

#1

7 September 1971

The Official Gazette

of the Grand Duchy

of P f e n n i g - H a l b p f e n n i g

Pfennig-Halbpennig is a journal of general Diplomacy interest, published by John McCallum, P. O. Box 52, Ralston, Alberta, Canada. Trade agreements with other Diplomacy publishers are welcomed. The subscription price is 100 pages for a dollar.

Pfennig-Halbpennig and SerenDip. As most readers will know, I have published the journal SerenDip for some years. I have recently found it increasingly difficult to run its games properly. The two remaining regular Diplomacy games, 1969U and 1969BH were accordingly turned over to Rod Walker to complete. He will continue to use the name SerenDip for the journal carrying the games. There were, however, a number of other features of SerenDip that were uncompleted; Pfennig-Halbpennig is designed to carry them. In particular it is hoped to carry to completion the Bourse being run on game 1969RH. Publication rate of this journal will be irregular, and will largely depend on the activity in the Bourse. The magazine goes to active players in game 1969BH and to players in its Bourse. This issue goes to all who previously regularly received SerenDip. Cash subscribers to the latter to whom a rebate is due will find cash, or the equivalent in postage stamps, enclosed. I will be happy to trade with any other Diplomacy publishers who wish to do so. The subscription price to others is a cent a page (I thought of increasing this by 50% in conformity with the title, but decided against it).

Bourse. The Bourse on game 1969BH continues; reporting its moves is the major reason for the existence of this journal. Several players have standing orders on hand but, as this page is typed, there are no transaction requiring reporting. Should any occur within the next few days there will be a Bourse report near the end of the magazine. I think it may happen fairly often, in other issues, that it will be convenient to do the Bourse report last. Bourse players should therefore always look at the final pages as well as the opening ones.

The Experiment. Jeff Power and Andy Phillips are playing a two-man game, starting from a position that arose in game 1969T. Both expressed willingness to continue, enthusiastic in one case, with some reservations in the other. My own feeling is that the point at issue will be decided within 3 or 4 more moves. The following errors occur in the report of moves for Fall 1909, as given in SerenDip #7 6:

1. The German fleet Bothnia is not listed. This fleet moved to Bothnia from the Baltic in Spring 1909 and, as far as is known, is still cruising in the Gulf of Finland and adjacent waters.

- 2, The statement that there is no English fleet, North Sea, is in error since the fleet formerly in Belgium retreated to the North Sea following the previous move. Therefore the English move to Denmark, from the North Sea, supported by the fleet Sweden, succeeds.
3. The error above results, in turn, in an error in the supply centre count. Denmark, credited to Germany, actually belongs to England. The total German count is therefore 15 and the total English count 12. Germany must remove one force, the other build and removal requirements remain unaltered.

Retreats, Fall 1909:

Power: Germany: Army Greece to Albania. Army Rumania to Budapest.
Army Burgundy to Munich.

Phillips: England: Fleet Sweden to Skagerrak.

Build and removal orders are now due.

The SerenDip Quotes Quiz. There has been a running contest in SerenDip, the object being to spot the source of its masthead quotes. The first of Rod Walker's issues of SerenDip has a masthead quote and I understand that he will continue to run them. As previously a prize of a free game will be awarded to the reader with the most correct replies on hand each time that there is a country drop in game 1969BH. Entries should be sent to me, not to Rod. All Laurania and SerenDip masthead quotes may be used except those from SerenDip's 34, 39, 44, and 46 which have been invalidated through correct replies from previous winners.

SerenDip Name Contest. In SerenDip #7 a contest was announced to give the origin of the name SerenDip. There were seven replies, a remarkably high number for a Diplomacy quiz. All of the replies were substantially correct, though none was correct in all details. I looked at the replies, as I have looked at them from time to time in the two years' interval that has since elapsed, and I didn't know what to do. To award the prize to anyone in preference to the other six seemed, and seems, impossible. The facts -

In 1557 there was published in Italy by C. Armeno a work called Peregrinaggio. It is a collection of tales, loosely strung together, dealing with the adventures of The Three Princes of SerenDip. They are sent by their father on a tour of neighbouring lands as a climax to their education. SerenDip was a then current name for what we call Ceylon, being the Arabic name for the place. The last syllable, variously given as -dip, -dib, -dab, etc., apparently means island. It is my feeling that Seren and Ceylon are merely different renderings of the same native word. The languages of Ceylon - I am told by a man from southern India that there are four - are descended from Sanskrit. Sanskrit itself, all its multitudinous daughter tongues,

as well as other Oriental languages, have no sound corresponding to our r or l. Instead they have another semi-vowel, intermediate between the two, although pronounced with the tongue inverted, unlike either. So the transliteration of an Oriental word containing this semi-vowel, into a Western language can never be exact, you have to opt for an r or an l, and so err on one side or the other. This can easily be checked by asking your newly arrived Japanese friend to pronounce Seren and Ceylon. He will say very much the same thing for both.

Anyhow, back to the book. It states that it is an Italian translation of a Persian original. Persian literature is both extensive and well known, but a diligent search of it over the centuries has failed to show anything that could be called a source of The Three Princes of Serendip. The assumption is, therefore, that Armeno himself wrote the story and added the Persian bit to give it a suitably exotic flavour. The book was quite popular and went through several editions and translations. Some two centuries later Horace Walpole ran across a French translation, was struck by it, and coined the word 'serendipity' from it. (In his book, "Serendip and The Three Princes" Remer insists that the common definition "a happy chance discovery" is not sufficient and that the element of sagacity must be there as in Walpole's original definition. That is, if I stagger homeward from the club one night, in my usual inebriated condition, stumble into a ditch, and wake up next morning stiff, cold, and miserable, but clutching in my hand a bag of gold that some one had deposited there, it would be a happy chance discovery, but not a serendipitous one, as sagacity would be notably lacking from the actions of all parties concerned.)

The seven answers were sent in by

Chuck Carey
Sid Cochran
Betsy du Bose (now Mrs. Mike Childers)
Terry Kuch
Banks Mebane
Jeff Power
Don Turnbull

All were more or less correct, though they included some errors. The most persistent error was that Walpole somehow wrote the book. He didn't; he read it, in a French translation, and coined the word 'serendipity' from it. One entrant suggested that I had changed the ending from -dab to -dip for the Diplomacy implication. This is not correct; many endings were used at the time and the one in the version used in the story was -dip. The only new information that I gleaned from the replies was Don Turnbull's statement that there is a vocal group in England called the "Serendipity Singers". Most knew that Serendip meant Ceylon, but none mentioned the virtual identity of the two words due to the confusion between r and l in passing from an oriental language to an occidental one. (This surprised me. Due to the 30 years of almost continuous warfare on the fringes of Asia, I thought that this fact was now well known.)

There was a further question as to whether the zine name, SerenDip, conformed with the old tradition of naming Diplomacy journals after fictional places. From the same basic data some said

it was, some said it wasn't, and some hedged. Obviously this is a matter of definition. My own feeling is that SerenDip cannot be regarded as the name of a fictional place.

What to do about the offered prize? There are some differences in completeness and exactness in the replies but they are not great enough so that any one answer can be selected as the best answer. I therefore propose a further contest, open only to the seven named, to decide the issue. Give a list of as many Diplomacy journals as possible which, like SerenDip, were named for actual countries (or territories, provinces, or what not). To prevent anyone from merely submitting a list of all Diplomacy zines, wrongs will be subtracted from rights. And a note of explanation should probably be added for the names of the more obscure countries included. Some of the people in our list have a waning, or extinguished, interest in postal Diplomacy. Such a one may, if desired, receive as prize a slightly eye-tracked copy of T. G. Remer: SerenDip and The Three Princes, Oklahoma University Press. It includes, by the way, what purports to be the first direct translation of the story from 16th century Italian into English. It is claimed that all previous translations were made from French or German translations.

Recently Completed Games

The following games have ended in the last month or so:

19680 WON 1911

Zine: Costaguana

Gamesmaster: Conrad von Metzke

Winner: Turkey, Karl Wittmann '06 Andrew Phillips

Survivors: France, Hal Naus, 9 forces

England, Wade Johnston (Alias Larry Peery), 6 forces

Eliminated: Germany, Bill Linden '09

Austria, Sid Cochran '06 civ. dis. '08

Italy, Stephen H ueston '04 Roland Tzudiker '05

Russia, Bob Ward '05

1968X WON 1911

Zine: Xenogogic, its X-13

Winner: France, Robert Perkins '07 John Beshara

Survivors: England, Gary Dickson '08 Pete Comber 8 forces

Austria, Keith Polan 5 forces

Turkey, Bob Kinney '10 Chris Schleicher, 3 forces

Eliminated: Italy, Roland Tzudiker '05 Jon Kline '07 Larry St.

Cyr '11

Russia, Greg Warden '05 civ. dis. '06

Germany, Jim Latimer '05

1968Y WON 1913

Zine: Xenogogic, its X-16

Winner: Turkey, Kenneth Hake '09 Edi Birsan

Survivors: England, Hal Naus, 10 forces

France, Bud Pendergrass '05 Mark Sawchuck '09

John Beshara '12 civ. dis. 4 forces

Eliminated: Russia, Keith Polan '13
Italy, Harold Peck '09
Austria, Conrad von Lietzke '09
Germany, Sidney Jolly '04

1968AB WON 1909

Zines: Valhalla, then sTab
Gamesmasters: John Koning '08 Conrad von Lietzke
Winner: Turkey, Monte Zelazny '08 Jerry Pournelle
Survivors: Germany, Larry Peery '08 Charles Welsh, 10 forces
France, Jim Latimer '07 Larry St. Cyr 4 forces
Russia, John Smythe '08 Eric Just 2 forces
Eliminated: Italy, John McCallum '09
England, Charles Reinsel '05
Austria, Jerry Pournelle '05

Valhalla was a sort of Diplomacy supplement to Strategy and Tactics when that magazine was new. The game was by invitation and was to have been a demonstration game, for wargamers who had not seen Diplomacy before. I wonder what they made of a game where the first man eliminated was also the winner. And where one of the strongest players around, Monte Zelazny, dropped out when within sight of victory.

1968AI WON 1912

Zines: Glockorla '02 Diplophobia
Gamesmasters: Dave Lebling '02 Don Miller
Winner: Turkey, Geo. Schelz '07 Andrew Phillips
Survivors: England, Norman McLeod '03 Hal Naus 10 forces
Germany, Charles Welsh, 6 forces
Eliminated: Austria, Geo. Grayson '08 Larry St. Cyr '12
France, Charles Reinsel '08
Italy, John Koning '03 Ritchie Dean '06
Russia, Mark Bird '04 Doug Beyerlein '05 Steve Bruce '06

1968BT WON 1907

Zines: Aeolus to Aerlion to Brobdingnag
Gamesmasters: Monte Zelazny, Ed Helle, Rod Walker
Winner: Russia, Lehran Thomson
Survivors: Germany, Banks Liebane 8 forces
Italy, Hal Naus 4 forces
France, Buddy Tretick 3 forces
Eliminated, Austria Norman Zinkhan '06 Charles Welsh '07
England, George Grayson '04
Turkey, Jerry White '04

1968CF DRAW 1908

Zines: Costaguana '02 ADAG
Gamesmasters: Conrad von Lietzke '02 Hal Naus
Survivors: France, George Schelz 8 forces
Russia, John McCallum 8 forces
Turkey, Jerry White 8 forces
England, Andrew Phillips 7 forces
Italy, Peter Rosamalia 3 forces
Eliminated: Germany, Dick Reiter '05 Lee Childs '05
Austria, Frank Lunney '04

1969BO WON 1911

Zine: Thulcandra/Lonely Mountain, its #3

Gamesmaster: Terry Kuck

Winner: Russia, John Shutelock

Survivors: Austria, Thom Holaday '06 Rod Walker 6 forces

France, Steve Caplan '10 civ. dis., 3 forces

Turkey, Steve Cairns '08 Conrad von Metzke 3 forces

England, Jay Bennett '09 Andrew Phillips

Eliminated: Italy, Mike Goldstein '08

Germany, Buddy Tretick '07

The achievement of the runnerup is remarkable. When he took Austria over in 1906 that country was down to 1 force, but managed to build it up to 6 by game's end, 5 years later.

1969CA WON 1911

Zine: Diplophobia, its QAC

Don Miller: Gamesmaster

Winner: Italy, Jeff Power

Survivors: Germany, Bernie Ackerman 11 forces

Russia, Vince O'Hara '04 Buddy Tretick '04 Bob Johnson 4 forces

France, Tom Oleson '09 Peter Rosamalia 1 force

Eliminated: Turkey, Don Cowan '04 Larry St. Cyr '06

England, Bill Inner '04 George Grayson '05

Austria, Ritche Dean '04

This is the first game carrying a Bourse to be completed. Don Miller expects to have a discussion of it in his next issue, something which should be of interest to all playing in Bourses, or interested in them.

1969CK WON 1908

Zine: Erehwon/Numenor

Gamesmaster: Rod Walker

Winner: France, Gary Jones

Survivors: Russia, David May '03 Lee Childs, 8 forces

Austria: Gary Gyax, 6 forces

England, David Rockwell '04 Andy Phillips, 1 force

Italy, Bill McDuffie '05 Conrad von Metzke, 1 force

Eliminated: Germany, Chuck Carey, '04 Laurence Rusiecki '05

Hal Naus '07

Turkey, George Patton '04

1970E WON 1912

Zine: Graustark (its Beginners' Game)

Gamesmaster: John Boardman

Winner: Italy, John Behhara (James Becker until 1909)

Survivors: Russia, Brian Bailey, 12 forces

England, Bruce Gletty, 4 forces

Eliminated: Germany, Stephen Tang '12

Turkey, Ray Anling '06

France, Ray Hoseley '04

Austria, Thomas Poplawski '02 James Barber '02

1970J WON 1914

Zine: Graustark

Gamesmaster: John Boardman

Winner: England, Jack Chalker '02 Dick Miller

Survivors: Italy, Peter Comber 10 forces

Turkey, Michael Aita, 4 forces

Germany, Donald Berman '08 Brian Burley '14

Eliminated: France, George Schelz '03 Richard Locke

Russia, George Grayson '11

Austria, Marty Kirkpatrick '04

1970M WON 1910

Zine: Graustark

Gamesmaster: John Boardman

Winner: France, Bob Strayer

Survivors: Russia, Duane Leinhos 9 forces

Italy, Buddy Tretick '03 Marty Kirkpatrick '06

Rod Walker

Turkey, Steven Cairns '07 Brian Burley 2 forces

Germany, Herb Barents, 1 force

Eliminated: England, Thomas Bray '03 Richard Locke '08

Austria, Hugh Anderson '07

1970W WON 1911

Zine: Graustark (Its Prize Winners Game)

Gamesmaster: John Boardman

Winner: Italy, Bob Ward

Survivors: Russia, Ron Salcedo 6 forces

England, Jay Kimmel '07 Rod Walker 4 forces

Germany, John McCallum, 4 forces

France, Charles Vest, 1 force

Eliminated: Turkey, George Grayson '07

Austria, Mike Aita '03

This game ended on the Spring 1911 move. Forces shown are as they were at end of 1910, with the exception of France. France had 3 forces at the end of 1910; the annihilation of two of them in Spring 1911 brought the game to an end.

Admission to this game was restricted to those who had won one or another of a series of Quiz Contests run in Grau.

1970AH CANCELLED 1900

Gamesmaster: Scott Hankin

The strange case of the disappearing gamesmaster. This game was organized, or at least initiated, by Rod Walker. The players were some of the most noteworthy writers of press releases. Scott Hankin agreed to run the game, with the understanding that press releases would be unrestricted. He collected the fees and has not since been heard from in postal Diplomacy circles. A replacement game, 1971BA, with much the same group of players, is now being run by Conrad von Metzke in Die Schuldigkeit.

1968I The winner and still the champion, John Smythe! News of this game came in too late for it to be taken in correct chronological order. Details overleaf.

1968I WON 1912

Zine: ADAG
Gamesmaster: Hal Naus

Winner: John Smythe, playing France

Survivors: Turkey, John Koning '07 Steve Ball, 15 forces

Eliminated: England, Larry Peery, 1 force
Russia, Jerry Pournelle '06 Andrew Phillips '12
Italy, Edi Birsan '06
Germany, Jim Latimer '05
Austria, Charles Reinsel '04

This is John's eighth win, made with a country which he has stated is impossible to play.

Calhamer Point Count Rating List (172)

	<u>W</u>	<u>T</u>	<u>3D</u>	<u>4D</u>	<u>5D</u>	<u>6D</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Price</u>
Russia	34	4	1	2	3	1	37:36	1.53
Turkey	30	4	3	2	5	1	34:40	1.41
England	20	2	2	3	6	1	23:47	.97
France	20		4	2	4	1	22:48	.93
Austria	17	2	1		3	1	19:06	.78
Germany	14	4		4	4	1	17:58	.73
Italy	14		1	3	5		16:05	.66
Total	149	8	4	4	6	1	172	

8:20	John Smythe	3:00	James Dygert Don Miller Derek Nelson
7:25	Edi Birsan	2:57	Larry St. Cyr
7:04	Charles Turner	2:55	Larry Peery
6:12	John Beshara Eugene Prosnitz	2:54	Peter Rosamalia
5:34	Andrew Phillips	2:30	Bud Pendergrass
5:00	Jerry Pournelle	2:20	Charles Reinsel
4:40	Hal Naus	2:12	George Schelz Mehran Thomson
4:12	Doug Beyerlein Dave Lebling	2:00	Randy Bytwerk Thomas Eller Jeff Key Richard Miller
4:00	John Koning Buddy Tretick Charles Wells Monte Zelazny	1:45	Frank Clark Banks Mebane
3:27	Conrad von Metzke	1:42	Dan Barrows
3:10	Mike Goldstein		
3:02	Rod Walker		

1:32	Don Berman John McCallum	1:00	Tom Rosenbaum John Shutelock Bob Strayer Brenton Ver Ploeg Bob Ward Malcolm Watson Norman Zinkhan
1:30	Robert Johnson James Latimer		
1:25	Eduard Halle		
1:15	Alan Huff	0:45	Terry Kuch
1:12	Hugh Anderson	0:30	Rick Brooks Ken Davidson
1:00	Peter Ansoff Sharon Beier Stephen Bobker Ron Delbringge Jon Everson Margaret Gemignani George Grayson Jack Greene George Inzer Gary Jones Robert Katzive Kurt Krey David Lindsay James MacKenzie David Lay James Munroe Mark Nyderek Brad Payne Harold Peck Bruce Pelz Jeff Power Lewis Pulsipher Hank Reinhardt	0:27	David Johnston
		0:24	Gerald White
		0:20	Ken Levinson Chris Wagner
		0:15	Chuck Carey Russ Jones Cliff Ollila Charles Welsh
		0:12	Brian Bailey Sid Cochran O.L. DeWitt George Heap Sherry Heap J. Ted Holcombe Oktay Oztunali
		0:10	Bruce Coy

Walter Buchanan has indicated that he will be taking over this Rating List. Readers interested in seeing further editions of it should, therefore, subscribe to his Hoosier Archives (Walter W. Buchanan, RR #3, Lebanon, Indiana, 46052). It is an excellent journal, well worth getting, Rating List or no Rating List.

Der Beutel

John Leeder, Box 1606, Huntsville, Ontario:

18/5/71

In our previous letters we discussed 4-, 3-, and 2-player games. In order to familiarize myself with the board, I'm using a "solitaire" variation which operates as follows:

The player chooses two countries at random. All other countries have no civil government: their forces defend themselves but do not support each other - they are destroyed by a supported attack. The object of the game is to control

ALL supply centres in the minimum possible time. My best so far is 4 years, by Germany and Italy.

25/6/71
Still experimenting with my solitaire version of Diplomacy. Your suggested France-Russia combination took me four full years, the same as Germany Italy. France-Turkey took $4\frac{1}{2}$ years, Turkey-Italy 6, Turkey-Germany $4\frac{1}{2}$.

27/8/71
As you've expressed interest in my solitaire version (Solodip? or is that too corny?) I'll fill you in on recent developments. I've been trying combinations off and on over a very broken-up summer, and the following pattern is beginning to emerge:

"Neighbouring" countries take longer than four years to conquer all supply centres. "Separate" countries can conquer all supply centres in four years, except when one of the countries is Turkey. This is just an hypothesis as I haven't tried anywhere near all possible combinations, nor am I convinced that my own tactics are perfect for the countries involved. I'd be interested in hearing from anyone whose results confirm or deny the hypothesis. I haven't yet evolved a definition of "neighbouring" or "separate" either.

((+(Thanks for the description of the solitaire version of the game. This would probably be very useful for some one wanting to become rapidly familiar with the board but who lives in an area where it is difficult to find opponents. Some years ago Ken Davidson and I had a series of some fifty two-man duels for the same reason. Besides, Ken's sport was fencing so that duels seemed natural to him. On your game I think that your remark on separate and neighbouring countries is probably correct. In the regular game it is often advantageous for two close neighbours to ally. Then can then defend an extensive joint home base on a relatively/perimeter and so have troops left /short over for conquests elsewhere. The solitaire game is different. The home bases with their neutral adjuncts don't need to be defended. So that best results will be achieved if their natural areas of expansion do not overlap. Without having tried it I would think that England-Turkey and France-Russia would be natural pairs with better than normal chances. There is another thing worth noting, however. That is that Russia has four home supply centres to everyone else's three. There is then the advantage of an extra force to begin with, and also the advantage of building 4 forces instead of 3 (2 for England and Italy) in subsequent years and so having more forces for further conquests. Things could be evened out a little by not allowing builds in Moscow, while retaining the initial Moscow army. If others try this game I would be glad to report results so that comparisons can be made between their results and yours. jamcc+))

Edi Birsan, 48-20 39th St., Long Island City, N.Y., 11104:

31/8/81
The Calhamer Rating is nice for a quick review of who has won how much and the placing of the countries. The BROB list can get very annoying to the point of generating player feuds over ratings... something which the Calhamer List seems not to do. So I would suggest that the BROB List be dropped and the Calhamer List kept... just to reduce the friction

in the community/mob.

((+(You will notice, Edi, that I have adopted a suggestion that you made some months ago, namely to date letters. In old BROB days, with published letters being only a few weeks or a month old, such a procedure would have been superfluous. Now, with my current slow rate of publishing letter columns, it is an excellent procedure.

For more on Rating Lists see the letters that follow. You are, by the way, the first person to send cash for a subscription to Pfennig-Halbpennig; welcome aboard. jance)+))

Jeff Power, 521 Sixth Street, Traverse City, Michigan, 49684:

19/8/71

Regarding the BROB Rating List, I have the time, funds, and equipment necessary to publish such a list three or possibly four times a year. I do not have the time or inclination to track down the results of every postal game ever completed. I would not intend to struggle with gamesmasters to get them to send me results of their games in the future. Provided with the necessary information I am willing and able to publish free of charge and distribute the list to other publishers of Diplomact related material for further distribution. Your assistance in obtaining back information on games and in establishing guidelines in compiling and publishing the list would be necessary. I would have to rely on gamesmasters and players voluntarily to send me results of their recently completed games to maintain the list in future.

((+(There would be no need to obtain game reports from individual gamesmasters or players. There are two lists of completed games regularly published, one in Rod Walker's Numenor, the other, up to now in SerenDip, the most recent edition of which you will find on pages 4 - 8 of this issue of Pfennig-Halbpennig. You will need a complete file of whichever of these two sources you decide to use going back to the point where you take the list over from and continuing up to date. The most recently published BROB List was in BROB 107, dated 22 May 1970. It included a list of all games rated in it. You might well decide to accept that list as given, it will be in what has happened since that point that you will be interested. Suppose you decide on the Numenor completed game listing as your game authority. If you take an issue of it well before the time of this BROB list, say January 1970, you will find that all games mentioned in it will have been included in the last BROB listing. If you take one well after its date, say August 1970, you will find none of the games ending there will be included in the BROB List. In the intermediate period, however, you will have to proceed with great caution. In the period late winter-spring-early summer 1970 you will find, if you compare a Numenor listing newly completed games with the last BROB list that some have already been included and some have not. This overlap period will have to be treated with more than usual care, since you do not want to omit a game, and likewise you do not want to count the same game twice. Once past summer 1970, however, it is straightforward, as every game of the required type which is reported as ending should be added in to the Listing.

Once you have your file of Numenor, or of SerenDip, running from early 1970 to date, and have checked on it which games have already been included in the last BROB listing, which should not be entered if they are of a type that you do not rate (e.g., 5-man games), and have indicated which should now be included for the first time, your real work begins. You will need some form of personal record for every Diplomacy player. I use file index cards for this purpose. The first entry on the card for Jeff Power reads:

1968CH Big Brother #12 France 3rd elim.'10 -2

This tells me that you played France in the indicated game. That you were eliminated in 1910, being the third to be eliminated, and earned -2 points in the BROB scheme as a result. If you had taken over the position from a dropped player in mid game, the time of your entry would be indicated, as would the time of your resignation if you yourself dropped out. Whether you use file cards, or some other scheme is, of course, immaterial. But you must have some source of personal record for each player. Otherwise when some question arises - and, in my experience, queries were fairly frequent - you have nothing to refer to except a foot thick pile of Numenors or SerenDips. For every game completed there will be about 10 cards to be completed, as above, on the average, since most games have replacements. When all the cards have been filled in for the batch of new games that you are handling, scores are totalled, number of games rated counted for each player, and the score is converted to a percentage by means of the formula

$$\% \text{ is } 50 \left(1 + \frac{S}{6n} \left(1 - 1/2^n \right) \right) \quad \text{where } n \text{ is number of games and } S \text{ is total score.}$$

Players are then arranged in order of percentage score, and the list typed.

The listing is now a year and a half in arrears (65 games) and bringing it up to date will be a very big job. After that, publishing 3 times a year as you propose, each revision would have about 20 - 25 additional games. I think you could count on the better part of a week-end for each of these later revisions, and double that time for the first up-dating. The reward is, of course, that the listing is popular. I never receive a letter from Brenton Ver Ploeg without having it include a plaintive paragraph about hoping to see the BROB Listing again soon. Many others also want it, though they are less insistent. jamcc+))

Arnold Vagts, P. O. Box 5817, Sherman Oaks, California, 91413:

I am curious about rating systems; how is the Calhamer Point Rating computed, i.e., what is the formula? The BROB Rating formula? How are replacement players rated; original players who drop out? Are there any other ratings out?

25/8/71

((+ (To take your last question first, there have been some two dozen rating systems proposed at one time or another, beginning with Reinsel's system first proposed just over 6 years ago in the summer of 1965. Some 8 or 9 of them were developed to the stage where they appeared regularly for some time, the others being suggestions only. Two

listings only appear regularly these days. They are the Calhamer Point Count Rating List, the latest revision of which appears several pages back, and the Numenor Rating List, sometimes known as the Non-Rating List Rating List. Publication of all the others has ceased.

The Calhamer Rating List is the easiest of all systems to compute. It is just a record of the number of games that the player concerned has won. Drawn games are regarded as fractional wins, its point being split among those drawing. That is, a split board draw would bring each of the players involved in the tie a half-point. A three way draw would net those drawing a third point, and so on. The figures appearing after the colon are the fractional points in sixtieths; this is used instead of the more usual decimal notation for convenience. As it is a total system based on wins and draws only, the score is credited to the final player, not the initial player in cases of player replacement.

The BROB listing is rather more complicated. In it each game is regarded as a tournament, each player being compared with every other player in the game. He gains a point for every player in the game that he does better than, that is for every player that he out-survives, or that he is stronger than at game's end if both survive to the end. We then get the following series of points for a game:

- +6 to the winner who has beaten all the other players
- +4 to the runner-up who has done better than 5, but who has been bettered by the winner
- +2 to the third player who will either be the third strongest survivor or the last eliminated
- 0
- 2
- 4
- 6 to the player who is the first to be eliminated and who, consequently, has done worse than anyone else.

There may, of course, be places, anywhere in this list, where two or more players do equally well. For instance, next to the winner there may be two survivors each with 8 forces at game's end: they would then each get +3, instead of one +4 and the other +2. If the game itself is a draw then all in the draw get equal points regardless of the fact that there may be differences in their holdings at game's end.

To obtain a player's total score we take his game score, as described above, for each of his games and add them up. If a player, rated on three games say, had a total score of +8, it would mean that the number of opponents that he had done better than would be 8 more than those who had done better than him. In three games he would have met 18 opponents altogether, so he would have bettered the performance of 13 and been bettered by 5.

Originally that was all there was to the BROB Rating List. However, as the number of games completed steadily increased it became more and more apparent that of two players doing about equally well, the one who had been around the longer and who had been rated on more games would inevitably have a higher score than the player rated on only a few games. It seemed that some sort of averaging was required.

The formula given on page 12 is what we use to average the scores and, at the same time, convert them to the familiar percentage scale. The first part of it,

$$\% \text{ is } 50(1 + \frac{S}{6n}) \text{ is straightforward. By it a}$$

player who wins all his games, and so gets +6 points on each of them, nets a score of 100%. The player who is the first eliminated in all his games, so scoring -6 in each game, gets 0%. The player who has as many ups as downs, beating as many as he is beaten by, will have an S of 0, and net a score of 50%.

There is a difficulty. What if a player plays one game, wins that, and then plays no more? This happened in the case of Bruce Pelz, the winner of game 1963B, the first 7-man postal game played, although not the first to be completed. He would then have a score of a 100%, a score unapproachable by anyone who had ever had anything worse than a win on a single game. Don Miller, for instance, has played 4 games and won three of them, a tremendous achievement. He would net a score of something like 92%, well below Bruce's 100%. I think you will agree that to have won 3 games out of 4 establishes that player's superiority far more convincingly than to have one a single game. About half the players who have won at all won their first game to be rated. Some have tried to get around this difficulty by not rating players with only one game to their credit, but accepting those with two. This evades the problem rather than solving it. A player who plays two games, & wins both, is not necessarily the best player there ever was or ever will be, who should be given a score which no one else can ever reach, if he has lost a single game. A player who wins his first two games is, of course, a good player. But several people have done it and they are not all superior to everyone else who plays the game. So what is wanted is not a total score system, which gives all the advantage to the player who has played many games. Nor yet a simple minded arithmetic mean average system, which gives all the advantage to the player rated on very few games, and who has been fortunate in those. What is wanted is something between the two, a system which tends to the arithmetic mean asymptotically, but which does not suddenly jump to it after one game, or after two games either. The factor

$$1 - \frac{1}{2^n}$$

is a crude, rough and dirty, means of achieving this end. With it the result from a single game is not thrown out, but is treated at half its face value. The result from two games is treated at three quarters its face value; from three games at seven-eighths, and so on. With it a player rated on 6 games will be within 1%, about, of his true mean performance. A player rated on 10 games will be within less than one tenth of one percent of his true mean. Since the Rating list is only given to one tenth of one percent, from this point onwards the factor is omitted. The examples, above, have dealt with players doing well, at the top end of the scale. But exactly the same thing applies at the bottom. A player may be the first eliminated in his first game without necessarily being the worst player in the world. Under this procedure he nets 25%, not 0. And so on. There is no theoretical basis for this factor, it is just a device which does,

more or less, what we want. There is a rough rule-of-thumb among statisticians that about 30 samples are required for a reliable estimate of a statistic. If we were to replace the factor given near the bottom of the last page with another which would express more realistically the amount of scepticism they would feel for results based on only a few games, every player in the upper part of the BROB Rating List, except Edi Birsan, would have his score lowered; seriously lowered in the case of, for instance, Don Miller, rated on only four games.

If you will turn back to page 13, you will note that the whole system is based, within each game, on ranking the seven countries in order of merit according to length and strength of survival. There are Rating systems which can apportion points between the players involved, in cases where there has been replacement, and more than one player has commanded the forces of a given country during the course of a game. This system cannot: seven players only can be rated. At the time this Rating was first introduced there was a great deal of concern about drop out players and their replacements. In order to encourage players to continue with their games, and not to discourage replacements I adopted the rule that positive scores would be assigned to the final player for a country, negative ones debited to the initial player. This meant that no player could have his score hurt by acting as a replacement, no matter how hopeless the situation that he took over. The same rule was continued when the system was converted to an averaging one. However, the result is not the same: in the averaging version, now used, a highly rated player can have his score hurt by accepting a position as a replacement. I don't know how to easily prevent this. Other Rating systems have different procedures. Lebling's Mean Rate of Growth Rating List was the only one that I know of which was able to assign to initial player, and replacement player, their proportional shares of the achievement of the country concerned. jamcc+))

Burton R. Labelle, 146 Elm Street, Saco, Maine, 04072:

11/7/71

John Beshara has informed me that you publish info on the number of games all players are active in. ...Also I am researching all present player-rating systems in the hopes of starting one within 12 months or so. I am extremely interested in a copy of your ratings and also how they are compiled, tabulated, etc. Any hints you might render (other than that I sh ouldn't do it) will be appreciated.

((+(I don't publish information on the activity of postal Diplomacy players. I do have this information tabulated on file index card and if anyone wants it for a particular player, or for a small group of players, I can often provide it. But there are now between 400 and 500 such cards and the number grows every week; any wholesale duplication of the information on them is obviously impossible. Moreover, these cards were prepared for use in maintaining the BROB and Callamer Rating Lists. Anything irrelevant to both those listings, e.g., the intermediate player if a country passed through three pairs of hands in the course of a game, is frequently omitted. However, all the information you need is in the public domain. In Graustark #54, dated 13 June 1965, John Boardman published "Postal Diplomacy Game Directory", later usually known as the Roster. John continued the Roster at suitable intervals up to Grau #133, dated 1 July 1967.

For any postal Diplomacy game, up to the latter date, the Roster gives complete information: players, country assignment, replacements, outcome, and supply centre charts. Thereafter the Roster was continued for about a year by Charles Wells in Lonely Mountain, and then it was taken over by John Koning who published it in Lab. Rod Walker now publishes this game listing in Numeror. By getting all of the relevant issues of these four publications it is possible to get almost complete information on all postal games so far completed, as well as information on those in progress. In many cases the editor concerned will have spare copies available; where not Xerox copies can be obtained from Walt Buchanan.

For a description of the Calhamer Rating List, which I now maintain, and of the BROB Rating List which I formerly published, see the preceding pages. For a brief but good description of other systems the most convenient source is the series of articles that Doug Beyerlein published some time ago. There are some errors in his account of Reinsel's Big Brother Rating List, the first attempted. but, for the rest, you will find his articles a much more convenient source of information than trying to dig up the relevant issues of the seven or eight different journals in which the various listings were first described.

For hints, other than the one you anticipated, "Don't" let me suggest the following points:

1. Any idiot can devise a Rating List. I have dreamed up a half dozen myself. The work comes in maintaining the things once they have been invented. With the present rate of game production just maintaining your records will easily consume several hours every week. Not this week, and next week, but 50 weeks a year. Do you have that kind of time to spare?

2. Of the 6 or 7 Rating Lists which were published for a time and then abandoned, at least three were very favourably received by their readers. Those three were the Reinsel Big Brother Rating List, the first rating list of all; Lebling's Mean Rate of Growth Rating List, published in Glockorla; and the BROB Rating List. Editors do not willingly give up the publication of anything for which there is an expressed demand; if publication of these has ceased there is a reason for it. In the BROB case at least I know what the reason is: continued publication of it was just too time consuming to be considered. Will yours be less time consuming?

After that it was taken over by Charles Wells, who maintained it for about a year, and published the results of game outcomes in Lonely Mountain during that period. The roster was then transferred to John Koning who published it for some time in sTab. About two years ago it was taken over from Koning by Rod Walker and it is now published in Numenor. Spare copies of many of these issues can be obtained from the editors mentioned. Xerox copies of the remainder you can get from Walt Buchanan. Between them you will have a complete record of all Diplomacy games of the postal type and can prepare your rating list from them. I might perhaps mention that the BROB Rating List has recently been taken over by Jeff Power. The BROB listing was last published about a year and a half ago and Jeff could, if he had wished, merely ^{have} accepted that previous listing as it stood and then added on later games, records of which he could get from either Numenor or SerenDip, which also published a completed game summary. He did not choose to do this, however, as he knew of several errors in the old BROB listing and so wanted to go back to the original records as provided by the Roster under its various custodians. That is what he is doing, re-compiling it from scratch. You can readily do the same.

Since getting your letter I have seen a published account of your proposed Rating List system. As far as I can see it is quite close to the Reinsel Big Brother system, the first Rating List ever proposed. It first appeared in the summer of 1965 and was updated at frequent intervals for the next four and a half years. The Big Brother system was well liked by some. (Charles Wells called it the best Rating system ever devised) and your system will have many of the same advantages. The big point in its favour was that it rewarded the winner strongly in comparison with other survivors; other systems sometimes tend to lose sight of the fact that it is the winner who wins - the worst ever in that respect being Boardman's Centre-Year Rating List in which it was possible for the runner-up to have a better score than the winner. The second advantage of the Big Brother system was its simplicity - maintaining it is child's play compared with what is required to maintain monsters like the BROB system, or Lebling's Mean Rate of Growth system. Its major drawback is one which it shares with all totalizing schemes: If there are two players who are doing proportionately about as well as one another, one of them being a real old timer who has been in, say, three times as many games as the other, he will not only stand higher in the listing than the other but about three times as high. This tends to be very discouraging to newer players who are doing well with their games.

The main point I would like to make to anyone starting a new rating list is this: Designing a new scheme is nothing; any idiot can do it. As evidence of this I have thought of some 6 or 8 different systems myself. The real problem is to publish it regularly and reasonably frequently. This must be done if a Rating List is to obtain acceptance as a standard by any wide group of players. And any rating list, even the simplest, requires a fair amount of work to maintain. If you can't afford the time to do that work, best to forget the idea - a self-maintaining rating list has yet to be devised. -jamcc+))

I had planned at this point to describe several Rating Lists which I have recently been working on. However if the New Blood players are not to get the idea that they have been totally forgotten I must get this issue in the mail. For that reason the article will be postponed until next issue. In the article there will be described 4 new rating lists schemes, each and every one of which is, in my opinion, superior to any Rating List so far devised. The catch is that each and every one of them (one possible exception) virtually demands the use of a computer to maintain. Does anyone out there have the use of free computer time to devote to the cause? They are also, for ordinary players such as myself, quite ego-deflating; they show quite clearly that there is only a small handful of really good players among us.

Bourse on Game 1969BH:

Further Strengthening of Pound

	Open (10/5)		Close (6/10)		Units	Units
	<u>Bid</u>	<u>Asked</u>	<u>Bid</u>	<u>Asked</u>	<u>Bought</u>	<u>Sold</u>
Pounds	1.44	1.45	1.63	1.64	400	-
Marks	1.60	1.61	1.40	1.41	-	400
Lire	.09	.10	.09	.10	-	-
Roubles	.97	.98	.97	.98	-	-
Piastres	1.29	1.30	1.29	1.30	-	-

This Bourse report is near the end of the issue because orders came in while stencilling was in progress. It may be advisable to always put it at the end, until the termination of the current Bourse.

New Blood

The following have indicated an interest in Postal Diplomacy:

Jacques Lapointe, Apt. K, 723 Bloor St., West, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

David G. Potter, 77 Botfield Avenue, Islington, Ontario, Canada

Paul E. Spangler, 2403 Bryn Mawr Ave., Philadelphia, Penn., ---31

Craig Besinque, c/o Lane Haywood, General Delivery, Princeton,
British Columbia, Canada

Blair Cusack, 552 Acadia Drive, Calgary 30, Alberta, Canada

Scot Faulkner, Brockaw Hall, 320 East Lawrence St., Appleton,
Wisconsin, 54911

Douglas Ryan, 155-52nd Ave., Lachine 610, Quebec, Canada

Mark McKibben, 11418 Woodley Ave., Granada Hills, California, 91344

Jim Gingrich, 286 Waterman Ct., Danville, California, 94526

W. (Bill) H. Lafosse, 64 Laird Drive, Trenton, Ontario, Canada

Hal Norman, 1020 Leff St., San Luis Obispo, California, 93401

Paul H. Stone, 47 Morgandale Cr., Agincourt, Ontario, Canada

Rocky S. Bagala, 2318 No. B Howe St., Berkeley, California, 94705

Michael L. Pierson, 44 Center Grove Road, Apt. k-16, Dover, New Jersey, 07801

Arteries New and Old

Before listing game openings I would like to point out to the New Blood people listed above that there are two ways of entering a postal Diplomacy game. 1. A gamesmaster announces a new game; prospective players send in their applications and fees and assume play from the beginning. 2. As a replacement. Postal Diplomacy games normally last about 2 years. Players are often forced to resign due to pressure of other activities. Others are asked to replace them. Such replacement positions are often rather poor as far as winning prospects are concerned. On the other hand they usually require no fee and so give an unrivalled opportunity to see how games are run in a given magazine, at little cost to the player. Some of the gamesmasters, listed below as having vacancies, have vacancies only for replacements. Another thing that newcomers might note is that all gamesmasters run games which are essentially the same as regards rules of play, barring one or two minor details where there is a dispute about rule interpretation. However, there are considerable differences in things like speed of play, style of magazine, replacement procedures, and so on. So newcomers should see an issue or two of as many different Diplomacy magazines as possible. Only in that way can they determine which ones will most appeal to their own particular tastes. The following gamesmasters are believed to have openings, although sometimes they are for replacement players only.

John Boardman, 234 East 19th St., Brooklyn, NY, 11226. At the moment probably for replacements only. However, the games now running in Graustark are drawing to a close. If new ones are offered you cannot afford to wait until you hear about it at second hand, if you wish to enter, as Grau games are invariably filled by return of mail after announcement. If you want in you should subscribe so as to have the earliest possible word of the openings.

Don Turnbull, 6 St. George's Avenue, Timperley, Cheshire, England. Don's Albion is one of the best journals now appearing. From time to time he offers an international game. One now running has players from the USA in the west to Israel in the east, from Sweden in the north to South Africa in the south. If you are interested in such a game, which will necessarily be somewhat slow, write him.

Hal Maus, 1011 Barrett Ave., Chula Vista, California, 92011. Hal's ADAG is one of the best places to escape the noise of the feud.

Don Miller, 12315 Judson Road, Wheaton, Maryland, 20906. Diplophobia always has openings for replacement players. Also variant games.

Rod Walker, 5058 Hawley Blvd., San Diego, California, 92116. Rod invariably has openings of one sort or another in one of his many publications.

Doug Schaefer, 84 Farm View Drive, Guilford, Conn., 06437

Greg Warden, Apt. 106, 4500 Walnut St., Philadelphia, Pa., 19139
Replacements only required in En Passant at the moment.

Robert Johnson, Box 134, Whippany, New Jersey, 07981 has openings for regular games and variants in one or other of his publications.

Charles Welsh and Tom Leahy, Box 3197, Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island, 02192, publish Xanadu as a joint effort. Openings for new games forming.

Paul Bond, Box 6477, College Station, Texas, 77840, has openings for Verrat, a Diplomacy variant, in Voyna I Mir (War and Peace).

Len Lakofka, 1806 North Richmond, Chicago, Illinois, 60647 has games for beginners only in Neophyte and standard games in Liaisons Dangereuses.

Tony Pandin, 10406 Shaker Blvd, Cleveland, Ohio, 44104, needs stand-by players for Legatus.

Andrew Phillips, 128 Oliver St., Daly City, California, 94014 has openings in Shafft!! for various games.

Larry Peery, 816 24th St., San Diego, California, 92102, probably has openings in Xenogogic or one of his other publications though it is so difficult to find one's way around his editorials on world events that I can't be sure.

Walter Buchanan's Hoosier Archives (RR #3, Lebanon, Indiana, 46052 was one of the most important additions to the scene this last year. I am not certain but I think he soon intends to offer a game, likely in some other publication.

Bob Van Andel, 749 Thomas St., S.E., Grand Rapids, Michigan, 49503, has openings for games forming in Saeta.

John McCallum, P. O. Box 52, Ralston, Alberta, Canada, expects to offer a game, former winners only, in a month or two.

There are, doubtless, others but this should do for now.

There will be a wargamers' meeting at The Calgary Inn, Calgary, Alberta, on 14th of November. Write Mr. B. Schell, 2111 14th St., S.W., Apt. #5, Calgary, Alberta, Canada for further information