

1974: AS/BA-BB/BH.

RUSSIA = 20.000      GERMANY = 17.450      TURKEY = 11.617      AUSTRIA = 10.450  
FRANCE = 9.783      ENGLAND = 7.367      ITALY = 6.333



THE BROODINGNAG RATING SYSTEM: ((Compiled by M.B.))

Game winners receive 6 points, 2nd place 4 points, 3rd = 2, etc, down to 7th = -6. Cumulative points are expressed as a percentage where +6 per game would be 100% and +/- 0 per game would be 50%. A 'gearing' factor is applied where players have completed less than 6 games, in an attempt to level out ratings based on a small number of games.

The system was invented in the States by person/s unknown to me: the U.S. list is compiled by Jeff Power (430 W. 34th St. Apt 12D, New York, NY 10001) and appears fairly regularly in Diplomacy World (Walt Buchanan, RR3, Box 324, Lebanon, Indiana 46052).

Pos.		%	'S'	'N'	Pos.		%	'S'	'N'
1	Andy Holborn	87.5	+12	2	=34	Bernie Ackerman	59.4	+3	2
2	Gus Ferguson	87.1	+19	4		Geoff Challinger	59.4	+3	2
3	Mick Bullock	86.4	+15	3	=36	Edi Birsan	57.3	+3	3
4	John Balson	84.0	+14	3		David Wheeler	57.3	+3	3
5	Ray Evans	81.3	+16	4	=38	Ron Kelly	55.9	+3	4
= 6	Roger Blewitt	81.2	+10	2		John Morrison	55.9	+3	4
	Tom Corden	81.2	+10	2	40	Dave Black	53.9	+2	4
	Steve Doubleday	81.2	+10	2	41	John Meadon	52.7	+2	6
	Tony Hickie	81.2	+10	2	42	Les Pimley	52.5	+3	10
10	Tony Ball	79.3	+15	4	43	Andrew Waldie	51.4	+2	12
11	Richard Walkerdine	79.1	+18	5	=44	Will Haven	50.0	0	5
12	Jack Westlake	78.1	+9	2		Brian Lavington	50.0	0	2
=13	Norman Nathan	76.7	+11	3		Jim Roberts	50.0	0	2
	Pete Swanson	76.7	+11	3	47	Martin Davis	47.6	-1	3
15	Allan Owens	71.5	+11	4	=48	Adrien Baird	46.9	-1	2
=16	John Coombe	69.4	+8	3		Richard Wein	46.9	-1	2
	Alan Humphrey	69.4	+8	3	=50	Duncan Morris	45.1	-2	3
	Richard Scott	69.4	+8	3		Wink Thompson	45.1	-2	3
=19	Pete Cousins	68.8	+6	2	=52	Tony Cox	43.8	-2	2
	Edwin Godfrey	68.8	+6	2		Maurice Roth	43.8	-2	2
21	John Hendry	67.6	+9	4	=54	Charles Burton	40.3	-6	5
22	John Piggott	66.7	+28	14		Phil Shaw	40.3	-4	3
23	Glyn Palmer	65.6	+8	4	=56	Richard Donaldson	37.5	-4	2
24	Michel Feron	63.7	+7	4		Michael Hardwick	37.5	-4	2
25	Ken Murray	62.5	+4	2	58	Martin Searle	34.4	-5	2
=26	Stewart Buckingham	62.1	+5	3	59	Dave Allen	28.1	-7	2
	Graham Jeffery	62.1	+5	3	60	Andrew Herd	27.4	-14	5
=28	Pete Charlton	61.7	+6	4	61	Chris Hancock	26.4	-12	4
	Geof Nuttall	61.7	+6	4	=62	Glen Cheney	25.0	-8	2
	Peter Robertson	61.7	+6	4		Dave Pink	25.0	-8	2
31	Richard Sharp	61.3	+7	5		Colin Walsh	25.0	-8	2
32	Andy Davidson	60.3	+21	17		Raymond Warwick	25.0	-8	2
33	Chris Harvey	59.7	+4	3	66	Howell Davies	24.2	-16	5
					67	Steve Plater	18.4	-13	3

And once again, applying points to countries gives:-

FRANCE +81 = 58.1%    GERMANY +36 = 53.6%    TURKEY +17 = 51.7%    RUSSIA -5 = 49.5%  
 ITALY -36 = 46.4%    ENGLAND -44 = 45.6%    AUSTRIA -49 = 45.1%

Comparisons with the U.S. list in Diplomacy World are interesting - the number of games rated totals 515 including approx 50 U.K. ones. The countries list is as follows:

FRANCE +327 = 55.3%    ENGLAND +326 = 55.3%    TURKEY +229 = 53.7%    RUSSIA +18 = 50.3%  
 ITALY -101 = 48.3%    GERMANY -200 = 46.8%    AUSTRIA -599 = 40.3%

In other words the country order is identical to the U.K. list except for that very curious transposition of England and Germany.

The top players' list reads:-

Walt Buchanan	97.2	+51	9 (7 wins)
Brenton Ver Ploeg	96.2	+61	11 (8 wins)
Mike Rocamora	94.2	+53	10 (6 wins)
Tom Berendt	93.0	+22	4
Donald Pitsch	90.4	+25	5
Lee Childs	89.1	+20	4
John Beshara	88.2	+55	12
Marie Beyerlein	87.5	+12	2

which is where Andy would come in.



Pos.	Rating	Pos.	Rating	Pos.	Rating
1. Andy Holborn	1054	24. Duncan Morris	742	=45. Glen Cheney	505
2. Ray Evans	990	25. Richard Scott	726	Tony Cox	505
3. Mick Bullock	975	26. Allan Ovens	721	Richard Donaldson	505
4. John Piggott	958	27. Norman Nathan	708	Michael Hardwick	505
5. Andrew Waldie	945	28. Andy Davidson	696	Ken Murray	505
6. Tony Ball	929	29. Will Haven	694	Richard Wein	505
7. Edwin Godfrey	905	30. David Wheeler	671	51. Charles Burton	503
8. Richard Walkerdine	904	31. Alan Humphrey	657	52. Brian Lavington	502
9. Gus Ferguson	893	32. Peter Robertson	626	53. Geoff Challinger	500
10. Jack Westlake	884	33. Stewart Buckingham	593	54. Bernie Ackerman	496
11. Tony Hickie	868	34. Martin Davis	591	55. Dave Black	494
=12. Roger Blewitt	867	35. John Coombe	551	56. Steve Plater	478
Graham Jeffery	867	36. John Hendry	543	57. Pete Charlton	471
14. Tom Corden	865	37. Glyn Palmer	532	58. Wink Thompson	465
15. Pete Swanson	859	38. Maurice Roth	528	59. Dave Allen	462
16. Richard Sharp	838	39. Adrien Baird	524	=60. Howell Davies	460
17. John Balson	816	=40. Pete Cousins	512	Phil Shaw	460
18. Ron Kelly	815	Colin Walsh	512	62. Edi Birsan	456
19. Jim Roberts	812	=42. Dave Pink	509	63. Chris Hancock	453
20. Geof Nuttall	775	Martin Searle	509	64. John Morrison	424
21. Steve Doubleday	772	Raymond Warwick	509	65. Andrew Herd	421
22. Michel Feron	765			66. John Meadon	350
23. Chris Harvey	756			67. Les Pimley	321

The following letter, from Nicky Palmer, arrived sometime last May, and any response resulting from it will be printed in the January issue. Rather like Bellicus isn't it...?

"To start with a personal bias: I agree with John Meadon ((TOP' 3)) that his system is the best in the short term, though in the long term (the very long term!) one will play every country a few times and it will even out. I can see counter-arguments on the lines you suggest though. What I cannot grasp is how that horrific parody of a system aptly called ODD succeeded in getting in. Nothing wrong with a form rating system e.g. one which only counts the results in the last year. But ODD is just a farce - if one of the top half dozen players were to play the bottom half-dozen (5 of whom are quite well-known, so it's not a totally impossible situation), he would lose points even if they never sent in a single order and he won in 1904! Conversely, Les Pimley will gain points against 6 leading players on the list even if he's knocked out in 1901, or never moves at all! This phenomenon should actually appear in practice eventually, when sufficient players have come on the list to give a number at each extreme. Even if this particular nonsense were eliminated (and there are plenty of more limited examples which must actually happen, of a winning result receiving minimal credit), the system is rubbish, as it is so heavily weighted to the latest result that if two results finish in the same zine issue, one 1st and one 7th place, you will have to toss a coin to decide whether the poor bastard goes to the top or the bottom of the list. For heaven's sake scrap it from the Jane averages; a system like Calhamer's fulfils the objective of its designer (gauging win frequency in that case) but the results of ODD are quite at variance with the stated intentions of the designer in TOP' 1.

"As a matter of fact, I think that it should be possible to gauge the success of a rating system in its own terms, with the exception of form rating systems, by looking to see how well they predict future rating positions. After all, the main point is so one can look at the list and say "Omigod I'm playing Tony Ball and Dave Johnson, where do I commit suicide?" - if a rating is no guide to future play there seems little point to it. There is still room for rival systems based on different definitions of success - two 2nd places vis-a-vis a 1st and a 7th, etc - but the system should be able to predict further success of the same kind. Thus Calhamer's system is good if it is true that a player with 3 1sts and 3 7ths is much more likely to win than one with 6 2nds - which in my view is probably true. Meadon's system is good if the player with 6 2nds is likely to come in the first 3 in his next game, which is probably also true, and it does have an edge on the others if some countries are much more difficult to get a high average place than the other ones (again true, though perhaps somewhat less so in top-flight play). A glance at the change in ratings for Piggott, Pimley and Davidson (A) through issues 1-3 (players with sufficient results to give the systems a fair chance) suggests that Brob is very good in this 'internal consistency' test, Calhamer and MWR pretty good, (I assume that MWR hasn't changed the basis of the ratings too much from the old MP system - possibly MWR compared with itself will be even better in the long run), the old NGC system fair, the new NGC system fair, and of course the ODD system abysmal, though if it were a form system as it claimed the test would also not be suitable for it. So I agree with you, with the exception of ODD, that they all have some justification

((Cont))



"...from different viewpoints, but ODD does stick out as the exception - and anyway it even purports to measure form rather than strength, so isn't really appropriate for averaging with the others.

"Note that I have no results yet so it's nothing ODD has done to me personally! I should feel just the same if I topped its list. (Hmm, or would I?)."

MB: Several of Nicky's complaints about ODD are based on a misunderstanding about the actual mechanics of the system. This is possibly my fault for not having gone into more detailed explanation earlier, so now seems an appropriate time.

Ratings are calculated at the end of the game.

Each first-time player is given a notional rating of 600.

ODD is a win-only system so that all losers are classed as having finished equal, each contributing points to the winner depending on their relative ratings. These point contributions are made as follows:

Each loser gives 50 points to the winner. In addition to this, 10% of the difference between their ratings are added to the 50 if the loser was previously higher rated than the winner, or are taken off the 50 if the winner was higher rated than the loser. However, the total number of points transferred from loser to winner can never exceed 100, nor can it ever go below 0, regardless of their relative ratings.

Each player's new rating is then calculated by adding (in the winner's case) or deducting these point transfers to/from the previous ratings. E.g.'s:

Example 1					Example 2				
Country	Player's rating	Constant	10%	New Rating					
A	600	-50	0	550	A	300	-50 +50		300
E	600	-50	0	550	E	400	-50 +50		400
F	600	-50	0	550	F	500	-50 +40		490
G	600	-50	0	550	G	600	-50 +30		580
I	600	-50	0	550	I	700	-50 +20		670
R	600	-50	0	550	R	800	-50 +10		760
T	600 (wins)	+300	0	900	T	900 (wins)	+300 -200		1000
Example 3									
A	300 (wins)	+300	+200	800	A	300	-50 +30		280
E	400	-50	-10	340	E	400	-50 +20		370
F	500	-50	-20	430	F	500	-50 +10		460
G	600	-50	-30	520	G	600 (wins)	+300 .0		900
I	700	-50	-40	610	I	700	-50 -10		640
R	800	-50	-50	700	R	800	-50 -20		730
T	900	-50	-50	800	T	900	-50 -30		820

Those are very simple examples but I hope they give some idea as to the different affects relative ratings have on each other. Thus EG1 is a fairly typical beginner's game: EG2 shows that a strong player doesn't gain as many points from the lower rated players (but never loses points): EG3 is just opposite, showing how a low rated player does much better by winning against the same opposition.

Note: that the actual ratings are really immaterial; it is the differences between players that effect the changes i.e. in EG1 it would make no difference to the points transferred if all the players had 300 ratings or 800 ratings.

The logic behind ODD is that high rated players ought to do better than low rated and so don't benefit much from beating them. And vice versa. But when a low rated player does well against high rated then he consequently scores higher. Note therefore that a 1200 rated player wouldn't profit by joining (and winning) a game against 6 first-timers. But he wouldn't lose anything to them either.

Draws are quite a bit more complicated to work out, in that each loser's rating has to be related to each winner's and averaged, and also each winner's has to be related to each of the other winners. But the basic principles of the system can still be followed.

So in reply to some of Nicky's points: well, I think I've dispelled the complaints about winners losing points and losers gaining them. Nicky goes on to say: "even if this particular nonsense were eliminated (there are plenty more limited examples of a winning result receiving minimal credit) two results finishing in the same zine issue could result in a player being rated top or bottom". On the first point, as I've tried to show, this is a deliberate, and, I feel, excellent feature of the system. That all wins are not treated the same - that wins against strong opposition are better rated than wins against weak opposition - to the extremes that wins against 'dummies' count for nothing. My only doubt in this area is that perhaps experience ought to come into the reckoning somewhere.

Nevertheless the other systems that work on the principle of points transference....



... (NGC) also, to some degree, credit a win against poor opposition less highly than a win against good opposition.

On Nicky's other point about "top or bottom", again, this isn't true. Admittedly the order in which games are rated does have a bearing on the final ratings, but this applies to other similar systems too (certainly NGC, and I should think, to MWR too). A couple more examples might show the true situation.

Assume that one of the losing players in EG1 simultaneously (i.e. in the same issue) won a game. (And that for ease of calculation the second game was also against novices). Then if the lose were rated first (EG1) then his second game (his win) would be:

### Example 5

A	550 (wins)	+300	+30	880
E	600	-50	-5	545
F	600	-50	-5	545
G	600	-50	-5	545
I	600	-50	-5	545
R	600	-50	-5	545
T	600	-50	-5	545

But if the win were rated first then the rating after the lose would be:

### Example 6

A	900 (loses)	-50 -30	820
E	600		
F	600		
G			
I			
R	(rest are immaterial)		
T			

So the effect, though significant, is not as dynamic as you suggest. This problem about which order to rate games in is doubtless an old 'nigger in the woodpile' and presumably can only be got round by clearly stating the system's terms of reference at the outset - probably that in such an event the games are rated in numerical order or alphabetically.

I'm afraid I must do less than **justice** to the remainder of Nicky's letter if I'm to keep this TOP' to normal size. As for predicting game results from ratings, this is a very moot point I feel. Perhaps you'd care to do my Football Pools for me based on the League Tables?

I feel also that I must continue to include ODD in 'Jane's': the idea of the latter is to draw together all lists put forward as rating lists,,and although ODD may be quite a bit different to the others it certainly qualifies for inclusion, to my mind. I'll be willing to continue this topic if anyone wants me to, in the next issue.

[illegible]

THE MWR RATING SYSTEM: ((Compiled by John Meadon. Appears regularly in Mad Policy))

Well, this is the space where MWR was supposed to appear, but it doesn't I'm afraid, thanks to a bog-up in communications between John and myself. The situation is: that Richard Walkerdine/John Meadon, Andrew Waldie and Mick Who have been trying to come up with a system (no, not a rating system) whereby each source (John, Andrew and I) brings out its updated rating lists simultaneously at fixed times throughout the year. If we don't do this and I publish TOP' as and when the other lists appear, then by the time it comes out it can be hopelessly out of date, apart from the fact that John and Andrew may have brought their lists out at different times and based on different TFT's. Sorry it sounds complicated, it really isn't, it's just thicky me who can't explain it clearly.

Anyway, I typed up the rest of this issue of TOP' (including that horrible squeeze on the back page) in advance, hoping to be able to fill this space with MWR and then collate JANE'S from the 6 lists, thus enabling me to push this issue out mid-September with 1901 when the lists are still fresh. Unforch, John doesn't seem to have realised, or I didn't put it across to him properly, that I'd set myself a TOP' deadline for September 1st and so MWR hasn't yet appeared.

I could have sat on the stencils for a few more weeks, but that would have meant that it would have been well into October before this TOP' came out by which time it would have been old hat. So the best thing seems to be to go ahead and publish TOP' without MWR, to apologise to John for my part in any confusion, to apologise to you-all for this shambles, together with a sort of promise to have it all sorted out by Jan., when the next issue is due, to do a JANE'S based on only 5 systems instead of 6, to congratulate this issue's undisputed leader ANDY HOLBORN here, instead of on the back page where I ain't got room, to curse him for keeping me off the top of the list, to go on woffling until line 75 comes up which it does in 9 lines, etc. etc.....



NGC ORIGINAL RATING SYSTEM: ((Compiled by M.B.))

Pos.	Rating	Pos.	Rating	Pos.	Rating
1 Andy Holborn	215	=24 John Hendry	127	46 Wink Thompson	92
2 Mick Bullock	206	Ron Kelly	127	47 Phil Shaw	90
3 Tony Hickie	192	=26 Michel Feron	126	48 Charles Burton	85
4 Gus Ferguson	188	Jim Roberts	126	49 Maurice Roth	84
5 Roger Blewitt	179	28 Alan Humphrey	124	50 Dave Black	83
6 Jack Westlake	177	29 Andy Davidson	123	51 Glyn Palmer	82
7 John Balson	176	30 Pete Cousins	122	52 Michael Hardwick	79
= 8 Tony Ball	174	=31 John Coombe	121	=53 Adrien Baird	76
Ray Evans	174	Andrew Waldie	121	Richard Donaldson	76
10 Norman Nathan	170	33 Pete Charlton	120	Brian Lavington	76
Tom Corden	167	34 Martin Davis	116	56 Tony Cox	74
12 Steve Doubleday	161	35 Stewart Buckingham	115	57 Richard Wein	72
13 Richard Walkerdine	158	36 Duncan Morris	114	=58 Howell Davies	64
14 Graham Jeffery	154	37 Geoff Challinger	110	Chris Hancock	64
15 Pete Swanson	152	38 Bernie Ackerman	108	60 Dave Allen	59
=16 Edwin Godfrey	143	39 Will Haven	104	=61 Martin Searle	58
Richard Sharp	143	40 Ken Murray	103	Raymond Warwick	58
=18 Chris Harvey	142	=41 Edi Birsan	98	=63 Glen Cheney	55
John Piggott	142	John Meadon	98	Dave Pink	55
Richard Scott	142	43 David Wheeler	97	Colin Walsh	55
21 Allan Ovens	140	44 Les Pimley	94	66 Andrew Herd	52
22 Peter Robertson	138	45 John Morrison	93	67 Steve Plater	51
23 Geof Nuttall	135				

NGC REVISED RATING SYSTEM: ((Compiled by Andrew Waldie for ~~Doyle's~~ ~~Top~~ Victor Ludorum))

Pos.	Rating	Pos.	Rating	Pos.	Rating
1 Andy Holborn	182.3	24 Chris Harvey	123.5	46 Wink Thompson	89.3
2 Gus Ferguson	178.5	25 Peter Robertson	121.1	47 John Meadon	89.1
3 Tony Ball	167.7	=26 Pete Charlton	121.0	48 Brian Lavington	88.3
4 Ray Evans	167.6	Tony Hickie	121.0	49 Phil Shaw	86.9
5 Mick Bullock	158.0	28 Andrew Waldie	120.3	50 Richard Wein	86.4
6 John Balson	151.2	29 Jim Roberts	117.6	51 Adrien Baird	86.2
7 Jack Westlake	151.1	30 Stewart Buckingham	113.6	52 Ken Murray	85.4
8 Richard Sharp	148.5	31 Geof Nuttall	111.8	53 Charles Burton	84.0
9 Roger Blewitt	146.0	32 Andy Davidson	111.6	54 Dave Black	83.0
10 Richard Walkerdine	143.9	33 Duncan Morris	111.1	55 Martin Searle	81.8
11 Pete Swanson	143.2	34 Pete Cousins	109.7	56 Dave Allen	81.6
12 Steve Doubleday	139.7	35 Bernie Ackerman	106.4	57 Michael Hardwick	81.1
13 Norman Nathan	135.1	36 Maurice Roth	104.0	58 Richard Donaldson	77.5
14 Graham Jeffery	133.7	37 Glyn Palmer	102.2	59 Raymond Warwick	73.5
15 Michel Feron	132.7	38 Geoff Challinger	101.9	60 Colin Walsh	69.4
16 Richard Scott	131.9	39 Martin Davis	100.9	61 Dave Pink	68.8
17 Tom Corden	131.3	40 David Wheeler	100.2	62 Glen Cheney	68.6
18 Alan Humphrey	130.2	41 John Coombe	98.1	63 Will Haven	68.2
19 Ron Kelly	127.1	42 Tony Cox	97.4	64 Steve Plater	63.6
20 Allan Ovens	126.4	43 Edi Birsan	95.9	65 Andrew Herd	62.4
21 Edwin Godfrey	125.4	44 John Morrison	93.2	66 Howell Davies	61.7
22 John Hendry	125.2	45 Les Pimley	92.1	67 Chris Hancock	59.0
23 John Piggott	124.4				

JANE'S ALL THE WORLD'S RATINGS: ((6 lists averaged, by M.B.))

Pos.				
1 ANDY HOLBORN	18 John Piggott	35 David Wheeler	52 Richard Donaldson	
2 Mick Bullock	19 Richard Scott	36 Martin Davis	53 John Morrison	
3 Gus Ferguson	20 Michel Feron	37 Glyn Palmer	54 Martin Searle	
4 Ray Evans	21 Allan Ovens	38 Will Haven	55 Wink Thompson	
5 Tony Ball	22 Ron Kelly	=39 Bernie Ackerman	56 John Meadon	
6 Jack Westlake	23 Jim Roberts	Pete Charlton	57 Raymond Warwick	
7 Roger Blewitt	24 Chris Harvey	=41 Geoff Challinger	=58 Les Pimley	
8 John Balson	25 Alan Humphrey	Ken Murray	Colin Walsh	
9 Tony Hickie	26 Geof Nuttall	43 Maurice Roth	60 Dave Pink	
10 Tom Corden	27 Andrew Waldie	44 Adrien Baird	61 Phil Shaw	
11 Steve Doubleday	28 Peter Robertson	45 Tony Cox	62 Glen Cheney	
12 Pete Swanson	29 John Hendry	=46 Dave Black	63 Howell Davies	
13 Richard Walkerdine	=30 Stewart Buckingham	Brian Lavington	64 Dave Allen	
14 Edwin Godfrey	Andy Davidson	48 Edi Birsan	65 Chris Hancock	
15 Graham Jeffery	32 John Coombe	49 Richard Wein	66 Steve Plater	
16 Norman Nathan	=33 Pete Cousins	50 Charles Burton	67 Andrew Herd	
17 Richard Sharp	Duncan Morris	51 Michael Hardwick		