

B R O B D I N G N A G

 Brobdingnag #86

 End of Strike Issue.

 12 August 1968

Rule Interpretation in the Magazines.

Cut off as I am from the outside world by the Canadian postal strike, it seemed that a useful article that might be prepared from the files, without receipt of letters or the latest zines, might be to list particulars of the position on the various rule disputes of all the Dippy zines.

For description of what is meant by the terms used, reference should be made to the leading article in BROB #84. The same numbering, lettering, and so on, is used here as in that article. The position of every zine, so far as it is known to me, is indicated for each item. However, the games in the various zines have not been played through; had this been done some of the interpretations, marked below as "unknown", might have been deduced by inference from moves allowed or disallowed. And, of course, "unknown" means unknown to me; the position may be perfectly clear to the editor concerned and to his players. My collection of zines is extensive but not fully complete.

1. Koning's Rule.

<u>Adag.</u>	Unknown, but follows "accepted" rules.
<u>Aeolus.</u>	Unknown.
<u>Armageddonia.</u>	Yes.
<u>Big Brother.</u>	Yes.
<u>Brobdingnag.</u>	Yes.
<u>Cerebral Nebula.</u>	Yes.
<u>Costaguana.</u>	Unknown. (Believed NOT used.)
<u>Diplomania-Diplophobia.</u>	Yes.
<u>Efgiart.</u>	Unknown.
<u>Erehwon.</u>	Yes.
<u>Glockorla.</u>	Unknown.
<u>Graustark.</u>	No.
<u>Jutland Jollies.</u>	Yes.
<u>Kalmar.</u>	Yes.
<u>Lonely Mountain.</u>	Yes.
<u>Lost Ones.</u>	Yes.
<u>Miskatonio University.</u>	Unknown.
<u>stab.</u>	Yes.
<u>Thulcandra.</u>	Yes.
<u>Valhalla.</u>	Yes.
<u>Wild 'n Wooly.</u>	No.
<u>Xanadu.</u>	Unknown.
<u>Xenogogic.</u>	Yes.

2. Wells' Extension of Koning's Rule.

<u>ADAG.</u>	Unknown.
<u>Aeolus.</u>	Unknown.
<u>Big Brother.</u>	Unknown.

Broddingnag.	Yes
Cerebral Nebula.	Unknown.
Costaguana.	Unknown.
Diplomania.	Yes.
Efigiart.	Unknown.
Erehwon.	Yes.
Glockorla.	Unknown.
Graustark.	No.
Jutland Jollies.	Unknown. YES
Kalmar.	Unknown.
Lonely Mountain.	Unknown.
Lost Ones.	Unknown.
sTab.	Unknown.
Thulcandra.	Unknown.
Valhalla.	Unknown.
Wild 'n Wooly.	No.
Xanadu.	Unknown.
Xenogogic.	Unknown.

3. Boardman's Dilemma. The expression M-C will be used to denote the Miller-Calhamer solution to the dilemma, namely, that the support of a dislodged force is always cut. B-R will be used to denote the Boardman-rulebook solution, that is, that a dislodged supporting force is treated exactly as any other supporting force, its support being cut if the attack comes from the side, but not if it is frontal.

ADAG.	B-r.
Aeolus.	M-C.
Armageddonia.	B-r.
Big Brother.	Unknown.
Broddingnag.	B-r.
Cerebral Nebula.	Unknown.
Costaguana.	Unknown.
Diplomania.	M-C.
Efigiart.	B-r.
Erehwon.	M-C.
Glockorla.	B-r.
Graustark.	B-r.
Jutland Jollies.	B-r. (With reluctance on the part of one of (A-C) its two gamesmasters.)
Kalmar.	Unknown.
Lonely Mountain.	B-r.
Lost Ones.	B-r.
Miskatonic Univ.	Unknown.
sTab.	B-r.
Thulcandra.	Unknown.
Valhalla.	B-r.
Wild 'n Wooly	Unknown.
Xanadu.	Unknown.
Xenogogic.	M-C.

4. The Victory Criterion. A, B, C, and D, as defined in EROB #84.

ADAG	C		
Aeolus.	C		
Armageddonia.	D		
Big Brother.	B or C, whichever occurs sooner.		
Brobdingnag.	A, in future games.		
Cerebral Nebula.	C		
Diplomania.	A		
Efgiart.	D		
Erehwon.	C		
Glockorla.	Must have BOTH a majority of supply centres and majority of pieces on board.		
Graustark.	D		
Jutland Jollies.	C (A)	Costaguana	A, or one half plus one, of units on board.
Kalmar.	C		
Lonely Mountain.	C		
Lost Ones.	Unknown.		
Miskatonic U.	Unknown.		
sTab.	C		
Thulcandra.	C		
Valhalla.	C		
Wild 'n Wooly	B		
Xanadu.	Unknown.		
Xenogogic.	A		

5. Ties and Draws.

ADAG	No draws unless all surviving players agree to it.
Aeolus.	Unknown.
Armageddonia.	Unknown.
Big Brother.	Unknown.
Brobdingnag	Agreement among survivors. Or, failing agreement, on failure of any survivor to submit, after three years have elapsed without change in supply centres, a feasible plan for breaking deadlock.
Cerebral Nebula.	Unknown.
Costaguana.	Unknown.
Diplomania.	Unknown.
Efgiart.	Unknown.
Erehwon.	Unknown.
Glockorla.	On agreement among surviving players. Otherwise may be declared by gamesmaster after 6 years without change of supply centres.
Graustark.	After three years with no change of supply centres.
Jutland Jollies.	Unknown. <i>same as draw & on judgment of gamesmaster or</i>
Kalmar.	Unknown. <i>agreement among surviving players</i>
Lonely Mountain	Unknown.
Lost Ones.	Unknown.
Miskatonic U.	Unknown.
sTab.	Unknown.
Thulcandra.	Unknown.
Valhalla.	Unknown.

Wild 'n Wooly.	Unknown.
Xanadu.	Unknown.
Xenogogic.	Unknown.

6. Support Standing of unit ordered to move. Practically speaking no one allows this. The following zines have explicitly declared against it. Aeolus, Armageddonia, Big Brother, Brobdingnag, Erehwon, Graustark, Kalmar, Lonely Mountain, Wild'n Wooly. Those who have not made a statement may be assumed to follow the same procedure.
7. Support by fleets in provinces with split coastlines. The standard ruling is that an army or a fleet in Gascony can support a fleet in the south coast of Spain, or attacking the south coast of Spain. But that a fleet in the south coast of Spain can NOT support a unit in Gascony. The following have definitely indicated that they follow that procedure: Armageddonia, Big Brother, Brobdingnag, Diplomania, Erehwon, Glockorla, Graustark, Jutland Jollies, Lonely Mountain, sTab, Thulcandra, Valhalla. Those not declaring presumably do the same.
8. The Cutting of the Cutting of Support. Not used in any zine.
9. Cutting One's own Throat. Everyone who has specifically ruled on this has said that one cannot cut one's own support. The following zines have made that statement or its equivalent: Armageddonia, Big Brother, Brobdingnag, Diplomania, Glockorla, Graustark, Kalmar, Thulcandra, Xenogogic. Others have no explicit statement of their stand.
10. A. Brannen's Rule, Part A.

ADAG	Unknown.
Aeolus	Yes.
Armageddonia.	No.
Big Brother.	Yes.
Brobdingnag.	Yes.
Cerebral Nebula.	Unknown.
Costaguana.	Unknown. (Believed No.)
Diplomania.	No.
Efgiart.	Yes.
Erehwon.	No.
Glockorla.	Yes.
Graustark.	Yes.
Jutland Jollies.	Yes.
Kalmar.	Yes.
Lonely Mountain.	Yes.
Lost Ones.	Yes.
Miskatonic U.	Unknown.
sTab.	Yes.
Thulcandra.	Yes.
Valhalla.	Yes.
Wild 'n Wooly	Yes.
Xanadu	Unknown.
Xenogogic.	Unknown.

10. B. Brannan's Rule, Part B. Very few zines have discussed this rule. Those who have have all allowed it. They are, Big Brother, Brobdingnag, Diplomania (which denies the necessity of the rule but follows its procedures in practice), Miskatonic U., Thulcandra, Wild 'n Woolly. Most of those who have not commented are probably in the position of Diplomania: they regard the matter as already sufficiently covered in the rulebook and, in practice, rule the same way as those who explicitly support the rule.
11. Convoy between contiguous provinces. As far as I know, no one has ever expressly forbidden this move. Those who definitely allow it include, Armageddonia, Brobdingnag, Diplomania, Glockorla, Graustark, Jutland Jollies, sTab, Valhalla.
12. Shagrin's Alternate route convoy. The few who have ruled have expressed a ruling as indicated below.

Aeolus does not allow the move.
Brobdingnag will only permit the move to succeed if no fleet involved is dislodged.
Glockorla does not allow the move.
Graustark has not ruled but, I believe, once permitted the move in a game.
Lonely Mountain will permit the move only if all the fleets are in a position which would allow the move to go through a single convoy chain, and then only if none of the fleets is dislodged.
13. Convoy of Support. Really not allowed by anyone, and only suggested as a future possibility. Those expressly declaring against the move are, Aeolus, Armageddonia, Brobdingnag, Diplomania, Erehwon, Graustark, Kalmar, Lonely Mountain, Thulcandra.
14. The Mislaidd army. The move has never been permitted since Calhammar declared against it in the first year of postal play. Graustark and Thulcandra have express prohibitions of the move, no one else has bothered.
15. Fate of army convoyed by dislodged fleet. The question has never previously been raised. All zines leave the army intact at its point of embarkation.
16. Retreat Rule. In the case of a dislodged force with a single space available for retreat there are three possible rules in a postal game: 1. The retreat is made automatically by the gamesmaster and the unit must remain there. 2. The retreat is made by the gamesmaster, but the player has the option of removing it. 3. All retreats must be ordered by the player concerned.

ADAG	Unknown.
Aeolus	2
Armageddonia	Unknown
Big Brother	Unknown

Broddingnag.	2
Cerebral Nebula.	Unknown.
Costaguana.	2
Diplomania.	Allows "fight to death" order.
Efgiart.	Unknown.
Erehwon.	Unknown.
Glockorla.	2
Graustark.	1
Jutland Jollies.	2
Kalmar.	3
Lonely Mountain	2
Lost Ones.	Unknown.
Miskatonic U.	Unknown.
sTab.	2
Thulcandra.	Player must make explicit "No Retreat" order to prevent stand-by from making one for him.
Valhalla.	2
Wild 'n Wooly	3
Xanadu.	Unknown
Xenogogic.	Unknown.

17. Two forces retreating to same space. Calhamer's view that units retreating to same space should have additional opportunities to retreat has never been accepted in the postal game. Every zine declaring on the issue has said that both forces are immediately annihilated. Those who have so ruled are the following, Aeolus, Armageddonia, Big Brother, Broddingnag, Cerebral Nebula, Diplomania, Erehwon, Graustark, Kalmar, Lonely Mountain, sTab, Thulcandra, Valhalla, Wild 'n Wooly, Xenogogic.
18. Latimer's suggestion that a stand-off should not close the space to retreats by units other than those involved in the stand-off has received no support from any zine.
19. Retreat via convoy. Though sometimes discussed, the move has not been permitted in any zine. Those explicitly prohibiting it include, ADAG, Diplomania, Graustark, Lonely Mountain, Xenogogic.
20. The Coastal Crawl.

ADAG	Unknown.
Aeolus.	Unknown.
Armageddonia.	Yes.
Big Brother.	Yes.
Broddingnag.	Yes.
Cerebral Nebula.	Yes
Costaguana.	Unknown. (Believed No.)
Diplomania.	Unknown.
Efgiart.	Used in 1967AG but not in other games.
Erehwon.	Yes.
Glockorla.	Yes.
Graustark.	Yes.
Jutland Jollies.	Yes.

Kalmar	Unknown.
Lonely Mountain	No.
Lost Ones	No.
Miskatonic U.	Unknown.
sTab	Yes.
Thulcandra	Yes.
Valhalla	Yes.
Wild 'n Woolly	Unknown.
Xanadu	Unknown.
Xenogogic	Yes.

21. The Crawling Retreat. Very few gamesmasters have, as yet, ruled on the Crawling Retreat. Those who don't use the Coastal Crawl itself would not, of course, use this retreat either. Those who do use the Coastal Crawl and who have ruled that they would allow the Crawling Retreat, are the following: Brobdingnag, Erehwon./
No one else has ruled. /Thulcandra.
22. The force simultaneously attacked, with equal strength, from two sides. The standard ruling is that a force so attacked survives the ordeal, quite unharmed. Specific rulings to that effect have been made by the following: Armageddonia, Big Brother, Brobdingnag, Diplomania, Erehwon, Glookorla, Graustark, Jutland Jollies, sTab, Thulcandra, Valhalla, Xenogogic.
23. The Spring Raid. The standard ruling is that to enter a supply centre in the Spring, and to leave it in the same Fall, does not remove it from the custody of its previous owner. Don Miller, in Diplomania, later Diplophobia, had a few games in which the Spring Raid removed the centre from the ownership of the initial owner without adding it to the property of the raider. I believe that no other zine has ever used the Raid. Those who have specifically declared against it are, Aeolus, Armageddonia, Brobdingnag, Erehwon, Graustark, Jutland Jollies, Lonely Mountain, sTab, Valhalla.
24. Order of removal of forces by gamesmaster, when player neglects to order.

ADAG	Unknown.
Aeolus.	Dot of capital city is home. measurement made from dot to nearest boundary of spaces concerned.
Armageddonia.	Unit is removed which, in gamesmaster's judgment does least harm to power concerned.
Big Brother.	Unknown.
Brobdingnag.	Home is any home supply centre. Distance measured in seasons' march. Convoy allowed in count only if necessary to reach position. If two equal one is removed which is in space standing higher in alphabetical order.
Cerebral Nebula.	Unknown.

Costaguana	Unknown.
Diplomania	Unknown.
Efgiart	Unknown
Erehwon	1. Farthest from home. 2 Non-supply centre before supply-centre. 3. Fleet before army. 4. North before south. 5. East before west. Farthest from country's capital. Fleet before army. Distance measured from capital black dot to nearest border of space.
Glockorla.	Unknown in detail. Distance is counted in marches, and, in practice, non-supply centres before supply centres.
Graustark.	Gamesmaster's judgment of least important.
Jutland Jollies.	Unknown.
Kalmar.	Those not within boundaries of country concerned before those that are. Distance measured from capital city black dot.
Lonely Mountain.	Unknown.
Lost Ones.	Unknown.
Miskatonic U.	Unknown.
sTab	Unknown
Thulcandra	Unknown.
Valhalla	Unknown.
Wild 'n Wooly	Unknown.
Xanadu	Unknown.
Xenogogic	Unknown.

25. The you-only-live-once game. This game has been used for over-the-board play at various times. It has never been used in postal play.
26. The Gilliland Incident situation. The standard game is that to give a unit support standing by attacking the space it occupies with a force equal to or superior to that used by a hostile force attacking it is legal. As far as known the only gamesmaster who ever ruled otherwise was Chalker in Barad-dur, a zine which no longer exists. Explicit statement of the standard position has been made by, ADAG, Aeolus, Cerebral Nebula, Diplomania, Glockorla, sTab, Valhalla, Xenogogic. The position in Jutland Jollies is not understood. They state that Chalker's rule is not used and then, in the next sentence, apparently explaining what they do do, they give a paraphrase of Chalker's rule.
27. The self stand off. The self stand off move is so widely accepted that few gamemasters have bothered to declare their support of it. Among the zines which have declared are, Glockorla, Graustark, Thulcandra
28. The self stand off countered by hostile support. The only zines which seem to have declared on the issue are Brobdingnag, Lonely Mountain, and Thulcandra, all of whom allow the move.
29. The Changing of the Guard (Direct interchange of a fleet and army belonging to the same power.), and

30. Exchange of position by convoy.

	<u>29</u>	<u>30</u>
ADAG	Unknown.	Unknown.
Armageddonia	No.	No.
Big Brother	Unknown.	Unknown.
Brobdingnag	No.	No.
Cerebral Nebula	No.	No.
Costaguana	Unknown.	Unknown.
Diplomania	No.	No.
Efgiart	No.	No.
Erehwon	Yes.	Yes.
Glockorla	Unknown.	Unknown.
Graustark	Probably No.	Yes.
Jutland Jollies	Unknown	Yes.
Kalmar	No.	No.
Lonely Mountain	No.	No.
Lost Ones	Unknown.	Unknown.
Miskatonic U.	Unknown.	Unknown.
sTab	Unknown.	Yes.
Thulcandra	No.	Yes.
Valhalla	Unknown.	Yes.
Wild 'n Woolly	No.	No.
Xanadu	No.	No.
Xenogogic	No.	No.
Aeolus	Unknown.	Unknown.

31. The convey-through-coastal-province game. Proposed once in Xanadu; not used in any other zine.

32. The Kolin game. Not used in any game.

There are undoubtedly many errors of omission or commission in the above listing. I would be grateful to any gamesmaster who will inform me of such errors. The reason for the large number of "Unknown"s for Xanadu is that I don't have the issue in which its rules were stated.

- - - - -

Recently Completed Games.

Game 1966H was recently completed in Wild 'n Woolly (its game 1966KN) being won by James Dygert. This is Dygert's third win putting him one step behind the perennial front runners, John Smythe and Charles Wells, who have four wins each. BROB's congratulations, Jim! As Wild 'n Woolly does not normally supply a centre chart one is given overleaf. Zine: Wild 'n Woolly #'s 51-127. Gamesmaster, Dan Brannan. Players: England, Derek Nelson. France, Leonard Garland. Germany, Ken Davidson. Italy Roland Tzudiker. Austria, Ken Fletthner. Russia, James Dygert. Turkey, Margaret Gemignani.

	<u>01</u>	<u>02</u>	<u>03</u>	<u>04</u>	<u>05</u>	<u>06</u>	<u>07</u>
England	4	6	6	3	4	4	4
France	4	6	6	8	6	4	4
Germany	3	2	OUT				
Italy	4	4	5	5	4	3	3
Austria	3	3	3	3	2	1	OUT
Russia	6	7	9	11	13	16	18 and wins!
Turkey	4	5	4	4	5	6	6

I believe this is the best game to date for Margaret Gemignani who was runner-up. Dont stop there, Margaret; avanti!

Game 1966N

Game 1966N was recently completed in Marsovia being its only game. I believe that Marsovia plans to cease publication with its next issue. Congratulations to Dan Barrows on his win, one of the very few wins ever made by France. Marsovia does not provide a supply centre listing so one is given below:

	<u>01</u>	<u>02</u>	<u>03</u>	<u>04</u>	<u>05</u>	<u>06</u>	<u>07</u>	<u>08</u>	<u>09</u>
England	4	4	4	5	7	8	9	10	10
France	4	5	6	9/8	9	11	13	16	19
Germany	4	6	3	2/1	OUT				
Italy	4	4	3	1	OUT				
Austria	4	2	3	4	4	4	3	OUT	
Russia	5	7	7	6	5	6	6	5	4
Turkey	4	6	7	7	7	5	3	3	1

Gamesmaster: Bob Cline. Players: England, Conrad von Metzke. France, Dan Barrows. Germany, Roland Tzudiker. Italy, Anders Swenson. Austria, Art Canfil, replaced in '04 by Rod Walker. Russia, Jim Latimer. Turkey, Dan Brannan.

Game 1966AG

Game 1966AG was originally announced in Costaguana but was transferred, with a few changes in the players list to ADAG before the first move. Our congratulations to Bud Pendergrass who has won as Turkey. There is a supply centre chart in ADAG #31, where the win is announced.

Game 1966AL

This game has also just been completed in ADAG. It is unique in being a drawn game with five survivors. The four major ones, England (Charles Turner), Germany (Rod Walker), Italy (Dan Barrows), and Turkey (Conrad von Metzke), were closely equal in strength and made no gains in the last three years of play. Russia (Doug Beyerlein) was the other survivor.

The Rating List.

The last complete edition of the Rating List was given in BROB #81, and there were revisions in #'s 82 and 83. A further revision is required as a result of the four games mentioned above, together with the normal developments of the last month or so. Games now included in the listing are, 1963A, B, 1964A, B, D, 1965A, B, D, E, F, G, H, I, L, M, O, Q, R, S, T, U, 1966B, D, G, L, M, N, O, AA, AC, AG, AI, AK, AL, AM, AP, AQ, AU, AV, BC, BJ, 1967H, AK, AU. Underlined games are five-man games and are not included in the country list, which follows, below,

Turkey	●55	61.3%
England	+51	60.5%
Russia	+13	52.7%
France	+11	52.3%
Italy	-31	43.6%
Austria	-46	40.6%
Germany	-53	39.1%

a splendid example of the rich growing richer and the poor growing poorer.

Dan Barrows (W)	+8; 75%; +10
Beyerlein & Baker	+1
Douglas Beyerlein	+4; 62%; -1
Dan Brannan	-8; 43%; -9
Art Canfil	-6; 31%; -6
Robert Cline	-4; 33%; -4
Ken Davidson	+1; 52%; +6
James Dygert (W)	+22; 76%; +29
Dan Evans	+2
Ken Flethher	-4; 42%; -5
Dennis Frisch	-4; 33%; -4
Leonard Garland	-12; 21%; -12
Margaret Gemignani	-19; 33%; -30
Sidney Get	-6; 25%; -14
Bill Haggart	0
Cole Harrison	+3
Wayne Hoheisel	0
Allan Huff (W)	-6; 38%; +11
James Latimer (W)	+8; 66%; +14
John Mazor	-4; 33%; +2
Hal Naus (W)	+8; 75%; +21

Derek Nelson (W)	+11; 58%; +21
Larry Peery	+10; 75%; +19
Bud Pendergrass (W)	+12; 88%; +14
Perrin	+2
Anders Swenson	-6; 35%; -10
Earl Thompson	0; 50%; 0
Charles Turner (W)	+21; 79%; +28
Roland Tzudiker	-21; 28%; -25
Conrad von Metzke (W)	-7; 46%; -14
Rod Walker	+15; 74%; +16
Robert Ward	-3; 45%; -11
Charles Welsh	+1
Mente Zelazny (W)	+18; 85%; +26

Top Board

90.4%	Charles Wells	25/29
87.5	Bud Pendergrass	12/14
85.2	Monte Zelazny	18/26
84.0	Donald Miller	14/18
81.2	Harold Peck	10/14
78.7	Charles Turner	21/26
78.1	Banks Mebane	9/7

Second Board

75.9	James Dygert	22/29
75.0	Don Barrows	8/10
75.0	John Beshara	6/6
75.0	Hal Maus	8/21
75.0	Larry Peery	10/19
75.0	Bruce Pelz	6/6
75.0	Eugene Prosnitz	6/18

For the benefit of those who came in late. The main listing is merely an amendment of previous listings and lists only those who have had changes in their scores during the previous month or so. The first figure given is the BROB Completed game score, which is additive; that is, a high score may merely represent doing fairly well in a large number of games, rather than really well in a few. The next figure, the percentage, is the same thing averaged over games played; it measures mean performance in games completed to date. The final figure is the Current game rating. It adds to the total game rating partial results from games in progress. The Top and Second Board lists show, in order of ranking, those currently near the top of the percentage listing. The figures following the names are the Completed Game/Current Game scores which enable the reader to estimate if the player is advancing or not.

Sealed Bag.

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

I think your suggestion re a current game rating list ((EROB 82, reply to a letter from Walker)) is the best one I've heard yet. The suggestion to give games different weights, depending upon the last year completed, makes good sense. (Of course the faults common to all rating systems, i.e. encouraging people to play for second place rather than to stop the winner, still exist, but that is almost impossible to cure in a current game system.)

I realize it would be an enormous amount of work to calculate ratings under your proposal. However, since I'm not publishing a magazine, I'd volunteer to make the calculations and come up with a list, if you'll send me the data I need. Obviously, the starters would have to have the games they've been eliminated from count in the rating system. (For a person eliminated, the game would be treated as a complete game, with a final supply centre count of zero.)

In cases where there has been a replacement, I'd credit the game to the substitute only if it helps his overall rating, and credit the game to the starter only if it hurts his rating. Under this method, some positions would be credited to two people, or to none, but this wouldn't interfere with the validity of the rating system.

I would make a slight modification in your figures, for purposes of simplicity, i.e. games which have completed 1909 or later, 80%, 1906-08, 60%, 1904-05, 40%, 1903, 20%. Earlier than that I wouldn't rate.

((A later letter)): I'm looking forward to seeing the results of this rating system for current games. I suspect that John Beshara will have the leading rating, since his comes to about 13. The average rating will be somewhat below 5, since a game in progress counts full value for those players wiped out, but only fractionally for those players doing well.

((Well, Gene, here, at last, is your rating list. Note the following features. This was done about a month ago and is updated only to about the third week of June. For comparison with the EROB listing see issue #83, rather than the listing in this issue. Also the weights I used were those originally proposed, one tenth for a game in 1903, two tenths for 1904, and so on up to eight tenths for any uncompleted game in year 1910 or later. Note, too, that I think your system of counting a game for a player if it helps his average is rather impractical. This means that for a game which is near the player's own average, it will be counted on one listing, deleted on the next when he has made a gain, inserted again, after his next loss, and so on. In this listing, if a game helped a player's rating, counted on games he had completed up to then, I counted it for him, and, if not, charged it to the beginning player. I made no further adjustments afterward. My comments follow the listing.

17.00	Rick Brooks Bruce Pelz	8.02	Frank Clark
14.91	Chris Wagner	8.00	Donald Berman Sherry Heap Bob Kinney Paul Mosslander
14.00	Dian Pelz		
13.00	Trevor H earndon	7.56	Rod Walker
12.50	Don Miller	7.43	Derek Nelson
11.64	Charles Wells	7.00	Clive H arris Perkins Chuck Schloti Charles Welsh Michael Wolf
11.45	Monte Zelazny		
11.40	John Austin		
11.10	Banks Mebane	6.80	Michael Miller
11.00	Cliff Ollila	6.73	Mal Maus
10.98	Jerry Pournelle	6.50	Norman Zinkhan
10.96	Charles Turner	6.32	James Latimer
10.92	Eugene Prosnitz	6.00	Hugh Anderson Len Atkins Evans Linn Haramis Russ Jones Wm. Lee Linden Gary Nemeth Ray Stokely
10.88	Dan Barrows		
10.25	Paul Leith		
10.00	Ken Rosamalia		
9.94	John Beshara	5.96	Ken Davidson
9.90	Larry Peery	5.79	John Mazor
9.60	James Dygert	5.75	Jim Houghton
8.69	John Koning	5.71	Gerald White
8.54	Terry Kuch	5.50	Ben Turk
8.50	Ed Halle	5.33	Steve Eltings
8.45	Bud Pendergrass	5.25	David Lebling
8.38	John Smythe	5.20	Richard Houston
8.35	Jack Greene, Jr.	5.11	Cole Harrison
8.30	Harold Peck Buddy Trettick		

5.00	Wm. R. Connelly Robert Curran Michael H. Kulin Stephen Hueston Polan Paul Scroggie	3.29	Carl Anderson
		3.25	Perrin
4.96	Conrad von Metzke	3.00	Lee Arico Bruce Chapman John Davey Norman McLeod Edward Meyer John Neahr San Diego DC&CBW Paul Watterson
4.91	Michael Childers		
4.85	Chuck Carey	2.91	Mehran Thomson
4.82	Robert Johnson	2.87	Hank Reinhardt
4.80	Alan Huff	2.81	Greg Long
4.71	John McCallum	2.75	Richard Czata
4.67	Geo. Schelz	2.67	Ron Tzudiker
4.50	James Sanders	2.63	Gail Schow
4.38	Charles Reinsel	2.60	James Munroe
4.33	James MacKenzie	2.57	Douglas Baker
4.11	Richard Bryant	2.50	Jack Chalker Jock Root
4.00	Scott Berschig Edi Birsan Christina Brannen Ron Glavie G. I. Grayson George Heap Bob Komada Lafayette Tactics Assoc. John Leckner Mark Lyon W. McLinn David Mayhall K. Porter	2.19	Dan Brannen
		2.00	Doug Beyerlein Allan Calhamer Rober Champer Bill Christian Debbie Goldman Kenneth Levinson Henry Stine James Tuttle
3.68	Thomas Griffin	1.88	Margaret Gemignani
3.60	Earl Thompson	1.86	Wayne Hoheisel Bob Ward
3.58	Dave Francis	1.80	Dave Bischoff
3.57	Bill Schreffler	1.71	Richard Shagrin
3.47	Sid Cochran	1.48	Ken Fletcher
3.42	Bob Lake	1.10	Thomas Eller

1.00 McDonald
Gregory Moleneer
Mark Owings
Bob Reiter
J. Thomas

0.96 James Goldman

0.95 Greg Warden

0.75 Dick Schultz

0.73 Bill Haggart

0.72 Anders Swenson

0.67 Leonard Garland
Pat McDonnell

0.63 Al Scott

0.60 Brian Bailey

0.50 Scott Duncan
Jack Harness
K. V. Wittmann

0.46 W. Celestre

0.33 John Boardman
Louis Gallo
Clyde Johnson
Mike McIntyre

0.28 Ron Bounds

0.18 Robert Maloney

0.06 Charles Alexander

0.00 Michael Aita
Lew Bailes
Brenda Banks
Edwin Baker
Stephen Barr
Tom Bulmer
Art Canfil
Phil Castora
Bob Cline
Louis Curtiss
Deborah Deutsch
Alan Fisher
Dennis Frisch

0.00 Sydney Get
Alexis Gilliland
Al Goggins
Barry Gold
Stephen Gordon
Thomas Gorman
Jay Haldeman
Paul Harley
Ben Hendin
Jerald Jacks
Terry Huston
Mark Johnson
Wade Johnston
Stuart Keshner
Bernie Kling
Fred Lerner
Jack Longbine
Fritz Mulhauser
Frank Musbach
Ivan Musicant
Tommy Lee Ogle
Jerry Page
Geo. Parks
Ron Parks
Steven Patt
Rick Payment
Steve Powlesland
Don Recklies
John Reiner
Charles Roland
John Sandoval
Joel Sattel
Bob Speed
Bill Stewart
Wm. Sullivan
Jerry Tenney
Richard Uhr
John Videtto
Whalen
Stephen Willard

I am sure that you, Gene, will agree that this listing has many faults. As I see it there are two major ones. Let us look at the less important one first.

This counting of games in progress as fractional games was introduced so as to be fair to the player now active. If every game, completed and in progress, is counted as an equal game, it will be found that the player now

in many games will have his score lowered in comparison with another player who has done about equally well in the past but who is now in fewer, or no games. I have done some experimenting and I now think that the set of fractions previously proposed, a game in 1903 counting as a tenth game, a game in 1904 as two tenths, and so on, up to eight tenths for a game in 1910 or later, is not really satisfactory. It is an improvement over counting all games in progress as straight games, on a par with finished ones, but it still hurts the currently active player in comparison with the less active one. Using a set of weights with a quadratic term could be an improvement. Consider the following table:

	Completed Games	No weight	Linear Weight	Quadratic Weight
Donald Miller	12.67	13.50	12.53	13.35
Monte Zelazny	12.50	9.73	11.45	12.94

As you can see, I have used for comparison purposes two well known players, both of whom have done extra-ordinarily well in their completed games and both of whom are doing just as well in their games in progress. Miller has completed three games, two of which he won. In his third game he survived with 2 forces. He is now enrolled in only one game, which is currently in 1913. In that game he has 16 forces. Monte Zelazny has completed four games, two of which he won; in a third he was in the runner-up position with ten centres at game's end, and in his other game he survived with 5 centres. In contrast to Miller, however, he is now enrolled in seven games which have progressed to 1903 or further. Typical positions of his in these games in progress are 13 centres in 1907, 12 centres in 1906, 8 centres in 1903, and so on.

In all averaging Rating Lists these two players get scores which are nearly equal. In the list above you will note that Miller has a very slight edge on completed games; the BROB listing some pages back puts the advantage the other way but in both cases the difference is very small.

The second column in the table above shows what happens when we add in games in progress but count such games as full games without weighting them. Miller makes a little gain, which is not unreasonable since he will likely win his sole game in progress. However, Zelazny, who is in many games in the early stages of 1903, 1904, 1905, takes a cut of 3 points, and ends up with only about three quarters of his completed game score. Everyone will agree, I think, that this does not do justice to how well he is actually doing in the current games. To have 8 centres in a game in 1903 should not lower anyone's score. And so we proposed the weighting scheme in BROB 82 which you support in your letter, making some minor changes for ease in computation. The result is given in the third column, headed "Linear Weight". As regards the comparison between these two players it is an improvement, Zelazny is not

now penalized nearly as much merely on account of his greater activity. But he is penalized somewhat being shown as more than a full point behind Miller, although on their completed games they are within less than a fifth point of one another. Moreover, both players have some cause for complaint. Why should either of them suffer a drop from their completed game position when you consider how well both are doing in their games in progress? The final column is the result of my attempt to improve the situation by the use of a set of quadratic weights. The margin between the two players is now much reduced; both show some gains over their completed game position, in my opinion well justified by their success to date in those current games.

The weights used in producing the final column were based on a remark of Gerhard Graebner's. He feels that to use years of progress is a poor basis for deciding what fraction of a game's life is passed. Some games have ended in 1907; to say of such a game, in 1906, that it is fourtenths finished is a great underestimate. On the other hand some games have lasted until 1920. To call such a game eight tenths complete in 1910 is an equally poor estimate in the other direction. Graebner proposes that the best basis is to consider the position of the leading power in the game. If the leading power has 16 or 17 centres the game is nearly over; if the leading power has only eight or nine centres, the game is about half over, and so on, regardless of the number of years. The table of weights I used was as follows:

m	a
4	0
5	.02
6	.05
7	.08
8	.13
9	.18
10	.24
11	.31
12	.38
13	.46
14	.56
15	.66
16	.77
17	.88
18	1.00

where m is the number of centres held by the leading power in the game, and where a is the weight to use. The latter figures are obtained from the equation

$$m^2 = 4m$$

252

which is derived on the assumption that a game in which the leading power has 4 forces should not count at all as every game is in that condition in 1900, and that a game where the leading power has 18 centres, should be counted

as a full game, since that is the condition of victory.

However, there is a far more serious difficulty with the listing given on pages 14 - 16. Note the large number of people who have scores ending in -.00. There are exceptions, of course, such as Edi Birsan, but the great majority of such scores belong to people rated on one game only and quite often on a game which is now in its early years of play. Note that whatever fraction of a total

is regarded as appropriate for a game in 1904, say, then for a player who is in this game and no other game, current or finished, the game will be rated as a full game -- the fraction, whatever it may be, appears in both numerator and denominator and cancels out. That is, while these figures may be suitable enough for a player with several full games behind him, or who has a number of other games at a nearly completed stage, for the newcomer who only has one or two games at an early stage, these games are rated, for him, as if they were completed games.

This has a serious consequence. Note that for a completed game, to have survived with five centres is by no means a negligible achievement. It is, about, what the third player in a game usually achieves. But in year 1903 it is not unusual for 5 players in the game, and perhaps even 6, to have 5 centres each. All of these are, on that game, treated exactly like a person who ends a game as third survivor, i.e., much better than the average player. No harm is done as regards the player who has a number of other more advanced games to his credit, as the fractional weights reduce this beginning game to little influence. But for the beginning player, there he is, rated at a point only achieved by about one old timer in three, and he finds himself up far above the median line of the listing, in 1902 of his first game. It is unfair to those who do fight their way to third survivor position on their finished games, to find their score equalled by the great majority of those just beginning their first game. It is unfair to the beginner himself - for many of them this will be the high water-mark of their Rating List career; as they take the inevitable losses in this or other games they will go downward from the point they had when their names first appeared on the Rating List.

What should be done to remedy this is, I think, to apply an averaging shaping factor. This has been discussed previously in BROB; it was what was done to the completed game version of your listing appearing in sTab #'s 47 and 48. The multiplicative factor used in BROB's percentage listing is

$$1 - 1/2^n,$$

where n is the number of games on which the player is rated. The effect of this is to downgrade the score of a player with just a few games. Bruce Pelz, for instance, who played in only one game would have his score reduced from 17.0 to 8.5. Of course, in your current game listing where n would, usually, include a fraction, the factor would be time consuming to compute. It, or something similar, would have a very beneficial effect, however. First, some one like Pelz, who has played exactly one game, and done very well in that, would not stand forever at the head of the list, with a score unattainable by anyone who plays at all frequently and so, at least now and then, will inevitably suffer a few reverses. Secondly, it will prevent some one with 6 centres in 1905 in his first game from outranking 80% of the players on the list. To have 6 centres in 1905 in one's first game is, of course, creditable - but it has been achieved by many people who didn't thereafter win all their games, and so the

listing should not treat such a player as a serious threat to Zelazny or Smythe.

If you accept both of these changes then the score of a particular player is - but let me go over to my other typewriter which can cope with this sort of thing -

$$\left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^N S_i + \sum_{j=1}^n a_j T_j}{N + \sum_{j=1}^n a_j} \right] \cdot \left[1 - \frac{1}{2(N + \sum_{j=1}^n a_j)} \right]$$

where $a_j = m_j^2 - 4m_j$,

- m_j is the number of supply centres held by the largest power in our player's j th game,
- N is the number of completed games of our player
- S_i is the number of supply centres held at the end of his i th completed game,
- n is the number of his games in progress,
- T_j is the number of supply centres he currently holds in his j th game in progress.

I suspect that the result would be a highly interesting rating list, one that would show, reasonably well, the results of the ebb and flow of battle in progress, and one which would, at least for players with several games, say 4, correlate quite well with performance. It would certainly be the only rating list, actual or proposed, which could be regarded as fully up to date. The Glock Rating List attends to current games only as far as eliminated players are concerned. The BROB one attempts to deal with currently active players but not very successfully. No other listing pays any attention at all to current games. The system also has the very great merit that the number produced means something in itself, it is not merely an index on an arbitrary scale. For players with many games to their credit a score of x does mean that the player averages x centres at the end of his games; for the newer player the score means that he averages x centres or more in his games.

However, it seems to me that we are getting a long way from one of the features that Charles Reinsel emphasized when he prepared the first Rating List, appearing in Graustark #57, three years ago, namely, simplicity. Are you planning on giving up part of your law practice so as to devote your time to compiling Diplomacy Rating Lists? Or, perhaps, expanding it to double its present size so as to acquire the fees to pay IBM to carry out the actual computation? One or the other seems indicated.

There are a number of minor points that will have to be considered if you decide to go ahead with this listing:

1. Occasionally, in a game with one dominant player, the others will concede the issue a move or two short of the point where

the win is actually established. There was an instance of this recently in ADAG; and I believe that there was an earlier case in Grau. In such a case should the winner be credited with his actual holdings, 16 in the ADAG example, or should he be allowed the full 18 that he would have won had the game been played out to the last gasp? It seems unfair to deprive him of points that he certainly could have made if the game had been played out. On the other hand, if he is given the additional points, where do they come from? Do we assess the other players in proportion to their holdings, or what?

2. A player in a game is eliminated. Later he takes over from another player in the same game who has resigned. This has happened frequently. In taking averages, should this be regarded as two games for that player, or as one?

3. Many games are played under pseudo-nyms. Often the identity of such players is known to the Diplomacy community. Should Robin Hood's games be lumped with Locksley's in taking averages?

4. Related to the last point, club entries are often played by one individual, at least after the first few moves. Should such games be averaged separately from his other games?

5. The policy on replacement players needs tightening up. In particular, the listing cannot reconsider the assignment of the moves of a certain country first to the initial player, then the final one, then revert to the initial, and so on indefinitely.

BROB is over-burdened with Rating Lists now. It will not be taking on this one. However, if there is any other editor who would like to have a Rating List, and who likes the sound of this one, in one or other of its versions, I suggest, Gene, that such an editor contact you and that you arrange the matter between you. I have the notes I made in taking the original listing up to late June if they are of any use to you. -jamcc+))

- - - - -

New Blood.

Thomas R. Coveney, 4511 West 126th Street, Hawthorne, California, 90250, has written, indicating an interest in postal Diplomacy.

Jeff W. Key, 70 Lewis Street, Eatontown, N. J., 07724 is not so much New Blood as an entire Blood Donors' Clinic. Let us quote part of his letter:

Although I rate myself as one of the earliest converts to Diplomacy (I purchased my first set not long after Allan B. Calhamer copyrighted the game in 1959), I have only just now become aware of the existence of the great number of postal Diplomacy groups flourishing across the continent. A friend sent me several issues of Strategy and Tactics magazine and

through that medium I learned of the widespread acceptance gained by Diplomacy. It was a pleasing moment when I realized that not only were there other players who indulge in Diplomania, but there were enough of them that they had a loosely knit organization to monitor and report their activities.

My own group has two postal Dippy games in progress, both started prior to our discovery of the "outside world". Although we have taught many individuals to play the game over the last ten years, the active group now numbers only twelve players spread across the country and to Viet Nam. This small active number is mostly the result of the dispersion of players caused by college graduations and marriages.

It is my own wish to integrate my own group with the larger community and to eventually start a postal Diplomacy magazine of my own. This last is only an idea which may never bear fruit. My own experience in that field is extremely limited as I have only edited The Voice which carried the press releases and material related to our own games.

Well, Jeff, integration with Diplomacy fandom causes no difficulty whatever, at least not to you or your associates, just enter a game and you are integrated. In fact, it might be even easier than that. John Koning, whose address you have, is the official record keeper of the postal regular game. Tell him the details of the games, who was in them, what countries they played, with what results, and so on, and those games of yours will probably be put on the roster. The difficulty, such as it is, will be the other way. With a number of new games added to the roster all Rating List makers will have to revise their listings. And completist collectors now have a new magazine, namely The Voice, of which they will want copies. If you have any copies of back issues of The Voice available, I am in the market for them. And don't be so diffident about your experience. If The Voice carries press releases and other material related to your games, it is exactly the same as every other Diplomacy zine from Great Thundering Gau itself down to the late, unlamented, Lusitania. Some zines have extras; but the good reliable reporting of its games is the essential feature for any Diplomacy bulletin.

- - - - -

The Canadian Postal strike began on Thursday the 18th of July, just in time to ruin my plans for carrying the Mrehwon and Graustark games while their own editors were away on summer vacation. There are a number of American organizations with detachments here this summer. On news of the impending strike they rented Post Office boxes in Sweet Grass, Montana, about 200 miles from here, and arranged to have a man go there on Tuesdays and Fridays to pick up and send out mail. The latter kindly consented to take out a certain amount of mail for me while he was at it, however, he could not handle a bulk mailing of BROB. Players' copies of BROB 85, with moves of games 1966A0 and 1966B1 were sent out that way, as were a few other copies to gamesmasters such as John Koning. However, the great majority of you will receive issues 84, 85, and 86 together. My apologies, but nothing better could

be arranged.

The Erehwon games have been handed back to the control of Rod Walker who has returned to Rantoul.

Graustark games have had their troubles. As I understand it, John Boardman's mimeograph broke down so that he could not publish the issue he had planned to put out on July 20th. A substitute issue was published by John Koning instead. The deadline indicated in all games in that issue was two weeks after the end of the Canadian postal strike. The last day of the strike was Thursday, 8 August, 1968, with mail delivery resumed on the 9th. Accordingly the deadline for all Graustark games is now set for Thursday the 22nd of August.

Drought or deluge, feast or famine, it never rains but it pours, and all similar expressions. Two or three days ago I received word that I may have to be away for the last two weeks of August. If that is so publication of the next issue will have to be postponed until the Labour Day weekend. Graustark players should submit moves by the deadline indicated above, but should not become unduly alarmed if they do not receive the next BROB until early September. If I am here I will publish in two weeks' time; if not there will be a delay of a week.

- - - - -

The Diplomacy Press.

Listed below are the names and addresses of all Diplomacy bulletins known to me. Most are glad of subscribers though a few are sent only to players in their games. Write to the editors concerned for information on game openings.

ADAG, Hal Maus, 999 Division Street, Space B-29, National City, Calif., 92050. Well conducted games, published in a magazine with a minimum of the literary, historical, statistical, and rule-nitpicking frills which are found elsewhere. There are openings nearly always.

Aeolus, Monte J. Zelazny, P. O. Box 1062, Melbourne, Florida, 32901. The most meticulous gamesmastering in the hobby, but games are by invitation only.

Big Brother, Charles W. Reinsel, 120 8th Ave., Clarion, Penna., 16214. The fastest games published west of the Appalachians.

Froddingnag. You are looking at it. Address at end of last page.

Costaguana, Conrad von Metzke, 5327 Hilltop Drive, San Diego, Calif., 92114. The one zine where you can't guess what the next issue will contain. Interesting editorials. Openings.

Diplomania & Diplophobia, Donald Miller, 12315 Judson Road, Wheaton, Maryland, 20906. The EREF Games Bureau

zines. There are nearly always openings.

Efigiart, Doug Beyerlein, 3934 S.W. Southern, Seattle, Wash., 98116,
and Doug Baker, 19633 S.E. 29th, Issaquah,
Wash., 98027. There are openings, I believe.

Erehwon, Rod Walker, 1575A White Drive, Rantoul, Ill., 61866. Foted
for its excellent press releases. A sister zine
carries many variants mostly based on other historical epochs.

Glockorla, Dave Lebling, 3 Rollins Court, Rockville, Md., 20852. The
other WFFF zine. Carries the mean rate of
growth rating list.

Graustark, John Boardman, 592 16th St., Brooklyn, NY, 11612. Where
it all began.

Jutland Jollies, Derek Nelson, 18 Granard Blvd., Scarborough, Ontario,
Canada; and Bob Lake, Apt. #904,
35 Esterbrooke Ave., Willowdale, Ontario, Canada. O Canada!

Kalmar, Christina Brannan, 2542 North West Vaughan, Portland, Oregon,
97210, the last I heard but expecting a
move shortly.

Lonely Mountain, Charles Wells, 3021 Washington Blvd., Cleveland,
Ohio, 44118. The only magazine with
a good system of showing all moves pictorially on a map.

The Lost Ones, Stephen P. H ueston, P.O.Box 25, Zenith, Washington,
98073. Steve also contributes h is excellent work with
the mimeo to Efigiart.

Miskatonic University, Anders Swenson, 145 Ponderosa Lane, Walnut Creek,
Calif., 94598. Specializes in 5-man games.

Ragnarok, John Koning, 318 South Bella Vista, Y oungestown, Ohio, 44509.
A brand new zine, published by Diplomacy's best
known gamesmaster, it expects to always have game openings, new games
being formed continuously.

sTab, John Koning, address immediately above. Carries the Roster of
all postal Diplomacy games. sTab is a must for
all addicts of the game.

Thulcandra, Terry Kuch, Apt. 204, 1910 13th St., North, Arlington,
Virginia, 22201. The Mensa Diplomacy zine it
is not generally available for subscription or trade. Diplomacydom
seems given to statistics; it might prove interesting to find out the
proportion of postal Diplomacy players who would be eligible to join
Mensa.

Valhalla, John Koning, whose address is given a few lines back. In
addition to one Diplomacy game this carries

the classified advertising and similar material for Strategy and Tactics.

Wild 'n Woolly, Dan Brannan, 2542 North West Vaughan, Portland, Oregon, 97210, but due for change shortly. This is where the present magazine form of Diplomacy bulletin originated, with many games, illustrations at times, and other features.

Xenadu, Norman McLeod, 906 Kimberwicke Road, McLean, Virginia, 22101, and Charles Welsh, 6917 Cherry Lane, Annandale, Virginia, 22003. Has openings.

Xenogogic, Lawrence Peery, 4567 Virginia Ave., San Diego, Calif., 92115. Persistent Peeritis Peerpetuated! You must see at least one issue.

The following zines have either ceased publication or are about to do so:

Armageddonia: In early June I had a letter from its editor, Charles Turner, stating that its publisher, Jim Dygert, had just left for Texas. Charles at that time planned to issue one further issue, which would wind up two of its games, just completed, and then planned to hand its remaining games over to BROB. No further word from him has been received here and I understand that Charles is now, himself, away from home on a course. Presumably there will be, at most, one further issue.

Cerebral Nebula. Its last issue was published in November 1967. One of its three games is now carried in Efgiart; no provision seems to have been made for the other two.

International Enquirer, the only Dippy zine with a cartoon strip. Its most recent issue appeared in November 1967 and no word has been received concerning provision for its only game.

Marsovia carried only one game, which ended in the last issue appearing about 6 weeks ago. Its editor, Bob Ward, stated that there would be one further issue if the winner wished to publish a victory statement but not otherwise.

- - - - -

Diplomacy is a game invented by Allan B. Calhammer about a decade ago. The commercial version of it is manufactured and sold by Games Research, Inc., 48 Wareham St., Boston, Mass., 02118. It is also obtainable at some Game stores. The price is \$7.95. The magazines listed above are devoted to the postal play of the game. There are many others which cover variants of different sorts.

BROEDIMMAG is one of the magazines covering the standard game. It is edited and published by John McCallum, Ralston, Alberta, Canada. Back, current, and future issues are alike ten cents per copy.