

B R O B D I N G N A G

-----  
Brobdingnag #62            1966AQ (W'06)    1966AV (W'05)            31 May 1967  
-----

Game 1966AQ

Winter 1906

MAJOR THEATRE OF WAR SHIFTS SOUTHWARD  
NAVAL EXPANSION IN MEDITERRANEAN

Fall 1906 Retreats:

GERMANY (Nelson): Army Munich to Kiel.

Build and removal orders:

RUSSIA (Reinsel): Build army Sevastopol. Build army Moscow.

FRANCE (Thompson): Build fleet Marseilles.

TURKEY (Greene): Build fleet Ankara. Build fleet Constantinople. Build army Smyrna.

GERMANY (Nelson): Remove army Kiel. Remove army Ruhr.

PRESS RELEASES

Izmir, 4 Dec. Fuat A. Pasha today discussed the full meaning of the speech of Sultan Abdul III.

"We have Turkey today", he said, "And will press our Jihad. However, excesses will try to be kept within check where at all possible. The leaders must be, and will be, realistic in our drive to make the Caliph of the Faithful the leader of the world.

"At the same time we must show the Islamic people, especially the cynical Arab and to some extent the Turk as well, that this Jihad is just. A sort of mixture of realistic and fanatic."

Moscow, 15 Dec. The Czar paid a pre-Christmas visit to the Kremlin. Before returning to St. Petersburg he made public a message which he is having transmitted to the Sultan, through the good offices of the Persian ambassador. It read:

Big Brother to Abdul Osman. You have broken a six year trust. We helped you to grow and we ignored many chances to wipe you out because we trusted you. Beware our vengeance! Big Brother has agreed to all terms of the Earl of Paris and we will use every man and boy of our "Vendetta Corps" to crush Turkey!

South of Koram, Abyssinia, 31 Dec. The Turkish army of Africa began its march on Addis Abbaba early this month. Meshat Bey expects to meet Emperor Menelek's forces, estimated at a quarter million, somewhere on the Upper Blue Nile.

The advance began badly, though, with the advance from Massaua to Asmara being repulsed. However, the amphibious troops still hold Massaua.

The British Indian army in Aden continues to gain strength but many are tied down in keeping order, as are many more potential reinforcements in India.

Paris, 6 Jan. A note addressed to Turkey has been made public by the

Foreign Office. It read:

Again France advises Turkey, Tunis, Tuscany, and the Tyrrhenian Sea are off limits to Turkish fleets. You are warned, we will fight to kill if attacked.

The above moves and Press Releases were sent to the players by carbon copy letter, dated 23 May 1967. The deadline for moves for Spring 1967 was set at Wednesday, 7 June 1967.

Game 1966AV

Winter 1905

**AUSTRIAN WIRELESS STILL SENDING!**

The adjustments:

GERMANY (Shagrin): Build army Munich. Build army Berlin. Build army Kiel.

ENGLAND (Wells): Remove fleet Edinburgh.

RUSSIA (Zelazny): Build army Sevastopol.

ITALY (Francis): Build army Rome.

AFRICA (Munroe): Remove army Tyrolia.

Monte Zelazny, playing Russia in the game, will be away from his usual address for two weeks, beginning June 4. His mail will be forwarded but there will, inevitably, be delays. To permit him to have an opportunity of negotiating the deadline for moves for Spring 1967 is accordingly set at three weeks from today, Wednesday 21 June 1967. Hopefully this will also allow the two games to be brought once more into step.

**PRESS RELEASE**

Zurich, 1 Feb. Swiss Military Wireless receiving stations report that signals are still heard coming from Lower Austria, apparently from Vienna itself. Unlike the many messages from Tyrolia, which are in code, these messages are in clear. Apparently the units sending them are on the run before the Prussian invaders and have lost their code books. The messages, addressed to Austrian army commanders in Belgrade, invariably conclude with the words, "Leben Sie wohl!"

There's but the twinkling of a star  
Between a man of peace and war.

- Samuel Butler

("Hudibras" Samuel Butler that is, not "Way of All Flesh" Samuel Butler. I suppose that Rod Walker has a pre-emptive right to all quotes from the latter. A pity, as there are many good ones in "The Notebooks!")

BROBDINGNAG Completed Game Rating List - #7.

BROBDINGNAG would like to congratulate James Latimer on his win in Game 1966E in Diplophobia. Well, the win is not quite official yet as, under Diplophobia house rules, the win is not declared until the builds and removals are actually submitted; however all that remains is the formality of his submitting his build order.

Jim Latimer, as most will know, is about the most active around, being in more than thirty games. He is also, practically speaking, the official stand-by player for all games in the Diplomania family - those of them that he doesn't enter when they are formed, he enters later when someone drops out. Jim, too, is well known as a completist collector of Diplomacy '2 nes. He has a Graustark #1 which I envy him. Our heartiest congratulations to him on his win.

This win for Russia is the second win for that country. All countries which have won once in 7-man games have now won at least twice. The two hold outs, which haven't won at all, are France and Germany. In this game Turkey was the first to be eliminated. England, played in its final stages by the new comer, Richard Bryant, was the second to the winner. The result is to bring, in the country list, the two perennial front-runners much closer together. The game, incidentally, ended in 1907, as did game 1966D; they are the two shortest 7-man games on record.

The listing below includes games 1963A, B, 1964A, B, C, D, 1965A, E, H, I, L, S, T, 1966D, E, AP. The first and the last, being 5-man games, are omitted from the country listing.

+24 John Smythe (W)	+ 2 Dave Lebling
	Mark Owings
+10 John Koning	Jock Root
	Gail Schow
+ 9 Banks Mebane	
Derek Nelson (W)	+ 1 Bill Christian
	Ken Davidson
+ 8 Donald Miller (W)	Anders Swenson
	Robert Ward
+ 7 Frank Clark	
	0 Len Bailes
+ 6 James Latimer (W)	Christina Brannen
John McCallum (W)	John Davey
Bruce Pelz (W)	Ben Hendin
Charles Wells (W)	Alan Huff (W)
	Geo. Parks
+ 5 Rick Brooks	
	- 1 Earl Thompson
+ 4 Eric Blake	
John Boardman (W)	- 2 Bob Adams
Richard Bryant	Ron Daniels
Robert Lake	James Dygert
James MacKenzie (W)	James Goldman
Dian Pelz	Gregory Molenaar
Charles Turner (W)	Charles Reinsel
	James Sanders.

- 3 Ron Bounds  
Conrad von Metzke
- 4 Clint Bigglestone  
Margaret Gemignani  
Jack Harness  
John Mazor  
Dave McDaniel  
Roland Tzudiker
- 5 Tom Bulmer  
Jerald Jacks  
Stuart Keshner  
Stephen Patt
- 6 Sidney Get  
Bernie Kling  
Don Recklies  
Joel Sattel
- 10 Charles Brannan  
Richard Schultz
- 12 Fred Lerner
- 15 Paul Harley

#### The Country List

Turkey	+18	60.7%
England	+16	59.5
Austria	+ 1	50.8
France	- 2	48.5
Russia	- 8	45.2
Italy	- 8	45.2
Germany	-17	39.9

It has frequently been objected that these lists tend to award mere activity, that a player who is in many games will get a fairly high score even if he doesn't do very well in any of his games. That is certainly true of the Centre-year rating system, although not of the Glockorla modification of it, which is an averaging scheme. The EROB listing has the odd feature that activity may help or hinder, depending on whether the player does better or worse than most players. A player whose triumphs are exactly balanced by his disasters will have a score near zero, whether he is rated on two games or on

twenty. But a player who consistently does a little better than average will get a higher score the more games he is in. Conversely, a player who does a little worse than average will have his score lowered by playing in many games. A case of this is Charles Brannan. He has had no absolute disasters but has done a little worse than the average player in most of his games. By dint, however, of playing many games he has contrived to force his score down to a point comparable with those of Fred Lerner and Paul Harley, who were always the first to be wiped out in the two or three games that they played.

So to even out the effect of the different number of games on which the various players are rated, it seemed that it might be a good idea to give the average score for each player. The scale is per mil, that is a player who has played many games and won them all gets a score of 1000; one who has played many games and been the first eliminated in them all gets 0. Other players in proportion to where they stand between these two extremes. Those who prefer the more familiar percentage scale, need only insert a decimal point between the last two digits.

#### EROB Average Rating List.

John Smythe	722
Banks Mebane	688
James Latimer	667
Don Miller	
Bruce Pelz	
Charles Turner	
Charles Wells	
Frank Clark	646
Rick Brooks	639

Derek Nelson 622  
 John Koning 619  
 Eric Blake 611  
 Richard Bryant  
 Bill Christian  
 Bob Lake  
 Dian Pelz  
 John Boardman 583  
 John McCallum  
 Gail Schow  
 Dave Lebling 556  
 James MacKenzie  
 Mark Owings 542  
 Jock Root  
 Ken Davidson 528  
 Anders Swenson  
 Robert Ward  
 Len Bailes 500  
 Christina Brannan  
 John Davey  
 Ben Hendon  
 Alan Huff  
 Geo. Parks  
 Earl Thompson 483  
 James Goldman 458  
 Charles Reinsel  
 Conrad von Metzke 450  
 Ron Daniels 444  
 James Dygert  
 Gregory Molenaar  
 James Sanders  
 Ron Bounds 438  
 Bob Adams 417  
 Jack Harness  
 Charles Brannan 396  
 Margaret Gemignani 389  
 Roland Tzudiker  
 John Mazor

Jerald Jacks 361  
 Stephen Patt  
 Clint Bigglestone 333  
 Sidney Get  
 Stuart Keshner  
 Bernie Kling  
 Dave McDaniel  
 Don Recklies  
 Joel Sattel  
 Dick Schultz  
 Tom Bulmer 306  
 Paul Harley 250  
 Fred Leber 200

It is hard to say whether this is an improvement or not. It brings those who have very high, or very low, scores, due to their being rated on many games, closer to the centre, relative to those who are rated on only one or two games.

I expect that this rating will be closer to the Glock one than is the standard BROB list; but it will not correspond with it exactly, due to the different criteria used.

For more on rating lists see the letter from Chris Wagner, elsewhere in this issue.

- - - - -

# SEALED BAG

Hal Naus, 288 Broadway, Space 139,  
 Chula Vista, Calif., 92010.

I am no longer lenient about players' moves! When I used to have it printed a week after the schedule date, I was lenient about moves a day late, but since I print my own I am no longer!

((+(Take notice, all you ADAG players, Hal is no longer lenient about late moves. That he means what he says is shown by his second letter, on the next page.-jamcc)+))

Hal Maus. (Address above.): I still had two players who missed moves ((in ADAG #15)). It's kind of funny in a way, because I started Saturday after the 4 P.M. deadline to run off the magazine. I wanted to get it done quickly as I am having troubles with my typewriter - the ribbon change is not functioning right - so, consequently I didn't get the results I wanted. But the fun part: I finished running off the magazine Sunday morning and by 1 P.M. I was stapling the last batch together, and putting the labels and stamps on, when a mail truck pulled up in front of my trailer. I was talking to Larry Peery (Xenogogio) at the time. When I started to laugh, he wanted to know what was so funny. I told him about the mail truck and said I bet there are some Special Delivery letters for me, and, sure enough, there were two letters. Since it was past the deadline and I had already run off the magazine I couldn't accept them as moves. I enclosed a note to the two players explaining why I wouldn't accept them and why, in future I still would not accept similar moves. I sure hope that it sinks in.

Another note on players not sending in moves. In Game... I replaced a player with a new player because the original player failed to submit moves and builds. So what happens? The replacement player doesn't send in his moves either!

((+(Join the club. Your current method of dealing with moves received late is much the same as that used in BROB. Stenciling of Spring and Fall moves is not begun until the announced deadline date. Through a local house rule retreat and build and removal orders, however, may be put on stencil as soon as moves have been received from all players concerned. Any moves received after moves are on stencil are too late. I'll admit that in the way I do it there is a loop-hole for chance. A player whose move is a day late might just possibly have his move accepted if, on that issue, I happen to be delayed myself and so have not cut the stencils. Mostly, though, the movement orders are typed out on the deadline date, so that a delayed move can not be accepted.

Most readers will probably know by now that ADAG has, with its latest issue, divided itself into three publications: ADAG, which will carry standard games at a normal rate of speed; Costa II, which has standard games some of whose players live in Europe and so must be run at a slower speed; and T.S.II, which carries variant games. All of these have game openings for additional games. Those writing Hal should note the space number given with his address on the previous page. It seems that some of his mail has been delayed due to that feature being omitted or wrong. -jamcc)+))

SSgt. C. R. Wagner, Box 6008, APO San Francisco, Calif., 96328:

I was particularly interested in John Smythe's letter on rating systems ((BROB #60)). I think both of you have a point or two: (1) the rating systems are all a bit complex and hard to interpret unless you put in some time, and (2) their major justification is their value to the newer players. With this in mind, I would like your thoughts on a possible answer (like anyone who has been in Postal Diplomacy more than two weeks, I have my own rating system). I suggest that the current systems continue to be compiled (they will be anyway) and that a general categorization be developed that would take all systems into account. For instance:

Category A: John Smythe and anyone else who attains his level.

Category B: All regular Diplomacy winners and all those who appear within the range of winners on ALL rating lists. If we use, for an example, just the BROB list in #60, everyone between John Koning and Alan Huff, inclusive, would be considered a B player. If any of these players are not listed within the range of winners on any other list, they would be C players.

Category C: Everyone else who has completed a Postal Diplomacy game (standard game - whatever that is).

Thus the new player has a quick reference giving the following information: Who is outstanding? Who is considerably above average? Who has experience? Does he need anything more?

((+Well, Chris, as we know, the Postal Chess players have used the four categories of A, B, C, and D players for years and something similar for Diplomacy would seem to be an excellent idea. I must say, though, that there appear to be two objections to your scheme as presented here.

First, a person's category will depend far more on what John Smythe does, and on what the lowest rated winner does, than on what he does himself. It is true, of course, that every rating score is a meaningless figure by itself, and only takes on meaning when seen in relation to the scores of other players. But the comparison should be with all the other players, or with the bulk of them, and not with two specified individuals.

In BROB #52, published early last February, appears the most recent edition of the BROB Current game Rating List, which rates players not only of completed games but of games in progress as well. I have discontinued publishing it because, partly, of laziness: it takes a great deal more in the way of detailed record keeping than does a completed game listing. But partly also because of a curious incident. Smythe ceased play last winter in a Graustark game in which he was playing. The country was re-assigned but the new player was soon eliminated. Now under the BROB system such early annihilations are charged to the initial player, not to the player who is required to salvage what he can from the ruin. With the result that Smythe's score drops by 6 points. If we were to apply your scheme to this list, Koning, Wells, and I, would suddenly become A class players. Not on account of anything which we have done ourselves, our own scores are just what they were before, 'give or take a point, but because Smythe's score dropped.

Similarly, should the lowest ranking winner, at present Huff, win his next game, a number of people who now would be rated as B players, would be dropped to the C category. Or if he is wiped out early in the next game, so that his rating is much lower than at present many C players would be immediately elevated to B status. Including, possibly, Dave McDaniel, for example, who hasn't played for 3 years.

So if we are to have this grouping scheme at all, the demarcation points must be made dependent on many players, not just one.

That is perhaps a rather theoretical point. The other

is more practical. By insisting that the B player must be within the range of winners in ALL rating lists you are, in fact, making the whole thing depend on one listing alone, namely the Reinsel Rating system. In the Reinsel system it is far more difficult for a non-winner to advance far than is the case in the other systems. A player who gets a tie, or who is a strong second, will in the other systems get nearly as many points as he would have if he had won in most of the systems. Not so in the Reinsel system where a win always gets very much more than anything else.

Look at Banks Lebane and John Honing. They have each had a drawn game and they have each done well in several other games. In all the rating lists, except the Reinsel one, they are up very close to the top. Lebane is actually in the top position, ahead of Smythe in the Glock list. But in the Reinsel rating list they both rank below the lowest winner. They could, of course, become B players, even on the basis of the Reinsel listing. Let them both finish strongly in their next two games they would, even without winning, draw level with Huff on the Reinsel list. But it will always be the Reinsel list, and no other list, which will be the deciding one, since it is the list where it is most difficult for a non-winner to advance.

So, in effect, your requirements could be stated more simply: On the Reinsel rating list draw a line beneath John Smythe's name, and beneath the name of the man who is the lowest rated game winner. All above the first line are A class players, all between the two lines are B class players, all others are C class players.

I don't say that the Reinsel Listing is a bad one to tie the scheme to, if it must be tied to one listing. But one should be aware that, in practice, it is tied to one listing and not to others.

Perhaps what we should really have is not a rating list, as such, at all, but rather a tabulation of the performance of the players. A sort of racing form of Diplomacy players. To take, as an example, a few well known players we would get a listing as follows:

Charles Brannan	3S 3E	5C 1CE	V	May 64
John Honing	1D 1B 1S	2R 7C		May 64
Derek Nelson	1W 2B 2S	4C 2CE	V	May 63
John Smythe	4W	1S 2E 1C	1CR V	Mar 64
Conrad von Metzke	2S 1E	6C 5CE 1CR		Jan 65

The 4W after Smythe's name means that he has won 4 times. 1D for Honing means that he has drawn a game. 2B for Nelson means that twice he has been the runner-up (B for best-of-the-rest). S gives the number of completed games which the player survived without winning, drawing, or coming second. R indicates resignations from games which have since been completed. I haven't thought it worth while to differentiate between players who have formally resigned and those who have just dropped out; it would often be difficult to decide, depending on the editorial policy of the magazine concerned. C represents current games in progress in which the player is enrolled. CE current games in progress from which the player has already been



eliminated. CR, a game in progress from which he has resigned. V that he is in one or more variant (major variant, that is) games. The date shown is the date of his first entry into a magazine postal game. There would then be an additional column with another date to indicate the date of the last move made by a player who is no longer active. All of these that I have chosen for examples are most damnably active so that that feature doesn't appear here. (In reading this table don't put too much weight on the figures for current games. I am using them for purposes of example but they are not accurate. Those for completed games are, I believe, accurate.)

This sort of listing would give the reader, in summarized and somewhat pre-digested form, the data. If, like the Reinsel system, he thinks that a win is the important thing, and that ties are unimportant in comparison, then he need only pay attention to the first column. If, like most of the other rating lists, he thinks that a draw, or a second best position is only a little less desirable than a win, then he can study those columns as well. And so on.

Notice that such a listing need not be confined to players in completed games. There would be no reason why any player in a current game could not be listed.

For such a listing to be complete the entire Postal Diplomacy careers of some 175 individuals would have to be studied. Only a semi-lunatic could be induced to prepare such a list. But that need prove no insuperable impediment in Postal Diplomacy, where mild lunatics abound. The full listing need only be published every six months or so with intervening issues giving amendments only. It would certainly be a lot more work than a rating list but perhaps it would be more useful. -jamcc+))

Douglas Beyerlein, 3934 S. W. Southern, Seattle, Wash., 98116.

But for my sake I wish to continue ((the discussion in BROB #60)) a bit further. In Graustark #128 you will notice that I am the second stand-by for Boardman's new game 1967U, as I was too late to enter the game. Now, I received Grau #127 announcing the two new games about five days after Dr. Boardman mailed it first class. Immediately I sent the game fee and asked to be in the game; the letter was sent Air Mail the day I received Grau. I have just received Grau #128 and found out that I have been beaten out by at least 16 other players. This proves my original point that a 'zine well established and well known like Graustark only has to announce a new game and within a week or two all the game positions are filled. But an inexperienced 'zine must wait a lengthy period of time before enough people ask to enter a game. Therefore, to say plan to start a new game in September one must start looking for players in say June or July at the latest. Well this is okay, but who wants to pay for a game three months in advance. At this time (when paying) one does not feel that his payment is accomplishing anything at the present. This is the same as the reason that Social Security in the United States is not on a voluntary basis. Hence fee not until first move.

By the way, remember I asked you what you would do when a player did not send in the Spring 1901 move. I failed to mention that the player had paid his fee before the game started. This does change the situation and there is no real way to prevent it.

((+(As you say, there is no real way to prevent a player missing his

first move, any more than there is any way to prevent him missing any other. But to insist on the fee with the application will at least insure that he really intends to play when he makes the application. Without it there is no assurance that he is not just being vaguely benevolent when he says, "Put me in your first game, when you start that magazine of yours."

Of course it is true that a magazine with Graustark's reputation can fill a game more readily than other 'zines can. I don't think anyone would dispute that. Note, though, that Boardman asked for fees with application on those two new games that you mention. In principle at least, I think that that has always been the Graustark policy, tho' he may occasionally have accepted the oddplayer who didn't understand that fact.

Well, this is a question of game management and, as such, must always remain in the hands of the particular gamesmaster concerned. In EROB fees will be demanded with application. -jamcc)+))

William Lee Linden, 83-33 Austin Street, Kew Gardens, New York, 11415.

As far as fantasy derived names for 'zines go how about the works of the late Eric R. Edlison? I should be proud to play in Ouroboros or Krothering. Carce? Horasp? Koshtra? Possibilities are almost endless.

((+(Endless or not, at the rate at which new Diplomacy 'zines are appearing they may all eventually be needed. My own choice for the ideal name for a Diplomacy journal, and adhering to the tradition of naming them after fictional places, would be Serendip, from the 17th century tale, "The Three Princes of Serendip". In fact, if Dick Schultz could have been persuaded last summer to resume the publication of BROEDINGWAG, that was what I intended to call my own 'zine.

The word "serendipity", the faculty of making happy chance discoveries, is derived from the name of the story and not vice-versa. I always think that Becquerel was the most serendipitous of physicists. Perhaps John Boardman could be persuaded to to give us a professional's opinion. jamcc)+))

- - - - -

SerendIP, I mean BROEDINGWAG, is a journal of Postal Diplomacy. It currently reports the progress of games 1966AQ and 1966AV. It is edited and published by John McCallum, Halston, Alberta, Canada. The price is ten cents a copy and subscriptions can be entered for any number of issues at the same price. Copies are available of most back issues, at least from #25, also for a dime. Trades are solicited from all other Postal Diplomacy editors on an all for all basis.