

DIPLOMACY DIGEST

Issue #76/77
Nov/Dec 1983
Variants

Mark L Berch
492 Naylor Place
Alexandria VA 22304

Subs: 10 for \$4.00
Europe: 10/\$4.50 or 7/£2
Circulation: 129

Variants. I figure at least 1/3 of my subbers are already sighing, groaning, muttering or cussing. I have, you say, absolutely no interest in variants, and to make matters worse, Berch has gone and done a double issue on the topic. Well, I sympathize. I don't have much interest in variants myself (except the three that I created myself, of course). I have gone to some effort, and I hope it shows, to find variant material to reprint which will interest even those who ordinarily don't bother with the entire topic. No maps are reprinted, and no long descriptions of variants are presented. These don't make interesting reading, I'm well aware of that. The short descriptions are there to give you some ideas, perhaps for varying your FTF game, or for creating your own, or just giving you a flavor of how people change the game. Some of the regular articles in here (e.g. the one on reprinting variants) have implications for the hobby at large. Actually, I don't know why I'm being apologetic. I guess I don't want you to take a defeatist attitude before you've given the issue a try.

I think I should comment on the 4-page Shep Rose letter that is being distributed. Its already appeared in or with VOD, Whitestonia, Coat of Arms in toto, and has been excerpted elsewhere. Apparently, quite a few people are taking this as a hoax or joke (or at least, that's what they tell me they're doing). In fact, I'd just as soon you all took it as a hoax. That's unlikely to happen, tho, so, in the interests of candor, I'd better make at least a few comments.

Probably the most startling statement is that there is a Shep Rose. This is, I will admit, true, and I was in contact with him several times in the preparation of the article, tho he did not know the details of what I was up to. Moreover, on page 3 he says, "Many of the dirty tricks he "credits" me with are old ideas of his that he never had the nerve to play in his own games." Again, true, tho better would have been, "nerve or opportunity". Note that the first word of the sentence was "many", not "all". With regard to the "personal" stuff which covers most of the first 2 pages, I want to be careful of what I say. To begin with, he has his date pushed too far forward. None of those incidents occurred in the 70s. Some of the "holes" in what he said should be obvious. He seems to feel that, when making dope deals, the person who puts his ass on the line (i.e. risking being ripped off or, worse, busted) should also be the person who puts his money on the line --- and he wanted to do neither. So in his letter, Berch gets criticized for not wanting to do both. I also want to deny that I have ever heard the "Amboy Dukes" in concert. Skipping over a bit now, I will admit that yes, I have mailed some stuff from Lancaster Penna, so if he produces envelopes with such a postmark, they are probably legit. My inlaws live there, and I visit from time to time. However, the entire "Poy Sippi Dippi" business is a complete fabrication. There has never been such a zine, so far as I know. More than that I'd rather not say, except to state that everything in this paragraph is true.

THE NORTH AMERICAN VARIANT BANK

The North American Variant Bank is a collection of some 600+ variants of Diplomacy. Games unavailable from their original sources may be ordered from the Bank at costs detailed in our catalogue (but basically \$.10 per sheet plus handling & postage). Games range from very, very short rules, often collected with 2 or more games to a page, to extremely long and complex games with dozens of pages of rules and maps. NAVB handles only variants of Diplomacy and, by convention, the variant rules do not repeat the rules for the basic game, but only the changex, exceptions, and additions to them which constitute the variant per se.

Ordering variants is done through the NAVB Catalogue, currently published as issue #10 of the NAVB's gazette, ARDA. ARDA #10 costs \$1 from NAVB (Rod Walker, 1273 Crest Dr., Encinitas CA 92024). The main listing of games is by game type, with many descriptive subdivisions. There is also an alphabetical cross-index. Each listing indicates the catalogue number of the game and the number of sheets (maps and/or rules) constituting it. NAVB can conduct research to locate a game known only by description; however, such searches are on a time-available basis and frankly not much time is available in our present circumstances. Inquiries to NAVB, other than orders, should be accompanied by SASE (self-addressed, stamped envelope).

PLAY DIPLOMACY? SURE...WHAT KIND?
Rod Walker, Custodian NAVB

I assume that any subscriber to DIPLOMACY DIGEST knows that ours is The Game. But even The Game has its limitations. For one thing, it requires 7 people (yes, there are authorized versions for 5 and 6 people, but long experience has shown that the 6-man game isn't very well balanced and the 5-man game is hardly much better). And of course there's the embarrassing moment when you discover that you invited 8 people to your Diplomacy party, not 7, and nobody wants to GM. (You won't have that problem with me...I always GM, owing to the well-known Hobby Rule that if you are an old enough Old Fogey, you have totally forgotten the Rules and are therefore fit for nothing but GMing. Mark Berch, for instance, has not played the game...despite rumors to the contrary...since 1964; and John Boardman has not played since 1956, 2 years before the game was even invented!)

So variants can get you out of those embarrassing moments when you find you have too many people (or too few). There are versions for as few as 3 players. There are others which will take as many as...well, in a few cases, theoretically the entire population of the planet could play. Theory is always wonderful when you want a little hyperbole. But given any number of players from 3 to 34, there is probably at least one game requiring that precise number. Just think how smug you'll feel when you discover you've goofed and invited 21 people, and then smirk and drag out Mercator VIII! Too bad you forgot that 21 people are exactly 3 boards of regular Diplomacy and you've got them playing Mercator instead. I mean, in that game, somebody has to play Argentina!

Then there is the problem of Scenario Burn-out. There will come a time when you decide if you have to look at that old World War I map one more time, you'll do something drastic, like scream, vomit, or volunteer to play Italy. Variants can give you considerable variety. Why look at an old World War I map when you can look at an old Roman Empire map? Or Thirty Years' War, or Wars of the Roses, or pre-Columbian America? Sure, some of your friends think you're peculiar for being interested in the era of Kaiser Bill. Just think: these games are, by comparison, a sure ticket to the funny farm.

Many variants are "what if?" games...what if Italy had another fleet? What if Switzerland were passable? What if you had air power? What if you could move to Ireland, Iceland, Sicily, and other places few of us would want? What if Paris bordered Moscow? Well, obviously the list of these things is endless (and peculiar), and that's about the same with regard to the variants, which fiddle with The Game. Many of these variants which fiddle with the

((Lets start the with an article which is in part a personal account of the games played by a hard core variant fan, and in part a survey of many of the variants played in the 60's, when the whole operation was a lot less complex than it is now, when variants were less sophisticated. I should explain, or try to, the three letter codes you will see below. These identified the individual games (sections) of a variant. As best I understand it, the first letter reflects the designer or zine, so that, for example, the Dipsomania games began with "D". The third letter reflected the particular variant, and the second, the section, so that DAA and DCA were both Miller's Game of Anonymity. I'm not sure how rigorously it was followed. Anyhow, the writer is Rick Brooks, the Zine is Hoosier Archives #49, the date is December 11, 1971))

THE VARIANTS

I started playing Diplomacy in late 1965. I had joined the N3F Games Bureau ((National Fantasy Fan Federation Games Bureau. Its Diplomacy Division appears to be the first non-geographically based Diplomacy Organization)) in about April 1965 thru my Science Fiction interests and drifted into the Games Bureau....With most of the players in the Games Bureau being in the Washington Science Fiction Association, a face to face game of Diplomacy was out of the question. So I enrolled in 1965T and my early talents asserted themselves.....

Up until 1971, I had played ^{entirely} in the Games Bureau ((and thus, with Don Miller or one of his cohorts as a GM)) with two exceptions, LCA, and Walker's 68BZ, only my third regular game as opposed to 17 variants. When I got on top of LCA enuf to try another game, GB-1966-XF ((??)) was open. This was a Chalker ((Jack Chalker, who has since become a well known Science Fiction writer)) 9-man game where the Barbary Coast and Scandinavia were the extra countries....This was the game where France (Don Miller) ended up with an army in Persia.....

From there, I tried almost every variant that I could (I dislike economic Diplomacy). At this time, Don Miller ran about every variant that he could find players for and postulated and collected ones even wilder. I have always been more interested in learning a game and playing it enough to grasp its potential that I have been in playing one for extended periods of time.

Variants can be split basically into 2 groups, those with a regular board, and those without. I would be tempted to group those with a European board, such as those with a 9-man or those with a strengthened Germany into a subgroup of the first ... as variants of the board rather than board variants.

The regular board has been used for some good variants. SAA, the Game of Anarchy, started out with 34 players ((each with one Supply Center)) which really put the emphasis on Diplomacy. I started with Marseilles and Hoheinsel managed to set up an alliance between Spa, Por, Mar, Bre, and Par. Par and Bre were to go after Bel while Spa and Mar would head after Rome, and Por would take Mid and guard our flank. Unfortunately, 5-man alliances are unstable especially when one realizes that all 5 stand little chance of lasting the entire game. Our "allies" wiped out Spa and me in 2 years ((I believe that this game ended in a 2-way draw)) A later version narrowed the players down to 17, but with widely separated centers such as Mar and Mos. In both, when any player reached 5 centers, he had to declare 3 his home centers and could only build in them after that.

DEE (A & B), the Game of Chaos, have been the only games I have ever dropped out of (I have an overdeveloped sense of obligation, but there are limits). These games consisted of each player writing up orders for all 7 countries, then the GM would draw the order set that would be used. Germany ... had a burst of luck and got to 11.... Naturally the rest of us "played" against him and cut him back down. 3 or 4 of us had a loose alliance together, with me masterminding the move sets. T with his one unit had as much chance of getting his orders drawn as G with 11. So we brought him in, and worked against G, A, and R. I quit the game as the results were too uncertain, and the game looked as if it would seesaw indefinitely...There was a large turnover of players...

DKJ was the Lebling variant with all neutrals armed and it went slower than a regular game. DCA was a game of Anonymity where the players were unknown to each other, with the hope that tactics would shine. LCA was the year-at-a-time variant of Tretick where a player wrote up moves (non-conditional of course) for a whole year and hoped that he hadn't overlooked anything. PME was the Calhamer Napoleonic rule-book variant with G and I in standing disorder.

DJI was a 3x3 with a wild card player, featuring R-A-T and F-I-E with a strengthened Germany in between. This had the weakness of any 3-man game that two gang up on one. The team captain only was permitted to submit the 3 players' moves, so the game didn't allow for defections. Other variants have concerned smaller changes....

My first FTF gaming started at Tri-state college in Jan 1971....Most ... were 3, 4, and 5 man as our schedules didn't allow all of us to get together at once. The original Rulebook 3-man with E, F, and G usually started with G getting a fast lead. Then E and F at least informally allied and tended to deadlock over the corpse of G. ((He then discusses the shortcomings of the Rulebook suggestions for 4-player games, a format no longer used)).

WE developed an interesting 3-man game in which A, G, and R face each other. All of E, F, and T were off limits... and all of I. Tun and Bul (the Black was connected to Aeg) as well as Bel were omitted. Nth was connected to Ion and formed the limits of the playing area.

Some of the variant boards can lead to interesting games. FDC, FEC, and FLC were all variants using the same board based on Tolkein's Middle Earth with the last two being Mordor vs the World...FJF was based on Tolkein's Second Age....

FIE (Scottomacy) had England the most powerful country with the clans of Scotland having their centers intermingled....CAA (Indianomacy) had a board of North America and featured the Indian wars. I played the Iroquois and was fortunate enuf to have an isolated power so that I needed no working alliance all game. This did away with the need for Diplomacy and I enjoyed myself....In both games, once I worked matters down to a one-on-one, I'm ashamed to admit that I lost them both.

Don Miller also GMed a regular map variant where each player could at the end of his moves link or separate two pairs of provinces. These would hold until another player changed them...SCC (The Foundation Game) was based on Isaac Asimov's Foundation series...The board was strictly synthetic since the Foundation series covered most of our galaxy from rim to center. Fritz Mulhauser developed the board...The board (don't panic) is formed of 3-dimensional polyhedra with two and three factor supply centers and spaces at the vertices. The board uses two-dimensional Schlegel diagrams to represent the 5 interconnected polyhedra. Each of the 6 players could write 2 hyperspace linkage orders with the Spring and Fall moves that could only be used by the person who wrote them and only up thru the next movement season. The only units were fleets. This has been the most tactically complex variant that I've ever played in and I liked it best despite loosing it on the last move (I was young and trusting). I am definately hoping for another game....

The tactical possibilities of Diplomacy are too limited....It's time the variants stopped being the poor relations of Diplomacy. I have a great deal of respect for Allan Calhamer's designing ability but I seriously doubt that his concepts can't be improved upon. The weakness of Italy, the defensive strength of Turkey, the expansive potential of Russia, the convoying strength of England, the vulnerability of Austria are all imbalances. Probably all imbalances will be impossible to remove without a cloying symmetry that would leave one country in exactly the same position as another. Improvement is possible. Let's get on with it.

((And on with it they did. The 70's saw an explosion of creativity, especially as British and European designers entered the arena. The percentage of variants actually played postally, however, fell in the 70's. I suspect that fewer than 20% --- perhaps a lot fewer than that --- were played, in marked contrast to the 60's.))

ules can themselves be applied to other variants, so that ultimately the number of subvariants and variants of variants which you can get involved with is just about endless. Why, with variants you could play Diplomacy 24 hours a day, 7 days a week...and so on and on, getting the whole neighborhood involved, the whole city, the whole state...the entire world playing Diplomacy 65 days a year!! Well, whatever. You'll find there are variants for almost every taste, even versions of the game for dopers and alcoholics and groupies. here's Mafia-style Dip and Middle-earth Dip...there's Bharf Dip and Utter chaos (and Near Utter Chaos, too)...theres 3-dimensional Dip and Dip with only

Go to P22

REPRINTING VARIANTS

((The question of reprinting variants has sometimes been a troublesome one for the variant hobby. DW #34 had some comments by Lewis Pulsipher and Rod Walker on the topic, which is of course related to the broader question of what can be reproduced. The following discussion began, as some of the best hobby discussions have, with an almost offhand comment. We begin with Walter Luc Haas in his Bumm #6, July 1975. Altho the zine was (and still is, I beleive) published in Switzerland and was mostly in German, it had a strong international flavor))

.....Actually, Will ((Haven, publisher of the British zine "Bellicus")), did you ask the publisher of, say, the "Persian Variant I" for the right to copy this variant?....

((We now jump to Bumm #9, where Walter reprints the following exchange of letters which appeared in Bellicus #27))

Richard Walkerdine: Now, what's all this about you selling copies of Multiplicity rules ((this is a very popular regular board variant created by RW))? Don't you think it would have been a bit more polite to write and ask me if I minded your selling them before you went ahead and did so? I don't suppose I would have said no of course, but politeness costs nothing.

Will Haven replied: Hmmm. Well, actually Richard, politeness costs 13p (6 $\frac{1}{2}$ p each for stamps) which may not be much, but multiply that by the 50 or so variants in the Bank already and you have £7! The money ((from variant sales)) goes in part to subsidize Bellicus which loses about £1 per issue, and in part to a fund so that I can carry on offering variants for a limited period out of my own pocket, should I ever lose my Xeroxing facilities, until alternative arrangements can be made. ((Walter then replied:))

Will, it did cost me £3 $\frac{1}{2}$ to get the 300 copies of the Persian variant map printed offset; I made addional copies in order to sell them by my Variant Bank. Since you now sell them too, just copying them from Europa ((where it was first published)), I can throw them away more or less, I suppose, and I will lose actually much more than the 2 x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ pence we would have needed for stamps

....I agree with Will: it costs money to ask for copyrights (I know, since I ask a lot of people) and some designers can't be asked at all, since their addresses got lost, and others are no longer interested and will not reply. But I agree more with Richard: it is an act of politenessto ask ... and if it goes on too much, it will happen too often that the same variant will get reprinted several times within a short period by different zines....

That triggered the following response from Lew Pulsipher, in the following issue:

I don't care how much it costs to get permission, it is obviously, clearly, and undisputably wrong to reprint a variant (or even fotocopy it for other than your own personal use) without permission of the designer (an exception could be made for someone who has definitely dropped from the hobby and cannot, consequently, be contacted). I do not think the hobby ought to tolerate reprinting without permission, and whenever it is done I will speak out as I have in the past. Frankly, I am amazed that anyone would even consider reprinting without permission, tho I know we've had it happen in non-variant areas and in other areas of wargaming. ((Haas then responded:))

I fully agree with Lew - the problem will only be, what can we do against piracy - even if you use a copyright, this doesn't help much, cf the piracy xeroxes of the "Persian Variant". On the other side, I know that it is a costly and time-consuming task to build up a variant bank, if, on one hand, you wish to include a lot of variants, and if, on the other hand, you try to get the reprint permission first.

There are also several designers and publishers who obviously don't mind, if the variants they designed/published get reprinted/xeroxed by whomever. Others of course would like to sell their stocks first, but before someone else reprints it. And others too would like to choose themselves who should be allowed to reprint their variant. And some maybe would like to add some comments, rectifications, etc before an old variant gets reprinted.

Hopefully not to get misunderstood (since by chance I am one part of the World Variant Banks), I would like to propose the following points for discussion:

1) If at all possible, all designers/publishers of variants should send their variants automatically to one of the WVBs (or to both, if they can afford to do so)...

2) The WVBs would get by this automatically the reprint-permission to copy all the variants they get. On the other side, in order not to compete with other VBs or variant-publishers they will ask for higher prices -- which actually will be the case anyhow, since Xeroxing is more expensive than mimeo.

3) All designers/publishers who don't mind their variants getting reprinted should state so on their variants: Them eveybody can reprint wihtout asking....

4) All other variants (without that or another statement) are considered to be copyrighted; the designer and publisher have to be asked before another reprint gets done.

5) The big organizations (like IDA, NGC, etc) should try to find an agreement in order to avoid their members making or supporting piracy prints....

I should probably add that the above points are not to be considered as "official" WVB-policy, since I couldn't reach Dave Kadlecck in time to...publish a common statement

((In Bumm #11, Michel Liesnard checked in with the following:))

Firstly, it should be known that I belong to that catagory of variants designers who do not care at all whether somebody reprints or translates my games without my permission, provided that person mails me one copy of said reprint or translation AFTER it has been published. Indeed, I do not see why I should have to spend money for a stamp ((to give permission to reprint, as Lew says should be done)) when some other publisher makes me the flattering honor of considering that one of my creations deserves publication "To sell one's own stock first" is a feeble argument, and lets be serious: where is the variant publisher who ever made money with his inventions? Most often, those that are even published, are in fa nzines living on subscriptions by persons who accept to lose money in trade agreements, complimentary subs, and the like.

You used the term "piracy".....Is he a "pirate", the man who (even implicitly) states that he has found Mr X's variant so good or original that he is willing to lose money to let his readers know about it? Should he pay also for a supplimentary letter just to "have the right" to reprint something which is not officially copyrighted....?

In 1972, I translated Brian Libby's "Third Age" into French, without asking the author's permitssion, altho I had his address. No one ever complained, certainly not Libby, who

thanked me for having allowed a revival of his variant thru John Piggott's retranslation into English.

To let a designer know that you have reprinted his variant is pure tact. To ask him the permission is a waste of time and money for both.... ((Haas then responded:))

....I don't agree with Michel Liesnard in this subject. But I agree that some, maybe even a lot of the designers will share his opinion, but ... certainly not all --- and how should you know in advance, how a designer feels about this?....Designers should publish their decision, along with the variant (something like, "uncommercial reprints/translations allowed ... after (date)"etc) And, to sell one's own stock first is not a feeble argument. That's the only way by which a publisher might be able to reduce some of his losses. If he can't be sure anymore that he can sell his stocks first, he might be reluctant to publish variants at all, which wouldn't be in the interests of designers... As an example, it did cost me money to get the "Persian Variant" map offset printed; if I now can't sell these stocks of maps (because a British VB makes cheap Xeroxs of it), this will mean that I'll sit on my stock, and never will get the money back for this investment --- not even a part of this money, actually. Do you think I would ever again risk to get maps printed....The same with mimeos, by the way: If I include a variant in Bumm, especially one of several pages, this costs additional money....a lot of these variants are given away to traders, but if I can't sell some of these variants (even at cost) this means I have to pay for all of the loss myself...A publisher could decide to publish a variant, but without issuing it as part of his zine; he would try to sell it separately, i.e. he would act like a VB. But do you think he will be prepared to do this if he can't be sure that he will sell all the variants he printed?

((A few months later, in March 1976, Bumm #14/15, Walter Luc Haas had the following:))

As Fred Davis and Raymond Heuer wrote, it is actually impossible to copyright a variant. "All variants infringe on GRI's copyright of "Diplomacy" ((GRI owned the game before Avalon Hill)) and in addition, literary copyrights have been infringed upon by, just to take one example, the Tolkein Variants. While there is no real danger of prosecution by the affected parties, there is really no basis for claiming that a variant is "copyrighted". HOWEVER, hobby traditions frown upon reproducing something over the expressed objections of the author/designer." (Ray Heuer) Lew Pulsipher obviously doesn't agree when he writes: "One way or another permission must be obtained; it is immoral and illegal (for copyrighted material) to reprint variants without permission." Despite what I'll suggest later ... I agree that it is immoral to reprint a variant without permission. On the other hand we have to face the fact that variants can't be copyrighted really. ((Elsewhere in the issue is another Pulsipher letter:))

I suggest that you devise a standard statement such as the following: "The World Variant Bank requests permission to make fotocopies of and/or reprints your variant (s) for distribution to interested players at cost. The purpose of the WVB is to give players a single convenient source for out of print or hard to find Diplomacy variants and to provide an historical variant archive for research or other purposes, and simply to see that some variants are not permanently lost. It does not compete with individual publishers and makes not profit ... We ask that permission be transferable between the branches of the WVB, no matter which individual is director of any branch ... By all means please specify any restrictions of time, area, or otherwise that you desire - for example, ... "no reprinting till Jan 1977" The WVB is a non-profit hobby service and can pay no royalties. Even if you will permit no reproduction, the WVB would like to obtain copies of your variants for its historical archives ..." A lot of people won't reply until they receive a direct request, and some not even then I have great difficulty obtaining copies of variants for description in DW, even with the entitlement that the GM (who is usually the designer) might obtain more players from the extra publicity...We can ask designers to include permission ((for the reproduction)) of the variant. I don't know how many will bother to do so. Designers/publishers should support a WVB, but they won't ... There are many things that people in the hobby

should do but won't. That's because the "should" is based on the assumption that they care about the hobby as a whole, and most don't. ((Haas replied:))

I feel that such a standard statement ... would be excellent ... ((but)) it would be difficult to always get a reply; furthermore, something like this costs a lot of money and time ... if you try to collect most of the 350-450 existing and coming variants it will be enuf trouble to get even a copy of those which you don't get with your trades, for instance. ((Buzz #16 next had this from Fred Davis:))

...In the case of a variant design MORE than 2 years old, designed by someone who has since dropped out of the hobby, I see no need to try to contact him for permission to include the variant in the VB. If he's dropped out of the hobby, he probably couldn't care less....((Then, in #17, Haas described what he decided upon:))

The catalogue mentions only those variants as available for which I either got the permission personally or which are part of the North American Variant Bank. Some are marked "AO" (archives only): they will be available in a year, if the designer doesn't ask for a prolongation before then. Others are marked "AO?"; they mostly concern variants published by traders of Buzz; I assume that they agree to include them in the WVB, if they don't write differently in the near future. Since I obviously cannot expect that designers/publishers always will remember to give automatic permission, and since on the other hand it is impossible (and not worth the investment of time and money too) to run after every published variant to get ... the permission. Note: WVB is not one of the usual VB's with a limited amount of popular variants (for which a permission can be easily obtained)....Therefore, and since it is a project which to me at least seems to be in the interests of the hobby, may I assume that all variants I or Dave Kadlecsek((head of the NAVB)) get in their trades can automatically be made part of the WVB, unless something else is specifically stated? This is the only method I can see which could, maybe, enable us to manage the WVB, ...with a reasonable relation between workload and utility....

I agree, tho, that a publisher should still ask a designer before he publishes his variant: The designer might want to make some changes, to add some notes, or he might not want to see his design published again, or, for whatever reason, not in that zine. Also, this asking could prevent unnecessary duplications. Since it is no real problem to ask for reprint/xerox-permission of only a limited number of variants are concerned, other VBs should still ask for that permission: this would allow the designers to have a more perfect control over their products. Therefore, I would suggest giving the World Variant Bank a special status ... considering the amount of designs ... involved, considering that it would be a real hobby service, considering that it would be run as a non-profitting, neutral institution....((etc, etc. Not surprisingly, this didn't go down very well. Starting in #18 is Will Haven:))

You cannot make one set of rules for yourself and another for other people. The logic re copyright applies equally to me and thee, and I consider myself released from that obligation in the same way you have wiggled out of it yourself. It doesn't matter much anyhow - I have enuf variants with permission to keep me going (as a publisher) all year. My intention is to sell only a limited number of popular variants, which will be numbered and slowly expand. If you are willing to refer Europeans to my bank for these (i.e. by making your copies AO), I shall publish your lists and direct my people to you for the ones I don't have. This seems only sensible. Please answer Yes or No --- no maybes, huh?((Haas then replied that he had explained the difference last issue, and then also noted:))

One difference, for instance, is that the WVB loses money, and your VB makes money. The suggestion (and that is what it was - no decision yet: In the meantime we are still trying to get as many permissions - not copyrights - as possible) I made there seems to be reasonable - if someone cares to have such a ((complete)) WVB.... Its just too time- and money consuming, considering that we sell at (real!) xerox-costs and postage only. I don't mind whether you or anyone else makes propoganda for the variants which WVB stocks, or not: It would be in the interests of the variant collectors and players

, maybe also in the interest of some designers, and historians. I have no personal ((financial, I assume he means)) interest in the WVB. I am doing this as pure service to the hobby, since ... I would be in a position to get these easier maybe than most others...The answer to your question is definitely no. There is no reason why the WVB shouldn't stock, or make Archives Only a variant just because any other VB is selling this variant too (Exceptions of course would be where a variant gets published first and the designer/publisher wants to get rid of his stocks first.)...There is not much reason why WVB should sell only unpopular variants ... and renounce all popular ones. ((He then quotes the following by Robert Sacks which appeared in the July 1976 Lord of Hosts, and discussed Haas' WVB thusly:))

I would suggest that there is grounds for a public investigation of this "strictly personal" effort for conducting public business under false pretenses and violation of public trust; for myself, I wish to give public notice that WVB is expressly denied permission to reprint variants of my design ... and urge all other designers to do likewise.((Haas replied as follows:))

Okay. Variants of Mr Sacks are Archives only from now on.((He then went on to list a lengthy set of complaints against Sacks, concluding: I shall now follow from now on the example of many others: I shall ignore him...." Next up is Richard Walkerdine:))

If you want to distribute my revised Multiplicity rules from your variant Bank I will require a promise that I will receive 1 pence ((2-3p)) per copy sold; otherwise it is no deal ((Haas then replied:))

Nicky Palmer informs me that he intends to suggest that the British VB run by the NGC ask for a few extra-pennies so that the designers could get some kind of royalties. I am against this idea, and the revised Multiplicity therefore will be Archives Only. The WVB works at xerox + postage price, as a real hobby service; I don't even ask for the costs of envelopes, extra correspondence (with customers, designers/publishers), etc; should I now ask/pay for an extra penny for the designer? (or: should I ask at least a penny from the designer that I give some publicity to his variant and am prepared to help to spread it out?). Organizational problem: How long would it take until, say, 10 copies of a variant got sold? A year? Five years? More? What would the designer pay me for the bookkeeping? 1p per entrance? And then, who would pay for the transfer of the money ((even)) a seamailed letter costs me 19p. It is also a legal problem: Even if only a penny should get paid: Diplomacy is a copyrighted game - variants, if sold for money other than costs, infringe the copyright, I suppose. And finally, it is a question of principle --- do we want this commercialization of the variant field? ((And now, for a few comments of my own:

1. If the designer of a variant does not want his creation reproduced without permission, he should so state when he has it first published. If he can't be bothered to say that, I don't see that anyone need to go to the trouble of contacting him. So I do not agree with WLH's Birt "4)" of 3 pages back.

2. As a legal point, it is by no means true that all Diplomacy variants infringe on the Diplomacy copyright. If the map is significantly changed, and the rules are significantly altered, then there's not a chance of such an infringement. One cannot copyright an idea (e.g. simultaneous movement, a support order, etc), only the specific expression of that idea. Moreover, neither GRI nor AH has made any attempt over the last nearly twenty years that Diplomacy variants have existed to enforce their legal rights, even by warning people not to do it. As a result, the copyright is probably unenforceable. The sole exception might be the map itself, since I've heard rumors of AH objecting to photocopying of that. Indeed, even their trademark on "Diplomacy" (assuming they have one) might well be forfeit due to lack of policing, and due to the "Anti-Monopoly" legal decision of about a year ago, in which the trademark "Monopoly" was ruled unenforceable.

3. I'd be surprised if many designers are like Walkerdine and want some sort of royalty on sales, and WLH rightly points out, in effect, how petty Walkerdine is being. If someone were determined, however, to get some sort of payment other than by

direct sales, the best approach would be to hit up the person who is getting some money in the first place: the GM. If a GM is collecting, say, \$30 in gamefees for running a variant created by someone else, I could see the designer asking for, say, 10% of that for his services as designer. I wouldn't charge a fee myself, but such a charge is not totally unreasonable.

4. Running a variant Bank is a great deal of work, I'm sure, a labor of love. And I wouldn't favor any practices that significantly add to the work involved, altho alas there are always going to be people like Sacks around to complicate things. Still, a designer may have gone to some effort and expense to prepare maps (and may not want the diminution of quality that comes from a second generation Xerox). He may be refining the game, or just may want to write the person who is buying it. These things do have to be taken into consideration. If I were in the shoes of such a designer, I might well send the VB head, in addition to a copy for his files, a bunch of postcards, which basically said, if you'd like this variant, the price is such and such, write Berch at this address. If a request came in to the VB head, he'd reach into the file for that game, discover the postcard, and send that out instead. If I'm going to be catered to, it should be at my expense.



((GMing a complex variant can be an exhausting undertaking. The following is Geoff Challenger's account in Ethil the Frog #9, phase 2, Sept 1977))

I don't usually write anything so imperious as a "letter for publication", but in this case I strongly request that this be printed, because any credibility I have left depends on my answer to Chris Rick's comments ((earlier)).....

I was introduced to the hobby in Oct 1973 by the "Dinsbury Mob", with whom I was at school, and was involved with the early rise of Hannibal, one of several new zines which sprang up at that time. I got the taste for running games, and began Polaris, a subzine to Duncan Morris' Frigate, in the summer of 1974. Shortly after this I floated the idea of running a game of Hypereconomic Diplomacy, designed by Don Miller and Pete Ansoff. Interest grew slowly, until by the Autumn of 1974, I found myself running Hyperion, which was a kind of discussion zine for the game. And when the game started, I spent most of 1975 running both, apart from a short break for my "A" level Exams. A Quote from Hyperion #6: I'm certain I'll have the time to run both Polaris and Hyperion simultaneously without ruinging either. Just watch me."

While this was true at the time, it was because I had very little in the way of entertainment outside Diplomacy - the result of going to a Catholic, single sex school. When I went to college, I found I no longer had the 6 or 7 hours spare time each day necessary to produce Hyperion and Polaris. By now Polaris had become a full zine, and the Hyperec game had become unsatisfactory. Some people were using "dummy players", others were just mucking around, making no attempt to stay within the spirit of the rules.

I was quite pissed off with the while thing, and just let it drift. However, some people were still interested, and Martin Feather took over as GM with the aid of a computer to do the printing. I took little part in the game from then. Martin announced that he was quitting GMing after two seasons. By that time, the number of players had declined considerably, along with general interest in the game. But I had finished my first year at college and was living at home; having time on my hands, and not wanting my little game to die (I still feel quite paternaliztic about it), I became GM again. I tried to increase the number of players, and to simplify the game, but it didn't seem to have much effect.

When I moved down south again to seek fame and fortune my interest had declined and I seemd to be beating my head against a brick wall and was losing nearly £10 per issue in the process. When I was under pressure for money to live on and spare time to produce in, I just gave up. The final Hyperion, #13, came out in Oct 1976.

During my phase of trying to revitalize the game, I asked a number of people if they would help by mentioning the game to friends. Steve Plater's plug in Leviathan, WHICH was hadrly recent, was an unsolicited testimonial. All it said was what a really excellent and mind-blowing game Hyperec is. It mentioned that the British game was being run by me; I beleive that I got a couple of responses from it....

S teve Plater is right - Hyperec is a really excellent variant, well designed, and, if run properly, very enjoyable to play in. However, it puts a pretty frightening strain on the GM. Every issue of Hyperion used to take approximately 100 man-hours to produce. In all, 9 seasons were adjudicated: 6 by me, one by steve Brown, 2 by Martin Feather.....

So much for history. The current situation is that I owe various people a total of about £35. I also owe the ... bank £120. If I could afford to pay people back, I would. I recognize that I have ripped people off; some are owed as much as £4. However, I do not like the image that I am storing up vast profits on my past zines. I ran H rather idealistically. The actual cost of most issues was about 40pence a copy. Obviously, no one would pay that, once you added 15 p in postage. I couldn't put a fi figure on what I've lost running H but it must be in three figures.

I will pay back the money when I can; the fact that I have already lost a lot of money is irrelevant, for a GM should expect that. However, I strongly resists any attempt to sequestrate my credit. I am buying Ethil the Frog from John at the price he is charging, the fact that I owe someone else money doesn't enter into it ((he then goes on to give a variety of tips and advice for those who wish to avoid the problems of his "haphazard career", but its getting further and further away from the theme of this issue. Pete Ansoff is still around and is a DD subber; I bleive he mentioned once that a US Hyperec game ran for at least 10 years real-time and may still be going. Geoff (which I beleive is pronounced "Jeff") was bitten by the bug again, and in June 1981 began publishing Home of the Brave. The zine is still running, with games of regular dip, variant dip, and non-Dip games. But no Hyperec.....))

YOUNGSTOWN

((Without question, the variant which has gotten the most play in the more-than-7-players catagory is Youngstown. This is actually a family of closely related games, and even the modern versions are not exactly the same. Here are some comments that came at the close of 1973Cwei ("Sierra" in 1901 and all that). I'm taking only snippets from the endgame statements)) ((The game was a China-Japan-Italy-Russia-Germany draw))

China It was obvious from the stat that a Sino-Japanese alliance was the only way that these two powers could grow to any size. Tony ((Japan)) saw this as well....I never want to paly a Youngstown again, ever!

Italy This was the most enthralling game in which I have ever played and I was very sad when I realized that that the stalemate line which Japan and China had long claimed in fact lay further west (in the Off-Board-Boxes) than I had searched...Let's have another game of Youngstown as soon as possible!

RussiaAs for Youngestown in general, I dislike the variant. It is unbalanced (T and J are certainly better than the other countries and France is awful) and it is too easy to form stalemate lines. There ought to be more provices in central Russia nad Iran should be split up. One thing good about it are the Off Board Boxes which create some very interesting problems....

Japan A 5-way draw was a just result and with the benefit of hindsight the most probable result (along with a 4-way draw) for all Youngestown games...The eastern alliance will always have the initial edge as there are fewer adjacent opponents to overcome, but once they start to move against the west, they must telegraph their intentions as they have to cross intervening sea (OBBs) or land (Siberia, Iran) psaces. Becasue of the large number of spaces needed to win, an early stab of an ally is not very likely, as faster progress can be made by staying faithful to your ally, and an alliance will al-

ways meet an equal and opposite alliance resulting in a deadlock. This game has lessened my interest in the Youngstown variant and I no longer rate it as one of the better variants.

GM ...I just throw my weight behind the opinions of Japan and China....From a GMing point of view Y starts off as a nightmare, taking easily 4 or 5 times as long as a standard game to adjudicate. In the middle game it's depressing to see all those people getting beaten. And the end game, if such it could be called ... was pretty boring I'm afraid...I would be gratified to find out some day, just what it is about Y that makes it so popular, especially in the U.S., where it is far and away the most popular variant Here is a run-down on the progress of the 10 U.K. Y games which have started:

1. Mad Policy C ...ran 36 issues ending in a 5 way draw, A-C-E-G-J in F17. The C-J alliance was prominent. There were 6 drops/resignations.
2. Grafeti 73/9V. Ill fated game ...transferred to Tales from the Black Forest ... thence to The Norms where it ended in a win for Andy Davison playing R in 1912. Sheer persistence won the day 7 dropouts.
3. Our 'Eury IV FO4 reached, game is in limbo.
4. Bellicus SY1 ...in 1910 it looks as it is could be drawing to a conclusion, with 8 countries still in, 4 of them in anarchy. Concession to J seems likely, ...there have been no less than 11 drops/resignation, including all 10 original players.
5. 1901 ... Sierra ((the above game)) 5-way draw, 4 drops/resignations
6. Frigate 74/11V now carried in Chimera 6 countries left in F11, T win looks inevitable.
7. Comet BDC 57V ...ending in a concession draw to G/I in FO9, with C/F & J surviving ((Remaining 3 not yet resolved))

And that's it. Not much is there, but what there is doesn't say much in Y's favor ... draws certainly look as if they're going to win the day.... ((The day of Youngstown has definitely passed in the US as well. So far as I know, the only postal section of it in the 80s was 80Ecv, Youngstown IV in Baumeister's Politician and 81Djm, Youngstown XII with Glenn Taylor Gning. Perhaps its swansong was at EastCon 1981, when Glenn ran a tournament of Y XII. More recently, the popular variants for more than 7 players have been games like Colonia and World War IIIb. The only one I'm deeply familiar enuf with to recommend is McLendon's "Holocaust", a very well designed global variant. We'll close with two more items on Youngstown. The first is a letter in the following 1901 and all that, #59, 2-13-76 by Allan Ovens))

...I have recently introduced Diplomacy to my Squadron and so great was the interest shown, that after the initial game of Diplomacy, to enable everyone to familiarize themselves with the rules, it was necessary to make a large Youngstown board for the next game. Even with 10 countries demand is so great that each power is managed by 2 players and there are still many who wanted to play but for which there wasn't room. All players quickly picked up the rules and most now play like veterans, so giving the following remarks more credence.

The statements about deadlocks and opposite alliances which cannot afford to break are all true. But to shorten the game, and reduce the number of these situations I altered the victory criterion to 25. This has immediate effects on the alliance structures if joint wins are disallowed except in the event of a stalemate...There is now much more incentive to stab your ally because your ultimate target ((win)) is now in reach. It may be departing from the traditional concept of Diplomacy, which is total domination, but it makes a more interesting game....The game currently played is about to end with a Russian victory in 1908 or 1909, and to make the next game even faster and more fluid I am considering reducing the victory criterion to 20.

((And finally, here is John Leeder, with comments about Youngstown VIII (an expanded version with Africa added, an extra combatant (Transvaal) and an extra complicated set of fleet rules) in the Oct 13, 1981 issue of Lord of Hosts:))

...From a GM's view, consider: The game I'm GMing has been running for over 3½ years, real time, 23 players have been involved in the game so far. There are 92 units on the board. It takes me at least 2 hours to GM and type up a season; even then, because of the vast number of units and (especially) the OBB fleet rules, there's rarely a season without a GMing or typo error, often causing game delays.

Any GM considering running Y VII (or any large scale game...) should be prepared to stick at it for years, and to spend a lot of time adjudicating....He must also have a healthy standby list, as there's a lot of attrition in a game which lasts so long. But as I said, I like the game ((In Feb, 1983, with the game still going, John transferred it to Luedi to GM. Unless I'm mistaken, the game ended shortly thereafter, so it ran about 5 years. One of the most common problems with large scale variants is that the victory criterion is set too high)).



((Next we turn to Hoosier Archives #105, January 1973. The author is Lew Pulsipher. I have removed a few of the items because they've already been explained earlier in this issue))

SIMPLE DIPLOMACY VARIANTS

Most of the well-known Diplomacy variants include a new or redesigned board, tho there may not be radical changes. There are also as many, if not more, variants which retain the regular board and change only one or a few rules. These variants are excellent for face to face play (tho a few require a GM) since they are easy to learn and do not require play on an unfamiliar board. The following list includes most of the simple variants known to me, tho there are surely many more. Some resulted from misinterpretation of the old rules (eg, the Key rule), some were originally used in new-board variants (double armies), and some were specifically designed for use with the regular board and rules (armed neutrals). These rules may be used as individual variants, or a number of them may be used in a single game. Some may seem unclear, either interpretation may be used. I have not credited designers, even where known in order to save space.

Winter 1900: Before S01, players build in their home centers, which are all empty

Armed Neutrals: A neutral center is occupied by an army in civil disorder. This army is effective for a certain number of game years and is then removed. Another variation is a CD army which defends only certain borders of a neutral....

Blitzkrieg or disorganization: Players must write orders for a move season (S or F) before adjudication of the previous move-season's orders. Thus, players write FO1 orders and conditional builds before S01 moves are adjudicated. After S01, Fall moves and builds may not be changed. Conditional retreats, or a special retreat rule, are necessary.

Twin Earths: Two sets are used. Each player plays the same country on both boards. Units may move between a space on one board and the same space on another board (e.g. between Mun I and Mun II) Victory criterion was usually doubled. Builds and removals could be made on either board ...

Supply Each winter each unit must trace a contiguous line of spaces to the center supplying it, which have been captured by that unit's forces or which are designated friendly by the player who owns the space(s). Capture takes place in any season for supply purposes. This eliminates such anomalies as guerilla fleets behind the lines and similar historical nonsense.

Changing of the guard: A fleet and an army of the same country may exchange places as long as each move will otherwise succeed...This would fail completely if some other unit were ordered to one of the spaces.

Exchange: Like Changing of the Guard, except that units of any type and any nation may participate as long as both agree.

You only live once: When a unit is annihilated (including retreat off the board) it may never be rebuilt. Thus, that country will be permanently short one unit. ((This

is a good way to speed up a FTF game)).

Annihilation Rules: 1) A unit is never permitted to retreat off the board when another retreat is possible. 2) When a unit is annihilated, it may not be rebuilt the following winter, leaving the country one short the next year unless it has lost a center.

Air Power: Each SC is worth 4 supply points. A and F require 3 points, air units require 4 for support. An air unit may fly up to 4 spaces total in a movement season. It may support an attack on or defense of, the space it is bombing. Any number may bomb a given space. An air unit may not capture a space.

Submarines: These are like fleets except that a sub may move in a subspace under a normal sea space as well as on the surface. Many variations of this and the air power rule are possible.

Key Rule A unit which is ordered to move gives up its right to the space it is moving from, even if its move fails. Thus, if A Vie-Gal fails, A Bud-Vie dislodges Vie even if it attacks without support.

Cutting the cutting of support: A unit may not cut support if its space is attacked. There may also be cutting of the cutting of the cutting, etc.

Atomic Weapons: Each player receives one bomb per year (or one per move season) Bombs may be carried by other units. A bomb may be fired one space (perhaps more later in the game) and destroys everything in that space at the end of the move (including the SC for a specified period of time). If there are many bombs, then a stalemate is likely unless range is increased later in the game.

Multiple units: Each country is allowed a double army or double fleet (or even triple units, etc) The unit should be specified (perhaps secretly at the start of the game). A Leader unit can be added which doubles any unit it is with; more than one leader can be used as well. (You also have to decide how these multiple units work. Will a single attack on a double unit cut all of its supports, or just one? Does a DA need a DF to convoy it? If a DU is annihilated, must it be rebuilt, or can an existing unit be doubled?)

Border prohibitions: Units of a particular country, or coming from a particular direction, may not enter certain spaces for a specified period, e.g. players might be prohibited from entering other player's countries in 1901.

Builds: (1) units may be built in any ((open??)) center in a player's hands, not just home centers, or in any province, or in any province in the player's home country. (2) A player may build in an open home center even if another player owns the center (guerilla build); of course, the player must first be entitled to a build. ((Lets add a few more. (3) Swaps. A player may both remove and build units in the same winter, so long as he comes up with the correct total (actually, the Rulebook does not specifically ban this). (4) Changes. Armies can be converted into fleets and vice versa. (5) Belligerent removals. Each winter, a player may order one removal against another player. This may be against an existing unit, or one which he thinks will be built that season. The victim will thus be one unit short (or several, if more than one player targets him), unless it turns out he was removing that piece anyhow. (6) Invisible builds. Winter adjustments are not revealed at that time. Instead, the other players learn about them only when the following Spring orders are read. A players pre-SO2 negotiations, for example, could involve discussing units he doesn't actually have (7) Split Builds. If you have one build, instead of getting one unit for two seasons, you get 2 builds, but for just one season --- after Spring, the units come. Changing the build rules is one of the easiest and least complicated ways of adding variety to a game, be it in the context of a new variant you're creating, or just changing your ordinary face to face games))

Support: A unit may support in place a unit that is ordered to move. If the move fails, then the unit is still supported in its beginning space...

Basic Defense: All centers have a permanent basic defense of one, which is added to any unit occupying the center but operates for the owning player even when no unit occupies it. This basic defense may instead be used only for home centers, or for certain centers or provinces specified by the player (fortresses built by the player, in other words). A wild variation is that the basic defense applies against ALL

countries, even the owning country unless the center is actually occupied. ((It seems to me this rule would really slow a game down))

Coastal crawl: A fleet may move from a coast of a double coasted province to another coastal space, while another fleet in that ((other)) coastal space moves to the other coast of the 2-coasted province, e.g. F Spa(sc)-Por, F Por-Spa(nc)

Spring Raid: When a player occupies another player's center in the Spring, the center becomes neutral and must be captured as any other neutral center.

Center Ownership: (1) Centers may be captured in any season (2) A Player may loan a center to another for support of a unit, but may rescind the loan at any time, forcing the former recipient to find new supplies by the next winter for any units supported by the loan. (3) Centers may be given outright (4) The owner and occupier of a center may agree that the former will retain the center even tho the latter occupies it.

Time: Game years may last three seasons instead of two

Escalation: Units never need be removed for lack of centers

Convoys: (1) Fleets in coastal provinces may convoy (2) All units may convoy (e.g. A Bre, F Eng and F Wal C A Par-Lpl) (3) An army is annihilated if its convoy is disrupted by dislodgement of one of its fleets (4) Any attack on a convoying fleet disrupts the convoy (5) Alternate convoy routes may be ordered in case one route is disrupted (6) a Fleet convoying an army of another country may annihilate it (7) Fleets may carry armies by forming army fleets (A/F's) ((Let's add a few more (8) Support can be convoyed, e.g. A Lon S A Bel-Hol via C of F Nth (so that F Den-Nth would not cut support) (9) Retreat can be convoyed, e.g. F Nth stands by to convoy A Bel-Lon if dislodged (10) A Fleet can convoy several armies in the same season to different destinations (11) Fleets can convoy fleets, e.g. F Nth C F Lon-Den. F Lon-Nth, F Nth-Den could be partially foiled by F Nwy-Nth (12) Armies can convoy fleets, e.g. A Mar C F Gas-Lyo))

Decoy units: A player may build in every open home center every winter. He may only have as many real units as SCs. The rest are fake units which are destroyed when attacked and may not effect combat (tho they may be ordered to support, etc as a decoy) This works best with a GM ((A less drastic version may be easier at first, and does not need a GM. Each player may have one more unit than his SC count will justify. When he writes his orders, he labels one of them as a decoy. Such a unit can only move or stay put; it cannot C or S and is dislodged by a single attack. Each season a player can change which unit is his decoy if he likes.

Kriegspiel: Players know the location only of their own units and units in adjacent spaces or variations thereof. Requires a GM. ((These are now known as blind or hidden movement games, and many variations have been played))

Anonymity III: Players do not know which of the other players is playing which of the countries, Requires a GM....((Again, lets add a few more to the list:

Never Sound retreat Units are never permitted to retreat. For extra zip, add the "You only live once" rule.

Decaying Cities Starting in, say, 1903, each player is entitled to one fewer unit than his SC total; in 1904, 2 fewer, etc. This is done to speed up a FTF game.

Glass Units Units when built cannot be seen. They only become visible when they are ordered to S or C or to be supported or are dislodged. Once seen, they become normal units.

Fleet Rome Italy begins with F Rom rather than A Rom.

Treaty Diplomacy Written treaties are binding and enforced by the GM, to the extent that moves inconsistent with the treaties are nullified.

Borrowed Moves: A unit is allowed 2 moves in the Spring but must remain inert in the fall. May best be limited to C and S moves.

Off Board Boxes These normally are used in modified boards, but could be used on a regular board as well. One would connect Ion with Nwg. That is, a unit in Ion moves to the OBB in one season, and into Nwg the next, or vice versa. The OBB is otherwise like an ordinary board space. Alternatively, a box could connect Mid with Bla, or both could be used. The purpose is to tie the board together a little better

by facilitating North-South or East-West movements.

Madman If there are only 6 players, Italy is not assigned a player. Each season every player writes orders for Italy. One of these is drawn at random and used. For better balance, bar any player from ordering Italy twice in one year.

He Who laughs last A player may write his Spring orders after having seen everyone else's first. But as a price his units must be in CD in the fall. If more than one player takes this option, a) one player at random would be permitted to actually do this, or b) all who so desire may do so, tho of course they will not see the orders of others who are also delaying their moves. This would probably unduly delay a postal game, but might work very well face to face.

Fifth Column Builds A player can build in any open home center except his own. If two or more order to the same center, none of them take place.

Some of the above are well known (F Rom, Madman). Others are ones that so far as I know, are my own creations (He who laffs last, 5th Column builds). I hope you've found something here you can use.))

THE ZINE COLUMN #68

ELECTRONIC MAIL DIPPY

First, a quick summary. In PBEM (Play by electronic mail) Diplomacy, all player-player and player-GM communication takes place via electronic mail. This can involve either of the commercial computer networks (The Source or Compuserve) or ordinary long distance lines. To do this, you need a computer and a modem (or equivalent device), which allows a computer to "talk" over telephone lines. And thats about it.

Russell Sipe PO Box 4566 Anaheim CA 92803 publishes an occasional information zine on PBEM dippy called A=Z. In issue #2, Bill Quinn, publisher of Everything writes in a letter, "I cannot see the postal hobby accepting PBEM games alongside postal games" He goes on to suggest that "it would be possible for me to recognize PBEM games as separate and carry them as such in a separate report." He goes on to suggest that a separate numbering system be set up for PBEM games.

I don't know whether Quinn's prediction about the acceptance of PBEM games will turn out to be accurate, but I certainly hope not. Yes, there are differences between regular postal and PBEM games, and apperntly Kieth Sherwood has, for now, decided not to include them in his rating system. But I fail to see what significance these differences have. So, lets have a look at them:

1. PBEM games have shorter deadlines, typically 1-2 weeks. Big Deal. Zines such as Greatest War in Modern Memory, Libertterrean, and Brutus Bulletin have run games with deadlines of 2 weeks or less, and no one cared.

2. Only certain people can get into these games. Again, so what? There have been plenty of restricted entry games in the hobby. Invitational or Demo games, all-women games, novice games, games-for-new-subbers-only all limit who can enter.

3. PBEM uses electronic mail, Postal uses USP"S". But why should that make any difference? Apostal game that I'm in now, 83X, has three players communicating to me primarily or exclusively via the telephone. So we have voice over the telephone lines. In PBEM we have written messages over the telephone line. If anything, PBEM sounds more like postal. After all, written PBEM messages, like ordinary postal, lack any tone-of-voice considerations, and leave a written message that you can examine (and prepare) with care, and do not force you to "think on your feet" ---- all in contrast to the fone calls that appear to be completely acceptable in an ordinary postal game. Really, the difference between using electronic mail and USP"S" is much smaller than the difference between fone and USP"S", yet the latter does not bother us.

Rather than erecting barriers, we should be doing our best to integrate these newcomers, and show them what we have to offer in the way of an extended community. They have things to offer us to, and questions to pose, and changes to bring, and possibilities to explore. Lets have a look at a few:

A. Are "Wordworks" games variants? Wesley Ives, 500 Lester Lane Winston-Salem NC 27103 runs games out of his computer. That is, your computer calls his computer via ordinary fone lines. He has a special number, (919)-723-5275 for data, which can be sent "at 300 or 1200 baud, 8-bit words, one stop bit, and no parity." (and no, I haven't the slightest idea what that means). This way, you don't have to join a computer network --- just be willing to pay the long distance bills. You compose your letters to various players, send them off to Wes' computer, and get your messages by calling his computer up and giving your special password. OK, here comes the twist. At gamestart, each player is given an official pseudonym, a "nom de Dip", and that is all you ever know about the identity of the other players (unless they choose to tell you more). You don't need any more because you send all your messages, and get all your messages, from Wes' computer. Kathy Byrne has refused to give such a game a Boardman Number, on the grounds that this is an anonymous game, which of course it is. There have been many anon games played postally, and none of them have ever gotten a Boardman Number. These were generally of two types. The first has no negotiation whatsoever, a "Gunboat" game. The 2nd permits negotiation via press, which is somewhat after the fact, of course. Both lack one of the essential elements of the game, viz, the right to confidential communication with other players unable to see the contents of the messages. But the wordsworth game is quite different --- player can communicate privately with each other. They don't know each other's names but so what? If the Official Pseudonyms had all turned out to be accurate, would that have mattered? If anything, this can produce a slightly purer game. Such considerations as who stabbed whom in the last game, who has what reputation or who is feuding with whom are whisked away. More to the point of the theme of this issue, I do not see how such a game qualifies as a variant. Wes is, incidently, organizing another such game.

B. What is a zine, and how is it distributed? Sipe runs his games in The Armchair Diplomat. On CompuServe, TAD is posted in what is called a "public access area" Anyone who is on "Gamesig" can see it --- its not limited to players in the games. Obviously, one cannot charge a subfee for such a zine (tho one could for a hardcopy printed and sent via USP"S"). But this greatly expands the audience for a zine and a game. People who never even heard of Diplomacy could be drawn in....I should add that the players get a special message on their computer when a new issue is out. The Wordworks is even a more fluid concept: "It is an Electronic magazine ... published continuously ... which I call an 'online magazine'this means that the content is substantially changed every week or so, but "back issue" material is kept online for a considerable period." There are no subfees, and you can call at any time ---best is night when rates are lowest.

C. Can your negotiations taken on an extra sparkle? Rule IV says, "Public announcements may be made and documents may be written and made public or not...." This is not so easy to do in postal Diplomacy. Announcements made in press are not really in "real time" --- they are too late to affect that season's moves. Players can mail out announcements, but you can never be sure that the announcement that you are getting is really the same one as the next guy is getting, but at least on The Wordworks games and, I think the CompuServe games as well, there is a Public Bulletinboard, where you can, if you so desire, you can put out a message openly to all other players. I can think of circumstances where the ability to take a "public stance" could be useful. As players get experienced that this sort of thing, they will find other ways in which EM will facilitate communication between the players, which, after all, is what the game is all about.

The number of people who can take advantage of this now is fairly limited, but it will grow (tho not, I think, as fast as some people are predicting). The number of people who are already using computers for some aspect of their hobby activities may surprise you. Jim Bumpas, Tom Swider, Dick Martin, and Bill Quinn, for example all use an Atari 800, quite a few people have Commodore 64's, and others are in use as well.

((At the near edge of variants are games which aren't designed to be fundamentally different from the standard game, just some touching up of the regular board to improve things a bit. An example of this is the following from Fred Davis, and appeared in his Bushwacker Vol 1, #10 November 1972))

EQUALIZATION OF THE GREAT POWERS - A TRIAL BALLOON

Statistics are now available on over 200 completed games of standard postal Diplomacy. These statistics on wins, draws, second place finishes, eliminations, etc., have now reached a significant level. Based on the reports which have been painstakingly gathered by others, there appears to be no question that England, Russia, and Turkey are the "most favored nations," and Germany, Austria, and Italy have drawn the short end of the stick. (Since most of you have read these reports elsewhere, there's no point in my repeating them here).

Had the Diplomacy board been designed from scratch as an abstract board, all the countries could have been created equal. This is the situation in most other games, ranging from chess down to Chinese checkers (perhaps the first multi-player game involving an abstract board). However, once Dr. Calhmer decided to use the map of Europe and the Mediterranean world, he was forced to fit everything into the Procrustean bed of geographic reality. There is just no way to give Germany and Austria, as center powers, an equal chance with the "edge powers" of England, Russia, and Turkey, as long as we retain the concept that all Great Powers except Russia shall consist of six provinces and three Supply Centers. Of course, this means that when a person playing Austria, Germany, or Italy actually wins a game, it is a greater victory than were he playing one of the other Powers. There are some players who prefer to play these more difficult positions because of their greater challenge. We can understand this feeling. Perhaps this additional challenge is one of the reasons for the popularity of the game. But, speaking in the abstract, I wonder whether it would not be a better game if all players started out with an equal chance to win.

I feel, although I have no evidence to prove it, that one reason why so many variant games have been created was to establish a scenario where the players were more equal to begin with. Outside of the Middle Earth variants, where Mordor is dominant, and my own "Germany Vs. the World," most variants have established equal starting positions for most Powers. "Abstraction" is the end result of a considerable effort toward that goal. In Abstraction, Turkey's corner position has been compromised by the inclusion of Persia in the north and the division of the E. Med. into two sea spaces, either one of which can be used to reach Damascus (Syria). It's too early to say whether England has been weakened by the inclusion of the extra sea spaces, Hebrides Sea and Anglian Sea. Germany and Austria have been strengthened by adding Swabia to protect Munich; placing Croatia between Venice and the new Austrian fleet base at Zara; and by permitting the Austrians to place an Army in Tyrol at the start of the game. Austria may still be too weak, since the province Macedonia prevents her from making her "traditional" move to attack Greece directly from Serbia.

Many players, however, have no interest in variants. They want to play only the Standard game. I would think that these players would be even more interested in improving the Board than those players who can comfortably escape into variants. Therefore, I suggest that all players take the following question under consideration: "How can the Standard Diplomacy board be improved with the least possible number of changes?"

It is my belief that the most needed change is for a province separating Venice from Trieste. This is the only point on the Board where two Great Powers start out with forces facing each other. This immediate eyeball-to-eyeball confrontation hamstringing both Italy and Austria. On my Standard board, I have moved the Austrian fleet down the coast to Zara, which consists of about the southern 2/3 of the old Trieste

province, and created the new province of Croatia in the north. This gives Austria a 7th province. Not only does she have more breathing room, but an attack by Italy is not immediately devastating.

Also, we have added a sea space called Southern Mediterranean below the Eastern Med., bordering on the Ionian Sea and Syria. This increases Turkish vulnerability in the south. It also serves the secondary purpose of completing the Mediterranean sea-coast, which I believe is badly needed for purposes of realism. Then, the area above the word "Diplomacy" to the east of Armenia has been recognized as the passable province of Persia. This enables Turkey and Russia to get at each other more easily. Persia also borders on Syria, which can lead to interesting results.

I believe that these 3 changes are the minimum required to bring the game into a better alignment. One GM told me that he believed that Allen Calhmer had once considered the inclusion of "Croatia" as described above. If this is true, I hope that Allen will again give this point serious consideration.

In addition, on my board, I have divided St. Petersburg into two one-coast provinces, calling that area bordering on the Barents Sea "Archangel." As special rule permits Russia to build fleets there if she controls St. Pete. This is partly to eliminate my pet peeve, the fantastic move from Norway to St. Pete in one turn, and partly to eliminate a two-coast province. We have also added the sea space, "South Atlantic Ocean," bordering on the south coast of Portugal and Spain. This was done partly because I feel that the space Mid-Atlantic is just too powerful as presently constituted, touching 10 other spaces (counting both coasts of Spain), and partly to prevent a fleet in Portugal from being bottled up. I have also made both Ireland and Sicily passable. Theoretically, opening up Ireland should make it easier to move against England, although the situation has never arisen in one of my games. In any event, since both areas were legally part of Great Powers at the time of the game, I find it impossible to play the game comfortably without their inclusion. Some players may be able to look at the Board as just a bunch of abstract squares, but to me they are really the areas the map says they are. I find the game more enjoyable with these changes, since the geographic realism level has gone up, and some equalization has occurred.

One could go on endlessly with further proposals, such as considering whether Germany and Austria should start the game with 4 units apiece. However, I'm skipping over these since my proposal was only to consider minimum changes, so that the Standard game would continue to be similar to the game as we know it today.

Alternately, one could leave the Board as it is, and assign different point scores for winning as various Powers. One might receive, say, 2 points for winning as England, Russia, or Turkey, 3 for winning as France, and 4 for the Central Powers. (These are purely arbitrary numbers, used for the purpose of an example. I do not mean to imply that they are scientifically correct. One could use decimals to give a different point value for victory for each country.)

((The next issue had the following from Doug Beyerlein:))

... Actually, I think that as the play improves the interior countries will do much better than the present statistics indicate. In fact, almost all of the articles written today on strategies and game openings deal with interior powers. This is equalization in terms of fame Diplomacy and strategies. This is a much easier and less expensive way to equalize the powers in contrast to modifying the board...I think that if you polled the top players and GMs you would find that they consider the board extremely well balanced. I have enjoyed great success playing Austria, and hate to play

F or T. I am sure that all of the good players favor one of the interior powers. Walt Buchanan summed it up best when he wrote, "In Diplomacy, the equality of the countries is directly proportional to the quality of play((ers, I assume))"

John PiggottA change I've always favored in order to make Austria a better bet is to devide Budapest into 2 provinces, each a SC. I've not tried it in practice, so I don't know what kind of effect it would have, but in 90% of the games I play FTF, Austria gets raped by all 3 of her neighbors as soon as the game starts. One might possibly extend this by granting an extra center at the beginning to each of the 3 center powers. I think it would make for a more equal game without the extra changes which you've described....

((I beleive that Fred has used such a board in quite a few games. The weakness of Austria is a rather debateable point. We now have far more postal games, so the statistics can be more reliable. A's strength depends somewhat on how you score the various outcomes, but in terms of WINNING, I beleive that Austria is in second place. Perhaps more importantly, Fred's game is used for FTF play, yet he is using as a criteria, postal stats. It appears, however, that the ranking of countries in postal games differs from non-postal games. I have collected stats on 20+ tournament games, which are probably quite similar to FTF games. The full details are in the "DipCon XV" booklet (\$1 from me), but basically they show E and T the strongest, F close behind, next is G, then A, with R and I sharing the cellar. So perhaps revisions for FTF play should bolster Russia rather than Austria, or at least, bolster R at the expense of E and T.))

I made more changes in reading

THE ZINE COLUMN #69

PEERIBASHING

Perribashing might be defined as making grossly misleading descriptions of what Peery is doing, ad hominim attacks on his ideas and the like. To list all the examples would take more space than I plan to devote, so one will do nicely: John Michalski.

John is one of those people who bitches about zines that he does not actually sub to or trade for. The theory, I guess, is that a zine not only has to meet the standards of people who want to get it, but also the standards of those who don't want to get it. Writing in Mos Eisley Spaceport #48 (which appeared in Europa Express #29) about the "Hobby Power Poll" (see DD #73, page 11), which garnered only 5 complete votes, he states: "So, Peery has come out with a 56 page analysis of this 5-vote poll! Now, Linsey might put out 2 pages as a joke, or maybe Highfield or Barents run it as a feature item, but come on now, 56 pages?" Well, now, lets have a look at those 56 pages. They include photographs from various cons, an extremely funny "description" of the Washington D.C. dippy scene by "Shallow Mind", John Caruso on the N.Y. hobby scene, some letters (generally critical) written about the idea of the poll, capsule reviews of several dozen zines, and a number of essays about, for example, the role of polls in the hobby, and an overview of his own hobby activities. None of this could possibly qualify as an "analysis" of the 5-vote results. And what if it were? So what? Michalski's zine (Brutus Bulletin) was known for devoting huge amounts of space to people's views on things. Michalski has labeled Peery "the resident hobby laughingstock." He's entitled to his opinion of course, but I'd much rather be a laughingstock than a purveyor of misinformation or exaggeration.

Peery is also in the nooze for his suggestion of a DipTax. In a nutshell, players in postal and tournament games would be "taxed", and the proceeds would be used to defray the expenses of the hobby custodians, which can be considerable. He suggested a figure of \$1. He emphasized, quite explicitly, that the tax would be "voluntary". One Peeribasher in this case is Kathy Byrne, who proceeded to treat the

idea as if it were for a mandatory tax: "Larry can't force players to pay a tax" Now, if you had read that (which was in W/KK #80) you sure wouldn't get the idea that it was voluntary, would you? I might add that her editorial did not elsewhere state or imply that the "DipTax" was actually voluntary. Or take this quote from HoL: "No one should be forced to pay a tax in a hobby." If Kathy doesn't like it, fine, she's entitled to her opinion, but I think its a shame that she should attack it as a mandatory tax that people would be "forced to pay".

Now as to the issue itself, a real double standard has developed here. Lets have a look at a few responses to the "DipTax":

Robert Sacks: "I am opposed. I will not collect the tax"

John Caruso: "A Voluntary DipTax is stupidity - as near no one will pay. Mandatory is unenforcible"

Kathy Byrne: "As BNC, I want it publically stated that I will not support this tax in any way...."

Other response has been rather negative (but not uniformly so), but I've selected these three for a specific reason. The dirty little secret is, we've had a number of DipTaxes in the hobby. Kathy (and the 4 previous BNCs) have run a voluntary one, and Sacks, Caruso, and Berch have run a mandatory DipTax.

At DipCon XV in 1982, the tournament fee was set well in excess of even the worst case estimate of expenses. I did this (with the consent of the other two members of the DipCon committee) for the express purpose of generating funds to be used for hobby services. Discussions of how this money would be spent actually began at least 8 months before the Tournament itself. That, folkes, was a DipTax. We charged you an extra amount for the specific and only purpose of turning it over to the hobby custodians. The differences between what I did and what Larry did were:

1. I charged more than \$1. Well over \$1.
2. It was not voluntary. You could not avoid paying that part of the gamefee.
3. My name is not Larry Peery, I did not propose the idea for hobby discussion, and I did not call it a DipTax. I just did it.

In my view, factor 3 was the most important reason for the fact that Larry's idea is being savaged and mine was not --- after all, the first two should make it less acceptable. Let me tell you, I was not subject to any of the criticism and personal abuse that Larry was. Nossir! I was applauded and thanked! Every custodian accepted their cut of the DipTax. This did not raise nearly enuf money. Despite the fact that we had \$290 to give away, and depite the fact that several custodians drastically cut back their requests because they knew there would not be enuf money, we still didn't have enuf to go around.

And the year before, Robert Sacks did the same thing at GenCon 1981. His expenses (according to what he told me) were almost negligible, so he had well in excess of \$100 to give away to hobby custodians. As I understand it, he had done this in 1980 as well. Nor was he the first, as Greg Costikyan (and Ben Grossman, I think) said early in 1977 that they would use the proceeds from the upcoming Origins III for the Boardman Number Custodian (tho I don't know how much the BNC actually got). And I wasn't the last. At this year's DipCon XVI, fees were again set well in excess of anticipated expenses, for the purpose of raising money from hobby services (as of this writing, tho, the Convention Organizers have not turned these funds back over, which is absolutely disgraceful). So don't beleive any of this talk about not being able to force people to pay. It can be done, I did it.

The \$1 fee for a Boarman Number is entirely voluntary. Those who make this donation are treated exactly the same as those who don't, except that the former have their donation noted in Everything. This was originally proposed by Doug Beyerlein as a mandatory fee of \$1 --- if not paid by FO1, you didn't get a number! There was a lot of controversy over this 14¢-per-player charge, with plenty of support on both sides of the argument. When promised the proceeds from Origins III, Doug switched it to a vol-

untary fee, and the \$1 figure remains to this day (For example, Lee Kendter, Sr in E #43: "I am asking for a \$1 donation for all number requests. I feel this is necessary to offset my costs of publishing, mailing, etc. This is not mandatory, but I really will appreciate it."). This is then a voluntary DipTax, the difference being that Peery proposes to raise \$1 per player rather than 14¢.

This is not to say that I entirely agree with Larry's proposal. \$1/player is probably more than postal GMs will accept, and I think that his mechanism for determining where the money goes should be changed (I'd favor a committee-of-3 to make this choice. They should be picked by a hobby election, nothing fancy). And if people don't like the idea, fine, that doesn't bother me. What bothers me is people who treat this as some brand new outrage (as in, "This is the most outrageous thing I've ever heard!" ---yes, that's an actual quote), or a some totally impractical plan. There is plenty of precedent for such a thing. Larry's use of the word, "Tax" shows political naivete, and he may be the wrong person to propose it in the first place, and the idea is probably doomed for now. I hope when the idea is raised again later in the 80s that the hobby will respond with less hysteria, and no Peeribashing.

.....

I supply center that everyone fights over...there's Dip played in a rat maze and Dip played between galaxies...and there's the Ultimate Diplomacy variant: Cannibalism!

Try variants; you might like them. They will certainly make your Diplomacy parties more lively.

Mark says this article should be humorous. So I guess we'll close with A Diplomacy Joke: How many Diplomacy players does it take to change a light bulb? Answer: Two; one to do the actual changing, and one to sneak up behind him and....

GLOBAL VARIANTS

Global variants are, not surprisingly, designed to cover the entire globe. Since a spherical map is a bit awkward, this comes down, as a practical matter, to a map where left and right sides meet. The map is thus an unrolled cylinder. There are three of these in particular I'd like to mention.

The first is World Diplomacy IV. This game has evolved from considerable FTF and postal playtesting (done by a group who were pretty much unaware of the larger postal hobby). The game uses a third type of piece, air units, which have vast range but can only be used for supporting. The game requires 8 players, and a few openings are available at present. Contact Ken Peel 8708 First Ave #t-2 Silver Spring MD 20910

Second is Final Conflict. This is a 7-player game which is getting considerable play, as Tom Swider has completed at least one game of this, started two more in 1983 one of which, (or possibly a third one, I'm not sure) will be a variant Demo game in DW, and Keith Sesler is running another section in his Manifest Destiny. This game also has planes, and the rules seem more complex than WD IV. For further info, contact Tom at 1183 Robinson Hill Rd, Endwell, NY, 13760.

There is a game which has no openings at present, but one which I can strongly recommend as a very well designed game: Steve McLendon's "Holocaust". I prepared a detailed analysis of the structure of the game, and was very impressed. I believe 2 postal sections of it were played, and the games turned out well, and so I think it deserves further play. Rules are in DIPLOMACY WORLD #22, or from Rod Walker. 9 players

There have been other popular global games as well. Mercator was in its day very popular in England, altho the most popular versions of this require 13 players. Colonia IV has gotten quite a bit of play on this side of the Atlantic. So if you are looking something on a grander scale, but don't want an untested product, there are several you could try.

THE ZINE COLUMN #70

John Caruso's 4th Annual Player/Writer poll garnered a very impressive 65 votes. The top 10 players, in descending order, were Kathy Byrne, Dan Stafford, Eric Ozog, Mark Berch, Randolph Smyth, Paul Rauterberg, Blair Cusack, Mike Mazzer, Jim Meinel and Lee Kendter, Sr. [This was remarkably similar to a similar Poll run in DW, which gave a top 10 of Berch/Byrne (tie), Kendter, Ditter, Smyth, Cusack, Birsan, Stafford, Mau-meister and Beyerlein --- 7 names in common to both lists.] John also gave the top 10 writers as Bob Olsen, Gary Coughlan, Rod Walker, Kathy Byrne, Mark Berch, John Michalski, Dick Martin, Scott Hanson, Ron Brown (Canada), and Terry Tallman. I was rather pleased to be the only one to make the top 5 of both lists. In fact, you have to go down to #14 to find another hobby person on both lists (Dick Martin). The lack of overlap says something about the hobby, but what? (OOps, Tallman should be tied also with Ed Wrobel for 10th there).

Mark Larzelere's Marco Polo got 73 voters, and asks for your favorite half dozen or so (The "Runestone" Poll asks everything). Best Zines, in descending order; EE, VoD, W/KK, DW, Apalling Greed, Sleepless Knights, SANFU!; Best Subzines were Mos Eisley Spaceport, KK, Expletive deleted, Humbolt, Fiat Bellum; Best GMs were Coughlan, Lis-chett, Larzelere, Meinel, Linsey, Brown(US).

And finally, for some balance, Mark Luedi ran a poll of "Best Zine that you Don't Get" in his zine Dirty Piles of Plaid Clothes. The winner was SNAFU!

Ed Wrobel Department The situation of a player ordering a unit to both support and hold has arisen again, this time in FO3 of 1982HU. GM Mike Conner ruled the piece double ordered, the same as Bruce did, and the same as I would if I were a GM. Bruce, incidently, polled his readers on, amount, other things, that question, and found a resounding majority favored the ruling he had made.

The fall saw the first sizable fake in a while, Ya'All #5. Its a bit of a semantic question as to whether this can be considered a fake zine at all. The previous 3 issues (then called Y'all) were all themselves fakes of a non-existent zine. After a while, tho, there gets to be a "real" zine, published anonymously at irregular intervals by various people. Such a zine would really be impossible to fake, tho I suppose someone claiming to be the publisher and trying to collect sub fees could be considered a fake publisher. The issue was rather entertaining in parts, and I hope whoever did it will do another one.

Ron Brown has completed a census of those receiving a canadian Postal zine. Only 39% of these are Canadian, and they total only 75 people. Of these, over half are in Ontario, with Alberta in second place. Ron got responses from every known canadian Dipzine, so the results are complete.....Randolph Smyth, back from his travels and with his computer operating at last, has resumed publication of Fol Si Fie. Randolph is quite possible the best writer in North America on the psychology and strategy of the game, especially on negotiations, and he frequently writes on the topic in FSF. For those looking for a leisurely game, FSF deadlines are 6-weeks (212 Aberdeen St S.E. Medicine Hat Alta T1A 0R1 Canada. Subs 10/\$6).

Everything #58 has just arrived (i.e. after the PBEM editorial elsewhere in this issue was written). In it, the PBEM game whose conclusion is reported is not listed separately, but in the main listing, just the way I think it should be. Bill also gives his reasons why the PBEM "games aren't equal" to regular postal games. The issue also has a standard form for reporting game conclusions. I hope all GMs will follow it. The BNC, Kathy Byrne, has been working very hard at what is a time consuming task, and anything people can do to facilitate her labors should be done.

Finally, in keeping with the theme of this issue, a plug for Alpha and Omega. This is the official zine of the Miller Number Custodian, with the information on game-starts and gameconclusions in the variant hobby. Its available from Lee Kendter, Sr, 4347 Benner Street, Phila Pa 19135, at a cost of 3¢/page plus postage. Send him \$1 and he'll do the bookkeeping. It also includes "Gerrymandering", a subzine by Tom Swider designed, I think, for chatting about variants.

Mark Berch
492 Naylor Place
Alexandria, VA 22304

Doug Beyerlein 640 College Ave Menlo Park,
CA 94025 has written a 9 page pamphlet
called "Proper Adjudication Procedures",
which covers the subject in great detail,
and is available from him for \$2. Polls
have consistantly shown Doug to be one of
the most highly thought of GMs.