

# L A U R A N I A

"But the meanest historian owes something to truth."

---

Laurania #2

History of Rules Issue.

20 June 1969

---

Laurania is an occasional journal of postal Diplomacy, edited and published by John McCallum, Ralston, Alberta, Canada. The subscription price is a hundred pages for a dollar. Individual issues cost ten cents, except issues more than ten pages long cost twenty cents. Diplomacy is a game manufactured and sold by Games Research, Inc., 48 Wareham St., Boston, Mass., 02118.

---

## The Editions of the Rulebook - I.

In 1961 Games Research took over the manufacture and sale of Diplomacy. For the great majority of us the sets they produced, and the rulebooks that they had printed, constitute the game as we know it. However, for some time prior to this Allan Calhamer himself marketed the game. He had the pieces made for him in job lots, made up the sets himself, and sold them, I believe, from his apartment in Boston. The rules in the early personally produced sets consisted of a set of Dittoed sheets. Jeff Key is probably the only player active in postal play today who used the early set of rules. And even he lost his copy of those rules to a forgetful borrower.

About a year and a half ago, - just prior to his departure for Dominica - Allan Calhamer kindly sent me one of those old Dittoed sets of rules. Undoubtedly there were even earlier manuscript rules used as the game was being evolved. However, these rules were the first available to the general public and not merely to Calhamer's friends and colleagues. As most players will have no other chance to see them it appeared to me that it would be a good idea to reproduce them here. Permission to do so has been granted by Dr. Calhamer, the copyright owner. The rules were, of course, written by him and the copyright dates from 1958.

---

## Rules of the Game of Diplomacy.

**Players and Countries.** The game is played by seven players, each of whom represents one of the Great Powers in Europe in the Nineteenth Century: Austria-Hungary, England, France, Germany, Italy, Russia, and Turkey. Each player is independent of the others. At the start of the game the names of the Great Powers should be written on slips of paper. Each player then selects his country by chance by drawing a slip.

Object of the Game. If any player gains a majority (18) of the possible units in the game within the time set aside for play, he is the winner, and the others are losers. If no player secures a majority, all players still in the game tie. Any player who loses all his military units is out of the game, and loses in any case.

Diplomacy. Before each move, a period of time is set aside for diplomacy. This period is thirty minutes before the first move, and fifteen minutes before each subsequent move. Any diplomacy period may be closed sooner than this, if all the players agree at the time of closing the period. During the diplomacy period the players may confer with each other, publicly or privately, at the board or elsewhere. There are no rules governing what they may say during this period, nor are they required by the rules to live up to what they say, afterward. Small copies of the game board are provided for reference during conversations away from the board.

Military rules. Supply. Thirty-five spaces on the board are designated as supply centers. Each of these is capable of continuously furnishing supplies necessary to maintain a military unit. At the start of the game each Great Power contains three supply centers, except Russia, which contains four. Each Great Power has three military units, except Russia, which has four. If a Great Power occupies another supply center, it may raise another military unit. If a supply center formerly under its occupation is occupied by another Great Power, the Power losing the supply center must remove one of its units.

Military rules. Military units. Each player has two sets of markers, called military units. One type represents military control of a province, and is called an army. The other type represents naval control of a province or body of water, and is called a fleet. Each marker is numbered for identification. Each marker is numbered for identification. The colors represent different countries, as follows: Red, white, and blue, England; Blue, France; Black, Germany; Green, Italy; Red, Austria-Hungary; White, Russia; Yellow, Turkey.

Military rules. The board. The Great Powers have each been divided into provinces, each of which is a space for purposes of reckoning the moves of armies, and fleets. The sea has been divided into bodies of water, each of which is a space for purposes of reckoning the moves of fleets. The small countries are each one province for purposes of reckoning moves. The islands, except England, cannot be moved to.

Military rules. The moves of armies and fleets. After the diplomacy period has closed, the players write down the moves they wish to make with their armies and fleets. These written "orders" are usually kept secret until all players have written their orders. The orders are given to one player who then exposes them all, and makes the moves on the board. This duty falls on each player in turn for two moves in succession, starting with the player of England and proceeding clockwise around the table. The players should sit each behind his own country, and thus should be in the following order, clockwise

from England: Germany, Russia, Turkey, Austria-Hungary, Italy, France. The moves are named in order: Spring, 1901; Fall, 1901; Spring, 1902; and so on. In writing moves it is sufficient to write the name of one's country, the season & year, the number of each army, with the name of the province to which it is to move after it, and the number of each fleet, followed by an F, followed by the name of the province to which it is to move.

A player may move all his fleets and armies on each move. If he fails to order one of his units, it loses its move. If he orders it to make an impossible move or an ambiguous move, it loses its move. If he mistakenly writes down an order he does not intend, but which is possible, his unit executes the order. An army may move to any adjacent province on the land, subject to exceptions when its move conflicts with that of another unit. A fleet may move to any body of water adjacent to its location, or to any coastal province adjacent to its location, subject to exceptions when its move conflicts with that of another unit. When a province has two separated stretches of coastline, however (i.e., Spain, Finland, St. Petersburg, Bulgaria), a fleet which enters the province by one part of its coastline may move out only to a province or body of water adjacent to that stretch of coastline. Note that if a fleet in Portugal is ordered to Spain or a fleet in Constantinople is ordered to Bulgaria, the player must indicate which coast the fleet is to move to, or his move is ambiguous, hence forfeited. Likewise a fleet in a coastal province may move to another coastal province only if they are adjacent along a coastline.

The space which an army or fleet is in prior to a given move shall be called its "location". The space to which it is ordered shall be called its "objective".

If an army stands in its location, and another army is ordered to move to that province, the army ordered to move loses its move. If two armies are ordered to the same objective, they both lose their moves. If each army is ordered to the other's location, they both lose their moves. The result is the same between two fleets, or, when fleets and armies conflict, which may only occur in the coastal provinces, the result is again the same, the fleets and armies being equal in strength.

A player may order any army or fleet belonging to his country to give up its move in order to support another unit. A unit giving support may not move. If it is ordered both to move and to support, the move is considered, the support is ignored. The unit giving support may support only in a space to which it could legally move if unopposed by other units; that is, an army may support only if the objective of the unit receiving support is in a province adjacent by land to the army; a fleet may support an action only in a body of water or coastal province adjacent to its location as previously discussed. A unit receiving support has the power of two units; that is, it will move to its objective in spite of the presence or conflicting move of one or more other

armies acting without support. It does not matter if the opposing unit thus ousted from its location was ordered to attack the locations either of the attacking or the supporting units. A unit acting with the power of two nevertheless will not move if opposed directly by a unit acting with the power of two.

A unit may receive support from several units on the same move, and then may be prevented from moving only if directly opposed by a unit equally heavily supported. If a province is occupied, and two contesting units equally heavily supported attempt to enter it and fail, the army occupying it remains in occupation, unless it has been successfully ordered out on the move.

If the location of a supporting unit is attacked by a unit, not the one whose location is the objective of the unit receiving support, the supporting unit is treated as a unit not ordered to move, standing its ground against an unsupported attack, but not carrying out the support order. Thus a support may be "cut" by an attack from the side.

If a unit is ordered to follow another unit moving on the same move, and the leading unit is prevented from moving, the following unit is also prevented from moving.

The above rules apply whether the units belong to one country or to several; except that a country may not drive out one of its own units by an attack or support by another of its own units.

The units of one country may freely support those of another. When a support is ordered, it is sufficient to write the number of the unit supporting (plus "F" if a fleet) and an "S" indicating "supports", and the number and objective of the unit receiving support. If a foreign unit is to receive support, its country must also be given.

When a unit is driven out of a space, it must retreat before the next move begins. In a retreat the player of the retreating piece simply reaches over and moves the unit, to any adjacent space open to that type of unit, provided that that space is not occupied, not the space the attacker came from, and not a space that two units attempted to occupy on the move and failed to occupy due to a conflict in orders (called a "stand-off"). If two or more units have to retreat, and, in the opinion of the players, knowing what retreat one has chosen would affect the choice of the other, the retreats must be written privately and then shown. If no retreat is possible, or only one retreat is possible for two retreating units, the unit or units unable to retreat are annihilated and removed from the board. If no supply center has been lost, however, a new unit may be brought in as indicated below, as when a country has gained a supply center.

If the above rules are observed there will never be two units in the same space. This is subject to exceptions in the case of capitals, naval bases, and armies on board fleets, which will be discussed below.

**Military rules. Occupation of supply centers.** At the beginning of the game, each Great Power occupies the supply centers inside its boundaries. It may establish occupation of any other supply center by having a unit in that supply center at the close of a fall move. Once occupation of a supply center has been established, it continues until some other power establishes occupation of it. If a Power occupies more supply centers at the close of a fall move than it has units on the board, it may raise new units to bring its total up to the number of its supply centers. The player may apportion his new units between armies and fleets as he sees fit. Armies start in their capital, fleets in their naval base. If a country has lost its naval base, it may not raise fleets, unless and until it recaptures its naval base. If a country has lost its capital, it should immediately name another of its original supply centers as capital. If it recaptures its original capital, the capital moves back automatically. If a country has lost all its original supply centers, it may not raise new units, though it may keep its existing units on the board if it controls foreign supply centers; it may capture other foreign supply centers, cutting the supplies off from other Powers; it may, if it recaptures an original supply center, again set up a capital and raise armies.

If, at the close of a fall move, a country has more units on the board than it has supply centers under its occupation, it must remove units until its units are equal in number to the supply centers it occupies. The player losing the units may choose which of his units shall be removed. Raising and removal take place after the retreats, if any, as a result of the fall move have been made. Raising and removal should be written privately and revealed all at the same time by the player whose duty it is on the particular move to make physical moves.

**Capitals and naval bases.** The countries start the game each with two armies in its capital and one fleet in its naval base; except that England starts with two fleets and one army, and Russia starts with two armies in her capital, and one fleet in each of her two naval bases. When Russia builds a fleet she must indicate at which naval base it is to start.

A country may have any number of its own fleets in its naval base and any number of its own armies in its capital. When multiple units are in one province, however, they are worth only one in defence of that province. They may not support each other, nor may they both support the same unit outside the province. Only one of them may receive support in the capital or naval base.

An army may not move into its own capital if one of its own fleets is in it, nor a fleet into its naval base if occupied by its own army. But the presence of such units shall not prevent the raising of a unit in its proper place.

**Armies on board fleets.** If a fleet and army are in the same province, the army may be ordered "on board" the designated fleet and the

fleet moved on the same move. If an army is in a coastal province to which a fleet could ordinarily move, it may move in, provided the army is ordered on board. If the fleet is in a coastal province to which an army could ordinarily move, the army may move in, provided it is ordered on board at the same time. Once an army is on board a fleet, the two units may not support each other, nor has the army any fighting power. The army stays with the fleet until the fleet puts in at some coastal province, when the army may be ordered off, provided the fleet is also ordered out on the same move. If the army is attacked at this time, it is treated as if it had been located there previously and had not been ordered to move. If the fleet is prevented from moving, the army stays on board. Both the fleet and the army may receive support from other surrounding units, but may not support each other until the army is disembarked.

Miel and Constantinople. Miel and Constantinople may be crossed either by armies or by fleets. In either case the unit crossing must first stop in the given province, and thus by the above rules may not cross against opposition unless superior force is brought to bear.

Modifications for fewer players. With six players, Italy is deleted as Great Power, and Venice and Naples are deleted as supply centers. A majority of units is then 17. With five players, Turkey is deleted, and Ankara and Erzurum deleted as supply centers, bringing a majority down to 16.

Length of game. If no winner appears earlier, a game is usually played over a period of about four hours.

---

The above are the rules as originally copyright by Allan Calhauer in 1958 and supplied in ditto form with the early sets. As will be apparent by the mention of Erzurum and by reference to 35 supply centers the map was not identical with the one with which we are now so familiar. In fact there were two different versions of the map in use before the present one was finally adopted. The sheets of paper on which they were reproduced by some process similar to Ozalid, are larger than our current board and reproduction in this magazine presents some difficulties. However, the Ways and Means Committee is considering the matter and I hope to show the maps in a future issue. Comment on these rules will be deferred until then.

---

#### Name of Diplomacies.

In the last issue I stated that I thought that 25% of all Diplomacy magazines have followed the tradition of taking their names from the names of countries appearing in works of fiction. In Erebyon Vol. III, No. 9, Rod Walker published his list of all the zines known to him. He listed 147 titles and there are, as far as I know, only two or three others which he omitted. Well, I lost my bet that 25% had followed the old Graustark-Nuritania tradition. According to my count the

the fraction which did so is just under a quarter, although it is well over a fifth.

### Guarantors

Here are brief excerpts from a number of letters which I have received in the last few months. Dave Francis: "What's happened to Koning?" Ed Halle: "Well, I wonder how long it will be before Lebling and Koning come out of hibernation." Charles Welsh: "Could you tell me what is going on with Jutland Jollies?" Hal Maus: "...you have taken one of the Jutland Jollies games. What has happened to the rest?" Hal Maus, again: "Can you send me a list of the mags that have folded and what has happened to their games?" A list of similar queries could be extended almost endlessly. All of those appearing above were written within an inclusive period of three and a half weeks. It is apparent from them that there is widespread concern in Dippydom about the unexplained delays in so many zines' publication rates.

The deplorable level to which Diplomacy publishing has fallen may be shown by the following facts. As many of you know I was away from Ralston for a little over two weeks at the end of May and the beginning of June. I am currently playing in nine games in seven different zines. Prior to going away I only thought it worthwhile informing two of the editors concerned, giving them an alternate address to which to send issues of their zines published while I was away. Charles Weinsel was one of the two. I was quite confident that none of the others would produce anything requiring attention within the period of absence. How right I was! In fact, I needn't have bothered to inform the second editor, although the information was required in Weinsel's case. He and John Boardman are the only two editors who publish on a regular and prompt schedule. There are two or three others who are regular but who have a less exacting schedule, Ed Halle being the one who springs most immediately to mind. Outside of this handful, a half dozen at the most, every editor has been in arrears lately, some of them very much so. How different the situation would have been four or five years ago. At that time if I had had a similar trip to make I would have given the most detailed instructions to all gamesmasters of games I was in as to where I would be, and on what dates. Nowadays the management of games is so slack that only one game in nine requires that attention. In most of the games I am in delays have become the rule rather than the exception; but, at least, they are delays only, the games are still in progress after a fashion. In many other games the situation is far worse, the games have been abandoned by their gamesmasters.

Can anything be done about the large number of games so abandoned? Or, at least, can anything be done to decrease the number of such cases in future?

Some years ago Earl Thompson tried to ensure that the games in the zine he began, Vandy II, would not collapse. His method was to turn over the game fees to someone else who was instructed to return the fees to the players if issues did not appear regularly. That was

the first, and so far the only, attempt to protect the players against the failure of a gamesmaster to run his games. I am not sure, however, that such a money back offer really meets the case. An incident may show the weakness of this approach.

A year or so ago the Brannans made one of their frequent moves. I wrote Dan and offered to run his games for a time until he was settled again. He published this offer in his next issue and added the remark that he would transfer to me whichever of his games offered the most money in support of the change. Now Dan obviously meant this facetiously, but it wasn't so taken by all his players. One player in a WnW game who had a rather good position promptly wrote me and offered \$10 if I would take the game over, that sum being about double the WnW game fee. This incident, I think, illustrates the weakness of Thompson's solution to the abandoned game problem: It is not return of cash that the players want; he wants those games in which he is interested run off on a regular and reasonably fast rate. After all, if money was the main object we could all save some by never entering any games at all.

Is there any other procedure which might be used which would cut down on the number of abandoned games and which would keep the players informed of what is going on when games are temporarily delayed? On mulling this over recently it seemed to me that one possibility might be to have for every game, not only a gamesmaster, but also a guarantor, who would have to be himself a publisher and gamesmaster.

Here is how the system would work. Suppose Charles Larriwalker wanted to open a new game. He would first write to that well known gamesmaster, John W. Wells, and ask the latter if he would guarantee his game. On receiving an affirmative answer he would announce his game in the usual way, stating his playing procedures, fees, etc., and also indicating that John Wells would guarantee the game. The gamesmaster would then be obliged to send the latter all moves, not only the published ones in the ordinary way, but carbon-copy moves as well. He would inform him of any changes of address of players. If he felt that he would have to delay some issue he should inform the guarantor of the fact, and of the time that he expected the delay to last. If, at any time, an issue of the magazine did not appear at the expected time, the guarantor would have the right to write the gamesmaster to find out why; he would also be entitled to a reply to such a query. If a reply should not be received within a reasonable time he could assume that the game had been abandoned and he could assume control of it.

I think that there are a number of advantages to this system as compared with our present haphazard way of transferring abandoned games.

1. Charles Weissel has frequently stated that either a wine should appear within 72 hours of its previously announced deadline, or that the gamesmaster should write all his players explaining the



delay with an estimate of how long it will last. This may be all right in a perfect world. In the real one, an editor prevented from publishing due to domestic, scholastic, or business pressures would also find it impossible to write 25, or whatever, individual letters to his players explaining matters. But to write a card to one man, the guarantor, is another matter; only very very rarely will this be impossible. As the guarantor would himself be a publisher, the explanation would appear in print and would diffuse through the Diplomacy world so that the information would soon be known to all concerned.

2. When management of a game is transferred, the person taking over would, under this proposal, be fully informed of the prior situation. This is a feature that I personally feel strongly about at the moment. As many readers will know I recently took over an abandoned Jutland Jollies game. The first notable thing that happened after the take over was that one of the players began to complain long and bitterly that he didn't see why the game had to be set back to the position that it had before its last carbon-copy move. Now I didn't know anything about a carbon-copy move, I had just assumed that the last move published was the last of any type. The game was to be transferred from Jutland Jollies to John Moning, and was then transferred indirectly to me through Moning. I asked Moning if there was anything further on the game and he said that there wasn't. Admittedly, this query of mine was not made with any idea of carbon-copy moves, but because I thought that Bob Lake, the game's previous gamesmaster, might have forwarded current moves to Moning. But, however it arose, a player was made to feel that he was being put at a disadvantage. This sort of thing could not happen under the proposed scheme. The guarantor, who would normally be come the new gamesmaster, would be informed continuously of the events of the game and would know about carbon-copy moves and similar features.

5. Games could be transferred with far less bad feeling than now sometimes occurs. Many gamesmasters seem to feel that they own their games and that anyone who offers to take them over is attempting theft. Rightly considered the games belong, if they belong to anyone, to the players in them. In any event, under the proposed procedure, the gamesmaster says, implicitly at least, when he asks another gamesmaster to be his guarantor, "You are authorized to take this game over if I allow it to fall seriously behind the advertised schedule." Of course, no one expects the guarantor to take over a game which has a move that is two days late. The gamesmaster can easily look after occasional emergencies by informing the guarantor, "Binals prevent my publishing, there will be a delay of three weeks", or whatever. But if he just lets things fall, as has happened so often in the past, he automatically transfers authority to the guarantor to pick up the pieces, and had already done so at the time of asking the latter to guarantee his game.

4. Finally the time required to transfer a game would be much reduced. When a game is abandoned it now usually takes at least three months for some one else to take it over and get it

going again. Under the proposal, the guarantor would probably wait a week or ten days after the time he expected to receive an issue before writing the editor about it. He would then have to wait a reasonable time for a reply. But within three weeks or a month he should be able to satisfy himself that the game had been abandoned, and himself assume publication of it. All the steam won't be out of the players by the time the game is resumed.

I think it is ironic that many zines have the most elaborate schemes, spelled out in the minutest detail, as to what they will do if a player defaults, and there hasn't been the slightest thought given to the far more serious matter of default of the gamesmaster. Note that the rule-book itself gives one possible solution to the player default question. There is no reason why zines should not adopt other procedures if they think them better. But it isn't urgent, since we have that laid down procedure given to us. And a player can, to some extent at least, protect himself against the effects of the departure of another player. He has no such protection against the departure of a gamesmaster. I think it is time that some thought was given to the question.

No doubt if we adopted this procedure another question would immediately arise: quis custodiam custodiet? We may need a Super-guarantor to guarantee the guarantor.

---

Despatch Box

S. A. Cochran, Jr., 805 Citizens Bank Building, Tyler, Texas, 75701:

I have just received my second copy of Vimy Victors No. 2. Can it be that your addressing machine has the hiccups?

((+(When I took over the publication of Brobdingnag from Dick Schultz, nearly four years ago now, there had been several cases of players failing to receive issues of zines sent to them. In particular, an issue of Graustark mailed to John Moning did not reach him and his position in one of its games was seriously affected. I resolved that nothing of this sort would happen in Prob if I could help it and sent two copies of each issue to the players. These copies were mailed from different Post Offices, or on consecutive dates, or both. The same procedure has been followed by my other zines since, with the modification that if there are several games, and if a particular issue concerns only one of those games, then only the players in that game are sent a second copy.

You state that it was No. 2 for which you received two copies. What about No. 1? You were sent two copies of it as well. If you only received one, it is possible that the system has already paid off in your own case.

By the way, one copy of No. 2 was mailed from Winstan on a Thursday evening. The second copy was mailed from Winnipeg, some 5 or 6

hundred miles further east. Only rarely is it possible to have as good a separation as this in the points of mailing. -jamcc+))

Brenton Vex Floeg, 3241 North Tintrop, 605, Chicago, Illinois, 60626:

Two brief questions. First, why don't you, in the DRGB rating list, list not only the wins in ( ), but the number of wins. I am interested in that, and so are most others. With the great number of games that have been won, the mere fact that a person has won, and that in itself, is not very enlightening. It would be a simple matter to put, for Smythe as an example, (5W). True?

Second. Rod Walker and I stopped to see Allan Calhauer yesterday for about six hours, and, in addition to a fascinating conversation, came up with another rule consideration for you. This was something which he had been asked about, but hadn't passed it along...Incidentally, he considers it to be very legit, within terms of what is defined in the rulebook.

To wit: The rules say that a player can build in an unoccupied home center. Nowhere in the rules does it say that the player had to be the last to own the center, even on a Wall move. Thus, the player could raise whether or not his country had been overrun completely, provided, of course, that he could meet the other requirements.

What's it, and it's so simple I'm surprised that no-one in Postal play ever asked about it before. As Howardman says: "Play Calhauer's Rules." Now, pray tell, what does the rulebook say about that? I realize of course, that the implications of interpreting it this way would be heinous. And, clearly, this was not Calhauer's intention. Nevertheless, he claimed to have a red face. I wonder how many others like that are nosing around waiting to be uncovered simply because every one interprets them the same.

((+(The DRGB Rating List did, in fact, give the number of wins at one time. See the Rating List in DRGB #75 for example. I soon dropped the idea because at that time I included 5-man games as well as 7-man games and it seemed to me that the two types of win should really be distinguished from one another. Also there were then far fewer winners than now and everyone knew that John Smythe had won 4 games, far more than anyone else, so it didn't really give much information. Time has brought a change to both these objections and I think it would be a good idea to adopt your suggestion. As you know, I am no longer the manager of the DRGB Rating List but just its bookkeeper. However, if Ed Hille has no objections I will do as you suggest in future editions of the listing.

As to the rule point, I don't think you, or Walker, or Calhauer can have read the rules very thoroughly. What the rulebook says is "If he gains units, he places them, one in each unoccupied supply center in his home country only (provided such supply centers are still under his control). The words underlined appear to me to very clearly prohibit a build behind the enemy lines, such as you suggest.

In this instance the rulebook clearly states what Calhauer clearly meant. This is not the same thing as saying that our existing rule is the best, either from the point of view of the most interesting game, or from the point of view of paralleling the actual historical situation. As to the rule which makes the more interesting game it can only be determined if players with experience of the traditional game try a few games of the variant and express their opinion of it. As to historical realism, consider the following case. Suppose that in 1914 the German advance had not been stopped on the Marne. Suppose they had succeeded in surrounding and capturing Paris. Let us suppose further that after many anxious moments through the year 1915 that the French managed to establish a defensible front but one which left the enemy in occupation of the north-eastern fifth of France. Suppose now that the resources, human, financial, with the goodwill of allies, sufficient to maintain their existing armies, repair wastage, and so on, and that they have something additional, over and above this. What should they do with the extra? An additional Army Corps in the line may make no practical difference at all: they can hold with what they have, but a successful offensive might require not a mere addition but a doubling of their army. In such circumstances it might make more military sense not to raise the additional troops at all but to use their resources differently. There would almost certainly be unrest in the occupied areas. They might very well decide that they could do more toward the eventual winning of the war by supporting guerilla action there, running small arms and ammunition along the Channel coast and so on. Our game speaks of an "army". Nothing is said of its composition. We tacitly assume that it is supposed to be a conventional organized army. But there is nothing to prevent it from being an army of a resistance movement instead. I would like to see a game played under this rule, that is, where a country can make a raise to which it is entitled in any vacant home centre, even though the centre is the property of another power. Unless you or Calhauer have a better suggestion I propose calling this rule dispute the Guerilla Raise question.

As to how many other items of possible dispute may still be lurking undetected in the rulebook, two and a half years ago I rashly stated that I thought that all the major disputes had been discovered. I had barely published that statement when Richard Shagrin wrote me with his Alternate Route Convoy question. So I won't make a rash prophecy this time.

Anyhow, I don't think that the rulebook has ever defined the game. It has, at most, provided a rough guide, but we have all really learned the game from other players, not from the book. That this is so is shown by the fact that every time a group of any size has joined the main body they have been found to have a somewhat different set of rules. The Toronto group had several rules different from what is now normally accepted, for instance they destroyed an army which was being convoyed by a fleet if the fleet were dislodged. In Youngstown a unit ordered to move could be supported standing, until Moning and Smythe changed things to agree with what was usually done in postal play. Last year when the Key-Just group joined us they had a rule that a force ordered to move and prevented from doing so by other forces could be dislodged by the attack of a single unit.

There were formerly many Diplomacy players who contacted one another to arrange games. They did not unite with the existing "zine" body of players until the Spring-Summer of 1966. Prior to that union they almost universally allowed convoy through coastal provinces. If it comes to that, the Washington and vicinity group still play a game which differs in some respects from that used by everyone else.

Many layers never read the rulebook. When Ken Davidson left this area for Denmark he was in about a half-dozen games but had not read the rulebook, although he may have done so since. When Dan Brannan first read the rulebook he announced the fact in Wild in Woolly; not only had he played the game for years previously, he was already a gamesmaster of standing.

Jeff Key calls the main body of postal Diplomacy players "the mainstream". The game that the mainstream plays is the game taught, directly or indirectly, by Calhauer, at least for the most part. The rulebook game is something else. In a sense it is unplayable, since there are frequently occurring situations which it doesn't cover at all. For instance, an y game basing itself solely on the rulebook would have to come to a standstill if two players ordered a retreat to the same space, since there is nothing in the book to decide what should be done in such a case. In the very early days the most active group of Diplomacy players was the East Paterson Diplomacy Club, a group which Calhauer had personally addressed and explained the game to. Someone (Dean Dickensheet???) carried word of the game from there to the West Coast and there was tremendous, if short lived, enthusiasm in Los Angeles. Boardman learned the game at the East Paterson club, and Graustark grew from that. Ruritania grew out of the Los Angeles group. Both groups, as we have seen, taught the game by Calhauer, in one case directly, in the other indirectly. Calhauer's influence on these two early zines was reinforced by his entering a game in one and by his writing quite frequently in the other. Nearly all magazines published today have a line of descent from these two original zines. For instance, I played in several Boardman games before I began publishing. As mentioned earlier, in all cases of groups or of magazines which began independently of this main line, that is where a set was bought and the rulebook interpreted as best it could be without reference to other players, there are differences between the game so developed and the mainstream game. And nothing can more starkly show the inadequacy of the rulebook as a definition of the game. -jmcce+))

Hal Thus, 1011 Barrett Avenue, Chula Vista, California, 92010:

Was messing around out in my shed this morning and, while looking thru old issues of Trob and your latest magazines, I started a list of the new bloods that you had listed.. with the following results.

(+((Hal, as you know, you then had about three pages of listings. I won't quote the remainder of your letter, but will summarize it. What Hal did was to go through all the Diplomacy magazines which I have published and to list all the names appearing in the New Blood columns of them. We then took these names and checked them against

a game roster which he maintains to find out how many games each had entered. He found 86 New Blood names in all, exactly half of whom, 43, became active to some extent. Two of those who became active have since dropped out of postal Diplomacy, and 7 publish zines of their own now. Of those who became active by far the most active was Edi Mirson, so much so that Hal gave up on the job of counting his games, he just puts "Active" in large letters beside his name. Others who were very active include Ed Hallie with 15 games, Ruddy Wretick with 12, Sid Cochran with 11, and Bob Minney with 12. Many are in the 6 or 7 category, and very many in the 1, 2, or 3.

Hal, I am not surprised that only half of these people became active. Many of them had heard about the name, were interested enough to write to try to find out more about it, but did not really expect to enter games. What surprises me more is that only two of those once active have dropped out. This is much below the proportion of drop outs in the hobby as a whole. In any event, many thanks for digging out this information, it must have been a great deal of work to do. (-jamcc+))

---

#### New Blood

There is no need to let that number remain at 86 indefinitely. The following have written indicating an interest in the game.

Francis E. Long, 122-10 16th Avenue, College Point, New York, 11356

Jay Bennett, 8203 Southampton Ave., Wyndmoor, Pennsylvania, 19118

Murty G. Kirkpatrick, 320 Yale Street,ampa, Idaho, 83651

---

#### New Games

The queries above asked about game openings. Listed below are games forming which I have heard about in the last month or so:

The Fugot Sound Gazette, Hal Maus, 1011 Barrett Avenue, Clula Vista, California, 92010. The Fugot Sound Gazette, by the way, will incorporate Cerebral Pebula, The Lost Ones and MEGLANT.

Problemsong, Ed Wille, P. O. Box 903, Gainesville, Florida, 32601. The fee is \$3, \$4, or \$5, depending on whether or not you are a present player and whether or not you are a member of the World Games Bureau. Ed is also offering a game of the variant, Cryptodiplomacy. Write him for details.

Olympia, Rich Rubin, 3580 N. Pointe Drive, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 53217.

Thulcandra, 4242 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Maryland, 20015.  
Moves will actually be published in Charles Wells' Lonely Mountain but fees and applications should go to Herry.

Half 'n' Half, David Lindsay, 2245 Fairmont Parkway, Erie, Pennsylvania, 16510.

The Voice, Jeff W. Hey, P. O. Box 251, Eatontown, N. J., 07724.

Attacher, Donald Cowan, 1605 8th Ave., S. W., Decatur, Alabama, 35601.

Verbal Chaos Ltd., Bill McDuffie, 20 Gail Drive, Nyack, New York, 10960

Limbourg Gazette and Bi-monthly Almanac, Craig Mlyver, 6254 Langdon Ave., Van Nuys, California, 91401

---

Ye Olde Busie Bulletryne Boarde is a new venture by Jeff W. Hey, P. O. Box 251, Eatontown, New Jersey, 07724. It lists new magazines, delays in existing magazines, new game openings, new players, players' address changes, and things of that nature. The price is 12 issues for a dollar, or fifty cents for the same dozen issues to those currently receiving The Voice. Appearing every three weeks it is intended to keep us all up to date with what we might term administrative news. If it can maintain its schedule and if editors co-operate by sending in their news, this could easily be one of the most useful innovations on the bippy scene.

My own publishing plans for the coming summer include the following:

Laurans. Buff. This is a journal of discussion about Diplomacy. It carries no games and is unlikely to do so in the near future. In fact it carries no regular features at all. However, I expect to continue the series, begun this issue, on the evolution of the rulebook, although not in every issue.

Vimy Victors. Green. Carries game 1967AJ taken over from Jutland Jollies. Also the Callahan Point Count rating list. And, in conjunction with the last item, a brief summary of all recently completed games.

Name undecided. Blue. Last summer Rod Walker asked me to handle his Erehyon regular games while he was away on vacation. That idea was ruined by the Canadian postal strike. Nothing daunted by that experience he has again asked me to look after some of his games this summer while he is moving from Illinois to California. The first issue is expected out about mid July, depending on the first deadline that Rod gives me.

Subscription price for any or all of these is 100 pages for a dollar. Individual items are 10cents each, 20 cents if more than 10 pages long. Subscribers' and traders' copies may be sent several issues together to save mailing charges, although Imperania will normally be mailed on publication.

I should have mentioned, a page back, that Half 'n' Half's games are carried in Lonely Mountain. Also among games forming there is

Ernstark, John Boardman, 592 16th St., Brooklyn, New York, 11218.

The first ever Diplomacy magazine, now in its seventh year, limits itself to three or four new games per year. One of these is due to be announced soon. However, the only way you can enter it is to win one of the series of contests which Ernstark is now running. The current contest is on names of fictional countries, a subject which should be dear to the heart of all diplomacy bibliophiles. Just send John the origin, author, book, and so on, of the following fictional countries, Altheuland, Sondour, Free City of Judenstadt, Klopstockia, Lampederra, Libertaria (Libertatie), Pharamaul, Severanbie, Empire of Tollan, Ubigucki; a successful entry will give you a free game in one of the most eagerly sought after playing fields.

---

#### State of the Games

Listed below is the current state of affairs of a number of games in progress. This attempts to give both the publishing status, and the game-development status of each game. For the former the most recent information of any kind; for the latter the state reached at the end of the latest completed build move. For example, 16, after a player's name indicated that he is playing Italy and that he had 3 forces on the board at the end of the last build season, whatever may have happened since then.

It will be noted that games are listed in three different ways. (1) No underlining. The game is moving along on schedule. (2) Single underlining. More than two weeks have elapsed since the previously announced deadline with no further word being received. The game seems late but there is no reason to suppose that anything more serious is wrong with it. (3) Double underlining. As far as the reader can judge the game has been abandoned, no word of it having been received in months. It should be pointed out that appearances are sometimes deceiving. Lately many games have been transferred from a published magazine to carbon-copy letter mode of production. If one is in the game one knows all about these carbon-copy games; if not, the game appears to have stopped although perhaps it is progressing normally. Any editors or players who have information more complete and up to date than that indicated below are requested inform me of such errors.

1965C, Wild'n Wooly's 1965EM. Dan Krauman, gam master. Fall 1918 moves in Wny 140, dated 30 March 1968. No deadline assigned but other games in same issue had deadline 15 May. Players:



Pournelle G16, von Metzke E7, Dygert I6, McCallum R5. This game has been in progress for four and a half years and is the only 1965 game still on the books.

1966C. Wild 'n Woolly's 1966ML. Winter 1912 in Wn7 140. Deadline for moves for Spring 1913, 5 May. Players: Wells E10, McCallum, E9, Moning E9, Maus E6. Gamesmaster Prannan.

1966E. Diplophobia's PFC. Don Miller Gamesmaster. Fall 1911 in Diplophobia 46, dated 28 March. Deadline 22 April. Players: Schelz E13, Huff E10, Lebling E10.

1966W. Bölverk. James Wright gamesmaster. All of the players in this game lived in, or near, Richland, Oregon, and it is believed that the game was completed over the board.

1966X. Arbitaria. Swenson gamesmaster. This game had the misfortune to be born in Lusitania. It was later transferred to Andy Swenson's Ligatonic University, but the editor of the latter is now in the services. Ideally it would be a good thing for some one to pick the game up but, in this case, the front running player is usually highly uncooperative. Players: Dygert E14, Wolf E7, Prannan E5 Ward E4, Gemignani E3, Peck E1. And those positions are at the end of 1967

1966Z. Wild 'n Woolly's 1966Mj. Prannan gamesmaster had its Spring 1968 move in WnW 140 with a deadline of 12 May for the fall move. Players: Davidson E11, Moning E8, Buch E8, Christina Prannan E7.

1966AF. ADAC. Maus gamesmaster. Spring 1911 in ADAC 39. Deadline 14 June. Players: Peery E14, Turner E10. St. Cyr E11.

1966AS. Diplophobia's PFC. Don Miller Gamesmaster. 1911 builds in #46 with next deadline 22 April. Players: Greene E17, von Metzke E8, Huff E7, Lebling E2.

1966AM. Diplophobia's PFC. Miller gamesmaster. 1911 builds in #47. Deadline 24 June. Players: Lebling E16, Zelazny E14, Huff E1.

1966AW & 1966BA. Corsair. Bob Speed gamesmaster. Nothing has been heard of these two games since their opening move. Since all the players were fairly close neighbours it is possible that they were completed over the board.

1966ED. Diplophobia's PFC. Miller gamesmaster. 1909 builds in #47. Deadline 24 June. Players: Erosnitz E13, Lebling E11, Maus E9, Schelz E1.

1966EH. Kalmar. Christina Prannan gamesmaster. 1908 builds in Wild 'n Woolly 141. Deadline 31 May. All countries still alive. This game also known as Kalmar 1966EH

- 1966BH. Malnar's 63MS. Christina Brannan gamesmaster. Fall 1907 moves in WnW 141. Deadline 27 May. Players at end '05: Bretick 113, Firsan 19, Tzudiker 29, Fletcher 12.
- 1966BF. Malnar's 63KT. Fall 1907 moves in WnW 141. Deadline for builds 4 June. Christina Brannan gamesmaster. Players ('06): Long 111, Turner 18, Houston 16, Feyerlein 34, Warden 24.
- 1966BO. Malnar's 63KV. Christina Brannan gamesmaster. Spring '08 in WnW 141. Deadline for retreats 30 May. Players: Firsan 113, Maus 112, Peery 115, Ferrin 12, Chapman 12, Maus 61.
- 1967A. steb, John Meng gamesmaster. Fall 1915 in steb 82 with deadline for builds 11 April. Players: Smythe 113, Fournelle 110, Clark 19, Latimer 61.
- 1967B. Diplophobia's PIC. Miller gamesmaster. 1909 builds in #47. Deadline 24 June. Players: Bretick 113, Maus 18, Huff 14, Carey 13, von Letzke 12
- 1967J. The Puget Sound Gazette. Maus gamesmaster. 1905 builds in #1. Deadline 14 June. Players: Metzger 9E, St. Cyr 31, Rosenbaum 6R, Eddy 11, 5A, Novack 2E.
- 1967H. Diplophobia's POC. Miller Gamesmaster. Fall 1906 in #47. Deadline for builds 24 June. Players ('07): Prosnitz 131, Lebling 131, von Letzke 4E, Maus 2E, Huff 2E.
- 1967O. Xenogogic. Peery gamesmaster. Fall 1910 in II,12,0. Deadline for builds 5 July. Players (1909): Leshard 12E, Prosnitz 6A, Comber 6E, Carey 5R, Maus 4E.
- 1967T. The Puget Sound Gazette. Hal Maus gamesmaster. Spring '03 in #1. Deadline 14 June. Players: Phillips 111, Turner 3E, Maggart 3E, St. Cyr 5E, Pendergrass 2E.
- 1967U. Braustark. John Boardman gamesmaster. Winter 1920 was in Brau #185, 3 May. Deadline 17 May. More recent issues of Brau-stark do not list this game. Players: Michael Miller 11E, Clark 10E, Meshara 10E, Leo Neap 3E.
- 1967W. Xenogogic. Peery gamesmaster. Fall 1910 in II,12,0. Deadline for builds 5 July. Players ('09): Walker 12E, Leshard 9E, Maus 7E, Linden 6E.
- 1967Y. Xenogogic. Peery gamesmaster. Fall 1909 in II,12,0. Deadline for builds 5 July. Players ('08): Robt Perkins 9A, Polan 6E, Cochran 8E, Leckner 8E.

(To be continued.)