

# DIPLOMACY DIGEST

Issue #94  
October 1985  
GMing

Mark L Berch  
492 Naylor Place  
Alexandria VA 22304

Subs: 10/\$4.50  
Europe: 5/E2  
Circulation: 99

Inside this issue should be a ballot for the North American Diplomacy Players' Survey #3. If you've never heard of #1 and #2, its because they were run in 1974 and 1975, to very good response. Lew Pulsipher has decided to revive and revise this survey, taking into account recent input from Kathy Byrne, Bruce Linsey, Fred Davis, Rod Walker, Larry Peery, and myself. Some prizes will be given out to names drawn at random from those voting. This poll has a lot of interesting questions targeted to the interests of players, and your views could help shape the hobby, since we (publishers and others providing hobby services will be listening. DEADLINE: NOVEMBER 20, 1985, but send it in now so you won't forget!

## ENDING THE FEUD?

No less than three proposals have been suggested recently on this subject, one from each side, and one from someone on neither. Its encouraging to see people thinking in this direction. All have their strengths and weaknesses, and all are quite different.

1. Ken Peel's is "A Call to Contain the Great Feud". Ken urges people, once this ideals discussed to "resign from any zine that remains infected with the feud. I will send a letter for print explaining the reasons for my action....I will make no statements on the "substance" or personalities of the feud .... only ending it can end it." This approaches the problem thru the zines, not the people themselves. It has the advantage of being readily implementable (and probably has been already to some degree) and so its a do-it-yourself plan. Unfortunately, it doesn't get at a lot of non-zine type activities, such as boycotts and mass mailings. Ken also proposes to "Freeze the custodian status of feuders": "An'honorable' feuder will assign a temporary substitute for important custodial projects", unless s/he ceases participation. If said feuder refuses to voluntarily withdraw, at least temporarily, Ken urges "the establishments of duplicative services or projects." This part doesn't strike me as very practical. For example, where would Larry find a replacement for Kathy at DW; a duplicative DW isn't practicable. And we already have duplicative projects (e.g. 2 novice publications) in many areas.

2. Bruce Linsey has recently mass-mailed "A proposal to End the Feud". This is an extremely ambitious plan to basically shut down the entire feud, with a lot of detail. No more Mass Mailings from Bruce, Feuding publications Feudesse and Bad Doggie would vanish, the feud discussions would disappear from The Not for Hire, and No Fixed Address. Kathy would have to accede to Bruce's version of the "Francine Letter" biz, and in return, Bruce would drop his demands that the vast litany of other charges against

(turn to top of page 10

((The Major topic for this issue will be the question of delaying a game due to the existence of excessive NMRs. This can place the GM in a fairly difficult position. While the situation is not common, it can have great impact when it occurs. We start with Richard Sharp, in Dolchstoss #63, April 1978))

### GM Dilemmas

Most GMing problems arise from uncertainty on how to adjudicate a certain set of moves. But an important and very common group of problems concerns a more basic question: 'Should I adjudicate at all?' The decision whether or not to hold over a game until the following deadline is one that has caused me headaches in the past and is still doing so, so I thought I'd ramble on about it for a bit and see if I get anywhere.

The latest bone of contention is not one of the games I'm running, but one I'm playing in - NGC 191 in Greatest Hits. A quick rundown on the background: as Russia, I have had appalling ally trouble. My first choice of an ally was Italy, who during the four seasons of our relationship sent only one set of orders, and got those wrong. He was finally evicted, and I chummed up with Austria (one G. Palmer) - the only times I could get him to send in orders were when I was able to stand over him and dictate them. Despite these set-backs I managed to get up to about 14 centres before my three main opponents - Messrs Piggott, Walkerdine and Baird as England, Germany and France respectively - managed to settle their private differences and put up a highly effective defence which began to roll me back. At this point, astonishingly, Messrs Baird and Walkerdine sent no orders ... and GM Pete Birks held the game over on the grounds that the two NMRs would spoil it! I have appealed against this decision, and at the moment the probable upshot is that Pete will refer the question to an impartial third party - probably the inevitable Don Turnbull.

My intention is certainly not to criticize Pete - I have much sympathy for his point of view. If you think the decision is an easy one, one way or the other, try asking yourself these questions:

- (1) Would you hold over if you received only one set of orders in Autumn 1901?
- (2) Would you if a one-unit country NMR'd in Spring 1907?

All GMs would answer 'no' to (2), and I think there would probably be a unanimous 'yes' to (1), though many of us would have some pretty blistering comments and might well abandon the game altogether. So the question is, where do you draw the line? In the game in question, Richard and Adrien are 2 out of 5 survivors, controlling 15 out of 34 centres - which side of your line does this fall?

My argument, thrashed out in a long phone conversation with Pete (at his expense!), was that though he had a perfect right to do as he did, thinking he was acting in the best interests of all the players, he should be prepared to change his ruling if the most powerful (and non-defaulting) country objects to it. I should say that nine times out of ten Pete would have been unchallenged, as I don't normally like profiting from NMRs; but in this particular case there were special circumstances that affected my opinion. Namely: (a) I had taken some trouble to sow confusion in this particular season, and it is possible that one of the NMRs might be due to this; (b) I had suffered so much from NMRs by other players that I am quite prepared to benefit from them for a change; (c) the Greatest Hits in question was six weeks late appearing, so the defaulters had not been exactly pressed for time. I should stress that none of these is a reason for Pete not to hold the game over - they are reasons for my adopting an unusual attitude.

The whole business of holding games over poses some important basic questions. Does a player have a right to benefit by other players' NMRs? Does a player have the right to demand that a game be held over? What difference, if any, does it make if the decision is taken before the deadline? Most basic of all, can a GM's decision be reversed once it is taken, and if so what should the procedure be?

Well, I don't think a player has a right to demand a holding-over. I am very reluctant to hold over games, myself, and have often refused to do so - for instance, I am unimpressed by the traditional bleat of 'You forgot to send me last issue', which

most of us have tried on from time to time. Occasionally it may even be true; well, hard lines. I make a special case of the games in which Duncan Morris is playing, because of the almost insuperable difficulties he has to cope with; I am always prepared to hold over games involving other overseas players around Christmas; and when a player tells me well in advance that he will be out of touch during one particular season I will make some arrangement for him. Also, of course, I may hold over if it turns out at some late stage that I have made a serious GMing error. But in general I reckon that a game should be held over only if it seems absolutely essential to give all players a fair deal. And if you ever write asking me to hold a game over and fail to enclose 'just-in-case' orders ... well, you deserve all you get.

Holding over for NMRs is a very different matter. I have done it myself, rarely, and have never had a complaint. I dislike doing it because I always bear in mind that an NMR may have been engineered by another player. Another, allied point is that if the GM prints the names of the defaulters, then those players who have sent in orders are known not to have NMR'd, which could weight fractionally against them. (In NGC 191 I was very anxious, for reasons I won't go into here, that John Piggott should not know whether I had submitted orders.) I think it's fair to say that I would consider holding over if the NMRs involved at least half the players and half the units. But it's not logical: one player missing orders four times is probably more destructive than four players missing simultaneously!

I am not one of those who reserve to the GM a godlike right to do what he likes because it's his zine (Piggott's Theory). I can and do make mistakes, and it's right that they should be redressed. Profound differences of opinion are rare, and when they do arise I am prepared to have them referred to a responsible third party - though I once had a nasty shock when Richard Walkerdine in this capacity over-ruled me when I was (and still am) quite certain I was right! I have often been asked for opinions by other GMs, and am always glad to help; occasionally one learns something valuable in this way.

As a result of my brooding on the NGC 191 misfortune, and similar cases, I have reached some decisions which will affect players in my games from now on. I offer these pearls free to other GMs - they make sense, and in some cases I can now see that the standard practice is wrongly conceived.

(1) When a double deadline is in operation, or a game is held over for any reason, I will not say which countries have orders 'on file'. A player has the right to the usual degree of uncertainty as to whether he has ordered or not.

(2) If I consider a game is likely to be spoilt by one or more NMRs, I may decide not to print the adjudication at once; I will suggest that the game be held over. But if any non-defaulting player demands an adjudication, he must have one. (Remember, he will not know - though he may guess - how many or which players have missed.)

(3) If a player wants a game held over for any reason he must say so before the deadline, or he has no rights in the matter. If I agree (and I usually won't) I shall simply say 'The game is held over', without going into details.

I think (1) and (2) are simple enough, but (3) could still cause problems. Let's take one hypothetical case. Germany asks for a game to be held over, and the GM agrees. Between the deadline and publication, Russia and Turkey happen to meet in the urinal on Crewe station and - inevitably, if unwisely - discuss the game, Russia admitting that he has stabbed Turkey. The zine appears, and Turkey gleefully sends in new orders to nullify the Russian stab.

None of the obvious counters to this is really any good. Useless to say that Russia and Turkey shouldn't discuss the game before they see the results - if one of them refuses the other is certain to smell a rat. For the GM to inform all players of the decision before the deadline is an ideal but often quite impractical solution. For him to refuse order changes from anyone but Germany is absurd - he must assume that Germany's negotiations are likely to make other people change orders.

There's no easy way out of this one, and it probably doesn't matter very much - after all, it requires several unlikely contingencies all to arise at once. But I must say that

I like to have a cut-and-dried answer ready for the improbable question ...

By way of conclusion, I shall simply repeat something I've often said before in these pages. The GM's job is to ensure that all players get a fair deal, and particularly that no non-defaulting player suffers, however indirectly, from other players' inefficiency, bad luck or whatever. If the GM occasionally has to bend the rules to preserve the spirit, he should not hesitate to do so. Where a genuine dispute arises, a good GM should admit he can be wrong, and accept arbitration by one or more responsible third parties.

((The reference to Duncan Morris concerned the fact that Duncan was at that time in what was then called Rhodesia, in its air force as I recall, and mail service was very poor. Sharp was not the only GM to make special allowances. OK, a response to that appeared in Greatest Hits #43 by the GM in question, Pete Birks))

...Richard Sharp ... objected to me holding over the game because Richard Walkerdine and Adrien Baird failed to send in orders for a season. This objection became academic when, last season, Adrien and RJW received NMRs anyway. The point of principle, however, remains.

I hasten to point out that Richard agreed, in the midst of a not too short telephone conversation, that my action in holding over the game was not incorrect (nor was it correct - it was a legitimate matter for GM discretion, cf Piggott's Law on GMing). He did, however, claim that if any player wished for the season to be adjudicated as it stood, i.e. with the NMRs, then he had the right to request it. Richard has admitted that things would never have arisen as they did if he had sent me a short note telling me that he was trying to manoeuvre an NMR from the other players, but the fact is that he did not inform me that this was the case, and RJW and Adrien, being fairly reliable normally, looked like "special cases" so I held the game over. Afterwards, Tricky ((Sharp)) informs me that the NMRs may have been manoeuvred by him (well - one of the NMRs, actually). What, therefore, do I do? I think that I have no choice but to adjudicate the game as it stood at the deadline for #41, i.e. with two of the 4 players NMRing, but what if there were valid reasons for the NMR? For example, supposing RJW had fallen under a bus or something? Could one of the other players demand then that the season be adjudicated as per orders received on the deadline? Given the decision on the previous point, then I suppose that you do. I think this is a situation where one, regretably, has to rely on the inherent decency of the human race, and assume that people don't want to win so desperately that they are willing to take advantage of personal crises in the lives of the other players.

Richard's conclusion is that it is the GM's job to ensure that all players get a fair deal - the trouble is that often a situation arises where it is impossible for all players to get a fair deal, and one has to be unfair to someone. In this case, accusations of victimization tend to fly around like nobody's business. A GM should certainly have the courage to admit when he's wrong - but in this case it was agreed that I wasn't so much wrong, as uninformed.

((I'm not sure how much of this I buy. I don't see that RJW and Adrien being "fairly reliable normally" should matter at all. This amounts to discrimination against new players, or players new to the Zine, since they simply will not have had the time to establish for themselves a track record of regularity. And what does the fact that Sharp says he may have caused one of the NMRs have to do with anything? Maybe he succeeded, and maybe the NMR had nothing to do with it. The GM has no way of knowing, so why should this be a factor. How do we know that Sharp isn't making this whole thing up? Of course, you shouldn't lie to the GM, but a GM shouldn't rely <sup>on</sup> a player's being honest unless circumstances require him to do so, and this certainly isn't one of those cases. And finally, I think GMs are looking for trouble when they try to employ various subjective judgements as to what constitutes grounds for holding a game over due to NMRs. Any subjective judgement is at risk of being seen differently by some of the players. I think they are better off with fairly firm, explicit rules. What these lose in being explicitly rigid, they gain in avoiding disputes.))

((Our next exchange of views comes from Ruritania #46, June 1978, edited by Tony Watson. We start with a letter by John Michalski))

May 31, 1978

Dear Tony,

This is the type of letter that I really hate to send, knowing as I do how it is to receive them. Nonetheless, I really have to note my disagreement over the delay again of 1977Y. It is bad enough that the deadline was extended due to lack of what was felt to be an appropriate number of orders on file. But to move the whole works to late June now, because of an unwillingness to list 3 NMRs, is just too much. True, any game moves better with everyone submitting orders; but why on earth should players conscientious enough to GET orders in be penalized simply because half the players don't give a damn to do the same? One of the advantages in my eyes of Diplomacy over most wargames is that the set deadlines reward the prompt and penalize the pokey. If a player doesn't give a shit enough to send something in, he and those foolish enuf to ally with him suffer the consequences. In 77Y, however, this is reversed: those foolish enuf to make damn sure they have orders in on time have to wait an extra month or so until enuf of the dawdlers come thru to convince you and Mr. Mirti ((the GM for that game)) that it is now worth printing up the season. Personally, I think that if one person submits orders and 6 do not, then that one person deserves the advantages he will gain over the others, and order should be closed on the deadline day .... even if 5 of the others arrive 3 or 4 days later. Now, if they were all postmarked 10 days earlier or something, I could just see "winking" at it ((by that I assume he means ignoring the fact that they arrived late)) and running them. Bit in a case like this, it is just too much for me to sit on my hands and wait till the end of June for. I only wish this had come up in one of those all-too-many games where I have just 2 centers or so; hell, let it ride forever. But here I am doing half-assed well for a welcome change, and after seeing SO4 in an issue postmarked April 4, I'm not eager to wait for the next Ruri late this month or early next arrives ((the issue was actually postmarked June 30, tho players might have gotten it earlier)). Especially if those 3 or 4 others still don't come thru. My main concern in writing this is to point this out, for I know from personal experience that the rush of work can or will cause you to lose sight of the individual view "from below" as you bust your butt to chug this stuff out for everyone on a prompt schedule to keep everyone happy....I believe that the only just solution is to print up Mirti's original adjudications next time. Or even on a post card now, and print up WINTER with it next issue. Fair is fair.

If you print this, it may bring in some other side and create a little controversy that always helps, altho I really don't see how any other position could have a leg to stand on.((Ah, and it was such a tactful letter until that last phrase!))  
((Next up is Tony's response))

.....If it is any consequence, Tom originally sent in the adjudications (without the three orders) and said something to the effect that we might as well go ahead and run the game despite the unnatural and disturbing amount of NMRs. I found this distressing, since two of these guys (Lynn and Kassel) never miss. Lynn had even bothered to call earlier concerning a game I was GMing and when I asked if he was OK for orders with Mirti he said he was. I have a tendency to beleive George, so assumed he had sent orders to Mirti. No such orders appearing on the adjudication left reasonable doubt in my mind as to whether or not Geroge's orders had been lost in transit. I would hate to have a player pay for a USPS mistake, even tho one could construe such a mistake as the breaks of the game.

I agree, prompt players should not have to be penalized for their promptness. But I view the game as a whole. I would never run a game with 1 set of orders and 6 NMRs. I would find 6 new players first. I view NMRs as serious disruptions to a game, and not ploys or situations to be exploited. I did not mean to penalize those 1977Y players who did get their orders in; I meant to preserve the integrity and interest of 77Y as a whole. When Tom came up for the weekend during the production of Ruri #45 he ((Tom Mirti)) had doubts about running the game and we decided to go with the delay. If Mirti had been adamant for running the game "as was" I would have, since I gave the game

to him and wouldn't override him unless I was convinced he were wrong and was willing to yank him as GM.

As for your suggestion of running the adjudications now without the three missing sets of orders, and asking for winter with the next RURI I have to say no. (Mirti agrees). We made our decision with the last Ruri and still beleive in it. Anyhow, it would hardly be fair to the others now would it? How can I say, "Yes, send in your orders by this new deadline" and then two weeks later say I wasn't going to allow them? I'm convinced that Mirti and I made the right decision and vacilating about it would only worsen the situation.

Anyway, I appreciate your writing and will consider your viewpoint again in any similar situation ... I hope you can see my points for doing it as I did.

I would be interested in hearing what any other 77Y players have to say about this matter. How about one of the three with disputed orders?? ((In that issue, FOH was finally played with 2NMRs, including the aforementioned Lynn NMRing.)) ((The discussion then continued in the next issue:))

David Wiencok: I am not in 77Y but I have to agree with John Michalski ..... A game should be printed no matter how many entires are in. You should, assume nothing about the players. I've been PBing for about 5 years and I see no way to know why people miss moves.....

I think some GMs cause their own grief with missed moves. When a zine gets irregular you never know when your moves are due. Its simple enuf to know every third Saturday I have to send moves, but when things are altered with every issue, its hard to keep the moves straight. Also, if a zine is off schedule, the players never know if it is lost or late. For a while, my mail was being r outed thru Florida and I had to write GMs (if I remembered) todiscover if mags were lost or late. It is inevitable that orders will get lost in the mail, even from the most regular players. Diplomacy is a game, and those are the breaks.

Tony Watson: I appreciate your writing. Many of your points are well taken...I beleive Mirti and I did the right thing .... and will continue to delay games in which less than half (barring any extremely minor powers of a center or two) don't submit orders. Its just not a game if people aren't playing. I will, however, think twice about waiting because the late player is usually trustworthy. Mirti and I learned a lesson in that, since when we did delay the game, only one of the three players without orders bothered to get any to Mirti, leaving us with egg on our faces.

I will also agree that zines which always publish on a certain time are more consistant and easier to follow. However, the nature of my life doesn't allow me to structure my time in that way.....((he was at the time a grad student))

((At one level, the discussion here is whether or not to delay the game, but the ultimate issue is: Who Owns the Game? The GM and the player are in their own context BOTH RIGHT. Thus, while John Michalski talks about which "person deserves the advantages he will gain", that's irrelevant to the GM. He must be completely unconcerned as to who is reaping advantages, and they are doing it, and whether or not it is deserved, so long as everyone follows the HRs. He must float above all that. On the other hand, Tony's saying, "I view the game as a whole" is meaningless to the player. So far as he is concerned, the "whole" of the game is his getting his orders in. Thats all he has responsibility for, and if his orders are in, the game should proceed. If the game belongs to the GM, then the GM's view should prevail. If it belongs to the players, then the Michalski view ought to prevail. As for me, I take the latter view. With one exception, I would run the game regardless of who got their orders in. The one exception would be if there were clear evidence that there was a problem with the mail getting delivered at my end. If an airplane crash had destroyed mail destined for my city (which does happen) or my kid shredded the mail, or there was labor chaos in the postal service or some such. I could even assume, in some circumstances that this had happened if I noticed that such a problem was affecting all of my games.

In addition, and I know this will sound like a broken record, this kind of issue is an excellent argument for having a thoro set of HRs. If a GM has a policy, such as Tony says, then it belongs in the HRs, for all to see. Those who don't want to play in such a game can thus be aware of it in advance, and avoid the zine. Moreover, player bitterness can be avoided, since no one will feel that they are being treated unfairly.

Finally, for those further interested in the topic of delaying the game, issue #69 (35¢) has several other items, dealing with such things as delaying a game on account of a player's vacation, delay caused by GM error, etc.))

## LATE ORDERS

((One of the differences between North American and British GMing styles concerns the treatment of late orders. The NA rule is nearly always, if its late --- even a day late --- its not used. Some GMs will make exceptions if the postmark indicates that an extraordinary mail delay occured, but even those are in a distinct minority. In Britian, by contrast, it is apparently considered acceptable (tho whether its common, I don't know) to take the stance that late orders are acceptable even if they are posted as late as the day before the deadline by first class mail. I have seen many refernces to later orders being accepted, especially by pubbers who are not highly punctual themselves. What follows are two short items, each at the extremes of behavior for the continent. We start first with Conrad von Metzke, writing in sTab #104, Oct 20, 1973))

Shortly after printing and mailing last issue, I received late orders from Ray and Peggy Bowers. I thereupon printed a supplimental sheet advising that, while late moves are late moves, nevertheless it seemed realistic to me to keep the Bowers in the game rather than boot them out in favor of replacements ((i.e. the moves were not accepted, but the players were kept in the game.)) Several days later the following letter from Ray, countersigned by Peggy, plunked into my mailbox:

"Conrad: I cannot beleive that the fall moves were late. It seems as tho something out of line is occuring in this game. I do not intend to argue the point, but neither Peg or I will continue under these circumstances. In short, it stongly appears as (((tho))) Phillips is intended to win regardless of whether we play or not. I cannot play under such tactics. Therefore, both Peggy and I have no other recourse but to resign, effective immediately."

Now, I've got to hand it to these two; that is indeed a novel way of being a spoilsport. Cast implications of underhandedness, refuse to argue the matter, offer no evidence, and resign. Ah, well, you learn the strangest things about the strangest people in the strangest ways....."

((Our other item comes from the Austrian victory statement in 73HF, by Tony Ball, which appeared in 1901 And All That #43, 2-21-75))

.....I nearly lost in S01. I thought I had an alliance with Italy and had submitted my order to Mick ((Bullock, the GM)) when the day after the deadline I received a letter from Clive Spark saying that he had moved to Tri. I immediately phoned Mick wondering if I could change my orders, and to my eternal gratitude Mick accepted them..... ((At this point, the GM interjected:))

((ahem, er, cough, sputter, choke, I DID?! Pious, principled, hard-liner me? Should I send back my Calhamer Outstanding GM no-award, do you think?))

((And I really don't know what to make of that!!!))



((It is pretty unusual for a GM to set forth a comprehensive view of how the inter-relationship of GM, player and publisher ought to operate. This one comes from Larry Peery, and appeared in En Passant #38 and #39, June and July of 1973))

1. A postal Diplomacy game represents 2 or 3 categories of implied contracts: The first between the seven players, the second between each player as an individual and the GM, and the third between each player as an individual ((sic. This repeats the second. Perhaps what was meant was "the players collectively")) and the GM. ((pubber??))
2. A Postal Diplomacy games begins as the common property of those seven individuals (the players) who have established it.
3. The seven individuals (the players) enter into separate service contracts of equal validity with an eight individual who is the GM of the game.
4. The GM of the game is an independent contractor serving as executive secretary and referee for the 7 individuals (the players) who have entered into contracts with him for his services as GM.
5. The GM is entitled to reasonable compensation for his services and expenses subject to agreement between he and the 7 parties of the contracts.
6. The GM has no tangible and/or intangible rights (property) to the game.
7. Unless specified otherwise in the contracts the GM is a position, not a person; thus, any competent individual may function as a GM, as long as he functions under the terms of the original contracts.
8. The 7 individuals (the players) enter into separate contracts with an other, ninth individual to publish the game.
9. The publisher of the game is an independent contractor of the 7 individuals who have entered into contracts with him for his services as publisher.
10. The publisher is entitled to reasonable compensation for his services and expenses subject to agreement between he and the 7 parties of the contracts.
11. The publisher has no intangible rights to the game. He does, however, have certain limited tangible property rights to the game (e.g. distribution of surplus copies of the magazines, etc.)
12. Unless specified otherwise in the contracts the publisher is a position, not a person. Thus, any competent individual may function as a publisher, as long as he functions under the terms of the original contracts between the publisher and players.
13. When one individual acts as both GM and publisher he still has no intangible rights to the game.
14. The GM/publisher remains responsible to the players for performing his role as GM/publisher under the provisions of the contracts and in conformance with traditions, customs of trade, and the House Rules which were part of the original contracts.
15. The vehicle in which the game is published, or magazine, is the exclusive property of the publisher, subject to the provisions of the universal copyright law and the terms of the contract between the seven individuals ... and the publisher.
16. The contents of the magazine are divided between individual property, such as press releases, and common property, such as moves.
17. The right of republication of the contents of the magazine is either an individual, common or exclusive right of the parties to the contracts as agreed to by the parties of those contracts.
18. The players, by majority decision, may make any decisions regarding the game they desire, subject only to their acceptance of the HRs of the GM/publisher and the conditions in them at the time the contracts were established between the players and the GM/publisher.
19. All rights to the game, including the game number, remain the common pro-



party of the seven contracting individuals(the players)

20. When an individual ceases to be a party to the contract by elimination, removal, or resignation from the game, his portion of the contract is divided equally among the remaining parties or is vested in a new individual if one joins the game.

21. An individual may remove himself with cause from the partnership formed by the contracts by failing to fulfill the obligations of the partnership (e.g. failure to submit moves, failure to publish), in which case he removes himself from the contract. He is not removed ((by others, I assume he means)). The remaining parties of the contract may then vest his former interest in another individual or otherwise vest it.

22. Prior to the end of the game the seven individuals or remaining players may jointly declare, by majority decision, their contracts with the GM and/or publisher to be terminated. In doing so, they must show reasonable cause. In such cases, all rights revert to the 7 individuals (the players) subject to the above.

23. At the conclusion of the game all contracts between GM and players, between player and publisher, and among players are terminated.

24. All residual rights remain with the players except as noted above or unless otherwise agreed to in contracts by the parties.

25. Points not made clear by the rules of the game, tradition, custom of trade, or House rules should be determined and stated in the various contracts at the start of the game.

((You might not agree with all of that. You might find some of it repetitive (for example, I think that 13 follows from 6 and 11). And some of it is a little vague. But it is an ambitious attempt to compile a full framework for their interactions. I think some interesting questions can arise:

1. Suppose a player is also the publisher, i.e. a player plays in his own zine, using a Guest GM. Larry's code covers a GM/publisher combination, but the player/publisher one is potentially more difficult since it's much easier for the interests of player and publisher to conflict than publisher and GM. Can such a publisher provide a standby for the GGM? Ought some method be used to cope with the fact that the publisher gets his orders before the other players do? Can such a player participate in a vote to move the game to a new publisher?

2. Who can remove a Guest GM? It would appear under point #22, that this can be done only by the players. The only cases that I can think of where this happened, it was done by the Publisher. I was in 1976 IF when this happened (GM wasn't getting the game results to the publisher promptly). In 1977 IW the GGM (Oaklyn) was removed for failing to use orders received from a player. And I vaguely recall a third case where some sort of personality clash occurred between the publisher and GGM.

3. Does it really take just a majority vote of the players to replace a GM? I suspect that most GMs would not accept a new game unless all, or maybe all-but-one, of the players voted for it. When I tried (successfully, as it turned out) to transfer 76EN from the defaulting Clifford Mann, GM insisted that he (Steve McLendon) would have to get all active players to agree before he'd agree to take the game over.

4. Once the game is over, who owns the game record itself? Publisher? GM? Surviving players? All the players? Suppose, for example, that DW decided to reprint some of their Demo games (which, incidentally, I think would be an excellent idea). Suppose one or some or all of the players in the game objected. Could it still be done? Suppose I were to write a tactics article, and wanted to demonstrate a point by looking at a particular season, reprinting the orders. Would I be stepping on someone's toes to do that? Could a player, or former player, or GM or publisher, object?

If you've any thoughts on Larry's fine list of principles, or the above questions, send 'em it!))

from page 1

him be either substantiated or retracted. Attempts to discredit the Runestone Poll would disappear, as would the boycott-Bruce stuff from DW, etc, etc. If either side felt the terms were being violated, and attempt would be made first to resolve it privately thru a neutral party. Its strength is that it is an extremely comprehensive plan, since it attempts to get rid of pretty much everything. Thats also its key weakness as well ---- an awful lot of pieces all have to fall into place for this to work, giving it very much of an all-or-nothing cast.

3. John Caruso in a letter in THFH #4 states his willingness to have "anything and everything that involves Linsey myself and my family" go before an ombudsman. Those who couldn't prove their charges would have to retract them. This, in my opinion is the best of the three plans. A few things about it are worrisome: 1) John apparently couldn't bring himself to actually send a copy of his proposal directly to Bruce. 2) John wants to have all this conducted in public (and in TNFH to boot, which is one of the most hostile-to-Linsey forums available). But doing this in public converts it into yet another public-relations excercise, making it much more difficult to resolve differences. I've handled two major "personal" disputes in the past, and I wouldn't have considered doing either in public 3) John lists 10 people he considers "neutral" and "uninvolved". The list is practically a "Whitestonia Whds Who" and includes people like Robert Sacks and Keith Sherwood who could not remotely be considered neutral.

So thats where things stand at present; I hopesomething good will come from some or all of them.

## THE MAIL

In the last issue, I posed an adjudication question. Suppose you were a GM with the philosophy that "A Pic S F Eng-Bel", as the player's entire orders, was acceptable and would be treated as a supported move. The theory is that the player has already written "F Eng-Bel", and that this can be treated as a legitimate "unexpressed" move. Suppose that such a player, with you as the GM, also appended F Eng-Bre. Is the unexpressed order still there, and combined with the expressed order, is the player then double ordered? Or does the expressed order knock out the unexpressed order? The actual GM ruled the latter, but I personally am not so sure that this is the right adjudication. I didn't get much mail on the question.

Mark Coldiron: .....My HRs now specifically state that unexpressed moves are perfectly acceptable. My motto is "avoid redundancy" whenever possible. I therefore prefer the move-and-support-as-one philosophy. However, I do prefer the parenthetical expression F Eng-Bel(A Pic S) rather than A Pic S F Eng-Bel. The former is more akin to having 2 separate orders while (I must admit) the latter does appear to be a support with a missing move.....If a player puts in A Pic S F Eng-Bel, F Eng-Bre, I would allow the F Eng-Bre, and put "No Such Order" on the support. I don't really agree that "the individual order takes priority", how do you really refine individual?! My feeling is that without the move to support, there can be no support and so the move takes priority over the support. Now, I realize that the converse argument could be built concerning the convoys (i.e. without the convoy, the move couldn't go - in most cases), but I consider the entire issue to be more of a matter of semantics or "order writing" if you will. And in those terms, I always consider the move or hold as higher priority than supports or convoys. That is why I always put the supports or convoys in parenthesis and give them short shrift when they conflict with the order they've been pared with. On the matter of "double ordered" units - the rules allow also for "ambiguous" as well as "badly written" orders.....I interpret the case at hand, not as double ordered but as "badly written" orders and use my best judgement in calling the move correct and the support invalid. ((Fair enough. While I consider these to indeed be double ordered, one could take the "badly written" path rather than the "ambiguous" path. I prefer the latter because of the Rulesbook's explicit prohibition against two orders, but a reasonable case can be made for the former. This discussion in some ways parallels the earlier hobby debate that once raged on whether a unit ordered to both hold and support was double ordered)) ((Robert Stimmel checked in with the view that, while he hans't GMed in a while, he too would treat the move to Bre as legal, and the support as just NSO.))

## DISTRESS at DW

A great deal has happened at Diplomacy World recently. This is designed to be my summary and commentary on the situation.

Rod Walker, as part of his semi-retirement from the hobby, gave up on DW, and turned the whole sorry mess over to probably the only person in the hobby with the raw energy and savvy to rescue it: Larry Peery. The situation was quite grim. DW's debt (total obligations minus assets) was well in excess of \$1000. Even more serious, there was simply not enuf money, or even the prospect of enuf money, to pay for the printing and postage for DW #40. Larry determined that there were only two options: Fold the zine, and repay the subscribers as best could be done, or default on all the subs, and ask people to resub to keep the operation going. These were grim alternatives. DW is for many people, their point of entry into the hobby, particularly for people entering the hobby without knowing anyone else in the hobby. On the other hand, defaulting on subs is a very drastic step, and will make it difficult for DW to regain many of its lost subbers, since no one wants to be twice burned. I discussed this matter in some detail with Larry, and I am persuaded that those were indeed the only choices, painful as they are. DW was in fact, bankrupt. Larry polled the readers, heard from about 1/3 of them, and they favored reorganization by about a 2/3 margin. Thus, if you want to get the zine, you have to resubscribe (4/\$12, from Larry Peery Box 8416 San Diego CA 92102). The zine will expand in size to 60 pages, and will be mailed first class. Canada is \$2 extra, Overseas, \$4 extra.

While it was essential to address the financial problem, I view it only as a symptom of DW's more fundamental problems. In its first 15 issues, DW built up to a circulation of over 700. In the next two dozen, covering 4 editors, it steadily dwindled to less than half of that. These things happen for reasons. I view DW's underlying problems as follows:

1. A long term inability to get DW out on anything even approaching a regular schedule. People, justifiably, have had no confidence that DW will appear when it should.
2. A Certain sameness, and predictability to what appears, especially as to who writes for the zine. DW has too narrow a base of writers. Each new editor may tend to bring in his or her own new "crew", but that doesn't change the fact that DW needs to draw from across the entire hobby.
3. A lack of excitement, of the unexpected. People don't look forward to seeing what the next issue will come up with. There is no sense that you "have" to get DW. What appears in DW is no longer a "talking point" in the hobby. DW is, in a word, no longer at the center of the hobby. It hasn't fulfilled its role as the "flagship zine" of the hobby, in the eyes of too many people.

I wrote to Larry suggesting a very unorthodox solution that I was sure would address all three of those problems: Kathy would be the editor for the even numbered issues, Bruce Linsey would be the editor for the odd-numbered issues, and Larry would handle the administrative matters and keep the whole shebang on an even keel. This would not entail Bruce and Kathy cooperating with each other, only with Larry. Each of the two would put out the issue himself or herself. I believe that this would solve both the quality and regularity issues. Do you think that Kathy would dare be late, after Bruce had just been on time? Would Bruce put out a so-so issue after Kathy just did an excellent one? And vice versa. In a sense, the energy that these two, and their pals, have been pouring into the feud would be, shall we say, "diverted" into putting out a DW second to none. There are writers who wouldn't feel comfortable writing for Bruce, just as there are those on the other position as well. Between the two of them, everyone would be accesable. Since each would have only two issues a year, DW could avoid that "rushed" quality so often seen in the past. And the groundwork could be laid for going to a bimonthly, which I think DW should do eventually. Alas, the idea was shot down by the powers that be at DW, so, at least for the time being, its dead.

Larry has spun off some other imaginative ideas. He has set up an "Endowment Fund" "to provide a means of financing projects to make money for DW, and as a reserve" and collected over \$500 for it, with more to come from a "raffle" later on. Also planned

is an "Anthology" --- the "best" article from each of the previous 39 issues, reprinted "in a special full-size, legal-page edition with comb binding and a heavy duty cover." Cost is \$8 before Dec 1, \$10 thereafter. He also plans a reprint of all articles in the entire 39 previous issues, at a cost of \$75, and possibly some "theme" collections (e.g. all the articles on GMing and publishing). There is also a "DW Supporters Fund", of various materials that can be used to reimburse people for their defaulted subs. These include back issues of DW, and contributions from other publishers. And there's more....

I strongly support DW, and urge you to sub. DD has reviewed almost every issue of DW since this zine began. I personally have written more pages for DW than anyone else --- and I don't intend to be overtaken! I have sent in a sub, and a contribution to the Endowment fund, and a substantial pledge for the DWSF. Larry has righted the flagship in the water, assembled a fine crew, and now its: "All Aboard....."

## THE ZINE COLUMN # 88

The newest hobby service zine is DIP ZIP from Thomas H. Hurst (2686 Richardson Drive, Fitchburg, WI 53711). This is a listing of zines and subzines, generally presenting the same information as is in the Zine Directory. The main differences are 1) DZ is slated to be published thrice-yearly, so that it can be more up to date 2) Only information provided by the publisher is printed 3) The entries are not in any alphabetical order, and 4) Bruce Linsey doesn't have his cooties on it. The first issue was remarkably skimpy, with only 28 entries. There are no European zines and only one Canadian. It may be that publishers don't see the need for a second such publication, or it may be that Tom just didn't get the word out. It might conceivably be Tom himself; the few letters of his that I have gotten have been among the most belligerent I've gotten from anyone.

Hard on the heels of the above is news of changes at The Zine Directory. Roy Henricks will remain as publisher, but editing duties will be done by Simon Billeness, 61A Park Ave, Albany, NY 12202. Simon is a superb choice, because he ran a similar operation in England called 20 Years On, so he's quite experienced. He is switching ZD to a thrice-yearly system, too, which is similar to how 20YO was run. He is looking to trade ZD with any publisher; ordinary subscription rates have apparently not been set yet. In addition, Simon is setting up "The American Zine Bank". Those who wish samples should send Simon a "large envelope" and \$1-\$2, and he'll send he'll send you samples of various zines. These samples will come from 1) trade copies, and 2) batches of zines wh publishers decide to send him for this purpose. I've already sent him off a batch of those, and I hope that other pubbers who would like to expand their readership will do the same. This is an idea which has worked well for many years in Britian, and I hope it will catch on here. It will be a very valuable service for novices, since its a quick way to get hold of a bunch of zines to look at. The AZB isn't quite functioning yet because a supply of zines isn't available yet, but it should be soon; its a swell idea, one that I wrote in favor of some time in the past, but didn't get much response.

And, for the sake of completeness, Robert Sacks is also publishing a "KGO Zine Directory" on a semi-annual basis. He's also looking for a 1986 Editor.

Last issue I mentioned Randolph Smyth's FolSiFie as a fine source of play-of-the -game writing. Since then, #167 has appeared, with a real gem on how to handle a conflicting alliance situation. It is drawn from a real game, Randolph gives you the board situation, the diplomatic setup, the crucial letter that he wrote, and his reasoning in constructing it. Its one of the most cunning letters I've ever seen, and the 3-pages essay is one of the <sup>best</sup> glimpses you'll get into the mind of an expert player.

Bruce Linsey has put out a fake issue of DW, "#40!" It was, in Larry Peery's words, a very good fake. Larry also wants it to be known that this fake was not an attempt to "circumvent" his efforts to rescue DW (whatever that means). The fake, in fact made no reference at all to DW's financial crisis. The Shop Rose piece in there was written by me. It appeared there rather than in the real DW because it had been ~~turned~~ <sup>fa #1</sup> turned down by Kathy as being "dull". ~~I don't know if~~ Extra copies are available. If not, its your own fault for not subscribing to DW!.....And lastly, Bill Quinn 301 Conroe Drive Conroe TX 77301 is looking for someone to take over the job of Boardman Number C.