This time the arrival of the new year brings more than the traditional good cheer of the yuletide season. A pall of recession hangs over the nation with ever increasing certainty. Reports of raw material shortages have been with us for over a year and relief is not yet in sight. Ads to this the more widely publicized energy shortage, inflation, and a general lack of faith in the economy and prospects for the coming year must be considered grim at best. The state of the nation is foreboding without doubt but before burying our heads in the sand let's take a realistic look at events as they stand now and try to appraise the situation.

Foremost in the minds of all printers is the paper shortage. A labor problem in the Californian mills plus an attempt by the Japanese to transplant American forests overseas in rising quantities has caused a major shortage of cheap paper and cardboard, or chipboard as it is commonly referred to in the trade, which has existed for over a year. The result has been spiraling costs and the imposing of quota systems by paper suppliers. This, in turn, has increased the price of printing across the board and threatens to put more than one small printer out of business. Avalon Hill, being a major paper user, has been caught in the crunch like everyone else. Fortunately however, the effects will not weigh so heavily on us as on others.

Paper is not the only raw material in short supply. Plastics, by-product of petroleum, have become harder and harder to obtain. And with gasoline rationing in the offing, plastics may' result we've paid in the past. The usual antidote is to pass on rising costs to the consumer. If you don't believe it check what you're paying for gas next time you fill up. However, where people may not balk at paying 90c a gallon for gasoline which they view as a necessity, many will refuse to buy a $12 or $15 game. Therefore, we've taken an alternate route to maintain our prices at the current level. We'll continue to publish new games as usual; in fact, we do use tremendous quantities of cardboard and outer sleeves. While few will refuse to pay $12 or $15 for a game, many will refuse to buy a $12 or $15 game. Furthermore, the effects will not weigh so heavily on us as on others.
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1974 — WHAT WILL IT BRING??

pay higher rates not only to get the raw materials to the factories but also to send finished games to our wholesalers.

But how will all of this affect Avalon Hill and wargaming in general? Of a certainty something must be done to meet the specter of rising costs. The usual antidote is to pass on rising costs to the consumer. If you don't believe it check what you're paying for gas next time you fill up. However, where people may not balk at paying 90c a gallon for gasoline which they view as a necessity, many will refuse to buy a $12 or $15 game. Therefore, we've taken an alternate route to maintain our prices at the current level. We'll be cutting the cost of manufacture by doing away with surplus and unnecessary niceties such as the plastic trays and outer box sleeves. While making little difference to the game player these cuts will enable us to hold the prices steady in the face of inflation for at least another year.

These changes will go in effect with our spring release. Eventually, all of the bookcase games will be stripped of their outer sleeve and given the new packaging treatment. So if you want the 'deluxe' sets it might be wise to fill your bookcase collection now while they are still available in their present form.

What other changes will there be? None of any real consequence to you. We've already cut back on our advertising outlay to avoid selling more games than we can produce. But, we shall continue to publish new games as usual; in fact, we may even pick up the pace a bit. As such, we foresee little difficulty in matching 1973's sales — an all-time high for Avalon Hill. The spring release will be previewed in the next issue and we guarantee you'll find this land battle game to your liking, especially the Campaign Game, which will have more than a few of you up all night and into the morning. We will continue to upgrade the GENERAL and hopefully will see an increase in pages to 34 sometime in the year. Now that's not so bad for a year of disaster is it?
ANZIO — WAS THIS TRIP NECESSARY?

That was a familiar question during gasoline rationing in World War II — trying to prevent wasting precious resources for no good purpose. This, in my opinion, fairly sums up not only the Anzio invasion, but the entire Italian Campaign. I call it a blunder by the Allies, a waste of lives overcoming non-essential geographical barriers reminiscent of World War I, not only in the heroism of the men who died, but also in the obfuscation of the generals who sent them to their deaths.

Most students of World War II know the sequence of events which led the Allies to invade Italy. It began with the German pressure on Russia, still nearly overwhelming in 1942, and the inability of Russia’s allies to distract that pressure. Morocco seemed the only point where something could be done. The North African campaign completed, the Allies evidently could think of nothing better than to follow their noses: proceeding to the next adjacent Axis-occupied land mass, regardless of whether some other plan might have made more strategic sense.

Douglas Orgill, on page 10 of his interesting book The Gothic Line, quotes Montgomery’s worry over the lack of strategic thinking behind the Italian campaign: “But he had been told of no plan, and therefore there was none. Montgomery had, in fact, already seen the flaw in Allied thinking which...cost the Allies thousands of lives in exchange for a few muddy miles of the Appenine mountains.”

So began a series of errors and wasted opportunities which may have prolonged the war for months.

A. The Invasion of Sicily

General Patton, with his characteristic boldness, wanted the Americans to invade in the northwest near Palermo, placing the Germans and their increasingly war-weary Italian allies between the tongs of a pincer, with the British landing in the southeast. Boldness was not to be the theme of this part of the war, however, save a few exceptions such as the imaginative seizure of Taranto. Patton’s plan was vetoed in favor of an invasion in the southeast corner, which allowed the Germans to withdraw in good order along a narrowing front. But for Patton’s typical unauthorized probing to the northwest, and his later risky amphibious assaults on the coast west of Messina, the Germans might have delayed the Allies another month in Sicily. Sir Basil Liddell Hart, on page 440 of his indispensable History of the Second World War, has this to say: If Patton had landed near Palermo on the northwest coast, he would have been well on the way to the Straits of Messina...all the enemy forces in Sicily could have been trapped. In the event, the escape of the German divisions had far-reaching ill effect on the Allies further moves.”

B. The failure to trap the Germans in Sicily

Perhaps the greatest fruit of the North African campaign was the capture of the best part of the Afrika Korps. Had the Italian veterans been able to withdraw, Rommel had “guaranteed” Hitler to repel any Allied invasion of southern Europe. Even after rejecting Patton’s plan to dash for Messina, the Allies had another chance to repeat their Tunisian coup, and ignored it. It would have been on a smaller scale, but perhaps with equal, or greater consequences.

From the German viewpoint, the Sicilian campaign was a masterful delaying action, capped by a skillful withdrawal despite Allied naval and air superiority. Had the 60,000 German troops on the island been isolated there, the invasion of Italy could have been the dramatic success the Allies envisioned. Try playing Anzio without the four German divisions involved, and see what I mean!

This objective could’ve been accomplished had the Allies invaded the Italian “toe”, Reggio Calabria, while engaging the Germans in central Sicily. It is a moot question whether such a move would have succeeded, but had it, German withdrawal from Sicily would’ve been impossible.

The “toe” is virtually an island, only 20 miles across at the “joints”, with rugged, easily held terrain. If the Allies could’ve held this peninsula, not only would they have made Sicily another disaster for the Germans, but they would’ve won a beachhead on the mainland. Turning again to Liddell Hart’s book, page 446, he quotes Kesselring as saying “a secondary attack on Calabria would have enabled the Sicily landing to be developed into an overwhelming Allied victory”, and he goes on to note that the Germans had but two divisions to cover all of southern Italy!

C. What next after Sicily?

When the Allies invaded in Salerno, they did so in the expectation that it was a conservative approach, certain to win a beachhead. They considered, and abandoned, a number of more daring plans involving air-drops on Rome, or north of Naples, perhaps together with an amphibious assault just north of Naples. Salerno didn’t work out as planned, because the Germans read their intentions, and had forces in the vicinity which turned the landing into a very near thing. Had it not been for other units menacing the German rear from Taranto and Calabria, the invasion might well have been repulsed.

Why was Salerno obvious? Because it was the nearest suitable point to the great port of Naples which enjoyed air cover from Sicily.

A better course would have been to capture Sardinia and Corsica next. Neither island was heavily defended. Although no airbases comparable to Foggia were available, they could’ve been built. From islands not only could a much greater part of the Italian coast be threatened, but the south of France as well. In the game of Anzio one of the great problems of the German player is protecting the long seaward flanks. The same is true in D-Day. The Allies dominated the sea and much of the air, and could strike at too many places for the Germans to properly protect them all. I contend that the threat posed by Allied control of all three of these islands would’ve tied down quite a few German divisions at minimal cost to the Allies. Then, an invasion with air cover could have been attempted by the Allies, if desirable, at a far greater range of points along the coast.

Winston Churchill, in one of his books on World War II, Closing the Ring (page 154), takes a rather different view. “Sardinia, so long thrust forward in Staff argument as the alternative to the assault on Italy, fell into our hands for nothing, as a mere bonus, on September 19, and Corsica was taken by French troops a fortnight later. The Italian enterprise, to launch which we had struggled so hard, had been vindicated beyond the hopes of its most ardent and persistent advocates.” Of course, foremost among these advocates was Churchill himself! I think that one could turn his argument around: perhaps if Sardinia and Corsica had been taken first, which
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should not have been hard, the Italian peninsula would have been the bonus. Even Hitler was dubious that the peninsula could be held. If the Germans had had to worry about an air-supported invasion all along the French and Italian Riviera, or the coast north of Rome, Kesselring's near-miraculous defense of the peninsula might never have taken place.

D. The choice of Salerno

Leaving aside the alternate strategy suggested above, in my opinion Salerno was not the ideal choice. Strategy is the continual calculation of the best ratio between risk and reward. Of course, it seemed riskier to invade further north, where the relatively small German air force in Italy would be unchallenged. The Germans learned to fight pretty well without air support, however! Such an invasion might have been repulsed, a great victory and morale booster for the Axis. It can't be proven either way, but what did the Germans think about it? Kesselring's Chief of Staff, General Westphal: "If the forces employed at Salerno had been used instead...north of Rome the results would have been much more decisive...there were only two German divisions in Rome...no others could have been brought up quickly enough to defend it. In conjunction with the five Italian divisions stationed at Rome, a combined sea and air landing would have taken the Italian capital inside 72 hours. Quite apart from the political repercussions...this would have resulted in cutting off at one blow the supplies of the five German divisions retreating from Calabria...would have brought all Italy south of the line Rome-Pescara into Allied hands!" as quoted by Liddell Hart on page 364 of The Other Side of the Hill. This is an interesting book, long out of print, published not long after the war on the basis of interviews with the defeated soldiers themselves.

It seems to me that this is accurately reflected in the game as well. An invasion in the south probably gets you on the board, but then you have the tortuous slog up the peninsula, crossing river after river, ridge after ridge, as the casualties mount, often leaving the Allies so spent they just can not attack, as game repeats history. On the other hand, a skillful and lucky invasion in the Rome area is about the only chance the Allies have to capture most of the peninsula early in the game. This is VICTORY, not a bloody stalemate! Another bold stroke that never came to pass.

E. Anzio, the open road to Rome

Col. Trevor Dupuy, on pages 76-77 of the 3rd volume of his The Military History of World War II, sums up the initial phase of the Anzio landing this way: "The British and American troops...found little resistance in their excellently conducted landing, and were able to push inland quickly. General Lucas now had to make a difficult decision. One possibility was to seize Rome itself. In that case, his three divisions, even if quickly reinforced, would be in danger of being smashed if Kesselring acted with his usual skill and vigor. The other choice was to advance slowly, making sure that the beachhead area was secure, and that the units kept together so as to be able to support each other against the expected German counter-attack. Lucas chose the latter course of action."

Churchill put the situation more vividly when he heatedly remarked that he had thought the Allies were flinging a tiger ashore at Anzio, but it 'turned out to be a beached whale!' It can not be proven whether such a dramatic Allied move would have been another disaster, like Arnhem, or a stunning coup, like the German airdrop on the fortress of Liege. It seems to me that the Germans so desperately engaged at Cassino, a mere fifty miles south, might have panicked with the Allies astride their communications northward, permitting the Allies to burst forward like a flood into the Liri Valley separating the two forces.

Instead, the beachhead was turned into "the largest prison camp in Europe," to quote Hitler. The irony of the Italian campaign is that despite Allied caution, the odds turned out to be as close as if they had really gambled.

There is another aspect of the Anzio landing which I find interesting. This campaign is always defended because it tied up German troops. The American commander in Italy, General Mark Clark, stresses this point in his memoirs, Calculated Risk. I think that it shows how easily the Allies lost sight of even this dubious strategy when on page 286, discussing Anzio, he says "We
were fully aware that German divisions outside of Italy might be dragged into our battle, but we hoped they would not be." Then what was it all about? Marching on Vienna? Not hardly!

Although I am convinced that Anzio was mismanaged both in conception and execution, I think it only fair to quote the opinion of General Lucien Truscott, who replaced General Lucas when he was relieved of the Anzio command for lack of aggressiveness. From Truscott's memoirs, Command Missions: "I suppose that armchair strategists will always labour under the delusion that there was a 'fleeting opportunity' at Anzio during which some Napoleonic figure would have charged over the (Alban Hills), played havoc with the German line of Communications, and galloped on into Rome. Any such concept betrays lack of comprehension of the military problems involved." He continues with a detailed explanation of the difficulties which prevented the Allies from advancing more than a few miles inshore. It would be impossible to dismiss, were not the history of warfare replete with examples of even greater obstacles successfully ignored. I suppose that the British at Dunkirk should've just surrendered!

I have not seen mentioned a third course of action which the Allies could have followed in order to exploit their surprise landing. During the Anzio operation, the Fifth Army to the south was exerting itself to the utmost to breach the German Winter Line. True, the Pontine Marshes lay to the south of Anzio, but they were penetrated by Route Seven. Just fifty miles separated the two Allied armies. What might a daring Allied move southward towards Terracina have accomplished? Surely it could not end in a greater disaster than the virtual annihilation which befell the Rangers who tried to take Cisterna after Lucas had "consolidated".

F. The same results at far less cost

One can quarrel with any of the contentions above, but it seems to me that a broader criticism of the entire campaign can be made which is not easily refuted.

This part of the war has been the subject of debate for nearly 30 years now. As the notes to the game of Anzio point out, those who defend the Allied strategy argue that invading Italy was the only feasible way to tie down many German divisions sorely needed elsewhere. A good example occurred not long after D-Day when Hitler personally transferred an infantry division from Pas de Calais to Italy. I won't join the argument, as it seems to me merely to disguise the most important question: having invaded Italy, why was it necessary to try to occupy it completely?

It took the Allies over a year and a half to cover the 700 miles from Salerno to Bologna. The average length of the peninsula on that journey is only 100 miles. Not only is the front narrow, but the terrain is very difficult. A few quotations give the flavor of the struggle:

Page 210 of Mark Clark's book: "Kesselring was a master of delaying tactics. His use of artillery was highly effective in the mountains and region through which we had to pass. Small rear-guard detachments... dug in their machine guns on important hillsides while their riflemen on higher ground forced us to make wide, time-consuming envelopments almost every mile of the way. As we did so, the enemy artillery harassed our columns. Often one 88-mm. gun... could deliver fire along an entire valley floor and might not be knocked out for many hours. Mud added to our woes, and with trucks mired down, soldiers and pack mules had to move supplies over rugged hills. Blown bridges and mines were constant problems; each hillside became a small but difficult military problem that could be solved only by careful preparation and almost inevitably by the spilling of blood."

The Canadian Army at War, official history of the Canadian campaign in Sicily and Italy, 1943, page 104: "Central and Southern Italy offer little opportunity for the manoeuvres of thrust and envelopment so profitable in modern warfare. Areas suitable for cross-country movement of tanks are few and in almost every case overlooked by steeply rising mountains."

Fred Majdalany's Cassino - Portrait of a Battle, page 30: "'Battling through these outposts of the winter line... cost the 5th Army nearly 16,000 casualties. It had given an ominous foretaste of how useless machines can be when climate and terrain conspire to make them so. It consummated the pattern of fighting in Italy: the monotonous, heart-breaking, exhausting, seemingly pointless battle for one great obstacle only to be faced immediately afterwards by another. It had taken eight divisions six weeks to advance seven miles at a cost of 16,000 casualties."

The war was ending when the Allies finally burst into the Po Valley. The German retreat in Italy was the most orderly of any front; a decisive break-through was never achieved.

Therefore, I argue that the same result -- engaging the enemy -- could have been achieved as well or better, and at far less cost, by the plan described below.

First, it's interesting to note that the number of divisions in Italy was not great. Chester Wilmot, in The Struggle for Europe, gives this table of divisions as of November, 1943:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Divisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russia (German)</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France and the Low Countries</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia (Axis Allies)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balkans</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark and Norway</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty-two divisions is nothing to scoff at, but it was only a small fraction of total German strength.

I argue that after the capture of the great port of Naples, and the air bases near Foggia, so valuable for raids on Polesine, the Allies should not have tried to press northward at so great a cost. Apart from the chimera of an advance through the Ljubljana Gap to Vienna, the psychologically important prize of Rome, and airbases nearer to southern Germany, Italy above Cassino was of little value to the Allies. Moreover, winning it freed the Germans from the necessity of guarding the long seaward flanks, and shortened their supply line while lengthening that of the Allies.

The more of Italy which Germany held, the more it might not be knocked out for many hours. Mud added to our woes, and with trucks mired down, soldiers and pack mules had to move supplies over rugged hills. Blown bridges and mines were constant problems; each hillside became a small but difficult military problem that could be solved only by careful preparation and almost inevitably by the spilling of blood."

I do not say that the Allies should've adopted a "sitzkrieg" policy. They could've kept pressure on the Germans with small-scale attacks along the main front, and more importantly, with commando raids, perhaps even secondary invasions, all along the more than 1000 miles of Nazi-held coast from the Pyrenees to the Peloponnesus. On page 136 of Wilmot's book, he mentions Churchil's belief that no invasion of southern France was necessary, because "the German divisions in this area could be pinned down by the mere threat of invasion..." When one notes that Germany stationed 42 divisions in the Balkans and Scandinavia in late 1943, it can be seen that threats may tie up troops as effectively as trading life for life, maybe more so.

One could argue that the Germans might have willingly shortened their flanks by withdrawing to the Gothic Line. Apart from the fact that Hitler seldom willingly retreated, it has been the exception he originally contemplated, so much the better. If by this strategy the ground paid for in blood could have been won by making it risky for the Germans to hold, fine!

In sum, I argue that those 700 bloody miles were not strategically important to victory in World War II. If their conquest served no useful purpose, then truly, this trip was not necessary.
ANZIO was discontinued several years ago due to poor sales. The cries of anguish from the hard core have still not died down. It was, in many respects, the ultimate wargame but suffered from rules which were packed with ambiguities, a super realistic mapboard which left doubts as to exactly what was in each hex, poor playing aids, and sub-par packaging. The game itself, when cleaned up, remains one of the ultimate experiences in land battle games.

Tom Oleson stands out as the one gamer whose infatuation with the title knows no bounds. Upon hearing that the game was being discontinued, Tom sent us a standing order for whatever games were left. He now provides us with the official rule interpretations for ANZIO and is our recognized expert on the game. It is doubtful whether even Dave Williams, the game's original designer, has explored the many possibilities of this unique game as much as our present author.

One of the few unusual features of Anzio which has become fairly common is the variable Order of Battle (OoB). An aspect of this which remains more developed in Anzio than almost any other game, however, is the extent to which the actions of one side (the Allies) influence the strength of the other.

But first, let's compare their strengths. Apart from the difficulty of the terrain, one of the reasons the Allies moved so slowly in Italy, was that they never were greatly superior in numbers to the Germans, although they did enjoy dominance of the sea and air. This is well reflected in the game. The Axis OoB included the equivalent of over 57 divisions, vs. the equivalent of less than 40 divisions for the Allies, of which 15 represent the Italian army as of early September, 1943. Of course, the German advantage here is illusory, not so much because usually not all of these 57 divisions are available, but because the typical Allied unit is stronger.

Another comparison is more revealing. Including all Italians, and replacement steps available at the start, the Axis OoB includes 224 steps, vs. 228 for the Allies, counting the Axis divisions with regimental counters in their divisional configuration. For those unfamiliar with the Step Reduction Table of Anzio III, a "step" is the unit by which casualties are taken, although units equal in steps may be unequal in combat factors.

Be that as it may, the point is valid by whatever comparison is chosen: the Allies may not be able to count on much, if any, numerical advantage.

The first key to Allied victory in Anzio is to realize that you can weaken your enemy. How? Some examples:

1. Assume that the Germans do get a first invasion reaction. At the very minimum, this represents an increment of 786 step/weeks. How's that again? Well, if you had an extra Wehrmacht Panzer division (5 steps) for 10 weeks, that would be 50 step/weeks. So 786 step/weeks is a lot.

2. Chances are the Germans will get more; the maximum is 2131 step/weeks. In this calculation, I am not forgetting that most of these units enter the game later, anyway. I am only counting the extra weeks, basis arrival in September, 1943.

3. But don't the Allies get "The Big Red One" infantry division, among others, to balance the German reaction? True, and the total is 488 step/weeks. So if the Germans get a first invasion reaction, it represents 162% to 437% of the Allied reaction.

Each invasion area in Anzio has a certain probability that there will be a German reaction, but more of that later.

The first invasion reaction is not the only instance where the Germans can benefit by Allied decisions. If the Allies invade for the second time, the Germans also get reinforcements. A typical second invasion, in the spring of 1944, would represent over 1600 step/weeks for the Germans, and this time the Allies get no compensations.

The timing of the second invasion also influences the German OoB. Depending on how early it may be before the third week of February, 1943, several strong divisions will delay their departure. Allied proximity to Rome, Naples, etc., also plays a role. The total effect is enormous, as the chart shows.

The lower red line shows the monthly ratio of Allied to German strength if the Germans have gotten the best reaction possible, using certain probable assumptions as to when these will occur. Note that the Germans are stronger than the Allies throughout the entire game!

The upper red line shows the opposite extreme: no first invasion reaction, and no second invasion, and all other reactions minimized.

Obviously, a comparison chart of a typical game would fall somewhere in between the two red lines. The point is clear, nonetheless: the Allied player can do a great deal to shift the odds in his favor.

The first step is deciding where to invade. This is an interesting question, and has sparked the most attention in articles about Anzio. Whether because the invasion force must be small, as at Rimini, or the proximity of defenders, as at Genoa, several areas are obviously uninteresting, except for a second invasion. There are several others marginally worth a try, such as Livorno or Civitavecchia, just for the novelty, even though the odds are against them. Then, too, initial German dispositions are an important factor.

Naples is of great value to the Allies. Through this great port units of all nationalities may arrive, thus saving the non-US/British forces the several turn delay they would otherwise suffer by disembarking at Taranto or Messina. Moreover, if the Germans fail to garrison Naples, or what can be even worse, garrison it so lightly that an Allied attack may receive "bonus" movement from an Automatic Victory, an invasion here is attractive. Not the least of Naples attractions is the quick build-up permitted.

When choosing among the various beaches, it is important to weigh carefully the probability of German reaction. For example, is Mondragone that much better than Salerno that it justifies a 100% increase in the probability of a reaction?
Of course, avoiding a German reaction is not the only objective. Foremost is winning a secure lodgement, and it is also of great importance to invade far enough north to prevent the Germans from stalling the Allied drive, as they did historically.

To me, the best bets are Rome, and the Termoli/Pescara area, always coupled, of course, with the South End options.

1. Although risky, a Rome invasion is the best chance, short of German ineptitude, for quick Allied capture of the peninsula south of the Arno River.

Moreover, the Allies have a 1/3 chance that the Germans will not get any reaction, while they always get more than six extra divisions at Rome. This is the very best combination of circumstances for the Allies, even better than the top red line on the "Balance of Forces" chart.

Presuming optional stacking is used, let's examine in more detail the invasion force. Since U.S. divisions count 4 points, all divisions are British (3 points). The total is 19 points.

A. The Key Attack

I believe that the Alban Hills at Frascati are the most important position. History showed they dominate the beaches, and it works that way in the game, too. Moreover, if the Germans retain or recapture this position, they outflank Rome from the south. Therefore, attack this position at 3-1, using one regiment of 82nd Para., the Ariete armorized division, and all three of the 3-4-12 infantry divisions (see map). One of these divisions stays put on the Appian Way next to German 2nd Para, as does one of the two just south of Frascati. The other division advances if possible.

B. The 2nd Para. Problem

The big German division at Practica is the major problem for a Rome invasion. Some players try a 1-1 attack, and maybe that's a good idea, but then you can't get 3-1 on Frascati. The 1-2 attack I suggest gives you 1/3 chance of surrounding the unit. Even if you retreat, it still will have a hard time breaking out.

Take any losses from the 82nd Para., regiment, and advance south on the Appian Way from Rome to join the British 5th in the attack. If necessary, retreat the 5th just one hex south, to guard the Anzio port.

C. The Southern Flank

Here is the greatest danger. Presuming that the 16th Panzer is in the south, it and the strong German Goering and 15th Panzergrenadier divisions, and the Nebelwerfer brigade, add up to 20 attack factors threatening Anzio. I used to guard the southern approaches with commandos on the hill at H48 until a sharp-eyed opponent pointed out to me that I was crossing a swamp hex-side advancing up the Mussolini Canal across the Appian Way! I suggest a daring use of the two available commando units (the third is part of 82nd Para.) to block the two main Naples/Rome roads, forcing the German units to deal with them first before moving on Rome. This is a gamble for both sides. The two valuable commando units probably will be lost, and this can hurt in a second invasion. I feel the sacrifice is worthwhile if they hold their ground, but if the Germans are lucky, they may achieve an AVII situation. The second Automatic Victory alternative awards bonus movement in certain circumstances, and it could be enough to carry them northward for a second combat south of Rome. Barricading this, their situation on the Allied September III turn can be vulnerable: not only will their front be very wide along the Sacco River, but by concentrating enough of their units north of Gaeta to smash the commandos, they may deter lightly elsewhere, perhaps creating Automatic Victory situations for the Allies.

It is important to put the stronger commando unit nearer the coast, since it is theoretically possible for the Germans to get Automatic Victory both on the weaker commando unit and the brigade which is discussed below, permitting one of the other southern units, using Strategic Movement, to pass thru their suppressed zones-control all the way to Anzio, if they can move up the coast road. If they have to go inland, it's too far.

The last link in the southern flank defense is to station one brigade on the Appian Way due east of Anzio (G48). This serves two purposes: blocking a Strategic Movement thru an Automatic Victory (type I) to the south, and defending against a second combat after an Automatic Victory (type II). In the latter case, if the Germans get up this far they obviously are still strong, and can probably crush this lone brigade, too. If so, they advance first into the ZOC of one or two infantry divisions just south of Frascati, and they should stop right there. Whatever happens, it surely won't be dull!

D. The Northern Flank

Even if the Germans get the maximum possible reaction, only the Panzer division stationed in Florence can move down the Via Cassia in time to counter-attack on the first turn. Together with the 3rd Panzergrenadier, the total is 8 attack factors. One of the nice things about Anzio is that there is no stereotyped way to handle many problems, including this one. One approach is to stack the remaining brigade plus one regiment of the 82nd together with an Italian division. This could be just north of Rome, or in the northernmost Rome hex. In the latter case, presumably the German forces might lose some strength smashing thru the northernmost Italian unit into the Allies. I might even decide to pull back behind the Tiber River, which bisects Rome. I prefer, again, a bolder disposition: send the brigade towards Civitavecchia, and also move out of Rome to the northeast with the one remaining regiment of the 82nd. I reason that the bigger the Allied beach-head is, the more opportunity available during the third week of September.

True, the two German divisions will get a second and perhaps even a third combat, but one bad roll will stop them. If the Germans don't get a reaction, they will be powerless on the northern flank. Of course, it is vital to try to hold on to at least one Rome hex, to deny the Germans air superiority by September III. Here again, this is greatly facilitated by holding Frascati.

E. Rome

Although the Rome invasion can be made without a paratroop drop on Rome (which would release another commando unit to solidify the southern blockade), it seems to me much better to do so. Not only does it enable Frascati to be surrounded, but more important, the entire Italian Army defects to the Allies. The Germans can destroy most of these units on their turn, but doing so costs them strength, and delays their rush to Rome. Moreover, it is not at all unlikely that one or two Italian units will survive to attack the German Rome perimeter from the rear as the Allies try to break out.

Again I want to stress that the Rome invasion is risky and demanding, but especially if the Germans fail to get a reaction, a very dramatic advance is a good possibility for the Allies.

2. Many German players, if they are faced by an experienced opponent, make a Rome invasion foolishly by stationing 16th Panzer at Anzio or somewhere nearby. In that case, and presuming 16th Panzer is not on the Adriatic, I recommend Termoli. In fact, all things considered, I rate this invasion site No. 1, for the following reasons:

1. Only 1/6 chance of a first invasion reaction.
2. Rome garrison doesn't enter the game.
3. Very wide perimeter.
4. Hard for the Germans to mass for a counter-attack.
5. Excellent communications on interior lines.
6. Poor German communications along secondary roads.
8. German air superiority likely to be short-lived.
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9. Quick link-up with the South End Options. The Allies may use the same units as at Rome, except delete 4 regiments/brigades and add the U.S. 45th Infantry Division.

**ANZIO:**

**THE BATTLE MANUAL**

Anzio is packed with novelties, a tribute to the thoroughness and ingenuity of its designer, Dave Williams. Some of these, like the colorful and detailed map and counters, have not set a trend. The addition of certain rules, for example, rules in Anzio, have become popular.

Of course, you don't need the Battle Manual to play Anzio, but you would be lacking at Ascalon. I will go through the map, with all options, and discuss the results. I think all the players will agree on the players' agree in advance that the players can pick and choose among the 20 options of Anzio III, if you wish. Let's examine a few parts of the manual:

1. Optional Stackings Points
   - 1 point is used when units are stacked on the line, in a 6x6 grid.

2. Defensible Counters
   - The rules state that all units use the substitute regional counters. This dramatically changes the balance in favor of the Germans, as the player can afford to lose units.

3. Replacement
   - Although I prefer to throw a strong commando, a single brigade can hold the "joint" between the northern and southern parts of the beach-head (U43). If the position can be attacked, a division.

The Weak Link
- If 16th Panzer is near Rome, it is possible for Frascati to be an additional unit at T42. They will have to attack across the Pescara River, 2-1 with air support. Use the commando unit here. This attack could sever the link with the northern units, and it would be impossible to reinforce them.

Defending the Port
- One of the reasons I prefer Ortona is the ability of the Allies to block the remaining defensive positions west of Termoli on the map.

Threat to Foggia
- It is not that unusual to invade at Termoli, but it is the Germans who are planning a restricted beach-head, the Allies need about 11 units just to hold it. This wide perimeter, at Rome, makes it very hard for the Germans to hold the 7 units needed to seal off the South End.

In both cases, attrition favors the Allies. Although the Germans do not suffer terrain penalties, counter-attacking out of forts, a glance at the table above shows that their loss ratio is unfavorable. It's interesting that they do better at 1-1, sometimes 1-2. Let's study the results at both odds:

Series of 2-1 attacks, and German counter-attacks at 1-4 or 1-2 only when required, obviously. Allied casualty percentage: 2-1, 1-2 164% of Germans 2-1, 1-2 169%.

In both cases, attrition favors the Allies.

**Conclusion:** slight advantage to the Germans.

So attrition can pay, not so much from Allied attacks, but obligatory German counter-attacks.

There is another aspect to this question. As the blue line on the chart shows, the ratio of...
German/Allied replacements swings from a high of 1–1 during the Winter to a low of less than 1/3–1 during the Summer. Here again, I want to stress that so much of this analysis is predicated on the law of averages, which should have plenty of time to work out in this long game.

The months when the Germans are likely to get less than half Allied replacements are just at the start, March/August 1944, and February/April 1945. Therefore, these are the periods when attrition will be most painful for them (see blue line on the chart).

Fortunately for the Allies, these periods coincide with two air strikes which are their most potent weapon. To win, the Allied player not only must make maximum use of the air strikes, but coordinate them properly with the second invasion.

As explained, just in terms of OcO, the Allies do a favor to the Germans by invading a second time. Should they do it then? If an invasion at Rome or elsewhere could not succeed, a second invasion might not be necessary to do what the historical Anzio invasion did: drive the Cassino Line. In any case, the Allies should always pose the threat of an invasion to tie up German troops along the coastal flanks. Try to do this with units that are building-up, or that, from Naples, could either invade or reach the front to attack in any one turn. Otherwise, both Allies and Germans may suffer from withdrawals. Try to make this a handicap only for the Germans.

If a second invasion is necessary, how should it be done? Of course, if the Germans are so foolish as to do it, then? If an invasion at Rome or elsewhere could not succeed, a second invasion might not be necessary to do what the historical Anzio invasion did: drive the Cassino Line. In any case, the Allies should always pose the threat of an invasion to tie up German troops along the coastal flanks. Try to do this with units that are building-up, or that, from Naples, could either invade or reach the front to attack in any one turn. Otherwise, both Allies and Germans may suffer from withdrawals. Try to make this a handicap only for the Germans.

If a second invasion is necessary, how should it be done? Of course, if the Germans are so foolish as to do it, then? If an invasion at Rome or elsewhere could not succeed, a second invasion might not be necessary to do what the historical Anzio invasion did: drive the Cassino Line. In any case, the Allies should always pose the threat of an invasion to tie up German troops along the coastal flanks. Try to do this with units that are building-up, or that, from Naples, could either invade or reach the front to attack in any one turn. Otherwise, both Allies and Germans may suffer from withdrawals. Try to make this a handicap only for the Germans.

German Strategy In Anzio

Rommel or Kesselring?

Late summer, 1943, The Kursk attack has failed, and the Russians roll forward in the Ukraine. Dozens of divisions are tied down in the Balkans and Western Europe. The problem: how to defend Italy from Allied invasion. Depleted by their losses in North Africa and Sicily, few German units are available. The best of these must hold down the industrial North. Due to the great length of the Italian coastline, much of it can not be defended. Moreover, Sicily showed that the war-weary Italian army and populace are eminently more hostile than friendly.

Two brilliant German generals ponder the problem. Their solutions:

Rommel - hold at the narrow northern neck not only to shorten the front and its flanks, but the lines of communication as well.

Kesselring - abandon only the barren southern third of the peninsula, holding fast in the difficult terrain between Naples and Rome.

We know what happened in history, but what is the best plan for the game?

Many of the basic considerations shaping Allied strategy, such as comparison of forces and replacements, obviously must be weighed by the Germans as well. The first question is which invasion area to deny to the Allies.

Historically, the Germans correctly deduced that Allied thinking would lead them to Salerno, because of its proximity both to Naples and to the Mediterranean. By so doing, their forces prevented this sound deduction from giving them a great victory. How about your opponent? Does he have a favorite beach? Is he conservative, or a gambler? Is he new to the game, therefore likely to prefer Salerno or perhaps Termoli? Then you could put Nebelwerfer and two regiments of Herman Goering at Naples, one regiment at Vescovio, and 16th Panzer just south of Vasto on the Adriatic. Or to really rule out Salerno, put 16th Panzer, 100th Motorized, and 16th SS Panzer on Route 7 just south of Avellino. Not only a good spot for Salerno, but also within attacking radius of Termoli and Rome.

In no circumstances would I put less than two regiments at Naples. Only one unit there is an easy mark for the Allies.

On the other hand, suppose you have a wily opponent who could give you a lot of trouble at Rome. Then you put all the Naples garrison at Naples itself, in order not to slow yourself down exiting Vescovio. There are many places for 16th Panzer:

1. Anzio - spoils Rome and is 12 movement factors from S42 near Ortona, presuming other units get Automatic Victory on the Italian at Tivoli.

2. Avezzano - can hit Rome even if the Naples roads are cut; can reach the Adriatic at several places, and also nearly as far south as Pompeii.

3. Vasto - spoils a Termoli invasion, but can also attack as far west as Tivoli.

There is also another way to look at invasions: where would you like the Allies to invade? Grosseto or Rimini, of course, but let's be serious! I would say Mondragone. Why?

1. Twice the chance of a First Invasion Rejection compared with Salerno.

2. You can still hold at Cassino or just north of it.

3. Good chance to counter-attack.

4. Good chance Allies won't immediately capture the port they need (Naples).

Therefore, to tempt the Allies, you might leave only two regiments at Naples, say six defense factors, perhaps just enough to draw an Allied attack, but too much for them to be certain of success. A bit risky if they are lucky, admitted, but you have 1/3 chance of reaction, which surely does make the game more fun for the Germans!

Next, to me the most interesting phase of the game comes: whether to try to block the units coming from Taranto and Messina. You have to divert seven units that are desperately needed elsewhere. They could be Nembo, 26th Panzer, three regiments from either the Naples or the Foggia garrison, and both regiments of 29th Panzer Grenadier. Why the strong Panzer division instead of another regiment? Because that regiment from Naples or Foggia probably can hit the beach-head September II; 26th Panzer can't. To relieve the unnecessarily strong force blocking the South End, immediately rush southward as many of the four Viterbo replacements, plus any other replacements or weak units as soon as you get them. Nothing frustrates an Allied player like cooling his heels at Taranto or Messina with big divisions of Canadians, Indians, etc., while the Germans hold Y60, Y62, Y64, O73, Q72, S71, and U70 with schlock! This tactic of sealing off the South End is obviously artificial, but how else to handle it? The Germans can not advance into the toe and heel. If the Allies should attack off the board and retreat, perhaps as an inverted counter, the Germans can't follow. So allowing the
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Germans to seal off these edges at a high price seems the best solution. Although I disagree, some players feel the Germans have an edge in Anzio. There are two logical ways to handicap the German player with regard to the South End.

1. Allow entry ex-Taranto as far up the board as Y51, which would be geographically feasible if there had been room for the toe and heel on the game board. This would make it virtually impossible to seal off Taranto, therefore nearly guaranteeing Allied capture of Italy south of Cassino.

2. Allow Allied units of whatever nationality to enter any opened port. Some Allied players find it highly unrealistic that some of their strongest units are made unusable by what they consider a German gimmick.

I do not suggest either alternative for equal players. Personally, I play with a complete map, using toe and heel extensions drawn up by a friend, but this article isn't intended to discuss variants.

Many German players, especially if confronted with a cautious invasion below the Cassino Line, prefer not to counter-attack vigorously. They conserve strength, so that they can retain their ersetzung counters rather than using them to build up. I concede this is the smarter strategy. But what the heck, it's only a game, so enjoy it! Nothing beats nauniumi.

The West coast is more vulnerable, as it is relatively open terrain. Concentrate your strength here. If you feel a counter-attack is worthwhile, do it here. Try not to defend undoubled more than absolutely necessary.

The Allies will try to lengthen your front to force a pull-back in order to straighten it. How long a front can you tolerate? It's not so much a question of 'heses', but of strength-per-position. If the Allies are able to get good odds at several positions, pull back.

Remember that after six weeks you may be vulnerable, all the more so if you have already gotten most of the Second Invasion Reaction. So again you must garrison the flanks, with priority to your main line, and the far North.

Your objective: still be in the Gothic Line in Spring, 1945. If you have done this, you have probably won.

In automobile racing, the contest is often won or lost in the curves. A few feet gained braking late, entering the turn, can yield surprising distance accelerating up the straight. So it is in Anzio: the initial struggle for position in 1943 has great effect on the whole game. If the Germans keep the Allies away from the Gothic Line in 1944, they are far ahead.

Or are they?

Rommel thought otherwise. He commanded the strong North Italy garrison in the summer of 1943, and he wrote off the peninsula to the
south. Hitler never liked to retreat, even when advisable, but even he had to agree with the Desert Fox that withdrawal would be wise when the Allies invaded. Kesselring, the southern commander, had other ideas. His unexpected success was all Hitler needed to encourage him to hold fast. History acquitted Kesselring, and most German-side Anzio players follow his plan. It was right for history, but perhaps for the game, Rommel's analysis deserves further study.

As we have seen, often the Allies invade far enough south to permit the first German Line to be built across the narrowest part of the peninsula just south of Cassino, as historically it was (see map). Presume that instead the first line is far north. It could be either side of Florence. The Germans then withdraw northward as forced by the Allies.

Disadvantages:
1. The Allies take the peninsula before the game is half over.
2. They get their Rome replacements sooner than otherwise, in all probability.
3. There will be little scope or need for a second invasion, so the Germans will not get the tremendous reinforcement it represents.

These beaches requires the equivalent of 3 divisions or more. The problem is acute if the second invasion and 1944 Air Strike coincide. As discussed, either the beaches are left open, or more units are exposed to air attack. On the other hand, if the Germans do not try to hold a line between the first and the second line, the Allies are not going to do this willingly, because of the industrial potential of that area, and because it could have exposed southern France before the Allies invaded there. Therefore, if this suggested strategy works, Anzio the game fails to reflect history.

Anzio came before the trend towards levels of victory, which can be as frustrating as they are theoretically logical. Perhaps this is regrettable, because it is a game that lends itself to that technique. There can be a difference between playing a game for a narrow win just within the rules, and playing for fun, or to satisfy levels of victory at least mentally. To put it another way, there is more glory being Kesselring than Rommel, in this particular campaign.

Personally, I can not resist the temptation to have as much of the map for as long as I can, and the chance to throw those Tigers and Panthers against a second invasion! Be that as it may, I do think that "The Rommel Plan" should not be dismissed.

ANZIO TACTICS

No one should fool himself that wargames come anywhere near to reflecting real war. Just to cite two areas, morale and logistics, wargames have never made more than a gesture towards their simulation. One aspect of war that is rather well reflected in games, however, is the consequences of a blunder or miscalculation. Few games exceed Anzio in this respect. Why?

1. The three types of Automatic Victory (one from Game II, two from Game III).
2. The unusual SRT.
3. The terrain.
4. The importance of ports to Allied logistics.
5. The multiple invasions.
6. The varying capabilities of the units.
7. The way in which units can be destroyed, or rebuilt from a cadre. This is not an exhaustive list, but it serves to make this point: failure to always keep in mind the unique rules configuration of Anzio may lead to a blunder with consequences very realistic indeed! To examine this, let's discuss Anzio tactics in detail. Here are some do's and don'ts:

1. Defending in adjacent hexes is often necessary, but it can be dangerous, just as in Stalingrad. If you push back one unit, while engaging the second on the flank, the first group of attackers can advance for a second combat with the second defender, now surrounded.
2. Ersatz and other weak units can be very useful to hold parts of the front, IF you carefully calculate what the enemy can do to them. This is essential, because otherwise you might open the way to an Automatic Victory which could rupture your entire front.
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It's obvious that if this strategy is followed, many months will be devoted to World War I type attrition along the fort lines, a war of attrition which I do not believe the Allies can win, especially by giving away the lines.

I have mentioned the historical basis for this strategy. As applied to the game, if line C in the Po Valley is the second line, then the Germans concede Genoa and much of North Italy to the Allies during 1944. Historically, the Germans never would have done this willingly, because of the industrial potential of that area, and because it could have exposed southern France before the Allies invaded there. Therefore, if this suggested strategy works, Anzio the game fails to reflect history.

Anzio came before the trend towards levels of victory, which can be as frustrating as they are theoretically logical. Perhaps this is regrettable, because it is a game that lends itself to that technique. There can be a difference between playing a game for a narrow win just within the rules, and playing for fun, or to satisfy levels of victory at least mentally. To put it another way, there is more glory being Kesselring than Rommel, in this particular campaign.

Personally, I can not resist the temptation to have as much of the map for as long as I can, and the chance to throw those Tigers and Panthers against a second invasion! Be that as it may, I do think that "The Rommel Plan" should not be dismissed.

ANZIO TACTICS

No one should fool himself that wargames come anywhere near to reflecting real war. Just to cite two areas, morale and logistics, wargames have never made more than a gesture towards their simulation. One aspect of war that is rather well reflected in games, however, is the consequences of a blunder or miscalculation. Few games exceed Anzio in this respect. Why?

1. The three types of Automatic Victory (one from Game II, two from Game III).
2. The unusual SRT.
3. The terrain.
4. The importance of ports to Allied logistics.
5. The multiple invasions.
6. The varying capabilities of the units.
7. The way in which units can be destroyed, or rebuilt from a cadre. This is not an exhaustive list, but it serves to make this point: failure to always keep in mind the unique rules configuration of Anzio may lead to a blunder with consequences very realistic indeed! To examine this, let's discuss Anzio tactics in detail. Here are some do's and don'ts:

1. Defending in adjacent hexes is often necessary, but it can be dangerous, just as in Stalingrad. If you push back one unit, while engaging the second on the flank, the first group of attackers can advance for a second combat with the second defender, now surrounded.
2. Ersatz and other weak units can be very useful to hold parts of the front, IF you carefully calculate what the enemy can do to them. This is essential, because otherwise you might open the way to an Automatic Victory which could rupture your entire front.
SO YOU WANT TO PLAY ANZIO?

Are you a guest collection, or a game player? These days, it's hard not to be as much the former as the latter. Most serious gamers negate even the existence of any other kind of Collective, and the same is true for the Anzio-based game players. Probably the Anzio face is that these players are all registered under V.1, and that when they get involved with the game itself, they just never get into the advanced version. The lowest version that is considered to be a "game" is V.1.0. In this version, you can take part in the great Anzio battle and save the Allied soldiers, but, as far as I can remember, you can't actually play the game as such. You can only read the text and hear the commentary.

4. The German regiments are of great interest, too. The only thing you can do since you can rebuild the entire division from just one counter.

5. Both sides have an ample supply of brigades and regiments. When you attack, try always to include one or more. Do the same in each defensive position likely to be attacked. It is much more convenient to rebuild these units than a division.

6. Units withdrawn can still be useful while building up. Germans can use them to fill up the small invasion zones like Pescara, Terracina, or Genoa. Allies can build up from only one supply point, Sicily, so that the units involved pose an invasion threat. It is often hard to spare big units from the front, so the units should be build up. A good time to do so is when the front is fluid, with units advancing and withdrawing, therefore sufficiently distant from new units to be built.

7. For the Germans, it is obviously better to build up by regiments rather than pull a whole division out of the line, so try not to take casualties in divisions which you can't break down.

8. An exception to that suggestion concerns units slated to leave the game. Even though you eventually may make up the deficit if they withdraw under strength, it is better to deplete them first. Every "tempweek" count; as Nathan Bedford Forrest said, "Get there first with the most-men!" For this campaign, it's the most men that count. This applies to both sides.

9. At Germans, don't waste armor replaced in combat. Be generous in your supply of armor. The best way to get replacements in combat is by buying new ones.

10. There are special units in Anzio with useful capabilities:
   a) On both sides there are units which have a high combat value in relation to their stacking cost. Prime examples are the German Panthers and Tigers.
   b) The Allied commandos are very useful in invasion.
   c) The Partisans can pull any number of dirty tricks on the Germans, especially when the Allies invade, later in the game or have an extra FRP for placing Partisans in the Invasion zone. Sometimes they can be very important. There are 3 mountain units which are U.S. or British, and therefore can invade. In areas which are high in the Invasion zone, these units can be very useful.

Don't risk any of these units in a dangerous situation, if you are making use of their special capabilities. If an ordinary infantry or armored unit could serve just as well, use it.

21. If you have to choose between capturing a position or destroying an enemy division, it would have to be a very important position indeed to dissuade me from doing the latter.

22. Anzio is a game which is powerfully influenced by the temperament of the players. It would probably be more fun to watch flowers grow than for this game to play Anzio. Know your opponent. Don't be timid. Few games reward intelligent daring and aggressiveness or penalize timidity, more than Anzio. Tenacity also pays. Most players are ready to quit if an invasion aborts, or they lose a key division or two. That's all right, but you could still have won the game. If you are determined to win, Anzio is a game which is powerfully influenced by the temperament of the players. It would probably be more fun to watch flowers grow than for this game to play Anzio. Know your opponent. Don't be timid.
The Reader Response survey is meant to be your "hot-line" to the editors of the GENERAL. We can best serve your needs and give you what you want only if you keep us informed of what those needs and desires are. Cognizant of the fact that you can't please all the people all of the time, the Reader Response survey is our answer to finding out precisely what the majority wants. By filling out the survey and returning it to us promptly after reading each issue of the GENERAL you will be helping us to determine future publishing policy. The card printed below is only an answering vehicle. The questions will be found on Page 22 of the magazine. We suggest that you remove the Reader Insert page and hold it alongside the question so that you can refer to each question as you record the answer. Please answer all questions. A partially completed questionnaire has to be discounted.

You would help us greatly by cutting out each card before its submission. In other words, even if you intend to send in an opponent's wanted ad, contest entry, buyer's guide response, and the survey; be sure to cut the page into the four required parts before mailing. Such action does not preclude you from enclosing all 4 cards in the same envelope however, or sending them individually as post card entries.

DIRECTIONS: Answer all yes or no questions with a simple yes or no. Questions which ask you to rate choices from best choice to third best choice should be answered with a "1" for best choice, "2" for second best choice, "3" for third best and so on. Questions which ask you to give a numerical rating to a subject should be answered on a 1-10 scale with 1 equating excellent, 3 good, 6 average, 9 poor, and 10 terrible.

SECTION I

SECTION II

SECTION III

AVALON HILL
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I am the German player
I am the Allied player

Record any attacks you wish to make on the chart below. If your move leaves any units on the portion of the mapboard shown above be sure to note their position in the appropriate boxes.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY

STATE

ZIP

We're experiencing growing pains. More subscribers means more Want Ads. We just don't have the space for every subscriber to wax rhetorical as in the past. To make it easier, and more meaningful for all concerned, we introduce the Mini-ad.

1) Print your city and state in Box A above.
2) Insert copy where required on lines provided.
3) Print your name and address where indicated.

Want-ads will be accepted only when printed on this form.
To be acceptable, this section must be cut out along the lines indicated.
are pressing you back to the sea, often to do so they must leave at least one point weakly held, sometimes just with an ersatz counter. Hit that one point with every unit that can be stacked against it, even if by so doing you leave your front wide open! You have a good chance to get enough extra movement by AV-11 so that you can redeploy right back again to defense positions. Moreover, in such a situation you can advance right into enemy ZOC, perhaps forcing their withdrawal next time.

Isn’t this a very gimmicky move? The move is, the results are not. One of the most unrealistic aspects of many wargames old and new is the lack of comprehensiveness. Automatic Victory rules that prevent one weak unit from performing a role it never would be expected to in real warfare. I don’t say that weak units aren’t used, but they never could do what they can in situations such as that described above and that is realistic.

24. As discussed above, the ability to advance after combat into attacking positions can be a potent weapon, but you do not have to attack just because you advance. It’s awfully tempting to keep rolling, but if the odds no longer favor you, think twice before you press your luck. Just your advance may be problem enough for the enemy.

If I may be permitted a personal word, I own 150 wargames, and 10% of them are copies of Anzio, about five of which are in continual use. After scores of Anzio games, I can honestly say that no two have ever been the same; I learned something new from each one, and am still truly startled by the battles that develop. So this list of tactical tips should grow in the years to come.

---

**BREAKING PAR**

Continued from page 16

"intelligence." Or, you may have your own method, other than the card illustrated. In any event, separate the airplanes from that tangle on the ACC if you want to know them as entities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAR FACTOR</th>
<th>FOR ACC AIRCRAFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NIE/27</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVA/7/17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIR/12/6</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAL/24</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIE/24</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE/7/8</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR/bal</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAR/100</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV/501</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICK/70</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO/P/Tab</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOI/1/14</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOX/39</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFAL/121</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PAR for ACC aircraft: FOX/48 82

If you’re using the PAR factor to make new situations, you can use it as a handicap or as a means of making a fairly even (within 10 points) match. If you use it in recon, bombing, strafing, or spotting missions, try to give the defending player at least a PAR-10 margin over the aggressor. Sure, you can draw up situations where your opponent gets an inferior airplane (as often happened in real life—look at Richthofen’s body-count list), but don’t try to claim a victory when you were shooting 30 over PAR!

---

**THE GENERAL**

**DESIGN ANALYSIS**

PzKw VIa

ABS 3.2" GUN 88mm/L56 EffRng 3000m

ABF 4.0" AMMO 92 PEN 4.9" 2 MG 34

GPros 14

8 Wt 60.5t HPWt 11.6

BEHIND THE LUFTWAFFE AERIAL COMBAT TABLE

Lou Zocchi is probably the father of modern air warfare games as we know them today. The groundwork he laid in designing 3 earlier, now out of print, air games was the major factor in our publication of LUFTWAFFE. Lou takes over the Design Analysis chores this month to give you an in-depth view of what goes into a Combat Results Table; a study made more interesting by the application of tactical doctrine to a strategic level game.

**GAME DESIGN CREDITS: ALIEN SPACE, BATTLE OF BRITAIN, FLYING TIGERS, HARDTACK, LUFTWAFFE, MINUTEMAN, TWELVE O’CLOCK HIGH.**

Although aerial combat results table in the Luftwaffe game appears to be a collection of randomly selected numbers, it is the essence of a number of related studies. On page 3 of the designers notes, I explained that the table shows what happens when an aircraft fires a burst. When fighting superior opponents, players subtract points from the die roll to simulate the difficult an inferior plane has trying to achieve a good shooting position. When fighting an inferior aircraft, the shooting position is more easily attained but this does not increase the number of bullets fired during a single burst. So you get the full value of each die roll, but add nothing to the rolled numbers, even though you had to deduct from them when shooting from an inferior plane.

To understand where this comes from, let’s look at where and how damage is inflicted and how much damage a plane suffers before destruction.

According to "RIFLES & MACHINE GUNS", "A MODERN HANDBOOK ON INFANTRY AND AIRCRAFT ARMS", "GERMAN MILITARY AIRCRAFT OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR", and other sources, the machine-guns mounted in aircraft wings average one round in six on target when firing from a plane. This size of unit is 25 square meters target at 200 meters. At least 5 rounds out of 6 miss their mark during a typical burst. Since the parameter above assumes that the target is relatively stationary, a situation rarely encountered during air to air combat (you can see that allowing 1/6th of all bullets fired to hit on the combat results table would be overly generous. But even the single bullet which hits is not always effective. The following information shows that much depends upon where those bullets go.

Generally speaking, bullets strike the body of an aircraft in direct proportion to the amount of surface exposed during the attack. From head on, the engine presents the largest and easiest target area while the wings are the smallest. Attacking from behind puts few rounds into the engine but many into the body. Attacking from above is almost the same as attacking from below because most of the rounds hit the wings and a smaller number go through the body. A side attack causes more body hits than wing hits. The size of the target affects the number of hits taken and the design of the plane determines in large measure the number of hits it can survive.

A number of private and military studies indicate that damage can be classified into three categories:

**CATEGORY I** includes pilot and gunner cabins, controls and vital equipment in wings and fuselage. This is generally estimated to be 2/3rds of the wing fuselage area of the plane. When struck by a 50 caliber bullet, every twelfth penetration (8%) generally causes damage. One instance of damage in this area has a 16% chance of killing or injuring nearby crew members and a 2% chance of starting a fire.

**CATEGORY II** includes the oil and gas tanks. They average 1/3rd of the wing fuselage area of the plane and are generally damaged by every third (33%) 50 caliber bullet which penetrates. Each instance of damage causes fuel loss and 50% of the time will start fires.

**CATEGORY III** is the engine or engines of the plane. One out of 3 penetrations (33%) causes critical damage. Such damage could stop engines and 16% of the time will start fires.

Explosions are most likely when category II or III areas are damaged. One case in six causes an explosion in category II while only one case in fifty (2%) causes an explosion in category III.

To provide a better understanding of the information expressed in the former statements, I’ve restated the facts in a graphic format which follows.

There are many recorded instances when a damaged aircraft has been able to continue combat effectively. There are even a few recorded instances when...
instances where a burning aircraft has been able to continue combat. I can find no instances where an aircraft has continued combat after exploding. It therefore seemed logical to assume that the situation which required the least number of bullets to achieve an explosion would be the safest example upon which a fire power chart could be calculated. Since the smallest number of 50 caliber bullets which can cause an explosion is 108 in category II, the number 108 became very significant because it also caused fires in category III.

Because the formulas given in standard cases assumed that the damaging bullets were all 50 caliber, the firepower of every aircraft in the game had to be translated into something which would equate their true destructive abilities, as expressed in 50 caliber bullets. Since a 30 caliber bullet is only 5/6th the size of a 50 caliber bullet, it is only 5/6ths as effective when only its outside diameter is considered. 100 thirty caliber bullets cause about the same amount of damage as 60 fifty caliber bullets. A 20mm shell is the equivalent of 1 1/2 fifty caliber rounds if only the outside diameter is considered. However, the greater mass, penetrating power and explosiveness of the 20mm shell entitles it to a higher rating than its outside diameter indicates.

In addition to caliber sizes, the differing rates of fire for each weapon had to considered if a true firepower picture was to be obtained. Another complication to be surmounted was the change in weaponry as the war progressed.

Rapid fire weapons are best for fighter to fighter combat because the shooter can put more bullets into more spaces and increase his chances for hits. While a bomber may be held in the gnsights for one or two seconds, the smaller, more maneuverable fighter moving at twice bomber speeds is rarely held for more than a second. During that second the 20mm cannon would give you only 5 chances to hit the target while a 30 caliber machinegun would give you 13! The R.A.F. defeated Luwaffe fighters during the Battle of Britain because their armament was suited for fighter to fighter combat. The R.A.F. fighters were splitting out 104 thirty caliber rounds per second while their German opponents fired only 21 projectiles in the same time period. While the impact of a full German burst was more effective than that of an R.A.F. fighter, a target rarely received the full burst.

In the later stages of the Battle of Britain, when few fighters were being encountered, the R.A.F. switched over from eight 30 caliber guns per fighter to 4 twenty millimeter cannons per plane. A few big hits on bombers are more effective than many small hits.

As the menace of the American bombardment effort mounted, the Germans switched from small caliber fast firing anti-aircraft weapons to heavier caliber anti-bomber cannons.

While allied armament remained fairly consistent throughout the war, the Germans continued to upgrade and increase their weapon calibers and rates of fire. Rapid advances in German weapon technology during the last stages of the war complicated the firepower picture. I resolved the situation by freezing the game at “TYPICAL” points. In other words, the P-51 began the war with only 4 fifty caliber machine guns but later carried 6. In our game, it is assumed to be carrying 6 since this is the most common configuration. Page 20 of the Campaign Briefing Manual describes the armament which I felt was most often used by each aircraft in the game.

**THE GENERAL**

![Graph](image)

**German MG15** - The MG15 was introduced in 1956 and replaced the MG15 in the following aircraft: Gotha 722, JU88, ME110, FW190. The MG15 was used by the Luftwaffe as a free traverse and fixed front gun. The MG15 was equipped with a muzzle boomer, and was the first German iron mounted machinegun. The MG15 was capable of firing a pattern when used as a twin mount.

**Rate of Fire 1200 rounds per minute**

**German MG81** - The MG81 was introduced in 1959 and replaced the MG15 in the following aircraft: Bf111, Bf110, Ju88. The MG81 was used by the Luftwaffe as a free traverse and fixed front gun. The MG81 was equipped with a muzzle boomer, and was the first German iron mounted machinegun. The MG81 was capable of firing a pattern when used as a twin mount.

**Firepower OutputExpressed in 50 Caliber Shells**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMERICAN</th>
<th>GERMAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-26</td>
<td>1066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-26</td>
<td>2133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-25</td>
<td>2133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-17</td>
<td>2133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-14</td>
<td>4266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-24</td>
<td>4266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-38</td>
<td>4983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-33</td>
<td>6565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-46</td>
<td>6400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-51</td>
<td>6600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spitfire</td>
<td>7180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-47</td>
<td>8553</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each American counter represents 75 planes when at 3/4 strength and 150 planes at full strength. Because 108 fifty caliber bullets are required to destroy one aircraft, 8100 fifty caliber bullets are needed to destroy the 75 American planes we refer to as one factor.

German counters were figured to average 160 planes each although many had only 120. The reason for the average is that a number of Geschwaders had a fourth group of 40 more fighters. This group was usually a training outfit which further polished the pilots before committing them to combat. However, when unescorted bombers were within range, these training groups and anything else which could fly were used.

To provide you with a working example of how this was built into the aerial combat table, I'll try to explain why the light American bombers shoot as they do.

I analyzed each bomber design to determine the minimum number of guns an attacker would face when fighting such a formation. Since the A-20 could bring only one gun to bear in its weakest area, its firepower was too insignificant to register on the results table. We would have needed at least 8 of them to shoot down one factor. Since there are only 4 factors of A-20's in the game, they were omitted from the results table.

Each A-26, B-25 and B-26 was able to bring at least four 50 caliber guns into play against attackers so their firepower is the equivalent of four guns per plane times 75 planes per factor... which works out as 2133 fifty caliber shells per factor. Four factors shooting yield a combined output of 8532 which is less than 8640, and 8640 you'll remember is the minimum number of 50 caliber rounds needed to destroy one factor of German fighters. The American needs at least 5 factors shooting before his firepower exceeds 8640 and has a chance of causing the Germans a loss.

Since there are less than 5 B-25 and A-26 factors in the game, these bombers are not permitted to return fire. There is no way they can generate the volume of fire needed to register on the results table.

Since one bullet out of 6 reaching the target is considered to be optimum accuracy, I had to figure out the consequences of shooting at less than maximum accuracy.

The 6 column of the aerial combat table shows how many factors are destroyed if 1/6th of all bullets fired hit the target. The 5 column on the combat table shows only 5/6ths of the hits registered in the six column. A die roll of 4 means you'd have to use the 4th column which is only 4/6ths as effective as the 6 column and so on.

The B-26 results table looked something like this before I boiled it down,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roll 1</th>
<th>Roll 2</th>
<th>Roll 3</th>
<th>Roll 4</th>
<th>Roll 5</th>
<th>Roll 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>468</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>1422</td>
<td>1777</td>
<td>2133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A die roll of 1 meant only 355 bullets hit the target. A die roll of two meant 711 bullets found their mark and so on. If two factors were shooting and rolled a 5, they would each score 1777 hits for a combined total of 3554. Since 3554 hits is less than 8640, the Germans suffered no measurable losses.

You can see how 5 factors of B-26's shooting 2133 bullets into the target will give you the number of hits needed to reach or exceed 8640. But if you had rolled a 5 on the die instead of a 6, your firepower would be 1777 per factor. 5X1777=8885 hits on target which is greater than the minimum 8640 and thereby causing the Germans a loss.

If you could put 17,280 hits into a German counter, you'd inflict a two factor loss. Each multiple of 840 causes the Germans to lose another factor.

Since the Germans have to score only 8100 hits, to destroy an American bomber, you may be wondering why all the German planes with a firepower greater than 8100 are not able to score more American factors. In this situation, I exerted my prerogatives as the designer, I believe
enhanced playbalance by considering the following rationales...

1. Not every German Geschwader mustered 160 fighters.
2. Even when 160 fighters were mustered, they were not all equally effective due to training in progress.
3. It takes more hits to destroy a two-engined plane than it does to destroy a single-engined plane. A four-engined plane can survive more damage than a two-engined plane.
4. While some of the German planes had two engines, most were single-engined. Many of the American planes were multi-engined.
5. Most American planes were a bit more sturdy than their German counterparts and able to survive more punishment.

In light of these considerations, I decided that the Germans would have to score 8640 hits to destroy one American combat fighter. The Fw 190 shoots 8624 per factor which is just short of the required 8640 needed. But the Me 262, Do 217, He 219 and Me 410 fire more than 8640 which is why each of these fighters finds it a chance to destroy an equal number of enemy factors.

In rare circumstances, the Me 410 is allowed to kill more factors than he commits to battle. These circumstances do not occur unless the German saves all his Me 410's from their Rail Road duties and combines them with his regular Air to Air 410's.

I have yet to see a game where this happened, but there is a remote possibility of it happening. If it does happen, the Me 410 is allowed to kill more than it has in combat because of the strength in its rearward shooting 13mm machine-guns.

The forward firepower of the Me 410 is so formidable that rolling a 5 causes just as many losses to the enemy as rolling a 6 until you have 5 or more factors involved. At this point, the two stingers in the tail become measurably effective and are allowed to add their firepower to that already inflicted on the attacking inbound pass. In other words, as the Me 410 retires from its inbound attack, its tail gunner gets in a few choice licks.

I've had many irate letters from fans who claim that the LUFTWAFFE results table is a piece of SCIENCE FICTION because it allows too much variation between the results of a one and a six on the die. They claim that their games are better balanced and more accurate because they call a roll of one on the die a two. When they roll a six on the die they call it a five. By eliminating the two extreme outcomes called for on the one and six column, they find a more convenient game. This is not what I had in mind when I designed the game, but if doing so gives you pleasure, go ahead. I designed the LUFT-WAFFE game to give you a minimum of book-keeping and a maximum of action. I was quite surprised to learn that some of you find the game too lively. While I like to think I can keep an open mind to the suggestions made by fellow enthusiasts, I must admit that I was unable to go along with an earlier suggestion which recommended "BOMBERS SHOULD BE ENTITLED TO TRIPLE THEIR DEFENSE RATING WHEN ENTRENCHED UPON FORTIFIED CLOUDS."
**The General**

Strong points: firepower and maneuverability; damage and rear firepower make it good in defensive situations. Weak firepower in front; maneuverability and slow. Limited in all respects. This aircraft was used often in home defense and bombing missions, as well as by Italian and Belgians mainly.

(PAR 56) - In all categories except firepower. It will manage against any German machines other than the Fokker series. This aircraft was used often in home defense and RNAS carrier squadrons.

(PAR 54) - A fairly durable, but clumsy aircraft. Good damage factor; weak in maneuverability and speed. Undistinguished but workable.

(PAR 52) - Good by 2-seater standards in all categories; best feature is its high damage factor. Reliable and sturdy. Only aircraft of its type to withstand a direct hit without detraction from its mission; should press on unless cornered. This airplane is a bomber, not an oversized fighter like the Brisif.

(PAR 59) - Somewhat agile, but typically flimsy. OK in most categories; good climb; lousy damage factor. Firepower weak in punch and ammo. This plane must kill quickly or suffer. Used widely by British as well as French.

(PAR 42) - Fairly good as a 2-seater - damage and rear firepower make it good in defensive situations. Weak firepower in front; undistinguished in most other respects.

(PAR 38) - Same comments as for the 1½-Strutter. Maneuverability rather poor but is generally acceptable for most missions.

(PAR 36) - Usable only if Optional Rule firepower is used. Unlike other 2-seaters this plane MUST bring its front gun to bear - too much blind area in back. Maneuverability and fields of fire OK - ammo limited. Speed and damage factors are serious weaknesses. This aircraft generally has to stand and fight.

(PAR 34) - No front gun, clumsy, rather slow. Limited in all respects. Only thing that makes this aircraft acceptable is a fairly high damage factor. IMPORTANT NOTE: The Armstrong Whitworth Fk.8 was equipped with dual controls. If the pilot is killed or wounded, the observer can take the controls if necessary. This makes the airplane immune to chance shots in that respect.

(PAR 32) - The only French two-seater represented in the game. Slow, fragile, poorly armed. Only decent capability is maneuverability. Will accomplish mission only through evasion. This early plane was suposed by the Salmons 2A2.

(PAR 30) - The worst of the 2-seaters. Slow, hard to maneuver, unable to climb or dive effectively - damage factor is fairly high but offset by airplane's lack of ability to fight or evade. Pathetic.

(PAR 28) - Weak in all categories, flimsy, slow, badly under-armed (came out in '15, to face the Endekkers; badly outclassed by 1916). Main weaknesses are damage and firepower - can't dish it out or take it. Speed is least of its problems. Fortunately, does not appear in any AH scenarios.

(PAR 26) - Poor in all categories. The only Albatros this plane could take on is the kind with feathers.

As you may have noticed, the PAR factor is an assessment of each airplane's fighting ability (generally the most important). When two-seaters are present, this consideration is often second to whether the plane can accomplish its mission. Evasion is usually the rule of the day, especially in situations where destroying the target is all that really matters (as in trench strafing and, especially, bombing missions, as well as artillery spotting). But the PAR does provide an indication of how well an aircraft can do when the interceptors strike.

Now for the German aircraft. None of these have the glaring weaknesses common to Allied aircraft, i.e., the flimsy construction and toothless armament common to many of them. But German fighters, notably the Pfalz and Halberstadt, lose in clumsiness what they make up in dependability and armament.

(PAR 88) - Excellent in every respect, capable of outmaneuvering and outslugging virtually every Allied fighter - and a match for any of them. Does not appear in any scenarios, but was most visible German fighter in 1918. (Note: the Fokker D-7a has the same PAR factor; PAR 88 is the highest factor in any aircraft in the game.)

(PAR 76) - Somewhat overrated; a limited fighter - but highly dangerous in action. Chief weaknesses are limited dive capacity, slow speed, and relatively low damage factor - not good compared to Allied aircraft above PAR 70. But: its firepower and maneuverability make this airplane lethal at close quarters. At its best in the clinch, especially against Spad 13. A menace, if used right.

(PAR 72) - Best of Albatros series, fast and durable. Not nimble - can't even outmaneuver Spad 13. Climb is excellent, dive OK. As a late-model Albatros, the D-5a was called upon to face more agile and powerful Allied fighters. Can fight on their own terms, trade shot for shot.

(PAR 66) - Similar to D-5a, but somewhat inferior in climb and speed capabilities. Against more agile - or faster - Allied fighters, the D-5 must take every shot possible, at any range - ammo capacity can take it. This and all other Albatros and Pfalz fighters must rely more and more on superior armor to fight against better Allied aircraft designs - from here on down the list they have to stand and fight if menaced, and make firing runs against anything they are menacing.

(PAR 66) - A little too stumpy - tends to be slow, with poor climb and maneuver factors. Main strengths are dive and damage factors, as well as firepower.

(PAR 64) - Similar to D-5, but weaker than other Albatros fighters in terms of damage capacity. Has difficulties with dive speed.

(PAR 62) - Similar to D-3a. Climb and max speed even poorer. Undistinguished but passable.

(PAR 60) - 1916 model, and Richthofen's first fighter. Limited capabilities but durable and well-armed; for its time, it was outstanding (against DH/2 and Nieuport 17-type aircraft). Surprisingly, more durable than ALB/83.

(PAR 59) - LTD PAR factor, but highly capable as recon/bomber aircraft. Slow and clumsy - can't run away from interception. But the Roland doesn't have to. The ring-mount (Optional Rules) gives it an excellent defense and its damage factor is the highest in the game. Hard to stop.

(PAR 48) - A little more maneuverable than the Roland, but has none of its firepower or durability. Climb capacity poor. Has slightly more firepower than most Allied 2-seaters.

(PAR 46) - The one German pursuit plane with substantial armament. Also clumsy and slow. Vaguely comparable to the Henriot 1. 

(PAR 40) - Slow and clumsy. Armament and damage factor are strong points. Not a terribly good plane, but somewhat reliable.

---

**Preliminary Aircraft Readiness Ratings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vertical Maneuverability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max Dive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50x-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100x-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300x-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500x-700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700x-900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fire Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TDT Column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horizontal Maneuverability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn Mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attack</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max Altitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Climb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Dive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Dive Speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Overdive Speed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: dual controls A G

These comments are only brief descriptions; an introduction, if you will. Perhaps the best method of familiarizing yourself with each of the 34 aircraft (or more, if you incorporate the Auxiliary ACC) is to write each aircraft's vital statistics down on a 3x5 card. That way, you can analyze each airplane singly, or compare it with another. (You will also have a readout on every aircraft your opponent has - wins and all. That's called Continued on Page 13 Column 3
The Series Replay which was forecast as being a matchup of the country's best game players in demonstrations of their skills is beginning to look more like a Clinic on how to play.

The Afrika Korps match printed below is the 4th consecutive game in which our neutral commentators have ginned down the participants for flaws in their play. But perhaps that's as it should be, It is an educational adage that students remember their mistakes for longer than correct responses. For some reason, errors stand out far better in our memory processes.

If such is truly the case we should have another great lesson lined up for you as our neutral judge, Robert Beyma takes exception to the prowess displayed below.

AFRIKA KORPS SERIES REPLAY

PARTICIPANTS: Robert Garbisch; (Germans) staff member; Bill Hoyer; (Allies) ex-president of the IFW.

April 1, 1941:

German move:
Have garrisoned Home Base with Savena Infantry and isolated Br. 2/2 S.G. at Bengasi. Attack is unnecessary at this time and too costly in terms of using my only Supply Unit. Whereas by using my slow-moving Italian Infantry units I can continue the isolated siege of Bengasi and be just as effective in eliminating the British unit. I advanced the main Panzer striking force to G-9, in expectation of a British defensive screen along the escarpments running from Tmimi to Mechili and extending inland.

Rommel - G9; 2106 - G10; 2110/4 - G9; 211Recce - G4; Ariete - I3; Trenta - K3; Brescia - K4; Porta - K3; Bologna - K4; Savena - K3; 15 - G9

British move:
The movement of the 21st Panzer along the Coast Road to the Northern escarpments is interesting. Obviously, the Italian infantry and Ariete did not use the Rommel bonus; I wonder why? I find the 21st Recce unit being employed near Bengasi to be a strange move.

April 1, 1941

AFK5 - At Sea; 4FX3 - At Sea; 4IX11 - At Sea; PolXCar - HE; 7AX1 - At Sea; 7AX2 - At Sea; 22GDS - G18; 9AX20 - M28; 7X33M - K15; 205 - H17; 2025G - Bengasi; 15 - Tobru

Third party commentary:
The German player seems to be isolating Bengasi the hard way. 2/2 S.G. could still move out to G-2 and block the road at H-3. The employment of the mobile 21st Panzer division so far north is somewhat weak.

The British player has gone into a standard screening defense west of Tobruch. The POL infantry unit really is not needed to garrison the home base, a supply unit will work just as well.

April 2, 1941:

German:
Second Supply Unit arrives. It's too early to risk a breakthrough attack on the British escarpment defenses. Instead, two strong panzer forces have been maneuvered into threatening positions. Hopefully, this will cause the British forward units to fall back in defense of the Tobruk area.

Rommel - J3; 2105 - 021; 2109/4 - 021; 211Recce - E11; Ariete - C11; Trenta - C11; Brescia - H3; Porta - C11; Bologna - I3; Savena - W3; 15 - 021; 28 - H4

British:
Bah, too many supplies. Well, the 7th Australian division should be able to tie up some units for a while, maybe even cause him to use a supply unit, but I doubt it. 7A/1 also closes the coast road to the Italians Standard defense deployed around Tobruch.

April 2, 1941

AFK5 - K36; 4FX3 - K56; 4IX11 - K56; PolXCar - HE; G18; 7A2 - L16; 22GDS - H26; 9AX20 - M28; 7X33M - H26; 205 - Tob; 2025G - Bengasi; 15 - Tobruch; 25 - H8

Third party:
The Germans did a sloppy job isolating Bengasi. The 2/2 S.G. could have moved to G-2 and attacked at 1-3 and have a retreat route. But the British player missed it.
P-22 is a better square than O-21 for a southern threat because O-21 can be blocked from one square (N-22).

Although he has forced the British back to the escarpments behind Mechili and is blanking the British defenses to the south the German 2nd move is lethargic and contains a major error. The German has allowed the 2/2SG to escape isolation in Bengasi via a 1-3 attack on Brescia. Only the failure of the British player to grasp this opportunity has saved the German from an embarrassing situation.
**THE GENERAL**

The British player withdrew prematurely. The escarpments west of Tobruch can be held until the arrival of the 15th Panzer division. 7A/2 is being needlessly sacrificed. The British player is playing rather conservatively.

May 1, 1941:

**Germans:**

Third Supply Unit and 15th Panzer Division arrives. There's now a sufficient force to push forth in a more aggressive manner. The forward British defenses have now been weakened to a mere delaying screen. The main British defense is now centered around Tobruch, thereby preventing a quick thrust at capturing Tobruch with the 21st Panzer division. Therefore the elimination of the two weak forward British units became mandatory in order to insure a safe supply line.

**Rommel**

I am beginning to wonder whether the German defenses have now been weakened to a mere delaying screen. The main British defense is now centered around Tobruch, thereby preventing a quick thrust at capturing Tobruch with the 21st Panzer division. Therefore the elimination of the two weak forward British units became mandatory in order to insure a safe supply line.

**Rommel - F18**: 2168 - M20; 210104 - K18; 21Rc33 - H18; Ariete - F18; Tunisia - F18; 18Rc33 - G03; Brescia - C14; Paiva - F18; Bologna - C13; Savona - W2; 1508 - H4; 150115 - H4; IS - 25; T2 - F18; 30 - H4

**British:**

When will the German supplies stop? Strange that the 15th Panzer went north along the coast road, no sense to it. Halfaya pass is weakly garrisoned but there was not much I could do about it. 41/11 prevents a decent attack on Tobruch.

May 1, 1941:

6X5 - K30: 41X7 - K36; 41X11 - H25; Po1XCar - At Sea; 22 GDS - Tobruch; BAX20 - At Sea; TX31M - Tobruch; 203 - Tobruch; 15 - Tobruch; 25 - HB

**Third party:**

I am beginning to wonder whether the German player realizes that his mobile units can get to Tobruch faster via MSUS than by the coast road. The Germans made a nice, safe attack, there was not much else to do. Note that if the Germans had not attacked they could not have gotten a supply unit next turn.

The British player apparently is planning on a long tough game and is taking no chance with losing Tobruch. The Polish infantry finally got moved out to sea, a little late.

May 2, 1941:

**Germans:**

It now appears as if the British shall be defending the Tobruch fortress in strength. A weak but still effective buffer has been placed in front of the Tobruch fortress, thereby preventing a concentrated assault on Tobruch. Once this single unit is eliminated, I can construct a close-knit defensive perimeter around Tobruch and restrict any tactical breakout attacks. Once the Halfaya Pass position is cleared my east flank can be easily protected. The possibility may exist for a swift advance onto the Allied Home Base.

**Rommel**

I am beginning to wonder whether the German player realizes that his mobile units can get to Tobruch faster via MSUS than by the coast road. The Germans made a nice, safe attack, there was not much else to do. Note that if the Germans had not attacked they could not have gotten a supply unit next turn.

The British player apparently is planning on a long tough game and is taking no chance with losing Tobruch. The Polish infantry finally got moved out to sea, a little late.

**Rommel - J27**: 2165 - K35; 210104 - K36; 21Rc33 - K36; Ariete - H25; Tunisia - J26; 18Rc33 - J26; Brescia - C03; Paiva - D06; Bologna - J26; Savona - W2; 1508 - G21; 150115 - G21; IS - 25; T2 - K30; IS - G21

**British:**

A German supply unit was finally sunk. I really should not have moved the Poles and 9A/20 out to sea last turn. Thank heavens we was not a colossal mistake. I have a chance if supplies continue to be sunk.

**May 2, 1941**

4X5 - J37; Po1XCar - L50; 22 GDS - Tobruch; BAX20 - L50; TX31M - Tobruch; 203 - Tobruch; 15 - Tobruch; 25 - HB

**June 1, 1941:**

**Germans:**

With the added pressure of more British units arriving and the inconvenience of a long, time-consuming, and not always reliable supply line, it has become imperative that I assault the Tobruch fortress with no more delay. Although the risk of an A-elim (2:1 odds) does exist, I am counting on Lady Luck to see me through this time. If an exchange occurs, I will still have sufficiently strong units to continue the struggle with my British opponent. With A-back 2, it will delay me in my offensive time schedule. A disastrous A-elim will spell the effective finish of the D.A.K. However, if I am able to eliminate the British defenders then I will have gained a valuable asset in continuing my offensive. To delay the elimination of the Tobruch defenders will only place me in a precarious two front position, between Tobruch itself and the arriving British units from their Home Base.

**Rommel**

When I arrived the Tobruch fortress was still intact, a 1-1 chance. A brief analysis of the 2-1 attack follows.

A roll of 1 or 3, a 33% chance, and the Germans are in great shape and should win. A roll of 6 and the Germans have lost the game. A roll of 4, attacker back 2, hurts the Germans. They use a supply unit, waste a turn, and the British can reinforce Tobruch. In this attack an A-back 2 could be potentially dangerous due to the poor placement of Brescia. The British could retreat the Panzers in such a way that they could...
get out of Tobruch, capture some supply units, and surround a good portion of the Axis forces. A better placement for Brescia would be 1-26. An exchange, a 33% chance, would capture Tobruch but would decimate the Axis forces. The Axis would be incapable of major offensive operations the rest of the year. The British would enjoy a significant numerical superiority especially after November and should win the game. In summary, I think the odds were 2-1 against the German player and that the risk really was not necessary at this stage of the game.

The decision to attack Tobruch or proceed on to Alexandria is always a major one in Afrika Corps. Unless Tobruch can be taken fairly easily, I personally feel that it is better to go to the British home base. With average supplies a good player can get mighty close by November. You player and that the risk really was not necessary to capture Tobruch or proceed on to Alexandria is always a major one in Afrika Corps. Unless Tobruch can be taken fairly easily, I personally feel that it is better to go to the British home base. With average supplies a good player can get mighty close by November. You should be able to kill 10-20 British factors at virtually no loss to yourself. This will leave the Germans with a tremendous tactical advantage. At worst, the Germans can always withdraw to Tobruch, and if the situation warrants it, attack Tobruch at 1-1 or 2-1. An exchange at this point might even be a victory for the Germans. Now on with the game.

June 2, 1941:

Germs:

Supply units continue to be sunk. However, Tobruch has fallen and with no serious losses to the D.A.K. With Tobruch now in Axis control, I can advance onto the Allied home base in a very bold and threatening style.

British:

I am trying something new. He can get AV’s on 41/5 and 41/23 but then he must stop unless he wants to try poor odds attacks on the stacked units directly behind. Since everything is north of the escarpment it is safe for this turn. I will do this again but must conserve units to last to November. Maybe he will waste supply, maybe not. I must chance it. The German player should have moved something onto the escarpment just in case for a flanking move.

Third party:

The German player should have moved some units onto the escarpment. The British came up with a screen defense but the Germans are strong enough to nail 4 or 5 factors. The British player should be pulling back to El Alamein and thinking about a couple 1-1’s if the Germans keep getting supplies.

July 1, 1941:

Germans:

Encountering stronger resistance than expected around the Matruh area. Sending out a powerful flanking threat along the escarpments while maintaining frontal pressure on the forward British defensive buffer, I hope to turn the Matruh defenses into a British withdrawal. Because now the British commander will be confronted with the choice of either counter-attacking or pulling back to a more defendable position.

July 2, 1941:

Germans:

The southern flanking threat has apparently convinced the British to withdraw from the Mahrur area. I am surprised that a stiffer defense was not attempted, because my forces were easily bottle-necked in the escarpment narrows near Mahrur. Now that Mahrur and Fuka are in Axis control, and El-Alamein, the British are definitely pressured into a very conining corner. British resistance should be quite a tactical challenge now that their backs are up against a wall.

My five Automatic Victory attacks were conducted as follows:

15/33 Recce moved south of the escarpment ridge then wheeled northwest to engage the 7/45A, Motor. The Trenta and Brescia Divisions then moved into the attack to create a 6-1 surrounded AV. With the 7/45A, Motor’s ZOC now nullified, the Ariete division goes into a frontal assault while the Pavia division overruns the 7/45A, Motor to engage the Polish Carpathian Brigade in a 6-1 surrounded AV. With the British Mahrur’s ZOC being nullified the 21/3 Recce, 15/115, and 21/104 Panzer-Grenadier units pass in-between the two surrounded British defenders to attack the 50/150 at a 8-1 AV. This unit and the next two units to be attacked are a
part of the British lines defending in front of the El Alamein area. The 21/5 Panzer overruns the 7/48A. Motor and advances to engage the 50/69 at a 7-1 AV. In the same series of actions, Rommel leads the 15/8 Panzer in an attack on the 50/68. A Motor, a 7-1 AV.

The British have now suffered heavy losses at no cost to the D.A.K. Some supplies have been lost but were not damaging to my offensive control. No cost to the D.A.K. Some supplies have been received for the Axis. The British have no idea of the important factor.

El Alamein
just could not see how anyone could expect a 1-1 attack on Tobruk. Rommel did not have a chance to pull things out with a desperate counterattack. He could have moved N-55 a chance to pull things out with a desperate move. The British player passed up chances for some 1-1 counterattacks late in the game which could have evened things up had he got lucky.

I should not have let all five factors get underestimation of your intentions. This last turn was eliminated. There is not much excuse for going down without a fight.

The British have surrendered. In all honesty, I should not have let all five factors get underestimation of your intentions. This last turn was eliminated. There is not much excuse for going down without a fight.

Third party: The German player went right after the British and cleaned up the 5 units given to him. He had a chance to pull things out with a desperate counterattack. He could have moved 2SA/7 to N-55 and gotten two 1-1 surrounded attacks against the two 7-7-10's. Two victories here, a 1/9th chance, and the British are still in the game. Also, the 2 remaining German supply units would be eliminated. There is not much excuse for going down without a fight.

Aftermath: The British have surrendered. In all honesty, I just could not see how anyone could hold out and protect the Allied home base until the arrival of the important British November 1941 reinforcements.

In retrospect, I believe that my unconservative 2-1 assault on the Tobruk fortification and its explosive success was quite unexpected by the British player. His underestimation of my aggressive intentions in conducting such an attack started him on a defensive series of hopeless delay actions.

Third Party Summary:
Both players played a rather conservative game, except for the one 2-1 attack. The tactical execution of moves was adequate but left something to be desired. I felt that the British fell back to Tobruk too quickly. In the final analysis, however, the 2-1 attack against Tobruk was the decisive play of the game. After winning the 2-1 the Germans just about had it wrapped up. The British player passed up chances for some 1-1 counterattacks late in the game which could have evened things up had he got lucky.

THE ATTACKS

HOW THEY FELL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Attack</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 1, 1941</td>
<td>21/5</td>
<td>7AX2</td>
<td>5-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21/104</td>
<td>Automatic</td>
<td>D Elim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2, 1941</td>
<td>21/3</td>
<td>7AX1</td>
<td>1-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Automatic</td>
<td>A82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21/6</td>
<td>7AX1</td>
<td>5-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21/104</td>
<td>Automatic</td>
<td>D Elim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1, 1941</td>
<td>21/5</td>
<td>4X5</td>
<td>1-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21/106</td>
<td>Automatic</td>
<td>AB2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21/3</td>
<td>4X11</td>
<td>5-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21/106</td>
<td>Automatic</td>
<td>D Elim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15/33</td>
<td>21/106</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15/33</td>
<td>2SA17</td>
<td>2-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21/106</td>
<td>Automatic</td>
<td>D Elim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1, 1941</td>
<td>4X5</td>
<td>Automatic</td>
<td>2-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4X23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2, 1941</td>
<td>4X23</td>
<td>Automatic</td>
<td>2-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7/4SAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7/4SAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE LUCK FACTOR

It is difficult to objectively analyze the luck factor in an Afrika Korps game due to the small number of die rolls, their vastly different consequences, and the automatic victory rule. The usual “average” percentage calculations of attacks at varying odds can be misleading, especially in a game as short as this one was.

However, the formula can be applied to tell us something about the effects of Lady Luck in this particular game. We do know for a fact that the Germans should receive an average of 5.35 supply units in an 8 turn game. The usual “average” percentage calculations of attacks at varying odds can be misleading, especially in a game as short as this one was.

However, the formula can be applied to tell us something about the effects of Lady Luck in this particular game. We do know for a fact that the Germans should receive an average of 5.35 supply units in an 8 turn game. The fact that the Germans got only 4 does not give the British player much excuse for his defeat. However, there is something to be said for the good fortune of getting those all-important first two supplies in April and May when they are most needed.

Analyzing the battles themselves is simply a matter of calculating the average losses for 9 automatic victory attacks, two 5-1's, a 2-1, and a 1-1 with their respective factor involvements. Doing this we find that the British player should have given up 14.67 factors instead of his actual losses of 19. Somewhat unlucky but not tremendously so. Taking a look at the German player though we find that his two low odds attacks left him with a loss expectancy of 11.66 factors of which he actually lost nothing. THIS must be considered good fortune.

Anyway you cut it, the game hinges around the 2-1 attack on Tobruk. A different die roll could have very easily caused a different winner. All of which seems to give the impression that Afrika Korps is a game of luck coming down to one 50-50 die roll. Perhaps that statement is true given play at this level. However, more expert play would have found the German driving on the British home base and not exposing himself to the ultimate gamble so early in the game. Just because this German player happened to make the right sacrifices to the God of Chance doesn’t excuse his technique. The successful way is not always the right way – at least not over the course of any one experience.

There is a thin line between luck and skill in Afrika Korps. If played well, it can be the most skillful of all wargames; being the ultimate in maneuver. No other game gives mobility the power it holds in Afrika Korps. Here positions are gained by threats and feints, not frontal assaults. An expert player can literally throw the die away as he maneuvers his opponent into a trap. Unfortunately, this was not the level of play we saw here.

The Luck Factor? Obviously, the Germans were courting Lady Luck in this game. However, aside from the 2-1 on Tobruk, the British player can hardly blame his defeat on the die. After all, he never rolled it!

GAME DESIGN EQUIPMENT

Like to make your own variants for Avalon Hill games? Or perhaps you’d just like to try your hand at designing a game on your favorite period? We have all the materials you’ll need to turn that budding idea into a workable prototype. All orders should be addressed to the Parts Department and include $1.00 extra for postage and handling charges.

22" x 28" Plain White Hex Sheet $1.00
Unmounted; specify size:
5/8" hex or 13/16" hex
Blank Mapboards $1.50
Specify size: 8" x 16", 8" x 22", or 14" x 22"
Blank Troop Counter Sheets $1.00
Die-cut white only; Specify size:
1/4" units or 5/8" units
Dice $ .25
Dear Sir,

Your decision to publish the article "In Defense Really Necessary" by Larry Wessel was an insult to your own intelligence. This is the biggest piece of rubbish that I have yet seen in your magazine. I shall not continue to make unsubstantiated charges, but will now demonstrate that Wessel's Plan is a detestable one to the arts of war and warship.

1) The placement of the Dutch Army is ridiculous. No nation in its right mind would ever place its army in such a location. The piece of real estate it guards is so unimportant! it probably didn't even account for more than five minutes work at the office of the Dutch military planner.

Mr. Wessel justifies his placement by saying "Here is the Dutch can be ready to run:" This is saying that the Dutch were just waiting to be invaded so they could pack up and race for France. (Abrund beyond reason.)

2) The placing of the Belgian army is just as bad as the Dutch. Mr. Wessel says "The Belgians should forget about saving the homeland." In case no one has told him, the main function of an army is to repel an enemy from its homestead. Mr. Wessel also says that the Belgians should be ready to run when the Germans come. He acts as if the main function of the Belgians and Dutch armies is to run for France at the sight of a German so as to help defend Paris, forgetting about their native countries.

3) There is not a chance of an Allied attack behind the Maginot Line is just plain stupid. Of course they must follow Mr. Wessel's plan in order to win at Paris even mention of the word German. Mr. Wessel forgets that most French industry and resources were in southern France, not in Paris. And because he forgets he also forgets to guard southern France against invasion. Mr. Wessel also states that the Allies will win because the Germans do not gain points for the capture of territory, however, (in case Mr. Wessel is misinformed) when the Germans reach the rest of France, enucleate the Allied armies and pin them into the "Paris pocket" leaving them without means of supply, I think the Germans will have won the war.

In conclusion, Mr. Wessel is one of those warships which believes unrealistic situations can happen because the rules say they can. Warships like these should not even be considered true warships due to their shortsightedness.

Don Richardson
Durham, California

Dear Illustrious Sirs:

Until recently, I was considering letting my subscription to the General run out. However, this last issue (Vol. 10, No. 1) has convinced me of the error of my ways. I must compliment Mr. Gene
good and all the rest for remolding the General to suit the times.

The cover is improved 2005; and after all, the cover is what we have to look at when we get it. I am looking forward to the Series Reply with bated breath. I trust that the somewhat facile attempt in the last issue is what you said it is and not the real thing. The Reader Response Page is long overdue; my compliments to the men who finally figured it out. Although the polling is not as refined as it could be, it is better than nothing. The refinement should come with more experience with it. The history articles are refreshing, especially those followed by a strategy or tactics article as was the case with the last issue. The article mix is excellent. Keep up the good work!

The price is unbeatable!

Mark Walter
Seattle, WA
THE GENERAL

READER BUYER’S GUIDE

TITRE: MIDWAY

SAILDATE: 1842 SHIP TO NAVAL BATTLE

MIDWAY faced rather well in the RSG a fact which reflects a rather pointed increase in its value. Despite this, the comments regarding our premier naval game in recent issues of the GENERAL have remained ireful in this 15 year old favorite.

The RSG review was the 8th in the RSG series and was one in which a "masterful" high or low rating wasn’t set for one of the companies, MIDWAY. In fact, the review was a "middle of the road" entry having no better than 3.30, nor worse than 2.30. In the case of the companies among the games played thus far. Its appropriateness to be Encouragement Level as it finished second to PANCESBLITZ and Courtesies of Rules, where it was rated only by STAUNTON/RAUSIG 2.32 rating. It fared the worst in the Midpoint company, probably due to the discussion of a new mapboard which lacks any real rethink appealing to nothing more than a representation of war.

The game did have a cumulative rating of 2.88 which is very high for any box top game provided thus far. Fortunately, operating the worst rating was not for its player balance, it bring the common belief that the game didn’t follow the action. Recent ratings in the GENERAL regarding off-board movement have improved this position but of a large discrepancy in opinion regarding the favorite side still exists.

Overall, the game fared very well against your ratings. The only other point of even mild concern being the 2.83 rating for Railroads. The main gripe here probably stems from the game’s rather artistic impression of railroad combat which all but eliminate any type of railroad supply movement or evacuation. A sacrifice to playability, surface combat procedures remain the normal in the general’s well received game.

WHAT THE NUMBERS MEAN: Put simply, the reviews can be considered like this:

1. Under 2.00 is pretty darn heavy, Score ranging from 2.50 anywhere within 2.50 is considered good, 4.50 through 4.99 would be considered fair, with the upper half of the 4.0 combination considered poor. Anything ranked higher than 4.50 isn’t that far behind and should meet immediate attempts at rating and would either automatically be considered poor. Happens to the game after initial release is large part up to you, if there are one deficiencies we are relying on the reader to spot them.

1. Physical Quality: 2.75
2. Clarity: 3.12
3. Components: 2.56
4. Ease of Understanding: 2.78
5. Completeness of Rules: 2.80
6. Play Balance: 2.58
7. Replayability: 3.08
8. Escalation Level: 2.73
9. Overall Value: 2.56
10. Game Length: 2 hr, 37 min.

Section V

1. Are you in favor of more game variants with in-game components such as Leyte Gulf?
2. How many non-bold with beardies do you have?
3. How many ships are in your game.
4. Do you keep a track of the best team you have?
5. Do you own either basketball or Football Strategy?

Anzio:
1. A stack with other units with a defense factor, use a unit with zero defense take as a stack and try to attack to not use?
2. A box not under the other units, including neutralized have been taken here.
3. A box not under the other units which attack with other units with attack factor. Can a unit which attack as to do so?
4. Yes, yes only if it has no other alternatives but immediate destruction, for example on the second turn of isolation.
5. When invading, can Allied units use a primary or secondary road through rough terrain, and only count each as one movement factor?
6. Yes.
7. When Allied units enter the game, may they immediately order to open any port or beachhead with a port country?
8. Yes, subject to high up orders, and with the exception that certain units can only move through Naples and/or the South East if open.
9. What happens if on the turn of construction a port country is captured?
10. It is destroyed, not delayed.
11. Can Allied units which start their turn in any open port or beachhead enter that town?
12. No. They must start their turn in Sicily, or in Naples with a port country.
13. Can Allied units move directly among open ports and beachheads in Naples or Sicily, or Sicily aren’t involved?
14. No. They could move one turn from Anzio to Naples or Sicily, for example. Then the next turn they could move one to Tunis, for instance. Always presenting the ports have coasters, so don’t dare them think this.
15. Can the units which can only enter the game via Naples or the South East move from the South East to Sicily and then to Anzio, for example?
16. No. Because these units are only allowed ENTER via the South East and/or Naples. The movement described could only be done by the units which may enter anywhere.
17. Suppose you want to break down a division which is underway into regiment, or to

The Question Box

To receive unattended expressions into a division but the counters are not exactly equivalent in strength?

1. You must take the next weaker counter on counters.
2. The northeast corner of the board is close to the water conditions. Where is it?
3. The hexes with rad coordinates 4-0 through 4-1.
4. B-144 point ofGeneric. Is 1.5% of path at Naples.
5. Neither of these cities is only one hex.
6. Is 25% of Liberty’s.
7. A, but CTS is the port.
8. Can Allied units enter from Tunis or Moncada directly into Axis zone of coast?
9. No.
10. Is Allied armored infantry instead as anis for fixing the difficultly of an assault and the road along that road in the same turn?

AFRIKA CORPS:
1. Once the fall, can a unit move from a clear desert area which does not contain any road and proceed to a point of an escape route by road and then continue along that road in the same turn?
2. You set question on if
3. HITLER: An Allied unit is stationed with a supply unit and attacked at 5-1 surrounded. In the number of supply units?
4. Captured. The British player could have destroyed the supply unit willingly but only his alone.
5. Note: Although the supply is captured it isn’t moved in the turn of capture unless a separate attacking place was used to capture if that one wasn’t involved in any attack.

PANCESBLITZ:
1. Non-ordered units cannot use the road movement rate while executing an invasion attack, can they still use the road to go through obstacles such as mountains unless while still following the non-road movement rate?
2. Yes.

Section VI

The questions posed below are meant to be a permanent part of your magazine. There is no need to remove this section from the rest of the issue. Elsewhere in the magazine you’ll find the Reader’s Response page. Among other things, it has a section especially constructed for your answers. We suggest you turn out the Reader’s Response page so that you can hold it parallel to the questions while writing in your answers. Detailed instructions on how to fill it out can be found on your answer card.

Section VII

How many are you in favor of more game variants with in-game components such as Leyte Gulf?

1. Are you in favor of more game variants with in-game components such as Leyte Gulf?
2. How many non-bold with beardies do you have?
3. How many ships are in your game.
4. Do you keep a track of the best team you have?
5. Do you own either basketball or Football Strategy?

AVALON HILL

1. How many are you in favor of more game variants with in-game components such as Leyte Gulf?
2. How many non-bold with beardies do you have?
3. How many ships are in your game.
4. Do you keep a track of the best team you have?
5. Do you own either basketball or Football Strategy?
Infiltrator's Report

Pictured above and below are members of the Richthofen Wing with hot-off-the press copies of RICHTHOFEN'S WAR. The Richthofen Wing is the unit originally named after the Red Baron and is one of only three units in the West German Air Forces allowed to use a name instead of a number as its official designation. The group is stationed at George AFB in California, learning to fly F-4 Phantoms. When they return to Germany they will act as instructors for the rest of the Wing. Many of the U.S. personnel at George including several wing commanders were equally impressed with the game and like their German counterparts were anxious to engage in dogfights — on the ground.

Taking a lesson from the SICL, the F.W.A. (Professional Wargamers Association) has become a corporate body under the laws of the state of Alabama. This guarantees the organization's prize lists. And those prizes are really growing! On March 1, 1974 the PWA will start its World Professional Championship Series. Approximately every two months in 1974 championship tournaments in one of the basic Avalon Hill games will be started. There will be trophies for the first five places in every category but the winner of each division will take home $200.00 to go with his trophy! The tournaments will open with STALINGRAD, and follow with AFRICA KORPS, WATERLOO, BULGE, PANZERBLITZ and D-DAY in that order. For further information write the PWA at 2313 Wexford Ln., Birmingham, AL 35216.

Although no one came up with the correct solution to Contest No. 58 the ones who came closest and were awarded prizes included: R. Reynolds, Houston, TX; L. Bucher, Dallas, TX; K. Gross, Seabrook, TX; S. Goodman, Sunnyvale, CA; M. Robinson, W. Lafayette, IN; C. Hoover, Denver, CO; K. Fung, San Francisco, CA; C. Derry, Akron, OH; W. Rose, Romulus, MI; and O. Hudson, Berkeley, CA.

LOYAL SUBSCRIBER DEAL: We start the new year off right by offering free parts postage on any parts order for plm kits, boards, boxes, counters, rules, manuals, cards, hex sheets or other miscellaneous items when your order is accompanied by the Loyal Subscriber Deal Star found on the Readers Response Page. Offer is good only for the months of January and February.