

Number 13

BLOOD AND IRON

December 30, '72

XX
Blood and Iron is devoted to multi-player "conflict simulations,"
especially Diplomacy variants. Subscription 8/\$1, sample issue 15¢
from the editor-publisher, Lewis Pulsipher, 329 Twin Towers, Albion,
Mich. 49224. BI is affiliated with the Michigan Organized Wargamers
and its games are guaranteed by that group. This is Orion Press
Publication #32. For game openings see below.
XX

72.23h

1936 attacks: GER (Roseman): In Aus vs. Bri and Fra, 18-6, D. Place.
Control in Aus.
US (Eynon): No attacks
FRA (McHoull): NMR
BRI (Lipson): NMR Places Understandings in Ger and Pol.
RUS (Van De Graaf): No attacks. Places control in Rom.

Deadline for 1937 Placements is January 18, 1973 at noon at 329
Twin Towers, Albion, Mi 49224. I'll be at home until the 14th in
case you need to reach me long before the deadline.

72.9h

1939 Placements.
US (Campion?): NMR 10-US
FRA (Hendry): 5-Pol, 5-Rom, 2-Fra
BRI (Caton): 8-Ger, 7-Rus, 1-Fra
RUS (Eynon): 12-Rus, 1-Rom, 1-Pol
GER (Birsan): 23-Ger, 4-Pol, 1-Rom

One British PF in Poland was inadvertently omitted from the chart
in BI 12.

	Al	Au	Ba	Br	Cz	Ge	It	Po	Rh	Ro	Ru	US	Fr
USA								7				18	
FRA	C			U		U+3		5		5			2
BRI						8		1		2	U+9	U+3	5
RUS			C	U+2		U+4		1		1	24		
GER		C	C		C	24		14	C	6			

Todd Roseman, 66 Montbello, Chula Vista, Calif. 92010 is asked to
submit standby moves for United States.

72.23h: I don't expect McHoull or Lipson to miss, but just in
case I'm asking Jim Gac, 552 Oaklawn, Chula Vista, Calif. 92010
to submit standby moves for both Britain and France. Will John
Caton also submit moves for both in case both miss or the first
standby misses. Thanks.

Mark Weidmark will probably run a game of Atlantica in
Thunderbird for \$4. Rules are 15¢. 528 Park Cr., Pickering, Ontario,
CANADA.

A backup for the person appointing Miller Numbers is not so
important as a backup for Boardman Numbers. Conrad von Metzke
has appointed a backup, Fred Winter, in order to avoid another
Rod Walker-type fiasco, and when I find someone willing and able
to back me up I will establish a similar system.

OPENINGS

Contrary to popular belief, there are some games open in BI. One Origins game, historical version, needs three more players to begin, and when 72.9h ends another Origins game will be opened, either historical or a new variant. Also open are two Diplomacy variants, Anarchy IV and Anonymity III. Both resemble regular Dippy closely. In the former each player receives three home centers randomly distributed about the board. In the latter a player knows only his own country, not which player is playing which other country. Play otherwise follows the regular game. Rules for both are 15¢ from me, but above description is sufficient for play. Players must sub to BI for the duration of their stay in a game, plus pay a \$1 position deposit per game which is refunded if the player does not quit; there is also a flat 50¢ fee for games after the first. Anonymity needs many players, but Anarchy needs only one more.

M.O.W.

There are many MOW openings for regular Dippy: Mike Bartnikowski, 943 Stewart, Lincoln Park, Mi. 48146 in his zine HGHIP, SSAE plus \$1, 50¢ refunded if you don't quit; Dean Schwass, SSAE plus 50¢, at RR 1 Ludington, Mi. 49431 (note that for both of these an SSAE per move is required); Bill Thomas, 18634 Birchcrest Dr., Detroit Mi. 48221, SSAE per move plus 50¢ (both Schwass and Thomas use carbon copies for move reports); Tim Tilson, 200 W 9th Ave., Sault Ste. Marie, Mi. 49783, in his zine Voice of the North, sub (8/\$1) plus \$1 game deposit. Herb Barents, 157 State St., Zeeland, Mi. 49464 has openings for Origins variants and the Youngstown Variant. Paul Den Uyl, 317 A Bryan MSU, East Lansing Mi. 48823 has openings for modified Nuclear Destruction for 10¢ per move.

Carbon copy Diplomacy games are proliferating in the state. I think the MOW GM group should establish a replacement player pool for MOW regular Dippy games, since it is sometimes difficult to find replacements unless one GM's many games. The replacement list could be published periodically in MOW 'zines; when a GM needs a replacement and does not have one on his own list he will send a copy of the latest move and a request for stand-by moves to the first person on the list. Persons on the list should specify preferences for type of game, for example, only games for which the requirement is an SSAE per move. Contact me if you want to be placed on the list.

MILLER NUMBERS

72Ydf (this was originally given Yw, but the players have agreed to so many rule changes that I have decided to assign a new designation) Cline 9-man game, revised. Conrad von Metzke, Rename. Austria-Charles Reinsel, England-William Osmanson, France-Germany-Blair Cusack, Italy-John Biehl, Russia-Reg Forester, Turkey-Donald Morrison, Barbary-David Potter, Persia-M R. Kindrachuck.

72AEcn. Imperialism IXR. Hartley Patterson, War Bulletin. Corinth Slipway rule added. Argolis-Graham Jeffery, Attika-John Morrison, Boeotia-Andy Davidson, Epiros-Ian Maule, Ionia-John Piggott, Lakonia-Geoff Corker, Makedonia-Martin Davis, Persia-Bruce Davidson, Thessaly-John Bullock.

72AFdf. Cline 9-man game, revised. Conrad von Metzke, Rename. Austria-Charles Sharp, England-Donald Morrison, France-Charles Reinsel, Germany-David De Luca, Italy-Austin Redlack, Russia-

Victor Ricci, Turkey-Richard Greenwell, Barbary-Reg Forester, Persia-Roger Nelson.

72AGdg. Jihad. Graham Jeffery, Der Krieg. Arabia-John Bullock, Byzantium-Jeremy Elsmore, Exarchate-John Piggott, Franks-Andy Davidson, Germany-Geoff Corker, Italy-John Lettice, Persia-Kevin Feintuck.

72AHdh. Legion. Mark Weidmark, Thunderbird. Carthage-John Ostapovich, Egypt-Paul Stone, Greece-Peter Bennett, Rome-Richard Greenwell, Syria-John Leeder.

NEW OPENINGS, NEW ZINES

Americana 1860 rules appeared in Tangelo Express, Richard Hull, 4720 Cloyne Apt. 2, Oxnard, Calif. 93030. This Dippy variant, no longer available from Rod Walker, is 15¢ from Richard.

Rules for the Reinsel Variant appeared in Brave New World 31. The game is played on a map of the United States. Each state is a supply center. Each player begins with three states selected by preference lists. Apparently there are no longer openings due to "lack of response". The Moses Game, for four players, is on the same order but uses a world map with 120 countries (no fleets, however). A game is open for \$2 plus \$1 for the map. I'm not sure whether the game will be played in ADAG or Brave New World. Contact Hal Naus, 1011 Barrett Ave. Chula Vista, Calif. 92011.

Bolshevik rules appeared in War Bulletin 28 (Hartley Patterson 7 Cambridge Rd. Beaconsfield, Bucks, United Kingdom). Although there is no indication on my copy, I believe Hartley designed the variant. Briefly the rules provide for an additional player who may conduct a revolution and take over the units of one of the seven player countries. Depending on the success of the revolutionary, he will gain about one half of the country's units and proceed as a normal player after choosing three home centers. It's not clear whether the revolutionary player can conduct a revolution in more than one country, or whether there can be more than one revolutionary player in a game, though apparently not.

According to a sample issue I recently received, the next issue of the Stuttgart Sentinel will include rules for Air War Diplomacy. This will be Volume 1 (or possibly 7), number 3, 20¢ from David Staples, RR 1 Box 120, Fargo, North Dakota, 58102. SS is an article crudzine, but also has openings for Nuclear Destruction, Diplomacy, and Origins by mail. However, there are some peculiar house rules which limit a player's options in the latter two games. Apparently Staples is unfamiliar with organized Diplomacy and Origins fandom.

IDA PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

Because the IDA elections are being held in December, and I do not like to set deadlines in the middle of that month, no comment I can make here will have any effect on the elections. However, I want to take a look at the Presidential election to explain why I voted for Rick Brooks and to consider what we might be in for if (I should probably say, when) Rick loses.

There are three candidates for President: Edi Birsan, Len Lakofka, and Brooks. I do not so much favor Brooks as I oppose Birsan and especially Lakofka. Two months ago I would have supported Birsan, and I still prefer him to Lakofka. I have been in contact with Len since before he became IFW President or entered postal

Diplomacy. I had virtually no contact with Edi before he became involved with Origins. I met Rick last year at an MOW convention but I have had little contact with him otherwise.

Lakofka-- Len likes to tell people in his campaign statements that under his "leadership IFW has grown from 170 members with a budget of \$1,500/year, to 540 members and a budget of \$6,500/year!" (From Liaisons Dangereuses #38) This and his sponsorship of conventions and publication of LD for three years is supposed to show that Len is the best qualified candidate. What he doesn't tell us is that IFW is down the tubes. The IW has not appeared in months (I'm still waiting for the April and May issues, though a later one may have reached the members). Most of the officers have quit, as well as many of the "Old Guard." The membership records are in a mess -- most of my information comes from an issue of the IFW Messenger which was sent to me in my capacity as President of the IFW Science Fiction and Fantasy Gaming Society, even though I have not been a member since May and even though the SF&FS was never officially chartered! This is what has happened to IFW -- will it happen to IDA too? I doubt it, since there are many more competent supporters of IDA than there ever were for IFW, and by nature IDA is a more stable organization. Perhaps IFW's demise is not Len's fault primarily, but some of the blame must be laid at his door. Moreover, he has attempted to deceive IDA members by acting as though IFW is in fine shape. In the Messenger I mentioned George Phillies states that "I must confess that I am directly prejudiced against Len Lakofka, who I find has consistently adjusted the truth (among other things) in an effort to maintain his position as IFW President (and, in practice, dictator)." Those of you who are familiar with George, who is one of the guiding spirits of the MIT organization which organized a convention in their area this winter, among other things, know that he is not given to exaggeration or character assassination. I have not had access to as much information as George, perhaps, but my opinion is the same. I would have to think long and hard to come up with anyone I would trust less than Lakofka. In my opinion, if he becomes President people will have to watch his every move, or he will do exactly what he please whether rules or opinion be against him or not. The only event I can think of which would persuade me to run for any office in IDA is the elction of Len to the Presidency. I didn't care about IFW, but I care a little about IDA and Dippydom.

Birsan-- Lakofka and Birsan are both overaggressive and tend to to be dictatorial. Lakofka proved it in IFW; Birsan's actions as IDA Ombudsman seem to indicate this attitude. My concept of IDA is as a regulating organization providing continuity for necessary functions, and sanctioning hobby-wide functions, such as Conrad von Metzke's efforts to find homes for orphan regular games, in order to avoid chaos. I do not want IDA to stick its nose into every facet of Dippydom. See the following two articles for elaboration.

Brooks-- Rick is a big variant fan, which of course interests me. He will not, so far as I know, try to dominate the organization or interfere with individuals through the organization. He is not aggressive, and I think that is the sort of leader IDA needs right now -- not a pusher, but a regulator.

THE IDA OMBUDSMAN CONTROVERSY

As many of you know, the IDA (primarily in the person of the officers, naturally) is currently considering the nature of the office of Ombudsman. The current Ombudsman, Edi Birsan, seems to favor a very strong OB, while President Larry Peery favors an OB of the type found in Scandinavian countries. I wholeheartedly agree with Larry. But let's begin with part of a letter from Edi (the remainder concerns packing the APP and will be printed later).

Edi Birsan, c/o Pat Verteramo, RD 5 Box 6, Hopewell Junction, NY 12511/16/72.

"1. Five or six years ago there was a sparky debate over the pro's and cons of Diplomacy Organizations. At that time I proposed that there be a group formed exclusively of GM's because, I argued, a player is a powerless individual actor and organization without power is pointless.

"2. Basically the power relationship has remained the same till now. Players put their money down-but the GM's decide whether or not to take it. Furthermore, GM's still decide what is printed, what games are played, how many and how fast. If a player doesn't like the behavior of a GM then there is no power that a player has immediately that can be brought to bear on the GM to get satisfaction: his only recourse is to begrudge the GM and vow not to play in the GM's zine again.

"3. The office of the Ombudsman was designed and has acted to alter that relationship between GM and player. In the process it is hoped that a line of distinction will be drawn between the rights and responsibilities of GM's and players, the two dominant actors in postal Diplomacy.

"4. As for the actual powers of the Ombudsman to act against a player or a GM, the constitution is purposely vague. This was to allow for the power to grow with the organization through test cases and the like.

"5. In all likelihood, it is doubtful that there will be many cases in which the Ombudsman would have to take direct action against a player. This is due to the fact that the existing powers or GM's would be enough to handle any problems of a less than extraordinary manner. In other words, when a player is found at fault, the decision not to take action (thus sustaining the GM's decision) is enough.

"6. The majority of cases calling for direct sanction by the organization will no doubt be on the heads of GM's that refuse to comply with the Ombudsman judgement. There is presently a case before the Council of exactly that nature, which will help to define the backing the Ombudsman would get in such matters.

"7. As for jurisdiction, according to the constitution the Ombudsman MUST investigate all complaints by at least one registered member in any dispute. Of the six cases that have been handled so far (one in progress now) two have involved GM's that were not members of the Organization. Oddly enough in both those cases it was ruled that the GM was correct in his actions. In short, we will cross our bridges as we come to them. Clearly the stronger the organization the stronger the sanctions that can be placed or affected. All of which must be allowed to develop.

"8. As for the Origin of my authority as Ombudsman; it is traced initially to the Constitution which was approved by an overwhelming

vote of the members. Secondly the authority can be traced to the individual election of myself held sometime ago. In short the members gave me the authority to use for a certain term as defined by the Constitution.

"9. In case you are wondering what is stopping the Ombudsman from taking an arbitrary stand on the dealing out of sanctions and using the post for power-ego trips; I'd like to remind you that in all cases in which there are organizational sanctions called for (organizational action) it must be approved by the Council."

I have numerous objections. Primarily my question is, what protects the GM's from the Ombudsman? I have played twice as long as I have GMed, and I have been victim of poor GM's as well as a player with very good ones. But my sympathies lie with the GM. In Edi's hands the Ombudsman has become a one-man tribunal giving rulings concerning disputes which, as he has said, sometimes concern non-IDA members. Authority stemming from IDA members and constitution has NOTHING to do with non-IDA members, unless you wish to claim that IDA somehow represents all Diplomacy players; I am not ready to accept such a claim, nor are many others. Also, shouldn't GM's be warned before they join IDA that, by virtue of their membership, they may become subject to "rulings" by the Ombudsman?

What special qualities does the Ombudsman possess, other than election by the members, which qualify him to determine what "custom" is? I think the Ombudsman should at least consult with recognized experts before he gives an ADVISORY OPINION. "Ruling?" I don't find that kind of authority in the constitution. At best, the Ombudsman is advising the Council. Only if all parties to a dispute ask for compulsory arbitration should the Ombudsman render a "ruling" and expect it to be followed. I have doubts about application of sanctions in any other situation, even when parties to the dispute are IDA members. I would have to seriously consider resigning from IDA if my membership automatically exposed me to "rulings" by the Ombudsman, whether I had to ask for one or not, and to sanctions of whatever nature. I would like to be able to consult the Ombudsman for an occasional advisory opinion (see below). In part I am repeating what Larry Peery said in Councillatory Notes #8, but my dislike of the Birsan-style Ombudsman may be even greater. (CN is available for an SSAE from Peery at Box 8416, San Diego, Calif. 92102.)

I also note, from the first four issues of OM (available from Birsan for two stamps), that Birsan seems to be setting up the Ombudsman as interpreter of the constitution, perhaps the only interpreter. Perhaps this is logical, although I prefer that the whole Council act as interpreter; I certainly object to any effort by the Ombudsman to tell the Council how it should run things.

Part of my antipathy to the Ombudsman position is that I strongly disagree with some of Birsan's "rulings" and his manner of arriving at a ruling, which seems to be to make a decision without regard for "expert" opinions. I know a committee process would slow things down, but I simply cannot swallow the notion that one man, no matter who he is, can always make an intelligent, "correct" decision. I am particularly interested to know what weight Birsan gives a GM's house rules. So far as I am concerned the GM's house rules are LAW, and should be written to give the GM great discretion. Unfortunately some inexperienced GM's hogtie themselves with poorly written house rules that can get them into trouble. Also,

GAME REVIEW: 4000 AD

This is the first and only commercially distributed space wargame. Play is strictly strategic; in battle the larger force eliminates the smaller without injury to itself. I'm afraid this game won't attract the massive-tactical-battles and miniatures nuts, but anyone who is interested in strategic games or a minimal luck factor will probably enjoy 4000 AD. Hard-core Diplomacy players will surely find the game interesting and challenging, especially as a vehicle for variations.

Two to four players may participate using the equipment provided, but it is easy to create variations with more players. Each player begins the game with 15 warships and a home system. He attempts to occupy other systems, gaining resource and population systems which allow production of more ships at the home system. (To simplify play, resources and population are automatically transported to the home system by matter transmitters.) The average production of ships per player is approximately 5.75 (production occurs after every other turn). The objective is to capture and hold other home systems, forcing the losing player to surrender his ships to whichever player reaches them first. Rules are provided to determine a winner if the game is terminated prematurely -- there are no draws.

The heart of the game is the method of movement. The board is divided into 24 sectors in two layers of 12 (players must visualize the layers, of course). Each sector contains two planets which provide resources which are together sufficient to build one ship per production. Each player is allowed a maximum of two groups of ships in hyperspacewarp at one time; no more than one group may enter warp per turn, and all ships in the group must start from the same system. Ships in hyperwarp must move one sector per turn outward, as recorded on warp-tracks on the edges of the board, so that no writing is needed. On a turn ships in warp may arrive at any sector which is the correct distance from their origin sector, but not closer or farther. Thus each turn there are a number of sectors at which a group may arrive if it chooses -- all sides know the set of possibilities, but the actual sector of destination is not determined until the player breaks out of warp and reenters the board. Even with a maximum of two warps per side, the possible combinations of moves are fascinating. Defense is difficult; a few systems may be defended adequately against forces in warp, but not all. The game becomes a series of raids into enemy territory, while both sides attempt to build up forces on valuable systems without weakening the attack or exposing the home system. The warp concept is simple but possibilities are limitless. There is no luck factor (even the board is symmetrical) yet there is the uncertainty of the warp movement which provides a happy alternative to the "realistic" but mechanically difficult hidden movement, and without requiring a gamemaster! Movement is not simultaneous, which creates a slight disadvantage for the player moving first after building, but simultaneous movement is easily incorporated if desired -- there is very little to write since only groups may move.

Game components include a two piece board of typical commercial game material, total 21 X 29 in. Each player's equipment includes two plastic warp-discs with pegs, plastic ship markers, and a plastic box. Rules are simple, about four pages of reduced type, and well-written. A strategy booklet is also included. I got my copy from

House of Games Corp. Ltd. Box 316 Don Mills, Ontario, CANADA for \$9, which includes shipping, handling, sales tax. The order form I received with the game states that the 10% US import duty is payable on receipt but I was not charged.

I am going to run a postal game of 4000AD for four players in Blood and Iron. A game is already in progress in War Bulletin, a British Diplomacy 'zine, and players have discussed a number of board variations. I have developed six and eight player versions in case there is interest. 4000 AD is a marvelous game, both in original form and as a vehicle for variants. I highly recommend it all but the pure tactical and pure miniatures nuts.

@ @ @

I do not think anyone should plead ignorance of the players of the house rules as a circumstance requiring IDA to come to their defense. I have no sympathy for anyone (except perhaps a rank novice) who plays in a 'zine before reading and understanding the house rules. Anyone who advises novices, whether through Diplomacy Review or a Pontevedria type thing, should stress the importance of reading HR before joining a game.

I have much more to say about this, but I will have to save it for next issue in New Gods and Ancient Custom, or, Wargaming is Just a Goddam Hobby.

And now I ask the Ombudsman for an advisory opinion for a hypothetical case (hypothetical only because the actual example has been resolved). A GM does not like a game to end in a draw unless all surviving players are part of the draw; however, he has left a loophole in his house rules that allow players in a game to unani ously end the game in any manner they choose, so that, say, three of the four survivors draw while the other one lives but does not take part in the draw (in the example, 1970 BA in SHAAFT!!, Russia with 3 would have survived while three other powers with 10 or 11 each). (In my opinion Phillips unduly influenced the game by doing his best to dissuade the players from voting a draw with survival -- and he succeeded by an appeal to ratings -- but I'm not asking for a ruling concerning that matter.) Now, what I want to know is if it is possible for a GM to prohibit the players from determining the outcome of a game by unanimous vote, whether this prohibition is in the House Rules or not. It is relevant that Phillips House Rules include a complete rewrite of Diplomacy rules, so that he can claim to be running a Diplomacy-related game, but not Diplomacy itself. He used to do this, though lately he has dropped the distinction in his writing.

Lewis Pulsipher
329 Twin Towers
Albion, Michigan 49224

First class

Return
Requested

FIRST CLASS

FIRST CLASS

HULL