



Empire

A GAMING AND SIMULATIONS QUARTERLY

In This Issue

- **The Games People Play.....Lew Scarr
- **A Close Up Look At The RAND Corporation
- **An Interview With Daniel Ellsberg
- **The Pentagon Game
- **The Irving Salomon Prize In Gaming and Simulations
- **New Games And The Free Form Historical Simulation.....Jack and Cathy Greene
- **The Tri Theta Epsilon Exercise

January 1973 Issue

Vol. 6 No. 1

ON TRADITION

From our old format as a Diplomacy magazine we have retained two things: our title, which is, for most people, meaningless and unpronounceable; and our cover, which to some people will be objectionable. However, the title XENOGOGIC goes back almost ten years, already having served for a newspaper column and a Diplomacy magazine, and seems too much a part of us to be sacrificed. XENOGOGIC should be pronounced, for the record, as ZEN-O-GO-JIK, emphasis on the first syllable. It is a corruption of a Greek phrase, meaning: "Know it all." We're still trying, after ten years, to live up to the title. Each year it becomes more and more obvious that we aren't going to make it. The cover was done by San Diego artist Geo. Samuel Harter for our Diplomacy magazine. Some people may object to having pictures of Hitler and Napoleon on the cover of a magazine of this type. Others may object to having my picture on the cover. Let the pictures of Hitler and Napoleon remain to remind each of us that we deal with a very important subject matter: the future of our world. Without proper preparation for our future leaders we have no guarantee that in some future issue the fourth corner may be filled by a new Hitler or Napoleon. Helping to provide that proper preparation is one of our goals. As for the picture of me, let it remain to remind me I need a haircut.

ADVERTISING RATES

<u>Per Issue</u>	<u>Rear Cover</u>	<u>Inside Cover</u>	<u>Interior Page</u>
¼ Page	OMIT	\$10.00	\$3.00
½ Page	\$25.00	\$15.00	\$7.00
1 Page	\$40.00	\$25.00	\$10.00

Prices are for black and white, ready copy, based on 8 inch by 10 inch page.

For yearly contract, four issues, multiply above by three.

For Flyers: \$15.00 per issue for one sheet, same contract.

For color copy: inquire.

Advertising revenues will be reinvested in the magazine.

XENOLOGIC

A Gaming and Simulations Quarterly

January 1973

A Letter From Lyndon Baines Johnson..... 2
A Letter From Margaret Chase Smith..... 2
Why Another Magazine?.....Lawrence Wm. Peery..... 3
The Games People Play.....Lew Scarr..... 5
Monopoly Is Forty Year Favorite.....Edward J. Doherty..... 7
A Close Up Look At The RAND Corporation..... 9
RAND Thinkers Zero In On Nonmilitary Problems.....10
Trial To Test Ownership: Interview With Daniel Ellsberg.....13
The Pentagon Game...For War Across The Coffee Table...W. Nelson17
The Institute For Diplomatic Studies.....18
The Irving Salomon Prize In Gaming and Simulations.....19
In Memoriam President Lyndon B. Johnson.....21
Johnson's Domestic Record Was Incredible.....Ernest Cuneo.....22
The New Games And The Free Form Historical Simulation
.....Jack and Cathy Greene.....24
Instructions For Contributing Authors.....27
Staff Positions Open For Zine.....28
The Tri Theta Epsilon Exercise.....29
Institute Announces Reorganization & Masterplan.....30

LAWRENCE WILLIAM PEERY

Editor

Contributing Editors

Douglas Beyerlein

Richard A. Brooks

Gary Gehrke

Rating Systems

Variants

Postal Gaming

Published quarterly by TTT Publications. Editorial and Business Offices, Box 8416, San Diego, Ca. 92102. All mail, including subscriptions, should be sent to this office. Subscriptions \$5.00 per year, \$8.00 Overseas air mail. The Editors will consider manuscripts submitted, but assume no responsibility regarding them. Reprints of articles are available for purchase.

Vol. 6, No. 1, Copyright 1973, LAWRENCE WM. PEERY, Printed in USA

Seal of
The President of
The United States of America

Office of
Lyndon B. Johnson

January 2, 1973

Dear Mr. Peery:

Your letter was very kind and very generous, and I am very grateful for your thoughtful words. However, the task you have given me will take more time than I now have. Therefore, I ask you to bear with me for a few weeks.

For your first issue I can only send my best wishes and highest hopes that you succeed with your most worthwhile endeavor.

Sincerely,

Lyndon B. Johnson

List of Members

UNITED STATES SENATE
Committee on Armed Services
Washington, D.C.

December 7, 1972

Dear Mr. Peery:

Thank you very much for your thoughtful letter and kind invitation. Mr. Braswell will be contacting you shortly about the interview and documents you requested and I trust the arrangements you work out with him will be satisfactory.

Your new magazine sounds most interesting and I will look forward to seeing a copy on my return to Skowhegan.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

MARGARET CHASE SMITH

United States Senator

WHY ANOTHER MAGAZINE?

By Lawrence Wm. Peery

According to a variety of sources, thousands of new magazines are started each year: most fold within a year's time. A few standards, like Life, also fall by the wayside as tastes and times change. But, constantly, new magazines hit the market and grow: Psychology Today is a good example. Most of these magazines are relatively specialized, appealing to a semi-exclusive group of readers, draw their subject matter from a single area, their advertising from a few sources, and fill a specialized need for some type of knowledge. A few magazines, like Reader's Digest or Foreign Affairs become standouts in that they either dominate their field or everyone in it grants their preeminence. But, for anyone, magazine publishing is a risky, often disastrous, business.

So, why has XENOGOGIC abandoned its traditional place in the sub-sub-sub field of postal Diplomacy (Note: Here we refer to Allan Calhamer's game, Diplomacy, which is published by GRI, 48 Wareham St., Boston, Mass.) publishing for a much larger, and much more competitive field: wargaming, and beyond that, gaming and simulations in general. Why give up the security of being a big fish in a small pond for the insecurity of being a lamb among wolves? A fair question but a difficult one to answer, simply. Most of the answers have been provided in the flyer announcing this magazine or in the old XENOGOGIC.

Simply put, we hope to provide a service we feel is lacking in the gaming and simulations field: a single source of information about many different organizations, activities, and interests; aimed at the key people in all those areas. We hope to bring together the people involved in gaming and simulations in Government, Commercial gaming and simulations, Educational simulations, Think Tank research, and talented amateurs in gaming and simulations.

In one magazine, aimed at the people who really count, or who hope to count someday, we hope to bring you, from within and without the gaming and simulations community, some of the best materials not generally available. Some of it will be specialized, some of it generalized, some only partially pertaining to gaming at all. Some will be serious, some humorous, some just narrative. Our articles, and other activities, will be as varied as the gaming and simulations community. Above all, they will be designed to develop a true community interest in the gaming field.

From high strategy, to parlor games, to psychological studies, to school childrens' experiences with games, to military wargames, to computer games: all this and more we will examine.

Remember, as we go on, if you will, that our aim is to write as little of this magazine as possible. We want you to contribute to its pages. We have this goal for two reasons: First, it will give us more time to work on our own projects and, Second, it gives you a chance to write for a broad audience spread across a broad spectrum of the gaming and simulations community.

As for that audience: we hope it will be a broadly based one representing all the fields we mentioned above: Commercial, Governmental, Think Tank, Educational, Amateur, etc. We need that diverse support to make this magazine function properly. However, circulation size and growth rates are not our goal. Initially, we hope to have only 100-150 subscribers; more than that will be too many. We will encourage purchases of yearly volumes instead of the quarterly issues. In time we may expand our size and our circulation. For the moment we aim for the highest quality, not quantity. We lack the resources to reach a large audience, but we do want to have an impact on the audience we do reach.

Financially, this magazine will lose money. At worst it may lose 50¢ for every 50¢ of income it has. But, if our circulation goals are reached, and some advertising (in actuality a form of contribution) is generated, losses will be minimal. Should, by a stroke of luck, we actually run in the black any excesses will be poured back into the magazine. No one will make any money off this effort and, more importantly, no one wants to; or more accurately, no one expects to.

Why? It seems the right thing to do at the right time. The question is, do you agree with us?

IN THE NEXT ISSUE

POTENTIAL AND DEVELOPMENT OF FUTURE

LEADERS

By

Lyndon Baines Johnson

We know that President Johnson was working on an article for us on this general subject; whether he had completed it we do not know at this time. However, what materials have been put on paper will appear in the next issue along with others on the subject from his public writings.

THE GAMES PEOPLE PLAY

By Lew Scarr

Everyone has a games drawer. That's where you put all of the games between the time you play them and the day you take them to the Goodwill.

Our games drawer is full these days. In it are: Something called "Po-Ke-No," said to be a 12-board combination of poker and keno; a dusty version of Scrabble, which had its brief day and then sputtered Roman candle-like because somehow all of the Ts got lost; a plastic board of Tic-Tac-Toe, which, while boring as the very devil, doesn't look passing bad on the cocktail table; Password by Milton Bradley; Hexed "for ages 6 to 60" (Sorry about that Harry if you just turned 61); Changeable Charlie; Monopoly, of course; two newcomers, Clue and Masterpiece; a set of 100 plastic interlocking poker chips; a piece of cheese.

Also: a roulette wheel; Yahtzee; Parker Brothers' Sorry, a "slide pursuit game" (?); a clutch of Pick Up Sticks, a paper backed copy of Hoyle's Rules of Games, and a 24-page pamphlet called "The Hunting Horn, What to Blow and How to Blow it."

Of this great storehouse of fun...Oh, the piece of cheese isn't a real piece of cheese. It is a clever wedge of plastic cheddar with a nip off the corner and a funny little mousey on top. It has three more little mouseys and some colored chips inside. And how you play this is, as far away from Daddy as possible.

But of this great storehouse of fun, I would say only three games get played with any regularity. Masterpiece and Clue, because they are the new kids on the block and Monopoly, which probably is the greatest game ever invented and that includes chess and baseball.

Both Masterpiece and Clue are by Parker Brothers, Monopoly, too, for that matter. Masterpiece is an art auction game, of some educational value, I suppose, because it utilizes reproductions of real masterpieces by people such as Edward Hopper, Caillebotte, El Greco and like that.

But Clue is more popular at our house, probably because it involves a choice of victims for murder and weapons from rope to a lead pipe.

In the end, though, I fear that they, too, will go the way of Lotto and the Mansion of Happiness.

But Monopoly will go on and on. In fact, if the Parkers don't guard their product as zealously as Coke it may pass into the public domain and wind up like checkers, all lower case.

What is there about Monopoly? It was born in the Great Depression and gave people a chance then to buy properties they couldn't otherwise afford. The prices, by the way, now are ridiculous. Did you know that you can still buy rotten old Baltic Avenue for \$60? And the Electric Company---the entire Electric Company, including all of the watts and poles and everything---for \$150!

But it has survived the Great Depression and prosperity, and is just as popular in whatever we call what we have today. And in England.

Why should Monopoly be popular in England? They play it there with quid, of course, and you can't go straight to jail without passing Go because then you would be driving on the wrong side of St. James Place.

But one thing has changed with Monopoly. Our set is a kind of hybrid with money, markers, and houses from two sets. The markers have changed.

Old sets had wooden pieces that looked like nipples and warts. The new sets have metal movers in the shape of shoes, airplanes, cars, and cannon.

And Monopoly still takes a long time to play, especially if there are just two of you. The record at our house for a two-man game is three days, three nights and until 6 p.m. on Sunday when a bandit came around, stole all the money and shot the players so they would come to dinner.

But as long-lived as Monopoly has been, games do change.

Board games in America didn't develop fully until the 1860s. One of the earliest game makers was John McLoughlin, who started as a lithographer in 1808. His biggest seller was Jackstraws.

The Milton Bradley Company bought out McLoughlin in 1920. Milton Bradley is one of three game manufacturers who started more than 100 years ago.

The other two are Parker Brothers of Salem, Mass., and Selchow and Righter of Bay Shore, New York.

Milton Bradley founded his company in 1859 and began with a game called the Checkered Game of Life. It was an instant success and Bradley was on his way.

And because of George S. Parker, Salem was to become known as the Game Capital of the World. Parker hit with early successes in Anagrams, Authors (conceived in 1861 by an instructor in a Salem school for young ladies) and the Game of Banking, using the same lure of making money which was to lead to Monopoly.

Scrabble probably has been Selchow and Righter's biggest seller over the years.

Games this year have au courant names like Seduction, Group Therapy, Blacks and Whites, and Ecology. And being an election year, politics are being played, too.

Who Can Beat Nixon? is one by Harrison-Blaine, but if you want to find out it will cost you \$7 for a set.

Mr. President by 3M Co. is another, this one for \$8.95. And, finally, The Next President, is the most complex and expensive (\$10) of all.

The Next President has three separate phases---nomination, caucusing and election. It even has a hypothetical feature with which players can pit such unlikely opponents as Abraham Lincoln and George Wallace.

About the only thing The Next President doesn't provide for is an alternate site in case some party wants to switch the national convention.

MONOPOLY IS FORTY YEAR FAVORITE

By Edward J. Doherty

Americans by the millions have long gleefully thumbed their noses at the Sherman Antitrust Act by creating monopolies. But it's all in fun, for Monopoly is a game that enters its 40th year in 1973, still on top of the parlor games heap.

In a world where everything changes, Monopoly does not. When inventor Charles Darrow first sold the game at the bottom of the depression, players could pick up fancy properties for a few hundred bucks in phony money. They still can.

The only things that have ever been altered in the game are the rules which have been clarified seven times-- and the physical properties, which have been converted from wood to plastic.

In the game the four railroads are rich and desirable properties. But in real life the Pennsylvania Railroad merged with the New York Central, and the combine went bankrupt. The Short Line trains have been replaced by buses; the Reading no longer calls at Monopoly town which is Atlantic City, and the Baltimore and Ohio never did.

Another thing which hasn't changed is the popularity of Monopoly. Seventy million games have been sold since Parker Brothers acquired it from Darrow in 1936, and in only one year since has any other proprietary parlor game outsold Monopoly.

It is produced--or "published" in the words of the manufacturer---in 16 languages and played in 26 countries. Monopoly was banned years ago in Russia as being "capitalistic". But when a handful of the games were displayed at a trade fair in Moscow, they quickly disappeared, presumably in the hands of some free enterprising Communists.

Royalties from his game made a rich man of Charles Darrow, who had been sorely hit by the depression. But when he first approached Parker Brothers with Monopoly they turned him down flat. "The game is too complicated," he was told. "It violates 52 of the standard rules of gamesmanship." Darrow forced Parker's hand by selling direct to several stores in his home town, Philadelphia, where it proved popular.

After Parker Brothers bought the rights to the game, Darrow invented another one and took it to them. The company didn't like this new game but the management figured, "We were wrong on Monopoly, and we may be wrong on this one." So they took a flyer on the second invention. Only 2,000 copies of it sold, and it was dropped---no matter, the company has enjoyed more than a \$100 million in sales over the years from Monopoly alone.

Monopoly madness takes many forms, including marathon playing. Last year Scott Pevahouse and Clay Ashley played an 80 hour game at Danville, California, a record for two players. The grand marathon was set in the same town when 20 people played continuously for 820 hours, Danville simply loves Monopoly.

The largest outdoor game involved a group of students at Juniata College, Huntingdon, Pa., who used campus streets and sidewalks as their board. Last June professional athletes set up a 52-foot square board at Flint, Michigan, to set a record for the largest indoor game. The Detroit Lion's Lem Barney won it. Each summer, in San Diego, California, local scuba divers play a game with a special underwater set of plastic and rubber-weighted pieces, on the bottom of an olympic-size swimming pool. Each player plays about 30 minutes and then a new player takes his place. A high point, of sorts, occurred when Monopoly "made" the centerfold of Playboy as a prop for one of the famed nude foldouts.

One college football coach, who felt he could sign up his hottest prospect if he could keep other coaches from talking to him, solved the problem by playing Monopoly with him all night in a room without a telephone. A teacher in Ft. Wayne, Indiana, used Monopoly for ghetto kids to get them interested in mathematics.

With Monopoly sets still selling by the millions after 40 years, many game lovers are trying to emulate Darrow by sending their ideas to Parker Brothers. The company received 3,000 potential new games last year and screened all carefully. But only once in five years do they find one they think might sell. The odds are much better than that for Monopoly players.

A CLOSE UP LOOK AT THE RAND CORPORATION

The following three articles: "RAND Thinkers Zero In On Nonmilitary Problems," "Trial To Test Ownership: Interview With Daniel Ellsberg," and "The Pentagon Game...For War Across The Coffee Table," all deal in some fashion with The Research and Development Corporation, RAND, and the consequences of its activities.

These three articles mark the beginning of a series of articles about RAND and its work. In our opinion the contribution of RAND to the gaming and simulations field ranks second to none. Such a contribution is worthy of further study. In future articles we will discuss some of RAND's studies in the gaming field, in game theory, and some of her projects which have dealt with gaming techniques as applied to real problems.

It is no accident that most of the men who have made their mark in the gaming and simulations field have, at one time or another, been involved in some fashion with RAND's activities. For almost twenty-five years, since its earliest work for the Air Force, RAND has been involved in gaming and simulations. From Herman Kahn to Martin Shubik, from Daniel Ellsberg to James Schlesinger, the men from RAND have had a profound affect on not only gaming and simulations but the entire nation; indeed, the entire modern world.

The articles in XENOGOGIC do not represent any consensus of beliefs or the viewpoints of any individual, organization or institution. We do not expect that the readers of this magazine will sympathize with all the viewpoints they find here, for some of our writers will present directly opposing viewpoints; but we believe that by avoiding the trite and trivial and concerning on the important areas of gaming and simulations, and making this magazine An Open Forum for all, we can perform a useful service to the entire community. We do not accept responsibility for the views expressed in any articles, signed or unsigned, which appear in these pages. What it does accept is the responsibility for giving them a chance to appear here.

THE EDITORS

With acknowledgment to Foreign Affairs.

RAND THINKERS ZERO IN ON NONMILITARY PROBLEMS

Some of the thinkers who run the top-secret secure ocean-front office building that is the RAND Institute may have oddball haircuts and funny clothes, but they are trying to think through the most serious problems on earth: the very life or death of the planet itself, through war, pollution, or just too much civilization.

Among the problems they are tackling now are how to get New York City straightened out and how to clean up the glut of paper-work in the securities industry.

RAND, a 1,200-employee idea factory to which the Air Force gave birth, comes of age at 21 this year. It was the first of the "think tanks"--an expression everyone around the place hates. Originally it was devoted to the problems of warfare, but increasingly its focus has been on nonmilitary problems. Said RAND Vice President Gus Shubert, 39, a young scientist:

"We're still concerned primarily with national security. But national security is more than the question of having the Russians looking at us over a gun barrel.

"It's the whole question of the public weal. And the nature of the problems, military or civilian, are not all that different. It involves a way of looking at the world."

That approach is what makes RAND unique, and not its much-publicized use of war games and computers as tools in thinking processes.

"A computer is a tool just like a typewriter and certainly doesn't dominate the way we look at the world," Shubert said.

What gives RAND its style, or "soul," as Shubert calls it?

"We get a problem. We put a bunch of mavericks into a room---say a philosopher, a sociologist, a physicist and a mathematician---each working on the problem in his own way.

"There is a debate, an argument, a dialog. When the smoke dies down and they get used to each other, I think typically we would come out with the answer that represents the best skill of each of them."

The meetings may be repeated over and over until there is a consensus. Even then RAND avoids coming up with one specific, singular plan.

"There's a myth that we try to tell others what to do," Shubert said. "We're simply an advisory organization that offers alternatives to the decision makers."

The RAND approach, now called systems analysis, is an outgrowth of research and analysis techniques developed during World War II.

Gen. Henry H. (Hap) Arnold, realizing that scientists mobilized on an emergency basis had contributed so much to the war---the atomic bomb, radar, the proximity fuse---wanted to keep top-flight advice available to the Air Force.

So, in early 1946, Arnold set up Project RAND (which stands for research and development) as an autonomous division of Douglas Aircraft Corporation of Santa Monica, California. RAND came up with studies on rocket engines, atmospheric physics, and nuclear propulsion.

Its first publication, dated June 1, 1946, was titled "Preliminary Design of an Experimental Earth-Circling Spaceship." It said the United States could have such a vehicle in five years.

RAND experts, studying freely available Soviet literature 11 years later, made an educated guess as to when Sputnik I would be launched. They missed by only two weeks. The 1957 launching drew national attention to RAND for the first time.

"Congress, universities, the Defense Department came to us---they wanted to know what space was all about," Shubert said. "We turned out a spacehandbook that became an immediate best seller."

In 1948, it seemed better to split RAND off from Douglas and stand it on its own two feet. There were fears in the aircraft industry that RAND people might give away some of their secrets to Douglas, and vice versa. So RAND picked out a spot overlooking Santa Monica's "muscle beach" and set up two large buildings, designed for maximum security.

Its No. 1 client remained---and remains---the Air Force and its budget is roughly \$25 million today. About one-third of its operating funds come from other governmental agencies for nonmilitary studies.

In 1960, RAND again attracted national attention when the public became aware of its "war games" and the fact that physicists, engineers, and mathematicians were advising the Pentagon on military strategy. Some staff members wrote books like "Strategic Surrender," "Strategy in the Missile Age," "On Thermonuclear War," and the scary "Delicate Balance of Terror," by Albert J. Wohlstetter, one of three alumni of RAND who are now professors at the University of Chicago.

The authors were simply trying to tell all of the aspects of weapons capability and at all the imaginable possibilities of war, including annihilation and surrender.

Philosopher Norman C. Dalkey told why he took part in such games:

"If you have concerns about the nature of war, these games are possibly the richest way of looking at the totality of issues---even moral issues---of nuclear war. The war game is a tool of analysis---it is nuclear. You can't hurt yourself by understanding what a war is about."

In a typical nuclear game, players representing opposing countries--tagged "red" and "blue"--and stand on opposite sides of a big board that has maps of the military and industrial complexes of the warring nations. Each player launches a nuclear attack on the other.

A referee sets the conditions. He may say, for example, that a limited attack has taken out one country's bases but not its cities. The player must then decide whether to send

his remaining missiles against the other side's cities or its missile bases.

While RAND officials play down the importance of the games, much of its energy is still devoted to the problem of war. As one Randman noted in an annual report:

"The unsolved problem of modern total war (if it should come) is how to stop it quickly, once it is decided upon. It is tantamount to negotiating complete disarmament with a 24-hour deadline, or less."

Figuring out how to save money is a factor in many RAND studies.

Wohlstetter, for example, in the 1950s considered the problem of the dispersion of overseas Strategic Air Command bases. His recommendations resulted in changes that both improved SAC's strategic strike capability and saved a billion dollars in installation costs.

RAND also came up with a whole new approach to Air Force budgeting, which was "not particularly welcomed" until Robert McNamara took over as secretary of defense. McNamara credited RAND with saving the Defense Department "four or five billion a year."

In August, 1965, President Johnson called a breakfast of 38 department heads---"everything from the Smithsonian Institution to the CIA"---and told them to emulate what McNamara had done with the RAND budgeting approach.

"Our book became an immediate best seller, but it's still going to be some years before all the government operations are on the same track," Shubert says.

The RAND idea of "programmed budgeting" is to lump costs together under a function, a goal, an objective or a mission, rather than just so much hardware and people under a department.

RAND at all times has 200 research projects under way and turns out 600 nonsecret publications a year. J. R. Goldstein, a RAND vice president, summed up the goal of the vast research effort this way:

"It's this simple. We are doing our best to insure for our children, and yours, the freedom and opportunities we enjoy."

/Publishers Note: The above article was written in May of 1969, prior to the publication of the Pentagon Papers, and the resulting shockwaves felt in RAND which have not yet completely subsided. Perhaps unintentionally the most important single problem RAND could have decided to study was the creditability of our own government. In the following interview Daniel Ellsberg discusses the Pentagon Papers and his role in gaming research at RAND./

TRIAL TO TEST OWNERSHIP:

Interview With Daniel Ellsberg

Daniel Ellsberg is facing trial in the Pentagon Papers case. He formerly was an analyst for the RAND Corporation and is accused of stealing secret government documents and making them public.

QUESTION: Are there any constraints on your part about talking about the Pentagon Papers since this affair is in the courts?

ANSWER: No, I'm glad to talk about the issues of the trial. I'm under no real constraints.

QUESTION: What are the issues as you see them?

ANSWER: The issues go very directly to the First Amendment. The indictment does not include distribution of the Pentagon Papers to any of the newspapers or to the Senate. The alleged conspiracy, which is one of the counts, has a date that ends in September, 1970, which is nine months before any of the newspapers actually printed the Pentagon Papers. But obviously I'm on trial because I was essentially a source of the material.

QUESTION: With what are you charged?

ANSWER: I am charged under three statutes, which include sections of the Espionage Act and another charge under the conversion statute which is often translated as theft. In this case it is probably better translated as "misuse." And third, under the conspiracy statute, the conspiracy to commit these two other types of offenses, and a new one that has not been used before---conspiracy to defraud the government of its lawful function of controlling information.

QUESTION: Do you think you violated the Espionage Act?

ANSWER: It was clear to me that I was violating the regulations of the Defense Department of which I was no longer a member. I was violating the regulations of the RAND Corporation. That was clear to me. What was not clear to me was whether there was any statutory basis for any of those regulations. What is clear now is that there is no statutory basis for the classification system.

QUESTION: Do you think the rights of the First Amendment are absolute?

ANSWER: I know more than I did a year ago about the way the Supreme Court has interpreted the First Amendment. It's clear that they have in fact, with the exception of Black and

Douglas, generally held there to be some permissible abridements of freedom of speech in this country. Black and Douglas and some others have consistently denied the constitutionality of that. But other justices have felt that one could abridge it. We do have an official secrets act with regard to two types of information---nuclear weapons and codes or cryptographic information. There are special acts that Congress has passed that makes giving out information, regardless of intent, criminal. Congress has refused to pass any other law making any other information criminal per se, regardless of intent.

QUESTION: Does a person take a pledge to secrecy when he goes to work for the RAND Corporation?

ANSWER: Yes, as a condition. It's the same as in the Executive Branch. We're talking about an executive rule which can be interpreted as a condition of employment. On that basis, the employer has a right to fire or to discipline in other administrative ways.

QUESTION: There are no criminal implications?

ANSWER: No. RAND can't put people in prison for violating its regulations and neither can the Executive Branch. Only Congress can do that.

QUESTION: Who physically owns the so-called Pentagon Papers?

ANSWER: That question will be tested in this case. It really hasn't been tested before. At this point it appears very probable that the jury will find that the government did not own these papers. The papers appear to have been the personal property of some former officials, not myself. They were not, of course, in the government at the time.

QUESTION: Were they yours?

ANSWER: No. They were not mine. I had authorized access to the papers.

QUESTION: Didn't it bother you to break your oath when you took papers that didn't belong to you?

ANSWER: A person who seems to have owned them has told me that he thinks I did my duty as a citizen and he wished he had had the guts to do it.

QUESTION: What do you think?

ANSWER: As I compare the action in revealing that information to the years in which I concealed it, I regret very deeply the cooperation that I gave earlier to concealing this information from the American public.

QUESTION: How would you end the war in Southeast Asia?

ANSWER: By taking the current Saigon regime off the American payroll, by removing all Americans from Vietnam, halt all the bombing and stop killing Vietnamese.

QUESTION: How would you retrieve our prisoners of war?

ANSWER: I think the President's current policy will keep the prisoners there so long as he is in office. I'm sorry about that.

QUESTION: You are reaching this judgment on the basis of what you learned in the Pentagon Papers and at RAND Corporation?

ANSWER: Partly. And partly from working for President Nixon and Henry Kissinger and maintaining contacts in the Administration since then.

QUESTION: If you grant that the government has the right or the need to maintain some official or military secrets, then don't you see a danger in individuals such as yourself assuming the responsibility for determining what shall and what shall not be kept secret?

ANSWER: Yes. I was very conscious of that problem during the three years I was in the Marine Corps and the twelve years I worked for the Executive Branch. I asked myself the question, who am I to decide that this should be open? What right do I have to reveal this? Now it seems to me that the logic underlying the First Amendment has to do not with any naive belief that information cannot be used inhumanely or wrongly by the American public. It has to do with the balancing of risk. The question is you have to weigh them against the risks of allowing individuals in the Executive Branch alone to decide for you what you shall know. The Pentagon Papers showed me the risks of closed government.

QUESTION: Can you name one positive result from the revelation of the Pentagon Papers?

ANSWER: There has been a great deal of discussion of issues that would not have been raised without the Pentagon Papers. The state of public awareness of the problems of executive lying and of the actual history of our involvement in Vietnam is very much greater than it would have been.

QUESTION: Are you at peace with yourself since you made the papers public?

ANSWER: Very much so. I'm glad that I was able to do what seemed clear to me was the right thing to do.

QUESTION: You aren't disappointed with the results?

ANSWER: I am disappointed that the war isn't over.

QUESTION: Don't you feel that the President can get us out of the war in Vietnam?

ANSWER: My tentative conclusion from studying the Pentagon Papers is that he can. He is less the prisoner of the bureaucracy than is commonly imagined. What I read from these documents is that one president after another did not what he was told to do by the bureaucracy but something else, usually a policy that he had invented more or less himself. For that he has to take personal responsibility.

QUESTION: Prior to your involvement with the Pentagon Papers while you were at RAND did you have any contact with their "war games?"

ANSWER: Yes. We used the "war games" as a tool for testing out various alternative solutions to different problems we were studying.

QUESTION: Did you find these games of value in your work?

ANSWER: In some instances. Unfortunately, there is a tendency to be too much emphasis put on the so-called solutions found in these games. At best they are a useful learning device for detecting areas that need further study. At worse they can act as a giant smokescreen to hide the real problems and the real solutions.

QUESTION: RAND has published many, many papers dealing with gaming, games, and simulations. Have you contributed to that effort?

ANSWER: Ironically, yes. While at RAND I wrote an unclassified paper called, "The Theory and Practice of Blackmail."

THE PENTAGON GAME...FOR WAR ACROSS THE COFFEE TABLE

By Warren L. Nelson

/Publishers Note: Games tend to reflect their times. Monopoly was created during the Great Depression. The 60s were the era of organized crime: The Mafia made the cover of Time and The Godfather was a million-seller book, a movie which will gross approximately \$500 million, and a game that sold 2 million copies in less than a year. Now, following the Pentagon Papers and reflecting the preoccupation of our society with the Southeast Asian conflict, we have The Pentagon Game./

Americans weary of Vietnam may find it hard to think of the war as a game, but Britons are now being offered just that. The can land U.S. Marines in North Vietnam or kill off civilians in South Vietnam.

The Pentagon Game will soon be available in the United States so neighborhood hawks and doves can do their battling across the coffee table.

The game was designed by two young Britons and an American as a novel and graphic way to disseminate antiwar views. The American, Brian B. Beckett, a graduate of the University of California, Berkeley and Kings College in London, emphasized that the game itself is straightforward and can be played by anyone regardless of political leanings. The commentary that goes along with the instructions is something else.

Printed in pamphlet form, The Pentagon Game purports to be a CIA document which should "under no circumstances be made known to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee or the New York Times."

The pamphlet includes a glossary translating military jargon into GI terminology. The official phrase "unacceptable losses" becomes "slaughter" and "psychological casualty" is defined as "heroin addict."

The cards used in the game, played on a stylized map of Indochina, take swipes at both sides. One card says, "US vice president pays goodwill visit to Saigon. Viet Cong gain one division." Another card reads; "Chinese supplies (30,000 volumes of the collected works of Mao Tse-tung) reach the Viet Cong.

Blank pieces on the board represent South Vietnamese peasants. But some of the pieces representing the Viet Cong are placed on the board upside down so as to be indistinguishable from the peasants.

To avoid being bushwacked by the hidden Viet Cong pieces, the American and Saigon forces can either attack and kill any blank pieces they choose or use up moves herding the blank pieces into strategic hamlets.

There is plenty in the game for hawks, too. For example, the rules allow the US player to land up to 10 Marine divisions in North Vietnam. However, this permits the North Vietnamese player to bring 15 Chinese divisions into play.

THE INSTITUTE FOR DIPLOMATIC STUDIES

The only gaming and simulations organization designed to bring amateur and professional together for the benefit of both.

OFFERS

PEERINALIS A Journal of Politico-Military Wargames

NEWSLETTER News of the activities of members and the gaming and simulations community at large

POLARIS**DOOMSDAY**COLD WAR GAME**TOP SECRET

Games and Simulations available to members at substantial discounts.

POSTAL GAMES Such as the Tri Theta Epsilon Exercise, the first postal simulation based on The SAGA OJCS Cold War Game, which deals with the events in Yugoslavia after Tito. The most elaborate, yet simple to play, simulation exercise yet developed.

LENDING LIBRARY The Institute's own research Library is available to members for their own research.

MILITARY ADVISORY COMMITTEE A distinguished panel of military figures offering advice on gaming matters.

HELP FOR THE AMATEUR The Institute brings the amateur game designer together with experts in the fields of gaming and subject matter.

A MEMBERSHIP OFFER

Membership is available in three categories:

STUDENT: \$3.00 per year including PEERINALIS, NEWSLETTER, and discounts on publications.

REGULAR \$5.00 per year for nonstudents, as above.

LIFE (THREE YEAR): \$25.00 which includes all publications in a three year period.

THE IRVING SALOMON PRIZE IN GAMING & SIMULATIONS

The Institute For Diplomatic Studies has established the Irving Salomon Prize In Gaming and Simulations to encourage original work in the field of gaming and simulations design.

The Prize honors Colonel Irving Salomon, former United States Ambassador to UNESCO and long-time benefactor to higher education in San Diego.

Individuals, Groups, and Institutions are eligible to enter original entries in any of three categories: 1) Game, 2) Simulation, 3) Man-Machine Game.

The competition will be divided into three areas: 1) Institutional Studies, 2) Contemporary International Problems, 3) Historical Studies. The subjects chosen for study in each area for this year are as follows:

Institutional Studies: The United Nations Security Council

Contemporary International Problems: The Middle East Conflict

Historical Studies: The Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962

Entrance requirements will include: 1) a signed declaration of originality by the entrant(s) to be submitted with the entry, 2) A \$5.00 registration fee for each entry submitted with the application, 3) All hardware and software needed for the entry. Further rules and application forms will be sent to all entrants. All entries will require a one year exclusive publication agreement with the Institute.

The Judging Committee will include:

Dr. Richard Gripp, Chairman, Department of Political Science, California State University, San Diego, author of: Patterns of Soviet Politics.

Dr. Sidney Warren, Chairman, Department of Political Science, United States International University, California Western Campus, author of: The President as World Leader.

Dr. Lincoln P. Bloomfield
Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, simulations designer and director.

Dr. Robert Noel, Director, The POLIS Laboratory,
University of California, Santa Barbara.

Mr. Thomas Shaw, Vice President
The Avalon Hill Company, Baltimore, Md.

Additional judges will be announced from time to time.

Judging will be based on the following criterion:

Value as a Simulation or Game: 50%

1. Realism (10 points)
2. Playability (10 points)
3. Adaption of the Game/Simulation Model to the Subject (10 points)
4. Advancement of the Gaming/Simulations Methodology (10 points)
5. Uses as a Problem Solving Tool (10 points)

Value as a Study of the Subject: 50%

1. Advancement of Knowledge of the Subject Contributed by the Game/Simulation (10 points)
2. Subject Definition (10 points)
3. Subject Analysis (10 points)
4. Subject Presentation (10 points)
5. Demonstrated Research Effort (10 points)

Deadline for submission of an application in the competition is July 1, 1973. All entries due on or before October 1, 1973. Winners will be announced January 1, 1974. Applications and rules available from the Institute.

Prizes will be awarded in the following categories: First, Second, Third, and Certificate(s) of Merit. Prizes will include cash grants, commissions, etc. as determined by the Institute. Minimum prize for First place will be \$100.00.

APPLICATIONS AVAILABLE
IDS
IRVING SALOMON COMPETITION
BOX 8416
SAN DIEGO, CA. 92102

IN MEMORIAM

PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

1908-1973

This nation, this generation, in this hour has man's first chance to build a great society, a place where the meaning of man's life matches the marvels of man's labors.

-Acceptance speech for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency,
August 1964

Lyndon B. Johnson was a man of monumental faults which, in a lesser man would be intolerable. But men of greatness are allowed greater flaws than lesser men and Lyndon Johnson was, above all, a great man. Only time will tell if he will be considered a great President but, from this day on, he will always be known as a great man.

Lyndon Johnson's greatness was centered in his very commonness, the courseness that irritated so many. It was part of him, in all of us, that made him great. It was part of us, in him, that made us great. A man of great vision and great action was Lyndon Johnson.

No President before Lyndon Johnson did so much for the common man of this nation and worked so hard to improve his lot.

On the following page is an editorial written by Ernest Cuneo which I have chosen as a final tribute to Lyndon Johnson. I chose it because so much of what it says applies to me, and I am a common man.

It is easy for the rich, the famous, and the powerful to protect the interests of the rich, the famous, and the powerful. It is rare for the rich, the famous, and the powerful to protect the interests of the common man.

My generation will probably never appreciate Lyndon Johnson the way my parents appreciated Franklin Roosevelt but we both share a common debt to men of greatness. My generation will wear the scars of War forever. But the next generation should remember him for what he did for them.

JOHNSON'S DOMESTIC RECORD WAS INCREDIBLE

By

Ernest Cuneo

The 1970 U.S. census figures are available and how beyond a doubt that the greatest period of prosperity in American history was during the tenure of President Lyndon Baines Johnson.

The actual record is incredible.

It indicates that black median income, for example, nearly doubled and that the number of black citizens living below the poverty line was cut to 50 per cent.

The white population fared even better, arithmetically, though not percentage wise.

Overall, the rate of actual recompense advanced at more than double the rate of inflation.

Family medians topped \$10,000 a year. This is quite a peak when it is considered that Huey Long of Louisiana was called a visionary as he bellowed "every man a king"---meaning a median income of \$6,000 per year.

And dreamy Henry Wallace foresaw a day of 60 million jobs in America---a mystic figure that LBJ topped by 18 million more jobs.

Furthermore, in a time pamphlet which was held up to wide derision. LBJ said that he had taught school to very poor little children and "under the Texas stars" he resolved that his public career would be devoted to giving them an equal chance at the books that they couldn't afford.

The census, thus, is a testimonial to his determination.

During his term as President, the college population of the United States doubled. Another bell rang alongside the school bell--"come and get it."

It is now generally accepted that any person of any race, creed, color or sex who is qualified to receive the instruction can get it in the United States if he really wants it, since LBJ put down his educational spade.

There is a proverb of Islam, "teach a man the bow and you'll get the first arrow."

Student violence, sensationalized by the mass media, flared as never before during the Johnson presidency--obscuring the fact that the President had caused more college cornerstones to be laid than all others combined.

President Jefferson started the University of Virginia and thought it so important, he caused it to be included in his epitaph, omitting that he was President of the United States.

Ben Franklin started the University of Pennsylvania.

President Lincoln traded off to the voracious railroads their land grants, virtually in exchange for the establishment of the land grant colleges, today our great state universities.

These brought learning to the then frontier states, but under LBJ's programs, today a college or vocational college is within walking distance of most high school graduates and available in nearly every county.

This certainly is an incredible record---so incredible that President Johnson was accused of creating a "credibility gap" when he told the American people, again and again, of the progress which was being made.

In brutal terms, he was called a liar.

It was said that the Vietnam War was bleeding the country to economic death.

The wails from the Penthouse politico drowned out the multiplying factory whistles--as the nation's Gross National Product nearly doubled.

Day after day, the single great spiritual heritage of the American nation--its indomitable optimism--was assailed.

Completely overlooked was the only war LBJ ever declared, the war on poverty, and that in this war he won a spectacular victory.

Add to this that he struck from the language the phrase that a man had to quit school because his father died.

Clearly this spells out an economic emancipation proclamation for the working Americans---the 83 million people who have to earn a living and get the kids off to school every day.

As compared with only 1960, this is the Great Society---the incredible Great Society Lyndon Baines Johnson promised, created, and delivered which the mass media reported as the "credibility gap."

The census figures are irrefutable.

Every "incredible" report of LBJ to the American people has proven to be the truth.

IN THE NEXT ISSUE

A REVIEW OF GAMING AND SIMULATIONS LITERATURE

A candid look at some of the major, minor, and better-ought-to-have-been-forgotten literature in the gaming and simulations field. Covering books, articles, magazines, from all areas.

The author's identity will not be revealed.

THE NEW GAMES AND THE FREE FORM HISTORICAL
SIMULATION

By

Jack and Cathy Greene

I should preface my remarks by saying I am a historian more than a gamer (as my win-less record quickly will give evidence to). However, gaming, though an imperfect tool, is a tool by which one can learn about history.

A new species of wargamer will be needed for the next stage that is evolving in wargaming. The traditional gamer thinks largely in terms of a win-lose approach. He may have fun losing but he still does not win. This syndrome is present from Monopoly to Acquire to Battle of the Bulge. The logical extreme is the gamer, who amid fun and excitement, wins in a non-realistic fashion. I recently played in an air wargame in which total points decided the winner. The winner was shot down twice and killed once, but won the simulation by downing many more points worth of enemy aircraft than he lost.

From a simple win-lose criterion we have seen graduated victories (or defeats) introduced; a decisive victory as opposed to merely a marginal one. Then there was the number 7 Panzerblitz scenario in which both sides could gain a decisive victory, or both sides could lose, plus all the other possible combinations available depending upon loss of territory or loss of units. This is an attempt to create historical accuracy and the different demands upon each side concerning a conflict.

Let me change gears and express what I have been leading up to. Diplomacy interested me until it seemed both unrealistic and too mechanically simple (simple in depth but not possible combinations of fleets and armies). Avalon Hill type wargames bored me for a while during my college years, until the new historically more accurate simulations began to appear on the market. A good example of historical accuracy is the Strategy and Tactics simulation Franco-Prussian War. Though I am sure more improvements could be made, the biggest factor missing from that simulation is a stupidity or Bazaine factor. This simulation reproduces well the inane tactics prevalent in that period, as well as giving the idea of the strengths and weaknesses of either side in political as well as military terms.

But from Diplomacy and wargaming a new animal has appeared. I am sure it has taken place somewhere; Hypereconomic Diplomacy, Strategy I, and a perverted form of Blitzkrieg are tending in this new direction. Larry Peery called it

free form historical simulation; we called it the Godawful Game, later known as Godawful Game 1 (though the correct term is simulation, since we did not use a computer, we always referred to it as a game). Now Godawful Game number 3 is beginning. Brian Bailey, Charles Turner, James Dygert, and Anders Swenson, among others, populated those games.

Basically, such a simulation attempts to recreate the political, military, historical, social, etc. factors of the country you play. Your capacity is a sort of chief of state and chief policy maker and executioner.

I have also joined the Godawful Game number 3 (Gamesmaster Mel Thompson, 310 Del Monte, So. San Francisco, Ca. 94080) and also Larry Peery's Tri Theta Epsilon. The latter will concern possible events upon the death of Tito in Yugoslavia. The Godawful simulations were all set in the 1900's. In the third game I will be playing Italy. Theoretically, the players will be bound by historical probability. In other words, the Gamesmaster should not let me shoot Catholics as head of state of Italy (Jews if I were Tsar of Russia would be allowable). There are two main problems with such a simulation, One is the paperwork, as the poor Gamesmaster is covered with fleet and army orders, crisis situations, assorted wars, etc. The other main problem is the victory criterion. If you play with a degree of historical correctness and probability then "politics is the art of the possible" and not the capability of a 1970 totalitarian dictator running a 1900 France. As Italy, if I conquer the world, then I would say the simulation was totally unrealistic. If, by the end of Godawful Game number 3, Italy is a respected Great Power, and the south of Italy is not quite so bad off, then I will consider my stint successful.

A good example of what can go wrong in a free form historical simulation follows. In Godawful #2 the logical culmination of the gamer syndrome as opposed to the historical syndrome took place and, in the process, I dropped out of the simulation. This simulation witnessed Austria-Hungary going on an industrial and military spree never seen before in history. Austria had the second largest navy in the world, purchased several colonies, ran several puppet states, including Portugal and Holland, had an S.S. and eventually collapsed as ordained by the Gamesmaster into a vast shambles of splintering nationalities, economies, and absurdities. Lenin was executed in 1902, England (me) sold or traded away most of her colonies of non-whites and non-Indians. Zeppelin air service was available to many points in the world, the Irish Republic of Northern Rhodesia was established, etc. Yet, in spite of these extremes there was much good gleaned from this simulation. The historical trivia would fill a book and what I learned, about myself, others, and historical processes was invaluable.

I am not saying that one should play Austria-Hungary as badly as it was historically, nor conveniently form several smaller nations in 1918, nor, if you are playing the French in the Franco-Prussian War act like Bazine. What I am saying is that one should study one's position and play as well as one can while realizing certain historical limitations inherent in any situation. If I play Bulgaria in the Tri Theta Epsilon simulation I should not start off by joining NATO, attacking Greece, and planning for the invasion of Russia, and the manufacture of nuclear weapons. I should play the simulation as well and as accurately as I can, and as I think a Bulgarian would. Though it would by no means be totally realistic, one could learn a great deal from such an experience and have quite a lot of fun in the process. There is a great learning potential pregnant in a game like this.

It is my opinion that with more comprehensive simulations developing which incorporate social, historical, diplomatic, military and cultural factors, even more interest in simulations will be generated. The Tri Theta Epsilon or Godawful simulation will be a total experience. Where else can one be Hitler, Goebbels, Speer, Goering, Raeder, and Brauchitsch at the same time? As a wargame friend of mine remarked, after I asked him to play Greece in the Godawful Game #3 and explained how it worked, "You want me to play history." He was uncertain if he wanted that responsibility upon his shoulders.

Comments or questions solicited. Jack Greene, Jr. 1231 21st St., San Diego, Ca. 92102.

A GAMING AND SIMULATION MILESTONE

Ten years ago, Charles and Margaret Hermann wrote an article, "An Attempt to Simulate the Outbreak of World War I", which appeared in The American Political Science Review and is considered by many to be a classic of gaming literature.

The Hermanns used the Inter-National Simulation of Harold Guetzkow to study student behaviour in roles of leaders involved in the earliest days of World War I. The Hermanns oriented their research to psychological and behaviour analysis of the participants, who were not aware of the historical nature of the exercise.

The results you can search out for yourself but they were, and are, most interesting.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR CONTRIBUTING AUTHORS

1. First, obtain subject approval from the Editor.
2. You will be assigned a date on which a tentative draft is due, normally two months prior to publication. All following requirements apply to both the tentative and final drafts. At his discretion the Editor may waive the requirement for a tentative draft.
3. Tentative drafts will be returned, with comments, and a final due date will be assigned.
4. For inclusion in the next issue all materials must be returned by the assigned date.
5. All articles must:
 - A. Be typed on 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ by 11 inch paper, double spaced, on one side only, in thesis style.
 - B. Footnotes and bibliographies, if required, at the end of the article.
 - C. Author's name on a separate title sheet.
 - D. Be submitted in two identical copies.
 - E. Accompanied by a statement of authenticity from the author.
6. All articles, and other materials, are protected by copyright through the publisher. The publisher has a one (1) year exclusive publishing right on all published magazine materials, other than advertisements.
7. Articles of more than 2,500 words may be published as monographs. Monographs are copyrighted and the same restrictions as on articles apply.
8. Authors will be reimbursed for out-of-pocket expenses to a maximum of \$5.00, receive two (2) copies of the issue in which the article appears gratis, or ten (10) copies of any monographs which they author.
9. Each year a \$50.00 prize will be awarded the author(s) of the outstanding article(s) of the previous year as determined by the readers.
- 10: Further information on request from the Editor.

The above requirements are not designed to stifle those of you who wish to contribute materials to this magazine. However, we believe if an article is worth writing it is worth doing well and that applies to format as well as content. Your cooperation in observing this simple requirements will make all our work much easier.

STAFF POSITIONS OPEN FOR ZINE

One of the things we would like to try with this magazine is to develop a system of staff (if such an organized term can be applied to such a disorganized group) correspondents and contributing editors.

The only difference between the two positions is that correspondents have no fixed subject areas and no commitments on submitting articles for publications. Contributing editors will deal with a given area: Book Review, Game Reviews, Postal Techniques, Variants, etc. And, they will be expected to produce one major article each year. Not very much, is it?

The reason we are adopting this procedure is to develop a system of sources on which the magazine's content can be based. Naturally, this will give more people an opportunity to contribute articles for publication and it will also broaden the areas covered by the magazine; both goals of ours. We think it will be good for us and it will be good for you.

Ideally, we hope to have a correspondent located in each organization, each school, each company, and each major area (geographical or subject matter wise) of gaming and simulations activities. These people will act as our eyes and ears, our free-lance reporters if you will.

They will be reporting to us activities going on in their area and, equally important, will be seeking to get XENOGOGIC to the people who count in their organization. This multi-directional goal of information flowing in all directions is one of our major functions.

Correspondents will receive complimentary copies of issues in which their reports appear. And, as with formal articles, each year a prize will be given to the outstanding article(s) contributed by a correspondent or contributing editor. These prizes will be determined by the readers.

If you would like to be a correspondent, or contributing editor, or you represent an organization which ought to have a correspondent for us in its midst write The Editor and let him know. We will be in contact with you.

This is the type of project where you can participate. By your participation you can improve our quality and increase your own enjoyment of this magazine. If you just sit and think to yourself, "It's a good idea but I'll let somebody else do it," nothing will be achieved and you will have only yourself to blame.

So, if you want to have a say in what appears in this magazine, here's your chance.

FOR MORE INFORMATION:
The Editor
XENOGOGIC
Box 8416, San Diego, Ca. 92102

THE TRI THETA EPSILON EXERCISE

Sponsored by the Institute for Diplomatic Studies, the Tri Theta Epsilon Exercise is a look at the future, using the Studies, Analysis, Gaming Agency, Office of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Cold War Game format.

The Exercise will consider the fate of Yugoslavia when President Josip Broz Tito is no longer leader of that nation.

Participants have been carefully selected and provided with the most reliable and extensive background materials available drawn from The Department of State, the U.S. Congress, The International Institute for Strategic Studies, official government reports and documents, and press media reports. Each participant has received more than 1,000 pages of background information to help his accurately portray his position.

Represented in the Exercise will be: USA, NATO, WTO, all major member states in the WTO, Albania, Yugoslavia, Mongolia, and the Peoples Republic of China.

The Exercise will consist of six turns and will last no more than nine months.

An important segment of the Exercise will be the monitors, who will comment on the Exercise. Included in this group are some of the most distinguished names in Eastern European and Soviet Studies.

A very few positions are still available to those who desire to participate in this unique experience. The fee is \$15.00 (less 25% for Institute members) which includes all materials needed for the Exercise. Applications may be made to: The Director, Institute for Diplomatic Studies, Box 8416, San Diego, California, 92102. All inquires should be sent air mail and marked Tri Theta Epsilon. The Institute reserves the right to refuse any application from those not qualified to participate. Applicants should include a statement of their background in gaming and simulation exercises.

A limited number of Reports On The Tri Theta Epsilon Exercise will be prepared when the simulation is concluded. Orders are now being accepted at \$5.00 per copy.

INSTITUTE ANNOUNCES REORGANIZATION
THREE YEAR MASTERPLAN UNVEILED!

We have spent a considerable amount of time over the past several months studying our current organization or, perhaps more accurately, lack of organization and our programs. We have also carefully studied our proposed programs for the next three years and our goals for the period 1973-1975. On the basis of these studies and because we hope our own attempt at long-range planning will encourage others in the gaming community, we are presenting to you a comprehensive reorganization program and a three year Masterplan for the Institute. In addition, we shall shortly be appointing a commission to study the role of the members in the Institute's decision-making processes.

Your comments, and suggestions, are welcome and, in due course, we will announce any modifications which we feel are needed in the Plan and the results of the Commission's studies.

This Plan is not intended to be a restrictive barrier to our activities but a guide to give them direction. It will always remain flexible enough to accomodate needed changes.

For convenience of discussion we have grouped our activities into several areas but please remember that there is, and will continue to be, a considerable over-lapping among these areas.

I. INSTITUTIONAL DIPLOMACY ACTIVITIES

Diplomacy refers to Allan Calhamer's game, Diplomacy, and our association with it. Over the past six years we have devoted a considerable amount of time and effort to activities in this field. Unfortunately, we find that the time and effort required for these activities is not returning suitable dividends to either the Institute or ourself. Therefore, we have decided to revamp our structure with the Institute taking precedence over TTT Publications, which has traditionally handled our Diplomacy activities. More on this below. Institutional activities applies to those which will be carried on by the Institute in its own name for the Diplomacy community as a whole.

A. The Games

The Institute will assume responsibility for the publication of the following regular postal Diplomacy games: X-21, 1971 CR, in XENOGOGIC; P 1-3, 1971 M-0, in PEERIGOGIC;

P 1-3/2, 1971 AW-AY, in PEERIPHOBIA; P 1-7/3, 1971 BL-BR, in PEERISITIS; P 1/4, 1971 EI, in PEERISTERICS; P 1/5, 1972 AJ, in PEERICOMO.

The games will continue with the same Houserules, and will continued to be printed at triweekly intervals using the ditto process.

At the current time we do not anticipate starting any new regular postal Diplomacy games.

B. The Strategy and Tactics of Diplomacy

The Institute will assume responsibility for Parts II and III of the above work, which was begun in 1967 and 1968. Hopefully, prior to the end of the current year, Part II, along with a new edition of Part I, will be completed through the Mid Game studies based on the Shrinks Series analysis of many of the above games.

C. Who's Who In Postal Diplomacy

If sufficient interest and support are generated within the Diplomacy community the Institute will undertake to publish in the next six months a Who's Who In Postal Diplomacy covering the 150 or so key people involved in this field. However, the Institute will not undertake this project unless support from the community is forecoming. If the project is carried out successfully and proves useful it may be expanded in two other directions: a Who Was Who In Postal Diplomacy covering prominent figures back to the origins of the game and a Who's Who In Games and Simulations covering key individuals in the entire field. This last would be an Institute project only. But, again, it will be attempted only if there is sufficient interest in it and cooperation from the community at-large.

D. Articles

The Institute intends to resume publication of articles about Diplomacy, both within its own houseorgans and in other publications. Monographs, such as the one mentioned elsewhere in this issue, will also be published from time to time dealing with Diplomacy related subjects.

II. PERSONAL ACTIVITIES OF THE DIRECTOR IN DIPLOMACY

Some may be interested in the plans of the Director vis-a-vis Diplomacy. Our own postal Diplomacy activities, which can only be separated from the Institute's with difficulty, will remain at a low level: although somewhat higher than our current level.

A. Hypereconomic Diplomacy

We will continue to participate, as Brazil, in Mr. Peter Ansoff's most interesting, and complex, variant, as Brazil.

B. Godawful Game III

We will assume the role of the British Empire in this third round of an on-going simulation project dating from 1967.

C. Games of Regular Postal Diplomacy

We have not yet determined whether we shall enter any regular Diplomacy games in other publications. If we do it will only be when all other projects are moving satisfactorily and time is available to take up these games.

III ACTIVITIES IN DIPLOMACY ORGANIZATIONS

During the past two years we have been vitally involved in Diplomacy organization activities, other than our own. First in the Diplomacy Association, and, secondly, in the International Diplomacy Association of which we were the first President. Our goals in establishing that organization as an independent organization in the Diplomacy community have been successfully realised and we have cut back drastically on our participation in such activities.

A. International Diplomacy Association

We will remain an active and interested member of the International Diplomacy Association but will seek no official positions. We believe our contribution to this group has been sufficient.

1. The Johnny Awards

At DIPCON V, in Chicago, July 1972, we transferred to the International Diplomacy Association responsibility for the Johnny Awards. We will continue to take an active interest in this program.

2. Discussion of Issues

We will continue to be a leader in the discussion of vital issues within the organization and the Diplomacy community in general. We kowtow to no special individual, interest group, or organization in expressing our opinions.

B. DIPCON VI

We hope to attend DIPCON VI, in Chicago, in 1973, provided we feel our attendance will benefit both ourself and others attending. However, the scope of our participation will not be at last year's high level.

IV. XENOGOGIC

The new XENOGOGIC, which you have before you, as a gaming and simulations quarterly will become the linkpin in our Diplomacy and other activities. The success of the new XENOGOGIC in its new role is vital to the well-being of the Institute. Every effort will be made to insure that XENOGOGIC becomes a respected, if small, voice in the field. Our constant goal will be to develop the finest magazine of its kind anywhere.

V. INSTITUTE FOR DIPLOMATIC STUDIES

The Institute will also undergo a significant change in the coming three years, a "new look" will be adopted as the Institute launches an aggressive campaign to establish itself as a leading force in the gaming and simulations community.

A. Peerinalis

The future of PEERINALIS is in doubt and the magazine may be absorbed into XENOGOGIC which will fulfill many of the goals originally set for PEERINALIS. Duplication, otherwise, is unavoidable. However, a firm decision on the future of the magazine has not been made. An alternative would be to upgrade PEERINALIS to the same caliber as XENOGOGIC. However, we believe producing two magazines of this quality would be too difficult at this time.

B. Newsletter

The above also applies to the Institute's NEWSLETTER.

C. Guide to Gaming and Simulations Literature

Originally we had intended to publish a comprehensive guide to the literature of gaming and simulations as a Handbook. We are now undecided whether to continue this approach or to produce the Guide as a monograph or incorporate it into XENOGOGIC's annual issue.

D. The Tri Theta Epsilon Exercise

Our major gaming and simulation activity for this year, which is expected to establish our "presence" in the community is the Tri Theta Epsilon exercise. Second only in importance to XENOGOGIC, the enterprise will receive

continuous supervision from the Institute. Hopefully, if all goes well this exercise will set a pattern for future ones to follow.

E. Games and Simulations

During the next three years we hope to reissue a number of previously published games and simulations in revised editions which have been improved, both in content, and in printing quality. All future games and simulations will be published by offset press. Several new simulations and games will be published in a more attractive and permanent fashion in the coming years.

F. Irving Salomon Prize In Gaming and Simulations

The Institute has launched a major effort in this competition to attract nationwide attention to gaming and simulations design. Initial response has been outstanding and the judges panel now includes some of the nation's foremost authorities on gaming and simulations. It is our hope that a nationwide publicity campaign will generate much interest and participation in the competition.

G. Membership

During the next three years the membership of the Institute will be brought into even closer contact with its operations.

1. Recruitment

The Institute hopes to raise its active membership from the 35-50 range to approximately 100 with the major increase coming from students and people involved in gaming and simulations professionally.

2. Costs

All of these programs will be expensive, especially with the use of improved printing methods. Therefore, the Institute hopes to increase its budget about 400% over the next two years. To raise these additional funds we will, it is assumed, raise certain membership fees; raise prices on publications, games, and simulations as new printings are made available; solicit donations and advertising revenues. Even with these increases we expect the Institute to operate at about a 50% deficit over the next year.

3. Membership Benefits

We are currently examining a most difficult decision. In producing new games, publications, etc. two

different methods are possible. First, we can raise dues to cover the costs of all anticipation publications and make these available to members as they are produced without additional charge. The biggest advantage to this method is it allows pre-planning: one knows when one produces 50, 100, or 200 copies of a publication that they will be distributed immediately. The Second method is more difficult and involves a hit-and-miss approach. A certain quantity of publications or games is produced: say 50, and they are then put up for sale to the members, and nonmembers, at a set cost which is in addition to membership fees. The disadvantage here, obviously, is you never know how many of them are going to sell. Another problem with this method is that it involves investing considerable sums of money in materials which may not be sold for months, or even years.

4. Membership Participation In Decision-Making

Another item under study is the possibility of including members in the decision-making apparatus of the Institute. A Commission will be appointed to look into this area, as well as the establishment of a formal organization for the Institute. We are not particularly concerned with members having a voice in the running of the Institute, per se, as we are with giving them an opportunity to make their desires and interests known. We wish no formal organization for the sake of organization but only if it can make a substantive contribution to the work of the Institute.

VI. CONCLUSION

We you can see a vast program has been laid out for the Institute. A good portion of that program can only be achieved through the interest and support of the members. If you support this program we want to know it. If you do not support this program we want to know that as well. And, equally important, we want to know what you propose. The basic principle behind the Institute is that of a partnership between those who have to give and those who have to receive. We have told you what we propose to give you; now you must tell us what you propose to do in return.

Comments should be addressed to:

IDS MASTERPLAN

The Director

IDS, Box 8416, San Diego, Ca. 92102

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Editors gratefully acknowledge the cooperation of the following individuals and institutions in preparing this issue:

The San Diego Union and Evening Tribune
San Diego, Ca.

The Copley International Press
La Jolla, Ca.

Col. and Mrs. Irving Salomon
Rancho Lilac, Ca.

Mr. Lew Scarr

Mr. Edward J. Doherty

Mr. Daniel Ellsberg

Mr. Warren L. Nelson

Mr. Ernest Cuneo

Mr. and Mrs. Jack Greene, Jr.

Dr. Robert Noel

The RAND Corporation

Dr. Lincoln P. Bloomfield
Center for International Studies,
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

CADACO

Simulations Publications Inc.
New York, New York

Foreign Policy Research Institute
University of Pennsylvania

The Avalon Hill Company
Baltimore, Md.

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
New York, New York

Games Research, Inc.
Boston, Mass.