

# BROBDINGNAG

-----  
 Brobdingnag #60      1966AV (S'05)      Spring AQ (F'06)      13 May 1967  
 -----

Game 1966AV

Spring 1905

GERMANS    MARCH    EAST    RUSSIANS    WEST  
 HEAVY CASUALTIES IN ALPINE FIGHTING  
 BRITISH FLEETS MOVE TOWARD SOUTHERN WATERS

The moves:

GERMANY (Shagrin): Army Livonia to Moscow. Army Silesia to Galicia.  
                                 Army Munich to Tyrolia. Army Bohemia support army  
 Munich to Tyrolia. Army Marseilles to Piedmont. Army Burgundy to  
Marseilles. Fleet Helgoland fight to Holland. Army Berlin to Silesia.  
 Army Warsaw support army Silesia to Galicia.

ENGLAND (Wells): Fleet Gulf of Bothnia to Sweden. Army St. Petersburg  
                                 support GERMAN army Warsaw to Moscow. Fleet Barents  
 Sea support army St. Petersburg. Fleet Spain (south coast) to Western  
Mediterranean. Fleet Portugal to Spain (south coast). Fleet Norwegian  
Sea to North Atlantic Ocean. Fleet Edinburgh stands. Fleet London to  
 English Channel. Fleet Liverpool to Irish Sea.

RUSSIA (Zelazny): Fleet Ankara to Black Sea. Fleet Bulgaria (south  
                                 coast) to Aegean. Army Constantinople to Bulgaria.  
 Army Rumania support army Galicia to Budapest. Army Galicia to  
 Budapest. Army Smyrna to Armenia. Army Moscow to Ukraine.

ITALY (Francis): Army Tyrolia to Vienna. Army Venice to Piedmont.  
                                 Army Trieste support RUSSIAN army Galicia to Budapest.  
 Army Rome to Tuscany. Fleet Gulf of Lyon to Western Mediterranean.  
 Fleet Greece to Ionian Sea.

AUSTRIA (Munroe): Army Vienna support army Budapest. Army Serbia  
                                 support army Budapest. Army Budapest support army  
Serbia.

The Italian army in Tyrolia is dislodged; it has no available  
 retreat as Piedmont was stood off on the move. It is therefore,  
 annihilated. There is some discussion of this move elsewhere in this  
 issue. The Austrian army in Budapest is likewise annihilated as it  
 is dislodged and there is no space open for retreat. These moves  
 were communicated to the players some time ago by carbon copy letter.  
 A deadline for moves for Fall 1905 was set for Monday, 15 May 1967.

## PRESS RELEASES

Sevastopol, 16 Apr. (Russkoe Znamia) The task of setting up the Czar's  
 bureaux in their new accommodations is done. This last major Russian  
 city under Imperial control is silent - a silence said to be equat-  
 able to the stillness before the storm - but which storm, the  
 Austrian turbulence, the German gale, or the English draft? Oh, for

a quiet game of Russian roulette.

Taurida, 4 June (RZ) A surprise attack enabled the Third Reserve to seize Budapest while the Germans moved east. With this success, hope is raised that the Balkan situation will be resolved by Winter 1906.

Taurida, 18 June (RZ) The Russian Fleet has been ordered to not repeat the wasteful gunnery practice which resulted in the defeat of the Imperial North Fleet last year. Ammunition is in short supply since the relocated munitions plant has not yet reached full production schedules.

Glatz, 26 June. (SP) Prince Vlad left his retreat here in early spring as soon as the campaigning season opened. But the local inhabitants are still curious about their famous visitor. Scarcely a week goes by without some unconfirmed report or other about him appearing in the local press. For instance, the latest issue of the Glatzer Wochenblatt had the following curious - and anonymous - report in its letter column: "By the way, Vlad and Luci were married on December 7 (a day of infamy!), not December 14. Further, Luci may just possibly be a little bit pregnant. Unter den Linden Bordscha-Vlad Junior? Would you believe Early Bird? I wonder if he will show a marked distaste for electric lights? Luci can't wait to meet In's friends (fiends?), Graf von Frankenstein, Count Dracula, etc., etc., when they get to Galicia."

- - - - -

Game 1966Aq

Fall 1906

A L L T R E A T I E S C R U M B L E  
RUSSIA INVADES GERMANY: TURKEY ATTACKS RUSSIA  
TURKISH AFRICAN WAR CONTINUES

The moves:

RUSSIA (Reinsel): Army Finland to Sweden. Army Sweden to Berlin. Army Budapest to Rumania. Army Vienna to Bohemia. Army Tyrolia to Munich. Army Trieste support army Venice. Army ~~Venice~~ support ~~TURKISH~~ Fleet Naples to Rome. Fleet Baltic convoy army Sweden to Berlin. Fleet Rumania to Black Sea. Fleet Norway to Skagerrak.

FRANCE (Thompson): Fleet Mid-Atlantic to Western Mediterranean. Fleet Tunis support ITALIAN fleet Tyrrhenian Sea. Army Edinburgh to Yorkshire. Fleet London to Yorkshire. Fleet English Channel support army Belgium. Army Picardy support army Belgium. Army Gascony support army Burgundy. Army Burgundy support ~~RUSSIAN~~ army Tyrolia to Munich. Army Belgium support army Burgundy.

TURKEY (Greene): Fleet Naples to Rome. Fleet Ionian Sea to Naples. Fleet Aegean to Ionian Sea. Fleet Albania to Trieste. Army Bulgaria to Rumania. Army Serbia support army ~~Bulgaria~~ to Rumania.

GERMANY (Melson): Fleet Denmark support fleet North Sea. Army Munich support army Ruhr. Army Holland support army Ruhr. Fleet North Sea and army Ruhr, unordered, stand.

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

Underlined moves do not succeed. The German army in Munich is dislodged

and may retreat to either Kiel or Silesia.

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

RUSSIA: 4 home, 3 Austrian, Venice, Norway, Sweden, Berlin, and Munich. (12). May build two.

FRANCE: 3 home, 3 English, 2 Iberian, Belgium, Tunis. (10). May build one.

TURKEY: 3 home, Rumania, Bulgaria, Serbia, Greece, Rome, Naples. (9). May build three.

GERMANY: Kiel, Holland, Denmark. (3). Must remove two.

ITALY: None. Must remove all remaining forces.

Deadline for adjustment orders is Saturday, 27 May 1967. Builds may be made conditional on the direction of the German retreat. If adjustment orders are received appreciably ahead of deadline, publication may be correspondingly advanced.

#### PRESS RELEASES:

St. Petersburg, 6 Aug. The Minister of War announced that a state of war existed between Russia and the German Empire. He stated that naval units in the Baltic were already engaged. "Russia has declared war on the central government of Germany. We hope that the French government will help us remove them from the earth! 'Sorry about that!' said 'Big Brother' ", said the official communique.

Ankara, 8 Aug. Approximately four million Turks looked on as the beloved Abdul Osman III was installed as Sultan of Turkey, Prince of the Balkans, Emperor of Italy, and Caliph of the Faithful. The largest crowd in Turkish history listened intently as the Sultan delivered his first official speech.

"Six years ago your sons marched off to war, under the orders of my father. Since then we have enlarged our lands, felt the weight of a severe plague, and seen savage combat and death.

"And while these brave sons defended the Ottoman Empire, key officials took bribes, others changed official foreign policy for their own ends, and we've seen the purge of the armed forces, a purge so complete that only two Generals remain of the six key Admirals and Generals that fought back in 1901. Now we see Russia, our only true ally, making ominous moves and carrying on talks with our enemies.

"Most, if not all, of the scandals and backstabbing can be ascribed to the Imperialism and political framework of our age, and I for one, Caliph of all Moslems, will not allow it any longer. Therefore, as leader of the Islamic nations, I, the Sultan, hereby declare a Holy War, a Jihad, against all nations who do not profess the one true faith!"

The last reports from Ankara, and Turkey in general, tell of wholesale massacres of the Christian population and of millions of voices shouting, "Allah Akbar".

Paris, 1 September. (APF) Turkey is advised: Tunis, Tuscany and the Tyrrhenian are off limits to Turkish fleets. Such, in summary, is believed to be the contents of a telegram transmitted to Turkey today.

Gedaref, Sudan, and Massaua, Eritrea, 1 Nov. Hoshat Bey, submitted the following appraisal of the situation of the Turkish Army of Africa. "Not since the days of the Mahdi have so many Moslems of the Sudan come together to wage a Holy War. We will march on Addis Ababa with 100,000 Sudanese, our camel corps remaining behind. About 4000 of our regular troops will create a diversion near Massaua.

"We are quite lucky in not having to fight in the Sudan.

"Yes, fortune was with us when the Italians surrendered Massaua to our amphibious troops. However, Aden has not fallen and the English Indian army continues to supply the fortress. We have too few regular troops to invest the city, and remember, I only have 8000 regular infantry and 2000 cavalry in Gedaref.

"Our agents are trying to persuade the Sultan of Harar to revolt, but we don't know the situation too well there."

- - - - -

#### Meteorological Notes from Ralston.

The deadline for the last set of moves in game 1966AV was Saturday, 29 April. On Friday it began to snow very heavily, and by Saturday morning there was a foot of fresh snow on the ground. This was the second heavy fall of snow within ten days, snow falls which have resulted in heavy loss of stock in this area which is primarily ranching country.

The last mail delivery here on Saturday is at noon. I was told at that time that no Air Mail had been received in that mail and, as moves from two players were missing, I tried to phone them. The misprint of the deadline in the previous issue contributing to that decision. However, all phone lines out of Medicine Hat proved to be down and it was not until some four hours later that I was able to reach the two players involved. One of them had apparently mailed his moves and the letter had been lost. The other had been trying to phone me, without success, since the previous day. The last mail out of Ralston on a Saturday is at 5 PM so that it was necessary to type the moves in haste, omitting Press Releases in order to catch that mail. Effort wasted: that mail also was not able to leave and I was told that nothing would get out from the Post Office until Monday morning. So, the moves were re-typed Sunday, with Press Releases, and mailed Monday.

Unfortunately, in the rush, errors occurred in reporting moves. In one typing Charles Wells fleets in England were omitted, in another his fleet in Portugal. I am not really trying to sink your fleets, Charles. As every player was sent two copies of the moves, and as the two copies always came from different typings, I believe that the actual position should have been clear to all.

My effort to get the moves out by Saturday if at all possible was an attempt to bring the two games, 1966AQ and 1966AV, into step with one another but, as can be seen, the effort was not successful. Although, as a matter of fact, as I write this, Thursday evening, 11 May, all the Wall moves for game 1966AV are in, and I have been tempted to publish them with this issue. However, better judgment has prevailed, and the moves will wait for the deadline, next Monday.

My earnest suggestion is, that for your next game, you choose a magazine whose editor lives in a more genial clime.

# ERORDINGWAG Completed Game Rating List - #6.

EROB would like to congratulate John Smythe for his recent win in Game 1965M. Carried in Wild 'n Woolly the game was known as 1965KY in that journal. This is John's fourth victory in Postal Diplomacy, his second as Italy.

A win by Italy, previously at the bottom of the country list, produces some changes in the listing for the countries. The inversion was carried right through the game: Turkey, at the top of the list, was the first to be eliminated in this game. England, second from the top, was the second to be eliminated. The result is that there is much less spread between the powers in the current listing than there was in the last previous one, given in EROB #53.

Games 1963A, B, 1964A, B, C, D, 1965A, E, I, L, M, S, T, 1966D, AP, are included in this listing. The first and the last, being 5-man games, are omitted from the country listing.

+24	John Smythe (W)	- 1	Earl Thompson
+10	John Moning	- 2	Bob Adams Ron Daniels James Dygert James Goldman Charles Reinsel James Sanders
+ 9	Banks Mebane Derek Nelson (W)		
+ 8	Donald Miller (W)		
+ 7	Frank Clark	- 3	Ron Bounds Conrad von Metzke
+ 6	John McCallum (W) Bruce Felz (W) Charles Wells (W)	- 4	Clint Digglesstone Margaret Gemignani Jack Harness Dave McDaniel Roland Tzudiker
+ 5	Rick Brooks		
+ 4	Eric Blake John Boardman (W) Robert Lake James MacKenzie (W) Dian Pelz Charles Turner (W)	- 5	Tom Bulmer Jerald Jacks Stuart Keshner Stephen Patt
+ 2	Mark Owings Jock Root Gail Schow	- 6	Bernie Illing Don Recklies Joel Sattel
+ 1	Bill Christian Ken Davidson Anders Swenson Robert Ward	-10	Charles Brannen Richard Schultz
		-12	Fred Lerner
		-15	Paul Harley
0	Ian Bailes Christina Brannen John Davey Ben Hendin Alan Huff (W)		

For John Smythe's own feelings about Rating Lists, see his letter in this issue.

The country list, omitting the two 5-man games:

Turkey	+24	65.4%
England	+12	57.7
France	0	50.0
Austria	- 1	49.4
Italy	- 8	44.9
Germany	-13	41.7
Russia	-14	41.0

- - - - -

#### RETREATS BARRED BY STAND-OFF

The rulebook states: "The ((retreating)) unit may not retreat..... to a space which was left vacant due to a stand-off on the move." See paragraph "The Retreat", page 5. The dots in the sentence quoted above represent clauses dealing with other conditions barring a retreating unit from certain spaces; those clauses have no relevance to what we are discussing here.

The quoted sentence has always been interpreted as meaning that a stand-off in any space, closes that space to retreats arising from moves on the same season of play. That interpretation is, as far as I know, universal in all the magazines; it certainly is the interpretation used in EROB.

Recently Jim Latimer has suggested that there is another possible interpretation. See his letter in Graustark #125 for a full statement of his views. Briefly, the crux of the argument is, what does "the move" mean in the quoted sentence? Does it mean all moves for the season of play under consideration? If so, the traditional interpretation is, of course, correct. A space left vacant by reason of a stand-off then becomes forbidden territory for any retreating unit. It is Latimer's suggestion that "the move" does not mean that. He thinks it means merely those movements directly involved in the stand-off, and no others. Under such an interpretation a space left open due to a stand-off would be prohibited ground as far as the two forces standing each other off are concerned: either of them, if forced to retreat, would not be allowed to enter the space which it had already made a try for. But any other force, compelled to retreat, might still use the space left vacant by the stand-off.

As stated, EROBINGAG's interpretation has, heretofore, been the conventional one. That will continue to be the interpretation here for the duration of the two current games. It is also, in my opinion, the correct interpretation. However, I think the point is of sufficient interest so that an opinion from Mr. Calhmer would be of value. I hope he will be able to indicate his views on the matter.

As it happens, there is a case of this uncertainty in the Spring 1905 move of game 1966AV, reported in this issue of EROB. There a German force in Marseilles and an Italian one in Venice both tried for Piedmont and stood each other off. Neither of these forces was dislodged. Had one of them been dislodged, then under any interpretation, Latimer's or any one else's, Piedmont would not be open to that force for retreat. However, there was another force in the vicinity which was dislodged, namely the Italian army in Tyrolia. Under the usual interpretation it cannot go to Piedmont, and is, therefore, annihilated as

there is no other opening for the retreat. Under Latimer's interpretation, the Tyrolian army would be allowed to retreat to Piedmont.

I don't know why these things always happen to Dave Francis. I already owe him a game by reason of my ruling on the Boardman Rule question. Should Mr. Calhamer support Latimer's suggestion, then I'll owe Dave another game. Nonetheless, for at least the duration of the two current games, the conventional interpretation of the sentence will apply in BROB.

- - - - -

#### SEALED BAG

John W. Smythe, Jr., 621 East Prospect, Girard, Ohio, 44420.: I have a very low opinion of the recent, and not so recent, attempts to rate Diplomacy players. A while ago I devised a system so complicated that I was sure everyone would forget about ratings. Sigh!, everyone just forgot about my rating system.

Unlike other games of skill where the opposition is known and generally limited to a single opponent (cut-throat pinochle is an exception in that there are two opponents), Diplomacy presents a player with six opponents. To make matters worse, players are encouraged to form coalitions, break coalitions, and form new coalitions, etc., until the game ends or the players lapse into the advanced stages of paranoia. Even so, an objective measure of skill could be devised if there existed one primary player motivation. I believe no primary player motivation exists in Diplomacy. Players may be motivated by any combination of an infinite number of needs. All too often the least of these is the need to be a "winner".

If Diplomacy players' primary motivation were to be a winner then an answer, or answers, must be devised to explain the following phenomena:

1. A player's willingness to assume responsibility for a country in an impossible situation midway through a game.
2. Players' willingness to play France and Germany, which are almost impossible to win with.
3. Conrad von Metzke's willingness to play Austria-Hungary, even though he has yet to survive a mail game, let alone win, while playing it.
4. Earl Thompson's willingness to violate Thompson-Smythe alliances, though doing so denies him the opportunity to win.

So beside the problem of mechanics, devisors of rating systems must discover what motivates people to play Diplomacy. Until they do ratings are nothing but amusing exercises in arithmetic.

((+(Your own name, John, heads all the rating lists and it certainly is interesting to hear your views on the subject. I don't know if any sane person plays Diplomacy. But if we give ourselves the benefit of the doubt, and say that some of us are more or less sane, I am sure that all sane players must agree with you, if your remarks refer to the details of the rating lists. To say that a point or two difference in some rating list has any significance is obvious nonsense, and your saying that the lists are mere exercises in arithmetic is, to that extent, perfectly valid. However, looked at in a broader way, I think

the lists

have a value and are even more or less accurate. If you turn back two or three pages you will come on the current edition of the BROB rating list. Immediately below your own name you will find John Koning's, and, slightly below his, Derek Nelson's. You know both personally as well as through mail Diplomacy. Would you not agree that both are superior players who play a better game than do most of the other people listed there? Would you not say that those near the bottom of the list have earned that position, as regards play in the game, whatever their contribution may have been as editors, writers, or the like? So that, provided one takes it with the proverbial grain of salt, I think the lists do provide some guidance as to the skill of the various players.

As an old timer you may say, "So what?" You have long since formed subjective judgments concerning all these people, multi-dimensional judgments quite impossible to compress into a linear scale. But not every one is an old-timer. This sort of thing does form some sort of guidance for the new comer who otherwise feels himself lost in a sea of unfamiliar names. I think that rating lists in one form or another are likely to last as long as the game lasts.

Newer readers may be interested, John, in that rating system of yours. It was suggested in a letter published in Graustark #62. It gave a point for every supply centre controlled at the termination of a game. One third point was subtracted for every Spring or Fall move missed. One half point to be deducted for every year that a game continued, after the elimination of the player being rated. Then a player's final score, for all games, is divided by the number of games he has played. To take the game which you, John, have just won in Wild 'n Woolly and whose completion gave rise to the rating list on a previous page, the table below shows the points assigned by your system and by the BROB system:

	<u>Smythe</u>	<u>BROB</u>
Smythe	+18	+6
Koning	+12	+4
Ward	+12	+1
McCallum	+12	+1
Harness	- 3.5	-3
Bounds	- 4.5	-3
von Metzke	- 4.	-6

Making allowance for the difference in scale, I am more struck by the similarity than the differences.

Your point 3 does von Metzke an injustice. In game 1965D, playing Austria-Hungary, his favorite country, he is one of the three survivors remaining in the game. He should be the runner-up when the game is concluded. -jamcc)+))

Douglas Beyerlein, 3934 S. W., Southern, Seattle, Wash., 98116: About game fees I generally agree with what John Koning said in BROB #59, but remember being the editor of a highly rated Diplomacy journal places you in the position that you can turn down people looking for game openings because whenever you are ready to start a new game, once it's announced the game fills quickly. This is true of all established Diplomacy journals. With Cerebral Nebula



we were very fortunate to start our first game quickly and now the second and we will begin a third game if there is any response from the public. But because we have a journal with no reputation we cannot be fussy and, therefore, we do not ask for the game fee until the game starts.

We have run into the situation where, on the spring move ((1901)), one player did not send in his moves by the deadline and, to keep the game fair (that is not the word I want but it will do), we had to sit around until the move was sent in. We are still waiting. What would you do in such a case.?

((+My reply to your second paragraph reminds me very much of that famous advice to mariners who find themselves on a lee shore. What to do in such a situation? First, never allow yourself to be caught in such a situation. You would not be in the predicament you mention if you demanded fees with game application.

You say that, as a beginning publication, you cannot afford to be fussy. It is precisely the beginning publication which can't afford to be anything else. Grau and stab both have outstanding reputations. They could, if they wanted to, coast for a while on those reputations. The editor of neither does coast; they both obviously put a great deal of effort into their publications continuously. But they could slack off a little, now and then, if they wanted to. The rest of us cannot afford to do that. And we do not have to offer that curious blend of "Liaisons dangereuses", Sherlock Holmes, and political polemic, which is Graustark, nor the polish and general finish which is stab, we have to be exceptionally careful that we do offer well conducted games. We cannot, unfortunately, guarantee that the players in a game will remain in it until the end or until they are eliminated in play. But we can do our best to ensure that a list of players for a game that we publish is a true one, and that everyone on the list actually intends to play. And one thing to help establish that fact is to demand payment with application.

It is worth noting that all the early Diplomacy 'zines did just that as a matter of course anyway. Graustark, Ruritania, Predonia, Dick Schultz's Broddingnag, and Trantor, all expected fee with application. It was not until Wild in Woolly came along just before the New Year of 1965 that the advertising gimmick of "Pay with first move" was introduced. What does it accomplish anyhow? Surely, if the player really intends to play it makes no difference to him whether he pays his two dollars now, or a month from now when the game actually starts. The only person who benefits by it, the person who gets "turned down" in your phrase, is the fellow who likes to see his name published in a game list, whether or not he actually plays in the game. What does Cerebral Nebula, or any other 'zine, lose by turning down such a player? Nothing. And, if the fact that it does so is known, it will gain considerably as far as its reputation for running a fair and well conducted game is concerned.

What it comes down to is this: Does one publish a magazine in order to conduct the games in it, or does one run a number of games to have an excuse for publishing a magazine? If the latter, then the other material in the magazine will have to be very good indeed if you are to continue to attract players, year after year. If the former, then one of the things you have to do in order to have a fair game, is to ensure that there are no extra "jokers" in the deck. -jamcc+))

And, John Smythe, may I come back to your letter for a moment? The correlation co-efficient between the scores which your system gives to the players in game 1965II, and the score given by the EROB system is 89.5%. As your letter strongly implies, we don't really know what we are measuring here. Of three players, one may want to win or, failing that, to come as near winning as possible. A second may want to set up game situations which allow him to ~~write~~ amusing press releases. And a third's motive may be to do as much damage as possible to another player who back-stabbed him some time in the past. All three may succeed as far as their subjective motivations are concerned. But it is apparent that they will get very different scores on rating lists. But, whatever we are measuring, with a 90% coefficient of correlation, I would say that we are both measuring the same thing. I doubt that that thing, whatever it is, is purely skill. I know that in any game where I have done well I have had a number of lucky breaks in my favor; so, presumably, these lists measure mean luck as well as mean skill. But, as consistent as they are, they are measuring something and, by and large, the same thing.

By the way, I was interested in your remark that France and Germany are practically impossible to win with. You may have noticed in EROB #54 that Mr. Calhamer told Jared Johnson that, in his opinion, all the countries are equal. Well, you are an expert in the game if anybody is, and your statement would seem to refute Calhamer's remark. Mr. Calhamer further said that among less experienced players Turkey had a 50% chance of winning, England 33%, France 10%, all of the others having virtually no chance at all. You rate France's chance as very low, in contrast to Mr. Calhamer's putting it in third place. It would be interesting to see how you rate the chances of all the countries.

- - - - -

#### NEW BLOOD

Douglas Beyerlein (address above) mentioned in his letter new players:

Boyd Benson, 831 Grand Ave., Everett, Wash., 98201, and  
W. Gerald White, 4004 S.E. Pine, Portland, Ore., 97214.

Lee Arico, 6401 May Blvd., Alexandria, Va., 22310, wrote asking about game openings.

Barry S. Levy, 904 West Lincoln Highway, #3, DeKalb, Ill., 60115, wrote asking about diplomacy.

- - - - -

((The ideal diplomat possesses)) truth, accuracy, calm, patience, good temper, modesty, loyalty. "But", the reader may object, "you have forgotten intelligence, knowledge, discernment, prudence, hospitality, charm, industry, courage and even tact." I have not forgotten them. I have taken them for granted.

Harold Nicolson: Diplomacy.

- - - - -

EROBINGHAM is published by John McCallum, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada.