



TEL. 0602 - 56925 (office hours)

ISSUE No. 4

RICHARD HUCKNALL, 124, SOUTHCLIFFE ROAD, CARLTON, NOTTM. NG4 1ES.

CONTENTS

Page 1 A sort of editorial
Page 2 " " " " (cont) / FOE 5 gamestart
Page 3 The Diplomacy Article
Page 4 " " " " (cont) / Letters
Page 5 Letters (cont)
Page 6 FOE 1
Page 7 FOE 2 / Waiting lists
Page 8 FOE 3
Page 9 FOE 4 (PEN 1 that was)
Page 10 Deadline / Credits

EDITORIAL

Welcome one and welcome all to the fourth edition of Fall of Eagles. One of the problems in running a non-controversial games zine is that I can't think of anything to put in the editorial, so lets have a quick look around other zines to see what they are finding to write about. Pete Swanson (RATS) is kicking hell out of Leviathan. Mick Bullock (1901) is belittling Seccerd/880ss and dice games in general. John Piggott (Ethil) is also knocking Leviathan. Can't you gentlemen just live and let live?

Ah well, lets see what news we have for you.

Dolchstoss player poll This is a poll to find the player's player in standard Diplomacy games only. You may vote for anyone (including even yourself !!) from 0 (Diabolical) to 30 (~~Richard/880ss~~ superb) but must restrict your votes to players you have played against or GM'd and these players must be playing in a UK or European zine at the moment. PLEASE do not give random marks based on hearsay to players you've never encountered. Votes to Richard Sharp, 27 Elm Close, Amersham, Bucks by April 30th. If you don't already receive Dolchstoss, you can receive issue 53 containing the results of the poll if you send a SAE of 6"x9" with your votes. This is a good opportunity to see what I think is the best zine at the moment.

PIMLEY memorial award This is an NGC award to commemorate Les Pimley who died last year in his early 30's. Les was my first GM in Shelobs Lair and helped me a lot with the hobby. The award is intended for the person who is judged to have done most for British Diplomacy. Candidates are :- Pete Birks, Walter-Luc Haas, Graeme Levin, Glyn Palmer, John Piggott, Richard Sharp, Don Turnbull, Doug Wakefield, Richard Walkerdine. To vote, list candidates in order of preference (omitting as many as you like) and send to Nicky Palmer, Lehvaldsvej 3 8g, DK-2800 Lyngby, Denmark. As soon as possible please.

Cover Design A few nice comments on Dave Perkin's cover design. Thanks to all who mentioned it and I'm sure that Dave Perkins appreciates your interest.

Choicest comment comes from Paul Simpkins in Bruce. "I was toying with the idea of designing a coat of arms for the NGC after seeing FOE's excellent cover design. However I couldn't get round to it so I'm going to throw it open to all and sundry. A coat of arms, designed to represent the NGC and all it's various parts, being not greater than a sheet of A4, although leave some room round the edges for printing it. I'll give a free game of Diplomacy and a subscription to Bruce for the life of that game for a good design. I reserve the right to reproduce the same design in whatever colours I choose on the front cover of Bruce."

OK then lads, that seems to me to be a very good prize. I'll back Dave Perkins to win should he enter.

THE DIPLOMACY ARTICLE

This is the second and final part of the article that was first published in Fifth Column 35. Once again, my thanks to the author for permission to reprint in FOE.

Middle-Game tactics in Diplomacy (Part II)

by Nicky Palmer

(4) Greater love hath no man than this...

A vast amount of attention is given to stabs in Diplomacy, but of course in most games you will normally see alliances last a few turns, and therefore how to keep an alliance going is frequently more important (and more difficult) than how to break it up. One method of proving loyalty which is quite well known in U.S. games but very rare in British games is a declined build. The Austro-Italian alliance offers the strongest incentive; suppose Italy gets three builds after the collapse of France, but has no desire to stab or worry Austria. Does he really need to build in Venice? If it is a fleet then he really is stabbing Austria, and if it is an army and he wants it to the west it may take ages to get it to the front past the Swiss bottleneck. Far better is to skip this build - it won't run away and you can build next year instead, then Nap will be free for a fleet there if that is what you want. Meanwhile Austria is bound to trust you unless he's really paranoid - short of laying down your life for him, refusing a build so he doesn't get worried is the greatest demonstration of loyalty you can make. Similarly France can skip a Bre build to avoid worrying England, Russia a Stp one to disclaim interest in the north, and so on.

A related question is how far you should go to anticipate possible worries; should you write pages about "you might, I can see, think I would go for Bre, but this doesn't make sense because of..... and I will anyway prove my good intentions by.....". It helps to know one's ally here, but there is no doubt that the above style carries very considerable dangers of causing the worries that it seeks to dispel. You may not give a watertight reason why you wouldn't want to do whatever it is, and then it looks like a bluff; even if you do find 100% solid reason, your ally may be left with an uneasy feeling that he may have overlooked a hole in it, or (almost as bad) that you wanted to stab him but have narrowly decided to wait a turn or two! Ignoring possible stabs has its drawbacks too; they let your ally's fears rage unchecked and it is no good asking him to tell you when he's worried; if he thinks you are going to stab him he will certainly not want you to know he's going to make a counter stab..... sometimes he may tell you what is worrying him, but usually not. I lean towards trying to cover his possible fears, without being too morbid about it. Never write to someone saying "I was thinking of stabbing you but I've changed my mind" as this will totally discredit any plausibility your earlier letters will have had - in fact the more he believed them, the more betrayed he will feel (rightly).

(5) The Gambit

Gambiting, or rejecting the chance of a centre to get a better tactical position, is quite common, but it's a tactical weapon that should be used in conjunction with your strategic plans. The nice thing about a gambit is that it will probably succeed. Suppose you are Russia with A(Gal) and A(War) and want to home in on Austria who has A(Vie) and A(Ser). You could have a go at Vie or Bud, but it seems very unlikely that you would get in; Austria will probably do a self stand-off over Bud, leaving your units stymied where they are. How much nicer to sneak round his flank with A(Gal)-Boh and A(War)-Gal! The likelihood of failing to get into Boh is very remote - if Austria suspects you

