

# D I P L O M A N I A

Diplomacy\* Genzine - N3F Games Bureau & IFW Diplomacy Divisions - Issue Number 29  
Editor and Publisher: Don Miller - - - - - March, 1970

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents; In Brief (misc. notes) .....	Page 1
The Courier (Lettercolumn) (I. <u>Unethical Practices by GM's</u> : Terry Kuch; II. <u>On the "Variants" and "Diplomacy Rules" Symposia</u> : Don Turnbull, John R. Moot, Rod Walker; III. <u>On Miscellaneous Subjects</u> : Dan Alderson, Charles Wells, Buddy Tretick, Doug Beyerlein, John Boardman; IV. <u>Sections I &amp; II Revisited</u> : Doug Beyerlein, Andrew Phillips, John McCallum; V. <u>On the "Diplobourse" Symposium</u> : Doug Beyerlein, Jeff Power, John McCallum, Richard Holcombe) (interspersed thruout with liberal comments by Ye Olde Edde) .....	Pages 2-18
Current Trades .....	Page 18
Postal Diplomacy Games Completed to Date -- A Short Listing .....	Pages 19,20
A Rating System...Of Sorts .....	Page 21
Back-Issues of Diplomacy Magazines (notice) .....	Page 21
Completed DIPLOMANIA-Family Games -- DAA (1966Cf; orig. TWJ-1966-EE) .....	Page 22
Colophon .....	Page 22

### In Brief --

\*Diplomacy is a registered trademark of Games Research, Inc., of Boston, Mass.

Pages 2-12 of this issue were typed in late January, so some of the statements made therein may have been superseded by later events. Also, this is a sort of "catch-up" issue, in which we publish all the letters which have been squeezed out or overlooked in the past few issues; we'll keep up-to-date on lettercol in future.

Pages 13 thru 21 were typed on an office typewriter, which was suffering from various maladies; we hope they are all legible, but we expect there may be some problems, particularly on page 15.

The mass of letters and editorial comments squeezed out all of our usual material; the various listings, and other features will return with DPMA #30.

Speaking of DPMA #30, remember the two symposia planned for this issue: "Missed Moves, Stand-Bys, and Replacement Players", and "The Use and Misuse of Propaganda and the Press Release". Deadline for these two symposia is extended to April 12. Please try to send us a few of your thoughts on the subjects to be covered....

The symposium on "Brannan's Rule, Convoys, and Multi-Coastal Provinces" is being extended to DPMA #31, deadline May 11. Let's hear from you on this one, too....

Rod Walker asks that the following be announced: ". . . the assignment of Boardman Numbers is my private responsibility, inherited from Boardman, Wells, and Koning, and has nothing to do with any group or organization. I will assign a number to any game which is 'regular' in the sense that I defined it in ACHERON 1, page 4. Note that the definition does not mention any interpretation of the rules, and I would assign a number to any game, even one which uses the Changing of the Guard or some other such nonsense, so long as the Gamesmaster regards it as a regular game. It may receive the '#' prefix, however, to indicate substantial irregularities. This was Koning's idea, as you remember, and I think it was a good one."

G.B. Dippy Div. 'zines with openings (see Roster distrib. with TGL #20 for addresses): ALBION (Don Turnbull), Abstraction; ANLARA (Jeff Key), Regular; AUX ARMES! (Don Miller), Hypereconomic (Off-Board nations, Revolutionaries, Replacements for FRANCE, JAPAN, and future drop-outs); BRONTOSAURUS (Len Lakofka), Regular, Rajomacy, Barbaria, Khanomacy; DIPLODEUR (Bob Johnson), Regular; DIPLOPHOBIA (Don Miller), Regular; FUG (Larry Fong), Regular; HYDROPHOBIA (Don Miller), Scotice Scripti; LA GUERRE (Buddy Tretick), Regular, Air-Sea I, Naval Variant, 7-Man 7-Game Tournament; NUMENOR (Rod Walker), Regular, Calhamer 5-Man Game; PUGET SOUND GAZETTE (Hal Naus), Regular; THANGORODRIM (Bill McDuffie), Third Age, Barbaria, Youngstown Variant, Napoleonic Diplomacy; ZOTHIQUE (Rod Walker), Aberration IV. Bourses in DIPLODEUR, SERENDIP.

I. UNETHICAL PRACTICES BY GM'S.

Terry Kuch

(4 Sep 69)

How about these, as a starter:

- 1) Dropping a game, or, if the GM must quit, failing to find a new home for the game. (Obvious.)
- 2) Failing to provide an alternate publication and/or alternate GM if the GM is away for more than 1½ months, or is otherwise prevented from publishing.
- 3) Failing to send something to players within three days of each deadline, or, in extenuating circumstances, within one week.
- 4) Charging game fees to some players, but not to others (exception: winners of contests).
- 5) Accepting late moves from some players, but not from others (this is not obvious -- I'd wait an extra day to get a set of moves from a country with 14 centers, but not from a country clearly about to go under; it's a matter of ruining the game, or having almost no effect on it).
- 6) Tipping off players as to the intent of other players. (Obvious.)
- 7) Failing to correct errors he has made.
- 8) Failing to stick by his own rule-interpretations.
- 9) Changing his rule-interpretations in mid-game (except with the consent of all the players).

Is there anybody still up there but John Boardman?

((Has anyone -- players or Gamesmasters -- any more "Unethical GM Practices" to add to Terry's list? If so, please send them in.

By and large, we agree with the unethicallity of the practices Terry lists, with the possible exception of number 3. We would change "3 days" to "within a reasonable time", with the word "reasonable" being interpreted according to (1) how many games the GM is running and (2) what sort of publishing interval the GM has established (in print) for himself. Thus, we can see no reason (except illness or the like) for a GM who is running only one game not getting the results to the players within a few days after his deadline (3 days might be appropriate here). However, for the GM who has a great many games (like this writer), an interval as short as three days would present an impossible burden -- we'd have to take off from work in order to GM all the games and type the stencils and run off the 'zine and collate and address it and mail it out -- something we're not about to do.... For us, a week is more like it. Players who desire almost immediate publication of results would have to steer clear of 'zines with lots of games....

We also disagree, at least in part, with Terry's exception to item number 5. We have sometimes, where we felt there may be extenuating circumstances involved, waited an extra day for moves -- but when we do this, we accept all late moves, and not just those from the stronger players. However, this is a policy (i.e., accepting any late moves) which we are trying to steer clear of. Again, a GM with only one or two games might be able to adopt such a liberal policy and still get his 'zine out in a reasonable time; but for the GM with lots of games, waiting for late moves can throw him so far off schedule that everything is late.... If a GM allows sufficient time between deadlines for normal activity, and sets forth provisions whereby players may protect themselves from missing deadlines ("General Orders", advance orders, etc.), then it is purely the responsibility of the player if his moves don't reach the GM on time. What would happen in a real battle if a unit reached its designated position late because of a communications foulup??

One more point here -- Some persons (e.g., Rod Walker in ACHERON #1) have been talking about declaring games to be "non-Regular" because the GM has done something they feel to be improper during the course of the game (in the above example, allowing the "Changing of the Guard" maneuver). We feel this would be grossly unfair to the players in the game -- that, perhaps, it would be better to rate all games, including Variants, on some simple scale such as assigning one point for a won game,

and  $1/n$  (where  $n$  equals the number of drawing players) points for a drawn game (we think this is the Calhamer Rating System, is it not?) -- and the GM's perhaps should be the ones being rated on their practices. The problem here would be, who would rate the GM's? One GM criticizing another is generally taken quite badly by the one being criticized -- and in the above example, Rod's position as Chief of the Games Bureau Diplomacy Division and the appearance of his criticism in an official Bureau publication could affect the success of the GM being criticized in getting future players. One GM criticizing another is sort of like one businessman criticizing his competitor.... And we can't leave it to the players, as few of them have played under a sufficient number of GM's to be able to make valid comparisons between their capabilities/ethicality/etc. Perhaps a committee of Gamesmasters? (This is one of the major problems to be resolved before any sort of "Gamesmaster Certification" system could be set up.)

We'll have more to say on this subject either later in this issue or in the next DIPLOMANIA, depending on how space holds out....))

## II. ON THE "VARIANTS" AND "DIPLOMACY RULES" SYMPOSIA.

Don Turnbull

(10 Oct 69)

. . . Perhaps I didn't make myself clear on the variant question -- I agree that within the terms of reference of the symposium the question of "variance" is rather hard to define. However, surely the question concerning the variance of certain rules cannot be decided by one Gamesmaster, or even a consortium of Gamesmasters, but by one authority only? And that authority must surely be Calhamer. It's no use our talking about niggly things like "our game is not a variant because it employs Koning's rule, and there is an example in the rule book examples of play", or "our game is a variant because it employs Koning's rule which contradicts a phrase in the text of the rule book". This is getting down to Bob Johnson's argument -- that any postal Diplomacy game is a variant anyway since the question of play by mail does not appear in the rules. Taken on the very narrow dictates of the question, it is impossible not to be variant, in some respect or to some degree. What we need is a broader look at the whole issue with the cooperation of the manufacturers, which of course is the means you propose anyway, and is very sensible, too.

Far be it for me, as a new member of the Diplomacy "community", to try to teach the experienced Gamesmasters to suck eggs, but I come back to my original statement (which perhaps wasn't so well qualified) that a lot of argument is going on about a relatively simple matter.

I would have thought that a select committee of Gamesmasters, acting in conjunction with Allan Calhamer and the manufacturers, could solve the problem without too much difficulty.

Incidentally, I see from the game listings that GRAUSTARK games are included with EREHWON games (these are only two examples of the point I want to make -- I am not getting at either or both magazines in particular). However, I gather from the marvellous BROEDINGNAG 84 that GRAUSTARK does not allow Koning's rule, while EREHWON does. Which then is the variant? And how can they both be listed under "regular games" if Koning's rule is one of the points of dispute? . . .

I take your point about PARLEMENT in the sense of a variant game; put in that way, it seems a very sensible method of cataloging. I suppose we should go formal and talk about game groups and sub-groups.

Perhaps I jumped to too hasty a conclusion about Jared Johnson's article -- it's merely that the GENERAL seems to have been dominated with the sort of gamesmanship articles he writes, to the detriment of other articles perhaps of more value. Perhaps it's just that no one writes for the GENERAL nowadays anyway.

((Bravo! Like ALBION, Don Turnbull's letters from Merrie Olde England are a breath of fresh air, clearing away many of the cobwebs of controversy which hang about the field of Postal Diplomacy!

You have gotten right to the heart of the matter concerning "Variant" and

"Regular" games. We were going to comment at length on this subject in a response we were writing (as a Games Bureau Diplomacy Division member, and not as Games Bureau Chairman -- all of our comments concerning and to Rod Walker are being made as a concerned member of the Division, rather than as a rebuke from the Chairman to his appointee, and are made in the spirit of friendly discussion rather than vitriolic criticism) to statements made by Rod Walker in his ACHERON #1 (the new official organ of the Games Bureau Diplomacy Division). But your letter provides ideal "comment hooks", which we can not let pass by without response....

At first we were reservedly in favor of Rod's attempt to derive a set of "rules" which would have to be followed by Division members, both in the sense of entrance requirements (and membership requirements), and in terms of defining, for Division purposes, what a "Regular" Diplomacy game was by establishing, through vote of the Division members, a set of rule interpretations to be followed in all Bureau Regular games. Our reservations stemmed from the fact that we had been the most outspoken opponent of the now-dead International Diplomacy Federation (I.D.F.), and one of the main reasons for our opposition was their attempt to establish a set of rules for a "Regular" game, and by exclusion from I.D.F. rating and certification systems, to place a stigma upon all games/GM's/magazines who/which did not follow the I.D.F. rules. Our acceptance of Rod's efforts was on the basis of our understanding that these rules were to be largely advisory rather than compulsory, and that his own personal definition of a "Regular" game was as broad-based as our own -- i.e., that a "Regular" game was one in which the play of the game was not substantially altered from play in a game in which the Rulebook rules were followed to a "T" (allowing for the fact that "substantially" is somewhat vague, and that the Rulebook rules are open to various interpretations). Thus, most of the games being played today (including 5-Man games, games of Anonymity, and the like) which utilize the standard 7-man Diplomacy map and a set of rules differing only in interpretation of the Rulebook rules would be "Regular", while such games as Twin-Earths (which uses two boards), 9-Man games (which utilize substantially-altered maps), Middle-Earth games (which use a whole new scenario), and the like would be "Variants". (And games like those utilizing the "Spring Raid" would be sort of borderline -- but, because the differing rules would, if utilized to a considerable extent during the game, produce substantially different play, we would tend to classify a "Spring Raid" game as Variant rather than Regular.)

But Rod, in his ACHERON 1, seems to have narrowed the definition of "Regular" game to the point where not only are games of Anonymity and the like excluded, but also games being run by John Boardman, Terry Kuch, Dave Johnston, and others. He has narrowed full Division membership to only those persons who are running "Regular" games, "as defined by the Permanent Rules", and has restricted voting on the Permanent Rules, and enforcement thereof, to Full members only. Thus, John Boardman, Dave Johnston, Terry Kuch, and quite a few others are in essence forbidden voting membership in the Division unless they bend their rules to conform to the Division rules -- on which many of them probably never even had the chance to vote (this is particularly relevant in the case of new Gamesmasters). The only way these persons can become voting members within the Division under the present rules would be for them to change their rules to apply to Division rules, then, once they are in the Division, fight the rules they don't like from the inside. However, results of the voting (i.e., names of persons voting and numerical results of voting) which established the Permanent Division Rules have yet to be released, so we, as members, are unable to make rational decisions as to the possibility of specific rules being overthrown.

Our own preference would be for the Division to be open to all, players and GM's alike -- with voting on specific issues generally being restricted to a committee of GM's which has been elected by the membership at large. Certainly persons such as John Boardman, Terry Kuch, and Dave Johnston have much to add to any Diplomacy-oriented group, and their membership should be encouraged rather than discouraged. Any "consensus" which is reached without as broad a base of participation as possible is no consensus at all. Our concern in the Division should be the stimulation of discussion and exchange of opinions, leading eventually to a consensus.---

but a consensus reached through mutual examination of the issues involved, rather than a simple "yes"/"no, "either"/"or", "black"/"white" vote.

To this end, we would encourage a Division membership fee -- and make this the only requirement for membership. As Games Bureau Chairman, if a Division fee is established, we are quite willing to waive the requirement that Division members must also be Regular members of the Bureau. And we would like to see a Division 'zine developed which serves three main purposes: (1) Dissemination of information concerning the Division; (2) Dissemination of information concerning Diplomacy in general; (3) Provision of a forum for discussion of the various issues plaguing the field of Postal Diplomacy. We would very much like to see, in fact, a series of Division "Forums" similar to the ones we are holding in DIPLOMANIA. Such a magazine would, essentially, render unnecessary most of the genzines or general information sections in many of the individual Diplomacy magazines, and would allow us as GM's to concentrate on Gamesmastering, directing our efforts in other areas towards the Division 'zine. We could all write for such a 'zine, confident that it's distribution would be larger than any of our individual 'zines on its own, and that in it we would be reaching the largest possible audience.

As far as the "Variant"/"Regular" controversy is concerned, Buddy Tretick has suggested a third classification -- "Variations" -- i.e., a Regular game would be one which explicitly followed the Rulebook, a Variation something which did not follow the Rulebook explicitly but was substantially similar in play to a game which did follow the Rulebook, and a Variant something substantially different from a Regular game. To determine what a "Regular" game is, though, one of two things would have to be done: (1) The Rulebook would have to be revised by Games Research to remove ambiguities and make explicit the points of contention which now exist; or, (2) A consortium of Gamesmasters would have to present to Allan Calhamer a set of those points which need clarification, have him rule on each of them, and publish the rulings for all of the Postal Diplomacy world to read. (We feel that if Rulebook revision does not occur, then method (2) is much more preferable than some group like the Diplomacy Division setting its own rulings. We feel that a more valuable service for the Division to do would be to identify the points of contention, and then seek rulings by Calhamer on them. Rulings by Calhamer would be much more likely to be recognized and accepted by all of the GM's than would rules adopted by a (with Boardman, Kuch, Johnston, and others absent) non-representative group such as the Division.)

Once a Regular game has been explicitly defined, it would then be up to the individuals compiling rating systems as to whether or not variations are included in their systems. Or, for that matter, Variants.... But a "central" rating system, such as one which could be set up for the Division using Calhamer's simple system, should rate all games, and not just those which meet an arbitrary set of definitions. A person who sees a Variant game through to victory, in our opinion deserves just as much credit for winning the game as does a person winning a Regular game.

To summarize, then, if the N3F Diplomacy Division is to truly become a moving force in the world of Diplomacy, it must be a broad-based group, open to all, with plenty of room within it for difference of opinion. It must not restrict itself only to a narrow group of conformists and "yes-men". It should provide a forum for discussion, and be a prime source of information on the field. It should attempt to cover the entire field of Diplomacy, treating all games equally, particularly in such areas as rating systems and the like. It should treat all Gamesmasters equally, regardless of whether they are running "Regular" games, "Variations", or "Variants". Until an acceptable system is set up for rating GM's, praise or censure of individual GM's and/or magazines should come from individuals rather than be made an official function of the Division. And the Division should take the lead in pinpointing problems to be solved in the field as a whole, and in suggesting or recommending solutions to them -- or, in the case of rule revision, in making the appropriate persons aware of the existence of the problems. The Division will be far more effective -- and valuable -- if it can speak for the body of Diplomacy players/GM's as a whole, rather than just a small group holding a single set of opinions about various controversial subjects....

Now, getting back to Don Turnbull's letter ("It's about time!", most of you say, with a loud sigh of relief) --

Concerning Rulebook revision: As you can see from the above, we agree fully that it must be Calhamer who is the only/final authority on Rulebook interpretation; and we agree that Games Research and Calhamer together should make the necessary Rulebook revision. However, Rod Walker has stated flatly that Calhamer will not agree to any Rulebook revision, and Jeff Key, in LEBOR GABALA, explained a bit of the problem when discussing a new controversy over non-ordered removals. It seems that Calhamer, when he sold the rights (or turned them over) to Games Research, stipulated that no Rule changes could take place without his permission. So G.R., no matter how badly they would like to change the Rulebook, can not do so without Calhamer's complicity. In fact, we wrote to both Allan Calhamer and Games Research, putting the question of Rulebook revision to them directly -- and only Games Research responded. (Their letter appears below.) Unless Calhamer will cooperate, then, we are whistling in the wind when we advocate Rulebook revision.

Actually, we can't understand Calhamer's reluctance to agree to any revision of the Rulebook. Personally, we do not advocate changing the map (as Terry Kuch once remarked after playing on several different Variant maps, "You can't appreciate how good a job Calhamer did on the Diplomacy map until you try playing on Variant maps."); granted, there are some imperfections in terms of historical names, boundaries, and the like -- but it would be hard to beat it in terms of playability. Nor do we advocate actually changing any of the rules. What we do advocate is clarifying those rules about which there is disagreement as to interpretation -- such as Koning's Rule and the Victory Criterion, to name two -- and adding some additional material of an informational and explanatory nature to better enable the serious player to understand the philosophy behind the game and to incorporate Postal play as another form of the game. In fact, it is not even really necessary to physically revise the Rulebook itself -- merely publishing a supplement and making it available to future purchasers and to current owners (through the various sources which already exist in the Postal Diplomacy world -- granted, we would not reach every set owner -- but if they didn't at some time come into contact with Postal Diplomacy, or with other persons who had come into contact with same, it wouldn't really matter whether they received the supplement or not....) would suffice.))

John R. Moot, President, Games Research Inc.

(6 Jan 70)

. . . Concerning rule changes, I am finding it difficult to get something **definitive** done. Allan Calhamer does not seem inclined to work on the rule changes as I had hoped. Therefore at some point we must make heads or tails out of all the recommendations that have come in. Once the rules are revised, they have to be approved by Allan Calhamer, and that undoubtedly will take some time.

I do appreciate all that you and others are doing for DIPLOMACY, and I agree that it is about time we responded by doing something about the rules which certainly are not clear on a number of points. Starting now, it seems that we could have rule changes by the end of the year, provided Mr. Calhamer does not prove to be an insurmountable obstacle. . . .

((Refer to the two paragraphs immediately preceding this letter for our comments.))

Rod Walker

(9 Jan 70)

This is in reply to Dave Lindsay's letter in DIPLOMANIA 27. I agree, of course, with everything which you said in reply to that letter, but there were some minor points which should be cleared up.

First, Dave's discussion of the victory criterion is all mixed up. The rules have never been revised on that point. The criterion in the summary sheet -- the 18-supply center chestnut -- is used by only one GM, to my knowledge: Buddy Tretick. Contrary to Dave's statement, I do not use any such criterion, which I regard as ridiculous. I do use, as do many GM's, the requirement of 18 units, which is merely my interpretation of the word "majority" in the Rulebook. At no time do I use the rather poor Summary for my rulings. Finally, Dave's comment that "there should



7  
be only one set of rules" is not well taken. There is only one set. The Summary is just that, a summary, and itself states that it is not a set of rules.

Second, I agree with Dave that house-rules which are contrary to the printed Rules should be given the axe. Koning's Rule does not happen to be one of these. It is in the Rules, as we all well know. For those of your readers who have not been in on this debate before, I will mention that, in the Fall 1902 moves of the sample game, a Koning's Rule situation occurs around Nwy and StP. I have heard the argument that this is merely the first recorded example of GM error, but Allan Calhamer has specifically said that the moves were correct and that the intent of the Rules is to allow Koning's Rule. Therefore, it is the GM's who do not use Koning's Rule who are going against the Rules, unless they wish to ignore both the Rules themselves and the statements of their author and restrict themselves to a narrow interpretation of a single sentence.

I might point out here that I have recently tested the opinions of those (like John Boardman and, presumably, Dave Lindsay) who regard themselves as "literalists" who use the Rulebook, the whole Rulebook (except the Sample Game, of course), and nothing but the Rulebook. The chief argument against Koning's Rule, of course, is that the absolute strict specific letter of the Rules doesn't say it applies. Now, if the literalists insist on that sort of method of interpreting the Rules, they must apply it in all cases. As you know, I printed in a recent EREHWON a well-known sentence from the Rules. If taken literally, it means that support can be cut only if the supporting unit and the unit whose attack would cut the support are located in provinces (i.e., not in bodies of water). Strangely enough, John Boardman's reaction was exactly what mine is -- that the rule is misprinted, and that it means to apply to units regardless of location. John naively wonders why I should have brought the point up at all. Yet this interpretation is exactly contrary to the interpretation he gives the passage relevant to Koning's Rule. I regard this attempt to have his cake and eat it too as typical of the real basis of the literalist position -- the narrowly restrictive interpretations of various passages are simply a reflection of a somewhat irrational opposition to interpretations based on careful analysis of the Rules, both what they do say and what they do not say.

Dave's suggestion on a section to help novices has merit; however, GR will obviously never publish such a thing, as it would be quite lengthy (or it would be worthless) and raise the cost of the game quite a bit. Furthermore, there are circumstances under which an attack normally unwise is a very good idea.

Finally, Dave's sudden seeming support for the "realist" position is, in my opinion, wrong-headed. To criticize the Rules because they are not "realistic" is not to criticize them at all. Nobody said Diplomacy was a simulation; it is a game. Anybody who wants realism can go to Viet Nam or Biafra. The rules which Dave complains of are both logical and good for the game.

(1) He objects to allowing a unit in province X to stand when two countries order A1-X with support of A2. He is assuming, perhaps, that each A1 is hostile to the unit now in X. This is not a reasonable assumption. If one of them is friendly, then "realism" demands a different result; does it not? Obviously, setting up rules which operate sometimes and do not operate sometimes, depending on who hates whom, is somewhat silly. It asks for unbelievable complication, confusion, and complexity, and creates a game which nobody in his right mind would want to play.

(2) He objects that a Changing of the Guard cannot take place (e.g., A Mar-Pie, F Pie-Mar). Your arguments, Don, are quite good. I might also point out that if A Mar and F Pie are from hostile nations, allowing them to exchange would be very unrealistic. So, again, we are faced with a suggestion which is predicated on the implication that the Rules have to determine who's fighting whom. You simply don't have a playable game with rules of that sort. The rule which forbids direct exchanges of units is therefore a wise one. On your showing, Don, it is also a realistic one.

I might also add that I am very much opposed to a new edition of the Rules, for the reasons given in the first issue of NUMENOR. Far more effective, and equitable,

will be the voluntary standardization of important questions by operating GM's.

One more point re the symposium: A couple of comments on Bob Johnson's (and indirectly Fred Davis') comments on the board. Given that there are geographical errors, which are very minor, on the board, I do not see that there is a problem. I disagree strongly with Bob that "when all other things are equal, Germany, Italy, and Austria always lose." All the countries have an equal chance; however, the players of the countries in the cellar have opted for good strategies less often.

The changes suggested in Turkey and France are not very good ones. Putting the Turkish F at Con cramps Turkey utterly. He is put in a position of choosing between Bul and Bla -- and if he takes Bul it must be with the weakest possible unit, the fleet. His changes for France deny to France an Atlantic alternative. With his fleet in Mar, and no supply center on the Atlantic coast, France is no longer in a position to attack England.

The board, it seems to me, is best left alone. There are no major problems --- and you can always make changes that intrigue you for a variant -- so why worry?

((Most of our comments to the above letter would be the same as the ones we made following Don Turnbull's letter, so we'll not repeat them here. Suffice it to say that we are in general agreement with what Rod has to say. However, we cannot agree fully that a section on strategy (in general) would not be of help to the novice -- general strategic guidelines would prove quite helpful to someone who has never played before. After all, isn't it generally true that one must know what the "rules" are before one breaks them? Certainly there will be exceptions to all strategies -- but this doesn't lower the value of the strategies. Perhaps a full sample game or two, annotated by Calhamer or some other highly experienced player, might be the best approach to introducing the novice to the strategies involved in the game. And such an addition need not be incorporated directly into the Rulebook -- why not make it available as a mimeographed supplement, similar to the one we suggested for rule interpretations and, perhaps, information on Postal play and on Postal contacts? Thus cost would be negligible.

And, of course, we do feel that there should be either (1) a new edition of the Rules, minus the ambiguity in the present version, or (2) a supplement, preferably prepared in consort with Allan Calhamer, clarifying the various points of dispute which exist with respect to the current Rulebook.

Instead of changing the map, there is one change in the Rules which might possibly satisfy many of the points made by those suggesting change, particularly with respect to France and Turkey -- allow choice of builds at the beginning of the game (e.g., there would be a "build" season at the start of the game, during which France could build a Fleet at Mar and a Fleet at Bre, or a Fleet at Mar and an Army at Bre, or a Fleet at Bre and an Army at Mar, or Armies at both Bre and Mar (in all cases, of course, with an Army at Paris), as he chose). Choice of builds would allow for considerably more variation in opening game strategy, and would provide a flexibility to the play which would make many of the suggested map changes unnecessary.))

### III. ON MISCELLANEOUS SUBJECTS.

Dan Alderson

(Undated)

. . . . A little history of the LASFS Dippy 'zines. In days of yore, there were organized four LASFS Diplomacy games. The various players would get together at (later, after) the weekly LASFS meetings for the weekly moves in the games. The first and second such games were ably chronicled throughout their lifetimes by Bruce Pelz in his 'zines WORLDIP and WITDIP, respectively. I now quote the reasoning behind these titles from WITDIP SPECIAL #2: "When the LASFS started its first one-move-per-week game, I published the moves under the title of 'WorldDip'. The words 'World Diplomacy' total 14 letters; 'WorldDip' totals seven. As LASFS has long been known in fandom as 'The Half World', it seemed appropriate to use WORLDIP as 'Half World Diplomacy' in two senses of the phrase. Then, when the second game



started, the moves were made so haphazardly and wildly -- and the press releases were so weird -- that I used part of the same analogy and called it WITDIP -- 'Half Wit Diplomacy'. Had I had the time to do the publications for the other two games, they would have been called AZZDIP, again using the analogy, and then, discarding the analogy completely to throw a curve to the players and readers, SHEEPDIP. But I had hardly enough time for the two I was doing, so these didn't get published." The third and fourth games were, at best, confused. The third game to be organized (thus, number three) started after the fourth, so that the latter was termed number two-and-a-half. This peculiarity led the chronicler of Game 2.5, Ed Baker, to name his publication TUPPENCE-HA'PENNY. The chronicler for Game 3, Bill Blackbeard, decided to name his 'zine LA GAZETTE D'EUROPE. Both games, 2.5 and 3, arrived at Spring 1903 simultaneously, chaotically fumbled into Fall 1903, and were simultaneously abandoned. By no means all of the moves in these games were documented: there were only two issues of TUPPENCE-HA'PENNY, covering Spring and Fall 1901, and only one issue of LA GAZETTE D'EUROPE, covering Spring 1903. (Blackbeard thinks that there may have been one more, earlier, issue of LA GAZETTE D'EUROPE, but I was around at the time, playing in Game 2.5 and buying any and all game 'zines, and I only got the Spring 1903 issue. Further, none of the then players, including Blackbeard, now has any but the Spring 1903 issue. I doubt that the earlier issue ever existed.) Two other 'zines emerged from Games 2.5 and 3. Published by Phil Castora, they were both, like TUPPENCE-HA'PENNY and LA GAZETTE D'EUROPE, one-page 'zines; in fact, they were published on opposite sides of a single sheet of paper. They were: ASDIP (AsDip; see Pelz's AZZDIP above), giving the Spring 1903 moves in Game 2.5, and MUTINY #1, "being a sort of substitute SheepDip", giving the Spring 1903 moves in Game 3 (yes, again!). Of all these 'zines, only WITDIP (in the form of WITDIP SPECIAL in N'APA) was ever distributed other than to local LASFS Diplomacy teams, as far as I know, although some collectors may by now have gotten some of them.

((Thanks for the very informative letter, Dan. It goes a long ways towards clearing up the "mystery" surrounding the elusive LASFS Diplomacy 'zines. Now, if anyone has a set (complete) of LASFS Dippy 'zines he'd like to part with....))

Charles Wells

(27 Sep 69)

I agree with your answer to Don Turnbull concerning variants. Practically all gamesmasters use rules which flatly contradict the rulebook, and even if they did not, one would still have trouble with those situations in which the rulebook is not clear.

One rule, by the way, that most people use that contradicts the rulebook is the one which says you can't cut your own support. At one time, EVERY gamesmaster ruled that way -- one of the few examples of unanimity in postal Diplomacy. (I now rule with the rulebook, mainly out of perversity.)

I also agree with you that Parlement can be considered a member of the "Diplomacy family" of games.

((Sorry; this extract from a longer letter from Charles should have appeared in Section II rather than Section III -- but the main part of the letter was concerned with Brannan's Rule -- and we had the letter filed in our newly-established "Brannan's Rule, etc." symposium folder, not realizing it also had comments on previous symposia until we had started typing Section III....))

Buddy Tretick

(19 Jan 70)

1. Victory Criteria Requirements for Postal Diplomacy (Regular or Variant).

Although the "Rulebook", as published by Games Research, Inc., states the victory criterion as "...a majority of pieces on the board", many of the postal Diplomacy gamesmasters choose either the ownership of 18 supply centers or 18 units on the board as the victory criterion.

It does not matter which victory criterion is chosen, since any choice gives each player in a game the same requirement for winning.

LA GUERRE has always had a victory criterion of either the ownership of 18 supply centers or a majority of units on the board at any given time, whichever occurs first. The effect of this choice allows a victory for the player who has overcome many of his opponents, but whose home country may be totally occupied, preventing builds.

In his publication of ACHERON 1, dated 25 December 1969, Rod Walker has criticized LA GUERRE's game of Regular Diplomacy, 1968AC, in that victory was allowed prior to having a majority of units on the board, even though Edi Birsan owned 18 supply centers at the time of victory -- this is one of the reasons stated by Rod to declare that game irregular and delete it from the rating systems. Such an action would deprive the players of that game from proper recognition of their achievement.

Any reasonable victory criterion is fair to each of the players in a game. As long as the victory criterion is comparable to those victory criteria required in other games, there should be no problem whatsoever...much less unwarranted criticism on that subject.

## 2. Responsibilities of the Player.

Focus your attention on Rule 1 of the EREHWON House Rules, published 1 January 1970, and on Revision C of LA GUERRE House Rules, published 31 October 1968. Both of these doctrines specify that errors not corrected within the game season stand.

Any gamesmaster will add to his unwieldy list of sources of errors such things as: (1) the handwriting and (dis-)organization of the written orders submitted by the player; and (2) moves received after the game has been gamesmastered....

To protect both the player and...ah, yes...even the gamesmaster from errors in his publication, LA GUERRE House Rules require the players to call attention to irregularities of this nature. Certainly seven players and one GM will spot an error. But when the error is not corrected in a timely fashion, that error stands...so says Rod Walker...so say I.

We wonder why Rod uses this problem as reason for declaring 1968AC an irregular game, and recommends its exclusion from the rating systems.

## 3. Retroactivity of Rules.

When a game is started under a given set of rules, only problem areas should result in a change of those rules...and each player in that game has the right to vote a rule out...unanimous decisions binding on the GM.

Apparently, due to some voting process under the guise of secret ballot, the results of which were not made available, the Games Bureau Diplomacy Division seems to have outlawed "The Changing of the Guard".

I will quote Rod Walker from his publication of ACHERON 1: "A more serious GM error occurred in 1968AC in S07 -- A Changing of the Guard was allowed . . . it makes the game a variant . . ."

First, that rule was in effect at the start of the game. Second, the move was not contested by the players. Third, who -- you, me, ... -- who has the right to state that such a simple maneuver should cause the game to become a variant?

((On the basis of the facts as we are aware of them, we would have to support Buddy in his contention that 1968AC should not be declared a variant. (This was the case to which we referred in our comments to Terry Kuch's letter in Section I of this lettercolumn.) If there is sloppy gamesmastering in a game (and we're not saying that there was in 1968AC), it is the GM, and not the players, who should be "penalized".

Taking Buddy's points in order, we do not agree with him that ownership of 18 supply centers should alone suffice as a criterion for victory. In our opinion, a player whose home centers are occupied so he can not build in them as not won at all -- how can a power be considered to have won a war when its very homeland has been overrun by its enemies? Certainly the first consideration of any nation in wartime is the protection of its own soil -- even if it means giving up and pulling out of conquered territories to regain lost home territory. A player who ignores

his homeland while greedily grabbing up the homeland of other nations doesn't deserve to win. (Certainly, in Chess, as in Shogi, one ignores the safety of one's own King only at one's own peril....) (We give as an example in Diplomacy the recently-completed DIPLOPHOBIA game PIC (1966AT), where the German player had the most supply centers for quite a while during the game, and could have had 18 -- had he not had to fight off the Austrians for possession of his homeland centers, while Austria overtook and passed him. Not to mention that the Austrian pressure on his homeland kept him from building the necessary forces to stave off the Austrian victory. And Austria, in turn, was kept from building for a long time by a German assault on the Austrian centers. Had the German players not played "musical countries" -- had Germany not missed so many moves and had so many changes of strategy because of the rotation of German players, the results of this game might have been far different.... At any rate, in this game possession of 18 supply centers alone in no way would have meant that the player who owned 18 centers would have emerged victorious. It is number of units, much more so than number of supply centers, which should determine who is victorious. The only thing an occupied supply center does when one cannot build for it is to deny the enemy one unit -- but if a player has 20 centers but only 12 units, that means his enemies have 14 units, so who is the stronger? The player with more centers but fewer units? Or the player with fewer centers but more units?)

And, again referring to the above example, we should point out that a mere majority of units should not in itself be the victory criterion -- unless that majority be an absolute majority of possible units on the board, rather than a temporary majority caused by some fluke in play. (Who could predict with any degree of certainty which player -- the one with 20 centers and 12 units, or the one with 14 centers and 14 units -- would eventually reach an absolute majority (18) of the possible 34 units on the board?) This is why we feel that the only realistic victory criterion is 18 units on the board at the completion of a game-year.

But, as Buddy points out, the fact that his victory criterion was not exactly the same as that of most other GM's should not make his game a "Variant" -- the important thing, as far as the players are concerned, should be that the criterion is clearly stated in the House Rules -- since it applies to all, all players should still have an equal chance for victory. The victory criterion does not describe the way the game is to be played (at least, it doesn't in this case), but rather the point at which the game ends.

And while we are on the subject, we were recently running through the list of completed Diplomacy games, both Variant and Regular, and noticed that many of them have ended by GM declaration or defection. When a GM declares a game ended because, in his opinion, one player (even though he has not yet reached the stated victory criterion) has a certain victory (or because he is simply tired of the game and wants an excuse for ending it), does that make it a Variant? Or when the other players "surrender", even though a player has not officially won? Or when the other players miss moves or disappear, leaving only one player who has 12 centers and units, and the GM declares him the winner? Or when the GM declares one player the winner, even though the victory criterion has not yet been reached and at least one of the other players wishes to continue the game? Where does one draw the line on which games should be rated, and which should not? How does one be fair to the players when the GM has abdicated his responsibilities by not seeing the game through to the stated victory criterion?

Perhaps an extreme example of this is former GLOCKORL game GBB. The GM decided, because of the press of his studies, to abandon the magazine he was publishing; he found a GM for the other three games in his 'zine, but declared GBB ended; and a specific player (the one who was ahead at that point) the winner, as, in his opinion, victory by that player was inevitable. But all of the players, including the one for whom victory was declared, wished the game to continue (not all of the players accepted the GM's opinion of the inevitability of victory for the declared winner), and someone volunteered to take over the Gamesmastering and

publication of the results. However, the original GM never came through with information necessary for the new GM to restart the game, and it finally had to be abandoned altogether, much to the dismay of some of the players.

Now, the question is, should the player for whom victory was declared by the GM receive credit for the "victory", or should the game simply go down as "abandoned by GM", with all credit lost? (And don't say, "but it's just a Variant", because players who play in Variant games try just as hard, and are just as much concerned with the propriety of the gamesmastering of the games in which they play and the outcome of the games, as are players who play only in Regular games.)

Let us, as GM's (perhaps through the Diplomacy Division of the G.B.), adopt a stringent code of ethics for ourselves, which will apply for all games which we gamesmaster, whether Variant or Regular. And let us be judged, both in the eyes of the players and our fellow GM's, on how well we apply this code to our actions in the field of Diplomacy. Let us pull up our own socks, and do a better job in serving those who patronize our magazines and gamesmastering, rather than penalizing the players for our own shortcomings and failings. After all, it is a service we are offering -- it is our duty to serve the players, and not their duty to serve us. They pay us for our service -- and once we have accepted their money, we have assumed the obligation of giving them the best service possible, and for seeing our obligation through to the end.

To climb back down off the soapbox and return to Buddy's letter, his second part of the letter, re "responsibilities of the player", and his requirement in his House Rules raises a couple of important points. First, while a player's "contractual" obligations to the GM extend only to that player's following the rules/House Rules of the game/magazine in which he has agreed and for which he has paid, he also has "common sense" obligations which benefit both the GM and himself (refer to the "Golden Rules" we published some time ago in DIPLOPHOBLI). Legible writing, for example, or anything which makes the GM's task easier, also benefits the player by enabling the GM to do a better job, cutting down delays in the game through GM errors, and the like. Secondly, one question concerning player ethics: Reference Buddy's House Rule which requires a player to inform him about GM errors he finds in the 'zine, is it unethical for a player who spots such an error not to report same to the GM? (Especially when that error benefits the player who spots it?) If the GM has rules, say, to a complex Variant, and himself gets confused and makes a mistaken ruling, and the only player who spots it is the player whom the mistake benefits -- who then decides to say nothing, so the error passes unnoticed...who, if anyone, is to blame for the result of the error -- the player, the GM, or both? Is the player's refusal to point the error out to the GM "deception of the GM", or a legitimate tactic in the game? In other words, is it a legitimate tactic of Diplomacy for a player to use a GM error to benefit his own position, either by saying nothing and just letting it stand, or by pointing it out when it **helps his enemy** more than himself? Or even to base one's strategy around the expectation that the GM will make such an error when the situation arises?

Concerning Buddy's third point, we feel that 1968AC should not be disqualified because it used the "Changing of the Guard" and said rule is contrary to Diplomacy Division rules. While we do not agree that the Division Rules should be the criterion for establishing a "Regular" game and excluding all others, we appointed Rod to the Division Chieftaincy with the proviso that he had a free hand to set things up as he saw fit. If he decides to stick by the concept of Permanent Rules, we will support him as Games Bureau Chairman, while we will oppose him as a rank-and-file member of the Division. However, we feel that such Permanent Rules should not be applied retroactively -- that only games starting after the rules were formulated should be subject to said rules. Thus, 1968AC, which started long before the Permanent Rules were drawn up, should not be subject to such Rules, and cannot be disqualified as a Regular game on the basis of such Rules. (The "Changing of the Guard" rule is anathema to us as a GM and player, but a GM's use of it in his games should really be between him and his players. Perhaps a simple chart, listing GM's and rule-interpretations, indicating which GM's use which interpretations but without critical comment, is the answer to enable players to decide where to play....)

Doug Beyerlein

(31 Jan 70)

If you are interested in learning of more variants of Diplomacy, there is one here in Seattle that is played almost as often as regular Diplomacy. We call it "Feudalism 70". There is no historical base and the regular board and rules are used. The only difference is that the players (from four to eleven) start out in a different set-up. The name of each province is placed on a card with 34 cards total. The stack of cards is then shuffled, and three cards are dealt out face up to each player. These three supply centers are his home centers, and the game starts with the Winter 1900 builds. The game is then played as a regular game from that point on, with the same victory conditions as in the rulebook, i.e. majority or 18 units (depending on houserules). The game may not be as classy as Pete Comber's Scotice Scripti, but the diplomacy involved is very interesting. I could not say about its postal appeal.

((It probably has little postal appeal -- back in the early days, when players were signing up for almost any kind of Variant one could come up with, we offered a similar game -- but had only a couple of takers, so dropped the idea. However, across the board, one can easily see that such a game should have considerable appeal. --ed.))

John Boardman

(1 Feb 70)

There's a minor error in the historical end of the Scotice Scripti rules in DIPLOMANIA #28. The Battle of Clontarf took place on 15 April 1014 (Good Friday). Sveyn Forkbeard had already died in February. ##### Jarl Sigurd of Orkney died in 1014 all right -- he was killed at Clontarf. So don't put his name on any post-Clontarf press releases. ##### "Sitric" is a latinized form of the actual "Sigtrygg" -- see the Njal Saga.

((Thanks, John -- Rod Walker, Pete Comber, and Scotice Scripti roster take note.))

#### IV. SECTIONS I & II REVISITED (Overlooked and recent letters).

##### I. (Revisited)

Doug Beyerlein

(5 Sep 69)

Ethics of Gamesmasters. Gamesmasters can be divided into two categories: the professional and the amateur. The professional GM is one who makes the running of his games as prompt and free of errors as is humanly possible. He also adds whatever extras he thinks appropriate. All the better 'zines have professional GM's -- that is why they stand out above other 'zines. The amateurs are the ones who can never get a 'zine out on time, and when they run into long delays they leave all their players wondering what happened to the games. Amateurs generally don't know what they are getting into when they start a 'zine, thinking that producing a good 'zine is all fun and little work. When they find it is not so they quit. I have few complaints directed to the professional GM's.

##### II. (Revisited).

Doug Beyerlein

(5 Sep 69)

Rule changes. I think the rules are very good as they stand, but I think there are a few things that should be clarified in the rule book. The victory criterion should be stated as 18 or more units on the board at the end of a fall build turn. The rules should read so that the Miller's Rule (revised) would be overturned. I doubt the second is possible with you and Walker for it.

Andrew Phillips

(Undated)

I don't think I want to see any changes in the rulebook. So the rulebook is obscure and contradictory? So what? It's better that way -- gives the GM some initiative....

So what's the hangup if every GM uses slightly different rules? I don't see the excitement over whether games are truly regular or really a variant. If you list a game in the 'MANIA listings as a regular and I don't like it, T.S. I can

either make up my own lists or lump it. As for the playing aspect of the thing: every GM is responsible for telling new players what his house rules are (perhaps he should publish a supplement to be sent out to new players?), and if a player doesn't know a ruling it's his responsibility to ask, submit conditionals, etc.

Anarchy forever!

I rather disagree with Bob Johnson on the victory criterion. The point of the 18-unit criterion is that once you've reached that point the rest should be downhill -- you ought to be able to wipe everybody out, given time. Thus second place is meaningless -- it merely means you get wiped out a bit later than most. In Diplomacy there are six losers and only one winner. If you can't accept that ratio, you ought to switch to other games which are easier on the ego.

That isn't to say second place shouldn't have any value in a rating system. Or that it should. It depends on what you're rating -- and how comprehensive you want to be.

Would you happen to know what Games Research's Diplomacy sales volume is?

Interesting that you never noticed that problem of Sweden's coastline. My first game of Dippy was a three-player FTF game, and I remember unsuccessfully arguing for Fred Davis' position. On the other hand, I disagree with you that the situation is not fundamentally different from St.P, Spa, Bul. In none of these cases are the "coasts" in question linked directly by coast. Secondly, and this is the argument that caused me to capitulate, there is no basis for assigning The Sound to Den rather than Swe. Examine the map and see if I'm not right in saying the boundary could just as easily be drawn on the north coast of Denmark.

((And Andy also expressed dissatisfaction with Fred Davis' "certification" ideas. ##### The problem with a player asking the GM for a ruling, or sending in conditional moves in such a situation, is that the player may not think of the situation as controversial -- i.e., he may think the GM ruling would be obvious, and not even consider bothering him about it. Before one can ask a question, one must first be aware that there is something there to be questioned.... We have often played in games (A-H games, in particular), where we went merrily along our way until a crucial point in the game, when we suddenly discovered that our opponent had been interpreting a particular rule exactly the opposite as we, and both we and he had based our entire offensive/defensive strategy upon our own interpretation. For either of us to give in -- or to flip a coin -- would be to concede defeat to the other -- so the game ends an exercise in futility, abandoned, with neither side satisfied. As far as we are concerned, the less ambiguity there is in a set of rules, the better. We prefer to start out with a straight-forward set of very simple and unambiguous rules, and add our own complexities later as variations. ##### Don't remember what Bob said about the victory criterion, so will add no comments here. ##### Don't know what G.R.'s Diplomacy sales volume is. Anyone? ##### What you say about Sweden is correct. Actually, we have a very vague recollection of, way back in our early Diplomacy-playing days, considering the problem of Sweden and then discarding the problem as insignificant. If one considers Denmark a sea- as well as a land-province, there is no problem whatsoever, as Sweden then is no more a multi-coastal province than is, say, Norway. But, of course, this does not remove all of the logical contradictions -- why, e.g., should a fleet entering Norway from the Skagerrak on one turn be able to enter St.Pete(North Coast) on the next, while a fleet moving by sea from Skagerrak would have to move to North Sea one turn, then Norwegian Sea, then Barents Sea, and finally, 4 turns after it started, it may enter St.Pete (North Coast)? (Perhaps the movement of a fleet...never mind, as it would mean splitting Norway into four sections to restrict fleet movement through Norway (rather, along the Norwegian coast) to that of the sea-provinces through which it moves along its northern journey....) This question, we hope, will be discussed more thoroughly in the "Multi-Coastal Provinces" Symposium....))

John McCallum

(20 Jan 70)

... On page 9 ((DPMA #27 --ed.)), in reply to a letter from Rod you say, "Actually, this whole thing about rulebook revision started some time ago when we



read in John McCallum's magazine. . . that Games Research was going to revise the Diplomacy Rule book, and wanted suggestions." As far as the underlined phrase is concerned the statement is in error. What you are undoubtedly referring to is the excerpt from a letter from John Moot, of Games Research, published in BROB 89. But the published excerpt read, in its entirety, "I am arranging to have the rules revised." Not a word about asking for suggestions. Where this part of the matter arose was with Walker. He picked up the quote from Moot in BROB, and suggested to the readers of EREHWON that they write Moot supporting the idea of rulebook revision and give him their suggestions. I have often wondered if one of the causes of the cooling of enthusiasm for Rulebook revision on the part of Games Research may not have been the deluge of unsolicited advice poured in on them as a result of EREHWON's remarks. Perhaps not though. Calhamer has always been lukewarm, when not downright hostile, to the idea of revision, and had expressed his feeling long before the remark of Moot's was published in BROB.

V. ON THE "DIPLOBOURSE" SYMPOSIUM.

Doug Beyerlein

(31 Jan 70)

The bourse symposium was interesting, with the Secondary Currency Redemption System the most informative part. I particularly like the way you handled awarding the diplodollars for the surviving countries. Your system used for rating Diplomacy games and not bourses (I know that was not your intention and was probably furthest from your mind) might make a good rating system. I guess I would then have to call it the Miller Rating System, if it was okay with you. Anyway, in principle I am opposed to the awarding of diplodollars to non-winners in a game, but I think your system has enough merit to be tried.

((Thanks, Doug -- if anyone wants to try out a Diplomacy Rating System using our Secondary Redemption System as a basis, he is welcome. Our own records, however, are too incomplete for us to do it. Besides, we don't like Rating Systems, and if we must have a Rating System for Dippy games, lean towards the Calhamer Point Count System (with Variants included along with Regular games).))

Jeff Power

(10 Feb 70)

In the bourse currently running in BROB an interesting problem has arisen concerning the setting of starting prices and the issuance of currency. It is found that if all players sell all their roubles the price will drop only as low as 60/65. In fact, the prices of several of the currencies can not drop as low as 0/5. It would seem reasonable that if no players have any faith in a currency the price should be 0/5. It follows that either the starting prices were set too high or there are too few players. It can also be argued that the price of lire was set too low, since several players will inevitably be stuck with worthless currency if Italy is eliminated from the game.

I believe the solution to this problem is to give each currency the same starting price and to set that price such that if every player sells all of some currency, the price will be 0/5. If there are 16 participants in some bourse, for instance, the starting prices should all be set at 160/165 if each player is issued 200 units of currency. It might be easier though to give each one 100 units and set the price at 80/85.

The arguments over secondary currency redemption appear to be inspired by a desire by some for yet another rating system. If bourse players become rating conscious, I believe game tampering may increase to such an extent that games with bourses would have to be classified as "variants", making them ineligible for half a dozen other rating systems. Players will be loath to play in such games, and the bourse will die. Another problem -- what is a "regular" bourse?

((Interesting that you should bring up the problem of the relationship between starting price and market "bottom". As soon as we had mailed out DIPLOMANIA #28, the very same problem occurred to us, only in a much broader context, and we had planned an article for this issue on the subject. However, since you have brought

the subject up now, we'll comment on it here rather than write a separate article about it.

It is our opinion that the starting price of all currencies should be set up so that any currency should be able to fall to 0/5 before all units have been sold, but not too much before. Thus, some players will always be stuck with some worthless currency. This adds another point of interest to the bourse -- if every player could get rid of all of his currency at any point in the bourse, and never have to worry about getting stuck with worthless currency before the bottom dropped out of the market, some of the fun would be gone from the game. This, of course, is our opinion -- what do the rest of you think about it?

The very possibility of the market hitting bottom before (or when) all currencies have been sold is the strongest argument yet for starting all currencies at the same price. Otherwise, some currencies would never hit bottom, and others would hit bottom too early. In the 23-player QAC Bourse, e.g., all currencies will be able to hit bottom because of the large number of players -- but some will (one already has) hit bottom much too soon, leaving a large number of players stuck with worthless "paper".

This means, of course, that the starting price should be set according to the number of Bourse players. The question is, how much of a difference should there be between market bottom and no. of players. For example, should the market start at 100 when there are 12 players, meaning that if a currency hits bottom, there will always be 400 worthless units of that currency held by one or more players? It is unfair to make the difference too great, and dangerous (in terms of fun) to make it too low (remembering that there may be dropouts before all of a given currency has been sold).

If there are dropouts, should the BM automatically lower the entire market by the proper (i.e., according to the unit buy/sell span) distance for each player who drops out, to always keep the level so that someone will eventually be stuck with worthless currency? Or should he merely set his initial market low enough to compensate for a reasonable number of dropouts?

This, we might add here, is another reason we are against the Bourse which starts out with a given amount of Dd held by each player, but no currency other than his own.))

John McCallum

(11 Feb 70)

... The formula I gave, by the way, is wrong -- the 34-18 should be inverted; but a far simpler formula, which is just as good, is:

$$S = \frac{W \cdot n}{34} \quad \text{where the symbols mean what is indicated in the letter.}$$

((Ref. to John's letter on pg. 11 of DPMA #28. --DM))

Richard Holcombe

(15 Feb 70)

There seem to be six major areas of debate concerning the Bourse. As the B.M. of PACIFIC DIPOLEUR, I would like to express my ideas and observations on them in outline form:

1. Players' participation.

A. The players participate in the Bourse in PD as:

1. We had too few non-players interested;
2. I wanted to experiment with the possibility of stimulation of interest (this could add an element of propaganda to the game).

B. Such participation requires a limitation on the sales of one's own currency in order to:

1. Reduce considerations that one might "throw the game for the Bourse";
2. Provide some handicap for the players who must have some advantage over the non-players because of correspondence.

C. While it is early to take a strong position on player participation, it should be recognized to be a different game from a non-players' Bourse.

2. Diplodollars vs. nation's currency to start.

A. (with fear and trepidation) Dd stimulate early trading as the players have nothing in the game.

- B. Dd gives the B.M. more control over trading, as additional Dd may be issued at his discretion.
- C. Dd inflates prices, as nothing need be sold early, and this could slow down later trading (although this is not much different from currency Bourses when some issues reach 0/5 or the like). In either case transfusions of additional Dd may be necessary to stimulate trading.

3. Original pricing of currencies.

- A. In a currency-starting game, even pricing (all currencies start at 100/105 in 100-unit game) is best in order to stimulate trading (note: this should be a non-players' Bourse).
- B. Handicapped (FD started Roubles 140, Piastres 130, Pounds 125, Francs 100, Marks 80, Kronen 75, and Lire 50) is better for players who can't sell their own currency (initial allotment).
- C. It would appear that in a Dd-started non-players' game that even pricing would lead to stronger early trading, but this was not the case in FD where the non-players bought mostly the less expensive currencies (Was the handicap too great? Probably.).

4. Units of exchange.

- A. Even 100's is the easiest for the B.M.
- B. 20's is OK, as each block would change the market by one point. I may introduce this into the FD Bourse to add interest, now that I've gained a bit of confidence.
- C. Odd lots, or lots less than 20 are a real headache for B.M. and participants alike (if they check B.M.'s figures). This can lead to miserable orders like "Sell all my Francs, and buy 1/2 Pounds and 1/2 Marks, as far as my money goes." This is bad enough in even 100's or 20's, but murder in units of 5 or 1. Yet, how else can the participant who wants to keep all his Dd working order when he can't be sure of the price levels?

5. Stock market vs. session.

- A. I see no advantage to either. A continuous open session is fine by me as either a participant or B.M. The best orders place price limits, and there is rarely enough unexpected trading to seriously distort anticipated prices.
- B. The FD uses the continuous open session, and refuses to reveal prices except through the 'zine. This encourages prompt orders and lightens the B.M.'s load at deadline time. In the continuous open session method, it is best to use the postmark rather than the date of receipt for order of filing orders. In the FD this is augmented by a handicap allowing for delay in receiving the 'zine due to distance. Telephone orders are handicapped an additional day.

6. Winning criterion.

- A. As Calhmer's idea on both the game and the Bourse was to award the winner only, FD intends to continue this. However,
- B. It's no big deal. Once the game is over, you, or anyone else, can figure who won by your, or their, criterion. The first 5 issues (esp. the first) are of significance in comparing results, or rating Bourse participants.

((How about you other B.M.'s -- Ed Halle and John McCallum -- responding in outline form to the major issues raised in DPMA #28. This way we can compare views and experiences to date, and maybe decide what the "best" way really is to handle a Bourse.))

#### 1. We feel game players who participate in Bourse should be allowed to sell their own currency, providing their names are not tied to their actions. In fact, we feel players should not participate in Bourse if names are tied to actions. 2. Our arguments here were set forth in DPMA 28, and augmented earlier in this issue. Suffice it to say that we, approaching it from the stand-point of a player, would not want to play in a Bourse which started with Dd instead of currency. The early decision-making forced by the players having to sell currency at the beginning in order to gain Dd's with which to operate is, in our opinion, fundamental. 3. Why do you feel "handicapped" pricing is better than even pricing when players can't

18

sell their own currency? What difference does it make whether all prices start at the same level, or whether different currencies start at different levels? If a player can't sell his own currency, he is handicapped no matter how the starting prices are set up. It is our opinion that no players should be so handicapped -- thus, either no game players should be allowed in Bourse, or those who are allowed in should not be tied by name to their actions (along with the other non-players).

4. Agree with you that 100's or 20's are easiest to handle. (And you are the only one, so far, who has given us an order like you suggested in C. -- Groan!) But, using the equations we hope to have room to print in THE EXCHANGE #7, plus solving for "amount bought" by reexpressing our formula as a quadratic equation and then solving it, amounts can be determined quite accurately. (But it is a lot of work....)

5. Continuous open session is of advantage only when we send market to players (at their request) immediately upon execution. Also like your handicapping system for postal delays -- but what happens when letter from Ohio, e.g., takes longer than letter from Calif. (which is usually the case)? And we allow no phone orders for Bourse.

6. The only significance is that knowing the end result will be judged by a Secondary Redemption System may influence the way the Bourse is played -- just as knowing that in a Regular Diplomacy Rating System, e.g., the yardstick is no. of supply centers held averaged over length of game can affect way Diplomacy game is played.)

-----

CURRENT TRADES

<u>Publisher</u>	<u>Magazine Title(S)</u>	<u>DPMA</u>	<u>DPBA</u>	<u>HPBA</u>	<u>A-AM</u>	<u>Dipl. Div.</u>	<u>1970 G.B.</u>
Boardman	GRAUSTARK	T	T	-	-	No	A
Borecki	ROHAN	T	T/B	-	-	Yes	R
Childers	HOSTIGOS/LOMOKOME/LAPUTA	T	T	T	T	No	R
Fong	BERZERKELEY BARK/FUG	T	P	T	T	Yes	R
Halle	BROBDINGNAG/AERLION	T	P/B	T	P/T	No	A
Holcombe	PACIFIC DIPLODEUR	T	T/B	-	-	Yes	R
R.Johnson	DIPLODEUR	T	P/B	T	P	Yes	R
Just	THE DIPLOMAT	T	T/B	-	P	No	A
Key	LEBOR GABALA/THE VOICE/YOBBB/ ANLARA	T	T	T	P/T	Yes	R
Kuch	LONELY MOUNTAIN	T	T	P	-	No	R
Lakofka	LIAISONS DANG./BRONTOSAURUS	T	T	T	-	Yes	R
McCallum	SERENDIP	T	T/B	-	-	No	A
McDuffie	THANGORODRIM/VERBAL CHAOS LTD	T	T	T	-	Yes	R
Menyhert	FRIGATE	T	T	-	-	No	R
Naus	ADAG/PUGET SOUND GAZETTE/BRAVE NEW WORLD/COSTA-II	T	P	P	T	Yes	R
Peery	XENOLOGIC/PEERIGOGIC-II	T	T	T	-	No	A
St.Cyr	GLORY ROAD	T	P/B	P	P	Yes	R
Schleicher	ATLANTIS	T	T	-	-	Yes	R
Tretick	LA GUERRE	T	P/B	T	-	Yes	R
Turnbull	ALBION	T	T	-	-	Yes	R
Walker	NUMENOR/UTOPIA/ZOTHIQUE/ BESEROVLA/CIRITH UNGOL	T	T	T	P/T	Yes	R

T, Trade; P, Player; B, Bourse; A, Associate Member; R, Regular Member (\$1 pd.).

Note that subs have been suspended with Cliff Olilla (INTERNATIONAL ENQUIRER), and with Scott Hankin (THE WATCHER), Marty Kirkpatrick (AWASIGPAC), Rich Rubin (MINAS MORGUL) -- we have yet to see a copy of the last three 'zines. ##### We are willing to trade DIPLOMANIA and either DIPLOPHOBLA or HYDROPHOBLA to Andy Phillips for SHAAFT, and DPMA and one games-'zine to anyone else publishing a 'zine. ##### LETHA, also still being traded with some persons, is excluded from the above list since the 'zine will cease publication with issue #10. ##### Note that we are no longer able to trade all of our 'zines with G.B. members who publish only one 'zine -- economics forbid....

-- DLM

## POSTAL DIPLOMACY GAMES COMPLETED TO DATE -- A Short Listing

## Regular

- 1963B -- Won Bruce Pelz, RUS, 1918  
 1964A -- James MacKenzie, TUR, 1911  
   B -- John Smythe, A-H, 1909  
   D -- John McCallum, A-H, 1916  
 1965A -- Charles Wells, TUR, 1912  
   B -- Conrad Von Metzke, RUS, 1914  
   C -- Jerry Pournelle, GER, 1919  
   D -- Jerry Pournelle, ITA, 1912  
   E -- John Smythe, ENG, 1911  
   F -- Charles Wells, TUR, 1914  
   G -- Derek Nelson, ENG, 1910  
   H -- John Smythe, ITA, 1911  
   I -- John Smythe, ITA, 1911  
   K -- Derek Nelson, RUS, 1913  
   L -- Drawn, Frank Clark, GER, &  
     John Koning, RUS, 1909  
   M -- Charles Wells, FRA, 1914  
   P -- Hank Reinhardt, ITA, 1922  
   Q -- D, John Koning, ENG, &  
     Terry Kuch, TUR, 1922  
   R -- Don Miller, RUS, 1913  
   S -- Don Miller, TUR, 1913  
   T -- D, Rick Brooks, RUS, &  
     Banks Mebane, TUR, 1911  
   U -- D, John McCallum, ENG, Charles  
     Reinsel, FRA, & John Smythe,  
     TUR, 1915  
   V -- D, F. Clark, ENG, T. Kuch, GER,  
     B. Mebane, ITA, Al Huff, TUR, '13  
   W -- Don Miller, FRA, 1913  
 1966A -- Jerry Pournelle, FRA, 1918  
   B -- Jerry Pournelle, TUR, 1912  
   D -- Al Huff, ENG, 1907  
   E -- Jim Latimer, ENG, 1907  
   F -- Monte Zelazny, ENG, 1913  
   H -- Jim Dygert, RUS, 1907  
   I -- D, Hal Naus, GER, & Ken  
     Davidson, TUR, 1914  
   K -- Dave Lebling, A-H, 1911  
   L -- John Koning, GER, 1919  
   M -- Jim Dygert, ENG, 1910  
   N -- Dan Barrows, FRA, ?  
   O -- D, Rod Walker, ENG, Charles  
     Turner, FRA, Larry Peery, TUR, '08  
   Q -- Michael Aita, RUS, 1915  
   R -- D, Don Berman, FRA, Chris Wag-  
     ner, TUR, Ken Levinson, RUS, '15  
   T -- George Schelz, RUS, 1913  
   W -- Karl Thompson, ENG, 1913  
   AA -- D, Jim Latimer, GER, & Rod  
     Walker, A-H, 1914  
   AB -- Mehran Thomson, GER, 1910  
   AC -- Harold Peck, ENG, 1910  
   AE -- John Smythe, TUR, 1913  
   AG -- Bud Pendergrass, TUR, 1909  
   AH -- D, Larry St. Cyr, A-H, L. Peery,  
     FRA, C. Turner, ITA, 1910  
 1966AI -- John Beshara, RUS, 1907  
   AK -- Monte Zelazny, A-H, 1913  
   AL -- D, C. Turner, ENG, R. Walker, GER,  
     C. von Metzke, TUR, D. Barrows,  
     ITA, Doug Beyerlein, RUS, '10  
   AM -- Monte Zelazny, GER, 1909  
   AO -- D, Chuck Carey, GER, Cliff Olilla,  
     TUR, L. Peery, FRA, Edi Birsan,  
     ENG, 1913  
   AQ -- Charles Reinsel, RUS, 1911  
   AS -- Jack Greene, TUR, 1911  
   AT -- Dave Lebling, A-H, 1914  
   AU -- Bud Pendergrass, GER, 1909  
   AV -- Charles Wells, GER, 1910  
   AZ -- Dave Lebling, FRA, 1910  
   BB -- Larry Peery, RUS, 1910  
   BC -- Gene Prosnitz, ENG, 1907  
   BG -- Derek Nelson, FRA, 1911  
   BI -- Tom Eller, FRA, 1910  
   BJ -- Jim Dygert, FRA, 1910  
   BK -- Paul Leitch, RUS, 1908  
 1967B -- Buddy Tretick, GER, 1911  
   E -- Monte Zelazny, ENG, 1909  
   H -- Charles Turner, RUS, 1909  
   I -- Peter Rosamilia, A-H, 1908  
   N -- Gene Prosnitz, ITA, 1909  
   P -- Gene Prosnitz, ENG, 1910  
   U -- D, Mike Miller, GER, & Frank  
     Clark, ITA, 1928  
   V -- D, G. Prosnitz, FRA, Sherry Heap,  
     TUR, D. Lebling, ENG, Hugh Ander-  
     son, A-H, M. Thomson, GER, 1912  
   W -- Rod Walker, ENG, 1911  
   Z -- D, D. Barrows, FRA, B. Pender-  
     grass, ITA, 1910  
   AA -- D. Beyerlein, RUS, 1909  
   AC -- Buddy Tretick, A-H, 1906  
   AF -- John Koning, ENG, 1915  
   AG -- Jim Munroe, ITA, 1906  
   AJ -- John Smythe, TUR, 1908  
   AK -- Tom Griffin, RUS, 1907  
   AQ -- Buddy Tretick, RUS, 1908  
   AT -- Bob Kinney, RUS, 1907  
   AU -- Hal Naus, TUR, 1907  
   AW -- Doug Beyerlein, RUS, 1907  
   BA -- Charles Reinsel, FRA, 1910  
   BC -- Norm Zinkhan, RUS, 1908  
 1968D -- George Schelz, GER, 1909  
   F -- Gene Prosnitz, RUS, 1910  
   G -- Dave Lebling, TUR, 1912  
   H -- Brad Payne, RUS, 1908  
   J -- Hugh Anderson, ENG, 1909  
   P -- Ed Halle, RUS, 1907  
   R -- Edi Birsan, A-H, 1911  
   S -- Mike Goldstein, GER, 1909  
   T -- Tom Eller, RUS, 1907  
   AC -- Edi Birsan, TUR, 1907  
   AG -- John Smythe, A-H, 1906

Regular (Cont) --

- 1968AH -- Ron Dellbringge, TUR, 1914
- AL -- Edi Birsan, A-H, 1907
- AZ -- Dave Johnston, TUR, 1910
- BB -- John Koning, A-H, 1909
- BD -- D, Bob Komada, FRA, Pete Comber, ENG, D. Berman, ITA, E. Birsab, TUR, Bill Linden, R, 09
- BY -- Edi Birsan, TUR, 1908
- CI -- Randy Bytwerk, RUS, 1909
- CK -- Gene Prosnitz, ENG, 1910
- CL -- John Beshara, TUR, 1911
- CU -- Kyle Johnson, FRA, 1906
- 1969C -- Brenton Ver Floeg, RUS, 1907

Variant Games --

- 1963Ac -- Derek Nelson, ITA, 1906
- \*1965Ga -- J. Koning (C), GER, 1905.
- Dc -- Conrad Von Metzke, A-H, 1908
- 1966Ad -- Don Berman, ITA, 1907
- Be -- Al Huff, GONDOR, 3009
- Cf -- Terry Kuch, FRA, 1914
- \* Eh -- D, D. Lebling (C), RUS, A. Huff (C), GER, 1878
- Fi -- Dave Lebling, GAILLARDIA, 1008
- \* Gj -- Al Huff (C), GER, 1874
- Ik -- Banks Mebane, MORDOR, 3004
- Km -- Dave Lebling, MORDOR, 3004
- Lk -- Al Huff, GONDOR, 3009
- Rr -- Don Miller, IROQUOIS, 1612
- Ss -- Banks Mebane, ENG, 1501
- Tt -- Al Huff, RHOVANION, TA 1907
- Ua -- Jim Latimer, A-E-R, 1908
- Vu -- Derek Nelson, A-R-T, 1908
- Wf -- George Schelz, ITA, 1911
- Xv -- Charles Turner, FRA, 1905
- Zw -- Marge Gemignani, ?, 1912

- 1966AAx -- Rick Brooks, RUS, 1912
- ABy -- Frank Clark, FRA, 1909
- ACt -- Rod Walker, HARAD, TA 1911
- ADw -- Jerry Pournelle, ?, 1912
- AEz -- Charles Turner, A-G-I, 1905
- AHAd -- Charles Welsh, PONTUS, 1001
- ANae -- D, D. Lebling, E-F-R, Mehran Thomson, A-G-T, 1922
- AOae -- Richard Uhr, A-I-T, 1907
- APaf -- J. Pournelle, ?, ?
- 1967Aaq -- Larry Kanner, RUS, 1908
- Bah -- Mike McIntyre, GER, 1904
- Cai -- Larry St. Cyr, RUS, 1908
- Daj -- Dave Lebling, MORDOR, 3003
- Er -- Don Miller, SHOSHONI, 1611
- Gc -- Jerry Pournelle, ?, ?
- Qaq -- Scott Bershig, LAKONIA, 423
- Rar -- Larry Peery, RUS, 1910
- Sar -- Derek Nelson, A-F-G, 1904
- Tas -- Hal Naus, A-F-R, 1904
- ABas -- John Smythe, A-F-R, 1903
- AJaq -- Pete Comber, MAKEDON, 424
- ANbh -- Hal Naus, CZECHO-POLSKA, 1956
- AObi -- Greg Long, SAXONY, ?
- APbj -- Jack Greene, NORMANDY, ?
- ATbq -- Jeff Key, A-H, 1909
- 1968Cbr -- D, Dick Reiter, GER, Bob Reiter, TUR, Dave Bischoff, A-H, 1909
- Ebl -- John Smythe, BARBARY-I-R, 1903
- Fbk -- Buddy Tretick, GER, 1909
- Hbm -- Chris Tretick, A-H, 1907
- If -- Steve Jent, ENG, 1909
- Kbo -- Hal Naus, YUGOSLAVIA, ?
- Nbm -- Buddy Tretick, ENG, 1908
- 1969Uv -- Joe Proskauer, ENG, 1911

\*In Team games, Team Capt. received win.

NOTE -- In the above listing, the following games were excluded:

- 1963C -- Over-the-Board Game, won F, 1914, Phil Castora, ENGLAND.
- 1964C -- Won F, 1913, by John Boardman, ?, who played two positions unknown to the other players.
- 1967F -- Drawn W, 1915, Hal Naus, ENGLAND, Dave Lebling, A-H and TURKEY.
- \*1965Aa -- Won F, 1902, Team of Derek Nelson (GER), Bob Lake (ITA), John Davey (RUS).
- 1966Aqa -- Won F, 1907, LTA Team (Jim Dygert, ENG; Brian Bailey, ITA; Clyde Johnson (GER). Need to know who was Team Capt. before can include in list.
- \*1967Ha -- Won W, 1901, via GM Declaration, by Team of Rod Walker, A-H; Stanley Pinck, FRA, & Arthur Simon, RUS.
- \*1967Lh -- Cancelled after 1902, but "officially" declared draw between Teams of Arthur Simon, ENG; Edward Meyer, FRA; Rod Walker, Rus; and Clyde Johnson, GER; Brian Bailey, A-H; Jim Dygert, TUR.
- \*1967Was -- Won W, 1902, Gene Prosnitz, A-H/FRA/RUS.

\*These games were considered to have been played for too short a time to be considered completed. Our criterion in making this choice was at least 3 game-years -- and even this might be considered too short a time.

Some persons may argue for exclusion of other games from the above list. If you think any more should be excluded, please let us know -- and state your reasons.



A RATING SYSTEM...OF SCRTS

Although we dislike Rating Systems, we feel that if there is to be any system, the Calhamer Point-Count System is the best -- and the system should be applied to all Diplomacy games played via the mail, Regular and Variant alike. Therefore, using the preceding list of completed games, we have thrown together a list of our own. Info given: Name; Point Count; (Regular P.C./Variant P.C.); Position in List.

John Smythe	9.33	(7.33/2)	1	Michael Aita	1.00	(1/-)
Dave Lebling	8.20	(4.20/4)	2	Randy Eytwerk	1.00	(1/-)
Jerry Pournelle	7.00	(4/3)	3	Scott Berschig	1.00	(-/1)
Derek Nelson	6.00	(3/3)	4	Ron Dellbringge	1.00	(1/-)
Alan Huff	5.75	(1.25/4.5)	5	Mike Goldstein	1.00	(1/-)
Gene Prosnitz	5.20	(5.20/-)	6	Tom Griffin	1.00	(1/-)
Don Miller	5.00	(3/2)	7/8	Marge Gemignani	1.00	(-/1)
Buddy Tretick	5.00	(3/2)	7/8	Ed Halle	1.00	(1/-)
John Koning	4.83	(3.83/1)	9	Kyle Johnson	1.00	(1/-)
Hal Naus	4.50	(1.5/3)	10	Dave Johnston	1.00	(1/-)
Edi Birsan	4.45	(4.45/1)	11	Steve Jent	1.00	(-/1)
Charles Wells	4.00	(4/-)	12/13	Bob Kinney	1.00	(1/-)
Monte Zelazny	4.00	(4/-)	12/13	Larry Kanner	1.00	(-/1)
Charles Turner	3.86	(1.86/2)	14	Jeff Key	1.00	(-/1)
Rod Walker	3.03	(2.03/1)	15	Paul Leitch	1.00	(1/-)
Jim Dygert	3.00	(3/-)	16/17	Greg Long	1.00	(-/1)
George Schelz	3.00	(2/1)	16/17	James MacKenzie	1.00	(1/-)
Larry Peery	2.91	(1.91/1)	18	Jim Munroe	1.00	(1/-)
Banks Mebane	2.75	(.75/1)	19	Mike McIntyre	1.00	(-/1)
Jim Latimer	2.50	(1.5/1)	20/21	Brad Payne	1.00	(1/-)
Bud Pendergrass	2.50	(2.5/-)	20/21	Harold Peck	1.00	(1/-)
Charles Reinsel	2.33	(2.33/-)	22	Bruce Pelz	1.00	(1/-)
Frank Clark	2.25	(1.25/1)	23	Joe Proskauer	1.00	(-/1)
Doug Beyerlein	2.20	(2.2/-)	24/25	Hank Reinhardt	1.00	(1/-)
Conrad Von Metzke	2.20	(1.2/1)	24/25	Pete Rosamilia	1.00	(1/-)
John Beshara	2.00	(2/-)	26/28	Karl Thompson	1.00	(1/-)
Tom Eller	2.00	(2/-)	26/28	Chris Tretick	1.00	(-/1)
Jack Greene	2.00	(1/1)	26/28	Richard Uhr	1.00	(-/1)
Terry Kuch	1.75	(.75/1)	29	Brenton Ver Floeg	1.00	(1/-)
Dan Barrows	1.70	(1.7/-)	30/31	Charles Welsh	1.00	(-/1)
Mehran Thomson	1.70	(1.25/.5)	30/31	Norm Zinkhan	1.00	(1/-)
Don Berman	1.53	(.53/1)	32			
Rick Brooks	1.50	(.5/1)	33	Ken Davidson	.50	(.5/-)
John McCallum	1.33	(.33/1)	34/35	Mike Miller	.50	(.5/-)
Larry St.Cyr	1.33	(.33/1)	34/35	Dave Bischoff	.33	(-/33)
Hugh Anderson	1.20	(1.2/-)	36/37	Ken Levinson	.33	(.33/-)
Peter Comber	1.20	(.2/1)	36/37	Bob Reiter	.33	(-/33)
				Dick Reiter	.33	(-/33)
				Chris Wagner	.33	(.33/-)
				Chuck Garey	.25	(.25/-)
				Cliff Olifla	.25	(.25/-)
				Sherry Heap	.20	(.2/-)
				Bob Komoda	.20	(.2/-)
				Bill Linden	.20	(.2/-)

Tied players are listed in alphabetical order, with Regular P.C. having precedence over Variant P.C. for each letter.

We will exclude position number from the remainder of this list.

BACK-ISSUES of Diplomacy Magazines -- Our stock of back-issues of DIPLOMANIA, DIPLOPHOBIA, FANTASIA, DIPSO MANIA, SUPERCALIFRAGILISTICEXPLALIDOCIOUS, ASTRA, LETHE, HYDROPHOBIA, AUX ARMES!, BARAD-DUR, and misc. assorted Alderson 'zines is getting very low -- if you need any back-issues, better get them while you can. There are a couple of complete runs, plus scattered individual issues. For prices, send want-list and 6¢ stamped, self-addressed envelope. --DLM

