

DIPLOMACY WORLD #96

Postal version cost \$3 per issue in North America, £2 per issue in rest 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, 4 Cedars Gardens, Brighton, BN1 6YD, UK.

CREDITS

Co-Editor - Jim Burgess
 Co-Editor - Tim Haffey
 Postal Publisher (North America) - David Partridge
 Postal Publisher for Rest of the world and Webmaster - Stephen Agar

Diplomacy World is available free on the Internet, as an Adobe pdf web zine. Join diplomacyworld at <http://games.groups.yahoo.com>. Go to <http://www.diplomacyworld.org> to see back issues of the 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 the new Executive Editor Andrew Neumann at andrewneum@gmail.com or Jim Burgess at jfburgess@gmail.com by March 1, 2006.

IN THIS ISSUE

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Flag Page | Flag Page |
| Credits | Flag Page |
| Table of Contents | Flag Page |
| Comments - Tim Haffey | 2 |
| Comments – Jim Burgess | 2 |
| Diplomacy World Cup – Dorian Love. | 3-5 |
| Upcoming Tournaments | 6 |
| Ye Old Mail Bag | 6-8 |
| News and Tidbits | 8 |
| Whipping Diplomacy Tournament - | 8-11 |
| REPRINT SECTION: Austria..... | 11 |
| THE AUSTRIAN NAVY - ANOTHER ALTERNATIVE - by Bob Olsen | 12-13 |
| AUSTRIA'S WIN VITHOUT A FLEETING CHANCE - By James Woodson, Ensign 13 | |
| THE REAL LEPANTO - By Mark L. Berch | 14 |
| A Hun Having Fun in the Sun - by Stan Johnson | 15-17 |
| Germany: The Slow Approach - by Paul F. Glenn | 18-19 |
| THE INVENTION OF DIPLOMACY - by Allan B. Calhamer | 19-20 |

Comments

by Tim Haffey

Well, other than a email from Jim-Bob telling me not to be so hard on everyone and that he would, personally, encourage people to send in articles, reports, etc. to *Diplomacy World*, I have not received a single email or letter from anyone. I did take some stuff off of a list I subscribe to so I guess those count for something. A report on BAD ASS Whipping Dip Con. But those were not really sent to DW, just out to the list they were on. But, being so desperate for content, I used them. Probably old news by now.

I can continue to reprint old articles and such from old issues of DW, but then I suppose we would have to change the name to *Diplomacy World Digest*. Hmm, I think that name is already taken. How about *Diplomacy World Retread Factory*? No? Oh Well.

I think I have made up my mind. *Diplomacy World* served a very useful purpose when *Diplomacy* was played primarily by postal mail. That generated a whole industry and DW served as the flagship of that industry. But, now with the decrease in postal Zines and the transfer of the game, in most circles, to the internet and email supported by websites, I just don't see the need for *Diplomacy World* any more, sad to say. Everything is almost instantly reported nowadays and by the time it comes out in DW, it is old news.

Therefore, I do hereby declare that I am resigning from *Diplomacy World* and this issue is my last. I did last two years and that is no small feat, but I just don't think it is worth it any more. Now, DW may continue under Jim-Bob's editorship but, probably not.

Comments

by Jim Burgess

I think we're lucky that Andrew Neumann has stepped forward and volunteered to be the new Executive Editor. I know that I cannot do it myself, but I do think that there is a role for *Diplomacy World*. And I think Andrew is going to take it in the direction it needs to be taken, toward the support of the FTF *Diplomacy* Hobby. Andrew is already hard at work on Issue #97 and if he stays on schedule that means that 2006 will see the monumental 100th issue of this szine. It will be over 30 years old to get there which means that on average it only has missed about one quarterly issue a year over that period. I would have guessed that the record was a bit worse than that. Please help Andrew (andrewneum@gmail.com) to get off to a good start.

I also want to salute Tim Haffey's efforts. I hope I can convince him to stay on as Archives editor and provide for us other information and tidbits out of the Archives in his possession, not just the Archives on *Diplomacy World*, but on other szines as well. Tim has done a brilliant job of keeping the szine on time, whereas I have not. I think Andrew will do more on the production end so I don't have to do quite so much copyediting.

Finally, Dorian Love (leogends@iafrica.com) is trying to revive and work out an old Larry Peery idea for competition between countries in *Diplomacy*. He asked me if I would post his draft Charter here for comments and possibly for interest. Please connect to the Yahooogroup for more.

DIPLOMACY WORLD CUP

by Dorian Love

This charter springs out of a debate within the DipWorld community. But seeks inclusivity of all Diplomacy communities. Please forward this document to all who might find it of interest.

A new yahoogroups listserv for discussion of this Charter and any future World Cup has been set up at <http://games.groups.yahoo.com/group/DiplomacyWorldCup/>

Subscribe by sending an email to: DiplomacyWorldCup-subscribe@yahoogroups.com

A webpage has been created at <http://www.embassysa.co.za/worldcup/worldcup.php> to carry revisions of the Charter.

CHARTER*1. Preamble*

In Most sports, the highest form of competitive play is the International, the Test Match, The World Cup, in which national teams compete to see which nation is the best in the World at their chosen sport. In Diplomacy there are tournaments, both face to face, and via the Internet in which players from many nations compete. There have been tournaments in which players are geographically chosen. However, there is no truly national team competition akin to a World Cup.

The aim of this charter is to set out some of the basic guidelines and principles which could be used to sanction tournaments which operate as a World Cup of Diplomacy.

*2. Definitions**i. The Diplomacy World Cup*

An Internet tournament organized on a regular basis, hosted by any site, in which teams competing are organized on the basis of the nationality of the players. Hereinafter referred to as The World Cup.

ii. The World Cup Council

A controlling body made up of eight people, elected at the time of the preceding World Cup, and given responsibility for organizing the next World Cup, for receiving and deciding Bids, for hearing Appeals and ensuring that the Charter is upheld. Herein after known as the WCC.

iii. Host Sites

Any organization, club, or Internet community which applies for, and is granted the Charter to host a World Cup Tournament. In principle the aim should be to rotate the host site amongst the sites capable of hosting a World Cup Tournament.

iv. World Cup Tournaments

Any tournament run as a World Cup, staged by a Host Site. The Tournament may be run via a forum, Play By E-Mail, or via a judge, or any medium acceptable to the World Cup Council.

v. **World Cup Bids**

A Bid by any Host Site to stage a World Cup Tournament. Bids should include details of the tournament rules and scoring system to be used.

3. ***The World Cup Council***

i. **Membership**

The WCC shall consist of eight members elected by all interested players at the time of a World Cup. It is intended that WCC members should be prominent members of the Diplomacy community.

ii. **The Election of Members**

The WCC shall be elected by poll or ballot in an election overseen by the out-going WCC, one of whose members will be appointed as a scrutineer. There will be a period during which candidates are nominated, of not less than three weeks. There will be a period for voting by whatever means of not less than two weeks.

iii. **Term of Duty**

The WCC assumes office immediately after the election has been declared, and is dissolved upon the declaration of the next WCC, serving for the term of one World Cup only. Should the WCC fail to stage a World Cup within two calendar years, it is considered dissolved, and a new election should be called.

iv. **The Duties and Responsibilities of the WCC**

The WCC shall be formed for the sole purpose of:

- a. **Calling for bids to host a World Cup.**
- b. **Assessing Bids received and deciding which Host Site will host the World Cup by simple majority.**
- c. **Hearing all Appeals against this decision by appointing three independent mediators to decide if the process was fair.**
- d. **Ensuring that the Host Site is discharging its duties responsibly, and re-awarding the World Cup should it deem necessary to do so.**
- e. **Deciding any adjustments to the Rules and format for the World Cup Tournament along with the Host Site. The WCC has a final say in approving any changes to the rules, regulations, format and scoring system laid out in the Bid.**
- f. **Hearing all appeals relating to the running of the World Cup Tournament.**
- g. **Electing a scrutineer and running the election for the next WCC as soon as the World Cup is over.**

v. **Chairmanship of the WCC**

The WCC, once elected, shall decide amongst its own members who will chair the WCC, and any other portfolios it may deem necessary to create. The WCC may also co-opt members as deemed necessary, or delegate duties as it sees fit.

4. ***World Cup Tournaments***

To qualify as a World Cup Tournament, the following criteria must be met:

- a. The Tournament must be open to all eligible team entries, seeking to be as inclusive as possible.
- b. The Tournament must run to completion according to the rules and regulations approved in the Bid.

5. ***World Cup Teams***

To qualify as a World Cup Team, the following criteria must be met:

- . The Team should consist only of eligible players
- a. The Team should be organized around the principle of common nationality

6. ***Eligibility***

Players are eligible to play for a World Cup Team if:

- . they share a common nationality by passport, residency or birth
- a. they share a common regional affiliation should insufficient players be available to represent a nation. For example a player from Argentina might represent a South American Team.
- b. they share a common regional affiliation should too many players be available to represent a nation. For example a player from the United States of America might represent an East Coast USA team.
- c. Should a player change affiliation from one World Cup Tournament to another to a team not bounded by the player's original nationality or residence. This change must be approved by the WCC. No such approval is necessary if a player representing USA East Coast in one tournament subsequently gets chosen for a combined USA team, or indeed for a West Coast Team following a change of residency within a national boundary.

7. ***Scoring Systems***

The Scoring Systems used will advertised and known before the World Cup Tournament begins. It will make part of any Bid, and will be approved by the WCC.

Upcoming Tournaments for 2006

WAC CON

January 26-29 Seattle WA

Contact nbarnes99@hotmail.com

<http://www.diplom.org/Face/Seattle/calendar.html>

DIPCON/PREZCON

DIPCON - Feb 24th- 26th, 2006

The North American Diplomacy Championships coincide with Prezcon in Charlottesville, VA.

For more information go to <http://www.dipconsocietyna.org> and click on convention reports area.

Contact gamerhood@charter.net

<http://www.prezcon.com/flvers/Dipcon2006.pdf>



14 Nov 2005

Adam Silverman

Here is how the GameSpy review is summed up:

"It's like someone tried to make the worst Diplomacy PC game possible, and succeeded."

For those still interested in reading more:

<http://pc.gamespy.com/pc/diplomacy-2005/665958p1.html>

Adam Silverman agman@stanford.edu

10/30/05

There has been some talk lately about the Bay Area submitting a bid for DipCon in 2007. I would like to put rumors to rest and officially announce that we will not be submitting a bid. Though the tournament was extremely successful by the standard I consider most important, the participants having a great time, we're not yet ready to host a DipCon. Despite great efforts on the parts of Edi Birsan, Tom Hilton, and myself to recruit players from our 120 local player list, barely being able to fill 3 boards with local players doesn't seem to justify a bid. Furthermore, I consider our inability to attract travelers (we had only one) to be a significant block at this time.

That being said, this year's Whipping was in my opinion, better than tentatively on Oct 28-29.

From the players at Whipping, it would be great to hear your comments so we can make it even better next year. What did and didn't you like about the tournament? What could we improve and how can we make it better?

On 11/5/05, Tom Hilton <tvhilton@gmail.com> wrote:

Added a bunch of pictures, and some commentary, to my blog at <http://tehipitetom.blogspot.com/2005/11/belated-diplo-blogging.html>

Enjoy!

buzeddy@aol.com
23 Oct 2005

Medford Game
October 22,2005
NADF Report - Medford 10/22 game

Organizer/Reporter - Alex Amann

Player.....Result..NADF masterpoints.....NADF Ratings(place)

| | | | | | |
|--------------------|----------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------|
| Adam Snodgrass... | D1i..... | 11.38(149)... | 12.96(134)..... | 1701(165)... | 1715(159) |
| Carl Ellis..... | D1a..... | 30.07(65)..... | 31.62(61)..... | 1784(140)... | 1798(135) |
| Jon Hill..... | D1g..... | 17.28(102)... | 18.82(95)..... | 2100(81)..... | 2114(80) |
| Ryan Groesbeck.... | D1f..... | 5.22(250)..... | 6.75(209)..... | 1437(260)... | 1451(257) |
| Alex Amann..... | D1r..... | 14.29(120)... | 15.79(109)..... | 1309(328)... | 1323(319) |
| Gregg Harry..... | D1e..... | 48.28(42)..... | 49.78(41)..... | 1795(134)... | 1809(133) |
| Igor Pedan..... | L1f..... | 0.00(-)..... | .16(894)..... | 1000(-)..... | 1012(761) |

From the Russian point of view:

The game opened in the west with E/G vs. F and in the east with I/R vs. A, with T pretty much just existing in the corner. In 1902, R moved aggressively against T and continued the campaign against A, while E/G continued in France. Around 1905, Italy made a misorder and that was the cue for Russia to make friends with Turkey to start getting the juggernaut together, albeit slightly later than usual. Italy was quickly brought down, and there were talks among some players of 3-way draws. Gregg had to leave around this time, and Igor was just about dead in France, so Igor ordered some final orders for France and took over after 1905 as England. Gregg would be proud, because Igor pushed for the solo, moving against Russia with Germany's help for just long enough to stab him for Belgium and Holland in 1907. Germany immediately realized that he was trying to get pushed out of the draw, and threatened to throw the solo to England, saying that he could walk out of his centers and let England in, and none of the rest of us could prevent it. The solo was not conceded, which was good, because Germany immediately turned around when England was getting into good position, citing that since he was trying to be cut out of the draw, he made sure there was a solo threat to get included in the stalemate line. After a few turns, the 6-way draw was agreed on, with Turkey and Russia allowing Austria to continue living in Venice with his remaining fleet (which had traveled around for a while previous to that).

Note about letting Austria live, despite that he wasn't useful on the stalemate line: we

obviously had to make sure that there was a continued trend of 6-ways at our house. Jon and I have now hosted two games in Medford, and both of them have ended in 6-ways, with 5 powers getting together to prevent one from soloing.

<http://www.diplom.org/NADF/index.htm>

*

News and Tidbits of Information around the Hobby.

Boardman Number Custodian is Tom Howell.
Miller Number Custodian is also Tom Howell. His address is
365 Storm King Road, Port Angeles, WA 98363.

US Orphan Game Custodian Michael Lowrey, m_lowrey@infionline.net is the US Orphan Game Custodian. If your postal Diplomacy or variant game is delayed by a GM who has not provided results in months, contact Michael, and he will try to resolve the problem by checking with the GM, and if necessary placing the game with another GM. If you are not on the web, send me your message and I will forward it to Michael. Diplomacy World, 810 53rd Ave., Oakland, CA. 94601

Fred Davis' backup of the former North American Variant Bank is still in existence. While the original NAVB and the UKVB were merged some years ago under the aegis of Stephen Agar, he still maintains a file of about 200 Dip variants, including all of his own designs, and that a catalog of what he has on file is available. He feels that some people would not want to write to England for copies of variants, so they can obtain them from him. Or, at least, look at his Catalog to see what he has in stock. Copies of this Catalog are available for \$1.00. Send request to Fred Davis, Jr., 3210 Wheaton Way, Apt. K, Ellicott City, MD, 21043-4254.

North American Dipcon society website is now up and ready for use. The website is dipconsocietyna.org. The idea behind this was to provide a location where the DipCon Society meetings could have a written record of what went on at the last meeting for reference for the next meeting, given that they are 12 or more months apart. The last meeting was a mess because nobody wrote anything down and I can't get anyone to agree on what was voted on. Anyway, check the site and let me know what you think.

Bay Area Diplomacy Association (B.A.D.Ass.) Whipping Diplomacy Tournament

BADAss Whipping 2005 Diplomacy Tournament Results

- Top Board**
Champion: Andrew Neuman
2nd place: Darin Leviloff
3rd place Eric Mead
4th place: Sarah Irons
5th place: Tom Hilton
6th place: Tim Rollins
7th place: Edi Birsan

Outstanding play of countries:

Austria: Eric Mead
England: Andrew Neuman
France: Eric Goodman
Germany: Sarah Irons
Italy: Shawn Bennet
Russia: Tim Rollins
Turkey: Darin Leviloff

Other awards:

Outstanding Debut: Joseph Onorati
Outstanding Play: Sarah Irons
Whipped: Tim Butler
Whipper (best stab): Andrew Neuman
Cannon Ball: Cesar Alvarez (dropped SCs as Russia just like one)
Raider: Tim Rollins (surviving 5 years with 1 center)
Master/Slave: Andrew Neuman and Eric Mead (carebear play on the same board)
Devil/Angel: David Leary and Edi Birsan (letting Edi live when he should have died)
Pig: Josh Shank (one-dotter)
Scardy Cat: Steve Ross (afraid to attack anyone until Edi and Adam were dead)

Full Standings and scores:

1. Andrew Neuman 33.1
2. Darin Leviloff 23.4
3. Eric Mead 23.2
4. Sarah Irons 20.7
5. Tom Hilton 19.2
6. Tim Rollins 19.1
7. Edi Birsan 17.1
8. Jack Twilly 16.7
9. Josh Shank 16.4
10. Zack Phillips 16.1
11. Siobhan Granvold 15.4
12. Eric Goodman 15.4
13. Shawn Bennett 15.2
14. Steve Ross 15.1
15. Larry Grein 15.1
16. Ron Braken 14.2
17. David Leary 14.1
18. Joseph Onorati 14.1
19. Cesar Alvarez 12.9
20. Tim Butler 8.2
21. Nat Holzgraf 6
22. Mark Chan 2
23. Lionel Levine 2
24. Adam Silverman (TD) 22.4

Round 1 Board 1

Austria: Edi Birsan 3 3 4 5 7 7 9 9 8
England: Darin Leviloff 4 5 5 7 8 10 9 10 10
France: David Leary 5 5 6 6 6 6 5 5 5
Germany: Eric Goodman 5 4 3 3 3 2 2 2 2

Italy: Nat Holzgraf 5 4 3 2 1 1 1 1 0
Russia: Cesar Alvarez 6 7 5 4 1 0
Turkey: Josh Shank 4 6 8 7 8 8 8 7 9

Round 1 Board 2

Austria: Andrew Neuman 5 7 6 7 8 9 9
England: Eric Mead 5 5 6 7 8 8 9
France: Ron Braken 5 5 6 6 7 7
Germany: Joe Onorati 5 5 5 5 3 2 1
Italy: Tom Hilton 4 4 5 6 6 7 7
Russia: Shawn Bennett 5 5 4 2 1 1 1
Turkey: Tim Rollins 5 3 2 1 1 0

Round 1 Board 3

Austria: Siobhan Granvold 5 6 6 7 8 5 6 6 8
England: Jack Twilley 5 6 5 7 7 7 8 9 9
France: Mark Chan 3 4 5 5 5 4 2 0
Germany: Sarah Irons 5 6 7 7 7 7 8 8
Italy: Larry Grein 3 3 2 1 0
Russia: Tim Butler 5 3 2 0
Turkey: Zack Phillips 4 5 6 7 7 10 9 9 9

Round 2 Board 1

Austria: Tim Butler 5 5 4 3 4 5 3 1
England: Tom Hilton 4 5 6 6 7 9 9 10
France: Adam Silverman 6 6 6 8 9 10 12 12
Germany: Cesar Alvarez 5 4 3 2 2 0
Italy: Lionel Levine 4 5 6 5 2 1 0
Russia: Sarah Irons 4 4 3 3 2 1 1 1
Turkey: Darin Leviloff 5 5 6 7 8 8 9 10

Round 2 Board 2

Austria: David Leary 4 5 6 6 6 6 7
England: 5 6 8 11 11 11 12
France: 5 5 6 6 6 6 5
Germany: 5 4 1 1 1 1 1
Italy: Zack Phillips 4 4 4 4 4 4 1
Russia: Joe Onorati 6 6 5 1 1 1 1
Turkey: Edi Birsan 4 4 4 5 5 5 7

Round 2 Board 3

Austria: Eric Mead 5 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
England: Steve Ross 4 5 5 5 4 3 4 4
France: 5 6 6 5 3 2 0
Germany: Jack Twilly 5 4 4 3 3 3 3 3
Italy: Shawn Bennett 4 4 4 5 6 6 7 8
Russia: Larry Grein 6 7 8 8 10 11 10 7
Turkey: Eric Goodman 4 4 2 2 1 1 1 2

Round 3 Board 1

Austria: Steve Ross 6 7 7 8 8
England: Cesar Alvarez 4 5 7 8 9
France: Larry Grein 4 6 6 6 6

Germany: Edi Birsan 4 3 2 1 1
 Italy: Adam Silverman 3 1 1 1 1
 Russia: Siobhan Granvold 6 6 5 3 2
 Turkey: Tom Hilton 4 5 6 7 7

Round 3 Board 2

Austria: Jack Twilly 4 3 4 4 3 3
 England: Joe Onorati 4 5 6 6 6 7
 France: Eric Goodman 5 5 5 7 7 8
 Germany: David Leary 5 6 6 4 3 3
 Italy: Josh Shank 5 5 4 3 4 2
 Russia: Nat Holzgraf 4 3 1 1 1 0
 Turkey: Andrew Neuman 5 7 9 10 11

Round 3 Board 3

Austria: Zack Phillips 5 4 0
 England: Tim Butler 4 3 3 1 1 0
 France: Sarah Irons 5 6 6 7 7 10
 Germany: Ron Bracken 5 5 5 4 3 3
 Italy: Adam Silverman 4 4 7 7 7 6
 Russia: Tim Rollins 6 8 8 8 9 11
 Turkey: Eric Mead 4 4 5 7 7 4

Reprint Section

Articles taken from previous Diplomacy World issues. I thought I would rerun some articles concerning the Austrian Navy and Germany. The Austrian article is from DW issue 56, Fall 1989, page 36.

THE AUSTRIAN NAVY

Austria's potential as a naval power has always fascinated Diplomacy players and writers about the game. Perhaps the leading expert on this subject is Randolph Smyth, the publisher of FOL SI FIE, who contributed an article entitled, "The Austrian Navy. A Viable Alternative," to DIPLOMACY WORLD #16. The same article appeared in FOL SI FIE #19 and was later reprinted in VOICE OF COOM, #100.

This issue we present an alternative view of the same subject by Bob Olsen, last year's Don Miller Memorial Award recipient, along with some comments on that article by Mark Berch, our own S&T editor.

And to round out our Austrian Navy report we'll have a look at the real historical event that was the Battle of Lepanto, contributed by Mark Berch with some further comments by Larry Peery.

Finally, by way of contrast, we present a reminiscence by James Woodson of his 1983 Grand Prize victory at PEERICON III, a victory by an Austria that ended the game with 18 units, all armies!

THE AUSTRIAN NAVY - ANOTHER ALSDTERNATIVE

by Bob Olsen

Superficially, the whole idea of an Austrian naval strategy seems silly. Austria has only one coastal supply center, Trieste, which is

1. a year away from the nearest important sea space (the Ionian Sea).
- 2, directly adjacent to an Italian home supply center.

The opportunities for building fleets couldn't be much worse, and yet.. a well-managed navy can make all the difference between ultimate success and failure for Austria.

It must be understood that no matter how much emphasis the Austrian wants to put on his navy, this can only be a secondary concern. The first concern must always be security and survival, which means that in order to get anywhere the Austrian must create favorable diplomatic conditions. Russia is a good place to start. A Russian invasion of Galicia is going to screw things up completely and must be prevented. More, a good solid alliance with Russia is a necessity; since otherwise building fleets, which can't defend the homeland against Russia, is suicidal.

To pursue a naval strategy, Austria must make sure above all that Trieste remains in Austrian hands at all times, and is open for a build as often as possible. The obvious, crude and ham-handed way of doing this is to attack Italy, capture Venice, and make sure that nobody ever gets anywhere near Trieste. But this points Austria's forces in the wrong direction, and gains against Italy will be slow in coming. Better is a strong diplomatic effort, including some adroit trans-board troublemaking.

The diplomatic climate Austria wants to create here is something like this: Austria makes a firm neutrality pact---at least---with Russia; she also agrees to ally with Italy against the Turks, while keeping contact with the Sultan. Normally, Italy's fleets would carry the action to Turkey, but what if something unfortunate happened in the west, say, a French presence in the western Mediterranean? Then it would only be reasonable for Austria to regretfully seek the Italian's permission to build a fleet or two, so the Austrians can counter the Turkish menace while Italy is fighting the treacherous, snail-eating Frogs. (Never mind if Austria's the one who got the French stirred up in the first place. Once a second fleet, or even more, is built, then Austria has the option of actually carrying through against the Turks, or just jumping on Italy, either convoying across the Adriatic or forcing the Ionian~ The latter is quicker, but either should result in the elimination of a rival for control of the Mediterranean.

Once that second Austrian fleet is built, interesting things start to happen. Austria's diplomatic position is both helped and hurt. Hurt, because Somebody--maybe more than one somebody---isn't going to like it one bit, and will see the Austrian navy as the menace it is. But, Austria's diplomatic position is also helped, because a two-fleet Austrian navy can tip the balance of power between Italy and Turkey---thus, Austria can take her pick of allies (presumably the one who is yelling less loudly about that fleet build!).

Over the long haul, developing the Austrian navy can only help Austria's chances for victory---always assuming that Russia remains friendly or otherwise occupied (again, Austria can help herself with still more troublemaking in her diplomacy with England or Germany...). Keeping a strong deployment of armies must be Austria's first concern, but every fleet built gives that many more options in regard to Italy and Turkey, and everybody else as well. After all the country with the widest range of options has the best chance for conducting successful diplomacy.. and DIPLOMACY is the name of the game.

And here's Mark's comments

Bob denigrates the idea of Italy as first victim, flatly calling it the "wrong direction," but I disagree. The Austrian naval strategy is perfectly consistent with either Italy or Turkey as a first victim, and which to use will depend on the diplomatic set-up and the personalities involved. If Russia and Turkey are very eager to go to war, or you just don't think you can work with the Italian player; then you can post one or two units in the east, and then go to work on Italy.

Bob somewhat contradicts himself by saying first that "a good solid alliance with Russia is a necessity" but later scaling that back to "Austria wants a firm neutrality pact." The latter is accurate; what Austria really wants is a northern campaign for Russia; which he can encourage by pursuing the naval Strategy.

If Austria wants to win, he must also plan for a third victim, since swallowing Turkey and Italy will give him only 14 centers. If the Mid Atlantic W11 be taken, then Marseilles, Spain, and Portugal will give him 17, and perhaps Brest for 18. Otherwise, armies will have to be built.

Finally, some openings should be mentioned. The standard Fleet Trieste- Albania - Greece can be used, although you may have problems getting that fleet into the water in Spring 1902. If Italy is to be attacked, Fleet Trieste-Adriatic is a fast start. If you're sure Italy will take Tunis, send your armies to take Serbia and or Greeceplus Fleet Albania-Ionian. This will by a lot of flexibility in 1902.

AUSTRIA'S WIN VITHOUT A FLEETING CHANCE

By James Woodson, Ensign

as told to Larry Peery

We've talked about Austria's naval potential and, I suppose, it's a classic case of making a mountain out of a molehill. Still, it is a possibility. The other side of the coin also deserves an examination. So, let's look at a real FTF game won by the then newly commissioned Ensign James WWoodson, USN.

It was a PEERICON, or perhaps a BETHOVENCON—I forget which—a few years ago. James was lucky enough to draw Austria as his country assignment and naturally that evoked gales of laughter among the players in the game.

Winter 1900 was the usual, reams of lies and lies. Spring and Fall 1901 were typical. James built a fleet in Trieste in Winter 1901, along with an army in Vienna as I recall. And then it began.

The game went on and on because games at PEERICONS and BETHOVENCONS always do. There are no time constraints per se. If a game takes 15 game years or 15 hours to complete, so be it. James did well, slowly at first and then with an increasing momentum that became a flood of ketchup on the game board. First he stabbed his friends and then he stabbed his enemies. But, one thing stood out as the game progressed, James wasn't using many fleets.

I knew James was getting serious when he came to me after five or six hours of play and said, "Do you have another Dippy game? I need another set of pieces. Naturally, I was curious but not alarmed. Every competent Dippy host always has at least seven Diplomacy sets on hand. So I found him another set and went about my hosting duties. Hours passed.

Then James tracked me down again and said, "Do you have another Dippy set? We need more pieces." Well, by now I was down to my plastic pieces, a Canadian set that must have been designed by a color blind Interior decorator, and my Gang of Pour set in Chinese. I was also curious. So, I found another set, gave it to James, waited a few diplomatic moments, and casually wandered over to where the game was going on. It was simple. The gameboard looked like a Big Mao that had had a massive thrombosis, or been attacked by a band of Killer Tomatoes. There, scattered all over Austria, Turkey, Russia, and Germany were no less than 16 Austrian units, each and every one an army. There wasn't one Austrian fleet to be seen.

Drawing James aside, I asked him *Sotto voce*, "Where's your fleets?"

"Well, the first one got blown up by one of my no longer existent foes."

"But what about the second one you built in 1902?" I asked.

"Well, when I saw a good thing going, I just kept it going. So I had an ally blow that one to bits," James said. "Besides I needed another army."

"You had 16 armies and no fleets and you needed an army?" I asked incredulously

"It's simple," he said. "It's called economy of scale."

Well, James went on to gain two more black dots, build two more armies, and ended up with 18 centers, 18 units, and 18 armies on the board. Today, years later, I still don't have all the right red armies back in all the right boxes. There's the red wooden one with the bright paint, the red wooden one with the dull paint, the red plastic one that looks like a din dun, and the red flag that

Looks like Madame Mao.

THE REAL LEPANTO

By Mark L. Berch

You've probably heard of the Lepanto Opening, named and popularized by Edi Birsan, which involves a spring 1902 attack on Turkey by Italy. But you may not realize that on October 7, 1511 there really was a Battle of Lepanto. It was, arguably, the most ferocious naval battle in history, in some respects dwarfing World War I's Battle of Jutland.

For about 400 years, enmity between the Christians had foiled their attempts to unite against Islam. But in May 1571, a "Holy League" was formed. King Phillip II of Spain was alarmed by the Turk. Instigating a revolt in southern Spain, and by their attack on Malta. The Pope was Pius V, an austere mystic with a hatred of the Turks. The Republic of Venice was very alarmed by the invasion of Cyprus (Nicosia had fallen in 1510, and Famagusta was besieged), and blamed Turkish agents for blowing up their huge powder magazine in the Arsenal. Holding this unlikely alliance together, and leading it in battle was Don John of Austria, the illegitimate half—brother of King Phillip II. This was no easy task, as Venice had been called "the harlot who slept with the Turk."

The cornerstone of the Christian fleet was 6 enormous Venetian galleasses, which, although cumbersome, had enormous firepower. They also had 205 galleys. Upwards of 84,000 men were assembled with the fleet in late August, in Sicily.

The Turks were led by Sultan Selim II, known then as "the Sot." He was lazy, brutal • fairly ugly, and a drunkard. He had a bodyguard of 100 dwarfs, clad in gold. He apparently needed a major victory to consolidate and legitimize his reign. On his flagship was a green flag, which had the name of Allah repeated 28,900 times in gold calligraphy. With him were Zulu Ali, the bey of Algericas, and also the Governor of Alexandria, Egypt. His entire fleet had 245 galleys, and as many as 88,000 men.

The two armadas met about 30 miles west of the Turkish base of Lepanto, Greece, in the Gulf of Petras in the Adriatic.

The Turks were devastated. Almost half their galleys were captured, and most of the rest were sunk. They lost all but about 10,000 men and two dozen galleys. The Meccan Flag was sent off to Phillip II. Selim II was decapitated, and his head hoisted on a pike. Most of the battle was done in just 4 hours!

Contrast that with Jutland. That involved only 250 vessels and 60,000 men total, for both sides. A grand total of 25 ships were sunk, and I don't believe any were captured. The battle took several days to play out. No one had his head raised on a pike, and in fact, there were promotions all around. Both sides declared themselves the winner.

But the battle, not unlike the opening, proved to have little practical value. The Christians made no attempt to capitalize on this astonishing victory, and indeed, two years later, the Venetians surrendered Cyprus to the Turks. Phillip II signed a truce with the Turks in 1580.

It did give an important boost to Christian morale, as it was a sterling example of what could be accomplished with cooperation. It also ratified the Spanish as (self-appointed) defenders of Christianity, although whether they would actually gain much from such a role is debatable. It was also a major turning point in naval warfare. It was the final great battle of the Age of Oared Warships, and pointed clearly to a new direction. The Galeasses, which used sail far more than the galleys, had a murderous effect on the Turkish oarsmen (it should be pointed out that by then, even the galleys were carrying guns). Even so, the day of the Galeasses was short lived and was only a transitional vessel toward the even more powerful galleon which had relatively little use for oars.

And now? We've got some fine paintings by Titian, Veronese, and Tintoretto, and some lyric writings by Cervantes (who was wounded in the battle). If you visit the Doge's Palace in Venice, you can see blood—red Turkish banners captured in the battle. And once a year, the priests of the Toledo Cathedral say a Mass for this great victory.

So Lepanto exists in history, and in our game. But, not on the maps. Lepanto has since been renamed Navpaktos.

| |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>How about some articles on Germany, the country I love to play and you should too. These are taken from DW #68 published in 1992, starting page 6.</p> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

A Hun Having Fun in the Sun

by Stan Johnson

Germany may easily be the most fun Power to play on the board. It surely can be the most challenging and rewarding to the enterprising Dip player. Being a successful Hun requires not only good tactics and diplomacy, but careful management of your own psyche.

By this, I mean that you must keep your emotions in check. Things may go so well for the Hun initially. However, he is also liable to start a war prematurely, or get big eyes and go for too much too soon, bringing the wrath of a vengeful world down on his head.

In the beginning, in a game with good writers, you seem to be friends with everyone. Perhaps it would be better said that you are hearing from everyone (or most everyone). How close chums (not chumps) you become depends on your ability to be pleasant and charming. You must point out the many benefits of being your ally.

One way of doing this is to promise things you do not have. Belgium is the best to start with. England is always hot for it, to get his second center, while France often covets it as well. Belgium can be the catalyst to get a real catfight going between England and France, which is the key to any successful German adventure. Your opening letters to both Powers should contain the offer of Belgium with a hint of possible support. If, on the other hand, you grab Belgium for yourself and get three builds it often unites England and France against you.

You also decide whether Russia can have Sweden in 1901, which gives you lots of leverage in the east. If you tie this in with the promise of Norway you can often receive a lot in return.

A problem may arise, however, if you wind up as friends with everyone. You have agreed to help France to attack England, England to attack France, and Russia to attack England. There comes a time when you must say yes to one and no to another. If you sit on the fence too long, you may feel like you are stuck on a post when everyone attacks you.

When you do decide which neighbor to attack, remember to be pleasant. Imply you were forced into the attack by circumstances beyond your control (read: you would be willing to move later against the co-conspirators if you can.) You can never know when you might need a friend. This type of fluidity is crucial to German success. You must be in close relations with three nations, and secondary relations with the other three — through alliance, one hopes.

There is no best strategy for Germany. Your relationship with each Power should be based partly on the personalities of the players and partly on your best guess of their ability.

The following are some general tips to guide this process. Although it should be remembered that Germany should not deal with absolutes.

France should be written ASAP. Attempt to get a demilitarized zone for Burgundy. If he's reluctant to agree, offer him Belgium. Also, suggest an alliance against England without saying so directly. You must watch what you say because letter-passers are particularly dangerous to the Hun, who deals with so many potential enemies. Learn to imply rather than to say. Your diplomacy should have its finest hour.

While it's important to have France attacking someone else, it is often even better to have someone else attacking France since you will often want to do the same thing. You can ally with

either England or Italy, but the EG has the benefit of also protectng you from the awesome British navy.

You must get someone on your side, though, since otherwise Germany and France can knock heads for years with no headway, barring major screw-ups.

Unless you like pre-arranged draws, there is no real long-term advantage to the German for an FG alliance. You must constantly wony about a knife in the back no matter what he tells you.

In review, be nice to France first, then get some help or turn his back towards you, then stab him to death, completely. A small France left alive can come back to haunt you with a vengeance later.

Next there is England. You and he can often reach an amicable agreement wherein you build only armies and he builds only fleets. This arrangement can work well, and, if you want to settle for a draw, can go the whole way. If you want a win, you must position yourself so as to be able to get the jump on the isolated English coastal centers and increase your fleet strength at his expense.

A hostile England can cause you even more problems than France. If he attacks France, you ought to join in and finish France ASAP. Then, if you have been living right and playing right, Russia should be causing trouble for Mr. E. This gives your alliance a target and eliminates another potential enemy.

If England hits Russia first, you should hang back (except to grab Sweden). This is because the sight of an exposed German rear drives Frenchmen wild. You'll look pretty foolish in the siege lines around Warsaw or Moscow when the frog leaps into Munich, and is marching on Kiel. Wait until France moves against England or into West Med before you ever head east.

The way to an Englishman's is heart is Belgium. It is the quickest and easiest way to get France and England fighting. Historically, the German invasion of Belgium brought England into the war on France's side. So you shouldn't try to grab it, as that will unite them against you. If you can get Mr. E and Mr. F fighting, you can get Belgium in the end, anyway.

If you and England are allied from the start, the question is whether to land his army in Belgium or Norway. The wise German will push for Norway. This is because it will focus Russian attention on England rather than you and put a lot of water between that army and you. If the army lands in Belgium, you must be prepared to deal with a possible E/F attack. Since England needs your support to Belgium, you should dictate which unit goes in. Of course, if England gets into the Channel, that English army could go to Brest or Picardy instead.

When it comes to the Russian Bear, you have one great advantage, Sweden. You can use this stick to tame the bear and make him dance to your tune. Russia may be looking to Sweden for his only build, if there is trouble in the south. Of course, you should try to make sure there is by passing on information to Austria and Turkey.

As to the price for Sweden, you should begin with DMZing your border areas. Once that is settled, you could make A Moscow - St Pete the key to Sweden. That should raise an eyebrow in London! A German who does not move to Denmark is depriving himself of a great bargaining chip, even if he intends on Russia as a friend. The G/R alliance is very powerful, and usually means the kiss of death for England. The trick is surviving after the fall of England. You need to keep Russia going west towards France, which should put you in position to call the shots. Then you and the winner of the Eastern Division Playoffs may agree to eat some bear meat.

This brings us to the eastern bloc. Many first-time Germans tend to ignore happenings in the east, often to their lasting regret. It is a fatal mistake to ignore the east if you have any intentions of going past the Midgame to the nitty-gritty.

It has always seemed to me that Austria and Germany should be the best of friends. If they used the spirit of Germanic brotherhood to its best advantage, they should be close to unstoppable despite their many enemies. Germany should stress common enemies when talking to Austria, and try to be Austria's Rich Uncle. In other words, use negotiation and moves to keep Russia out of Galicia and Italy out of Tyrolia, as well as put in a good word with the Turk.

However, I have seen few of these alliances bear the fruit of which they are capable. It seems each forgets the other and concentrates on their own affairs. Together Austria and Germany can cooperate and split the world between them. It is also wise to add Turkey to this alliance, at least until Russia and Italy are gone. Then, you can either split Austria between you and the Turk, or leave those two to battle it out while you gather winning dots in the *west*.

About that Turk:

I think you are a jerk if you don't write the Turk. Sure, he's far away, but he is also the only player who can't attack you in 1901. You and he can exchange much useful information about goings-on across the board. Also, it's easier to start a relationship in the beginning rather than when your units meet in the Midgame. In the short-term, you can have him tell England about the French attack he has heard about, or whatever. To the creative Hun, a friendly Turk is a real ace in the hole.

Last but not least, there is Italy. The Italian offers much potential to the Hun who knows how to tap it. It's little known, but Mussolini was the only one to ever get Hitler to back down in pre-WWII Europe. If Duce threatened to mobilize 40,000 troops if Germany annexed Austria. However, by clever diplomatic wooing and Allied lethargy, Hitler was eventually able to win Mussolini to his side, and later took Austria with Italian blessing.

The clear lesson here should be to make Italy your friend at all costs. A war against Italy can bring little profit, but can lead to many problems. You would be left with a wide open position that is easily flanked. Instead, concentrate on fostering Austrian/Italian peace, since it could lead to Italy attacking France and Austria attacking Russia. A wise Hun will attempt to orchestrate the entire scenario of events in the east to a boil under Russia's butt, while Italy heads west.

Even if the A/I you fostered goes against Turkey. Italy can still often spare a unit or two to help you versus the French. You may also plan ahead for future fun by promising both England and Italy Iberia. Of course, you will usually have the jump on Italy in the endgame as well, as you will be in a better position to grab 18 dots quickly.

While these tips focus on one country at a time, in a real game nothing happens in a vacuum. Events in the east must be balanced against those in the west, and vice versa. Due to his central position, Germany has a foot in each bloc, and must often be the fulcrum on which the whole game balances.

In conclusion, to be a successful German you must be a constant sower of discontent and confusion among your enemies. Write as if your life depended upon it, because it often does. In "Free for All", a game recently started in *Maniac's Paradise*, the German was a non-writer. In Spring 1901 he was attacked by England, France, Italy, Austria and Russia. Don't let this happen to you!

Germany: The Slow Approach

by Paul F. Glenn

In *Diplomacy World* 65, Joel Klein's article "A Grain of Slat" advised slow and steady progress for the two central powers, Austria and Germany. I agree with him on this approach. While Joel did go into detail as to how this strategy applies to Austria, he talked little about Germany. In this article, I examine the slow strategy with regard to Germany.

Germany's location is roughly equivalent to Austria's, in that it has three neighbors who can all benefit from its dismemberment. This positional consideration is the major reason why. Germany should not pursue a fast and risky strategy, i.e. one designed to rapidly eliminate one neighbor. In order to achieve such a "blitzkrieg" result, a country must concentrate massive forces against a single opponent. Certain countries, particularly the corner powers, can do this without as much risk due to their relative lack of exposure to attack.

However, for the central powers, it is usually suicidal to pursue such a strategy. They need to keep some forces in reserve for defense. If, for example, Germany attempted to blitz France in Spring 1901, and at the same time Russia invaded from the east, Germany would make an extremely quick exit. Mass concentration of force leaves too much territory exposed to attack.

Even if Germany pursues a fast opening and is not simultaneously invaded from another side, the situation is not necessarily good. Seeing Germany fully committed against France could be a serious temptation for another country to invade. This is particularly true for Russia, but also for England and Italy to some extent. Even one unit against Germany's exposed rear or flank is a huge threat.

Another reason for Germany adopting the slow but steady strategy is Germany's need to keep vigilant against threats from every corner as the game develops. Since Germany is right in the middle of the board, it is exposed to attack from all sides. Austria is unlikely to attack early on, which removes the danger from one front, but eventually a threat will develop from that area, whether it be Italy and/or Turkey over running Austria or Austria herself.

Because of this constant danger, it is a good idea for Germany to work to limit any threat from quiet sectors, by limiting the growth of the other powers through diplomacy and/or intervention. No power can be allowed to grow too powerful, for you can count on them attacking you down the road. Germany should back up the weaker side in conflicts away from the main front. For example, if Germany moves west against France or England (a usual occurrence) it is unwise to ignore the east and south. Intervention, even with just one unit, can be enough to prevent any power from becoming a large and dangerous threat.

In a game I played recently, an Email game through the Diplomacy Adjudicator, I successfully followed this strategy of intervention. In an alliance with England, I attacked France early on. However, I did not commit all of my forces to this struggle — I kept one or two in reserve to intervene in other theaters. When Italy pulled a sneak attack against Austria, threatening to win quickly, I sent a unit south to Tyrolia, and captured Venice in the Fall. This one unit killed any chance Italy had of defeating Austria quickly to become a threat to me. After this, the two sides were dead even, and neither could defeat the other. This "preventive intervention" insured that my southern flank would remain secure. I later took similar action in the east. The game ended in a two-way between England and me. My success was largely due to limiting the growth of my southern and eastern neighbors.

This strategy is, in a sense, a balance of power strategy. However, it differs from the "pure" balance of power strategy in that it is only temporary. Germany only has an interest in keeping her neighbors weak and divided to protect herself while her attention is turned elsewhere. As soon as the active

front becomes secure (i.e. France or England falls) Germany should turn to the quiet fronts and move in. In the game I described above, for instance, as soon as I had finished with France I turned south and east in force. The balance is not an end, but rather is a tool to protect oneself while engaged in other fronts.

All of this takes time — it can't be accomplished as part of a "fast" strategy. Intervention on one or two additional fronts draws units away from the main front, making it all but impossible for a quick victory. There is simply not enough force present. The primary enemy may not fall until 1905 or so. This is not a problem as long as Germany keeps her other neighbors in check.

The slow approach benefits Germany in another indirect way. As Joel Klein pointed out in his article, it is the corner players who gain most from a fast start. By following the strategy I have been discussing, Germany in effect forces other countries to also grow slowly. This gives the central powers an advantage, for they have limited the growth of their worst enemies.

Finally, the slow approach is useful for Germany for negative reason: the fast approach is largely ineffective against Germany's primary opponents, France and England. Both countries have tremendous defensive positions, making very difficult to quickly eliminate either (unless the victim makes some very bad moves). This is particularly true of England, as any attack can only be made with a number of fleets, which France and Germany don't even have combined at the beginning of the game. While it is a little easier to kill France quickly, it is still relatively difficult. Both countries require a protracted siege before they fall. Since the fast approach is unlikely to work against Germany's chief enemies, why try it at all?

Germany is a difficult country to play, and is frequently eliminated early in the game. However, if the German player can control the tempo of the game, and keep it slow, Germany is perhaps the best country to play. It is certainly my favorite, because of the special challenges it presents. When it survives to 1904 *and* beyond, Germany is very powerful, and a hell of a lot of fun to play.

THE INVENTION OF DIPLOMACY*

by Allan B. Calhamer

As the war drew to a close in 1945, I read an article on post-war planning in the magazine *LIFE*. This article reviewed the history of the Congress of Vienna and the subsequent period to 1914, arguing that a world containing several Great Powers all roughly equal in strength would offer the best guarantee of peace. Because whenever one or two of these powers acted aggressively, the others could unite against them, causing them to hack down by overwhelming threat before a war could break out. Regardless of whether such a plan would have worked or could have been brought about in the real world as suggested. The condition of multiple and flexible checks and balances obviously offered itself as a possible basis for a parlor strategic game of some depth and color.

In the course of debating it high school, I then encountered an argument against world government — a hot topic of the late forties — which was that governments now are checked both by internal and external factors, but that a world government would have no external checks upon it, hence it might be more likely to become tyrannical. Another debater and I attempted a game simulating the grand alliance of European history of the Eighteenth Century, but as we used only two players and did not find any way to simulate independent third or fourth parties. The effort ended in failure.

Meanwhile, several of us were playing Hearts, a card game in which several players participate, each independent of the others. We observed that the game was best if all the other players played against the current leader. Thus the current leader would tend to change hands, giving more players a chance to lead and a chance to be the leader at the end of the predetermined number of hands. Competition was further enhanced by ruling that if two players tied for the lead at the end, all players shared equally in the tie. Thus, all players who were hopelessly far behind still had incentive to try and bring about a tie between the leaders, thus increasing the competition instead of detracting from it. I noticed that players who did not understand all of this would tend to play for

second place, or simply to protect their own score, and thus would detract from the competition, while usually also detracting from their own chances of finishing first. It occurred to me that if negotiation were permitted, other players whose chances were diminished by this suboptimal play would have a chance to inform the suboptimal party and make a case for more nearly optimal play. If this effort failed, then they could say that their opportunities were foreclosed, not merely by the aberrant play of another, but also by their own failure to persuade, which would be an integral part of the contest.

From Chess, I borrowed the number of spaces, about 80 as opposed to 64 squares, and the number of pieces. 34 as opposed to 32. My pieces move only as Chess kings, but the king is about an average chessman in mobility, and thus the board is equally saturated with force. Diplomacy is thus much simpler than most war games in its small number of spaces. I think that the game should be as simple as possible, so long as the game is indeterminate and reasonably rich strategic choices.

In 1952 I studied, Nineteenth Century European history at Harvard under Professor Sidney H. Fay of then Harvard Class of 1895 (!), whose book, Origins of the World War, detailed the specific diplomatic developments leading to World War I. These consisted primarily of two- or three-party arrangements, wholly or partly secret in nature, as well as similar contacts and projects which did not mature into arrangements. The arrangements were frequently almost as brief and pointed as those made verbally during Diplomacy games!

At this time I also studied political geography under Professor Derwent Whittlesley. There I became reacquainted with the concept of "geopolitics" devised by Sir Halford MacKinder around 1904, which I had already encountered in an article, again in LIFE. The principle element of geopolitics seems to be the consideration of the effect upon the international power struggle of the particular geometric nature of the division of the surface of the earth, altogether specifically considered, into land and sea.

Thus, Diplomacy emerged as a game in which land power and sea power are almost equally significant, whereas nearly all other war games are primarily either land games or sea games. The decision whether to raise an army or a fleet is one of the most important decisions the player can make, and it is one of the most important indicators of the direction of future activity.

Diplomacy is perhaps the first, or only, war game played on the continental scale, in which entire campaigns are only elements of the whole. In designing the tactics, reference was made to the Napoleonic principle, unite to fight, separate to live. Separation is achieved first of all by requiring that there is only one piece in a space. Concentration is then arrived at by the use of "support" orders from different pieces which bear on the attacked province. Pieces farther from the crucial point are less likely to affect the struggle for it, but some of them may do so by cutting support. The use of supply centers causes further dispersion of forces and emphasizes the economic nature of objectives. It also makes the game primarily one of maneuver rather than annihilation. This aspect of the game is reminiscent of the "indirect approach" of Liddell-Hart, though I had not read him at the time.

Finally, the problem of organizing a seven-person game was not solved until I entered the study of law in 1953. I became aware that players who failed to meet their responsibilities toward the game should be made to suffer light penalties, such as the loss of a single move, so that they are encouraged to comply but are not usually wiped out by minor lapses. The game should be designed so that it can proceed along despite poorly written orders and the like. The notion that a person may tell all the lies he wants, cross up people as he pleases, and so on, which makes some players almost euphoric, and causes others to "shake like a leaf, as one new player put it, came up almost incidental, because it was the most realistic situation in international affairs and also far and away the most workable approach. To require that players adhere to alliances would result in a chivvying kind of negotiation, followed by the incorporation of the whole of contract law, as some erstwhile inventors of variants have found out

The game was completed in 1954 and has undergone relatively little change. The major changes have concerned adjusting the map to make the countries more nearly equal and to give them a wider range of strategic choices. Convoying was made simpler, and minor complications eliminated. These revisions occurred during 1958, when a good group of game players and Operations Research people played many games and offered suggestions for improvements. In 1959 I had 500 sets manufactured by my own capital after major companies rejected the game. Manufacture of the game was transferred to Gaines Research, Inc. in 1960. Sales have increased in every single year since the game has been on the market. Postal Diplomacy was begun in 1963 by Dr. John Boardman. The games are conducted through amateur magazines, of which a few dozen are always in existence. Annual conventions have been held in the United States for some years. Conventions have also been held in Belgium and Italy.