

# GLOCKORIA

Dave Lebling  
3 Rollins Court  
Rockville, Md. 20852

Issue #4  
GAA April 19, 1967

Winter, 1601 ANOTHER GOVERNMENT TOPPLES IN MID-WEST  
MIAMIS TAKE CONTROL IN ILLINOIS  
AMERINDS PREPARE FOR LONG WAR---  
SPANISH NOTE HORSE-THIEVERY ON RISE

Winter, 1601 builds and positions at end of 1601:

MUSKHOGEAN (Nelson): Build W 114 (W's 66, 113, 114, 115)

IROQUOIS (Brooks): Build W 14, W 11 (W's 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 61)

CADDO (Latimer): Build W 109 (W's 74, 75, 109, 110)

BLACKFOOT (Gemignani): (no builds) (W's 25, 28, 33)

SHOSHONI (Miller): Build W 45, W 47 (W's 29, 30, 38, 45, 47)

DAKOTA (Hoheisel): Build W 52 (W's 23, 52, 56, 79, 80)

APACHE (Mockus): Builds W96, W 99 (W's 82, 87, 96, 97, 99)

ILLINOIS (Huff): Build W 70 (W's 54, 69, 70, 72)

DEADLINE for Spring, 1602 moves and propaganda: Saturday, May 13, 1967.

\*\*\*\*\*Note that Wayne Hoheisel is now at 1426 21st Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037 (Phone 483-3797).

Note also: Alan Huff, 7603 Wells Blvd., Adelphi, Md. 20783 (Ph. 422-3559) has replaced Mark Owings as the Confederacy of the Illinois.

Corrections: In Issue #2, the move "W Caddo (110)-Choctow (113)" attempted by the Caddo, should, of course, be underlined. Also, add "50" to the list of Dakota supply centers.

Important: As of Issue #5, I will shorten the time between deadlines to two weeks; Unless I hear any strenuous objections, in which case we will stay on the same three-week schedule. If the two-week schedule is started, I will have the magazine out the day of the deadline, and you be able to be so lax as you have been (here I name no names).

(Propaganda, by custom, is on page two)

IROQUOIS to Lesser Tribes: You are outnumbered six divisions to thirty. Surrender now and all but the Apache and Shoshoni shall have mercy.

NAVAHO: Chief Powhangitangi of the Navahos appealed to the Hopi in a statement to the press yesterday for "aid and assistance in removing the menace of the Spanish and Apaches to our national integrity."

HOPi: A hogan-to-hogan survey of public opinion in the Hopi capital: the consensus of opinion concerning Navaho chief Powhangitangi's dramatic appeal for aid was: "Tough luck, Pow, baby. They're your problem, not ours. Why should we get involved in your internal troubles?"

PIEGAN: The chief of the Blackfoot Confederacy sends greetings and wampum to the chief of the Caddo. The chief was heard in the lodges of the Sarce: "Why do the Sioux steal our buffalo? Why do they let the Santee and Sisseton burn our lodges? Why do our brothers the Shoshoni kill our friends the Crow? This we ponder in sadness and again ask why?"

LENNI LENAPE: Chief Running-chipmunk-who-trips-over-his-size-16-double E-feet, spokesman for the Delaware League, declared today that if the Iroquois continue their occupation of the northern villages and continue their "development of the barbarous pressure-flake arrowheads, it would seem to force the Delaware League to respond by abandoning the more civilized folsom-type points" and do the same.

This statement is expected to aggravate the "maize or arrow" dispute which is already dividing the council of elders.

CHEROKEE: Several Muskhogean war-parties chasing Cherokee stragglers nearly blundered into the taboo ghost-builders land. One such party reported sighting ghosts, and one warrior of the Choctaw tribe reported that a ghost had given him a stick-that-burns. The warrior, who was aware of the soul-stealing habits of the ghost-builders, promptly used the stick on the spirits from Gorrthenya, as they called their abode, but they merely laughed and told him that he could use the stick-that-burns for better things than murder. The warrior turned and ran back towards the Choctaw camp, looking back only long enough to discover that the spirits and their long house had vanished. The chief of the Choctaws declares that the medicine men cannot purge the warrior of the demons within him and asks the other tribes to beware the Gorrthenay, who live near the Mounds in a huge white lodge.

\* \* \*

## ==kriegspiels==

\*\*\*\*As you can see from the antics of the past two issues, we have not been following Boardman's sort of replacement rules. However, starting with the next issue, we will actually start following them, so no move missing, right? Your war parties will stand and gorge themselves on buffalo or deer or fish, depending on what tribe you guide, chieftains.

\*\*\*\*Well, last ish I mentioned that I would have a discussion of impregnable defenses in this issue. This prompted a letter from:

JOHN MCCALLUM, Ralston, Alberta, Canada: . . . .You intend to raise that old question of what is the smallest force that can hold out indefinitely. The answer is 4.

For it to work the western power has to be England, or a France or Germany which has previously conquered England. The eastern power has to be Turkey, Austria, or Italy, that is a power whose room for naval builds is confined to the Med. with the Black Sea included.

(cont.)

(cont.) Under those conditions

WESTERN POWER: Fleet Portugal supports fleet Mid-Atlantic  
 Fleet Mid-Atlantic holds  
 Fleet North Atlantic (or Channel or Irish Sea)  
 supports fleet Mid-Atlantic

can hold forever against anything that the east can do, although the east may control the whole of the continent. This position is very well known. (\*\*!!!\*\*\*) Calhamer has written about it several times.

You will notice that I have said 4 is the minimum that can hold out but have only shown 3 forces as necessary. The reason is that, if it is England, then the west must own the 3 English centres and also Portugal for a total of 4, although the 4th force, whatever it is, is not doing anything.

(\*\*Very interesting, and many thanks; I have not heard of this position previously, although I think I did see the tail end of a discussion of it in one of the first issues of Wild 'n Woolly (?) that I received.

(\*\*I can see, however, a way that the position can be reduced to three forces in such a way that it would be impossible for the Western Power to go back and pick it up. (No doubt this too, was discussed) In a situation where the Western Power is driving, say, an Italian fleet out of London down towards the Med. as eastern forces pick off his continental centers, it isn't too far-fetched to assume that London, or Liverpool or Edinburgh might be left in Italian (or eastern) hands "because I can pick it up next year". But disaster strikes and the westerner finds he has only three units left, but they are in the right position. He must hold on at Gibraltar, so he can't go back and pick up the fourth center. He would finish impregnable until the eastern power conquered the rest of the world, starved him out, and occupied England. All with three lousy units.

(\*\*Pretty far-fetched, but it does get the impregnable fortress figure down to three centers. \*\*)

(\*\*More on this later\*\*)

\* \* \*

ratings - 3

Anyone interested in ratings of Diplomacy players (either pro- or anti-) should be reading Broddingnag. John McCallum has published a compendium of the various systems with various other goodies. He calls the Glock system a "mean rate of growth" system, which I like very much as a descriptive name.

He also questions my method of leaving out a power's rating when it is played by a replacement player, on the grounds that in a personal rating list that is fine, but all performances by a country should count. "Just a change of government" is one way to put it. I am a very pliable soul, so I thought it over and realize that John is right. Therefore, I present the new, supercharged, revamped Mean Rate of Change rating list for the various Great Powers:

Turkey	804.3	717.8	86.5
England	423.8	353.0	70.8
Austria	69.7	-13.9	55.8
France	21.9	-38.1	60.0
Russia	89.6	-75.5	165.1
Italy	-70.2	-82.8	12.6
Germany	-54.7	-100.2	45.5

(old style) (new style) (difference)

From the table the average rating, old and new, and the difference, average can be calculated:

Old average: 183.5  
New Average: 112.6  
Average Diff.: 70.9

Which surprised me a great deal. That means that the average replacement player only lowers the average rate of change by about 7/100 of a center per game-year. Of course that's only on an average gain of 18/100 c/yr, or about a 40% drop in rate of change. Still, to one who is accustomed to thinking of replacement players as somewhat akin to the plague as far as a country's chances of victory go, that comes as a surprise. Why, with the exception of France, every country with a rating lower than the new average has won a game or at least drawn one.

Now for a composit rating: One point will be given for a first, two- for a second, etc. in any of the four up-to-date systems (Brob, Center-year, Reinsel, and Rate-of-Change). Low score wins.

--Power-- --System--

	Brob,	C-Y	Reinsel	R-C	Final Pt.
Tur	1	1	1	1	4 -1
Eng	2	2	2	2	8 -2
A-H	4	3	3	3	13 -3
Fra	3	4	5	4	16 -4
Rus	5	5	4	5	19 -5
Ita	7	7	6	6	26 -6
Ger	6	6	7	7	26 -6

The results of this are very pleasing to me: My system agrees completely with the composit except in the German-Italian tie for sixth (and they are sort of close).

The figures these are based upon are from Brob #56, except for the R-C ones, which are my own and based upon center-year charts published by John Boardman in Graustark.

It might be noted that the replacement player figures fortify the common belief that Italy is somewhat harder to destroy & Russia is somewhat easier to destroy than the other powers once the country is on its way downhill. Of course many players think Turkey has an excellent defensive position, which is not shown by the table on page three.

\*\*\*

"How do you know I am a diplomat?"

"By the skilful way you hide your claws."

---Edmond Rostand, L'Aiglon

## FORTRESSES

Impregnable defenses are not made possible, as is commonly thought, by the fact that the board has corners. There are three different factors which make construction of these defenses possible. They are: (1) Switzerland, (2) the center complex in the Balkans, and (3) the Straits of Gibraltar.

Before I discuss these three points, here are the centers of defense which they make possible.

First, the Atlantic defense: F Mid holds, F's NAT & Iri S F Mid, A Spa holds, A Por S A Spa, A Mar holds, A Bur holds, A Gas S A Mar, A Pic S A Bur, A Hol holds, A Bel S A Hol, F Den holds, A St. holds, A Fin S A St.

Fourteen centers, fourteen units. There is one condition: Germany must have been eliminated, and there must be no enemy fleets in the north. The German condition may be removed by moving A's Pic, Bel, and Hol to Ruh, Kie, and Ber, adding a F Bal, and having F Bal S A Ber. But this takes 16 centers and if a person is that close to victory, he can surely pick up the other two centers. Of course you can move in the direction of simplicity, too.

If you extend the conditions of the example (Germany destroyed, etc.) to include any power whose builds are not confined to the Mediterranean, you can drop the center count as low as three (see John McCallum's letter on P. 2) The position is: F Mid holds, F Iri S F Mid, ~~A Por S F Mid~~. I think that no elaboration is needed to convince you that this is the ultimate in defenses. ((Oops: F Por S F Mid)

Now, the Eastern defense. The position is: F Tyn holds, F's Tus & Ion S F Tyn, A Pie holds, A Ven S A Pie, A Boh holds, A Tyo S A Boh, A Gal holds, A's Vie, Bud, Rum S A Gal, F Bla S A Rum, A Arm holds. This takes 13 centers and 13 units. There are no conditions, and I think the occurrence of this position is more likely than the Atlantic position. This position can be compacted somewhat: A Tyo holds, A Tri S A Tyo, A Vie holds, A Bud S A Vie, A Rum holds, A Ser & F Bla S A Rum, A Arm holds. The A Tyo may also be withdrawn as follows: A Tri, F Tus S A Pie, F Nap S F Tyn, etc. S A Vie

The army Pie, if desired, can withdraw to Tus, supported by an A Rom. But this means a support of Ven is necessary, so you build F Adr, and you have fourteen units, 13 centers. To make it work Sev is retaken and supported by A Arm. A 14 center, 14 unit defense.

I have not been able to find a defense for either the center or the north-east, and sincerely doubt if they are possible.

I said that Switzerland, Gibraltar and the Balkans make these defenses possible. From looking at the examples I give it should be obvious why. For instance, it is obvious that any player who seal off the Straits is in a good position; Seal them off and you control the North. The same, to a lesser extent, applies to the "strait" of Piedmont, at least for the west, as the French border can be sealed without difficulty (this too is a by-product of the Swiss impassability.) As for the Balkans, there is a ten center bloc in that area where only one land province (Albania) is without a supply center. It is this ten-center, ten-province condition which enables a player to construct the necessary armies to build a defense in that "open" area. As "proof" of the necessity of the Balkans to an eastern defense, merely create a center-less band in that area by removing the centers from Greece, Serbia, and Bulgaria. Then try to build a "fortress". It will become apparent that although you can remove as many as eleven centers from the Atlantic defense (or as few as seven), two is the upper limit in the east.

(cont.) Now comes the rub: What should a gamesmaster rule in the case of an impenetrable defense of 17 centers being set up (it can be done, as I will illustrate). The 17 center position is the same as the first eastern one I gave with the following changes: FBlA is in Sev, supported by A Arm, and the Med. is bottled up as follows: A Por holds, A Spa holds: F's Wes and Lyo S A Spa, F NAF hold. The support of Piedmont with Venice is not even needed. Again, the position can be voluntarily reduced to 16 centers by withdrawing F Sev to the Bla, supporting it with it A Rum, etc.

What I ask is this: Is a "victory" really a victory when there is an impenetrable defense on the board? I would assume that every gamesmaster around would answer yes. I also assume that this same question was brought up when the "fortress" question was first brought up. But I do think it is an interesting subject for discussion.

(Incidentally, the position above would be a draw: The player opposing the fortress described merely puts himself into the following position: A Mos holds, A St. S A Mos, A War holds, A Pru S A War, A Sil h, A Ber S A Sil, A Mun holds, A Kie S A Mun, A Mar h, A's Bur & Gas S A Mar, A Bre S A Gas, E Mid h, F's Eng, Iri, and Nat S F Mid. This position is as impenetrable as the eastern one. Well, happy fortresses.

Address Label Code: A: you are in GAA, B: you are on the tentative roster for GBB, T: we trade, S: you subscribe, you lucky dog, C: complimentary copy or sample copy, ?: this after anything means I'm not sure about it, RSVP.

GLOCKORLA #4

Dave Lebling  
3 Rollins Court  
Rockville, Md. 20852

Charles Wells (T?)  
3678 Lindholm Rd.  
Cleveland, Ohio 44120

