Avalon Hill Philosophy - Part 25

The Wargame Convention

Long suffering subscribers to this magazine have, in the past, been inundated in information dealing with the wargame convention. The camps have been divided on this subject; between those who think they serve no purpose at all to those who claim “this is really where the action is at.” “After all,” state disclaimers, “the conventions satisfy the appetites of only a miniscule number of wargamers why all the big fuss?”

“From little toe corns big blokes grow,” we always say. And it has been the big blokes from all those little wargame clubs working behind the scenes that have been responsible for the growth of wargaming outside the commeraderie of known convention outfits. This, of course, means that the disclaimers’ assumptions are in error.

There is no doubt that thousands more would be in attendance if convention sites were made available to all.

The major wargame groups are beginning to realize that they are sitting on top of a human powderkeg of enthusiasts — and are making plans in the right direction — that being “regional” which, hopefully, will bring out a lot more from the wargames woodwork.

Our preachings of seven years are beginning to bear fruit. One such example is I.G.B. That stands for Interest Group Baltimore, a wargame group that was located right in our backyard without us even knowing about it — until shortly before Thanksgiving when direct phone contact was made by Randy Reed.

During an 11th hour break, remaining diehards of the 60+ that attended I.G.B. pose for pix taken by early-morning milk man. Optimist Club House in Perry Hall, Md., was scene of Thanksgiving weekend bath.

Without the customary fanfare, publicity, or notice to The General, I.G.B. had planned a day-long wargame gathering featuring a variety of wargame play luring such notables as Tony Morale and Phil Pritchard from their far-off haunts.

Avalon Hill management had never before attended a full-blooded wargame gathering in the flesh. We convinced them “now was the time.” Priming themselves first by dining at nearby Nichobei-Kai, a Japanese culinary establishment, they burst in on the I.G.B. gathering with yells of “banzai.” The not-too-impressed throng merely pointed them to the Midway table and returned to their game-boards, unabashed.

Needless to say it was AH management that was impressed; not only by the organizational decorum of the group but by the skill and knowledge with which each game was being played. Most significant, however, was their realization that a great deal of time, effort, and resources go into bringing a convention, however small, to fruition.

“We didn’t realize how sophisticated the hard core fanatics have become,” mused company Vice-President A. Eric Dott to Marketing Director Tom Shaw who had accompanied him to the Perry Hall, Maryland sight of the I.G.B. gathering. When told by several gamers in attendance that this sort of thing is happening all over the country, Dott was quick to suggest to Shaw that management do even more in promoting the convention syndrome. “Yeah, that way we’ll sell more games... right Mr. Dott?”, was Shaw’s electrifyingly intelligent response.

The Fall River Conclave

Hardly had the embers of the I.G.B. flames cooled when plans were being laid for another, more ambitious regional gathering. Phil Pritchard announced at the I.G.B. the possibility of Spartan International sponsoring a regional east-coast conclave on board the U.S.S. Massachusetts moored at Fall River, Massachusetts.

That possibility has become a reality. The SICL (Spartan International) very definitely has contracted to hold a convention June 5-6, 1971 aboard the “Big Mamie... the ship that helped turn the tide of history,” as their brochure states. And thanks to Pritchard’s up-to-the-minute communications with our staff, we are able to provide all pertinent data to subscribers well in advance. A most unusual convention it will be, a tour of Big Mamie alone worth the price of the registration costs.

Spartan co-chairmen Tony Morale and Phil Pritchard will be glad to furnish all travel info and costs. Advance registrations: Spartan members — $1.25/day, non-members — $1.50/day. Registration at the door: Spartan members — $1.50/day, non-members — $2.00/day. When you consider that the normal admission to Big Mamie is $2.00, participants are in effect getting in on the convention tournament at below cost.

Displays, informal gaming, and unpruned tournament games will all be conducted right on board.

On Sunday, June 6, Sparta's 5th anniversary will be celebrated with a continuation of June 5th activities plus the Banquet and Post-banquet Seminar that will be held in the Admiral's Quarters. The Seminar will feature "explanation and theory" and a question and answer debate involving audience participation.

A far cry from the days of the back yard garage conventions, eh!

From Casablanca to Kimish

At Casablanca the Massachusetts became the first battleship to fire 16 inch guns on the enemy in World War II, when she returned a salvo from the Jean Bart, the newest battleship in the Vichy French Navy, to put her out of action with five direct hits. Three years later she fired the last shot from a ship of her class when her guns destroyed what was left of the Japanese factories and docks in Kamishii.

All told Big Mamie fought 35 engagements, including Leyte Gulf, and earned 11 battle stars. It is on board this very ship, raised from the scrap pile by school donations, where the SICL will conduct "similar" engagements but without the customary shedding of human lives.

The convention schedule allows time for a tour of the ship itself, which rests permanently at Battleship Cove as a national tourist attraction. It is to the credit of Pritchard, Morale, and all SICL members involved for their selection of this unusual attraction as the sight for the 2nd annual east coast convention.

More than a million visitors to Battleship Cove attest to its worthwhile nature; the ship itself with its seven decks and accommodations for 2500 officers and men will offer conventioners an unusually memorable experience. Going one better, the SICL will publish and distribute three issues of a convention newsletter which will include latest information on the events, accommodations, and side trips. Brochures from the ship will also be supplied upon receipt of 10 cents; all of which comes free to all.
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The Honor System

by Mathew Buynoski

The most persistent roadblock to realism in AH games has been the players' perfect intelligence concerning enemy dispositions, movements, and strength.

Many methods have been proposed to deal with this: hidden movement, upside-down units, three boards, etc. Except for those games with relatively few units, most of these attempts at creating uncertainties lengthen the game to the time span of the real campaign. Playability suffers.

The honor system is designed to give the best of both worlds. If properly used it can create the requisite unknowns and is just as playable as a normal AH game. Note the italicized it is important. They will work neither for those whose sole objective is to win, regardless of how unrealistic the game becomes, nor for their brethren, the rules nit-pickers. If you are interested in realism and have an opponent you trust, read on.

The actual remedy is both simple and difficult at the same time. There is no change in the actual play, units of both sides remain in both players' views. Players are, however, honor-bound to use only "legal" information, that which would be normally available to a field commander. Rules for determining what this information is vary from game to game (see example games below).

The major difficulty is a human one: mental discipline. It takes some doing to walk into a trap you can see on the board, but not in "reality." Would you do it, or would you modify your original plan and charge it off to intuition? That's not meant to insult, because I do it myself if I let my concentration dissipate. There are hints to help yourself in this regard. Write up a master plan at the start, allotting forces, assigning objectives, and setting up a timetable. Before each turn, look away and imagine a board; mull over the information you have and make your tactical decisions. Otherwise, you will find your planning unconsciously starts to use illegal information. Discuss the situation with your opponent, and state your reasons for making certain moves. Often you will find that the reason(s) are at best questionable, and you should rethink the move. If that sounds like high treason, remember he is honor-bound not to use the information.

Below are two games adapted for the honor system. The rules for information are my own; if they do not suit you, or strike you as unrealistic, change them.

Example 1, land tactical game, Bulge.

Bulge, and the IFW and S&T versions of the same battle, are all representations of a fast-moving, fluid, confused and ever-changing situation. In the real campaign, both the overall commanders (that's who you represent as a player) had not much more information than what enemy formations were vaguely in what area, and where his own forward positions were. To recreate this, restrict legal information to:

1. When attacking, you are told only in what squares the enemy units are in, both sides will know whether or not the odds are worse than 1-6, i.e., you know where he is, and how strong he is.

2. When attacked, you are told what division(s) are attacking.

3. Germans know what Allied divisions are in the game (in the real campaign, their radio-interception service did great work at locating Allied movements), but the Allies identify only those divisions that attack him - the rest are "not in the game."

In addition, divisional organization should be respected since otherwise the intelligence above is worthless and realism suffers. The US 28, 106, and 9 Armor divisions are excepted, as they scattered in the real campaign. To some extent this rule recreates the need for local control of parts of the front. One-way roads and some German supply limitations are also realistic and should be included.

One or two comments in order on the effects of the honor system on the game. The German will have to concentrate a great amount of effort on securing road junctions, and it is precisely there that the Allies make their hardest stands. Since you are not_told the odds until after moving and it is too late to change, you must allot attacking forces more on the importance of the objective than the immediate strength of enemy units on square "X". The Allies will find it imperative to keep a line, or otherwise an aggressive German will exploit and get in rear areas unobserved. At the start, roadblock and road-junction defenses will hamper the Germans, and the German needs essential - the Allies to counter German moves and possible breakthroughs, the German to exploit any weakness, or cover against counter-attack.

Tactics should include moving flanks first to cover the main assault, and feelers to find exact locations before committing the attack force. Even if you do not know the strength in any one square, it is at least helpful to find exactly what squares the enemy is in. Active patrolling on quiet sectors prevents embarrassment.

Example 2, naval game, Jutland

Jutland is simply a different game under the honor system. Considerable skull work is necessary to work out tactics, especially for light ships.

Besides the ability to see the enemy too clearly, Jutland suffers by allowing too perfect control of your own fleet. Transmission of complete movement and firing orders every 10 minutes is a bit much.

Therefore, Jutland needs two rules, and an exception, for honor system play.

Rule I is an approximation to simultaneous movement. Before the movement portion of the turn, each player contemplates the information available to him: which enemy units are in a sight range of his ships, where said units are going. On the basis of this, plus the status of your own damage, plot your best move. When both players have done this, move the ship counters as you had decided. By the way, it's best to move those ships making "daring" maneuvers first - avoids arguments.

To counter the excessive fire control, Rule II attempts to recreate the fact that both sides had to rely on prearranged tactics in an engagement. Firing is done on either of two bases. When there is a discernable organization, lines facing lines, every ship fires at its opposite number. When a real melee develops, each ship fires at the nearest target. However, if locally there is a short line vs. short line situation under the nearest target rule, these two lines fire at opposite numbers.

The great exception to both rules is the handling of torpedo attacks. In a two side opposing fleet facing lines, you are honor-bound to pick targets that are in range of the attackers. If, as sometimes happens, enemy movements make it impossible to reach the intended target, DD's may attack a target of opportunity near by the intended victim. In two side opposing, daring capital ships, every ship fires at its opposite number.

The effect on play is large. The fire at opposite rules almost negates the German protection advantage, since he can not concentrate enough firepower to achieve one-turn sinkings unless he can cause a confused situation, or has a numerical advantage on the battle-field. Broadside becomes the major factor in the battle; German ships will need to turn around often to bring undamaged guns into play on their Posen, Ostfriesland, and Kaiser class ships, since British battle ships in general have a larger broadside than their German counterparts. Scouting will assume much greater importance; proper use of light ships to screen and drive in enemy screens, and not lose inordinate numbers to enemy capital ships, is difficult. The British have a definite advantage here in that they outnumber the Germans 28 to 11 in CL's, and 106 to 59 in DD's (additional forces included).

As a last note, I recommend you do not use this system unless playing full-scale; for some reason it appears incompatible with the 1/3-scale version.

Mathew Buynoski
136 Brentwood Avenue
San Francisco, California 94127
Winning with the Wehrmacht

by Alan Augustinbraun

To those of you who have had the courage to tempt defeat by taking the German side in D-Day '44, I don't have to recount the disadvantages and problems facing the German commander. It seems a shame that the fine German armored divisions have but a slim chance of wreaking their wrath on the Allied invaders. Assuming that the panzers do get within range of the inferior Allied forces, Allied airpower is there to decimate them. No wonder then that the Opponent Wanted ads almost always seek German players! Never were there such easy pickings!

Before I proceed with my variant, let me justify it with an analysis of D-Day. The situation of June, 1944, is not accurately represented in the game. For example, the Allies were in no position to invade South France on June 6th for, dependent on surprise as the Allies were, it was impossible for their 5,000 ships carrying hundreds of thousands of troops to sail from Great Britain to South France unnoticed by the Germans. Besides, the trip would have taken too long. If you argue that an invasion force could have been diverted from Italy, you will find that, although the assault on South France (Operation Dragoon) was scheduled for early June, operations in Italy precluded this invasion. Allied troops in Italy could not yet be spared.

Furthermore, the Allies did not wish to invade the heavily defended Calais area because of the resistance they would encounter and because they could not achieve much of a surprise in that sector. Areas east of Calais were not conducive to amphibious operations for a variety of reasons. The Bay of Biscay likewise afforded little chance of surprise, and it too was rejected as a possible landing area. This left Normandy and Brittany, and the logical Allied choice was Normandy because of its proximity to Britain. There were, however, other strategic considerations as well which led to this decision.

If you will compare reality with situation in D-Day, you will immediately observe that the Allied players is not hampered by the problems of SHAEF in 1944. Everything is as easy as pie: pick out a nice, easy invasion beach, land your troops and kill the Krauts. This, however, is not the way it happened.

On the other hand, the German player is burdened with all of the mistakes committed by the German High Command. Although I won't go into details here, take my word for it that had Rommel's requests to OKW and Hitler been carried out and had the Germans not been bunglers and self-deceiving fools, we might very well have lost our marbles in that gambit on June 6. This opinion is based on very extensive research on the subject.

Thus, the German player bears the onus of someone else's errors committed 25 years ago. Is this not unfair? Are we not given "command" of our forces and the power to initiate and execute strategical policy rather than having decisions made for us?

Let me cite just one example such as the failure of the Germans to use the Luftwaffe in offensive operations. More than one historian has expressed surprise at the Germans' failure to bomb the "easy targets" on the beaches. You will recall, I trust, that despite the thousands of aircraft in the sky on D-Day, TWO lone German fighters managed to strafe the invasion beaches and return to base unscathed. One writer, commenting on German inlaying operations, declared that Allied anti-aircraft fire was not very effective even though it was heavy.

My variant aims at correcting some of the faults in D-Day. It consists of several optional rules or modifications which are listed below.

I. German Order of Battle: My research has uncovered the fact that the 10th SS Panzer Division, together with the 9th SS Panzer, formed the II SS Panzer Corps. So, add the 10th SS (6-6-4) to the German OB and place it with the 9th SS on any of the starred squares in Germany.

II. Invasion Areas: An invasion of South France may not occur until the ninth turn.

III. Weather: The Normandy invasion depended very heavily on the weather. This can be simulated by the following conditions:

To invade in the first week, you must roll 1, 2, 3 or 4
To invade in the second week, you must roll 1, 2, 3 or 4
To invade in the third week, you must roll 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5
You may artificially invade in the 4th week. In this way, bad weather can delay the invasion by a month just as it might have done in Normandy.

IV. Coastal Defense: It seems logical to me that if defense factors are doubled when a unit is attacked from across a river, defense factors should also be doubled when a unit is attacked from the sea. (The Omaha Beach landing was almost aborted because of the fierce resistance and the high casualty rate inflicted by the German 352nd Infantry.) This rule does not apply to Static Divisions and HQ units and does not apply to any unit attacked from sea and land at the same time.

V. German Air Force: In June, 1944, there were 481 German aircraft in France, including more than 150 fighters. (NOTE: While this number is very small compared to Allied figures, don't overlook the fact that German planes made runs over the beaches on D-Day and were completely unhindered by Allied aircraft.) Immediately after the invasion proper, 1,000 aircraft reinforcements were flown in from Germany and Italy. These carried out nightly raids from June 7th on. While Allied anti-aircraft fire was intense, it was not very damaging.

Now, the Allies had 5,800 bombers and 4,900 fighters in action during the invasion. This makes for a total of 10,700 aircraft. With that number, the Allies are entitled to eight air strikes per game. Proportionately, the Germans should be entitled to one air strike. Further, in the second week or turn of play, the V-1 came into use. Of the 18,000 bombs launched, 10,160 were fired against targets on the continent. These V-1s can be transformed into five air strikes. In the 18th week, 1,750 V-2's were launched against continental targets. This can be transformed into a single additional air strike. The following chart should be used for all German air power:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIE ROLL</th>
<th>RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 or 3</td>
<td>no effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 &amp; 5</td>
<td>units immobilized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>% defending units eliminated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No German units can be next to units under buzz-bomb attack. The Germans are limited to two air strikes per turn.

VI. The Great Storm: No air operations are permitted during the third week of the game due to a very severe storm over the English Channel.

VII. Allied Order of Battle: The following changes should be made: Add the British 15th Infantry (4-4-4) on D-Day, the U.S. 86th Infantry (4-4-4) on the 32nd week and the 1st Allied Airborne Army HQ (8-1-4) on the 32nd week. REMOVE the British 50th Infantry by the 43rd week and the British 1st Airborne by the 31st week.

While my variant may yet throw the game in favor of the Germans, I see nothing wrong in that. After all, nobody cried about the Allies' easy victory! Again, had the circumstances in 1944 been different, perhaps the war - but certainly the campaign - might have gone in favor of the Axis powers. It was an act of God that saved the free world at Normandy.

Perhaps further research will uncover additional German forces, but for the present, I think the forces and factors cited above will help the German player immensely, thereby balancing out a game which has tremendous potential for enjoyment.

Alan Augustinbraun
1755 Ocean Parkway
Brooklyn, N.Y.
A Shocking French Victory

by Raymond Hosler

Waterloo presents an interesting challenge to the French player in that the P.A.A. have a numerical advantage toward the crucial later stages of the game. After eleven PBM games and numerous face-to-face meetings I have employed, with overwhelming success, a French strategy that will increase chances of victory. The following procedure is called SHOCK TREATMENT.

The French forces must be distributed in the following manner during the early stages of the game (16th 7am-1pm). Advance the main force to Tilly only as a diversion, then striking toward Quatre Bras by the main road. If the P.A.A. has twenty factors or more on Tilly road your feint has been effective. If only a few 1-6's are left, send three 2-6's (no more) down the road as a diversion. Next, send seven cavalry factors, no more, as a diversion to the Nivelles area. Don't commit them unless a unique situation presents itself, Finally, place approximately 30-40% of the main force around the Quatre Bras ridges.

After these positions are taken up the second stage begins. Push forward to Quatre Bras from the NW. Take a 2-1 on the ridges if possible. Shift some of the NW units to the ridges if the attack succeeds. A good opponent will put up a stiff fight on the Quatre Bras – Tilly road. The only way to break this line is to keep a solid wall of fifteen factors except for the exposed square (square able to be attacked from two or three positions) which will have the 8-4 on it. When Quatre Bras is reached it should be around 9am on the 17th.

This leads to the final and crucial step. The P.A.A. will have prepared the Genappe defense line by now. On the 17th 11am or 1pm turn the French forces in the following positions and ready to attack. A. The main French force extended between V-33 and V-27 with a small reserve on X-28.B. The Nivelles diversion close to Nivelles, C. The Tilly diversion blocking Wavre and threatening the P.A.A. flanks. The French are now ready to attack the Genappe line. Keep these points in mind when attacking:

1. 2-1 on R-27 (no retreat)
2. 2-1 on S-31
3. 2-1 on T-32
4. 3-1 on T-36
5. 2-1 on T-39
6. attack T-34

Every unit should be engaged with the possible exception of the diversion units at Wavre.

Take 2-1's! Shocking! That's exactly what the P.A.A. doesn't expect. The advantages are unending. The P.A.A. is caught off guard, retreat routes are cut, no hope for counterattacks since more than one position should be pierced, many units are destroyed, and the P.A.A. is forced to expend those valuable 1-6's, covering the disorganized retreat. In short, the effect is complete. Total shock is incurred upon the army and often times your opponent as well.

NOTE: To assure the Napoleonic wargamer of a complete understanding of the strategy and tactics employed in that age I urge you to read ON WAR (6 vol's) by Karl von Clausewitz.

Plan of the Month

Gamble or Play it Safe??

by William B. Searight

By the dawns early light the coastline is a shadowy form as landing craft churn their way towards the beaches. Taut nerves reach their pitch as the ramps crash down. British, Canadian and American troops fan out to come to grips with the enemy, but initial contact is nil. How can this be? Is the invasion in Brittany or Biscay? No, the North Sea.

Numerous articles containing the initial German dispositions in D-Day are well written, but with only one sided general strategy on how to combat an allied landing. How would such a defense hold up against weeks of combat along with pulverizing bomber launched strikes? Normally the German defense is designed to force an allied landing as far as possible from Germany. While this is possible, the allies soon build up superiority over the local defenders and destroys the Wehrmacht piece meal as it advances. The great disadvantage is that numerous German divisions are still tied down to their coastal defense positions in fear of an additional invasion that may or not take place.

The setup shown is the over all defense, although we will be concerned mainly with the N. Sea area.

\[1-2-2\]
\[C-8 E-9 E-II G-41 G-13 L-20(2) M-22(3)\]
\[M23(2) N-24(3) Q-27(2) R-30(2) S-32(2)\]
\[S-33(2) S-34 Q-34 T-32 V-36 V-38(2)\]
\[X-42 Y-41 AA-41 LL-44\]
\[3-4-3\]
\[K-15 L-20 Q-25 Q-27 S-28 S-34\]

\[4-4-3\]
\[K-17 K-18 N-19 V-32 U-34 V-36\]
\[4-4-4\]
\[T-30 X-38 X-40 BB-40\]
\[5-5-4\]
\[I-15 FF-41\]
\[5-5-3\]
\[J-16\]
\[6-6-4\]
\[H-14 O-24\]
\[7-7-4\]
\[G-13 DD-41\]
\[I-I-3\]
\[K-13\]
\[3-3-3\]
\[L-17\]
\[O-1-4\]
\[G-9 H-12 M-15 N-21 P-23 U-29 W-35 DD-39\]

Reserves:

\[6-6-4 D-5\]
\[5-5-4 C-5 D-4 N-9\]
\[3-3-4 C-4 M-8\]
\[2-2-4\]
The Omniscient Wargamer

By Tom Oleson

Right after the 1967 war in the Middle East, I spoke with an Israeli pilot. He told me that their "secret weapon" was intelligence. An hour before take-off, they were given the location, to the inch, of each tank or plane they were to bomb. Incredible as it may seem, sometimes they were accurately informed of even slight changes in position moments before take-off. The only intelligence service better than that is "built-in" to all but a very few war-games, where you know the enemy's dispositions and OOB as well as your own.

In any view, this is a serious, but unnecessary, flaw. It could be remedied in several ways:

A. Variable OOB

Why should your opponent know your OOB? In fact, why should you know it yourself? (at least, to the last detail)? An element of uncertainty could be added in at least 3 ways:

1. Each side could choose among a number of OOB's balanced so that the advantages each offers are compensated for by some disadvantage. For example, less overall strength, but more at
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Simulating the Art of War

by J.E. Pournelle, Ph.D.

The title of this article is a misnomer. Although I have had some experience simulating the art of war, nothing would be duller for a game; so far as I can tell, the closest thing to bringing in the simulation, less playable the result. The best simulation of land warfare I have ever seen takes place at Research Analysis Corporation (RAC), an Army-related think-tank in Virginia. At RAC, they have three enormous war-rooms, each equipped with a war-games table some twenty feet square, each table having elaborate terrain features at a scale of about one inch to the kilometer. In the Blue room, only Blue units and the Red units located by reconnaissance are shown; in the Red room, the opposite; while the only complete record of all units in the game is in the Control room.

Each team consists of an arm of talent including historians, officers, intelligence officers, subordinate unit commanders, etc. Orders are given to a computer, which then sends the orders to the actual units, while members of the Control team move them rather than the players. Both teams send in orders simultaneously, so that the computer had no need to find which units actually get to move and which are interfered with. The last time I was involved with a RAC game (as a consultant to feed in data about how to simulate strategical and tactical air strikes) it took six months playing time to finish a forty-eight-hour simulation — and that was with about ten players on each side, a total of twenty referees, and a large computer to help. The game, incidentally, was one which eventually resulted in the US Army's evolving the Air Assault Division, now known as Air Cav.

The point is that although an accurate simulation — it had to be, since procurement and real-world organization decisions were based in part on the results — the "war game" at RAC was unplanned, and, one suspects, even the most fanatical war-games buffs would have found it dull after working at it full time for months.

Yet, what makes a war-game different from some other form of combat-game like chess? What is there about the war-game that can generate such enthusiasm? Obviously, it is the similarity to war, the element of simulation which is lacking from other games. Consequently, the game designer must know something about simulation, and must make realism his second goal in design.

There are two ways of making a war-game realistic. The first, which by and large has been exploited well, is "face-realism." That is, the game designer attempts to employ terrain features similar to a real world battle or war; designates units that either really were in a battle, or might have been; calls the playing pieces "armor" and "infantry," or "CCA," or "Forty-second Infantry Regiment," and the like. He tries, in other words, to give the appearance of reality. He may also, as is often done, make the rules complex, usually by adding "optional" rules to bring in such factors as "air power" or "supply," or "weather." The second way of making a war-game realistic is much more difficult, and has seldom been tried. This method is as follows: the designer abstracts the principles of war as we know them, and designs a game in which only the correct application of those principles brings success. There are, as I said, few of those games. I am tempted to say none, but this would be incorrect; many Avalon-Hill games partially meet the goal.

The second kind of simulation is admittedly far more difficult. To some extent it may even interfere with the "realism" of the first kind, in that some rather unusual "moves" may be required. In this and succeeding articles I shall attempt to analyze the principles of war which should be simulated, and the rules which may introduce "functional simulation" to the art of war-gaming.

**Tactics or Strategy?**

The first decision is a key one: do we simulate tactics or strategy? This is compounded by the problem that no really satisfactory definitions of strategy and tactics exist, and neither is very well understood in the United States. For example, there is nowhere a clear-cut way to do modern tactics, and the study of tactics has largely been neglected for the study of something which we call strategy, but which is often not that either. This is a large subject, and not one to be settled in The General; the interested reader might refer to The Strategy of Technology, by S. T. Vanden; and J. E. Pournelle, University Press of Cambridge Mass. for a fuller exposition on what I mean by that statement.

The average game of strategy, in any event, would be too complex, and simulation is extremely difficult because strategy operates against the will of the opponent rather than his means. Because there is no more penalty to a war-game for losing utterly than there is for losing all, it is difficult to make him surrender until his means of combat have been eliminated. I suppose rules could be devised in which a point system is employed, with a penalty to be paid for the number of points lost by the loser, rather than those which has gained against the winner, but then another difficulty arises: in the real world there are usually factors operating which make the victor anxious to accept the surrender of his enemy. In war games there is almost none, and consequently a player who is winning would be most reluctant to allow the loser to stop the war until the maximum number of points had been extracted. It is all a very difficult matter, and one which deserves more thought than we have time for in this article.

Consequently, we will discuss tactics more than "grand tactics," and "grand tactics" more than strategy. The subject is, I think, large enough for our purposes.

**Which Principles of War?**

The next problem is, which principles of war do we wish to emphasize? For that matter, which list of principles will we accept? Every serious student has his own set of "the" principles of war, and few lists are alike. Again, for our purposes, we will have to be satisfied with an arbitrary set of principles which seem appropriate for gaming, leaving the question of which are "the" principles of war to another discussion.

It seems to me that the most important principle of war neglected in popular games is the principle of surprise. Surprise has probably won more battles than all the other factors combined. Certainly it has provided most clear wins by a side which should reasonably be expected to lose. Consequently, let us examine the characteristics of surprise as it operates in real battles, and how it might be simulated in games.

Surprise consists of doing what the opponent is certain you will not or cannot do. Classical examples are: night marches; attacks by inferior forces; the use of equipment, or weapons in totally unexpected ways; attacks through impenetrable defenses; and "secret weapons" which quite often have not been secret in the sense of unknown, but secret in the sense of a capability previously unsuspected, as when infantry has been trained to make forced marches at speeds not thought possible.

Many of these kinds of surprise are impossible in my judgment. There is no way, at least none known to me, in which we can unexpectedly increase the striking radius of the gaming pieces, or change the terrain rules in the middle of the game, or combine forces in such a way that together they have a higher combat factor than they do separately. Certainly it is possible in many ways to offer some kind of card drawing or random number system; but the resultant would not be the mind-numbing shock of the totally unexpected, because the opponent would know from the rules that such things were possible. The true effect of surprise goes beyond the immediate effect to a player's mind that will: "What? Then what else might he be able to do? Wars have been won by exploiting that kind of surprise.

We can, however, introduce surprise by impersonal intelligence; allow a player to do, if not the totally unexpected, then at least something which the opponent has dismissed as highly unlikely. The best way to achieve this is through the "matchbox" system. In this system, each player has a certain number of "headquarters" type pieces, and for each such piece a matchbox or envelope. At any time a player may move a certain number of combat pieces up to the "headquarters" and take them off the board; the corresponding matchbox. The HQ then moves on the board, and the combat pieces are considered to be stacked on top of it, or, in non-stacking games, in the squares through which the headquarters has last moved. Obviously, by judicious moving of the headquarters units together and apart, a player can create confusion as to just what units are in any given formation containing headquarters pieces, so much so that what appears to be a minor raid might well be a full armed army, while what seems to be a major attack might be a reconnaissance in force. The matchboxes are used to keep the players honest; only those pieces in the matchbox can be claimed to be with the on-the-board box.

This rule alone can produce a major effect on war-games; I have seen the emergence of an army in a totally unexpected place bring about a paralysis of will that brought defeat to an otherwise winning player. I have also seen the fear of surprise attack stop an advance even though the army possessed more strength opposing it. In my judgment the rule should become a "standard" rule in all board-type war games.

The second most neglected factor in wargaming is the principle of economy of forces: the judicious combination of units of different types
to bring about a force sufficient for the objective set. Again, the really great exploitations of this principle are denied the gamer. We cannot change the rules in the middle of the game, or "discover" a new use for infantry-cavalry combinations unknown to the opponent. We can, however, provide a rich variety of really different units, each with a special capability.

This was discussed at great length in my previous article on "The Decisive Arm", and cannot be repeated here. Therefore, we will only examine some possibilities open to the wargamer.

First, it seems to me, we will need complexity; and complexity is generally the enemy of playability. In this case there is no help for it, and what we must do is strive to make our complexities such that we do not lose ourselves in them. What we need is a variety of kinds of units which have some really fundamental differences between them, not merely differences in strength and mobility.

For example: in Waterloo, the artillery should be allowed to stack without limit. This means that a player who has husbanded his artillery can bring an enormous concentration of force against a single point -- much as Napoleon was able to do. The P-A-A player, on the other hand, should be prevented from stacking dis-similar units, and in particular forbidden to place Prussians with Allies. Adding this rule and the matchbox rule can make the WATERLOO playing board too large for the role they play. As he says, each hex has a diameter of 500 yards or so, which is simply beyond the range of effective 1815 - type musketry. A properly designed board would have hexes of about 300 yards diameter. We would then have infantry with a range of 1 hex, light (horse) artillery with a range of 2, and Field (heavy) artillery with a range of 3 hexes. Unfortunately, this would require a much larger board or very tiny counters.

My suggestions, and Mr. Pournelle's, though different in application, have essentially the same purpose; that is, to bring the use of artillery into proper perspective. Mr. Pournelle suggested unlimited stacking of artillery units, which is much less realistic than my approach. For one thing, this system would leave you with mountainous stacks of units which would take very careful stacking and cluing up the board beyond belief.

My plan, which calls for a two-square range for artillery, (with the long-range firing at 3/5 normal CF), is not based purely on mechanical and technical factors, but on a tactical concept. That concept is that Napoleonic-era artillery was employed in two ways. First, at short range, it provided additional concentrated firepower for attack and defense of critical terrain. Second, it had a "stand-off" capability in that it could attack infantry/cavalry formations at ranges at which it would be unlikely to suffer casualties from return fire.

Another point, which Mr. Pournelle very wisely pointed out and Mr. Brady ignored, was that artillery fire can be massed for maximum effect.

Mr. Brady's article in the Nov-Dec '70 issue, (which replied to my previous article in the Jul-Aug issue), has given us useful technical information, but has really missed the point in two respects. First, he has presented yet another variation on the old "morale" theme. This issue has been debated for years in these pages, to little effect. Morale of subordinate units in a board-type wargame is not very practical. In real life, the morale of a given unit depends primarily on its composition, training and unit commander, (which should be accounted for in the assigned Combat Factor); and secondarily on the unit's experiences in the field. In wargaming, individual variations in unit efficiency are accounted for in the Combat Results Table, so there is little need for additional "morale" rules.

His second major point is well taken, but points out a deficiency in game design rather than in my artillery rules. Quite simply, the hexes on the WATERLOO playing board are too large for the role they play. As he says, each hex has a diameter of 500 yards or so, which is simply beyond the range of effective 1815 - type musketry. A properly designed board would have hexes of about 300 yards diameter. We would then have infantry with a range of 1 hex, light (horse) artillery with a range of 2, and Field (heavy) artillery with a range of 3 hexes. Unfortunately, this would require a much larger board or very tiny counters.

My suggestions, and Mr. Pournelle's, though different in application, have essentially the same purpose; that is, to bring the use of artillery into proper perspective. Mr. Pournelle suggested unlimited stacking of artillery units, which is much less realistic than my approach. For one thing, this system would leave you with mountainous stacks of units which would take very careful stacking and cluing up the board beyond belief.

My plan, which calls for a two-square range for artillery, (with the long-range firing at 3/5 normal CF), is not based purely on mechanical and technical factors, but on a tactical concept. That concept is that Napoleonic-era artillery was employed in two ways. First, at short range, it provided additional concentrated firepower for attack and defense of critical terrain. Second, it had a "stand-off" capability in that it could attack infantry/cavalry formations at ranges at which it would be unlikely to suffer casualties from return fire.

Another point, which Mr. Pournelle very wisely pointed out and Mr. Brady ignored, was that artillery fire can be massed for maximum effect.

This is not possible in the AH system, but is very effective in both the Pournelle system and my own. For example, suppose that you have a PAA unit (CF = 7), which can only be attacked from two squares. Under the AH system, the most firepower that can be brought to bear on it is 30 CF (4-1). Mr. Pournelle would be able to bring up to 76 factors to bear on it (10-1); Mr. Brady could bring up to 33 with a good die roll. My system would provide up to 56 (8-1). If the unit was doubled, AH and Mr. Brady are stuck with 2-1 attacks, whereas Mr. Pournelle has a 5-1 and I have a 4-1.

I might also point out that my system also enhances the value of the "1-4" and "1-6" PAA artillery units. Instead of being thrown away as delays or sinkers, these small units can now be effectively used in support of counterattacks. They can also be very useful in pecking away at the French flanks and smaller units in the line. This can be very helpful when the French are using their light cavalry to screen river crossings and as flank protection. (This is a two-way street, though, as the French can do the same thing against the PAA.)

As a practical matter, how many times have you been faced with the aggravation of being just 1 or 2 factors short of that critical 3-1 attack? Under the AH or Brady systems, you have to choose between gambling on a 2-1 and taking the consequences if it comes up "A-Elim", or letting a crucial square be given up or not attacked. Example: The PAA has a "6-4" on doubled terrain and you can only hit it from 2 squares. Do you go ahead and risk 24 factors in a 2-1 attack? Or do you just let the whole French Army grind its teeth in frustration while your cavalry tries to sneak around the end and lose 5-6 battle turns waiting for your opponent to withdraw? More likely, you attack at 1-2 and hope for a lucky die roll. Under my system (or Mr. Pournelle's), you can use your reserve firepower to breach the gap you need. A lot more realistic than just pushing a piece forward, crossing your fingers and watching the die settle down.

Really, the entire matter boils down to the two major areas of wargaming controversy. These are: Historical (and technical) accuracy vs playability, i.e. do we nit-pick ourselves into a beautiful historical simulation exercise or play a game? Second, we have the conflict between luck and skill, i.e. "If everything depends on one roll of the die, to hell with it. Let's get another die and shoot craps."

Richard D. Thurston
Route 2, Box 2643-S
Spanaway, Wash. 98387

Other future articles will analyse: the principle of pursuit; the principle of the objective; the principle of unit of command; logistics and supply; and the center of gravity. A European concept almost totally neglected in US military analyses.

J. E. Pournelle
12051 Laurel Terrace
Studio City, Cal. 91604
Tactics II Updated
by John Van Devender

Change has become a 20th Century fact of life everywhere, that is, except on the Tactics board. The trouble with Tactics II is that it is a 20th Century game played with 19th Century rules. When Tactics first made the scene, back in the old days (when the sun was white dwarf, and the continents were much closer together) we old-timers hailed it as the ultimate gaming experience. Present-day owners of libraries of so-called more “advanced” games may find this statement amusing, but before I put a few noses out of joint, let me set forth reasons why I believe Tactics II, for all its faults, is still the best of all possible war games.

Like all great classic games (go, checkers, chess) Tactics is an abstract contest between equal forces. But Tactics differs with its noble ancestors in that it is a truly open-ended game. That is, Tactics is readily adaptable to all sorts of situations. At this point, the reader may rightfully ask, “So what?” Well, for one thing anyone who bothers to read this far might be assumed to have a passing interest in the fate of a good game which has fallen on evil days. For another, almost everyone with a pile of A-H games has Tactics II. The irony is that hardly anyone plays it. Many A-H “veterans” will not touch Tactics with a 10-foot battle-lance—unless they use it to “break in” a neophyte wargamer, before going on to more “serious” games.

I submit that this attitude is simply because the rules are not as up-to-date as the game situation; i.e., two modern nations dueling for control of a continent. But first, a word (or two) about rules. Serious kriegspieiers possess many virtues such as patience (Anzio), honesty (Midway), nimble fingers (1914), or just being a good loser. But some otherwise well-informed and virtuous souls act as if changing a rule or two brings on a terrible Voodoo curse. Therefore, the faint-hearted need read no further. More stalwart types may push on to the first rule change.

The BTA rule is the first candidate for updating. A generous first-turn push carries forces of whomever is lucky enough to go first way over the centerfold. For the remainder of the game, his opponent struggles to overcome this advantage. All too often, he fails. Any BTA which allows units to speed halfway across the map on a single turn plays hob with strategic planning. And planning, for many of us, is half the fun of gaming. To slow things down somewhat, give armor a BTA of eight, which doubles—not triples—on roads. Reduce infantry to four BTA. I agree it is dumb for Red to take three months to get his island, so tack a mobilization turn before turn one, which does not throw weather and third-turn replacements out of sequence.

Next we face-lift troop counters. A common gripe is that everything in Tactics II acts like an infantry—even the armor, which is just a little stronger and faster. To this I say let armor enter forests using four BTA for each square covered. On any non-road retreat, armor is eliminated. For more specialization give each nation four cavalry brigades with a combat factor of one and a BTA of six. This will perk up peripheral battle zones (Forests) considerably. Still another bonus is to turn useless HQ’s into static forts. Give them a three square range of one factor (forts cannot be eliminated if they attack) and a defense of two for a regular zone of control. Forts may move three squares once, but only on the mobilization turn. Besides adding strong points, forts may help undog the glut of units found on the central plain after the second turn.

Now for the nuclear option. Whoever heard of two major powers with but one operational long-range hydrogen missile apiece? undoubtedly, Tactics’ inventors felt missile proliferation produced holocausts which swept both armies from the board. Real life provides evidence to the contrary, however, at least so far. Therefore, a realistic approach to updated Tactics is the presence of many nuclear weapons. Forget the rule-book option. Now add to each side any or all of the three following missile types, in any quantity, as long as the combined total numbers 20 (Yes, twenty!) 1. Attack Missile. 2. Retaliatory Missile. 3. Defense Missile. Missiles are retained by each side so long as it possesses control over at least one friendly city.

All missiles are effective anywhere on the board. Attack missiles can be used only as first strike weapons, with a yield of four squares in a square shape. Retaliatory missiles (second strike, same yield) are launched only after a player has been attacked by (what else?) attack missiles. One defense missile eliminates any incoming missile. Attack procedure is as follows: Attacker says his targets and the number of weapons directed at each. Defender decides which incoming missiles he will kill (write down number of missile types beforehand to avoid arguments). Simultaneously, the defender announces he is firing retaliatory missiles (if he has any) and the aggressor defends himself as best he can. After the missile exchange, no more missiles are built, and play resumes.

Any square subject to a nuclear strike should be marked off limits to all units for the rest of the game. Bombed-out cities cannot be rebuilt—a factor which affects future replacements. So long as no exchange takes place, at each replacement turn a player may elect to change one missile to another type, so long as his arsenal numbers 20 weapons.

All these options are guaranteed (well, practically) not to add a second to playing time. They do perk up the game. They add realism. And they help to drag Tactics II, kicking and screaming perhaps, but alive once more, into the present century.

John Van Devender
44 Warren St.
Grafton, Pa. 15205

Getting it Together
by Scott M. Sherwood

Having just re-read “Barboussas With A Purpose” (Sept.-Oct. ’70) I again find myself in a state of bewilderment. I still can’t believe that the author was serious about the “master plan” he presented (I hope he wasn’t). As it stands the plan is fine...if the opponent is a dolt.

Criticism. This is easy. The author’s plans for his offensive and its extension have no basis. How can one seriously approach the game and make any plans if the Russian forces are not definitely positioned? Drives “along the Koenigsberg-Leningrad” railway and an “assault” upon Brest-Litovsk sound like great fun. Such moves presume little Russian resistance. But, it is along the border region that the Soviet forces must and most often do put up their most tenacious defense. If this should fail, the Russian defense would become linear along the Dvina from Riga to Smolensk, along the Dnieper to Kiev, and from there south or to Knieper-Petrovsk. As many readers know, if the Russians have taken any losses up to this point and German losses have been moderate then the Soviets are in a difficult position. Necessity would demand that the Russian player shift to a “zone” defense of his major cities which is hard to negotiate when facing a competent German player.

Abandon the fantasies of a pre-determined, dogmatic German strategy. The Stalingrad battle manual should provide ample insights into the strategies of the game.

I’m sure most readers would rather read about methods of play than general strategy so I’ll mention some techniques that may be familiar to some of you.

Railways are of great importance to the Germans and can be useful if used properly. Early in any game the German can, by manuevering on the Russian right at Brest-Litovsk, force the Russian to abandon the area between the Nemunas and Bug Rivers north of Brest-Litovsk itself will either have to be abandoned or face a concentrated German assault. Once this move is accomplished, the German controls the junction of the Leningrad-Warsaw, the Minsk-Brest-Litovsk, and Brest-Litovsk-Miev railroads and has split the Russian front. Possession of these railroads will enable the German to concentrate large numbers of troops on and near the routes of the railroads either in the direction of Moscow, Leningrad, or Kiev in only one move. As Russian forces are pushed back on Minsk or Kiev the German player will appreciate the mobility he has gained when shifting large units to either of the two fronts and the Russian player will be forced to distribute his forces evenly between the upper and middle Dnieper (besides the Dvina) in expectation of German thrusts in either of the areas.

As it has been written about before, don’t risk
Simultaneous Movement for the Masses

by Richard Bareford

In the August 1967 (Vol. I No.7) of Strategy and Tactics, Bob Rauschlin presented an article on the joys of simultaneous movement. Some time later AH came out with an optional rule for simultaneous movement in 1914. These two are the only sources on the subject that have come to my attention - possibly due to the fact that until July 1970 the only gaming literature I've read was what lurked in the AH boxes and that dusty S&T copy; imprisoned on the Isle of Corfu, as I was, the Mainstream sorts passed me by - therefore, if any of the following is old hat have pity on a provincial free-lancer.

All right, now, we're all agreed that simultaneous movement would be optimum, "cause that's the way it's really done. So why are almost all the games of a consecutive nature? Time and Trouble. Routes of advance and/or retreat must be delineated exactly and in secret. The first necessity is a pain and the second often logistically difficult, being open to all sorts of bad gamemanship. Writing out your routes, hex by hex, is perhaps easiest to do in a PBM game, as you can take your time; it is a thoroughly fascinating procedure. If only you could just draw a line! The 1914 system, with its innumerable mapboard facsimiles uses such a gimmick. But still you can waste a lot of time coinciding moves, knocking counters about, erasing old moves - indeed, distinguishing your old moves from the present ones; and, of course, that paper doesn't last forever.

My answer? Acetate overlays and grease pencils.

I've found the implementation of the overlay system to be ultrasimple, devilishly realistic, and in many ways even more "playable" than the traditional forms. Equipment: Two battle-boards of the particular game to be played; two sheets of acetate (medium thickness behoves well), cut to the mapboard size; a number of grease pencils of assorted colors; and a clean, soft cloth or rag for erasing. When both players have completed indicating their units' routes with penciled lines, one player places his sheet over the other player's, making sure that they are properly indexed; battles resolved, uncontroverted moves completed, old positions and lines of march erased, the sheets are flipped over, and the turn's results are transferred to the other player's overlay (which is now overlaying).

Simple? Cheap, too. At least where I live, you can buy an acetate sheet large enough for two 22 x 28 mapboards for say, $2.50. The stuff is a pleasure to work with also; you can roll it up into a tight tube indefinitely and then have it flatten itself out in a minute or so when the tension is released. No elaborate clamping system is required to hold the sheet to the mapboard. If you are not satisfied with the job the static charges do, just place a heavy book on top (Chandler's The Campaigns of Napoleon is excellent for this purpose). With reasonable care (like don't crumple or crease) the acetate should last for years.

Of course, when utilizing this system no little cardboard counters are employed. Since everything is drawn (and fairly securely, too; it takes a conscious rubbing action to entirely eradicate anything) you need no longer be in mortal fear of chance gusts of wind, clumsy kibitzers, or sadistic opponents. If a game is running late, just roll up your sheet and steal away into the autumn mist. These same advantages accrue even if one does not play simultaneously; standard consecutive movement games work nicely with single sheet setups and no counters.

Units may be represented on the acetate with any conceivable code, using numbers and/or exotic alphabets. These can be straight-forward designations or "real" secret codes (like in "inverted counter" 1914, you only discover what an enemy-occupied hex contains when and if you attack it; a "G-2" or "GRU" can play an important role here, especially when "phony" units are allowed).

One useful gimmick is to have the opposing orders of battle under acetate (using the excess cut from the mapboard sheet). With the grease pencil, again, write over the various units the aliases under which they are traveling, and over the enemy units' last reported designations. When it's time to bedazzle your opponent change all your codes around (easily done with cloth and pencil). With step or attention CTRs the acetate provides a fine way of knowing track of casualties; quickly drawn tic marks over or beside the unit designation provide an easily readable accounting.

Well, once you've gotten this far you're ready for the myriad delights of simultaneous movement. A "movement sequence chart" on the model of the one appearing on page 17 of the 1914 Battle Manual is a must. Best of all, a playable simultaneous movement system as I have found this one to be offers the gamer certain prospects of epic new battles in rule interpretation. Though many of the inevitable questions can be resolved with a little common sense, quite a few points are wide open to contrary rationalizations. I would be pleased to hear some discussion on this vital subject.

Richard Bareford
62 12th Street
Carle Place, N.Y. 11514
The possibility of the intervention by the German Baltic Fleet in a general action between the Grand Fleet and the High Seas Fleet was always considered by the British Admiralty. The Germans paid no attention to it. Admiral Jellicoe was eternally dredging the thing up, and worrying over it, and asking his friends didn’t they think so too. They didn’t. There also dawned gradually upon the absolute certainty that Germany would choose the moment to strike, and would strike with every ship, submarine and zeppelin on hand and in peak condition, while at any given moment the Grand Fleet could be depended upon to have: “...two four-sixteens, one or two light cruisers, six destroyers, one or two destroyers, and perhaps a battlecruiser undergoing refit, in addition to whatever other vessels that might be temporarily disabled...” Reading these gloomy reports, one begins to wonder who had the bigger fleet, after all. Moreover, possible help from Dover and Harwich was discounted, owing to the Dover Patrol being made up of ungainly pre-dreadnoughts, and the distinct possibility that the Harwich Force might not be able to find the Grand Fleet in the limitless expanse of the North Sea.

The Battle of Jutland confirmed one-half of Jellicoe’s fears, in that the Grand Fleet never got the support of Dover or Harwich, and at the time of the battle there were two battleships (HMS “Emperor of India” and “Queen Elizabeth”) a battlecruiser (HMS “Australia”) and some light units laid up in the dockyards. But the Germans sailed missing an equal number of battleships (SMS “Bayern”, in the Baltic, and SMS “Konig Albert”, in the dockyards,) without any kind of support from the Baltic Fleet, without shotguns of submarines and minelayers, and without flocks of zeppelins. In this, Jellicoe was disappointed, and probably Beatty was too.

Certainly if Scheer meant to crush the British fleet, as he claimed he did, religiously, he would have scraped up everything that would float and shoot, to do it with. But the German Navy was always skulking around, looking for some small part of the enemy that it could assassinate or bushwack without too much trouble. Thus we must conclude that Scheer was an heretic.

There was little to stop the German high command from switching the Baltic Fleet to Wilhelmshaven if they took a notion to it. The Baltic Fleet was a separate command, and so there might be some friction between the respective commanders, but expedience can overcome anything but its ancestor circumstance. There was also a sort of Russian Navy to worry about, but the Russians of late have been reluctant to cast off from a nice, safe harbor until the German Army came stomping down the quays. They were still not over Tsushima, and morale was lower than a sub’s keel at test depth. Granted, after a few days even the Russians would notice that there were not so many enemy ships in sight as formerly; but that would just start them worrying over u-boats. And if they did sail, what sort of work could they do? Shell a few Pomeranian crows, perhaps, with the twelve-inch guns of the “Gangut”, pray that there were no subs around, and have two or three destroyers run aground, or torpedo each other - trust them to score with torpedoes when they make a mistake such as that, and trust the temperamental things to work just then, too - or surrender to an oncoming enemy island.

So, now that we have got the Baltic Fleet moving down the Kiel Canal to Wilhelmshaven and glory, let us sit on the grassy banks in Schleswig-Holstein and watch the pride of Germany pass in review. I don’t mean the milkmaids, either.

Leading the procession is the new SMS “Bayern”, twenty-eight thousand tons of wrath, eight fifteen-inch guns of thunder, and the speed of lightning, if there is lightning anywhere that a protection factor of 14, a motion factor of 9, and fourteen hit boxes, seven fore and aft, complete the picture. She will be the Fleet flagship one day, although at the time the Fleet will be in mutiny and so the honor will be dubious.

Bobbing along in the wake of this behemoth are three predreadnoughts of the “Hessen” class, fraternal twins of the “Deutschlands”. These are the “Preussen”, “Braunschweig” and “Elsass”. There would have been a fourth, but the “Lothringen” was eternally breaking down, and blowing boilers, and springing leaks, and dropping off propellers in odd places, so Scheer, a man with absolutely no sense of humor, ordered it scrapped early in 1916.

Next come “Wittelsbach”, “Wettin”, “Zähringen”, “Schwaben” and “Mehlenburg”, five seventeen-year-old predreadnoughts of the “Wittelsbach” class. They each displace 11,800 tons soaking wet, and carry four 9.4” and eighteen six-inch guns, which means that they have two hit boxes, one fore and aft, a protection factor of 8, and a motion factor of 7 apiece. Don’t be so discouraged. Look at the group as if it were one vast, slow battleship with a total of ten hit boxes and a protection factor of forty.

Following up are the last two armored cruisers in the German Navy. We started out with eight, but the war has depleted them somewhat. Furti­uous Alsbach bagged one by gunfire (Schain­horst, Gneisenau, Blucher) and another by tor­pedo. (Prinz Adalbert) The Russians, doubtless by accident, mined and sank another. (Friederich Karl) The sixth one committed hara-kari on one of its own mines a few miles from Helgoland (Yorck) Hence these two, “Roon” and “Prinz Heinrich”, are all that we have left. Each has a protection factor of 4, two hit boxes, one fore and aft, and a motion factor of 8.

With regards to light cruisers we do better: We have twelve of them. The first two, “Augsberg” and “Undine”, have gunnery factors of two in a single hit box apiece, and motion factors of 8. The next pair, “Berlin” and “Kolberg”, have identical gunnery factors, but motion factors of 9, and a load of 45 to 60 mines each. There is a foursome with gunnery factors of 3 in a single hit box and motion factors of 12 each, namely “Bremse”, “Stralsund” and “Strassburg”, bringing up the rear are four 20-year-old light cruisers with hit boxes as follows: [1, 1] and motion factors of 7; SMS “Freys”, “Hamann”, “Hertha” and “Victoria Luise”. What you do with them is entirely up to you.

There are thirty-eight destroyers, rendering from middle-aged to senile:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destroyer Class</th>
<th>Ship</th>
<th>Motion Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DD 5/Flot. 2</td>
<td>5-15</td>
<td>(3-2-2-1-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD 5/Flot. 7</td>
<td>5-14</td>
<td>(2-2-1-1-0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD 5/Flot. 8</td>
<td>5-14</td>
<td>(2-2-1-1-0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD 5/Flot. 15</td>
<td>6-13</td>
<td>(2-2-1-1-0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD 5/Flot. 16</td>
<td>5-13</td>
<td>(2-2-1-1-0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD 5/Flot. 19</td>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>(2-2-1-1-0-0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD 5/Flot. 20</td>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>(2-2-1-1-0-0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would strongly recommend that these last two half-fritatas do not venture too far from the Kiel Canal. There is no subs around, if they could have gone. Lastly come the u-boats, U26, U28, U33, U39, U58 and U60, and that is all. There is nothing left in the Baltic now except for a few fishing boats. And the fish.

Now that Scheer has pillaged the Baltic, he must terrorize the civilians. There was a chance the the “Kaiser” class battleship “Konig Albert” could have gone out with the rest of the fleet - in point of fact, Scheer delayed sailing because he was afraid of being caught in U-boats or trawlers. There is nothing in this ship in part. But the dockyard was lackadaisical. The kaiser, the “Konig Albert” in time, anything else means that the war would be won.

Now that we have brought to life Jellicoe’s worst nightmares, we ought to give the Royal Navy equal time. I will deal with it next round.

Postscript: According to official German sources, sixteen u-boats and ten zeppelins were employed with the High Seas Fleet at the time of the battle. They were: U-boats: U19, U22, U24, U32, U44, U45, U47, U52, U53* U63, U64, U66, U70, UB21, UB22. Zeppelins: L19, L11,L13, L14, L16, L17, L21, L22, L23, L24.

Stephen Lewis
363 Oxford Street
Rochester
New York 14607
Dear Sirs,

Unfortunately, Mr. Valenciak's article, HOLLAND 1914, (Vol. 17, No. 4) is ignored entirely. In fact, unlike real life, most of your French commanders in 1914 are reasonably competent. On the first turn, Mr. Valenciak invades Holland and with his superior force, begins crushing them. His one unsuspecting Allied opponent becomes suspicious and covers his northern border with a wall of 6-10's. After Mr. Valenciak has destroyed the Dutch army, his cavalry 'sweeping through Belgium' are confronted by the much stronger French force. On turn nine, the French commander clobbers Mr. Valenciak's cavalry and advances into Belgium. On turn ten, Mr. Valenciak has hopefully stopped the French advance and stabilized his line. So what? He's gained even fewer points than he had hoped for. Even if by some miraculous reason Mr. Valenciak does stop the French and achieves his ultimate desire, (102 points for the Germans plus about 30 for Metz and Strasbourg at a total of 126 points for the French), and even if he gets a couple of 100's points having the East, he gets a tactical victory* which means he will almost surely lose. With my letter, I quote Geoff Burkman "I have nothing to say... except... I'll play you by mail anytime, and I'll guarantee that you'll lose." (The General Vol. 6, No. 4).

If you add the French corps he will hopefully destroy.

Thomas Wilton
106 Hawthorne Pl.
Lake Forest, Ill. 60045

Dear Sirs,

Mandeville, it is a comprehensive map game journal, with articles for everyone. One year's subscription (quarterly) costs $2.00.

The Avalon Hill Intercontinental Kriegpiel Society
E. R. Johnson, Vice President/Editor
P.O. Box 134
Waltham, Mass. 02154

All -- The KOMANDEUR is a comprehensive map game journal with articles for everyone. (Send in the eyes really smart.)

To the Editor:

I strongly support Donald Greenwood's suggestions on layout. I'm sure many of the typos in the Opponents Wanted section are from trying to read ads that were in too small a font. You only need to request that ad requests be typeset. Surely it is not that difficult to check the number of words in a typed request.

You could prevent the recurrent criticism of the necessity of muting the German by putting the Club Registration form (if it is necessary) and the instructions about Subscriber Discount on a separate form. Then you could put the discount coupon itself in the upper right corner of the Opponents Wanted section (barely the "Inkwell" Report hearing).

The "Heller's Folly" article should have been returned to the author for a rewrite. It borders on the vicious. Your editorial policy should prohibit personal attacks.

Peace

David C. Bell
908 L. 37th
Austin, Texas 78705

All who had to do was add... set format change this issue.

Dear Editor,

Has anyone in wargaming ever considered the idea of a country-wide unified organization for wargaming that would be a counterpart to the United States Chess Federation?

Looking at the annual scene from a viewpoint of some one not involved in a club or league or whatever, it makes sense. As it stands now you have a host of local groups that are much more widespread and in competition with each other. That wastes efforts and resources, saps the life of the "Wargaming Movement" as well as this one can't really afford.

Each local area which had sufficient personal wealth and personal space to sustain one would be grouped into geographic regions (such as Los Angeles Basin or San Francisco Bay Area) compact enough to provide inter-club competition. Above that, there would be state and national levels charged mainly with administration and major tournaments.

PBM could be handled through a much larger network, instead of being restricted to your own club; each PBM player would then have more of a chance of finding someone interested in playing the particular game he is interested in.

Rules and rating systems could be standardized nationwide, ending this mess of who is better than who -- everyone would know at a glance at his opponent's rating just how strong he really is. PBM could then be set to pit pro versus pro and amateur versus amateur. The player has a chance of beating. There is very little glory in cobbling a novice (at least for me) and not too much to be learned from playing someone who is head- and-shoulders above you that his moves seem avoidable magic.

I won't go on listing advantages, but I think it is pretty clear that this kind of set-up could do a lot to help the hobby and the individual player.

One last note: for those of you concerned with the "dictatorial" or bobby aspect of such a setup, I would point out that large organizations as how grown up we all are. I've never felt anything like that in USCF, and I don't think it follows automatically from centralized organization.

M.S. Buyoinski
136 Brewton
San Fernando, Calif. 91427

Dear Sirs,

Readers who are unfamiliar with the truly last days of our hobby should not believe Mr. Greenwood's statements (Nov-Dec) about the qualities of first class issues. He said, "First year's articles in the General were filled with space garbage which the General was forced to use."

This gives a false impression of those early issues. In point of fact, each issue was eagerly anticipated and every single printed word was read, re-read and memorized. If the articles had been as bad as Mr. Greenwood says, the General would have failed.

Greenwood has forgotten that in issue No. 1 Karl Knabe described his revolutionary PLAN RED for D-DAY which made it impossible for the German player to lose. Players who followed Knabe's PLAN RED won so often as the Germans that A.H. had to redesign the game and invent air power to give the American side a chance of winning.

Another mind boggling article came from Hillary Smith who described a game which began in 1939 and ended in 1945. It used 6 players, included every major and minor power in Europe and was played on a 3 x 5 foot map of Europe. Hillary had a club, which was highly unusual in those days, and his boys would play this game for weeks on end. It was quite a shock to realize that they had devised their own war game and were playing it together. Multi-player games where each has his own copy of the map and nobody got upset were unheard of in those days!

My contribution to that issue was "How To Win With Opponents Wanted" and I outlined Zochof's Infamous dirty dozen tricks which told all the little things one could do while playing that would give you the psychological edge over your opponent. If this was so bad that A.H. was "forced to use it", can Mr. Greenwood explain why I was asked to do more articles along the same lines? At the risk of sounding concoted, I believe this was the best article I ever wrote.

Those of you who are new to this hobby should understand something about Mr. Green- wood. He publishes his own paper (Panzerfaust) and maintains a high degree of professionalism. I feel that the burden of regular publication and his broadened wargaming experiences has jaded his judgement to the point where he has lost perspective. In those early days the General was the only standard around which we could rally and we thought it was wonderful. Today there are many wargame publications from which to choose, but most of the old General articles are every bit as interesting as anything any of the new ones can offer. I admit that the General deliberately stirrup controversy by running two articles side by side which went as opposite as could be, but even this procedure was benefici- cial. One author claimed that Side No. 1 never lost in such and such a game and the author claimed that side No. 1 never wins. Readers knew that one of the authors was completely wrong and it was interesting to try out the proposed sure fire plans and see for oneself which had been guilty of faulty logic. In some cases, it turned out that the logic was wrong, but the author did uncover new areas of problem solving techniques and it was his tactics rather than his strategy which was winning his battles.

If A.H. ever reprints some of those vintage articles, I'm sure you'll find them just as interest- ing as today's works.

Louis Zochii
10413 Raymond Ave.
Rancho Cordova, Calif. 95670

Subscriber Discount

The coupon printed on the reverse side may be applied toward purchases of Avalon Hill products. Each coupon is worth 25 cents. How- ever, no less than 4 coupons can be used in any one purchase. Orders received accompanied by three coupons or less will be returned unfulfilled. Any number above four may be used in any single purchase. No photocopies please.

Contest No. 41

It is the 28th anniversary of the initial campa- gin in Stalingrad. The Russian Defense was an absolute surprise (if what its history reports it might have been 28th years ago. Here as the German commander you must imitate an attack on the rear of the Russian lines. Choose the best chance for strategic success. Objective in this instance is advance into Russia with attrition of Russian units secondary.

You have a total of 7. guilt factors to assign as you see fit. Simply write in on the squares adjacent to the Russian the total number of factors representing German units you would place there.

The ten entrants who come closest to what our experts consider is the optimum strategy will be awarded a prize of $10. Entries must be post- marked no later than February 19, 1971. Please state what you think are the three best articles of this issue in your entry. Entrants are free to bear on the contest but entries not bearing this information will be voided. Entries using the reverse side for submission of an ad are ensured that the ad will be picked up.
The Question Box

BLITZKRIEG

Q. If I capture and isolated enemy city with 12 of my airborne factors, may I air transport 12 additional factors to that city on the next turn?

A. Yes, but in doing so you overload the supply capacity of your airhead and must either capture additional supply cities or eliminate factors on the turn following the overload to “balance” your supplies. EXAMPLE: 12 factors of Blue airborne troops capture 00-40 on turn No. 3, 00-40 is behind Red lines and no supply route exists to a friendly port or supply line; thus, the Blue airhead has a supply capacity of 12 factors (one city square). On turn No. 4, Blue airlifts 12 factors of infantry to 00-40 to support his airborne troops, thereby overloading the supply capacity of the airhead by 12 factors (here we assume Red has just been watching this happen to himself, and has not eliminated any Blue factors). Blue now has one turn to (1) capture another city square to supply the additional troops, or (2) move them out again by airlift. If he accomplishes neither at the end of his portion of turn No. 5, he must eliminate factors until only 12 remain in the airhead; this brings his supply situation back into balance.

Q. Can you attack enemy units At Sea?

A. No!

ANZIO:

Q. If the German close off the South End, can the Allies continue their Build-Up off the board?

A. Yes.

Q. If the Allies invade Feb. 11, does HG return to game?

A. Yes.

Q. Commandos can land up to first squares from an invasion beach, but how is this measured?

A: Along the coast, not over water.

Q. Can the Allies overstock a beach and then simultaneously shift units back and forth so that the beach is continually supplied capacity?

A: No.

Q. When Monarchists enter the game can they use strategic movement on the first turn?

A: No. Also, they cannot enter at Naples unless it has a port counter.

Q. A unit is forced onto a close square as the result of first combat. If it is attacked again on second combat and forced across the river, is it eliminated?

A: Yes.

BULGE:

Q. Using the optional weather table, if the weather clears up on the roll before the Germans 24 AM turn, what is the movement rate of the German units reduced?

A: 24 hours later: during the 25 AM turn.

The following are all of the Question Box entries from past issues of the GENERAL that are still valid for STALINGRAD.

Q. Can Italian and Hungarian units be placed in EM?

A: No. No additional units can be placed in Finland after the first turn.

Q. Can Hungarian units start in Finland?

A: Yes. However, the number of non-Finnish combat factors that may start in Finland may not exceed 8.

Q. Can units be placed next to the Hungarian border on the first turn?

A. Yes.

Q. Can the armies at the Sea of Azov be used as a supply route?

A: No.

Q. Do defending units get double defending behind the Baltic, Volkhov, or Svir Rivers if they are on a swamp square?

A: Yes.

Q. If the German attacks a doubled 5-7-4 and gets an exchange, how many attack factors must the German remove?

A: 7.

Q. Can one friendly unit move into an enemy ZOC (and attack on unit) while a second friendly unit attacks the enemy unit?

A: No. All units in enemy ZOC MUST attack some enemy unit.

Q. If a unit on a river is attacked from a fork in the river and from a different river, is it doubled?

A: No.

Q. A unit on BB-22 attacked from CC-22 and CC-21 would defend at basic odds.

Q. If a replacement city is surrounded by enemy ZOC’s, how many replacement factors can be started in that city?

A: No.

Q. Can a unit in the ZOC of an enemy unit move one square into the ZOC of another enemy unit and attack the second unit?

A: Yes, as long as the attacker has not moved through the ZOC of any one enemy unit.

The following include all of the Question Box entries from past issues of the GENERAL that are still valid for WATERLOG:

Q. If the first retreat square is a woods square or a river square, is the unit eliminated?

A: Yes. If the square contains a road, the unit may retreat on the road.

Q. Are attacks at less than 1-4 allowed?

A: Yes. (H.Q. units may not attack.)

Q. Exactly where may Provision units start the game?

A: Provision units may start on any EE or north of EE, and on or east of Y-35, Z-25, AA-25, BB-24, CC-22, DD-23, EE-23.

Q: Can a unit traveling along clear terrain enter a road-woods square and continue along the road in the same turn?

A: Yes. A unit can move from E-35 to E-39 to E-40 and then along the road in the same turn.

Q. Can I.O.U. units delay enemy units?

A: No.

MISCELLANEOUS:

Q. Why must The General clutter up its pages with useless, space-taking forms such as “Opponents Wanted,” and “Club Registration” forms? Why can’t subscribers simply write such things down on pieces of paper?

A. When subscribers were not given the benefit of “forms,” we found it difficult to interpret the longhand entry. And, too, they tended to include such things on the same paper with orders, requests for brochures, etc., making it much more difficult to handle than via present methods. Believe us, it has worked out far better this way.

Q. Why is it so difficult locating Avalon Hill games in retail stores?

A. Like any product that is not massmarket in nature, the lack of consumer demand makes distribution to all stores impossible. Fortunately, the “repeat sales” nature makes Avalon games very popular with retailers for those relatively small number of outlets now stocking. Yes – the subscriber – are the key to widening the distribution base. Buy your favorite stores often enough – eventually it will stock AH games.

Q. How do I get on the Avalon Hill Consumer Test Panel?

A. For best testing results, prototypes are sent only to upscale clubs and organizations boasting at least 3 members. This way one prototype, which is an expensive production vehicle, can be circulated among the maximum number of participants. For approval to this panel, one must submit a list containing names, addresses, and short personal reviews of at least eight persons they call upon.

Q. Can you tell me where stores in my area carry AH games?

A. Not entirely. Upon occasion we will ship directly to retail outlets but in 95% of the cases, we ship to wholesalers who in turn deliver to retail outlets. Thus we have very little knowledge of who really sells them. But if you tell us the largest city within 100 miles of your town, we will send you the name of the wholesaler serving your area, who can furnish you with name of your local retail outlets.

Save this Discount Coupon

GOOD TOWARD THE PURCHASE OF ALL AVALON HILL PRODUCTS

JANUARY-FEBRUARY 1971

Opponents Wanted

All ads for opponents will be inserted as a free service to subscribers, one ad per subscriber per issue. Ads will not be passed from issue to issue; however, subscribers may re-submit the same ad or new ads for each successive issue. Please print or type your advertisement on the space provided below, maximum 25 words per ad (including name and address).
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NAME STREET ADDRESS CITY STATE ZIP

“For Safe, Trades,” and requests other than for opponents will be inserted only when space permits. Ads received after the 15th of the month preceding publication will appear in the following issue. Subscribers using the reverse side as a current entry are assured that it will be picked up.

Quality control all down the line is the credo at Avalon Hill. Here, cameraman Stanley Glaser picks up an error to Lou Velkasowsky that got by the design department. “Sometimes we even have to show the designers how to unfold the mapboard,” musters Glaser who, like all the others in the painting end of the company, are ever-vigilant in their quest for higher standards.
MERRY XMAS TO ALL subscribers who have
“grown” with The General, particularly those
who sent us Xmas cards - a most gratifying
gesture.

GAMES 101 is a brand new course on Beginning
Wargaming that “Professor” John P. Bobek
teaches at the U. of Illinois Circle Campus
Alternate University. Bobek’s field of endeavor is
Secondary Education and since his hobby is
wargaming, he was the natural choice of the Dean
instituting this elective course. The course runs
approximately 10 weeks; in due time this column
will be able to make a full report on the progress
of the class. Alternate University is an attempt to
set up a learning community on Circle Campus. A
learning community is where one is not lectured
at, but where people discuss; a place where
generative ideas and individual thinking are en­
couraged. Games 101, 117 Taft Hall, deals with
an introduction to wargaming including an
examination of its history and theory on the macro
and microcosmic levels. Lab work is assigned on
Tuesdays after 4 P.M. in the east cafeteria. A
similar project is being explored in far off Brazil;
David Robinson and Rick Britton are developing
a mini-course on military strategy, tactics, and
wargaming for implementation at the Associao
Escola Graduada de Sao Paulo. All that remains
now is for someone to come up with a corre­
spondence course on wargaming - under the G.J.
Bill, of course . . .

DRAKE PUBLISHERS, LTD. announces its
newest release, “Battles With Model Soldiers.”
Retailing for $5.95 it is available from the
publisher at 440 Park Avenue South, New York
10016 . . . .

POMPADOURL DOMINION puts out a catalog
of available games that beats anything we’ve seen
locally. General Manager Peter Statner claims that
with its “unique and original classification
system of all major games in the adult and family
game line” the catalog is the first of its kind ever
published. This publisher has more than just a
passing interest in games; they claim to be the
first Canadian retail outlet to stock games exclu­
sively and on a year-round basis. Known as
GAMEWAYS, the company also wholesales to
some dozen boutiques all across the province of
Ontario and in Quebec. The unique catalog may
be purchased by sending a U.S. dollar to 91
Bloor Street West, Suites 301-302, Toronto 181,
Ontario, Canada.

THE CHAMPION STOCKISTS FOR AH
GAMES IN CANADA is currently Canadian
Merchandisers, 1111 Finch Avenue, Unit 26, Downs­
view, Ontario who has been responsible for
tripling the exposure of AH games to interested
Canadians. We suggest that all Canadian friends
contact either of these outlets for direct pur­
chases - that way the high import duty can be
by-passed.

AMONG THE MORE DEDICATED WAR­
GAMERS must be Dana Lombardy. A notice in
the I.W.S. Tournament Bulletin states that
Dana “made a wargaming tour of the east last
summer, attending three conventions and seeing
many gamers throughout the east, midwest, and
south.” A story of his journey, with pictures, which
indeed must be an unusual one, is to be sent
to each player that finishes play undertaken in
the I.W.S. tournament. Surplus editions of his
story will hopefully be made available to those
participating in their 1971 tournament - info is
available from Dana Lombardy, 956 Kittiwake
Lane, Chula Vista, Cal. 92011. Meanwhile, hows
about sending us a copy now, Dana old fellow . . .

IN DIGESTING D-ELIM, the wargame journal
of St. John’s University’s Military Strategy Club.
We are reminded of George Phillips’ “Guide to
Wargaming Periodical Literature.” This quarterly
publication lists and catalogs all the articles in
just about every wargaming publication, inval­
uable for anyone interested in what really goes
behind the literary scene. A year’s subscription
costs $3.00 from Phillips, 505C, 305 Memorial
Drive, Cambridge, Mass. 02139 . . .

CONTEST NO. 40 SOLUTION: There are two
obvious facts that the solution to this tactical
problem could take: but one is much more
than the other. The less efficient solution
ensigns an outright assault on the 10/CCR,
with 3-1’s on the other two surrounding units
and soaks on the remaining two. But the probability
of this attack contacting or destroying the CCR
is 9/10 with no sure kill on the 506 or 501.
The alternative is to hit the 506 and 501 at 9/10
each. By occupying these two squares with
more than 16 factors, you make impossible
sink-offs and counterattacks by the American in
his turn. The attacks are most efficiently made in
this fashion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Attacker</th>
<th>Odds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>9/20, Lehr/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>Lehr/1, 2/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>CCR</td>
<td>62/123, 1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>326/662, 1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>327g</td>
<td>326/661, 2/7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The maximum number of sure-kills is three.
There are three exchange situations, undoubled
with the worst being the loss of the 2/8 in Battle
No. 2. The probability of capturing Bastogne is
still 5/6, the only unfavorable results being an
engaged which you have at all odds between 1-4
and 4-1. In this plan, the overriding feature is to
exclude the possibility of American counterattack
from strong formations they are assumed to have
in the area at this late date (after 23AM). Attacks
could be made on the CCR, 506, and 501 at 1-5
but this is weak because a) it opens the possibil­
ity of A Elim, and b) leaves no chance of D-Elim
on the CCR (1/6 at 1/2 in our solution), and
c) does not kill a “killaible” unit (the 506) in
violation of objective no. a. If the engaged does
not come up in Battle No. 3, then on the U.S.’s
half of the turn the CCR will have to attack at
1-8 or worse which will accomplish objective
no. c for the Germans. There is no way that the
CCR can be attacked that would assure a kill,
and the 1-2 against it accomplishes the same
results; with the same probability of success,
with a more efficient use of force, as the maximum
4-1.

In the contest format, as it is printed, it is not
possible to analyze a contestant’s advances after
combat. Therefore, in judging the entries, import­
ance must be placed in the units attacking the
501; because that is the only square wherein the
German units cannot be reached by an American
counterattack in aid of the CCR which must
attack those units if not engaged or eliminated.
To successfully accomplish this, at least 18
factors must attack the 101/501.

Maximizing all possible results, we find that
there is the possibility to:

a) Destroy two enemy units.
b) Lose two German units (14 factors).c) Take Bastogne in the German’s turn.

Minimizing all possible results we find the
possibility to:

a) Destroy two enemy units.
b) Lose no units (German).
c) Not take Bastogne.

By taking the expected values of the probabil­
ities: E(Z) = v, we find:

a) Expect to destroy 2 and 2/3 units.
b) Expect to lose 2 and 1/2 German unit.
c) Expect to take Bastogne 5/6 of the time.

Any other results are, in our opinion, less than
optimum.

TEN CONTEST NO. 40 PARTICIPANTS com­
ing closest (most matched it identically) to our
tactical solution were: Charles A. Fogggott, Clay­
month, Delaware; Bruce Chamberlain, E., Hart­
ford, Conn.; John Moriarty, N. Wales, Pa.;
Richard Anderson, Livermore, Cal.; Richard A.
Leiby, Mertztown, Pa.; George Rontop, Mt.
Vernon, Iowa; Dennis Milbert, Denver, Colorado;
Bob Karaluna, Warren, Michigan; Michael O. Fike,
Parma Heights, Ohio; and William Draker, W.
Plains, N.Y.

THE VOTING SPREAD ON LAST ISSUE’S
literary efforts were so mixed that picking the
top five required a recount by your editorial
staff. A virtual 3-way tie in total mentions
existed between Glenn Davis’ “Plan of the
Month,” Mark Morse’s “Fabian Stalingrad,” and
Donald Greenwood’s “Buyers Guide.” A count of
first-place votes, only, decided the top three in
the above order mentioned. Kevin Slimak’s “Mid·
day in Focus” took 4th place and Lawrence
Valencourt sneaked into 5th with “Holland 1914.”
Actually, a 3-way tie also existed here with
Valencourt winning out on greatest number of
first-place votes. Honorable mentions go to
T/Sgt. Robert A. Burge for Part II of his “Tac
Air in D-Day” and 1st Lt. Richard A. Shagrin for
“Heller’s Folly.”