

## B R O B D I N G N A G

-----  
Broddingnag #54      1966AQ (W'04)    1966AV (W'03)      4 March 1967  
-----

### Game 1966AQ

NEW POLISH ARMY RAISED  
FLEET ASSEMBLES AT TOULON  
AUSTRIAN REMNANTS FLEE INTO SWITZERLAND  
FRANCO-TURKISH RELATIONS INCREASINGLY STRAINED

Fall 1904

#### Erratum:

There was an error in the report of the Fall 1904 moves given in EROB #53. Through an oversight the successful move of the Turkish fleet from Smyrna to the Eastern Mediterranean was omitted. All players with builds to make were informed of this error by letter, mailed within 24 hours of the publication of that issue.

Winter 1904

#### Builds and removals:

RUSSIA (Reinsel): Build army Warsaw.

FRANCE (Thompson): Build fleet Marseilles.

ITALY (Goldman): Build fleet Naples.

AUSTRIA (Duncan): Remove army Tyrolia.

Players were informed of these builds and removals several days ago by carbon copy letter. A deadline for moves for Spring 1905 was set: Wednesday, 15 March 1967.

#### PRESS RELEASES

Paris, 1 Nov. France will build fleets in Marseilles in response to recent demands appearing in the Turkish press. France offers Italy the full use of these units in her home defense. If Turkey moves into Africa or the Tyrrhenian Sea, a state of war will exist between France and Turkey.

Bern, 5 Nov. The Swiss government today received a request from Turkey asking the former to explain to France the Turkish position. "Turkey would like to say that she warns France. Don't be a big bully." It is also understood that the Sultan will continue his tour of allied and neutral capitals. Tentative plans seem to include St. Petersburg and a prolonged visit to various points of the Russian front. Swiss officials say that it is likely that the itinerary will include this country. As the normally prosperous Swiss tourist industry has been hard hit by the war, suitable accomodation for the regal party is available at all Swiss cities and major tourist centers.

Rome, 15 Nov. In honor of Turkish defectors, Italian chefs have devised a succulent new dish, "Paste Faisal".

Geneva, 10 Jan. Prospects of the visit of the Turkish Sultan and his entourage have given a much needed surge of hope to owners of Swiss

- luxury hotels. These stand nearly empty at what would, in normal times, be the height of the winter sports season; a state of affairs which would have been unthinkable prior to 1901. However, this does not apply to smaller and cheaper establishments. Many of the latter have been taken over for the time being by the government to house the prisoners of war of the various belligerents who are exchanged through Switzerland. Basel has been the exchange point for French and German prisoners in each other's hands. It can't be said that this particular transfer has been very onerous. Hostilities between the two countries have consisted, for the most part of patrol action and occasional artillery duels across the Rhine. Although larger scale military action has taken place this last year, prisoners have remained comparatively few. Both sides have agreed to the exchange of wounded, both countries are in strong financial position and make proper provision for their troops, and Swiss involvement has been confined to providing dormitory housing for a day or so, as consignments of prisoners are counted off against one another.

Far different is the situation in the Grisons. Fierce Italo-Austrian battles have been almost continuous since 1901. Every victory, by one side or the other, has resulted in the capture of hosts of prisoners. Neither country has been particularly strong financially, and the burden of caring for the prisoners in transit has largely fallen on the Swiss. The situation, from the Swiss point of view, has worsened considerably with the capitulation of the Austrians this autumn. Many troops from Innsbruck, and even some from as far away as Salzburg, fled over the Swiss border to face internment rather than fall into the hands of the Russians. The legal position is far from clear. The Russian government is demanding the re-patriation of these internees but, in many cases, the troops themselves resist return.

The attitude of the various components of the heterogeneous armies of the Austro-Hungarian Empire is of some interest. The Bosnians have always been inclined to regard Russia as their Big Brother and protector, and Bosnian internees are eager to be re-patriated, probably to join the Russian army or a Russian dominated south Slav army. The Czechs of Bohemia and Moravia appear to feel similarly, if less enthusiastically. Not so the Poles. They have been the relatively most pampered of the subject peoples of the Austrian Empire and were used by the Hapsburgs as a make-weight to counter Hungarian intransigence. Many professional men from Russian Poland have, after securing an education abroad, settled in Galicia, as being the closest approximation to a free Poland existing. All the Polish prisoners interned in Switzerland are violently opposed to returning home, now that their homeland is under Russian rule.

The Magyars, on the other hand, although they have no ethnic ties with Russia as the Poles, the Czechs, and the South Slavs do, seem content enough with the Russian take-over of Hungary. A military people, used to fighting for pay, they seem to feel that they can make the same sort of arrangements with the Romanovs that they previously had with the Hapsburgs.

It is, however, the Austrians proper, from the German speaking parts of the Empire, who are creating the greatest problems for the Swiss authorities. Speaking the same language as the inhabitants of eastern Switzerland, in the case of the Tyrolese virtually the same dialect, they are naturally regarded with great sympathy by the Swiss.

The situation is aggravated by the peculiar confederate constitution of Switzerland. Although soldier prisoners are under the

jurisdiction of the army, and so of the federal government, the influx of Austrian troops after the debacle of last October was so great that the army has had to turn to the cantonal authorities to secure housing for this vast body of men. The governments of the Grisons and St. Gallen in particular, but of all the eastern cantons to some extent, make no bones about their sympathy for the Austrians. The Austrian internees under their care seem to mysteriously vanish away - whether to hole up in farm and village within Switzerland, or to go over the northern frontier into Bavaria, is a moot point.

Since the Russian government maintains steady diplomatic pressure on the Bern government to re-patriate all the Austrian prisoners, the federal authorities are in an embarrassing position. Unable to coerce the cantonal governments they can only try to influence them to maintain closer guard over the internees in their care; simultaneously they have to try to placate the Russians as best they can. In total war the path of the neutral is hard.

Las Palmas, Canary Islands, 31 Jan. The headquarters of the Espana Liberation Army was set up here today. It vowed to enter Madrid within 12 months.

- - - - -

Game 1966AV

Winter 1903

RUSSIA AND GERMANY EXPAND ARMIES  
SOUL SEARCHING IN VIENNA

**Builds and removals:**

GERMANY (Shagrin): Build army Berlin.

RUSSIA (Zelazny): Build army Sevastopol.

AUSTRIA (Munroe): Remove fleet Ionian Sea.

These moves were transmitted to the players several days ago by carbon copy letter. A deadline for moves for Spring 1904 was set: Wednesday, 15 March 1967.

A short note from Charles Wells confirms that he believes the retreat situation in this game last Fall to be the most complicated that he has seen.

**PRESS RELEASES**

St. Petersburg, 31 Dec. (Russkoe Znamia) Reports that the Imperial North Fleet has lost control of the province of Sweden were confirmed at 10 A.M. this morning. The official statement: "During the Spring, the German army that had wintered in Denmark occupied Sweden while the fleet held its annual manoeuvres in the Gulf. Repeated attempts to regain the province were repulsed."

Moscow, 1 Jan. (Russkoe Znamia) War! Today at noon the Czar declared that a state of war exists with England.

Vienna, 13 Jan. The staff of the Austrian Imperial War College today accepted the blame for the recent fiasco along the lightly manned Austro-Russian border. Colonel General Ubermensch regretfully admitted

that the fine Austrian officers' corps had never been exposed to the rigorous logic behind that basic postulate of diplomatic strategy, Zelazny's Rule. For the uninformed, this rule reads as follows: "When under attack by two strong adversaries, always attack a third power, preferably an ally." When asked directly what the logic behind this postulate is, General Ubermensch shook his head slowly and sadly responded, "It is only understood by the greatest diplomatic mind of our time, namely Dunderkopf, the Russian Command-in-Chief".

Frankfort-an-der-Oder, 28 Feb. (DPG) Prince Vlad the Impaler is reported moving to Silesia, in preparation for military occupation of German Poland. Residents of German France praise his fairness and equal justice and sigh with relief at his departure. It seems that "In", as his friends call him, acts on the precept: Equal justice for all, regardless of race, creed, color, nationality, sex, religion, or bust measurement.

Taurida, 8 Mar. (Russkoe Znamia) Fleet headquarters issued the following message to the sailors and soldiers investing Constantinople: "Look to Hagia Sophia! Again the word of Christ will echo within its mighty vaults! Godspeed your advance!"

- - - - -

### No Time for Decision

by Allan B. Calhamer

The "Home Soilers" stormed out of the Cabinet. In the aftermath, the Army was ordered from the south of England to Belgium. Haig accordingly embarked his troops.

The Home Fleet waited coolly in the Channel, reviewing its orders to escort the boats.

Meanwhile, a cutter bearing the flag of the German High Seas Fleet entered harbor at Southampton. Over the waters boomed the message, "The German High Seas Fleet is ready to escort you to Belgium through the North Sea, per agreement. Please get under way at once."

The skipper conned his orders. "You'd think they'd have the decency to tell a man his route," he said, dashing it.

"It might be a ruse," ventured the First. "After all, we're at war with them."

"Not declared, though," replied the Second.

"It might as well be," the First came back. "Their Zeppelin hit an orphanage last week."

"Why don't we get a declaration, then steam out?" asked the Third.

"I understand the Cabinet doesn't want to break off feelers", replied the First.

"There might not even be a fleet out there," suggested the Second. "Or it might be Greek or something."

"Not if I know the Jerries," answered the Skipper. "If they say they have a fleet, they probably don't. But if they offer one, they probably do."

"Why don't we just use our best judgment?" asked the Third, hesitantly.

"Don't be silly!" the First came back, hotly. "We're at war!"

"We could go back to Haag," the Second tossed in.

"Do we go back to Haag, or to the Admiralty?" asked the First. "Or to Whitehall?"

"Everybody would want in on it," murmured the Captain.

"It would take six months," groaned the Third.

"Now, wouldna yon be too down bad," said the Chief Engineer, coming to life. He poured three fingers of Dugan's Dew. "To the chain of command," he offered. "Ye canna gae o'err it, ye canna gae arpoon' it, and it takes six months tae gae thrur' it. But wi'oot it, ye'd be daid."

When the Germans tried the same thing a second time, British Intelligence guessed what they were up to, and ordered the Channel Fleet into action in the Mid-Atlantic. The British Army thereupon passed to Belgium, convoyed by the German High Seas Fleet. At the last minute, the German government ordered its Navy to sink the troopships entrusted to its care, but the Navy refused.

- - - - -

#### GAME FEES

There has grown up in some quarters the feeling that game fees should only be paid with the first set of moves. My own thought, on the contrary, is that the fee should accompany the application for admission to a game.

What is the fee? Is it payment for services rendered? If so, of course, there is something to be said for the view that the fee should only be paid when the services begin. However, it seems to me that this is a very wrong view of the purpose of the fee. Let us look at the financial position, using EROB for an example. The game fee here is \$2. If a player stays in a game until "year" 1910, I will spend on postage alone, sending him his copies of EROB, \$3.90, twice the amount of the fee. It is true that, if he is eliminated early, so that he gets his copies thereafter by surface mail, there will be some saving. To offset this the game may last far beyond 1910, most games last somewhat longer than 10 "years". Balancing off the two possibilities against each other we see that the \$2 fee covers, almost exactly, half the expenditure for postage to send the magazine to the player. It makes no provision whatever for other expenses, such as paper, ink, envelopes, stencils, or anything else. It is obvious, then, that the fee can not be

considered as payment.

The fee is not a payment; it is a deposit that the player makes as an indication that he intends to play. Call it caution money, key deposit, the ante, or what you will, it is a warranty that the player puts up to show that he means what he says when he says that he will play. Now a great deal has been said about players who disrupt games by deserting them in mid-course. See, for one example among many, Beardman's comments in Graustark #50. It is not so often noted that a game can be just as seriously disrupted by a player who leaves before the opening move. I will give an example, and I make no apology for naming the people involved.

On the 1st of August, 1965, in his journal Costaguana, Vol. I, #8, Conrad von Metzke announced the beginning of Game 1965M. Phil Castora was England, Charles Wells was France, I was Germany. I wrote Castora, suggesting an alliance directed against France. No answer. I wrote again, still no answer. In the meantime, Wells had approached me suggesting an anti-English alliance. I stalled as long as I could but one can't wait forever: shortly before the deadline I agreed to Charles' terms.

Then, after all of this, we learned that Castora had dropped out as England and was replaced by Bernie Kling. Kling wrote me a letter, a very reasonable letter, proposing very much the same plan as I had previously suggested to Castora, but, of course, it was then too late. I have no doubt he also wrote Wells proposing an alliance against me - again too late. Perhaps he wrote the player for Russia also, I don't know.

Notice the impossible situation Bernie was placed in. Ostensibly he was taking over the country from the beginning of the game, since he would make the opening moves. But every possibility of negotiation was closed to him, as a result of some one else having held the position during the 3 weeks customarily allowed for preliminary negotiations.

Bernie Kling was, I believe, 12 or 13 years old at the time. It is not surprising that he became discouraged and, after making a standard set of moves for 1901, while he tried to arrange an agreement with somebody, abandoned play. I know at least one player, three times Bernie's age, and more innured to the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune, who would also have been discouraged in like circumstance. Notice that every rating system will charge Bernie with the loss of England in that game, since he made the opening moves for that country. But, in fact, he never had a chance; every possibility had been thoroughly wrecked by the previously announced player.

I have gone into some detail in recounting what happened in game 1965M to show that a desertion before the opening can disrupt a game quite as much as a later desertion. Now it is all too easy for a player to say that he will enter a game and then change his mind, after the players' list is announced but before the first move. Some one else then pays the penalty and not the culprit. Such action can't be completely prevented, but it can be decreased by demanding that all players submit

(Continued on page 16)

SEALED BAG

SSGT. C. R. WAGNER, Box 6008, APO, San Francisco, Calif., 96328:

On BROB #51: Especially liked page 10, para 2. I might add that Diplomacy is fast becoming a "classic" game, like chess and Go. The drift toward the "conservative" interpretation of the rules is a good indicator of this. Mr. Calhamer may never be able to write a new rule book if he doesn't do it soon. In a year or two he may not be the primary authority on his own game.

((+Well, I think that Calhamer will always be an authority on Diplomacy. It is worth noting that his position on the two items of controversy we were discussing has been the popular one - popular among the players, at least, whatever it may be among game masters. Calhamer likes Koning's Rule - so do the great majority of players. Calhamer prefers the opposite interpretation to Boardman's on the Boardman's Rule question - so do most of the players, see, for example, several letters of Latimer's on this topic, and he is by no means alone. And the opposite point of view of those game masters who are in the other camp, should be understood in context. I don't think that John Boardman is against Koning's Rule, per se. After all, he used it himself until the facts of the case were pointed out to him in Koning's original article in Magis. What he is against is casual amendment of the rule book by game master's whim. Incorporate Koning's rule in a revised rule book and I assume that John would be happy enough with it.

That Calhamer's view and that of the majority of players so often coincide indicates that his feeling for the game is very similar to theirs. The pity is that he didn't translate that feeling into the written rules.

By the way, Chris, thanks for the second copy of Strategy and Tactics. The more heavily coated paper that it used is certainly the more attractive. Undoubtedly in means both higher paper costs and higher mailing costs. I don't know whether that higher cost is justified or not: the first copy, on the cheaper stock, seemed satisfactory to me. (jamco)+))

DAVE FRANCIS, 1612 7th Ave, New Westminster, B. C., Canada.:

In BROB #49 you wrote, "It was nearly two years ago when Boardman first posed the question ... It can do no harm if there is a delay of a few weeks before BROB's practice is published." In #50, while you seemed to lean in favor of Boardman's Rule you never actually took an official stand. While I think that delay hurt me this letter is not intended as an appeal, as I accept your ruling for 1966AV. However, I hope this is not your final decision of the Boardman Rule.

I think that this rule helps the defender too much, and slows down the game. Not allowing support to be cut will lead to a "ring around the rook" situation with the attacker getting nowhere.

This rule would change the whole game. Much of war is based on guesswork. Deciding what your opponent is going to do and stopping him, attacking where you hope he is unprepared. This will be eliminated to a large extent by this rule. For instance, Russia has an army in St. Petersburg and another in Sweden. England has a fleet in the North Sea and an army in each of Norway and Denmark. If St. Petersburg attacks Norway with Sweden supporting it is either a standoff or an

exchange of Sweden for Norway no matter what England does. Without this rule the attacker has a 50-50 chance of winning.

In a position like Galicia where an army can be surrounded by seven opposing armies does it make sense that the army in Galicia could still support an army against the position his attacker is leaving?

Shouldn't the fact that it is easier to enter a province which you already control than it is to enter an enemy province outweigh whatever slight support the army being routed can give.

As I said earlier I think this rule changes the game radically and therefore should be carefully studied before being accepted or rejected.

I'm glad you're bringing these rules (?) up. The only rules I know are the ones Derek ((Nelson)) taught me. I've never even heard of some of the ones you are raising.

... ..

I thank you for the kind offer to pay one of my game fees, but there is no need.

To me the problem seems to be that there hasn't been enough discussion of the rules in the mags (admittedly not having seen many back issues) by the players themselves.

((+Well, Dave, very many thanks for your two letters, both of which show that you took the decision against you in very good spirit. And I apologize for being so long in replying.

Re Boardman's Rule. First of all let us be quite clear what it does - the example that you give for the Scandinavian region makes me wonder. The fact that a supporting piece, frontally attacked, does not have its support cut was not brought into the game by Boardman's Rule. This has always been an integral part of the game, deliberately and intentionally brought into it by its inventor, Allan Calhamer. As you say, there is an element of luck in war. There is also an element of luck in this game. But to allow frontal cutting of support, as well as side cutting of support, in the normal case, would bring such a large element of luck into the game that we might as well decide all conflicts by shooting dice.

Where the difference of opinion arises, and the only place that it arises, is when the supporting force is actually dislodged. The rulebook doesn't say. Most gamesmasters have ruled that this exceptional case should be treated just as every other case of a frontally attacked force, since there is nothing in the rulebook to the contrary. Miller, on the other hand, has ruled that no dislodged force can maintain its support. Calhamer, the inventor of the game, in his letter in ERQB #50, indicates that he prefers Miller's interpretation to that of the majority. It is the majority's view, that the dislodged case should be treated just like the ordinary case, that is called Boardman's Rule.

My own view, for what it is worth, is that the Calhamer-Miller position would, probably, make a slightly better game; it would certainly make a game which would be closer to reality. However, much as I would like to see a new rulebook, it is not my job as gamesmaster to re-write the present one. It is my job to run the game according to the published rules as far as possible. According to my interpretation, and that of every other gamesmaster who has expressed himself, except Miller, what the present rulebook implies is Boardman's Rule. As long



as the present rulebook is the official one, Boardman's Rule will be used in BROB games.

As to the offensive-defensive aspect of the argument, we should be aware that the real difficulty usually occurs when neither side remains on the defensive, but both attack each other. That is what happened in your game: you, playing Italy and Munroe, playing Austria, attacked each other over your common frontier. Using Boardman's Rule both left wings were successful and the front line swung around to a position at right angles, more or less, to the previous front. A similar pivoting of a front about its centre was a very frequent occurrence in 17th-18th century battles. Though the scale of the map and of time in our game are all wrong for 17th-18th century warfare, I must say that I have long felt that what happens in an isolated battle area in Diplomacy far more resembles a battle of Queen Anne's time than it does early 20th century warfare.

I have only quoted a line or two from your second letter since you go into some detail of your future plans which I am sure you do not want divulged. However, I would like to say that my offer of paying the fee for your next game in no way depends on the outcome of this one. You may win the game, you may be the first to be eliminated, or you may come some where between those extremes. It makes no difference at all. As a player you are entitled to know the rules of the game that you are playing. Although in this case I believe that I am following the literal wording of the rulebook, there has been widespread controversy on the point, and I had not stated how I would rule in advance of the situation arising. You were the player who was treated worse than you would have been under the other interpretation and, as such, you are entitled to a new game. You don't have to run out tomorrow to join a new game but, when you do enter one, let me know the fee and I'll re-imburse you. Anyhow having the threat of a similar catastrophe befalling me with other players may spur me on to proceed with the discussion of all ambiguities known to me.

I am glad that I didn't rule on the question when I brought it up in BROB #49. That resulted in Calhauer having a chance to make his views known in his letter in BROB #50. I think it was a valuable letter, one that should help clarify everyone's views on the subject. In particular it brought out, very plainly, the strong parallel between this situation and the one covered by Moning's Rule. However, after that letter was received and published, there was no further excuse for delay. I should have ruled in #50. I didn't, and I owe you a game. Just as I will owe a game to any other player who is penalized, without first having been advised of how I will rule. -jamcc+))

- - - - -

JACK GREENE, Jr., 670 Darrell Road, Hillsborough, Calif., 94010:

I'd like to get into another game of Diplomacy. However, I'm at a complete loss as to how to go about it. I don't want to get in to one of the Diplomaniacs or another big one like it. Nor a Wild 'n Woolly. Can you help? What is the procedure?

((+ Jack, I have quoted these few lines from your letter because it is typical of several letters which I have received recently asking about game opening. As it is some time since BROB has given a list of Diplomacy magazines, all known to me are listed below, with some comments concerning the possibility of entering their games. The

number in brackets, following the name, is the number of the most recent issue received here. Game fees are listed, where known.

A DROITE A GAUCHE (12), Harold Maus, 288 Broadway, #139, Chula Vista, Calif., 92010. This is usually called ADAG. Until about a half year ago this magazine was very active in recruiting players for new games. After that it was somewhat swamped with the large number of Costaguana games which it had to take over, and I had thought that he wasn't accepting new players. However, the latest issue indicates that applications are invited for new games. Fee \$2.00.

ARMAGEDDONIA (9). It is published by a triumvirate, of whom the publisher is James J. Dygert, 2090 Blackwood Drive, Walnut Creek, Calif., 94596 to whom correspondence should normally be sent. However, in my experience is that it is safer to deal with the gamesmaster, Charles Turner, 843 Santa Fe Ave., Albany, Calif., 94706. No new games indicated.

BARAD-DUR (40) Jack L. Chalcker, 5111 Liberty Heights Ave., Baltimore, Md., 21207. This is one of the three magazines which appear with marked regularity. However, its editor has now entered military training and it is unlikely that there will be any new games until his return in mid-summer. The interim editor is Jim Sanders whose address appears below, under Euralia.

BIG BROTHER (27) Charles W. Reinsel, 120 8th Ave., Clarion, Penna., 16214. In the issue before the last the editor announced that there would be a new game, edmission to which would be restricted to gamesmasters. As it is unlikely that there are 7 gamesmasters who want to enter new games right now, perhaps Charles can be persuaded to make this a general game, open to anybody. This, with Barad-dur and Graustark, is one of the three regular and prompt 'zines. If you want a game where every two weeks sees another moved clicked off without fail, the three mentioned are the only possibilities. Game fee, to those not already playing in BB, \$4.00

BROBDINGNAG (54) John McCallum, Ralston, Alberta Canada. This rag. No new games at present.

BROKEN LINE (3) John Reiner, 361 South Elm Drive, Apt. 4, Beverley Hills, Calif., 90212. It is looking for players for its first game. The fee is \$1. The editor of this is closely associated in the public mind with the editor of the late, unlamented Lusitania. The fiasco that the latter proved to be may have scared players away from this one. Which would, no doubt, be unfair to Reiner.

COSTAGUANA (Vol. 2, No. 9) Conrad F. von Metzke, 5327 Hilltop Drive, San Diego, Calif., 92114. The status of this magazine is uncertain. At one time one of the most popular 'zines it shed most of its games last fall, most of them going to ADAG, the remainder to Graustark and Armageddonia. The last issue stated that it would retain one game, a slow game since most of its players

lived abroad. It also stated that another such slow game was in process of formation. However, the date of the last issue is Oct. 15, so presumably, Costa has folded.

DIPLOMANIA (14/15) Don Miller, 12315 Judson Road, Wheaton, Md., 20906. Diplomania carries no games of its own. It is a magazine of general comment on the Diplomacy scene. However, it has four daughter magazines which do carry games. Its editor is greatly interested in variants and all four of the daughter magazines carry variants of all types. One of them, Diplophobia, (#7) also carries regular games. There are openings, both regular and variant. Game fee for a first game \$3.

EREWHON (Vol. 1, No. 7) Capt. R. C. Walker, TUSLOG Det #183, APO New York City, NY, 09254. Published in Turkey this is, I believe, the only Diplomacy magazine published outside of the North American continent. It mostly features variant games but has some regular ones as well. There are vacancies, especially for replacement players. Game fee for a first game \$2. Note that all correspondence must be by Air Mail.

EURALIA (5) Jim Sanders, Rm. 3K4, 601 West 110th St., NY, NY, 10025. Now carries one game and would like to start more. Fee \$2.50

GLOCKORLA (2) Dave Lebling, 3 Rollins Court, Rockville, Md., 20852. Glockorla is an object lesson that it is unwise for a player to begin publishing until somewhat known in Diplomacy circles outside his own home town. The first issue, an excellent one, was published last May and invited players to join the game there in announced. There was no stampede to join it. When the seventh player was finally recruited it was found that some of those who had joined earlier wanted to drop out. This pattern has been repeated ever since. However, the magazine is now definitely rolling, with a variant game. The initially announced regular game still has a few vacancies and this is probably an opportunity to enter a game that will begin very soon. The fee for a first game is \$3.

GRAUSTARK (120) John Boardman, 592 16th St., Brooklyn, NY, 11218. Graustark, where Postal Diplomacy originated, has extreme pressure on its space and games. Anyone anxious to enter one here would be well advised to subscribe so that he will have the earliest possible word of any openings. As Graum is the only journal to make an attempt to cover the news of the whole Diplomacy field a subscription to it is very well worth while in any event. No new games currently advertised.

KALMAR (3) Christina Brannan, 3044A Telegraph Ave., Berkeley, Calif., 94705. Kalmar always has game openings. Fee is \$4 for a first game, fifty cents for each additional game ordered at approximately the same time. Players have choice of country. Kalmar has recognized the impossibility of an amateur editor, with average resources of time and energy, putting out a full magazine every two weeks. The games here are run by postcard with the magazine,

appearing every 3 or 4 weeks, merely providing a permanent record of moves already announced to the players. BROB games effectively run on the same basis.

LONELY MOUNTAIN (32) Charles Wells, 3678 Lindholm, Cleveland, Ohio, 44120. The editor is going to Norway this summer and has announced that he will begin no new games until his return. As I understand it, he hopes to cut down from the three games which he is currently running to two. This is a magazine on which there is a heavy pressure to play, as many of its players will play in no other. So if you want to enter a game here you will have to go after it actively.

MARSOVIA (Vol. 1, No. 11) Bob Ward, P. O. Box 19002, Camillia Station, Sacramento, Calif. But there is a good possibility of a new address shortly, so better mark letters "Please Forward". Carries one game but does not indicate that it wants more.

MISKATONIC UNIVERSITY (Series 1, No. 24) Anders Swenson, 145 Ponderosa Lane, Walnut Creek, Calif., 94598. Specializes in 5-man games. Stated in #23 that it would accept more games, but fee not announced.

OASIS. Some months ago Sean Donahue, 1020 Stoddert Ave., Waldorf, Md., 20601, wrote me to advise that he planned to begin a Diplomacy journal with the indicated title. I am afraid that I poured cold water on his enthusiasm. It was a time when Wild 'n Woolly was beating the drum for the forthcoming Kalmar and when there were many other openings available. I cited the sad case of Glockorla as an example of what would likely happen if someone not, at the time, fairly well known as a player started a new magazine. I don't know whether he intends to continue with his plan or not. But the time may now be ripe: As a glance through this list will verify, there are not too many openings right now and perhaps we could do with a new journal.

ORTHANC (32) Ron Bounds, 649 North Pace Street, Baltimore, Md., 21201. There is no indication of new games forming.

STAB (27) John Koning, 318 South Belle Vista, Youngstown, Ohio, 44509. sTab has just begun two new games and its editor has stated that he does not intend to expand beyond the five that the magazine now carries. Moreover admission to all games in sTab calls for prior invitation. If you are really anxious to play in sTab I can only suggest that you subscribe and that you let the editor know of your desire. As is the case with Grau, a sTab subscription is well worth the money.

WILD 'N WOOLY ((81) Dan Brannen, 3044A Telegraph Ave., Berkeley, Calif., 94705. I am not sure if there are openings in W'nW or not. #71 announced new games at \$6 for a first game, fifty cents for additional games. That offer has not been repeated since but, on the other hand, it has not been withdrawn. I suspect that all new applicants are being channelled into Kalmar.

Many of the magazines listed above carry variant as well as regular Diplomacy games. However, I have made no attempt to list the magazines that carry variant games only, such as the Superdiplomacy and Economic Diplomacy magazines. For a very full listing of such see the latest issue of Diplomania whose address is given above.

In your letter, Jack, you say that you don't want games in Diplomaniacs (your spelling: I assume you mean the whole Diplomania family) or W. 'n'W. I take it from this that you dislike the "wholesale" 'zines and prefer to play in a magazine which carries only a limited number of games. As you probably know, the multi-game 'zine was pioneered by Wild 'n' Woolly; prior to its appearance something over two years ago, every Diplomacy 'zine carried one game at a time only. For instance, back in 1964, when Boardman wanted to start another game in addition to the one then appearing in Graustark, he started a new journal, Fredonia, to carry it. That was the way things were then done. But the multi-game 'zine was an economic necessity: it is much more economic in money and, more important, in the effort involved, to carry three games in a single publication than it would be to publish three magazines. There can be little doubt, though, that the economic advantages were bought at a price. The early Graustark, Ruritania, Trantor, and Brobdignag when Dick Schultz was running it, had a club atmosphere about them, a personality, which is lacking from the more diffuse journals published today. Lonely Mountain perhaps comes closest to retaining something of the feeling of that period.

(Parenthetically, I'd like to say that the first ten or so issues of Ruritania had the most enjoyable reading ever to appear in any Diplomacy 'zine. Its editor Ted Johnstone/Dave McDaniel was a professional author, as were several of his contributors and it certainly showed. It had the diversity of individual author within the framework of a unified whole that you get in a well edited general magazine, something that has never even been approached in any Dippy 'zine since.)

If you want a game in a magazine with only a limited number of openings, you will need patience and you will need to take active steps to get into the one that you want. For those steps I can only repeat what I said under sTab: subscribe, and let the editor know what you want. -jamcc+))

JAMES JOHNSON, 1548 Rockelle Drive, Chamblee, Georgia, 30005:

As for the survey it proved to be a bit of a fiasco. Despite the fact that several Diplomacy magazines asked people to send me their opinions. In fact, I only got a dozen replies. Nevertheless, here are the results:

Probability of winning:

- |            |       |
|------------|-------|
| 1. Turkey  | 19.2% |
| 2. France  | 18.8  |
| 3. England | 15.7  |
| 4. Russia  | 15.1  |
| 5. Germany | 11.8  |
| 6. Austria | 10.8  |
| 7. Italy   | 8.6   |

Preferred country:

1. France 18
2. England 20
3. Germany 25
4. Russia 34
5. Austria 35
6. Turkey 42
7. Italy 50

No percentages are given for these. I used a point system. One point for first place, all the way to seven for "last Preference". I have given the total points so you can see where it was close.

There is pretty much of a correlation between the probability for winning and the favorite countries. The only major exception is Turkey, and to a slight extent Germany. Perhaps this is due to Turkey's isolated position at the beginning of the game. Although it is an advantageous position, perhaps it isn't as much fun (to begin with) because there is no one to make a real alliance with. Turkey has to go through Austria, and all he can do is make an alliance with Russia or Italy at the beginning of the game.

My ratings above (winning probabilities) also correspond fairly well to the list given on page six of EROB #51. In your list France and England are switched for second and third, and Austria and Russia for fourth and sixth. I must disagree with you on the strength of Austria at the beginning of the game. Austria has less room than even Germany to maneuver. Italy is right next door in the only situation where two countries' home supply centers are adjacent. However, Italy doesn't have an immediate threat from France to the West. Austria, on the other hand, has Turkey behind her, and Turkey's only way out is through Austria. An alliance to carve up Austria is quite common between Turkey and Russia. Thus, since I consider Russia far superior to Austria initially, I consider the rating that I have compiled to be accurate. It could be argued that England is better than France. They are separated by 34 in my list but that is pretty close.

Incidentally, I received Mr. Calhaver's opinions on the matter of which country has the advantage. With best play, he indicated that he believed chances of winning were equal with all seven players. With poor players he listed the following percentages:

1. Turkey 50%
2. England 33%
3. France 10%
4. Italy 2%
5. Russia 2%
6. Austria 2%
7. Germany 1%

This is obviously a bit exaggerated but his point is clear. The better the players, the more the chances of winning are evened out. With poorer players, especially a group which is slow to make alliances, the country with the initial advantage is going to take the lead right

off and probably keep it.

Mr. Calhamer also indicated that with beginning players, England and Turkey may not be quite as good because their positions are a little confusing.

I am conducting a second survey for Avalon-Hill games, asking simply for everyone to list their favorite side for each game they play. I would be interested in your favorite sides.

And let's do keep after Mr. Calhamer for the writing of a new rule book.

((+(As you will now know, the latest Diplomania, published about a week ago, contains a request for its readers to write you with their ratings. Perhaps it will bring in a few more replies, and so strengthen the confidence in the rating. I doubt, though, if there will be a major upset. The interchange, perhaps, of two close neighbours, but that is about all.

Did you get a reply from John Smythe? His views would be of real interest. In postal play he has won as Austria, generally regarded as difficult to play; he has won as Italy which, beyond question, has the poorest record in actual postal games; and he has won as England which ranks quite high on all the lists. In over-the-board play, I understand that he has won innumerable times with most countries. I would certainly like to hear his opinion as to what countries have the greatest possibilities.

As you say, Calhamer's estimate is exaggerated, on both sides. I doubt if they are absolutely equal among experts, and there certainly isn't the disparity he indicates, even among duffers. But, allowing for exaggeration, his point is well taken.

I am not an Avalon-Hill gamer myself but have put in the mention of your new survey in the hope that the A-H players among the readers may send you the information you are after. -jamcc+))

DEREK NELSON, 18 Granard Ave., Scarborough, Ontario: I'm not really sure which side I'm on in Boardman's Dilemma, as it is called. Right now I tend to take your side of the discussion. Some day I'll study all the opinions, pro and con, and make a final choice. It's something I've never taken into account when I've moved, and I just paid for that in a game in the latest STab.

((+(Well, Derek, I'm certainly surprised to hear this from you. Over the years you have been the most vehement defender of Koning's Rule. So I would have expected you to be on the Calhamer-Miller side of the Boardman Situation question. As a matter of fact, I have a sneaking sympathy for the Calhamer-Miller side of the argument myself. Only I don't think it can be supported by the current rulebook.-jamcc+))

- - - - -

Bear: But how do you know that I am a diplomat?

Lady: Why, by the skillful way that you hide your claws.

Rostand: L'Aiglon.

GAME FEES (Continued from page 6)

fees with their application for a position in a game - a deserter then at least pays for a place he ruins.

In any future games run by me, applications will not be considered at all unless accompanied by the game fee. I had, as a matter of fact, intended to specify this when I opened the present EROB games, but neglected to do so. Fortunately it didn't matter: those who didn't send the fee with their application sent it with the opening moves and, far more important, no one backed out at the last moment. In future, though, the ante must be on the table before the first card is dealt; and the first card is the list of players in the game.

- - - - -

NEW BLOOD

The following have written enquiring about Postal Diplomacy:

DAN EVANS, 3405 Westchester, Bakersfield, Calif., 93309.

BILL HAGGART, 9627 Maryknoll Ave., Whittier, Calif., 90605.

CHARLES WELSH, 6917 Cherry Lane, Annandale, Va., 22003.

BOB FUNDERBURK, 5314 Montgomery Street, Springfield, Va., 22151.

RUSS JONES, RR #2, Wenaimo, B. C., Canada.

Most of them asked about game openings. (In a few cases "asked" is much too weak a word: they clamored for game positions.) All editors with vacancies, please note.

And, to those of you whose names are listed above: The magazine, listed on page 10, 11, 12, all have a subscription rate of 10 issues for a dollar. So, if any one of them especially interests you, you can be sure of getting a sample copy by sending the editor concerned a dime.

There is an item that I neglected to mention with that list of 'zines. Barad-Dur, Orthanc, Glockorla, and the Diplomania family, Diplophobia, Dipsomania, Fantasia, and Supercalifragilisticexpialidocious, are all N3F Games Bureau publications. The practical effect being that a player in any one of them can enter a game in any other of them at a reduced fee.

- - - - -

"Diplomacy" is the copyright trade name of a game manufactured and sold by Games Research Inc., 48 Wareham St., Boston, Mass. They sell full sets, and also, separately, copies of the rulebook and conference maps. The latter two items may also, usually, be bought from John Boardman, 592 16th Street, Brooklyn, NY, 11218, who originated the idea of having Diplomacy magazines.

- - - - -

BROBDINGNAG records the progress of Postal Diplomacy games 1966AQ and 1966AV. It is edited and published by John McCallum, Ralston, Alberta, Canada, and sells for ten cents a copy.