

# Procedural Puzzle Challenge Generation in Fujisan

Mark Goadrich and James Droscha

**Abstract**—Challenges for physical solitaire puzzle games are typically designed in advance by humans and limited in number. Alternately, some games incorporate stochastic setup rules, where the human solver randomly sets up the game board before solving the challenge, which can greatly increase the number of possible challenges. However, these setup rules can often generate unsolvable or uninteresting challenges. To better understand these setup processes, we apply a taxonomy for procedural content generation algorithms to solitaire puzzle games. In particular, for the game Fujisan, we examine how different stochastic challenge generation algorithms attempt to minimize undesirable challenges, and we report their affect on ease of physical setup, challenge solvability, and challenge difficulty. We find that algorithms can be simple for the solver yet generate solvable and difficult challenges, by constraining randomness through embedding sub-elements of the puzzle mechanics into the physical pieces of the game.

**Index Terms**—Board Games, Procedural Content, Monte Carlo Methods, Game Design



## 1 INTRODUCTION

FUJISAN<sup>1</sup> is a physical solitaire puzzle game created for the piecepack game system [1]. In this game, a human solver must find a way to cooperatively move four Shinto Priests to the top of Mt. Fuji through incremental steps up the mountainside. A sample Fujisan challenge is shown in Figure 1, with two Priests on each edge and the goal summit spaces in gray. More details on Fujisan can be found in Section 3.

Challenges for Fujisan are created by the solver, using a random setup process to assemble the game pieces into the mountain. This process naturally leads to three questions. *How easy is the setup process for the solver to execute? Can all such challenges be solved? How difficult are the created challenges?*

To answer these questions, we first examine solitaire games through the lens of procedural content generation, where algorithms are used to create game content [2]. Next, we explore the creation of Fujisan and the piecepack game system for which it was designed. We provide detailed descriptions of five different challenge setup algorithms, then compare and contrast these multiple setup algorithms and constraints using computational simulations. Finally, we evaluate these algorithms with respect to ease of player setup, solvability, and difficulty. We find that algorithms can succeed across all three metrics by carefully incorporating desirable constraints based on the puzzle mechanics of Fujisan.

## 2 PROCEDURAL CHALLENGE GENERATION

Togelius et al. [3] describe a general taxonomy of dimensions for characterizing procedural content generation (PCG) al-

gorithms. PCG can occur *offline* (beforehand) or *online* (dynamically during the game). The content can be *constructed* by a system of rules, or use a *generate-and-test* process to winnow potential candidates for inclusion in the game. The algorithm can be *deterministic* and fixed or *stochastic*, incorporating randomness. Finally, the generated content can be *necessary* or *optional* for playing the game.

In many ways, the process by which a setter creates a challenge for a particular puzzle can be understood with this PCG taxonomy. We use here the puzzle terminology of Browne [4], such that there is a setter who creates challenges, and a solver who solves them. For puzzles, setters typically *construct* their challenges *offline* in advance, using creative yet *deterministic* means, and it is *necessary* that the challenge be solvable. Researchers have explored using PCG to replace the setter, employing metaheuristics to find interesting challenges for deductive logic puzzles, ranging from Sudoku [5] to Nonograms [6]. These algorithms similarly construct their challenges *offline*, and guarantee they are solvable, but substitute *stochastic* algorithms for the creative human process. Khalifa and Fayek [7] investigated a combination of construction and generate-and-test PCG for Sokoban challenges within a genetic algorithm framework, and this approach was extended to Monte Carlo Tree Search by Kartal et al. [8].

A less-explored variety of puzzle with relation to PCG are solitaire games, for example sliding block puzzles [9] (including Rush Hour<sup>2</sup>), and Hi-Q (generalized peg soli-

2. <https://www.thinkfun.com/products/rush-hour/>




Fig. 1. A sample Fujisan puzzle, with the summit denoted in gray.

• M. Goadrich is with the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Hendrix College, Conway, AR, 72034.  
E-mail: see <http://mark.goadrich.com/schedule.html>

• J. Droscha is with Glasygn Games.

1. <http://www.ludism.org/ppwiki/Fuji-san>




Fig. 2. The start of a solution demonstrating the rules of Priest movement, with move notation followed by the matching rule.

taire) [10]. In these games, solvers must manipulate physical pieces to solve a challenge. Since the initial setup for these games must be executed by the solver, providing the solver with predefined challenges and a solution book is common practice. PCG can also be applied to these games by, again, constructing challenges offline and guaranteeing they are solvable, as seen in recent work by Fogleman [11] and Köpp [12].

There are, however, alternative PCG approaches available for physical solitaire games, most popularly demonstrated by the card game Klondike Solitaire. In particular, this game uses an *online, stochastic, generate-and-test* PCG algorithm, which is as simple as shuffling the deck of cards at the start of the game. Also of note, having a solution for Klondike is *optional*; the *test* portion of the generate-and-test algorithm is left to the solver as they play through the game. Wolter [13] developed the Politaire system, and examines the effect of various shuffling algorithms across multiple solitaire card game variations. One variant called Thoughtful Solitaire, played such that all card locations are known to the solver at the beginning of the game, has been separately found to have setups between 82% and 91.44% solvable [14]. Also falling within this classification is BoxOff, a 2D token removal puzzle, for which Browne and Maire investigated game parameters using Monte Carlo simulation [15].

### 3 FUJISAN

To help us understand Fujisan challenge generation algorithms, we will first discuss the rules for solving Fujisan challenges, and the piecepack constraints that influenced its creation.

#### 3.1 Rules

Functionally, the area of play consists of a grid of spaces arranged into two rows by twelve columns. Each space contains a single value in the range of 0 to 5, inclusive. The two middle columns together comprise the mountain *summit*, while each other column forms a *step* of the mountain. Four pawns, representing the Priests, start off the mountain, just outside the two columns furthest from the summit.

The goal of the solver is to **move Priests one at a time until all four are at the summit**. A Priest can be moved according to the following rules:

- 1) No more than one Priest may occupy a space at any given time.
- 2) A Priest may move onto a space if that space's value matches the number of unoccupied spaces the Priest must move in a straight line, left or right, to get there (including the destination space itself, but not including the Priest's starting space).
  - a) Occupied spaces (containing intervening Priests) are not counted when determining the distance from a Priest to a given space.
- 3) A Priest may move freely up and down between the two spaces of any given step of the mountain.
  - a) A Priest's first move from the starting position must land on the mountain; that is, the Priest cannot move up or down while on the ground.
- 4) A Priest that lands on the mountain's summit can no longer move left or right, but may still move freely up or down within the column.<sup>3</sup>
  - a) A Priest may pass over the summit as part of a move.

Figure 2 shows a visual example of how these rules can be used to begin solving a sample challenge. We denote each move using a notation established by Kirkby<sup>4</sup> where the Priest moving (A, C, M, or S) is followed by either U, D, L, or R, for Up, Down, Left, Right, respectively. On L and R moves, we include the unoccupied spaces traveled, with occupied spaces skipped shown in parentheses.

3. The original rules released for the piecepack version of Fujisan also allowed a Priest on the summit to freely move left and right, provided the Priest remained at the summit. The summit rule as written here was a change made for the Engraved Tiles version, and retained for the Dominoes version, both described in Section 4. For purposes of statistical comparison, we have chosen to use this formulation of the rule for the computational simulations of all versions discussed.

4. [http://www.ludism.org/ppwiki/Fuji\\_2dsan\\_2fSolutionOne](http://www.ludism.org/ppwiki/Fuji_2dsan_2fSolutionOne)



Fig. 3. The piecepack, Infinite Board Game version. Photo courtesy of Workman Publishing.

### 3.2 Piecepack Components

Fujisan was created specifically for the piecepack game system<sup>5</sup>. The piecepack is a set of board game parts that can be used to design and play a wide variety of games. The piecepack was designed and placed into the public domain in 2000. Figure 3 shows one published version of the piecepack, including a rulebook of over 50 games that can be played with a piecepack.

Although several variations and “expansions” exist, a standard piecepack consists of the following components:

- 24 square tiles, indexed on the obverse in four suits (suns, moons, crowns, and arms) of six values each (null, ace, 2, 3, 4, and 5) and divided on the reverse into a 2×2 space grid.
- 24 round coins, each sized to fit comfortably into one space of a tile, marked on the obverse with one of the six values and on the reverse with one of the four suits.
- 4 cubic dice, one per suit, each side marked with one of the six values.
- 4 pawns, one per suit, each sized to fit comfortably into one space of a tile.

Fujisan uses the reverse side of 21 of the 24 tiles to form the mountain, the obverse of all 24 coins to assign values to spaces, and the four pawns to represent the Priests. Ace coins are assigned a value of 1, while null coins are assigned a value of 0. The dice are not used.

## 4 PCG SETUP ALGORITHMS

Using the PCG taxonomy described in Section 2, Fujisan, like Klondike Solitaire, uses an *online, stochastic, generate-and-test, optional* PCG algorithm for challenge setup. However, if the solver reaches a point in Fujisan where progress toward a solution no longer appears to be made, it might not be obvious whether the challenge setup is indeed solvable. Fujisan’s initial game state is preserved throughout play; the solver can easily return the Priests to their starting

locations and begin the challenge anew at any time. Thus, it is important to find algorithms that maximize solvability.

Here we explore a progression of constraints that create multiple variant algorithms that can be used for physical online challenge setup for Fujisan. Important statistics about each algorithm are summarized in Table 1, namely the number of possible challenges, the number of times a value may be repeated in a challenge, if the same value can occur in two spaces on the same step, and if the value pair present on a step can be repeated elsewhere in the challenge.

### 4.1 Pure Random

First, we examine a purely random process as a baseline algorithm for comparison purposes.

Take one die from the piecepack. For each space, roll the die and place a coin that matches the number rolled on the space.

With 24 spaces and six options for each space, this algorithm can generate  $\frac{6^{24}}{4} \approx 10^{18}$  possible challenges. We divide by 4 here and in subsequent calculations to account for Fujisan challenges displaying rotational, horizontal, and vertical symmetry, however, this slightly underestimates due to some challenges displaying more than one symmetry. Each subsequent algorithm will constrain this randomness in some way, eliminating possible challenges from consideration.

### 4.2 Any Coin

Next, we examine two algorithms that make use of the piecepack coin components to generate randomness. These will constrain our solutions to have exactly four of each value.

Shuffle the 24 coins face-down. For each space on the board, randomly select one coin and place it face-up on this space.

Since each of the numbers 0 to 5 are present four times (once per suit), we can use the multinomial theorem to determine that this method can create  $\frac{24!}{4!^6} \approx 10^{14}$  possible challenges.

However, if two 0 coins are placed in same row, then it becomes impossible to move a Priest onto that row. This creates holes in our challenges and reduces the number of solvable setups. More importantly, when both spaces of either of the summit columns contain 0s, the challenge becomes impossible to solve.

### 4.3 piecepack

The original published Fujisan ruleset was devised to address the issue of double 0 steps, adding the constraint that each step must have two different values.

Shuffle the 24 coins face-down, and separate into four groups based on their suit. Then repeatedly place two coins on the two right-most available spaces, choosing from each of the suits in turn (sun, moon, crown, arms).

With each space limited to choosing from a particular suit, the piecepack algorithm will generate  $\frac{6!^4}{4} \approx 10^{10}$  possible challenges. This algorithm will guarantee there are no double numbers on a step, thus eliminating the double 0 issue noted above.

5. <http://www.ludism.org/ppwiki/SolitaryConfinement>

TABLE 1  
Statistics about Fujisan Setup Algorithms for each metric.

PCG	Possible Challenges	Count of Each Value	Identical Step Values	Repeated Step Values
Random	$10^{18}$	0 to 24	yes	yes
Any Coin	$10^{14}$	exactly 4	yes	yes
Piecepack	$10^{10}$	exactly 4	no	yes
Engraved	$10^{13}$	0 to 7*	yes	only at summit
Domino	$10^{14}$	2 to 5	no	no

\* 0 to 5 for value 0




Fig. 4. Sample Engraved Fujisan Tiles.

#### 4.4 Engraved Tiles

There are other ways to generate Fujisan challenges if we look beyond the original piecepack components. One option is to combine the values with the  $2 \times 2$  tiles, engraving numerals onto the spaces. Here, we explore creating tiles with every possible pairing of values 0 through 5, including pairing a value with itself, and repeating these values diagonally on the tiles. Example tiles of this style are shown in Figure 4. We remove the 0:0 pairing, since it can create unsolvable challenges, leaving 20 tiles.

Shuffle the tiles face-down. Then, assemble the mountain by turning tiles face-up, using six for the bottom layer, five for the next layer, then four, then three, and finally two. The summit will be the center four spaces.

This further constrains each pair of numbers to appear no more than once in the puzzle, except for the top two tiles. There are 20 possible tiles, and only 10 of them can be seen once the puzzle is constructed, as shown in Figure 5. 15 of these tiles have two possible orientations, for a total of  $\sum_{i=5}^{10} \frac{\binom{15}{i} \binom{5}{10-i} 2^i 10!}{4} \approx 10^{13}$  possible challenges.

#### 4.5 Dominoes

Furthermore, we can look at alternate existing pieces with which to construct Fujisan challenges. A standard double-six domino set includes 28 dominoes. If we eliminate those dominoes that include a 6, along with all doubles, we are left with 15 dominoes.

Shuffle the dominoes face-down. Place 12 of these dominoes face-up in a row to create the mountain.

Place a face-down domino on each side of the mountain to denote the starting locations for the




Fig. 5. A sample Fujisan challenge from the Engraved Tiles algorithm.

Priests. Place the remaining face-down domino horizontally in the middle to raise up the two central dominoes, denoting the summit.

This constraint is similar to the Engraved Tiles algorithm, but with a subset of the value pairs, thus a different probability on their selection. Additionally, unlike the Engraved Tiles algorithm, the summit values are distinct from the two steps closest the summit. With 15 possible dominoes, only 12 of them are used in the challenge, as shown in Figure 6. Each of these dominoes has two possible orientations, for a total of  $\frac{\binom{15}{12} 2^{12} 12!}{4} \approx 10^{14}$  possible challenges.

## 5 EVALUATION

To evaluate each of the algorithms discussed above, we encoded a Monte Carlo Fujisan challenge generator using C#, along with an A\* solver for Fujisan challenges. Our admissible heuristic for A\* is the number of empty spaces on the summit. For each PCG algorithm, we generated 1000 random challenges, divided into 10 trials of 100 challenges.

We will use three criteria to quantify each of these variants: **ease of physical setup**, **solvability**, and **difficulty**. First, our stochastic generation algorithm must be easy for the solver to execute without complicated lookup tables or large numbers of components. Next, we judge a PCG algorithm to be working well when a high percentage of generated games are solvable by our A\* solver. Beyond solvability, we also wish for PCG algorithms to have a strong inclination to generate interesting and difficult challenges for the solver.

For each generated challenge in our trials, we recorded if the challenge was solvable, and if so, we also recorded the minimum solution length found with our A\* solver. The code used for our simulations is available on Github <sup>6</sup>.

### 5.1 Ease of Physical Setup

The **Pure Random** algorithm rates very low on the ease of setup metric when considering the piecepack components. There could be many cases when a number was

6. <http://github.com/mgoadric/fujisan>




Fig. 6. A sample Fujisan challenge from the Dominoes algorithm.




Fig. 7. Effect of challenge generation algorithms on solvability.

selected more than 4 times, thus exhausting the coins of one piecepack. Ultimately, six piecepacks would be needed for extreme cases when the same number is rolled for every space. Also, rolling a die 24 times at the beginning of a challenge quickly becomes tedious.

**Any Coin** is much more straightforward, since the coins can be shuffled on the table quickly, then added one by one to the board spaces. The **piecepack** constraint, while equivalent in the number of actual coin placements, is a little more difficult to setup by the solver. Tracking the ordering of suits and following the pattern can slow down a solver setup, but this ordering can be quickly memorized on repeated play.

**Engraved Tiles** shows a marked improvement in physical setup ease. The numbers are already on the tiles, so the challenge is created in the process of building the mountain; no additional algorithm is needed. Likewise with **Dominoes**, the challenge is again encoded in the board setup, and with fewer tiles, this setup is even more elegant.

## 5.2 Solvability

Figure 7 shows the distribution of solvability for the five PCG algorithms across the 10 trials in a box-and-whisker plot. The mean for each method is marked with a green triangle. Each method produces a healthy number of solvable challenges; every trial was above 75% solvable. **Pure Random** and **Any Coin** have the lowest mean value for solvability and these results are significantly lower than the other three algorithms, which is confirmed by t-tests using a p-value of 0.05.

Within the top three algorithms, only **Dominoes** is statistically higher than **piecepack**. To understand these results, we first explore the connections between steps in a challenge. We say step  $A$  is connected to step  $B$  in Fujisan if there is a move available according to rule 2 from  $B$  to  $A$ . While critical to solving most challenges, we simplify our connectedness calculation by ignoring the impact of intermediate Priests between  $B$  and  $A$ .

Figure 8 shows the average step connectedness within a challenge for each setup algorithm, differentiating solvable challenges in black from unsolvable challenges in white. We can see a large divide between solvable and unsolvable challenges on this metric for each algorithm, with higher




Fig. 8. Average connectedness for Fujisan challenges across each setup algorithm. Solvable challenges shown in black, and unsolvable challenges shown in white.

connectivity always related to higher solvability. Also, as shown in Table 1, both **piecepack** and **Dominoes** require that each step has two unique values. In these two algorithms, this uniqueness constraint strongly increases the connectedness of both solvable and unsolvable challenges, but the divide remains intact.

Second, for **Engraved Tiles** and **Dominoes**, repetition of pairs of values on a step are either restricted to the summit or not allowed elsewhere in the challenge. This causes the connections between steps to be more distributed and bind the puzzle together as a whole, instead of breaking apart into disjoint pieces. **Dominoes** combines two constraints to create well-connected and well-distributed challenges.

## 5.3 Difficulty

Browne and Maire [15] propose a metric by which a solitaire game is interesting if the difference in solvability between an AI solver and a random solver is high. Across all of our PCG algorithms implemented for Fujisan, however, we found a random solver would win less than 0.3%, making their metric equivalent to solvability for Fujisan. Instead, we define challenge difficulty here to be the minimum number of moves required to solve the challenge, and are interested in the distribution of challenge difficulties generated by each algorithm. We compare here the median level of challenge difficulty generated by each algorithm. The shortest possible solution to a Fujisan challenge involves eight moves, while the longest-known constructed challenge requires 62 moves<sup>7</sup>.

Figure 9 shows histograms of the minimum solution length for solvable challenges, pooled across all trials for each algorithm. The median is denoted with a dotted line. Our algorithms appear to follow a Poisson distribution rather than a normal distribution, since the smallest possible solution length for any challenge is 8, and the maximum solution length is currently unbounded. We employ a Kruskal-Wallis H-test [16] to determine if the median difficulty of our five algorithms is statistically the same, and we reject this null hypothesis very strongly, with a p-value of  $1.9 \times 10^{-8}$ .

7. <http://www.ludism.org/ppwiki/Fuji-san#Heading9>




Fig. 9. Histograms showing the effect of challenge generation algorithms on difficulty.

The algorithm responsible for this result is **Engraved Tiles**. We can see a strong tendency to have shorter solution lengths, with almost 10% of challenges having a solution length of eight or nine, whereas for **Dominoes**, this is true for only 3% of challenges. In **Engraved Tiles**, there are five tiles that contain a 0 value; since there will be ten total tiles hidden, on average a challenge will contain 2.5 zeros values. It appears that 0 values are one part of what makes Fujisan challenges interesting, since having fewer 0 values decreases the challenge difficulty.

TABLE 2  
Ranks of Fujisan Setup Algorithms for each metric. Statistical ties are denoted with \*.

PCG	Setup	Solvability	Difficulty
Random	5	5	1*
Any Coin	3	4	1*
Piecepack	4	2*	1*
Engraved	2	2*	5
Domino	1	1	1*

## 5.4 Summary

Table 2 summarizes our results on the three evaluation metrics. We can see computational evidence that the original **piecepack** ruleset is an improvement over both the **Pure Random** and **Any Coin** setup algorithm as hoped by the designer. While **Engraved Tiles** simplifies the ease of physical setup over the **piecepack** version, it is at the cost of challenge difficulty. The **Dominoes** algorithm maintains this easy setup and returns the challenge generation to a reasonable difficulty distribution.

## 6 CONCLUSION

Our work helps frame puzzle generation, particularly within solitaire puzzle games, within the taxonomy of procedural content generation (PCG). By examining variants for challenge creation, we can see that subtle changes in the random distribution used in an algorithm can have large-scale changes on the generated content.

There are many open questions related to physical games and PCG. First, we believe there is work to be done in formalizing our ease of physical setup metric. A simple approximation would be the time complexity of the algorithm, however, certain operations that are straightforward to a computer can be difficult for humans to track, and vice versa. With a formal metric, game and puzzle designers could be inclined to include more intricate PCG algorithms in their designs when provided guarantees these algorithms can reasonably be executed by a human player.

A further point to clarify is the exact relationship between the minimum solution length and challenge difficulty. We believe this metric can be expanded to include the branching factor along the solution path. Also, we have ignored a difference in move clarity for Fujisan. Up and down moves are always available for Priests on the mountain, but left and right moves must be visually identified and recalculated as spaces become occupied. It is unclear, therefore, whether both types of movement contribute equally to the level of challenge experienced by the solver. A more sophisticated difficulty metric could take these into account and further differentiate the above setup algorithms.

Finally, are there general methods that allow solvers to *construct* challenges online to guarantee solvability, as opposed to the *generate-and-test* algorithms discussed here? While this may be possible in certain situations, as employed in another piecepack solitaire game Cell Management<sup>8</sup>, care must be taken that the construction process does not give away the solution to the challenge.

8. <http://www.ludism.org/ppwiki/CellManagement>

## REFERENCES

- [1] J. Kyle, "The piecepack: In search of a generic, universal boardgame set," *Grampa Barmo's Discount Game Magazine*, vol. 1, 2001.
- [2] M. Hendriks, S. Meijer, J. Van Der Velden, and A. Iosup, "Procedural content generation for games: A survey," *ACM Transactions on Multimedia Computing, Communications, and Applications (TOMM)*, vol. 9, no. 1, p. 1, 2013.
- [3] J. Togelius, G. N. Yannakakis, K. O. Stanley, and C. Browne, "Search-based procedural content generation: A taxonomy and survey," *IEEE Transactions on Computational Intelligence and AI in Games*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 172–186, 2011.
- [4] C. Browne, "The nature of puzzles," *Game & Puzzle Design*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 23–34, 2015.
- [5] M. Hunt, C. Pong, and G. Tucker, "Difficulty-driven sudoku puzzle generation," *The UMAP Journal*, vol. 29, pp. 343–362, 2007.
- [6] K. J. Batenburg, S. Henstra, W. A. Kusters, and W. J. Palenstijn, "Constructing simple nonograms of varying difficulty," *Pure Mathematics and Applications (Pu. MA)*, vol. 20, pp. 1–15, 2009.
- [7] A. Khalifa and M. Fayek, "Automatic puzzle level generation: A general approach using a description language," in *Computational Creativity and Games Workshop*, 2015.
- [8] B. Kartal, N. Sohre, and S. Guy, "Generating sokoban puzzle game levels with monte carlo tree search," in *The IJCAI-16 Workshop on General Game Playing*, 2016, p. 47.
- [9] F. Karlemo and R. Patric, "On sliding block puzzles," *Methods*, vol. 13, no. 14, p. 15, 2000.
- [10] R. Uehara and S. Iwata, "Generalized Hi-Q is NP-complete," *IEICE TRANSACTIONS (1976-1990)*, vol. 73, no. 2, pp. 270–273, 1990.
- [11] M. Fogleman, "Solving rush hour, the puzzle," <https://www.michaelfogleman.com/rush/>, accessed: 2018-09-19.
- [12] W. Köpp, "Random generation of tangrams," *Interdisciplinary Project in Mathematics*, 2013.
- [13] J. Wolter, "Experimental analysis of various solitaire games," <https://politaire.com/article/intro.html>, accessed: 2018-09-19.
- [14] R. Bjarnason, A. Fern, and P. Tadepalli, "Lower bounding klondike solitaire with monte-carlo planning," in *International Conference on Automated Planning and Scheduling (ICAPS)*, 2009.
- [15] C. Browne and F. Maire, "Monte carlo analysis of a puzzle game," in *Australasian Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. Springer, 2015, pp. 83–95.
- [16] W. H. Kruskal and W. A. Wallis, "Use of ranks in one-criterion variance analysis," *Journal of the American statistical Association*, vol. 47, no. 260, pp. 583–621, 1952.



**Mark Goadrich** earned an A.B. in Mathematics and Philosophy at Kenyon College, and a M.S. and Ph.D. in Computer Sciences from the University of Wisconsin - Madison. He is currently an Associate Professor of Computer Science at Hendrix College in Conway, AR.



**James Droscha** is a designer and developer of software, games, and puzzles, including the piecepack and Fujisan.