

# Foolhardy - #7

---

Just \$1 An Issue!

Foolhardy - A zine dedicated to the open discussion of any topic relating to the Diplomacy hobby. Published six times a year by **Douglas Kent, 54 West Cherry St. #211, Rahway, NJ 07065**. Also available on CompuServe [73567,1414]. Subscriptions are \$1 an issue in the US and Canada, or \$2 an issue overseas. Trades are not always accepted, but if you're interested ask away - if I don't already get your zine I'll consider it.

Letters in this issue: Eric Brosius, Jeff McKee, John Caruso, Randy Cox, Stven Carlberg, Cal White, Peter Sullivan, Gary Behnen, Paul Kenny, Pete Gaughan, W. Andrew York, Alan Levin, Andy Bate, Per Westling, Jim Burgess, Mark Nelson, Michael Lowrey. *Next Foolhardy deadline: July 18, 1993.*

## The Concept:

(JEFF MCKEE) Not counting one warehouse zine I still get (even tho' I'm dead) Foolhardy is the only zine I get nowadays. I figure I'll depend on it to keep up-to-date on postal Dip until I discover that elusive reservoir of idle time I've been missing.

(RANDY COX) I wonder how liberally I may interpret "relating to the Diplomacy hobby?" To me, any game relates to the Diplomacy hobby, as the GAMING hobby and the Diplomacy hobby are one and the same.

I like most of the letters but quite a few seem to contain a lot of "inside" references. Those of us new to the hobby (who you say are sorely needed) don't get all the in jokes. As editor, help us out.

*{Anything in particular you need further details on?}*

## The Name:

(JOHN CARUSO) Brain cells? Hmm - guess they are dying off on me. At least I have brain cells to die off. Not like Jacques!

(PAUL KENNY) I liked the name on issue one, if you really wanted to know...

## Census:

(ERIC BROSIOUS) Last year's Runestone Poll turnout confirms the Census's indication that the Canadian Hobby is in decline. Votes from Canadians were way, way down (don't have the actual data with me, but I had to drop the "favorite zines of Canadians" feature from RotC.)

(JOHN CARUSO) Looks very good. Too bad some pubbers saw fit to not send their address lists. Their pettiness detracts from the completeness of the listing. Still, its a pretty worthy effort and worth having.

*{I'm not sure "pettiness" has anything to do with why a few lists weren't received. After all, Garret Schenck and I have been at odds for some time now, yet **he** sent his subscriber list in. Where does "pettiness" come into play here?}*

(RANDY COX) I found the census invaluable (for the mailing list of Cogniscenti #1) and the cross-matrix interesting. I was not surprised, as

many seemed to be, that so many people subscribe to only one or two zines. All this means is that the majority of the hobby is either being run by a vocal minority or simply doesn't give a damn. I suppose it's the latter. Most subscribers seem to value playing games (or reading about them) over petty politicking and maneuvering to run a pseudo-organization. Larry Peery's statement that this indicates a fragile infrastructure because so few "have a real overview of what is going on" seems presumptuous to me. The majority dictates what is going on, even a silent majority. To presume that not knowing what is going on in the heads of a few self-proclaimed leaders leaves one out in the cold is to think much of oneself.

I was also puzzled by Fred Davis' statement that he thought publishers were "supposed" to send the BNC and Archivist copies of their zines. First, what's a BNC? Please remember a primary rule of journalism. Expand all abbreviations upon first use. There are people out there who don't know what they stand for. And secondly, who could presume to dictate that all publishers send free copies to certain officers?

*{In case you don't know, BNC stands for the Boardman Number Custodian. The BNC issues "Boardman Numbers" (in effect registration numbers) to each PBM game that he or she knows about. The BNC also collects and reprints the end-game reports for each game. This lets us keep a handle on how many games are started each year, and to conduct statistical work on the game (like figuring out how often Italy wins solo and stuff like that). Such stats are also used to compare the players in the US with other lands - for example exposing that while E/F is popular in North America, E/G is much more popular in England. Some people also use the BNC data to compile player ratings.}*

(PER WESTLING) Interesting to compare a relatively young hobby like the Swedish with eg the North American. A couple of things are the same (eg the Poll with big P) while others differ (no Swedish census). Some of the concepts that are common have been imported while others have been in-vented independently. Sounds like this could be an interesting socio anthropological topic in a future article...

As for the cross-reference, Larry writes in #6 that he think it is highly unlikely that "five people from the same are and hobby block" would be able to see copies of a zine in second/third/... hand. I would come to a different conclusion; A similar situation exists in UK where people at the York hobby meet get to see copies of zeens they don't sub to. And the same would apply to other parts of the world a well that have

meetings/cons.

(MARK NELSON) Thanx for the copy of the PDO Census. I won't say that it was interesting reading, but them numbers sure be good.

There were two things which you may like to consider for inclusion in future surveys. I'd like to see some analysis of the overlap between differency surveys. This would help people decide how "stable" the hobby population is and how long people remain in the hobby. I would also like to see, no surprise, some comments on the overseas presence on mailing lists. How many non North-Americans are there in the NAM hobby, is this number declining or increasing, which zines do they see? Not important, but an interesting extra.

Fred mentions the need to send the official archivist a copy of your publication: There is no official archivist. Even if there was an official archivist editors would be unlikely to send him a copy of their zine gratis for archiving purposes; they would expect to get something in return! Andy Bate is the "UK archivist" but I only send him some of my publications because I "trade" with his "zine", not because he is the archivist! I feel under no obligation to mail him everything I produce and if I cut trades with him I would not bother sending him my zines. The notion of an official archivist is a diplomacy folkmyth.

I'm not surprised by the number of dipsters who see only one or two zines, previous surveys (in the UK Hobby) show that something like 75% of the people playing postal diplomacy and/or variants are only playing in one or two games. It seems likely that they are only playing in one or two zines.

#### Computers:

(RANDY COX) I agree that E-mail lends itself to the turbofreak (note the "f", I don't understand this fetish with adding letters in the Dip world -- like the h in god) mentality. If I want to play a game quickly and intensively, I'll host my buddies for a weekend. Plus, I simply don't have the time to sit in front of a computer screen scanning through E-mail, forums, and games all night long.

(ANDY BATE) It certainly seems as though you need to be committed to play an e-mail game - 90 letters in the first four years. Jeez. I can only presume that Crazie Markie logs on just to deal with e-mail stuff and not to do any work.

(PER WESTLING) To John C: Why quotes around the word illegal? It \*is\* illegal, end of discussion.

You don't have to have a UNIX machine to moderate games with the help of Judge. Access to e-mail should be enough. The reason for this is that it's possible to set up private games. I actually run all my regular Diplomacy games on one of the US Judges. It would even be possible to generate automatic (postscript) maps, somethin I haven't used which could be noticed by the many map errors. Use of Judge for private games requires agreement with the person that runs the Judge, though.

If I would nominate anyone for an Award, especially the Don Miller one, this would without any doubt be Ken Lowe at Washington University, USA, for his work on the Judge. This might be one of the best things for the game since Calhammer invented it 40 years ago! Maybe he can be nominated for 94?

#### Custodians:

(ANDY BATE) Peter's eight-point plan was interesting. The second point about feuds suggests that there is something you can do if someone takes umbrage with something you've done and starts printing vitriolic attacks. Well sure, you can just ignore it. However if it continues then you need a pretty thick skin, otherwise it's going to get to you. Perhaps point two should just say that you need that thick skin?

On money, I fail to see why editors should subsidize the cost of their zines. Period. There are usually incidental costs incurred in running a zine, postage or phone calls to let players know of mis-adjudications, sending out free samples, etc. How many editors figure these costs when working out how much they subsidize the cost of producing the zine? Well, if you use a computer or electric typewriter, you have a higher electricity bill for your troubles too. Thus, the cost of a zine should accurately reflect how much is spent on copying and mailing it. If we keep talking about editors having to subsidize their zine, how many people are we deterring from having a go themselves?

It is indeed sensible advice to have a separate account for your subscribers' money, but how many editors actually do so? As to keeping files in order, I thought all editors had to be slob, with piles of paper over every available square inch of floor space? Another possible "rule" is that, if you publish lots of chat/letters, then it might be an idea to learn touch type, since this can save you a lot of time.

Hmm, I wonder who Peter's "maybe even next week" comment was aimed at?

Game-end statements for Diplomacy variants - I too would like to see players approaching the task of writing one by thinking of themselves as critics (this needn't stop them writing the usual stuff as well, since thoughts about the variant will be tempered by correspondence during the course of the game). However, getting them to write anything at all is difficult enough... Personally, I think players should be encouraged to write game-end statements as the game progresses.

Why do people worry about players living too close together? If two people have access to e-mail then it doesn't matter how far apart they live, does it? Even fax machines allow players to communicate quickly and cheaply. Besides which, if players do live near each other than they can find things going against them, because the other players are suspicious.

Miller Number Custodians collect all of the details from games of Diplomacy variants, which facilitates statistical studies to be carried out on each variant. Since we MNC's spend far too much time on the Hobby, we leave the studies to those with more time on their hands. Like the Nelsons. Since it isn't worth looking at the stats for a particular variant unless several games have been played, the more games which are covered by the service the better. I've just started to chase up e-mail games, so I'm not quite sure what Per is worried about; admittedly whilst I don't have e-mail access it's not so easy to get hold of the game details, but I am making contacts.

(MARK NELSON) You're right, most endgame statements are not inspirational when it comes to discussing variant playability. Probable because most players are either not interested in writing that kind of material or just can't be bothered to do so. I have started to keep an "Endgames Bank" which consists of those endgame statements which do cast light on variant playability. Interestingly almost all Mercator games contain a few detailed statements on tactics/playability.

Per asks if MNs have ever been used for anything? The answer is

yes. James and myself have written articles about certain variants which have included data (results, endgame statements) from games run postally. That information was primarily accessed via first running through the MN records to see if, and then where, a variant had been run and then combing through the appropriate back issues. Without a list of variants that have been run this would be practically impossible.

MNs are a lot less important than BNs but they still serve a useful purpose.

Electronic variant games make up only a percentage of the total run, and if you discount the gunboat games then there have not been so that many games. The growing number of variants being run electronically is not an argument against the allocation of MNs, it's an argument for someone to keep track of those variants run to completion electronically. I have such a list for internet games awarded Electronic Protocol status.

#### DipCon:

(JOHN CARUSO) 1994 should see West and South as the eligible areas. 1995 - the South and Northeast. Votes for non-eligible areas carry only a 50% value.

(PETER SULLIVAN) James Nelson says that letting each site select the next World DipCon is "totally inappropriate." Yet the reasons he lists - most of the attendees won't go anyway, will have little knowledge of the proposed sites, and the bidders will find it difficult to bid - apply just as well to the US DipCon system as well! The problem with having a postal vote amongst those who pay a "World DipCon" membership fee is that different hobbies would react in different ways. Most Americans would ignore it, whilst the French would make sure all their members were signed up and voted (getting the French government to pay the fees for them).

I'm not sure why John Caruso is complaining that everyone seems to have adopted his idea of annual World DipCons and a formal charter - surely he should be welcoming the repentant sinners back into the fold! Have you seen the draft Charter yet? I know FlapJack was sent one, but I'm not sure if you were on the mailing list or not. If you need some spacefiller, you could always publish it in Foolhardy.

*{Obviously, those problems James listed apply much better to World DipCon than they do to DipCon. There are a number of people who attend DipCon every year, but I imagine the number that will attend World DipCon every time is far less, both in number and as a percentage.*

*As for the Charter, we ran it in Maniac's Paradise, and I will be putting it at the end of this zine. This seems as natural a place to discuss it as any other zine!}*

(PETE GAUGHAN) I hope you've seen the World DipCon stuff thrown out by Iain Bowen and Shawn Derrick. Funny how Shawn has suddenly come around to a three-zone rotation. He really is an advocate on behalf of Europe - a good thing, since the continentals haven't seen fit to comment on WDC in British or N.A. zines. A few words have turned up in European zines (notably L4E), but if this is to be World DipCon then maybe they should consider expanding their *worldwide* contacts.

I think it can only be a Good Thing, though, to have (in John Caruso's words!) "yearly World DipCons and a Charter." I'd support any of the current rotation ideas.

Let me put my DipCon Chair hat on: Zones I and IV - East and South

- are the zones eligible for 1994's DipCon XXVII. As David explained, this means votes for bids from the Midwest or West count as half-votes. Today (4/8) I received the first official word on any bid - DixieCon.

(ANDY BATE) I was going to give you the benefit of my thoughts on how the site for WDC should be selected, but since you lot can't work out how you determine where DipCon can be held, perhaps I'd be wasting my time? (grin) Anyway, I would have thought that the simplest way (this usually equates to the best) would be for whoever is interested (seemingly sundry hobby bigwigs) to determine the rotation between countries, and then for the host country to determine where it will actually be held by whatever means they choose to use. The only problem comes with a zone which consists of more than one country, but I'm sure something can be worked out there.

The alternative is the following scenario. If I have a vote for where WDC is to be held in the states, then I'll choose as close to Camden Fields, Baltimore and/or the Hall of Fame in Canton, Ohio, since I want to visit both those places, so I might as well try to ensure that it is easy if I can make it to WDC. So, providing that the host convention wouldn't be a complete disaster, I wouldn't really care what the other bids looked like. Is this how we want things to be decided?

(PER WESTLING) If a WDC meeting 1994 were to decide to give a convention hosting rights for 1995, it is up to the group getting the hostings rights to arrange a suitable location. Compare this with WorldCon where the con is decided several years in advance, although in this case it is not feasible to move locations. WorldCon *\*is\** the con, not a subpart of a bigger con.

(JIM BURGESS) I hope someone is trying to resolve the question of what regions are eligible to host the North American Dipcon in 1994. It seems also to be appropriate to decide what "we" in North America are going to do about selecting a site for the next World Dipcon we get. Let's look at each of these in turn:

I would be surprised if David Hood is right on the Southern and Western regions being the ones in play for 1994. As John Caruso says, the whole point is to avoid domination by any one region. It does seem to me we standardized the rotation so the rotation does not depend on the location of the previous year's site, though, so perhaps David and Don Del Grande is right. But it's time to be preparing bids for 1994. I'd like to ask Doug Kent to be sure that this is resolved definitively in this issue? Thank you!

*{Yeah, right. David and John say West & South, while Pete says East and South. Me? I don't know **who** to believe anymore, but since Pete had his Dipcon Chair hat on when he said it, I'm trusting him for now.}*

I am not going to be able to make this year's Dipcon, but I am going to make a strong effort to make it to England for World Dipcon in 1994. I think that it is not too early for those of us who are thinking about going to World Dipcon to consider how we will make a bid to bring the next World Dipcon here and then how the site would be selected here. The most obvious thing to do is to make that year's North American Dipcon also World Dipcon. I would support that idea. We (and I am as guilty of contributing to this as anyone) are not doing such a great job of promoting our own Dipcon, why would we be able to successfully promote two Dipcons in a year? I don't think John Caruso's comments, accusing the Brits of trying to take over the administration of World Dipcon, are especially helpful. I wouldn't be surprised if the Nelson brothers are

slamming him in this issue. I understand that there is a history to this (I was around), but it seems time to try to build on the concept of World Dipcon now! The reason is the international E-Mail hobby. I talk to Mark Nelson now than any of you except Yawn, and I only talk to him because of the Caruso baseball league which is a bit irrelevant to Dip. E-Mail has me talking to Hal Dace, Mark Nelson, Per Westling, and others more easily than I can mail a letter. This international contact creates a hankering to attend World Dipcon. Mark and I are just beginning to think about a major effort to promote World Dipcon on the E-Mail networks and I've been helping Pete to promote this year's North American Dipcon. Their hobby is now larger than ours, and while it may be a bit less committed around the edges, the central people in the E-Mail hobby spend a LOT more time on it than we do! I'd like Pete and Don Del Grande to figure out how the Dipcon organizers can communicate interactively with prospective attendees. Come on, guys, you have at least a thousand people in the US to try to attract! So, to finish, I think the Brits at THEIR World Dipcon should choose the country and then hand it over to Dippers in that country to locate where it is most convenient for them -- for us, that will be the location of North American Dipcon. When WE consider the joint Dipcon, we should consider things like international airports as Per suggests.

(MARK NELSON) John Caruso writes "So instead of yearly World DipCon's and a charter...". Obviously he isn't aware that WDC's will be yearly from 1994 and that, for the last 18 months or so, there has been a discussion about the setting up of a WDC Charter. The arguments that John advances against WDC being decided two years in advance are fairly weak and easily covered by a Charter. How does John think the SF WorldCon manages to avoid the problems that he advances? Something to remember is that WDC only selects from the sites that bid to hold WDC. Is a site that has bid for, and won the right to run, WDC going to change it's details?

#### Lack of New Zines:

(RANDY COX) See Cogniscienti #1.

(PAUL KENNY) About what was said on new zines getting plugs and the word spreading that they exist. From my own experience, I felt that Absolute!, which I would consider a new zine (vs. one that numbers in triple digits) was relatively ignored when it was new. Then, around issue 5 or 6, it started to get mentioned as a new zine almost worthy enough to play. Presently, I feel Absolute! is getting its share of praise and criticisms that a current zine should. But an interesting thing has happened. I was able to set up games of Diplomacy with relatively new players of Diplomacy. I was able to have games where I have met each one of the players face to face. The games that I run have mostly new people who are new to the hobby. Can you explain what the game would have been like with Mark Frueh or James Yerkey or Bob Hartwig? But instead, Absolute! was a place where new players could move to Clyde in Spring 1901 and live to talk about it. Each move doesn't have to be clockwork or it gets crushed like a bug.

It's good that there are those who want to help new zines. Best way is to help spread the word that it exists. Volunteering to be a standby is nice, but channeling new players is better. Also, one thing I've resented is both the subtle pressure that a zine must be thick with chat - a good way to become late, and a professional looking publication. This is an

Amateur hobby! And I wouldn't make anyone join a game that their heart wasn't 100% into. The motivation behind joining a game should be cause you want to.

(ALAN LEVIN) I wonder if there really is such a lack. I don't know the exact figure but let us assume that our hobby consists of 800 hobbyists and 50 zines. That would be one zine for every 16 hobbyists. Is that really too few zines? If it is true that the typical hobbyists subscribes to fewer than 5 zines that a hobby with 50 zines already offers a tremendously large variety. This is not to say, of course, that there is no need for new zines to enter the market from time to time. But unless the number of hobbyists expands greatly there is no need to worry as long as the number of zines doesn't drop too drastically.

(ANDY BATE) Why doesn't someone draw up a booklet which gives practical advice to anyone considering starting a zine? This would save people having the same discussions several times over with potential editors. If they were sensible they'd still seek advice, but at least some of the general groundwork would have been covered. Items for inclusion would include a lot of the points Peter made about avoiding a messy fold, along with details of the different methods of production. Of course, it should start with the standard opening shot:

"So you want to start a zine? Go away and lie down; you'll feel better in the morning. You still want to start? Boy, do you need a holiday!"

By the way, if you're sending a potential editor a collection of the worst zines ever, then don't forget to include a copy of mine. Yes, you too can run lots of games and chat (and receive letters) about lots of topics. Slowly. I've always said that potential editors should sub to my zine to see how not to do it.

*{For new pubbers, there's always Once Upon a Deadline, although last report I heard was that Mark Berch wasn't filling orders for it. Since that spends a lot of time talking about ancient and outdated production methods, and it doesn't mention the modern world of fax machines and email, someone probably **should** do a new one, or at least an updated version.}*

(JIM BURGESS) And now Hal Dace is kinda missing for the last few months, unless he forgot that we're trading. Hal was asking for lots of comments and maybe we gave him too many. I thought his szine was a nice little novice oriented effort that was completely appropriate for the fledgling South African hobby.

The deeper problem is that no one is doing much writing in the hobby these days. If you start a szine, no one writes to you and you get discouraged. Adrian Appleyard is right on when he says that editors (who know what it's about) need to write articles for fledgling szines. Doug's comment about plugging them is fine, but subbing and trading is not especially helpful. I've carefully nurtured my letter writers for years so that I have a rotating group of about 30-40 people who write me letters.

But I might not hear from Conrad von Metzke or Simon Billenness for six months or a year (Simon says he's sending me a letter any month now... for the last four months) and so it takes a large base to keep a letter column going. This letter column in Foolhardy is distinctive by its uniqueness. It takes a lot of effort and patience to build a szine! Ten years ago, I wrote a letter to every szine I received EVERY ISSUE (and I was getting more issues then). If I was playing games in a szine, that might be all I would do, but the concept of being a nonparticipating reader

was unthinkable, at least to me. That isn't the way things are any more, for me or anyone else. I feel sorry for anyone trying to get something started. You would admit, Doug, I'm sure, that your explosion on the scene is a result of the downsizing of efforts by the Carusos, Swider, and others of the East Coast Mob, so that Jack could lead the crew over to you. Garret Schenck was doing the same thing a bit earlier, but ultimately your style was more congenial to the group. Now, don't get me wrong, you've developed your own group of subbers, but having a base of Carusos, Swiders, McHughs, Mainardis, Milewskis, Johnsons, and Wilsons and others helped you get started.

*{True, although the East Coast Clique people didn't help start MP, they were a major force in the second 25 issues.*

*As for Hal Dace, he tells me that the next SAPC will out shortly - as soon as he has the money for postage.}*

(MARK NELSON) I think it is a little unfair of Hal to complain that the diplomacy jargon can be offputting to neos and then cite The Mouth of Sauron as an example since when I sent Hal a sample I specifically wrote "This zine contains a large amount of jargon and is not typical of most zines".

(MICHAEL LOWREY) I think Adrian noticed a symptom and not the fundamental problem: we don't have many new zines in North America these days. I've seen maybe four in the last year and a half or two years. Why? Probably because we're attracting too few new faces to the hobby.

The key answer here is working with Avalon Hill to promote the game and, hence, our hobby. And guess what, we, the hobby, and Avalon Hill both gain by doing this.

#### Polls & Awards:

(ERIC BROSIUS) Jack says "no one should sub to zines they don't like". On the contrary! What if you start a game in a zine, then it becomes one you don't like (because it starts coming out only once a year or something like that.) Many responsible players will continue with the game (and thus the zine) even though it isn't nearly as much fun as they originally hoped. I suspect this is the cause of a great deal of the low votes in the Runestone Poll (it certainly is the cause of any low votes I cast.)

(RANDY COX) No poll can be bad. Take them for what they are and shut up about it. We live and die by Nielsen polls, NY Book List polls, Stock Exchanges (a form of poll), and most recently by the election poll (think of all those who didn't participate in the election due to bickering and apathy). Jack McHugh says a poll only tells one that he is unliked and questions how that helps. Answer: it got Bush out of office. And to Stven Carlberg's statement that reliability and accuracy are a GM's cornerstones, I disagree. Humor and a good time are most important.

(STVEN CARLBERG) Once and for all, just exactly how does Eric Brosius decide which votes to count in the Runestone Poll? Does he throw out every 0 or 1 vote, or just a percentage of them, or what? I must admit that my desire to vote has been undermined by my not knowing whether my votes are being counted.

I agree with James Nelson pretty much down the line. People who vote in polls know what they're doing, and know pretty much what the results are worth. If they don't like popularity contests, they can stay away. And in any contest, there are going to be winners and losers, based

on the opinions of the voters. If you don't like the voters' opinions, don't pay attention to them. If you want to cater to popular opinion, you've got that option, too.

Jack McHugh's comment that "No one should sub to zines they don't like" doesn't seem to me to hold water. From personal experience, I know that I often sub to a zine that looks promising, only to see it get worse and worse instead of better and better. And then there are the orphan games that stick players in zines they'd never have otherwise had any interest in. And so on.

If I get a zine that turns out to be lousy, I think I should be able to vote it a 0 and have my vote counted. I'm not voting a grudge - I'm voting a genuine opinion. And if I get a zine that I think is destructive to the hobby, I certainly think my 0 should be counted. A negative number would be more accurate, and more satisfying, but I'm willing to settle for the 0, if it'll be counted. But apparently it isn't. Or is it? Exactly how high a number do I have to submit before my low opinion gets counted by the Poll?

(GARY BEHNEN) I don't know about you, but I'm surprised at the attention all the awards get, especially by those who "don't care" or "really feel they hurt the hobby." C'mon, it's only a hobby!

(PAUL KENNY) I nominate Ken Walker for the Rod Walker Award. After all, they have the same last name. Walker for Walker!

(PETE GAUGHAN) I disagree with John. I would rather play under a GM who only makes one error per year, no matter how he or she handles that error, than one who makes 10 per year! Can you imagine a game with an error *every month*? Yuch.

(ANDY BATE) Jimbo Nelson is right when he says that the voters can differentiate between different types of zines, though it might not always be easy. Surely people should simply list the zines in order of the enjoyment they've gotten from them during the past year? This leads to the only problem I can see with polls. A zine which finishes down the list is not necessarily disliked by its subscribers. It may just be that it is liked, but not preferred to the other zines which people see. Not that there's really a way round this. Flapper seems to think people shouldn't sub to zines they don't like, eh? Well, what happens if the zine goes downhill after you've just started playing in one or more games therein? Do you drop out of the games and ask for your money back, or see it out like a man (or woman)?

(PER WESTLING) "Would an Award go unawarded if no candidate was worthy?" This is up to the voters as they can vote 'No Award'. If 'No Award' "wins" the award will not be awarded, wont it? I don't know the rules for the Awards, but this is how I think it should be.

(MARK NELSON) Jack and myself are nevr going to agree about the Runestone Poll. A simple illustration is Jack's comment that "no one should sub to zines they don't like, yet people to get low votes". Perhaps this should be the question for next time "Are there legitimate reasons why you might have a sub to a zine you don't like?" I find it unlikely that Jack will be able to understand the answers to this question.

One should also consider that a low vote doesn't necessarily mean that you dislike a zine, only that you like other zines better. This is specifically the case with the Runestone Poll where it seems that Eric's

computer can't handle decimal places.

#### Novice Zines:

(JOHN CARUSO) A novice zine idea does have merit. However, a novice shouldn't be restricted to only playing in the novice zine, nor should they be prohibited from playing in mainstream zines. The choice should be left up to the novice - not the Diplomacy hobby.

(RANDY COX) Andy York says novices should play each other first. Are "veterans" afraid of learning a few new tricks from the novices? Let the new blood mix with the old. Don't discriminate. Stven Carlberg was right. Limiting novices to play only amongst themselves is frightening.

(STVEN CARLBERG) I wouldn't mind running a novice game in Hoodwink. Is anyone keeping a list of novices who might be interested?

(ANDY BATE) Novices. Hmm. I think they should be given choices - we shouldn't presume that we know best, even if we urge them to take our advice. A novice zine is a good idea, if it is done properly. You could always have a rotating editor, with one person producing an issue and then the next, etc. This would allow different Hobby perspectives to be presented to the novice, thereby ensuring that they get a feel of what the Hobby is about, without having one person impose their view on the matter.

You could run games this way by having several outside GMs, who mail the adjudication to the publisher each time. However, this can lead to the zine becoming unwieldy, as happened with Springboard over here. Instead, novices should be offered two choices; i) an all-novice game; ii) to go on to a list which needs filling. The latter would get them a gamestart quicker, but might simply feed the sharks (though novices could be given "Guardian Angels" to whom they could turn for advice - again, their choice whether they actually do so). The former should be handled so that the players are given a choice of zine (send out a sample, if they want to play there fine, if not ask for the sample to be returned).

(MICHAEL LOWREY) I have a question about novice games. What do you do about standbys? Given that replacements are all too common as is in the hobby and probably even more likely in novice games, how should this be handled? If the idea is to let novices compete against novices, it would seem that using veteran players as standbys in these games sort of defeats the whole purpose. But there aren't too many novices who are going to be in a given zine, not in that novice game who are willing to standby.

#### Burnout:

(JEFF MCKEE) My graceful exit from Dip has been 2 years and counting. All but one of my games are over (I was in 45 at one time, mostly Gunboat), with only two resignations (one Titan and one Gunboat that was a revived orphan). Given my experience with standby players, (both as one and as victims of them) I thought it was best to stay in my games rather than abandon them - my play was genuinely lousy - I guess there aren't often any real winners when players lose interest in the games they're playing.

#### Old Dirty Laundry:

(JIM BURGESS) Ah, Mark Nelson dragging things out of the attic again... I warn you, Mark, we may not be too pleased when you inform us that we have wrote exactly the same things over and over again from House of Lords to Foolhardy. Isn't it nice to have someone like Mark around to remind us of our foibles?

#### Ratings & Scoring Systems:

(ERIC BROSIUS) Not everyone believes in the Kinzett principle (and it's a good thing for those of us who do <g>.) It has occasionally been to me advantage to pretend not to believe in it, but I usually forget to do so because it never occurs to me that anyone would buy it.

(ANDY BATE) I'm with Crazie Markie on scoring systems. As to his question, well if Don rewards a 16 centre survival with more points than a share in a draw then it's not surprising. Players should be trying to: i) get eighteen centers; ii) stop someone else getting eighteen centers; iii) ensuring that they survive. If you play this way then you don't knock someone else out unless you benefit materially by doing so. It can be argued that removing someone without any gain to yourself can be good play, but you've got to be damn sure that you're going to gain in the long run by doing so. Thus I see talk of x-way draws as being fairly meaningless - what matters is how close you came to eighteen centers, and that you stopped someone else winning. (Maybe one day I'll get that article written... Oh look at that pig. I think its Immelmann Turn should earn 8 style points.)

#### The Future:

(ANDY BATE) Your idea of interactive TV set my brain off. You have public access TV in the States, so have anyone ever thought of running a Hobby show? Video a game of Diplomacy, edit it down and then show it on the TV (I'm sure you could persuade Avalon Hill to help). You could always script it to ensure that it was interesting... Do they allow advertising on public access? In other words, could you give an address from where someone could get details of the postal Hobby?

*{Jeez, now we need the custodian for Dip TV commercials and infomercials?}*

(MARK NELSON) It would be quite easy to set up a mud-like strucutre to run a game of diplomacy electronically in real time.

#### PDORA/Zine Register:

(JEFF MCKEE) Is there any way I can get my Foolhardy with all references to Garret and the PDO war edited out? This has gone on long enough. I'm determined not to have an opinion - both sides have credible arguments and both sides have resorted to infantile arguing (and I don't think it matters who started it).

*{Sure - the expurgated version of Foolhardy carries a slightly higher price tag - \$5 an issue. Let me know if you'd prefer to receive that! <grin>}*

(PETE GAUGHAN) I disagree with John again! ZR is a service. Would you call the phone book a magazine just because it comes out periodically?

*{I think John was quoting a letter he got from Garret, or something like*

that. Then again, who cares?}

#### Attracting New Blood:

(ERIC BROSIUS) I think there may be \*two\* different electronic creatures both called "Judge". Les Casey is selling a microcomputer software program for \$30 (I don't remember exactly where I saw an ad.) There is also a program (I think created by Ken Lowe) that is used to run zillions of games on the INTERNET. Maybe that's why people are so confused about it.

(RANDY COX) Mark Nelson wonders how often people "drop out of the hobby." Drop out? One can only drop out by vowing to never again play any game -- face to face, by mail, or (for the demented) by E-mail. The hobby exists beyond the boundaries of the postal service, and beyond Diplomacy.

Stven argues the less filling/tastes great line that we don't need new blood. This "good enough for my daddy, so it's good enough for me" tactic is nigh-Fascist. The reason for accruing more hobbyists are that people die. People also marry or have children and might as well be dead (no offense, some people start families and still have free time). So, without new infusion, the hobby will die. I suppose Stven figures the original 13 colonies were enough.

(PAUL KENNY) Want new players? Ask your friends if they would like to play.

(STVEN CARLBERG) You've made the point that an influx of new people into the hobby would likely result in a proportionate number of new zines "to handle the growth," which is fair enough, but it's not an answer to my question. I ask again, just what *benefits* do you think are supposed to accrue from a flood of new hobbyists? Merely not doing one particular sort of harm is hardly a benefit.

Let's face it: Diplomacy is a ton of fun, but only to a person with the particular turn of mind to enjoy it. We're never going to be as popular as bridge, chess, or as Pictionary. We shouldn't expect to and we shouldn't let it bug us. A recruitment campaign that is "successful" in bringing us a lot of people whose interest in the game is only lukewarm is not really what I would consider successful!

(PAUL KENNY) I'm trying something different. There were a group of guys at work that always liked to play Chess during lunch break. So, I showed them Diplomacy. We have just started a game. I am the GM, and 7 of my fellow workers are playing. If you want, I'll keep you posted of the results.

(ANDY BATE) Crazie Markie suggests that "someone with Internet access should start posting details of FTF tournaments and games." I hope he's already doing so with UK events...

Stven Carlberg shouldn't worry - being surrounded by 300 games players at ManorCon is great fun. Besides, surely you play games with as many people as you want to, so if there are lots of people there's no problem unless there isn't enough room for everyone. Doug, I have made the point before about the Hobby bursting at the seams if we advertise too well. We do need to advertise, but in such a way that there is a steady dribble of newcomers, not a sudden rush, since new zines won't spring up overnight.

#### Diplomacy Federation:

(RANDY COX) Ho-hum. One point, though...David Hood stated "there is no reason to have a Con without a Dip tournament." I do hope tongue was firmly in cheek there. Diplomacy is indeed in the hallowed "Top-couple-of-hundred games of all time" list, but other games DO exist and some are even (watch out for lightening) BETTER than Diplomacy.

*{I think what David meant was that, from the standpoint of the Diplomacy hobby, there is no reason why a Federation (or a few dedicated individuals) shouldn't be able to organize a Dip tournament at any sizable Con, and to miss the opportunity to set one up at that Con would be a waste, and a loss to the hobby.}*

(STVEN CARLBERG) Hey, Mark Nelson, right on! "Do they need a national organization, or do they need to get off their butts and do some work?" I couldn't have said it better.

David Hood's vision of a Diplomacy Federation apparently grows out of the belief that players should be "rated" in competition with one another, as in duplicate bridge, chess, or tennis. Frankly, I'm not convinced that this is such a wonderful idea. I admit it's interesting...but in the first place, it's not essential to the enjoyment of the game, and in the second place, Diplomacy is much more complicated to rate because it's not played one-against-one (or one partnership against another, as in bridge). Identical results don't mean identical skills: a Turkey who survives an early A/R alliance and goes on to get part of a three-way has been more successful than a Turkey who reaches 16 and then has to settle for a three-way, for example.

Finally, David says, "The big reason for this is to show an organized facade to the outside world." But what reason is there for showing an organized facade to the outside world? Why should I want to impress the outside world with my ability to organize something that didn't really need to be organized? This is a serious question. Obviously you're taking something for granted in your reasoning that I just don't get.

The "North American Team Tournament" idea leaves me cold, too. Face it, Diplomacy is played by individuals, not teams.

(GARY BEHNEN) As far as a Federation, what is the big deal? If someone (read that: not me!) wants to pour time into it, knock yourself out. If it's good, it'll work, if not, it will quickly fall by the wayside. By the way, who elected Jack "Hobby Guardian Angel" and what is his holy grail of "public discussion," as applied to almost everything he pens, all about?

(ANDY BATE) Crazie Markie is wrong about the informal organization which has been talked about over here, but only if people are actually prepared to do some work. If the Hobby is going to advertize itself then it needs to be done in a organized way, so that time is not wasted on duplicating efforts. Similarly there needs to be someone (or thing) to get feedback from people about how well this advertising is working, so that changes can be made where necessary, and ideas dropped if they're not working. Otherwise all you get is a mess, which could be worse than no advertising at all.

Markie is also wrong about what David Hood said with regard to the NATT. He didn't say that it would attract new blood to the Hobby. What he did say was that it might encourage people to go to a convention near them. It might do so, too. Certainly ManorCon's Diplomacy

tournament has more players than it would do if there was no team tournament. Of course, you'd have to determine a scoring system for the NATT... What goes around, comes around.

(MARK NELSON) I looked at the least of things that David suggests a Federation could do. I failed to see why he couldn't do them now without setting up a Federation. eg "Responsibility for keeping a current list of all Dip events". Does David need a federation to do that?

#### Zine Register:

(PETER SULLIVAN) I can only speak as I find on this. When I heard that Garret was taking over the Zine Register, I sent him a couple of copies of CMag, asking if he wanted to carry on trading the way Tom Nash had done (BTDT & ZR for 2 copies of CMag). He wrote back saying he wasn't interested in a double trade, but would willingly trade CMag for ZR.

Mark Nelson's main beef seems to be that Garret wasn't interested in the overseas hobby. To which I say, so what? The Zine Register is intended to be a listing of North American zeens. If previous custodians (Simon Billenness, Ken Hill and Tom Nash) had been sufficiently internationally-minded that they want to cover some overseas zeens as well, that's great, but it's not part of the "core business" of ZR. Garret is not bound by the policies of previous custodians - or do we suddenly have the "Zine Register Under the Covenant"?

As it is, ZR #20 and #21 have both had very strong international sections, which Garret has willingly carried. Heck, if I'd been producing monster issues like that, the International sections would have been the first thing to be cut! Now that Pete Gaughan has taken over the whole ZR, I have no doubt the International section will continue much as before, so the whole discussion is a tad pointless anyway.

Mark writes "Where are the overseas zeens that carried ads for TZR #19?" Well, CMag #108 carried a brief mention, and CMag #114 carried a detailed plug for ZR #19. But then, telling lies is something that Mark obviously knows a lot about (see, I can do the MegaDip Hobby Bitch Queen Feud thang as well!).

Oh yes, and I demand that you print this part of my letter in Foolhardy, Maniac's Paradise, Your Zine of Zines, And the Horse You Rode in On, and Been There, Done That. What do you mean, the last one's folded? Are you trying to start a feud or something?

*{My lawyers and toadies will be in touch, bricks and bats in hand.}*

(PETE GAUGHAN) I don't remember if I sent you, or Crazie Markie, or Jack McHugh, my recollections on the ZR/foreign sub issue. (I think it was Flap). If it wasn't you and you want to see 'em, let me know.

(JIM BURGESS) As one of those who sided with Mark Nelson in the "overseas trade" controversy, Garret and I had discussions about this privately too. I, of course, had MY trade with Garret cut at the same time he took over the Zine Register. This didn't directly involve the Zine Register since the issue was my szine for his szine, but we discussed it (calmly at that point) and he said that taking over the Zine Register was going to cost a lot of money and he had to take steps to contain his costs. I might have been able to trade my szine for the Zine Register, but Garret had just gotten finished saying that he didn't like my szine and never found anything interesting to read in it. This did not make me feel like trading with the Zine Register to read what he had to say (and did eventually say)

in print. I was and am sympathetic to Garret's financial position, but if you take on these things you need to understand the various kinds of sacrifices involved. There are many hobby services that just cost time and not money. The Zine Register is not and has not been one of them. You do hobby services to give something back to the hobby in general in an area in which you have an interest. These are services, after all. I lose as much money on my szine as anyone, but it's part of the deal to me.

I use my szine shamelessly as currency to get other szines. That's a perk of the Zine Register as well. I wish I didn't feel that I have to say so, but Mark's story matches my experience exactly.

(MICHAEL LOWREY) After reading Markie's comments and what Garret has said, it seems to me that there was, in part, a massive misunderstanding caused by Tom Nash's inaction. Markie doesn't get ZR #18 so he doesn't send Garret his zine as he thinks his trade has been cut. Garret doesn't get a foreign trade list from Nash and receives few foreign zines. Seems to me what probably happened is the massively pissed-off and burned out Nashling doesn't get around to mailing the foreign copies of ZR #18. The foreign editors, now knowing that Garret had taken over the ZR or mad because of Nash's publishing schedule, or because they didn't get ZR #18 don't send their zines to Garret. The result is pretty ugly, but a big misunderstanding: Mark Nelson was owed a ZR #18 and thought Garret was responsible for sending him one (when, in fact, Nash failed to send it) while Garret probably assumed (to the degree he cared) that Nash had mailed ZR #18 out to all foreign subscribers/traders and the level of foreign response was normal, having no real information to suggest otherwise. This isn't to say that Garret isn't a serious loser and a paranoid; he is. It's just that he should be bashed for what he's responsible for (like not sending a good friend of mine a copy of ZR #21 six months and numerous inquiries after cashing his check!!) and not silly stuff.

#### New Diplomacy Flyer/Gamer's Guide:

(GARY BEHNEN) Suffice to say I've processed 3 requests, just after X-mas, and look forward to a brisk Fall and Winter as the flyer hits the Con Circuit and come next X-mas. As far as Cal/Jack, I honestly don't remember the specifics of what was said, but Cal was probably tired of the same old "self-appointed but haven't done anything to help it" criticism crowd and Jack got the full barrage. As far as John Caruso stating this was done "in a backroom, privately, sneakily," he knows that is a cheap shot and wrong and we (Cal, David, Rex and I) purposely included John and a few others right from the start. Indeed, there was a roomfull of 10-12 other publishers at the publishing seminar at DipCon XXV in KC where this all began, and the 4 of us committed to get this done on AH's schedule, not Jack's or anyone else who wanted "full and open disclosure."

If you think an effort in incomplete, start your own or help us! Knowing Cal, I'm sure if he feels he was too harsh, he'll apologize. What about Jack, is he ready to pitch in? Have him write Cal!!

*{I don't think that's likely...see below.}*

(PAUL KENNY) What flyer? Sandy Styles just bought the game and it contained no flyer. It did have a price list from Summer 1992.

*{The flyer is only in the new Deluxe Dip sets, although I'm not sure if they will or will not be inserted into new copies of the old set.}*



### Jack McHugh:

(CAL WHITE) Here is my response to McHugh and Caruso - unlike my last "tirade", this one will not be rewritten or toned down.

So how come, all of a sudden, the big issue is the way I responded to McHugh? Why can't he or Caruso deal with the way I was slandered in the previous Foolhardy?

John says I'm "vulgar", "rude" and "have no place in the hobby". I say that the shit McHugh spreads around meets both those requirements (No, I'm not going to watch my language - I'm rude and vulgar, remember?).

Jack's original statement (in Foolhardy #4) was as follows: "Despite all the big talk by the David Hoods and Cal Whites of this hobby, when it comes time to do any work, they disappear."

Am I supposed to take that lying down?

First off, it's a blatant lie. I detailed last issue just what I have done since the meeting at DipCon. I have no need to apologize to ANYONE for what I've done these last seven months.

Secondly, I am offended by McHugh's arrogance in reporting on a topic of which he had ABSOLUTELY no information (whether or not I should have told him, or, for that matter, anyone else, what was going on is irrelevant here - he didn't know what was going on, but still chose to slander someone on the basis of poor reasoning and idle speculation. Try that just ONCE in your newspaper job, McHugh, and see what happens...).

Thirdly, I have never reacted kindly to having my integrity questioned. Maybe McHugh figures that because the mails and the distances involved give him the requisite safety to say anything he wants to about anyone. I bet he would never have said that to my face.

Now, should I have reacted in the manner I did? Some people don't think so. Caruso called me rude (although I figure that's either sour grapes because he wanted to control the entire novice entry process by having his name as the only one in the flyer and was frustrated in this or simply East Coast Clique solidarity). Hell, I even got a note from Bob Acheson telling me I was offside in asking for an apology.

Frankly, I don't care.

I've been in this hobby a fair while and I've tried to make it a better place for my having been here. I figured I had something to make up for after having messed up the Boardman Numbers as well as my own zine back in 1978. I think I've more than made up for that fiasco. Anybody who disagrees is welcome to their opinion. I know that my hobby involvement has cost me a wife and a way of life. I don't need to have insensitive, slanderous assholes telling me that when there's work to be done, I disappear.

As of this moment, Jack McHugh no longer exists in the part of the hobby that I inhabit. As for John Caruso, well, I have to be in contact with him re: the novice Contact PErson project, but that'll be more than enough for me, thanks.

If anybody cares to write and tell me I'm a jerk, feel free - maybe you're right. All I know is that I have certain values and they don't include careless hurt of my supposed "friends".

### Orphan Games:

(RANDY COX) Here, Stven is right. Let aborted babies die. Games exist WITHIN zines not IN SPITE of them. If the zine dies, so do the letters, contests, and the games.

(STVEN CARLBERG) Another approach to rehousing orphan games

would be for the Orphan Administrator to take action only when requested to do so by players in the game (or by a GM in anticipation of having to quit).

(PETER SULLIVAN) I understand what Stven Carlberg is getting at, but this is always going to be a tricky one to call. The situation in Britain is simplified by the fact that virtually no-one uses standbys, so the OGRE (Orphan Games Rehouser) wouldn't use them for orphan games either. Thus, the game he refers to where only two of the original players wanted to continue would have seen all the other powers go into Civil Disorder, and the two remaining players would presumably either have split a 2-way draw or agreed on a concession there and then. The problem with Stven's suggestion is that if one player is on 17-going-on-18 centers when the game is orphaned, presumably he's the only one who's going to want to continue.

As for choosing GMs, this isn't always practical, although in orphaning the games from A Step Further Out, I did ask players to let me know what zeens they were already playing in. This was mainly to reduce the number of people who would end up having to take out another sub rather than give them a choice of GM, though.

(JIM BURGESS) As a former custodian, I must disagree vehemently with Stven Carlberg's proposed "solution" to the orphan game problem. Those with little stomach for sarcasm can skip the rest of this, I'd apologize, but I'm doing it with a bit of malice aforethought. I understand completely his feelings of burnout, but would the GM under which the games were housed REALLY have made a difference? It seems to me that he was indeed perfectly happy to have the games go into oblivion and he is free to take that opinion. It seems to me that his vote on the "Do you want this game to be revived?" question was clear and the outcome was appropriate -- he was replaced. As someone with lots of experience on all sides of the orphan issue, it's also true that the continued game is "actually a different game entirely." My answer to the "is this dumb, or what?" is: NO!!!!!!!!!!!!!! The players who want to play get to play, the standbys (like me) who enjoy coming into a game with a bunch of fresh players and a unique starting configuration get just that, and the GM who wants a game with some age that might not last 3-5 more real time years gets that too. You get to know for sure that your game is truly over and that your original GM (like Tom Nash) won't resurrect himself and say -- hey, guys, let's finish this game! What's dumb is leaving the game in limbo. The general rule of thumb is that at least two players should be interested in continuing (as in your example), but whether or not one of the players is a standby himself is totally irrelevant. Two official players in a game want to play it out. We should be happy for them! Why aren't you? You still get what you want. Might you have wanted to restart them with a szine like Retaliation that has a publication schedule slow enough to balance your level of burnout? Sure, that's fair to the people that want to play the game out. If you're pissed at Tom Nash and the others for ruining your game in the first place, that might be fair, but don't take it out on the Orphan Games Custodian!! [An aside here: that happens ALL THE TIME -- see why it's such a fun job?] I say salutations and felicitations to Eric Ozog!! He deserves a Miller award nomination too. The Orphan Games Custodian has the highest ratio of work required to kudos received of any hobby service. That's regardless of personality conflicts which just make the ratio even worse. Now let's deal with your ill-thought out proposal in detail:

1) Ask players if they want to continue the game before rehousing it:

I've done it this way and the way Eric has been doing it. When Eric took the position, I described what happens under each approach and he made the same decision that I ultimately did. When you communicate with players, ask for orders, not an answer to the question of whether or not you want to continue. In nearly all cases, games are rehoused with a turn of orders buried in the former GM's mail pile, so asking for those orders to be sent along is not a hardship on the players. I want Stven to be honest here -- given that by his own admission he was NMRing and in a timecrunch -- would he have responded to a request whether or not he wanted to continue any differently than he did to a request for orders? Guess what happens, boys and girls? You got it. The players who don't want to continue simply don't answer you. Moreover, those who want to continue are pissed by what they correctly see as more delay. I'd like to know what Stven thinks would be different other than the same "meager choice: to play or not to play." Isn't that what we would be asking if we asked if you wanted to continue the game before rehousing it? Or would you want the option of choosing a restart date... "let's see, I think I should have some time free about August... of 1994." Now, the "how many players, or how many dots, should wish to continue if a game is to be rehoused" question IS legitimate and I have no answer except to say that there should not be a rule. No Orphan Games Custodian is going to rehouse a game if there is absolutely no interest in reviving it. Usually (to the extent you can make generalization in a situation where every case is unique), one player who is doing well is pushing the restart and a few other players are interested in continuing. Some inflexible rule like "half of all dots on the board" would not be fair since that is by definition the median -- about half of all orphan games would be abandoned (really roughly) using that procedure -- so I (and I think Eric) likes the idea that at least two people need to want to continue, the new GM has to be willing to go along, and someone must show some serious interest. I know that's somewhat nebulous, but it's the best I was able to do after two and a half years of experience. I suspect Stven was doing well in some of these games and felt forced to abandon them. I am sympathetic, but you said yourself that you signed up for all of those games with early enthusiasm.

Was it ever going to return? It's a damned shame that so many games get orphaned. They are NEVER the same after a delay, even if all the players return. It would be nice if more GMs came to realize this, but I wouldn't expect them to do so. I can remember countless arguments with GMs whose games were delayed three months, six months, or a year, that "the players really want to play with me, if you try to rehouse them, they won't play anyway OR you know, they really like these delays because they're in time crunches." To the extent that Stven is perpetuating these ideas we are generating more GMs who will start too many games and orphan them later. One of things I like about our "stripped down hobby" today is that I see less of the big szine with too many games teetering on the edge of folding than I did five or ten years ago. I think that's good.

2) Which of these suggested GMs would be acceptable to you?: Now this isn't a terrible idea, but it simply isn't practical. One thing I did that Eric doesn't is that I had everyone send that first set of new orders to me instead of the new GM. I then ran one or two adjudications until the game stabilized in my Orphan Games szine. Yes, Virginia, there is a Santa Claus before I passed the game to the new GM. Recall I said upfront that there are some players who like standby positions in orphaned games because they are like a restart. I am one of those people. I had a standby list of people who liked being passed off into new games and new szines (recall my list of three types of "winners" above?). Now the

Orphan Games Custodian COULD give people a list of suggested GMs, but why throw in another point of controversy in a game that already by definition is controversial. You implied that you didn't like being scattered into a large number of szines. No editor wants to take on a whole pile of orphan games at once, so that was destined to happen anyway. Do you really think that all of the players would neatly agree to go to the same szine? Even if they did, might not all of the players in all of the games being rehoused want to go to the same szine? Then you would have to make someone unhappy. Nope. I want nothing to do with that. I would informally ask for some ideas or preferences on rehousing (which I was able to do since I ran a season or two), but I wouldn't want to formalize it and make the Custodian's life more difficult.

In summary, we can grieve for your games that were lost, Stven. But they are lost and they were lost as soon as Tom Nash and the others orphaned them. I know it's tempting, but try not to take it out on the Orphan Games Custodian. Most of us have been cheery guys who are committed to the difficult task that we have taken on. Eric has had the job for a while now and probably is beginning to approach the burnout stage. The last thing he needs is abuse of the type that Stven attempts to give him. I should state that, in general, I am in support of giving custodians honest feedback. If I felt that Stven was making a reasonable proposal, even one which I disagreed with or one which I felt was worded in stronger language than I thought appropriate, I would not have been as ridiculing as I attempted to be here, but I think the Orphan problem is not well understood and the Orphan Custodian is not well appreciated, so I wanted to make my point as emphatically as I possibly could. There are lots of more difficult policy questions that we could debate, such as how long should the Orphan Custodian allow a GM to be late before he or she: (a) inquires what is up, (b) attempts to take the game when the GM does not respond to inquiries, (c) attempts to take the game when the GM responds to inquiries, but doesn't adjudicate the games?

(MARK NELSON) I'd answer Carlberg's question on orphaning games by saying, yes that was dumb. Wonder if Pete Sullivan will mail you his story about the BNC a few years ago who...

#### Getting Into Dip:

(ANDY BATE) I first played Diplomacy in October 1983 at meetings of the Birmingham University Diplomacy (& Boardgames) Society. We played quite a few postal games via the internal mail network. I missed MidCon in November of that year, so my first convention was ManorCon in July 1984. I discovered the Hobby there, and signed up for a couple of zines. By the next month I was in my first real postal game (Railway Rivals in [Rostherne Games Review](#)), though I don't remember starting a Diplomacy game until the following year (in [Mad Policy](#)).

#### John Caruso's Introductory Package:

(JOHN CARUSO) Mark Nelson's suggestion is noted. I have 3 PBEM contacts listed. Not the whole network.

I have been informed that Fred Davis would be taking over [Supernova](#) from Bruce Reiff.

Someone has suggested that a glossary of frequently used terms and abbreviations be listed within [Dip](#) (the handout that people receive when they write to the names on the box). Things like NMR, NVR, Autumn, Lepanto Opening, Byrne Opening, etc.

There are two things I'd like from the Foolhardy readers - comments on this, and if you think it's good idea, a listing of terms and abbreviations.

To date, Dip has added plugs for MENSA, Supernova, and FTF gaming club contacts.

#### Deluxe Diplomacy:

(JOHN CARUSO) Looks like an excellent effort. Rex Martin did a great job. However, that \$55 price tag does bother me.

(RANDY COX) My views are well known. Don't put the work "Deluxe" in front of it; sell it for \$35; and it's a great game. I find it amusing that Rex referred to me as annoyed. I guess a negative letter constitutes "annoyed." In fact, I wrote to Rex and said I'd bought the game anyway even knowing it was bad, but that the hype didn't merit the product.

(PETER SULLIVAN) It looks like the main complaint over Deluxe Diplomacy is the price, which is probably one of the things Rex Martin had the least input on! Of course, it's difficult to tell how representative postal hobbyists are of the wider Dip-playing community. One aspect in which they are obviously unrepresentative is that most of them will have the "non-deluxe" edition already - \$55 for a Deluxe edition of a game you already have is always going to look worse value than \$55 for a Deluxe edition of a game you've never played before!

(GARY BEHNEN) Deluxe Diplomacy looks good to me. If \$55 is too high (and it is a little pricey), I understand some dealers are offering it for \$45. If, however, wood pieces aren't important to you, I'd suggest you buy a "regular" version.

(MARK NELSON) I found David's review of the deluxe edition in DW most interesting, especially in view of the fact that I seem to remember that there have been some adds placed in DW by Avalon Hill.

#### Inactive Subscribers:

(RANDY COX) How many Times readers are active? Only those who write letters. Why can't zine readers do just that? Read the zine and nothing else.

(PETER SULLIVAN) I love them! But then, with my method of production (mimeo), the marginal cost (i.e. the cost of printing an extra copy) is less than the price, so inactive subbers actually reduce my overall loss. If I could get an extra 65 inactive British subbers, I'd actually break even on the thing! If I was photocopied (where the cost of producing an extra copy is virtually the same for any size print run), I might feel differently.

(PETE GAUGHAN) I love deadwood! I used to have a sweepstakes where one person who didn't sub to the zine and wouldn't write was given a free sub. For someone who's trying to be a "reading" zine, there's no greater compliment than the subber who's not playing in any games.

(ALAN LEVIN) I've always been puzzled by them. Still, if they want to sub without participating, that's their business. Maybe they just enjoy learning what others think about the issues being debated in the letter column. Or perhaps they're trying to improve their Dip skills by

following the games as they progress. Rather than kicking inactive subbers off their sub lists, pubbers who resent losing the money it costs to send such subbers issues could consider a two-tier sub fee. In most zines players pay game fees which help cover the difference between what pubbers take in from sub fees and spend on publication costs. If inactive subbers are costing money, why not charge them a somewhat higher sub fee than the players pay? If such subbers truly like a zine, they'll probably be willing to pay a somewhat higher sub fee to help the pubber keep the zine at a loss level he can afford. If these subbers aren't willing to pay a higher price, then they will undoubtedly allow their sub to lapse and thus help the pubber clear "the deadwood" away without resorting to highhanded actions like cancelling or refusing subs.

#### You Control the Hobby Awards:

(JEFF MCKEE) I think it would be a wonderful to re-appropriate the Holley Award to the best- performance-service-to-the-hobby by a standby player. Here's an area that could really use some formal reward.

(RANDY COX) I don't know Melinda Holley from Eve, but why does everyone pick on the award named after her? I firmly believe in the quantity-over-quality school of thought. Aaron took many more at bats to break Ruth's homer total, but he did it nonetheless and is the All Time Home Run King. In gaming terms, I have friends who are so selective as to what game they will play (and with whom) that they rarely get into a game. Sure, they win a bunch, but they rarely play. This does nothing to advance the hobby. To reach out, you must play hard and play often. Reward such efforts.

#### Improving the BNC:

(JOHN CARUSO) I'd expand the numbering and ratings to cover all Dip games - FTF and PBM. I'd eliminate the "local" game and "Relatives in same game" categories. What makes anyone think two brothers in a game is an advantage? If anything - they are more likely to be whacked first!

(RANDY COX) I guess I'd eliminate it. Granted, I don't know what it's all about and I don't know what happens to the BNC's information. But, I come back to the fact that this is a hobby, not a business.

(STVEN CARLBERG) Well, for one thing, I'd make the BNC easier to find. Once I did find him, the only gripe I really had with the previous BNC is that he issued me some game numbers for the wrong year, assuming that the games are supposed to be numbered after the year they started in. I got 1992M and 1992N (bound to be confused) for games that didn't even start at near the same time. Consequently, I've been rather disillusioned about getting Boardman numbers and have two or three games going now where I haven't bothered.

(GARY BEHNEN) How would I improve the BNC? I'd go to annual issues, immediately. What do you need 3 or 4 issues for? It is expensive to produce and is only of interest to part of the hobby. Also, I'd like to see every GM (including E-Mail) request a BN (with full address info, game/country assignments, etc.) by Spring 1901 of their game (so it isn't forgotten) to be returned within 2 months. Lastly, limit or eliminate trades to make E... strictly subscriber only. If GM's send gamestarts and

endgames (complete) the rest is simply additional expense. Draconian, maybe a little, but it would help reduce the ton of mail that usually deluges a BNC to help them be as efficient with the time spent "in hobby service". Regardless, good luck Vince!

(PAUL KENNY) Vince Lutterbie is the new BNC? Oh. What I want to know is why there is a BNC. And why do we need BNs? And does anybody do anything with these BNs? What? Why?

(W. ANDREW YORK) I don't really have too much to add to Vice's efforts as the new BNC. I'm happy to see the GM's Helper redone - the old sheet had been photocopied way too many times. His efforts to computerize the record keeping are needed.

I would like to see a revision in the irregular game format. The old "area code" criteria should be revised to better reflect our current situation. There are a number of people I contact more often via CIS of GENie than I call friends who live down the street.

(JIM BURGESS) I have seen amazing things done with the Hall of Fame that collects the results from all Diplomacy games played on the E-Mail Internet system. Some of these amazing things are nonsense as far as I am concerned, but when you computerize records, they are easy to do. So that is what I think we need to do -- computerize our records and make them available to article writers, rating system designers, and anyone else who wants to see them by electronic mail or diskette for the cost of a diskette. As one of the few people who has seen the BNC records and knows what a mess they are, I know that many of the things that are done with the Internet records will never be possible; however, I do think that something extremely useful could be done. It could generate years of good Diplomacy World articles. I do not volunteer to do the project, but perhaps someone else will. Mark Nelson and I could share some of the information that has been culled from the Internet records and Mark has been computerizing the British records (or has access to them), so perhaps the data bases could be merged.

(MARK NELSON) If Vince wants to improve the BNC position I suggests that he considers making two changes. I think that Everything needs to be published more frequently, say twice a year, and I think that Everything should carry articles to make it more interesting. I would be especially interested in articles which are based upon the statistics that are published in Everything. When I first started trading with Everything Steve Heinowski was Custodian and there was always at least one article in Everything.

(MICHAEL LOWREY) The main thing I think the BNC needs to do is increase his visibility. That means putting Everything out more than once a year.

#### Fannishness:

(JOHN CARUSO) Fannishness is having fun and enjoying yourself with your hobby - whether you GM, play, write or just read.

(STVEN CARLBERG) To be fannish basically means that you like to talk about the stuff you like, and I think it's fine. In sf fandom, there are two additional distinctions on either side of "fannishness": there's "faanishness" (two a's), which means that the person likes fannish stuff

and likes talking about fans and fanzines, and on the other hand, there's "sercon", short for serious and constructive.

(PETER SULLIVAN) Two possible definitions: (a) "If you has to ask, you ain't got it." (As the old jazzman said of rhythm). (b) Fannishness is what Mark Nelson approves of; unfannishness anything/anybody Mark disapproves of.

(PAUL KENNY) Fannishness is a scifi groupie term. The Dipdom hobby is a cult, of a sort. But Dipdom is more "real time", if you will, cause, basically, we are gaming with each other (i.e. in real competition with each other). So I guess I would say we get fannish when we write about our lives, the conventions that we went to, the house cons we attended, how many chairs Jack McHugh broke, or, at best, fictional stories with the characters of this hobby in it, all of which I would call positive or good fannishness.

Then there is another type of fannish activity, one which almost caused me to (?) the hobby and if it kicks again I'm history. That is feuding. I've got better things to do with my life than to be involved in such nonsense. Picture yourself sitting on a jet plane next to GE CEO John Welsh. Picture yourself trying to explain the last "great hobby" feud to him. What do you think he would be thinking about you? Say, instead of John Welsh, it was Cindy Crawford or Connie Celica...stupid nonsense.

(W. ANDREW YORK) Fannishness, hmmm, a very hard thing to define. As the saying goes, "I know it when I see it."

(JIM BURGESS) I think Per got it in his comment on inactive subbers, which I suspect is why he asked the question: "I find them boring, or rather frustrating. Regardless of what one does they never react... Fanzeens are more or less like APAs -- the idea is to interact with others in the letter column (or play games)." I like fannishness. And I define it as getting involved and being an active subber!" Whether it is press writing, mega-Dip, personality disputes, or thoughtful letter writing, it is fannishness. Generally, I like all of it, though I prefer positive fannishness infinitely over negative fannishness (sometimes called feuding...).

#### Variants:

(RANDY COX) BLACK PRESS GUNBOAT!!! But, the best "variants" are the non-Dip games. Other boardgames exist and are fun. Don't shun them.

(STVEN CARLBERG) Gunboat without press. I like the tactical purity of it. The "Fog of War" idea intrigues me, too, but I haven't had a chance to play it. "What is your least favorite?" By trying a couple, I have discovered that I have virtually no interest in playing Diplomacy on variant maps, as they are no improvement over the regular map and therefore, in my opinion, pointless.

(PETER SULLIVAN) My favorite variant to watch (not necessarily to run) is Downfall, especially if there are a couple of good press sagas going on with it. (For obvious reasons, Downfall seems to attract press-writers disproportionately.) I'm not sure it's quite such fun to GM (lots of fiddly rules to add "chrome") or play (the victory conditions for most versions

are fairly poorly thought-out). As far as new versions go, I think there should be a voluntary moratorium on redesigning Downfall - what is it, 13 versions now?

(PAUL KENNY) I could be vain and say I like the variant Northern Ireland, but in truth, I've never played it, only GM'd it twice. (In fact, to the best of my knowledge, it has only been played four times, counting the current game).

I really like Balkan Wars III. Version 6 isn't bad either. As variants go it is good because there are not too many neutral supply centers to suck up. You have to get into battle. Also, it probably would go faster.

One rule on whether I would get involved in a variant is the size of the rules. While I'm sure I could figure out the more complicated games (shut up Jack, I know what you are thinking), I don't have time. I'm surprised that I ever bothered to learn "Touchdown!" and "United". But simpler games are better. Not only does one get to spend more time on moves and negotiations, but there isn't dumb mistakes over some loophole that too many rules bring. I want to enjoy the game when I play it, not spend 80% of my time reading rules, 10% of the time setting it up, and 10% playing.

I also would prefer a game that doesn't take longer than a couple of years real time to play. I don't know what I will be doing 10 years from now.

On that note, I could relay my experience with Vacation Dip III. Vacation Diplomacy III is a Dip variant where all powers have an extra piece somewhere on the board. Also, event cards are dealt out which could give one an extra support, move another's piece or pieces, give yourself an extra SC for a turn, or freeze a space, etc. I played it, and it was a fun game to play. But then I tried GMing it as my 1st game I GM'd (in "Standard Deviation", then a subzine to Comrades in Arms). It was a nightmare to keep the cards straight. I hated running it. I would play it again, but not run it. Also, I think that variants should have rules that speed up play, not slow it down.

Asian Dip and African Dip look real promising. I may run such a game in the near future. When is someone going to do the Black and Tan War?

(W. ANDREW YORK) Favorite variant to play is definitely Gunboat. I enjoy the aspect of anonymity with a tad bit of role-playing thrown in. I suppose the variant where the GM passes on your letters (I forget the name) without identifying the players would be the best for me.

To GM, I can't say as I've only GM'd a couple of them.

Least favorite that I've played is Middle Earth (II?). There were too many centers/units for the number of players (five). It created a severe gridlock. I prefer more open area and manoeuver.

(ANDY BATE) Hmm, favorite variants? Well, wither Vain Star or Vain Arts for a start (playing or GMing) and Somewhat Demiurgic Diplomacy (playing only, for some strange reason). Other favorites include Africa II, something simple involving nukes, and what Necromancer will become when it's been play-tested (this is the revision of Downfall which attempts to allow the players to work with who they want, not just fight Sauron - it seems likely to result in two different variants being produced). Dislikes - Gunboat, Gunboat and Gunboat. Oh and anything with crap play-balance and no other redeeming features, which variants deter people from trying any others. Wants - a Second World War variant which

captures the feel of the battles without being horrendously complex.

(JIM BURGESS) My favorite variant to GM is my own variant of Spy Diplomacy. I'd like to run another game some time, but I've never played it (from lack of opportunity) so I guess my favorite to play is Nuclear Yuppie Evil Empire Diplomacy because it is so pure and lightning quick. THE GAME is the best variant of all. My least favorite is hard. I've decided that I don't like running Gunboat much, but it isn't too bad with Black press the way I run it. I think pure tactical Gunboat is pretty boring when press is not allowed. As far as ignored types of variants go, I think there is lots of potential to take Diplomacy straight into the business world. We could get business schools and management strategists playing it if we redesigned it in a business environment. Contrary to what your first thought might be, this would be an intracorporation game, not an intercorporation game (i.e. between divisions of a company fighting for resources). Is there such a game? The biggest challenge would be how to conceive of "provinces" and other elements of Dip so that it made sense. You might have to think about a "product" that the corporation produced. I have some other ideas, but I think I'll leave it there as a challenge. A variant updated or revised... well, the Youngstown game that the Internet people play (it's unique, but early design with off board boxes that constrict flow), but I don't like the whole idea of Youngstown all that much. If someone could redesign it... I guess Pete Gaughan is going to playtest a new design. We'll see.

(PER WESTLING) Beeeing a lazy bastard I prefer to GM variants close to the regular Dip, or ones implemented on the Judge.... To play I currently prefer Davis' 1885.

Can't think of any variants to update/revise right now, but I would really like to see a translation of the German variant "Gilgamesh".

(MARK NELSON) I don't have a favourite variant although there are some types of variants which I do not like playing: games which add two players onto a slightly modified regular map and games which have only minimal changes (often only one) to the rules. If you want to play a 9-player variant then I'd recommend a game specifically designed with nine player in mind (eg Rod Walker's Abberation 3) and I'd rather play regular than a really minor rule-change variant.

*{For my own part, I very much enjoy playing Woolworth, and find Middle Eastern Dip to be enjoyable as well. I haven't delved into the world of Tolkien variants much. The variants I hope to either design or to see designed are: one depicting a war in the Hundred Acre Wood, and an updated Balkan Wars variant that includes (somehow) some of the former Yugoslav and former Soviet states as powers...although I'm not sure that could be done.}*

## For Next Time:

- 1) (from Alan Levin) One subject I'd like to see discussed is the costliness of publishing. Is there anybody who isn't losing money?
- 2) Let's assume that you control PDORA, and that after the auction and after funding all requests for this year at 100%, you're left with \$500. What do you think should be done with the money? Note - this is just hypothetical, folks. There's not going to be any \$500 carryover this year, I'd wager.
- 3) Comments on the World DipCon charter proposal (reprinted on the next few pages)? Do you even care about WDC?

## Next Foolhardy Deadline - July 18, 1993

### A Proposal for Writing a World DipCon Charter

by Iain Bowen (5 Wigginton Terrace, York U.K., YO3 7JD)

World DipCon arose as an idea in the US zine House of Lords; Simon Billenness came up with the idea of having a DipCon in the UK. The idea was eventually rejected; but from that idea of WorldDipCon. ManorCon as the largest UK Diplomacy convention took up the idea of holding the first WorldDipCon and organized the sixth ManorCon as World DipCon I. It proved to be the second biggest ManorCon ever (the largest was in 1992) and over 300 gamers turned up including a dozen from Europe; two from Australia and five from North America.

At a meeting of about 10 people from five nations in a Birmingham Curry House during the convention; a small unelected cabal of people agreed that WDC was a good idea and that it should be continued. It was decided that WDC should visit the USA and Australia before returning to ManorCon in 1994 where the whole idea would be put on a firmer footing. This 'Imran's Protocol' is what has been worked on since. This led to World DipCon II at DixieCon in 1990 and World DipCon III at CanCon in 1992. Apart from good international attendance at WDC II (a dozen players from the UK; plus some from Europe and Australia); the concept remained fairly dormant until 1992; save for criticism of WDC III lack of organized publicity in the UK.

At the ninth ManorCon (1991); our usual international attendees from Belgium the Netherlands and Germany (not forgetting the Republic of Ireland) were joined by two hobbyists from France who demanded that the ManorCon committee would support a French WDC in 1993. The ManorCon Committee declined to do this as they would support a French WDC in 1993. The ManorCon Committee declined to do this as they did not feel that they had the power under Imran's Protocol; any decisions on WDC should be left to a hobby meeting at WDC IV. The French hobby members accepted this decision and some individual members of that committee supported the idea of a French bid for WDC in 1995.

At the same time; a better network of pan-European hobby contacts started to emerge and evidence of postal and/or tournament Diplomacy hobbies of good size in Sweden and France; and of smaller size in Austria, Belgium, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands and Spain emerged. Some of these hobbies are highly organized, especially when compared to the underlying anarchy of both the UK and US hobbies; therefore giving their viewpoints a high profile and degree of credence.

In late 1991, Shaun Derrick restarted the fourth volume of Globetrotter to publicize conventions around the world. In hindsight, the use of this title may have been a mistake as its two most prominent uses before that have been as the official WDC I zine to attract overseas players to WDC I and as the official WDC II zine to attract UK players to the USA. The opinions expressed by Shaun in Globetrotter have always been his personal opinions and do not necessarily reflect any views held by the *deutero*-World DipCon committee.

In 1992 the WDC debate reached reasonably high proportions with contributors from several countries; in several zines. The point appeared to be that several opposing views were held by various hobbyists; although there was general agreement on three things: firstly, that there should be an annual WDC; secondly, that there should be a European zone of some sort (definitions of this vary) and thirdly, that more democracy was needed in the WDC process (although one prominent hobbyist and one democratic centralist national hobby disagreed.)

As the debate reached a conclusion, Shaun Derrick, who has no official status as so far as WDC is concerned seemingly came under excessive European influence and has been proposing gradually more complicated and difficult schemes to implement - the consensus of the hobby seemed to come to several compromise solutions. After the debacle of the so-called ManorCon 10 hobby meeting; I decided to withdraw from the WDC debate for the time being and get on with the real job at hand.

I am the chairman of ManorCon and therefore *de facto* whilst not *de jure* chairman of WDC IV. Therefore under Imran's Protocol; I feel it is up to me to organize the hobby meeting in a democratic manner and I have considered all options that were presented in so doing. I feel that as I have no axe to grind with either the US or various national European hobbies; having attended the conventions of both and having working knowledge of the WDC debate; hobby politics and being committed to hobby democracy - then I am a suitable person to do this.

What I intend to do over the next fifteen months is as follows:

1. By ManorCon 11 (July 1993), I intend to circulate a draft WDC Charter to all interested parties *for comments only*. I would hope that

these comments would get back to me by September 1993. I am placing things in this charter that I do not personally agree with but that appear to be the consensus of opinion in the World.

2. By October 1993, I intend to issue a WDC Charter to all interested parties; altered by any comments that I received that seem to be universal. The Charter will be available for amendment in all sections and I would expect the amendments by Easter 1994.

3. After Easter 1994, I will issue the Charter again with the proposed amendments (subject to consolidating where amendments are similar.) These will be published before the convention to enable discussion to be held on them.

4. At WDC IV, there will be a meeting of interested hobbyists. In order to stop domination of the meeting by any one nation; there has been a designed a voting system to remove this bias. This is in order to give the best possible *world consensus* on the Charter. I shall explain how this system works. The voting system means that each country may have as many voters as they like; but a maximum of 10 votes - if they have more than 10 votes then their votes are turned into 10 votes proportionally. A country means the country of residence for the player.

For example; let us assume the meeting contains 70 people; 40 from Gondor; 10 from Mordor; 6 from Rhun; 4 from Harad; 6 from Rohan, 2 from Arthedain and 1 each from Umbar and Lorient. It is proposed that Gondor is an imperialist power, it should not be allowed a zone for WDC. The vote is held 36 Gondorians vote Against and 4 Gondorians vote For; Rohan, Arthedain and Lorient all vote Against. The Harad voters are split 3 For, 1 Against, Mordor, Rhun and Umbar all vote For. The Result is For  $1+3+10+6+1 = 21$  Against  $9+6+2+1+1=19$ . So the proposal is passed despite the fact that there are a majority of Gondorian voters in the hall.

I see this as the fairest system that can be used for WDC. I have considered proxy voting but there are side-effects of this that hold within them the potential destruction of the WDC concept. Consider if there is one nation that has a large hobby with a national organization funded by its governments; they are democratic centralists (which means that they take an internal decision and then all abide by it); if then there was created a WDC supporting membership with voting rights; they would have the ability, finance and discipline to possibly swamp the voting with up to 200 votes. The idea of this disgusts me and if the meeting does pass proxy voting and this happens at a future WDC; then I will never attend WDC again.

I have generally based the WDC charter on the DipCon Charter, save for a few extra ideas; so it should be familiar to most US hobby members with an interest in this idea.

THE CHARTER OF WORLD DIP CON SOCIETY

Version 1.03 (Draft for Discussion); March 1, 1993

by Iain Bowen

To be presented for adoption at World Dip Con IV (Birmingham, UK, July 1994)

1 Definitions, Purposes and Membership

- .1 World Dip Con is an annual International Diplomacy convention; hosted by another convention.
- .2 The World Dip Con Society exists for the purpose of selecting a site for each successive World Dip Con.
- .3 Each person who has registered for an is attending a World Dip Con is considered a member of that year's World Dip Con Society. When World Dip Con is a separate event requiring separate registration within another larger event; then only these who have registered and attended the World DipCon are members of the World Dip Con Society. Membership in any other organization may not be considered qualifying or disqualifying in this regard. No absentee person is a member of the World Dip Con Society. No body corporate is a member of the World Dip Con Society
- .4 The host convention shall have the following duties to World Dip Con:
  - .1 To host a Diplomacy tournament at the convention. The Winner of the tournament shall be awarded the title World Diplomacy Champion for that year.
  - .2 To conduct a World Dip Con Society meeting under the usual rules of meetings.
- .5 All voting during the World Dip Con Society meeting shall be by QUALIFIED NATIONAL VOTE. The voting may be in the open (by show of hands or cards) or by secret ballot as the Chairperson of the meeting decides. Members of the Society vote as individuals but no total sum of a nation's votes within the meeting of a the World Dip Con Society shall exceed the total of 10 votes. If more than 10 voters at the meeting come from a giving nation; the number of votes being cast for each site is expressed by the formula  $(\text{number of votes}/\text{number of national votes}) \times 10$ . The nationality of a voter is determined by his/her nation of residence. Any ties will be broken by the Chairperson having a casting vote. There shall be no absentee or proxy voting.

2 World Dip Con Site Selection

- .1 The World Dip Con Society will have one meeting, which may be spread over several sessions, at each World Dip Con to select the site for the World Dip Con<sup>1</sup> for two years hence. This meeting will not be earlier than the second day of the convention. It will be at time and a place which will have been publicized at least 1 day in advance, and communicated to all players at the Diplomacy tournament. The meeting shall be held in a language suitable for the largest number of members of the society to conduct a debate.
- .2 Any individual or group wishing to bid for the next Word DipCon will be given sufficient time, not to exceed 15 minutes, to present their bid to the Society. If a representative from a bidding site is unable to attend than a written bid may be submitted to the Society by that group. This bid will be presented to the Society by the Chairperson of the meeting. Written material may be used to supplement such bids; but all costs of such material must be paid for by the bidders. The order that the bids are made in shall be determined by lot.
- .3 After all bids have been presented, any member may propose that none of the bids be accepted, and that the decision be referred to the host committee. If this is passed, then the host committee may either  
i) Select a site or ii) Pass the selection to the next year's World Dip Con.
- .4 For the Purposes of World Dip Con administration and rotation of the convention site, the World is divided

---

<sup>1</sup>In 1994, the Society will decide the site for both 1995 and 1996; this is due to the lack of a formal procedure before this date. This will by the only exception to this rule, except under 3.4.



into 5 regions:

.1 Region I (British Isles) consists of the United Kingdom, The Republic of Ireland, The Isle of Man and the Channel Islands.

.2 Region II (Europe) consists of the territory encompassed by the following sovereign countries within the European land mass of 1/1/93: Albania, Austria, Belgium, Belarus, Bosnia, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Lands, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Moldava, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, Russian Federation, Spain, Slovika, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, Yugoslavia.

.3 Region III (North America) All stats of the United States of America plus the Territory of Puerto Rico, Canada, and the Republic of Mexico.

.4 Region IV (Australasia) Australia and New Zealand.

.5 Region V (Floating Region) This region encompasses the following, all of which are equally qualified to bid:

.1 Any country or area of a country not defined in the above zones.

.2 Any nation in Region II; which did not hold a World Dip Con in this rotation.

.3 Any DipCon<sup>2</sup> in Region III; which did not hold a World Dip Con in this rotation.

.5 The World Dip Con site must be rotated among the regions. For any given World Dip con year, one region is eligible to bid for the conventions, as follows (see 2.6 for bids from outside these regions):

1995: Region II

1996: Region III

1996: Region IV

1999: Region V

2000: Region II

2001: Region III

2002: Region IV

The regional eligibility will then continue to rotate in the above sequence.

.6 If the motion of 2.3 is not put, or is put and defeated, a vote shall be taken between the bids presented.

Each member may vote for one bid to abstain. If one bid has more than half the QUALIFIED NATIONAL VOTE (See 1.5) it is selected, If not, then the bid with the least QUALIFIED NATIONAL VOTE is eliminated and a new vote is taken from the remaining bids. This process continues until one bid is selected.

.7 A bid may be submitted from outside the Region which would be normally eligible to bid under the provisions of Section 2.4. However, in counting QUALIFIED NATIONAL VOTES (see 1.5) for any such bid, each vote in favor will only count as 1/2 of a vote.

.8 Whilst lack of the following does not preclude a bid for the site of World Dip Con; the World Dip Con Society should regard the following as being guidelines towards what will make a good Word Dip Con site:

- i. The site should be easily accessible for international attenders.
- ii. The site should have reasonably priced accommodation, either on site or within walking distance.
- iii. The hosting convention should have been running for at least two years at the time of bidding.
- iv. A Diplomacy Tournament should have been a major feature of the hosting convention at the time of bidding.
- v. World Dip Con should be the major event at the hosting convention.
- vi. The hosting convention bear in mind the cost of international travel and shall attempt to reduce cost

---

<sup>2</sup>North America is divided into 4 regions for its national convention, Dip Con. Details of these regions and their rotation sequence is available on request.

for its international attenders if possible.

- vii. The Diplomacy Tournament should have at least two rounds.
- viii. The hosting convention shall be at least two days in length.
- ix. It is desirable that allowances are made for players, in the Diplomacy tournament whose native tongue is not that of the host nation; by, if possible; grouping them with other players with whom they share a common language. A similar amount of consideration should be given at the World

Society meeting.

Dip Con

x. World Dip Con is not just about the play of Diplomacy; but about encouraging Diplomacy players from around the world to meet and share their experiences. It is desirable that some informal social functions are also provided at the convention.

### 3 Administration

.1 The World Dip Con Society has no formal committee for its next meeting is held to be the committee of the hosting convention. One of these members should be allocated special responsibility for World Dip Con.

.2 The hosting convention has complete responsibility for making all preparations for the up coming World Dip Con and will produce a newsletter to keep the world hobby at large informed of World Dip Con's progress. The hosting convention's committee shall arrange all other aspects of the convention which must include the aspects listed in section 1.4.

.3 The member of the committee with the special responsibility for World Dip Con society; if he/she can not be present; he/she shall nominate someone to be the Chairperson of the Society's Meeting. The Chairperson of the Meeting shall produce, within two calendar months of the Society Meeting, a report of the activities of the meeting.

.4 If the committee of successful site for World DipCon cease to function as a convention committee in the intervening two years; then its powers devolve upon the National Diplomacy Association or (failing the existence of such) the National Boardman Number Custodian. They shall do what is necessary to either revive the convention to reallocate the site within the hosting nation. Should they not be able so to do; then they should announce that there is to be no World Dip Con that year and pass on the responsibility for that site selection to next year's World Dip Con where the Society meeting shall then select a site for goth the forthcoming year's World DipCon and the ordinary selection year.

### 4 Amendments to this Charter

.1 Any member may propose an amendment to the Charter by submitting it to the responsible member of the host committee two months in advance of the Convention. The hosting committee must publish such amendments at least one moth before the convention, but may at their discretion combine like amendments as long as substantive changes are not made in the text of the amendments. Persons submitting amendments may, at the discretion of the hosting committee, be charged the cost of publication of these amendments. If payment is requested and refused, the hosting committee is not longer obligated to publish to or to introduce that amendment.

.2 Ordinary Parliamentary procedure applies to the consideration of all amendments. Amendments is considered adopted if a 2/3 majority f the QUALIFIED NATIONAL VOTE is in favor of it. They then become the first items of business of the next World Dip Con Society meeting.

.3 All amendments approved must then be ratified at the next World Dip Con held in a region other than the one in which they were adopted. When ratified they become effective at the end of the World Dip Con at which they are ratified unless they modify they Rotation of World Dip Con, in which case they take effect at the start of the next rotation.

### 5 Enactment

.1 This Charter becomes effective immediately on its ratification by QUALIFIED NATIONAL VOTE at World Dip Con IV. Amendments at this convention require only simply QNV to be passed.