

ATLANTIS

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

Subscriptions to ATLANTIS are \$1.50 for 10 issues. There are no games opening at the present time, but there are substitute positions open -- see below.

"Spring 1902"

1971CQ

R-5

ITALY & AUSTRIA SILENT

ENGLAND (Horvath):

F Ska-Swe
F Nwy (S) F Ska-Swe
A Wal holds
F Lon-Nth

GERMANY (Trtek):

A Bel holds
A Hol-Ruh
F Kie-Hol
A Mun-Kie
F Ber-Bal
F Den (S) F Ber-Bal

RUSSIA (Proujansky):

A Gal-Sil
A Mos-Liv
A Ukr-Rum
F Bot-Swe
F Rum-Sev

TURKEY (McGee):

A Bul-Gre
F Con-Bul (sc)
A Ank-Con
A Smy holds

FRANCE (Bell):

A Por-Spa
A Spa-Mar
A Par-Bre
F Bre-Mid
F Mid-NAT

ITALY (N/A): [Resigned]

A Tyr [Unordered; holds]
A Rom "
F Tun "

the convoying fleet in the North Sea has been determined as successful in resisting the attack from the enemy fleet. Two points are very important in determining the correct results in Beshara's Example One and in any others like it:

(1) The attack on a convoy is on the convoying fleet and not on the army being convoyed, and (2) The attack on the convoying fleet occurs (is adjudicated) before the attack of the army to be convoyed (if the convoy is not disrupted).

Thus, in Example One, the convoying fleet was protected from dislodgment and allowed the army to be convoyed. Using Brannan's Rule, you would be having the German Holland fleet attacking two different units at one time in one space which is doubly illegal. In other words, one cannot attack twice with the same unit in the same move, and one cannot have an attack coming from two units "located" in the same space. I hope that this clears up Example One, that is, the English convoy succeeds because its convoy was not disrupted and because the army was not opposed in Holland.

Mr. Beshara's Example Four was similar to his first example except for the reversal of the German fleet orders with Holland now supporting instead of attacking as in Example One. Everyone agrees on the results, but there were disagreements on the actual ruling. Now, according to those who are using Brannan's Rule, the convoyed army is attacking from the North Sea, and with support from the army in Belgium, it dislodges the fleet in Holland. A neat example of Rule X which would rule that the Holland fleet's support would be cut. Ah, ha! But, they say the convoyed army can't cut the support of the Holland fleet because Rule XII.5 specifically says it can't.

Hold it, everyone! Don't forget that our controversial Example Four is not the same as Example 13 in the Rulebook. In Example Four, the English fleet in the North Sea is being protected (supported) by the English fleet in the English Channel. Thus, when the convoyed army attacked Holland, it was not trying to protect itself but trying to dislodge that fleet in Holland, or rather, trying to gain entry into the Holland space. Remove that English supporting fleet in the English Channel and you have the application of Rule XII.5. There could have been no conflict of Rules X and XII.5, as stated in Mr. Beshara's Paradox and "shown" in his Example Four, because Rule XII.5 never came into play and was not used in the adjudication of Example Four. Indeed, I will go further to say that Rule XII.5 is an application of Rule X as applied to convoys! Yes, even if one were to think that Rule XII.5 was an application of Brannan's Rule, the logical result would still be the same. That, with or without Brannan's Rule, the convoyed army cannot cut the "convoy disrupting support" of the fleet which it was attacking because the convoy itself had already been cut. One must remember that the convoy move requires two units at the minimum, and involves using both a fleet and an army unit. If one unit fails, the other unit fails. If the convoying fleet fails to convoy, the army fails to move. This is what happened in the Rulebook's Example 13. Rule XII.5 is just an application of Rule X and is really not a rule of its own. The support wasn't cut because the convoy failed to resist the convoy disrupting attack and not because it couldn't in any other situations such as Mr. Beshara's Example Four. A convoyed attack cannot protect the convoying fleet when the convoying fleet is disrupted, and in this respect, Rule XII.5 is a rule. But, when the convoying fleet under attack is protected by another friendly fleet, that condition allows the convoyed army to cut the support and dislodge the supporting enemy fleet. In other words, Mr. Calhmer did not say that the convoyed attack couldn't cut the support of an enemy fleet if that convoyed army was allowed to move (because of a friendly fleet supporting the convoy against disruption). And, if we were to go by his other rules, we certainly can in Mr. Beshara's Example Four.

To sum up--Although we actually are cutting the support in Holland (in Mr. Beshara's Example Four), it was not necessary for the success of the "convoyed army being able to move and attack" Holland. The convoyed army is not cutting the

support and thus going against any possible interpretation of Rule XII.5, but attacking the Holland Space. If the convoy was not supported as in Example 13 of Rule XII.5, then we would have to rule that the convoyed attack on the Holland Space did not cut the support of the enemy fleet in Holland. However, as with Mr. Beshara's Example Four, the friendly supporting fleet in the English Channel had already seen to success of the convoy and the failure of the German attack on the North Sea space (and the fleet in it). Thus, Rule XII.5 was not applied and couldn't possibly conflict with Rule X which was used. Again, I rest my case for the defense of Mr. Calhamer and the new Rulebook.

[John Boyer, 117 Garland Drive, Carlisle, Penn. 17013.]

[The following is an article commenting on the article by Buddy Tretick that appeared in ATLANTIS #48.]

[Rod Walker, 4719 Felton St., San Diego, California 92116; 3 February 1972.]

There are four comments I'd like to make on Buddy's article. The first is that he has managed to become very confused on the question of Brannan's Rule. In the first part of the article, he accepts Brannan's Rule that the attack of a convoyed army comes from the direction of the last convoying fleet. Note, for instance, "The army (Edinburgh) was the attacking army,..." and the following sentence. Also note, later on, "Fleet Belgium is giving support into the English Channel. The attacking army is coming, not from London, but from the last space of the convoy, namely, the English Channel." That is a classic statement of Brannan's Rule. Yet almost immediately, in his discussion of Example 4, he switches ground and decides that the convoyed attack is not coming from the direction of the last convoying fleet (cf. "The convoying fleet is NOT the attacking unit..."). This is very confusing, and very confused. The entire analysis suffers from this sort of doublethink and I doubt the reader can glean much from it as a result.

Secondly, Buddy considers a slightly revised version of Example 1:

ENGLAND: A Edi-Hol, F Nth C A Edi-Hol, A Bel S A Edi-Hol.

GERMANY: F Hol-Nth, F Den S F Hol-Nth.

He suggests that most 'zines (GRAUSTARK excepted) rule this way. To my knowledge, most 'zines have not specifically ruled on this question, but GRAUSTARK has ruled on it. The GRAUSTARK ruling, in issue 253, page 6, is exactly the one Buddy gives, and not different from it, as he seems to believe. Buddy's ideas on this subject seem to be drawn from GRAUSTARK (the examples are quite similar), and he is a player in that 'zine, so it is surprising that he does not know how Boardman rules. Many other 'zines are exceptions, however, and rule the situation as a stand-off (this is generally known as Walker's Rule). These include EREHWON (and my other 'zines), DIPLODEUR, VERBAL CHAOS, LTD., MIDWESTERN COURIER, SMUT*, XENOGOGIC. Some 'zines, such as VULCAN and SAETA, merely state they use Brannan's Rule (from which the Walker Rule is derived), without detailing in what ways they use it. In short, it would not appear that Buddy is very well informed on who rules what way on this question, and I suggest he research it more thoroughly before attempting to write on it.

Thirdly, Buddy says all would be well if the Rulebook specified that the support of a fleet cannot be cut by an attack from a space into which that fleet is giving support. And so it does. Rule XII.5 says exactly that ("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"). Rule X supports this by noting that, "If a unit ordered to support in a given space is attacked from a space different from the one into which it is giving support, or is dislodged..., then its support is 'cut'." This brings us back to John Beshara's original point, however, and shows that Rule X and XII.5, far from producing and sort of paradox, work very well together and are in complete harmony.

Fourthly, Buddy's ruling that a unit can be forced to retreat even though not dislodged is contrary to the old Rulebook, which states clearly that a unit is dislodged and must retreat only if the space it is in is occupied by another unit (i.e., one with greater support). This requirement of the Rulebook has long been recognized by the Beleaguered Garrison rule, which was used universally at one time until Buddy changed his mind (his 1968 house rules, for instance, used that ruling, not his present one). The new Rulebook makes this ruling even more specific in Rule IX.5, Beleaguered Garrison (thus adopting the postal terminology). Buddy's ruling here is thus completely out of line and has no support from an extant edition of the Rulebook. In all other 'zines, the Rulebook is followed.

&

[The following is also from Rod Walker, dated 14 February 1972.]

One short rejoinder to Beshara's letter in ATLANTIS 48. One wonders how far John will go in order to prove a paradox which does not exist and in attempting to discredit people who are pointing this out. Two points should be noted:

1. I did not agree with his Example 2 in GRAUSTARK 255. There, as in ATLANTIS, I contend that the army and the fleet, having equal support for their attacks, stand each other off. I suggest John reread GRAU 255 more carefully; he has obviously read in it what he wants to see there, not what was actually there. It is the same with his misuse of the Rulebook.

2. There is no paradox involved in all this. A paradox, as anyone who has taken a course in elementary logic would know, arises when two or more axiomatic propositions, each necessary to a logical structure, lead to a question or problem which cannot be answered or resolved within that logical structure. Pandin's Paradox is a good example (and, in my opinion, the only example) of a paradox arising under the Rulebook. A paradox does not arise merely because Rule A covers a complex of situations and Rule B merely covers one of them. Consider these two statements:

- A. A square has four corners.
- B. A square has a corner.

Statement A describes the whole square, whereas statement B describes only part of it. Yet there is no contradiction between them, even though John Beshara, using the "logic" of his letter, would say that B disputes A in saying a square has only one corner and that a "paradox" is created.

That is what he has done with the convoy rules. Rule X lays down the rules governing when a support is or is not cut. Rule XII.5 merely defines where a convoyed attack fits within Rule X. It is not necessary to repeat the whole of Rule X; that would be redundant. We know that a dislodging attack cuts support. What we do not know is whether a convoyed attack (on a fleet supporting an attack on the convoying fleet) would otherwise cut support. Rule XII.5 says it does not. It is silly to contend that a "paradox" arises from a clarification. In any event, Beshara shows that all he has done is raise a tempest in a teapot by recommending exactly the adjudication the Rulebook requires. Except for his known frantic desire to have a paradox or rule interpretation named after himself, I cannot see

why he is spilling all this ink over nothing. I hope that he will spend more time trying to make a useful contribution to postal Diplomacy instead of pursuing quibbles and raising shades. Go labor in the vinyards of the Lord, John, and stay away from the Witch of En-Lor.

On to your problem, Chris:

FRANCE: A Bre-Naf, F Mid C A Bre-Naf, F Wes C A Bre-Naf, F Tun S A Bre-Naf. F Mid is dislodged.

ITALY: F Spa (sc)-Mid, F Naf S F Spa (sc)-Mid.

There is no doubt this is a sticky one, and you have uncovered a problem that John has ignored in his haste to play at "paradoxes". My ruling is shown. This is really a chicken-and-egg situation. I suspect, however, that most GMs will rule as I have, but the reasons will differ. My reasoning is as follows, and will be a bit lengthy:

1. I suspect you meant to write: F Wes S A Bre-Naf. [No.] Even so, I would rule the same. First, I proceed from analogy. Consider:

FRANCE: F Mid-Naf, F Wes & F Tun S F Mid-Naf.

ITALY: F Spa (sc)-Mid, F Naf S F Spa (sc)-Mid (F Naf is dislodged).

F Naf is annihilated in fact. Now, it is clear that F Spa (sc)-Mid goes, regardless, and that the support would have been valid if F Naf had not been dislodged. Of course, F Bre-Mid then results in a stand-off, and succeeds if it obtains one support (e.g., F Iri S F Bre-Mid).

2. However, if we eliminate the French supports, then F Spa (sc) succeeds and the F Mid is dislodged.

3. Your problem eliminates one key element in all this. The F Mid is not ordered to move, but convoys. We are therefore faced with the problem of asking which order came first, even though they are all simultaneous. That cannot be resolved, and yet the situation is obviously not a stand-off. In the Paradox, the success of each attack is the cause of its own failure. In this, the success of each attack is the cause of its own success--that is, each attack must succeed before it can be successful, which is enough to boggle the mind.

4. We must therefore fall back on a key phrase in the Rulebook, rule XII.5 again, which says: "A convoyed attack does not protect the convoying fleets." That is the only way to resolve this, and it takes us back to the analogy of the fleet attack I made in paragraph 1 above. This is the situation in Example 13, but with the army being supported in its attack. I would rule exactly as Example 13 rules; namely, that the convoying fleet is dislodged and the attack on Naf therefore fails. I realize this is arbitrary and one could argue out of both sides of one's mouth on this one. However, this ruling at least has some sanction within the Rulebook.

You know, now that I think about it, you meant to write "F Wes C A Bre-Naf", didn't you? That's sticky, also. There is no rule to cover that in the Rulebook, and no guidance except the initial sentence of Rule XII.5, which I have already quoted.

The orders are themselves somewhat nonsensical, unless France could contrive some advantage that way--which he could do if the GM would rule the support of F Naf cut by this attack.

Your argument, that F Mid is dislodged, makes sense, particularly under XII.5. However, Rule X says that the support is cut by an attack "from a space different from the one into which" support is being given, and Rule VII.2 defines an attack as "a move order, correctly given." It could be argued that it is the order, not

the movement, which cuts support, and that therefore A Bre-NAf succeeds.

It could be argued that allowing A Bre-NAf in this instance would give greater flexibility and tactical power to the convoy order. On the other hand, it could be argued that allowing F Spa (sc)-Mid is more consistent with the rest of the Rulebook.

I am therefore not quite sure how this should be adjudicated. I would like to see other arguments on it from others. I would particularly be anxious to see Allan Calhamer's ideas on the subject. I am inclined to agree with your ruling, but I am not altogether sure. These problems arise just as much under the old Rulebook, by the way--both the one you originally suggested and my variation of it, making F Wes a supporting unit. It is a pity no one saw them before so that we could have put something in to cover them. Yours, with F Wes convoying, would arise very rarely, but it might arise once in a while if the GM in question ruled A Bre-NAf succeeds. There would then be some percentage in making such an order. I am writing Allan on all this and asking his opinion.

#####

[The following is from Andrew Phillips, 128 Oliver St., Daly City, California 94014. It was written before ATLANTIS #48 was published.]

John Boyer is right, and the rest of you are all wet. Consider Example 1:
ENGLAND: A Edi-Hol, F Nth C A Edi-Hol, A Bel S A Edi-Hol, F Eng S F Nth.
GERMANY: F Hol-Nth, F Den S F Hol-Nth.

"Because two opposing units are attempting to move with equal support into and out of Holland via the North Sea, a standoff occurs"--John Bechara.

"...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, 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 Brannan Rule] states that 'the attack of the convoyed army is interpreted as coming from the location of the last convoying fleet.' Thus...the attack on Holland is coming from the direction of Nth (not Edi)."--Rod Walker.

"...the convoyed army with one support is attempting to move into Holland, while an equally-well-supported F Hol 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..."--Chris Schleicher.

"What standoff, I ask?"--John Boyer.

What standoff, indeed? If the first three of you had consulted the text of the new Rulebook instead of your preconceptions (because Boyer didn't have any, that's what he did) you would have found that only three situations are properly so classified.

"If two or more units are ordered to the same space... If a unit is not ordered to move, or is prevented from moving, and other units are ordered to its space... If two units are ordered, each to the space the other occupies... These three situations are called 'stand-offs'."--GRI Rulebook, 1971 Edition, CONFLICTS.

What standoff, indeed! Certainly the first classification doesn't apply. F Hol is certainly prevented from moving, but A Edi "unless...opposed by a unit equally well or better supported... may make its move, the rules under CONFLICTS above notwithstanding." F Hol obviously isn't equally well or better supported

in place so the second classification doesn't apply either.

Does the third? Are F Hol and A Edi equally well supported, "each to the space the other occupies..."? By what stretch of phrase does A Edi "occupy" the North Sea? Only Rod Walker even takes a stab at the kind of heavy-duty stretching required, and when he stops--still several stretchings removed from a satisfactory conclusion--he seems rightly dubious ("I think it can be argued...") that the resultant distorted shape bears any relationship to the original text.

In fact that relationship is tenuous indeed. XII.5 and XIV.5c are not merely and necessarily rulings, illustrations of some more basic principle. The former, indeed, says a number of things in no way implied by Brannan's Rule, and either is in any case quite capable of standing on its own as a rule, capable of independent and reasonable application.

It follows that John Beshara's ruling on Example 1 is in error, and his ruling on Example 2 correct (and how he managed to contradict himself between the two is for him to explain and me to wonder at).

The problems with Examples 3 and 4 do not appear to be major--as Boyer has rightly observed, the wording of XII.5 is not preemptive, and merely because a support is not cut by a convoyed attack does not prevent it from being cut by the resultant dislodgement of a second attack. The rulings are correct.

For example, consider:

ENGLAND: F Eng (C) A Lon-Bel, A Lon-Bel, F Nth (C) A Lon-Bel.

FRANCE: F Bel (S) F Pic-Eng, F Pic-Eng or F Bel (S) F Hol-Nth, F Hol-Nth.

NB: Walker used to rule the former a standoff, the latter a dislodgement. Obviously under the new Rulebook either is a dislodgement. I'd rule the attempted English move in improper format, but that's another story...

&

[The following is also by Andy, written after ATLANTIS #48 came out.]

The problem you pose, hereby dubbed the Schleicher Paradox, is insoluble by reference to the new Rulebook, with the result that you should probably rule that all moves fail. A similar insoluble situation is obtained by reversing the French moves in Beshara's Example 2:

ENGLAND: A Lon-Bel via F Eng & (S) by F Nth.

FRANCE: F Bel (S) F Bre-Eng.

This is the Schleicher Paradox writ simple, and again the proper ruling is probably that both moves fail. Your proposed dislodgement of the convoy is in accordance with Miller's old principle that convoys are, in effect, adjudicated last (he never stated it, but that's the way he ruled). However there is no basis for that principle in either this Rulebook or the old one.

#####

DIPCON V - DIPCON V

Diplomacy Convention V will be held in Chicago at the Sherman House on July 22 & 23. Some of the featured events include a dinner[!] with Allan Calhamer giving the keynote address, a 49-player tournament (double elimination), lectures and discussions plus a full wargaming convention! Fees are not yet set, but there will be discounts for prepayment, IFW, under 18, etc. There will also be plenty of rooms -- the normal \$50 double will be only \$18/night for you out-of-towners.

We'll see you there!

#####