

BROBDINGNAG

 Brobdingnag #51 1966AV (S '03) 1966AQ (F '03) 14 January 196

Game 1966AV

Spring 1903

UNITED AUSTRO-RUSSIAN ONSLAUGHT ON TURKISH CAPITAL
 ITALY DEFENDS ALPINE PASSES FRANCE RE-OCCUPIES SPAIN
 AUSTRIANS SEIZE PO VALLEY

The moves:

GERMANY (Shagron): Army Picardy to Burgundy. Army Paris to Gascony.
 Army Burgundy to Munich. Army Ruhr supports army
 Burgundy to Munich. Army Denmark to Sweden. Fleet Belgium to Holland.

RUSSIA (Zelazny): Army Sevastopol to Armenia. Fleet Black Sea to
 Constantinople. Fleet Rumania to Black Sea. Army
 Livonia stands. Army Warsaw stands. Fleet Sweden to Gulf of Bothnia.

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

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

ITALY (Francis): Fleet Spain (south coast) to Mid-Atlantic Ocean. Army
 Piedmont supports army Venice to Tyrolia. Army Venice
 to Tyrolia. Army Rome to Venice. Fleet Ionian Sea to Adriatic Sea.

TURKEY (Lebling): Fleet Constantinople stands. Fleet Ankara supports
 fleet Constantinople. Army Armenia to Smyrna.

FRANCE (Birsan): Army Marseilles supports army Portugal to Spain. Army
 Portugal to Spain.

Underlined moves do not succeed. The Italian Fleet formerly in Spain
 must retreat to either the Gulf of Lyon or the the Western Mediterranean.
 The Austrian army, formerly in Tyrolia, is dislodged and must retreat
 to Bohemia, Vienna, or Trieste. The successful move of the Austrian
 army moving from Trieste to Venice is an example of Boardman's Rule.
 There is some disoussion of it elsewhere in this issue.

As there are two ambiguous retreats a summer move is called
 for. The deadline for it is Wednesday, 18 January 1967, by which time
 the Italian and the Austrian players must submit retreat orders. All
 players may, if they wish, submit Fall moves, conditional on the Italian
 and Austrian retreats. If all players submit such conditional Fall
 orders, then the Fall moves will be combined with the Summer ones. But
 Fall moves are not demanded. If any player does not submit them in time
 for the above mentioned deadline, the only effect will be to delay the
 game by two weeks.

Press releases on page 4 . The Turkish Fleet in Constantinople
 is annihilated, having no available retreat.

Game 1966AQ

Fall 1903

FRENCH INVADE ENGLAND
TURKEY AND RUSSIA DIVIDE BALKANS
DEUTSCHLAND STANDS STILL

The moves :

RUSSIA (Reinsel): Army St. Petersburg supports fleet Sweden to Finland.
Army Livonia supports army St. Petersburg. Army Bohemia to Vienna. Army Vienna to Budapest. Army Rumania supports army Vienna to Budapest. Fleet Sweden to Finland. Fleet Black Sea supports army Rumania.

FRANCE (Thompson): Fleet English Channel convoys army Belgium to London.
Army Burgundy to Belgium. Army Belgium to London.
Army Paris supports army Gascony to Burgundy. Army Gascony to Burgundy.
Army Picardy supports army Burgundy to Belgium.

GERMANY (Nelson): Army Munich supports army Ruhr. Army Ruhr supports army Holland. Fleet Kiel supports fleet Denmark Army Holland stands. Fleet Denmark stands.

AUSTRIA (Duncan): Army Serbia to Trieste. Army Budapest to Galicia.
Army Trieste to Venice.

ENGLAND (Long): No moves received. Fleets Norwegian Sea, Norway and Skagerrak stand. Army Finland stands.

TURKEY (Greene): Army Bulgaria supports army Greece to Serbia. Army Greece to Serbia. Fleet Aegean to Greece. Fleet Eastern Mediterranean to Ionian Sea.

ITALY(Goldman): Army Albania to Serbia. Army Tyrolia to Venice.
Fleet Ionian Sea to Adriatic Sea. Fleet Naples to Ionian Sea.

Underlined moves do not succeed. The Austrian army formerly in Serbia is dislodged and, having no available retreat, is removed from play. Likewise the English army in Finland is dislodged and, having received no orders, is annihilated.

As a result of these moves the belligerent powers control the supply centres listed:

RUSSIA: 4 home, Sweden, Vienna, Budapest, Rumania. 8 in all. May build 1.

FRANCE: 3 home, 2 Iberian, Belgium, London. 7 in all. May build 1.

TURKEY: 3 home, Bulgaria, Greece, Serbia. 6 in all. May build 2.

GERMANY: 3 home, Denmark, Holland. 5 in all. No change.

ITALY: 3 home, Tunis. 4 in all. No change.

ENGLAND: Edinburgh, Liverpool, Norway. 3 in all. No change.

AUSTRIA: Trieste. Must remove 1.

The deadline for builds and removals is Wednesday, 18 January 1967. As is usual with Winter moves, if they are received substantially ahead of deadline, publication will be advanced, thereby speeding the game.

PRESS RELEASES

Constantinople, 16 May. News of the glorious victory swept through Constantinople. The following is part of the message that the Duke of Greenwich gave before 1,000,000 Turks, "Turkey has fulfilled my hopes" (cheers and cries of "Long live the Sultan") "Turkey is no longer a fledgling naval power, but the Queen of the Mediterranean."

Athens, 16 May. Athens was busily being plundered tonight, as the biggest sack in modern military history took place.

Rome, 4 Aug. The government proclaimed today that a state of war exists between the nation of Italy and the government of Austria.

Edirne, 12 Aug. Sultan Abdul Osman remarked here on the Near Eastern situation: "Italy for the past month has been violating the Albanian-Greek border, therefore we have laid down a tremendous naval expansion program which will make Turkey unchallengeable on the sea...I show nothing but praise for our excellent Ally, Mother Russia" (the Sultan refused to comment why he was not staying in Ankara or Constantinople) "...I also have plans for a new "Sedate Empire" in which all Turks will be equal and rich."

Paris, 5 Sept. A cryptic communique was handed representatives of the world press at the Quai d'Orsay. It read: France suspects England of betrayal, and although it may not be true, (in fact very unlikely), France is none the less greedy.

Berlin, 10 Nov. The mood of the German capital, and of the nation, is very strange and puzzling to the foreign observer. Far different from the wild exultation of 1901 with its easy, if not quite bloodless, conquests of Denmark and Holland.

Then the whole nation was united - even anti-war factions took pride in the feats of the forces. Now the predominant feeling seems to be one of puzzlement as another campaigning season has passed without any sign of activity by the Imperial troops.

Nor is the feeling of uncertainty confined to the civilian population. It seems, if anything, even more in evidence among the members of the forces. The Fleet, especially, in an unsteady state, and in certain quarters one hears rumours of an incipient mutiny. Old navy men, home on leave, show the strain under which they exist. Used as garrison troops in Denmark, a sort of super-police force, a task for which they are neither trained nor particularly suited, they have had to listen frequently to the sound of gunfire in the Kattegat and the North Sea, as the Russian and British fleets have duelled incessantly over the last two years. Uncertain of their role, deprived of most of their capital ships, which have been used by the new naval units in training at Cuxhaven, Kiel, and Travemünde, infected by a thousand rumours which the strictest censorship can't prevent from crossing the Sound separating them from Sweden, they are an unhappy lot.

But such feeling is not confined to the Fleet. The Army too is infected. A few weeks ago, in a theatre in Königsberg, there was a near riot among troops of the local garrison, attending a performance of Lessing's "Minna" when Werner - always a popular figure among German troops - spoke his lines, "Ich habe lange genug gehofft, es sollte hier wieder losgehen. Aber da sitzen sie und heilen sich die Haut." Such an

incident is only a straw, of course; but it indicates clearly enough the restlessness of the troops at their long inactivity. Psychologists, and some statesmen, are saying that it is impossible to keep such large forces ever on the alert, but without the relief which action brings - that the country should either enter the war, or revert to peace status. They are supported by the economists, who feel that the withdrawal of such a large proportion of the productive labour force of the nation must eventually hurt the economy. But the General Staff is adamant. Some over-age Landwehr men have, indeed, been discharged; but the armed forces as a whole remain on a war footing, at double the peace time establishment - and with no war to fight.

- - - - -

Game 1966AV (Continued from page 1)

PRESS RELEASES.

London, 1 Apr. The English government regrets the hostile attitude Germany has shown us. We have found it necessary to maneuver our fleet around our ancestral Saxon homeland.

Berlin, 2 Apr. England, we shall trust you for the final time. If you prove false, let death and despoilation be thy fate. Already the Russians vultures gather, but if they do not recoil we shall bury them. Already the military government of Prince Vlad the Impaler of our Rumanian ally has quieted the civil population of Alsace-Lorraine and outlying areas such as Paris and the Ile-de-France. Rumour has it that he is studying Polish and Russian in case it becomes necessary to avenge Russian incursions into Prussia and Silesia. "Inn", as his friends call him, has already accepted the Blue Win from the hands of the Kaiser himself. Unfortunately even Ursula Undress could not stand to be near him, so he has recently been reviewing new methods of tearing wings off flies.

- - - - -

Deadlines.

Players in both games were informed of the moves carried in this issue of BROODINGWAG by carbon copy letter. A new deadline of 21 January 1967 was there indicated.

- - - - -

BOARDMAN'S RULE

Boardman's Dilemma was discussed in this magazine in issue #49. The support of a frontally attacked force (that is, one attacked from the space into which it is attacking) is normally not cut, but continues to be good. The question arises, does this remain true if the force is actually dislodged. This question was first brought up, nearly two years ago, by John Boardman, in Graustark #45. Both sides of the question were there fairly presented, but the question was left unresolved, whence my use of the word "dilemma" in describing the situation. More recently, however, the question has again arisen in several Graustark games, and John has each time ruled in conformity with the literal wording of the rulebook. That this is his deliberate intention is stated categorically in the latest issue of Graustark, #114. I therefore suggest, to the fraternity at large, that we now call the question

the "Boardman's Rule Situation", with Boardman's Rule itself stating something like, "A unit, attacked from a space into which it is supporting, does not have its support thereby cut, even if it is dislodged". I recognize John Boardman's dislike of tinkering with the rulebook, so that he may dislike having his name connected with a "Rule". However, it seems to me that it is at least preferable to "Dilemma", which implies that he has not made up his mind. That indecision is certainly not true today, whatever may have been the case two years ago, when he first mentioned the situation.

It will be noticed that there is a difference between Boardman's Rule and the other two well known rules, Koning's and Brannan's. Koning's Rule was an attempt to resolve a contradiction in the rulebook, Brannan's Rule an attempt to fill a void left by the rulebook. They are, therefore, both amendments of the rulebook, in fact as well as in wording. They may have been necessary - Brannan's certainly was, as, with a real omission, something had to be said, one way or the other. Boardman's Rule is not an amendment in that sense. It merely makes explicit something which is already, although vaguely, implied by the printed rules.

Boardman's Rule situation has come up quite frequently of late. As we have mentioned, it arose several times in Graustark games. Also, it appeared twice in recent months in Lonely Mountain, whose gamesmaster, Charles Wells, ruled in the sense that we are here calling Boardman's Rule. Walker has also said that he would adopt that ruling (see Erewhon #6), and Reinsel has stated that he would do the same (see his letter in EROB #50). On the situation arising in Game 1966AV, in the set of moves published in this issue, I found to my horror that I had not declared how I would rule. In #49 I deliberately left the question open, in order to give Mr. Calhamer a chance to express his views. He did so, in #50, and said that he preferred the opposite solution to Boardman's. I think that my reply to his letter expressed my feeling on the issue clearly enough, but I did not make a definite ruling. I therefore owe the player for Italy in Game 1966AV an apology. It is hereby tendered and, if he would care to enter any other game of Postal Diplomacy whatsoever, I will be happy to pay his game fee, by way of trying to make amends. However, I hope he will continue to play his present position in this game.

This issue, by the way, is one where there seems to be a decided divergence between the views of players and gamesmasters. Boardman, Wells, Walker, Reinsel, and myself have all declared in the same sense. Miller is the only gamesmaster who has declared in the opposite sense, but some players are known to be violently opposed to the majority gamesmaster view. See, for example, Jim Latimer's letter in Graustark #114. In this respect, as in others, it has parallels with the Koning's rule situation. On that issue I find myself on both sides of the fence: As referee, I like the rule less and less the more I look at it; as player, I almost automatically assume that Koning's rule is in effect in every game I am in.

All players please note, Boardman's Rule applies in EROB DINGWAG.

- - - - -

A EROB player, Richard A. Shagrin, Room 356, Haggett Hall, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, 98105, announces the publication of his new 'zine, The High Liver, a journal of Economic Diplomacy. Write him for details.

BROBDINGNAG Completed Game Rating List - #3

Two games have recently ended in sTab, necessitating a revision of the BROB Rating List. Game 1964D, a very long game lasting two and a half years, was won by Austria with Italy coming second. This does something to even out the Country List, in which those countries previously trailed the field.

Game 1965E was won by John Smythe, playing England. Our congratulations to him. It is, as most will know, his third win. As no one else has won more than one game, this pretty well clinches the widely held opinion that Smythe is the best Diplomacy player around. Incidentally, this makes three wins in a row for England, following, as it does, immediately after John Boardman's win with that country in 1964C, and Alan Huff's in 1966D; this is also reflected in the new country listing.

+18 John Smythe (W)
+ 9 Derek Nelson (W)
+ 6 Alan Huff (W)
John Koning
Bruce Pelz (W)
Charles Wells (W)
+ 5 Frank Clark
John McCallum (W)
+ 4 Eric Blake
John Boardman (W)
Robert Lake
James MacKenzie (W)
Dian Pelz
+ 3 Conrad von Metzke
+ 2 Donald Miller
Jock Root
+ 1 Bill Christian
Ken Davidson
Anders Swenson
0 Len Bailes
John Davey
Mark Owings
- 1 Jack Harness
Earl Thompson
- 2 Ron Daniels
James Dygert
James Goldman
Jim Sanders

- 4 Margaret Gemignani
Dave McDaniel
Roland Tzudiker
- 5 Tom Bulmer
Stuart Keshner
- 6 Bernie Kling
Don Recklies
-10 Charles Brannan
Richard Schultz
-12 Fred Lerner
-15 Paul Marley

(W), as usual, indicates a game winner. This listing is based on completed games 1963A, 1963B, 1964A, 1964B, 1964C, 1964D, 1965A, 1965I, 1965L, 1965U, and 1966D. Incidentally, six of the seven oldest games now in progress are in Wild 'n Woolly. It is likely, however, that other games, in Barad-dur and elsewhere, will be finished before them.

The current country list is:

Turkey	+19	65.15
England	+13	60.3
France	+ 3	52.4
Austria	- 2	48.4
Germany	- 7	44.4
Russia	-10	42.0
Italy	-16	37.3

It will be noticed that Turkey, although it won neither of the new games, has increased its lead over the other powers. And Italy, although it came in second in one of these two games, has dropped still further back from its position in the last listing. I believe that the superiority of the one and the inferiority of the other, relative to the remaining powers, is real. Therefore, the difference between their scores will increase without bound, as time goes on. So it seemed a good idea to introduce another scale, which shows the average performance of each country as a percentage of what is possible. On this scale, a country which was always the first to be eliminated would get 0%; a country which won all its games would get 100%. On this scale 50% is the break even point: it is the score that a country gets which has beaten as many other countries as it has been beaten by.

While, of course, on this scale as on the other, there will be continual jockeying for position among nearly equal powers, as new games are added to the list, no score will increase, or decrease, indefinitely. It will, for every country, eventually settle down to give the average achievement of that country.

Anyone who wants to find the percentage that Jared Johnson asked for some months ago, the share of the cake which a country has in prospect at the beginning of the game, need only divide the percentages here given by 3.5 to find it.

It should be noted that the game is considerably better balanced, as between the various countries, than many people appear to think. On the evidence so far, at least, the strongest country is far short of being twice as strong as the weakest.

I am also glad to see that Austria has risen up into the middle rank of powers, where I think it belongs. Just what its eventual position will be in relation to France and Russia, say, it is still too early to tell. However, I think we can say now that it is a country comparable with those powers, and not the weakling that it is often supposed to be.

The two recently completed games, as well as the usual wear and tear of the last few weeks, give rise to a new Current Rating List. It is based on the completed games listed on the previous page, as well as on partial results from games in progress 1965B(1911), C(1911), D(1909), F(1909), G(1908), H(1909), M(1907), Q(1910), R(1909), S(1912), T(1910), U(1907), V(1906), W(1906), 1966A(1906), B(1905), C(1905), E(1905), K(1903), L(1907). As usual, numbers in brackets refer to the latest game "year" used in compiling the list.

BROODINGWAG Current Game Rating List - #5

+25 John Smythe (W)	+ 8 Derek Nelson (W)
	Jerry Pournelle
+24 John McCallum (W)	
	+ 7 Mark Owings
+21 John Koning	
	+ 6 Terry Kuch
+16 Charles Wells (W)	Bruce Pelz (W)
+13 Donald Miller	+ 4 Eric Blake
	John Boardman (W)
+11 Frank Clark	Rick Brooks
	James Goldman
+10 Banks Mebane	James MacKenzie (W)

- | | | | |
|-----|---|-----|---|
| + 4 | Bob Lake
George Parks
Dien Pelz
Robert Ward | - 3 | James Latimer
John Mazor
Conrad von Metzke |
| + 3 | Harold Peck
Charles Reinsel | - 4 | Charles Brannen
Margaret Gemignani
Alexis Gilliland
Jack Harness
Dave McDaniel
Ron Parks |
| + 2 | Ken Davidson
Gregory Molenaar
Anders Swenson | - 5 | Tom Bulmer
Stuart Keshner
Steven Patt |
| + 1 | John Austin
Don Berman
Bill Christian
Robert Cline
Jay Maldeman
Wayne Hoheisel
David Lebling
Kim Pattee
Hank Reinhardt
Jock Root
Earl Thompson
Robert Whelan | - 6 | Sidney Get
Thomas Gorman
Bernie Kling
Don Recklies
John Sandoval
Bill Schreffler
Al Scott |
| 0 | Len Atkins
Len Bailes
Edwin Baker
Jack Chalker
John Davey
Ben Hendin
Ronald Wilson | - 7 | Ron Bounds |
| - 1 | James Dygert
Allan Huff (W) | - 9 | Barry Gold |
| - 2 | Brenda Banks
Ron Daniels
Jim Sanders
Dennis Smith | -10 | Joel Sattel
Richard Schultz |
| | | -11 | Jerald Jacks |
| | | -12 | Stephen Barr
Fred Lerner
Roland Tzudiker |
| | | -15 | Phil Castora
Paul Harley |

SEALLED BAG

JARED JOHNSON, 1548 Rochelle Drive, Chamblee, Georgia, 30005: I enjoyed the articles on the rules in #'s 48, 49, and 50 of PRODDINGMAG. Concerning Boardman's Dilemma, going by the rules there is nothing that says that the army in Silesia in your example would have the support it is giving out. This seems to me not in the nature of rule interpretation but rather rule change, just like Moning's Rule.

In your discussion of Brannen's Rule, you failed to comment on the extension of it to covering the exchange of two pieces by convoying one of them.

I have several times read of Mr. Calhamer's referring to the "sheer bulk" of the rules as they are now, which is one of his major reasons for not wishing to add anymore, or add any exceptions to present rules. As far as "bulky" rules are concerned they would not bother me at all as long as they are clear. Perhaps this is because I am an avid Avalon-Hill fan, and you undoubtedly know what their rules are like. He also mentions the possibility of even more latent ambiguities which might arise after the rules are rewritten, if this were done. It would seem to me that this is not much of a possibility. There are only so many odd situations, and I'm sure that all could be found before the rules are re-written.

I am beginning to change my mind about what I said before; that we don't need a new set of rules, just clarification. As you said, in BROB #50, the place for "these rules" is in the rulebook, and not a gamesmaster's fiat. I think some kind of universal agreement, at least is necessary for these rule clarifications. Perhaps there could be some kind of a vote, which everyone would agree to. It is awkward when everyone is using different rules, and also results in some feelings of resentment, I would imagine, on the part of any player who has had a ruling made against him on a move that is legal in the games of another gamesmaster. Since this discussion of the rules has started, I think it is going to have to be settled to some degree, and not left suspended in the air.

((+(For more on Boardman's Rule, see elsewhere in this issue.

Whether two units can change places by convoy has nothing whatever to do with Brannan's Rule, nothing, that is, except that they both deal with convoy movements. It is true that if one doesn't use Brannan's own phrasing for his rule, but the more usual, "For purposes of cutting support, a unit is regarded as etc., etc" that some confusion could arise, if insufficient stress is given to the phrase that I have underlined, above. However, in reality it is possible for a person who uses Brannan's Rule to adopt either viewpoint on the exchange, and similarly for anyone who doesn't accept Brannan's rule. Brannan had, long before he published what is now known as his rule, printed another rule expressly prohibiting the exchange of position by two units, whether they used convoys or not. In the circumstances to call this thing an extension of Brannan's Rule is a gross misuse of language. Whoever it was who first called it that should be shot for muddying waters which are already murky enough.

The interchange movement will be discussed in its proper place, when we come to consider the whole question of what Rod Walker calls, in Erethon #4, the Changing of the Guard.

As to the increased "bulk" that will result from a revised rulebook, there can be two opinions on the matter. There is one case where the only difficulty with the present rule is that it contains one word too many. Delete that word and you get a clear statement of the intended rule; retain it and the whole thing becomes fuzzy. So that a clear rulebook would, in places, be shorter than the present one. I suppose, in toto, there would be some increase in length, but probably not much.

For the possibility of a revision introducing latent ambiguities I am less optimistic than you are. I have never written anything that didn't still have errors in the third draft. But that, to my mind, is no argument for not revising the book. We know that the present rulebook has ambiguities of one sort or another. 9 in my list in EROB #44. Likewise 9 in Moning's list in stab #22. 18 in Boardman's list in Graustark #112, (in fairness, it should be said that a few of the latter are not ambiguities in the basic game, but questions of adapting that game to postal procedures.) Surely a revision could be made that would be a lot better than this. That the result would perhaps still have an error or two lurking around is no argument at all against a revision.

My feeling is that Calhamer's opposition to rulebook revision stems not from the chance of leaving a latent error undetected, but from a fear that his game may be destroyed in the process. However, it seems to me that the shoe may very well be on the other foot: that the game as usually played is becoming less and less his concept of the game, and that the only way to stop this drift may very well be to revise the rulebook. Look at his letter in the last issue. It is obvious from it that he prefers the game to be played with Moning's Rule, but gamesmasters are becoming very chary of that rule. He would also like what might be called the counter-Boardman rule, while nearly every gamesmaster who has declared himself on the issue has supported Boardman's rule. In these two cases, of course, the gamesmasters involved have the "law", the literal wording of the rulebook, on their side. But the consensus is also going against Calhamer in the case of the two interfering retreats. In effect the gamesmasters are saying, "On this issue you left us in the wilderness, without guidelines, to find our own way. The way we found is to annihilate the two retreating forces, if their retreats interfere with one another. We are going to keep to that way, whatever your feeling in the matter." Less bluntly phrased, of course, but that is what it comes to. On this issue there is no letter of the law on the gamesmasters' side. What little can be got from logical consistency supports Calhamer, if anything: Moves are not quite final, as retreats may arise from them; but retreats are in many ways like moves, therefore they shouldn't be quite final either, but leave a loophole for a further retreat if possible. Therefore, it seems to me, if Calhamer wants his own game to be played, the one that he "feels in his joints" to use his own phrase, as opposed to the one he has written, he will have to write that real game. Now, since he neglected to do so earlier.

Anyhow, Jared, welcome aboard. Since I first stated that I thought the rulebook should be revised, back in EROB #30, about a year ago, everyone who has written me on the matter, Calhamer excepted, has agreed. And the list has included both "legalists" and "realists" and many in between.

By the way, what happened to that poll you were taking, as to the most popular countries to play. With the increasing number of games now completed, it would be interesting to compare that subjective list of preferences with the objective list of actual achievement, as shown in the country list appended to the rating list. -jamcc+))

~~~~~

ERODIUS MAG reports erratically on the progress of Postal Diplomacy games 1966AQ and 1966AV. It is published and edited by John A. McCallum, Ralston, Alberta, Canada. The price is ten cents a copy and pro rata.