

□ **Economic Boom**—This represents a period of political stability, public/private investment, and growth. The Regime Mode is Economic. The commerce and gift actions does not count against your turn’s two actions.

REGIME CHANGE ARROW—Whenever a card with this icon is played, the game’s current Regime changes to match the color of the arrow.

ROAD—A cylinder on a Connection space in one of the three imperial colors, representing Roads and other economic infrastructures aiding commerce.

RUPEE—Rupees are represented by white discs (1 rupee each) or red discs (5 rupees each). Rupees will circulate between players during the game. Rupees are added to or subtracted from the game through the play or discard of Leveraged cards, or with bonuses gained through Imperial Investment (British favor card). The rupees provided in the game are not a hard limit. Use spare tokens if required.

SPECIAL ACTIONS—Most cards offer Special Actions which are shown as a row of icons across the middle of the card. Each card in your Tableau can only be used for one action per turn (E1). Special Actions described in section E.

SPY—A cube on a Tableau card in one of the five player colors, representing an intelligence unit.

SUPREMACY—To have a successful Topple, an Empire must achieve Supremacy, by having both more cubes/cylinders in the current Regime’s Mode than all other players and Empires combined, and by having at least one Army and one Road, and having at least one Spy and Tribe belonging to any Loyal player.

STANDARD ACTION—Unlike a Special Action, you do not need a Tableau Card to perform a Standard Action. The discard action (E2), the purchase action (E3) and the play action (E4) are Standard Actions.

TABLEAU—This is a row of face-up cards under your control.

TABLEAU SIZE—Your maximum Tableau size is THREE PLUS THE SUM OF THE RANKS ON ALL OF YOUR POLITICAL CARDS ON YOUR Tableau.

During the cleanup phase, if your Tableau has expanded beyond this threshold, you must discard cards until your Tableau is within this limit.

TAX SHELTER—Tax Shelters allow players to protect their rupees from the tax action (E8). The total number of economic stars on your Tableau indicate the amount of rupees you can shelter from the tax action. Any rupees you hold in excess of your Tax Shelter are vulnerable to the tax action. A convenient way to show sheltered rupees is to place the sheltered ones directly on top of the economic cards in your Tableau, up to one coin per yellow star.

TOPPLE—One of four cards that triggers a Supremacy check if purchased.

TRIBE—A cube on a Location in one of the five player colors, represent a political unit such as a warlord or a tribal council.

UNIT—A wooden cube or cylinder.

L. Historical Notes (Cole Wehrle).

L1. Endnotes.

¹ Pax Pamir draws its images from primarily mid-19th century publications. The cover image is from a political cartoon drawn by Sir John Tenniel for Punch Magazine, 1878. I have made particular use of James Rattray’s *Afghaunistan* (1842), James Atikson’s *Sketches in Afghaunistan* (1842, see back of box), and August Wahlen’s *Moeurs, Usages, et Costumes de tous les Peuples de Monde, d’apres des Documents Authentiques et les Voyages les plus Recents* (1843-44). When possible, historically accurate images have been used. However, because some of the game’s named characters are obscure, some liberties have been taken. Those cards with approximate illustrations of named characters are listed here by ID number: 2, 9, 45, 47, 49, 51, 55, 62.

² Players represent political factions. The images on the player cards are taken from James Rattray’s *Afghaunistan* (1842). These anonymous figures represent the powerful, non-public actors within factions, often forgotten to history. One of five images is of a woman from Rattray’s illustration “Kandahar, Lady of Rank.” In his note on the illustration, Rattray writes “Many of these Afghan ladies have rendered their names

celebrated in history by their conjugal attachment and devotion to the cause they supported.” He also writes of Shujah’s favourite wife, Wafadar Begum, who rescued him from imprisonment by the Sikh ruler Ranjeet Singh and of the brave widow of Akram Khan, who was a powerful chief of Zamindawar to the south of Kandahar. When Khan was executed, his widow threw off her burkha and led her tribe to battle. Though the vast majority of women in Afghanistan had few rights in the early 19th century, I feel that it is important to note that women of rank did have a role in political affairs, even if they were seldom seen.

³ Loyalty cards represent diplomatic networking which occurs outside of the scope of the game (1810s and early 20s).

⁴ Pax Pamir’s six Location cards cover an area about three times larger than the area covered in Pax Porfiriana. This area includes four distinct political topos: Persian court intrigue, the warlords and minor khanates of the Transcaspian Oblast, the dynastic dueling between the Durrani and the Barakzai in Afghanistan (Kabul, Kandahar, and Herat), and the struggles of the fledgling Sikh Empire in the Punjab. In general, Russia’s positions are strongest in Persia and in the Transcaspian while the British are mostly based in the Punjab. Pax Pamir uses an amalgam of naming systems and combines both modern and period usage in a way that I hope is both evocative and easy to grasp. The cities take their spellings from modern English usage (Kabul vs Cabool) while the areas around modern-day nations (Turkmenistan, Iran, Pakistan/northwest India) take their archaic regional names (the Transcaspian Oblast, Persia, and the Punjab). In all cases, the name of each location covers a very broad and loose area. For instance, for game purposes Kabul extends far north into Badakhshan and its mineral riches. The reason for this is two-fold. First, the game could only have so many Locations and still be playable, and, second, the cities service as political, communications, and economic nodes. Kabul would have been Badakhshan’s regional trade hub, even if the mines were quite distant from its market streets.

⁵ A player’s pile of rupees should be understood to include both a small physical bank as well as a broad

network of IOUs, blackmail, democratic and/or religious legitimacy, as well as other forms of political capital.

⁶ The placing of Units on the map represents the aligning of extant assets in the current political struggle. In this sense, unlike enterprises in Pax Porfiriana, players do not “build” anything. Many of the economic cards in this game represent trade routes, patrols, and markets which have existed for a thousand years. By placing Roads on the map in their empire’s color, the player is simply signifying that a particular patrol has chosen a side in the current conflict. It’s worth noting that while Spies and Tribes will “follow” a player if they change Loyalty, Armies and Roads do not. The reason is one of scale, supply, and control. The alignment of Armies and Roads represents their enmeshment with forces outside of a player’s direct control. Though they may have delivered the army to the empire, the empire is now the one footing the bill.

⁷ The Bribe action is a targeted attempt to win over certain key figures currently working with your opponents. A coup represents a succession dispute. In buffer regions between superpowers, it is common for them to support rival contenders for the throne to gain influence in the new regime.

⁸ Cards on a player Tableaus represent ministers and administrative assets. For this reason, although an assassination may kill off a key person, it will not directly remove the broader resources that the minister helped coordinate.

⁹ Association with an empire is often a liability. The ability to tax players loyal to an empire reflects efforts of tribes to consolidate control and political legitimacy. It should surprise no one that some of these situations will be baldly hypocritical. For instance, in the example one player Loyal to Russia can Tax another player, also Loyal to Russia.

¹⁰ Despite a disastrous initial march, the British expedition into Afghanistan did succeed in Toppling Dost Mohammad’s fledgling kingdom. However, Afghanistan proved a hard place to rule and it was not long before Auckland and the East India Company realized how many resources it would take to consolidate power and bring stability to the country.

¹¹ The traditional Pashtun ethical code makes special provision for the concept of “Nyaw aw Badal” (justice and revenge). This provision was often carried out in ways that would be illogical in a contemporary political and economic framework. The idea was particularly effective when appealing to the more traditional rural Tribes. This optional rule attempts to capture that dimension of political life and the cycles of violence that the idea engendered.

L3. Bibliographic Essay (Cole Wehrle)

This game draws on the work of many scholars in several disciplines. In the following section, I would like to offer a brief selection of those books, both for those with a passing interest in the game and its subject as well as those looking to engage more deeply with the game’s concepts.

Most general histories of the early phases of the Great Game tend to lionize Britain and Russian agents. This is an understandable impulse. The region did attract brilliant and creative thinkers, but we should not overemphasize their influence and should be careful with texts which place them on pillars. A fine example is Eldred Pottinger who is made out to be the “Hero of Herat” by a Victorian novel of that name. In point of fact, the siege of Herat was likely not turned by a single inventive Westerner, and Afghan histories rarely take note of Pottinger’s involvement. The legacy of that Victorian legend has endured and lingers even in otherwise excellent books such as Peter Hopkirk’s *The Great Game* (1992). Hopkirk offers many compelling portraits of some of the conflict’s most interesting characters. However, more recent treatments of the period, such as William Dalrymple’s *Return of a King* (2012), provide a much richer analysis. Dalrymple also has a particular talent for capturing the contradictions of British policy in the period. For those looking for a more academic and rigorous treatment of that subject, the work of M. E. Yapp will be useful. His book *Strategies of British India, Britain, Iran and Afghanistan* (1980), remains the seminal text on the subject. Yapp bores deeply into the bureaucratic underbelly of Britain’s diplomatic apparatus and helps one understand the concerns (both in London and in India) about the question of India’s northwestern frontier and Britain’s ability to interface with its politics.

In terms of understanding those politics, Christine Noelle’s *State and Tribe in Nineteenth Century Afghanistan* (1997) is a remarkable text which I have drawn on heavily in capturing the landscape of power and privilege in Afghanistan. Noelle’s book explains the successful rule of Dost Muhammad as the management of an amalgam of power centers. Noelle’s work also considers the economic state of nineteenth century Afghanistan and pays particular attention to the role of customs and bribes, and the relationship between economic forces and political power. Much of this dimension of Noelle’s research is reflected in the game’s semi-closed cash system which seeks to capture the ebb and flow of political will and capability among the players.

The game’s emphasis on intelligence resources comes largely from C.A. Bayly’s *magisterial Empire and Information* (2000). Bayly argues that a large portion of the British success in India was tied to its ability to control information and participate in an economy of intelligence with the other centers of political power. Accordingly, intelligence is a critical element in the game, enabling greater strategic flexibility (hand size), operational power (the disruption of Tableaus, Intel), as well as Influence.

When I first set out to design this game I started with the victory condition and, indeed, it has not changed in over two years of development. The general theories of empire and Supremacy come from Jane Burbank and Frederick Cooper’s *Empires in World History: Power and the Politics of Difference* (2011). Burbank and Cooper suggest that empire is not hegemonic in practice, and that an effective imperial operation requires a robust infrastructure that is sensitive to traditional centers of power. For this reason, regardless of Regime, Empires need at least some presence in the four modes of power.

L4. Empire and Supremacy (Phil Eklund)

The best source for this theme is Thomas Sowell’s *Conquests and Cultures*. This regards “political capital” as an euphemism for “bullets”. If you want to be left alone, or if you want to share power, you give rupees to whomever has the most bullets in the area. Which has little to do with the economy, which is a function of the

productive infrastructure, transactional freedoms, and worker skills of the region. The last is what Sowell calls “human capital”, and in Afghanistan there was essentially only human capital and bullets.

L5. A Defense of British Colonialism (Phil Eklund).

Although much maligned, British Colonialism had significant advantages for its colonies, as evidenced by how well some of them turned out. The USA, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Hong Kong and Singapore are among the most civilized and best places to live today. Why?

The British Legal Tradition. The British de facto separation of powers, first between lords and king and then between king and parliament, yielded a unique framework of law that facilitated economic transactions. A vast improvement over tribal justice, where all three branches of government were embodied in one warlord.

Pax Britannia. British rule was more stable than the weak, corrupt, and capricious regimes they replaced. Both India and Afghanistan had suffered from centuries of battles between petty warlords. But in India, British rule brought a century of peace, marred only by the localized 1857 Indian Mutiny. Upon Indian independence in 1947, the end of Pax Britannica immediately sparked the Tamil separatist movement, as well as an endless series of Indo-Pakistani wars and conflicts. Since both countries now have the bomb, the next war could be nuclear, with dire consequences for the world.

Slavery. Britain was the first to enforce abolishment of the international slave trade in 1807, and slavery itself in 1833, ending centuries of this entrenched institution in her colonies (see cards 51, 53, 64, 67). This is perhaps the most momentous political accomplishment in history.

Globalization. The mass-produced goods of the British Industrial Revolution raised the quality of life of their customers in the colonies. Because native Handicrafts often could not compete with factory-made goods, artisans moved to the thriving export trade, which enjoyed low British duties.

Which of these advantages did Afghanistan enjoy? None, because it was a buffer zone, not a colony. A buffer zone is a rugged piece of territory between superpowers, such as (in Europe) Andorra, Switzerland, Karaman, and Finland. Both superpowers gain a mutual stabilizing advantage in maintaining a buffer zone with a bit of independence and neutrality.

Afghanistan’s legacy as a plaything of superpowers has left it as one of the world’s worst places to live. Female literacy is just 17%. Ranked 174 out of 176 on the corruption index. Ongoing civil wars since the Soviets pulled out in 1978. These Soviet-US hot wars of the Cold War Era were accompanied by just as much destruction for little gain as in the “Great Game” period.

Neighboring India has fared better as a British colony, but here too policy failures have left their mark in what will be soon the world’s most populous nation. Nearly a quarter of the population lives in poverty (about \$1.25 a day). Other policies such as the General Service Enlistment Act increased domestic unrest and contributed to the Indian Rebellion of 1857 and the eventual nationalization of the East India Company. Furthermore, the continuance of the medieval Jajmani system and a reliance on cash crops left India vulnerable to famine cycles such as the big one in 1876. Still, British rule did shield India from many major confrontations and helped modernize the Indian economy. Decolonization, while providing greater autonomy, has also set the stage for today’s deadly nuclear confrontation with Pakistan.