



Hobsley Archives was originally a periodic listing of the Diplomacy archives of Walter Buchanan, R.R. 3, Lebanon, Indiana 46052, telephone (317) 482-2824; Archives Director, IAD, and V.P./Treas., International Diplomacy Association. It is now primarily a Diplomacy gazette devoted to articles on good play, demonstration games such as The Grudge Game (1971BC) now in progress, rating systems and game news. Information from the archives is vital for all this and is available to the public as well. Although the archives is virtually complete in at least xerox form, missing undamaged originals are solicited, either for purchase or a loan to permit xeroxing. (See the last archive listing in Hobsley Archives #53 for times needed.) Many original spares are now available from the archives; more are solicited so as to make them available to others. A subscription to Hobsley Archives is 13/\$2.00 or 7/\$1.00; back issues are available for 15¢ apiece (25% discount for all available). Ask for #73 to get a list of all articles through #74. This is Albatross Press publication #84.

INTO THE ARCHIVES NO. 36

GAMES & RATING SYSTEM MAKE

by Walt Buchanan

Included in this issue of Hobsley Archives you will find a completely updated and revised Cadhamer Point Count Rating List. I have finally had the time to go back, check, and compile all past game records and in honor of the occasion I have decided to become more selective in the games rated.

During the past year many old rating systems have been updated and new ones devised. All of them have their strong and weak points as pointed out in Doug Beyerlein's "A Comparison of Rating Systems" published in Hobsley Archives #74. Rod Walker will also give his views on the different rating systems in an article to be published in the near future.

My purpose here, however, is not to review the different rating systems. All of them have their good and bad points and since the perfect rating system is yet to be devised, I think a study of all of them has merit to the player that wants to try to gauge the caliber of his opponents.

Instead, my purpose in this article is to review the quality of games rated and to try and determine which should be included in any postal rating system. In order to do this, I will start with the hypothesis that for any rating system to be meaningful, the games in it should have a "certain quality." I feel that they should conform to a given standard and if any game doesn't reasonably meet this standard, it should be excluded. Otherwise, a player's score in any rating system will include certain variables that on its face are impossible to determine and the rating will therefore have less value than it could. Additionally, I feel that a collateral goal of any rating system should be to try to promote quality play, as this can only benefit the hobby. Also, standardization is important.

With the above objectives in mind, I propose the following criteria to use in deciding on which games should be rated. (These criteria are used in the following CPCRL.) If anyone disagrees with my criteria, I would of course welcome their comments. I realize that some people will be unhappy if a game they have won is disqualified due to the following criteria, and to then I can only apologize in advance. However, I feel that the main function of a rating system is not to please the player rated, but to impart the most information possible to his opponents. (Of course, it can't be denied that recognition is a key factor in rating systems in general, and contrary to some, I see nothing wrong in a player being motivated by the ratings and playing because of them. After all, to most chess masters the world over, the ratings are everything. As Paul Morphy once said, "I play for honor, not wealth.")

Also, I would like to say that I could very well be in error as to the importance of some of the criteria below. I would welcome the Postal Diplomacy Rating Commission taking a stand on any of these criteria, and if it decides against any of them, I will be happy to acquiesce.

will lead to the score in mind. I now propose to proceed to the heart of this article, the following criteria for rating postal Diplomacy games:

(1) "Only games that are played in accordance with the rules as set forth in the GRI rulebook which was in effect at the start of the game will be rated." This means that no "variant" rules will be allowed or rules that expressly contradict the rulebook. (I do not apply to differing rule interpretations as long as these interpretations are reasonable. I feel that this criterion is the most important of all because without it, variations may be introduced into the game that will effect the outcome and, therefore, the player's scores in ways that the score itself won't show.

(2) "Only 7-player games will be rated." Not much explanation is needed here. Games with fewer players obviously increase the mathematical odds of any one player winning. Of course weighted scores could be used, but still, the game is different and different skills may be needed to win the game. I feel any rating system should try to measure that "certain quality" as clearly as possible and, therefore, the more we can narrow that "certain quality" the better off we are.

(3) "Only 'postal' games will be rated." At first blush this seems obvious since we are dealing with postal games. However, the term "postal" requires some definition. Rules have run the gamut here from any game with a published record to only games in which everything takes place by mail. While I favor the latter strict view of postal games since there we are measuring purely postal skills, it is not a practical criterion. Players can and do negotiate by phone and there is no way of checking this. Therefore, I would define a postal game as any game that is substantially so. Of course this means that a game must be conducted by mail. However, I also feel that this excludes "local games," i.e., games where the players may negotiate without resorting to long distance phone calls. It seems to me that phone negotiation may require different skills than postal negotiation. A player may be a fine talker, but a lousy writer! Of course in any postal game, a player may resort to a long distance call, but due to the expense involved, this will be the exception rather than the rule. The game will therefore still be "substantially" a postal one.

(4) "Only games with an independent Gamesmaster will be rated." Although some people have claimed to have established foolproof systems whereby one player can GM at the same time without cheating, these systems have one key flaw. Every player must communicate with the player-GM for each move. This alone gives the player-GM a tremendous advantage since communication is at the heart of the game. Practice bears the above proposition out, too, since in virtually every game in which the GM was a player, he finished first or second.

(5) "Games in which gross GM or player irregularities occur will not be rated." Well, this is the catch-all rule if there ever was one and it requires a lot of discretion on the rater's part. Some of the things that I would consider would be and are:

(a) A player plays 2 erasore positions, all but one under a fake name. This has already occurred once with the famous "Eric Black Bear."

(b) A player has a "friend" play the majority of the game for him, and when victory is assured, steps in to claim it.

(c) A GM arbitrarily throws out and replaces a player even though the player in question has not violated the GM's house rules.

(d) The GM continually makes gross errors in move adjudications and this has a substantial effect on the outcome of the game. (I feel that this rule should be liberally construed since the players themselves are obviously innocent of any wrongdoing.)

To sum up, basically in the above, we are looking for things that so alter the course of the game that the score itself is meaningless. Of course, this doesn't outlaw player deception "among themselves" as this is part of the game. What I am looking for are player or GM practices that are grossly unconscionable even within the spirit of the rulebook.

(6) "When a player is replaced in a game, the replacement that finishes the game will have his performance rated only if he has played for 3 full game years." This, of course, is the most arbitrary rule of all and is only used since it seems to have become accepted by past practice. I feel that some improvement will have to eventually be made on this, however, since some players may make a practice of this method of play. The result is that their score probably has different meaning than it would if they played a reasonable amount of games as an original player, i.e., the skills necessary as an original player to win may be different than as a replacement when the pattern of the game is already set. We can't eliminate replacement scores entirely, however, due to balancing interests. Due to the high

disappear into the postal game. replacements are necessary and so their performance should be evaluated in some degree, if nothing else than in order to get people to play so that the game may continue in a reasonable fashion.

Well, the above are the criteria used in the following CRRL. I will be very interested in any comments any of you out there may have.

CALHAHER POINT COUNT RATING LIST (201)

Country	W	T	3D	4D	5D	6D	Total
Russia	37	4	2	2	3	1	40.933
Turkey	31	4	6	2	6	1	36.867
England	29	2	4	3	7	1	33.650
France	23	1	5	2	5	1	26.633
Austria	24	1	2	0	3	1	25.933
Italy	16	1	1	3	6	0	18.784
Germany	14	3	1	4	5	1	18.000
Total	175	8	7	4	7	1	201

8.617	Edi Birsan	2,200	George Schels	1,000 (cont.)
8.333	John Smythe		Mehran Thomson	Paul Leitch
6.567	Andy Phillips	2,000	Jeff Power	Dave Lindsay
6.200	Doug Deyerleis		Brenton Van Ploeg	James MacKenzie
	Gene Prosnitz	1,750	Frank Clark	David May
			Banks Mebane	Richard Miller
5.200	John Beshara			Jim Monroe
5.067	Charles Turner	1,700	Dan Barrows	Eric Nielsen
		1,533	Don Berman	Sam Nierenberg
5.000	Thomas Eller			Brad Payne
	Hal Naus	1,500	Rick Brooks	Harold Peck
			Bob Johnson	Bruce Felz
4.200	Dave Lebling		James Laitman	Hank Reinhardt
4.167	Mike Goldstein	1,333	Len Lakofka	Tom Rosenbaum
				Bob Rosenfeld
4.000	John Koning	1,250	Ed Halle	Rich Rubin
	Jerry Pournelle		Allan Huff	Chris Schleicher
	Charles Wells		Charles Welsh	John Shuteck
	Monte Zelazny	1,200	Hugh Anderson	Bob Strayer
3.900	Bob Pournelle	1,000	Peter Ansoff	Russell Tulp
			Steve Bokker	Arnold Wags
3.367	Rod Walker		Ken Borecki	Bob Ward
3.333	Lewis Pulsipher		Peggy Bowers	Colin Watson
			Walt Buchanan	Jeff Wolfe
3.150	Larry St. Cyr		Lee Childs	Norman Zirkhan
3.000	Randy Bytwerk		Ren Dellbringge	.750 Terry Kush
	James Dygert		Jack Flemming	.600 Jerry White
	Don Miller		Margaret Gemignani	.500 Ken Davidson
	Derek Nelson		George Grayson	.333 Henry Krigsman
	Buddy Tretick		Thomas Griffin	Ken Levinson
2.950	Conrad von Metzke		Jack Greene	Robert Nudelman
2.917	Larry Peery		Glen Hertz	Jim Pratt
			George Inzer	Joseph Proskauer
2.533	John McCallum		Gary Jones	Ken Valentine
2.500	Bud Pendergrass		Robert Katzive	Chris Wagner
			Jeff Key	
2.450	Dave Johnston		Bob Kinney	.250 Chuck Carey
2.333	Charles Reinsel		Kurt Krey	Russ Jones
				Cliff Ollila

1000 Edith Blyden
 Sid Solomon
 O. L. De Witt
 Bruce Clardy

1000 George Neap
 Chery Neap
 Ted Holcombe
 Eric Just

1000 Oktan Oztunali
 Sid Witt
 167 Bruce Say

The Boardman Numbers for the games rated above are as follows:

- 1963: 6
 1964: A, B, D
 1965: A-I, K-H, P-W
 1966: A-F, H-I, K-O, R, T, S-AC, AY, AG-AI, AK-AH, AO, AQ, AS-AV, AG, BB-BD, CC, EE-EG, HW-IO
 1967: B, E, H, N-E, TW, Y-AG, AP-AH, AJ-AL, AO-AU, AW, AB-BC
 1968: C-F, B-T, V-S, AC, AE, AG-AL, AM-AO, AV, AX-BC, ES-BU, BY-DB, CD, CF, CH-CT, EK, OM, OP, OW
 1969: G, B-H, K-M, R-U, X-Z, AC, AF, AZ-BA, BC, BG, BI, BK, BO, BX-CB, CE, CK-CL
 1970: A, B, C, K-H, I, J, L, M, N, O, P, Q, R, S, T, U, V, W, X, Y, Z

NOTE: As you may have noticed from the above, I have switched back to the familiar point count system in recording results. As always, a win counts as one point and a multiple draw its respective fraction of a point thereof. Also, since the above was typed, I have discovered that 1965 W, E, F, & K used the variant "Spring Raid" and should therefore not be counted. This will be remedied next time along with any other games that I find don't meet my listed criteria. That is, unless any of you can talk me out of any of them. Maybe we can get the Postal Diplomacy Rating Commission spurred into action yet!

THE CPCRL BY COUNTRY

When Allan Cuthamer was here during his visit last month, one of the subjects discussed was Diplomacy rating systems. As curator of the Cuthamer Point Count Rating List, I was pleased to hear that Allan still feels that the point count system is the best rating system, at least for this early period in the history of postal play. Allan also suggested that it might be interesting to apply the point count system to the individual countries and see how the different players fared. In this way, if a player prefers or happens to get one of the central powers in many games, his performance will only be compared against other players who have played the same country. Although I happen to believe that the central powers (especially Italy and Austria) are underrated, it is fairly obvious that there is some inherent difference in strength among the different countries. Therefore, if the players are listed as to their performance by country, we may get a better idea of their relative strength. Under this system, the player who makes up a large number of draws with say, Russia, won't have an advantage over the other players that don't get Russia often and still do well. On the other hand, a player that is particularly skilled at playing Russia will have his achievement even more emphasized, and only against other players as Russia. So as we hear, Conrad, if you ever win with Austria, your achievement will not go unnoticed! Since it would take too much space to give the CPCRL for all countries in a single issue, I will take them one at a time over several issues.

AUSTRIA

3,000	Edi Blazan	1,000	Rick Brooks	500	Red Walker
2,000	Daug Beyerslein		John Kaufing	333	Leslie Palstipher
	Dave Lebling		John McCallum		
	Andy Phillips		Hal Naus	200	Hugh Anderson
	Peter Rosamilla		Sam Nierenberg		John Goshava
	John Smythe		Euddy Trelick		Oktay Oztunali
1,500	Larry St. Cyr		Charles Turner		
1,000	Steve Sicker		Arnold Vagts		
			Monte Zelazny		