

ATLANTIS

This is ATLANTIS, a journal of postal Diplomacy, edited and published by Deborah and Christopher Schleicher, 5122 W. Carmen Ave., Chicago, Illinois 60630.

ATLANTIS is affiliated with the IFW Diplomacy Society. The editor is a member of The Diplomacy Association.

Subscriptions to ATLANTIS are \$1.50 for 10 issues. There are no games opening at the present time.

Last issue's article on "The Convoy Order" by John J. Beshara has produced two articles by readers contradicting Mr. Beshara, to some degree or another. They are printed below, in article form, because they represent a major effort on the writers' part to discuss the new Rulebook just recently published by Games Research, Inc.

ATLANTIS welcomes these articles, and will continue to publish articles of general interest, dealing with the new Rulebook, and any other aspects of the game of Diplomacy that appeal to our readers.

My comments, as ever, will appear within brackets: []. Because I have decided that these will be in article format, my comments will NOT interrupt the author -- they will appear after the article.

CONVOYS AND THE BRANNAN RULE

...Rod Walker

The article The Convoy Order by John Beshara in ATLANTIS 46 raises some interesting points. I think, however, that the difficulty he raises does not exist, or at least is easily resolved.

One of the basic interpretations given the Rulebook for the past six years is the Brannan Rule. This states that "the attack of a convoyed army is interpreted as coming from the location of the last convoying fleet." Thus, in John's example 1, the attack on Holland is coming from the direction of Nth (not Edi). This rule is extremely useful in resolving complex convoy situations.

When I prepared the original Working Draft of the new Rulebook for consideration by Allan Calhamer and Games Research, I included Brannan's Rule and all its ramifications. Ultimately, however, Mr. Calhamer chose not to include the language of the Brannan Rule and kept only two of its applications. These appear as Rule XII.5 (and Example 13) and the last paragraph of Rule XIV.5 (two units exchanging places via convoy). The Rulebook thus adopts, specifically,

[continued on page 2]

two implications of the Brannan Rule. I think it can be argued that the Rulebook has therefore adopted the Brannan Rule itself, since neither ruling just mentioned would be possible without it. The importance of this assumption will soon become clear.

Before going further, let me also observe that the interpretation of any document can be strained if one is determined to make it so. It seems to me more fruitful to attempt to make the best, most consistent, most useful, and most rational interpretation. The Rulebook is to help, not hinder, the game, and it is best not to lose sight of that fact.

This brings me to Example 2 in John's article. I believe it is incorrectly adjudicated. As will be seen, it can be argued both ways. However, if we accept the interpretation that a convoyed army is coming from the direction of the last convoying fleet, then we have a unit coming from the direction of Eng to Bel, and another from Bel to Eng, each with one support, and the result is a stand-off:

Example A

ENGLAND: A Lon-Bel, F Eng C A Lon-Bel, F Nth S A Lon-Bel.
FRANCE: F Bel-Eng, F Bre S F Bel-Eng.

The difficulty here is that Allan Calhamer originally intended specifically to reject this interpretation. The rule now noted as XII.5 was to have done this. But in the published version, that interpretation has been removed, and a simple basic Brannan's Rule situation (and solution) is given instead. While I am certain that Allan intended to rule exactly as John did in Example 2 of his article, I cannot explain why the change was made. Did Allan change his mind? In any event, the Rulebook is now silent on this problem, and since it has elsewhere accepted Brannan's Rule, it seems logical in this situation to accept a Brannan's Rule solution (Example A).

John's Examples 3 and 4 are correctly adjudicated, but for the wrong reasons, it seems to me. Rules X and XII.5 do not conflict. Rule XII.5 covers only a convoyed attack, not any other, and John's attempt to make it seem that Rule XII.5 would negate the effect of Germany's A Ruh-Bel (in his Example 3) in cutting the support of France's F Bel is not convincing.

There is no conflict between X and XII.5, and hence there is not paradox as John suggests. In fact, when John suggests that Gamesmasters should "interpret Section XII to mean that the support is not cut by the convoyed army, unless the supporting fleet is dislodged" he is merely recommending the ruling clearly given in Example 13. The Rulebook is therefore already clear and consistent on this point and I see no need to raise unnecessary difficulties.

As an historical note, Rule XII.5 is not an attempt to deal with Pandin's Paradox. In the process of writing the new Rulebook, I suggested to Allan that a rule be included which might deal with the situation. His reaction was sensible and pragmatic: a Pandin's Paradox situation has yet to arise in play, and if it did arise it would probably be contrived, so that it made little sense to make a rule to deal with a situation which is so rare as to be little more than hypothetical. There was therefore, no attempt to deal with the Paradox--and, in fact, where the Paradox depended on interpretation of the Rules (however implicit it might have been in the Rules themselves), the essential factor in the Paradox has now been made explicit in Rule XII.3 ("...and has no effect on the province to which it was ordered.").

In sum, therefore, it seems to me to be more sensible to assume that the Rulebook was intended to be internally self-consistent, and that, therefore, there is no real inconsistency between Rules X and XII.5 (and this assumption

[continued on page 4]

"Winter 1909"

1970C

R-1

FRANCE (Comber): Builds A Mar.
RUSSIA (Peery): No Change.
ENGLAND (Miller): No Change.

"Spring 1910" moves are due:
11 February 1972.

XX

"Fall 1903"

1971R

R-3

GERMANY INVADES ENGLAND -- TURKEY INVADES GERMANY
AUSTRIA SILENT

ENGLAND (Lakofka):

F Bel (S) RUSSIAN F Ska-Nth
F Den (S) RUSSIAN F Ska-Nth
A Edi (S) FRENCH F Eng-Lon [Illegal order]

RUSSIA (Horvath):

A Smy (S) F Bla-Ank
F Bla-Ank
F Sev holds
A Mos-War
F Ska-Nth
F Nwy-Nrg
F Swe-Nwy

ITALY (Hoyer):

A Ven (S) AUSTRIAN A Tri-Tyr [NSO]
F Lyo (S) A Mar
A Mar (S) F Wes-Spa (sc)
F Wes-Spa (sc)

GERMANY (Tretick):

F Hel (S) F Nth
A Kie-Den
A Tyr-Pie
A Hol-Cly
F Nth (C) A Hol-Cly
F Nrg (C) A Hol-Cly

TURKEY (Leahey):

A Sil-Mun

FRANCE (Blandin):

A Bur-Mar
A Spa (S) A Bur-Mar
F Eng-Lon
F Bre-Eng
F Mid (S) A Spa

AUSTRIA (Brooks):

[No Moves Received]

F Tri [Unordered; holds]
F Con "
A Gal "
A Vie "
A Rum "
A Bud "

Underlined moves do not succeed. Supply Center Chart follows on page 4.

[Moving further on to your comments on Example 2 of John's article, I think I should repeat the example:

ENGLAND: A Lon-Bel, F Eng C A Lon-Bel, F Nth S A Lon-Bel.
FRANCE: F Bel-Eng, F Bre S F Bel-Eng.

The rule on disrupting convoys (XII.3) states: "If a fleet ordered to convoy is dislodged during the move, the army to be convoyed remains in its original province and has no effect on the province to which it was ordered." (Emphasis mine.) It seems obvious to me that if the convoying fleet was dislodged in any way, the convoy is unsuccessful, no matter how well supported. That is why I would adjudicate the situation as indicated above, not as you do.

[I don't particularly like the inclusion of the phrase "including the one into which it is giving support"--this was known as Miller's Rule, that a dislodged unit could not give support. I never did think that dislodging a unit would cut the support when the attack came from the province to which support was being given, and I have consistently ruled that way. (Any new games I open in the future will, however, follow the Rulebook, even though I disagree with some parts.)

[In John's Example 4, I would rule that the support was not cut by the convoyed attack, even though the unit (F Hol) was dislodged. This is consistent with my own feelings on the Miller Rule, as outlined above. I am afraid that means I disagree with both of you...poison pen letters will be accepted from both of you, but absolutely NO ticking packages....]

[And now another article, from John Boyer, 117 Garland Drive, Carlisle, Pennsylvania 17013.]

"THE CONVOY ORDER" -- REBUTTAL

John Boyer

I have read "The Convoy Order" by John J. Beshara in the January 7th issue of Atlantis, and I must confess that I don't see any paradox. Furthermore, I disagree with the results of Example 1 used by Mr. Beshara. Before I go on to explain what I mean, I would like to remind everyone to get out their copy of the January 7th issue of Atlantis for future references to Mr. Beshara's examples as I won't waste space to reprint the examples.

In Example 1, Mr. Beshara had the English convoy fail because of a standoff. What standoff, I ask? Do not overlook the unique character of a convoying fleet, that is, the convoying fleet is not moving. Looking up Rule XII.3 in the 1971 Edition of Rules of Diplomacy, we read in the last sentence, "An attack on a convoying fleet which does not dislodge it does not affect the convoy." Here, in Example 1, the English convoying fleet in the North Sea is supported by the fleet in the English Channel. Thus, the convoy is not disrupted and the convoyed army continues on its merry way to Holland with the support of the English army in Belgium. This is clear to me and should be clear to anyone else.

Now, Example 2's results are okay with me, and so is Mr. Beshara's reasoning, so let us get on to Example 3. Again, I agree with Mr. Beshara's results, but the following two paragraphs of reasoning is all fouled up. There are two points to which I want to refer. Point one is that Mr. Beshara's inference of Rule X as applied to convoys is that the convoyed army is attacking from a "different space" (in Example 3) and should cut the French support coming from Belgium. Okay, in this I agree with Mr. Beshara, but only if the convoy has

not been disrupted (look up Rule XII.3 again). However, my second reference to Mr. Beshara's claims is purely problematical (rather, grammatical), and that is that in the second sentence of the second paragraph of Mr. Beshara's reasoning following Example 3 we read, "But Section XII conflicts with Section X by stating the 'support is not cut' by either A London or A Ruhr." How, I ask, does A Ruhr get into Rule XII? In fact, in Example 3, it is not the English army which cuts the French support in Belgium, but the German attack from the Ruhr. This results in a standoff between the English and the Germans in Belgium, allowing the French fleet to remain in Belgium. This example (Beshara's third example) is a clear case of Rule IX.5, the "Beleaguered Garrison."

Now, the last example is similar to Example 1 except for the reversed orders of the two German fleets. The results I agree with, and I can see Mr. Beshara's "a" interpretation, but "b" is wrong. I quote Mr. Beshara's "b": "According to Paragraph 5 of Section XII, F Holland can give support because its support cannot be cut by the convoyed army." In fact, Mr. Beshara has misunderstood Mr. Calhamer in a pure case of semantics. One may say here that one should not read more than what a line says, and this is to be the case with Rule XII.5. What does it say then? Simply by making an intelligent reference to Mr. Calhamer's Example 13 in Rule XII.5 we can easily see what he actually meant. "If a convoyed army attacks a fleet which is supporting a fleet which is attacking one of the convoying fleets, that support is not cut." Notice that I underlined "a convoyed army." As in Example 13, the convoyed attack (convoyed army's attack) in the above quote is not supported, that is, the convoyed army is attempting an attack on the "supporting fleet" all by itself. If the convoyed army receives enough support to dislodge the "supporting fleet," then according to Rule X, it succeeds in not only cutting the support, but also dislodging the fleet giving the support. But what happens if the convoyed army is not able to dislodge that "supporting fleet"? Obviously, if the convoy is not protected by another friendly fleet, as in Mr. Beshara's Example 2, the convoy fails to allow the army to succeed in moving to dislodge the "supporting fleet." In other words, it all boils down to a very simple reasoning--If a supported attack on a convoying fleet succeeds in dislodging that convoying fleet, then the army "being convoyed" cannot be convoyed. This is analogous to a battle situation: If the German navy had defeated the English convoy, then the English ships were either sunk or driven back to England with the army still on it. Again, I restate this in another way--An attack on a convoying fleet occurs before the attack of the army being convoyed occurs, regardless of whether its attack is directed upon the "supporting fleet" or on anything else.

As far as I am concerned, this is crystal clear and Mr. Calhamer may be rest assured that his Rule X and XII.5 do not conflict because of two other rules--IX.5 and XII.3 with Rule XII.3 being most important. It says that, "An attack on a convoying fleet which does not dislodge it does not affect the convoy." This alone allows Rule X to take effect. How can Rule X be contradicted if a convoyed army can not move and attack when the convoying fleet has been dislodged? I rest my case for the defense of Mr. Calhamer and his rules.

[A few comments of my own on your article: Why do you say the convoyed army (Example 1) succeeds into Holland? The convoy order is valid, as none of the convoying fleets were dislodged, yet the convoy itself does not succeed as the convoyed army with one support is attempting to move into Holland, while an equally-well-supported F Holland attempts to move into North Sea--the space from where the convoyed army is presumed to be coming (the last convoying fleet). Thus it seems clear to me that there is a stand-off, and the convoy does not

