

B R O B D I N G N A G

 Brobdingnag #49 1966AV (F '02) 1966AQ (W '02) 24 November 1966

Game 1966AV

Fall 1902

FRENCH NAVAL FORCES CRUMBLE. PARIS SEIZED BY TEUTONS
 FRANC-TIREURS BELIEVED HOLDING OUT IN SOUTH
 ITALIAN BLUE-JACKETS LAND AT MALAGA AND BARCELONA
 TSAR'S OWN FLEET SWEEPS BLACK SEA
 TURKEY DECLARES WAR ON AUSTRIA-HUNGARY
 KAISER SPEAKS IN REICHSTAG

The moves:

GERMANY (Shagrin): Fleet Belgium supports ENGLISH fleet London to English Channel. Army Picardy supports ENGLISH fleet Mid-Atlantic to Brest. Army Burgundy to Paris. Army Munich to Burgundy. Army Ruhr supports army Munich to Burgundy. Army Denmark stands.

RUSSIA (Zelazny): Fleet Sweden stands. Army St. Petersburg to Livonia. Army Moscow to Warsaw. Army Ukraine to Sevastopol. Fleet Rumania supports fleet Sevastopol to Black Sea. Fleet Sevastopol to Black Sea.

AUSTRIA (Munroe): Army Vienna to Tyrolia. Army Trieste to Venice. Fleet Adriatic supports army Trieste to Venice. Army Bulgaria to Constantinople. Fleet Greece to Aegean Sea.

ENGLAND (Wells): Fleet Mid-Atlantic to Brest. Fleet North Sea to Holland. Fleet London to English Channel. Army Wales stands.

FRANCE (Birsan): No moves received. Fleets Brest and English Channel stand. Armies Marseilles and Portugal stand.

ITALY (Francis): Army Piedmont supports army Venice. Army Venice supports GERMAN army Munich to Tyrolia. Fleet Tyrrhenian Sea to Ionian Sea. Fleet Western Mediterranean Sea to Spain (south coast).

TURKEY (Lebling): Army Armenia to Bulgaria. Fleet Black Sea convoys army Armenia to Bulgaria. Fleet Constantinople supports army Armenia to Bulgaria.

Underlined moves do not succeed. The French fleets in Brest and the English Channel are dislodged and, having received no orders, are removed from play. The Turkish fleet in the Black Sea is dislodged and has only Ankara open for retreat. There are no other retreats.

As a result of these moves the belligerent powers control the supply centres listed on the next page.

- - - - -

PROBRODINGNAG is published by John A. McCallum, Ralston, Alberta, Canada.
 It records Postal Diplomacy games 1966AQ and 1966AV. Price ten cents.

GERMANY: 3 home, Denmark, Belgium, Paris. 6 in all. No change.
RUSSIA: 4 home, Sweden Rumania. 6 in all. No change.
AUSTRIA: 3 home, Serbia, Greece, Bulgaria. 6 in all. May build one.
ENGLAND: 3 home, Norway, Holland, Brest. 6 in all. May build two.
ITALY: 3 home, Tunis, Spain. 5 in all. May build one.
TURKEY: 3 home. No change.
FRANCE: Marseilles, Portugal. 2 in all. No change.

Deadline for build moves is Thursday, 8 December 1966. If build orders are received appreciably ahead of the announced deadline, players will be informed by letter so that the game may be speeded.

PRESS RELEASES:

Ankara, 14 Sept. 1902: Upon receipt of the news of the dastardly attack upon the Turkish province of Bulgaria, the Parliament immediately stopped debate on the question of raising pay of municipal officers, and as a man voted to declare war upon the Empire of Austria-Hungary. It was also noted that within five minutes after the news became known, Sultan Abdul Hamid II announced his intention to add the title of Emperor of Austria and King of Hungary to his present honors. . Rome, 15 Sept. There is fierce speculation here in the capital that a decision on the question of Austria is near. The Austrian attempt to put an army in the Tyrol is viewed as a threat to Italy itself, and the residents of the Venetian area and the region around Milan and Florence are especially concerned. The King has promised a decision by next Wednesday.

Berlin, 1 Oct.: The Kaiser spoke before a packed Reichstag today. After a brief review of the state of Europe and the progress of German arms he ended by stating, "Russia need have no fear of the victorious Anglo-German forces as long as Norway remains English. England and Germany are a team, and I, as Kaiser, trust my ally implicitly. France had to fall as its threat to peace-loving Germany" (at this point someone in the diplomatic gallery was seized by a choking fit), "as its threat to peace-loving Germany from Burgundy was unbearable. Prime Minister Birsan was warned! Death to the enemies of Anglo-German victory!"

- - - - -

Address changes:

Pvt. Anders B. Swenson, FG28281120, C-1-2, Flat #4, Ft. Ord, Calif., 93941.
(Same base; different unit.)
Brenton Ver Floeg, Beta Theta Pi, 2349 Sheridan Road, Evanston, Ill., 60201.

And that last one reminds me. College students who want EROB sent to their home addresses over the holidays should advise me of the dates. If players feel that they need a copy sent to both addresses over the Christmas season, they should say so.

Game 1966A0

Fall & Winter 1902

FURTHER MOBILIZATIONS IN PARIS AND MOSCOW
NEW BATTLESHIPS COMMISSIONED AT NAPOLI

Fall Retreats: GERMAN army Belgium to Holland. AUSTRIAN army Vienna to Trieste. RUSSIAN army St. Petersburg to Livonia.

Builds and removals:

FRANCE (Thompson): Builds army Paris.

RUSSIA (Reinsel): Builds army Moscow.

AUSTRIA (Duncan): Removes fleet Albania. (See NOTE below.)

ITALY (Goldman): Builds fleet Naples.

NOTE: The actual Austrian order was for the removal of a non-existent force. Fortunately the Austrian player had sent in conditional moves with his Fall orders, orders which covered the case of removals. By making use of them I was able, I think, to deduce what he meant. But players are advised to re-read the story of Lord Raglan's incomprehensible order and the resultant needless destruction of the Light Brigade. And to draw the moral that orders should always be clear.

Anyone who does want to re-read that story will find that both of the following books are very readable accounts of the Crimean War: "The Reason Why" by Cecil Woodham-Smith, and "The Destruction of Lord Raglan" by Christopher Hibbert. The latter, although the less scholarly of the two, indicates clearly enough that "someone had blundered" was by no means confined to one side in that war, but was an apt description of all policy making in it. Savoy was the only country to behave with much sense. After most of the fighting and all of the bitter winter weather were past, Savoy sent out several regiments who camped, in balmy summer conditions, in the Yalta region, sometimes known as the Russian Riviera. As a reward for this action Savoy gained a place at the peace table. I know nothing of the military prowess of the Savoyards but they would seem to have had diplomatic skill and general sagacity of a high order.

Moves, clear, skillful, and sagacious, or otherwise, for spring 1903, are due on the deadline, Thursday, 8 December 1966.

SEALING BAG

DEREK NELSON, 18 Granard Avenue, Scarborough, Ontario: About Koning's Rule. Yes, I feel that is a fair statement of my position. The same reasoning applies to the compound version of the rule, i.e., a shattered attack could not possibly affect the movement of reinforcements to the old front line. ((+ (Thanks, Derek. Now if John could also say that it was fair, that point would be settled; however misguided one, the other, or both of you, may think my conclusions. jamcc) +))

Continued on last page.

BROEDINGWAG Current Game Rating List #3

+20	John Smythe (W)	0	Len Atkins Len Bailes Jack Chalker Robert Cline John Davey Ronald Wilson
+18	John Moning John McCallum		
+13	Charles Wells (W)		
+11	Donald Miller Mark Owings	- 2	Brenda Banks Ron Daniels Jim Sanders
+ 9	Frank Clark		
+ 8	John Boardman (W) Derek Nelson (W) Jerry Pournelle	- 4	Dan Brannan Margaret Gemignani Alexis Gilliland Jack Harness Dave McDaniel Bill Schreffler
+ 7	James MacKenzie (W) Banks Mebane	- 5	Ron Bounds Tom Bulmer Allan Huff Stuart Keshner James Latimer Steven Patt
+ 6	Bruce Pelz (W) Charles Reinsel Jock Root		
+ 5	James Goldman Terry Kuch	- 6	Sidney Get Thomas Gorman Bernie Kling Don Recklies John Sandoval Al Scott
+ 4	Eric Blake Bob Lake Dian Pelz		
+ 3	Edwin Baker Rick Brooks James Dygert Geo. Parks	- 8	Conrad von Metzke
+ 2	Ken Davidson Harold Peck Dennis Smith Anders Svenson Earl Thompson Robert Ward	- 9	Barry Gold
+ 1	John Austin Bill Christian John Hazor Gregory Molenaar Kim Pattee Ron Parks Hank Reinhardt Reinstein/Berman Bob Whelan	-10	Joel Sattel Richard Schultz
		-11	Jerald Jacks
		-12	Stephen Barr Fred Lerner Roland Tzudiker
		-15	Phil Castora Paul Harley

In addition to completed games
1963A, B, 1964A, B, C, 1965A, I, L,
this listing includes partial results
from games in progress, 1964D(1915),
1965B(1910), C(1910), D(1908),
E(1910), F(1908), G(1907), H(1908), H(1907), Q(1908), R(1909), S(1910),

T(1909), U(1906), V(1906), W(1906), 1966A(1906), B(1904), C(1904), D(1906), E(1904), L(1907). The symbol (W) after a player's name indicates that he is a game winner. Numbers in brackets are the latest game "year" for which information was available when the listing was compiled. Games underlined are those in which there have been changes since the last previous edition of this listing; most players in them will find that their scores have altered for better or for worse. I would like to thank Charles Reinsel for publishing the second revision of this rating list in Big Brother #19. Big Brother will not carry future revisions of the Brobdingnag rating list. It will, however, publish, as required, further revisions of the Reinsel Rating List, the first rating scheme to be proposed for Postal Diplomacy. My guess is that two current games will end by mid-December, so that the next revision of BB's list should be out quite soon.

- - - - -

Two Forces Retreating to the Same Space.

One of the most glaring omissions in the rulebook is that nothing is said as to what happens when two dislodged forces are both ordered to retreat to the same space. It was surprisingly late before the omission was noticed in postal circles. The first reference to it known to me appeared in Wild 'n Woolly #21, dated 18 May 1965, some two years after postal Diplomacy began.

In the edition of his house rules given in that issue Brannan published rule 14. It read: "When two or more units are dislodged and ordered to retreat to the same space, they are both, or all, removed from the board." This rule had not appeared in previous editions of his house rules. Some months later, Robert Shapiro, in a letter to Graustark, #76, asked Boardman about this case, and the latter replied in the same sense as Brannan's statement. That solution has been generally adopted throughout the postal Diplomacy world.

In his recent article, Diplomania #12, and Graustark #100, Calhamer comments on this situation. He states that his solution is to have both powers submit a second retreat order, the space to which they previously ordered the retreat being barred to both. This process is continued until a compatible set of retreat orders is found. If, during the search for a rat hole to retreat to, one force runs out of available retreats, its force comes off the board.

It should be noted that retreats are always a little different in over-the-board play from what they are in postal play. In the former are a retreat order takes a minute, at most, after the moves from which it arises. If there is only one retreat on a move it need not even be written down, the player just moves the piece involved. The postal case is quite different - as much time is required for a retreat as is required for a full set of moves, since the player(s) involved must be informed and sufficient time must be allowed for the reply. In postal play every retreat becomes an interruption of the game adding, in most games, two weeks to the playing time. To have not one, but a series, of retreats would therefore be intolerable given the conditions of postal play.

An example. A fleet dislodged from the North Sea could, conceivably, have 9 spaces open to it for retreat. A fleet expelled from Sweden or Kiel could have 5 spaces open, 3 of which are the same as those open to the fleet driven from the North Sea. So it would be

possible for eight weeks to be required to find an acceptable retreat if both of these dislodgments occurred on a move - eight weeks during which the other 5 powers would have nothing whatever to do except wait for the retreat to be completed. I am, in general, opposed to altering the basic game on account of the peculiar circumstances of postal play but to open up the possibility of needing 8 weeks for one retreat order is ridiculous. Therefore, BROEDINGWAG adheres to what has become the standard practice in postal Diplomacy. Two dislodged forces, both ordered to retreat to the same space, both come off, immediately, without having an opportunity to try other alternatives. If the two powers involved, on account of a close alliance, prefer to let one make the retreat and the other to be removed on account of no submitted retreat order, they must think of this in advance; if they don't, and both order to the same spot; they will both be removed.

In the event that a single power has two dislodged forces, and if there is only one and the same retreat available to both, the gamesmaster will order one of them to space and the other off the board. This is the /the solution adopted by Charles Wells in game 1966A when this situation came up (Lonely Mountain #20). It is fully compatible with other BROB practices as regards retreats and will be retained.

. . . .

Support by Fleets in Split Provinces.

The rulebook states: "A fleet which may move to one of these provinces ((i.e., a province with a divided coastline)) may support in such a province, without regard for the separation of the coastline into two stretches."

Plainly from this a fleet in Gascony can support a fleet holding in Spain (south coast). But two questions do arise:

1. May a fleet in Gascony support another fleet which is not yet in Spain (s.c.) but which is attempting to go there? Is the move, Fleet Gascony supports fleet Gulf of Lyon to Spain (s.c.), legal or not?
2. May a fleet in Spain (s.c.) support a fleet in Gascony?

The answer to the first question depends on the interpretation of the word "in" in the quoted sentence from the rulebook. Does it here mean just "in" or does it mean "in or into"? In BROEDINGWAG it is regarded as meaning "in or into" and the illustrative move is legal. It should be mentioned that there is another case elsewhere in the rulebook where "in" seems to be used in this inclusive sense.

The answer to the second question is that there appears to be no indication in the rulebook that reciprocity holds in this case. Therefore, in BROEDINGWAG, a fleet in Spain (s.c.) may not support a fleet, or an army, in Gascony.

Needless to say, the whole discussion could be repeated with respect to the other coast of Spain, and there are similar cases in the two other provinces with split coastlines, Bulgaria and St. Petersburg. BROEDINGWAG's practice in both cases is, I believe, in accordance with that of the great majority of gamesmasters.

There was a very full discussion of the whole situation in Costaguana, Vol. 1, #18, Vol. 1, #20, and Vol. 2, #4. Interested readers are referred to those publications, edited by Conrad von Metzke, 5327 Hilltop Drive, San Diego, California.

. . . .

Boardman's Dilemma.

Consider the following set of moves:

RUSSIA: Army Prussia to Berlin. Army Silesia supports army Prussia to Berlin.

GERMANY: Army Berlin to Silesia. Army Munich supports army Berlin to Silesia. Army Kiel to Berlin.

The attack of the German army in Berlin on Silesia is certainly successful since it is made with a force of two against an unsupported force. The Silesian army is, therefore, dislodged. But is its support cut? We notice that the dislodging force came from Berlin, the province into which the Silesian army is supporting - therefore, not an "attack from the side". According to the rulebook it is only attacks from the side which cut support. So this Silesian force, although dislodged, can, apparently, still support - and, moreover, support into the very province previously occupied by the victorious army which routed it.

From time to time there is mention of this type of situation in the Diplomacy journals. Quite recently Armageddonia presented a rule puzzle; it was more complicated than the case above, but a situation of this type formed an essential part of it.

The first case known to me in which a similar combination of moves was discussed was given in John Boardman's Graustark #45. After quoting the section of the rulebook at the bottom of page 4, on "cutting supports", John went on to say: "By omission, then, we can conclude that if the "unit ordered to support" ((army Silesia, in our example)) is attacked from the same province in which it is ordered to support, the support is still valid. But, on the other hand, it is hard to believe that an army attacked from one province and forced to retreat to another, can offer support in the province from which it was attacked."

In the case in Graustark, it happened that the attack, which the dislodged force was supporting, received still other support from an ally. The support of the dislodged unit was, therefore, superfluous, and John did not have to rule whether the support of the dislodged unit was good or not.

I have my views on this situation; in fact, they have been published, although only incidentally, in an item about something else. Rather than repeat my opinion here, I would prefer to ask Mr. Calhamer to answer the question:

If a force is dislodged by an attack, not from the side but frontally (i.e., from the space into which it is supporting), is its support cut or does it remain good?

After all, it was nearly two years ago when Boardman first posed the question. No authoritative ruling on the question has been given in the time since. It can do no harm if there is a delay of a few more weeks before BROB's practice is published.

CHARLES F. BENNETT, 120 8th Ave., Clarion, Penna., 16214: In EROB #47, page 3, you state that "the rest is silence" re the Coastal Crawl.

I refer you to Big Brother #17, (8 Oct. 1966), Rule #17. In this rule I stated "Yes" on the Coastal Crawl. Please look again. ((+(Yes, Chas., and I knew it too. Don't know why I made that mistake. Since then several others have declared on the crawl. When my "Rules" series of articles gets that far, I intend to list how everyone has declared on that issue.

This brings up a peculiar point, though. The Coastal Crawl is something that might arise perhaps once in a hundred games. Certainly not a very important point. And yet nearly every gamesmaster has now gone on record on it. But the case of "Boardman's Dilemma" is just the reverse. It is a situation which will arise with fair frequency; not as often as Moning's Rule, of course, but often enough. Moreover, whether a player should attack with force A and support with force B, or whether he should do it the other way around, will often depend on how the gamesmaster of the game plays "Boardman's Dilemma". Yet, as far as I know, from John's raising the question a year and three quarters ago until this issue of EROB, there has never been a word of discussion about it. And not a single gamesmaster, not even John himself, has ruled on the question. (When reading over Graustark #45, I always think I hear a sigh of relief because he didn't have to rule, on account of the additional support. I think I know how John would rule today, and, if I am right in my guess, I concur. But he didn't actually make a ruling, and neither has anyone else since. And not from lack of material on which to base a decision. John made a very fair appraisal of the difficulties attached to both sides of the argument. The whole thing was published in the most widely read Diplomacy Journal. And not a murmur from anybody.)

Well, I hope reviving the question, on page 7, will persuade not only Galkamer, but a lot of others, to express an opinion of the subject.

Good luck in getting that final player you need for your new game, Chas. Perhaps I should advise readers that Big Brother #17 tells not only how you stand on the Coastal Crawl but on the great majority of the other controversies. So that players in your games have at least prior knowledge of the rules they are played under, whether they agree with them all or not. jamcc+))

- - - - -

Other journals with game openings:

Glockoria, Dave Lebling, 3 Rollins Court, Rockville, Md., 20852.

Malnar, Christina Cartier, 2417 Webster Street, Berkeley, Calif., 94705.

Diplomania's numerous progeny, Donald Miller, 12315 Judson Road, Glenmont, Wheaton, Md., 20906.