

DIPLMACY WORLD

Spring 2004 - Issue #89

Diplomacy World appears four times a year and is available as a postal zine:

Postal version cost \$3 per issue in North America, £2 per issue in the UK and £3 per issue in the rest of the world. North American subs should be sent to David Partridge, 15 Woodland Drive, Brookline, NH 03033, USA. Email: rebhuhn@rocketmail.com Rest of World subs should be sent to Stephen Agar, 47 Preston Drove, Brighton, BN1 6LA, UK.

Diplomacy World Credits

Editor Emeritus - Jim Burgess
Publishing Editor - Tim Haffey
Postal Publisher - David Partridge
Webmaster - Stephen Agar
Contributing Editor - Mark Berch
Contributing Editor - Fred Davis

Diplomacy World is available free on the Internet, as a web zine or as a downloadable ebook. Go to <http://www.diplomacyworld.org> to see web version.

Contributions for the next issue (articles, convention reports, art, cartoons, jokes, or anything else related to the game of Diplomacy, should be sent to Jim Burgess , burgess@theworld.org or Tim Haffey, diplomacyworld@aol.com by June 1, 2004.

DIPLOMACY WORLD

Table of Contents

[Front Page with Credits](#)

Ye Old Mailbag

Message from Jim Burgess

Editorial by Tim Haffey

ARTICLES

Negotiating as Austria - Author Unknown

Burgandy Tipoff Opening by Mark Berch

St. Petersburg - Gateway to the West by Tim Haffey

INTERVIEW

Interview of Stephen Agar by Jim Burgess

Game Review

WAR: Age of Imperialism by Fred C. Davis, Jr.

"Diplomacy World" Demonstation Game

DipCon XXXVII

DipCon XXXVII House Rules

DipCon XXXVII Scoring System

List of Diplomacy Tournaments/Conventions

Submission Requirements

DIPLOMACY WORLD

Ye Old Mailbag

Subject: Diplomacy World new co-editorship
Date: Sun, 1 Feb 2004 10:02:40 PM EST
From: Mike Barno <mpbarno@lightlink.com>
To: TRHAFFEY@aol.com

Tim,

Hi, Mike Barno here, website editor for the Diplomatic Corps. I want to say **THANK YOU** for helping Jim and Stephen resume DW's long (albeit patchy) publication history. And **GOOD LUCK**. I bet you'll outlast the Jack McHugh lead-editorship of DW, and probably a few others.

I expect that you and I will end up helping each other out a lot with information -- the DC's main purpose is to promote all groups worldwide, all ways that they play Dip. Before DW's recent hiatus, its Upcoming Tournaments page (by some name or another, for instance I think "Conventions" was used instead of "Tournaments") was taken from DC's page www.diplomaticcorps.org/ComingEvents/ComingEventsList.html with simple modifications for DW's format and the editors' trimming of extra content. You can resume that if you like, but David Norman developed a system of scripts that would spit an updated list of tournaments out in three formats, one each for DC, DW, and the Pouch site's FTF > Cons page... so long as someone entered newly announced event dates into the Excel database. He was working on a system to collect tournament announcements and was working to get someone to serve as custodian. These had gotten that far by mid-'03 and I've heard naught since. Not sure if Pouch inertia and DW inertia coinciding hindered that from progressing more.

Anyhow thanks for helping get DW going. I'll promote it on DC (the submission deadlines might motivate people, you never know) and I'll give you any help I can. Similarly I expect you see parts of the hobby that I normally don't, and you'll be able to suggest good information sources or Dip communities that I don't have listed.

- Mike

To: Mike Barno.

Thanks for the welcome and the support offered. I will be sure to include you in my "Ye Old Mail Bag". With your permission, I may include an article from Diplomatic Corp or other items such as the convention notices you mentioned. I have also found a real neat "Diplomacy Ring" that is a list of Diplomacy related sites that is really quite amazing. I will be mining that for some time to come. I thinking about showcasing a site or reviewing a site each issue, but I as still running that around in my head. If you are going to the DIPCON in Portland in April, perhaps I will see you there.

Tim Haffey, co-editor of DW (I love that title)

Not much email this time, but, perhaps I will receive more now tht DW is back on track. send your emails to trhaffey@aol.com

DIPLOMACY WORLD

Message from Jim on the restart of Diplomacy World and adding Tim Haffey as a co-editor and about the Final Hobby Awards Ballot for 2004. The following message was sent out by Jim on the DW email announcement list and is provided here for the postal subscribers.

From: "Jim Burgess" <burgess@w...>

Date: Sun Feb 1, 2004 3:31 pm

Subject: Return of Diplomacy World -- Welcome to Tim Haffey who joins me as Co-Editor

Return of Diplomacy World and Call for Hobby Awards Nominations

Diplomacy World is now officially resurrected and continuing with its four times a year publication schedule as a Web zine (www.diplomacyworld.org) and is available as a postal zine: cost \$3 per issue in North America, £2 per issue in the UK and £3 per issue in the rest of the world.

Tim Haffey will join Jim Burgess as an editor. Stephen Agar will continue to do upkeep on the Web site. Note all E-Mails below are in the spam friendly format "person of site.com" where that translates into person@s....

North American postal subs should be sent to David Partridge, 15 Woodland Drive, Brookline, NH 03033, USA.
Email: rebhuhn of rocketmail.com

Rest of World postal subs should be sent to Stephen Agar, 4 Cedars Gardens, Brighton, UNITED KINGDOM BN1 6YD
Email: stephen of stephenagar.com

Contributions for the next issue should be sent to Tim Haffey by 1st March 2004: trhaffey of aol.com or Timothy R. Haffey, Sr., 810 53rd Ave., Oakland, CA 94601 USA.

Tim is going to be formatting the issues in the "Industry Standard" ebook format (see www.openebook.org) and this is a major contribution that maintains Diplomacy World as a bridge between all of the Diplomacy Hobby mediums, since it will be easily available on the web and by post.

I (Jim Burgess) will continue to co-edit and contribute the popular Diplomacy World Interviews (I've already interviewed such luminaries as Richard Sharp, Edi Birsan, and Brandon Clarke). I am currently seeking a "quick turnaround" interview candidate for the

next issue, Number 89, who can get me a paragraph Diplomacy bio in the next week or so. Please ask me (burgess of world.std.com) if you have any questions or want to volunteer to be interviewed.

We also would like volunteers for the next Diplomacy World Demo Game. The last demo game (recount, using the Modern Diplomacy variant) never was properly written up here in DW. I hope we can get that in the Pouch Showcase section and a write-up here in good time. Rick Desper (previous DW Demo Game GM and recount GM, rick_desper of yahoo.com), Tim Haffey, and myself will consider those requests and make a Demo Game determination of GM, location, and Variant (if any) to be announced in Issue Number 89. Also, any of the participants in recount who would like to contribute to an article or articles on this game, should contact me or Rick. I have all of your E-Mailed endgame statements.

Other articles of all types are welcome (we already have four articles in hand, so we're in good shape for the return issue): historical articles, convention write-ups and descriptions, strategy or tactics articles, personality profiles, descriptions of gaming environments, or anything else you can think of. If you aren't sure if it works, ask one of us.

Upcoming Issue Deadlines:

Deadline Spring 2004, Issue #89: March 1, 2004
 Deadline Summer 2004, Issue #90: June 1, 2004
 Deadline Fall 2004, Issue #91: September 1, 2004
 Deadline Winter 2004, Issue #92: December 1, 2004

Other Highlights of Issue #89:

Updates on North American DipCon, April 23-25, 2004, Portland, OR, USA
 Updates on World Dipcon XIV, July 16-19 2004, Birmingham, ENGLAND, UK
 (with pre-event the week before in Paris, FRANCE; post-event
 the week after in Dublin, IRELAND
 Updates on European DipCon, September 23-26, 2004, Darmstadt, GERMANY

Final Hobby Awards Ballot for 2004, nominations now to: burgess of world.std.com

The qualifications for the Kathy Byrne Caruso Lifetime Achievement Award are that the awardee must have been: (1) Active in the Diplomacy Hobby in at least Three Separate Decades; (2) Multidimensional in their Contributions to the Hobby (e.g. writing, playing, publishing); (3) Taking Retirement or Semi-Retirement from the Diplomacy Hobby; and (4) One of the Hobby's Unique Personalities Worthy of Being Remembered as Long as THE Game Continues to be Played. This award need not be awarded each year, but only as worthy candidates are identified. The only past honoree is the late Richard Sharp.

The other award categories are self-explanatory:

Nominees for the 2004 Don Miller Award for Meritorious Service
 Nominees for the 2004 Rod Walker Award for Literary Achievement
 Nominees for the 2004 John Koning Award for Player Performance
 Nominees for the 2004 Fred Hyatt Award for GM Performance

The Hobby Awards Committee is Jim Burgess (Chair and Treasurer), Fred Davis, Jr., Melinda Holley, Gary Behnen, Jamie Dreier, Paul Kenny, Mark Stretch, and Robert Lesco.

Editorial Board for Diplomacy World:

Jim Burgess, 664 Smith Street, Providence, RI 02908-4327, USA;
burgess of world.std.com -- Co-Editor

Tim Haffey, 810 53rd Ave., Oakland, CA 94601 USA; trhaffey of
aol.com -- Co-Editor and ebook Publisher

Stephen Agar, 4 Cedars Gardens, Brighton, UNITED KINGDOM BN1 6YD;
stephen of stephenagar.com -- Webmaster and Non-US Postal

Rick Desper, 5440 Marinelli Road, #204, Rockville, MD 20852, USA;
rick_desper of yahoo.com -- Demo Games

Dave Partridge, 15 Woodland Drive, Brookline, NH 03033, USA;
rebhuhn of rocketmail.com -- US Postal

And last, but not least, I wish John Coffin and David Hertzman the best of luck as they take on their new challenge of following up Manus Hand and Edward Hawthorne as editors of The Diplomatic Pouch. I fervently believe that having both DW and the Pouch active and vibrant creates better writing and better things for all of us in the hobby. I intentionally waited with this announcement until they hit the ground with two weeks running. But 2004 should be a fun year for the hobby.

Jim Burgess
Co-Editor, Diplomacy World

DIPLOMACY WORLD

Editorial: Why I want to be a co-editor of "Diplomacy World"

by Tim Haffey

This is kind of an introduction to everyone of myself and some other rambling thoughts. One day, not to long ago, I was surfing on the web and I punched up "Diplomacy World" and noticed that the last issue was Spring 2002. So, I sent an email to Jim and asked him what was going on. He replied he needed a co-editor who had time to work on the zine and asked if I was interested. I said I most certainly was and there you are, I am a co-editor. Easiest job I every got.

Now, you might ask why would I want to take on such a thankless job as co-editor of a zine that has changed from a postal zine to, primarily, an ezine. I mean it can be a lot of work and hassle. Well, that may be true but, I have lots of time since I am now retired and my kids are all grown up. I do have a five year old grandson but, I don't have to raise him, just spoil him.

My reasons for taking on this job are emotional more than anything else. I have been playing this great game of Diplomacy for over 30 years. I have played FTF, in tournaments, by postal mail and by email. I have even played by telephone. Back in the 80s, the heyday of the postal zines, I was playing games in several zines at once and gamemastering a half dozen more. All that while I was working full time, going to school and raising a family, two kids. But, it was fun.

"Diplomacy World", at this time, was the flagship of the diplomacy communitie. And, of course, I was subscribe to it. I still have copies around here somewhere. So, I have a strong attachment to DW and I don't want to see it just rollover and die. So, I will do what I can to keep it alive for as long as I am alive, which may not be very long.

But, Jim is right. We can not do it all alone. We need people to contribute articles, convention news, reports, artwork, cartoons, and anything else related to Diplomacy. I don't think every varient possible has been invented yet so there should be something there people to work on.

If you ever wanted to be published, now is your chance. Write an article, on whatever, and send it to me. There is a very good chance I will use it.

Bio: Timothy R. Haffey, Sr., 63 years old. Retired Public Safety Director for a military base. Live in Oakland, California and have two kids, a boy, Tim, Jr. and a girl, Deanna Berzins, who is married with one son, John Ryan Berzins, and works as a Vice President of a Bank in Richmond, CA. I am really proud of her. Tim, Jr. deals in sports memorabilia and make a good living at it. And, I told him he would never make any money selling baseball cards. So, what do I know.

DIPLOMACY WORLD

Negotiating as Austria

by Fishburne

Austria has everyone as an enemy and, therefore, needs everyone as a friend. Negotiations with your neighbors are a normal part of standard Diplomacy, but when there are only two players who aren't your immediate neighbors (France and England), the need for diverse and constant negotiation cannot be understated.

The time for Austria to negotiate is at the very beginning before the Spring 1901 moves. While everyone should negotiate at this time, it is very unlikely that Austria will have as much leverage later in the game as she does at the very beginning. She will either be dictating terms or the recipient of dictation later in the game. Almost all of the southern stalemate positions include Austria, thus Austria must be in a position to win (dictating terms) or be a small part of a larger defense (accepting terms) by the mid-game.

England

The start of negotiations should almost always be with England. First, it is hard to do a lot of short-term harm by talking with England. On the other hand, England will provide insight into the English/German/French power struggle. If hard-nosed diplomacists play the game, England is likely to try to ally with Germany against France. This is good news for Austria, because Germany and Austria walk hand-in-hand into the grave.

Germany

Clearly the next set of talks should be with Germany. If Germany has spent any time reading strategy guides, then he knows that he needs to help Austria and keep Italy off Austria's back. A good Germany will use the Austrians as a pawn to keep the Balkans messy and, thus, the Russians occupied. This is fine for the Austrian, as a German/Italian alliance cannot be beaten even with ardent support from the Russian. Austria tends to be consumed and then Germany is stabbed or overrun and both end up in the dustbin. The Austrian should coddle the German's affection and swear off any attack on Italy, mollifying him with talk about a Lepanto.

Italy

Italy, on the other hand, needs to attack France. A German/Italian alliance that has Italy going at France frees up the center of the Med for Austrian dominance. A careful negotiation between Italy, Germany, and Austria will often insure that Italy doesn't come after Austria full bore in Spring 1901. Doing so, will cripple Austria, but, again, Austria and Italy walk into the grave together. By the time Italy has dispatched Austria, France is breathing heavily down Italy's back or Turkey has moved into a position of power in the Med. Both leave Italy without any space for growth and Italy dies slowly rotting.

Since Italy has to get its growth from Tunis anyway, encouraging a rampant war on France with ardent discussions of how Italian supply centers are sacrosanct to Austria is critical. If Italy can be persuaded to move on France, then a thankful England or Germany will remember Austria's part when it comes time for a stab. The Italian supply centers foregone in the early part of the game will be grist for the Austrian mill when the English/German alliance collapses. With Italy strongly pointed toward France, however, Turkey has an opening to move into the Med.

Turkey

Austria should encourage Turkey's move into the Med. If Austria can get Turkey away from the Balkans, then Turkey is ripe for destruction. Since Turkey's only growth path is really through Austria, there is no long-term productive alliance possible. Austria, however, should be talking to Turkey about how Turkey can control the Med with Italy's back turned. Drawing Turkey out into the Med early and sending him building fleets like crazy in a mad rush for the Mid-Atlantic Ocean (one of the stalemate lines Turkey can reasonably break) can't hurt Austria (whose power base will usually be armies) and could lead to Turkey leaving open some growth space in the Balkans for Austria to exploit. If the worst comes, and Turkey is successful, he will need an Austrian alliance to put an end to Germany, so Austria's only real hope of survival in an all-out Turkish run is to have Turkey running across the Med. Meanwhile, Turkey turning his back on Russia leaves open some interesting negotiations!

Russia

Russia and Germany rub elbows almost right away. If they don't then the Austrian is expendable as Germany gets an instant 3 build turn without having to monitor the Russians. Austria needs to encourage the Russian/German mistrust and animosity. Basically, Russia is the country most likely to go after Austria and Austria gets consumed first by a Juggernaut (Russian/Turkish alliance). By sending the Turk into the Med, that broad expanse of exposed Turkish back becomes irresistible to the Russian. Calm assurances from Austria about a mutual split of the Balkans and saber rattling from the German should keep Russia pushing both North

and South. Russia needs some quick success against the Turk, or the two will ally in an effort to grow, so supporting Russia into Rumania is not always a bad idea although it can quickly turn sour if the Russian hasn't lied to the Turk. It is critical for Austria to convince the Russian to agree to some sort of pact with the Turk without any intention of honoring that pact. This destroys early trust between Russia and Turkey and eliminates the threat of a Juggernaut. Meanwhile, Russia has to be discouraged from moving into Gallacia and this can usually be aided by Germany with the fleet in Denmark threatening to bounce the Russian out of Sweden if he moves on Gallacia. Meanwhile, Austria needs to tell Russia everything he knows about the English plans. This should be done, ideally, with Germany's knowledge and understanding as a way to bolster relations between Germany and Russia and keep Russia concentrating on going after Turkey.

France

Finally we get around to France. Austria should do everything possible to get France to believe that Italy and Austria plan a Lepanto. With Austria's first moves basically in the form of a Lepanto no matter what happens, the move of Italy on France will appear to be a surprise to Austria and Austria can sympathize with France's pain. Austria can even offer to attack Italy from behind after the builds in 1901 to help alleviate the French martyrdom, but this is an offer that should only be made to assure that France falls. Ideally, France should take a few years to fall so that Italy stays very busy with France and doesn't get ideas about sending troops in Austria's direction. When Austria builds a fleet in 1902, Italy will be aware of what is happening, but is too committed to killing France to do anything serious about what will later be Austria's vehicle for sending troops into Italy to complete the German or English stab (in the fall of 1904). If France has rogue units at this time, offering to free the French homeland may get Austria some needed breathing space in the West while mopping up Italy and Turkey.

DIPLOMACY WORLD

A FRENCH OPENING: THE BURGUNDY TIPOFF

By Mark Berch

You as France face a greater diversity of openings than any other player. If you are firmly set with an ally (or two) and a target, the choice is usually a fairly straightforward business. But if you are uncommitted for Spring 1901, and most players are, it can be a complicated mess. In such a case, however, there is one opening which I consider to be among the most overlooked and underrated in Diplomacy. The initial moves are: F Bre-Mid, A Par-Pic, A Mar-Bur.

It is a defining characteristic of this opening that you inform Germany early on that you will be going to Burgundy in Spring 1901 without support. That is the “TIPOFF” part of the opening. It should go no later than the third communication, and ideally no later than the second. Don’t mention which army will be making the move, and don’t tell even if you are asked. Tell the German player that seeing a German army in Burgundy in Spring 1901 is the worst possible calamity that can befall France. When this happens, France seldom can recover. You just can’t afford to take that risk. This is an eminently plausible position to take because it is quite true. GA Bur is much more dangerous than EF Eng or IA Pie. It borders so much, and it makes France look crippled from the start.

Alternatively tell him how you as Germany had once slipped into Burgundy in S01 and what fun that turned out to be! Of course, this doesn’t have to be the least bit true. You just need to demonstrate a well founded fear of GA Bur. But at the same time, tell him that he should feel free to stand you out if he wants because your essential requirement is to guard the province, not necessarily to occupy it. Make it clear that you don’t care a whit whether he stands you out or he doesn’t, and that he doesn’t need to even bother telling you what his plans are. The fact that you don’t care whether you enter Bur should alleviate German anxiety. The fact that you aren’t asking him what he’ll do should allay any fears that he is being manipulated.

Indeed, he may not want to take the tactical risk of telling you the truth about his plans, and may not want to take the diplomatic risk of lying to you.

If he believes you, he may even draw some psychological comfort from the fact that he possesses more knowledge than you do. And the truth of the matter is, you can be content with either German choice, and you don't need to know in advance what Germany will do. So be low key about the whole discussion of what he does. I've been stood out and been let in, but only once was I ever told in advance, and he lied!

One advantage that this diplomatic stance has is that it should make a GI or EG S01 attack a little less likely. Germany usually (not always) agrees to these with at least a modest hope that he will be able to get into Burgandy in S01. With that hope gone, an IG or EG attack may seem less promising, as Germany understands that his ally will get into France sooner than he.

The game has two branches: Spring 1901 finds you in Mar or in Bur. In the former case, if the coast is clear, you can next glide into Spain for the build. In this way, the army in Mar really does work both seasons. This is often not that case for A Mar in S01. Players often move to Spain in S01 and just sit there in the Fall, eating tapas. Or they provide support for A Par-Bur, when that support isn't needed, making the French player look either a tad overaggressive or a little paranoid.

With Spa and Por squared away, your army in Picardy has a slightly freer hand in Belgium with that German army still in Mun than you would with Ger A Ruhr. Depending on where the German fleet is, Germany will have either no say at all about Belgium, or no more say than you. That is, the southern army in S01 has kept the western Germany army away from your new A Pic, giving it a freer hand. If England is in the Channel, you've reaped a major benefit from this opening. Picardy is the best place to be when faced with hostile England --- far better than Burgundy, because A Pic can cover Bre, and A Bur cannot. Also, if matters turn dark with Germany after S01, and you decide you need to cover Bur with A Pic, it's much better to do the standoff from Pic than from Par, because that way, both Par and Mar will be open for builds.

If Italy is in Pie, then life is more complicated. Then you'll really wish you were in Spa, so that you'd have at least the chance of guessing correctly with Italy. Still, Italy won't be helped by this turn of events. There's no Germany ally in Bur, and there's no chance that France will gamble on A Spa H and hope for the best, because there is no A Spa. A Mar is just going to hold, period. However, F Lon-Eng is much more common than A Ven-Pie (at least, it was when I was still active), so this is a reasonable tradeoff of risks. Still, if you're getting bad vibes from Italy but all seems cool with England, you'll need to consider whether this is really the right environment for such an opening.

The other branch is that you get into Bur, in most cases with A Mun-Ruh. This yields a much more complex setup. You now don't get two Iberian builds, altho you gain the option of taking Spain with Spa(sc). Your second build will have to be Belgium --- or Munich. On the other hand, if you have no problems with Italy or England, a second build isn't all that vital even if you can't take either Bel or Mun. And of course, there's always the possibility of getting both if Germany runs into real conflict in the east in S01. Still, even ignoring Munich, you should be odds on favorite to take Belgium, especially if there is no fleet in Hol or Eng. If you think that Germany will be spooked enough to cover Mun, you might even land up in Bel and Ruhr. If Italy enters Pie, you're in similar situation as the other branch. You can guard Mar, but Spain is now out of reach for the army. You have the slight advantage that if there really is a standoff in Mar, you'll be able to build there, something not possible in the other branch. The problem comes if S01 brings F Lon-Eng. You still have A Pic for guard duty, but that second build will now be hard to come by, since you don't have the easy grab of Spain.

Relations with Germany should be good either way. You'll get a point for honesty when the results are read, for you did what you said. Germany can't complain about where your army is, since she selected the spot, and she may even feel in control for having determined this. Of the two branches, I prefer the first. Your pieces have all done something useful and are all properly placed to move again in F01 if circumstances permit. If all goes well, you'll get two builds plus a say in the Belgium story. In short, this is a splendid opening for a French player who doesn't want to commit too early, and who wants to guard against a German incursion while staying on good terms with Germany. Give it a try!

DIPLOMACY WORLD

St Petersburg: the Gateway to the West

by Timothy R. Haffey, Sr.

St Petersburg is a home center of the Russian player that is critically important both strategically and tactically. It is important to Russia because it is the only center where Russia can build fleets that can move into the west directly. If Russia loses StP he will never be able to build and move fleets into the west directly. Besides that, once St Petersburg is taken by a western power, it can normally be held with only two units. With such a terrible loss, Sweden will most likely fall as well. Besides representing a two unit/center loss, it also means the North is closed to the Russians. Any dreams of moving out of StP and attacking England are gone.

That is exactly why this center is also so important to the English player. He needs to close the gateway as soon as possible or face a flood of white Fleets sooner or later. It will also stop any other eastern power from moving into the Norway/Sweden area forcing them to move against Germany or the central European land mass where stalemates are easy to come by.

The Russian almost always moves the F StP-Bot in Spring 01 and then to Sweden in Fall 01. He must build a unit in StP, What he builds depends on what England has done. If England has gotten sidetracked with a war with the French or goes after Belgium then there is probably an English fleet in Norway. Russia should build a nice neutral build in StP to not threaten the English player.

If the English have convoyed the army into Norway then moved their fleet Nwg-Bar, Russia will be forced to build not only a unit in StP, probably a fleet on the (nc), but also an army in Moscow to support it. This, of course, forces him to make concessions in the Balkans. Not good!

If Russia can not afford to build in Moscow, (only one build available) Russia will be forced into a dangerous guessing game around StP, Worse yet!

Russia must keep StP. How to do it. If he can out guess the English and the German does not help England, he can build an army in Moscow in 02. But, the most effective way, and the safest way, is to convince England not to attack StP in the first place, or even move to Bar as soon as you can. Keep the German off your back too. Impossible? It is if I am playing England. I

totally understand the importance of StP and I am not going to leave that center in Russian hands if I can help it. None the less the Russia must try to get England to go somewhere else. Promise him anything. Defend StP. Getting the German to move toward Holland and Belgium in Spring 01 is usually not too hard. He still picks up Denmark in the Fall and it is the better deal for him. A strong hint that you will move against him if he blocks you in Sweden will usually encourage him to go west. Germany does not want to have to fight Russia until he has gotten some sort of alliance in the west nailed down. Only Germany can stop Russia from taking Sweden but he has to be willing to accept only two builds giving up a chance at three units. So, the Russian plan is to take Sweden and get three units, including Sweden's, in and around StP until he can afford to build more units and attack England, or whoever the western power is. England's plan should be to capture StP as soon as possible.

Something Both player's need to remember is that Russia needs StP to win, but it does not need Sweden to win. Russia, or, whoever comes out on top in the east, can win without taking a single western center. Russia = 4. Turkey = 3, Austria=3, Italy=3 for 13 and the 4 neutrals in the Balkans plus Tun = 18. Victory. So, Russia only has to be defensive, It is up to England to be aggressive. The west only have 16 centers, so they have to take at least two eastern centers to win. StP is the easy one if attacked early. The other one? Well, this article is about StP. As they say, the other one is a whole 'nother story.

I

DIPLOMACY WORLD

"Diplomacy World" Interview V Jim Burgess Discusses All Things Diplomacy with his Outgoing Co-Editor Stephen Agar

Hello all, we're going to be continuing the series of Interviews that I started in the last incarnation of "Diplomacy World". I think they've worked out very well, with a wide variety of people and views from around the world. I'm always looking for new people to be interviewed, it's really easy, I do all the hard work thinking up the questions! This time I (Jim Burgess = JB) will interview my outgoing co-editor (Stephen Agar = SA) in what admittedly is a bit of a filler interview to get us going again. As such I'm going to dispense with a "get to know you" introduction and jump into my questions.

JB: I'd like to start out asking about your szine publication career, you might set the record for most different szine names published. Can you tell me some name, date and issue highlights?

SA: I'm not really sure I can remember how many zines (note the spelling Jim : z-i-n-e-s) I have produced over the years. Let's see. The first was Pigmy which started life as a couple of pages running a single game and ended up being a bit of a monster. That started in August 1977 and finally folded in December 1979 after issue 32. In retrospect I think the zine was not half bad for a teenager, but with all the problems of youth and inexperience.

JB: Yes, that was way back in the wild 1970's!

SA: Then I ended up having a year between school and university, so I launched a Diplomacy chat-only zine, called "Here We Go Again". That only lasted two issues as I simply couldn't get enough contributions. So I launched my third zine, Variants & Uncles which was a variant zine which I used as a way of advertising the UKVB which I was running at the time.

JB: Ah, so that was how you got into the Variant Bank business, I had never known it was so early in hobby history.

SA: V&U was still in existence when I went up to Oxford in October 1980 - but suddenly finding myself in the company of lots of intelligent and available young women soon put paid to that. By spring 1981 I was willing to admit defeat and V&U ended at issue 6.

JB: Yes, how much more active the Diplomacy hobby would be if women didn't exist.... but the world would be far the loser, as would we all.

SA: And then there was a gap. A very long gap. I got a degree. I fell in love. I got another degree. I lost in love. I qualified as a Barrister. I met someone new and got engaged. We parted. Eventually I met Esme. I moved to Brighton and we got married. And it was 1992 - 11 years later. I hadn't got a clue what had happened to Diplomacy etc. in the intervening years, life was far too, er, interesting.

JB: Ah, again, I had no idea your ``gap'' was so long. In many ways you didn't miss much in the 1980's, it wasn't the hobby's best decade.

SA: Early in 1992 I saw an advert for postal Diplomacy players in a wargames magazine, so I wrote off out of curiosity. I ended up playing in a zine called "Age of Reason" - and I thought I can do this. So I decided on the spot to start another zine (a mere couple of weeks after having got married - what was I thinking??). I chose the name Spring Offensive after one of Wildred Owen's poems from the First World War, and off I went. SpOff enjoyed reasonable success, winning the Zine Poll three times in the following five years. It ran from 1992 until 1997 when I folded it after issue 50 (as by then I had two young kids). I decided to try running a Diplomacy chat zine again, called The Tangled Web We Weave. That was going more or less OK, only the zine I had handed all the Spring Offensive games over to folded after only one issue! I felt morally obliged to do something, so I started Spring Offensive again to take care of my own orphans.

JB: I do think that the threat of orphans does keep us going when things get rough.

SA: SpOff soldiered on until issue 68 put out in March 1999 - I was burned out and decided to fold after a particular exhausting week at work. I continued with an online version for a while, but this finally ended after issue 73.

JB: And that's five szines, sorry zines, already and you're hardly done. we just can't stop.

SA: Of course zine editing is a chronic disease and I started my sixth zine, Armistice Day, in January 2001. Clearly I felt I had too much free time. Armistice Day was doing OK, but a promotion at work into a very stressful and time consuming job meant that any free time disappeared and I had to fold the zine in July 2003 after only 22 issues.

JB: And of course, we also ran into the problem with Diplomacy World at the same time.

SA: And so on to my seventh and final zine, The League of the Last Days. This is another Diplomacy chat zine which is up to issue 2 and available for download at www.leagueofthelastdays.com

JB: And I like the idea that you do it occasionally, when you feel like it.

SA: Throughout the 90s I was also playing with projects such as www.diplomacy-archive.com and variantbank.org, but that's another story.

JB: I think pretty much everyone agrees that szine publishing is much more about the publisher than it is about the market or the hobby. So what is it that drives/causes you to start and stop so many publications (in contrast to me, who started and just can't seem to stop -- though I've also done other side projects at times)?

SA: I think I usually end up putting too much into it and burning out. I have written over 40 articles on Diplomacy strategy and tactics and invented over 30 variants - but that has always been a means as an end to filling up my zines. But creating original material is time consuming and tiring. After a decent rest, the itch has always been there to keep me going. I have never been able to pace myself. But I am sure I will never again run a traditional Dip zine or Dip website as I don't have a compatible lifestyle and my free time is very unpredictable.

JB: Ah yes, I work hard at pacing myself, and usually see it as a signal that if my szine is having problems then the diagnosis is that some other part of my life is out of control, as it kind of is now...

Thanks, that's great, now for the hard analytic question, is there a future for szines in the Diplomacy hobby? If so, do you think it will adapt more, it does seem like most all of the szines in the future will have a web presence as well as a postal presence?

SA: No, I don't think so. That's why I call my final zine the League of the Last Days - documenting the end of the postal Diplomacy hobby. There hasn't been a new zine launched in the UK for years and the hobby will die with the current generation of editors who are few in number). The format may survive for a while on the web, but that medium is far more suited either for archives or game adjudicating engines.

JB: I find the most fun in these interviews delving back into the long past. When you started out in the hobby, who were some of the players (or games) that were particularly memorable to you? Do you remember some of those

first stabs (both directions)?

SA: Just as everyone always remembers their first love, everyone remembers their first Diplomacy game. Mine was playing Germany in NGC 184 which started in a zine called turn of the Screw and ended in John Piggott's Ethil the Frog. It was the only postal game I ever won outright, mainly because I put an incredible amount of effort into it. You just can't do well at Diplomacy without putting in the hard work. I well remember my truly excellent stab on my English ally, which happened at about the same time that Turkey stabbed his Austrian ally. The game ended in a race between myself and Turkey which I managed to win by a whisker. Even after all these years I can remember the game.

JB: I thought so, my first postal game was a bit of a disaster, my high school friends started it going away to college, and it just didn't match up with all our new directions and responsibilities. But I remember it vividly.

SA: After my first game I just never put in the effort the game demanded as I was always too busy editing zines. So I guess I was usually a victim and easily eliminated. It was only in the late 90s after I had folded SpOff that I played a game on the Internet and really put a lot of effort into it - to be rewarded with a 17 centre Italy by 1908 (one centre short!).

JB: Yeah, I have the same problem, I can't tell you how many times I've written someone "I'll get back to you once I get TAP out" and how often that is an opportunity lost. I think of the British hobby style of play in that period as being heavily influenced by Richard Sharp's views and his book. As you played back then, does that ring true? What were some of the strategic and tactical markers that characterized the play that you remember back then?

SA: Richard's book was hugely influential - particularly his Anschluss article. For reasons I never really understood though, the game has always been played differently on the two sides of the Atlantic - in the USA England and Turkey did far better than in the UK, but on our side of the pond Russia and in particular Germany have done far better. I have never understood why. From the mid-70s onwards one big difference was that in the UK we abandoned standbys and went for anarchy when players dropped out. This had the unpredictable consequence that we seemed to have fewer dropouts (maybe because the result was more of a let down for the other players), but anarchy does affect the game to a greater degree - though not by as much as many might suppose.

JB: Do these things persist in the British hobby of today, or do you see more diversity with the breakdown of country barriers with the Internet hobby?

SA: I'm not sure there is much of the British hobby left these days. A handful of Dip zines survive, but their circulations are declining and soon they will be unable to get enough players for gamestarts. The Internet is the future for the hobby - but then you are more likely to have a Redscope or a Bounced tradition, rather than anything to do with nationality.

JB: I'd like to shift gears and talk about variants now, a subject on which you've weighed in early and often over the years. My view seems to be that most variant designers today are taking one of two approaches. People are designing map variants, most of whom are trying to eliminate or drastically minimize the stalemate lines that are part of the play of the original. Most of these map variants also seem to be doing a good job of paying attention to the ideas of yours and others about spacing and density of centers to non-centers. Would you agree with those assessments and what do you think of trends you see in map making? In thinking about this, I'm thinking about variants in the Internet era like Modern and Ancient Mediterranean as well as what seems to me to be a torrent of map variants in the last two years or so (with minor, if any, rule changes that are directed at particular characteristics of the map or time period of the variant).

SA: A lot of this is the influence of the Judge software. It can cope with map change variants, so people produced map change variants. The software can be adapted to cope with minor rule changes, so people invent minor rule change variants. But ultimately this stifles creativity. The fact that it is now relatively easy to produce colourful and attractive maps, makes map change variants even more attractive. Personally, I have always liked new historical scenarios with at least one major rule twist - e.g. Storm from the East, Latin Wars or Game of the Clans III. I think I have published about 35 variants over the years - never counted them up.

JB: The other approach I've seen a lot of is designing variants that are aimed at trying to add lots of players to the game (mostly this is in the Judge hobby) with ideas like Backseat Driver, or games where players have to gain control over units, or games where teams of players run each country, or similar ideas that create mini-countries in each country. What do you think of these variants?

In some sense, many of them aren't even variants, they just determine how units are ordered.

SA: To be honest they just bore me. They used to be common in postal zines as a way of getting all the readers to join in (e.g. Vote). I just don't see the point.

JB: One type of variant that seems to have run its course is the fantasy variant (you wrote about the issue very well in DW: <http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/DiplomacyWorld/fantasy.htm>). Do you believe that your article, the natural weight of the problem, and what I think to be the central issue (that Diplomacy is what it is because you can ally with anyone and change any time, which seems at odds with the design attempt) has pretty much killed the idea for the foreseeable future?

SA: Any variant based on history has its work cut out. Add in a narrative as well (and a scenario which is unlikely to include several competing major powers) then it gets very difficult indeed. Most fantasy and SF literature is fairly binary - i.e. good vs. evil - which doesn't work well for a negotiation game. SF games suffer further because of the abstract maps. On top of all that, most people won't play unless they know the books. I'm surprised that we haven't seen a resurgence of interest in Tolkien variants though - I am sure there are possibilities remaining in that particular scenario.

JB: As someone who sees more of the variant creation effort in its totality, is there another class of variants that you see coming out more recently that you'd like to comment on? Or do you have anything more to say about the idea of variants in general?

SA: The finished articles by today's variant designers are often better than those which have gone before - mainly because the Internet allows proper playtesting and revision (though this sometimes means that designers don't move on they just keep tinkering with their baby forever). By contrast many postal variants were never tested at all. But I do admire some of the current batch of designers (such as Michael Golbe) for the quality and quantity of what they produce.

JB: I'd also like to ask you about the FTF hobby and the growing worldwide appeal of the game, with people traveling quite considerable distances to get together. ManorCon in Birmingham has World DipCon again this year, if memory serves ten years after the last time it was hosted there. Will you be there and what are your thoughts on the ManorCon World DipCon?

SA: Probably, but it all depends on family commitments etc. Maybe I'll make it my last DipCon - the buzz just isn't there anymore for me. The last two cons I attended I left before the end. For some reason I find them depressing.

JB: Really, you and Cal White have many personality similarities. My attitude has precisely been going the other way. I've been feeling the itch to

go to more, especially as I meet more dippers from all over the world. Were you present at World DipCon IV (Birmingham)? If so, I don't recall meeting you there, though I may have. If you were there, you will recall that there were extremely strong nationalistic feelings running as an undercurrent and at times in the open. I'm very pleased that these sorts of issues have never again been as bad as they were at that World DipCon, but what do you think about nationalism/country loyalty and World DipCon?

SA: Well, there was a problem one year at Manorcon with the way a few French players threw games for other French players to give them solos. That was fairly despicable. Personally I despise nationalism in 99% of its manifestations.

JB: Yes, that 1994 ManorCon/World DipCon was the very year for that. Thankfully, this has not been happening in recent years. I through games to French and Norwegian players in the last World DipCon (NOT intentionally!) so they could beat out all the Americans.

The other big trend in Tournament play has been the growth of Internet tournaments. I believe you played (are playing?) in the current WorldMasters tournament. What do you think of these tournaments in general and WorldMasters in particular? They do seem to be going a long way toward linking disparate playing communities together.

SA: I played one year - got through to the last 49 and then retired. It was too intense for me.

JB: Yes, I find the same thing. There are a lot of players putting in an incredible amount of time into these tournaments. I don't have that kind of time either.

That's why I've retired to the WorldMasters Tournament Management Committee.

SA: The postal world had lots of communities based around zines - but then there was the concept of editors "trading" which ensured that the various communities got to know about each other. Internet communities don't have that sort of interaction and are sufficiently samey that there is not a lot of point in being active in more than one. And the growth of web-based communities has led to a decline in rec.games.diplomacy being the bulletin board for the whole hobby. That's a shame.

JB: Thanks very much, I hope the revival of Diplomacy World again helps to deal with some of these separations and fills the roles that the lack of editor trading induces. Plus, I do what I can to keep rec.games.diplomacy as

a bulletin board for the whole hobby, but I guess I am a bit of a wolf in the wilderness on that.

Anyway, a great start and a great challenge to continuing these high quality interviews. Anyone else want a turn? Contact me through the redits page.

DIPLOMACY WORLD

"Age of Imperialism", a wargame by Eagle Games.

Reviewed by Fred C. Davis, an Old Timer in the Diplomacy Hobby.

To begin with, the full legal name of this game is supposed to be "War: Age of Imperialism," but I'm sure that it will mostly just be called "Imperialism" by most people. It is a game for from 3 to 6 players, although a special rule permits a two-player game. From the illustration on the box, I thought it might be classified as a Diplomacy variant, but upon review it seems to be more of a combination of Diplomacy and "Risk." Like "Risk," the players move one at a time, although if one sought to offer a postal/electronic mail version, a sino-move version could be arranged.

There will be comparisons to Diplomacy in this Review, since the readers will be familiar with that game. As the former Custodian of the North American Variant Bank, I have studied the rules and maps for over 400 variants of the original Diplomacy, so I may make mention of some of these designs also. I will not get too deeply into the Rules of "Imperialism", but there is an extensive and well written rulebook.

Some first impressions of the game and the board. The board is enormous. It is divided into three parts, like many Avalon Hill games, but I didn't see any clips to hold them together. (You could use clips from other games). The map is too big to fit on many dining room tables. I spread it out on the floor to study it. It is a map of the Eastern Hemisphere. Europe is only a small section, although there is an implication that most of the Imperialists are Europeans. There are vast areas of Africa and Asia that need to be "explored." Many contain Native armies, which, while they can't move, can put up quite a fight due to their numbers.

I have three criticisms of the map.

1. The names of many of the land provinces are not always clearly legible.
2. The boundaries of the sea spaces are not always adequately marked.
3. Many of the sea spaces are not named. This would not cause difficulty in a FTF game, but every space needs to be named for any Postal play.

The first thing I plan to do with my board is to clearly delineate the sea space boundaries with a marking pen. Then, I will name every space. There are no Conference maps with the set. If there were, I'd list my names for these sea spaces on one. (Many are obvious, like Eastern Med and Western Mod, but for a few there might be a difference of opinion on the names. (Perhaps I can list my suggestion, in an addenda to this Review.) Someone with a talent for drawing will have to make up a Conference map, and hopefully distribute copies to those of us who are interested. I can only suggest using about three sheets of legal (8 x 14) pages to do so.

The land space boundaries are not always correct. For example, the map shows

“Germany” as including the Low Countries, while “Prussia” is a separate space. The game reflects the era between 1850 and 1900, so it’s all right to show Prussia as a separate space at the start of the game, since Germany did not become a united country until 1871. There is no Switzerland no Portugal, and “Great Britain” is a single space which includes Ireland. The land spaces on the rest of the board consist of a combination of ancient and modern names. For example, in addition to the space “India,” there are also spaces called “Bengal” and “Kashmir.” Anyone who is a map purist will just have to swallow hard and ignore real history. The rulebook states that the game was extensively playtested before going on sale, so I’m giving them the benefit of the doubt that they found that the spaces used are the most suitable for good flow of play.

No actual dates are shown for the start of play, but since the Rulebook states that the “Age of Imperialism” was 1850 to 1900, the first move could be called “1851.” (In reality, the Imperialist era really lasted from about 1815 to 1914, but this is just a game). It is interesting to note that after every two moving rounds, there is a “Building” round. This is similar to the Spring—Fall—Winter moves in Dip. Instead of being called Winter, the build period is called the “Production Round.” This is similar to the various “Economic Diplomacy” variants, in that the players can produce more Armies, Ships, Cities, Forts, Railroads, etc. in the Production Round. Each piece costs a specific price, starting with Infantry at 10 Production Points (PP’s), up to Ships @ 25 PP’s and Leaders @ 40 PP’s. A leader unit adds extra strength to an attack or defense, similar to the “Leader Module” which I created for Diplomacy.

Each land space is called a Region, and each Region can contribute Production Points to a player’s total in each Production Round, depending upon how many non-moving units are built in that Region. Players have to add up their Production Points, and then decide how to spend them. Since PP’s cannot be carried over from one turn to another, the players must try to spend all of them each round. As the Rulebook says, “Use them or lose them.

It can be quite a task counting up your PP’s, and deciding how to spend them. This is why the Rulebook suggests a short game may want to cover just five complete turns. A medium-length game would consist of ten turns. A long game would consist of at least 15 turns, but could go on longer. (For a Postal game, then would be no need to limit the number of turns, but it would be necessary to always have separate Production Rounds).

It would probably be best to use a separate year for each round. The first move would be 1851, the second 1852; then the first Production Round 1853, and so on. A 15—turn game would last to 1895.

There are no specific countries at the start of the game. There are just six sets of colored pieces, such as Red, Blue, Yellow, etc. The players could, of course, name their countries or empires, like people do in the various Railroad games. There are six Global Regions, each identified by a light different color. These are: Europe, Islam, Central Asia, East Asia, Australia and the Sub-Saharan Africa. (North Africa is part of Islam). The game winner is the player with ownership of the greatest number of Regions (every land space is a “Supply Center”). However, a player who owns an entire Global Region may add another five to his regional total. There is no automatic Victory Criterion.

It seems to me that players might want to arrange for each player to start in a different Global Region, to avoid a clogging of the board. Again, there ought to be a more definite boundary between these Global Regions, which I shall do with a marking pen. It is not clear whether Persia is part of Islam or Central Asia, although it seems to belong to Islam. Also, is New Guinea a part of East Asia or Australia? I'm going to say it's part of Australia, because otherwise that Global Region is too small, compared to the others. And, Java is not named, adding to the confusion. I wish they'd made the colors stronger and more definitive. I will list the Regions (land spaces) within each Global Region at the end, to clarify the strengths of each such Region. I'm including Borneo & Sumatra in Australia, too.

For starting positions in a 6-player game, each player starts with 4 Regions (spaces). In a 5-player game they would start with 5 Regions, and so on. Players claim their starting Regions by placing a free Infantry piece on them. Just one piece is placed each time, as the play goes around the table in a clockwise manner. In a Postal game, it would be simpler for each player to place all of his pieces at once.

For this to be effective in a Postal game, I believe it would be wise to have each player start with all of his units in the same Global Region. Even in a FTP game, the old Diplomacy method of choosing a Global Region out of a box or hat would seem to be better. All of these placements occur before the first move. Then, each player is allotted 120 Production Points to build his initial units. They must be placed in the initially claimed Regions. Any number of pieces can be placed in each owned Region.

All of the unoccupied Regions then have two Markers placed in them, one indicating the value of the Region(if any), and the other the strength of any Native Armies in that area. I dislike the idea of placing any Native Armies in unoccupied spaces in Europe. With the exception of the "Caucasus" space, these are not areas to which the Imperialists wanted to move. One solution would be to allow two players to start from Europe, and leave Australia vacant at the beginning. Then, eight of the 13 or 14 spaces would have European units from the beginning. Great Britain and Russia would have to be the starting areas, to avoid the two player, from getting in each other's way. After all units are placed, the first movement round begins (here, in 1851).

Note that in each Production Round, a player who owns an entire Global Region will add an additional 30 Production Points to his totals. This is a very good reason why a player should concentrate on owning all the Regions (spaces) in a Global Region. However, if the suggested rule to allow two players to start from the European Global Region is adopted, this additional 30 PP rule should be allowed for any player who owns at least 8 European Regions. The idea of having 14 Regions in Europe is to make it easier for a player to gain control of a Global Region, with ownership of just 8 of these Regions. One could also add Iceland, giving 15 Regions in Europe, making it still easier. And, if just one more Region were added (Finland or Byelorussia are suggested), each of the two players starting in Europe could theoretically control an 8-space Region. They could even be called "Eastern Europe" and "Western Europe."

Fighting Battles: Dice Throws

More than one moving piece may occupy the same Region (space). Whenever units of

two different countries are in the same space at the end of a turn, there will be a battle to determine which Army will own the space. But, when two ships belonging to different countries occupy the same space, they need not fight unless at least one player wishes to do battle.

Once battle has begun, it must be fought out until one side or the other is totally destroyed. A unit cannot retreat from the battle. You "fight to the death!"

The Big Question is: How to fight battles in PBM or PBEM games where dice are used to determine outcomes. There are two solutions. The easiest way is to have the GM, who is presumed to be above reproach, throw the dice while adjudicating the moves. Since there can be no Retreats, the GM continues the dice throws until one or the other side is eliminated. A second method involves the use of Stock Market tables. This has been used in the past in certain games. Particular stocks are selected, and certain pre-arranged reports are used to simulate the dice results. The technical details can be found in some of the Avalon Hill and other game rules. There may be a problem in that, effective with January 2004 reports, not all stock market events are being reported in the newspapers. This would need to be worked out by the players before the start of a game. In FTP games, of course, the usual dice throwing methods are used.

Ship Movements. Ships may carry (Convoy) Armies from one Region to another, but do not attack or defend land spaces. Each Ship (Fleet) may carry up to 5 Armies. Ships may move up to 3 sea spaces each turn, but they will lose one movement point for every Region into which they land an Army. A Ship doesn't lose any movement points for boarding an Army, as that movement is charged to the Army.

Ships can fight each other at sea. This is optional. A player having more than one Ship in a sea space can select to lose ships not carrying Armies in a battle. If a Ship carrying Armies is destroyed, any Armies on board are also lost. The Rulebook has excellent illustrations of how both land and sea battles are fought.

An additional factor in this game is the use of Explorer units to see what is in the unowned areas. The Explorer attempts to persuade the unclaimed Region to join his empire. Dice are rolled to see whether the Explorer is successful. If he rolls a higher number, the Region joins the empire. If his throw is lower, the Explorer is annihilated. This provides a way other than brute military force for an empire to expand. This is a nice twist, considering that huge parts of the world were still unknown in the 1850s and 60s.

Additional Comments on establishing two Regions i.n Europe. (for 6-player game.)

This is strongly recommended to avoid the situation of having "Native" Armies in this area. It is recommended that certain specific Regions be selected as starting Regions. These would be Gt. Britain, France and Germany for Western Europe; and Russia, Prussia and Austria for Eastern Europe. The fourth starting space would be left to the choice of the players. One could either specify precisely which spaces were part of Eastern and Western Europe, or leave some up to the ebb and flow of the game. To have the needed 16 spaces, Iceland, Ireland and either Finland or Byelorussia are added to the original 13. In the precise division, Iceland, Ireland, Italy and Spain would be

included in the West and Balkans, Caucasus, Lithuania and Ukraine in the East. Finland and Scandinavia would be “swing” spaces, able to be molded in either Global Region.

A couple of other comments: 1. All of the spaces are large enough to contain several units. There are no tiny “Italian” spaces. I believe China may be the largest single space, with only Manchuria and Mongolia shown as separate spaces. BTW , Tibet is shown as a separate Central Asian space.

2. There are no trays in the box, so once you break lose the plastic pieces from their holders, you have no place to put them back. Perhaps you have extra game trays left over from other games. Does Hasbro still sell separate game trays?

3. The plastic pieces are nicely done. They are about one inch (2.5 cm.) high. The Infantry could be used in FTP Diplomacy instead of the awful anti-aircraft guns used in the current Dip sets. When I first saw this game, I thought the pieces were larger, and might be made of wood, which would have been perfect for Diplomacy, but even as is, they could be useful.

Address for Eagle Games: 13731 Capista, Plainfield, IL 60544. Phone: (815) 577- 8920. E-mail: www.eaglegames.net. (Street address is not shown in the Rulebook)

P.S. There is a report that a new edition of “Imperialism” will be out soon, which will include the Americas.

Map Clarifications by Game’s Author: (Pg. 38 of Rulebook)

Land movement from Spain to Morocco is not allowed.
Sea movement from Eastern Med. to Black Sea is allowed if permission is granted by the owner of the Ottoman (Turkey) Region.
Sea movement from Eastern Mad to Red Sea is not allowed. Suez Canal not completed until 1 869.

Multi— island Regions (Japan, Philippines) are considered to be single spaces. If Ireland is made a space, Armies may move directly between it and Great Britain. I am ruling that Armies may move directly between Java and Sumatra, following the spirit of the above clarification. The Rulebook does not say whether Armies may move directly between Germany and Scandinavia. I am ruling that they may do so, similar to the way Armies may move between Denmark and Sweden in Diplomacy.

Addenda: Regions (Spaces) belonging to each Global Region:

Europe (13 saces)/(14)

Great Brit ian (I)
France
Germany
Italy
Spain

Prussia
Austria—Hungary
Lithuania
Russia
Balkans
Ukraine
Scandinayia
Caucasus~ (N)

Africa (13)

Mauretania
Nigeria
West Africa
Equitorial Africa
Kongo.
Angola
Natal
Abyssinia
Kenya
Sudan
Mozambique
Tanganikya
Madagascar (I)

Central Asia (9)

Siberia
Trans—Ura].
Afghanistan
Kazakhstan
Turkestan
India
Kashmir
Tibet
Bengal

Islam (9)

Algeria
Morocco
Tripoli
Egypt
Ottoman (Turkey)
Arabia
Mesopotamia
Palestine
Persia

East Asia (11)China

Mongolia
 Manchuria
 Annam
 Japan (I)
 Korea
 Kamchatka (R)
 Yakut (R)
 Buryat (R)
 Siam
 Philippine. (I)

Australia (8)/(9)
 New South Wales
 Northern Territory
 Queensland
 South Australia
 Western Australia
 New Guinea (I).
 Borneo (I)
 Sumatra (I)
 Java (I)

Added land space/ (Ireland, Java)

(I) = Island (R) = Russian areas

(N) Part of Europe where Natives still strong. Native Army makes sense here.

P.P.S. There are three sets of rules, called "Basic Rules," "Standard Rules," and "Advanced Rules" The Basic Rules are repeated in the Standard Rules section, which merely adds more "tinsel" to the game. This is done so players do not have to go back to read the Basic Rules while they're playing the Standard game. The Advanced Rules seem to add a lot more technical details. I would advise players to use only the Basic or Standard rules, and disregard the complexities added by the Advance Rules, which make the game far different from what we are used to.

Names Established for Sea Spaces:

Board I (Western Board) From West to East, from North to South (101/2)

North Atlantic Ocean
 North Sea
 Baltic Sea

Bay of Bis cay (Mid-level)

Mid-Atlantic Ocean
 Western Med.
 (Part of) Eastern Med.

Gulf of Guinea

South Atlantic (Printed on map)

South African Coast
Cape of Good Hope

(S.W. corner of South Atlantic space not used)

(The printed “North Atlantic” words on board not used)

Board II (Center Board)(101/2)

(No sea spaces at top of board)

Black Sea
Eastern Med. (Part)
Red Sea
Persian Gulf
(Caspian Sea Impassable — not named)

Arabian Sea
Bay of Bengal
East African Coast
West Indian Ocean
East Indian Ocean
(Word “Indian Ocean” printed on board)

Board III (Eastern Board) (14)

Bering Sea (at top of board)
North Pacific (printed on board)
Sea of Japan

South China Sea
Mid Pacific
South Pacific (printed on board)
Tumor Sea
Corel Sea
Tasman Sea

(Roaring 40’s runs over into Board III, touching Western & South Australia)
(East Indian Ocean runs into Board III, touching Sumatra)

No sea spaces have been added, nor have any of them had their shape changed.
Only alteration has been decision not to use the lower left—hand corner space
on Board I, which doesn’t seem to have any practical use.

Some of these names have been added directly to the board with a pen.
Others were written on white labels & then stuck on the board. If those which
were written directly on the board start to smear, they will either have to be
covered with tape or replaced with white labels.

South Indian Ocean
Roaring 40’s

(Part of Cape of Good Hope sea space touches S. Indian Ocean)

Note: If there were Conference Maps included with this game, I would have included one showing the locations of these names with each copy of this Review.

Hope you can visualize this.

Circled numbers indicate no. of sea spaces on each part of the Board.

DIPLOMACY WORLD

The 2004 North American Diplomacy Championships April 23-25th, 2004 - Portland, Oregon

If there's only one tournament to attend, it's DipCon! This year, DipCon 37 will be hosted in Portland, Oregon by the PiggyBack Society for Northwest Diplomacy. DipCon is the longest-running Diplomacy tournament in the world. To better understand the rich history of the event, read Edi Birsan's article, "The DipCon Story".

Please email the PiggyBackers with any suggestions or comments. This is an event for the entire community, and we welcome your input.

Tournament Date:

This year the tournament will be held April 23rd - 25th, 2004. Sign-up starts @ 5:30PM PT and opening ceremonies @ 6:15PM PT on Friday the 23rd. If at all possible, try to show up early to check in for each round, or warn us ahead of time that you'll be showing up at the last minute. There will be four rounds:

Friday 23rd: Spring 1901 starts @ 7:00PM

Saturday 24th: starting at 10:00AM

Saturday 24th: starting at 7:00PM

Sunday 25th: starting at 9:00AM

Awards Ceremony upon completion of Final Round

At 6PM PT, on Saturday the 24th, the DipCon Committee will convene in order to award DipCon '05. Those TD's that would like to host DipCon should bring their bids. We highly encourage all attendees to participate, and help in the selection process so that we can be sure DipCon is going to a place that the majority of players want to go.

Registration & Fees:

Pre-registration is USD \$30.00 until March 1st and \$35.00 thereafter. Proceeds will help us purchase trophies, food and organize group dinners/events. Thank you for your continued support of the DipCon institution.

Tournament Rules:

The scoring system was conceived by the Northwest's very own Jake Mannix. Please review the 2004 DipCon rules (in MSWord format) to better understand tournament format. There will be central time and play continues until completion on all Friday and Saturday rounds (re: Hood style). Sunday's rounds will be time limited.

Convention Site & Directions:

DipCon 2004 will be at the Portland Lloyd Center DoubleTree Hotel. When calling, give reservations the code "PBS" or say you're booking with the "PiggyBack Society". The hotel phone number is 503-281-6111.

You can reserve a room at the USD \$99.00 rate until April 7th. If you can get a

cheaper price, through Orbitz for example, please be sure to let us know so that we can contact the hotel and link your room stay with our event. The DoubleTree Hotel is located at 1000 NE Multnomah, Portland, OR 97232. That's only 9 miles from the Portland International Airport.

From the PORTLAND INTERNATIONAL:

Distance from hotel: 9 mi.

Drive time: 20 min.

Directions: 205 South to I-84 West, use Lloyd Center exit. (map it)

Taxi: typical minimum charge is USD \$20.00

If you need a ride from the Portland area, please contact PiggyBackers. Car pools can be arranged accordingly.

Finally, please take some time to forward this and future announcements to anyone we are not reaching, your support only makes DipCon that much better.

We'll see you in April!

The PiggyBack Society for Pacific Northwest Diplomacy © 2000-2004.

Diplomacy is a Registered Trademark of Hasbro.

Site designed by edward@handprintdesign.com.

DRAFT --- DipCon XXXVII Diplomacy Tournament Rules --- DRAFT

These rules will be used at the DipCon Tournament in Portland April 23-25 2004

Welcome to DipCon 37, the fifth annual tournament sponsored by the PiggyBack Society for Pacific Northwest Diplomacy. We are honored that you have chosen to attend DipCon and have made every effort to ensure that your experience here is an enjoyable one. If we have fallen short of your expectations in any way, please do not hesitate to bring your concern to the attention of one of the several PiggyBack board members in the room.

This document contains the tournament rules and other details for DipCon 37. The Tournament Directors for this event are Matt Shields and Kevin Kacmarynski. Please direct any questions about the event to Matt Shields at MChirchill@comcast.net

Schedule

Thursday, April 22, 2003

Day and Evening: Activities for early arrivals -- TO BE ANNOUNCED

Friday, April 23, 2003

0

Day: Activities for early arrivals -- TO BE ANNOUNCED

5:30 PM Check In

6:15 Opening Ceremonies

ROUND ONE (Times for games are approximate.)

6:45 PM Board Call

7:00 1901-1905

9:40 BREAK

10:00 1906+

Saturday, April 24 2003

ROUND TWO (Times for games are approximate.)

09:15 AM Check In

09:45 Board Call

10:00 1901-1905

12:40 BREAK

1:00 1906+

5:45 DipCon Society Meeting - Site selection for DipCon 39, and other hobby politics.

Time permitting, the Annual Meeting of the PiggyBack Society will be held immediately upon conclusion of the DipCon Society Meeting. Otherwise, it will be held immediately after the Awards Ceremony on Sunday.

ROUND THREE (Times for games are approximate.)

**6:15 Check In
6:45 Board Call
7:00 1901-1905
9:40 BREAK
10:00 1906+**

Sunday, April 25, 2003

ROUND FOUR (Times for games are approximate.)

**8:15 AM Check In
8:45 Board Call
9:00 1901-1905
11:40 BREAK
12:00 1906-1910
2:10 Call Period (1911-19??)**

3:30 Awards & Closing Ceremony

Board Call & Power Assignments

Players will be assigned to tables and powers by the Tournament Director during the 15-minute Board Call period prior to the start of each round. To be eligible to play during a round, players must have checked in with the Tournament Director or designated assistant BEFORE the Board Call period begins.

In order to expedite Board Call and ensure a prompt start to rounds, players are asked for their attention and quiet courtesy until ALL boards have been called.

First round placement will be random within the guidelines of point (5) below.

Where possible and at the Tournament Director's discretion, players with off-board associations such as team members, family members or other excessively positive or negative relationships will not be placed on the same board. Every effort will be made to ensure that each player faces as many new opponents as possible in each round.

To the extent possible based the constraints of point (5) above, players will be assigned different powers in each round, with efforts made to assign players to different board ‘theaters’ in each round, as designated below:

WEST: England/France

CENTER: Germany/Austria/Italy

EAST: Russia/Turkey

In the event that it is not possible to seat a full board, pre-determined local Piggies will stand down to ensure that players who have traveled will be seated. At their discretion, either or both of the tournament directors may play in a round in order to fill out a board.

Central Clock

1. All boards play against a Central Clock and follow simultaneous timelines. No exceptions.
2. Please note that there is one scheduled break during each round. All other breaks taken by players are on the clock.
3. The both negotiation and order-writing are timed on this central clock. There is no separate time for order-writing. Players are instructed to submit their orders before the clock expires. The time remaining before orders must be submitted for a particular movement phase will be visible in the tournament play area at all times on at least one computer screen.
4. The time allowed for negotiations AND order-writing before orders for a particular movement phase **MUST** be submitted is shown in the following table:

1901	1902/05	1906+
20 minutes	15 minutes	13 minutes

Once the Tournament Director calls a start to the games, **THE CLOCK IS ALWAYS RUNNING!** As soon as the time period for spring 1901 expires, the time for the fall 1901 period begins. **THIS MEANS** that the time you spend adjudicating a movement phase, and submitting and adjudicating any retreats and/or adjustments, uses time available to you before the orders for the next movement phase **MUST** be submitted.

Victory Conditions

A game will end in a Solo Victory:

- a. At the beginning of any adjustment phase where a single power controls 18 or more supply centers, or
- b. If all players who own at least one supply center vote unanimously to concede the game to a publicly specified single power. A game may not be conceded to a single power who has less than 15 centers, and a game may not be conceded to any power who is not the largest power on the board.

c. In the case of an 18-center solo, the Tournament Director must be notified that the game has concluded **BEFORE** players clean up the board. The TD shall review the board position and verify that the game has ended.

A game will end in a multiple-player Draw:

a. If all players who own at least one supply center vote unanimously to concede the game to a publicly specified coalition of two (2) or more powers, or

b. If the Tournament Director calls an end to games as specified in point (3) below. In this event, all players who own at least one supply center participate in the draw.

c. In the case of a voted draw under IV (2) (a) above, games are non-DIAS, meaning that draws do not need to include all players, though the vote for any particular draw proposal must be unanimous.

During the fourth round, all games will end at the beginning of an adjustment phase during the designated Call Period of each round, which begins with the spring 1911 movement phase.

The Tournament Director shall determine the specific adjustment phase for calling games **PRIOR** to the commencement of the fourth round and record it in a sealed envelop for player inspection after the call is made.

If the Tournament Director calls an end to the games, **ALL** games will immediately cease, the option for concession votes will no longer be available, and victory shall be determined by point (2b) above.

Concession votes shall be supervised by the Tournament Director or designated assistant who may be summoned to the table by any player still in ownership of at least one supply center. For a concession to pass, **ALL** players still in ownership of at least one supply center must vote in favor of the concession. Players who have abandoned their position are **NOT** considered to be in ownership of **ANY** supply centers.

Votes shall be conducted in secret and in a manner determined by the Tournament Director or designated assistant.

Votes may be called during any spring or fall phase, but only **ONE** vote may be called by each player during each phase, and **NO** votes shall be entertained prior to 1906.

Once a player calls for a vote, that same player may not call for another vote until all players who still own at least one supply center have exercised their option to call for a vote.

THE CLOCK DOES NOT STOP FOR VOTES. All voting is considered part of the game and uses time as if play is continuing.

Scoring System Summary - See Appendix A for details

DipCon 37 will have a “Top Board”. The player who has the highest score on that board will be declared the DipCon 37 Champion. The remainder of the standings will be based solely on a player’s final point total.

The Top Board will be played during the Sunday morning round, as part of

round 4. The 7 players who have the highest point total after the conclusion of round 3 will be invited to play on the Top Board. If any of those players decline to play on the top board, or fail to show up Sunday morning, their spots will be offered to the next highest ranked players in order (8th, 9th, 10th, etc.) However, a player must participate in at least 2 of the first 3 rounds on Friday and Saturday in order to be eligible to play on the top board. **No Exceptions!**

A complete explanation of the (somewhat complicated) scoring system is included in Appendix “A”. This Appendix is considered to be part of the rules to this tournament. If you are not interested in the details, then there are essentially two things to understand in order to maximize your performance.

Rather than simply scoring points for achieving specific results during the tournament, you are actually wining part of a “pot”, like in poker. Every player begins the tournament with 100 points. Before each game you “ante” 10% of your current point total in to the pot. Functionally this means that you get more points for beating players who have been more successful in other rounds, and you get fewer points for beating players who have been less successful.

If the game ends in a solo victory, that winner takes the whole pot.

If the game ends in any kind of draw, the pot is divided up according to the formula in Appendix “A”. The short explanation of this system is that it rewards players for finishing a board in a significantly better position than their opponents. A player’s goal should be to have as many supply centers as possible, and to be larger than as many opponents as possible. This is where the bulk of your points will come from. Being in the draw is better than being excluded from the draw, but this is not as big a deal. Thus, eliminating smaller powers from the draw will usually only improve your score slightly, and could hurt your score if someone else is the one getting the dots. (e.g. England may not benefit from Russia eliminating Turkey from the draw, but Russia will benefit from the extra dots.)

In the unlikely event of ties in the final standings, or ties in determining who plays on the Top Board, the tie will be broken based on the following conditions in the order listed, and in favor of:

the player with the highest score obtained in any game in which the tied players opposed each other.

the player whose highest single-game score is greater.

the player whose second-highest single-game score is greater.

the player for whom the tournament is furthest from home as determined by the mileage of a hotel to home address Yahoo driving map.

Awards

1. DipCon XXXVIII Tournament Champion

The DipCon champion will be the player who scores the most points on the Top Board

Second through Seventh Place

Determined by total point score - ties broken as specified in Section V4

3. Best Country for each power

Determined by HIGHEST NUMBER OF OWNED SUPPLY CENTERS at game end - ties broken in the following order:

§ Solo beats draw

§ Draw beats survival/elimination

§ The player with the larger Percentile Score during the games in question.

If a tie still exists, the player for whom the tournament is furthest from home as determined by the mileage of a hotel to home address Yahoo driving map wins the award.

Team Champions

a. Any three players may declare their intention to enter the Team Competition by informing the Tournament Director or a designated assistant PRIOR to the Round 1 Call Period on Friday night. Teams may reveal themselves or keep their status secret, at team discretion. No player may serve on more than ONE team.

b. The award will go to the team with the highest total point score of all three players, with the following qualification:

§ If two or more team members play on the top board, then those players Round 3 Point Totals shall be used instead of their Round 4 Point Totals. Under no other circumstance shall team members ever play on the same board. Team members are instructed to immediately bring it to the Tournament Directors' attention if they are ever inadvertently put on the same board together.

Ties will be broken in the following order:

§ In favor of the GREATEST number of TOTAL supply centers owned by all team members at the end of all rounds counted.

§ In favor of the LEAST number of TOTAL game years played by all team members in all rounds counted.

If a tie still exists, the team for whom the tournament is furthest from home as determined by the total mileage of a hotel to home address Yahoo driving map for each member wins the award.

Best Stab Award

Awarded for best stab as determined by the Tournament Director. Players are encouraged to nominate bastards ... er, I mean ... players for this award.

Order of the Solo

Awarded for any and all solo performances.

Other awards at the discretion of the tournament directors.

Player Responsibilities

Players are asked to enjoy themselves and behave appropriately. Where these two requests conflict, the behavior request shall take precedence. Players are responsible for getting their orders into the designated box or table area before the deadline expires. **ABSOLUTELY NO WRITING IS PERMITTED AFTER THE CLOCK EXPIRES.** Any violation of this clause results in that player's units holding with the ability to receive support to hold. As the tournament directors will be unable to watch all boards at the same time, it is the individual boards' responsibilities to police themselves. Although some boards may be more lenient with players who still have their orders in their hand when the clock expires, players are still responsible to submit orders before the deadline.

Players are responsible for the legibility of their orders. Ambiguous, unclear, or illegible orders may be voided.

Players are responsible for adjudicating all moves. Players may freely determine in any manner of choosing which player at each turn will read orders. The designated reader must begin with his or her own orders.

§ If all players have submitted orders before the deadline expires, the players are free and encouraged to adjudicate their board (and any retreat and adjustments thereafter) and begin the next negotiation phase early; taking advantage of the time they have gained.

5. Players are responsible for proper recording of the progress of the game on the tournament-provided record sheet.

The game board/pieces are not to be cleared from the table until the scoring sheet has been reviewed and accepted by the Tournament Director or designated assistant. Once accepted, that game is **OVER** and the results will **NOT** be altered by protest.

6. Players are responsible for seeing their games through to the conclusion. Players may **NOT** proxy their units to other players or issue perpetual orders. If a player abandons a position during a game, that player's units hold with the ability to receive support to hold. Concession votes will be conducted without the input of that player.

7. Players are responsible for good sportsmanship and fair play. The Tournament Director will deal harshly with confirmed instances of cheating or intentional manipulation of game pieces (Flying Dutchmen, etc.) under the authority of Section X4.

8. Players are responsible for limiting game conversation to those players involved in their specific game, and players not involved in a game shall not insert themselves in any game conversation or action. Actionable violations are to be reported to the Tournament Director or designated assistant.

Retreats and Adjustments

Players are not to negotiate during retreat and adjustment phases.

After movement adjudication, players should immediately submit and adjudicate any retreats and/or adjustment orders, as appropriate. Remember that the clock for negotiation of the next movement phase has already begun!

If more than ONE (1) player has retreats or adjustments, ALL such orders MUST be written and adjudicated in the same manner as movement orders. If only ONE (1) player has retreats or adjustments, that player may simply execute their orders on the board without writing them down.

Players are expected to submit retreat and adjustment orders as quickly as possible. If a player is thought by others on the board to be taking too long to submit retreat and adjustment orders, the Tournament Director or designated assistant may be called to the table to implement a 30 second count down to adjudication, or to otherwise deal with the problem as they deem appropriate.

Players may not volunteer retreat options or suggestions during retreat phase. However, a retreating player may ask to be told whether a particular province is a legal retreat options. (e.g. “Can I retreat in to Belgium?” “Was there a bounce in Norway?” etc.) If such a request is made, any other player may answer “yes” or “no”. It is still the retreating player’s responsibility to know the legal retreat options, regardless of whether this request was made, or the information given was accurate. If a player requires further assistance, THAT player may call the Tournament Director to the table, and the Tournament Director will answer any question regarding retreat possibilities. Once all questions at a table have been answered, the Tournament Director will implement a 30 second count down to adjudication.

Governing Rules

1. The 1976 (USA-Avalon Hill) edition of the rules of Diplomacy will govern play with exceptions only as noted in this document.

2. The Tournament Director will have a copy of these rules for players to review by request.

Convoys

The ENTIRE convoy path of the army being convoyed MUST be specified. Unwanted (kidnapped) convoys are not permitted.

Alternate convoy paths are not permitted.

Orders

It is not necessary to designate the unit type (Army or Fleet) except in build orders for coastal provinces.

It is not necessary to specify the nationality of a piece in any order to support or convoy that piece.

Standard abbreviations will be accepted. Unambiguous orders will be accepted. The Tournament Director or designated assistant will be the final authority in all cases of ambiguity. Please note that Liv and Nor are not

valid abbreviations for any province. Leeway will be given only if the order is unambiguous.

Dual Coast Provinces

Failure to indicate a coast on a St. Petersburg fleet build order will result in a waived build.

Any fleet move or retreat order from Portugal to Spain, from the Mid-Atlantic Ocean to Spain, or from Constantinople to Bulgaria, **MUST** include a coast specification. In all other cases, failure to specify a coast will not invalidate the order.

Tournament Director Authority

1. The Tournament Directors may designate assistants with full or partial authority at will.
2. The Tournament Directors are the final authority in all cases not covered by this document.
3. While it is not expected that the situation will arise, the Tournament Directors have the authority to make decisions without being bound by this document.
4. The Tournament Directors have the authority to make any decision, up to and including invalidating results and asking players to leave without recourse or refund.

Appendix A

DipCon 38 Scoring System

Definitions:

“Ante” refers to that part of a player’s point total which they contribute to the “pot” before each game.

“Draw Participant” refers to players who are declared to be “in the draw” when a draw vote passes.

“Point Total” refers to the number of points a player has at any point in time. A player “antes” points from their point total.

“Pot” refers to the pool of points for which a single board is competing.

“Remainder” refers to that part of the pot not awarded based on survival or draw participation.

“Score” when used as a verb simply refers to receiving points from the “pot”.

“Scoring Points” refers to a player winning a certain number of points from the “pot”. The term “point” generally refers to the points in the “pot”, a share of which is added to a player’s “Point total”, as opposed to a player’s raw score or his percentile score.

“Survivor” refers to a player who has one or more supply centers in a game that ends in a draw, but who is not a “Draw Participant”.

Before a game begins, each of the 7 players in that game antes 10% of their current point total to the pot. Their point total is thus decreased by 10%.

If the game ends in a solo victory, the winner scores points equal to the size of the pot, and those points are added to their point total. In the next round the player will ante based on her new point total.

If the game ends in a multiple-player draw, each player in that draw scores points equal to 5% of the pot. Each player who is not in the draw, but who still has at least one supply center (survivors) scores points equal to 1% of the pot. The remainder of the pot (that is, that part of the pot left over after subtracting the number of points awarded for draw participation and for survival) is divided up in the following way. Note that this remainder may be anywhere between 65% and 90% of the total pot.

A player’s “Raw Score” is calculated according to the following formula:

$$\text{Raw Score} = [S * (N_s + 1)] + [(1/5) * M * (N_m + 1)] + Y$$

Where:

S = Supply centers owned at the end of the game

N_s = Number of players who own fewer supply centers than you at the end of the game

M = Largest number of supply centers owned at any point in the game

N_m = Number of players whose maximum supply center count was smaller than yours

Y = Number of years in which you ended the game with one or more supply centers

A player’s Percentile Score is equal to her Raw Score divided by the total Raw Scores of all 7 players in the game. A player’s share of the remainder of the pot is equal to his Percentile Score times the value of the pot. These points, along with points for draw participation and survival are added to the player’s point total.

Upon the completion of round 3, the tournament directors will use the preceding system to recalculate the Point Total for all players as though the first 3 rounds occurred in each of the 6 possible orders. [1,2,3; 1,3,2; 2,1,3; 2,3,1; 3,1,2; and 3,2,1]. The official Point Total that all players will have going in to round four, and the Point Total from which Top Board assignments shall be made, shall be the average (arithmetic mean) of these 6 point totals.

Round four will be played and scored based on this new Point Total. The Point Totals after round four shall be the official standings for the tournament, with the exception that the player who wins the largest share of the pot on the top board shall be the DipCon Champion.

Although players will be assigned to boards more or less randomly during the first 3 rounds, in order to give all players the best chance at improving their final standing, round 4 will be a seeded round. As mentioned previously, the Top 7 players will be placed on the Top Board. The remaining players will be put in groups of 7 based on their Point Total after round 3, within the confines of Rule II (5). Powers will still be assigned randomly within the confines of Rule II (6).

DIPLOMACY WORLD

WACKyCon Scoring Primer

This scoring system will be used at the Dipcon Tournament at Portland 23-25 April, 2004. If lyou can figure it out, let me know.

Very Short Form

Play to win.

If you can solo, great. If you can't solo, try as hard as you can to get as close as you can to soloing. "As close as you can" does not mean a 3-way draw is closer than a 5-way draw, necessarily. Your own Supply Center count is a better indicator of your chances of winning than the size of the draw, and thus counts more toward your score (but yes, being in the draw is better than just surviving is better than getting eliminated).

Slightly Longer Description

These are the following things that determine your score:

1. Whether you are in the draw or not (but not the size of the draw, much).
2. What your SC count is at the end of the game.
3. Your rank - the number of people you're ahead of in the SC-counts - and how far ahead of them you are - being at 14 SC's when your next best competitor is at 7 counts much better than if you're in a 14-10-10 3-way.
4. If you ended the game doing worse than at some earlier point, your earlier max SC count does help your score (a little).
5. If you survive to the end of the game, you're rewarded (a little) for that, and if you didn't, the longer you survived, the better your score.
6. The strength of your opponents - if you solo (or just do well) on a board with people who have been doing well all tournament, you are more highly rewarded than if you solo (or just do well) against people who have been getting killed all tournament.

Once you've read the longer description and the math, and you still have questions (other than "Where's the examples?", send me an email, and maybe I'll both answer it, and put the question and answer in the FAQ down at the bottom of the page).

Long Description

If you care at all about the actual math of the scoring system, skip down to the next section, then come back to this one if you still have any questions. If you're not interested in the specifics, basically the point of the system is to reward self-serving play - the way I phrased it late one night when I was looking at it was "Get More Biggerer!" (yes, I was tired, give me a break).

What this means in practice is the value of your SCs (to your score) is proportional to the number of people you are ahead of (note that if you're tied with someone, you're not ahead of them), so each center you pick up when you're in 1st place is worth quite a bit more than when you're in 5th.

If it looks like the game will end in a draw, you do want to be in that draw, as doing so gets you a flat 5% of pot back (and typically you will have contributed 10 to 20% of the pot in the first place - see below for what I mean by "pot") right off the bat, no matter how big you are. This won't be most of your points if you're doing well, but if you're in 5th place at 4 or 5 centers, it will be getting close to the amount you're getting from SCs.

Point 4) above is different than any scoring system I know - it rewards you for the best position you had all game: if you made it up to 17 centers, but were eventually eliminated (ouch!), then your score will reflect having made such a valiant effort - but not by a huge amount (1/5th the value of having actually ended the game at 17 SCs).

Point 6) is also different from any known dip tournament scoring system I've encountered - and deserves its own subsection.

Ante Scoring

The main idea is similar to how Chess ratings (or NADF, for that matter) work: if you beat stronger players, you're doing better than if you beat weaker players. The way this works in this system is at the beginning of the tournament, everyone starts with a tournament score of 100 points. When you go into a game, each player contributes 10% of their current score to "the pot" - this is the total value of that particular game that everyone in the game is fighting over.

At the end of game, if someone solos, they take all of the points in the pot, and nobody else gets any. If there's a draw, then the points are divided up using the formula below (in the Math section).

In subsequent rounds, the same thing happens - each player contributes 10% of their current score to the pot of their game, and fights to try to take more than that back out to increase their score. If you are playing against strong players, who have done well in previous rounds, then they've contributed a large number of points to the pot, and you don't have to do as well to increase your score, while if you are at a board with players who have been losing all tournament, then you have to do better to get that same score.

As the tournament progresses, players scores will go up and down, and the

overall average score of everyone in the tournament stays the same, at 100 points (because the only points you can get are those that someone else lost - it's a zero-sum game). What this also means is that it doesn't matter how many rounds you play - just because you weren't around for a game (you slept in, wanted to go sightseeing, or missed the Friday night round), it won't hurt your score (it just takes away an opportunity to raise [or lower] it). Of course, to make sure that someone doesn't solo in the first round and then sit out, there is a minimum required number of rounds to play in to qualify for ranking - at WACkyCon it will be 2.

Math

At the start of each game, everyone antes 10% of their current score to the pot. At the end of the game, if someone solos, they get it all, everyone else gets zero. If the game ends in a draw, then each player in the draw takes out 5% of the pot to start with (no matter how big the draw is), and people who survived to the end but voted themselves out of the draw take 1% of the pot each.

The rest of the pot is divided up among the players in the following way: the formula below tells you the "raw score" of a player, given their performance in the game. This raw score determines what portion of the remaining pot goes to them - if Player A had a raw score of 10, Player B had 20, and Player C had 30, and the pot had 50 points left in it (after the percentages from the above paragraph were taken out), then Player A would get $50 * [10/(10+20+30)] = 12$ of the 50, Player B would get twice that, and player C would get three times that. The raw score formula is, for someone who ended the game with S supply centers, and was, at the end of the game, ahead of N_s other players in the supply center counts, who had a maximum supply center count over the whole game of M (S may often equal M), which when compared to everyone else's maximum supply center count was greater than N_m of them, and who survived for Y years, gets a raw score of:

$$\text{Raw Score} = [S * (N_s + 1)] + [(1/5) * M * (N_m + 1)] + Y$$

If you want to try scoring up some games on your own, don't try to do it by hand, what are you crazy? Use my ever-crashing and buggy program, available [here](#).

Examples

The following game was a recent house game in Portland OR. For the purposes of this example, everyone antes 10 points each (for far more data, check out what happened at WACkyCon itself).

Game Exhibit A: R/F/T Draw in 1908

Power In Draw/lifetime Max SC count Game End SC count Score

Austria No/5 4 0 1.21

England No/8 5 2 3.83

France Yes 8 8 17.1
 Germany No/8 6 3 5.25
 Italy No/8 4 4 5.87
 Russia Yes 7 7 13.9
 Turkey Yes 10 10 22.7

In this example, England, Germany, and Italy were willing to vote themselves out of the draw, as they were fairly weak. Should they have? I said that draw size doesn't matter (much), but how "much" is "much"? Lets look at the extreme case of the same game, but a 6-way DIAS style result:

Game Exhibit B: R/F/T/G/I/E Draw in 1908

Power In Draw/lifetime Max SC count Game End SC count Score
 Austria No/5 4 0 1.03
 England Yes 5 2 6.17
 France Yes 8 8 15.1
 Germany Yes 6 3 7.38
 Italy Yes 4 4 7.91
 Russia Yes 7 7 12.4
 Turkey Yes 10 10 19.8

So the smallest of the original draw members (Russia) loses a point and a half, France loses 2pts, and Turkey loses 3 points, while the opposite happens among the former survivors - the lowest scores go up the most.

Is this a lot of points? It's significant, as will be shown below in an application of this scoring to The Potomac Tea & Knife Society's "Tempest in a Teapot III". But who among the original drawing powers would have really pushed for more play even to the point of eliminating a few small powers? It's important to remember the situation - there's an R/T alliance rolling west, Austria is dead, and France is propping up Germany and Italy while England barely holds his own against Russia, who is focussed more on Germany.

What if just Italy demanded to be in the draw?

Game Exhibit C: R/F/T/I Draw in 1908

Power In Draw/lifetime Max SC count Game End SC count Score
 Austria No/5 4 0 1.15
 England No/8 5 2 3.67
 France Yes 8 8 16.5
 Germany No/8 6 3 5.02
 Italy Yes 4 4 8.42
 Russia Yes 7 7 12.4
 Turkey Yes 10 10 19.8

What if France and Turkey decide to cut Italy out, because he's being obstinate and wanting a place in the draw:

Game Exhibit D: R/F/T Draw in 1910

Power In Draw/lifetime Max SC count Game End SC count Score

Austria No/5 4 0 1.10

England No/10 5 2 4.30

France Yes 10 10 19.0

Germany No/10 6 3 5.78

Italy No/9 4 4 1.85

Russia Yes 7 7 13.3

Turkey Yes 12 12 24.5

So compared to Exhibit A), France and Turkey go up about 2 points, Germany and England go down about a point, and Russia actually loses a half point as well. Of course, in the case at hand, if in the process of stabbing Italy, France is not able to hold those centers against Turkey (especially once Italy throws himself on his sword and helps Turkey through), and ends up only taking one of them, while Turkey takes the other three:

Game Exhibit E: R/F/T Draw in 1910

Power In Draw/lifetime Max SC count Game End SC count Score

Austria No/5 4 0 1.09

England No/10 5 2 4.27

France Yes 10 10 17.8

Germany No/10 6 3 5.74

Italy No/9 4 4 1.84

Russia Yes 7 7 13.2

Turkey Yes 12 12 25.9

i.e. - if France only keeps one of the Italian centers while cutting him out of the draw, he ends up only netting 0.7 points, while Turkey gets 3.2 points. So lets recap the choices in France's situation (it's easy to see that Turkey would love to keep playing as long as Russia is stuck dealing with the stalemated north), assuming for the sake of simplicity that in the tournament, he's competing closely with both the turkish and italian players.

* If he can convince EGI to vote themselves out of the draw, the scores are:

o France: 17.1

o Turkey: 22.7

o Italy: 5.87

* If he can't, and it's a 4-way with Italy as well:

o France: 16.5

o Turkey: 21.7

o Italy: 8.42

* If France and Turkey split Italy down the middle, and it holds that way?

- o France: 19.0
- o Turkey: 24.5
- o Italy: 1.85
- * If he tries this, but Turkey gets 3 out of 4 of Italy's centers?
- o France: 17.8
- o Turkey: 25.9
- o Italy: 1.84

What do you think the moral of the story is? I think, in this case, it says several things:

- o "Include small powers in the draw (if they demand it) unless you can be sure you will benefit the most from their elimination"
- o "If you're the biggest power on board, and you're not looking like you're going to lose any ground - don't take any draw: keep playing!"

And you know what? I think those are good morals to learn about the game in general, regardless of whether it maximizes your WACky score. How close can things get?

To see what France should do in the above example, you really should know how close these scores are going to get over the course of a tournament. To that purpose, I went through the laborious process of entering (by hand) all of the data from The Potomac Tea & Knife Society's Tempest in a Teapot III's games (which are available for viewing at their site) into this scoring system, and here is what it would have said:

1. Person 1: 180.82 - (solo + strong 2-way + 3-way)
2. Person 2: 151.41 - (solo late in tournament)
3. Person 3: 132.71 - (solo in round 1, then eliminations)
4. Person 4: 132.49 - (4-way + 2 strong 3-ways)
5. Person 5: 120.76 - (4-way + 1 strong 3-way)
6. Person 6: 113.87 - (3-way + strong 3-way + survival)
7. Person 7: 113.56 -- disqualified for WACky Scoring - only 1 game.
8. Person 8: 113.42 - (4-way + strong 3-way + elimination)
9. Person 9: 112.31 -- disqualified for WACky Scoring - only 1 game.
10. Person 10: 109.39 - (strong 3-way + survival)
11. Person 11: 108.45 - (weak 4-way, two 3-ways)
12. Person 12: 105.13 - (2-way, survival)

I'd guess also that the reason some of these scores seem in the wrong order is that people had good results against players who had been doing poorly in the tournament, or who did well early, then poorly later on.

Frequently Asked Questions

- o Question: When do I accept defeat and vote yes for a draw proposal in such a way as to maximize my tournament score?
- o Answer: When you've gotten as close as you can to soloing, and think that playing on isn't going to improve your position.
- o more coming... (send them to jake at rset.net)

DIPLOMACY WORLD

"Diplomacy World's" International Invitational Diplomacy Demonstration Game

We have decided to host an International Invitational Diplomacy Demonstration Game here in the pages of "Diplomacy World". It will be gamemaster by Tim Haffey who has over 30 years experience playing Diplomacy and gamemassting. Jim Burgess will also be available to provide advice on difficult adjudications, should there be any. The name of this game will be Unicorn 2004.

So much for the gamemaster. The game will be played via email. Players will be invited from various Diplomacy communities to get differrent styles demonstated perhaps. Jim Burgess is responsible for inviting people and so far we have the following individuals.

Edward Hawthorne, edward_hawthorne@yahoo.com

Steve Cooley, tmssteve@sbcglobal.net

David Cohen, zendip18@optonline.net

Tim Goodwin, tim@9oakhill.com

Jim-Bob Burgess, burgess@theworld.com

Roger Yonkoski, rky_diplomacy@att.net

One Invited but Yet to Accept

When the seventh player is found, Conntry assignments will be made and several moves will have taken place by the time the next issue comes out along with commentary. Should be interesting.

Bye the way, the play of this game will be followed in the pages of "Diplomacy World" along with commentary, so you might need a thick skin as well.

DIPLOMACY WORLD

List of Diplomacy Events taken from the Diplomatic Corps website. You should visit this site if you want to see a long list of International Events. [Click Here](#)
If the link does not work, load the following address into your browser:
<http://www.diplomaticcorps.org/ComingEvents/ComingEventsList.html>

United States:

PrezCon:

The eleventh annual multi-game convention PrezCon will be held on 25-29 February 2004 in Charlottesville, Virginia, USA, including the second annual United States Diplomacy Championship tournament. This will be part of the 2004 Eastern Swing. For more details about PrezCon in general, see the PrezCon website, or contact PrezCon president Justin Thompson, jthompson@prezcon.com. Send E-mail to Dip tournament director David Hood at gamerhood@charter.net for further information about the Diplomacy tournament, and let him know you are coming. Then go to www.prezcon.com to preregister.

This tournament will be over by the time this issue comes out, but if someone can send me a report on the tournament, that would be nice. What do you say Justin?

DipCon XXXVII:

The North American Diplomacy championship DipCon XXXVII will be held on 25-27 April 2004 at the Four Points Sheridan Hotel in Portland, Oregon, USA, hosted by the PiggyBack IV convention and organized by the PiggyBack Society for Pacific Northwest Diplomacy and the DipCon Committee.

There will be four rounds of the Diplomacy tournament: Friday 7pm, Saturday 10am, Saturday 7pm, Sunday 9am. The DipCon Administrative Committee will consist of the PSPND Executive Director (Jerry Fest), the Tournament Organizer (Matt Shields), and the outgoing chairman (Andy Marshall). More details about the event can be found at the PiggyBack Society website.

See the DipCon Page for more details on this tournament

Dixiecon XVIII:

The annual Diplomacy convention Dixiecon XVIII will be held on Memorial Day weekend, late May 2004 at Granville Towers in Chapel Hill, North Carolina, USA. For details of 2003 (most will be similar for 2004), see the Dixiecon 2003 website. Dixiecon will also be part of the 2003 Eastern Swing. If you have any questions, send e-mail to tournament director David Hood, gamerhood@charter.net. Here is the Dixiecon Hall of Fame, with the top three finishers from the previous 17 years, including hosting the 1990 and 1998 DipCon/World DipCon events and the 1994 and 2002 DipCons.

KublaCon:

A Diplomacy tournament will be held on 29-30 May 2004 at the Hyatt Regency in Burlingame, California, USA (in the San Francisco Bay area) as part of the annual multigame convention KublaCon. There will be a teaching round on Friday evening 28 May. For more details, see the KublaCon website, or send E-mail to Edi Birsan, edi@mgames.com.

Dragonglight:

The next Dragonflight will be held in August 2004 in Seattle, Washington, USA. Specific dates have not yet been announced. This longtime multi-game convention will include a Diplomacy tournament. For general convention details, see the Dragonflight website, www.dragonflight.org. For more Diplomacy details, contact Buz Eddy, BuzEddy@aol.com.

ConQuest 2004:

The annual multi-game convention ConQuest 2004 will include a Diplomacy tournament on 3-5 September 2004 at the San Francisco Airport Marriott in Burlingame, California, USA. More details can be found at the host event's ConQuest website. For more Diplomacy tournament information, contact tournament director Edi Birsan, edi@mgames.com.

Tempest in a Teapot VI Diplomacy convention:

The annual Tempest in a Teapot VI Diplomacy convention will be held in October 2004 at the Washington Terrace Hotel in Washington, DC, USA, organized by the Potomac Tea and Knife Society. Tempest will be part of the 2004 Eastern Swing. More details about the event will be posted eventually at the PTKS website. Details about the four-star host hotel can be found at the W

Canada:

The first Championnat du Québec was planned for 21-23 February 2003 in Québec, Québec, Canada. Unfortunately, this event could not be held as

planned. When a new date is selected, it will be posted on the French-language OFD website, ofd.telaneos.com. Send questions to Antoine Bel Rio, anbelrio@videotron.ca.

There may be a QuebeCon held on an undetermined date in 2004 in Montreal, Quebec, Canada. For details when they get decided, see www.diplom.ca, or contact dipmtl@diplom.ca or Etienne Brodeur, e.brodeur@sympatico.ca.

Another attempt to organize a Diplomacy convention in Quebec, possibly in early to middle August 2004, is being made by Nicolas Lessard, nicolaslessard@hotmail.com, who organized the 21-player New Year's event in Quebec.

The annual Can-Con will be held on the third weekend of August 2004 at the University of Toronto's branch campus at Scarborough, Ontario, Canada.

For more details, send E-mail to: Cal White, diplomat@idirect.com.

[links] More information on upcoming Canadian FTF Diplomacy tournaments can be found on the [Diplom.ca Tournaments](#) page. Information on Canadian local FTF Diplomacy groups (which may schedule local, regional, or national events) can be found on the [Diplom.ca Local Clubs](#) page.

Submission Requirements

"Diplomacy World" is looking for Diplomacy players to send in articles, convention reports, convention artwork, humor, variants, maps, game reviews, and anything else related to Diplomacy.

Submission Deadlines:

For Spring Issue, ..March 1st

For Summer Issue, June 1st

For Fall Issue,September 1st

For Winter Issue, ..December 1st

It is helpful if all articles, reports, etc are typewritten, but we will take them anyway you want to send them.

Attach to email and send to diplomacyworl@aol.com

or mail to Timothy R. Haffey

810 53rd Ave/

Oakland, California 94601