game after game, both always denying that they committed any crime? Even if the reward for finking on the other is large?

You might try cooperating or defecting, depending on how the previous game or games have gone. If you cooperate overmuch, the other player may exploit your good nature. If you defect overmuch, your friend is likely to defect often, and this is bad for both of you. You know your defection pattern is data being fed to the other player. What is the right mix of cooperation and defection? How to behave then becomes, like any other question in Nature, a subject to be investigated experimentally. This matter has been explored in a continuing round-robin computer tournament by the University of Michigan sociologist Robert Axelrod, in his remarkable book The Evolution of Cooperation. Various codes of behavior confront one another, and at the end we see who wins (who gets the lightest cumulative prison term). The simplest strategies might be to cooperate all the time, no matter how much advantage is taken of you; or never to cooperate, no matter what benefits might accrue from cooperation. These are the Golden Rule and the Iron Rule. They always lose, the one from a superfluity of kindness, the other from an overabundance of ruthlessness.

Strategies slow to punish defection lose—in part because they send a signal that noncooperation can win. The Golden Rule is not only an unsuccessful strategy; it is also dangerous for other players, who may succeed in the short term only to be mowed down by exploiters in the long term.

Should you defect at first, but if your opponent cooperates even once, cooperate in all future games? Should you cooperate at first, but if your opponent defects even once, defect in all future games? These strategies also lose. Unlike sports, you cannot rely on your opponent to be always out to get you.

**The most effective strategy in many such tournaments is called "Tit-for-Tat.**" It's very simple: You start out cooperating, and in each subsequent round simply do what your opponent did the last time. You punish defections, but once the other player cooperates, you're willing to let bygones be bygones. At first it seems to garner only mediocre success. But as time goes on, the other strategies defeat themselves, from too much kindness or too much cruelty-and this middle way pulls ahead. Except for always being nice on the first move, Tit-for-Tat is identical to the Brazen Rule. It promptly (in the very next game) rewards cooperation and punishes defection and has the great virtue that it makes your strategy absolutely clear to your opponent. (Strategic ambiguity can be lethal.)

TABLE OF PROPOSED RULES TO LIVE BY

The Golden Rule Do unto others as you would have them do unto you.
The Silver Rule Do not do unto others what you would not have them do unto you.
The Brazen Rule Do unto others as they do unto you.
The Iron Rule Do unto others as you like, before they do it unto you.
The Tit-for-Tat Rule Cooperate with others first, then do unto them as they do unto you.

When there get to be several players employing Tit-for-Tat, they rise in the standings together. To succeed, Tit-for-Tat strategists must find others who are willing to reciprocate, with whom they can cooperate. After the first tournament in which the Brazen Rule unexpectedly won, some experts thought the strategy too forgiving. In the next tournament, they tried to exploit it by defecting more often. They always lost. Even experienced strategists tended to underestimate the power of forgiveness and reconciliation. Tit-for-Tat involves an interesting mix of proclivities: initial friendliness, willingness to forgive, and fearless retaliation. The superiority of the Tit-for-Tat Rule in such tournaments was recounted by Axelrod.

Something like it can be found throughout the animal kingdom and has been well-studied in our closest relatives, the chimps. Described and named "**reciprocal altruism"** by the biologist Robert Trivers, animals may do favors for others in expectation of having the favors returned—not every time, but often enough to be useful. This is hardly an invariable moral strategy but is not uncommon either. So, there is no need to debate the antiquity of the Golden, Silver, and Brazen Rules, or Tit-for-Tat, and the priority of the moral prescriptives in the Book of Leviticus. Ethical rules of this sort were not originally invented by some enlightened human lawgiver. They go deep into our evolutionary past. They were with our ancestral line from a time before we were human.

The Prisoner's Dilemma is a very simple game. Real life is considerably more complex. If he gives our apple to the pencil man, is my father more likely to get an apple back? Not from the pencil man, we will never see him again. But might widespread acts of charity improve the economy and give my father a raise? Or do we give the apple for emotional, not economic rewards? Also, unlike the players in an ideal Prisoner's Dilemma game, human beings and nations come to their interactions with predispositions, both hereditary and cultural.

But the central lessons in a not very prolonged round-robin of Prisoner's Dilemma are about **strategic clarity;** about the self-defeating nature of envy; about the importance of long-term over short-term goals; about the dangers of both tyranny and patsydom; and especially about approaching the whole issue of rules to live by as an experimental question. Game theory also suggests that a broad knowledge of history is a key survival tool.

Do you have a personal code of conduct? Do you play by the rules? What game are you playing? Are you playing to win - win?

**Who said it:**
(Answers at the END)
How many did you know?

1. Winston Churchill
2. Benjamin Franklin
3. George Washington
4. Ralph Waldo Emerson
5. George Bernard Shaw

**CALL for TRESTLEBOARD and WEBSITE ADVERTISERS!**
2020
We are looking for additional Trestleboard and Website advertisers! Advertising with Phoenicia 58 promotes your products and services to its members and anyone who visits its website.

Ad space is now available on the Trestleboard. You may purchase a business card size for $25 for one year and renew in January.

Please support our Brothers and Friends of the Lodge who advertise in our Trestleboard.