

DIPLOMACY DIGEST

Issue #68
February 1983
Potpourri

Mark L Berch
492 Naylor Place
Alexandria VA 22304

Subs: 10 for \$3.50
Europe: 8/E2 or 10/\$4
Circulation: 119

This summer will see the first regional con for the Washington DC metro area: MaryCon. It will be held June 4-5 at Mary Washington College in Fredricksburg VA, about an hour south of D.C. Two rounds will be Sat and Sun, so there should be plenty of time for extra socializing. There will be dorm space and a meal plan available for a very modest cost, and for those who want to commute, meals can be purchased separately. Arrangements are being made via Dick Warner, who teaches history there. The facilities have been checked out and it appears that plenty of space will be available. For those interested, contact Ed Wrobel 3932 North Forestdale Ave Dale City, VA 22193. He is open for any suggestions you want to make on other activities, scoring system, and suggestions for how to make this a fun Con.

Over the Washington's Birthday Weekend I visited my sister Margo and Bruce Lindsey up in Albany. Margo works for the Minority Leader in the NY State Senate, and the staff let me sit in on one of their planning meetings, so I got to see how much fun it is to be on the side without any power. I visited Brux Center, and saw the map of the US where Bruce has a pin for the location of each of his subbers. Michalski's pin is red, Walker's is bent, Berch's is as pure as the driven snow, and you don't want to know what happens to the pin of people who drop their sub to VOD.

Coming up in the April or May issue -- not the next one --- will be the second DIPLOMACY DIGEST Hobby History, Trivia, and General Tomfoolery Quiz. There will be some changes from the first one. It will have very few "old" questions in it ---- almost everything will be from events in the hobby after the last quiz in Aug 1981. And it won't be quite as long. If you'd like to contribute some questions, send them in, along with the zine with the answer in it (or a citation if you think I get the zine), as I'd like a few outside contributions (no hoaxes, tho). Preference is given to questions which are tricky or cunning, but not hopelessly obscure. As before, if no one gets the question right, I'll give the point to the most entertaining answer.

New Zines

Every Little Thing Kieth Sherwood PO Box 6457 La Jolla CA 92037
Hail Jakall Mark S. Keller 9536 Shumway Drive Orangevale CA 95662 (30¢ per issue)
War and Peace Derek Caws 94 Mill Hill Rd Cower, Isle of Wight PO31 7EQ England
Mercurius Aulicus Paul McGivern 11 Airdale Hadrian Lodge W Wallsend on Tyne England
Politesse Ed Wrobel 3932 N. Forestdale Ave Dale City VA 22193
Je Maintiendrai Hauke Jansen, Berensteinlaan 385, 2542 JK Den Haag The Netherlands
Festungs Hof Bob Howerton 4510 Treeline Dr Pensacola FL 32504
Howay the Lads Willy Haughan 8 Windsor Terrace Whitely Bay, Tyne&Wear England
The Road Goes On Gary Piper 2b Woodstock, Billing Road Northampton England
Midlife Crisis Paul Rauterberg 4922 W. Wisconsin Ave Milwaukee WI 53208
Weismark DIP-Press "Anwyl of Weismark" E-6 Pinewood Ave Toronto Ontario Canada M6C2V1
Thirty Miles of Bad Road Mark Luedi 730 Atwater #15 Bloomington IN 47401

((In Wazir #3, William Linden had an article entitled "You blew it, Calhamer", which alleged errors in the gameboard. In #4, Calhamer, the inventor of the game, presented his response, July 1972))

REALITIES OF THE GAMEBOARD

....Due to the exigencies of the game, there are historical discrepancies on the board. John McCallum noted in a good article, for example, Ankara was a village in 1914. The original Supply Center in that part of the board was Erzurum, a fortress that changed hands during World War I. To reduce the excessive likelihood of Turko-Russian conflict, I moved the SC westward. It is important to balance the board so each country has a reasonable choice of major campaigns at the start of the game. ((If the fleet were initially placed in Con or Smy, it would be much more difficult for T to begin with an anti-Russian campaign, to the point that such openings would be very unlikely, making the T-R alliance more or less automatic))

As Mr. Linden recognizes, the gameboard is based on the map as of 1914 tho the game begins in 1901 so the years are numbered 1, 2, 3 sequentially. It is my belief the kind of diplomacy the players play is better associated in the public mind with a period like 1901-11 than 1914-1925 and the list of Great Powers is better for a game ending before 1918. Of course, the maps of 1901 and 1914 needed to be pretty similar, as they are, or 1901 would not be a good starting choice.

Tunisia was, of course, French in this period. Permitting the French to own Tunis at the onset of the game is impractical. If F and I compete for it initially, they are replaying the diplomacy of 1830. Italy eventually picked up Libya from Turkey in 1912, rather than Tunisia, but for our purposes Tunis represents Italian interests in the area.

In order to speed up the game, the single large space of North Africa is not divided. For this same reason, Luxembourg and Montenegro are not included. Slowness was originally a major drawback ((in earlier versions of the game)); the game still takes quite a while. During the period of development of the gameboard, all the small countries were one space and one SC, except Montenegro, which was only a space, while Luxembourg, Andora, San Marino, Lichenstein, among others, were omitted. But six spaces and 5 SCs between T, A, and R were too many. Besides dropping Montenegro, Albania is reduced to a space only.

The border of Belgium is moved south to include Calais so the move of Eng-Bel is possible.

Switzerland was not impassable to Hannibal or Napoleon. I tried it too, but we got fearfully huge battles over it which are non-historic. If it had been Verdun ((the location of a very major battle)), it would have been fine.

In general, I tried to keep the spaces large in the corners and around the edges so the units would not get lost out of play in those areas. Hence, the board approximates a segment of a spherical surface; that is, if the board were deformed so all the spaces were the same size, the board would tend to bow up or down in the center.

One of the unusual features of Diplomacy is that the land area and the land forces seem to be about equally important as the sea area and forces. The typical wargame is either a land game or a sea game, with the opposite element clearly subordinated. One of the reasons this came about, I think, is that Diplomacy is one of the first, perhaps the first, staged on the continental scale ((This was also a tradeoff of playability versus realism. The balance makes the game play better, but in World War I, ground warfare was much more important than sea warfare.)).

Diplomacy is substantially the first coalition type game and so far as I know, Diplomacy is the first to be played that way, to mention the possibility in the rules and to make a major point of it. Monopoly is sometimes played that way, and to a limited degree other games can be played that way, particularly the monopoly type-board games and the card game hearts ((when played expertly, both Monopoly and Risk

was I...Walt Buchanan ... told me I was in the top 10 of all time pubbers. Thanks. Just what I wanted to be, one of the ten top weirdos to have gone wacky on account of printing ink odors....

Yeah, I was beginning to feel like a hypochondriac! I mean, here I was sitting each day (after 8 hours sitting at work) for 4 hours typing with a bent back, bent fingers, screwed eyesight, inhaling the flammable stencil correction fluid and getting high on it. Besides that, when I ran off my copies, my parents would open the upstairs windows and doors to help disperse the odor of the printing ink. I think I remember reading somewhere about Social Security benefits for Printer's Ink disease of the lungs....

Yeah, like I spent over \$1000 in equipment and supplies ... and realize a net loss of about \$500 because the US Post Office raised their price of a stamp from 8¢ to 10¢....You don't know how many rolls I use every month. (Each roll, remember kiddies, has 100 stamps --- ever try licking 120 stamps in one hour? You're so thirsty that 3 bottles of diet Pepsi won't quench it)

We shouldn't forget all those nice, long, long letters I sent to all of my friends in reply to their letters...I was beginning to wonder by Nov 1974 just where all my time was going. I mean, here I was doing my best to cut back on publishing, cutting out the egotistical and powerful position as Editor of IDA, taking it easy, or trying to, and I was still in a constant jam! So, I started a survey this Jan on my mail volume. You want to know how many letters I have already written? (You don't? You crum...) 57! ((The zine was postmarked Jan 22)) And that's the damn truth (See, I mean it, it isn't always that I would swear in print) Now, if that would be true for all of 1975 that would mean I would write by Dec 31st 1, 098 letters...don't forget that 1975 is a leap year!...((which)) means for 1974 ((at that rate)) I would have spent \$109 alone for stamps on my personal letters. Sending out 14 issues of Impassable would be roughly 1,700+ stamps (imagine licking all those stamps in one year!). Well, I now go to my family doctor for tonguenitis (inflammation of the tongue) and have shots in the gums to reduce gluing my teeth together (I'm not that desperate to lose weight).

Yes, 1974 was a memorable year. One electric typewriter worn out, a part never replaced in my mimeo machine, 100+ copies of the Handbook still to put together (I do them when the sales come in), 6 new filing cabinets to hide all the junk mail I get in trade for the junk I put out, licking 1700 stamps for Impassable alone, not counting those for Lost Horizons, Diplomacy Review, Aquarius or Diplomacy Handbook nor personal letters ... buying over 100 reams of paper (that is equivalent to buying over 50,000 sheets of paper), over 60 quires of stencils (a quire is 24), lord knows how many tubes of printer's ink -- I think I'll save them and sell them to a metal dealer for their aluminum contents....

Yeah, and I am getting involved in Civil War ((wargaming)) also! Before last summer I wasn't much different from any other wargamer mildly interested in history of war, now I have to read an hour a day on Civil War history I am even printing Civil War anecdotes! I'm running my first game of Bull Run by mail, I have bought over \$200 of books on the Civil War period and haven't read $\frac{1}{4}$ of them.

You know, I think I'm crazy! Oh well, it was a fun 1974, maybe I'll live long enuf to enjoy 1975? Sigh....((Actually, I think stamps taste rather nice))

((What to do about poorly written orders has bugged GMs and players almost from the very start. Here are some short takes from several types of problems. First up is Peter Birks, GM and editor of Greatest Hits, from #17, Nov 1975))

Marcus Watney has sent me hundreds of letters claiming that what he wrote was F Aeg S F Ion C A Gre - Alb. I would normally interpret this as supporting the move rather than the fleet, but after receiving his letter, and a IS PRIBÉ, I took expert advice, viz Gordon Bell, Dave Allen, and John Piggott. They all stated that they would interpret it as support for the fleet, which is obviously what Marcus intended. As a result, F Ion did not have to retreat....the order was ambiguous to say the least, and

Marcus should be bloody pleased that he was given the benefit of the doubt twice in 2 seasons. ((I agree with this ruling. For the fleet to support the move, it would have had to have been written F Aeg S & F Ion C A Gre - Alb)) ((Next, we move to a zine called " " (pronounced Quotes). From #31, Oct 1973, this is the GM Jim Massar))

Rick Loomis has protested my ruling that "F Spa-Por" was not a valid order. His main argument, it seems, is based on the Rulebook's statement that "A badly written order, which nevertheless can have only one meaning, must be followed." The preceding sentences are however, also important.. :An illegal order is not followed, and the unit so ordered simply stand in its place. A mistaken order, if legal, must be followed. An order which admits of two meaning is not followed."

The problem seems to be one of definition. What is a "badly written order"? My position is that the order was not "badly written" but totally illegal. The space "Spa" does not exist when one considers the fleet. The fleet is not in Spa, but in Spa(sc). Rick replies that, "Maybe I do not have a fleet in Spain, but there is only one possible fleet to which I could be referring." True, I suppose, but if Italy had only one fleet, and it was in the Ionian, and she ordered F Tyh-Nap, would I be obligated to change it to F Ion-Nap. as this was the only possible fleet....?

The Rulebook invariably, when referring to fleets in coastal provinces uses the notation south coast and north coast. This, I think, invalidates Rick's claim that he did not have my HRs. They say, "The location of a unit is both necessary and sufficient to identify it." I think that any careful reading of the Rulebook would allow me to strike out "necessary" from the above rule.

Finally, even if the move were not illegal, I would still consider it as ambiguous, or "one which admits of two meanings." And finally finally, Rick has always used coasts in all his previous orders, and all I can judge is that his one time it was an oversight. Rick thinks he's been cheated, but I feel I would have cheated Kunz ((another player)) were I to allow this move. The decision stands, in any case, as Rick doesn't want to appeal "to the Supreme Court" or, as I take it, the IDA's Ombudsman. Comments, questions, lambasts and anything else you have on your mind ... are invited. ((The discussion concluded in #32, starting with a letter from Dave Kadlecek:))

I think Loomis is right....In the Rulebook, it says "If a fleet is ordered to one of these provinces and it is possible for the fleet to move to either coast, the order must specify which coast of the fleet does not move." This clearly implies that in other cases it is not necessary to specify which coast. (((Correct, F Aeg-Bul is legal. But this says nothing, and in my opinion, implies nothing, about pieces in double-coasted provinces moving --- Massar))) ALSO, in the sample game it says, "F StP-Both!" This is because the fleet is not in either of the only situations in which a coast is required, namely, moving to a province with 2 coasts where one fleet could move to either, or building in StP (((...since Bot does not border on both StP(nc) and StP(sc) the problem is not quite the same. The above order, while illegal under my HRs implies where the unit must be. However, F Spa-Por doesn't imply anything))) For a third point, F Spa-Por is not ambiguous. Por is the only possible space it could be moving to, and Spain is the only possible space it could be moving from. Finally, an interpretation such as you give that there is no space Spain for fleets, but that there are two, Spa(sc) and Spa(nc) is what gives use to allowing "coastal crawl" which you yourself call illegal.....(((In any case, Rick has acquiesced ...In the future, as my HRs require, I will always require (sc) or (nc).....))) ((For the life of me, I do not, and never have, understood, why postal GMs feel compelled to add additional requirements which are not in the Rulebook, and then invalidate orders for not meeting them. This is a prime example. The Rulebook is quite specific on when you have to put the coast on, but GMs such as Massar and others can't leave well enuf alone, but feel they must add the requirement for other cases as well. Another example is naming the country for international supports and convoys. The Rulebook says, "for clarity, the player may wish to indicate the foreign nationality." And yet there are plenty of GMs who seem to feel that the Rulebook just isn't strict enough, and make it an absolute requirement. I fail utterly to see what such requirements add to the enjoyment of the game. While these

ressurrect his Zine Rating Project just to castigate him. The game could even be called irregular. But on the other hand, to deny the build will incite a storm of criticism from the Russian player, not to mention his allies, cantankerous readers and those who just love a fight. They will all point out that the section on builds says nothing against this unorthodox tactic.

There are however, some players for whom harrasing the GM is not one of their prime reasons for playing Diplomacy: Myself for example (I'll have to ask several of you to stop snickering). So consider the following board situation: You have Mos open for a build. England has A StP and another fleet in an adjacent province. The F-E-G triangle is somewhat stagnant, and so there are no compelling demands on England for that fleet. There is no chance for getting help from a German fleet.

Your long range goal, of course, is to retake StP, but as long as that English fleet is uncommitted, this cannot happen. The best you can do is place armies in Lvn and Mos, not enuf to dislodge the supported English A StP. Your building A Mos and/or bring up armies north will only cause England to arrange his alliances in such a way that the fleet will not be needed elsewhere, dooming your attempts to retake StP. Building F Mos will signal to England your "disinterest" in retaking StP while at the same time not tempting him by leaving Mos open. The goal of all this is to have England involve the fleet elsewhere in such a way that quick return is not possible. Indeed, it may be possible to get England to pull the army out too, in much the same way that and English Fleet in StP does not require a Russian army in Mos. If this happens, you may be able to retake StP by building A War later. Otherwise, the carcass of F Mos will have to be disposed of. The simplest way is to "loan" a southern center to an ally, necessitating the removal of F Mos. Later the center is taken back, and A Mos appears.

Alternatively, F Mos can be part of a plan not to take StP, but rather to avoid further war with England, a war you may be unable to wage. This is especially true if England has taken StP with a fleet. This is somewhat analogous to building F Smy when the Russians have a unit in Ank.

In conclusion, building F Mos can be used to aggravate the GM, and to defend Mos without threatening StP regardless of your ultimate aims.

Normally, an article such as this ends at the end, not unlike a lecture without a homework assignment. Not this one, folkes. For the following "excercise" you may use your Rulebook and conference maps --- this is an openbook assignment

1. You have sucessfully gotten the GM to allow your F Mos. You now wish to move the fleet south from Mos to Sev, relying on the common coastline along the Caspian Sea. What approach do you use to the GM under the following conditions:

- A. (novices) You and the GM are closely allied in another game.
- B. (intermediate players) You are in no other games with the GM.
- C. (advanced players) You have just stabbed the GM in a fall move in another game. This is a particularly brutal stab, because in the Spring move, the GM had to save your ass by supporting you during a really serious attack.

2. You are the GM and have rejected the build. The player has come back with all the arguments listed above. What is your crushing response? Keep in mind that the response should not only devastate the player's arguments, but also insure that no one will ever dare challenge you again on any other issue as well.

For those having trouble with question #1, here is a hint. Rule VII,1 states only that units may not move "to any location not specifically named." It does not state that locations not specifically named (e.g. the Caspian Sea) cannot be employed to show a common coastline.

((Feel free to take a shot at either #1 or #2, and if I get some good ones I'll print them, with three free issues going to the most entertaining one printed, and one free issue to any others printed))

8

fine conventions he has operated for Viking Systems ((Gordon was the prime mover behind Viking Systems, which sponsored Citex '74 and '75 in Chicago))

The question of the payment of the prize money continues to disturb me. I had hoped and believed that the apparent non-payment of the prizes for Citex '75 was a result of a misunderstanding. At this date, I know of at least one winner of the Diplomacy Tournament who remains unpaid. The discussions which have occurred in the April 11 1976 issue of Due Process (the magazine of the IDA Ombudsman) lead me to believe that other prize winners remain unpaid. It is my understanding that Mr. Calhmer ((who was the tournament director)) provided Gordon with a listing of the winners in a letter dated 18 Aug 1975. When Gordon told me he had never received a listing of the prize winners, I mailed him a copy of the same listing which had appeared in Paroxysm #14. That letter was mailed 20 Feb 1976.

In addition it would appear that there has been some difficulty in the reimbursement of Mike Rocamora for his travel expenses to Citex '75 --- which formed part of the prize for his first place finish in the Citex '74 Diplomacy Tournament. It appeared that VS made some attempt to pay for these tickets, but their check bounced because it had no signature...so far, this check has not been replaced.

It is my understanding that Bob Wartenburg attempted to take legal action in suit for the prize money he won at Citex '75. However, his legal counsel was reported to have advised him that a suit for a sum as small as \$225 is not worthwhile. It would appear that a hobby of the common people has few legal alternatives because its members cannot afford to seek justice through the courts. I guess we'll have to settle for moral suasion.

As a result of these unanswered questions against the reputation of VS, I will not attend Citex '76....If I have been incorrect or misinformed regarding any of the circumstances discussed, I would appreciate, and will print, any corrections that are tendered to me in writing. This editorial has been prepared by Robert Correll and represents the opinions of all 3 Paroxysm editors.((This was one of the milder editorials which appeared at that time. DipCon IX was, around that time, switched from Citex '76 to Origins II in Baltimore. So far as I know, the checks were never made good, and this was the last major tournament that I know of which featured cash prizes. An attempt by Dave Grabar a few years back to organize one never got off the ground, due to a lack of interest.))((Another mention of prize money comes this time from Everything #26, May 1, 1976, edited by the Boardman Number Custodian, Doug Beyerlein:))

... 1973DT was reported in the last issue of Everything. After the results were published the GM ((Burt Labelle)) suddenly discovered a vast conspiracy among the members of the BNC staff. It seems there was prize money associated with the game. How this made any difference in the outcome I have no idea. The game is still as regular as any of the others as far as I can see. But as the publisher of Everything ((John Weswig)) was a member of the 3-way draw which concluded the game, and as I did not declare the game irregular, it is obvious to one person (the GM) that we conspired to gain John whatever points the finish might be worth in various rating systems. I will let you make your own conclusion. And all ratingskeepers please note: if you think that the game should be declared irregular because of prize money then please do so for your rating system (You lost your bet, Burt.) ((It would seem that Diplomacy is best played for fun)).

.....
((Lets give Doug a chance to be more substantive. This is from Hoosier Archives #98))

THE BLITZ

In Impassable #6, I wrote an article entitled "Options". It demonstrated the strategic gains made possible by first forcing the neighboring powers into conflicts and then choosing the side which will result in the maximum possible benefits. This wait-and-see attitude is just one way to play a country opening. In this article I will discuss the other side of the coin: The Blitz.

As most people know, the term blitz is an abbreviation for the German word

blitzkrieg. Made popular by Germany's early victories in WWII, blitzkrieg means lightning war or a sudden swift, overwhelming attack. Applying the concept to Diplomacy, we have a strategic plan which can often determine the game's outcome.

A blitz is most formidable in the opening stage of the game, that is, 1901... when all the major powers are at minimum strength, their frontiers are largely unguarded, and diplomacy and the acceptance of new ideas is at a maximum.....

Step 1. Select the victim this has to be a neighboring power to whom you have good access.

Step 2. Conclude an alliance with the other power adjacent to the victim. This is the most sensitive and trickiest part of the whole plan. You and your ally must have complete trust in each other --- or as much as 2 Diplomacy players can have. There is no room for hesitation, blunders, or a breakdown in communication if the blitz is to work.

Step 3. Set up the victim with a fake alliance or pledge. This should make him make the necessary moves to cause the blitz to work...if you mention the blitz to some non-involved third power, don't expect it to remain a secret.

Step 4. This is the actual movements of units in S01 which starts the blitz on its forward march. Complete coordination with your ally is the key....

Step 5. This is when the blitz hits in F01. The victim's defensive position is smashed and all that is left for 1902 is the job of cleaning up the debris and gaining the victim's SCs.

While the blitz may sound quite easy to perform, there are obvious risks involved. As you are setting up your victim ... your ally may be just going along to force you into a poor strategic position where an attack from unexpected quarters can catch you off guard. The blitz forces you into an early commitment while other powers may be taking a wait-and-see attitude. This can result in other previously neutral countries now working for your downfall in terms of their own self interest. Therefore, the blitz is an all-or-nothing offense. The player that lives by the blitz can also die by it. Some examples of the blitz now follow.

1. England. Assuming that all the diplomacy has gone as planned, G and F decide to blitz England. They invite Russia to take Norway. The moves in S01:

E: F Lon-Nth, F Edi-Nwg, A Liv-Edi G: F Kie-Den, A Ber-Kie, A Mun-Ruh
F: F Bre-Eng, A Par-Pic, A Mar-Spa R: A Mos-StP

England now sees the stab, but what should he do? Defend Lon? Nth? Attack Nwy? It is now a guessing game. A good set of moves for F 01:

F: F Eng S Ger F Den-Nth, A Pic-Bel. R:A StP-Nwy. G: F Den-Nth, A Kie-Den, A Ruh-Bel
No matter how well England guesses, he is doomed and will be lucky to live past 1903. The blitzers have only to convoy into England for their gains. ((Doug is being somewhat overoptimistic here. If E plays the conservative F Nwg S F Nth, F Nth C A Edi-Lon in F01, and then guards Lpl against F Eng-Iri with F Nwg-cly, and guards Wal with A Lon-Wal, then GF must guess whether he will do F Nth H or F Nth-Lon. A wrong guess means FG will get nothing in 1902. If E plays the riskier A Edi-Yor in F01, FG will have to guess correctly in both S02 and F02 to take even one center.))

2. Turkey. This involves A and R with T not realizing the blitz until after F01. S01:

A: A Bud-Ser, F Tri-Alb; R: F Sev-Rum, A Mos-Sev; T: A Con-Bul, F Ank-Con
It looks like an R-T alliance, but..... F01:

A: A Ser-Bul, F Alb-Gre; R: F Rum S Aus A Ser-Bul, A Sev-Arm; T: A Bul-Gre, F Con-Aeg
And before T knows what's happened, R builds F Sev and it's all over for T

There are many other possible blitz situations. And some that can be used as late as 1903 have devastating results. Only ingenuity and the diplomatic skill of the blitzers place a limit on the range and effectiveness of the blitz. The possibilities are as endless as one's imagination.

The Zine Column #60

No Room For Headline

Quote of the month comes from magazine Magus #20, discussing #19: "... 67 pages is 7 pages too many." Having accumulated some of the most prolific press writers in the hobby, a huge stable of subzines, and Greg Fritz's wife, some reorganization was needed. Things have gotten back to a more reasonable size, but the zine is still a tremendous

read, and a fine buy at 10/\$6 from Steve and Daf Langley, 4112 Boone Lane Sacramento CA 95821. This can't keep up, of course, but then such predictions were wrong about BB, VOD, and EE.

John Caruso has come up with a novel alternative to grudge voting in the Runestone Zine Poll, held every summer. He's organized a Bourse around it. You buy and sell shares in a few dozen zines, and then hope that when the results come out, you've managed to accumulate shares in the zines which did best. An intriguing idea...also from John is confirmation that DipCon XVI will be with Origins in Detroit July 15-17 (tho I understand some of the dorms used will be in Canada!) as originally planned. There will be a gunboat (no Diplomacy) tournament Friday nite, with a two round regular Tourney Sat and Sunday, with the second round seeded as was done last year. Other ideas up for discussion are a Diplomacy Auction, a Seminar/Panel Discussion, the scoring system, amending the DipCon Charter, and the like. The te also includes Byrne, Ozog, Pearson, and Schilling. For further information, and constructive suggestions, write John at 160-02 43rd Ave Flushing NY 11358.

One practice that I don't much care for is that of printing letters which have unsubstantiated allegations, abusive language, and harsh comments on people's personal life. I refer particularly to an inflammatory piece by Jack Brawner in, of all places Whitestonia, to Julie Martin's comments about Gary Coughlan in VOD #70, and to Mike Bar-no's nasty letter in VOD #72. I should also include a "private" letter written by Woody, tho with 23 copies going out (a circulation larger than some zines!) its a question of semantics as to whether this can be called published after all. I wonder if the writers of these letters realize that such tactics will make themselves look a lot worse than their intended targets. And publishers, don't think your readers can't tell the difference between a good clean fight and some of this below the belt stuff. If you can't make your point without stooping that low, write on another topic or just shut up. DIPLOMACY DIGEST has never published these kinds of letters, and never will.

....Not much space left....Europa Express #21 has a good collection of letters on player rights...the recent issue of SNAFU! warns that another canadian postal strike may be on its way, and has a cryptic note by Ron about an apparently unsuccessful attempt to forge someorders.....I think I'll wrap things up with a pair of

A,B,C,D,E,F,G,H,I,J,K,L,M,N,O,P,Q,R,S,T,U,V,W,X,Y,Z.

Michael Nelson:to familiarize us (the class) with geographic locations and the need for diplomatic relations with other countries, we are playing Diplomacy...our whole class plays the game (5 or 6 to a country)...however, I have gotten too involved and carried away with the game.....((hey, don't we all! Its hard enough to persuade one person to support you, can you imagine having to persuade 6? Such "team" games would present interesting possibilities for moles and turncoats, however. And I can just imagine being able to say, "I'm sorry we stabbed you, but it was our homework assignment to betray our closest ally.....!"))

Doug Beyerlein: The publishing survey results were very interesting. I was rather surprised that the median age of publishers is 32. I would have thought that the mid 20s would be more likely. And I found it rather surprising that anyone actually finds typing enjoyable ((surprising? I find it virtually incomprehensible))....I think you are wrong regarding your comment on the mean circulation today and 8 years ago. I doubt that there is actually any difference since the early 70s. One item I want correct is your comment on Question 45. Most of the top players over the years have also been GMs (John Smyth, Edi Birsan, Brenton ver Ploeg, Walt Buchanan etc) Today I play only standby positions because of lack of time to do anything more, but back in the late '60s and early '70s I racked up just about as many wins as anyone else including Birsan. I beleive that I am a good GM today because of the experience I gained as a player over the years playing under 30+ GMs. I copied from the best (Boardman, von Metxke, McCallum) and tried to make sure that I never repeated the mistakes of the worst (too many to name ((OK, the way I should have worded it was "most of the pubbers who have been at it for a very long time no longer play postally"))