

NORTH AMERICAN DIPLOMACY PLAYERS' SURVEY #2 RESULTS

"Man's greatest enemy is ignorance"-anon.

Many of you probably read the results of the first NADPS as printed in Diplomacy World 1-6. A five-page report of the raw data, without most accompanying comment, but including the results of the overseas section of the survey, is available from me for a stamped, self-addressed envelope (Lewis Pulsipher, 423 N Main St., Bellevue, MICH 49021). It is also being printed in a number of issues of Impassable. As in the DW article, I will comment on the results as I report it, this time, I hope, with somewhat more organization so that data is easier to find. Since NADPS #1 I have not seen any surveys but #2 and Thomas Galloway's SF&F Variant Poll. I hope that this summer we will see a little more activity. I've also found that a few people would prefer to ignore results. Among those who call for "democracy" as a prerequisite for action, this could only be described as hypocritical. I do NOT claim that NADPS results are gospel, but they are the best indicator we have of the characteristics and beliefs of hobbyists, and I hope that those who must deal with large groups of DIPPY fans will pay attention to what they have said here.

Copies of these results are available from me at cost (20¢). The entire results will be printed also in the IDA 75 Handbook or in Diplomacy World, probably the former. Permission is hereby given to any publisher to reprint any titled section of the results, even the entire thing if desired, provided credit for original publication is given of course. Naturally the raw results can be repeated as you choose--the information is the property of the hobby, though my words are my own property. I am eager to see the reprinted sections and comments on the results, of course.

INTRODUCTION

168 males and 3 females replied to NADPS #2, compared to 156 and 2 for #1. This amounts to more than 15% of the total of North American fans. The form was printed in several more zines than #1 and more fans were reached, though I am sure that many more did not see the form. A chronological list with zine, publisher, and number of replies follows: Diplomacy World (Buchanan) 73, Blood and Iron (Pulsipher) 14 +5 private distribution, Lord of Hosts (Sacks) 2, Paroxysm (Correll, Ronson, Drews) 9, Impassable (Boyer) 14, Ragweed (A. and T. Burkacki) 1, American Wargamer (Slimak and AWA) 1, Book of Stab (Bart et al.) 3, Poictesme (Schlickbernd) 3, Exponent (Kovalcik) 14, Berserker (Ronson) 2, Pen & Sword (Lind) 3, Pouch (Neiger) 2, Runestone (Leeder) 7, Speculum (Kadlecek) 3, Ruritania (Watson) 2, Erewhon (Walker) 2, Liaisons Dangereuses (Lakofka) 5, Arrakis (Head) 1, Cimmeria (Nozik) 2, Shaaf (Phillips) 2, 1 uncredited photocopy. Herb Barents also offered to distribute it, but I couldn't print more copies and his machine wasn't up to it. Thanks to all who printed and replied to the survey.

By state and province, replies came from: NY-23, CA-20, Ont-16, MICH-11, PA-10, IL, MA-8, VA, IN-6, Alb, NC, OH-5, MD, NJ-4, WA-3, 19 states with 0, others with 1 or 2. Only 2 from a state as large as Texas is surprising. 3 replies came from overseas people who play in N American zines (Sweden, Denmark, Switzerland). 29 more were from Canada, the rest from the U.S.

Two duplicates were sent in, and three without names; these were not tallied. The figures seldom add up to 171 because no all questions were answered and because of inevitable tallying errors.

You may have noted that #1 was officially supported by IDA, while

#2 was not associated with any club. I did this with the hope that those who do not particularly care for IDA, especially members of other organizations, would be more likely to participate in #2. Insofar as zines go, at least, this was not the case.

Despite my estimate (in the form of a percentage) given in the #1 results, and the listing of over 300 subbers to DW, some amazing estimates of the number of postal Dip players were sent in even by DW subscribers. I asked "How many postal Dip players do you think there are?" Highest answer was 25,000, lowest 50. 20 answered 2,500 or more, 43 answered less than 600. The median is somewhere along 1,100. The answer most often given was between 1,000 and 1,099 (often "1,000+"). The latest DIPLOMACY census lists about 1,250 players worldwide. Considering turnover rate, error, etc., my estimate of the number of postal players in the world is 1,350. Walt Bucharian's was 1,500 as of January. In my opinion the hobby is growing very little if at all. We have now saturated wargaming, that is, most wargamers know of DIPLOMACY and a surprisingly large percentage know how to play, so we'll recruit fewer persons from that group as time passes and as wargaming itself saturates the continent. So long as the flyer is in the new sets we can expect to recruit 100-250 a year in that manner. There will also be friends of players and others who learn of postal DIPPY through other means. But we seem to be losing almost as many every year to boredom, school, marriage/family life, etc. I suppose it is possible that DIPLOMACY may catch on nationally the way BACK-GAMMON has, but it seems unlikely in the foreseeable future. Until then, we can plan on staying below 1,500 players in North America.

In some questions I organized responses according to number of games played, in order to see what difference experience might make. I asked "How many games (standard and variant) have you been in (completed and in progress)", with four categories. It was with near-horror that I noticed after initial distribution that I had not said "postal". However, I found that almost everyone understood what I meant, and I could spot virtually all (I think) who didn't by my personal knowledge of them, by the year they began playing, by the zines they received, or other indications. A few times in doubt I shoveled the respondent into the 0-5 game category. In the next NADPS (if there is one) I want to do more of this, but I am not sure which categories ought to be used. Would it be better to go by the year one began to play postal DIP? If the present scheme is retained, I'll have to revise the categories so that responses to each are more nearly equal in number; I may also reduce to three categories. Or I might use different categories for different questions. I would appreciate suggestions for handling this problem.

You will find many times below a statement followed by six categories of answers, what I call degree questions. I made the statement and then asked players to answer with one of the following: Z=unfamiliar with idea, A=agree strongly, B=agree somewhat, C=neutral, D=disagree somewhat, E=disagree strongly.

I asked people to check the top right corner of the form if they read the introductory paragraph. 64 (37%) did. I guess we're no better at reading instructions than anyone else. I also asked whether the respondent had replied to #1. 71 (42%) had not, 17 because they didn't get around to it, 40 because they didn't see it, 2 because they thought it was a waste of time, and the rest for other reasons (often that they didn't feel qualified. At least 4 who had said they

did not, had. That may have been true for others as well whom I didn't recall.

RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS

I asked people if they knew what these are, giving only the letters: AWA (American Wargaming Association)-60, TDA (The Diplomacy Association)-127 (74%), MGA (Midwest Gaming Association)-98, GHS-6, IDA (International Diplomacy Association)-165 (96%). I haven't listed what GHS means because I don't know myself. I put it in as a dummy just to see how many yeses I'd get. I don't doubt that there is a GHS somewhere, though, and I'd appreciate it if one of the people who said yes would let me know what it is--if they didn't goof, that is.

88 (51%) knew who the Orphan Game Director is (Greg Warden), 118 (69%, 4% less than #1) knew who the Boardman Number Custodian is (Doug Beyerlein). 55 (32%, 8% less than #1) knew who the Miller Number Custodian is (Robert Sacks). Of course, both BNC and MNC have changed since NADPS #1.

I asked how many years people expected to remain in the hobby. Many didn't know or answered "many". Of those who answered more specifically, 22 said "life", "forever", "infinity". 55 answered five years or more (half of those over 10 years), 26 three years or less.

Degree questions: "Diplomacy is the best game I have ever played" Agree strongly 41, somewhat 47, neutral 24, disagree somewhat 33, strongly 23, unfamiliar 1 (huh?). "I am quick to explain to people about Dippy" agree strongly 58, somewhat 72, neutral 28, disagree somewhat 22, strongly 7, unfamiliar 2. "Postal Dippy players are abnormal" agree strongly 52, somewhat 42, neutral 22, disagree somewhat 11, strongly 34, unfamiliar 4. This was admittedly a somewhat whimsical question.

"Which subject area are you most interested in": social science 47, math 35, natural science 29, humanities 29, "professional (law, med)" 27. I hypothesized a fairly strong showing against math and natural science, which require a more abstract kind of thinking which, in my opinion, is more suitable for play of two-player wargames than for Dippy. I am not surprised that social science came out on top, but it seems my initial idea has little validity in reflecting the kinds of people who play the game.

131 (77%) read science fiction/fantasy. 89 have at least one close person (wife, girl/boy friend, parent) who thinks he's crazy to play DIP.

Of men, 20 of their wives/girl friends play DIP, 91 do not, 45 not applicable, others no answer. Of women, 1 no, 1 not applicable, 1 no answer.

Time spent on wargaming (including DIP) and Dippy alone, in hours per week:

	0-2	3-5	6-9	10-15	16-20	21-25	26+
Wargames	21	42	25	51	19	6	9
Dippy	53	45	33	28	6	1	3

Pages of press releases written per quarter year: 0-1) 78, 1+-5) 49, 5+-10) 13, 10+-20) 14, 20+)10.

I asked, "Why are you in the hobby," mental competition-96, meeting people-65, release aggressions-33, escape-50, boost to ego-46, God knows!-68, other: variant design, masochistic desire for self-abasement, publishing, blackmail, regressive trait, like to get mail, to be creative, keeps me off streets, can't figure it all out, love to persuade, need to be always planning, I'm crazy--it's good therapy,

thrill of victory and agony of defeat, I am mad, renews my faith in humanity.

"What part (in %) would you say luck (as opposed to skill) plays in:"

% luck	Diplomacy	Chess	Bridge	Poker
0-5	29	118	8	1
6-15	54	35	14	7
16-25	41	10	31	14
26-50	37	2	50	62
51-70	5	1	10	44
71-100	0	0	10	25

The breakdown I tallied includes four times as man categories. I've simplified it for this report. I kept track of DIPLOMACY's place among the four. First (lowest luck) 18 times, second 114, third 25, fourth 6. 86 (52%) play bridge, 124 poker, 133 other card games (81%). (This is of 164 due to printing error.)

Age: Mean age was 24.48, median 24. The mean is .54 higher than for #1, median the same. Youngest was 14, oldest 51. Rather than say more I'll list the entire boodle, from both surveys.

Age 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35
 #2 2 8 10 2 11 14 5 8 5 8 14 11 10 5 7 4 5 7 5 5 4 5
 #1 4 7 15 5 5 10 5 6 4 11 7 10 12 7 12 1 5 10 2 2 3 4
 plus one each for 36, 37, 38, 44, 46, 51 in #2 and one each for 41, 37, 38, 43, 45 and two for 42 in #1. 10 did not answer in #2.

PLAYING CHARACTERISTICS

I asked people what year they began playing:

	standard DIPLOMACY		variant DIPLOMACY	
	postal	face-to-face	postal	face-to-face
thru 65	5 (4)	8	1 (2)	2
1966	4 (5)	1	2 (3)	0
1967	1 (1)	5	2 (0)	1
1968	3 (3)	13	4 (2)	1
1969	5 (5)	12	3 (4)	1
1970	5 (4)	11	1 (0)	4
1971	17 (17)	21	6 (5)	6
1972	36 (29)	29	13 (8)	13
1973	37 (41)	23	33 (35)	21
1974	38 (31)	24	25 (19)	17
1975	10 ----	3	4 ----	2

The figures in parentheses are from NADPS #1.

I listed a number of zines, asking which ones people read regularly. I was curious to see what percentage response #2 got from the readers of zines that are often concerned with the hobby as a whole (though not all on the list are such), Diplomacy World 123, Diplomacy Review 80, Strategy and Tactics 87, Pouch 45, Graustark 35, Impassable 63, any wargame zine 104, Erewhon 41. Approximately one third response from the Dipzines is pretty good. If I could get that kind of response from the entire North American hobby I would have received twice as many replies.

I asked "how many overseas Dipzines do you read regularly?" A total of 37 people read 144 zines, or 3.89 each. 27 of these were publishers, and 2 from overseas. Only 8 of 122 non-publishers read any overseas Dipzines regularly. The links at the "grass roots" level between the two segments of the hobby are very tenuous.

I asked "how well do you think you play DIP (1=very poorly to 9=very well)".

	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	NoAns	Avg.	respon.
# games	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1			
0-5	3	2	19	15	9	5	3	7	2	5	5.47	70
6-10	0	2	16	6	6	7	2	0	0	0	5.85	39
11-20	3	8	13	7	4	0	1	0	0	0	6.86	36
20+	8	1	5	7	1	1	0	0	1	1	6.92	25
Total	14	13	53	35	20	13	6	7	3	6	6.09	170

In a future survey this question ought to be divided for postal and PFP skill.

I asked people to "indicate relative importance in play of these 3 oft-identified elements of Dippy from 0=no importance to 10=very important" I think now that a better question would have been to assign a total of 10 among the three. No zeros were assigned.

	Tactics										avg.	diff. w/ tot. avg.
# games	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		
0-5	8	8	6	20	6	11	3	2	1	1	6.85	-.98
6-10	1	1	8	12	5	5	1	0	2	0	6.57	-1.20
11-20	1	1	7	7	8	8	3	1	0	0	6.31	-1.35
20+	3	3	3	8	2	1	1	2	0	2	6.64	-.96
Total	13	13	24	47	21	25	8	5	3	3	6.64	-1.09

The last column relates the average given by each experience group for the element to the average for that group of all three elements. This is for most purposes more accurate than the next-to last column for purposes of comparison.

	Strategy										avg.	diff. w/ avg.
# games	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		
0-5	16	8	16	11	5	6	1	1	2	1	7.60	-.23
6-10	5	6	9	4	2	4	2	1	1	0	7.32	-.45
11-20	6	4	9	6	6	4	1	0	0	0	7.50	-.16
20+	6	2	6	3	3	2	0	0	2	1	7.20	-.40
Total	33	20	40	24	16	16	4	2	5	2	7.47	-.26

	Negotiations										avg.	diff. w/ avg.
# games	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		
0-5	39	8	10	4	2	3	0	0	0	1	9.05	+1.22
6-10	22	7	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	9.41	+1.64
11-20	17	12	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	9.17	+1.51
20+	15	3	2	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	8.96	+1.36
Total	93	30	19	10	4	5	0	0	0	1	9.09	+1.36

Overall average was 7.73. For 0-5, 7.83, for 6-10, 7.77. For 11-20, 7.66, for 20+, 7.60.

I kept track of which element was given the highest rating by each respondent.

	0-5	6-10	11-20	20+
Tactics	8	1	1	1
Strategy	9	4	6	4
Negotiations	46	28	28	19

The overall results are not unexpected. I thought that the more experienced players might discount the role of tactics more than those less experienced, but there seems to be no significant pattern in the averages. While the middle two groups discount tactics and give more strength to negotiations than the least experienced group, the most experienced players reverse the trend. However, very few of the

players with more than 5 games consider tactics most important--3% compared to 12%. A different (and to me preferable) way to put the question would be to ask, how difficult is it to become a proficient player in each of these elements. In my opinion tactics are easily learned, so that you become as good as anyone else in them relatively easily. (Of course, this doesn't take intuition into account, since intuition cannot be learned.) It might be interesting to compare the ratings on importance of tactics and difficulty of learning tactics by wargamers and non-wargamers. I doubt that many people who play wargames successfully could think of DIPLOMACY tactics as complex or difficult.

I asked players to "assign #'s (1=very weak to 9=very strong, 5=average) to indicate relative strength of the countries in standard Dip". I suppose I should have stressed "relative". Whatever the reason, only four people gave a variation of 1 (that is, for example, assigned all 5's and 6's or all 4's and 5's, indicating that the countries are quite close together in strength), and only two gave variation of 2. I assigned four 5's and three 6's, a very uncommon configuration. The reason I mention this is that I understood the question to mean that a country with strength 3 would be half as strong as one with strength 6. Looking at the averages, I can hardly believe that people answered the question with this in mind. Are some countries really three times as strong as others? Of course not. Is Russia really almost twice as strong as Italy? No. Inexperienced and incompetent players may tend to go down more easily when playing the inner three countries than the outer four, but this is not true for experienced players. I've managed less than a 3-way draw (a 3rd in my first game) only once in nine games with the Central Powers, so perhaps this effects my thinking.

Austria										
	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	avg.
0-5	0	2	4	4	12	10	16	11	7	3.71
6-10	0	0	2	3	6	8	9	6	1	3.83
11-20	0	0	1	3	6	9	11	4	2	3.72
20+	0	0	3	5	3	5	4	1	3	4.29
total avg. 3.83										
England										
	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	avg.
0-5	5	17	23	6	10	2	2	0	0	6.93
6-10	5	7	11	7	3	0	1	1	0	6.86
11-20	5	8	7	11	2	2	0	0	0	6.91
20+	3	5	6	4	3	1	2	0	0	6.58
total avg. 6.86										
France										
	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	avg.
0-5	4	14	16	20	10	4	0	1	0	6.49
6-10	3	4	7	8	11	1	0	0	1	6.17
11-20	2	7	11	9	4	3	0	0	0	6.58
20+	2	3	5	6	7	1	0	0	0	6.33
total avg. 6.42										
Germany										
	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	avg.
0-5	0	4	4	16	16	13	12	3	0	4.85
6-10	0	0	6	3	9	7	5	3	2	4.46
11-20	0	2	3	5	10	8	6	2	0	4.75
20+	1	1	1	2	10	7	1	1	0	4.76
total avg. 4.76										
Italy										
	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	avg.
0-5	1	1	1	5	8	19	17	12	4	3.66
6-10	0	0	2	1	4	8	11	6	3	3.43
11-20	0	0	1	1	7	11	10	3	4	3.57
20+	0	0	1	2	5	4	6	3	3	3.63
total avg. 3.59										

	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	avg.
0-5	8	9	13	17	8	9	6	2	0	6.32
6-10	4	8	10	6	4	2	1	0	0	6.77
11-20	5	8	7	11	5	0	0	0	0	6.92
20+	4	3	7	5	2	3	0	0	0	6.71
Russia										
0-5	11	10	23	4	13	3	2	0	1	6.42
6-10	3	6	5	8	7	2	2	2	0	6.03
11-20	4	6	12	7	7	2	0	0	0	6.66
20+	5	5	3	4	4	3	0	0	0	6.75
Turkey										
										total avg. 6.61
										total avg. 6.59

I compared the countries, taking the average of all values (5.51) as 1.00:

	Aus	Eng	Fra	Ger	Ita	Rus	Tur	
Avg.	3.83	6.86	6.42	4.76	3.59	6.61	6.59	5.51
% comp	.70	1.25	1.17	.86	.65	1.20	1.20	1.00

The relative ranking of strength here does not differ from NADPS #1 results, where players were asked to rank the seven.

	0-5	6-10	11-20	20+	Total
Total avg.	5.48	5.36	5.59	5.61	5.51
range	3.27	3.43	3.35	3.12	3.27
standard deviation	1.39	1.43	1.52	1.29	1.42
of 7 averages					

Here I again looked for smaller differences from the more experienced players, to no avail. The standard deviation and total range are indications of how much variation there was in strength assignments. The least experienced confound the trend toward a smaller range with less experience.

When comparing the strengths assigned to a country by each experience group, remember to compensate for the difference in their averages. For example, it looks like the 20+ group has a higher regard for Russia than the average, but when you subtract .10 because the 20+ group's overall average is .10 higher than the total average, you find that no difference exists. (This is not fully accurate, but anyone with any math background can see what I'm getting at.)

Degree questions: "It is better to be a one unit puppet than to be wiped out" 64 agree strongly, 47 somewhat, 20 neutral, 15 disagree somewhat, 19 strongly, 1 unfamiliar. That helps restore my faith in the players. A follow-up question would ask the same thing "if there were no rating systems", since most ratings give more credit for survival than elimination. "How to play" articles help improve my playing ability" 41 agree strongly, 71 somewhat, 27 neutral, 14 disagree somewhat, 11 strongly, 2 unfamiliar. "How to play" articles contribute to my enjoyment of the hobby" 59 agree strongly, 74 somewhat, 17 neutral, 8 disagree somewhat, 8 strongly, 2 unfamiliar. "FTF play offers greater possibilities and variety than postal play" 4 agree strongly, 27 somewhat, 30 neutral, 61 disagree somewhat, 37 strongly, 9 unfamiliar. "FTF games are more likely to end in a draw than postal games" 38 agree strongly, 38 somewhat, 35 neutral, 29 disagree somewhat, 14 strongly, 14 unfamiliar. I expected even more agreement to the last question.

BOARDMAN NUMBERS AND RATINGS

I link these because ratingmasters would have great difficulty functioning without the help of the activities of the Boardman Number

Custodian (BNC), and there is little justification for the BN other than ratings needs.

I have already mentioned that 69% knew who the BNC is. I asked three degree questions about the BN. "The continued maintenance of the Boardman Numbers is 'vital' to the hobby" 45 agree strongly, 61 somewhat, 25 neutral, 16 disagree somewhat, 16 strongly, 4 unfamiliar. "Same as above except substitute 'an asset' for 'vital'" 105 agree strongly, 42 somewhat, 9 neutral, 5 disagree somewhat, 2 strongly, 3 unfamiliar. "The hobby would be better off if the Boardman Numbers did not exist" 1 agree strongly, 1 somewhat, 19 neutral, 57 disagree somewhat, 86 strongly, 4 unfamiliar. I suspect that many people, especially those little experienced in the hobby, believe that the BN are vital because a few bigwigs (almost always ratingmasters) say that they are. When you come down to it, BN are important almost solely for ratings (the other purpose is statistics), and the hobby would exist just as well, and perhaps more amicably, if there were no ratings. The ratings chasers have helped drive many of the old-time people, who just liked to play, out of the hobby. All this noise about chaos in the hobby if something happens to the BN means chaos in the ratings. Games will form, games will be played, zines will be published, whether there are BN or not. On the other hand, the BN Custodianship could become a political football, and nearly did last year. The erection of a second BNC, antagonistic to the first, could bring much trouble; but this would be a symptom of a deeper split, and not a cause. See my article in The Pouch #74 for more on this subject.

I also gave players a choice of means by which the BNC "should be selected": predecessor 71, election 25, independent committee 24, IDA committee 24, TDA committee 2. Others--divine revelation, a game tourney of those interested (?), PDRC, GRI, Boardman if he'd like, divine revelation through Calhamer. Naturally conservatism wins here--many people are not willing to change anything until there is an emergency (witness the CA flaps last year), but other methods received more support altogether than predecessor.

I asked players to "assign #'s indicating relative value to you of the following outcomes from 0=no importance to 100=highest importance (assign 100 to at least one outcome)". In NADPS #1 I asked people to rank outcomes. Below column (A) is total number (out of 15,900 possible), column (B) is a percentage conversion, with the value for win taken as 100. Column (C) lists total values (for 140 people) in the #1 rankings. Of course, the necessity for ranking skewed the results, since whatever outcome was listed second could only be half as valuable as a win, and the lower values had to be less than 1/10th of a value for a win, but could not be less than 8%. Column (D) is a conversion of these scores for curiosity's sake. You'll note that in two cases draws are shifted one place lower in the present survey than in #1.

	A	B	C	D
Win	15,809	100	140	100
2-way draw	12,550	79	295	47
3-way draw	9,918	63	502	28
2nd place	9,489	60	612	23
4-way draw	7,498	47	708	20
3rd place	6,823	43	941	15
5-way draw	5,563	35	930	15
4th place	4,244	27	1147	12
6-way draw	3,904	25	1122	12

	A	B	C	D
7-way draw	2,691	17	1318	11
5th place	2,613	17	1345	10
6th place	1,638	10	1521	09
7th place	628	04	(1750)	08

You'll notice that I counted some cases in which a win was given less than 100. There were four results which I did not count. I look for data about competition from this kind of question (what else is it worth?), and obviously anyone who assigns 100 to a 7-way draw and decreasing values to 50 for a 2-way and 0 for other outcomes (including win) is not a competitive player. An assignment of 100 for third place (25 for win, 45 for second, 80 for 7-way) is also extremely unusual. Of the listings which were not of this type, some had to make me wonder what criteria (if any) were being used. I believe that many people just lopped off 5 or so with each reduction of outcome, for example, without thinking about it. How can 4th or 5th place, or worse, a 7th place, where you are surely eliminated, be better than a draw where you surely are not eliminated? Well, I don't worry too much about this any more; it only shows how varied opinions can be. I'd like to devise yet another way of asking this outcome question, but I have no hard ideas right now.

I mentioned with the first survey results printed in DW that while the idea of a universal rating system is silly and impracticable, perhaps the best means of determining values for such a system would be to ask the question for which results are now above. No other system comes close to giving these rankings and relative weights to outcomes. It would be very easy to use the figures in column B or A to create a rating system. Simply average the values of the outcomes a player obtains. To take a brief example, if a player scores a 2-way draw in one game and a 5th place in another, his total score (which is useless as a rating of skill) is 96 (or if you wish to be more accurate, 15,163) and his average, which is his rating, is 48 (or 7,581½). If the results could be computerized, then the entire process could be redone each time new values are obtained from a survey. I've never understood why the results of games five and more years old are retained in rating systems, since competition was so different and skill can change in that length of time. Why not rate the outcomes of games the player has finished in the last 3-4 years, with an additional listing of the total number of games he has played in his career to indicate experience? I think the only reason is that it would be too difficult to police the ratings every year to throw out the oldest year's games. A computerized rating would not entail such difficulty.

I have no intention of starting a rating myself; I would be perfectly content if there were none at all. But if there must be some, I would like to see them run well and run in a manner most advantageous to those who like them and use them.

A FACE-TO-FACE RATING?

I have recently been considering the trend toward more FTF play as more opponents are available, and the relative stagnation in growth of the postal hobby. What can we offer to people to get them interested in postal DIPLOMACY when they already have FTF opponents? One answer is variants. Another answer is glory, ego--that is, ratings. I have already proposed the following system to the IDA Council in

somewhat abbreviated form. I have no idea how they will react to it. I imagine that if a number of people can be found to take care of it, IDA will support it. If not IDA, perhaps some other organization or individual will take up the idea. At any rate, what I proposed was a rating system for FTF play only. The rating would cover a calendar year, with a new one to start each year (good month to start would be February or October). This means that new players will be attracted to the system because they will not have to overcome huge leads as people do in many postal systems. One year ought to be enough for participants to play 6 games or whatever is considered enough to give a valid rating. At the beginning of the year and throughout the first half players who wish to be rated would be asked to register with one of the curators. A registration fee would be required both to indicate serious interest and to support administrative costs, primarily publication of two zines. 50¢ would be enough. The first publication, going to all participants, would indicate who was registered for the benefit of those looking for enough registered players to play a game which would count. The second publication would give final ratings. NO interim ratings would be revealed, to encourage competition and to discourage gang-ups on rating leaders. It might create difficulties for players already registered to permit others to register after the initial publication, but on the other hand it would not be satisfactory to force people to wait a year to register for the next rating--six months would be enough. An alternative would be to have two ratings series running at once, starting six months apart. Players would be permitted to register only in one of the two, so that one game could contribute to different rating series. One rating would end its year every sixth month, so that the wait for a new player to sign up in one or the other of the ratings would not be long.

In order to be counted a game would have to either be part of a recognized tournament at a convention, or it would have to meet fairly strict criteria so that packing and collusion could be avoided. As for recognition, this could come from the curators. Probably they would require submission of game results as a condition for recognition. I think at least 4-5 conventions each year run tournaments, with 2-3 games played by each person in each one, and this would provide good base material. (It might even give players the incentive to stick it out in a tournament they no longer have a chance to win, since resignations and dropouts would be treated pretty severely.) As for the criteria if the game is not part of a tournament, I tentatively suggest the following. (1) At least 5 of the 7 players must be registered (it might be found impractical to require this many--perhaps only 4). (2) Only 1 game per quarter year could be rated in which three players are the same, that is, if three people (one or more of whom are registered) get together and decide to push the rating of one of their number, at best they can get four games rated in this manner; this also prevents a huge influx of scores from one active group of local players, collusion or not. (3) 5 (or perhaps 4) players would be required to sign the results, which would be sent to the curator for that region. (4) The only results required would be placing of each player and listing replacements, if any. It would be desired, however, that a complete center chart be submitted so that the data could be used by statistics fans. (5) Every game which is eligible to be rated must be rated (unless players agree not to before-

hand?); this is to prevent 5 registered players from playing with two unregistered ones and rating only those games in which the two unregistered ones do very poorly, throwing out those games where the unregistered players do very well. (6) An additional possible limitation would be to permit no more than one game per month to be rated, excluding recognized tournaments.

What rating system would be used? First, it would have to be an average system; second, one that could be used only with bare results without center charts; third, one that could be easily used and understood. The obvious choice is the Averaged Calhamer Point Count. Another good choice (having the virtue of no previous use) would be the rating I described above based on survey results. I suggest one very important addition, no matter which system is used--RATE VARIANTS. Though some variants are very strange and it would be undesirable to include them, many require as much or more skill and effort as standard DIPLOMACY. FTF variant play is not uncommon. Many years ago Don Miller maintained a Calhamer Point Count Rating which included variants as well as standard DIP, but he did not discriminate between ratable and non-ratable (especially very unbalanced) variants. While it would be difficult for ratingmasters to go back to try to pick up variants now, it would not be difficult to add variants in a new FTF rating. In fact, for clarity, it would be desirable to specify at the beginning of the year exactly which variants would be counted.

DIPPY AND WARGAMES

I have been trying to convince some people for quite a while that for most Dip-players it is only one good game among many, not "the only game". The data from NADPS #1 helped show that, and here is some more. First, DIPLOMACY is considered a very good game: "Diplomacy is the best game I have ever played" 41 agree strongly, 47 somewhat, 24 neutral, 33 disagree somewhat, 23 strongly, 1 unfamiliar (huh?). Of course, not all of the disagreement originates with wargames--card games must also be included. But consider. 130 of 167 (83%) of respondents have played an Avalon Hill or SPI wargame, and a few may have played wargames only of the smaller companies. 87 regularly read the largest circulation wargame magazine (Strategy and Tactics). Altogether 104 regularly read at least one wargaming zine. That is 61% of the most active segment of DIPLOMACY fandom. I am sure that there are many people who consider themselves wargamers who play only a few postal Dipgames, and who consequently did not believe it worthwhile to reply to the survey. See also the figures for timespent on wargaming and Dip on page 3.

ORGANIZATIONS

"The hobby would be better off if The Diplomacy Association did not exist" 17 agree strongly, 16 agree somewhat, 57 neutral, 22 disagree somewhat, 33 disagree strongly, 23 unfamiliar. Same question but for International Diplomacy Association: 5 agree strongly, 5 somewhat, 37 neutral, 44 disagree somewhat, 64 strongly, 12 unfamiliar. I at first looked for some differences in the opinions of New Yorkers, Californians, and (in the opinion of IDA) from those who answered disagree strongly to the TDA question. It was not easy to keep track of and I gave up when I found no apparent trends. I suspect that, in this response group, support for organizations in themselves is pretty strong, no matter which organization you are talking about. It is reasonable that the people most interested in the hobby (that is, those most likely to reply to the NADPS) are also interested in hobby

organizations. Of course, there is a great difference between TDA, which is a private organization primarily interested in helping its own members, and the mass-membership IDA which tends to support hobby-wide projects more often.

I also asked: "A hobby-wide organization must be administered by elected officers" 51 agreed strongly, 37 somewhat, 38 neutral, 31 disagree somewhat, 9 strongly, 4 unfamiliar. Of the various clubs which are involved in the hobby, only IDA has elections. I think what is much more important than elections is that capable people can participate in the government (not guaranteed by elections as present IDA practice shows) and that members can throw out officers they find inadequate for whatever reason (not possible in practice in any club at present--only officers have any real power to can other officers).

I assume that most of those who read Diplomacy Review are IDA members. The 80 who do include more than half of all North American members of IDA.

ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTIONS

This is a hodgepodge category. Let's take degree questions first. "The rulebook is clear and concise" 23 agree strongly, 65 somewhat, 19 neutral, 40 disagree somewhat, 19 strongly, 4 unfamiliar. I am surprised at the disagreement. The rulebook has been revised once and is much more clear than before; it is MUCH more clear than the average wargame rulebook. There are virtually no rule questions which ever come up in play that are not clearly ruled upon. "Gamefees are generally too high" 6 agree strongly, 22 somewhat, 45 neutral, 51 disagree somewhat, 36 strongly, 3 unfamiliar. "Unordered units should not be eliminated when dislodged in order to minimize the effects of missed moves on postal play" 46 agree strongly, 45 somewhat, 16 neutral, 24 disagree somewhat, 32 strongly, 5 unfamiliar. I understand that a dispute over this recently took place on the west coast. I strongly agree with the majority. It is stupid to worship the rules to the extent of screwing up a postal game, when postal games were not foreseen in the original rules and largely if not totally ignored in the revised set (since postal fans make up only a very small portion of those who buy the game). Why let a missed move louse up the game any more than it has to? And why cripple a replacement when you can just as easily let him retreat the unit as part of his first move? This is another argument against the use of "prophetics" which require a player to list all possible retreats with his moves, and an argument in favor of those who require moves to be made conditional on retreats (a procedure which is easier on players anyway).

I asked "who 'owns' the postal game". I divided replies by my four categories, to see if the more experienced players, who are familiar with the kinds of problems that can come up, would differ from the less experienced ones who would be more likely to see the gamesmaster as a kind of hero or "Ghod of Diplomacy". I tried to separate out publishers but failed to do so in some cases, I think.

	0-5	6-10	11-20	20+	GM's
GM	12(22%)	7(30%)	5(24%)	2(20%)	9(23%)
Players	29(55%)	12(52%)	12(57%)	6(60%)	24(62%)
Both	13	4	4	2	6

I didn't give "both" as an alternative, but many wrote it in. This omission was deliberate, because I wanted to force players to choose one or the other. Naturally both GM and players have rights and duties.

but in a dispute, I think the players have the greater right to determine what will happen to the game (after all they're paying for it, and more).

In the results of NADPS #1 I discussed a possible GM group, membership in which would be an indication of reliability though it would not involve actual game guarantees. In the next issue of DW was a little article by me, "Listening Post", which suggested that a listing of gm's/publishers who overstep certain objective limits of involvement in the hobby ought to be printed periodically in hobby zines in order to make players aware that such persons are more susceptible to burnouts, on the average, than others. The article was about 6 months old when printed, and I no longer entirely agree with the limits I suggested. I asked in the survey, "should a GM limit himself in the # of games he runs--if yes, how many".

	Yes, but don't know what limit or varies with person	yes with median limit	no
0-5	23 (35%)	28--7	15 (23%)
6-10	16 (42%)	19--7-8	3 (8%)
11-20	7 (21%)	21--8	5 (15%)
20+	4 (15%)	15--7	7 (27%)

I will not again go through the arguments in favor of establishing some kind of objective limit for identification of possible problems. I stand foursquare for letting people use their own judgement, but I want to help reduce their ignorance of what they might be getting into. I also want to see if public pressure on GM's, publishers, and zines, not coercion by any organization, can persuade those who are overinvolved to alter their ways. I have introduced the following resolution into the IDA Council. "The IDA Council strongly recommends to all postal players that they avoid joining any new games under a GM, zine, or publisher that runs more than 6 uninsured/unguaranteed games or 9 insured/guaranteed games. For those with less than one year experience the Council recommends a limit of 4 uninsured/unguaranteed games or 6 insured/guaranteed games. Any GM, zine, or publisher that opens a new game above these limits is acting irresponsibly. This is because 1) a large number of games contributes to the possibility of drop-out of the GM, zine, or publisher through overwork 2) just as important, in those cases where a drop out occurs, for whatever reason, those that have a large number of games help create a chaos in which other GM's, zines, and publishers can become overburdened with orphan games and players are forced to undergo long delays before their games are restarted, if they are at all. The latter problem contributes to the hobby drop-out rate. The IDA further hopes that all IDA publishers will frequently print this recommendation and that they will urge players to do as it suggests."

I recorded the number of GM's and publishers (the latter excluding carbon copy and guest GM's).

	0-5	6-10	11-20	20+
GM's	10 (14%)	14 (36%)	16 (44%)	14 (56%)
Pubbers	9 (13%)	14 (36%)	13 (36%)	10 (40%)

The percentages refer to the total number of respondents in each experience category. Mean age of publishers was 22.89, median 22-3; mean of GM's who aren't publishers is 22.33, median 21.

VARIANTS

Degree question: "Variants contribute to my enjoyment of the hobby." 56 agree strongly, 43 somewhat, 28 neutral, 11 disagree somewhat, 13 strongly, 13 unfamiliar. I must say I am very pleased. Variants have come a long way in North America since 1972, when Dick Vedder and I were the only people who really cared about them.

I mentioned in connection with the FTF rating that variants are one thing that can be used to attract FTF players to the hobby. Several people already have been introduced to DIPLOMACY itself through variants, or never became active players until they discovered a variant which particularly struck their fancy. I suspect that there are many people who become bored with standard DIPLOMACY and drop out of the hobby, who would remain if they could find a few variants which offered new opportunities not found in the standard game. Unfortunately it is difficult to obtain information about variants unless you go looking--even the columns in DW are not adequate.

I asked whether people have played a Dipvariant, 0-5 games 33 (47% of that group), 6-10 games 25 (64%), 11-20 29 (81%), 20+ 23 (92%), total 110 (64%). As one might expect, the more experienced players are more often variant players, and the most experienced ones, the ones who haven't become bored to the point of dropping out, almost all have played variants.

I asked people to name their three favorite Dipvariants. The listing below does not include games mentioned only once. In a few cases I have combined versions which are related but may have considerable differences, because some people did not specify which version they meant. The first number is for those who have played FTF, the second for those who haven't.

Youngstown Variant	33-22	Black Hole (3 vers)	11-4	Anarchy	2-7
Middle Earth V	4-7	Michigan	7-0	Militarism III	1-4
1721 (2 vers)	6-2	Lord of the Rings (2 vers)	5-3		
Downfall o.t.l.o.t.r.a.t.r.o.t.k.	5-1	Jihad (2 vers)	4-2		
Scotice Scripti III	3-2	1885	2-1	Atlantica (2 vers)	3-1
Diadochi (4 vers)	2-0	Variants of the Ghods	2-0		
Colonia	3-1	Slobbovia	3-0	Napoleon's Europe	4-0
Dalarna II	2-1	Coyne-Hubbard	1-1	Imperialism VIII	1-1
Westphalia (2 vers)	4-0	Imperialism VII	2-1	1600	2-0
Lunatic (3 vers)	2-0	Biodiplomacy	3-0	Schizodip	2-0
Economic IV?	1-1	HyperEc (many vers)	2-0		
Imperialism IX (2 vers)	2-0	War of the Roses	2-0		
North American	2-0	Kriegsmarine	2-0	1648	0-2
Middle Earth IV	1-3	Intimate	2-0	Abstraction	0-3
Mordor vs the World (4 vers)	1-1				

CONVENTIONS

"I go to conventions to" play in tournies-43, play non-tourny games -24, socialize-54, other; negotiate meeting, observe, run Dip-tournies, play variants; remainder don't go.

"Do you prefer one national or several regional DipCons per year" national 27, regional 73, both 16. The last alternative is a write-in. Of course, that is what will probably happen. I would like to see regional DipCons springing up which can take turns handling the North American DipCon.

At present there is considerable discussion about how the site of the DipCon ought to be selected if more than one group is interested in holding it. I summarize here an article forthcoming in

Impassable. I suggest adopting a modified version of the method used by science fiction fans. A committee (presumably appointed by the IDA) would supervise what would amount to an election by persons interested enough to contribute money toward the con (say, \$1). Money remaining after expenses of running the voting process would be given to the convention organizers at the convention. The first committee would be responsible for setting up guidelines to determine whether a group bidding for the site would be considered reliable enough to be placed on the ballot--for example, one-man shows would be frowned upon. Otherwise it would be the advertising and campaigns of the various competing groups and the reputation of the persons involved which would probably determine which group won the vote. Final votes would be due about late March.

I also asked what month is best for a DipCon. June-30, July-26, August-34, September-7, December-4, others 0-2 each. The period from June 15 to August 20, when everyone is out of school, is the only practical time for a DipCon. I see no imperative reason to hold it in August as it has been in the past.

CALHAMER AWARDS

I asked a number of questions about the Calhamer Awards to determine how they ought to be reformed, if at all. "The Calhamer Awards (CA) contribute to my enjoyment of the hobby" 9 agree strongly, 28 agree somewhat, 50 neutral, 32 disagree somewhat, 27 strongly, 22 unfamiliar. "The Calhamer Awards should be abolished" 12 agree strongly, 13 somewhat, 56 neutral, 29 disagree somewhat, 31 strongly, 24 unfamiliar. Though only 25 can be found against the CA, only 60 out of 171 can be found to defend them. Obviously people are very dissatisfied with the past performance of the CA but feel that something can be done to improve them, rather than ditch them altogether. "If the CA are not abolished, there ought to be separate awards for North America and overseas" 25 agree strongly, 41 somewhat, 41 neutral, 15 disagree somewhat, 24 strongly, 21 unfamiliar. Some people continue to want to buck forces stronger than we can do anything about. With the very small number of zines which pass across the sea, how can we compare or even, most of us, be aware of what is going on in the other segment of the hobby? "A self-perpetuating (by co-optation) panel of experts should choose the CA recipients" 6 agree strongly, 12 somewhat, 55 neutral, 26 disagree somewhat, 37 strongly, 29 unfamiliar. "A panel of experts elected by players should choose the CA winners" 16 agree strongly, 36 somewhat, 54 neutral, 20 disagree somewhat, 14 strongly, 26 unfamiliar. It's been shown time and again that most average players don't know enough, aren't knowledgeable enough to be able to select winners. Yet it is pretty apparent that people don't like the idea of not participating at any level. I suggest that a panel be elected in a vote of the hobbyists involved (North America--the British to do it whatever way they like). Most players will be able to vote for, say, 5 people whose judgement they trust/agree with. People will also be asked to suggest nominees. The panel will do the actual nominations and final voting (using Australian ballot). There are of course many minor details that must be changed, such as permitting persons the opportunity to remove themselves from the ballot if they so desire. The categories need some revision, too. I hope that such things will be accomplished by the IDA CA Committee.

MISCELLANEOUS

"Name the three most important people in the hobby (in order)"
I assigned 3 points for first, 2 for second, 1 for third. I am listing only those who received at least 10 points. After that, the next largest total was 7. In the list, point total is followed by the number of people who named the person.

W. Buchanan 168-68	L. Pulsipher 34-18	G. Warden 16-9
D. Beyerlein 129½-60	J. Boyer 30-15	C. von Metzke 14½-8
E. Birsan 73½-38	J. Boardman 29-15	G. Neiger 10-7
A. Calhamer 61-26	R. Walker 26½-18	J. Leeder 10-4
	J. Beshara 17-10	

Many people did not answer this, often because they felt unqualified to.

I did not ask this question as an ego booster for anyone. I wanted to "test" a hypothesis, that people would either name the only Big Name Fan they knew or they would name people according to their functions or jobs. It wasn't hard to anticipate that Buchanan, whose function is DW editor/publisher and who is identified almost exclusively with DW, and Beyerlein, as BNC, would be named most often. I wanted three names in order to see who would be selected after these two went by. The choice in this case depended on what official function (if any) one thought was important. Birsan was named because he is IDA President. A few chose the IDA editor (Neiger) or the TDA Chairman of the Board (Beshara). Yet others faced with this choice named Calhamer or no one at all. Another factor that naturally affected choice was how one defined "important". I deliberately left the term undefined, again to see, by looking at who was selected, what kinds of things hobbyists considered important. Three definitions come to mind (roughly). One, the most important are those least likely to be replaced in a hobby function. For example, how many people are willing and able to be DW editor or BNC? A second definition might be, the most important are those whose removal without replacement would most hurt the hobby. A third definition would be that the ones whose contributions are the most valuable, more valuable than those of others, are the most important. This probably was my unconscious definition. I chose Buchanan, Boyer, Neiger.

Degree questions: "The hobby would be better off if Diplomacy World did not exist" 6 agree strongly, 4 somewhat, 16 neutral, 47 disagree somewhat, 83 strongly, 12 unfamiliar. At first I looked for a trend among publisher respondents, but I gave up when they seemed to be spread in the same manner as others. "Games Research Inc ownership of Diplomacy World is good for the hobby" 17 agree strongly, 35 somewhat, 75 neutral, 13 disagree somewhat, 11 strongly, 17 unfamiliar.

FUTURE OF NADPS

I assume that the Beyerlein Player Poll will appear again this summer; I understand there is another effort afoot to sabotage it (there was one unpublicized effort last time). There may be a variant survey forthcoming from California, and Thomas Galloway's SF&F variant survey is an ongoing project. I know of two people who have vague plans to do surveys of the characteristics (good and bad) of hobby zines. A survey for GM's only, asking about their methods in crucial areas of disagreement such as draw vote procedures, might be useful. An obvious subject for a survey is a more in-depth look at playing characteristics than I've attempted in the NADPS. One of the great advantages of a general survey like this one is that there is something on it to interest almost everyone so that they'll be willing to answer

some uninteresting questions as well as the interesting ones. For most purposes the more responses you can get from the relatively uninterested, the more accurate your results will be.

Someone suggested that more responses would be obtained if a prize were offered. This is fine when financial backing is available, but I already spend quite a bit on this and I don't wish to spend a lot more. Ideally, support of GRI and of major organizations ought to be obtained so that prizes could be offered for respondents and for publishers who print the form, and so that people would be urged to participate. If there is ever another NADPS I will try to obtain some external support.

DIPLOMACY AND WOMEN

Recently I've read a discussion by both sexes concerning the reasons why wargamers are so seldom female. The same question can be asked of DIPLOMACY. There is only one female player with as many as two wins, and the two NADPS together have received only 2% of their response from women. Why the lack of interest in our game? First, let's throw out the stupid delusion that "women are of inferior intelligence". My view is that differences of nature between the two sexes are very limited. The only ones definitely proved to be differences of nature are physiological, of reproductive systems and size (and possibly muscular development). I cannot accept the reason advanced by one woman that wargames are an expression of a territorial imperative instinct in man which somehow doesn't affect women. One man suggested that interest in playing wargames stems from the attractions of the glory of war and of the hunt. This may influence a small (and immature?) minority of wargamers, but I seriously doubt that this has much to do with playing DIPLOMACY. Even if it does, this is a consequence of nurture, of the way men are brought up, not an "instinct" or some such rot.

I think that most people play DIPLOMACY at least in part because they like to compete. This is not true for everyone, of course. Also, it is clear that women, even many women who get around to playing DIP, are not particularly interested in this kind of competition. This may be partly a matter of nature but is largely because of differences in nurture. As for the former, women are generally smaller than men and consequently they are forced to find some means other than brute physical aggression to accomplish their ends. This could just as well be presented as a reason why women ought to be interested in board games, since the physical attributes of the players don't affect the game (except under unusual circumstances, of course...). On the other hand, the actual presentation is of brute military force, which women might generally have learned to avoid. The second, and far more convincing reason, is that women have been taught and in many quarters are still being taught that open competition, especially anything smacking of aggression, is unladylike and ought to be avoided, while men are taught just the opposite. This "teaching" takes place not only in the home, but wherever the person goes. This is changing (look at high school and college sports, for example), but at this time most women have been affected by the older style of upbringing. They learn not to be interested in competition such as we indulge in in DIPPY.

They also learn, in some cases, to avoid using their heads as much as possible because this is supposed to be unattractive or useless. Those women who can't overcome this teaching are certainly

not going to wish to play a game as cerebral as DIPLOMACY, whether they feel like competing or not. Many men are also taught that mental competition is somehow unmasculine or inferior, and you seldom see these types playing DIP. I have listed the "play dumb" reason in a subsidiary position because even women who have overcome this teaching or who were fortunate enough not to be subjected to it in the home, are seldom interested in playing DIPLOMACY. The teaching against competition is far more important.

QUESTIONS

I'll use the remaining space to list some suggested questions. I would like to get the bugs out before the questions are actually put in a survey form, and other poll-takers might want to use some of the suggestions themselves.

To what degree are things like the NADPS needed and useful (automatic bias in favor of such--those who don't think so probably won't answer)

Are players "oppressed" by GM's, are they careful enough of player interests--breakdown between GM's and players.

In a perfectly played game, what would be the inevitable outcome (if any): win __, 2-player draw __ (etc.)

"If my first __ ((3)) postal games had been orphaned, I would have quit the hobby" A-E

Race (to see how WASish we are)

Rate your skill and experience (on 1-9 scale as in #2) for FTF and for postal play (total of 4 ratings)

"Name the 3 most important hobby offices-jobs-functions in order"

"Should countries be assigned by lot __ or by preference __"

"I would never ally again with someone who stabbed me" A-E

"How many hours/week do you watch on TV: sports __, movies __, other __"

"Is DIP a wargame __" "Is chess a wargame __"

Which rating do you consider the least inaccurate reflection of skill?

What type of zine do you prefer to play in? one game __, 2-6 games __, 7-10 __ 11 or more __, Publisher pubs only 1 zine __ more than 1 __. Circulation of less than 25 __, 26-50 __, 50-100 __, over 100 __. IDA game insurance __, regional association guarantee __, no guarantee needed __. One editor __, more than one __. Your GM is publisher __, your GM is not publisher __.

May 11, 1975. This is Orion Press Publication #104, 20¢ (30¢ first class) from address below.

Lewis Pulsipher
423 N Main St.
Bellevue, MI 49021

1ST
CLASS
CLASS
Class

ROD WALKER
1273 CREST DR
ENCINITAS, CALIF 92024

