

ROB

I WASN'T A SUBBER THOUGH I DID RECEIVE SOME OF YOUR ZINES; AND MY SCHOOL ADDRESS HAS CHANGED, THOUGH NOT HOME ADDRESS. IF YOU DON'T CARE TO TRADE JD' LIKE TO SUB TO EREWNN IF YOU DO DECIDE TO RESUME PUBLICATION.

Number 28

BLOOD AND IRON

November, 1973

BI is a forum for discussion of Diplomacy variants, multi-player games, and wargaming in general. Sub 5/31, single issue 20¢. OP#63. Published irregularly. c 1973 Lewis E. Pulsipher; all rights assigned to respective authors. BI is affiliated with MOW.

Well, but for the death of his business partner, Adolph Rupp would have been the new basketball coach at dear old Duke (or Dook as it's known around here), my little island of the north in this marvelously warm area. Sometime in early or mid-December I'm going home until around January 11, so along about the third you should see mail to Bellevue, or be prepared to wait.

LETTERS

Randolph Bart, 18249 Donmetz, Northridge, Calif. 4/Oct.

"Enrico Manfredi's Worldiplomacy is not really what we need. Enrico has, in the interest of preserving his own sanity, ignored these facts:

1) Turkey, Italy, China, Mexico and others were powers. True they were minor, but they were powers. Turkey and Italy together were certainly worth more than Austria.

2) At no time in the world's history has there been any country worth taking that could be taken without a fight.

3) Internal problems would prevent any country from expanding indefinitely. Napoleon and Hitler found this out.

4) The underlying economic structure of Diplomacy is faulty. Ruhr is certainly not a barren wasteland, nor is Paris worth no more than Tunis.

5) As Lew said on page one of BI 27, often the most profitable part of war is peace. ((Well, that's not quite what I said, but the point is made.))

6) A fact overlooked by many game designers: you treat your allies as you treat your own. The rules of regular Diplomacy prohibit dislodging yourself, but not your friend. This could be extended to Fast Movement in Worldiplomacy.

No, I'm not trying to tear down Mr. Manfredi's work, which I'm sure he bled sweat over; I simply mean that designing a realistic wargame is futile. No matter how finely you work out the rules to a game, someone will find reason to make them finer. If you want to study history, study history. If you want to play a game, play a game. But don't look for both in the same place."

((Randolph also asks "what 'zines traveling around postal Dippdom would print a longer article in this vein." To answer that first, the subject doesn't really belong in a Diplomacy 'zine. BI would probably be the closest thing to what you're looking for among nominal Dippy 'zines. Third Millenia is starting a game design 'zine called Concepts which might print something on that order. Hoosier Archives is the Dippy 'zine with the largest circulation.

Since Enrico won't be able to answer for quite a while, at least, I'll have to try to do so for him. First, he has redesigned WD, including civil disorder armies in many neutral countries. I hope that the final version of WD, if there ever is one, will be in a future MOW variant package.

What you have said should come as no news to readers. Perhaps you have missed the point. Obviously, no one can create an absolutely realistic game. The endeavor is to design a more realistic game, or better yet, a less unrealistic game. This is entirely a matter of degree, not kind. Customarily wargamers try to agree on some level of unrealism which they call realistic, but there's much disagreement over where this level is, and how one judges what level of unrealism a game involves. World Diplomacy should be considered as an attempt to create a more realistic game than regular Diplomacy. Fast Movement alone accomplishes this, so far as I am concerned.

Obviously you are not a historian. I suppose you've forgotten Austria and Czechoslovakia in the 30's; you've also forgotten that the movement of units in Diplomacy is not supposed to represent the actual maneuvers of units at all times. For example, the movement of a unit into Serbia might signify a strong alliance just formed between Serbia and the intruder's unit, rather than a military takeover. In general, your points 2 and 3 are both very rash statements. 4 is a good point; I hope someday to finish a WW II variant which assigns a separate point value to each province, just as Interstellar Diplomacy and Hypereconomic Diplomacy do. But the counterpart to the realism controversy is the playability question: which do you sacrifice, a relatively realistic element, or one that is conducive to playability, when you cannot have both? Separate economic values for individual provinces are not worthwhile unless the entire economic structure of the game is largely altered.

Point 6 is interesting, and something which designers of multi-player games must watch for. What should an ally be allowed to do with respect to his ally? For example, if there are supply rules, a designer should be sure that allies may form part of the supply line. In a two-player game it is not necessary to worry about such things.))

S.K. Howard, 494 Pleasant St Apt 1, Gardner, MA 01440. Oct.

"...In a heavily economic game - like your ((4000AD)) variant - the natural tendency of players is to optimize their own operations rather than de-optimize those of opponents. When the game is non zero-sum, this tendency will exist throughout. Whoever tries to impair the efficiency of the leader in middle-game will impair his own efficiency as well and reduce his own relative standing. The result of this "air of good feeling" is that the rich get richer and the poor get frustrated.

"When the game is zero-sum there will be a strategy shift in middle-game. The little fish must go after the big or else they lose. An up-till-then lesser player may overcome the leader - and win - or he may not. The relative skills of the players in adapting to the shift will determine the winner. The fact that the final showdown can be so iffy is reflected by the often almost equal scores at the finish. But these close standings don't render the outcome insignificant; rather, they demonstrate that a zero-sum requirement is a challenging and necessary variable.

"A better alternative to dropping the zero-sum element would be to compromise by de-emphasizing it. Winning a game series rather than a game would be the goal. The economic scores of the players would be kept cumulatively for a specified number of games,

at the end of which whichever player with the greatest scores accumulation would be declared (series) winner.

"About the value of the barren worlds, okay, they are useful for u-turns. However, they aren't used much for that purpose in 4000AD because there is little point. No man's space is pretty spacious with everyone staying close to home system (largely because of few available warps). With little to attack or be attacked by, the sudden need to change course is minimized.

"Now introduce more warps and departures/turn - as in your variant - and people will use the new potential, and make greater use of the zip stars. Even so, it's still wasteful to use 25% of the board in only this limited way. Of course, if the zip stars are made to produce fuel, then by definition they become unzipped. Glad you came around.

"Re my CRT, please understand that I wasn't suggesting it for use with your 4000AD variant but was presenting it for your appraisal because it's based on the same formula that your variant's CR system employs. It was intended for a political game. In such a game the goal is often to merely reduce the opponent to a certain level of strength to reduce his political options. Thus the lesser force is permitted to attack and partial destruction is allowed. The person who initiates the attack - the attacker - decides the destruction level since if he didn't attack there would be no destruction at all.

"Now, if one were to apply my CRT to your variant a natural translation would rule that when two opposing forces simultaneously land on a system, whoever chooses to attack is the attacker. If both do so then both are attackers. The most severe level of destruction chosen should be the one used unless withdrawal is allowed. This should also apply to enemy forces landing on an already-controlled system. Until one force is either eliminated or withdraws (assuming withdrawal is permitted) the system is in contest and none can claim it.

"As for using withdrawal during hostilities, it seems logical to rule that ability to withdraw must also depend upon relative strength. If player A has half the strength of B - and thus one third overall - the most he'd be able to withdraw would be a third of his force at that turn during hostilities, but B could withdraw two-thirds.

"When a system is contested among more than two players it would be convenient to rule that a person could attack - but not be attacked by - just one person/system/turn. When more than one person attacks another person, the plural parties are considered temporary allies and the allied force is combined against the defender. The allies receive losses relative to the number of allies - e.g. when there are three allies each receives one-third of the victim's destructive capability - unless the victim had singled one out - in which case that person would bear the full brunt until the desired level was reached, at which point all allies would share, again, equally in the carnage. No doubt there are a few technical problems with multi-player attack that you will be able to find but I think it possible to resolve them as they occur."

((I agree generally with your analysis of what happens in a heavily economic game. My postal Starlord game is one such. However, I think there's a greater tendency for the "poor" to gang up on the "rich" quite quickly; if someone makes a mistake along the line, then one or two players will pull out ahead. The game will NOT end with many players with nearly equal scores, or if it does, there will be one or two clearly ahead. And they have drawn. I see no other way to look at it. In fact, I think that it is inevitable that many non zero-sum wargames, such as 4000AD, will end in draws. If you want to arbitrarily decide that a player who has scored a few more points has won, OK, but I see no justification for it except that there's no other way for you to get a winner. No matter how you get to the "nearly equal points" situation, I cannot understand how one player can be considered to have played a clearly more skillful game because he's a few points ahead. You're just stuck with a lot of draws. Diplomacy, a zero-sum game, is nevertheless theoretically a draw every time because there are more than seven players. The current lopsided ratio of wins to draws in postal Diplomacy reflects the efforts of "holy alliances", which are legitimate and intelligent methods for breaking draws, in the final analysis, but primarily it reflects the incompetence of the majority of postal players. Let me ask this, do you think that, in a Diplomacy game which ends at a specified time, the player with 9 centers should be declared winner over two players with 8? I say that makes no sense. What do you other people think?

A game series is nice if you can swing it; it would tend to increase the small lead of a more skillful player over time. But why not simply eliminate the time limit in the first game and keep hacking until someone pulls into a clear lead?

Barren worlds: I suggested a solution for comment -- that doesn't mean I think it should be used. This concern with the zip stars makes little sense. Why let yourself be controlled by what happens to be on the board? Just because it happens to be there doesn't mean you've got to use it.

I seem to be disagreeing with you a lot today. I don't understand why only the attacker should have the opportunity to limit losses. A defender can withdraw to cut losses too, even in a political game. On the other hand, the defender can launch a local counterattack to cause losses. I suppose the decision is wholly arbitrary when there is no basis in reality to extrapolate from. In a space game, why choose the numbers you have selected? It makes as much sense to declare that the defender can detect the attacker in time to withdraw his entire force if he wishes before any combat contact takes place. And while he is withdrawing, he may slow down enough to inflict casualties on the attacker if the attacker is willing to press the pursuit. And again, so long as a defensive force exists in defensive position, why can't it protect a planet so that the planet is still useful to the defender? It depends purely on how you choose to look at it, I think. In non-realistic situations the choice is purely arbitrary.

Multi-player battles are a can of worms. I don't like your system, but I also don't like any system I know of.

I suppose my preference for allowing either player to cut losses comes from the nature of most space wargames, in which you cannot withdraw from a conflict at all, not even mutually.))

An Editorial by Greg Warden

(The following is reprinted with Greg's permission from his 'zine En Passant #43).

Quality, I believe, should be the primary concern of every Diplomacy publisher. Of late, however, the quality of most Diplomacy magazines seems to be slipping. Why? Well, I'm not sure, but I think that the major reason may be that many Diplomacy publishers have expanded far too much. In the past few years growth, rather than quality, has been the major objective of the Diplomacy world.

The trend of this growth syndrome is apparent everywhere. Many gamemasters feel that they haven't made it as a big time publisher unless their circulation is over one hundred. Why I've even noticed some writers defining a first class magazine by its circulation. This, of course, is just plain poppycock. The number of subscribers does not determine the quality of a magazine (although naturally a good quality magazine will usually develop a large subscriber list) except for cases where the quantity of subscribers deteriorates the quality by overburdening the publisher.

For years now, persons have been gloating over the Diplomacy "boom". The rationale is that the greater the number of new games, the larger the progress of Diplomacy. This seems to be a logical derivative of our growth oriented society, where progress is equated with numerical growth. In Diplomacy, however, growth has brought disastrous results. We've seen the consequences already. Look at all the gamemasters who have quit the hobby this year. Look at all the abandoned games. And worst of all, look at all the games that are semi-abandoned, whose gamemasters are merely making a pretense of publishing. I guarantee you that if Conrad von Metzke hadn't been around to pick up the pieces this year, the Diplomacy world would be in a state of chaos right now.

Exaggeration, you say? I doubt it, and I believe that the worst may be yet to come. If we insist on placing the emphasis on numbers, those very numbers will be our undoing. Why is it that publishers have to prove how professional they are by taking on responsibilities which they cannot keep? Why is it that publisher after publisher has to establish his own empire, his own "press?" Take the case of Mark Weidmark, for instance. Here was an extremely talented gamemaster and publisher who felt he had to put out a whole series of magazines. Well, he managed to put out more magazines than anyone else at the time (with the exception of Conrad, of course), but in the meantime he overextended himself to the point where he had to stop publishing.

It all adds up to this. If we don't stop trying for unlimited growth, if we don't stop putting the overwhelming emphasis on numerical increase, rather than on qualitative increase, the hobby will soon be so chaotic, so disorganized, and so unmanageable that no one will want to play Diplomacy any more.

What can we do about it? Well, if you're a gamemaster you can try not to take on too many commitments; make sure that you don't make any promises that you can't keep. If you're a player, be a little more tolerant. I've found that many players believe that every gamemaster is only interested in getting their money. There are players who have no conception of the cost of running a Diplomacy magazine, both in money and time. If a magazine seems to be

in trouble see if there's anything you can do to help rather than just writing nasty letters. After all, it's in your best interest to keep the magazine, and the game, going. Another way to help out is by playing as a replacement player. It always amazes me when a player writes a nasty letter complaining that the game he "paid good money for" is rotten because of all the missed moves, and at the same time that player would never take a replacement position for fear of ruining his rating.

Another thing that everyone can do is to change his thinking. We must stop assuming that a greater number of games means a better "hobby". Large numbers of new games mean nothing unless there are competent persons who can handle them. Presently there aren't enough gamemasters to go around; the shortage is even more critical when you consider the number of reliable gamemasters. One interesting proposal to remedy the situation is the idea of "apprentice gamemasters." That is, when a person feels that he would like to try his hand at gamemastering, but doesn't want to assume the responsibility of running a magazine, he will be able to sign up with an established publisher to gamemaster one (or perhaps more) games in the publisher's magazine. The publisher, of course, would assume the responsibility for making sure that the game got completed. I, myself, would like to start this system in EN PASSANT for any games (orphans, probably) that come my way in the future. I feel that this is an excellent way to save myself some work, and to give other persons a chance to try gamemastering a Postal Diplomacy game without going out on a limb. If anyone is interested in trying it, I urge him to contact me as soon as possible.

All in all, I don't believe that the situation is hopeless. Diplomacy has great potential, but in order to exploit it we must be aware of some of the dangers of growth. Unfortunately these dangers seem to become more awesome every day. Beware...

Greg's address is 4305 Baltimore Ave., Philadelphia, Pa. 19104.

@

I would like to add a few comments to what Greg has said. I generally agree with him, but I'm not so concerned about whether Dippydom suffers an interregnum or not. Little pockets (such as the Michigan publishers and players) would survive a general collapse of the less reliable GM's. I have not noticed a general decrease in quality, but I have seen very few of the new 'zines and had nothing to do with most of the 'zines that have died. But anyone who has read Impassable closely, to take one example, will see how John Boyer is overextending himself and consequently making more errors and falling behind. An example of a new publisher who may overextend himself is John Hlland, who took over many of Weidmark's games and is opening many more.

Perhaps we're seeing the results of a "little Hearst" complex akin to the "little Napoleon" idea. Just as some players enter Dippydom with the goal of making a name for themselves as a player, many begin publishing with a similar intent. And in both cases, even though the work load might be acceptable in normal terms, when the guy realizes that he's not going to be a new Napoleon or Hearst, he can't accept anything less and gives up instead. This is in many respects a simple mark of immaturity. Most of the failed and failing publishers are less than 20 years old (Weidmark is 16 or 17 now. Winter is a college sophomore). But there is another class of

failed publishers, those who are very capable but who do not realize, or do not want to admit, that they aren't superhuman. For example, Payton Turpin finally gave up when he entered Med school. I believe Med school finally did in Steve Cooper, too. Richard Hull's bane was school (for the Navy).

Perhaps too many publishers begin with the intention of gaining some egoboo rather than of publishing a good 'zine. When the novelty wears off, and the egoboo dividends decrease, the guy quits.

Another indication or culprit in this business is the Calhauer Awards. The indication comes from the list of those who won the awards; in all categories the winner was the game, or 'zine, or release, which had the largest circulation among those nominated. The "culprit" aspect comes from the continuation of the awards without checks to help avoid this distribution problem. When you've got many neos voting, and they only receive the large-circulation stuff, naturally the vote will be biased for the large circulations. I hope that next years CA will avoid this problem by limiting the vote to persons who have been playing for the entire year, but I don't look for that in this country.

A less satisfactory alternative to the apprentice GM is the carbon copy game. One cc game is much easier to run than a 'zine, MUCH easier; and it's often difficult to limit oneself to one game in a 'zine when there's obviously room for more.

@ @ @

That Survey...

Despite the doubters, I received a 35% response to the survey, and a much larger response from new subbers; I am not including results from some of the latter, however. The following results are from 27 replies. Results are median average, not mean.

How many postal games are you playing: reg. Dippy-3 (7 none); Dipvariant-1 (12 nones, only 3 over 5); other multi-player-1 (10 none, 3 over 5); 2-player games-(total of 19 among 9 persons). 11 play Dipvariants FTF. People read about 3 SF&F books per month, and own about 10 Dipvariants.

Club membership: 6 IDA, 3 MOW (some MOW didn't list it), 2 SICL, 3 American Designers Association, 1 for various.

Deadline lengths: there was a slavish tendency to give the same length deadlines for fall and spring, even though winter gives time for extra negotiation before spring. Most people stuck with 21 days (BI deadlines used to be 19 days) for Dippy. There was great variation in the suggestions for Origins, from 10-21 days for attacks and 10-30 for placements. The question about ideal and practical numbers of players was not well-put. Most preferred 7 for both questions for regular Dippy. For a postal variant there was great variation, with an average of 7. For FTF Dipvariants five was favored as the practical number of players.

Favorite games mentioned more than once: Diplomacy 17, Blitzkrieg 6, Red Star/White Star 4, Starlord 3, Origins, Panzerblitz, Battle Plan, Barbarossa 2. Favorite variants: Youngstown 5, Third Age, Imperialism VII, Atlantica, Diadochi, Black Hole, Lord of the Rings 2 each, many others one.

Six are currently designing a variant. Average age 24, education 15 years. Number of people playing each type (FTF-PBM): AH 24-5; S&T 22-3; Miniatures 10-0; Space 12-8; Nuclear Dest. 5-7; Battle Plan 4-5; other 2-3.

Suggestions for improvement and for subjects for Dipvariants: More organization - sorry, if I have a choice between typing this thing at one shot, and typing it in three or four segments (like this issue), then I'll take whatever is more convenient -- usually the latter.##### "B&I could use a little physical improvement in the way of more artwork, drawings, lettering. A regular format would be nice. Some of the maps leave much to be desired in the way of readability. I consider artwork etc. to be a tremendous waste of space. Moreover, this type of thing is difficult to do with mimeo stencils. That's why the maps are bad. By virtue of using mimeo, however, BI is more readable than any ditto 'zine. A regular format is nothing more than a straitjacket, if you mean what I think you mean.##### "...print new variant rules/maps fairly regularly." Haven't I? Of course, there seems to be an idea around that a full-fledged variant just can't use the regular board.##### "glad you've stopped the squabbling with everyone as it's a waste of space (or is that the point?)" The point is that the "squabbling" sometimes brings the desired results, so it need not continue. Also, I've moved the remainder of my polemics to the sources rather than take the space here.

"I like the idea of using new areas (like Michigan) for the board. Using the same board gets kinda dull after a while." Unfortunately most areas have no seaspaces. Such games are inevitably somewhat inferior to regular Diplomacy. Even Michigan, which is perhaps the best state for making a board, lacks sufficient sea space. The latest variant of this type is Algonquin Park Dippy, I think.### "A hypereconomic version using labor units, capital units, and army units with developed and undeveloped centers."### "Seven Years War - general on just the western campaigns between Ferdinand and the French. American Indian Wars." There are two versions of Indianomacy. I am working on Seven Years War.### "Jack Vance's The Dragon Masters. 1812 World view (including US, Canada, Russia, France, Prussia, and Japan." TDM is "two-player" isn't it?### "Ancient China, Medieval Europe, better Middle Earth Variants." I'm working on the latter. There are many Medieval variants; I don't know of anything on ancient China, though.### Just about any time in history where several countries were involved in a conflict would be good: Pakistan, the Middle East, the Cold War, Vietnam, Korea of the modern era would all make good subjects. Previous eras also make good subjects...Another excellent one would be a space variant similar to 4000AD, but with more players." I disagree that many, if any, of the modern situations you name can be turned into good Diplomacy variants. Good games, perhaps, but not Dippy games. When there are only two or three real powers, as in the 50's and 60's, how can you have a Diplomacy game? Perhaps variable victory conditions could be devised, but that's a real can of worms.

I want to thank everyone who submitted a survey. The results were useful to me, and I hope to you.

POTPPOURRI

1. Herb Barents, 157 State St., Zeeland, Mich 49464 has recently begun a mail order wargame-miniatures business offering discounts to MOW members. For more information get BOAST 37 from Herb.
2. MGR was mailed in late August and should have reached all MOW members by now. The tentative date of January 5, in Ann Arbor, has been selected for MOW Wintercon II. Since the next BI may not appear until just before the con, or even after, I'd better say that Barry Eynon, 1700 Geddes Apt B-8, Ann arbor, Mich. 48104 will be in charge.
3. The mail service here does not seem to be good. One piece of mail may have been lost already, and sometimes transit time is quite long. By the way, I'm heading back north about December 14 and will be in Bellevue for about four weeks.
4. Avalon Hill says they've rewritten the Stalingrad rules, making 4-5-6 replacements and exchange by attack factors standard. The rules will not be available until the current supply is exhausted. They are now working on a Waterloo revision.
5. Origins of WW II fans might be interested in a couple variants I designed about a year ago which finally have been published in the GENERAL. Also, Herb Barents is taking over assignment of Origins Numbers now that Fred Winter has dropped out of gaming.
6. I know you MOW types will find this hard to believe, but I actually played five games PTF in September. There's a group here that meet every Saturday,...
7. The IDA elections are in progress as this is being typed. There were 14 candidates (out of 44 nominated positions) for 10 posts, and at least six posts will be occupied by new men.
8. Some of you have mentioned to me that J.R.R. Tolkien, author of The Hobbit and The Lord of the Rings among others, died recently at a very advanced age. Four years ago it was known among science fiction people that Tolkien was working on a sort of sequel to TLOTR. One fan claimed to have held the manuscript, which Tolkien had finished except for extensive retouching. He was a very careful writer and could not work very hard, of course, and TLOTR is a tough act to follow. I think, however, that four more years of work probably left the work in presentable condition. The trilogy, the Silmarillion, deals with the First Age of Middle Earth that is referred to in TLOTR, but the struggle rather dwarfs the Third Age war, since Sauron is only the protege of Morgoth, the enemy in the First Age. Does anyone know more about when this might be published?
9. If you ever have the opportunity, I suggest you read The Chessplayers by Charles L. Harness for a humorous look at the fanaticism of game players. I don't want to say any more about it except that it's short and ostensibly science fiction.
10. Any psychologists out there? What significance might there be in someone naming his car, and particularly, a girl giving her car a guy's name?
11. Here's a problem which arose during an 1812 game that I'd like to hear from you on. Now on every turn in 1812 each player is allowed to make an army and a fleet move (or naval move - same thing). For a naval move a player may construct a fleet or move a group of fleets. The problem arose when all 12 fleet counters supplied with the game were used, already on the board, and one player wished to build another fleet. The other said that none could be built because there were no more counters, though the rules were silent concerning

insufficient counters. The first player wished to indicate that a fleet was being built by using any old piece or thing that came to hand, but the other objected. The problem was finally settled by a die roll, the first time in my recollection that I've had to resort to such a stupid measure. Now how do you think the problem should have been resolved?

12. Andy Phillips, 128 Oliver St., Daly City, Calif 94014 maintains a computer-printed list of gamers including address and, when known, gaming preferences. A list of gamers nearest to you (by zip code) is available from him for two 8¢ stamps. Most of the names are from the Bay area, I believe, compared to the concentration of any other area.

13. John Hulland, RR #4, Guelph, Ontario, Canada has openings in The Tactition (sic) for any SPI tactical games and Panzerblitz. I don't understand how these games are supposed to differ from normal postal versions which do not require a GM -- nothing is said about it. I am not familiar with all the possible games, so perhaps some require a GM. But Panzerblitz? Fee is \$1 plus \$2 game deposit plus sub (\$¢ per page plus postage). John has recently picked up many of Mark Weidmark's games (beginning his publishing with those) and is expanding rapidly.

14. I've mentioned the MOW Variant Package #1 before. If you haven't got it, you're not a true variant fan. \$1.75 (\$1.50 MOW) from Paul J. Wood, 24613 Harmon Court, St Clair Shores, Mich. 48080.

15. I've recently run across an interesting two-player game, Conquest, which was designed by someone completely ignorant of wargaming fandom. It resembles chess in some respects, though more than one piece may move in a turn, and the units represent ships and ancient units such as elephants and chariots in a manner somewhat less abstract than chess. Since I'm writing a review for a larger 'zine I can't say much more here. It's available from Donald Bengé, 1122 W Burbank Blvd, Burbank, Calif for \$5.95 postpaid.

16. How about a tournament game of 4000AD? A multiple of 4 is required for play, with boards accordingly. Each board is a "cell" in the Galaxy (C.C. McCapp uses this concept). The only way to move from one cell to another is to go out to the fifth level of the track and then transfer, on this fifth move, to any other cell (or an adjacent cell if you wish to set things up that way). A warp enters a new cell in either H or E if its origin point in the cell it is leaving is on the H side of the board, E if on the other half, and in the same color as its origin. On the fifth turn out, then, and only on the fifth turn, a warp may transfer, for example beginning on A yellow and coming into the new cell on turn five in E yellow, which becomes its new origin at level one. Also, it might be interesting to allow a player two warps PER CELL, or better, allow him to take a warp with him and then acquire another in the home cell, but still he would have only one in the invaded cell. Otherwise, the only point in moving to a new cell would be to give some ships to an ally for use; with only two warps total, there'd be no advantage in sending one into the sticks.

17. In the future, and especially this summer, I am going to be working on a number of games and variants. Is anyone interested in helping comment/playtest any of the games I work on? I am looking for people who will provide fairly prompt constructive criticism, especially concerning the clarity and completeness of the rules.

Mailing Roster 10/31/73

The number following your address indicates the last issue of your sub, according to my records. A "T" indicates a trader.

1. Paul Angel, 2825 S Raleigh St. Denver Colo 80236 32
2. Joe Antosiak, 422 East Ave. LaGrange, Ill 60525 T
3. John Arbogast, 3325 Old Kirkwood Dr. Va. Beach, Va 23452 31
4. Peter Aronson, 82 Park Ave. Newton, Mass 02158 32
5. Stephen Baird, 167 Rhode Island Ave. Highland Park, MI 48203-37
6. Herb Barents, 157 State St. Zeeland, MI 49464 T
7. Randolph Bart, 18249 Donmetz St. Northridge, Calif 91324 T
8. Mike Bartnikowski, 943 Stewart, Lincoln Park, MI 48146 36
9. C.A. Beam, 9611 Corbin Ave. Northridge, Calif 91324 28
10. Edl Birsan, RD 1 Smithtown Rd. Fishkill, NY 12524 T
11. Robert Blau, 604 Crestwood Dr. Alexandria, VA. 22302 29
12. John Boyer, 117 Garland Dr. Carlisle, PA 17013 T
13. Rick Brooks, RR #1 Box 167 Fremont, Ind. 46737 31
14. Walt Buchanan, RR 3 Lebanon Ind 46052 T
15. David Burkett, RR 4 Oakdale Dr. Springfield, Ill 62707 30
16. Martin Campion, History Dept. KSC, Pittsburg, Kansas 66762 31
17. John Cleaveland, 257 South 46 St. Philadelphia, PA 19139 32
18. William Clumm, 6407 Kennedy Ave. Cincinnati, Ohio 45213 29
19. Barry Eynon, 1700 Geddes Apt B-8, Ann Arbor, MI 48104 40
20. Michel Feron, Grand-Place 7, B 4280 Hannut, Belgium T
21. Carl Fishman, 2244 Shannon Dr. Adrian, MI 49221 28 32
22. Thomas Galloway, Prog Tra B-522, FCDSTCL DNECK, Va. Beach, Va 23461
23. Gamers Guide, Box 5076, Long Beach, Calif. 90805 T
24. Gary Gehrke, 21 Meadowbrook Court, Appleton, Wis 54911 35
25. Greg Greer, Box 771, Clinton, N.C. 28328 37
26. Raymond Heuer, 102-42 Jamaica Ave. Richmond Hill, NY 11418 31
27. Chic Hilliker, PO Box 1195, Bloomington, Ind 47401 T
28. S.K. Howard, 494 Pleasant St Apt 1 Gardner, Mass 01440 32
29. Jonathan Jacobs, 1717 Peirce Tower, 5514 S University Ave. Chicago, Ill 60631 28
30. Tom Keller, 317 East 12th St. New Albany, Ind 47150 28
31. Ronald Kelly, #210, 225 Virginia Ave SE, Washington, DC 20003-28
32. Stephen Knoop, CMR-8 Box 8419, Lackland AFB, Tex 78236 28
33. Burt Labelle, Forest Park #23, Biddeford, Maine 04005 30
34. Len Lakofka, 644 West Briar Place Chicago, Ill 60657 T
35. Steve Langs, 7809 S Quad, 600 E Madison, Ann Arbor, MI 48104 28
36. Rick Loomis, 8149 E Thomas Rd. Scottsdale, AZ 85251 T
37. Ernie Melchior, Box 5318, Station B, Nashville, Tenn 37235 32
38. Don Miller, 12315 Judson Rd. Wheaton, Md 20906 T
39. R. L. Morton, 306 Frank St Apt 7 Ottawa, Ontario K2P 0X8 29
40. Francis McIlvaine, 9040 Project Ave. Ft Bliss, Tex 79906 30
41. Zane Parks, 37-C Univ. Houses, Madison, Wis. 53705 29
42. Hartley Patterson, 7 Cambridge Rd. Beaconsfield, Bucks, UK T
43. Andy Phillips, 128 Oliver St. Daly City, Calif 94014 T
44. Arnold Proujansky, 50 W 77 St. NY NY 10024 29
45. Todd Roseman, 66 Montbello St. Chula Vista, Calif 92010 33
46. Gerald Ross, 2433 Ross Dr. Sebawaing, MI 48759 31
47. David Sleight, 6914 E 1st Ave. Scottsdale, AZ 85251 35
48. Dave Staples, RR 1 Box 120, Fargo, N.D. 58102 T
49. Adam Stephanides, 1365 E 60th St. Chicago, Ill 60637 31
50. Rudolph Tatay, RR 7 Box 28B, Greenfield, Ind 46140 32
51. Third Millenia, Inc. 465 Woodland Hills, Philadelphia, Miss T

52. Jeffrey Topper, 4616 Dundee Dr Los Angeles, Calif 90027 30
53. John Van De Graaf, 37343 Glenbrook, Mt. Clemens, MI 48043-30+32
54. Dick Vedder, 1451 N Warren, Tucson, AZ 85919 30
55. Conrad von Metzke, PO Box 8342, San Diego, Calif. 92102 T
56. Tony Watson, 201 Minnesota, Las Vegas, Nevada 89107 28
57. Mark Weidmark, 528 Park Cr. Pickering, Ontario 35
58. John Weswig, 2115 N W Elder St. Corvallis, Oregon 97330 37
59. Paul Wood, 24613 Harmon, St. Clair Shores, MI 48080 T
60. Stan Wrobel, 7 Poland Village Blvd., Poland, Ohio 44514 T

Cripe, I need about four more pages. Openings:

Hyborian Age II. \$5. Ray Bowers, 11870 Twillwood Dr. St Louis, MO.

Logical Diplomacy. Conrad von Metzke(see above); sub to Rename.

473 BC, Algonquin Park Diplomacy. John Hulland, RR 4, Guelph, Ont. \$2.50.

Logical Diplomacy, by Allan Owens, printed in Rename 15, 254 from Conrad von Metzke. This could also be called Cut-throat Dippy. Six players are crowded onto a symmetrical board; no seas. There are 31 centers but only 43 spaces. I do not appreciate this game much. The removal of fleets decreases the number of decisions a player can and must make. The crowding also decreases the skill required. It becomes a guessing game; if you guess wrong, you're had. But it should be fast, and I can see only one stalemate line, requiring 12 centers, so draws might be relatively uncommon.

In the previous issue of Rename Conrad printed rules for a variant of the Youngstown Variant, by Dick Vedder. There are a number of versions, but all include addition of Africa. Usually Transvaal is one of the powers. Sometimes India is removed, which sounds like a bda idea on the face of it considering the already great power of the Sino-Japanese alliance, which can almost force a draw in the regular game.

It looks like Conrad is going to try to print a variant in every issue of Rename, now. I recommend a sub.

Burt Labelle now assigns the Miller Numbers. I hope you will all support him.

A Diplomacy variant was recently included in MOVES. Strength values were assigned to each type of unit of each country in an attempt to make the game less unrealistic. Unfortunately the designer specified double force (of attacker and supports) to dislodge a defending force. This means, for example, that three 5 armies could not dislodge two 4 armies! A sure stalemate, aside from the lack of balance.

"It just happens to be so that southern California is a giant outdoor nuthouse." - Dr. Theodore Ropp. "Derision is no substitute for discussion" - Guess who.

Lewis Pulsipher
Box 1021 Graduate Center
Duke U.
Durham, N.C. 27706

ROD WALKER

3343 FIRST AVE

SAN DIEGO, CALIF. 92103



First class

(see pg 17P)

First class