

# IMPASSABLE

Issue #40, September 22, 1974

Chapel Hill Publications

Circulation: 110

Impassable is a journal of postal Diplomacy published and edited by John Boyer 117 Garland Drive, Carlisle, PA 17013. Phone: (717) 249-1343, between 9 and 10:30 p.m., E.D.S.T., on weeknights. Subscription rate to Impassable is 12/\$2.00. A shorter sub at 6/\$1 is available for new bloods. This zine is a subsidiary of Chapel Hill Publications founded in March of 1972.

-----  
Diplomacy is a registered trademark for a game invented by Allan B. Calhamer and copyright by Games Research, Inc., 500 Harrison Ave., Boston, MA 02118.  
-----

## GAME OPENINGS!

We are still working on the final set-up for our second round of games. Next issue should include all the information needed about our new game openings and please wait until then to write or ask about them!

We can tell you now, however, that we have decided on starting a mixture of games: 3 for newbloods/novices, and 2 for experienced players besides the two championship games.

A final note is that we do need your written desire to play in the championship games! If I don't forget, another brief form for indicating a desire to play in either game will be included in this issue. I should add that everyone not a subscriber and whose game has ended will no longer receive this gamezine and that if you want to be remembered as wanting to play in either of our two championship games, then you have to send us your written desire with your address. This will make it much easier for us to keep track of those who are eligible and are willing to enter or play in the game(s).

Do not think that you are not eligible! Anyone is eligible regardless of your finish! If no one above you wanted to play, then I go down the list to find my players.

So far, the following are the only ones who have indicated desire to enter: McKeon, Osmanson, St. Johns, and Blank. Your game need not be finished as I would like to know now who will play if they're eligible!!

We are going to use a different system for gamefees and subscriptions than we have  
(cont. pg. 2, col. 2)

## ZINE REVIEW

There's a small stack of zines this time and so let's zip through them all this time! 1901 AND ALL THAT..., Mick Bullock, 14 Nursery Avenue, Halifax, Yorkshire HX3 5SZ, England. Mimeo. Issue #32 is typical quality of a British publisher--strangely enough, they are more alike than American-Canadian zines! Surface sub is 6/1 \$ in their currency. I trade with him because he's good.

CLAW & FANG, #38. Don Horton, 16 Jordan Ct., Sacramento, CA 95826. Ditto. Sub is 10/\$2. Is in need of standbys--must sub or trade.

One of the few prompt publishers in the hobby. BINARY, #1. Harry Riley, 144 Lafayette Ave., Trenton, NJ 08910. Computer Printout. This is a new one! Has an associate GM in Francis

McIlvaine who knows the game. Sub is 6/\$1 or \$3/year. Has openings in regular dippy to be gmd by McIlvaine. Send the \$2 GF and your continuing sub to Francis McIlvaine, 144 Sackett Rd., Apt. 6, Aron, NY 14414 and to Harry Riley, respectively. Should be an interesting format to be on a printout form! THE MASTER MACHIAVELLIAN, #1. The Master Machiavellian, 238 N. Bowling Green Way, Los Angeles, CA 90049. Ditto. A new one, this is being run by a group of people, hence their "corporate" name. Sub is 12/\$2.50 or 24/\$4.50. GF is \$1.00 plus sub. There are three types of schedules: four-season dippy (springmoves/spring retreats-summer moves/summer retreats-fall moves/fall retreats-winter moves/winter retreats-builds), Yearly dippy (yearly moves/winter retreats-builds) and regular dippy. The two are really variants, so specify which you're entering.

BLOOD & IRON, #39. Lew Rulsipher, Box 1021 Graduate Center, Duke University, Durham, NC 27706. Mimeo. Sub is 10/\$1 in twos or 6/\$1, none past issue 50. You can get B&I either two issues at a time or singly. No openings, but has interesting reading on science fiction games.

EREWON, #80. Rod Walker, 4069 Jackdaw St., San Diego, CA 92103. Sub is 10/\$1 (for zine publishers!) otherwise, subs are 6/\$1. No openings. Ditto. #80 means just that though it was broken for about a year during 1973. Witty, urbane, talented, etc. are the good words you can say about this one, as for the  
(cont. pg. 2, col. 2)

## NEWS OF THE HOBBY

Well, it has been confirmed that Conrad von Metzke will remain as the Boardman Numbers Custodian with assistance from Rod Walker (Both live in San Diego, and Rod has had experience in the past as Boardman Numbers Man). As for the Miller Numbers, Burt Labelle has turned the job over to Robert Sacks, 15-F Tang Hall, 550 Memorial Dr., Cambridge, MA 02139. If you're starting a new variant game, let him know about it!

Greg Warden, 804 S. 48th St., Philadelphia, PA 19143, has returned from his annual expedition to Italy. I wonder what he dug up this time! (He's studying to be a professional fossil-bone digger, or otherwise known as an arkeologist) Welcome back to the USA Greg! He also happens to be the head man of the Orphan Games Project, so send him requests for games you want to finish out! You'll get paid by the IDA for helping out.

Diplomacy World, a controversy since its birth is going to be bought out by Games Research, Inc. come next January. Walt will remain as the editor for GRI. We don't know if the basic format will change much, but it is being planned to go quarterly! Why do the best things have to become rarer?!

The results of the Seventh Beyerlein Player Poll will be printed elsewhere, but it is noticeable that only one ballot was received from Impassable readers! Shame on you guys! Where were you when Doug needed your help? Nevertheless, enough people thought enough of me to vote for me and put me in the unenviable position of second board. I don't deserve it, guys! How can I? I'm a nice respectable person who plays like one. I'm not like Birsan, Rocamora, Buchanan, Beshara, etc. The only thing you could say is that my last name begins with a "b", but not important, is it? Well, at least the poll was accurate enough to put Micheal Rocamora where he belongs: on top of the heap--that is, until the "reaction" sets in!

The Annual Elections for International Diplomacy Association is just coming around the corner (by the way, I gotta do that next week!) and the following positions are up for grabs: President (ever since the Nixon fiasco it appears no one wants to be President anymore.), Ombudsman (a special election to fill out the term since the appointed replacement, Doug Beyerlein, will not be able to continue and won't run for that office. Anyone interested?), Editor (This position is now up in the Council for a salary and the current bid is for \$200.00! Anybody wants to make some

(cont. pg. 7, col. 1)

## GAME OPENINGS, CONT.

before. That is, we are asking those who have asked us for gamefees to sub to this zine for further information. This is to make it easier for us to handle requests to enter games.

Most of the newbloods have subscribed with the intention to enter a game when they open. We will provide a form next issue to convert the remaining sub towards the gamefee--a simple math problem. Then, they add what needs to be added to get what they want.

Two gamefees will be available for all games: one gamefee to cover your time in the game, i.e., until you drop-out or are knocked-out, and the other gamefee to cover the entire life of the game unless you drop out of the game.

For those with a sub, it will be a simple matter to convert their subs. For others who may be receiving their last issue of Impassable and perhaps want to play in our experienced games, then you should subscribe to keep up with the news.

Sorry, but that's the way it is. It has been a great time gamesmastering for those of you who have finished their games, and I hope some of you will return in a second game. Peace!

## ZINE SCENE, CONT.

bad words, you can name all those obscene ones you have ever heard of and he'll come up with new ones. A weirdly wrought zine, I wonder what God will come up with next? Not recommended for adults under 18. Ditto. MIXUMAXU GAZETTE, Quantity #24. Robert Lipton Box 360, Lafayette College, Easton, PA 18042. Mimec. Sub is 5/\$. This is another witty, urbane publication except that it is on the opposite side of the railroad tracks as the one just mentioned above. Some good press included along with Lipton's honest reviews of the hobby. Not recommended for children over 18.

COMMAND POST, #10. John Mirassou, Rt. 2, Box 623AC, Morgan Hill, CA 95037. ditto. Sub is 6/\$1.10. Openings in regular dippy at GF of \$1.00 plus sub. Another one from California this one is!

BOAST, #52. Herb Barents, 1142 S. 96th Ave., Zeeland, MI 49464. Ditto. Sub is \$2.75/year. Another prompt publisher. Makes money on the side as a seller of wargames. Ask him for those he has on hand (SPI products mostly) and his low, low prices! Nice guy.

(cont. pg. 6, col. 1)

1970BJ, Autumn & Winter 1912

ITALY'S PEACE PROPOSAL FALLS THROUGH BOTH WAYS

Autumn 1912: Austria R A Tyr-Boh; England R F Lon-Nth; Italy R F Tri-Adr

Winter 1912:

AUSTRIA(Beyerlein): B A Vie, will be 1 short  
ENGLAND(Keller): R F Bel  
GERMANY(Mahler): B A Kie  
ITALY(Phillips): SP  
RUSSIA(Kelly): SP

Votes on Draw and Armistice both defeated by Austria.

SPRING 1913 orders due Friday, October 11, 1974 at noon, E.D.S.T.

Winter 1912 Positions:

Austria: A Boh, A Tri, A Bud, A Bul, A Gre, A Ser, A Mos, A Sev, A Sil, A Vie (10); Eng-land: F Nth (1); Germany: F Eng, A Mun, F Hel, A Kie (4); Italy: F Mid, F NAT, F Wal, F Lon, A Par, A Pic, A Bur, A Tyr, A Ven, F Aeg, F Adr (11); Russia: A Smy, A Con, A Liv, A Nwy, A Swe, F Cly, F Ehi (7).

Press:

Italy: I do not believe that the players have any ability to declare anything true by unanimous declaration that is not otherwise so. If hostilities end at this point it is an armistice, whether called by that name or called a draw. Calling an armistice a draw is of no more effect than a joint press release. In fact, that's the way I characterize a "draw": "an armistice with a press release". I want an armistice, and I don't care what "scrap of paper" I have to sign in order to get it.

Impassable: Thank you for your explanation. If I can read simple English, there is no such thing as a draw? That is, either you have a won game or you have a game ended by agreement in which case, to have it be called an armistice would be more accurate than to call it a draw? For further discussion, please refer to Letters to the Editor column.

1972BG, Spring 1912

RUSSIAN UNITS CUT OFF IN HOLLAND ARE DESTROYED

GM Note: Russia is eligible for championship or winners game if finish is high enough. Does that clear it up for you Jim?

Spring 1912:

AUSTRIA(Ball): A Kie-Hol, A Ruh S A Kie-Hol, A Mun-Kie, A Ber-Fru, A Sil-War, A Ukr S A Sil-War, A Gal S A Ukr, A Boh-Vie, A Bul-Rum, A Ser S A Bul-Rum, F Ank-Hla

ENGLAND(Swies): F Nth C A Den-Yor, F Nwg-Cly, F Eng-Wal, A Den-Yor

ITALY(Hrbek): A Par-Bur, A Rom-Tus, A Nap-Apu, F NAT-Nwg, F Lyp-Cly, F Mid-Eng, A Pic S Rus F Bel, F Tyn-Ion, F Wes-Tun, F Con H, A Ven H, A Bre H

RUSSIA(Fish): F Bar S Ita F NAT-Nwg/nsu/, A Fin-Swe, A Nwy S A Fin-Swe, A Mos S A War, A Sev-Ukr, A War S A Sev-Ukr, F Bel/u/, A Hol/u/a/

FALL 1912 orders due Friday, October 11, 1974 at noon, E.D.S.T.

1972AZ, Conclusion

Game Chart:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
AUS(Osmanson):	6	7	8	10	11	11	11	10	9	10	10	10
ENG(Wiskow):	5	7	7	9	10	11	13	14	14	14	16	18
FRA(Mahler):	5	6	8	8	9	10	9	9	10	9	7	5
GER(Placek-Richter, Spr '03):	3	3	2	2	1	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
ITA(Hollingsworth):	4	5	4	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
RUS(Bessen-DePrisco, F '02):	5	2	1	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TUR(Thomas):	4	4	4	2	1	1	0	-	-	-	-	-

Quotes from the French mailbag: From Austria 4-29-72 (before Sp 01): "I propose an (sic) long range alliance between our two countries France and Austria. I await your reply." 5-1-72 "...Sincerely yours, Matthew Bessen, commander of Russian military and consistant Diplomacy loser ". from Italy 5-6-72"...I kept my part of our bargain and kept out of Piedmont, now I would like you to assist me in securing Munich..." 5-20-72 (deadline for F 01 was 5-21) "You can believe me or not, but my move into Piedmont was purely a defensive move caused by reports ((from Austria?)) that France was attempting to negotiate alliances to encircle Italy."

France (for additional comments see Imp #36-39): Before Spring 1901 my grand strategy became to get Germany. I think my entering this, my first postal game, already leaning towards getting Germany unfairly hurt him (Placek). However, he did want Belgium and (cont. next page)

wanted me out of Burgundy so perhaps our falling out wasn't all my fault.

I neutralized the English Channel and Piedmont, and I hoped I had committed England and Italy to attack Germany. Russia (Bessen) had come to me saying he would attack Germany in Sp '01. Austria and I had concluded an alliance to protect each other against Germany and Italy.

My Spring moves were A Far-Bur, A Mar-Spa, F Bre-Pic. This was a big mistake, I would need the fleet in the south and the army in the north. F Bre-Mid, A Far-Pic, A Mar-Bur, would have accomplished the same thing and I wouldn't have been crippled in later years by the misplacement of units. England moved as expected and Italy went to Tyrolia. Austria went to Bud. showing trust of Italy and Russia. Turkey went to Armenia, this was the beginning of his game long and single-minded attack on Russia. Russia went A War-Sil, but also went A Mos-War (??) and F St P-Nor/imp/ (?!). Germany didn't move!!

My plan to get Germany had worked too well; now all my calculations were off. I wouldn't have to fight for Belgium and would now be expected to help Italy into Munich the first year. I could see England as the giant of the north since Russia & Germany had completely blown it. I therefore offered to support Russia to Munich (otherwise he'd get no build) provided he built in St. Pete to control England. By the way, it turned out that Russia was all set to offer to support me into Munich when he got my letter.

I got two builds, but England got two and Austria three! I looked on Italy's move to Piedmont in the Fall as breaking a treaty for no good reason. I was really angry, although Italy was also mad at me for my failure to support him to Munich as agreed. My reasons for not supporting him to Munich were, the need of a Russian build in the north and also the suspicion that rather than going to Munich as he kept telling me he would (which information I passed on to Austria, which Italy may have expected and wanted) Italy would go A Ven to Tri and A Tyr to Vie, thus executing a masterful stab of Austria. The game would have been vastly different had I supported Italy to Munich or if he had stabbed Austria. In the latter case with 3 builds versus 1 for Austria, Italy would have been the dominant power in the East. In any case, I built 2 fleets with the sole idea of going after Italy; this necessitated a halt on the German front.

So at the end of the first year I could see I had almost no chance to win; England

was behind me with no effective opposition, while an Italian plan of attack (imagine if he'd been in Munich as well as Piedmont) had just barely been foiled. Meanwhile Austria seemed to have no effective opposition in the East. I'd have rated the chances to win (assuming there wasn't a draw) as Austria 50%, England 40%, France 7%, and Italy 3%.

In this game we saw how missed moves and complete incompetence can affect the outcome. However, not only did Germany and Russia continued to miss at just the right times to help England and hurt me. For example, in Sp '02 Germany holds in Holland and goes to Warsaw and Berlin. Then in F '02 having moved out of Kiel in the Spring, he lets England into Kiel by missing his moves. To add to my frustration Italy, the one person who I'd have liked to miss, always sent in his moves. However, Turkey, so as not to be left out of the act, promised to support me to Ionian and then missed his moves that season. You don't know how glad I was to see Italy and Austria get extra builds from Turkey's misses.

Before the game settled into England with a French ally versus Austria with an Italian ally, there were a series of unsuccessful and frustrating attempts by me to do something to change the course of the game: disengage from Italy, get Russia and Germany to ally, get Austria to attack Italy, prop up Germany with Italian help, to disengage from Italy yet again. During this time I made a key tactical mistake. Italy had gotten into Munich in F '02; I'd used my A Bur to keep Italy out of Marseilles rather than support Russia in Munich. I'd expected Russia to try to take Berlin, but the new Russian player tried to hold in Munich instead. In F '03 that Italian army got into Burgundy. Looking back I can see I should have gone Bel-Bur, but I was so busy trying to prop up Germany (Italy had helped in the Spring) and worrying about retaliation from England for helping Germany that I gambled too much that Italy would stay in Munich for fear of losing it to Austria or a retreating German Army. In Winter 1903 I resigned myself to the impossibility of winning and went along with England and his terms of surrendering Belgium and Holland.

I think it's fair to say that circumstances beyond my control made this game almost impossible for me to win almost from the beginning. However, I must admit that in spite of that it was still the best man who won. To Doug Wiskow: May we meet again. Did you guess that the 'fake' French press in W '03,

(cont. on next page)

denouncing England as a tyrant and labeled France (Build Fleet Brest), was actually written by me (as well as the fake English press) in order to make you think Italy was trying to stir up trouble between us? Did it effect your dealings with Italy and me?  
To William Osmanson: May we never meet again.  
To Doug Hollingsworth: No hard feelings, don't you wish we could go back and play the game differently with what we know now?  
To everyone: Yes, I was Stephan of LWOW. (Lwow is the major city of Galicia; my father's side of the family is from Galicia). I'm sorry if anyone was offended, but then I was still learning how to write propaganda.  
To John Boyer: Thanks for a fun 2½ years!  
Impassable: So long gang, so my first novice game and first new game has ended on a wistful note. For some reason, the first games are lasting longer than those which started later!

-----  
 1972BW, Spring 1912

TURKS ARRIVE TO ADD TROOPS TO BIG BATTLE FOR CITY OF MUNICH IN GERMAN HEARTLAND! WHO IS TO GET MUNICH THIS FALL? TUNE IN AND FIND OUT

COA: David Davies, 2385 Lawrence Ave., San Bernardino, CA 92404; William Abbott, 701 Miller, Apt. 20, Ann Arbor, MI 48103.

FRANCE(DePrisco): F Edi-Nwg, F Nth-Nwy/r/, A Lvp-Edi, F Nat S F Edi-Nwg, F Hel-Kie, A Hol S F Hel-Kie, A Ruh S F Hel-Kie, A Bur S Ita A Mun, A Tyr-Vie/r/

GERMANY(Davies): A Kie S Rus A Sil-Mun, A Ber S A Kie, F Den-Hel

ITALY(Lindauer): A Mun H, A Ven S A Tri H, A Tri-H/a/, F Adr S F Ion, F Ion H, F Tun S F Ion

RUSSIA(Knudsen): F Nwg-Edi/r/, F StP(nc)-Nwy, F Yor-Nth, A Sil-Mun, F Ska S F Yor-Nth, F Bal S Ger A Kie, A Boh-Tyr, A Vie S A Boh-Tyr, A Bud S Tur A Alb-Tri

TURKEY(Abbott): A Ser S A Alb-Tri, A Alb-Tri, A Gal-Boh, F Eas-Ion, F Aeg S F Eas-Ion, F Gre S F Eas-Ion

SUMMER & FALL 1912 orders due Friday, October 11, 1974 at noon, E.D.S.T.

-----  
 1973ddl, Summer & Fall 1021

ENGLAND SPURNS SURVIVAL FOR DEATH WITH HONOR!

Summer 1021: Scotland R F SIS-Dub  
Fall 1021:

ENGLAND(Swies): A Gwy-Mon  
 KYMRU(Gemignani): A Str-Che, A Shr-Sta, A Her S A Shr-Sta, A Brk H  
 LEINSTER(Fujihara): F SIS-Dub, F NIS-Man, A Ona-Arm/a/, A Tyr S A Ona-Arm, A Tar-Mea  
 MUNSTER(Dick): NOR. A Sli H/r/, A Tua h/r/, A Cas H, F NSG H, F GaB H, F TrB H  
 ORKNEY(Keller): F Dow-Arm, A Dal-Ona, A Spe S A Dal-Ona, A Bre-Sli, F SIB S A Bre-Sli, F Iat S Sco F Mid-Tua, F CaB-Mon  
 SCOTLAND(Tonnesen): A Car S A Pow, A Pow S Eng A Gwy-Shr/nso/, F Che S Eng A Gwy-Che/imp/, A Yor-Der, A Ber-Cum, A New-Ber, A Uri-Tyr, F Mid-Tua, F Dub S Mun F NSG-SIS/nso/, F Wic S F Dub, F Isl-Don

AUTUMN & WINTER 1021 orders due Friday, October 11, 1974 at noon, e.d.s.t.

Stand-by: Fred G. Hyatt, 378 State St., Brooklyn, NY 11217, for Munster.

Fall 1021 SCC:

England: ~~Pov~~ (0) Rl, out of game

Kymru: ~~Cat~~, Bue, Shr, Brk, Sta (4) SP

Leinster: Mea, Kil, Wax, Tar, ~~Ros?~~, ~~Ona~~, Man (5 or 6) Bl or B2

Munster: Hom, Lei, ~~Yth~~, ~~Stl~~, ~~Ros?~~, (5 or 6) Rl or R2

Orkney: Heb, Sky, Cai, ~~Pov~~, Mon, Ona, Arm, Dur, Sli, Dow (9) B2

Scotland: Hom, Kin, Der, Che, ~~Pov~~, ~~Yth~~, ~~Stl~~, Dub, Don, Tua, Pow, Car (12) Bl

Press:

Kymru: Aye, war is a funny thing especially when the Great Stone is laughing at ye Scotland and Orkney, do ye think foul deed be forgotten?

Scone: King Malcom II invites the Queen of Kymru to his homeland. The King feels as long as his pikes are making use of the fair maids of Kymru's western areas the Queen is invited to come make use of King Malcom's middle area. Also the King wishes the Queen "to pick a few things," in fact she may pick whatever she finds open to her. King Malcom will get into whatever the Queen of Kymru leaves open for him.

Stonehenge: For the first time ever in recorded history, a laugh was heard coming from the Great Stone. Asked by a local female (well stacked) priest of the faith why the Stone laughed, the Great One spake: "I find the mortal combat among mortal fools funnier than any fun I had when I was just a young whipper-snapper skipping across water." As usual, the Great Stone's wisdom would be hard to translate and interpret. Amen!



## ZINE SCENE, CONT.

SPECULUM, #4. Dave Kadlecsek, 1447 Sierra Creek Way, San Jose, CA 95132. Sub is 10/\$2 or 10/\$2.30 airmail. Openings in regular dippy at GF of \$1.50 plus sub, YV variant at GF \$2 + sub, and Third Age at \$1.50 plus sub. Ditto. Really an intelligent guy since he's plugged Impassable already! I mean, how far can a guy go wrong when he plugs me??? Try him, you may like him!

BUSHWACKER, Vol. 3, #10. Fred C. Davis, Jr., 3012 Oak Green Ct., Ellicott City, MD 21043. Sub is 12/\$2.00. Needs standbys for two variants: Atlantica II and 1885 at \$3.00 (includes sub and privilege for standing by). Mimeo. A neat little thing that comes out on time each month. Watch me lose as Canada!

PELLUCIDAR, #25. Burton Labelle, Forest Park #23, Biddeford, ME 04005. Ditto. Sub is 10/\$2.20. Will probably have openings in the future on YV variant, but stay tuned until he actually announces them! The big one from the Farthest Northeastern portion of the USA.

COSTAGUANA, Vol. VII, #9. Conrad von Metzke (alias, Grendel Press International), PO Box 4, San Diego, CA 92112. Sub is \$1/5. No game openings. For once we have a real issue and not a fake. The usual quality press and sworn words from Grendel--your lovable California mailman publisher! Ops, ditto.

DORSAI, #10. Francis McIlvaine, 144 Sackett Rd., Apt. 6, Avon, NY 14414. Sub is 11/\$2. No openings. One of the very few ditto pubbers to print on only one side. We wonder how he stays in the business that way! This is not an Avon Salesman!

QUO VADIS, #39. Dick Vedder, 1451 N. Warren, Tucson, AZ 85719. Sub is 10/\$2. Standbys are needed. Completely devoted to variants, Dick is also working his ass off as the unsung, unheralded chairman of the IDA Variant Committee. Openings in: Diadochi V, The Downfall of the Lord of the Rings and the Return of the King, and Excalibur. GF is \$2 plus sub. One of the leaders in variants, worth reading if not playing in.

DIPLOMACY WORLD, Vol. 1, #4. Walter Buchanan, R.R. #3, Lebanon, IN 46052. Offset. Sub is 6/\$3.00, \$1 discount to IDA members if asked. Sample issue to non-subbers can be had for a 10¢ stamp. The only offset publication to deal entirely and solely on the dippy hobby. This bi-monthly publication 32 pages and filled with articles on better play, ratings, variants, news, etc. Frequently interrupted with vile and revolutionary remarks from the wife, it provides a good general publication for anyone interested in

the game itself and in directly related fields of interest. Can't be overemphasized! This zine will soon become affiliated by being bought out by Games Research, Inc. who will use Walt as its editor to make DW the equivalent of SPI's S&T or AH's The General... adapted, of course, to the peculiarities of the postal Diplomacy hobby.

SHAAFT!!, #120? Andy Phillips, 128 Oliver St., Daly City, CA 94014. Ditto. Sub is 7/\$1. Strictly a gamezine, but specializes in dippy fought to the finish (34 centers for a win).

ARRAKIS, #37. John Leeder, Box 1606, Huntsville, Ont., CANADA POA 1K0. Ditto. Sub is 1¢/page plus postage (send him a lump sum, he'll keep the records in a honest fashion). No openings. Games and press.

THE POCKET ARMENIAN, Vol. 1, #4. Mimeo. Scott Rosenberg, 182-31 Radnor Rd., Jamaica, NY 11432. Sub is 10/\$2. Openings in regl dippy at GF of \$5.00. An independent pubber from the New York area. This issue included a new variant, 1618 by Scott.

ALTERNATE REALITY, #10. Offset. Ron Melton, 694 Broadway, El Centro, CA 92243. First issue to be in offset format. This zine has always been good for stories of science fiction and game reviews of science fiction wargames. Sub is 12/\$3. No openings.

CALIFORNIA REPORTS, #18. Ditto. Doug Beyerlein, 330 Curtner Ave., Apt. #8, Palo Alto, CA 94306. This is a personal type zine which does not carry games. Its primary function is to cover ratings and besides that it covers letters to the editor and whatever he happens to be doing at the time (like bicycling or hiking in the woods. Sub is 10/\$2.

TURNABOUT, #1. Mimeo. Peter Berggren, Davistown Schoolhouse rd., Orford, NH 03777. A new zine. Sub is 10/\$2. Openings in reg. dippy at GF of \$5.00. This first issue included a map for The Allied and German Plans for May, 1940 (The AH 1940 Game). The guy seems to be an intelligent fellow who happens to be nutty on games such as dippy--aren't we all?

RAGWEED, #7. Mimeo. Ragweed (alias the Burkacki Brothers, Inc.), 13201 Dwyer, Detroit, MI 48212. Openings in reg. dippy for GF of \$1.50, plus sub at 10/\$1.00. Has openings in non-dippy, inquire.

BERSERKER, #21. Mimeo. Doug Ronson, 864 Ingersoll Ct., Mississauga, Ontario, Canada. Sub is 7/\$1.00 (Hey! He's cheaper than me!) Openings in reg. dippy with GF of \$2.00 plus sub. GF is refundable if you don't drop out. Sigh, another Canadian zine. Won't they stop

(cont. col. 1, pg. 7)

# ZINE SCENE, CONT.

trying to overwhelm us Americans? Sigh, I guess that's the price you gotta pay for being an internationalist.

\* \* \* \*

Well, that was only 20 reviews. We did some close counting of our current circulation figures and after this issue with the effect of paring off most of our players and a few deadwood publishers, we will be down to a total circulation of 108: 2 complimentary copies, 18 players, 38 subscribers and 50 traders. When all the new games are started, we feel that we will have around 50 players or a total circulation of about 140. We will then make a new concerted effort to reach all the new publications in the hobby for trades. I have read many reviews in the trades I now have and will sooner or later get around to writing them! There must be about 15 or so I want to add to make the circulation at about 155 sometime in the future. Ambitious, but we're trying to concentrate in our Impassable effort and make it outstanding as it once was. What you've been reading for the past year has only been the shell of what I could do!

-----

## NEWS OF THE HOBBY, CONT.

money on the side while pretending to be a public servant helping the community? A big job for an egotist. Anyone who's interested in running for this spot can ask me questions about the position. I will be working and helping the new Editor during the transitory period.), and several At-Large and Regional Secretarial positions. These latter get to vote on the Council without having any real chores--they're the easy jobs, but we do expect them to help out on the committees! The President's job, by the way, is to lead the IDA into new horizons and to publish the Council Courier (which actually helps him organize the agenda and prod the Council to do something) covering the bills and votes and debates of the IDA Council. The Ombudsman handles gripes between publishers and players, but of late that hasn't been happening too much. These elections will start with the September Diplomacy Review's announcement for nominations with deadline for such in October. In October a special issue will go out to those who have been nominated to ask them to confirm or deny their nomination. If they run, then they send in their campaign statements for print in the November issue of the DR. The votes will then be due at end of

the year. Not forgetting, I should note that a year's membership to IDA is still only \$2.00. Send your check (made out to International Diplomacy Association) or money order to: Walter Buchanan, R.R. #3, Lebanon, IN 46052. Fringe benefits includes getting the bi-monthly organizational publication, Diplomacy Review, as well as supporting the various committees and worthwhile projects which offer services and other intangibles to the Diplomacy community.

Speaking of such things, the Calhamer Awards is one special project, service, or whatever you want to call it. Unfortunately, the CA has been more of a farce than anything else the few years it has been in existence. It started out as the Johnny Awards which was a mistake already, but changed to the much more plausible name of the CA which it is today. However, the results remains lower than our expectations. So, I am at this time offering a package proposal to the IDA to run the next CA on an international panel basis. The idea is to draw upon a group of selected knowledgeable publishers from the international Diplomacy community. The hope is to include Canadians, Americans and English publishers of repute. Their objectives will be to decide the categories and the definitions, the prizes, and then work on establishing the list of nominees for each award category. The public will be invited to send the panel their own nominations and the panel will consider them all plus their own. The overall scheme then includes the publication of all nominees in the completist possible form. Thus, by purchasing a copy of the publication containing all the nominees, the reader then would be able to make an intelligent choice. This system deals directly with the problem of the ocean separating England from North America, thus allowing the Calhamer Awards to remain on an international basis. Again, the idea is to have a panel publication to operate this committee and that I have proposed to do it myself if no one wants to do it. It will be a deliberate process taking several months (until next summer) and the sooner I get the okay from IDA, the better. I have already selected a preliminary list of Canadians, Englishmen and Americans for the panel. I will select replacements should any decline working on the panel. We will need "experts" in many fields such as variants, press, publishing, and the like. One criterion is that the person must be a publisher and/or extensive contact with the main stream of the hobby--this much is necessary to help

(cont. pg. 8, col. 1)

## HOBBY NEWS, CONT.

the panel members judge and compare the many nominees and to select the smaller number for actual voting.

Looking back over the whole idea being proposed, I want to add that this proposed system is generally what's done with other awards. That a group should have power to select the restricted number of nominees is a necessary evil to accomplish the job. Thus, there should be absolutely no controversy over the method. Actually, the panel will be playing it pretty much by ear as they progress to the conclusion. As with anything new, trials and errors must be the rule before it is perfected. I will welcome all suggestions for the panel's operations and when the time is ready, the panel will accept nominees from the public. Whatever, I feel that this is a most plausible solution to the past problems with the Calhamer Awards.

That concludes all the news we can think of right now. Next time--more news! #end#

## THE RESULTS OF BEYERLEIN PLAYER POLL NUMBER 7

TOP BOARD:	S	N
1. Michael Rocamora (8)	395	25
2. Walt Buchanan (7)	360	24
3. Doug Beyerlein (1)	350	26
4. Ed Birsan (2)	254	22
5. John Beshara (9)	229	15
6. Lew Pulsipher (2)	183	19
7. Tom Eller	164	16

## SECOND BOARD:

8. Len Lakofka (1)	155	19
9. Ronald Kelly (4)	137	15
10. Andy Phillips	111	14
11. John Boyer (1)	110	14
12. Randy Bytwerk	97	14
13. Chris Schleicher	73	5
14. Eric Verheiden	60	9

## THIRD BOARD:

15. Conrad von Metzke	56	5
16. Peter Rosamilia	47	8
17. Rod Walker	46	6
18. Jeff Power	41	5
Hal Naus	41	6
20. Gordon Anderson	39	5
21. Brian Burley	38	4

Players with 20 points or more: A. Calhamer, B. Cusack, M. Gemignani, R. Heuer, D. Johnson, J. Key, B. Kindig, B. Labelle (1), D. Lagerson (1), D. Linstrom, E. Lipson, R. Lipton, C.

McCustion, A Meier, J. Model, S. Nierenberg, J. Rogowski, H. Sidor, D. Stehle, G. Thor-gaard, T. Tilson, P. Wood, & M. Zelazny.

Note: S means the score or total number of points tabulated from the ballots; N means the number of ballots listing the player's name on the top or second board. The number of first place votes is given in parentheses.

A total of 38 ballots were cast. I wish to thank all the publishers who reprinted or otherwise publicized the ballot in their zines. They are: John Boyer, Walt Buchanan, Gil Neiger, and Robert Lipton.

Ballots were received as follows: Diplomacy World (20), California Reports (16), The Pouch (1), and Impassable (1).

The eighth poll will be conducted next summer, probably at about this time. Advance information will go out to all publishers in late spring or early summer about the distribution of ballots for BPP #8. All questions and comments should be directed to Doug Beyerlein, 330 Curtner Ave., Apt. #8, Palo Alto, CA 94306. All publishers are encouraged to reprint the above results. ((Hey! Next time, you guys use my poll forms and then you'll make both me and Doug happy!))

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR,  
or a little discussion!

Well, it seems as if my statements has drawn some fire from several people and so in the interest of free press and all that crap we will present uncut and in full living color, the responses from three gentlemen (?) who know how to play the game!

From Andy Phillips:

You're misunderstanding me again. I agree with you that center count is the only feasible way to measure achievement (and, over the long haul, ability). Now actually a 17 unit country in a four-way "draw" is stronger than one in a two-way stalemate, but rating them as equal is a minor crudity compared with other proposals that have been put forward (notably the current "official" one that the stronger result is only half as good as the weaker). Where I differ with you is on the proposition that center-count as you propose to apply it has any utility in a win situation. Neither do I agree that draws and wins must be measured separately.

Center-count can be applied to victories in the same manner as it is applied to armistices. Not by counting centers held at the transitory point where the criterion

(cont. pg. 9, col. 1)



## LETTERS, CONT.

for inevitability of conclusion is reached, however. The center count of losers at that point has no more significance than their count in any previous winter season. Only the territory held at the conclusion of hostilities is significant. In an armistice hostilities conclude at the same point that the game does. In a stalemate the hostilities might continue for some time, but it is the assumption of the declaration that they will not affect territorial control. In both cases you can count the centers held at the conclusion of hostilities merely by counting the centers held at the conclusion of play.

In a win, however, the centers to be held at the conclusion of hostilities are not the same as those held at the conclusion of play. By concession or the assumption of the victory criterion all centers will be held by the winner at the conclusion of hostilities and no one else will control any. The appropriate center count is 34 for the winner and zero for all other countries. This is quite comparable with 17-17 for a two-way draw, e.g., and only one achievement list is necessary.

On your list of accomplishments I suggest you leave out the "how close" ones. Only actual achievements are even crudely measurable. To go back again to that instructive example, the first completed game of regular postal Diplomacy, 1963B, Russia's puppet, Austria, which actually ended the game with as many centers as the winner (17), did not come as close to winning, or any closer to truly surviving, than Allan Calhamer's Germany, which got up to around 15 centers before being eliminated.

((Andy's game philosophy is apparent in that victory is automatically 34 centers, with this in mind, he has asked me to plug a zine: BARTOVIA, Carl Adamec, 1168 Fernwood Dr., Schenectady, NY 12309. Has an open section of Balance of Power Diplomacy (Miller Type 'cw'--no victory criterion short of 34), which is the only version of Diplomacy he recommends. 50¢ game fee, \$2.00 deposit, sub (10/\$1.50) required.))

From Rod Walker:

I guess you know that I would side with you in that dispute with Andy Phillips. A game ends when one player has 19 centers, and that player wins the game. If I choose to refuse to oppose that player, or even to help him to win, for whatever reason, that is my right as a player. There are a good many such reasons potentially. Andy Phillips is

crazy if he thinks he can tell me--or anyone else--that I have to play for a win or a draw and nothing else. I'll play for what I damn well please.

Now, as to rating games. You have to deal with cold, hard facts. One is final result (win, draw, survive, elimination). That is the basis of the Reinsel System. Another is order of finish. That is the basis of the BROEDINGNAG System. Another is length of survival. Another is centers--either totals, as in the old Boardman System, or end-game figure, which is the basis of the Batting Average Rating System I've just produced. (See EREHWON 79 or DIPLOMACY WORLD #5--when it comes out--for details) Finally, you can consider the relationship of each player to the others, the basis of the ODD system. All rating systems are based on those factors or some combination of them. They are verifiable facts.

The purpose of a rating system is not to reward (or punish) people. Nor is it to influence style of play. All arguments that a given rating system influence people to play in such-and-such a manner are utter hogwash. There is no proof for such an assertion, and since there are so many different rating systems, they would cancel each other out anyway. And, as I have pointed out in another article in EL CONQUISTADOR, every rating system ever designed ultimately encourages a player to play for win, or draw.

Anyway, as you will notice in EREHWON 79, my rating system uses exactly what you suggested--supply centers. In this case, the total held at the end of the game. That means that all eliminated people get zilch. The winner will always be rated as holding 18 centers, regardless of how many he actually held when he was declared the winner. That is done to simplify calculation and also to pre-1971 games into line with the new victory criterion. It also means that an 18-center victory is only marginally better than a 16-unit 2nd place. That is as it should be, and if Andy doesn't like it...well, that's kind of tough, isn't it?

From Doug Beyerlein:

I don't know what is meant by an armistice finish and I doubt that the other ratings-keepers do either. By all of the current systems (save, perhaps, for Walker's new one) a game can only be rated as a win or draw or not be rated. I suspect that a vote for something called an armistice would result in the game being rated as a five-way draw or not rated at all. In any case, I would like to see the term 'armistice' defined as

(cont. pg. 10, col. 1)

## LETTERS, CONT.

it pertains to the game of Diplomacy. ((See the 1970BJ game report on page 3))

I don't particularly want to get drawn into this debate between you and Phillips regarding player philosophies, but I thought it might be worth adding my two cents. If I understand the argument correctly (and I am not at all sure that I do) you believe that the number of supply centers a player has at the finish of a game is the best indicator of that player's performance. Therefore, he or she should be rated on that basis. If that is true then you will inherently judge as best the player who consistently plays for second place. An average player, having only this goal in mind and showing no indications of wanting a win, should have no or at worse little trouble in attaining this finish. This is especially true if the player is only the second best in the game and quickly spots and latches onto the player with the best chance of winning. Then diligently playing the role of the faithful puppet, a second place finish is not only easily obtainable but almost guaranteed.

Admittedly, the second place player will not in any one game gain as many points as the winner, but over the long span consistent second places (worth up to 16/18ths of a win by your way of thinking) will average out far better than the player who gambles all seeking the win. Sure the consistent second place player will not rate as well as someone winning all their games, but so far there is only one Walt Buchanan in the hobby (thank goodness). The rest of us people seeking wins instead of second place finishes and taking the risk incurred by such actions have little hope in maintaining an average finish in terms of supply centers equal to that of the second place finisher. And the ease at which a second place finish can be obtained cannot be over emphasized. In my wins I have supported a number of weak players to excellent second and third place finishes which they could have never gained on their own in return for their complete loyalty to the cause of my winning the game. I was quite happy to have their help (and they were happy with their finishes in return), but their end position in terms of supply centers gave no true indication of their skill or performance. It was solely a function of my generosity and commanding position.

This use of minor powers in return for guaranteed second and third place finishes is IMPASSABLE IMPASSABLE IMPASSABLE IMPASSABLE

common among winning players. I outlined its use in my article "The Art of Puppetry" published in HA some two years ago. And it is because of this fact that such a philosophy as the one that you support is very inaccurate in its assessment of a player's performance and degree of skill.

\* \* \* \* \*

Well, right now my head is brimming with counter arguments to all three letters! But, right now is late to do so and this must wait until tomorrow--I only hope that I retain my ideas that long. The next line to be typed will be tomorrow! zzzzzzzzzz.... Here we are again! For Andy's comments, we say that the rules of the game, as well as history, indicates that a majority of Europe is all you need to win the game. In history, no single country ever controlled all of Europe. Also, the fact that you reached 15 at one point in center count is irrelevant and I do not consider them at all--what I consider is the final center-count when the game is ended either by victory or by some agreement. Again, I still maintain that a separate list be kept of winners and of other than winners for this would help bypass problems pointed out by Rod Walker.

As for Rod's comments, I agree that the winner should be rated at 18 centers even if he's been voted to have the win when he's around 12 or so centers. Len's idea that there (Len Iakofka's rating system, Rogues' Gallery requires a minimum number of centers) should be a certain minimum before being given a full 18 center point for a win has some merits, but I fail to see any easy point to choose and so this should be dropped in favor of accepting all wins as wins whether voted upon or actually won outright with 18 centers. The problem with the Walker solution is how to reflect this center count-change on those surviving, that is, if the winner had 16 centers and we give him 18, do we take 2 off someone else? I don't know the real answer here, but perhaps some ratio should be maintained by adding proportionally enough to the leader to give him 18 and add to the others to keep the same ratio as the actual finish? However, this would end up giving more points/centers than they had in the game!

Rod's major point is that systems, no matter how you rig it, will influence the play--if you play for ratings. Thus, if a system punishes second place finishers, then you'll more likely play to the death rather than accept second place deals from the leader--this is more typical of the winners in the hobby--their intense will to win

(cont. pg. 11, col. 1)

## LETTERS, CONT.

doesn't allow them to accept second place very often! On the other hand, there are many players who would take second place since they know they're not good enough to win! There may be other reasons and other player philosophies involving personal objectives in the game of Diplomacy, but the point is that to win outright is not the only goal of the game! An excellent treatise on this exact same subject is to be found in the IDA's second Diplomacy Handbook in the article, Objectives Other Than Winning in Diplomacy, by Allan B. Calhamer. To take this in historical aspect, consider English history: they never tried to take control of Europe and played for balance of power and not actual military conquest. They were always on the right side of most wars and if they didn't want to tip one alliance over another in Europe, they were just as likely to stay out, altogether! Here is the example of a country playing for second or a position less than total domination (equivalent to 18 center control) via military conquest.

Getting back to systems punishing or favoring certain types of philosophies, I agree that this is so with all of your rating systems. Even to avoid the controversy and complexities of the various systems by proposing a straight center-count system does not get us away from influencing the game's objectives (in this case for wins). But, the natural gift of a point for each center is not unduly effecting the game, I would think, and quite acceptable as far as I am concerned. If someone wants to get less than total victory and is willing to accept second or less, then okay with me.

This brings us to Doug's comments! Doug, I cannot see how you could have made such a mistake in asserting that one who goes for second all the time will make it most of the time enough to come out on top of a natural winner! Besides,  $2+2+2+2=2$  avg. is better than  $1+7+5+4=4.2$ ! I'm sorry if you think that to win is the only objective allowed! This is Diplomacy and in that respect, many countries throughout history have been successful in surviving much longer as a small power than empires. Israel has a broken history, but it is still around and where is the Babylonian Empire? Switzerland has a remarkably peaceful history and what about the suffering peoples of Germany and Vietnam? In real life, objectives other than empires can be peace and a higher standard of living. This can be translated into second place in

a Diplomacy game.

Another way to look at it is to find out how many players are highly ranked in any of the systems who have not won games--I would think that anyone good enough to take second is also good enough to take first every now and then. Also, good players, missing first should often be able to obtain second place--why not? When I have not won myself, I have placed fairly high often myself! I don't go for second unless the circumstances indicate that I should, but I can take second just as well as anyone in games I'm not going to win. I don't see your point as valid.

Well, so I have argued against everyone who has been kind enough to comment on the little debate between Andy and me. Whether we have gone off the initial track or not is irrelevant since we ended up covering a lot of relevant ground to the game. Thanks and all of you are welcome to counter-point those points I have just made! Peace.

## DIPCON PART TWO

The unholy group was just leaving for bleak and windy Chicago when we left off the last time. Now, zooming in with our palantir, we can see the two VW vehicle convoy snake its way along the twisting, rut-filled dirt route once known as U.S. Interstate 65. The scenery is one of general bleakness--the flat lands of Hoosierland is not known for its beauty. As we move in closer we can see that the larger VW vehicle, known in mortal circles as a Bus, is leading the convoy. In and out the convoy weaves among the mortals avoiding all accidents while moving at a fast pace of 20 miles per hour. To all appearances, the convoy was just another bunch of horses and carriages running at breakneck speeds, but the veil of secrecy still held against all--powerful the Witch of the Hold was!

Arriving in Chicago, an ancient city of the mortals and rebuilt after the second great fire, the company checked into the hotel holding the annual convention of dippy players. Unknown to most at the DipCon, these people, who were not mortals, were headed for a secret convention of their own. Ah, the black magic and the white to be woven tonight will be a crowning event of the year! The joys of stabbing your loyal allies, the absolute ecstasy of meeting face-to-face the likes of Birsan the Cruel! Too few they were, but powerful all they were.

The Trio, our brave warriors, Mahler the  
(con. pg. 12, col. 1)

## DIPCON, CONT.

Prince, Boyer the Impossible, and Beyerlein the Lesser, occupied the same den on the third level of the building. They came to the heavy oak door of their room.

"Hey Doug, don't you think that this door could be stronger than Walt's Green Vault?" I quizzed Doug.

"You don't know Walt--I tell you his vault is impregnable and for this door, we just opened it!" replied Doug as he opened the door.

"Right enough, John, I know only too true about Walt's vault!" chipped in Howard.

My stupid question answered, I marched with the two inside our room. Spacious it was but the ceiling was low and I thought I saw some cobwebs.

"This place doesn't look too new to me," I remarked, "Perhaps we ought to demand some room service to clean up the place?"

"Who cares? We're not going to be staying in our room much during the DipCon, and besides, you can alert the desk about their sloppy service," answered Howard.

Well, I thought, at least it was spacious enough and it could have slept four people. Stashing my clothes into the closet, I bid farewell to the others and went by myself to the DipCon. I took the golden stairway...it wasn't true, however, that it was made of gold. At the bottom of the stairs, I halted and took a deep breath. I pushed open the great door with bronze fittings on it and it groaned loudly from its weight and age. The view of the vast Hall of Diplomacy was clear. The milling crowd of thousands was to be seen in the dim light. Imperceptively, but slowly and surely, my hawk eyesight adapted themselves

to the dim environment. I could see Birsan the Cruel, Rocamora the Cheater, Lakofka the Pollock, Ralsipher the Prophet and so on. Each known for earthly powers beyond mere mortals! I shuddered and steelled myself to walk inside and immediately felt the bristling air laden with untold of powers!

-to be continued.

## POLAND, PART TWO

Stephen Bathory and the Vasa Kings (1587-1668) were involved in bitter struggles with Russia and Sweden. Poland, though preserved by the miracle of Czestochowa (The famed monastery of Jasna Gora in 1655 was defended by only a handful of soldiers and withstood a Swedish seige for 40 days. The Swedes then withdrew, and the alleged miracle fired Poland to successful resistance to the invaders.), lost much territory in the treaties of Oliva and Andrusov. John III briefly restored Polish prestige, but with the accession (1697) of the electors of Saxony as kings of Poland, national independence was virtually lost.--to be continued.

## THEM CHESS GAMES?

Game #1: White--Harbor, Black--Bisher  
13. QRP-QR4 RXP  
14. NXR\* . . .

Note, this is a correction to last issue's report. White gave us alternative moves for possible black moves and we read the wrong one off. Sorry!

Game #5: White--Bisher, Black--?????  
2. P-QB4 P-K3  
3. NMR.

IMPASSABLE #40  
117 Garland Drive  
Carlisle, PA 17013

Experience is the fool's best teacher; the wise do not need it. --Welsh Proverb.

Sinner! Your sub is up!\_\_

Rod Walker  
4069 Jackdaw St.  
San Diego, CA 92103



FIRST CLASS MAIL

FIRST CLASS MAIL