

ALBION

ISSUE
14



Six Little Diplomats
All on words do thrive.
One used the wrong ones
And then there were five.

BUSINESS GAME NUMBER ONE.

by RENE NOKIN.

Copyright Rene Nokin. Reproduced by permission of the inventor.

INTRODUCTION.

The game is played by four players representing four companies A, B, C and D. The market is represented by six customers, numbered 1 to 6 inclusive; customers are not represented by players in the game - their actions and decisions are determined by the monitor.

Production facilities for each company are identical in layout, but not necessarily in size. Three workshops (designated WS1 etc.) successively treat the same raw material, using each its special expendable material, in order to manufacture five items for sale. Each item requires different lengths of time (in man-hours) and different quantities of material to manufacture.

Each turn, which represents a month in the game, each player makes a series of decisions which are communicated to the monitor; the latter determines the results of each decision and advises each player individually of his results. At the end of a 'normal' turn each player receives only his own results; however the balance sheets of all companies are communicated to all companies every four months.

The decisions required of each company each month consist of allocation of manpower to workshops, purchase of raw material, tenders for items to be manufactured for customers, etc.

TECHNICAL RULES.

Five items may be produced simultaneously in each factory, each requiring a definite quantity of raw material and expendable material per unit produced. Similarly each unit produced requires a certain number of manhours in each of the three specialised workshops of each factory.

Item.	Expendable Material (Quantities per unit)			Raw Material.	Manpower in hours. (per unit)		
	WS1	WS2	WS3		WS1	WS2	WS3
1	30	4	8	38	17	3	8
2	20	3	6	22	1.5	0.4	1
3	150	16	31	140	4	16	10
4	1	1	1	7	0.2	0.1	0.1
5	5	1	3	10	2	1	0.5

Workshop Investment.

In addition, the tools in each workshop require a definite investment per man working in the workshop.

WS1.	Investment	£10,000	per man.
WS2	"	£ 5,000	" "
WS3	"	£ 4,000	" "

Material.

All material (raw and expendable) can be ordered in the decisions of the month. It is delivered in the turn following the decision and is paid for (and can be used) in the second turn after the decision.

Costs of material are:-

Expendable material	WS1	\$0.2 per unit.
	WS2	\$0.4 per unit.
	WS3	\$0.8 per unit.
Raw material (all workshops)		\$2.0 per unit.

Working Hours.

Each company should state, on the decisions of the month, the number of hours to be worked by each employee in each workshop separately. Normal hours are 173 per month, and the salary is \$4.00 per hour.

When required, unscheduled overtime may be worked. Overtime hours are paid at .. \$5.00 per hour, from 174 to 200 hours per month. \$6.00 per hour, from 201 to 220 hours per month.

The total number of hours worked can under no circumstances be above 220 hours per month (i.e. the maximum overtime per month is 47 hours).

Rent.

Buildings are easy to obtain and to dispose of, so the rent is 3% of the investment per turn.

FINANCIAL RULES.

The Administrative Expenses, which are to be determined by each company for each month, and included on the decisions of the month, should be at least 5% of the monthly turnover. If they are lower, delay in invoicing and collecting of money occurs and UNPAID invoices appear on the balance sheet. Administrative expenses can not be reduced once they have reached any level, although they may, of course, be further increased beyond that level.

MARKETING INFORMATION.

Certain information is available to companies at the start of the game which will assist them in making initial decisions.

The variation in the global market index number for all products, all customers and all companies has been:

	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
1968	100	110	115	122	130	128	110	085	112	127	130	135
1969	140	149	163	171	180	177	161	134	162	175	179	185

The sales forecast for January 1970 (start of game) is:-

- Item 1 - 2,200 units.
- Item 2 - 50,000 units.
- Item 3 - 100 units.
- Item 4 - 49,000 units.
- Item 5 - 4,600 units.

MARKETING RULES.

Bids.

Each turn, each customer is assumed to be asking each company for bid prices for all five items. Therefore each company must make 30 bids in each turn (although of course a company may quote a single price to all customers for a particular item if desired). For each bid, each company quotes its price if it thinks that it will be able to deliver. If a company does not wish to bid on one or more items, the quote is NO.

Each company must also supply, with the quotes, a customer priority list, ranking the customers in order of preference.

Game Theory Homework Review.

1.

4	0	2
6	7	1

Quite easy, this one. Pausing only to verify that there is no saddle point (maxmin is 1, minmax is 2) and that there is no dominance, we proceed to have a look at the sub-games.

Sub-game 1.

4	0
6	7

Saddle point at Blue 2 /
Red 1. Not the solution.

Sub-game 2.

4	2
6	1

Saddle point at Blue 1 /
Red 2. Not the solution.

Sub-game 3.

0	2
7	1

Blue plays 3:1
Red plays 1:7
Value $1\frac{3}{4}$

Final test: using the Blue mixed strategy from sub-game 3 against the Red strategy not appearing in that sub-game (i.e. Red 1) we get the fact that Blue would win $4\frac{1}{2}$. Thus the player with the two strategies (blue) does better against the missing Red strategy than against those Red strategies appearing in the sub-game (Red 2 and Red 3). Hence this is the right sub-game, and the complete solution is:-

Blue plays 3:1.
Red plays 0:1:7.
Value $1\frac{3}{4}$.

2.

1	-3	5	-7	9
-2	4	-6	8	-10

A bit more tricky (or rather just as easy, but longer). No saddle point, and no dominance. I'm really being cruel to you poor souls this time. OK - let's try the sub-games. And this time we will make it clearer where these come from.

			Red	
			1	2
Blue	1	1	-3	
	2	-2	4	

The solution of sub-game 1 is soon found to be:-

Blue plays 3:2 Red plays 7:3
 Value of the game is -0.2 (sorry about the decimal).

Unfortunately, this isn't the right sub-game. For it to be so, we should try the mixed Blue strategy against Red 3, Red 4 and Red 5 in turn, and each time get a value better (for Blue) than -0.2 . Against Red 3 the value is 0.6 so that's OK, and against Red 5 the value is 1.4 so that's OK as well. However against Red 4 the value is -1 . Therefore this one isn't the right sub-game, and we must try again.

Sub-game 2.

		Red	
		1	3
Blue	1	1	5
	2	-2	-6

Saddle point here, at Red 1 / Blue 1, so this one is no good either.

Sub-game 3.

		Red	
		1	4
Blue	1	1	-7
	2	-2	8

The solution is:- Blue plays 5:4 Red plays 5:1
 Value of the sub-game is $-\frac{1}{3}$

Trying this in turn against the missing Red strategies, we get:-

 Against Red 2 the value is $1/9$.
 Against Red 3 the value is $1/9$ again.
 Against Red 5 the value is $5/9$.

Therefore we have hit the right one - Blue does better against any of the missing Red strategies than he does against the right play of strategies 1 and 4. The final solution is:-

 Blue plays 5:4
 Red plays 5:0:0:1:0
 Value $-\frac{1}{3}$

3.

1	5
2	4
3	3
4	2
5	1

Again, no saddle point and no dominance. So we have a look at the sub-games. And you are going to love me for this one - it looks ominous, anyway, with the symmetry of the payoffs. Without going into full detail, what happens when you consider the sub-games is....

		Red			Red			Red	
		1	2		1	2		1	2
Blue	1	1 5		1	1 5		2	2 4	
	2	2 4		3	3 3		3	3 3	
		Red			Red			Red	
		1	2		1	2		1	2
Blue	3	3 3		3	3 3		4	4 2	
	4	4 2		5	5 1		5	5 1	

ALL the above sub-games have saddle points - check them yourself. Therefore they cannot be the solutions; there are ten sub-games in a 5x2, and the other four are equally interesting.

		Red			Red	
		1	2		1	2
Blue	1	1 5		1	1 5	
	4	4 2		5	5 1	
		Red			Red	
		1	2		1	2
Blue	2	2 4		2	2 4	
	4	4 2		5	5 1	

All these sub-games have the same solution:-

Blue plays the strategies in ratio 1:1 (for the second and third sub-games) or in ratio 1;2 (for the first) or 2:1 (for the fourth).
 Red plays in ratio 1:1 for all four.
 The value of each game is 3.

It should come as no surprise to you that, when you try the Blue mix from one particular sub-game against the Red strategies omitted from that game, the value remains the same - 3. This is a property of the symmetry of the original game, and we can use it to advantage. You see, there's no point in considering Blue 3 in any sub-game, since it will always, and obviously, yield a saddle point in that sub-game, which in turn means it cannot solve the original. This avoids the necessity of considering 4 of the 10 sub-games right from the start.

The complete solution is, of course, a bit complex.
 Blue plays 1:0:0:0:1 or 0:1:0:1:0 or 1:0:0:2:0 or 0:2:0:0:1 (or any combination of these).
 Red plays a dour 1:1. Value of the game is 3.

Sorry about that one, folks. Still, it all adds to the interest. As the loan merchant once remarked.

4.

-1	5
-3	1
0	-3
-3	0
1	-3
5	-1

Something approaching symmetry here, too, but you will find it's not so bad as the last.

Clearly there is no saddle point, neither is there any dominance. Here's for the sub-games, then.

Sub-game 1.

-1	5
-3	1

Saddle point at Blue 1 / Red 1. Not the solution.

Sub-game 2.

-1	5
0	-3

Solution: Blue 2:1
Red 8:1.
Value $-\frac{1}{2}$

No good, however, since the following winnings against the absent Blue strategies don't work:

- Red mix against Blue 2 gives $-23/9$.
- against Blue 4 gives $-24/9$.
- against Blue 5 gives $5/9$.
- against Blue 6 gives $39/9$.

Too much discrepancy here, I'm afraid, so on we go.

Sub-game 3.

-1	5
1	-3

Solution: Blue 2:3
Red 4:1
Value $1/5$

Again, no good.

- Red mix against Blue 2 gives $-11/5$
- against Blue 3 gives $-3/5$
- against Blue 4 gives $-12/5$.
- against Blue 6 gives $19/5$.

Pity about Blue 6 - the other results are OK. But we are not there yet. Don't worry - this takes a lot less time to calculate than it does to write down.

Sub-game 4.

-1	5
5	-1

Solution: Blue 1:1
Red 1:1
Value 2.

This seems more hopeful, since there is a nice symmetry about the results which reflects that of the question. Trying the Red mix, we get:

against Blue 2 gives -1
 against Blue 3 gives $-1\frac{1}{2}$
 against Blue 4 gives $-1\frac{1}{2}$
 against Blue 5 gives -1

Therefore Red could do better in this game if he were to avoid the sub-game above, based on Blue 1 and 6. However Blue can ensure that Red is forced to play that sub-game, by avoiding all strategies except 1 and 6. Hence we have the solution, as follows:-

Blue plays 1:0:0:0:1.

Red plays 1:1

Value 2.

Hope you enjoyed this little excursion into more difficult games, by and large, than you have met before. Preparing you, as it were, for the rigours of the ~~3~~3 games to come. Incidentally, what does 'by and large' mean? Anyone? Will have to write a story on that someday, involving a character called (you have guessed it) Grossertweedle, who was so fat that he couldn't get out of an open prison. Now, on with the series, and something easy for you this time.

GAME THEORY.

Part 10. Our friend the determinant.

Before you look at larger games, it would be wise for you to get some knowledge of another mathematical weapon we keep tucked away in the armoury. The determinant is a harmless beast, really, and very similar to his brother, the matrix, who you have met so often.

Like a matrix, a determinant is merely an array of numbers. However there are two principal features which distinguish him from the matrix - the way he is written, and his shape.

So far we have been accustomed to writing a matrix in a square box, thus:-

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 3 & 5 \\ \hline 4 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array}$$

However he would have been most offended had he known, since it is usual to write the matrix in brackets, either curved or square, as below:-

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 3 & 5 \\ \hline 4 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array} \quad (\text{square}) \quad \text{or} \quad \left(\begin{array}{cc} 3 & 5 \\ 4 & 1 \end{array} \right) \quad (\text{curved}).$$

Now the determinant is still an array of numbers, but written in a different fashion, thus:-

Our new friend, the chummy determinant:-

$$\begin{vmatrix} 5 & 3 \\ 2 & 4 \end{vmatrix}$$

Subtle, difference, eh? Notice the grandeur, the polish, which comes from being a determinant rather than a mere matrix.

In future we will continue to show game matrices in boxes, as before. However, if we want ever to distinguish between a matrix and a determinant, we will have to write the former in either square or curved brackets. OK?

The determinant is a rather more classy and particular beast in respect of his shape, also. A matrix can be any rectangular shape - we have already met 2×4 matrices etc. - but the determinant is always square. No comment.

Finally, and more important than ever, a determinant has a value, which is more than can be said for a matrix (of course a game has a value, and we represent games in matrices, but the word 'value' is rather different in meaning when we talk of a determinant).

Here is a nice anonymous determinant.

$$\begin{vmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{vmatrix}$$

The letters stand for numbers - you have all done algebra, I suppose, albeit at the wrong end of a gun.

The value of this determinant is quite simply the difference between the diagonal products, thus:

$$\text{Determinant value} = ad - bc$$

This applies to a 2×2 determinant, such as we have here; a 3×3 determinant (and larger) has a value, but I'm not going into that now.

A couple of examples should accustom you to the job, which is going to be important, as well as allowing you to brush up on your algebra, a craft I warrant you thought you had left behind for good.

$$\begin{vmatrix} 5 & 2 \\ 1 & 4 \end{vmatrix} \quad \text{Determinant value} = 5 \times 4 - 1 \times 2 = 20 - 2 = 18.$$

$$\begin{vmatrix} 3 & -2 \\ 1 & -4 \end{vmatrix} \quad \text{Determinant value} = 3 \times -4 - 1 \times -2 = -12 - (-2) = -12 + 2 = -10$$

$$\begin{vmatrix} -4 & -3 \\ -1 & -7 \end{vmatrix} \quad \text{Determinant value} = -4 \times -7 - -1 \times -3 = 28 - 3 = 25.$$

Hope you have all remembered that two negative signs multiply to form a positive sign. Rather like throwing a promissory note down the drain (the note is negative, since it records the fact you owe cash; the action is negative, in the sense that you throw the thing away rather than picking it up; result - you have saved yourself money, hence the combination produces a positive sign).

More Letters to ALBION.

David Jones, 4/58 Deveron Drive, Tilehurst, Reading RG3 4YE.

Dear Don,

Many thanks for your letter. Now that I know the postal procedure bit, I'm sure 70/3 on an international basis should be great fun. You perilously asked for my opinion of ALBION. Frankly it's hard to find words to describe it. Seriously it's great to know that the whole caper is as informal as fish and chips out of the Sunday Times. I always knew that there must be other nuts in this great wide world; now it's confirmed.

Seriously, again (but not too seriously) you're doing a grand job. As that immortal bard, S.M. once said - 'several and a half miles north east of Knutsford is where it all happens - or doesn't, as the case may be.'

Looking forward to receiving ALBION 14.

David Jones

Charles Wells, 3021 Washington Boulevard, Cleveland, Ohio 44118.

Dear Don,

Several comments on ALBION. First, there are at least four American gamesmasters who do not allow a player to remove a retreating unit if there is enough space to retreat it to; namely John McCallum, who first thought up the idea, myself and Sid Cochran and Terry Kuch, who use the rules I wrote.

The introduction of this rule, which I call the McCallum rule (after all, it's about time that Diplomacydom's foremost rules expert should have a rule named after him), is fraught with a difficulty. Namely, what do you do if a player refuses to retreat? McCallum and I both solved that by specifying where the retreat will be if the player doesn't make it. McCallum uses the Just Right Hand Rule; I wrote a much more complicated one in an attempt to make the retreat that results reasonably good. I did the latter also because I have long been interested in the idea of a computer program for playing Diplomacy. Such a thing would be monstrously difficult; indeed, the retreat 'program' that I wrote is 1) quite complicated, and 2) probably not complicated enough!

By the way, both McCallum and I make this automatic retreat only in the case that the player cannot or does not send in a retreat order, and we both allow an extra season for the retreat to be made. Just's original Right Hand Rule was used for ALL retreats, which of course speeds up the game at the expense of good play. I won't comment on the victory criterion except to say that I wrote an article on it in the last LM which is on its way to you.

Concerning variants: I have NEVER understood why people care about these elephantine games with pages and pages of rules and huge, complicated maps. They generally seem to be attempts to combine Avalon Hill fineness of maneuvering with Diplomacy's large-scale strategy. Such a thing ceases to be a game; it becomes a simulation, and although I have nothing against simulations, you CANNOT do a decent one without several years' full-time research, plus a computer.

I have had proposals from many people about how I should jazz up Parlemtent. These usually consist of numerous additional bills, more complicated and varied sources of votes in elections, Presidents, Senates etc. Since the people who think up these rules seem

to do it more or less at random, they gain NO realism, only more complexity.

Parlement is designed so that when the players play it, their actions mimic the actions of real-life politicians in multi-Party Parliaments. One may criticise it for not doing this, or for not being a good game, but I resent the criticism that it is not 'realistic' enough. It's not too simple - it's too complicated NOW!

Of course, a lot of the complaints have come from people who expect it to be like American politics, when it is supposed to be like French politics. The trouble is, not many Americans know anything about European politics; at least, not war-games players and Diplomacy players. I need to advertise the game in political magazines, I guess.

On page 28 of the January issue; I must clarify one point. I allowed Smythe to gobble up my Italy from behind in the game McCallum mentions because I was carrying out an agreement that I would help him win, since he had helped me win 1965A. My 'feud' with Reinsel was not my reason for allowing Smythe to do this. My 'feud', by the way, consisted of my criticising Reinsel's postal rules as encouraging dropouts, and of his calling me names. Stay well; Charles.

** It's nice to know that the inventor of Parlement thinks the game is too complex in its present form - I thought I was thick (and I am probably still right) in being unable to grasp the rules. Glad to hear that Charles is stoutly resisting arguments asking for more complications; what I need, to be safe, is a 'kiddies' version to give me a chance to understand the game. The lack of response to the offer we made of a Parlement game in ALBION some time ago is a fair indication that others who have the rules think likewise. Anyway, many thanks for the comments, Charles. One point, though, as a mathematician, the game theory articles will be old hat to you, no doubt; the question is - how many mistakes have I made so far? The rest of the readership seem singularly uninspired in their efforts to pick out my errors. djt**

Larry Fong, 704 Alice Street, Oakland, California 94607.

Dear Don,

Your ALBION is well worth double the price. I would appreciate knowing when you will be accepting trades. I will soon be putting out my third Dippy 'zine, and if you trade you'll get all three. Mostly, trades are good for keeping records, in that I won't have to keep remembering to send you money.

WRONG! The BERZERKELEY BARK is one section of three which go to form the LGBBAHBC. Let's start all over....The LIMBOURG GAZETTE AND BI-MONTHLY ALMANAC, published by Craig Klyver with 6 games, ceased to be. Games were distributed to volunteers. I received two and formed the BERZERKELEY BARK around them. Lee Childs, my co-editor, received one game and formed a continuation of the LIMBOURG GAZETTE. We wrote one another quite often on cooperation and finally we merged. Lee Childs happened to mention something about HOLY BIBLE CRUSADE so we added that to our name. Lee picked up one more game from a deserting substitute gamesmaster of one of the Limbourg games and we had four of the original. Our title became THE LIMBOURG GAZETTE, BERZERKELEY BARK & HOLY BIBLE CRUSADE

which may be referred to as the LGBBAHBC, the BARK, or anything you want to call it. From there we expanded to 6 games. The LGBBAHBC grew out of one 'zine - the now defunct Craig Klyver's LIMBOURG GAZETTE AND BI-MONTHLY ALMANAC.

Our second 'zine, which is edited by George Schelz Jnr, Lee Childs and myself (also publisher) is called FUG, with sections to be called FUG EAST (George living in NY), FUG WEST (my section) and Lee's yet un-named section. This 'zine is based on very fast games and little small talk. Deadlines are zip zip zip, or will be if we ever get organised.

The third 'zine is not yet out and is just me. It's to form the basis of a Diplomacy Society of a wargaming club/corporation. Gonna go and call it the SITZMARK.

Your 'zine quality is very good, as is your your your your (I wrote one too many and figured, why quit?) content. It is absolutely lovable (ugh!). Well, anyway I continue to invest if you'll let me know how.

Sincerely; Larry.

Larry's reference to his difficulty in subscribing cash to the ALBION coffers refers back to the dollar note (sorry, bill) he sent me, which caused me to indulge in some rather undercounter financial transactions, recounted in an earlier issue. At the moment, as it happens, I am quite happy to receive dollar bills (preference will be given to multiples of ten) since I can then spend them in the U.S.A. this summer, and save taking over any gold bricks, or the Tower of London for sale. However after July this method will be obsolete - it's unlikely we will be able to afford to leave Timperley, never mind go to somewhere in the dollar area, after the expense of the trip this year. Subs from U.S. subscribers can therefore go to Bob Johnson, who will keep me posted. djt

Dick Holcombe, 45 Kimberlin Heights Drive, Oakland, California.
Dear Don,

.....Truly I was aware of your 25¢ price for subs (presumably by surface), but knowing that some of our more affluent members might insist on air, and believing that you lack back copies of one or two of your earlier issues, I felt constrained to do a little pricing for you.

First, for air, I believe this costs you 1/6d per 1/2 oz. Your paper seems to be about the same weight as that used in the PACIFIC DIPLODEUR, which I've observed to be JUST over five sheets to the ounce. The first 10 issues probably averaged around 10 sheets apiece, so I anticipated a mailing cost of (now in U.S.) 18¢x4 = 72¢. Future issues were anticipated to run closer to 15 sheets, so 18¢x6 = 1.08 dollars. So I figured a dollar should be a nice even price to set you until you had a chance to re-evaluate. Naturally, if you use less than first class for single mailings, I overestimated.

When pricing your back issues by surface, I took into consideration that you might have to photocopy some of the back issues, probably at about 5¢ per page, so left you some leeway for that purpose. Anyway, how can you possibly make it at 25¢ per issue???

** The ALBION Comptroller and Financial Advisory Panel is housed

in a dingy office in Manchester. So far I haven't been able to find it, although curious sounds reach me whenever I pass the Tatler 'Adult Film Club', and my suspicions have been aroused (along with other things) more than once. At present, however, I think I know how I manage on 25~~6~~ per issue. I just lose money. How much is not yet revealed to me. However in a future issue I aim to produce a financial account for the entire ALBION publication roster in the last nine months or so. This article promises to be the funniest since Hypertweedle, so don't miss it.

Seriously, I will have to re-evaluate the affairs of the magazine. Overseas response has been larger than I had thought possible, and the fact that envelopes and things keep going up in price hasn't made the job easier. Dear reader, don't destroy the envelope in which this issue reached you - it cost 5d to purchase and hence should be good for a few years yet. Anyway, here's a warning - soon I will be publishing a financial account. And after that you will be able to see me on visiting days only. Please don't hide the file in the cherry cake - it plays hell with my teeth. djt**

Trades and Subscriber List. Additions and corrections.

Please amend the list published in issue 13 as follows:-

Add 29. Bernie Ackerman, (S). (14). P.O.Box 6, Daggafontein, Transvaal, South Africa.

Amend. Buddy Tretick (S). (23).

Add 30. David Jones (S).(?). 4/58 Deveron Drive, Tilehurst, Reading.

Back issue requirements list.

Please send your requirements for this list if your name does not appear and, for some reason, you want to obtain copies of those issues of ALBION currently out of print. At present the list is as follows:-

23. Bill Heim. Wants 1,3,4,5.

28. Rod Blackshaw. Wants 1,3,4,5.

29. Bernie Ackerman. Wants 1,3,4,5.

New Games.

The lists for Abstraction, 70/3 and 70/4 are filling up nicely, and confirmations are coming in. Still one or two unconfirmed places in each game, so if you want a place, now is the time to write! Don't send game fees etc. yet, incidentally.

I hope to be publishing a list of confirmed players in issue 15, together with the first deadline date.

Note that 70/3 will be run on slightly different lines - I will be playing! No, I won't cheat and gamesmaster as well - Malcolm Watson has kindly volunteered, with his arm up his back, to act as gamesmaster for that game. However you can still send your orders to me - just stick them up with Sellotape and Malcolm will verify that the seal is unbroken when the orders reach him. Write your initials under the tape, perhaps, so that I can't open the orders without defacing the initials. Looking forward to being locked in combat again, after my first tragic effort in DIPLODEUR II. What Malcolm doesn't know is that he will be doing the typing for 70/3 as well.....

REPORT.ALBION 69/1 (1969BG).Autumn 1907 orders.

Austria (Nethercot);	A(Gal) S Russian A(Mos)-War. A(Tyr) S A(Ven). A(Boh)stands.	A(Tri) S A(Ven). A(Ven) stands.
France (Watson);	A(Tus)-Rom. F(IOUS)-Tun. F(NTH) C A(Yor)-Nor. F(Ska) S A(Yor)-Nor. <u>A(Pie)-Ven.</u>	F(Nap) S A(Tus)-Rom. A(Yor)-Nor. F(NWG) S A(Yor)-Nor. F(MAO)-WMS. A(Ruh) S German A(Mun).
Germany (Newcombe);	A(Mun) stands. A(Pru) S F(BAL)-Liv. <u>A(War)-Mos.</u>	F(BAL)-Liv. F(Ber)-BAL. <u>F(Den)-Swe.</u>
Italy (Robertson);	<u>A(Rom)-Ven.</u>	F(ADS) S A(Rom)-Ven.
Russia (Hancock);	A(Mos)-War. F(BAS) S F(Nor). <u>F(Nor) S A(Swe).</u>	<u>A(Liv) S A(Mos)-War.</u> F(GoB) S A(Swe). <u>A(Swe) S F(Nor).</u>
Turkey (Wood);	F(AES)-EMS. A(Arm) stands. A(Alb) stands.	A(Bul)-Gre. F(Con)-AES.

Retreats: Russian A(Liv) retreats to St.P or Moscow.
 Russian F(Nor) retreats to St.P-NC (only place).
 Italian A(Rom) retreats to Apu (only place).
 German A(War) retreats to Sil (only place).

The Russian retreats being possible in only one way, they will be performed as follows:- F(Nor) retreats to StP-NC, A(Liv) to Mos.

Notation: S = supports. C = convoys. Underlined moves fail.

Builds.

Austria controls:	Vie, Tri, Bud, Ser, Ven.	No change for 5.
France controls:	Par, Bre, Mar, Por, Bel, Spa, Lon, Lpl, Edi, Nap, Tun, Rom, Nor.	Builds 3 for 13.
Italy controls:	Rom, Ty. Eliminated.	Removes A(Apu), F(ADS).
Germany controls:	Ber, Kie, Mun, Den, Hol, Mos.	Removes 1 for 5.
Russia controls:	Mos, War, StP, Swe, Rum, Sev, Mos.	No change for 6.
Turkey controls:	Ank, Smy, Con, Gre, Bul.	No change for 5.

DEADLINE FOR WINTER 1907 BUILDS IS Wednesday April 8th.

Press Releases.

From the German Press. There is a lull over Central Europe which, we feel, must soon break into open conflict as the Russians try to stir up trouble to postpone the hour of their ultimate collapse. The vulture of doom is hanging over the Eastern capital and its fickle dependencies. The German system of defensive alliances has shown itself to be the backbone of our conquests and of those of our friends and allies. Poland is only the beginning!
 Bülow.

REPORT.ALBION 69/2 (1969CF)Autumn 1903.

First, an apology for an error which appeared in the report for Spring 1903. The Austrian order F(Alb) S A(Ser) is clearly illegal, and should have been underlined. My thanks to Bob Stuart who pointed out the mistake.

Austria (Wood);	F(Alb) S Italian A(Tun)-Gre. A(Ser) S A(Bud). A(Vie) S A(Bud).	A(Bud) S A(Ser).
England (Hancock);	F(Cly)-Lpl. <u>F(Lon)-Wal.</u>	A(Yor) S F(Cly)-Lpl.
France (Evans);	F(ENC)-Lon. <u>F(Lpl) stands.</u> F(MAO) stands.	A(Wal) S F(ENC)-Lon. A(Bur) stands. A(Spa) stands.
Germany (Stuart);	F(NTH)-Edi. F(BAL)-Swe. A(Pru) S A(Sil).	F(Swe)-Nor. A(Kie)-Mun. A(Sil) S A(Pru).
Italy (Watson);	A(Tun)-Gre. F(IOUS) C A(Tun)-Gre. F(AES) S F(Smy)-Con.	A(Tyr) stands. F(Smy)-Con.
Russia (Robertson);	F(BAS)-NWG. A(Liv) S A(Gal)-War. A(Ukr) S F(Rum).	A(Gal)-War. F(Rum) stands. F(GoB)-BAL.
Turkey (Thomas);	F(EMS) stands. <u>A(Bul)-Con.</u>	<u>A(Gre)-Bul.</u> F(Con)-BLA.

Retreats: English F(Lon) retreats to NTH (only available).
French F(Lpl) retreats to IRI or NAO.
Turkish A(Gre) cannot retreat and it eliminated.

Notation: C = convoys. S = supports. Underlined moves fail

Builds.

Austria controls:	Tri, Bud, Vie, Ser.	No change for 4.
England controls:	Lpl , Lpl, Edi .	Removes 2 for 1.
France controls:	Par, Mar, Bre, Bel, Por, Spa, Lon.	Builds 1 for 7.
Germany controls:	Ber, Mun, Kie, Den, Hol, Nor, Swe, Edi.	Builds 2 for 8.
Italy controls:	Ven, Rom, Nap, Tun, Smy, Con, Gre.	Builds 2 for 7.
Russia controls:	Mos, War, Sev, StP, Rum, Syl .	Removes 1 for 5.
Turkey controls:	Lpl , Ank, Bul, Edi .	Removes 1 for 2.

DEADLINE FOR WINTER 1903 BUILDS IS Wednesday April 8th.

INFORMATION: THE CONSERVATIVE POSITION ON
DEFENCE EAST OF SUEZ.

