

The only dippzine typed using the ytpists toes is:

DIPLOMACY DIGEST

Issue #47

May 1981

In the Beginning, Calhamer...

Mark L Berch

492 Naylor Place

Alexandria, VA 22304

Subs: 10 for \$3.50

Europe: 10 for \$4.00

Circulation: 110

OK, here's the story on DIPCON 1981. This will be held in association with Pacificon and Origins '81 over the July 4th weekend in the San Francisco area. Hotel accommodations are from Dunfey Hotel 1770 S. Amphlett Blvd San Mateo CA 94402 (Tel: (415) 573-7661. This is the site of the Con itself, so be sure you mention that you are associated with the War Gaming convention. For the convention itself, send your name, address and \$11 to Pacificon (make checks out to Pacificon) Pacific Origins Box 5548 San Jose CA 95150. They will then send you all the information. The Dip tournament will likely have a separate registration, as they always do, but many events are free.

The tournament will be run the same way other Pacificon tournaments have been run in the past, tho its somewhat different from the usual DipCon. There is a scoring system, giving so many points for Wins, seconds, thirds, draws, etc. And there are points for SCs accumulated during the game. This sum of points is then divided by your total number of games, but at least two. That is, if you play just one, you can't really rest on your big success because you'll be divided by 2 anyhow. For all but the top 7 players, then, two games is all you need. On Sunday Morning, the top seven players so far are gathered for a top-board game. Points scored in this game aren't figured in with the rest of the points, but are "bonus points", added onto one's previous score. Thus, its a big advantage to make this game. Plus, a portion of the prize \$\$\$ is set aside to those who make it to this board. Prizes will be given to at least the top 10, so the winners list goes beyond those who make it to the special top board game.

The games start Friday morning --- but remember, Frid is July 3, for most a holiday. You can start your games whenever you like, tho, but for best results you will want to finish 2 games by Sat nite, to give you the best shot at the top board. But with the longer period of time, there will be more flexibility in your scheduld. The gaming goes on all nite, I think --- this is in a hotel so accommodations are supposed to be very good. A game is started as soon as there are 7 people ready to play, with the sole limitation that the game can't put you into a game with someone who was in the last game you were in. Last year they supposedly had over 100 players, and they have used this system 4 times already, I think. Except, I think, for the Top Board game on Sunday morning, games are NOT TIME-CURTAILED, so that should eliminate that problem. So games can be played out to their natural end. For further info on how the tournament will be run (not everything has been worked out yet) contact Jim Bumpas 2375 Chambers St Eugene OR 97405. There may be a diplomacy Seminar, this I'm not sure of yet. DipCon XV (1982) will use a modified Calhamer system.

The Zine Column #37

Da Latest Nooze

Have you reflected recently on what a fine zine you've gotten from me in, oh, say the last 12 months? First there was the Lexicon, the definitive collection of the hobby's terminology -- a true reference item. And what about the Ethics issue, which generated so much response there was a follow-up issue as well? And the Germany issue, with those oddball yet appealing openings, another favorite. There were several potpurri issues for variety, and a villifications issue for controversy. I won't even mention the fakes issue because Bruce put that one out. And finally, the two recent double issues on publishing (with lots of British material) and Hobby History. Where else have you seen such interesting reading? And so little space consumed by all those games that you're not in?

And that, folks, is the hard sell for the upcoming 1981 North American Zine and GM Poll. Rate zines (in alphabetical order) which you have seen enuf of to make an assessment of their product from April 1, 1980. ^{to 11/81} John Leeder asks you to "base your rating on the quality of the zine itself", from 0 (total worthlessness) to 10, no fractions. Any zine devoted substantially to Diplomacy qualifies. Sign, and give your hobby role (player, GM, reader or whatever), and send to John Leeder at 121 19th Ave NE, Calgary, Alta Canada T2E 1N9 by the deadline of June 30 (but do it now before you forget and to make it easier for John). Similar is the GM poll. In this separate poll, rate your GMs BY NAME, alphabetically, so long as you've seen enuf of his GMing since April 1, 1980 to make a judgement. All ballots will be kept confidential. I consider voting in these two polls to be essential for conscientious hobby members. Those doing a good job deserve to hear about it; those who aren't --- perhaps the message will jolt them into some changes.

Remember the "tro" affair mentioned lastish? In VOD ##32, Bruce continued to get chlobbered on the issue, but Sherwood, the original perpetrator, checked in with a cute article, suggesting that the best way to get back at Bruce was to agree with him on everything, and thus squelching the very controversy that Bruce clearly needs for his mental balance (Bruce told him that his article earned him "tro free issues"). Then in #33, a strange turn of events. Sherwood reveals that "A Vie-Tro" was a deliberate disorder, cleared in advance with Bruce. To make the disorder seem accidental (and thus persuasive to the person who he promised he would do A Vie-Tyo) he created the entire controversy and protest, and of course Bruce could not reveal that he had discussed the move in advance with the player. So Keith brags about having been able "to bring this high-and-mighty egotist to his knees", but compliments him on his GMing and says "You can take the heat without wilting." Then again, this entire "revelation" may also be part of Sherwood's strategy, and may be as phoney as he says the original protest was.

* The digest (center staple) physical format continues to gain adherents. The new Xenogogic (about 35 pages giving some personal and hobby history of Peery, results of a hobby survey, a music column, ambitious plans for the future --- definitely worth a look) Just Among Friends #7 (now on a word processor, and featuring an article on an unorthodox German opening by, of all people, John Michalski) Whitestonia #32 (the zine shows considerable improvement over a year ago) and The Chamber all join the club. This complicates the description of zines, in number of pages, since they vary enormously on the size of line, depending on whether or not there is reduction, and the size of side margins (more important, as there are now 4 margins (6 for DW) per sheet). DD runs about 87 characters per line, 74 for JAF, 56 in Back Frog, 83 in Dot Happy, 62 in Xenogogic, 76 in Whitestonia, 71 in St Geo, 80 in DW, 59 in Volkerwanderung. There are variations in # of lines per page too, but I'll let someone else count that. In general, tho, unless the pubber uses reduction, his digest style page will not be as large as a regular type page. And LSD pages are much larger, as he uses reduction but not the deviding action of the digest format.

Some quick takes now. Dragon and Lamb's 4th annish has a fine article on Steve's
2 (turn to p 11)

((What follows is Allan Calhamer's classic essay on how he came to invent the game, and what the general principles that he followed were. The essay appeared both in Diplomania #12 and Graustark, both in the Aug 13, 1966 issue! This engendered comments both from Boardman and Don Miller, publisher of Diplomania, two of the early pillars of the hobby. First, Calhamer, then Miller, and then Boardman.

A DOZEN YEARS OF "DIPLOMACY"
by Allan B. Calhamer

There is a lot to talk about after twelve years of "Diplomacy". People frequently ask me how I came to create the game. Something this complicated undoubtedly springs from a person's total experience, but there are main lines and points which I can recall. I got an early introduction to games, to maps, and to history, and spent a lot of time making up games.

At the end of World War II, I came across an article on "post-war planning" which reviewed the European diplomacy of the period 1815-1914 and argued that coalitions tend to shift and form so as to oppose the most powerful or most aggressive elements. Later, when high school debaters were considering the issue of world government, I ran across the argument that external governments can serve the function of checking a rampant government which is not sufficiently checked internally.

About this time a friend of mine and I attempted to play a game which would model the intanglements of European history. As we had only two players, you can imagine that the results were not very successful.

In college I came in contact with the remarkable book Origins of the World War, by S. B. Fay. This book explored the secret alliance diplomacy leading up to the war in great detail. After the war nearly all the governments involved threw open the secret correspondence of that period, offering an opportunity to the observer which may never come again. I was impressed by the importance of personal contact and personal decision-making, and of alternatives that were not chosen, and of individual failures and blunders. All of this is in contrast to the determinism frequently implied by generalizations about history. I think the mysterious "semi-determinism" of life has been pretty well captured by the game of Diplomacy.

I also took a course in political geography under Prof. Whittlesley, which course influenced the relationship among country, military forces, and supply centers which went into the game. Thus we find that power arises from resources found at specific points, but is dealt out as the country sees fit. If it is not so dealt as to protect the resources, however, they may pass into the invisible envelope of another country's influence, and be dealt by someone else to some other faraway point.

I began devising the game in 1953 and completed the first set in 1954. Armies were blocks two inches high, painted with three horizontal stripes taken from the colors of the country's flag in 1914. Fleets were 2½ inches long, and the board was quite large. In the first two games, negotiation was entirely by written notes passed from player to player at the board. Reading the notes after the game was most interesting. Verbal negotiation, however, was faster and gave the players a chance to move around, which is an advantage in a game of this duration.

In 1958 I went to work in a research laboratory which was interested in the game as a possible research tool. For a variety of reasons, that objective was never achieved. The game, however, was played frequently there, and the players, who were good game players generally, did a great deal of analysis and contributed

many suggestions and played many experimental games. Several small changes were made in the rules. At first, a country could have multiple units in its capital or naval base, which were two of its supply centers. Almost an entire duplicate set of rules was necessary to govern the interactions involving these multiple units, which were consequently done away with. The number of provinces within a Great Power was reduced from seven to six. This change speeded up the early mobilization, although it is now a little harder to catch a country completely off guard, because opposite frontiers are closer together. Changes in the map were made, to make the countries more nearly equal, and convoying was made much faster. A large number of ambiguities in the written rules were discovered and disposed of.

A variety of rough-and-ready tactics were developed at this time. One was the "Flying Dutchman", which consisted in playing with a piece to which you were not entitled. It was ruled that this practice was legal so long as it was a deception; i.e., any player had a right to demand restoration of the true position, but if moves had intervened, they could not be taken back. It was never clear what the rights were if the deception were discovered during a move. Players quickly learned not to challenge a "Flying Dutchman" unless its removal was in their interest; sometimes a player might let one survive for several moves, then challenge it when alliances began to shift. The easiest way to put on a "Flying Dutchman" is to raise one when other players are raising, or to "forget" to drop one; but they are sometimes just placed on the board when only yourself or allies are present. Also pieces have been advanced or pushed back, armies have turned into fleets, and so on.

The ploy which came closest to provoking mayhem was move-stealing. After a player had tucked his orders under the board, they were quietly lifted and some other paper put in their place. If other moves had been read before the deception was discovered, it was ruled that the victim could not make out a new set, because he had already seen other moves. Consequently his pieces stood in place. If the theft was coupled with an all-out attack it was very effective, and it had its analog in sabotage of communication lines prior to an attack. One trick which did not get very far occurred when I was playing France and another player had been knocked out as Germany. It was my turn to read when he suddenly began declaiming, "France. Army to Belgium. Fleet to Naples..." and so on. In the ensuing hubbub he claimed that he was the legal government of France and challenged me to prove anything to the contrary.

These tactics seem to have died out with passage of time, -except for an occasional "Flying Dutchman", peeking while others write their orders, and so on. For one thing, these practices became dogged and incessant rather than clever, after a while; today they seem to belong to the past. There is no written rule saying that any deception is legal, anyway.

The game was put into its final commercial form and put on the market in 1959. I let contracts for the manufacture of the parts, assembled the sets in my apartment, and sold them however I could. At one time my living room was so full of bundles of boxes that I had only about six inches clearance around three sides of the room; no clearance on the fourth side. As sets were sold it became easier to move around. Games Research took the game over in 1960 and took the last material off my hands.

Postal Diplomacy was begun in 1963 on the initiative of John Boardman. Its surprising development has been very gratifying to me. It provides a channel of communication among many players, which helps to supplement some of the vagaries of the rules and may help to increase the quality of play.

People have sometimes asked why I chose the scenario of 1914. That period was a period in which there were several Great Powers which were more or less equal in power. It was a period of alliances and coalitions. It was also a period, as I have indicated above, that we know a lot about today. Other good scenarios that have been tried are Ancient Greece and 12th or 13th century Asia. The evidence is that there was quite a little diplomacy, aimed at coalition-forming for the largest purposes, throughout Asia at that time. Europe between the Wars is not so good, because the break-up of Austria-Hungary, the contraction of Turkey, etc., create too great a power vacuum in the Balkans. One game based on the world as of 1940 had to resort to Brazil as a great power, to balance the board. The destructiveness of present-day warfare makes it very difficult to model so as to represent the choices at all realistically.

Also, I believe it would be a mistake to model the present, because simple and unrealistic conclusions might be accepted uncritically. Something relevant to the present day can probably be learned from the existing game, but the required carry-over guards against hasty conclusions.

I chose a physical rather than a political map because a physical map looks more like the Earth itself.

"Diplomacy" seems to contain a number of elements which are original or at least very unusual. A workable multi-player military game is unusual. If the game employed the rule in checkers or chess, that a player may not pass his move, it would be slowed up badly by players who were inattentive or indecisive. The rule that a piece not ordered simply stands, and the rule that illegal orders are treated as orders to stand, are important in keeping the game moving. Also these rules amount to a mild penalty, which induces the players to remain attentive.

The effect of moving all the pieces simultaneously tends to be realistic, and also keeps things moving. In about five minutes as many as 34 moves may take place, and the situation may change quite a little bit as those 34 pieces move. It is good that the moves are fairly restricted in view of the number that take place at one time. The moves have to be complicated enough to permit of deception in the negotiations; beyond that, additional complications tend to detract from the diplomatic side of the game. For the same reason, it is good that each player have only a few pieces.

The interaction between land and sea is not dealt with very well in any other game of which I know. Usually the game is either a land game or a sea game, the opposite element serving only as a boundary, or as the wings from which pieces come onto the stage. In "Diplomacy" sea power is as important as land power. It operates against landward targets, by supporting military forces (not physically represented but assumed to be there) in actual occupation of coastal areas. Engagement on the high seas occurs infrequently, and almost always because one side is moving to attack landward targets and the other is trying to prevent it.

A country's capabilities depend very much on how her force is divided between armies and fleets. These capabilities in turn reveal a great deal about her intentions and consequently her trustworthiness. The way in which the earth-space represented on the board is divided into land and sea is very important. The water areas of the board are divided into two distinct parts, the northern and the Mediterranean. A country which has an absolute majority of fleets in one of these parts is likely to be able to sweep everything on those coasts, first by taking the supply centers which are most exposed to seaward attack, then by raising either type of piece and mopping up. There are 14 supply centers bordering each of these water areas, Spain being counted twice. There are only seven wholly inland supply centers. An absolute majority of armies in the large land area con-

taining most of the land-locked supply centers should have the same effect as a majority of fleets in a water area, but it is much harder to achieve. If a country stays in its water area it may use both its fleets and its armies in the same conflict, but if it goes overland its fleets will be out of play. Usually the only countries that can successfully fight in both water areas at once are France, or some country which has conquered France, or, occasionally, Russia.

Some players believe that there should be a class of alliance, possibly written, which should be binding under the rules. I have always believed that such a thing would be unrealistic. Furthermore, when a player has learned how to devise alliances that are likely to succeed in the environment of the present game, he has really learned something. I understand that a California group experimented with binding alliances and found that they spent the whole game litigating over whether an alliance had been violated or not, and also spent a lot of effort tricking people into agreeing to things they did not really intend. How much simpler is the present game!

Other players object to a lack of protocol. I believe that protocol should arise if it serves a function and not otherwise. If protocol were necessary in order to get an alliance, players would use it. I believe that protocol, credentials, etc., developed largely as a means of determining whether a person was authentic or not. If you had, say, seven floors of a dormitory, each playing a country at the rate of a move a day, then it might be necessary to know whether a given resident of the second floor really spoke for the second floor or not, hence credentials might be necessary. Over a still more vast game, protocol might be necessary. Perhaps we should be relieved that it is not necessary around the "Diplomacy" board.

There has been much talk about rewriting the rules. The very serious problem that arises in connection with a rewrite of the rules is that of latent errors. Mere latent ambiguities, which, I am convinced, are almost inevitable, could sometimes be resolved by referring back to the original rules, although it would be just as easy to keep the existing rules and add explanations. The problem is that the introduction of an actual error that no one noticed at the time would either change the game in some unpredictable way, almost certainly for the worse, since there are a lot of factors in balance in the game now; or else compel some authority or other to rule against the literal wording.

Where there are ambiguities in the rules at present I feel no hesitation in telling people that the rule is whatever I intended it to be. If I am playing in a game when the matter comes up, I usually accept a vote as binding for that game only. But if there is, essentially, an error in the rules -- if they really say something I didn't intend -- I prefer to go along with the written wording. So far that situation has arisen only once, so far as I know, and I was lucky: the literal wording did not result in a bad rule, though my intention was better. I never intended that a piece actually dislodged by an attacker coming from province A could still stand off another piece attempting to enter A, simply by virtue of an order to attack A. That is, however, the rule as written.

If I should be unlucky, in that some literal wording were discovered which would spoil the game, I would not follow the literal wording.

A few strange results occur from time to time under the rules because of the desire to keep the rules simple and to keep their sheer bulk down. Thus the notion that determination of the outcome would not depend on the nationality of the pieces in any way was devised. This result was intellectually pretty, but I actually had to make an exception, to the effect that a country may not drive out its own piece, to keep a country from deliberately securing a retreat in certain positions where a retreat can be a very powerful move (because all the other pieces are frozen in

place during the retreat). Most players think there should also be an exception permitting a country to exchange the positions of its own army and fleet, but under the rules these two stand each other off. Rules covering the situation in which two armies wish to retreat into the same province never even got into the rulebook. The rule I use is that they must write the retreats, and if they choose the same space they must write again but may not go to that space. The result frequently is that one country may annihilate the piece of the other and then retreat, because one of them frequently has only one possible retreat. Sometimes both are limited to one space only, in which case they annihilate each other. When these pieces both come from the same country, the player involved raises an awful yell, but I do not like a special rule to cover that situation only. The real problem is what to do if the victim demands a look at the rule book. I have sometimes gotten by in the past by denying that I had a copy.

Some time ago I suggested new rules for the six-man game. I have tested these recently, and I am very much in favor of them. My suggestion was to drop Italy as a player, rather than Turkey; to permit moves to Italian places and use of the Italian supply centers, but to have the Italian pieces stand in place to defend themselves, without supporting each other. Such is just what would happen if the Italian player started the game and dropped out before the first move, anyway. It is good historically (Italy was the last country unified) and the feel of the resulting game is almost identical to the seven-man game.

I have not yet tested my new suggestion for the five-man game, in which Germany also is treated as Italy above.

I have been asked about the proposed new federation. I have no personal objection to its use of the name "Diplomacy", but Games Research would like to consider the matter, and I will back them in this matter. I would be willing to help such a federation in any convenient way, but I would not want to give the impression that it had some sort of official or monopolistic position.

I am really more interested in vitality than in organization, and it is just in that respect that I feel most optimistic today (knock on wood). Diplomacy, like its fans, may be a little disorganized, but both have a certain vitality that bodes well for the future.

(This concludes Mr. Calhamer's long, interesting and informative article. We understand he has sent the same article to John Boardman, so we expect that you will shortly be reading it in John's fine magazine, GRAUSTARK. We are also planning to reprint it in THE GAMESMAN #4, to ensure that it received the widest possible circulation. Actually, when we received it we were tempted to hold it for THE GAMESMAN #4, but we decided it was too timely in light of the recent rule- and IDF-controversies (see elsewhere in this issue of DIPLOMANIA) and should see publication as soon as possible. Hence its publication here in DIPLOMANIA #12.

We hope the readers will comment profusely upon Mr. Calhamer's article -- fill up the nascent DIPLOMANIA letter-column with your erudite remarks. Ask any questions you may have concerning the article, and (hopefully) Mr. Calhamer or one of the leaders in the Postal Diplomacy field will reply to them.

We have a few remarks we would like to make before we close; we hope that Mr. Calhamer and/or some of our readers will see fit to comment upon them.

We have always wondered why the year "1901" was chosen as the first game-year in Diplomacy, when the map, or "scenario", represented Europe as it was in the year 1914? Why not use a 1901 map of Europe (see the map for DIPLOMANIA's 9-man game

which was published in DIPSOMANIA #1)?

Strange that you should mention Ancient Greece as providing a good scenario for a Diplomacy-type game -- one of our players (Wayne Hoheisel) is currently hard at work on a Diplomacy-type game involving the Peloponnesian War (which will, hopefully, involve a good deal of tactical play as well as strategic and diplomatic) -- or were you referring to Greece prior to the Peloponnesian War, at the time of the Greek City States?

Should a game such as Diplomacy concentrate on achieving realism in the play? Or simplicity? Or a "happy medium" between the two? Perhaps one of the features which makes Diplomacy popular is its relative simplicity -- but this is done at the sacrifice of a great deal of realism. Take the convoy rules, for example. One of the least realistic situations in the game is that in which a convoy which is stood off from a province (i.e., the army which is being convoyed is stood off) from a province which it is attacking -- and the result of the move is (as far as the army being convoyed is concerned) as if the convoy never started -- in other words, the army remains in the province from which its convoy move was started. Why not allow fleets to carry armies around with them? To get around all of the complications which could result from such "double units", simply state in the rules that the "double unit" of fleet and army only carries the weight of a single unit in any battles in which it may be engaged until such time as the "double unit" separates and returns to two single units. There would, of course, be situations which would need explaining in terms of the rule -- but then, that seems to be the case with many of the rules already in use.

We are not seriously suggesting this revised convoy rule as a replacement for the one already in Diplomacy -- it has not been tested, for one thing -- it is just given as an example as to how the rules could be changed to achieve greater realism without sacrificing much of the game's simplicity.

You mentioned the educational aspect of Diplomacy. This side of games-playing (at least, of war-games-playing) only recently seems to have come into "vogue" among the intelligentsia (excepting, of course, the military "Kriegsspieler" -- if you can call them "intelligentsia") -- spurred on, perhaps, by computers and the development of game theory. Actually, our experience has been that most of the players with whom we have come in contact play games not so much for the educational benefits as for recreation -- in other words, purely and simply, for "fun". Of course (as we stated in our letter which was published in GRAUSTARK #89), what makes a game "fun" will vary from player to player. Some players would choose a game which provided them with an intellectual challenge; others would choose a game for its simplicity, as a respite from the intellectual chores they are called upon to perform in their jobs; still others would choose a game for realism per se, even if the game were so complex as to be virtually unplayable, or so simple as to be completely lacking in challenge.

We agree that now is not the time to rewrite the rules -- far too few games have been played, and far too little testing of alternatives has been done to formally change the rules in the rule book as now written. Eventually some changes are inevitable -- but, for the present, more explanation, examples, etc., of the rules would be sufficient to achieve a greater degree of uniformity in play and in Gamesmaster-interpretation. We might also suggest the rulebook eventually be expanded to include a few suggestions for variant-play on the standard board and using the standard pieces -- this would add to the enjoyment of the game for many.

You state "Where there are ambiguities in the rules at present I feel no hesitation in telling people that the rule is whatever I intended it to be." So, what did you intend these "ambiguous" rules to be? In making our interpretations of

the rulebook rules we Gamesmasters sometimes justify our decisions with statements like, "Well, we believe that this is what Calhamer actually intended in this situation." So, what did you intend in these situations? From your article it is apparent that you intended that the rulebook be followed literally, except, as you say, in cases where such literal interpretation would ruin the game. The question of this "literal" interpretation of the rules is one of the major bones of contention between Diplomacy Gamesmasters and players today; the "purists" argue for a strict and literal interpretation of the rulebook, no matter what the outcome, and that they do this because only Calhamer and Games Research have the power to change the rules; others argue that the rules should be those which make the game most interesting and enjoyable for those who are playing it -- that if the players in a specific game wish to play with a variant rule or rules, they will be glad to accommodate these players -- that this can be done in individual games regardless of what the written rules say, as long as the players in these individual games know about these variant rules in advance and approve of them. These Gamesmasters who run variant games are not trying to rewrite the rulebook, or to force all of the other Diplomacy players and Gamesmasters to come into the fold and play/run their games under the same variant rules. They are simply treating Diplomacy as "fun", and running whatever variants the players in their magazines want.

We in DIPLOMANIA have experimented with a few variant rules in our Regular games, and we have eliminated all but two from our "house-rules" in the magazine in which our Regular games are run (some of these variant rules are still in use in the early Regular games, as the games were started under these rules and we are reluctant to change the rules in the middle of the game). The two rules we still use are the one which states that, to win, a player must have 18 (or more) units on the board at the completion of a Winter season (instead of the rulebook rule that a player wins when he has a majority of the units on the board), and the "stand-by player" rule (who submits moves, at the Gamesmaster's request, for a country whose player fails to do so, without regard to alliances, etc, considering only the situation as it appears on the board at the time the moves are due). This "stand-by player" rule is in lieu of the rulebook rule that the units of a player who fails to submit his moves on time simply stand in place; this rule is, of course, peculiar to Postal Diplomacy -- it would be better to keep the rulebook rule for across-the-board play.

((Next up is Boardman's article from Graustark #100, 13 August 1966))

Allan Calhamer, to whom we all owe a great debt of gratitude for inventing and polishing up the game of Diplomacy, has written a most interesting account of the background and Development of Diplomacy. From Childhood I have been interested in history and in games which reproduce it, tho I have never encountered, or invented for my own amusement, anything to compare with Diplomacy. In about 1946 I acquired, and played by myself ~~for~~ lack of other opposition, a game which reproduced an ~~american~~ presidential election. (This game took cognizance of history, in that it was easier for Democrats to win some states and for Republicans to win others.) I also tried my variation of the card game War, for use with a map of Europe. Players would stake portions of their countries on the outcome of the game.

The original Diplomacy set was shown by Calhamer at a talk that he gave to a number of Diplomacy Players at Columbia University on 19 Oct 1963....The active play of postal Diplomacy seems to have begun with my suggestion made in Knowable #3 and Graustark #1, but the idea was "in the air". In 1962, several months before I proposed the idea, Conrad von Metzke designed a postal version of Diplomacy. And John McCallum has reported recently that for several years some Avalon-Hill game fans have been playing postal Diplomacy. He is now making contacts between this group and the postal Diplomacy players largely recruited from science-fiction fandom, who play in Graustark and its sister publications.

Donald Miller, in his postal Diplomacy and variant publications, is now undertaking games in milieux other than Europe of 1914. Among them are: American Indian Tribes, Scottish clans and tribes, and, as Calhmer suggested, ancient Greece ((none of these turned out to be particularly popular.))

Two of the most unusual features of Diplomacy are these: That it is neither a game of fixed partnerships, like bridge or canasta, or a game of everyman for himself, like poker, but a game of changing partnership in which the changes are part of the game; and that, instead of playing in rotation, the players make their moves simultaneously. The only other game I know with the latter feature is the childhood game of "scissors-paper-rock".

The fact that the game features joint land-sea operations indicates its American origin. The peculiarly American contribution to military theory, as Fletcher Pratt has observed, in the combination of land and sea forces, from Grant's campaign on the western rivers during the War of the Rebellion ((that's JB's name, not mine. My school-teacher mother preferred "The War for Southern Independence")), to the landings at Normandy and Okinawa. However, Diplomacy's use of sea power departs from the Anglo-American tradition in that it operates against landward targets, by supporting military forces ... in actual occupation of coastal areas. Engagement on the high seas occurs infrequently, and almost always because one side is moving to attack landward targets and the other is trying to prevent it."

The Anglo-American theory of sea power, as announced by Alfred Thayer Mahan but employed long before his time, is that control of the seas is valuable, not merely to support operations on land, but for its own sake. French naval theorists, on the other hand, have generally operated according to the precept used by Calahmer in diplomacy. Americans, however, have reason to be grateful for this theory, erroneous tho it has proved to be in practice. The American Revolution took place at one of the very few times in history that the French navy was superior to the British, and it was by "supporting military forces ... in coastal areas" that Suffron won at Trincomalee and de Grasso helped at Yorktown.

Since all the above was written 15 years ago, it is clear that, unlike virtually all other wargames, Diplomacy has stood the test of time. This is due, I think, to 2 factors. The first is that it is an unusually well balanced game, quite difficult to do with 7 players. The second is that by keeping the game relatively simple, tactically, he has made success dependent on negotiating and psychological skills. But these are so dependent on personalities that, while the start of each game looks the same (pieces on the board in the same positions and all that), the influence of non-tactical factors is so large that in reality, each game starts quite differently. Thus, there is a freshness that you don't get with something like, for example, checkers.

All this is not to say, however, that the game is perfect. If I had one quarrel with the way the game was designed, it is with Calahmers decision to have an even number of supply centers, rather than an odd number. The two-way game-long alliance is such a powerful tool that it can reduce the amount of Diplomacy present. Having 35 or 33 centers would have built in an instability into such alliances that would, I think, provided for a more fluid game. Then again, if he had done such a thing, perhaps people (like myself) would now be complaining that nothing holds together for long enough, etc. I wonder about the real-life analogy of all this, too. Have actual military alliances ever operated with complete equality at the end? Its hard to say. The only people who could be said to have controlled "Europe" are Ceasar, Alexander of Macedon, and Napoleon, and none of them made equal-type alliances. Incidentally, to close on an irrelevant note, did you know that the only major city conquered by all 3 of Europe's greatest conquerors was Alexandria, Egypt?

Coming up this summer will be DD's 50th issue! I am soliticing original articles on any aspect of the game or hobby. I pay well (\$2 sub credit per page) for quality writing --- I'm fairly selective. I strongly prefer (but do not require) articles single spaced, with lines no longer than 7 1/2". If you want editing help, let me know.

NASA job, and on the astronauts and their special status. Definately w~~orth~~ the nearly three year wait on that one! NADF has published Zimiamvia #2, a service directory listing, for whom to contact about what, and Zimiavia #3, an information guide listing various special publications and information. Both are available from the publisher and president, Rod Walker 1273 Crest Dr Encinitas CA 92024 at 25¢ each, or 2/35¢..... Dot Happy #3 has a solid account of "Electronic Mail Diplomacy", a brand new format played over the computer net at Xerox. It combines some of the best features of postal and face-to-face diplomacy.....Y"AlI #3 arrives, presenting a classification problem for us archivists. Should this be viewed as a hoax-of-a-non-existant-zine? Or an an anonymous zine? Or is it a hoax-fake, that is, is it really put out by Gary Coughlan after all, and is just trying to look like a fake zine?.....Emhain Macha continues strongly, with openings in the british variant Vain Rats, a Bourse for 80AP with commentary, several subzines, and more (Mike Mills 1585 Quaker Rd Macedon N.Y. 14502, subs 50¢ each ish, minimum of 3).....Greg Costikyan seeks a replacement for his Miller Number Custodian job. Those interested should write him at P.O. Box 865 Brown U. Providence RI 02912.....Claw and Fang recently published its last, #124..... Lee Kendter Sr, citing excessive levels of criticism, is resigning the BNC position as of May 31, 1981, turning the job over to Don Ditter. Lee did a tremendous amount of work straightening out some of the problems caused by his two predecessors, and always got his own numbers assignments out on time, and got the results published. The Hobby will be in his debt for as long as the Numbers continue to be kept.... Apalling Greed #9 features a strange SO2 in 81E (Kolinar --- actually there used to be a dipzine of that name). Dick Martin as Austria gave Italy (McLendon) two supports for Italy against Russia (Ron Kelly) and also gave Turkey a support against Italy! Larzelere (GM) also sports the most exotic neutral order since Cuerrier's F Edi H: A Vie-Gal, A Bud-Gal, F Tri H. Thats right --- no piece actually moves! Unless R moves A War-Gal, this is indistinguishable from all Units hold, which is just what neutral orders are supposed to avoid... Fol Si Fie #138 from Alberta, postmarked 5/12 arrived here 5/15!!!! Three days. And ironically enuf, the issue reports that players have voted to switch to 6-week deadlines. Perhaps this is a fluke, perhaps a sign of change. FSF uses an unorthodox pagination system. The fronts of sheets are numbered sequentially to the back, and then reversed, so page 1 is backed by 26, 2 with 25, etc. Its just as easy to read, and helps with ditto, as it is best to let the sheets dry before printing on their other side. The issue has the first part of a super essay on the mid-game, one of the most completely neglected aspects of play-of-the-game writing. Also included is an interesting history of an international game, 76IP and much more (Randolph Smyth 212 Aberdeen St S.E. Medicine Hat Alta T1A 0R1 price 50¢/issue, very highly recommended)... DW #27 is also very strong, with Fred Davis' comprehensive history of the variant hobby one of the best hobby history articles you will ever see. Also included is my first variant, designed specifically to expand the diplomacy but not the tactics of the game. Oddly, I now have 7 players for this game --- but no GM! Plus where's Larzelere on Rulebook convoy problems, Beyerlein on Hal Naus, and two Russian openings articles by me. This is part of a series on unorthodox openings. If you'd like to write one for this series, let me know. There is, methinks, much too rigidity in the selection of openings, so we are looking for the Offbeat-but-sensible (Jerry Jones 1854 Wagner Street Pasadena CA 91107, 4/\$5. This is the flagship zine for the hobby, and consistantly features the hobby's best writers. A bit tardy, tho.) Navel Orange is supposedly from Jean Marie Corfield/Bobby Stevens, but it seems to be full of those languid, bosomy women that Jack Masters loves to put in his zines. It has a droll parody of Brux's HouseRules, such as units having to be labeled as to location and year built. Actually, in the early days (1959 rulebook) units were numbered sequentially, thus:4F Nth -Bel.

The avalanche of new zines continues, not all of which I have seen:

Xenogoc Larry Peery Box 8416 San Diego CA 92102 (\$4/year, a quaterly, \$5 gets you sub-zines too)
The Chamber Dave Manual 10318 Oakgate Bellflower CA 90706 (10/\$4)
Klepto Mania Jerry Austin P.O. Box 40123 St. Petersburg FL 33743
Sleepless Knights Dave Carter 118 Horsham Ave Willowdale ONT Canada M2N 1Z9
Hoof and Mouth Donal Sigwalt 125 Hebard St Rochester, N.Y. 14605 (60¢ per issue)

Mark L Berch
492 Naylor Place
Alexandria VA 22304