Home of The Zine Column, but otherwise, "content without form" is:

# DIPLOMACY DIGEST

Issue #38
August 1980
Theme issue: Ethics

Mark L Berch 492 Naylor Place Alexandria VA 22304 Subs: 10 for \$3.00 Eutrope: 10 for \$3.50 Circulation: 118

This is another one of those stride-briskly-into-the-quicksand issues, for the topic is a sensitive one. Inside is a look at what is probably the biggest dippy cheating
scandal to hit England, a look at what constitutes deception of the GM and much more.
There is an abundance of British material here, probably because the game is looser
there; stunts that would get you severly criticized here is much more acceptable there.
Plus there are quite a few characters who will try to pull such a stunt just for the
fun of it, even if it has little chance of helping things.

A few quick takes on lastish...Konrad Baumeister is apparently backing off that ill-advised idea...I appreciate your coments on the "Awards", and no, I see no contradiction between criticiszing some of these people on other matters and giving them these awards. Actually, I don't have too much to say here, so I'M gonna switch the rest of the front page over to a TZC column, so it won't take as much bite from the rest.

## The Zine Column #27

ľ

### Zine Nooze

A number of my subbers have started their zines this summer, so I thought I\*d list; Al Pearson Route 1 Box 17785 Kearneysville W. Va 25430 (Just Amoung Friends)
Bernard Sampson 123 Sixth Street Middlesex, N.J. 08846 (Torpedo)
Mike Conner 3214 Beverly Road Austin, Texas 78703 (Lone Star Diplomat)
Jack Masters 25711 N. Vista Fwys Dr Valencia, CA 91355 (Black Frog)

Its interestesting to note that three of these of these are Zeroz/Offset. In the next few years, the use of X/O will continue to rise. This will be due in part to new technology coming on stream for photocoping: Fiber Optics. Those machines will have some limitations (the optics are fixed, so the document must move, making books impractical) but they will significantly lower the price of these machines, down to about \$3000 at the bottom of the line. This means greater penetration of these machines into small stores and offices, meaning that accessat workplace or via parents will increase Indeed, the gap in prices between more fannish methods and Xerox is smaller than you may think --- Ron Brown in MM #23 reports that he plans to lay out "well over a thousand bucks" for a new mimeo. Note of course that Ditto is Dead (hm -- good headline!) Indeed, Passchendaele #26 and #27 featured astonishingly good repro, probably as good as the medium is capable of. But lets face it folkes, inking drums and pinning up sheets on the line to dry are traditionally fannish, but they aren't very creative, and creativity is what the hobby is all about (the amateur publishing hobby that is).

Fakes are back in center stage again. Eggnog was faked with a modest job. In it is a very old essay -- about 8 years ago. To me, that points a bit of a finger at Ralph Morton, which means that Cuerrier might have had his finger in it too --- some of the humor sounds like his, and not someone like, say, Rod Walker. Jack Maters sez that (turn to page 12)

((Starting things off will be what was perhaps Englands most celebrated cheating scandal. It did not occur in some obscure corner of the hobby, but to one of the best known players, in a solidly establishiment zine. Our story starts in Ethil the Frog #21, 26 Jan 1973, with an essay by the editor and GM, John Piggott))

### TREACHERY IN MALCOIM STREET!

Somethimes, spectators of Ethil games have asked me whether I experience any problems with having some players live so close to me. Up till now, the answer has been a firm"no", but I regret to say that this is no longer the case. Last Thursday, when about half of the players had sent in their orders, I returned to my room somethat earlier than usual, having decided not to attend a physics practical session. On opening the door, I discovered Andy Davidson industriously copying down various sets of Orders from "A", "B", "D", amd "G" games.

Obviously, I couldn't let Andy get awat with this. As I saw it, I have three alternative solutions to the problem: I could discuss him from the games and appoint a standby player, or I could suspend the game and call for a resubmission of the orders, or I could order all Andy's units this season to stand whilst the other players performed their planned manoeuvres. The question was, which? I asked Don Turnbull for his opinion, taking as example a hypothetical situation --- this maybe wasn't quite fair to Don, but I couldn't think of any other way to get Don's views, especially as Andy was in the same room at the time ((!!)) and I couldn't really order him to leave the room while in someone else's house. Anyway, Don advised that a player offending in this way should be chucked out of the games, because altho this would be a legitimate tactic in face-to-face games ((not where I play))players have paid money to participate in a postal game, and are entitled to receive absolutely fair treatment in matters of this sort.

I thought this a trifle harsh, on reflection, so for once I've decided not to take Don's advice. ((I should explain that England does not really have an "ombudsman" tradition as we do. GMs often just consult their peers (other GMs), and most often they consult Don, as he seems to have some sort of Grandfatherly image, and was Britians first postal GM.)) Rather than call for resubmission of orders (which I feel would be unfair to the rest of the players, because Andy already had details of any stabs they might have lined up for him, which he would obviously been unaware of normally), I decided to rule that Andy's units shall stand unsupported for this season of play. I hope that this seems a reasonably fair ruling to the other players.

This business obviiously raises the question of whether Andy hhas been pulling this kind of trick before. Andy denies it, and personally I feel inclined to believe him at this time. ((Why? If Andy hd gotten away with this stunt undiscovered, and John had happened to ask hhim the same question, would he have admitted what he had just done? I can't imagine why he would. It seems to me the same reasoning would apply to the actual question that John asked him.)) Its's unfortunate, tho, that he happenes to be doing well in all his games, because the suspicion must now automatically ar se that his good positions are due to frequent foreknowledge of other players' moves.

I have warned Andy that any repetition of this will result in his immediate removal from all games. In a way, all this is my fault, for not keeping players' orders under lock and key. Tehy will be, in future, tho its going to be a dammed nuisance forever locking and unlocking doors. I hope no-one criticises me too heavily over this, because quite frankly I'm already feeling quite pissed off about the whole business. ((Note that last sentence. Its the closest that John can come to actually criticizing Andy. And he seems to be concerend mostly for the extra bother. You would think that Andy's actions would at least rate a few sentences of withering criticism, no? And you would think that in the next issue, Andy would be all knids of contrite. Well, guess again, cause next up is from #22))

A number of people have commented on my handling of the Davidson affair recounted last issue. Gratifyingly, most supported the action I took, tho a few thought I should have taken Don Turnbull's advice and cast him out from all hismgames. Unfortunately,

ત

there have also been a few dissenting voices, like this one:

Andy Davidson: Might I be permitted to say a few words in my defense before a mob of enraged Ethil readers descend on Cambridge and string me up from the nearest lampost that isn't already festooned with bicycles. I am, of course, referring to the great Spy Scandal as reported in Ethil #21.

Everyone seems to assume automatically that I was breaking the rules, i.e. cheating (horrified gasps). So, lets take a look at the rules of Diplomacy. What do we find but that "in the Diplomacy period nothing is sacred". In all the face to face groups I've played in this means that looking at other people's orders, if you get the chance, is perfectly permissable. Ah-ha, you all cry, but this is postal play. I can hardly disagree (((!!!))) so we now look at the rules covering postal play then applicable, These are the Ethil house rules as published in #1. The first sentence states, "The normal rules of Diplomacy (9171) will be in operation unless otherwise specified." That seems pretty clear to me; so where's the bit saying that reading people's orders is illegal once the GM has read them? Try as you might, I don't think you'll find it? "Deception of the GM is not tolerated under any circulmstances", maybe? I'm afraid that won!t do; not only have I not lied to John about this, but I have repeatedly woarned him that it was quite possible for me to cunduct such espionage, and suggested that he improve his extremely lax security.

Thus, what John is doing, is making up a new house rule to cover the situation, and then applying it retroactively. I cant; stop him from doing that (as John said to me, "I"m the GM and I can do what I bloody well like".) but don 't expect me to like it. After all, I have to work on t e basis of the rules as they stand, rather than any that might be invented in the fututre. If I find a loophole in the rules, I dont' see why I shouldn't tkae advantage of it...

That's my main argument completed, so now for a few incidental items. About Don's comments to John: What does money have to do with it? People often pay money to play in face to face games, in the NGC and CUEWC for a start, so surely there's a contradiction somewhere?

There's the idea that John's punishment is more lenient than having me kicked out. That's not so - I don't mind being kicked out, I've got plenty of other games to keep me happy. However, it prolongs the agony having to miss a season (and also the builds) and then struggle on with the crippled remains of a once great country - tho I admit it hasn't had much effect on my position in 1972 ABde.

As for the unfair argument, it's not as if I'm the only person in the country who can do this. lots of players live close to GMs, and those who don't will have advantages that the others don't have. Anyway, if Diplomacy were made completely fair, every game: would end in a seven way draw.....

- (((The whole point is, it isn't fair to all the players equally. If you're playing is a face to face game, and someone reads your orders, won't you take steps to rewrite your orders sot that he can't benefit by your espionage. Damn right you will!
- (((Okay, so this is a postal game. I submit that when a player's orders have been lodged with the GM, it is now, for that player, "after the period for writing down the set of orders" even the he and other players may still submit further sets of orders up until the deadline period has passed. That player therefore has a right to expect that his orders will not be read by anyone until the adjudications are made, and you must be as aware of this as anyone else.
- (((OK, my security system was lax. That doesn't automatically allow you to go snooping around in my room, does it? The fact that you told me I ought to tighten up my security is no excuse for your behavior.
- (((What advantages have those who live far away from GMs? None as far as I can see. And while it's true that you're not the only person who could cary out such antics,

that's going to be small comfort to poor old Evan Evans from Penmaenmawr, who plays postally because his face goes red whenever he plans a stab, when he finds his orders have been read and he doesn't even know it!

(((You've brought up a fair amount of verbiage in trying to justify yourself in temrs of the rules of Diplomacy and my houserules. As you pointed out, no rule covered this situation, and so I had to make one up. Many times in the past the rulebook and houserules of various magazines have been found inadequate; mypresent rules are a conglom eration of years of experience in postal play. It is perhaps unfortunate that I applied my new rule retroactively, but I felt, and I still do, that i had no real choice in the matter. If you feel so bad about this, then I suggest you stop bleating about how cruel it is to stick around watching your country disintrigrate, and resign like a gebtleman and get out while you're still ahead.

(((Ultimately, you know, my final answer is one you have already trotted out: I'm the GM and I can do what I bloody well like....)))

Then there's your hypocrisy in refusing to accept my orders for "B" game, and then complaining about the lack of orders for the game. And what about the past moans about people who miss moves spoiling the games for others --- another contradiction, I think. There are further aspects of your hypocrisy that I woun't go into, 'cos you won't print them, but I'll leave them for people to guess about.

(((I presume you are referring to the situation in BritDipCon I, when I (and several others) were able to read sets of orders for <u>War Bulletin</u> games. In particular, I saw Michel Feron's orders for 1971BU; however, my orders had already been submitted at that stage, and I took no action as a result of my espionage. I suppose you have further examples of my "hypocricy - your letter suggests as much - but you don't seem to be very willing to put your arguments forward, whatever they may be.)))

Finally, should you have any further doubts, Gentlemen of the Jury, God himself has given his verdict. As a trial by combat (((!!))), John and I played two games of Situation 4 - needless to say, I won!

(((Yes, and you keep beating me at bar billiards, you bastard; and that's a game I'm supposed to be good at! Never mind, I'm sure Geoff Corker will give you the come-uppance you destave when he arrives here next october. I hope you don't expect to do any work here, Geoff....))).

Richard Walkerdine:.....As for Andy Davidson, I expect you'd prefer to leave that episode as quickly as possible. Complete expulsion from all games would probably have been a bit harsh for a first offense, especially as it was a first offense not only for andy but also for any of your readers. Your action and public announcement of the affair will proabaly guarentee Andy's good behaivior, and if you couple this with a warning that anything similar will be dealt with more harshly in future I think you will proabably have done as much as anyone could in the circumstances. And that will be my last word on the subject; some things benefit by continued discussion, but with others, its best to get them over with as soon as possible, and leave them well enuf alone. (((And that just about sums up my sentiments))).

((But not mine, naturally, as I have reprinted this whole matter, albeit more than 7 years later. And this sounds like a nice one for a GM poll, especially since I have quite GMs now on my mailing list. How would you rule if you were the GM? If you feel that the impossibility of the event makes an answer unrealistic, then how would you advise another GM? If it matters, assume that the player isn't a DD subscriber:

A. Do nothing at all

D. Expell him from his games

E. Other (specify)

B. Inform players and reset the dealine
6. NMR him for that season (what JP did)

If the response is large enuf, I'll break it down according to experienced/inexperienced, so give me the number of yers you've been gming. If you attack comments, please be sure to indicate that they are off the record, otherwise I'll assume its OK))

# NORTH AMERICAN DIPLOMACY FEDERATION: HOBBY BOGEYMAN OR BOOM?

Last December I received in the mail "And Now For SomethingCompletely Different" from Rod Walker, which turned out to be the "specs" for a brand new organization, complete with historical backround, a proposed constitution, and a call for suggestions and criticisms. I cackled with glee --- ripping this apart would be such fun! Next, I assembled the tools of my trade: my bound volumes of Quibbler's Quarterly, "The Almanac of Obfuscation", "Nitpicking by Number", plus several items by Robert Sacks, including "Triumph Through Terrific Titles", "Let's do it my way", and of course, "Sacks on Sub-Sub-Committees." I plowed thru the entire affair and came to a dismaying conclusion: I couldn't find any really serious problems. Oh, I had about 20 criticizms, but nothing major, and besides, the Constitution is easily amended. So I sent off the 20\* items to Rod, but told him that I was willing to ratify it even in its present form. And, as it turned out, so was everyone else. This was no accident. Rod has had a lot of experience at this sort of thing, and he had a good idea of what was acceptable. There then followed several issues of a discussion zine, and a round of votes, with the issues on which we were split put off until later. Ratification by everyone but Sacks and Lipscomb followed, and NADF was born.

NADF is a <u>federation of hobby custodians</u>. It is and must be a "federation" because each of the custodians is an independent service, and NADF does not change that. Each of us is still responsible for doing our jobs, including raising the money for it if no other source is available. We are banding together for whatever benefits will accrue to us in doing so, and to benefit the hobby as well.

One of our prime responsibilites will be to replace a non-functioning custodian when the normal methods fail. For example, once upon a time, a certain Boardman Number Custodian absquatulated, but did not appoint a sucessor. The result was a lot of complaints and delays, and ultimately much more tangled work for the next BNCs. Even today the records are not fully back in order. It will be the NADF's responsibility to see that this does not happen again with hobby custodians.

At present, NADF is in the final stages of internal matters and finalizing its membership. There is no precise answer to the question, "Who is a custodian?" By and large, it is whomever the rest of the custodians think is, a somewhat selfiterative process. If an offer is made, and declined, fine. And if any of the custodians change their minds, they can just resign, and that ends any obligations on both sides. There is neither coercion or obligation, beyond what you want to do.

The first order of substantive business is to locate an NADF Ombudsman. If your game has a canadian in it, its covered by the CDO Ombudsman (Cuerrier), or if its in the PDT, its covered by me, but otherwise, as of Jan 1, 1980, you were out of luck. I persually know of at least 4 disputes that could have been handled MUCH better had an Ombudsman been available. Of course, if you don't want to use one, fine, but at least this way you have the option. Anyhow, this will almost certainly be Randolph Smyth, and I think that without NADF, the present state of affairs would continue indefinately.

No sconer did the word get out, than the criticism started flowing. Leading off was Cuerrier who worried that we were trying to "merge" with CDO. But by its very nature NADF is in no position to merge with other organizations. We seek cooperation of course, but this cooperation need not entail any changes in the nature of the other organization. Anyhow, that mater has been cleared up entirely after numerous letters. The rest of the criticism has gone along the lines of: "You're a mass-membership Dippy organization, so a) why wasn't my opinion solicited b) we've seen this before and know it won't work c) You're just trying to kill off the IDA d) You're not organizing this right for a mass-membership outfit e) who needs it. I'm leaving out some of the purely ad hominem stuff.

NADF is NOT intended as a mass-membership organization. Incidently, I see nothing wrong with them, and while IDA has been a fiasco during the last few years, in its prime it got a lot done for the hobby, but that sanother subject

The primary membership of the NADF are the custodians, who comprise the Steering Committee. The SC has the authority to set forth and impliment NADF policy. In addition, there are provisions for two auxiliaries. One is a CM/Publisher's outfit. Aside from the responsibility for writing a CM Code of Ethics, the structure and function of this outfit has been left vague, to give it maximum freedom. This CM/P will come into being if 1) Someone feels like doing the work of organizing it, and 2) The CM/Ps feel that there is a need for such an outfit. Personally, I see no rush, andonly time will tell if its implemented. Second, there will be the supporting members. There are always people around who would like to support the hobby, but lack either the time or the inclination to do so directly. But they do have cash, and that sometimes helps. This will be a means for those who would like to contribute.

Now, you would think that people would wait until we actually ask for dues, explaining how much they are, what will be done with them, and what you get in return, before discussing it. But no, people are so down on organizations they just can't wait. Such editorializing as you saw recently in St Geo and the Dragon is, in a word, premature.

What I'd like the hobby to do is wait till we actually start screwing things up before coming in with the criticism. Judge us by our deeds, not by some preconceived notion of what we are or what you think we should be, or are about to become. I really don't think that's too much to ask.

... The basic problem was is it ethical to bribe a player in a game to get him to do what you want. I.E. I'll give you five bucks to invade this guy or that...

The major problem in such a bribm is that of promise of delivery. For, there is nothing to bind the player to act once he has the bribe, and then nothing to force the briber to pay off when the deed is done. For this reason there will probably be no cases of bribery for a while. But, a more interestinf case will develope with the spread of prize money for the DipCon tournaments and the like. While this is being written on June 10 I can see a very valuable tool in the use of bribes in the final round of the tourney. No doubt I would use it if I had the opportunity, and it would go like this:

I'm closing on the endgame period of the final round with an ally who has been faithful and what not. It becomes obvious from the situation that it is a three power game with the promise of a long drawn out game if we attempt to have an even growth against the third party. I turn to my ally and say: "Look, I want the trophy, support me to the win and you can have the cashprim"

Now, when you're talking about \$5 and \$10 by andlarge the ally will talk circles around you andlaugh behind your back. But when the cash prizes hit two-three hundred dollars there is going to be a lot of soul searching. The question remains. The question remains, fine, I made the offer, what prevents me from stabbing my ally and not giving him the money. After all, the show recognizes only one winner. Well, the same thing that prevents a player from stabbing all the time would prevent me from stabbing here: I'd never get another alliance for the rest of my career. While there would be some people who would say: Well, dummy deserved everything he got for such a stupid deal, the majority would be so outraged that it would have a drastic effect on my future enjoyment of the game. ((I wonder. If the deal wasn't written, you could always deny that it was ever consumated. Plus I suspect that those who would be outraged by the betrayal would for the most part be those who were outraged by the deal in the first place, so you didn't lose them with the betrayal. Those who accept the ethics of such a deal under the alls-fair-in-love-and-war notion are not going to be bothered by the betrayal, figuring that's the Tisk you take.))

Is such a deal Ethical??? From my standpoint totally so. After all you are

barganing with parts of the game. You are not making cross game alliances nor are you introducing elements from outside that particular game....i.e. The prize money is an internal part of that particular game and therefore subject to use ((This ocassioned the following exchange in #38, 11-30-73))

Nicky Palmer: ....re bribes. Maybe you're right that these are ethically in keeping with the game. But that doesn't mean they should be allowed, because the effect is to turn Diplomacy into a playground for the rich, like polo, yachting and winning fortunes on the stockmarket. If I play in a prize tournament (that'll be the day when Denmark ((Where Nicky lived then)) runs a Diplomacy tournament at all) I don't have so much money that I would want, except as a last resort, to start promising the \$500 prize moneyto other players so that I can win some trophy, nice that that would be, no doubt. If however I had a steady \$10,000 a year income, then I would certainly do it if it is allowed; indeed I might add some of my own money too. Thus \$10,000 per year guys will tend to win prize tournaments. Don't the rich in a private enterprise society get enough unearned prizes as it is?

(((Not a bad reply. Well let me add here that from my point of view adding some of your own money would be unethical as you are introducing something into the game which is not within the original boundaries, like the cross game deals. At the moment, there is one cash prize game in the hobby: In Warlord and one big Prize game in Pellucidar where the prizes are free games and subscriptions and what-not. Hoosier Archives has a trophy series going and that about covers it for rewards. I would suppose that once the money pots reached the hundreds of dollars the wealthier players would have an advantage and in those circumstances I can see your point. But with the cash prizes as they are now the deciding factor is not really the monetary gain.....but then again I'm speculating. I'm in that Warlord game, and I have figured that if I go to say past 1911 or so (the average game length) I might spend \$3 on phone calls, \$7.50 on postage and \$.50 on envelopes and the like or \$11, added to this is the game fee of \$5 and if I win I come ahead \$9 IF I keep all the money. I plan to use the prize money as a barganing weapon in the final reaches of the game, if I survive 1902 as I'm playing Germany -- just to see what the reactions of everyone are. So we'll see. ((They didn't get to ---Edi was eliminated in F04. The \$25 prize was won by Doug Beyerlein who took over England in 1909. Doug said he was giving the dough to charity.)) ((Sometimes a GM must make a spot decision on whether a particular stunt is ethical, when he sees it unfolding before his very eyes. If he can't apporve, he can "expose" it, otherwise, he lets it pass. Here is an account of such an incident, quoted, but not occuring, in Megalomania #20 9-3-79 written by Chris Tringham, the editor))

An interesting problem has arisen in Spirit of the Age. In the Game Two press for issue #12, the following press release was printed (NB: The  $\mathtt{GM}^{ullet}$ s dateline is "GROUNDHOG"): "Groundhogg: Owing to Mr McHales desire to pull out of this game for his exams the Fall 1904 orders should be resubmitted for issue #14. He has agreed to submit orders for the OK?" Note that the spelling is different, and it does not appear in capitals. However, it seemed to have fooled two of the players in the game, as they failed to submit orders for the next issue (#13). Peter Caldraft (the GM) didn't print an adjudication in issue 13, but instead asked for a player vote on whether Russia and Italy should be allowed to submit orders for the next deadline. Both did, but the proposal to allow these orders was defeated (presumably by Austria - who had written the press in question; and England and Turkey who gained from the manoeuvers). The two affected players also wrote Pete, which appear in the current Spirit, protesting at the deception and blaming him for (1) publishing the press and (2) not then holding the game over. They have also both threatened to drop out, as has Andrew Parsons, who had actually gained from the NMRs. Pete has vigourously defended himself against all complaints, pointing out that its not up to him to censor or alter press, and that it wasn't a very convinving fake - the grammar is an obvious giveaway, as is the use of "Fall" rather than Autumn ((In Britian, what we call Fall they call Autumn)). There

There was also a genuine piece of GM press earlier on, so I doubt if any reasonable player would be fooled: Pete seems to have allowed for this, never actually thinking that anyone would NMR because of it - ((dubious speculation)) tho even if he beleived it would cause NMRs he should still have printed it.

I can find nothing wrong with what Pete has done, and in his position I would have done exactly the same thing. If anything, he was overfair to the affected players, being quite within his rights to carry on without giving the players an opportunity to vvote on whether to allow late orders. Diplomacy is not a game played by gentlemen, and fair play doesn't come into it. If a player finds a way of gaining an "unfair" but leagal way of gaining an advantage - good luck to him. Incidently, players in Meglomania are warned that if the same were to happen here I would make the same decision as peter did.

((One way of fending off such disputes is to cover these type of stunts, in general or in particular in the House Rules. Very few GMs do so. Here are some that touch on general ethical questions. The first are from Passchendaele:))

XI. Deception of the GM: A player must have the GM's permission before entering a game under an alias: No mention of the use of a penname will be made in the zine.

No one may borrow his pseudonym ...((by using)) another player's name. A player may mislead the GM and the other players as to his age, sex, job, education, etc if he belives this will improve his chances in the game.

It is forbidden to play several positions in the same game under multiple identites or to use a mail drop location to conceal a fact of importance to the game. It is forbidden to forge the GM's or the publisher's signature in a letter to another plaer. No nne may forge another's signature in a letter to the GM or the publisher. It is forbiden to mutilate another's letter and send it to the GM or publisher while making it appear to be authentic. All players are warned against "signing their orders" in the co cousse of their negotiations with another player.

No one may prejudice an opponent's chances by undermining the information and other services which the publisher and his GM make available to all players as recompense for game- and sub-fees. ((This appears to be ruling out a phoney readjudication, but it is unclear to me if the press stunt above would be bared under this.))

((The next excerpt comes from Hessel's DIMAN #29, 1/22/77:))

III A) Cheating -- "Cheating" is derined as an unsucessful effort to decive the Games master by submitting orders for moves, retreats, builds and/or removals, and signing an eroneous name thereto, in such a manner as to suggest appear as the it were written by another person. Such offenses shall be dealt with severely; upon detection, such perpetrators shall be immediately expelled from <u>Diman</u> games and their subscriptions terminated with no refund. There is no penalty for successful attempts to decive the GM. However, there is no stature of Limitations.

((Next is from the <u>Meglomania</u> 1979 HRs (Chris Tringham)(Chris incidently puts out one of the most interesting and chatty zines around and I will be doing a review of it for <u>DD</u> a little later in 1980)))

Deception of the GM is not allowed, but everything else is - so don't come complaining to me when another player "cheats", or deceives YOU!...If you are in doubt about these rules ((his HRs)), the Diplomacy Rules, or the legality of any scheme to fool the other player, please ask me. If you wish to deliberatlely mis-order a unit, or are planning to issue a fake readjudication, tell me. As long as its legal, I will be happy to give assistance/advice - but my main concern is toknow about it, so that I don't destroy your plan unintentionally. (If you had tried to bring about an NMR from a fellow player, then it saves me the worry of looking for his orders and even checking with him to see if he sent orders.) ((I do wonder about that "assistance" bit. I really

×

don't think that a GM should assist in any way. Its one thing to stay out of the way; its quite another to lend assistance))

Probably the most famous deception-of-the-GM scandal to hit the US hobby in many years was the Black Hole affair in Linsey's Voice of Doom. In my opinion, Bruce made several procedural errors in that business, but ultimately, his decision to expell the player (who changed his story) was correct, and I would also have expelled had I been in his shoes. One off the points made in that discussion was that when GMs bar deception, they really mean attempted deception, a point alluded to by Diman earlier. And Bruce raises a question that I frankly don't have the answer to: Suppose someone has deceived you, or tried to, but you can't prove it, tho you are certain of it (i.e.g. deception was in the course of a telephone conversation.) Do you overlook it, in which case you are breaking your houserules and are encouraging further attempts? Or do you expell the player, knowing that he will bitterly deny everything and you will not have anything to rely upon except the its-his-word-again-mine argument, which can never really be 100% persuasive. But I digress. Here's his latest HR on this, from YBD##24:

((Our next bit of skulldugery appeared in <u>Dolchstoss</u> #26, 12/9/74 an was an "Open Letter from Sturrt Dagger", appearing along with the FO1 adjudications in a game of Youngestown in which Stuart was playing France( what else is there to do with the line)

In any game there are certain ethical standards. These are normally difficult to codify, but without them the game becomes unplayable. In postal Diplomacy I would suggest that one of these principles is that the GM must not be dragged into the skulduggery. He is not, must not be, part of the game. To impersonate him, whether in a letter or over the telephone is to drag him in in a way that must jeopardize the trust which has to exist between him and the players. If one cannot believe the signed notes from the GM it becomes almost impossible for him to correct the errors which occur in even the best run games. When that happens the system is not far from breaking down.

3 or 4 days after receiving the last <u>Dolchstoss</u>, I received a readjudication notice, supposedly from Richard, and supposedly signed by him. This altered the moves of the other countries in a way that affected my position greatly. I later got a letter from the player whose moves had been altered, and he still seemed to be talking about the moves in the original report of the game. So I checked up, and a long distance telephone call from London to Aberdeen revealed that there had been no readjudication and that Richard's signature on the note was therefore a forgery. This, to my way of thinking is a gross violation of the ethics of the game.

So, 8 of you, be on your guard, and if the ninth would care to come forward and defend his action I should be very interested to hear him. I don't know who the culprit was and I have refrained from asking for his expulsion from the game, tho I feel that he probably deserves it.

GM ((Richard Sharp)) I do not regard this action as unethical in any way - fortunately, as I have twice tried something similar myself. Whole zines have been forged in the past! This sort of thing is hallowed (if that's the word) by long tradition now anyhow. When I hear of this type of tactic, I shall always do what I have done this time i.e. anywer those who ask me about it, but not inform anyone voluntarily. Stuart doesn't know my signature, but to me there are obvious reaons for being suspicious: a London postmark (my GMing efforts are usually posted here in Amersham) ((suppose the postmark was illegible, and is a player really expected to check these things and besides, GMs do move about)), an improbable story ((I don't know what that refers to, but lots of things, especially errors, are improbable in this game)), and wrong punctuation! ((wonderful. A player is supposed to check his GMs punctuation)) Those who have played in

games with me know my signature and would have spotted this travesty a mile off anyway! And I never use blue carbon paper, nor is the typewriter much like any of the five I use. ((And what of those not favored with a signed letter from Richard? Or who aren"t sure whether he uses 5 typewriters or perhaps a sixth they weren't aware of. And how woulds anyone know what type of carbon paper he doesn't use??))...

((In the next issue, he presented "some views on the Great Youngstown Readjudication Scandal". In that issue, I might add, Richard totally changed his format and printing style, going from mimeo on 14 inch paper to offset digest-style. So much for this supposed GM consistancy that players are supposed to spot the lack of))

Peter Birks: The question is: Was it illegal? Some people know the full story, which is too stupid to recount in these pages (no need to agree, Sharp), but I reckon that a forged adjudication is, at the moment, legal. Whether it should remain so is a matter for debate. Let me throw up a test questions, tho. Suppose the forger of a fake readjudication telephones the GM to find out whether the readjudication is a forgery. He asks the GM, "Has there been a readjudication?" Is that legal? Or has the player decived the GM? My personal view is that any player is entitled, at any time, to enquire whether there had been a readjudication or not; but then again, I'm biased.

Robin Brown: ... Lagree with ... (Dagger)).. 100%. Any amount of lies, threats and comical letters from anyone, in or out of the game, is perfectly fair and above board. But as the GM does not really exist within the framework of the game itself, he cannot be part of the game or part of the deception. There must be one reliable source of information on which players can rely without question: The GM. The I would be the first to agree that I am not a good player I should hazte to think that the only way I could gain an advantage would be to behaive as someone has toward Stuart. It would be better not to, play at all. I'm very sorry to hear that you not only condone this sort of thing but admit to having taken similar action yourself. "Tradition is not the world I would use to describe this sort of conduct. I doubt very much if Alan Calhamer intended it when he game the world Diplomacy.

Greg Hawes ((Speculates and offers some proof that Birks did it, and indicates he was in fact fooled, concluding:)) "Oh well, I'm on my guard now."

Editorial Comment: There was another letter from Stuart, but I'm afraid that I've mislaid half of it; roughly it accepted my ruling but restated the case for changing the rules to cover this sort of matter. There has also been a great deal of (largely ribald) verbal comment from others, the long-term player coming down massively on the si ide of the forger, as was only to be expected.

Now, I know who did it, so I won't comment on Greg's letter. So far as Pete's question goes, this is obviously a nasty point - I think it is deception but of course its impossible to prove it was intentional. Rowin, I think puts the case very well for the small but obviously ernest minority, the I don't think we can bring Alan Calahmer into it - did he envisage postal Diplomacy at all? I can only disagree - like Greg, w whos admits to having been deceived completely, I learned mistrust the hard way. My view is that anything goes except deception of the GM, because that is the way I understand the game. I can even imagine cases where a breach of a law of the land would not in my view be unethical in Diplomacy! ((Exactly, and this is part of the anything-goes problem. What's to prevent a player from pulling the orders out of the GMs mailbox; thus NMRing his opponent? Or intercepting the zine from a player's mailbox? None of these involve deception of the GM.))

Robin's argument is that the GM should be above suspicion. Fair enuf. In the same way you might regard the Archbishop of Canterbury as above suspicion, but before you commit yourself you would do well to make sure that the tall, robed, impressive apparition on your doorstep really is an Archbishop and not just Duncan Morris in Drag... ((I side squabely with Stuart and Robin, and I like Cuerrier's way of putting the matter. Such actions undermine the services that players have paid for, and that's not fair))

(continued from the last page) tom six for zines getting large numbers of votes. This reduces the influence of grudge votes, tho it does add to Leeder's work.

- ... Not having the necessary support to kick Austria out of Gal, Italy's move to Gal should have failed. When I pointed this out to Lee, on the phone, he urged me not to point out this error to anyone ((this is Lee Kendter, Sr, the Italian player)) I should have taken the hint that something devious was going on in his head...
- GM ((John Boyer)) : I was wondering is I did make such a mistake! I was also wondering why Austria didn't bring it up! The case was Austria was wiped out regardless of that move and so no one complained! I am very sorry that a mistake was made by myself, but I am also sorry to hear that players can be unethical to notice a mistake, but not to report it. I don't make mistakes on purpose, and if I see an error I correct it. And I expected the players to do the same. It saddens me
- ...In my view (often stated before) a player who takes part in a game without any attempt to win it should be banned from any further games...

  ...A cheat is one who enters a game with no intention of winning it, and whose moves are directed, deliberately, to some other purpose, such as obtaining a draw or allowing another player to win, for however deviews a reason. Cheats should be banned...

  ...A moron is one whose moves are based on the keeping of treaties, irrespective of the results thereof...The distinction between a cheat and a moron is a rather subtile one, tho I know the difference when I come to inspect individual specimens...
- ((Here's a question in face-to-face ethics, from <u>Diplomanta</u> #24/25, June 1969. A few issues back, Jared Johnson had run an article "Unethical Practices in Diplomacy" with a series of questions. In one of these:))
- 1. A player agrees to let his ally see his orders before they ar e all exposed to all players, to make sure he is not being double-crossed. Unanimously ((by his respondents)) declaired ethical. A majority would not resort to this themselves, but would not mind if someone else did, and definately would not have made this illegal. ((This sometimes comes up at tournaments, and at DipCon 1979 this question was brought to the GM for a ruling. Basically we said that it was up to the people in the game to decide what to do, and how/whether to enforce any standards that they decided to set in the matter))

Black Frog #11 was a hoax issue and that he hasn't seen it yet, but I've got my doubts. It defianately has a fake feel to it, but I suspect that Jack has faked his own zine (a fake fake, not to be confused with what Jerry Jones called a fake fake in his fake). The zine is hilarious, and features what I think may be a first for a dipzine: color fotos (presumably Xerox). I will be amazed to learn that anyone can mimic Jack's sense of humor so closely. Incidently, Jack has had a droll series of "southern" definitions, laced with hobby references (E.G. Libel. Likely to. "If yore wife finds out you roomed with Kathy Byrne at Origins, she'slibel to kill you.")

But the biggest fake was a masterful fake of <u>Brutus Bulletin</u>. Letters of all sorts appeared in there, and in general were typical of what goes on in <u>BB</u>, because mostwere written by their signatories. There were numerous references to <u>BB</u>'s past. Speculation about authorship goes in all directions. Michalski writes me that he thinks Jack Masters did it. Baumeister hints strongly that Linsey did it, and Linsey sez that I did it. I of course know exactly who did it, but I'm not saying just yet.

### The Leeder Poll

Randolph Smyth and his Fol Si Fie have deservedly won the Zine poll of North America FSF has been relentlessyplugged here, so I am very pleased. Beyond that, I admit to being very puzzled, a little disappointed, and a trifle frustrated. #2 is Volkerwanderung. Now, V is a good zine, and I resubbed earlier in the summer, and I hope that Bob won't be offended, but I can see no way in which V is the second best zine in North America. #3 was The National. This is a sideline by Cuerrier, and I think only appeared three times during the period covered. By contrast, his superb Passchendaele finished down at 23. This makes no sense to me --- the reverse would be emminently sensible. Similarly, Baumeister's variant zine Politician finished in a tie for 5th, while the fine Eggnog is back at 17. Maybe my tastes are out of step. I am disappointed that DD finished 13th. I can't quite figure my ranking lower than Everything. Now, I mean no disrespect (15m possibly the only pubber in the whole country who actually pays to get Everything) but E is a pretty boring zine, and I suspect its votes come from people who are thankful that the whole BNC operation is running smoothly again.

Part of the problem is a point I raised last year (so I can't be faulted for sour grapes on this one) Setting a five vote minimum is just too low. I'd set it at 10 or 12. In this regard, Leeder's winner last year had only 5 votes, and there's no way you can convince me that a zine can be #1 and get only 5 votes.

Konrad Baumeister in EggNog #54 presents a more sinister explanation, saying that "It has come to my attention that people are voting for zines which they don't regularly receive. It's called dishonesty and it stinks" I don't know KB's source for this, but he goes on to say that Leeder told him that Eggnog got either very high or very low marks, leading him to speculate that "The low scores can be explained away by my own personal arguments with people in the hobby." A related thunght was expressed by Michalski, who says that a top position "is no longer possible when you take solid stands on anything in this hobby." These kind of problems can be ameliorated by dropping, say, the top 3 and bottom three votes for low-vote zines, and dropping say the top 6 and bot-(turn to previous page)