

B R O E D I N G N A G

Brobdingnag #59

1966AQ (S'06)

26 April 1967

Game 1966AQ

Spring 1906

I T A L Y S U C C U M B S T O P L A G U E FRENCH TURKISH AND RUSSIAN FORCES SEIZE ITALIAN TERRITORY ETERNAL CITY ALONE FREE OF INVADERS

The moves:

RUSSIA (Reinsel): Army Norway to Finland. Army Sweden support fleet St. Petersburg (north coast) to Norway. Army Piedmont to Venice. Army Tyrolia support army Piedmont to Venice. Army Vienna support army Trieste. Army Trieste support army Piedmont to Venice. Army Budapest support fleet Rumania. Fleet Rumania stand. Fleet Gulf of Bothnia to Baltic Sea. Fleet St. Petersburg (north coast) to Norway.

FRANCE (Thompson): Fleet Brest to Mid-Atlantic Ocean. Fleet Western Mediterranean to Tunis. Army Edinburgh stand. Fleet Yorkshire to London. Fleet Channel support army Belgium. Army Picardy support army Belgium. Army Belgium support army Burgundy. Army Paris to Gascony. Army Burgundy support ~~RUSSIAN~~ army Tyrolia to Munich.

TURKEY (Greene): Army Serbia support ~~RUSSIAN~~ army Trieste. Army Bulgaria support army Serbia. Fleet Ionian Sea to Naples. Fleet Albania to Adriatic. Fleet Eastern Mediterranean to Ionian Sea. Fleet Aegean Sea support fleet Eastern Mediterranean to Ionian Sea.

GERMANY (Nelson): Fleet North Sea convoy ~~RUSSIAN~~ army Norway to Edinburgh. Fleet Denmark support fleet North Sea. Army Munich support army Ruhr. Army Holland support army Ruhr. Army Ruhr stand.

ITALY (Goldman): No moves received. Fleets Tyrrhenian Sea, Albania, and Adriatic Sea, stand.

The underlined move does not succeed. There are no retreats. The Italian army formerly in Venice is dislodged and, having received no orders, is annihilated. Deadline for moves for Fall 1906 is Wednesday, 10 May 1967. If players who expect to have builds will submit them, on a conditional basis, with their Fall moves, the need of a Winter move could be avoided. This is, of course, not demanded.

PRESS RELEASES

Milan, 2 May. The Czar, just back from the launching of the new fleet in Archangel, is spending some time visiting his forces in northern Italy. "Russia will continue her freeing of suppressed Italy! With Turkey's aid!" he said to a regiment of Polish Lancers which he reviewed here today.

Ankara, 9 May. The following is the gist of the recent "Turkish Proclamation #1". It was delivered before the assembled Ambassadors stationed in Ankara by Mustafa A Pasha, the new Chief Minister.

"It has been decided by the newly installed Socialist government and the armed forces that certain key personnel will be changed.

"Sometime this fall, depending on the present epidemic sweeping our land, we will attempt to install Abdul Osman as Sultan.

"Yes, it is true that the Turkish government will nationalize the Suez canal."

Washington, 19 May. Reports from our consulate in Imir tell of wholesale purge of the admirals of the fleet for incompetence. The army is temporarily in charge of all fleet movements.

It is also reported that the plague is now mainly centered in the Balkans and western Turkey. Deaths, so far, have been put at 300,000. Suez and Kurusku, 8 June. Neshat Bey, Commander in Chief of the Turkish Army of Africa began gathering forces for a descent into the Sudan and northeastern Africa. An amphibious force of 3000 men will operate in the Red Sea. Other forces based on the Nile include a Camel Corps, Cavalry Corps, and 8000 men of the Mosul-Adana infantry. Only three batteries are present.

Neshat Bey told of his plans, "We hope to make some arrangement with the natives and hope to be in communication with our coastal units when we reach Kassala."

"Yes, supplies will be a problem for an army of this size."

- - - - -

A MISPRINT

BROB #58 stated that the deadline for the next moves, in game 1966AV, would be Saturday, 20 April. This was a misprint for Saturday 29 April. Judging by the letters so far received most players in the game understood the situation. One player, unfortunately, did not. As a result he has given himself a lot of unnecessary expense and anxiety. I can reimburse him for the expense, but not for the anxiety. In case this sort of thing happens again (and it may; I am the world's worst typist) all players should note that in BROB games you always have two weeks for all Spring and Fall moves. So do not become unduly alarmed by errors in typing.

- - - - -

NEW BLOOD

The following have indicated an interest in Postal Diplomacy:

Michael R. Childers, Buckner Hall, San Marcos, Texas, 78666.

Don Greenwood, Box 280, RD #2, Sayre, Penna., 18840.

Mark Lyon, 4885 Shoreline Drive, Salem, Oregon, 97303.

- - - - -

NEW ARTERY

International Enquirer, Box 14021, University Station, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 55414, is a new 'zine which offers regular Diplomacy, Economic Diplomacy and another variant. Fee \$2.

FINISHED GAMES

Game	A.D.	Player	Country	Magazine
1963A	(1)	<u>Derek Nelson</u>	Italy	Graustark #'s 1-15
1963B		Bruce Pelz	Russia	Ruritania #'s 1-40
1964A		<u>James MacKenzie</u>	Turkey	Graustark #'s 15-48
1964B		<u>John Smythe</u>	Austria	Fredonia #'s 1-28
1964C		John Boardman	England	Brobdingnag #'s 1-40
1964D		<u>John McCallum</u>	Austria	Trantor #'s 1-23 sTab #'s 1-24
1965A		<u>Charles Wells</u>	Turkey	Graustark #'s 42-86
1965E		John Smythe	England	Massif #'s 1-10 sTab #'s 1-24
1965I	1965KJ	John Smythe	Italy	Wild ' Woolly #'s 20-51
1965L	(2)			Graustark #'s 57-99
1965S	B	Donald Miller	Turkey	Barad-Dur #'s 1-39
1965T	C	(3)		Barad-Dur #'s 4-37
1966D	E	Alan Huff	England	Barad-Dur #'s 12-34
1966AP	(4)	Charles Turner	France	Miskatonic University #'s 2-18

- Notes: (1) 1963A was a five man game, played under the rules laid down in the rulebook for such games, that is with Russia and Turkey and bordering neutral country off the board.
- (2) In 1965L, Frank Clark's Germany and John Koning's Russia split the board 17-17. As neither player wished to continue to try for an outright win the game was declared a draw.
- (3) 1965T was a draw with Rick Brooks' Russia and Banks Mebane's Turkey splitting the board 17-17 and neither player wishing to continue.
- (4) 1965AP was a five-man game under the rules recently suggested by Calhamer for such games. That is, Germany and Italy have no players but have their supply centres occupied at the beginning of play. The forces for those two countries may not move but may be supported in place by other players.

Fourteen games of standard Postal Diplomacy have so far been finished in the magazines. A statement of the outcome of them is given in the

table above. For a more complete summary of these games see the Roster appearing regularly in Graustark. Or see the magazines in which they appeared, the issues concerned being indicated in the last column. Some 'zines have their own system for naming games; such names are indicated in the "Alternate Designation" column.

It has frequently been suggested that there should be a championship game made up of the first 7 winners of Postal Diplomacy games. Charles Reinsel attempted to organize such a championship match in his journal Big Brother. The original idea proved impossible to carry out in full detail, due to several winners not wishing to play, for one reason or another. However, he has now managed to start a Winners' Game, although the players in it are not the first seven winners. The names of those who are in it are underlined above. The seventh player is Jerry Pournelle whose win in 1965D is a foregone conclusion, although it has not been officially announced. So if you wish to see your kindly old gamesmaster get stomped to fudge, subscribe to Big Brother now and watch, from the first stomp.

The above mentioned 1965D is only one of some 5 or 6 games now in the final stages. It seemed that it might be of interest to list all games which are getting on toward the conclusion. The list has been arbitrarily restricted to those games in which the leading player has at least a quarter of the forces on the board. That means, of course, that the games included are not only those in the final stages but also many still in the middle game phase.

<u>Game</u>	<u>A.D.</u>	<u>Journal</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Survivors</u>
1965B	65KL	Wild 'n Wooly	1912	Root, E-14; von Metzke, R-14;
1965C	65KM	Wild 'n Wooly	1912	E. Thompson, E-3; Boardman, I-3
1965D	65KX	Wild 'n Wooly	1911	Pournelle, G-11; McCallum, R-10;
1965E		Costaguana then Graustark	1912	von Metzke, F-7; Goldman, I-6
1965G	65KY	Wild 'n Wooly	1909	Pournelle, I-17; McCallum, R-9;
1965H	65KN	Wild 'n Wooly	1910	von Metzke, A-8
1965K	65KQ	Wild 'n Wooly	1908	Wells, T-16; Sanders, E-10;
1965M		Costaguana then ADAG	1909	Brannan, F-7; Koning, I-1
1965O		Lusitania then Miskatonic U.	1905	Nelson, E-17; Koning, F-9;
1965P		Lonely Mountain	1910	Ward, A-8
1965Q		Graustark	1913	Smythe, I-15; Koning, A-12;
				Ward, F-5; McCallum, G-3
				Nelson, R-9; Swenson, A-8; Ward,
				E-5; Wells, F-5; Pournelle, T-5
				Wells, F-15; Atkins, A-14;
				von Metzke, R-2, McCallum, G-1;
				Boggert, G-7; von Metzke, A-7;
				Brannan, F-5; Reinsel, E-3;
				McCallum, I-1
				Atkins, F-10; Reinhardt, I-8;
				Reinsel, A-8; Scott, T-6, Koning,
				E-1; Brannan, G-1.
				Koning, E-16; Kuch, T-11; K.
				Pattee, A-3; Whalen, F-2,
				Latimer, G-2

<u>Game</u>	<u>A.D.</u>	<u>Journal</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Survivors</u>
1965R	A	Orthanc	1910	Miller, R-13; Reinsel, E-11; Chalker, T-10
1965U		sTab	1909	Smythe, T-13; McCallum, E-9; Reinsel, E-8; Wells, I-4
1965V	PAA	Diplophobia	1907	Huff, T-12; Mebane, I-9; Kuch, G-8; Clark, E-4; Latimer, E-1
1965W	D	Orthanc	1907	Miller, E-11; Reinsel, T-11; Huff, G-10; Owings, E-2
1966A		Lonely Mountain	1909	Pournelle, E-13; Austin, T-9; Kuch, G-7; McCallum, E-5
1966B		Costaguana then Graustark	1908	Pournelle, T-12; Davidson, E-11; Sanders, G-5; Ward, I-5; Prosnitz, E-1
1966C	66KL	Wild 'n Wooly	1906	Cline, G-11; Wells, E-9; McCallum, E-7; Moning, T-7
1966E	PBA	Diplophobia	1906	Latimer, R-17; Bryant, E-6; Kuch, I-4; Lebling, A-4; Molenaar, E-3
1966F	PCA	Diplophobia	1905	Latimer, I-9; Weston, T-7; Mazor, E-6; Lebling, G-4; Huff, E-3; Mebane, A-2; Moheisel, A-2
1966H	66KW	Wild'n Wooly	1903	Dygert, R-9; Felson, E-6; Garland, E-6; Tzudiker, I-5; Gemignani, T-4; Fletcher, A-3
1966I		sTab	1906	Davidson, T-10; Tzudiker, E-7; Naus, G-6; Brannan, E-6; Wells, I-3
1966L	#1	Big Brother	1911	Brannan, E-11; Moning, G-8; McCallum, I-6; Wells, T-6
1966M		Fidgely then ADAG	1905	Dygert, E-10; Reinsel, A-10; Tzudiker, I-5; Brannan, T-5; Johnson, G-1
1966N		Marsovia	1904	Barrows, E-9; Brannan, T-7; Latimer R-6; von Metzke, E-5; Walker, A-4; Tzudiker, G-2; Swenson, I-1
1966O		Costaguana then ADAG	1904	Peery, T-10; Turner, E-9; von Metzke, I-6; Garland, G-1; Long, R-1
1966R		Graustark	1908	Wagner, T-14; Berman, E-11; Levin- son, R-7; Lebling, G-1; E. Thompson, I-1
1966AA		Graustark	1907	Latimer, G-11; Dygert, E-10; Walker, A-8; E. Thompson, T-3; Aita, I-1; Turner, R-1
1966AK	#2	Big Brother	1907	Zelazny, A-10; Dygert, T-10; MacKenzie, E-7; Birsan, E-7
1966AL		ADAG	1904	Schow, R-9; Walker, G-6; Turner, E-5; von Metzke, T-5; E. Thompson, E-4; Barrows, I-4
1966AM		ADAG	1904	Zelazny, G-11; Duncan, A-6; von Metzke, R-6; Donohue, I-4; Birsan, T-3; Alexander, E-2; Peck, E-2
1966AQ		Broddingnag	1905	Reinsel, R-10; E. Thompson, E-9; Greene, T-6; Nelson, G-5; Goldman, I-4

<u>Game</u>	<u>A.D.</u>	<u>Journal</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Survivors</u>
1966AV		Broddingnag	1904	Wells, E-9; Shagrin, G-9; Zelazny, R-7; Francis, I-6; Munroe, A-3

The survivors have been listed in order of their remaining forces. The initial following the name of each survivor designates the country he is playing, followed by the number of forces he had on the board at end of the last build move. The year is the last playing "year" for which build moves have been submitted. As can be seen there are about a half dozen games which are near completion. In addition which will make considerable difference to all of the playing lists. The other games, while well into the middle game stage, have a great deal of play left to them.

As the Boardman designation, by which all of these games are listed in the left hand column, is assigned approximately in the order of games beginning, it is possible, by looking down the "year" column, to make a rough estimate of how promptly the various games have been run. A feature which may be of some interest to those considering entering additional games.

It depends somewhat on the alliances, of course, but all of 65D, 65F, 65G, 65H, 65M, 65Q, 65R, and 66E should end before the summer is far advanced. Some of them look as if they may create changes in the country ratings.

SEALING TAG

Greg Long, 3526 S.W. 112, Seattle, Washington, 98146.: I am particularly interested in your "simultaneous attack and support of the same foreign unit." You first raised this question in PROB #52 and again in PROB #56; in both cases, however, you limited this manoeuver against a foreign unit. My question is: Why not against a unit of same country? I.e., FRANCE: Army Burgundy to Munich, Army Ruhr support army Burgundy to Munich, Army Munich stand, army Tyrolia support army Munich.

The rulebook would support the theory that the supported French attack against their own unit would hold off an equally supported attack by another power. The rulebook states that an attack against one's own unit is only null when the attacked unit is forced to retreat due to the attack. Well, since Munich is supported, the attack from Burgundy would not succeed but it would hold off any other power attacking that province with less support. Right?

((+(Yes, but the move is nonsensical, as it ties up too much force to do too little. It is quite correct that an attack on territory occupied by one's own forces may sometime be used to good advantage as a sort of left handed de facto support. PROB will discuss this in full when it gets around to the discussion of the doubly attacked space. And it will get around to that discussion when it gets off its current rating list, country rating, magazine rating jag. Your supported move Burgundy to Munich will serve to stand off two hostile forces. The Tyrolean support is wholly irrelevant to that stand off, since a country cannot dislodge one of its own forces. Similarly, the stand order in Munich supported by Tyrolia will stand off two hostile

units, that is a singly supported attack. But the two pairs of orders together still only serve to stand off two hostile units. So you are using four forces to do what either pair of two could do. If the worst you have to fear is an enemy double attack then you should use one or the other of the two pairs as you have suggested and make use of the remaining two forces for something else to your greater advantage. If perhaps there is a possibility of the enemy using more than two forces on his attack on Munich, say three, then your moves will not succeed at all. In this case you will have to decide which way you are going to defend. If by support, then either the Burgundian or the Ruhrische (what is the English adjective?) should give additional support; if by stand-off, then the Tyrolese army should support the attack from Burgundy. The way you suggest gives you little security at heavy cost in manpower, an offence against the idea of economy of force, one of the most fundamental principles of war.

The case of this move against a foreign force in Munich is a little different. There were two foreign powers to be considered, the one already in Munich, whom we regard as the lesser of two evils, and the real enemy who threatens to enter Munich. In such a case it might be advantageous to support Munich to keep the dangerous enemy out and, simultaneously, to attack it so as to cut possible support being given by the unit already there. -jamcc+)) @ army

Hal Naus, 288 Broadway, Apt. #139, Chula Vista, Calif., 92010.: ...

...a comment about some players complaining about too long a time between moves. Well, I have an answer for that. I sent ADAG #13 out on March 25th, with a deadline of April 22nd, a good four weeks, which should give nobody any problems, setting up their alliances and getting their moves in. Here it is the 18th, just four days from the deadline, and I don't have the moves for 20 positions. ... So here I sit waiting for players to send in moves. I found out that it is impossible to try to keep to a two-week deadline because I usually don't receive all the moves until the last day; especially when you have players who play in more than one game, then you can see the amount of work that is piled up waiting for players to send in their moves.

Another thing that gripes me is when you have a Fall situation where two or three players, say, have builds, as I had in one game recently: I had to wait for three weeks for one player to send in his build, so I couldn't move from Fall and Winter into Spring. So now, I will still ask for the Winter builds ahead of the Spring moves and, if they respond, I will then notify the other players of the builds; if they don't then I will just publish the Winter builds. You can figure out how long that will take, if you have Spring, Fall, and Winter moves in three separate issues. It will take three months to complete one "year" and one full ((calendar)) year to complete four game "years", and that is slow. I'd much rather try and get through one game "year" in two issues. You take my magazine which is carrying 15 games, 11 regular and 4 variant. In the next issue, #15, I will have 11 games in the Fall move. Now, if I ask for the Winter builds and then notify each player of the builds so that they can submit their Spring moves in time for the next issue, it will take a total of 2.37 to mail the notifications out and that doesn't include the cost of paper and envelopes. Yet I am willing to incur this extra cost to speed up the games a little; but you still have players who drag their feet. ... But that's life: they complain but they are the biggest reason many

games drag, especially when you have a player who forgets to submit his moves or builds so that you have to wait till the last day to determine the outcome.

((+(I think most EROB readers are familiar with your journal, ADAG, Hal, but perhaps I had better explain matters for those who are not. As most will know there are now only two Diplomacy 'zines which adhere to a rigid two week publication schedule, namely John Boardman's Graustark and Charles Reinsel's Big Brother. (When its own editor was running it, Jack Chalker's Barad-Dur was in the same category.) The result of this policy can be readily seen by a glance at the table given on pages 4 and 5 of this issue: every Graustark or Big Brother game will be found to be some 3 or 4 "years" in advance of games in other 'zines begun at about the same time. Such two-weeks-per-move games are usually run with 3 issues of the magazine per playing "year" and in them it takes about 15 months to complete an average length game, that is one running to 1912.

Many editors have found it impossible to maintain such a schedule and have had to adopt a slower one. slab is a good example; it has gone over to a three-week interval between issues while retaining the three issues per playing "year" feature. This has two advantages for the editor: First, of course, he publishes less frequently. But there is another and often greater advantage: he can be a few days late with a given issue, still go back to the expected deadline for the next following issue, and not impose an undue hardship on his players. A player only given 17 days, instead of the usual 20, for a move has no real grounds for complaint, he can certainly do everything he has to do in that time if he tries. The case is far different with a two-week schedule; a usual 13 day interval suddenly lopped to 10 days on one move would make play virtually impossible for those living in remoter points.

Hal found himself in the latter category of editors who could not maintain a fortnightly publication rate. He decided to go over to publication once a month. With three issues per playing "year" that would mean it would take two and a half years to play a game of normal length; a game as intrinsically long as the Ruritania one would take four years at such a rate. So his thought was to try to cover each playing "year" in two issues, looking after the winter builds and removals by correspondence between issues, with the results which he explains in his letter above.

Well, Hal, after that introduction I must say that my sympathies are on both sides. Running 15 games as you /it seems to me that it /do would be impossible to put them all on stencil in a single burst of energy. The job will have to be spread over several days and your players might well show a little consideration by getting their moves in a few days early so as to permit you to do that. With 4 weeks between issues I can see no reason why they couldn't. On the other hand we must consider the fact that there are people who are temperamentally incapable of doing anything until the last possible moment. It seems to me that you would be well advised to make your official deadline some 4 or 5 days shorter than your actual one. I mean, if you really plan on publishing on Friday the 15th, set a deadline of Monday the 11th. And be brutal about enforcing it. If a straggler comes in after it, even though his game happens to be one that you haven't yet put on stencil, mark him, "No moves received on time". The lesson will be learned

surprisingly quickly and it will give you a chance to cut stencils without killing yourself in the process. For the winter move question, why not assign a deadline for such moves, say 8 or 10 days after publication. You have several players in Europe and may need to moderate things a little in their games but, in the others, why not give a winter move deadline? Builds are due on the 10th of June, Spring moves on the 30th, if you plan on publishing on the 4th of July? This will give you enough time to inform the other players of the builds, and still keep to your planned publishing deadline.

It is easy to give advice, of course. In practice things are run much more haphazardly in EROB. For a sad example see page 2. --jamcc)+))

John Koning, 318 South Belle Vista, Youngstown, Ohio, 44509.: On the Games Fee issue, I didn't really comment on your editorial because players saying they want to play and then dropping out have never been a problem in slab. I do collect game fees before the game starts, but in a few cases I have waited for them when players mentioned some financial hangup. I agree completely with your original editorial, however. The \$2 I charge per game is more a guarantee of willingness to play than anything else. I could have to charge \$4 or \$5 if I wanted to try to make slab self-supporting.

(+(It hasn't been a problem in EROB either, but it has happened elsewhere. In a portion of Hal Maus' letter, above, which I cut out, he mentioned that it had happened to him once. Once is not many, considering the number of ADAG games. But it is one too many, if it can be prevented. And I think that one way to prevent it is to accept no application made casually, unaccompanied by fee. --jamcc)+))

- - - - -
GAME OPENINGS

There are two cases known to me of games which need (or needed a few days ago) only one additional player to complete a board:

One is for the 13th game in ADAG. The address of its editor, Hal Maus, is given above in the letter column. Fee \$2. This game will probably be the last which he will start until a number of current ones are ended.

The other is the game to be run by Al Scott (2769 Hampshire, Cleveland, Ohio, 44106) in Lonely Mountain. I don't believe that the fee for this has been announced but, if it follows general LM practice, it will be \$3. This is, in all probability, the last chance to enter a Lonely Mountain game until its editor, Charles Wells, returns from Europe next Fall.

- - - - -
As this issue will not be mailed until tomorrow, Thursday, 27 April, players in 1966AQ should note that the deadline will be one day later than indicated on page 1.

- - - - -
ERODINGWAG is a journal of Postal Diplomacy edited and published by John McCallum, Ralston, Alberta, Canada. Price ten cents.