

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

Broddingnag #82

Letter Issue

30 April 1968

## Game 1966AI

Game 1966AI has recently ended in ADAG. BROB's congratulations to the winner, John Beshara, playing Russia. John has a very high reputation as a player among the New York group and it is a pleasure to see him win a game in postal play. There is a supply centre chart in ADAG 27, and it appears also in stab 46.

## Game 1967LK

Game 1967LK has recently ended in Big Brother. Again a first win, and again for Russia. Our congratulations to the winner Thomas Griffin. As Big Brother does not normally publish a centre-year chart one is give below.

	<u>1901</u>	<u>02</u>	<u>03</u>	<u>04</u>	<u>05</u>	<u>06</u>	<u>07</u>
England	4	4	6	7	8	10	10
France	3	2	1	1	OUT		
Germany	3	3	3	2	OUT		
Italy	3	3	4/3	2	1	OUT	
Austria	6	5/4	4	3	1	1	1
Russia	6	8	9	11	15/11	17/15	18 and wins!
Turkey	4	5	6	8	9	6	5

The gamesmaster, Charles Reinsel. The players: England, Edl Birsan. France, Margaret Gemignani, disorder after 1902. Germany, Solebury School Diplomacy Club, represented by Greg Warden. Italy, Roland Tzudiker, disorder after Fall 1904. Austria, Karl Wittmann, disorder after Spring 1907. Russia, Thomas Griffin. Turkey, Michael Childers.

It is remarkable that a game begun in mid-1967 is already completed. Of course, it was a rather short game, ending in 1907, and Big Brother has a reputation for running its games promptly. Still it is surprising when one considers that there are still three 1965 games not yet completed. The oldest of them was begun approximately two and a half years prior to the game mentioned above.

## The Rating List

The last issue of BROB contained a complete Rating List, both for completed games and for games in progress. John Moning has pointed out several errors in it. One of the most serious was in the score for Monte Zelazny which was two points too low on both listings. The corrections still further improve his standing in the ten top names listing given on page 13 of the last issue. There were about eight other errors as well.

The two games recently completed and listed above, the rrors mentioned,

and the normal wear and tear of the intervening two months, give rise to the Rating List Revision given below. The letter M after an entry indicates a mistake in the entry given in the last issue. Games now listed are the following: 1963A, B, 1964A, B, D, 1965A, B, D, E, F, G, H, I, L, M, O, Q, R, S, T, U, 1966B, D, L, M, O, AA, AI, AK, AM, AP, AQ, AU, AV, BJ, 1967AK. The three games underlined were 5-man games and so are not counted in the country listing.

The country listing.

Turkey	+39	59.6%
England	+28	56.9
France	+ 8	52.0
Russia	+ 7	51.7
Italy	-15	46.3
Germany	-32	42.1
Austria	-35	41.4

The personal listings.

Charles Alexander	-12; 19%;	(-30)	
Hugh Anderson		(+2)	
John Austin		(+7)	M
Brian Bailey	- 8; 31%;	(-12)	
John Beshara (W)	+ 6; 75%;	(+5)	
Edi Birsan	- 7; 42%;	(+3)	M
Dan Brannan	- 7; 43%;	(-9)	
Michael Childers	+ 2; 62%;	(+2)	
Frank Clark	+ 2; 55%;	(+9)	
Sid Cochran		(+3)	
Deborah Deutsch		(-6)	
James Dygert (W)	+12; 69%;	(+20)	
Louis Gallo		(+1)	
Leonard Garland	- 8; 31%;	(-7)	
Margaret Gemignani	-17; 16%;	(-29)	
Sidney Get	- 6; 25%;	(-12)	
Jack Greene, Jr.	+ 4; 67%;	(+9)	
Thomas Griffin (W)	+ 6; 69%;	(+5)	
George Heap		(+3)	
Sherry Heap		(+2)	
Trevor Hearndon		(+2)	
Wayne Hoheisel		(+2)	
Stephen Hueston		(+2)	
Allan Huff (W)	- 6; 38%;	(+10)	
Glyde Johnson		(-8)	
Wade Johnston		(+2)	
John Koning (W)	+25; 73%;	(+26)	M

Bob Lake	+4; 67%;	(+6)	
James Latimer (W)	+6; 65%;	(+9)	M
Dave Lebling	-5; 38%;	(+8)	
Paul Leitch		(+3)	
Wm Lee Linden	+2; 58%;	(+3)	M
Greg Long	-4; 33%;	(+8)	
Mark Lyon		(+1)	
John McCallum (W)	+15; 66%;	(+24)	
James MacKenzie (W)	+6; 60%;	(+6)	
Mike Miller		(+3)	
Paul Moslander		(+1)	
Fritz Mulhauser		(-2)	
James Munroe	-2; 42%;	(-1)	
Hal Naus	+2; 58%;	(+13)	
Derek Nelson (W)	+15; 63%;	(+20)	
Harold Peck	+4; 67%;	(+10)	
Larry Peery	+4; 67%;	(+15)	
Bud Pendergrass (W)	+6; 75%;	(+9)	
Jerry Fournelle (W)	+10; 74%;	(+14)	
Eugene Prosnitz		(+11)	
Charles Reinsel (W)	+12; 67%;	(+16)	
Charles Roland		(+2)	
John Smythe (W)	+20; 67%;	(+20)	
Solebury SDC	-5; 29%;	(-5)	
Bill Stewart	-6; 25%;	(-10)	
Anders Swenson	-1; 47%;	(-5)	
Charles Turner (W)	+13; 75%;	(+23)	
Roland Tzudiker	-14; 21%;	(-22)	
Conrad von Metzke (W)			
	-3; 48%;	(-8)	
Rod Walker	+9; 78%;	(+19)	
Greg Warden		(-13)	M
Charles Wells (W)	+25; 90%;	(+29)	M
Gerald White		(+2)	
Karl Wittmann	0; 50%;	(0)	
Monte Zelazny (W)	+18; 87%;	(+23)	M

I would like to thank John Koning for the care with which he has gone over the previously published figures, thus ensuring that errors do not remain uncorrected.

As most readers will know, John Koning has recently taken over the Diplomacy Roster, originated by John Boardman in Graustark, and more recently maintained by Charles Wells. It could not be in better hands as there is little in the Diplomacy world which escapes John's attention.

Sealed Bag.

Eugene Prosnitz, 200 Clinton St., Brooklyn, NY, 11201.:

I found your article on missed moves interesting. ((BROB #81)). Personally, I like the Boardman method, as it minimizes the number of missed moves. Even though I've been the beneficiary of missed moves by enemies, and have never missed a set myself, I still feel it often distorts a game and gives people an unfair advantage if their neighbors miss moves.

Often the whole game can be affected by the missed move. In Graustark's 1967V, England and France were/are allied against Germany. Germany had eight units, including most of Russia and Scandinavia, and a long, even battle was in prospect. However, Germany missed one extremely critical move season, had three pieces annihilated, and the balance of power radically shifted, making Germany's demise certain, barring a shift in alliances.

Thus, even under the Boardman method, missed moves can wreck a position. However, at least under Boardman's approach, no country misses two moves in a row, and the other players have to earn their victory. Contrast this with some of the Big Brother games, where players win by default, and achieve undeserved victories, not through especially good play, but simply because almost everybody else's pieces are stationary.

However, even Boardman's rule could be improved by allowing the person who missed moves to retreat, as Miller allows. Very often the fact that the dislodged piece is annihilated is even more costly than the fact that a move was missed. Since retreats are customarily submitted with the next set of moves, with conditional moves allowed accordingly, no time would be lost by permitting these retreats.

Actually, I think the best system is to have substitutes make the moves for the players who miss them, although obviously this puts an extra burden on the gamesmaster, especially those who run numerous games. Larry Peery was doing this for a while, the only trouble was that he wasn't consistent and didn't do it in all cases. True, a player may intentionally miss moves and hope that the substitute will double cross his "ally", but is this really any different than a direct stab? If it happened to me, I'd be highly dubious about continuing the alliance. (Actually it did happen to me in Xenogotic's X-2. I was England, and stabbed Germany. I would have gotten three builds, except that, on the very same move, the German player missed moves and his substitute stabbed me, so I only got one build.)

Regarding rating systems, I still feel that you would obtain a more accurate reflection of positions in a game if you rated current games according to current supply centre count. It can make quite a difference; my own rating is, I believe, plus 8, but would be plus 33, if based on present position in all games, not

counting games just starting. When these seven games end, my rating for those games will probably be around 25, so that the rating of 8 is unrealistic.

Conversely, take the case of Tom Griffin, who is rated, as I recall, at 11. He is about to be eliminated in two games (he has one unit in each). When that happens, his rating will plummet from 11 to 2, despite the fact that his overall status in all his games remains unchanged. He might actually have bettered his position in these other games, yet the fact that he lost that last meaningless supply center will cause a drastic and unrealistic change in his rating.

One thing I will say on behalf of your system: It encourages people to fight on in hopeless positions, which is for the good of the game.

Incidentally, can a substitute request that a game be counted for him, in advance of termination. For example, if it obvious that a substitute will finish in the top three, why not give him the credit now, on the current game list?

((+(For a contrary view on the anonymous replacement system see Monte Zelazny's letter in Armageddonia #32. Diplomacy is not a determinate game, like noughts-and-crosses, nor even like Chess, where there is often a best move. As its own publicity states, it is a game with a personal element. The psychological factor is dominant. The usual situation for a Diplomacy player to be in is to have to try to out-guess his opponent. If the latter is to play so-and-so then A is his own best set of moves, if thus-and-thus, then B, and so on. The play he makes will not be what he considers the best set of moves in general, but what he considers the best set of moves given that his opponent is the particular individual he is. Under such circumstances to allow moves by anonymous players is, in my opinion, to slip an extra Joker in the deck. I think it makes a travesty of the game. An anonymous player, bound by instructions from the original player is, I think, as far as you can go in that direction and stay within the bounds of respectability. I would never knowingly play in a game with an anonymous replacement player rule, although I think I was once, as a replacement player, briefly in such a game.

For Rating systems have you see Slab 47 where Moning develops your system, although only for completed games. To extend it to current games would involve a prohibitive amount of work. As far as the EROB Current Game Rating List is concerned it will continue as it is; I have no intention of bringing supply centres into a scheme which is based on quite different principles.

The replacement player is always credited with any positive score, in the Current game listing. If he is later eliminated then, of course, there is a change made and the minus score is debited to the initial player. The Current Game Rating List is meant to show the potential of the players; it is the player currently playing a position who has that potential, whether it is in the outcome realized or not, and in all cases the current player gets the plus scores.  
-jamcc+))

Rod Walker, 1611 Lowry Drive, Rantoul, Ill., 61866:

Oh, tragedy! Now I have a rating sytem. For players. And countries. And all like that. ...wow...

Anyway, I am not happy with any of the present systems. I don't understand Lebling's. Reinsel's is hopelessly arbitrary. Yours also, in a way. The Centre-Year system is, well, yech. I asked myself, if I were a country at war, what would be my objectives? Obviously, in this order:

1. To win.
  - a. In fact, to win as fast as possible
2. To stalemate
3. To survive to the end.
  - a. To survive with as much power as possible.
4. To survive as long as possible.

The national objectives are obvious, and so is their priority. But no rating system gives any consideration to 1a or 4. What I have done is to give a point value to the achieving of any of these objectives based on the multi-player concept. Mine, unlike others, does not give minus scores. Further, the final result is an average, not a compilation, so number of games played does not count. My system:

<u>Objective</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	players
Win	10	8	7	
Draw (2 way)	7	6	5	
Draw (3 way)	5	4	3	
Survival, 2nd place	5	4	3	
Survival to end of game	3	3	2	
Survival through 1910	2	2	1	
Survival through 1955	1	1	0	
Eliminated in or before 1905	0	0	0	

Bonus points based on average growth rate based on average growth rate (final total of supply centers, less starting total, divided by total years). G. R. of over 1.00 = 1 pt; G. R. of 1.51 or higher = 2 pts.

Points for all games are averaged. Any country or player averaging less than 3.00 is not "surviving". In the event of a tie for 2nd place, tie is broken by centre-year total (if no significant difference, duplicate award of points is made.

Other rules:

1. A substitute or stand-by player will automatically collect his score if 3 or more; he will not if 2 or less.
2. Any player who resigns from a game without cause, or drops out, receives a score of 0. Players who resign with cause receive no score, or penalty.
3. Substitutions in original game lists made in or before Spring 1901 are not counted as substitutions.
4. A substitute player who takes over a country which is at the time above average in size or in no current military difficulty will receive the score of that country, regardless of subsequent military fortune.
5. A "draw" can only be between major powers. A country with 1 or 2 units only, which survives a game otherwise drawn between its larger competitors, will receive the survival points only.
6. It is possible for more than one player to receive points for a country. Thus, given country A, played by: W(droS02), X (droF06), Y (resS08), and Z (won F12), their respective scores would be: W, 0; X, 0; Y, none; Z, 10 with perhaps a bonus point. Only Z receives the country's score; W and X are penalized for dropping.

After working with this for some time, it seems to me an effective way of indicating how well countries and players are doing. ...Below are the country results.

<u>Country</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>GLOCK</u> <u>Standing</u>	<u>BROB</u> <u>Standing</u>
Turkey	4.12	1	1
England	3.87	2	2
Russia	3.58	3	4
France	3.35	4	3
Italy	3.13	6	5
Germany	2.92	5	6
Austria	2.65	7	7

Now for a bit of a shock. My personal ratings. Would you like to guess who is not in the top 10? Would you like to believe Derek Nelson? John Smythe? Etc. Here's my list, using only those with two or more games reported (W is a won game, + is a drawn game):

9.20	Wells (5WWW)	Reinsel (7W+)
8.33	Hiller (3WW)	Smythe (9WWW+)
7.75	Zelazny (4WW)	4.60 MacKenzie (5W)
7.67	Pournelle (3WW)	4.00 Clark (3+)
7.00	Latimer (3W+)	Root (2)
	Hebane (2+)	3.90 McCallum (10W+)
6.33	Berman (3W+)	3.62 von Metzke (13W+)
	Turner (3W+)	3.50 Huff (4W)
6.00	Walker (2++)	3.00 Castora (3W)
5.62	Koning (8W++)	Davidson (2)
5.00	Dygert (3WW)	- - - survival level - - -
	Kuch (2+)	2.50 Aita (2)
	Nelson (8WW)	Bounds (2)

2.50 Owings (2)  
 Ward (4)  
 2.43 E. Thompson (7)  
 2.33 Borden (3)  
 Peck (3)  
 2.18 D. Brannen (11)  
 2.00 ~~Sebow~~ (2)  
 1.75 Tzudiker (4)  
 1.67 Lake (3)  
 1.50 Chalker (4)  
 Duncan (2)  
 Goldman (4)  
 McDaniel (2)

1.40 Birsan (5)  
 1.33 H arness (3)  
 Lebling (3)  
 - - - initial survival level - - -  
 0.67 Garland (3)  
 Lerner (3)  
 Schultz (3)  
 0.50 Bailey (2)  
 0.25 Genignani (4)  
 0.00 Jacks (3)  
 Kling (2)

Some players whom I am sure are not active are omitted. Some others probably should be. Note what would happen to the list if I required 4 or 5 completed games before inclusion. I probably will later.

((+What was that again? Reinsel's system is hopelessly arbitrary? Arbitrariness aside I think you are being somewhat unfair to other Rating Lists. You say that no rating list gives any consideration to your points 1a and 4. The Glock listing considers both. And the EROB listing considers point 4, although not 1a.

Notice that, with the exception of Reinsel's, all the Completed Game listings published today use some sort of averaging. The EROB, The EROB Rating List in its percentage form is an averaging scheme. The Prosnitz-Koning list recently published in stab is an averaging scheme. The Glock List has been averaged over games played since its beginning. What is more, all of these average lists produce very much the same result. If you turn to page 13 of the last issue of EROB and look at the top 10 names in the EROB percentage list you will note how similar it is to your listing. The top 4 names are the same on both lists with one interchange of position. What differences there are are more due to games counted than anything else. I list Pelz and Pendergrass, you do not since each was rated on only one game. You list Castora as a winner, I do not since the game in question was not a postal game. But these administrative details aside the two listings are closely similar. Your listing is also very similar to the latest edition of the Glock one; and to the Prosnitz-Koning one. In the latter, if I can persuade Koning to change the shaping factor he used, the similarity will become greater yet.

In a sense I think that the attempt to obtain a better completed game listing is labour wasted. All of the present ones give much the same result. One may prefer one to another, but there really isn't much to choose. Where the interest is today is in getting a better Current Game Rating List. The only one now published is the EROB one. It is, what you term a compilation, not an average. An averaging scheme would be far superior, but the difficulties of producing one, for a current game listing, are quite considerable.



Consider two players, each of whom have played three games, two of which they won, and in the other being strong contenders with, say, 9 forces at end of play. In all averaging rating lists these two players will have equal, or closely equal scores. Taking the Prosnitz-Koning scheme as typical of the others the score of each would be something like

$$\frac{18 + 18 + 9}{3} = 15.00$$

Now suppose that one of these players has just finished one of these three games. He expects to enter another game soon but, for the moment, is active in no regular game. His score in a Current Game version of this rating list will again be 15.00.

The other player, however, is more active. He is in two games. One of them is at 1903 and he is forging ahead and now has 7 forces on the board. The other is at 1907 and in it he now has 13 forces. I.e., he is doing very well in both his games in progress, and may perhaps win one or both of them. If we treat these current games on a par with completed games his score in a current game listing according to the above scheme would be

$$\frac{18 + 18 + 9 + 7 + 13}{5} = 11.00$$

i.e. he has been penalized 4 whole points compared with his rival, merely because he is active. And not because he is doing poorly in the current games, he is in fact doing much better than average. Moreover this penalty for activity will be the greater the more active the player is.

Obviously, games in progress can not be treated as though they were finished. These games will have to be weighted so as to decrease their importance compared with finished games. Unfortunately, there is no very evident weighting scale that we should use. Suppose that, completely arbitrarily, we set up the following weights:

Any game still in progress in 1910 or later	0.8
1909	0.7
1908	0.6
1907	0.5
1906	0.4
1905	0.3
1904	0.2
1901, 1902, 1903	0.1

The player in the example then gets the score

$$\frac{18 + 18 + 9 + 0.1(7) + 0.5(13)}{3.6} = 14.5$$

Presumably this is a much better estimate of what he deserves

The choosing of a fair set of weights to use would be a tricky business. If they are too high, the active player will be penalized in comparison with the less active player. If they are too

low, then the current game listing will just reproduce the completed game listing, with a little embroidery on it, and not give a true picture of what is actually going on at the moment. (This is, more or less, what Prosntiz' objection to the BROB current game listing list is. See his letter above.)

It does seem to me that the requirement now is for something along these lines. I.e. a Rating List which would allow every game to be assessed up to the last set of build orders, and reduced to some sort of mean or percentage scale. Still another completed game listing, which merely puts Miller 0.023 points ahead of Pournelle, instead of being 0.008 points behind him, doesn't seem to me to accomplish very much. -jamcc+))

John Koning, 2008 Sherman, Apt. 1, Evanston, Ill., 60201:

There are few enough people who were in postal Diplomacy around its beginnings that are still around. Only Nelson and Boardman remain from 1963A, unless I am mistaken, and most of the players from 1963B (original cast) have likewise vanished. I can see myself in 25 years putting out DWE Pub #1000 and still trying to get my Ph. D. from N. U.

The other night I ran correlation coefficients between countries in the McCallum, Reinsel, Lebling, and Koning (center-year) systems. They were pretty high. Then I ran correlation coefficients between relative scores in each system (assuming that it is a premise of each system that a score of, say, +40 is twice as good as one of +20), and the coefficients are not nearly as good. So, the systems agree as ordinal indicators pretty well, but not as cardinal indicators. It was the Koning system, by the way, which had poor correlation with the others. I suspect because in center-year listings, (averages), Italy is so far below the other six that it is the only country below the mean, (and it is way below), while the other six are grouped closely, slightly above the mean. I may publish that too, before another game ends. Strangely enough, the Koning list correlates most strongly with all the others in an ordinal sense.

((+(This issue is going to a number of newcomers to the game so it may be of interest to publish the list of players for those early games you mention.

1963A, Graustark: Boardman, Keshner, Lerner, Goldman, Nelson, McDaniel, Lerner, Root, Callhamer, Bulmer, D. Boardman, B. Pelz, Boardman (Christian)  
 1964A, Graustark: Boardman, Goldman (Smythe), Nelson, Keshner, Christian, Lerner, Schultz, MacKenzie.  
 1964B, Fredonia: Boardman, Castora (Bramman), Lake, Davey, Koning, Smythe, Schultz, McCallum.

As you can see I have started each list with the name of the gamesmaster. Also I have included names of replacements, in brackets, if entered the game in its early stages, but not, for example, my own

entry into the Ruritania game when it had already been running for a year and a half. I have underlined the names of those still active today. (I am a little hazy as to the extent of the activity of MacKenzie.) It seems to me that it was the Fredonia game where the permanently active players first appeared in large numbers. Nelson, by the way, should really, I suppose, be listed for all four of these games, as he was Christian's advisor in 1963B, and, for a move or two, Lake and Davey's advisor in 1964B.

Correlation coefficients between players, in addition to countries, between the various lists would also, I think, be interesting. I think that you would get the same result as you did with countries, namely that rank correlations would be quite high, but score correlations would be considerably lower. Consider your new Prosnitz-Koning listing, and the EROB one for example. The EROB percentage score distribution is reasonably close to Gaussian. The P-K listing with 40 people with zero scores, is, on the other hand not a bad fit to a Poisson distribution. I made a few tests on that the other day but seem to have thrown away my notes. Anyway, if we accept that they do approximate to these two distributions it would be idle to expect a very high correlation; but, if all those zero scores of yours are people who are out on the left hand tail of my Gaussian distribution, the rankings are closely comparable, and I expect that that is the case.

In a way, that is the main point of my reply to Walker above. As far as rankings are concerned, I feel that the problem has, for completed games, been solved. You can go on making new brews forever, with a dash more of supply centre, and a shade less win bonus, or vice-versa, but really such concoctions produce nothing new. However, what we do not have, and what would be good to have, is a Current Game Listing that is really up to date with its information, and which is also fair. It is more difficult to do than it looks.

Boardman, Wells, Pournelle, and Kuch had the right idea. They got their Ph. D.'s before they entered Diplomacy. -jamec)+))

- - - - -

#### Announcements.

Rod Walker, 1611 Lowry Drive, Rantoul, Ill., 61866, has indicated, both in the latest Erehwon and by private letter, that he intends to poll all active Diplomacy players to obtain their views on the various zines. Players will be asked to rate the zines on various points such as legibility, gamesmastering, and so on. Those of you who subscribe to Erehwon will get your blank forms direct from Rod. The remainder of the EROB sub list will get blank forms from me. Perhaps they will be enclosed herewith, if they arrive before mailing of this issue, otherwise with the next issue of EROB. Please note that completed forms are to be mailed to Rod, at the above address; they should not be sent to me.

Rod also mentions that he may be able to continue publishing his own games this coming summer and fall, rather than transferring them temporarily to BROB as had previously been planned. As a result I will not be as busy as I had thought. Any other editor who would like a temporary home for his games while he is on summer vacation, or the like, should feel free to contact me about it.

Seth Johnson's Fanzine Clearing House. Most Diplomacy editors over print quite considerably so that if an issue is lost in the mail they will have a reserve supply from which to replace it. However such stocks rapidly accumulate and take up a good deal of space. If you are in that predicament, do not burn or otherwise destroy the issues of your zine but ship them to

Seth Johnson  
345 Yale Ave.,  
Hillside, N.J., 07205

who will, in turn, distribute them to many people around the country. John Boardman used that method of disposing of excess copies in the very early days of the game, and I have done so also. Some currently active players were first attracted to the game as a result of seeing issues of zines which Seth distributed; doubtless there will be others similarly attracted in the future. Such disposal action costs you nothing except the bulk mailing charges to ship the issues to Seth, and may result in additional players or additional subscribers.

There is to be a Diplomacy tournament in Seattle in June. Details below,

Time: June 15-16, 9AM - 11 PM.

Place: Student Union Building of the University of Washington in Seattle.

Sponsors: The Pacific Northwest War Games Association.

Admission Fee: Free for members of PNWWGA. \$1 for non-members.

Game Divisions: Avalon Hill (Doug Beyerlein)  
Diplomacy (Stephen Hueston)  
Tabletop Miniatures (Richard Shagrin)  
Naval War Games (Brad Payne)  
Chess (Buz Eddy)

Tournaments: Avalon Hill Games  
Diplomacy  
Chess

Fee: Fifty cents per tournament.

For accomodation write Douglas Beyerlein, 3934 S.W. Southern,  
Seattle, Wash., 98116.

Prizes, guest speakers, inexpensive housing, etc., are among the attractions offered.

The eagerly awaited first issue of Valhalla has appeared. Not content with producing sTab universally regarded as one of the best Diplomacy zines, John Koning is now publishing Valhalla to attract new players to the game. Successfully, too: I had a letter from such a new comer within a very few days of Valhalla's appearing. The subscription price is \$2 per year from Chris Wagner, c/o Strategy and Tactics, Box 11-187, Loudonville, NY, 12211. Or, for \$3, you can get a year's subscription to both Valhalla and sTab, undoubtedly the best buy on the Diplomacy market. For a combined subscription write to Koning whose address is given on a previous page.

- - -

Rod Walker publishes a game of Das Dimpyspiel in his zine The Free Press. As he is himself a player in the game he has asked me to be a sort of spare referee to verify his own moves. He sent me such a set of moves on April 10. The moves printed in the issue of the zine mailed 24 April agree with those previously sent to me.

- - -

Scott P. Duncan, 2249 North Broad St., Apt. 1, Philadelphia, Pa., 19132, plans to publish a magazine devoted to games of Chief-of-State. This is Gamesceince Confrontation and its supplementary kit.

- - -

### New Blood.

The following have indicated an interest in postal Diplomacy, several of them by subscribing, the type of interest we like to see:

Charles E. Johnson, 3539 South 40, Lincoln, Nebraska, 65506.

Thomas F. Miller, 3245 Halifax Ave., North, Minneapolis, Minn., 55422.

Harlon Fields, 2313 East 20th St., Joplin, Missouri.

Gerhard F. H. Graebner, Box 242, Sub P. O. 6, Saskatoon, Sask.

Randy Bytwerk, 1034 Barber Te, N. W., Grand Rapids, Mich., 49504.

- - - - -

### The Map Quiz.

The last issue featured a quiz on the Diplomacy map. Six readers sent in replies. They are, Norman Zinkhan, Charles Welsh, Rod Walker, John Koning, Bill Linden, and Gerhard Graebner, in order of replying.

1. What province on the map is badly named? Well, the one I dislike is "Clyde". If we take Edinburgh as being correctly placed - and it seems to be, just south of the Firth of Forth - then the city of Glasgow is due west of Edinburgh on the other coast, due west and just a hair south. That means it is well inside our "Liverpool".

The river Clyde flows from south-east to north-west and empties into the sea at Glasgow. This means that not a single drop of rain - and it is not a region where there is any lack of drops of rain - falling in our "Clyde" would ever reach the Clyde. (Note that I use "Clyde" in quotes to mean the region marked on our map; Clyde, without quotes to mean the river of that name. Analogously for other places dealt with in this quiz.) What it should be named I don't know. It corresponds with what would be called, in British weather reports and the like, the Northwestern Highlands and the Isles, a terribly long name for the smallest scrap of territory on the map. "Clyde" overlaps, in part, with the county of Ross and Cromarty, and I suppose Ross would do for a name. Also a major feature of our "Clyde" is the island of Skye. We are not supposed to use islands but the whole region is such a maze of capes and bays that many mainland places are more easily reached by boat than any other way, so I suppose a point might be stretched and it could be called "Skye".

The other province I dislike the name of is "Ankara". Many years ago, five to be exact, when postal Diplomacy was very new, John Boardman used to send copies of Graustark to many of his acquaintances. There was one such recipient in Europe who raised howls of anguish when he saw the words, "Build fleet Ankara." "You can't build a fleet in Ankara," he said, "it is miles from the sea and up in the mountains." That isn't what bothers me, however; after all you could say the same thing, except for the mountains, about Berlin. But I don't know how many press releases I have read where the Sultan or some other leading Turk made a speech to thousands in Ankara. I have no doubt that some Sultans visited Ankara in the course of a royal tour. But no one in his senses would make a speech meant to have international repercussions in Ankara, it would never have been heard of. Ankara was a small mountain town, mainly known for raising goats, vastly overshadowed in importance by many, many cities in the Turkish Empire, many of them in the Anatolian peninsula, and even by two or three within the boundaries of our "Ankara". Perhaps the Sultan is supposed to make his speech to the goats. Of course, Kemal did, later on, move the capital there but that was a quarter century after the time of our quiz.

Answers submitted by contestants:

Norman Zinkhan: Prussia is probably the most badly named province. Actually Prussia was almost 3 times the size shown on the board.

((+(Well, if you mean the Kingdom of Prussia it was certainly very much larger. It had, in fact, about two thirds of the area of the whole of Germany. There were only scattered bits and pieces of the Kingdom of Prussia in our "Munich" but it owned major slices of all 5 of the remaining provinces. However, if by Prussia you mean old Prussia, that region outside the boundaries of the Holy Roman Empire, conquered by the Margraves of Brandenburg, which gave them a kingdom, then our "Prussia" corresponds very closely with the German provinces of West and East Prussia. ))+))

Charles Welsh: North Africa. ((+(It is true that there was <sup>no</sup> political entity so named and that this territory contains various separate

regions under diverse ownership. )+))

Rod Walker: The most badly named is the Gulf of Lyon, which is a corruption of the correct name, Gulf of Lions, the gulf having nothing to do with the far-inland city of Lyon. ((+(Yes. Although the spelling Lyons is fairly widely used. Perhaps it would be better to call it the Italian designation, the Ligurian Sea. )+))

Koning: Livonia, since its abbreviation is easily confused with Liverpool. ((+(Now there's a man who thinks about the practical aspects of the game, rather than geographical nonsense. )+))

Bill Linden: The badly named province is "Ukraina" since most of the Ukraine is in "Sevastopol" province. ((+(Today. But in Czarist days I don't think the Ukraine stretched as far east as the Crimea. )+))

Gerhard Graebner: "Ruhr" appears to be too far south to include the Ruhr valley. ((+(I think that the main Ruhr cities would at least be in the northern part of our "Ruhr". This is something like the "Clyde" discussion above except that the Clyde is not in "Clyde" at all. It is easy to see who is named John McCallum and who is named Gerhard Graebner. )+)) The Gulf of Bothnia is properly only the arm of the sea between Finland and Sweden. The area should perhaps be named the Gulf of Finland. ((+(No. The area does include both the Gulf of Bothnia and the Gulf of Finland but as the former is by far the larger it is the more appropriate name. )+))

Livonia should be named Latvia or Lithuania. ((+(No. The region contained in our "Livonia" included the Russian provinces of Estonia, Livonia, and Courland, as well as some peripheral bits of other provinces. Livonia seems as good a name as any. )+))

2. What supply centre provinces are not named for their largest cities?

Kiel. Exceeded by many cities in the area, of which Hamburg was the largest. Zinkhan, Walker, Linden, Graebner correct.

Liverpool. Glasgow larger. But the issue is in some doubt, due to what looks like a skew of the map. See above. Welsh, Walker correct. Sevastopol. Several larger of which Odessa was the largest. Zinkhan, Welsh, Walker, Linden, and Graebner correct.

Brest. Nantes and Le Havre both larger. Zinkhan, Welsh, Walker, Linden, Graebner correct.

Ankara. Several larger. Walker, Welsh, Linden, correct.

Venice, I am uncertain of. Both Linden and Walker state Bologna to be bigger, but the reference I consulted does not show it as larger.

3. Which supply centres are incorrectly placed for their cities.

Frankly, I had only known two. The glaring one is Kiel. It is at the eastern end of the Kiel canal shown on our map. Whereas our map puts it on the Elbe in the approximate position of Hamburg. Several people commented on this. Possibly in an earlier version of the game the province may have been named Hamburg and was then re-named Kiel on account of the naval associations of that city.

The other one that I had thought of was Trieste which is on the western side of the Istrian peninsula, not on the eastern as shown on our map.

Answers received:

Zinkhan: Kiel, Tunis, Trieste. ((Well, Tunis is pretty close.))

Welsh: Serbia, Trieste, Kiel. ((Belgrade, the capital of Serbia was on the Danube which there formed the boundary between Serbia and the Austrian Empire. A little white space is shown on our map between the dot and the border, but this may merely be for clarity. I suppose the same argument might apply to Trieste.))

Walker: Brest should be slightly more west. ((Very slightly))  
Brussels, for Belgium should be somewhat more south. ((Somewhat))  
The capital of Holland is The Hague, not Amsterdam as indicated on the map. ((Yes, although it isn't a big distance.))  
Kiel.

Copenhagen, for Denmark. ((Copenhagen is so far east that it is practically in Sweden. This may be another case, like Belgrade, where it has been moved a little away from the border for greater clarity.))

Tunis.

Athens should be in Attica, not Boetia ((as any classical scholar should know)).

Trieste

Constantinople should be not so far west, but right on the Bosphorus. ((Again, perhaps, clarity, to show that there is a passage from the Black Sea to the Bosphorus?))

Belgrade. ((See above)).

Sevastopol should be a bit more south. ((A bit.))

Venice should be a half diameter south east. ((No more.))

Linden: Kiel, and Copenhagen for Denmark.

Graebner: Kiel, Trieste, Tunis.

4. Why may an army not move directly from Moscow to Syria. Everyone stated that the Caspian Sea cuts the edge of the map.

5. What legal move would be impossible to carry out, in 1914?...

((In my opinion a move which would have been logistically impossible to carry out, is the move Army St. Petersburg to Norway, or, of course, the reverse. That is if one considers "Norway" as meaning the populated southern part of Norway, Oslo and Bergen. Also if one interprets an "army" to mean 100,000 to 150,000 men with their equipment, supplies, and so on. There was no railway north of Trondhjem. (And, in the early years of the century large numbers of men and supplies could only be moved by railway, or not at all over land.) What few roads, or tracks or trails, there were in northern Norway did not run in the right direction, i.e. parallel with the coast and Swedish border but, on the contrary, ran from the head of the fjords, over the ridge of Scandinavia, into Sweden. A few men might do it, living on the country, either by hunting and fishing or by buying food from the local inhabitants. But the local inhabitants in northern Norway were very few in number. There would be no stocks of food capable of supporting even a fraction of the number which might reasonably be designated an army.

The retreat of the Serbian army across the Albanian mountains to the coast is usually regarded as one of the epics of the First World War, as indeed it was. Notice the contrast to the move St. Pete -



to Norway. The Serbian army was fighting a rear-guard action against the advancing Austro-Germans; but it was not expected to fight again until after being re-equipped by the western allies, so that it could destroy all material no longer of immediate use to it. In our game, on the contrary, an army moving from St. Petersburg to Norway, or the reverse, is expected to go into immediate action on the following move. That is, all its artillery and other impedimenta must go with it. The Serbian army had to cross one range of mountains to the sea; the move considered involves crossing one mountain spur after another, there being a projection of the mountains between each of the innumerable fjords along their path. Rather typically, although it has a scale of depth of the sea in fathoms, which in no way affects the game, our map has no scale of miles; however, the proposed move involves a distance about 8 times that of the Serbian retreat. The Balkan peninsula is not thickly inhabited, in the sense that Western Europe is, but it has a much denser population than northern Norway, so that some food stocks were available and procurable, unlike the situation which would meet an army in northern Norway. It was long before the days of bull-dozers and air-lifts, so it would be impossible to rapidly make roads or to feed the army from the air. All in all, the move would be quite impossible. If supported from the sea, so that the baggage train was actually carried by ship, and supplies brought to the troops the same way, it might be possible, but, in that case, why not move the troops themselves by sea as well, the natural method of travel in that part of the world. Similarly, the move, if supported by Sweden, might be possible, meaning that all heavier equipment was to be moved through Sweden and food supplies to be produced from the same source. But without support from one flank or the other, I don't think the move could have been made.))

Replies received for this question:

Zinkhan: Army Denmark to Sweden would be impossible without without convoy. ((Boats would certainly be needed for the move. However, the Sound is only a few miles wide and, it seems to me that their passage could as readily be covered by shore batteries as by naval guns. How little admirals relish putting fleets in such confined and shallow waters is shown by the fact that in the first world war Denmark had agreements with both Britain and Germany to mine its coastal waters, thus effectively denying them to the other major naval power, in return for the power concerned staying out. Both naval powers kept the agreement; i.e., they did not want to risk their fleets in seas where they had no room to manoeuvre.))

Welsh: Moving into the Barents Sea. ((Did you never hear of the Murmansk run? It operated in both world wars))

Kroefing: You couldn't move "Z Helgoland to Kiel" and then "Z Kiel to Baltic" since the Kiel canal wasn't built. ((It was, though.))

Linden: Trieste to Albania, since Montenegro intervened. ((Correct, in a way, although the interposition of neutral territory rarely stops armies from going where they wish. See the fate of Luxembourg and Belgium in the first world war. The early Diplomacy maps did, as a matter of fact, show Montenegro, but it was removed before the commercial stage was reached, in order to make a more playable game.))

6. What is the highest point within the borders of our map? Mount Elbruz, in the Caucasus, 18,500 feet, and the highest point in Europe. It is due north of the "D" in Diplomacy. Zinkhan, Welsh, Walker, Linden, and Graebner gave the correct answer.
7. What is the lowest point? Any point on the shore of the Caspian Sea whose surface is some 90 feet below mean sea level. Though our map would only have to be extended slightly to the south east to include the Jordan Valley which is much lower than that. Correct answers from Zinkhan, Welsh, Walker, and Graebner.

As will be noted, questions 1 and 5 are matters of opinion, not of fact. As it happens no contestant gave the answer I would have to either of these questions. Of the factual questions, Walker gave by far the most complete and detailed answers. However, an extension of his BROB subscription will do him little good, as he gets it in trade anyhow. Most of the others were very closely equal, the exact points depending on whether we list every entry under question 2, for example, as a distinct question worth a point, or give 1 point for the question and only fractions for each part. There is also the question whether deductions should be made for bad guesses in questions 2 and 3. (Damn it all, we are back at Rating lists again.) As good as any of the others, and getting his entry in the earliest, was Norman Zinkhan. Accordingly he is awarded a 10 issue extension of his subscription.

I would like to thank all 6 contestants for submitting entries. Especially I would like to thank Rod Walker for submitting several additional questions of a similar nature. I have partly prepared several additional quizzes (not all on geography though) which I may run in the future. If so, Rod's questions will likely be included with one or another of them.

- - - - -

Diplomacy is the registered trade mark of a game manufactured and sold by Games Research, Inc., 48 Wareham St., Boston, Mass, 02118.

There are currently over a hundred postal games of Diplomacy in progress, reported in various amateur magazines. One such magazine, although one which does not, at the moment carry a game is

BROODINGHAG, edited and published by John McCallum, Halston, Alberta, Canada. It sells for ten cents a copy, and has a similar rate for subscriptions.

- - - - -

This issue was intended as a letter issue but it has made a scarcely noticable dent in the correspondence files. So the next issue will likely also be a letter issue.