

NOE

Another

Mosier

ABCDEFGHIJKL



ABCVA

by  
Constance

Hoosier 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, Postal Diplomacy Congress, 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 Multiple Winners Invitational (1972CR) 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 archives listing in Hoosier Archives #53 for zines needed.) Many original spares are now available from the archives; more are solicited so as to make them available to others. A subscription to Hoosier Archives is 13/\$2.00 or 6/\$1.00; back issues are 15¢ apiece (20% discount for all available). Ask for #87 to get a list of all articles through #90. This is Albacross Press publication #105.

OUT OF THE ARCHIVES NO. 26

Len Lakofka has been our main contributor of original articles lately, but recently I came across an old article of his that was too good to pass up. The article was published in the November 1970 issue of Spartan International Monthly and is reprinted here with the permission of SICL.

THE BELGIAN SECTOR  
by Lenard Lakofka

In the play of live or play-by-mail Diplomacy, certain patterns of play repeat themselves over and over. The two most common patterns to be seen involve the initial alliance structure of countries in the Belgian and Balkan "sectors" of the Diplomacy map. A "sector" is an area of the map where intense fighting among players usually occurs. I would like to make a detailed analysis of the six sectors and their inter-relations in a series of three articles.

The Belgian Sector (all the provinces adjacent to Belgium) is one of the two classic areas where conflict begins early. The reason for this is many-faceted. Briefly, each country possesses a normal sphere of influence. This is an area that he can develop into without running into too much military or diplomatic pressure. This is the area that he expects to gain his first build(s) from without being contested. In the Belgian Sector, the countries of England, France and Germany have the following spheres of influence. England: North Sea (Nth), Norwegian Sea (Nwg), North Atlantic Ocean (Nao), and Norway (Nwy) where no major contention will occur. The Irish Sea is a border-line case. The English Channel, Skaggorak, Helgoland and Barents are all areas where immediate contention will occur. France: Iberia and surrounding waters. The Western Mediterranean is a sore bone of contention with Italy and of course the Channel with England. Note Belgium is again in line with normal French development. Germany: Denmark, Holland, and that's about all she can move to without making someone uneasy. Helgoland looks like a threat on England, Baltic like a potential attack on Sweden or Russia herself, and then there's Belgium... Note that France and Germany have an additional problem in that they can not move freely in their own countries without causing a little friction. Germany gets upset over pieces in Burgundy, Italy gets distraught over fleets in Marseilles, and Russia has cat fits over pieces in Prussia or Silesia.

Thus, the province of Belgium is right in the center of things. England wants it so as to gain two quick builds, hopefully without having to fight for it. France or Germany may be willing to cede it to her for her cooperation later. Any other province in the area will very likely mean total war with some other power. Germany wants Belgium so as to secure the lowlands. This makes her less easily attacked by England from the sea and gives her an important wedge to use versus Burgundy in case war with France ever begins. France wants Belgium because it presses directly on Burgundy. She may give it to an ally to take by fleet capture (since a fleet can't move or lend support inland) so as to keep peace, but it is always a reluctant gift. Note that Burgundy is the hinge-pin to land attack of France. It im-

pinges on the two key areas of France and will cause great defensive problems if it falls to a hostile power. Imagine what would happen if an enemy piece does move to Burgundy. The French player must defend Paris, Marseilles and Gascony. Were Gascony to fall his problems are compounded ten-fold--it impinges on Paris, Brest, Spain, and Marseilles! But I digress.

Thus, we see that each country desires to own Belgium. Not only for the build it will supply, but also for the tactical-diplomatic position it gives its possessor. There is, of course, another very important reason why the Belgian sector ignites, other than possession of Belgium itself. To not have a fight here, i.e., a three-player alliance, will produce many problems.

France would have to attack Italy, Germany would have to take on Austria or Russia, or attack Italy--the hard way, and England could only attack Russia in the north. As soon as such attacks would be made, the balance of power would be thrown into chaos! Cooperation between even two of the powers is greatly impeded by the fact that they soon find themselves tripping all over each other. Each of the powers must, more or less single handed, attack another of the great powers.

Therefore, we find that the most equitable solution is for two of these powers to ally versus the third. This is why I say these countries are involved in two classic patterns in Diplomacy. (The other being the inevitable fight among Russia, Austria, and Turkey in the Balkan Sector.)

Now let us analyze the three possible alliances. The best alliance is probably the German-English one. The reasons for this are: independent building capability--England builds almost all fleets while Germany builds almost all armies, (thus, neither is in a position to "stab" the other), great mobility--areas of cooperation are present not only against France but also against Russia, greater development possibility--they can cooperate directly by giving supports for each other's attacks, as opposed to having to attack an enemy from two sides, and lastly, each country can ally with another player without interfering with his primary alliance with the other. England and Italy can ally vs France as can England and Turkey vs Russia, while Germany can ally with Austria vs Russia, or with Italy or Turkey vs Austria and neither gets in the other's way. Let me make a note here. The alliance is good in that a "stab" can not be driven home because Germany can't penetrate the seas easily, but England can't penetrate inland easily. Thus, if they stab, they can only make minor progress. However, the fact that they must telegraph their punch, England building armies, and Germany building fleets, plus the fact that they can't really make deep independent inroads into that enemy makes a stab difficult.

For France and Germany to ally, the problem is one of builds. One or the other or both must build more fleets than normal. Thus, if he gets stabbed, his defenses have been greatly compromised. His development, his mobility and his cooperation capability are all as good as the English-German alliance. Now, by assigning values to alliance characteristics we find that the French-German alliance is better yet this estimate reflects a perfect alliance in which "stabs" will not occur.

For England and France to ally would seem to be as viable an alliance as the English-German. However, the situation is different. England and France can cooperate effectively only versus Germany. Other factors are good but builds are slightly inhibited.

Now let us add the final facet in this analysis, namely the other powers. If we see that one of these three alliances will form more often than not, what would you do if you were the odd man in the sector? Cry? Well...your best approach is obviously other alliances. To throw up your hands in despair is the mark of the very poor Diplomacy player.

As England you can call on either Italy or Russia to form mutual aggression treaties vs France and Germany respectively. As Germany, seek mutual aggression treaties with Italy and Russia. As France, you should consider crying! France will be hard-pressed to call on Russia vs Germany, and Russia does not want to fight both Germany and England in Scandinavia because she will lose. Italy can't really help you because you would have to allow Italian fleets into the MAO (Mid-Atlantic Ocean) or somehow Austria has to be persuaded to allow Italy to move to Tyrolia. Austria will not be too fond of that possibility. As for Austrian aid, the problem is that Austria would have to turn away from the Balkan sector and she would have to move to Tyrolia herself. Italy would not be fond of that. Yet France can get help because the other powers would be fools to allow Germany and England to gobble up France and then come after them.

## VISIT TO THE ARCHIVES NO. 11

Although we have had several visitors lately, the visit of Len Lakofka last weekend was an especially significant event. It was the first working visit to the archives ever! Len has designed a new rating system (called the Rogues' Gallery) and he needed completed game result data from the archives. We were delighted to accommodate him as that is one of the reasons for the archives being here. (Remember that you all and come on out!)

Anyway, we had a nice visit with Len in between his groanings with copying all that data! I didn't envy his task due to all the detail he needed. The results should be quite fascinating, however, as in Len's new system such factors as strength of place or draw and length of time as a replacement will determine the final score. This is quite a step forward in analysis from present day rating systems. I just hope Len is up to all the work required to maintain this system. As I told him, I didn't pick the Calhamer Point Count Rating List to maintain for nothing!

In any case, Len lugged a lot of data home, over 200 sheets worth. He even left Carol a box of candy. I'm beginning to think our recent visitors are trying to subvert the Diplomacy Widows' movement!

### THE CALHAMER POINT COUNT RATING LIST BY COUNTRY

#### England

3.000 Gene Prosnitz	1.000 James Dygert	.533 Andy Phillips
2.000 Mike Goldstein	Tom Eller	.500 Peter Rosamilia
Len Lakofka	Allan Huff	.450 Edi Birsan
Brenton Ver Ploeg	Dave Johnston	.400 Charles Turner
1.500 John Koning	Richard Miller	.333 Henry Krigsman
1.333 John McCallum	Derek Nelson	Jerry Pournelle
Rod Walker	Harold Peck	Joseph Proskauer
1.000 Hugh Anderson	Larry Peery	.250 Charles Welsh
John Beshara	Jeff Power	.200 Dave Lebling
Doug Beyerlein	John Saythe	Jerry White
Randy Bytwerk	Charles Wells	
Lee Childs	Jeff Wolfe	
	Monte Zelazny	

### ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. **IDA 1972 GENERAL ELECTIONS.** The latest issue of the official newsletter of the International Diplomacy Association, Diplomacy Review #3, has just come out announcing the annual elections of IDA. Most of the organization's officers will be up for election this time including President, Editor, and all Regional and At-Large Secretaries, and nominations are due in the hands of the President, Larry Peery (Box 8412, San Diego, Cal. 92102) and the Editor, John Boyer (117 Garland Dr., Carlisle, Pa. 17013) by 10 November 1972. If you would like to join and participate in these nominations and the subsequent election, send \$1.00 to me, the Vice-President/Treasurer. Make your cheque out to "International Diplomacy Association."

2. **BIG BROTHER.** Charles Reinsel (PO Box 8342, San Diego, Cal. 92102) has filled one game in his "World Series" and has 6 games to go to fill the preliminary round. Send a \$7 game fee to Charles if you would like to participate in the most professionally run games in the hobby. Big Brother has run for over 100 issues and completed a dozen games without missing a 2-week deadline, and the adjudication errors have been so rare as to be almost nonexistent. For a serious player who only wants a prompt, well-run game, I recommend this highly.

3. **THE SILMARILLI.** Believe it or not, Chic Hilliker (3312 Stoneycrest, Bloomington, Ind. 47401) has started Indiana's second Diplomacy zine! Chic is off to a roaring start, too, what with sending out the first issue to over 250 players, an all-time record I do believe. An introductory sub is 5/50¢ and game fees are \$4 with many chances for a refund. Judging from the first issues, this zine should be a real comer. But what was that crack about the "unfortunate state of Indiana," Chic?! I get enough static from Carol about what she falsely calls the "Swampland of the Midwest." Just because she came from a desert state....!

ROGUES' GALLERY MAGAZINE POLL

The Rogues' Gallery Magazine Poll will be a bi-annual survey that will be taken two months before the updating of the Rogues' Gallery rating system. Both shall appear in Liaisons Dangereuses and other magazines that participate in the survey and/or wish to reproduce the results.

There are four categories to rate each magazine/gamesmaster. These are: (1) Quality of reproduction, (2) Quality of gamesmastering (lack of GM errors, rulings, etc.), (3) Interest (features, ratings, articles, etc.), and (4) Overall (general impression of the zine).

Below list those magazines in which you are playing, subscribing to, or have seen within the last 3 months. List no magazine which you have not seen recently. You may list as many zines as you choose. Five is the high rating in a category, one is low. Send your ballot to Lenard Lakofka, 4970 N. Marine Drive, Apt. 525, Chicago, Ill. 60640. Ballots are due by January 15, 1973.

<u>Magazine</u>	<u>Publisher</u>	<u>Reproduction</u>	<u>Games-</u> <u>mastering</u>	<u>Interest</u>	<u>Overall</u>
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____