

Balance of Power
The 1990 Edition

by Chris Crawford

Mindscape Inc.
3444 Dundee Road
Northbrook, Illinois 60062

Copyright (c) 1988 Chris Crawford

All rights reserved.

Balance of Power: The 1990 Edition and Balance of Power
are Trademarks of Mindscape Inc.

Printed in the United States of America.

[IMAGE]

August, 1988

My Dear Aspiring Geopolitician,

I have always resisted suggestions that I create sequels or second editions to any of my games. But the demand for a new edition of *Balance of Power* has been loud, determined and insistent. At trade shows, in customer feedback cards, and in letters, thousands of people have made it clear that they want a new edition. After two years of such pressure, I have finally caved in. Here it is.

This new edition of *Balance of Power* has a variety of new features. First and foremost is multipolarity. This brings along with it several secondary features, such as the minor country crisis and wars between minor countries. The new advisory function makes it easier to figure your way through crises. I have added more countries and a provision for trade policy. The database has been updated to early 1988. There is additional reference material in the background section. I have rewritten large portions of the code to make it run faster and more accurately, and in the process I uncovered and gleefully squashed two tiny bugs in the original version that nobody had reported.

Finally an editorial comment. I am especially gratified by the effect of *Balance of Power* on the games industry. The common wisdom has always been that games are bought only by adolescents who are interested in fast action, intense graphics, and loud sounds. But the success of *Balance of Power* and games like it is changing the marketplace. Because of you, publishers are now bringing more advanced games to the dealers shelves. For that you have my profound thanks.

Thanks also for the royalties - - it's especially nice to be able to make a living in this crazy business!

Chris Crawford

Table of Contents

Features of This Edition	5
Quick Walkthrough	7
Your First Real Game of Balance of Power	11
Mastering the Beginner Level Game	23
The Intermediate Level Game	29
The Expert Level Game	35
Multipolar Level	43
Reference to Commands	49
Appendices	
How Realistic is the Game?	75
Models Used in the Simulation	79
Acknowledgements	87
Bibliography	89

Features of Balance of Power: The 1990 Edition

This is the second edition of *Balance of Power*. It boasts many improvements over the first edition of the game. This version requires 512K of RAM, and takes advantage of the additional RAM to speed up many processes, improving the responsiveness of the game. It has 80 countries instead of 62; additional data in the Background section; a new "Crisis Advisory" feature to help the player in a crisis; updated information on all the countries of the world; and some refinements in the internal algorithms. The most important improvement, though, is the addition of a new fourth level, called "Multipolar." This is the single most requested feature by owners of the first edition, and now it's in *Balance of Power: The 1990 Edition*. In this level, actions by all countries of the world impact the course of the game, making it richer and more challenging. To keep track of the more complex world of the multipolar level game, there are additional displays showing the state of all aid and troops going into a country and out of a country. The player is allowed to make use of the trade weapon in this level. Minor countries are allowed to fight wars. Finally, there is now a "minor country crisis" that allows the player to discourage minor countries from pursuing unwise policies.

Many customers have complained about copy protection, especially those customers with hard disks. Recognizing the legitimacy of these complaints, we have adopted an alternative form of theft protection that makes it possible for you to make copies or install the program on your hard disk with no constraints.

Note: MacintoshTM screens are pictured throughout this manual. Macintosh is a trademark of Apple Computer, Inc.

Quick Walkthrough

Insert the disk into your computer. The first thing you will see after you double-click the Balance of Power icon is the title screen. Click the NEW GAME button and you will encounter the OPTIONS screen. For now, just click the START GAME button and after a brief wait the game will be ready to play.

Note: Early in the game you will be presented with a dialog box demanding to know if your papers are in order. This is an alternative form of copy protection that users have indicated is preferable to conventional forms of copy protection. You will need to **refer to your manual** to answer the challenge. Note that the program gives you a hint by telling you the first letter of the word you need. That should help eliminate any confusion. Type in the answer and click on the "Proceed" button.

[IMAGE]

You will see a map of the world. The year is 1989. The countries of the world will be shaded to indicate the occurrence of major events within each. Click on the United States of America, note

that it turns black. Pull down the menu labelled "Relations." The first item on this menu is "Diplomatic Relationships." Select this item; the computer will shade each country to show its diplomatic relationship to the United States. Check out the status of relations with Nicaragua, the middle country of the six Central American countries. Note that the shading indicates a cool or hostile relationship with the USA.

[IMAGE]

You'll teach them! Place the cursor on Nicaragua and click the mouse button. That country will turn black and its name will appear at the top of the map. You have selected Nicaragua for further consideration. Pull down the menu labelled "Make Policies."

[IMAGE]

This is the menu from which you make decisions about the world. Select the item labelled "Aid to Insurgents." A window will appear with a variety of policy options, ranging from no aid to a very large amount of aid.

[IMAGE]

Click the greatest possible amount of aid and click the "Enact" button. You have just made a Presidential decision-you are shipping lots of weapons to the Contras.

Let's just say that this is all you will do for now. Note your current score (0) at the bottom of the screen. Go to the "Game" menu and select the "Next Turn" item.

[IMAGE]

The computer will figure the behavior of the world for one year; this may take as long as a minute- The USSR may well take exception to your weapons shipments to the rebels in that war-torn country; if so, it may start a crisis over your action. In a crisis, you always have two options: escalate (reject Soviet objection) or back down. If you escalate, you bring the world closer to war; if either side escalates to DefCon 1, a nuclear war starts and you lose the game. If you back down, your policy is reversed and you lose prestige. (See Superpower Crisis under Reference to Commands, later in the manual.)

When the cursor reverts to its familiar arrow shape, the computer has finished calculating the behavior of the world and you can resume play - It is now 1990. Check your score as reported on the lower edge of the screen- If you have done well, your geopolitical prestige will be higher than that of the USSR. If your relative score is lower, you are losing. The game continues for eight years. If at the end of that period you and your opponent have managed to avoid nuclear confrontation, the side with the highest prestige score wins.

There are many other options in the various menus that will give you more information on the state of the world. Weaken your enemies, support your friends-that's all it takes. Play around for a while and then read the Beginner Level manual before starting your first real game of *Balance of Power. The 1990 Edition.*

Your First Real Game

You have goofed around with the game for a while and now you are ready to really give it a go. Let's begin. Start up a new game; in the OPTIONS screen, leave everything as it is: Beginner Level, Single Player, with you as the American President.

Goal

Your goal in this game is to increase your geopolitical prestige and weaken the geopolitical prestige of the Soviet Union. The concept of geopolitical prestige is not difficult to understand. It's much like popularity. You want to be popular with the other nations of the world. The twist is, you want to be popular with the countries that count the most. In the world of geopolitics, countries that count are the countries that are militarily powerful. Thus, your goal is to accumulate lots of powerful friends, and insure that your enemies are few and weak.

Although prestige is akin to "geopolitical popularity," there is much more at stake here than a simple beauty contest. The nations of the world are sovereign states; they do whatever they choose to do. Your country's ability to influence the course of events is directly related to its prestige. Short of direct conquest or the exercise of naked military power, prestige is the closest a country can get to true international power.

Of course, you must avoid a nuclear war while pursuing prestige. If nuclear war breaks out, you lose, no matter how well you were doing before everything was reduced to ashes.

Overall Approach

How do you get a country to like you? There are two ways: you can do nice things for it in an effort to convince it to like you, or you can wipe the bastards out. The strategy you pursue depends on your relationship with the country. If relations are relatively good, you should try to buy their sympathies; if the government seems unalterably opposed to you, you should with great regret seek to eliminate it.

Every nation of the world is blessed with its very own insurgency. From the African National Congress in South Africa to ZAPU in Zimbabwe, from the Canary Islands Liberation Front to the Sendero Luminoso ("Shining Path"), the wonderful world of insurgency spans the spectrum of political causes. It matters not what the cause is; the primary significance of a local insurgency is that it is an excellent vehicle for pursuing larger and more important superpower goals. By supporting a local insurgency, a superpower can destroy an unfriendly government and replace it with a grateful, friendly, (and presumably malleable) government. This is the primary strategy of the Beginner Level game.

Complicating this are the nuclear arsenals of the two superpowers. The fact that we can annihilate each other means that every action we take requires the tacit approval, or at least the acquiescence, of the USSR. If either side does something that angers the other, a crisis can start that can lead straight into nuclear war.

Offensive Strategy

Your strategy in this game has two faces: offensive and defensive. On the offensive side, you must identify and topple those regimes unfriendly to your country. There are two constraints on your actions. First, some countries are much too strong to be overthrown by insurgents. For example, the government of China is far too strong to be overthrown by insurgency; funding insurgency there is a waste of money. Second, you dare not attempt to topple regimes closely tied to the Soviet Union. For example, Poland may be vulnerable because of the problems between Solidarity and the government. Yet you dare not foment trouble in Poland, for Poland is a member of the Warsaw Pact and a close ally of the Soviet Union. Any attempt to overthrow the government of Poland would undoubtedly generate an enraged response from the USSR.

Identifying Insurgencies

There are three types of insurgents: terrorists, guerrillas, and rebels. A powerful and stable government has none of these. Terrorists are the weakest form of insurgents. If the terrorists are successful and grow in power, they become guerrillas and initiate a guerrilla war. If the guerrillas grow in power, they start a civil war. Then they are called rebels.

These seemingly semantic issues are crucial to the game. A special map ("Insurgency"- the fourth entry on the "Countries" menu) presents the level of insurgency for each country of the world.

[IMAGE]

By consulting this map, you can identify those insurgencies that are in the crucial stage of civil war. These insurgencies are the ones most deserving of your attention. Guerrilla wars deserve some attention, especially if the country in question is important.

Helping Insurgents

Once you have identified a likely candidate for subversion, you have two weapons: Aid to Insurgents and Intervene for Rebels. These can be found on the "Make Policies' menu. You can ship Aid to Insurgents only if there are insurgents to receive that aid: terrorists, guerrillas, or rebels. The amount of aid you can ship depends on the level of insurgency. Terrorists can't use that much money-a few guns, a little dynamite is all they need to be happy. Guerrillas need more elaborate accoutrements- more guns, lots of ammunition, rockets, mines, and so forth. Rebels are the most demanding insurgents and need the most expensive equipment - tanks, artillery, and other weapons that the big boys use.

A second constraint is even more severe. A superpower can only ship weapons to a country through contiguous allies in which it has stationed troops. For example, you must have troops in Honduras, El Salvador, or Costa Rica to ship weapons to the contras in Nicaragua. The amount of weapons that can be shipped is dependent on the number of troops so stationed. After all, why

should a small country risk all the trouble associated with weapons shipments if it doesn't have guarantees of protection? However, a superpower can always leak a small amount of weaponry into any country in the world borders aren't airtight. For the purposes of this game, each island nation is considered to be contiguous with its nearest neighbor.

The most sincere form of assistance is direct intervention. This means that you are sending part of your own army into that country to help the rebels overthrow the government. You are limited in much the same way as with military aid to insurgencies. A superpower must have troops in a contiguous country before it can send troops to intervene for the rebels in a civil war; the number of troops that can intervene is always less than or equal to the number of troops stationed in the contiguous country. However, both sides have the equivalent of 5,000 marines that can be sent anywhere in the globe in violation of the contiguity requirement.

When you do send such troops, you must realize that your American boys will end up fighting anybody else out there. If there are Soviet boys fighting on the side of the government and American boys fighting on the side of the rebels, then you're going to get American boys shipped home with Russian bullets in them, and vice versa. Such a direct confrontation is not conducive to world peace- The world diplomatic climate will disintegrate very quickly if this happens, so be careful about where you send in the Marines.

Once you enter a policy, *it remains in place until is revoked*. Thus, if you send troops somewhere, they will stay there until you recall them or they are ejected by their host. If you send military aid, it will be automatically renewed each year. Thus, if you choose to send \$10 million in aid, an additional \$10 million will be sent *every year until you change the policy*.

Defensive Strategy

The defensive side of your game requires you to protect your friends from insurgency. There are two direct ways to do this: Aid to Government and Intervene for Government. These directly correspond to the options available for insurgencies, except of course that the action is taken in favor of the government. The restrictions on this action are somewhat different. For example, insurgents are

eager to take all the weaponry they can handle. Not so a government- Every government in the world knows that help from superpowers always seems to come with sticky strings attached. Most governments are understandably reluctant to accept an unseemly amount of aid from a superpower. This reluctance is directly related to the degree of enmity between the two nations. Thus, that fun-loving Colonel Khaddafy of Libya would not accept your generous offer of military assistance-he would undoubtedly suspect some fiendish infidel subterfuge. On the other hand, West Germany has already cast its lot with the United States and would have no reservations about accepting scads of military aid from the USA. Nations are even more sensitive about allowing you to send troops onto their soil. This reluctance will express itself in the graying out of the more ambitious policy options in the policy window. You may want to give 100 million dollars to the government, but if the option is grayed out, you can't do it.

[IMAGE]

By the way, there is another restriction on your spending habits: lack of money. You do not have an infinite supply of troops or money to strew all over the world. As you start using up your resources, your options will progressively narrow. If you really want to send some troops to one country, you may be forced to pull some out of another. The total amount of money or troops remaining for your use is displayed at the bottom of the policy making window.

Defensive Crisis

Another defensive strategy that can be used is the crisis that you initiate. It, for example, the Soviet Union sends massive aid to support the Red Army terrorists in West Germany, you had better Put a stop to it fast. You do this by starting a crisis and standing firm, demonstrating a willingness to escalate right up to (but not including!) DefCon 1.

[IMAGE]

The Mechanics of all this are simple enough. At the beginning of each turn, you should consult the "USSR actions" item in the "Events" menu. This will give you a quick summary of all your adversary's actions that demand your attention.

[IMAGE]

If you find any action unacceptable, simply click the "Question" button at the bottom of the window. This sends a polite diplomatic note to the Soviets, notifying them that you question the wisdom of their action. They will reconsider their action and respond, either by backing down or by challenging you. You may either back down or escalate to the next stage.

[IMAGE]

If you proceed to the next stage, then a diplomatic crisis is initiated; one side or the other will lose prestige by backing down. If neither side backs down, the crisis becomes a military crisis, with only two possible outcomes: nuclear war at DefCon 1 or a major diplomatic defeat (with consequent loss of prestige) for one side. A military crisis can start an accidental nuclear war. Don't start a crisis unless you are determined to stop the Soviets. Remember, backing down in a crisis will cost you prestige, and escalating can start a war.

The Soviets are also free to start a crisis over any of your actions that particularly displease them. If this happens, you must reconsider your policy. If you wish to keep the policy in force, you must stand up to the Soviets and escalate, even if this means risking a war. If you back down, you will lose prestige and your policy will be rescinded- Of course, if the Soviets are angry enough about the matter, they will escalate right up to DefCon 1 and start a nuclear war, in which event you both lose. So choose your tights carefully.

To help you with your deliberations, there is a special display "Crisis Advisory" - that pops up once a crisis has begun. It will show you the factors that you should consider in deciding whether to escalate or back down.

Other Menu Options

There are a great many menu items available to you that I have not discussed. These are all "accessories," not central to the play of the game, but very handy for gathering crucial information.

[IMAGE]

The "Countries" menu contains items that allow you to quickly determine trouble spots around the world. You can find where revolutions have taken place with the "Major Events" item and the state of insurgency for every country in the world with the "Insurgency" item. The "Spheres of Influence" chart will give you a brief idea of how the world is divided between the two superpowers. *Don't mess with countries that are within the Soviet sphere of influence. Don't let the Soviets mess with countries that are in your own sphere of influence.*

The "Relations" menu contains items that show the global policies of both superpowers. It is only enabled when one of the two superpowers has been selected by clicking on the superpower. Want to know where the Soviets are sending military aid? How about the status of Soviet interventions? It's all there.

The items in the "Events" menu present an organized view of events around the world. If you want to know what provocative actions the Soviets have taken, just consult the "USSR actions" item. Unprovocative items are presented in "USSR other." Events in minor countries are reported in the "Minor Country News" items.

[IMAGE]

The "Briefing" menu contains three items of interest. The "Closeup" gives a detailed rundown on the selected country. It shows the state of your policy toward the country and your opponent's policy toward the country, as well as some other useful information. Especially useful is the assessment of the strength of the insurgency and how quickly it is gaining or losing strength. The Closeup can also be obtained by double-clicking a country. The "Background" option is not necessary to the playing of the game. It is just that: background information on the countries of the world. It is provided for your curiosity only. You are free to browse around in the background mode at any time without affecting the game; when your curiosity is satisfied, select "Resume Game" to resume the play of the game. The "History" item displays a chart showing the development of the situation within the selected country as a function of time. It is most interesting late in the game, after you have created a little history.

End of Game

The game ends if either side goes to DefCon 1 in a crisis. It can also end in an accidental nuclear war during a military crisis. If you manage to avoid this, then the game will end when you reach the year 1997. Your score is your increase in prestige. If your prestige has increased and that of the Soviet Union has decreased, then you have done very well indeed. If you want to monitor your progress during the course of the game, consult the "Score" item from the "Game" menu.

[IMAGE]

The score you have earned during the current year (due to crises) and the net increase in prestige since the beginning of the game are all presented here. Your score is the last of these values. The course of your scores during the game is also graphed, with American values indicated by white squares and Soviet values by black squares. If the Soviet score is greater than yours, you have lost the game. If your score exceeds the Soviet score by less than

200 points, then it was a close game. On the other hand, if you beat the USSR by 700 points or better, you have done exceedingly well.

Some Hints on Play

Although there is a great deal of information available in this game, most of it is unimportant in the Beginner Level game. You really do not need to consider the state of countries that are quiet. There are really only two crucial questions to ask each turn "Who's having an internal war?" and "What are the Soviets up to?" You answer the first question by checking the "Insurgency" map from the "Countries" menu. A civil war should attract your attention the same way that a circled wagon train attracts both cavalry and Indians. A guerrilla war is less interesting but still laden with opportunity or vulnerability.

You answer the second question by consulting the "USSR Actions" item on the "Events menu." This will list every policy action taken by the Soviet Union over which you may wish to start a crisis.

That's all there is to playing the Beginner Level game. There are, of course, many fine points required to do well in the game. But for now, you should play your first game of *Balance of Power: The 1990 Edition*. Then come back and read the next section, "Mastering the Beginner Level Game."

Mastering the Beginner Level Game

You have played your first real game of *Balance of Power: The 1990 Edition*. You understand the mechanics of the game. Now you'd like to play the game well. This is mostly a matter of understanding what's going on in the game. This manual explains the ideas behind the Beginner Level game and gives hints on playing well.

Doinino Theory

The central superpower strategy of the Beginner Level game is a variation on the old Domino theory of international power politics. A superpower cannot support an insurgency in a country unless it has troops stationed in a neighboring country. Thus, a successful insurgency in one country can be used to further insurgencies in neighboring countries in a step-by-step process- It is therefore vitally important to prevent your opponent from stationing troops in new countries, and to place your own troops adjacent to unfriendly countries. You don't need to put garrisons all over the world; all you need are strategically-placed troops. You must also block Soviet efforts to place troops near vulnerable friendly nations.

Insurgencies don't just happen by accident, and they don't grow randomly. Insurgencies develop according to the conditions inside the country. An insurgency's strength is pitted against the strength of the government. Some governments are very strong and some are weak. Many governments are so strong that no insurgency could ever hope for success. However, steady funding will keep the insurgency alive, even if only at the level of terrorism. This is the situation with West Germany right now. The government there is far too strong to ever be vulnerable to insurgency, yet it is not quite strong enough to eradicate the small band of terrorists who occasionally strike.

The really vulnerable nations are those with governments so weak that even a small insurgency could quickly mushroom into a major civil war. Such states are often small, poor, and have little history of democratic traditions. Your insurgency dollar will go farther in these countries - and so will the Soviets'!

Many beginning players have a problem identifying their friends. How does one know whom to support and whom to weaken? The best answer to this is to consult the "Diplomatic Relations" display. It is good to do this regularly at first until you become familiar with political alignment among countries. You want to support friendly nations and undermine unfriendly nations.

This game is bipolar in structure. The world is divided into left-wing groups and right-wing groups. In most nations, the government is of one wing and the insurgency is of the opposite wing. If the insurgents win, they become the government and the old government becomes the insurgency. In general, left-wing governments lean towards the Soviet Union while right-wing governments lean towards the United States. Thus, if you find a left-wing government that is unfriendly to the USA, you would do well to support the insurgents against it; the right-wing insurgents will almost certainly be friendly if they win the revolution. On the other hand, a right-wing unfriendly government poses some tricky problems; if the rebels win, their left-wing government will be grateful to you for supporting them but they will probably be friendly to the USSR as well. You must carefully judge which course of action would be in your best interest in a situation like this.

Crises

Handling crises properly is crucial to success in this game; most games are won or lost in crises. This is because the prestige at stake in a crisis is normally greater than the prestige gain that will be won by the policy in question. For example, suppose you get into a crisis over weapons shipments to the Mujahedin in Afghanistan. Even if you were completely successful in Afghanistan, replacing the Communist government there with an absolutely faithful ally, the total gain in prestige for you from this would be perhaps 10 or 20 points. On the other hand, the crisis itself could easily generate 100 points of prestige loss. This is because the crisis is played out in front of the whole world, and the entire world reacts to your behavior in the crisis. Thus, **crises are where the game is won or lost.** You must know when to start a crisis and when to let something pass, when to escalate and when to back down.

Remember, a crisis is very much like a poker game. There is no absolute law that determines what the USA or the USSR can or cannot do. The only law is what you can bluff them into accepting. To work, a bluff has to be credible. Your opponent must believe that you really *will* push the button over the issue in contention. In

deciding whether to back down, the Soviets will consider such factors as your treaty commitments to the nation in question, state of diplomatic relations, your demonstrated record of integrity in supporting client states, and the resolve you have shown in previous crises. If you have laid the groundwork, you can stare them down. If you just bluster, you will start a war

Read the Soviet crisis statements diligently. They are worded very carefully; if you learn to read the diplomatic language used in them, you will better be able to tell when they are bluffing and when they are serious. Much diplomacy hinges on delicately phrased communications-be sensitive to their meanings!

Crises have many dangers. Don't ever enter a crisis with a cavalier attitude, expecting to see how far you can push the Soviets and thinking that you can always back down just short of war. if the crisis escalates to a Military Crisis, you could start an accidental nuclear war! Even if this doesn't happen, you face other risks. The higher you drive the crisis, the more prestige you lose when you back down. If you back down on the first or second step of the crisis (the steps marked "Question" and "Challenge"), then no prestige will be lost. Once you move past these low levels, the title of the window changes from "BackChannel Communication" to "Diplomatic Crisis" and the issue has gone public. With the whole world watching, the side that backs down is guaranteed to lose prestige. *Indeed, the loss of prestige associated with backing down can be more important to the outcome of the game than the issue being contested.*

To help you with this decision. the amount of prestige at risk is presented just below the two buttons for escalation and backdown The number presented is the amount of prestige that will be lost by the side that backs down. You can use this as a guide for your behavior in a crisis. For a variety of technical reasons, the number given is not a perfectly accurate predictor of the actual results, but it is a reliable guide.

Crises also tend to make the world less civilized. The more the superpowers rattle their sabers at each other, the more militaristic other nations become. The world operates under a diplomatic mood that greatly affects the behavior of nations; if you make that mood warlike, don't be surprised if the world situation deteriorates. The higher the tension between you and the USSR, the greater the chance of an accidental nuclear war starting during a Military Crisis.

Cause and Effect

It's very easy to become confused about the nature of cause and effect in this game. With all the activity, it's hard to know why things turn out the way they do. There is, of course, a great deal of information available to help you understand the situation. Between the events, the myriad map displays, and the closeups, nobody can complain about a shortage of information. The problem is more one of understanding how all these pieces fit together into a coherent whole

The danger here is the temptation to assume that there are always one-to-one relationships between causes and effects. Some people like to think that every single cause must have a single effect. The real world is far more complex than this, and this edition of *Balance of Power* reflects that complexity. Every action has many effects that ripple through the world, and every event has multiple causes. Everything is tied together. To cope with this, you have to use a skill seldom required in computer games: *judgment*. Consider how the impact of your own actions is affected by the actions of your adversary.

A good way to learn about the processes of the game is to check the "History" charts from time to time that are provided under the "Briefings" menu. These charts show the development of the internal situation for each country during the course of the game. Obviously, they will provide you with little useful information early on—there isn't much history to study early in the game. But late in the game, or after the game ends, you can study these charts to see how things developed.

Options

The Beginner Level game can be played with two variations: "side to play" and "number of players."

The "side to play" option offers you the choice to play as the General Secretary of the Soviet Union. The game is in every way the same, except that you see the world from the point of view of the USSR. You will find the experience quite enlightening.

The "number of players" option allows you to play the game with a friend. When this option is chosen, one player represents the USA and the other represents the USSR. You both use the same mouse to enter your commands. The problem here is that the

computer might get confused as to just who is doing the talking. If, for example, somebody decides, to send troops to intervene in favor of the government of Afghanistan, the computer had better not get mixed up and send the wrong troops!

The solution to this problem is to have the computer always declare who has the mouse- In the lower *left-hand corner* of the screen, the computer will print a message such as "USA holds mouse." This means that the computer is expecting the USA player to be holding the mouse and entering commands. The USSR player has to wait until the USA player relinquishes the mouse by selecting the "Change Sides" option from the "Game" menu. Whenever you change sides, the computer will beep and print the message telling who is holding the mouse. During a crisis, the computer will *automatically* change sides for the players. Players must be careful that they don't enter orders for their opponents.

The tone of the two-player game is very different from that of the single-player game. It's very hard for two friends sitting next to each other to agree to annihilate humanity. In the two-player game, a very important aspect of diplomacy is lacking: the sense of uncertainty arising from poor communications between the superpowers. In the real world, each of the two leaders never knows what the other is thinking; considerable energy is expended second-guessing the opposition. Such is seldom the case with the two-player game. However, the two-player game offers another possibility unavailable in the one-player game: detailed verbal treaty-making. It is very often possible to resolve a crisis through negotiation. ("Look, you get your troops out of Nicaragua and I'll stop funding the contras.")

Intermediate Level

The Beginner Level game is not meant to stand alone as a complete game-it is only a preparation for the next level of the game. When you feel that you have mastered the Beginner Level game, read the manual for the Intermediate Level and play the game at the next level. The world is getting more complex!

The Intermediate Level Game

The Intermediate Level game includes everything in the Beginner Level game and introduces new concepts, greater realism, and a deeper challenge. You should not tackle the Intermediate Level game until you are comfortable with the Beginner Level game.

Overall Approach

The Intermediate Level game introduces a new channel of geopolitical interaction: the subversion and destabilization of foreign governments. In the Beginner Level game one strives to overthrow an unfriendly government with local insurgents. In the Intermediate Level game, one can also replace the government with a more friendly one through the less violent avenue of the *coup d'etat*. This is a more subtle, less direct approach requiring a greater degree of finesse.

To support this greater degree of finesse, the game provides more information on the internal characteristics of each country. Several new menu options make it possible to obtain this information.

The game plays in much the same way as the Beginner Level game. Your goals are to: 1) Topple unfriendly regimes while protecting friendly ones; 2) Use crises to reverse objectionable Soviet actions; and 3) Defend your own policies in Soviet-initiated crises.

The Nature of Coups D'etat

The central new concept of the Intermediate Level game is the coup d'etat. This is a change of government initiated by political factors rather than military ones. Rebels must use military power to win a revolution, but a coup can overthrow a government only if the political climate is ripe for it. The most important element of the political climate is the performance of the economy. If the economy performs well, the political climate is favorable for the existing government. But if the economy performs poorly, discontent rises and *the government is vulnerable to a coup*. Modifying this is the political control exerted by the government. Some states, such as the Soviet Union or East Germany, exercise such thorough control over their citizens that there is little or no chance of a true coup d'etat. A changing of the guard, perhaps, but not a

policy-changing coup. Totalitarian governments with sufficiently strong political control can survive with economic performance that would topple other governments.

Although I use the term "coup d'etat," in this game the process applies to any significant change of executive brought about by political processes. Even elections fall under the broad definition of "coup d'etat" used in this game.

Destabilization

If a government is shaky, you can topple it (hence bringing about a coup d'etat) with the judicious use of "Destabilization." You destabilize a government by sending in the CIA to encourage dissidents, fund the opposition, incite riots, and create other domestic political mayhem. If the government is already weak, this might be enough to push it over the edge. If the government is strong, your efforts will accomplish nothing.

Destabilization costs you nothing ; it takes very little money to make trouble of this nature. It will, of course, anger your opponent, possibly triggering a crisis. It will also antagonize the government against which it is applied. If you are successful, this will not be a concern for long.

Preventing Coups-Economic Aid

You can protect a friendly regime from coups by assisting its economy. This is done with economic aid, a direct transfer of money from your economy to the recipient's. Your GNP will be reduced with the secondary effect of reducing the amount of money available for military expenditures. The recipient's economy will be boosted; this will increase public satisfaction with the regime. Thus, economic aid reduces a *country's vulnerability to coups d'etat*. Of course, the magnitude of the effect is dependent on the wealth of the recipient. If you dump 4 billion dollars on poverty-stricken Mali, that amounts to a near-doubling of its Gross National Product; the effect on the Malians will be electric. Basking in their immense wealth, their discontent with the government will completely vanish. However, a wealthier country like Britain is much harder to buy off. Four billion dollars is but a drop in the bucket for such a country. Thus, it is very difficult to save a wealthy nation with economic assistance.

Effects of Coups D'etat

When a coup d'etat occurs, the government reverses its domestic political philosophy. If the government was left-wing, then the right-wingers take over and the left-wingers head for the hills to take up their new role as the disloyal opposition, the insurgents. An exception to this general rule arises with some Communist countries (especially Eastern Bloc nations) for whom the notion of a right-wing government is simply absurd. In such countries, one left-wing government will be replaced by another left-wing government

The new government will also adjust its diplomatic alignments, especially with respect to the superpowers. When a government shifts to the right, that *often* (but not always) means that relations with the USA will improve. Similarly, when a government shifts to the left, that normally implies a worsening of relations. The exceptions occur when extremist governments take over. They tend to dislike everybody.

The moderate Western nations tend to avoid dramatic policy changes when they undergo a change of government. Britain may kick out Margaret Thatcher and swing toward the left, but the actual policy changes will be very minor; Britain will still be a friend of the USA. Look for dramatic changes in the less stable Third World countries.

When a coup d'etat takes place, the event will show up in the news. *The effect of the coup on the scores of the two superpowers will be presented.*

New Menu Options

Countries Menu

The Countries menu includes a new entry: the "Coup d'etat?" menu item. This menu item makes it easy to identify countries in which coups are likely and so require your attention.

Economic Aid and Destabilization

The "Economic Aid" and "Destabilization" items on the "Relations" menu are now enabled. You can readily see how much economic aid is going out of the USSR or the USA, and what their secret services are up to.

Make Policies Menu

Two new items are enabled on this menu: "Economic Aid" and "Destabilize." These two options allow you to implement the policies described above. The mechanics of these options are identical to the mechanics of the options you already know how to use.

Hints on Play

Your approach in this game will be similar to your approach in the Beginner Level game. You must keep an eye on the Soviets to make sure that they don't pull any fast ones. You must monitor the world for insurgencies. In addition, you must now be on the lookout for governments that are about to fall. When you find such a shaky government, you must decide whether you want to save it or give it a push. *Save friendly governments, push unfriendly ones.*

The Intermediate Level game introduces the concept of *indirect* actions. In the Beginner Level game, every event is the direct result of specific actions. But coup phenomena operate at a more subtle level. There are, of course, the direct elements of economic aid and destabilization. But there are also more indirect ways of influencing events within a country.

Remember that a coup is created by poor economic conditions within a country. A major contributor to poor economic performance is the military spending of the government. High military spending tends to weaken the economy. You can influence a government's military spending policies by making that government feel more or less militarily secure. Thus, *stationing troops in a country and giving it military aid will have the secondary effect of reducing the likelihood of a coup.* Conversely, funding insurgents or intervening in favor of the insurgency will reduce the government's political strength by forcing it to increase military spending to counter the threat.

Events Versus States

it is also useful to clearly understand the difference between *events and states*, and their significance to cause and effect in this game. A state is a condition that remains in force for some period of time, usually permanently- For example, economic aid, military aid, and interventions are all states; once you set them up they remain in force indefinitely.

An event is simply a transition between states. When you increase economic aid to Mexico, that is an event; you are changing the state of economic aid from a low state to a higher state. Events are transitory in nature; an event happens and goes away, leaving behind its effects on states.

The significance of all of this has to do with the nature of cause and effect in this game. Most effects are caused by states, not by events. For example, a coup d'etat in Honduras cannot be directly caused by the USA reducing economic aid to Honduras. A coup is triggered by poor economic performance, which in turn is affected by the state of American economic aid. To say that a reduction in aid caused the coup is indirect and misleading. It is more accurate to say that a low state of aid caused the coup.

Therefore, you should concentrate your attention on the states of your relationships with countries, not on the events. How you changed things last year is nowhere near as important as how things ended up. The state is what really matters, not the event

Be warned that the Intermediate Level game is not as easy to win as the Beginner Level game. In the Intermediate Level, you will find the Soviets to be less accommodating and more adventurous. Moreover, the Beginner Level game is fairly predictable; nations have pretty much the same outlook and policies from game to game. Not so the Intermediate Level game; the diplomatic relationships that begin the game are a bit different every game, so you can't take other countries for granted.

The Expert Level Game

The Expert Level game includes everything in the Intermediate Level game and adds new elements that increase the realism and challenge of the game. You should not attempt the Expert Level game until you are comfortable with the Intermediate Level game.

Overall Approach

The Expert Level game introduces the third vehicle for governmental change: *Finlandization*. The term comes from the postwar experience of Finland. Finland had been an ally of Nazi Germany against the USSR; when the war ended, Finland was not invaded by the Soviets only because they were too busy with bigger fish. Yet, Finland did not get off scot-free, None of the Western powers were willing to stand up for a Nazi ally. Thus, Finland was "diplomatically isolated"; it had no friends and lived in the shadow of a powerful enemy. The Soviets did not need to invade. The Finns saw the writing on the wall and started behaving themselves in a manner calculated to endear themselves to their powerful neighbors- Thus, while Finland is nominally a neutral country, it is effectively under very strong Soviet influence.

Finlandization can occur to any nation that perceives itself to be in a hopeless diplomatic and military position- If a superpower is hostile and possesses the power to crush the victim, and external support is inadequate to protect the victim, then the victim Finlandizes; it adjusts its diplomatic position to make itself less hostile and more friendly to the dangerous superpower. In the process, it partially assumes the diplomatic stance of that superpower. Thus, Finland's relations with the USA are poor not because of any disagreements between Finland and the USA but because the Soviets are unfriendly to the USA.

Finlandization is especially important in Europe, where countries like West Germany are intensely aware of massive Soviet power on the other side of their borders. Soviet military power in Eastern Europe constitutes a direct threat to Western Europe; the Western European nations would be forced to accommodate Soviet desires if it weren't for American protection.

In the Expert Level game, you attempt to encourage or discourage Finlandization among the nations of the world. You have two weapons to help you: Pressure and Treaties.

Pressure

Pressure is an attempt to intimidate a country with words and provocative actions. (you can exert diplomatic Pressure on a country from the "Policies" menu.)

[IMAGE]

A simple diplomatic note expressing "grave concern" can be interpreted as a very weak form of pressure. At the opposite extreme we have the full-scale diplomatic offensive, including an array of actions such as holding naval maneuvers off the coast of the victim, making speeches about the evil ways of the victim, or ostentatiously consulting with declared enemies of the victim. All of these actions serve to make a victim acutely aware of the disparity in strength between the two nations. If the victim feels sufficiently insecure, it will Finlandize to the superpower applying pressure. Obviously, the more pressure is applied, the greater the likelihood that the victim will indeed Finlandize.

It is also possible to indirectly pressure a country, If you project a ruthless image, countries will be more fearful of you and might Finlandize. This is especially likely after a big crisis. If you intimidate the Soviets in a big crisis and force them to back down, other countries may well Finlandize to you out of fear of those big bad Americans.

When a country Finlandizes to a superpower, a news message will be created describing how the leader of the Finlandizing country praises the Superpower that is the object of the policy. Although the word "Finlandize" does not appear, you should have no trouble interpreting the headline.

Treaties

The antidote for pressure is a treaty. If you fear that a client of yours may Finlandize to the Soviet Union, you can bolster that client's will to resist in several ways. You can send military aid to increase its military power, or you can station American troops in that country to help defend it. By increasing its defensive military strength, you shore up its flagging confidence. Another way to achieve the same end is to sign a treaty with the nation.

[IMAGE]

Treaties in this game are simpler than treaties in the real world. Their real value in this game is their symbolic value as a show of support for the country. A treaty implies a degree of commitment on your part for the regime with which you sign. *You are, to a greater or lesser degree, guaranteeing the security of the country with which you sign the treaty* The degree of commitment is related to the type of treaty. A treaty establishing diplomatic rela-

tions between your two countries commits You to very little. In contrast, a nuclear defense treaty is an *absolute commitment* that you will take all measures possible, *including the initiation of a nuclear holocaust*, to protect the signatory.

Caution

Nations with which you have treaty relationships place great stock in the value of the American commitment. A solid treaty commitment is worth many divisions of troops in terms of providing military security. And it costs nothing whatever to sign a treaty! However, there are several catches of which you should be aware. First, *you can never back out of a treaty*. Once you sign a treaty, it stays until the other country decides to cancel it. You, however, are not allowed to cancel treaties. Second, *the commitment you make must be honored*. If a government is destroyed by an internal rebellion or a coup, and you had a treaty relationship with that government, then the credibility of all your treaties all over the world will be diminished in proportion to the degree of commitment you had made. Consider, for example, West Germany. The United States has a nuclear defense treaty with West Germany, the most solemn pledge of support possible. If the government of West Germany were to fall to insurgents or a coup, the credibility of all your other treaties would plummet. It does not matter how hard you tried to defend West Germany-if the government falls, you have failed to meet your treaty obligations. The other nations of the world will take note, The amount of credibility you lose depends on the circumstances. You will always lose a great deal of credibility if the government falls to insurgents. If the government fails for political reasons, the amount of credibility you lose depends on the degree of political maturity within the country. Thus, a change of government in West Germany will not hurt your credibility very much because it corresponds to an election, with very little real change in policy. On the other hand, a coup in Zimbabwe could well mean a completely new government and a large swing in policy The previous president could well lose his head in such a coup your loss of credibility would thus be much larger.

Military Power

Military power is an important concept in this game. Three factors affect military power: military spending, military personnel, and distance. Intrinsic military power is related to both military spending and military personnel. Thus, you need lots of soldiers and lots of weapons to make a powerful army. If you have lots of one

and little of the other, your intrinsic military power will be less, but will still be sizable.

Intrinsic military power is the amount of military power you can bring to bear within your own borders. It is only significant in determining a country's ability to defend itself. An aggressor's ability to project military power against other countries depends on the distance between the aggressor and its intended victim. If the two countries are contiguous, then the aggressor can project its full military power against the victim. If not, the aggressor's military power is diminished by the distance between the two.

in practice, this means that Finlandization is most common with countries close to or bordering a superpower. However, there is one special circumstance that can radically alter this equation. If a superpower places troops in a country, it will be able to project power into neighboring countries as if they were contiguous with the superpower itself. For example, if the Soviet Union places troops into Libya, then the countries bordering on Libya (Tunisia, Algeria, Sudan, and Egypt) will have their security undermined by those Soviet troops and will be that much more vulnerable to Finlandization.

Strategy

This suggests a strategy for the game. If you can establish good relations with a country in a remote area and eventually send troops into that country, then the countries bordering on your client will suddenly be far more susceptible to Finlandization. A foothold gives you a point of leverage from which you can expand your influence dramatically. Of course, the Soviet Union can use the same strategy.

New Menu Items

Several new menu items extend your power to gather information and make policy. The "Countries" menu now includes two items that show you the likelihood that countries will Finlandize to you or to your adversary. This map can be misleading. It is based on information available at the *beginning of* each turn-year and does not take into account events that occur during the course of the Year. Thus, any treaties you sign, troops you place, or pressure you apply, or any such actions taken by your adversary, will not affect these displays. They are useful as general guides but cannot give you the absolute certainty arising from instant feedback.

The remaining new menu items are straightforward. Two new items in the "Make Policy" menu allow you to make treaties and to apply pressure. Other menu items on the "USA" and "USSR" menus allow you to monitor the state of treaties around the world. Finally, the "Closeup" display now includes information on the likelihood of Finlandization to each of the superpowers as well as the rate and direction of change in this likelihood.

[IMAGE]

Hints on Play

To win the Expert Level game, you must take a more careful approach to your policies. In the Beginner Level and Intermediate Level, you can use simple "cowboy" strategies. Get the bad guys and help the good guys-that's about all there is to these levels. In the Expert Level, you must more carefully consider the consequences of your actions. Treaties are a powerful means of securing your friends, but they can cause you to lose the game if they are misused.

Example

Consider the following scenario: The Mujahedin win the civil war in Afghanistan. You rush military aid to their support and foolishly sign a conventional defense treaty to bolster their confidence so that they will not Finlandize to the USSR. The Soviets, smarting under the loss, pour huge quantities of weapons into the country

to assist the ex-government, and intervene with even more troops than before. Not daring a direct confrontation by sending American troops in, you wait and hope. The new Mujahedin government is defeated by the Soviet-backed government. Nations all over the world suddenly realize that a defense treaty with the USA is worthless. Those most threatened by Soviet power immediately Finlandize. Diplomatic momentum moves against you and your prestige plummets. Had you written off Afghanistan without offering a treaty; you would have lost only Afghanistan.

Importance of Indirect Elements

Keep in mind the importance of indirect elements. The direct elements unique to the Expert Level game are treaties and pressure, but the indirect elements can exert a profound influence on the game. Indeed, the most important difference between the lower levels and the Expert Level is that the indirect elements play a much larger role.

- *Psychological effect of military power.* Troops stationed in a country can bolster its sense of security preventing Finlandization. Troops stationed in a country neighboring a hostile nation will greatly increase the sense of insecurity in the hostile nation, and may intimidate it into Finlandizing. Thus, military power can be used in the Expert Level game to produce results without ever a shot being fired.
- *Integrity.* The psychological value of your treaties is directly proportional to the integrity with which you back them. If you allow client states to fall to revolution or coups, your treaties lose their meaning.
- *Your image of ruthlessness.* If you ship troops all over the world, embark on grand military adventures, and above all, if you show no hesitation to escalate crises to dangerous levels, you will foster an image of an aggressive, ruthless wielder of power. Minor countries of the world will fear you because they know you are willing to use your military power. Finlandization will be more common. The problem is, such behavior on your part will probably encourage like behavior from your opponent.

Multipolar Level

The Multipolar level game is the most advanced level of *Balance of Power: The 1990 Edition*. It is also the most difficult. The primary difference between the multipolar level game and the expert level game is that the countries of the world are no longer passive pawns, but instead they pursue active foreign policies. They are limited to acting at the beginner level of the game—they can only ship weapons and troops. Moreover, few of the Third World countries have enough military power to make much impact on other countries. But there are lots of countries out there, and their cumulative impact can be large. They can also fight wars.

Theory

There are two competing views of international relations: the bipolar view and the multipolar view. The bipolar view is the simpler of the two. It holds that the world consists of two superpowers and many minor countries. The rivalry between the superpowers is the dominant issue in world affairs. The attitudes and actions of the minor countries are of secondary importance in the bipolar view of the international scene. Their primary role lies in their position in the superpower rivalry.

The multipolar view holds that the two superpowers are only the most powerful of a large community of nations. The superpower rivalry is important, but there remain local issues that are locally more important than the superpower rivalry. The multipolar view is more complex and more accurate than the bipolar view, but it is correspondingly more difficult to understand. The multipolar level of *Balance of Power: The 1990 Edition* simplifies matters considerably, but remains very challenging.

Trade

There is only one new policy option at this level: trade policy. You may adjust your trade policy toward any country. This policy will have no effect on its economy. It will, however, make a diplomatic statement that will affect relations between your two countries.

New Menu Options

You can now look at the policy actions of any country using the "Relations" menu.

[IMAGE]

Just click on the country in question and select the menu item you desire, You can look at either the Policies "going out" (the Policy decisions of the country towards other countries) or the Policies "going in" (the Policy decisions of other countries toward the selected country). Just select the option you want from the last two items on the menu. If for any reason you end up selecting a nonsensical option (e.g., destabilizing activity going into the USA), the map will be redrawn without shading.

Closeup Totals

The total values for such things as military aid and troop interventions presented in the CLOSEUP display now include the contributions of many countries. Therefore, they will no longer be equal to the sum of the superpower contributions.

Minor Country Crises

You can read the changes in policy of the minor (non-superpower) countries in the "Minor Country News" item from the "Events" menu.

[IMAGE]

If you have *influence* over a minor country, you will be able to challenge any of its decisions that you don't like.

Influence is derived from your relationship with the country; it is achieved through:

- good diplomatic relations
- a strong treaty relationship
- some troops stationed there
- some aid going to the government.

The right to challenge their actions does not guarantee compliance. The minor country may reject your challenge. You can escalate the crisis just like a crisis with a superpower, but the minor country crisis is a purely diplomatic one-there are no military overtones or consequences. You can't blow up the world with a minor country crisis. The higher you escalate, the more pressure you are placing on the minor country, and the more

antagonism you generate from that minor country. You stand to lose no prestige by backing down.

Minor Country Wars

Especially dangerous are the wars that minor countries can fight. Minor countries will go to war when their relations become particularly bad. When this happens, the two countries will fight it out until one of them is badly beaten; then the loser surrenders and the war is over. The loser adjusts its foreign policy stance to make it more compatible with the stance of the winner. There are two menu items that show the state of minor country wars.

Hints on Play

The Multipolar game takes even more assiduous effort on your part than the Expert level game. You must keep track of activity throughout the world and try to keep your all-too-eager allies under control. Remember that aggressive foreign policies can easily drag a minor country into foreign wars. When this happens, you will be forced to support your client state or allow it to be defeated. Since neither option is desirable, the best course you can take is to prevent the wars in the first place.

At this point you may be thinking, "Why do I care about what minor countries do-if there is no possibility of nuclear confrontation, what difference does it make?" The answer: The indirect effects of what those minor countries do CAN lead to superpower confrontation and potential nuclear war. It is up to you to make sure that doesn't happen.

But how do you prevent your client states from going too far? The first and best way is to exercise some self-restraint yourself. If you behave like an international hooligan, don't be surprised to see other countries start to act in the same way. Remember, the superpowers set the tone for much of what goes on in the world arena. The watchphrase here is "leadership by example."

Even so, there will still be cases in which an overeager friendly nation engages in an adventurous foreign policy. It is imperative that you bring matters under rein fast. Weapons shipped today can easily lead to troop movements tomorrow, and that leads directly to war. So use the minor country crisis to head off the small problems before they turn into big problems. It may cost you short-term prestige, but it will also save you grief later.

For example, suppose Israel begins shipping weapons to help the insurgency in Syria. You let it slip, telling yourself that Syria is a terrorist state anyway and probably deserves a little internal terrorism. Next thing you know, Syria and the rest of the Arab world have become even angrier with Israel, and they escalate their efforts against Israel. Pretty soon somebody sends in regular troops to help the Palestinians inside Israel, and then Israel declares war. Fine, you tell yourself; let the Israelis kick the Arabs again. Sure enough, the Israelis stomp the Syrians, Egyptians, and Jordanians just as they always have. This time, though, the Soviets are not about to let their Syrian allies down, so they send in troops to help the Syrians. Israelis shoot Russians, Russians shoot Israelis, and now you're watching as the Soviet Union brings the full power of its military forces against the state of Israel. NOW what are you going to do, smart person? Your only choice, of course, is to square off with the Soviets in a superpower crisis, the kind that blows up the world. Good luck. Maybe you should have shut this thing down before it got out of hand.

Reference to Commands

This document provides a reference to the commands and options available in *Balance of Power: The 1990 Edition*. It should not be read as a substitute for the tutorial manuals for the different levels. It assumes Multipolar Level throughout.

Title Screen

This screen presents you with two options: start a new game or load an old game. If you choose the former, you will proceed to the OPTIONS screen. If you choose the latter, the computer will load whatever game you were last playing, and it will be exactly as it was when you left it.

Options Screen

This screen is only available when you begin the game. It allows you to choose the type of game you will play. You have three choices to make: the level of play, the side to play, and the number of players.

Level of Play

This option allows you to determine the level at which you will play. The Beginner Level is intended for players who are just learning to play and has simplified play. The Intermediate Level is just that—an intermediate step between Beginner Level and Expert Level. It provides more complexity and greater realism. The Expert Level presents an even more complex game; its complexity is too great for inexperienced players. The Multipolar Level is the most advanced level in the game.

Side to Play

This option allows you to play as either the President of the United States or the General Secretary of the Soviet Union. If you choose to play the USSR, the computer will play the USA (unless you have a human opponent).

Number of Players

This option allows you to choose between a one-player game and a twoplayer game. In a one-player game, you play against the computer. In a twoplayer game, you play against another person, taking turns to make your moves.

Anti-Piracy Dialog

[IMAGE]

This is a dialog box that appears early in the game. It asks you to type the xth word from the nth line on page z of this manual. You must look up the answer here. In case you should become confused over the method used to count lines and words, here is the correct way to do it:

- For page numbers, just use the number at the bottom of the page.
 - For line numbers, start with the line of text at the top of the page (including headings) and count downward: the first line is #1, the second line is #2, etc. Short lines at the beginning of a paragraph, such as the above heading "Anti-Piracy Dialog" DO count as lines, while blank lines DO NOT.
- *Title lines in boxes at the top of the page (for example, **Reference to Commands** above) DO NOT count as lines.

- For word numbers, just count from the left side of the page. Any collection of letters or characters that has spaces on either side counts as one word. Thus, "anti-piracy" counts as one word, not two, and "Line #2" counts as two words.

If you type in the wrong answer, no harm will be done. The computer will say some unfriendly things and let you try again. You can keep trying forever. If you have pirated a copy of this game, and don't have this manual, then you will end up trying forever - DESERVEDLY so! But, as a gracious gesture, the author offers you the opportunity to escape from this trap by pressing the "Give Up" button. This will quit the game.

Game Menu

[IMAGE]

This menu handles options related to the administration of the game. It has five items: score, next turn, undo last turn, change sides, and quit game.

Score

This option raises the score window. This window presents the geopolitical prestige of the two superpowers. Two values are presented: the increase in prestige during this turn (arising from crises) and the increase in prestige since the game began. Your score is the last number. A graph of the scores of both superpowers over time is presented. Soviet scores are denoted by black boxes while American scores are denoted by white boxes. When you have finished reading the score window, click the close box in the upper left corner to resume play.

Next Turn

This item notifies the computer that the player has completed his move for the current year. When you choose next turn, the computer begins a long series of computations. It first determines the reactions of the Soviet Union to the actions taken by the USA. The Soviet Union has the option of triggering a crisis over any of these actions. If the Soviets take this option, you will enter the "Crisis" window.

After news is analyzed, the computer then determines the internal developments in each country. These include economic computations, such as the changes in GNP and population; adjustments in spending in response to changes in the world situation; the progress of any local insurgency; possible coups d'etat; and finlandization.

Lastly, the computer figures the move of the computer player. These things done, the computer advances the calendar by one year and returns control to the player. The entire process takes about twenty seconds.

This menu item is grayed out on two-player games until the Change Sides option is used.

Undo Last Turn

This option restores the game to its state just before you last chose the "Next Turn" option. It is useful if you make a major blunder and wish to correct it. You cannot go backwards more than one year. If you use this option, you cannot use it again to return to the future. It does one and only one thing: it restores the state of the game to what it was just before you last chose the "Next Turn" option.

Change Sides

This option allows you to change sides in a two-player game. It informs the computer that the mouse is now controlled by the other player. The computer will interpret mouse actions accordingly. This can be very important. If, for example, the Soviet player wants to give a billion dollars to Nicaragua, he wouldn't want the computer thinking that it's the American player doing so. Two additional features insure that there are no misunderstandings. First, in all two-player games, the computer lists the mouseholding player at the bottom of the screen. The USA player should

be the only one to handle the mouse as long as the screen says, "USA holds mouse." Second, to make absolutely sure that players know what's going on (and to prevent false move entries), the computer will beep whenever the Change Sides option is chosen.

The Next Turn option is grayed out in two-player games until the Change Sides option is used. This prevents a player from "accidentally" going to the next turn before the opponent has an opportunity to enter his own moves.

Quit Game

Use this option to exit the game and return to the desktop. The current state of the game will be automatically saved away and you can resume the game at a later time by selecting the "Load Old Game" option from the title screen.

Countries

This menu allows you to examine factors related to the nonsuperpowers.

Spheres of Influence

This menu item displays the spheres of influence of the two superpowers-in other words, the countries that are regarded as a superpower's private turf. For example, Eastern Europe is in the Soviet sphere of influence, while much of Latin America is in the American sphere of influence. Each side knows not to mess with the countries in the other's sphere of influence. However, many countries of the world do not clearly lie within either superpower's sphere of influence; these are shaded to indicate a "weak" sphere of influence. Be warned that a weak sphere of influence could be almost meaningless.

Spheres of influence change during the course of the game. A crisis is a tug of war over a country. Whoever wins the crisis establishes a stronger claim to that country.

Major Events

This menu item displays any major events that took place in the previous year. A major event is a transition associated with the three avenues of governmental change in the game (insurgency, coups, and finlandization). Thus, the three major events are revolutions, coups, and acts of finlandization. If any of these occurs in a country, it will be shaded accordingly. Since a country can hold only one shade, if several major events occur in one country, the lesser one(s) will not be displayed. A revolution takes priority over a coup, and a coup takes priority over an act of finlandization. Note also that an act of finlandization is recorded without reference to the object of that finlandization.

This display comes up automatically at the beginning of each turn; it is the most important display of the game.

Prestige Value

This menu item displays the prestige value of each country; that is, the value of that country towards your score.

Insurgency

This menu item presents the state of insurgency within each country.

Coup D'Etat

This item presents the likelihood that a government will fall to a change of government or coup d'etat.

Finland-USA?

This item presents the likelihood that a government will Finlandize to the United States. Note that the information used to draw this map is updated only at the beginning of each turn-year, and does not take into account actions taken by you or your adversary in the current year.

Finland-USSR?

This item presents the likelihood that a government will Finlandize to the Soviet Union. The same reservations cited above apply here.

Countries at War

This item shows all countries that are engaged in any wars.

Relations

This menu presents information on the policies and relationships of countries. In the lower three levels of the game it applies only to the two superpowers, but in the multipolar game it can be used with any selected country. It is for this reason that this menu is grayed out in the lower three levels unless a superpower is selected. Each of the possible policy options is presented as an item on the menu. By selecting that item, you can see the total policy activity of that type undertaken by the selected country. For example, to see all Soviet troop interventions for governments, select the item "Interventions for Govt."

The "Diplomatic Relationships" menu item allows you to find out the state of diplomatic relations between the selected country and all other countries. When it is selected, countries are shaded according to their diplomatic relationship with that selected country, with dark shading representing hostility and light shading representing friendship.

The "Going Out" and "Going In" options are available only in the Multipolar level game; they allow you to see how many troops or weapons have been sent out of the country to foreign powers or sent into the country by foreign powers.

Make Policies

[IMAGE]

This is the menu that allows you to implement your decisions; it is the only menu through which you actually win or lose the game. All of the other menus provide you with options for gathering information; this one lets you take action. All of the options work in the same fashion. Once you choose a policy direction, the computer will load a dialog window from the disk and will present it for your consideration. The current state of your policy towards the selected country will be marked. You can change it by clicking the mouse on any other option. At the bottom of the dialog window is a button labelled "Enact." When you are satisfied with the state of your policy, click that button. The window will close and you can proceed with the game.

When you raise a policy window, some of the options might be grayed out and therefore inaccessible. Policy options can be grayed out for three reasons: diplomatic, budgetary, and physical. The first restriction reflects the unwillingness of nations to accept generosity from nations they regard as unfriendly. For example, you are not allowed to give lots of military aid to VietNam. The VietNameese would suspect some devious capitalist plot, and besides, even if they would accept the money, Congress would never stand for your giving aid to them. So you can't do nice things for unfriendly nations.

The second restriction is budgetary. You are not allowed to give away too much of your military budget to other nations. As you give away more and more money, more and more of the options are grayed out, forcing you to give smaller and smaller amounts of money. The total amount of a resource that is still available is presented at the bottom of the window.

The third restriction is physical. A billion dollars worth of weapons is a lot of hardware; moving that or, say, 100,000 troops into a country is a big logistical challenge. If the country is friendly you can always use its port facilities, but when you are shipping the stuff in for the insurgency, the local government will not be so accommodating. Accordingly, you need staging areas in a neighboring country from which you can organize the shipment of the goods across the border. For the purposes of this game, your ability to build such staging areas is measured by the number of troops you have stationed in the neighboring country. The rule used is mathematically simple but cumbersome to express. Think in terms of the step level of a policy, this arising from the fact that all policy options have six steps or levels, ranging from 0 (nothing) to 5 (the highest policy level). The rule for insurgency aid is that the highest step level of insurgency aid you may provide is equal to the highest step level of troops supporting governments in a contiguous country, plus one. Thus, you may always ship the lowest step level of weapons (\$20 million worth) to any country. The limit on sending troops to support insurgents is the highest step level of troops supporting governments in a contiguous country. For example, if you have 20,000 troops in Honduras, then you may send up to \$1 billion to the Contras in Nicaragua, and up to 20,000 troops.

Policy options are presented in annualized figures but they remain in force until repealed. For example, if you choose the foreign aid option "\$1 billion," then you are offering one billion dollars per year to the recipient nation. Another billion dollars will be paid out every year until you repeal the policy or the recipient government rejects it.

Military Aid

This option allows you to provide weapons (but not soldiers) to a friendly government. It will boost the military power of the government, making it better able to withstand internal insurgencies and external military pressure. If the country is in serious military trouble, the aid will be greatly appreciated; if things are pretty

quiet, the country will be less appreciative. This means that you can give aid to a country in trouble, earning a great deal of friendship, and then take it away when the situation improves without angering the recipient. So long as you continue to give aid to that government, relations between your two countries will improve in proportion to the amount of aid and the degree of need.

Aid to Insurgents

This option is only allowed if there is an insurgency going on in a country. For example, the Soviet Union is free from the curse of terrorism. Thus, you cannot ship weapons to the "Russian underground" - there's nobody there to receive them!

Aid to insurgents, dollar for dollar, produces more bang for the buck than aid to the government. That's because insurgents tend to use their weapons more sparingly and more effectively than government soldiers. Moreover, insurgents tend to buy their victories with a greater blood/bullet ratio than government troops use. In other words, your investment of bullets is more than matched by their investment of blood-so your investment is often more meaningful here.

Aid to insurgents is constrained by the physical and budgetary factors discussed above. You need to have a strong local insurgency to give lots of aid, and you will need troops stationed in a contiguous country. You just can't subvert countries by remote control-you've got to have your own troops next door.

This policy is quite provocative. It will certainly infuriate the government against which it is directed. This is not a good way to win friends in the government.

Intervene for Government

This is a much more serious form of assistance. With this option you send your troops to the country in question; there they stand alongside the native government troops. If an insurgency is in progress, they will fight the insurgents. The dangerous aspect of intervention is the prospect of American and Soviet troops squaring off in some remote corner of the world. Such action will not directly precipitate a war, but it will harden attitudes on both sides in such a way as to make a war very difficult to avoid. It also increases the likelihood of a military crisis precipitating an accidental nuclear war. When emotions run high, troops on alert tend

to get jumpy; when their fingers are on nuclear triggers, it's hard to maintain full control of events.

it is possible to use intervention in a peaceful and constructive manner. For example, the American troops currently stationed in West Germany help stabilize an otherwise dangerous situation. Without them, the Soviets might be tempted to invade West Germany. Even more important than the deterrent effect on an aggressor is the sense of security provided the client, Troops stationed inside a country are a palpable demonstration of support that bolsters a country's willingness to stand up to an intimidating enemy. Moreover, the psychological effect of such intervention is greater than the number of troops actually committed. All parties know that, for every soldier actually based in the country, there are several more in the home country who could be deployed in an emergency. Thus, intervention is an excellent way to support beleaguered governments, so long as they are not actually caught up in fighting. Once the shooting starts, the situation becomes very delicate. This policy option can be very provocative to all interested parties.

Intervene for Rebels

This option allows you to send your troops into a country to support the heroic freedom fighters (known to the government as "bloodthirsty terrorists"). This is the modern-day (and often controversial) way to invade a country. In earlier times, such action would have been interpreted as starting a war; in today's world we say that we are only "intervening" in support of the legitimate insurgency. And when those freedom fighters win the civil war, our hope is that they will of course be grateful for our assistance and reward it with friendly relations.

Aside from the logistical restrictions on being able to intervene (you must have troops in a neighboring country), the act of intervention is similar to the act of intervention for the government. It is just as risky and even more infuriating to the other superpower. Use this one with caution.

Economic Aid

This option allows you to provide economic assistance to another nation. The economic assistance is a direct transfer of money from your GNP to the recipient's; it does not directly affect anybody's military potential. However, it does have an effect on both

countries. Your GNP growth is deleteriously affected, while the recipient's GNP growth is boosted. This is a good way to bolster the popular support of a friendly government. Of course, it will also improve diplomatic relations between your two countries in proportion to the degree of need (likelihood of a coup). You should give generously to friendly countries whose governments are in danger of a coup, then remove the aid once the crisis is averted or resolved; their resentment at losing all those free billions of dollars will be less when their economic situation is under control. Moreover, economic aid is generally viewed as a benign action. It is unlikely that your opponent will start a crisis over this option, and it would not be wise for you to start a crisis over such action, except in countries that are firmly in your sphere of influence.

Destabilize

This option allows you to "send in the spooks." If you are playing as the American, you send in the CIA; if you are playing as the Soviet, you send in the KGB. In either case, their orders are the same: to spread unrest and dissension within the country in the hope of triggering a coup d'etat. The greater the intensity of destabilization you opt for, the greater the probability of achieving a successful coup. Destabilization is a one-shot affair; it is not automatically renewed each year as the other policies are. If you wish to engage in long-running destabilization against a country, you must explicitly re-authorize the destabilization each year.

Treaty

The treaty option allows you to certify your level of support for another government. The treaties range from mere diplomatic relations to nuclear mutual defense. The real significance of treaties is that they commit you to supporting the government in greater or lesser degrees. Thus, if you sign a nuclear defense treaty with a foreign government, you are guaranteeing the security of that government against all threats. You should take whatever steps are necessary to protect that government. If, for any reason, that government falls to rebels or a coup, your international credibility, and the value of the treaties you sign, will fall in proportion to the strength of the commitment you made.

Treaties are a very economical way to boost a nation's will to resist aggression. They cost nothing by themselves, and will always generate good will with the recipient. The only danger with a treaty is that you must be prepared to live up to your treaty

commitments. In dealing with the Soviet Union, you must also consider the Soviet treaty commitments. You must handle very carefully those nations with which the Soviets have strong treaty commitments, with great deference to Soviet wishes. Like you, the Soviets cannot afford to have their closest clients destabilized.

Once signed, *you cannot repudiate a treaty*; the other country can repudiate it if it undergoes a coup d'etat or rebels win a civil war. There is one way that you can be forced out of a treaty you have signed. If the opposing player starts a crisis over a treaty, and the signing player backs down, then the treaty is null and void, Otherwise, it is permanent.

Diplomatic Pressure

This option allows you to "lean on" any foreign country. This is always a negative action taken against unfriendly nations. Its purpose is to intimidate that nation, making it feel a greater sense of insecurity, in the hope that it will Finlandize. Moreover, pressure can induce the victim to increase its military spending as a form of self-defense. This in turn forces the government to cut into consumer spending, an act that will increase public dissatisfaction with the regime and could lead to a coup d'etat or change of government. Thus, pressure can sometimes cause a coup d'etat. Unlike most other options, pressure is not an ongoing process, it is a one-time action that automatically terminates after one year.

Trade

This option allows you to restrict trade with another country. This is a diplomatic maneuver that won't have any effect on the country's economy, but has some value for posturing.

Events

[IMAGE]

This menu gives information on events. Events are presented in the form of headlines. They are grouped into folders to make it

easier for you to peruse them. Each folder is represented by one menu item.

Newspaper

[IMAGE]

This option applies only to the selected nation, and is grayed out when no nation is selected. When chosen, it presents a newspaper for the selected country, presenting information on events that concern the country. Every headline tells you something about the country, and sometimes a careful reading will give you valuable details. For example, where are the rebels fighting? In remote villages or in the capital? *If they are fighting in the capital, then surely the rebels are doing very well against the government*

A newspaper can have many pages; you can flip through the pages with the "Next" and "Previous."
If a newspaper headline

concerns a provocative act by the Soviet Union, you may be able to "Question" that act, in which case the "Question" button at the bottom of the newspaper will activate. For more details on this option, see the section on Crises. When you are done reading the newspaper, click the close box in the upper left corner of the window.

USSR Actions

This folder presents all provocative actions taken by the Soviets that you may wish to challenge through a crisis. This is a very good folder to check at the beginning of each turn; it gives you an idea of what those tricky Soviets have been up to.

USSR Other

This folder contains Soviet actions that you probably won't wish to challenge. Most of it is pretty boring stuff, troop pullouts and the like. Although it's not the stuff of Armageddon, it is sometimes useful to know where they are pulling out; you never know when a golden opportunity might present itself.

USA Actions

This folder corresponds to the "USSR Actions" folder, except it holds American actions. This is of interest if you are playing as the Soviet leader, or if you are the American and can't remember what you have already done this turn.

USA Other

This folder corresponds to the "USSR Other" folder except that it holds boring American actions.

Minor Country News

This folder contains news about non-superpowers. In the lower levels, it is news that is internal to the country, such as revolutions, declarations of provisional revolutionary governments, coups, and acts of finlandization. In the Multipolar level, it also contains news about policy decisions made by the minor countries- Some of these policy decisions you may be able to challenge, depending on your influence with the offending country.

Briefing

This menu contains items that give you more detailed information. These items take a little more time to go through, but give you more meat.

Closeup

This item opens up a large window that displays a great deal of information about the selected country. You get a complete summary of your policies towards that country, as well as the policies of your adversary. Those policies that are at their maximum value, for either diplomatic or budgetary reasons, are enclosed in brackets. An arrow next to a policy value indicates whether the value was recently increased or decreased. At the bottom of the window is information on the domestic state of the country. Note that for the state of insurgency, likelihood of a coup, and likelihood of Finlandization, the value is presented as well as the rate of change in the value.

This window can also be obtained by double-clicking on a country.

History

This window presents the history of the selected country- There is a great deal of information presented here, compressed into a small space, so the display can be a little cryptic at first. If you read it carefully, though, you'll find a great deal of information about the country.

This option is not very useful at the beginning of the game when you have little history to show; its real value comes later in the game.

The information is presented in nine charts- Three rules are used in presenting information. First, white or light gray shading indicates the USA, while black or dark gray shading indicates the USSR. Second, solid colors indicate policies that help the government, while gray colors indicate policies that hurt the government. Third, parallel vertical lines indicate a major event: a revolution, coup, or an act of Finlandization.

The first graph in the top left corner presents the course of the insurgency. A high value indicates a civil war; a low value indicates a state of peace. A revolution is marked by two parallel vertical lines. The political stance of the government is indicated

by the color of the squares that mark the level of insurgency: black squares indicate a left-wing government, while white squares indicate a right-wing government.

Below this graph is a bar chart of weapons shipments to both sides. Remember, pro-government policies are presented in solid color, while pro-insurgent policies are shown in shaded bars. Thus, a light gray bar indicates American weapons shipments to insurgents, while a solid black bar indicates Soviet weapons shipments to the government

The lowest graph in the first column presents information on interventions, using the same scheme as was used in the middle graph.

The first graph in the middle column presents the history of government stability. A high value here indicates a stable government, a low value indicates an unstable government. Parallel vertical lines indicate a coup. The graph below it shows the superpower policies related to the stability of the government. Pro-government policies (economic aid) are presented in solid color, while anti-government policies (destabilization) are shown in gray.

The lowest graph in the middle column shows the evolution of the diplomatic relationships between the country in question and the two superpowers. A high value on the graph indicates a friendly relationship, while a low value indicates an unfriendly one.

The top graph in the third column shows the proclivity towards finlandization within the country. Two curves are drawn, one for finlandization towards the USA and the other for finlandization towards the USSR. Two parallel vertical lines denote an act of finlandization.

The second graph in the third column shows the superpower policies that affect Finlandization: treaties and pressure. The same system is used to indicate USA and USSR actions, and pro-government policies (treaties) and anti-government policies (pressure).

The last graph in the third column shows the general insecurity experienced by the country over time. This is an amalgam of its insurgency problems as well as its perception of superpower attitudes. This is the factor that controls military spending.

Background

This menu item opens up a new mode of operation of the game. This mode is not necessary to the play of the game. It presents information that is interesting and useful for someone unfamiliar with the countries of the world. It is, in a word, *background* information. You can play the game without ever consulting the background option. It is included for your curiosity- You may find the information presented to be interesting.

If you select the background option, the game will be suspended; the menubar will be replaced by a new menubar with completely new menu options.

Resume Game

This menu has but a single entry: "Yes, Resume Game," If you select this option, the original menubar will reappear and you can resume play of the game.

Resources Map

This menu allows you to investigate the internal resources of the nations of the world and how they are expended. It allows a variety of options for seeing the data. If you have selected a country and its name appears at the top of the map, then the data presented will all be relative to the country, with countries having a higher value of the quantity being shaded dark gray and countries having a lower value of the quantity being shaded light gray. If you have instead selected no country (by pressing the mouse button while the cursor is over the ocean), then you will obtain a display of absolute ranks of the currently selected quantity. The computer will sort all the countries in the game by their values of the quantity and will shade them according to their rank. The highest quartile countries (that is, those countries in the top 25%) will be shaded dark gray. The countries in the second quartile will be shaded gray- Third quartile countries are shaded light gray, and fourth quartile countries are white. The menu items allow you to examine different quantities.

GNP

This is Gross National Product, the measure of the total value of the goods and services produced by the country. Loosely speaking, GNP is a measure of how wealthy the country is. GNP is divided among three sectors: military, consumer, and investment.

Military Spending

This is the first factor in overall military power, the second being number of soldiers (military personnel).

Consumer Spending

This is the amount of money spent on the material well-being of the population. It is the total amount of money spent on food, clothing, shelter, entertainment, and all the other things that people need, use, and enjoy. The popularity of the government is directly tied to the rate of increase of consumer spending per capita per year. If consumer spending per capita does not increase quickly enough, the popularity of the government will fall; if this continues too long, the government will be vulnerable to a change of executive, be it a revolution, coup d'etat, or elective ouster. Thus, the government cannot afford to cut consumer spending to provide more money for its military- A government under considerable external military pressure will cut into its consumer spending as an act of desperation. Thus, a large enough military threat can result in the fall of a foreign government.

Investment Spending

This is the amount of money expended on capital that will allow the GNP to grow. This money goes for roads, dams, schools, factories, and the like. Investment spending generates GNP growth. If a government attempts to cut investment spending too heavily, internal pressures generated by interest rates will eventually force it to restore the investment money. You will see none of these processes on the screen, only their result in terms of military, consumer, and investment spending.

Population

This is simply the total number of people living in the country.

Military Personnel

This is the number of people directly employed by the country's military forces. Roughly, it is the number of soldiers in the army. Together with military spending, this forms the basis of military power.

Per Capita

This option allows you to see each of the above variables presented on a per capita basis. This can be critically important. For example, India has a fairly high GNP, yet its very high population drives its GNP per capita down. Thus, although India might look very rich on the GNP map, the GNP per capita map reveals the extent of Indian poverty. Similarly, Libya has a very low GNP, but when one examines its GNP per capita, Libya comes out looking very wealthy indeed.

Per capita information is also useful for other purposes. An interesting item to consider is the variable "military personnel per capita" This indicates the proportion of the population serving in the armed forces. On this basis, Israel becomes quite prominent, for a gigantic percentage of Israelis serve in the Israeli armed forces.

Per GNP

This gives you an idea of how much money is allocated for different purposes. For example, "consumer spending per GNP" will show you the percentage of the total GNP that is spent on consumers, while "military spending per GNP" will show you the percentage of the total GNP that is spent on the military. Again, these numbers can be quite interesting and give you a much clearer idea of what is going on in the world.

Per Nothing

Select this item when you wish to see a quantity undivided by anything. It cancels out the "per capita" or "per GNP" option.

Well-Being

This menu allows you to examine a variety of factors related to the quality of life in each country of the world. The factors presented are: Literacy, Energy Consumption, Caloric Intake, Physicians per Million, Infant Mortality, School Enrollment, Televisions per capita, and Telephones per capita. The modifying terms from the previous menu ("per capita" and "per GNP") do not apply to the items on this menu.

Violence

This menu presents a number of factors that indicate the degree of violence that has characterized the political life of the country. These factors can be examined in either their direct form or on a per capita basis. This makes it easier to directly compare the level of violence in populous countries with that of less populous countries.

It is important to note that the data used for this menu are based on events in the time period 1948-1977. This period was wracked by a great deal of violence during its first decade. Thus, the levels of violence presented here may surprise you. For example, the number of political executions in China is somewhat misleading. For technical reasons, I had to present only a small fraction of the true number of such executions. My source ascribes 1,633,319 political executions to China. This makes China look quite bloodthirsty. But 1,631,497 of those executions took place in the period 1948-1952, during the period immediately after the civil war between the Chinese communists and the nationalists. One can understand that a civil war would trigger a great many executions. Similarly, the nearly 2 million deaths from political violence ascribed to Nigeria may surprise those who do not remember the Biafran civil war of 1968-70.

On the other hand, some modern events do not show up in the data used for these maps. The revolution that toppled the Shah of Iran does not show up on these maps, making Iran look like a bastion of peace and stability. The genocide in Kampuchea, unknown to the world in 1977, is also not evident in this data.

Political

This menu presents information on the political and civil rights obtained in each country. The scores are mean values of indexes coded annually by Raymond D. Gastil, published by Freedom House, and presented in *World Handbook of Political and Social Indicators* (Taylor and Jodice).

GNP %-ages

This menu provides information on the way that resources are used inside an economy. The values shown are all percentages of the Gross National Product. These items tell you how much of the GNP goes to or comes from different areas of the economy. The only confusing item here is the one labelled "Taxes"; it really

concerns the total amount of GNP that is consumed by the government. The "Trade" item shows the amount of international trade as a percentage of GNP.

Superpower Crisis

This is not a menu option, but it can be generated either by your actions or by Soviet reactions to your policies. A crisis is generated whenever one superpower objects to a policy action by the other. You can generate a crisis by pressing the "Question" *button* in the "USSR Actions" folder or the newspaper. The Soviets can generate a crisis during their turn by questioning one of your actions. Thus, every crisis has an initiator (the side that started the crisis) and a respondent.

The following sequence of events takes place when you are the initiator: You observe a Soviet action that you do not like; let's say the Soviets are sending weapons to support the Communist Tudeh insurgency in Iran, an act you find unacceptable. You press the "Question" button. This communicates to the USSR your displeasure over the action.

The Soviets now have two options: they can stick to their guns, or they can back down. In choosing between the options, they will consider the importance of the policy to their own plans, as well as their assessment of its importance to you. The case of Iran is useful: the Soviets know that the destabilization of the Iranian government is not crucial to their security, yet they also know that American relations with Iran are poor and the Americans will probably not go out on a limb for the Iranian government. Let us say that they decide they can win this crisis; they therefore refuse to back down, and respond by protesting. A message from the Soviet Union conveying this response will appear in the lower half of the window.

To help you with your decision, a special "Crisis Advisory" comes up next to the Crisis window. This box shows some additional information that might be useful in deciding what to do next.

Now the ball is back in your court. You now have the same options the Soviets had. You can continue to press your case, or you can back down. If you back down at this early stage, the matter is resolved quietly and neither side suffers any loss. If you do not wish to back down, you must raise the stakes. The word "Question" has been replaced by "Challenge-" If you press this

button, you are taking the crisis public and raising it another notch, indicating your resolve. Now that the crisis has gone public, the whole world will be watching. Whichever side backs down will lose considerable prestige. The amount of prestige at stake is displayed at the very bottom of the window. The number presented represents the amount of prestige that you will lose if you decide to back down at this point. Your opponent will lose a similar amount of prestige if he backs down. Note that, as the crisis escalates, these numbers rise. It is unwise to push a crisis too far without good reason, for the loss you suffer can become considerable. Indeed, the amount of prestige you can lose in a crisis can well be greater than the amount you would lose if the country became an outright Soviet ally.

Let's say that you choose to escalate; you press the "Challenge" button. The window title changes to "Diplomatic Crisis" to reflect the new state of affairs. Now the ball is back in the Soviets' court. If they refuse to back down, then it comes back to you, with considerably more at stake. If you back down, the crisis is over, and you have lost considerable face. The world will make note of the fact that the Americans talk big, but fold up when you call their bluff. Countries that had been rooting for you will be disgusted and angry at your lack of backbone; countries that had opposed you will hold you in contempt. The Soviet Union will be especially encouraged by your backing down, and will take increasingly more aggressive policies, knowing that you don't have the backbone to stand up to them.

Let's say you choose to escalate, they again must choose between escalation and retreat. This time, though, the diplomatic options have been exhausted. The only escalatory option available to the USSR is to raise its forces to DefCon 4. "DefCon" is a notation for the state of readiness of a superpower's military forces. It uses the following table:

DefCon 5: Peace, minimum readiness

DefCon 4: Low level of readiness

DefCon 3: Alert; forces ready for combat on short notice

DefCon 2: Maximum alert, all forces ready at a moment's notice

DefCon 1: War

The Soviet Union, if it chooses to escalate to DefCon 4, will do so as a means of demonstrating its determination to prevail in this dispute. Going to DefCon 4 sends the message, "We are preparing to fight you over this issue, if need be."

Going to DefCon 4 also changes the nature of the crisis dramatically. Earlier it was merely a diplomatic crisis, and only prestige was at stake. Now it has become a military crisis (and is noted as such), and the risk of accidental nuclear war exists. The better your relations with the Soviets, the lower the chance of accidental nuclear war. The worse those relations, the greater the chance of accidental Armageddon.

With the ball back in your court, you must again face the ugly choice between a retreat that could damage your diplomatic position and an escalation that could lead to war. If you wish to escalate, you must move to DefCon 3.

The Soviets may be intimidated by your demonstration of resolve. If so, they will back down. If not, they will go to DefCon 2, a state just short of war. The bombers are in the air, the fingers are poised over fatal buttons. You have the same two options: back down or escalate. Only this time, to escalate is to start World War III. If this happens, you lose the game. You have painted yourself into a corner and must back down, suffering the consequent loss of prestige.

If the Soviets initiate the crisis, then your last choice in this escalatory sequence will be to go to DefCon 2. If you take this option, the fate of the world is in Soviet hands. They may launch or they may back down.

Note that the amount of prestige lost by the loser of a crisis is proportional to the level of the crisis. If you back down at DefCon 2, you will pay a much higher price than if you back down at "Challenge." It is therefore unwise to push a crisis further than absolutely necessary.

Minor Country Crisis

This crisis can only arise in the Multipolar level game, and then only by your choice to do so. It operates much like the regular superpower crisis, except that it cannot end in a nuclear war, and you do not lose prestige by backing down. It is a way of pressuring a minor country into abandoning a policy that you don't like- It does cost you diplomatic affinity with the victim; the higher you escalate the crisis, the greater the chance of pressuring the victim, and the greater the loss of diplomatic affinity.

End of Game

The game ends when a nuclear war starts. Only superpower crises can start nuclear war. You always lose if a nuclear war starts; no points are awarded for any progress you had made. A nuclear war is always a total loss for both sides.

The game can also end when you reach the year 1997. In this event, a final score window is presented; you win if your score exceeds your opponent's score. You can still consult the history charts and other information utilities before quitting the game.

How Realistic is the Game

Balance of Power: The 1990 Edition provides an instructive simulation of global power politics. Players may want to know just how realistic this game is. The answer is tricky to explain.

Most people think of realism as a desirable trait that is approximated to a greater or lesser degree by any game or simulation. They judge a simulation the same way one might judge the quality of a photograph-on its fidelity, crispness, and accuracy. The truth is much more complex than that. Any game deliberately simplifies reality to emphasize some aspect of the world. In this sense, a game is more like a painting than a photograph. The painter does not slavishly copy the image his eyes behold-he emphasizes those things that are important about what he sees while eliminating unimportant aspects of the image. So too does the game designer eliminate some things from a game and emphasize others- This game is no exception. In designing it, I deliberately threw out many important elements of international relations to focus the player's attention on those elements that I thought most important. Thus, trade was stripped out completely, even though it plays a significant role in modern geopolitics. On the other hand, the nature of insurgencies was given great attention by the game, because I think that insurgencies are one of the vehicles of competition between the superpowers. Does the lack of trade make the game less realistic? Does the detailed handling of insurgency make the game more realistic?

These things said, there are still some issues related to the broad subject of realism that need clarification. For example, you might wonder about the accuracy of some of the numbers used in the game. This game does use a great many numbers that are objectively verifiable; are these numbers reliable? I can assure players that most of the numbers used in this game were researched wherever possible. For example, GNP data is quite easy to obtain, and military spending figures are commonly available, although there are many disagreements among the various sources.

One of my most useful resources was the *World Handbook of Political and Social Indicators, Third Edition*, by Taylor and Jodice (Yale University Press, 1983). This magnificent document presents a mountain of data on all the nations of the world: everything from "Public Health Expenditure as a Percentage of Gross National Product" to "Television Sets Per Thousand Population." Many of the numbers used in the background section of this program were calculated from data found in this reference.

Some important information I was not able to find and so was forced to create. Yes, I readily admit fabricating information that was not available. A text author can simply leave out information that is not available, but a game designer is not so fortunate. A game is an engine with moving parts; if one of the parts cannot be taken off the shelf, it must be fabricated by hand or the game simply won't work. So I invented the data in several key areas. For example, I made up the data for political philosophy, the degree to which a government leans to the right wing or to the left wing. Other factors that were fabricated were the resistance of a government to insurgency, the strength of democratic traditions within the country, and a variety of minor factors.

Another factor to remember is the fact that only 80 of the more than 170 nations of the world are represented in the game. One might think that eliminating half of all the countries of the world would make the game hopelessly simplistic, but indeed most of those rejected countries are truly insignificant. How many people have even heard of the Seychelles, Lesotho, Andorra, or Sierra Leone? Of course, there were a number of sizable countries that were lost in the shuffle, countries whose loss might seem surprising: El Salvador, Cambodia, Lebanon, and Bangladesh. These countries were rejected for a variety of reasons. In many cases, a country was simply so small that I could not make it visible on the map. In a few cases, I felt that the country could easily be represented by other countries. In eliminating nations, I tried to retain the central conflicts that drive international relationships.

The most important realism issue, though, is probably the one that will generate the fewest questions, and that concerns the dynamics of the simulation. How does a nation's GNP change from year to year? I have a formula for that; is it a realistic formula? What about the equations that govern the progress of an insurgency, or the fall of a government, or the determination of foreign policy? Even more important, what about the equations

that determine how the Soviets will behave in a crisis? Understanding Soviet behavior is vitally important to the very survival of this country, and many brilliant scholars devote much energy to understanding their behavior, and I have reduced it all to a few simple equations. How do we know that any of the equations are any good at all?

The answer to all of these questions is, we don't know. There is no way to reconcile the soft pastels and subtle shifting shades of reality with the simple hard numbers of a computer program. A painting does not capture reality in its entirety, and neither does a program. The significant question is, does this game capture the feel of reality? Does it seem right to you? Ultimately, the value of the game is measured against your own understanding of international relations. So long as you must ask somebody else whether the game is realistic, then the game has something to teach you. It is my hope that this game will challenge you, make you think about the dynamics of the world, encourage you to learn more about this deadly competition at which we superpowers play. If you rise to this challenge, then the day will come when you can judge for yourself the realism of this game. Later still, the day will come when you can clearly see the many, many flaws in this game. When that day comes, this game will have achieved the goal I set for it.

Models Used in the Simulation

This game uses a large and intricate set of models to determine the behavior of the actors. As complex as all the cosmetic elements may seem, the invisible internals are even more complex. They take up more code and consume more memory than the visible portions of the program. They present me with a serious documentation problem. The player has a real need to know what is going on inside the program, for this is the only way that s/he can come to understand the game and play well. Yet, if I simply publish source code for the program, much of the fantasy of the game is ruined for the player. The moviegoer doesn't want to know that the horrible monster is really just a clay model cleverly photographed; the game-player doesn't want to know that he is playing against a mere set of equations.

My approach to solving this problem is to sketch the outlines of the models used. I won't give away dirty details, but I will try to explain it well enough that you can understand what factors are included and what factors are not included. I will follow no particular order here but will instead tackle subjects in random order.

Military Power

Military power springs from two factors: military spending and military personnel. Some armies are money-heavy and soldier-poor; the American army is the most extreme example of this, but all the Western armies tend to follow this pattern. Poor nations tend to have armies that are money-poor and manpower-heavy. Military power is based on both of these the more money and more manpower the government throws at its army, the more powerful it will be.

The amount of manpower available to a government is based on the population and the "draft fraction," the percentage of the population that the government has typically drafted in times past.

Military power is augmented by the contributions of superpowers. Military aid is added directly to the military budget of the country; this is most effective with poor countries. Superpower troops that intervene in favor of the government are not integrated into

the host army; they bring a proportional amount of the superpower's military power with them. This additional military power is directly added to the country's military power.

Casualties from fighting the insurgency serve to reduce the military power of the government. Over a period of time, these casualties can produce a steady degradation of the government's military power. This effect can be observed in the History charts of Insurgency,

Insurgency

The local insurgency also has its own military power. It is derived from an entirely different source. The source of manpower is based on three factors: the total population of the country, the cultural proclivity of the *people towards* violent solutions to political problems, and the past record of success of the insurgency. In other words, some countries, such as West Germany or Canada, are not inclined towards insurgency. Other countries, mostly those without a long tradition of stable governmental institutions, are more likely to have a large portion of their populations run off to join the guerrillas. The other factor is the record of success of the insurgency. As they start to win, everybody wants to get in on the bandwagon. Thus, it is crucial that an insurgency be nipped in the bud. Once it gets momentum, it takes greater amounts of power to stop.

The manpower of an insurgency is normally much greater than the amount of weaponry it can assemble. Typically, insurgencies fight with military power that is very manpower-heavy and weapon-poor. This is why small amounts of aid to an insurgency can have a large effect on the success of the insurgency. Again, a direct intervention results in the intervening superpower's military power being directly injected into the insurgency.

Each year, the insurgency and the government shoot each other up. Each side suffers losses. If the insurgency ever comes out of the battle more powerful than the government, it is declared the winner of the revolution. Otherwise, it bides its time and waits.

Economics Processing

Each country has a Gross National Product (GNP). This GNP is divided among three areas: military spending, investment spending, and consumer spending. Military spending goes for weapons. Investment spending goes for roads, schools, factories, and other

things that will make the economy grow. The amount of investment spending determines the rate of growth of the GNP Consumer spending goes for food, clothing, housing, and all the things that consumers like.

The government of each country allocates its GNP among these three areas according to a nifty little algorithm that cleanly takes into account the pressures on that country. Military pressure in the form of a powerful insurgency or a threatening superpower is translated into pressure to increase the military portion of the budget. However, consumers expect the consumer portion of the GNP to increase by about 2% per year; if the government fails to meet this objective, its popularity falls. If the government's popularity falls below zero, it's time for a coup d'etat. Thus, the government's popularity acts as a pressure to increase consumer spending. Then there is always some pressure to maintain at least a small amount of investment spending to allow the GNP to grow. These three pressures are translated into a division of the GNP between the competing needs, and the spending figures are decided.

Crisis Artificial Intelligence

How does the computer decide whether to escalate or to back down? This is a vitally important question, the answer to which may surprise you. Some playtesters have been quite confused by the computer's behavior. In some cases, they simply could not believe that the computer would take a crisis so far over such a trivial issue. Herds the logic:

The central idea to understand is the concept of import. In this game, import is the degree to which a superpower becomes upset over a particular action. Import is in turn based on two factors: hurt and care. Hurt is a measure of just how much a particular action hurts (or helps) its object. Thus, if you destabilize a country, that constitutes a hurt. The amount of hurt for any given action is calculated by the program and used to calculate import. The second factor involved, though, is care. Care is the extent to which the superpower cares about the country in question. If he doesn't care very much, then the import is small even if the hurt is large. Care is based on four factors: the superpower's diplomatic affinity for the object country, their treaty relationship, the degree to which the object country is within the superpower's sphere of influence, and whether the policy at stake involves the use of intervening troops (this is a particularly sensitive issue).

Import is thus calculated for both superpowers. The computer player then compares its import with the import calculated for the human player. If its own import is much higher, then it will stand firm and refuse to back down. If its own import is much lower, then it will back down. Finally, if the two imports are close to each other, it will "flip a weighted coin" to determine the outcome.

This system produces some behaviors that may surprise you. For example, suppose that you as the American player gave economic aid to Nigeria. The Soviets take objection to this and start a crisis. You escalate, they escalate, and a nuclear war starts. The question on your lips is, why would those idiots annihilate the world over economic aid to Nigeria? The answer is, because you were willing to annihilate the world over Nigeria. Remember, it takes two to make a crisis. The computer figured that this just wasn't an important issue for you, and that, while trivial, it was still a more important issue for itself. It therefore stuck to its guns.

The surprising element here is anticipation. The computer attempts to anticipate your priorities. It assesses a variety of factors such as your diplomatic affinity toward Nigeria, your treaty relationships with Nigeria, your demonstrated record of integrity in defending your treaty clients, and your sphere of influence. It concluded from past history that economic aid to Nigeria was simply not very important to you.

This raises a very important point about geopolitics. You could protest loudly "But I do care about Nigeria! The computer can't assume what I'm really thinking!" You are absolutely right. Realworld diplomats don't know what is truly going on in the minds of their interlocutors. They know perfectly well that today's words are only an expression of today's exigencies. The only thing they can rely on are the substantial events of the past. If you have built up a record of close relations with Nigeria, your behavior in a crisis will have to be taken seriously. If your record is of weak relations, then your crisis behavior has to be a bluff. The computer treats it that way. If you want to convince people that you're serious, you've got to lay the groundwork.

This point caused more problems in the first edition of *Balance of Power* than any other. I have heard many objections from players, and read many objections from reviewers, faulting the game for this action. People just can't seem to accept this behavior in the game. They fail to understand the alternative. Suppose that I put in some sort of "reasonableness" algorithm for the computer

player, an algorithm that allowed the computer to say, "This is too trivial an item over which to blow up the world-I'll let it pass." Then it would be a trivial matter to win the game by engaging in unreasonable behavior. You simply go all over the world picking trivial fights with the computer, knowing full well that, reasonable creature that it is, it will surely back down. Each time, you pick up a few points. Do you really think that this would be a better game if it taught the lesson that irresponsible, unreasonable behavior on America's part is the way to geopolitical success?

Finlandization

The decision to Finlandize is based on a simple calculation that attempts to answer the question, "Does either superpower have the strength to overwhelm me, and would he use it?" Thus, if Canada has good relations with the USA, then Canada would never Finlandize, because the USA would never attack a friend. On the other hand, if relations soured, then Canada might come to fear an American attack, and would forestall such a possibility by Finlandizing first.

Another side to this question of whether a superpower would attack is the superpower's "adventurousness." This is the degree to which a superpower demonstrates a willingness to engage in dangerous or provocative behavior to further its own interests. Every time you ship troops around the world, give weapons to insurgents, or escalate in a crisis, you magnify your image as an adventurous superpower. This in turn makes minor countries more fearful of you. It also, of course, goads your opponent into like behavior. In other words, act tough and everyone will Finlandize to you-but the Soviets will get tougher, too.

The other aspect of Finlandization is projected military power. The amount of military power that you can project into a country is the primary determinant of its likelihood of Finlandization. Contiguity plays a large role in this determination. You can be sure, Mexico and Canada will always be your friends. If you place American troops in a country, that country acts as a base from which you project power to all its neighbors; the amount of power that you project is proportional to the number of troops you place.

Coups D'Etat

As I wrote earlier, coups are caused by failure to meet consumer expectations for increasing consumer spending. However, this is modified somewhat by the nature of the country. Countries with

extremist governments tend to be more repressive, and can maintain themselves against consumer unrest more readily than more centrist governments can. Thus, Western democracies will tend to change governments more readily than, say, Eastern bloc countries or Latin American dictatorships, but when they do change, the political swings are not as violent.

Diplomatic Affinity

This is the quantity that you attempt to change in your attempt to garner points. Prestige is the product of diplomatic affinity and military power. You cannot do much to influence military power, but you can do a great deal to change a country's diplomatic affinity towards you and your opponent. There are five ways that diplomatic affinity will change: insurgency, coup d'etat, finlandization, reactions to crises, and reactions to policies.

When a revolution occurs, the country undergoes a major change in its diplomatic relationships. If you were assisting the government in any way, the new government will treat you coldly. If you were assisting the insurgents, the new government will be grateful and will initiate a warm relationship. Moreover, there is an intrinsic bias based on the political stance of the new government. Leftwing governments tend toward good relations with the Soviet Union, while right-wing governments lean toward the United States. These are only leanings, however, not ironclad laws.

A government's behavior after a coup is similar to its behavior after a revolution, but not as extreme in nature. The new government's diplomatic affinities will shift based on its political leanings, but it will not shun a superpower for having given aid to the old government. If the superpower had assisted the coup with some destabilization, the new government will reward the assistance with somewhat better relations.

Finlandization has already been explained clearly elsewhere. The Finlandizing government adjusts its diplomatic affinities to be closer to the feared superpower and further away from its opponent.

Reactions to crises are the shifts in diplomatic affinities associated with your performance in a crisis. If you win the crisis, each nation of the world will like you a tiny bit more; if you lose, each nation will dislike you a tiny bit more.

Reactions to policies are based on the amount of hurt or help done by the superpower, and their effects are restricted to the object of the policy. Thus, if you do something nice for somebody, they will like you for it; if you do something nasty, they will resent you. Other minor countries will not care about your policy; each minor country cares only for itself. (This was, for me, a painful concession to playability). The response of a minor country to a policy action is proportional to the value of that policy. For example, economic aid to a poor country desperately in need of aid will be greatly appreciated, while the same amount of aid to a country that is doing well will not have so large an effect. Similarly, military aid to a country is appreciated in proportion to the country's perceived need for military aid. This does not work with negative actions, though. No matter what the situation is, aid to insurgents will infuriate the government. They will not shrug it off with the observation that the insurgents are too weak to do much harm anyway

Acknowledgements

I conceived, designed, programmed, developed, and tested this game. Yet, no such project is truly single-handed, every designer owes a debt of gratitude to a large number of people who lent him their advice, their assistance, and their sympathy.

As so many authors do, I must give a great deal of credit to my wife Kathy. I never made a big decision without consulting her first. She gave me valuable advice on almost every aspect of the program, helped with the images for the title page, and even posed for the picture of the anti-nuclear protester. Most important of all, she hung in there and supported me in the hard times when we faced the possibility of bankruptcy and loss of our home over this stupid game.

Dave Menconi also deserves to be singled out for special recognition. He playtested the game repeatedly, exposing numerous bugs and flaws. In at least two cases he found in less than thirty minutes serious bugs in what I thought was flawless code. I don't know how many patient hours he expended trying to help polish the game, but his contribution to the testing effort was far and away the greatest of any of my playtesters.

There are numerous other people who made their own contributions. In no particular order, these are Dale Yocum, Eric Goldberg, Gregg Williams, George Rosato, Steve Axelrod, Jim Warren, Steve Jasik, Scott Knaster, Joe Miller, and Tom Maremaa. Each of these people made a contribution that was in some way crucial to the progress of the game. Had any one of these people failed to offer his assistance so generously, *Balance of Power: The 1990 Edition* might not have seen the light of day.

Bibliography

A great deal of research went into this game. Players who want to follow up on some of the facts and ideas presented in the game are encouraged to consult some of these books that I read as part of my research effort:

White House Years and Years of Upheaval by Henry Kissinger, Little Brown and Company, Boston, 1979 and 1982. Whether or not you agree with Dr. Kissinger's policies, you will find these two books immensely informative on the workings of superpower diplomacy. Fascinating reading, highly recommended.

How to Make War, by James F. Dunnigan, Morrow, New York, 1982. An excellent description of the mechanics of modern warfare.

A Quick and Dirty Guide to War, by James F. Dunnigan and Austin Bay, Morrow, New York, 1985. Subtitled "Briefings on Present and Potential Wars," this book is loaded with solid information on the wars going on around the world. I only wish it had been published when I was first designing *Balance of Power*.

World Handbook of Political and Social Indicators, by Charles Lewis Taylor and David A. Jodice, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1983. A two-volume compilation of numbers about the nations of the world. This is a scholarly work, not for general readers. Nevertheless, the numbers are fascinating.

The War Atlas, by Michael Kidron and Dan Smith, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1983. Forty multi-colored maps showing the factors affecting war and peace in the world of the 1980's. The strong graphics make esoteric factors more understandable. This book was the inspiration for the mapintensive display of both editions of *Balance of Power*. I only wish I had as many colors as they do

The State of the World Atlas, by Michael Kidron and Ronald Segal, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1981. Similar to *The War Atlas*, but more general in the themes it addresses: Natural Resources, Economy, Government, Society, etc.

What About the Russians-and Nuclear War?, by Ground Zero, Pocket Books, New York, 1983. A balanced and careful discussion of the Soviet Union-its people, government, history, and psychology-and how these factors affect Soviet nuclear policy. Recommended reading.

The Causes of Wars, by Michael Howard, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1984. A series of essays by a noted historian. Thoughtprovoking but somewhat advanced for the general reader.

The East-West Strategic Balance, by T B. Millar. George Allen & Unwin, London, 1981. A region-by-region analysis of the geopolitical positions and strengths of the two superpowers.

The War Trap, by Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1981. A theoretical work that attempts to establish a mathematically rigorous theory explaining how seemingly reasonable national policies tend to trap nations into wars. Lots of equations for you math types. In the end, I elected not to use the very impressive mathematical results; I just couldn't work them in.

An Atlas of World Affairs, Seventh Edition, by Andrew Boyd, Methuen, London and New York, 1983. Covers each region of the world, discussing its political issues and how it affects the global equation. Not as insightful as Dunnigan's book but a good second opinion

An Atlas of African Affairs, by leuan ILL. Griffiths, Methuen, 1984. A similar treatment focusing on Africa and its problems.

Nuclear War in the 1980's?, by Christopher Chant and Ian Hogg, Harper and Row, New York, 1983. Lots of colorful pictures of rockets, guns, airplanes, and so forth. Some elementary information on the mechanics of nuclear war. Average text entry is only one page long. Get this for your teenager.

World View 1982, South End Press, Boston, 1982. "An economic and geopolitical yearbook" with a decidedly left-wing slant. Americans who do not understand European leftist anxieties about American policies should read this with an open but not gullible mind,

The Global 2000 Report to the President, Penguin Books, New York, 1982. Lots and lots of hard data on declining resources of all kinds.

The Soviet Estimate, by John Prados, The Dial Press, New York, 1982. A history of American assessment of Russian military strength. We always seemed to overestimate them.

Inside the Soviet Army by Vilkor Suvorov, Macmillan, New York, 1982. A defector talks about how the Soviet Army functions. Scary business; these people are not sweetie-pies!

The Nuclear Delusion, by George F. Kennan, Pantheon, 1982. For some reason I didn't get much out of this book.

The Wizards of Armageddon, by Fred Kaplan, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1983. The story of the think tank people who developed the strategies for nuclear war. An interesting exposition of how our thinking on nuclear war has developed. These people figured out how to fight nuclear war without ever asking why we should fight; that wasn't their job, I suppose.

Nuclear Proliferation Today by Leonard S. Spector, Vintage Books, New York, 1984. I didn't include proliferation in the game, and I'm glad I didn't you'd never win! This book should scare you. Lots of detailed information on how and why the nuclear genie is out of the bag.

America's War Machine, by Tom Gervasi, Grove Press, New York, 1984. The "Whole Earth Catalog" of weapons systems. A strong anti-militaristic tone pervades the book.