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MORE CHANGES IN THE WORKS

The response to Vol. 10, No. 5 of the GENERAL has been the heaviest we’ve ever received. It would be nice to report that feedback as 100% favorable—nice but not true. “ANZIO—Portrait of a Game” has elicited as much controversy as anything we’ve ever published. If nothing else it has decided our course of action for the GENERAL in future months.

The main objection to the issue was, of course, the large percentage of the magazine devoted to ANZIO—a discontinued game which many did not have or could expect to obtain. This, in effect, limited the issue to articles on just 4 games and those readers without the games in question were obviously dissatisfied. Yet, there’s a bright side to every problem. Those who had the game were generous with their praise of the “in-depth” approach of the new feature article premise. So, in an attempt to “have our cake and eat it too” we’ve decided to go ahead with plans for increasing the GENERAL to 34 pages. This way we can continue to offer detailed features while still providing the variety which the GENERAL has always been noted for. “Something for everybody” will be the slogan for 1974.

Despite all the fuss, Tom Oleson’s extra-ganza “ANZIO—Portrait of a Game” ran away with “best of issue” honors setting a new record for points scored in our 600 point maximum scoring system whereby 200 random responses are scored, giving 3 points for each 1st place vote, 2 for 2nd, and 1 for 3rd. However, the issue itself—bogged down by 9’s and 10’s from the ANZIO haters drew in a 3.98 rating—a considerably poorer performance than previous efforts. In addition, only 53% thought that this issue was better than the last as compared to figures of 96% and 72% for previous issues. Perhaps this reflects our overall improvement in recent months but we’ve decided to interpret it as a blackball vote against features on discontinued games. Therefore, it is unlikely whether any more shall appear in future issues. Unfortunately, the wheels of publication had advanced too far to cancel this issue’s GUADALCANAL feature. We thought that reading articles on discontinued games serves a dual purpose—providing interesting background data and playing information for those who had the game, and satisfying the curiosity of those who didn’t. Right or wrong, this issue’s GUADALCANAL feature will be the last attempt to turn back the hands of time for a discontinued game.

The GUADALCANAL feature is somewhat of an experiment in itself. We really don’t know how you’re going to react to this type of article which places so much emphasis on the battlefield as it appears 30 years later. No doubt you’ll let us know. We thought it an immensely interesting article, if only for its uniqueness. In any case, next issue will find us on hand with a more conventional feature and a 34 page format with which to diversify our efforts. And if it’s any comfort to those of you who were so impressed with ANZIO last time, we are giving strong consideration to rereleasing it after a redesign job due to the flood of mail the article has generated. For those interested in the complete voting breakdown for last issue it follows below:

ANZIO—Portrait of a Game .... 448 Series Replay—Afrika Korps .... 358 Breaking Par .... 200 Design Analysis .... 151 Avalon Hill Philosophy .... 23 Question Box .... 10 Infiltrator’s Report .... 10

As is readily apparent, only the Series Replay gave the lead article any real competition. From the comments we’ve received the Series Replay would be even more popular if the quality of play was improved. We think that problem has been solved now with 4 completed, well-played games in our files awaiting publication. The first, which appears in this issue pits Randy Reed and Don Lowry in a BULGE match—two rather esteemed players whose abilities pale only in contrast to this issue’s expert judge, Dave Roberts. Next time we’ll have a couple of Ph. D.’s slugging it out in PANZERBLITZ in a feature which should prove a 100% improvement over our previous PANZERBLITZ Series Replay in Vol. 10, No. 1. While on the subject of the Series Replay, 43% of you selected the MIDWAY approach used in Vol. 10, No 2 as the best Replay thus far. 34% opted for the STALINGRAD technique, while only 14% liked the strategic overview approach of the 1914 Replay. You really showed your unhappiness with the PANZERBLITZ Series Replay Preview which drew only 8% of the vote. This is especially surprising in view of the great popularity of PANZERBLITZ as a game. We feel we’re getting out of the experimental stage with the Plays now though and have the technique refined to the point where the next PANZERBLITZ Replay will be much more warmly received.

The remainder of the Readers’ Response Results provided some rather interesting food for thought. Again we found that less than half of you were using the 2 for 1 deal to recommend the magazine to your friends. To recap briefly, the 2 for 1 deal states that anytime you send in a paid subscription for someone else we will not subscribe to the GENERAL since 1972, your own subscription will be extended for 1 year free of charge. This offer expires at the end of May and will not be reoffered. 2 for 1 deals submitted after May, 1974 will not be honored. Now is your last chance to extend
GUADALCANAL
THE ISLAND, THE CAMPAIGN, THE GAME

by Joel S. Davis

Joel Davis is a graduate student at the University of Colorado and a longtime wargamer of the first order. By the time GUADALCANAL came out he had already mastered the remainder of the Avalon Hill line of that time. His fascination for the period has remained high ever since.

That's why when we heard he was about to set out on an extended tour of the South Pacific we handed him this GUADALCANAL assignment. An excellent photographer in his own right, Joel took all the photographs of the island used in this article, and blended them with a keen historical knowledge of the battle, expert gamesmanship, and an eyewitness account of the island as it is today to provide us with the very unusual feature which follows.

⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐
THE CAMPAIGN

When GUADALCANAL was first introduced by Avalon Hill, I bought a copy almost immediately. What a fantastic group of innovations it contained! Factor reduction... hidden movement... invasions... long-range artillery. Of course, check-off pads may be a bit cumbersome, and you really need two copies of the game to make hidden movement convenient, but what a challenge! Guadalcanal was the first U.S. counter-attack in the Pacific War, and was probably the only one where both sides had a chance of victory. It's a name that rings down through history—few may remember Truk, or Peleliu, or Tarawa, but almost everyone has heard of Guadalcanal.

Later, some of the game's problems began to appear. I played Basic GUADALCANAL a few times, but I found the game terribly restricted and one-sided. The tournament version is very interesting—and moderately balanced—but it has problems of its own. Even late in the game, the American player is almost forced to play a very conservative strategy—it's far too easy for the hidden Japanese to trap you while extended. On the other hand, with all that force bunched around Henderson Field, Japanese attacks are pretty much limited to mid-September. For the most part, Japanese strategy centers around staying within artillery range of Henderson Field without getting caught, while the Americans make occasional, cautious forays to flush them out.

The Japanese, like the sages who will tell you that all the really decisive action went on at sea... so why play out the land campaign at all? Things were decided—they say—in the Naval Battle of Guadalcanal (the last in a series of six major engagements in that area).

To this contention I give a qualified "Poppycock"! Qualified, because some of the naval engagements were decisive and could have thrown things either way. No one really disputes that the Naval Battle of Guadalcanal was a decisive factor in leading the Japanese to evacuate the island. But "Poppycock" because the war on land had several decisive battles too! If the Japanese had won any one of them—and the potential was there—it could have been the United States Marines who were forced to abandon the island.

As I shall point out, the situation pictured in GUADALCANAL the game doesn't match that which existed in the campaign very well... but this merely represents some problems in design, not a failure of the basic concept. To understand why this is so, you must be familiar with the story of the 1942 campaign.

In the summer of 1942, most U.S. force was committed to Europe, while the primary ground force available in the Pacific was the largely untried 1st Marine Division, under the command of Major General Alexander Vandegrift. In the battles of Coral Sea and Midway, the United States Navy had wrested the strategic initiative from the Imperial Japanese Navy, and was looking for a way to use this initiative to best advantage. When it was learned that the Japanese were building an airfield and seaplane base in the lower Solomons, it was clear that the intent was to cut the ocean link between America and Australia. Admiral Ernest King proposed to the Joint Chiefs that America act to halt this operation—by the capture of Guadalcanal and Tulagi.

So it was that on 7 August, 1942—the very day the first Japanese aircraft were to land on the newly constructed airfield on Guadalcanal—10,000 Americans drove ashore to capture "Henderson Field" (named after an American pilot lost at Midway) with no resistance. The two labor battalions engaged in its construction fled into the jungle. About 6000 troops were landed on Tulagi and other nearby islands to eliminate the seaplane base and other pockets of resistance. Here the fighting was bitter, but the garrisons were small. In a few days, the mopping up was over.

Japanese efforts to throw the Americans off Guadalcanal began almost immediately. Bombers began attacking from Rabaul, and in the early morning hours of 9 August, five heavy cruisers, two light cruisers, and one destroyer badly mauled the Allied (U.S. and Australian) covering force in the Battle of Savo Island.

While the Japanese force did not gain the objective of bombarding the beaches, the covering force did withdraw—an inauspicious beginning to the months of naval dueling that lay ahead. Transports were also ditched from Rabaul... Colonel Kiyomo Ichiki landed on Guadalcanal on 18 August with 1500 troops (An earlier reinforcement attempt was turned back when transport Meiyo Maru was sunk by submarine S-38). With the 900 troops already on the island, that made 2400. That isn't much with which to attack 10,000, even supported by the Japanese combined fleet. But the Japanese were under the impression that the Americans had only landed a raiding force to destroy the airfield—a regiment of 2000 to 3000 men at most. Such optimistic underestimations—usually by a factor of five or so—were to plague the Japanese throughout the campaign. The Japanese, though, had great faith in the spirit of their own troops. One would think they inventioned the line, "My strength is as that of ten, for my heart is pure!"

On numerous occasions, the Japanese Naval Command set up combined air-naval-ground operations to recapture Henderson Field. The reason that Henderson Field was so crucial was that, while it remained operational, the "Cactus Air Force" limited Japanese reinforcement to Destroyer runs at night by the "Tokyo Express." Transports were just too slow... Henderson's aircraft would catch them unloading by morning light. Destroyers were fast—but destroyers cannot carry heavy equipment, horses, or bulky supplies. The usual Japanese plan would bring the combined fleet into action. A large number of troops would be landed by the Tokyo Express (this part usually came off). These troops would launch a combined, multi-pronged attack on Henderson Field (these attacks were usually late, under-supplied, and lacked coordination), while the Imperial Japanese Navy would clear the U.S. Fleet from the area (which sometimes was accomplished) and bombard the beaches in support (again, sometimes managed). As soon as the Japanese ground forces captured Henderson (which never happened, but once almost...
did), Japanese aircraft would fly in, putting the United States Navy in the same daylight disadvantage suffered by the Japanese. In some ways it might be worse, since American forces were not used to using destroyers as transports, and were used to more abundant supply than the Japanese would put up with. In addition, Japanese transports with heavy equipment, supplies, etc., could land, greatly expediting the mop-up of American troops. These plans usually included elaborate arrangements for the surrender ceremonies.

What with the over-confidence of the Japanese—on their own combat effectiveness, and how fast they could get to their positions through the jungle, and their general lack of intelligence concerning overall U.S. dispositions and firepower, as well as the tremendous complexity and crucial timing necessary in these operations, things always went wrong.

What finally induced the Japanese to abandon Guadalcanal was the destruction of a transport fleet by Henderson-based aircraft, combined with a naval defeat in the Naval Battle of Guadalcanal. But, as most of the histories will admit, things were tough-and-go in spots, and if the Japanese had played their cards a little better, things might have gone differently.

The Main Road into the Hills from Matanikau is much the same today as it was 30 years ago, although other facilities have improved tremendously.

Surprise number two—as far as Pacific Islands go, Guadalcanal is amazingly modern. This is only true within a mile or so of the north coast, but, in comparison with the U.S. Trust Territories (again, except the Marianas), I found much more “civilization”—especially surprising in view of how much less the British spend than the Americans. Guadalcanal, for example, has good roads. The main coastal road is paved for about twenty miles. It’s smooth riding from Tasimboko to Tassafaronga, and even beyond Tassafaronga... though you have to drive through streams at fords. This wasn’t difficult—but I was there during the dry season. Later in the year, fording streams could have been a real problem.

Another significant difference is that a relatively large fraction of the natives speak English. In fact, the overall standard of education compares quite favorably, for example, with that in the Caroline Islands. Public utilities—electricity, phones, and running water—are more widespread.

My initial tour of the island was in a vehicle called a minikoke. It looks like a kind of cross between a dune-buggy and the surrey-with-the-fringe-on-top... but it’s rugged and will go almost anywhere.

The approach to Mt. Austen is much easier now than it was 32 years ago.

My first stop was Mount Austen. We drove on old U.S. jeep trails—still in use after thirty years—crunching down the tall grass and undergrowth which never stays down for long. There were a few of the Japanese memorials dedicated to “eternal world peace” that one sees on so many of these islands, but many landowners put up monuments of their own just by stacking up any old military hardware they found on their land. Even the fences brought back war memories... they were made of old Marston matting, salvaged from the military airstrips.

Nearby “Red Beach”—where the Americans came ashore—had little to distinguish it from other beaches, save some rusty scraps which thirty years had made unidentifiable. Not too far away, however, was the Betikama Museum & Souvenir shop. I looked over the numerous pieces of artillery and aircraft in relatively good condition before continuing to Edson’s (“Bloody”) Ridge, where Edson’s Raiders held off numerous determined Japanese attacks. One interesting feature was the unusual lack of trees. While thick forest existed around the ridge peaks, the top of the ridge was virtually clear, except for the ubiquitous high grass. I asked and discovered that this had always been so, which checks with some USMC sources... though it is contrary to the GUADALCANAL mapboard.

It was near Bloody Ridge that I saw what looked like airplane hangars covered with earth—old American supply sheds. We drove down an old jeep trail to look at one of them. The trail hadn’t been used in a week or so, there was about two feet of undergrowth! We found only a few rusting supply drums in the first shed, but a second shed was visibly further back. From the amount of undergrowth, I guessed that it was rarely visited. Such finds are often more interesting—but my struggle to get there yielded no relics... only a nervous surprise when the equally surprised resident bats took off and winged past me in fright. How poignant, though—structures which once shielded men from bullets, bombs, and shells are still shielding bats and spiders from rain, wind, and the tropical sun.

A view of the invasion beach (RED Beach) looking eastward toward Lunga Point.

A view of Bloody (Edson’s) Ridge from ‘s mile away to the north.

A brief visit to Henderson Field followed. Despite warning signs, I climbed to the top of the old control tower—safe enough, if you watch your step. The reward was a beautiful panoramic view of that part of the island.
40mm shells. Making souvenirs of them was a temptation, but I didn't really feel like dragging questionable World War II vintage ordnance half-way around the Pacific.

I left Guadalcanal for Rabaul on a Trans-Australia Airways DC-3 Thursday morning. Somehow, the airplane seemed fitting—one of the few survivors of the era, the DC-3 has been in use for about forty years ... and was used extensively throughout the war.

### THE GAME

The big question that now arises to the average gamer is what to do about GUADALCANAL—the game. I've talked about the island, and reviewed the campaign. Now, speaking as one who has thoroughly investigated the official histories, visited the island, and talked to some of the inhabitants, I believe I can outline a few factors that Avalon Hill did not properly allow for ... and suggest some modifications to the game.

#### GEOGRAPHY

Actually, Avalon Hill did a pretty fair job on their board. It coordinates quite well with the actual geography except in places developed since the war. I would make KK-26 (the top of Bloody Ridge) a clear square. It was clear ... and that fact was significant in the actions that occurred there. There's more forest/jungle between Kukumbona and Tenaro along the coast than what is shown ... but I don't think changing the terrain in that part of the board would affect the game significantly. During the Dry Season, the rivers don't amount to much—but the Wet Season began early in 1942 ... just before the Americans landed. Rivers can be left the way they are.

The current movement allowance through jungle is about right—one mile per day—but it must be remembered that all AH movement is drastically reduced to allow time for precautionary delays and for combat. As things stand, jungle movement is half as fast as normal terrain movement. Even though "clear" terrain on Guadalcanal can be pretty difficult, one quarter speed would probably be more reasonable. Therefore, jungle movement should be reduced to 4 BTA per square. To be even more realistic, include a strategy movement rule such as that used in ANZIO. I suggest that if a unit does not begin its move in an enemy zone of control, if no part of its move brings it into an enemy zone of control, and if it does not attack during its turn, that unit may move twice during the movement portion of its turn. Along with the 4 BTA jungle movement rule, this should more accurately simulate the movement problems encountered on Guadalcanal.

Bridging rivers is a minor point of contention too. Once a unit has built a bridge and controls both sides of a river, there's no reason why units coming later should pay the same penalty to cross. After all, unless you're crossing against enemy fire, bridges tend to be permanent structures. A blank counter can be used to indicate the existence of a bridge. Presumably a ground unit could destroy it in the same amount of time it takes to build by passing through the square, and it could be destroyed by artillery if one of the factors firing upon it rolls a one.

### LIMITED INTELLIGENCE

This is the most serious error in the game in that Avalon Hill had the situation backwards. What with aerial reconnaissance, friendly natives, and less faith in their own assessments, the Americans had far better intelligence than the Japanese did ... but, of course, no one's intelligence in the jungle was very good. One solution would be a set-up involving three boards, three sets of pieces, and a processor to give out intelligence to both sides. Unfortunately, such solutions are only for the most devoted! For a social game, something simpler is needed.

I suggest leaving the current limited intelligence procedure up to the players:

a) All American units in the jungle are kept upside down.

b) If the Americans can form a continuous line of squares containing either American units or American zones of control from one point on the coast to another point on the coast with no Japanese units inside, then American units INSIDE this line may be off the board if they are in the jungle, or flipped over no matter where they are. American zones of control along the coast (including the existence of American units) should be marked by blank counters, tokens, etc., so that the Japanese player will know if he's allowed to land back there or not.
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There is no way to really simulate the continual Japanese ignorance of American strength, but these two additions will bring the situation into at least a somewhat more realistic balance.

HENDERSON FIELD

Right now, players get a strategic advantage—victory points—for holding Henderson Field. In fact, Henderson had some hefty tactical advantages too. Airpower was what forced the Japanese to limit most of their supply and reinforcements to what destroyers could bring in. If Henderson Field were kept out of action or fell into Japanese hands, the Japanese could have landed large numbers of troops, horses, supplies, and heavy equipment. Furthermore, had the Japanese made Henderson Field operational, they could prevent the Americans from conducting major landings of almost any sort—as well as limiting American supply—virtually forcing a United States evacuation.

Extra Reinforcements: If the Japanese put Henderson Field out of commission or capture it at the end of their turn, they are entitled to land up to two combat units from those available at Rabaul (including regular reinforcements for that month that have not yet arrived) and four units of fire. These appear at the beginning of the next Japanese turn. If the Japanese possess Henderson Field—or if Henderson Field is out of commission— at the beginning of the Japanese turn, the Japanese player may land up to twelve combat units from those available at Rabaul and 24 units of fire that turn.

Japanese Air Operations: If the Japanese player holds Henderson Field at the beginning and end of his turn, and if Henderson has or is brought up to ten or more reduction factors (see Henderson Operations), then beginning on the following U.S. turn, each Japanese non-artillery unit fights as if it had one additional combat factor. This reflects the increased Japanese supply, reduced American supply, and support by Japanese aircraft. The American player may also roll for any reinforcements he wishes to land. A die is rolled for each unit—if a one, two, or three is rolled, that non-artillery unit is eliminated. Of course, if Henderson Field is out of commission, or if it is recaptured by the Americans, the Japanese player loses the advantages of air operations.

RABAUL REINFORCEMENTS

The Japanese had many forces available in addition to those actually landed on Guadalcanal. Through most of the campaign, tens of thousands of troops on Rabaul, in the Shortlands, and in other areas needed only a safe means of transport to enter the fray. The problem for Admiral Mikawa, on Rabaul, was providing that transport—many destroyers were sunk trying to reach Guadalcanal. Because of the risk, others were never sent.

In listing the additional troops available, numerous problems come up. The Japanese were not German-style record keepers, and American intelligence was not always accurate. Incompleteness, inexactitude, and unit identifications were always cropping up. Worse yet, often only a part of a unit was sent to Guadalcanal. Some would be left behind... some would be sunk in transit... and the elements actually arriving might arrive over a period of many weeks. In trying to stay as close as possible to Avalon Hill's Order of Appearance, I had to contend with the fact that units given sometimes had no real existence—or were far smaller than what is shown—but the extra factors helped represent a myriad of smaller units that couldn't be shown.

I have divided the game into four reinforcement periods, showing additional troops that may be landed only DURING THE PERIOD(S) SHOWN. They DO NOT accumulate. If a unit is not landed on Guadalcanal, and does not appear in the next period, you can assume that (a) It was sent... but sunk in transit, or (b) It was transferred to the Rabaul garrison or elsewhere, or (c) It is landed during the next period by a regular Tokyo Express run as shown in Avalon Hill's order of appearance. These additional units may be landed in accordance with the "Henderson Field" rules. No unit may land twice-i.e., you couldn't land 29/1 on 18 September as extra troops and land a second 29/1 on 9 October when called for by Avalon Hill. You could, in this case, land 10th Mt. Artillery and one other 4-10 infantry unit if any are available. Only exactly equivalent units may swap arrival times.

HENDERSON OPERATIONS

Even though the Japanese never captured Henderson Field, it was put out of action a few times by heavy bombardment, and almost put out of action on a few other occasions. Of course, the Japanese kept the area under continual bombardment, but ammunition limitations usually prevented such attacks from having more than nuisance value.

Henderson Field has twenty reduction factors—it requires at least ten to be operational. Reduction factors may be destroyed by artillery fire against Henderson Field... and may be replaced or destroyed by combat units present on the field. Henderson Field may never have more than twenty reduction factors or fewer than zero.

Artillery: When artillery (including naval bombardment) attacks square KK-22 (Henderson Field), a roll of six for any factor firing eliminates one reduction factor. Of course, if face-up units are on Henderson, these will take casualties on rolls of two and/or one, depending on the number of factors present.

Combat units: If an Engineer or Labor unit is on Henderson Field at the beginning of its move, and remains there throughout the move, two reduction factors may be rebuilt. If the unit is eligible for strategic movement, it may spend half its move (10 BTA) on Henderson and...
rebuild one reduction factor. Other types of units are treated similarly, except that they are not as effective at replacing reduction factors. If their entire move is spent there, a three, four, five, or six must be rolled for each unit to replace one reduction factor. If eligible for strategic movement and half a move is spent there, a five or six must be rolled.

As above, if an Engineer or Labor unit spends its entire move at Henderson Field, it may destroy six reduction factors—or three if only half its move (including strategic) is spent there. For any other type of unit, the figures are two and one respectively.

If Henderson Field is attacked and the units defending it are retreated, some damage to the field results. Roll one die...the number of spots showing is the amount of damage.

### NAVAL BOMBARDMENT

On several occasions, the Japanese mounted major naval bombardments of Henderson Field, in addition to frequent minor strikes by the Tokyo Express. To reflect this, beginning with the second (14 August) Japanese turn, the Japanese player may attempt a major bombardment. To do so, he merely announces a bombardment attack at the beginning of the combat portion of his turn and rolls a die. If a four, five, or six is rolled, the bombardment attempt succeeds. He then rolls the number of dice appropriate for that month and gets that many artillery factors applied to the Henderson Field square. Effects are determined by "Henderson Operations" and "Artillery" rules—note that if American combat units on Henderson are face-down, they are not affected. At least two of the six must be rolled before bombardment attempts by the Japanese, regardless of whether they are successful or not. If Henderson falls to the Japanese, the Americans may attempt bombardments in exactly the same way, except that the attempt is at the beginning of the U.S. combat segment, and only one turn need elapse between attempts.

### JAPANESE TENACITY

The value of Japanese "fighting spirit" may be open to question—but it WAS there. They made numerous "human wave" attacks—such as those at Bloody Ridge—often almost to the last man! To simulate this, if the Japanese player rolls a result with no advance or retreat, casualties are removed and he may immediately make the same attack again, though casualties may have changed the odds—in which case the appropriate new odds column is consulted. If the result calls for a Japanese retreat, the Japanese player may take double casualties, ignore the retreat, and immediately attack again, as in the previous case. Both of these tactics are options—not required—and can be exercised only once per attack. Renewed attacks may not be made after the first re-attack.

### ARTILLERY FIRE

Artillery used against troops under cover usually did little more than force them to keep their heads down. Where artillery WAS tremendously effective was in supporting and breaking up attacks, and in counter-battery fire.

Before artillery fire is exchanged, both sides designate which of their artillery units are firing—and from where—by the use of tokens, blank counters, etc. If you wish, you can imagine this reflects the initial appearance of muzzle flashes, smoke, and loud noise. Next, each side secretly assigns some, all, or none of his artillery units to counter-battery fire. Each artillery unit assigned to counter-battery fire will also have a target square (containing enemy artillery) assigned. After this is done, each player reveals which of their opponent's units are coming under counter-battery fire. For every artillery factor firing in a counter-battery capacity, roll once for each number of dice showing. If a four, five, or six is rolled, the targeted unit may not fire OTHER THAN IN A COUNTER-BATTERY CAPACITY during that exchange. If the targeted unit is assigned to counter-battery fire, there is no effect. Counter-battery fire never causes casualties. Units engaging in counter-battery fire use up ½ of a Unit of Fire per unit...units prevented from firing other missions by counter-battery fire use up no ammunition.

After counter-battery fire, artillery fire proceeds normally, except that only face-up units take casualties—including those about to have combat.

The more perceptive readers among you may wonder why units trying to repair Henderson Field don't take casualties from artillery directed at the field. This is a good question—especially since the Japanese had some nasty tricks right along this line. One was to fire a shell at the field...wait for the engineers to start fixing it...then fire another shell from the same gun. With no change in gun position, the shell lands in almost exactly the same place.

In point of fact, though, the number of casualties due to such tactics were in the dozens at most. Nerve-wracking as it might be, the Sea Bees got pretty good at second-guessing this sort of thing. They managed to keep the field in good repair as a rule, with a minimum of casualties.

### THE GENERAL

AMBUSCH

If a unit is exercising strategic movement and moves on top of or into the zone of control of an enemy unit, it is immediately ambushed. It immediately takes one factor of combat losses and attacks the off-the-board unit(s). Regardless of terrain, the defending unit(s) is doubled. Note that the "defending unit(s) is assumed to be conducting the ambush. If the ambushed unit is on top of the defending unit, the ambushed unit has no retreat.

### VICTORY CONDITIONS

The Japanese Army didn't really care how many casualties it took...as long as its objectives were obtained. Therefore, add to tournament game victory conditions the following: "If, at the end of the game (29 January), the Japanese are in possession of Henderson Field, they win, regardless of point totals.

* * * * *

These modifications are far from perfect. A major re-working of the game mechanics would be necessary to accurately reflect all of the important elements of the campaign and still leave a reasonably balanced game. These changes will, however, yield a more accurate simulation of the difficulties and goals of both sides—notably in the Japanese determination to capture Henderson Field. If they do manage to capture it, they have probably won the game.
OUTDOOR SURVIVAL is the only "peace" game which lends itself to "wargame" variation. A number of interesting things can be done with the game on a man to man level. Richard Jarvinen's effort below just touches the fringe of the tactical possibilities.

For hours the brilliant desert sun has been blinding your eyes, parching your throat, and burning into your head like a white hot iron. Each new step brings additional waves of agony, but the thought of gold, GOLD! drives you forward like a machine. If you can only reach it before— Crack! The sharp report of a high-powered rifle drives you instinctively down onto the browning desert floor. Crack! A near miss sends up a spray of stinging sand into your face. Each new step brings additional waves of agony, but the thought of gold, GOLD! drives you forward like a machine. If you can only reach it before— Crack! The sharp report of a high-powered rifle drives you instinctively down onto the browning desert floor. Crack! A near miss sends up a spray of stinging sand into your face.

Sounds like a scene starring Humphrey Bogart in The Treasure of Sierra Madre, right? It's a situation that could arise in my new scenario in one of Avalon Hill's more recent releases, Outdoor Survival. I personally found the game very entertaining, but I was less than satisfied with the object of my variation is simple: find the gold and get yourself and the gold out of the wilds alive. The only obstacles to overcome are the natural elements and a couple of other men, who just happen to be armed and dangerous.

To start, take four or five blank counters and one counter that you have marked "Gold" and place them upside-down on the center board. Mix them up and scatter them about, preferably in the wilds alive. The only obstacles to overcome are the natural elements and a couple of other men, who just happen to be armed and dangerous.

To locate the gold you must stop on the suspect counter before turning it over. Just passing over a counter without stopping does not give you the right to search. To carry the gold once you have found it simply place it under your man and move normally, with one exception: the man carrying the gold must subtract 1 from his movement allowance. (It is heavy, you know!)

Firing

Firing takes place at the end of each man's movement phase. The only requirements to fire are that you must have a rifle in good condition, a supply of ammunition, and a target to shoot at. You are not required to fire, but you may fire at the end of all your movement phases if you wish (and can do so legally). The one exception to firing after moving is when you have been fired upon the previous turn. Then you may choose to fire before moving but you can fire only at the man who shot at you and you must add one to the roll of the die when firing. You may not fire both before and after moving under any circumstances. Trails are considered clear terrain for firing purposes.

To shoot, first determine the terrain that the target is in, and then determine the range. (Note that you can be on the same square as an opponent, giving you a range of zero.) Consult Table I and cross reference the range with the terrain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Clear</th>
<th>Desert</th>
<th>Woods</th>
<th>Swamp</th>
<th>Mountains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>*D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note the asterisk at range 2 under clear. You may fire at a clear terrain hex at range 2 only if the intervening hex between the target and the shooter is a clear terrain hex, "*" means you are not allowed to fire.

After you have consulted Table I, you should come up with a letter. This letter is the firing column you will use in Table II. Roll the die and pray for results. An "X" means the target was killed; a number means the number of life levels lost by the target; a "*" means you missed; and an "**" means a special hit. Consult the Special Hit Table (Table III) and roll the die again.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firing Results Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You may pass your rifle to a friend who has lost his or had it destroyed, or you may pick up the rifle of any dead person. In each case you must stop on the same hex as the person (or body) to whom (or from whom) you are effecting the transfer. Gold may be transferred in the same manner.

Streams and catch basins in no way affect firing.

Direction Ability and Daily Necessities

Use the charts on Scenario No. 3 (Search) for both direction ability and daily food and water requirements.

Outposts

You cannot be fired upon if you are in an outpost. You may move into a hex containing an outpost occupied by an enemy man, but you are not considered in the outpost as he got there first. He may fire at you but you may not return fire.

Each outpost contains enough provisions to supply one man food and water for three turns, or two friendly men for one turn and one man for an additional turn. However used, the total supply capacity cannot exceed three of each item.

You may replenish yourself at an outpost as if it were a food and water hex as there are enough rations to support you for the required two turns. Once an outpost's provisions are gone they can never be replaced. You may voluntarily destroy the remainder of an outpost's supplies when leaving. You may meet your daily requirements of food and water by passing through an outpost that has provisions left, but you must stop on the outpost in order to destroy the remaining provisions.

The above rules apply only to Outposts 1, 2, 3, and 4. Outposts 6 through 9 are used only for setting up.

Optional Rules

Here are some additional rules to further increase your enjoyment and frustrate your goals:

1) Do not reveal to your opponent where you have found the gold, or to whom you have passed this spot, unless you wish. Use appropriate dummy and marked counters underneath each man.

2) Use three or more players per side.

3) Use the Wilderness Encounter Chart at the end of each man's turn (although the situation seems grim enough already!)

4) Limit the amount of rounds of ammunition of each man to seven. Ammo may be passed in the same manner as the gold and rifles.

Using the charts on Scenario No. 3 (Search) for both direction ability and daily food and water requirements.

Blitzkrieg

Continued from page 20

with 1 factor every turn, using up his 1-invasion-per-turn capacity.

Finally, a note on Tactics: specialized (airborne and Ranger) units can be vital once Red and Blue have come to grips. To those that haven't become aware of this, the following should prove instructive. When the battlefield is broken into small areas or sectors, the best defense is good offense. You can only attack the enemy in his rear areas or outposts. You can only attack the enemy in his rear areas or outposts.
**Panzerblitz Revisited**

by Kurt Nordquest

Many PANZERBLITZ players rush on past Situation One after only one try, dismissing it as an introductory Scenario with no real challenge. Kurt Nordquest thinks differently and has made a study of how to best defend the German lines of communications against the ravages of the 371st Cavalry Regiment.

In fact, Kurt has done such a good job that he's rubbed onto the reason why we had to change this situation when the revised scenario cards were issued in September, 1971. Those of you who have both sets will recall that the German was not forced to commit two of his forts to the hilltop hexes 129 and 132 and CP units counted as only 3 units for victory purposes, rather than the current five. Keeping these changes in mind, examine Mr. Nordquest's "Imploded Defense" and see for yourself why the scenario had to be changed.

**Imploded Defense**

**German Defensive Position: Panzerblitz Situation No. 1. 580th Signal Regiment, 286th Security Division, 10th Flak Regiment.**

When one first plays Panzerblitz, their first situation choice is probably No. 1 due to the small number of units involved. Quite logically they opt for a situation that will allow them to break into the game smoothly by avoiding the problems involved in handling the larger forces. After fighting this situation once they quickly move on to the more complex and glamorous situations. I feel that this is a grave error and situation No. 1 deserves another look. There are many valuable lessons to be learned on both sides but especially for the German as he masters the imploded defense.

The novice German player is immediately impressed by the prospects of using his 88mm anti-tank guns to destroy the Russian before he can even get close. So his set up is designed to make maximum use of their superb range. The fault with this strategy is that he cannot defend all the approaches to his position adequately, so the answer to his problem is not to look outward but inward. The imploded defense does just this. Just like an implosion its force is expended inward and that is its focus.

Since victory conditions don't require any Russian units being destroyed the goal of the German defense is to keep from being eliminated. This is achieved in this case by interlocking fields of fire on the plateau of Hill 132. The Russian has almost complete freedom of movement on any of the other boards. The only exceptions are a few hilltop hexes of no value in this situation. The plateau itself is well suited to defense, and setting up the interlocking fields of fire without regard for the approaches allows the German to make the most of the few units he has.

Because all German units are either in the woods or town hexes the Russian player is forced to come up on the plateau, first to spot and then destroy. The Russian cavalry is excellent for this purpose since they are capable of dispersing a fort quite easily. Once this is accomplished the tanks can move up on the plateau for the kill. It is the task of the German infantry to keep a close watch on the Russian cavalry and attack when the opportunity presents itself. The key to the defense of the German position is the fort in the woods and that is why the infantry support is located there. (Keep in mind that they must be ready to shift to the south to assist in repulsing an attack on the east side of the town which can be launched from the south east). If the woods fort and their infantry support are destroyed the Russians can easily hide their tanks at the edge of the woods and safely destroy the town forts.

Since this fort is the key and because the rewards of a Russian victory in the woods are greater than elsewhere the attack will most likely come there. This is where the German infantry stacks come in. They must prevent the Russian infantry/cavalry from clearing the woods, or at least, inflict such losses that spotting and dispersal of forts will be impossible.

As German player your ace card is the engineer reinforced infantry stacks. Their close assault is deadly due to both increased odds and die subtraction. Almost as important is their 21 defense factor which makes them a tough nut to crack; a rare occurrence with German infantry. Another big plus is the terrain which prevents him from attacking units separately while at the same time leaves him with that lingering doubt that comes because no matter how high the odds are against you there is always the chance that you will escape unharmed if he rolls a six. The psychological effect of such an occurrence can be devastating to his morale.

The Russians can attack this position from any one of three directions (North, Southeast, or Southwest) with the target being any one of the three forts, or they may try to go after all the units not in forts. This will give them a marginal victory if successful but such an attack requires two assaults, one in the woods and one in the town. A dual attack such as this is tricky and the time is very short. It can work if the luck of the game goes in his favor and he is a skilled player.

Rather than try to prepare for all assaults keep in mind that the only mobility the German has is the infantry stacks, don't overextend or commit them too soon or they may not be able to reach critical areas in time. This defense isn't foolproof but most of the time the Russian will be checked and forced, as time runs out on him, into a desperate attack with all the forces he can muster, rushing the plateau. It is in just such an attack as this that he will feel the full force of the imploded defense.

**GERMAN DEPLOYMENT**

![Diagram of German Deployment](image-url)

**THE GENERAL**

**GERMAN DEPLOYMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Troops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mine</td>
<td>O-4, V-7, W-5, W-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block</td>
<td>T-7, U-4, U-7, V-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort No. 1</td>
<td>U-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command Post</td>
<td>88mm Anti-Tank Gun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fort</td>
<td>Flak 20mm Gun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort No. 2</td>
<td>U-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command Post</td>
<td>88mm Anti-Tank Gun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fort</td>
<td>Flak 20mm Gun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort No. 3</td>
<td>R-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command Post</td>
<td>88mm Anti-Tank Gun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fort</td>
<td>50mm Anti-Tank Gun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nordquest**

**Anti-Tank Gun**

**Infantry Stacks**

**P-5, F-6**

**Stenpist Submachinegun Engineer**

**Infantry Artillery Stack**

**50mm Flak Gun**

**50mm Anti-Tank Gun**

**Panzerblitz**

**Situation No. 1. 580th Signal Regiment, 286th Security Division, 10th Flak Regiment.**

**The Key to the Defense of the German Position**

The key to the defense of the German position is the fort in the woods and that is why the infantry support is located there. (Keep in mind that they must be ready to shift to the south to assist in repulsing an attack on the east side of the town which can be launched from the south east). If the woods fort and their infantry support are destroyed the Russians can easily hide their tanks at the edge of the woods and safely destroy the town forts.

Since this fort is the key and because the rewards of a Russian victory in the woods are greater than elsewhere the attack will most likely come there. This is where the German infantry stacks come in. They must prevent the Russian infantry/cavalry from clearing the woods, or at least, inflict such losses that spotting and dispersal of forts will be impossible.

As German player your ace card is the engineer reinforced infantry stacks. Their close assault is deadly due to both increased odds and die subtraction. Almost as important is their 21 defense factor which makes them a tough nut to crack; a rare occurrence with German infantry. Another big plus is the terrain which prevents him from attacking units separately while at the same time leaves him with that lingering doubt that comes because no matter how high the odds are against you there is always the chance that you will escape unharmed if he rolls a six. The psychological effect of such an occurrence can be devastating to his morale.

The Russians can attack this position from any one of three directions (North, Southeast, or Southwest) with the target being any one of the three forts, or they may try to go after all the units not in forts. This will give them a marginal victory if successful but such an attack requires two assaults, one in the woods and one in the town. A dual attack such as this is tricky and the time is very short. It can work if the luck of the game goes in his favor and he is a skilled player.

Rather than try to prepare for all assaults keep in mind that the only mobility the German has is the infantry stacks, don't overextend or commit them too soon or they may not be able to reach critical areas in time. This defense isn't foolproof but most of the time the Russian will be checked and forced, as time runs out on him, into a desperate attack with all the forces he can muster, rushing the plateau. It is in just such an attack as this that he will feel the full force of the imploded defense.
This SERIES REPLAY is probably the best played game of the series to date. Without a doubt, the players and judge are of the highest caliber. However, perhaps for that very reason it may prove hard to follow. To aid you in organizing the exhaustive commentary which follows, the comments of the three parties have been set in 3 separate type faces; that of the neutral judge being italic. His format in this commentary was to make each move, read each player's comments, and then make his own. Since the game was unfinished when delivered to him with the Germans claiming victory and the Americans not admitting defeat, the judge was asked to declare a winner which he did without too much trouble.

Both the American and German player have a habit of analyzing the other's move prior to making comments on their own move. They also are analyzing the situation before and after the attacks are resolved. This, combined with their widely varying writing styles makes following along somewhat of a chore. We have reduced the type face in some making comments in the neutral's turn shows the German utilizing all 10 of their attacks which allows for a clearer read on the underlying captions.

GERMAN 16 AM

1. My weakest attack is the 1-1 against 28/110. It should be 2-1 or 3-1 to block road going north. Only—no more troops! Only advantage of 1-1 is small percentage of big AMIS retreat and good ENGAGE percentage. Disadvantage is the 30% (PB4) chance of A BACK.

2. I could move Iss 4 south to support attack on 28/110 at 2-1, but this would allow 14CAY to make a counterattack which could block an attack on St. Vith by the northern German forces. Otherwise, theory with the northern German forces. Otherwise, theory with this is a decent probability for a clear road to St. Vith.

3. With the attacks constructed as they are, there is no place for the 276/DIV to attack. I feel guilty about wasting the troops, very inefficient. Could really use it in the center, but 26/109 blocks the road.

4. Attacks on 99/393 & 395 may look bad at first sight (ie 3-1) could make it retractable to the Monschau-Malmedy road and thus deployable in the center) but it gives a better percentage than lower odds attacks. That is, only a 3-1 for attack 2/1 the chances of these are 50%, at 3-1 they are 50%. Also, 2-1 has the A back 1 possibility. The Road between Elenborn and St. Vith must be blocked at all costs.

5. Basically, my attack plan provides for a 70% chance of bottling up everything in the north during the first turn. It all hinges on that one attack...

The opening turn shows the German utilizing all 10 of their attacks and to my advantage. Four U.S. units are immediately eliminated and a fifth, the 106/423, is forced to attack at 1-18 surrounded thus assuring another American casualty.
The German 16PM move acts the 99/393 to the bag while securing an “Engaged” at 1-1 vs. 9/CCB and making substantial advances elsewhere. The American in his turn will counter with a 1-on-1 on the 12/23 without a Corps of 9/CCB and the 1086. Possible is the German making up other combat in his own turn. The American withdraws his armor from the engagement and pulls back to FF50 while managing an “Engaged” in his attack on the 12/23.

16AM American—Don’s move of the 4th Division shows the hard lifting of the single 8-1 against 4/8. Although Randy’s advance here might seem to be a victory, actually it was simply a wasted attack. The 4th is free to move to any place it would have wanted to move even if the attack hadn’t been made. The only good result would have been Engaged, but this would have been more likely at 1-1, and more economical. On the other hand, if an Engaged had been obtained against 4/12 and/or 4/16, the advance with the 3-1 against 4/8 would have achieved something.

The American places 4/12 in MM33, which is as far forward as he can place it without being subject to surrounding, I would have sacrificed 412 in QQ32. Where it is, it should be attacked at 8-1, and 70% of the time it will be eliminated anyway, but the German will have gained needless ground. However if 4/12 survives, as Don seems to hope, the German will gain ground of even greater advantage and be half way to Martelange.

I think Don seriously mishandled the 28th in moving them to MM44. They could, and should have moved to LL26, counter-attacking at 1-2 with a 70% chance to maintain a solid block on the vital Cleveraux-Bastogne road. Don has let Randy advance half way to Bastogne without opposition! 9/CCB could have been pushed up one more square to 12B. With the 1-2 probably covering the Cleveraux-Bastogne road anyway, 9/CCB could probably have been placed to good effect in J30. If the 28th is Engaged in MM44 it would be a disaster, whereas if 9/393 is correctly placed in 0010, rather than say 0011. In 0010 it can only be attacked from one square, and effectively blocks the road. I would have moved the 2nd Division to PPs rather than PFP. Followed by 006, 125, etc.

One has to say that it’s hard for the Americans to do anything good when the Germans get the critical advance adjacent to Cleveraux, and that Don made a good move, but it could have been better.

GERMAN 16PM

1. Basically, I plan to attack the 38/DIV at 1-1 since the only chance to bag the division is to engage it so that it may be surrounded in the next turn.

2. My thinking now is concentrating on pinning down and destroying as many units as possible. Best chances seem to be in the center and in the South. The north is going to be tough to crack because he can so easily reinforce it.

THE AFTERMATH

Things went very well in the center. Luck was not with me, however, in the south on or on the 1-1 attack against the 28/DIV.

AMERICAN 16PM COMMENTS:

There are no real surprises in the German move. The attack on the 28th Divtives of 8-1 hopes of an “Engaged” to keep these units from scattering in their path. Again he used all of his attacks and wisely so.

After checking the results of his attacks I see he has again locked up with an “A-Adv.” Note that his advance was calculated to surround the 4/8. The “Contact” against the 28th Div prevents a Reg’t of it from proceeding to NN20 this turn to replace the 106/424 which is needed elsewhere. Notice how the position of my 9/CCB blocked a long advance when 9/CCB had to retreat.

I am still hard pressed because of his long advance after combat last turn and have had to give ground faster than I’d like. However the situation is still not out of hand and substantial reinforcements from both north and south next turn should stabilize things somewhat.

The 1-1 attack I am making is, of course, with the object of occupying the hexes from which I am attacking in order to block a German advance across country toward Houffalize. This has a 70% chance. I moved 7/CRR to LaRoche in case it is needed south of Bastogne next time and the Houffalize road becomes blocked.

16PM German—As Don says, no real surprises in Randy’s move, just sound tactics. Randy’s move of his 62nd to QQ5 demonstrates the weakness of Don’s move to PFP rather than PPs with the 2nd. The 106/424 getting off scot-free demonstrates the flaw of Randy’s placement on the Our River of LeHer and especially 3/15. With the 1-1 against 9/CCB Randy hopes to open up a possible big advance in the attack against 9/CCB. This is a well engineered attack that could have been devastating, advancing adjacent to both Bastogne and Houffalize! Randy gets the rout against 9/CCB, but alas, the attack against 9/CCB bogs down, and the day is saved for the Americans.

The attack on 4/12 should have been at 8-1. Apparently Randy made this attack in the mistaken impression that he would be able to cut off 4/18 with the advance. Evidently the attack on 4/10 was designed to assist in cutting 4/8, and Randy chose 2-1 odds to avoid Exchange. Aside from the fact that there was no chance to cut off 4/18, this attack should have been 3-1. With the American having to bide for units, the Exchange would be far better for the German at this point. The extra force could be obtained by reducing the attack on 9/CCB to 1-2, and utilizing Lehr/1 P.G. and 12/22, which are wasted. In fact 12/23, as placed, only makes the German position weaker. With 9/CCB Engaged, an attack and
**The General**

**American 17AM**

1. The bottle-neck created by the attack of the 28/109 and 9/CCA doesn’t bother my central attack much. Yet it was a brilliantly conceived move—low risk with a good chance of upsetting the German player psychologically.

2. At this point a better picture of the game is beginning to form. The 2/1 AM has hit a good tributary and I’m hoping to get him enough material. With his big reinforcements to hit the board soon, I MUST cause more German attrition. Also, I must attempt to exploit the center so as to put him on the defensive in the future.

3. The situation in the north does not bother me too much. It will fall by default if all goes well in the center. The troops committed in the north can easily shift south in that event.

4. In the south, I can do damage—real damage, with a D4+4x against the D4. A big retreat means I can get the junction south of Martelange in my ZOC and delay the appearance of the 10/14 AM for a turn. Also, the 4/16 would be cut off.

5. I’m forcing him, by dint of my infiltration, to bed-up the Vielhalm sector. Hopefully, the northern action will provide something of a drain on his reinforcements.

6. Unless he counter-attacks very well, I will be able to secure the 38/109 and the 28/109 in the next two turns.

**German 17AM**

1. The American attack is a diversion only to defend against my attack. The American 28/109 has been out of play ever since 1/12. The American 9/CCA, however, has been involved in heavy fighting with the 28/109 in the north. My attack on 12/13 was brilliant. For two weeks, my forces have been drawing the Americans into a trap. The American 17AM is still trying to break through our line in the center. However, I will hold on for as long as possible.

2. The German 17AM has not been able to break through the American 17AM’s line in the center. However, the American 17AM has been able to break through my line in the north. I must continue to hold out as long as possible.

**American 17AM**

1. The American attack on 12/13 was brilliant. However, the German 17AM has been able to break through my line in the north. I must continue to hold out as long as possible.

2. The American 17AM has not been able to break through the German 17AM’s line in the center. However, the German 17AM has been able to break through my line in the north. I must continue to hold out as long as possible.

**American 17AM**

1. The American attack on 12/13 was brilliant. However, the German 17AM has been able to break through my line in the north. I must continue to hold out as long as possible.

2. The American 17AM has not been able to break through the German 17AM’s line in the center. However, the German 17AM has been able to break through my line in the north. I must continue to hold out as long as possible.

**American 17AM**

1. The American attack on 12/13 was brilliant. However, the German 17AM has been able to break through my line in the north. I must continue to hold out as long as possible.

2. The American 17AM has not been able to break through the German 17AM’s line in the center. However, the German 17AM has been able to break through my line in the north. I must continue to hold out as long as possible.

**American 17AM**

1. The American attack on 12/13 was brilliant. However, the German 17AM has been able to break through my line in the north. I must continue to hold out as long as possible.

2. The American 17AM has not been able to break through the German 17AM’s line in the center. However, the German 17AM has been able to break through my line in the north. I must continue to hold out as long as possible.

**American 17AM**

1. The American attack on 12/13 was brilliant. However, the German 17AM has been able to break through my line in the north. I must continue to hold out as long as possible.

2. The American 17AM has not been able to break through the German 17AM’s line in the center. However, the German 17AM has been able to break through my line in the north. I must continue to hold out as long as possible.

**American 17AM**

1. The American attack on 12/13 was brilliant. However, the German 17AM has been able to break through my line in the north. I must continue to hold out as long as possible.

2. The American 17AM has not been able to break through the German 17AM’s line in the center. However, the German 17AM has been able to break through my line in the north. I must continue to hold out as long as possible.

**American 17AM**

1. The American attack on 12/13 was brilliant. However, the German 17AM has been able to break through my line in the north. I must continue to hold out as long as possible.

2. The American 17AM has not been able to break through the German 17AM’s line in the center. However, the German 17AM has been able to break through my line in the north. I must continue to hold out as long as possible.

**American 17AM**

1. The American attack on 12/13 was brilliant. However, the German 17AM has been able to break through my line in the north. I must continue to hold out as long as possible.

2. The American 17AM has not been able to break through the German 17AM’s line in the center. However, the German 17AM has been able to break through my line in the north. I must continue to hold out as long as possible.
### Opponents Wanted

We're experiencing growing pains. More subscribers mean 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (in all caps)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STREET</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reader Buyer's Guide

**Title:** AFRICA KORPS

**Price:** $7.00

**Regimental-Battalion Level Game of the African Campaign 1941-42**

**Instructions:** Rate all categories by placing a number ranging from 1 through 9 in the appropriate spaces to the right. (1 equating excellent; 5-average; and 9-terrible). EXCEPTION: Rate Item No. 10 in terms of minutes necessary to play game as recorded in 10-minute increments. EXAMPLE: If you've found that it takes two and a half hours to play FRANCE 1940, you would give it a GAME LENGTH rating of "15."

Participate in these reviews only if you are familiar with the game in question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Physical Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Mapboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ease of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Completeness of Rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Play Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Realism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Excitement Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Overall Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Game Length</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The review sheet may be cut out, photocopied, or merely drawn on a separate sheet of paper. Mail it to our 4517 Harford Road address with your contest entry or opponents wanted ad. Mark such correspondence to the attention of the R & D Department.

Game to be reviewed next:

### LOYAL SUBSCRIBER DISCOUNT STAR

This star when "stapled" to your order entitles you to free postage for any Avalon Hill parts order with a minimum order of $1.00.

The star must be actually stapled to the order to earn credit. If you merely include it in your envelope and it becomes lost in the mail-sorting process here you will not receive credit for it. REPEAT — STAPLE IT to your order.
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Mar-Apr 1974

### Reader Feedback

This issue represents the completion of the first year of the improved, 26 pp format of the GENERAL. Before we embark into the next stage of our improvement process (to be marked by next issue's expansion to 34 pp), you can help us decide what we did right and wrong during the past year. By rating the following subjects on a 1-10 scale (1 equating excellent, and 10 terrible) you can show us where we went wrong and what to emphasize in future issues. Participate in this Reader Feedback only if you have all 6 of the Volume 10 issues as only those cards completely filled out will be processed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Issue As A Whole</th>
<th>BEST ARTICLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vol. 10, No. 1</td>
<td>CAMPAIGN AT WATERLOO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. 10, No. 2</td>
<td>ADVANCED BISMARCK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. 10, No. 3</td>
<td>D-DAY DEFENDED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. 10, No. 4</td>
<td>LUFTWAFFE ANALYSIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. 10, No. 5</td>
<td>SERIES REPLAY (which one)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. 10, No. 6</td>
<td>LEYTE GULF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPERATION CRUSADER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANATOMY OF A DEFENSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PORTRAIT OF A GAME</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SERIES REPLAYS**

- PANZERBLITZ PREVIEW
- MIDWAY
- STALINGRAD
- AFRICA KORPS
- BULGE

Because less than 10% of the readership participates in the contests we are considering dropping them in favor of more room for variant counters and feedback forms. Indicate your choices below.

---

This issue's articles:

- AVALON HILL PHILOSOPHY
- GUADALCANAL
- GOLD RUSH
- PANZERBLITZ REVISITED
- DESIGN ANALYSIS
- A REALISTIC SOLUTION
- BLITZKRIEG INVASION POSSIBILITIES

---

**AVALON HILL**

4517 Harford Road, Baltimore, Md. 21214
To be acceptable, this section must be cut out along the lines indicated.
German uses a 2/1 against them, in which case they would have a 20% to break out if their flanks had been protected. If 7/CCR should have built the fort in DD24 NOW! There may not be another chance. With this move the Americans have gotten themselves in deep trouble.

GERMAN 17 PM

Comments on American 17 AM: Very exciting turn. I made a big mistake in having the 326/562 with the 277/DIV because a D back I result against the 9/9, 1/8 would have resulted in its elimination. All in all, his expected counter-attack went badly; he lost ALL attacks—the ENGAGED against the 2/8 & 5/13 will cost him the 10/4/24 at 1/2 odds because he will be hardpressed to renew it at safe odds. I think this was his weakest turn; the commitment of the 10/ARM against the 2/7 was ill-conceived. He could very well lose the entire 10/ARM because of it! The placement of 7/CCA must have been a gross oversight. There is no reason to sacrifice THIS unit. The attack by 28/110 & 112, while it could have succeeded (20% chance), also could have cost him the 9/CCA, given a D back 3 result.

1. Hopefully, with these 17 PM attacks I can begin to drastically curtail his maneuverability. Besides those attacks against the surrounded units, all other attacks have the purpose of cutting roads (thus isolating the center of his line) supported by a quick thrust through the south.

2. TRICK MOVE: By switching Iss/Pieper to the south (for the extra movement factor needed in the southern thrust) a turn is cut off the time needed to develop that move. Also, reinforcing the engaged in center forces a 1-attack by the 106/424, thus saving a German attack.

GERMAN 17PM ATTACKS:

| 59/326/702, 155/P | 4/16 | 3-1 | CON |
| 110/310/312 | 7/CCA | 3-4 | ENG |
| 110/170/27 | 1/18 | 6-3 | D8 | D8 vs 136 |
| 9SS/18/180/30 | 1/17 | 6-3 | D8 | D8 vs 126 |
| 110/171/10 | 1-1 | ENG |
| 700/7/562, 162 | 28/110 | 6-3 | D8 | D8 vs 136 |
| 26/112 | 1/17 | 6-3 | D8 | D8 vs 126 |
| 9SS/18/180/30 | 1/17 | 6-3 | D8 | D8 vs 126 |
| 106/424 | 1/17 | 6-3 | D8 | D8 vs 126 |

GERMAN PREVIEW OF AMERICAN 17 PM:

1. I cannot understand why he persists in committing the 10/ARM and other units in the south like that. When I failed to cut off the 10/ARM in its turn of entry, I assumed he would have shived it up to the center, but he wants to stand and scrap it out with me! That's fine with me, I'd much rather fight the 10/ARM now, in the open, then in the Bastogne hills. I do not think his counterattacks in the south are nearly so effective as they would be if my units were pinned up against 'the Martelange River', for example. My casualty situation is great—I'm virtually unscathed, so I can easily afford to take casualties in the south in the next few turns. Nailing the 326/703 is not going to upset my plans.

2. He's doing some pretty hairy things in his attacks. The 1-3 involving the 11/18 vs. 9/36 & 326/562 could open a big hole (30% chance). The 1-1 involving 99/395 vs. 99/195 allows me to grab Spa (via a D+1 onto the road through terrain hex) if he gets an A back 2 result.

AFTERMATH

Success. Especially in the three areas discussed above. Hopefully, I can do a little crouching of my own now.

Roberts' Commentary:
17PM German—Another strong move of Randy's. He shows good strategic insight in whealing his panzer grenadiers past Viersnain and hitting 1/18. He should have added 326/562 to this attack to make it the optimum 6-1 odds to try to gain maximum ground or a D 1E1m, in the event, he would have only gained one square anyway.

Apparently Randy had misplaced 106/424 in EESO, which explains the confused tactics there. Instead of adding the 12th Division to the Engaged in F30 and attacking E31, I would have added my two heaviest units to the Engagement. attacked 9/CCA at 3-1, and the remnant of the 28th at the best available odds. Randy still has extra strength in the rear while hesitating to risk. Exchange at 3-1. The final demise of the 28th is the almost inevitable result of the way Don has mishandled this division, starting with the error of placing it in MM24 rather than trying to block the Culevans-Bastogne road from LL26. Most of Don's troubles in the center stem directly from that mistake.

Don comments, "Randy's luck wasn't much better than mine." In fact Randy got the worst possible result in every battle except the 6-1's against the 28th. This could have been Exchange! Nevertheless the German retains excellent prospects.

17PM American—Don is working himself deeper in attacks that Randy aptly describes as "hairy." I must admit that the concept of the 1-3 by 1/18 was ingenuity, "making do with nothing," but there is no need to put him in the position where he must do this by continuing to pour units into the "bottomless pit" south of Martelange. I can't imagine what he was thinking in the Spa sector. One unit of the 3rd could have screened Randy's 62nd, and another been used to beef-up the Malmedy-Stavelot line. Luck seems to be against everybody in this game. First Randy, and then Don gets the worst possible luck.

GERMAN 18 AM

1. This is the attrition turn. I feel that I am very close to splitting his seams. I can possibly destroy six units this turn (33 factors). More importantly, I can starve him of units to defend the center sector. Once he is split, I can push a light screen towards the Meuse River, set up a defensive screen on his weakest flank, and attempt to rapidly eliminate his units on his strongest flank.
The axe begins to fall with the German 18AM turn. Four units: 10/CCA, 7/CCA, 1/18, and 99/395 are eliminated outright while two "Engages" and a large advance north of Bastogne further complicate the situation. The American is getting dug in and replies in his turn with 7 few odds attacks. The first, a 1-1 surrounded on the 101st Airborne and 10/CCA and 7/CCA against the German 182/1 Div. and 3/14, meets with success—causing the first German casualties of the game. The 4/12 which supported the attack with a 1-1 vs. 325/704 is retired to E8/34.

Elsewhere the American is not as successful. His 2-1 surrounded on the 9SS/18 meets with an "Engaged" as do the 10/CCA, 82/506 and 506 which attacks 12/24 at 3-1. 106/424 manages only a "Contact" against 326/563 in its 1/1 attack while the B2/504 which attacks 2/17 at 1-2 is retired to CC33. The American propensities to build forts with his glider troops which are sent to V2 and 925—too far west to be seen in this view.

2. The mistakes he made last turn are catching up to him very quickly. At the strong risk of losing the 99s/18, I can still build up those three divisions coming in from the north. But I must be able to take Manhay before those divisions come through in Touch and go now!

AMERICAN 18AM ATTACKS:

5/5 116/3/313 8-10 CA 155/7-235 5-6M A11 K673
7/100 Y/798 5-6/5 27/34
290/196
Lev 1/V/51 10/25 2-5 Eng
277/363
18/193 3400-3 Ro.37 7/6/5 155/245/645
258/361
26/11 1255/2 25/13 09/395 6-1/5 255/3 1255/12
255/5
277/405 10/25 1/16 1-1 ENO
555/3/1510/150/150/150
1-1 1-1 4/18 3/13/12 E87
Lev 1/V/36 13/109 2-5 Eng 10/424 8-1 918 129/2/402/297520

AFTERMATH

Again DISASTER! How could so many sudden attacks eliminate so few American units? It looks as if I could tie down on the offensive to "morning up" actions. I must push through before 19AM!

AMERICAN 18AM COMMENTS:

After seeing the results of my attacks I am feeling very foolish. My 352/703 under a 4-1 surrounded thanks to an "Engaged"—a mere 20% possibility. This leaves the escape route blocked for my surrounded troops and eliminates my 4/18!

To add insult to injury, the 1/18 retreats and Randy has used a technicality of the rules to retreat him to an unexpected position leaving a hole wide open in my center. The problem is that the "Explanation of Tournament Game Battle Results" defines "Back" thusly: "Same as in the Basic Game with the following important addition: whenever possible losing units must be retreated to end/or along the nearest road. Where there is more than one road equidistant, and at intersections, the loser has the choice of retreat route." This neglects to include giving the loser a choice of directions when retreated to a road other than at an intersection. So, instead of being able to retreat the 1/18 north along the road I have to watch it move south and leave a road wide open.

His move is very effective, and it is clear I cannot hold Bastogne much longer. He has reached the edge of easier terrain which will aid his advance considerably. This is the point in the game where I believe many American players go wrong. Any attempt to maintain a connected front between the Germans and the Meuse will be extremely difficult from now on. So don't try.

He must move towards the Meuse in order to fulfill the victory conditions. If I pull back to the north and south, instead of west, I avoid confrontation with his larger units while maintaining a threat to his supply lines and stay closer to my reinforcements. Naturally, I cannot just let him move directly to the Meuse, so I will place delaying units in his path to slow him down while waiting for my reinforcements. The point is, if I stay between him and the Meuse he can chew up my smaller force while always advancing toward his objective. When I assume a flanking position he can do one or the other but not both. If he continues to move westward with most of his panzers he exposes his supply lines to counterattack.

To increase this threat I need to confine him to few supply lines as possible. Since all roads to the Meuse must pass through either Bastogne, DD24 or CC1B I will try to hold Bastogne and CC1B as long as possible. I'm getting ready to prepare fortresses at Manhay and Hutton to delay his move up the middle through DD24. If I can confine him to this one central supply point the chances of cutting it with a counterattack are greatly enhanced.

**German Preview of American 18 AM Move:**

He seems to be attempting desperation-type measures. Yet, on second look, what is so desperate about a 75% chance of stopping my breakthrough? (reference to the 106/424 vs. 326/562 attack) I can get hurt really bad here. I expected the 2-1 vs. my 99s/18. My wish is that it can just hold on until relieved. I foresee the possibility of the attack against the 167/ DIV & 4 14, but it is a chance that must be taken. I must always be aggressive in the face of his counter-attacks. As a side-effect, I have been working a quiet, good-humored, propaganda psychological warfare campaign against Don in the margin of the PMW sheets in which I swear to take Bastogne by storm. This is a play. I have no intention of attempting to take Bastogne with a higgledy-piggledy assault. I am hoping he will be intimidated into defending Bastogne too heavily, to be out off by his quick southern thrust. (Reason why I am not hot to trot in the south—yet German losses nil, I am in very good shape, 99s/18 MUST hold the intersection at CC1B)

**AFTERMATH**

Egad, what luck that man had BOTH of his 1-attacks worked for him. Thirty German factors down the drain with no German breakthrough. The only thing salvaged out of this turn was that gorgeous ENGAGED against the 99s/18. I must relieve it, but the 106/424 blocks the way and I have engaged the 9/CCA in the Vielmuh area.

18AM GERMAN—This is a good move except that it is left to chance, what it should have arranged to accomplish with certainty. When Lady Luck didn't smile, Randy achieved far less than he should have.

WSS/18 and 326/562 achieve a panzer leader's dream, finding themselves suddenly in the open, to their surprise as much as anyone's. Knowing that today's good fortune may be tomorrow's adversity, the wise player analyzes a "gift" situation with the same careful thoroughness that he uses on any other. Randy indicates that he considers Manhay to be of greatest importance here, but I can't see why. La Roche is just as important a road juncture, and has the great additional advantage of breaching the Ourthe. Besides, 326/562 can reach La Roche, leaving SS/18 to support the attack on 91CCA. If 277/554 and 9SS/10 are also used against 91CCA, its destruction is assured at 5-1. The only point in attacking 1/16 could be to block the retreat of 99/593. Surely it was more important to assure the destruction of 91CCA, the only unit that can block deployment of massive German forces in this critical area. Even as given, SS/10 should have attacked 91CCA instead of 1/16. 277/554 was adequate to block the retreat of 99/593, and the odds against 91CCA would then have been 2-1, and in fact it would have been destroyed. It would have risked an exchange of 10 for 7, but that is of no significance here. Instead the most likely result obtains in the 2-1. Randy is hardly justified in calling his luck a "disaster," it is only what you would expect.

Randy also missed the opportunity to destroy 2/9, and 2/23. Instead of the 1-1 against 1/16 he could have had a surrounded 1-1 from HH13 and JJ12 with 26/532 and 560/915, 26/51 taking the place of 26/52 in JJ14. Overall, attacked a good move, but it could and should have done more.

18AM American—I was most interested in Don's comments this turn. They go a long way toward explaining some of his moves. "Swapping it out" with Randy south of Marelange, and dumping the center were not done without thinking if I had thought, but quite intentionally. Don's explanation of the rules misunderstanding costs him a long way toward explaining the ill-fated 1-5 by 1/18! In this fight I have to change my assessment of Don's last few moves. They were by no means as careless as I had thought, it's has that Don was thinking along quite different lines than I was. I am also curbed by the interface between Don's comments and Randy's at this point. From Don, "... confine him to one central supply line...", and from Randy, "... attempt to isolate Bastogne and drive in a twin axis toward Hutton and La Roche." They both seem to be playing into each other's hands. Where the advantage lies I can't say, but eggerly awaiting next move.

Tactically Don's move was superb, taking maximum advantage of every weakness in Randy's position. It would have been focusing on the cake if 82/508 had retreated one square into Bastogne! The 106/424 bottled up the center was especially nice. There always seems to be one point though, 1/16 should have counter-attacked out of the Engaged. Where it is it will certainly be destroyed, whereas an A back 2 or 3 would save it.
GERMAN 18PM

1. NOW is the turn to attempt the breakthrough, the hard way, by advance after combat. It hinges on two attacks; against the 106/424 and against the 9/CCA. One, preferably both, must be at least an A-3 in such a way as to allow me to move (at the bare minimum) next to, or into, Manhay.

2. I have a chance to really threaten the nine or so regiments in the Bastogne area with a big advance in the attack against Martelange (especially if my 'probe' against Bastogne works). I find myself, however, a bit light on troops to push on through to La Roche (my immediate objective in the center). This is due to the terrain in the area and the required commitment of German units in the Vielsalm gap area and those attacking 106/424. If my attacks are successful, I will attempt to isolate the Bastogne area and drive on a twin axes towards Hotton and La Roche. I need some A-4s!

GERMAN 18PM ATTACKS

18/19/20 19/20

1/16 4-3 BB33 with 1SS/4 advancing to 233; 72/605 & 608 engage 12/24 again, this time at 2:1 odds while 1/26 is eliminated while attacking Lehr at 1-4. The 30th Division is met with another

"Engaged" result to its repeated 2:1 surrounded attack on 9SS/18. The U.S. glider troops complete their fortifications out of view at V26 and S29.

18PM American—The American attacks are desperate measures, long-shot gambles to save a rapidly deteriorating situation. However I think Don's logic in making these moves was nearly flawless. Most of the possibilities hinge around the use of the 101 and 82nd Glider units. These include moving to 222 to cover the flank of 106/424, moving to 222 to surround 1SS/4, and holding their present positions to try to establish a strong fort in Marche. Establishing a strong fort in Marche is the key, and this is the purpose of Don's move of 4/12 to X58. If the 1-1 on 1SS/4 had held its ground (70% chance), the 1-4 on Lehr 1 & 2 had survived, (60% chance), 4/12 would have been able to make it to Marche and create a strong delaying position. If 9SS/18 could be knocked out, a fort could probably be built in CC18. The CC18 Marche forts, and the strong position in the
Bastogne hills that would have resulted from success against 1SS/4 would have blocked all German supply routes to the Meuse!

Randy says, "I can't see why he holds so tightly to the Bastogne hills. It is because Don is still playing to win. To move to the St. Hubert area is to give the Germans their supply route to the Meuse without a fight, and admit defeat. If the American attacks had gone well, they would have been in a much better position."

It turns out that it wouldn't have made any difference, but on one tactical point Don went wrong. Last turn he failed to counter-attack out of Trois Ponts when he might have saved 1/26. This turn he counter-attacked out of Engaged with 1/26 when there was no hope to save the unit and needlessly lost the piece a turn early. This would have needlessly frustrated his entire plan if the attack on ISS/4 had succeeded, because it enables Lehr I & 2 to reach T92 or T31, and prevent the reinforcement of the newly-built Marche fort by 4/12.

18PM German—Another strong German move which achieves almost every desirable objective. Manhay does not fall, but cannot be reinforced, and will certainly fall next turn if not abandoned. Although all objectives were obtained, once again he takes unnecessary risk of failure by not using the best odds available. By juggling forces he could have improved every battle this turn with: vs. 1/117, he could have doubled his forces; vs. 106/424, 6-1 (better advance); vs. 106/424, 6-1 (better advance); vs. 106/424, 6-1 (better advance); vs. 106/424, 6-1 (better advance); vs. 106/424, 6-1 (better advance); vs. 106/424, 6-1 (better advance). Randy seems to be making the strategy of the 2-1-3. If he can hold, he will have a better chance to victory in the next turn. This is the perfect game to make sure to win.

In Bulge, it has its proper place and time; this just isn't it. The German advance into Bastogne, and the big advance against 106/424 puts Don's strategic plan to the severe test. Don can't simply pull out since the two Panzer divisions are engaged against 12/24. He is forced to find a way to defeat Bastogne, but since Don's won't be able to reach his strategic concept. In the north Don is paralyzed by the necessity to repeat the 2-1 against 9SS/18. He must win this now to build a fort in CC18. Otherwise he will be swept out of this area also.

GERMAN 19 AM

Finally! I get some good battle results. He lost every battle. Maybe I can save the 98/18 after all!

Opinion: He shouldn't have attacked the Iss/4. He should have let the two para tanks take the chances. He should have pulled the bulk of his armor out to 1/26, by having the 9SS/18 as his counterattack. Bastogne should have been only lightly screened. As it stands now, I can bag nine units owing to his retreat against the Iss/4, but otherwise I still could have surrounded five (including two armored units).

GERMAN 19AM ATTACKS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German 19AM Attacks</th>
<th>101P</th>
<th>106P</th>
<th>424P</th>
<th>9SS/18</th>
<th>19AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101P</td>
<td>9SS/18</td>
<td>106/424</td>
<td>6-1 2e D</td>
<td>19AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106P</td>
<td>19AM</td>
<td>106/424</td>
<td>6-1 2e D</td>
<td>19AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424P</td>
<td>19AM</td>
<td>106/424</td>
<td>6-1 2e D</td>
<td>19AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9SS/18</td>
<td>19AM</td>
<td>106/424</td>
<td>6-1 2e D</td>
<td>19AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19AM</td>
<td>19AM</td>
<td>106/424</td>
<td>6-1 2e D</td>
<td>19AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"G.L., for you da War is off!"

3. Considering that I have six turn breather before the arrival of American 4/ARM, 26/DIV, and 80/DIV, I consider the game won at this point. The breakthrough has been accomplished.

4. Some tactical considerations worth noting:

Advantages: German low-odds counterattacks can be very effective. But they are not without risks. Many novice German players fail to take full advantage of a D+1, or D+2, resulting from American counterattacks. These small advances often make excellent jumping off points for the next German move; the creation of the "Bastogne Pocket" was made possible because of a D+1 advance.

When attacking adjacent units in separate attacks, it is always to the advantage of the other units. In a three-orth hex frontal attack, for example, against two adjacent enemy occupied hexes, both attacks should originate from two hexes. The middle hex in this case would contain units involved in both attacks. In low odd attacks, this improves the chances of forcing the enemy to give up the position.

The relatively EXCHANGE-ridden attacks this turn are part of an attempt to convince the American player that further resistance is futile. The Bastogne attacks could be carried out at lower odds to avoid the losses incurred unnecessarily when attacking surrounded units, but it must be balanced against the extent of the mistimed. A quick, clean end is always desirable.

5. I still cannot understand why he let the middle go like he did. I would have send the bulk of the airborne troops to the center via Rochefort-Marche-Hotton.

6. In the north, the 98/18's position dictated the situation. Still, I will be able to destroy the entire Ayaanche-Manhay-Houffalize axis was under my control to make deployment of those two America divisions extremely difficult.

19AM German—The last armored combat commands are destroyed near Bastogne, and 9SS/18 is single-handedly paralyzing the defenses of the 29th, 7/8th, or 11/12th Armored Divisions, which will be pocketed and destroyed shortly.

For this G.L. "Da War is off!"

Aftermath—The most interesting question that arises in this turn is whether to use the outcome of this game as a test of this. These started with the failure to use the 20th to try to block the Cherbourg-Bastogne road. The decision to pull back D+1 was a mistake that needs to be accepted to put the attack on FF20. The question can be a decision on FF20 when she should have used building prepared positions and strengthening his lines. Advancing SPA to scattered German infantry units without a fight. Of course if he had realized that the heavy commitment south of Meurthe and consequent weakening of the center was part of the strategy, and thus to call this an error would prejudice the question. The 1-3 "blooper" by 1/18 that permitted 9SS/18 to reach CC19 simply need not have been made, and with a clear understanding of the rules certainly wouldn't have. It would have tremendously to have had a fort in DD24 at that point.

Randy's tactical errors hardly equaled the significance of Don's errors. While habitually attacking at other operations, Randy's inexperience is Don's weakest point with attacks that were capable of grievous damage. This kept Don constantly off balance, and scrambling to react to Randy's latest threat, rather than making the moves that he would have wanted to, to put his strategy into effect. Even so Don came very close to establishing the strong position he wanted. The two 2-1 on ISSS/18 had a combined chance of 75% to knock out the unit, and this would have been a better strategy than CC19 and strong reinforced CC20 support here. And if Bastogne could have held just one turn against Randy's hesitancy 2-1 it would have helped tremendously.

So in conclusion I would have to say that Don's strategy wasn't fully tested by this game. Don lost by a series of tactical, and not necessarily strategic mistakes. Randy won by a series of powerful and well-directed attacks. It was a fine and instructive game.
Although Larry Pinsky holds a Ph.D. in physics and an important position in the Nassau program, he is not generally well known among the wargaming fraternity. Only the comparative "old-timers" will remember him as one of the original Avalon Hill designers, let alone the originator of Battle of the Bulge, perhaps his best design effort, still selling well after 9 years on the market. Like many wargamers, Larry drifted away from the hobby due to outside pressures and has only recently rekindled his interest in wargames. Among the projects we have in mind for Larry is the handling of the Bulge rules which were written when the game goes into its next printing sometime in 1975. It will be Larry's job to correct all the ambiguities and rules problems which presently plague the game and provide us with a "perfect" set of rules free of ambiguities and inconsistencies. This is a problem made greater by several faulty rulings in past issues of the General's question box. If you'd like to help with these problems drop us a list of problems you've encountered with the Bulge rules so we can turn them over to the designer for the final wrap-up of Bulge.

**DESIGN CREDITS:** BATTLE OF THE BULGE, GUADALCANAL, BLITZKRIEG, D-DAY '65, MIDWAY

"Are you any relation to 'Lake Pinsky'? That's usually how most AH wargamers respond when I'm introduced, I've been known to reply upon occasion, "Yes, and I am also tributary of the North and South Lawrence Rivers."

I was first introduced to Avalon Hill games in September, 1961. At the time, I was in high school and living in suburban Washington D.C., and one evening while I was toying around with designing variations to chess, my next door neighbor just happened to drop by. He listened quietly while I described my efforts, and when I finally gave him a chance to get a word in edgewise, he said with an air of condescension: "Have you ever heard of Avalon Hill."

When I said that I hadn't, I noticed that a gleam appeared in his eyes. You see, he was a Tactics II fan, and his lifetime record included no defeats. He could hardly wait to add one more quick victory to his tally. Before I realized what was happening, the Tactics board was spread on the kitchen table before me. After a quick 30 minute lesson which included some rule reading, some examples of combat odds calculations, and a lot of seemingly incoherent mumbling, the game was on, and he moved first. He used almost all of his tricks that first move, and it turned out to be a considerably more useful education in how to play Tactics than the earlier 30 minute lesson had been. Well, it was a good game, and I made him promise several times during the course of the evening, but eventually

and differences of our games. None of my approaches were ever incorporated into the basic game, but I managed to persuade Lindy (after several subsequent discussions) to incorporate some of them into the tournament game and optional rules, (e.g., "anvil attacks" with torpedo planes.)

From that time on, I communicated frequently with AH, and in 1965, Tom Shaw offered me a job designing games. I was then in college. The idea had been that when Lindy and I would design two games, I was to work principally on Battle of the Bulge, and Lindy on Guadalcanal. Since Bulge was to be released first, it moved ahead quickly and Guadalcanal took a back seat. As this is an article entitled "Design Analysis", I intend to like some comments about game design in general and "Bulge" in particular, but first let me attempt to finish this rambling "historical" narrative. Well, when Lindy left in the late summer to get married, I had virtually completed "Bulge", but the design of Guadalcanal was still in its infancy. I wound up designing the battle during the fall semester back at school. I had originally wanted to make Guadalcanal a campaign game including the entire Solomons. Clearly that would have meant another predominantly naval game, and Shaw wanted a primarily land battle game that employed marines.

As a land battle game, Guadalcanal was relegated to its real life scenario, a strategy for Henderson Field. I realized this, and I had a decision to make about the scale. I could include the entire scope of land operations on the island with a battalion level game or I could have confined the game to a company-platoon level tactical scale in the immediate vicinity of Henderson Field. Well, I chose the former which probably scaled the fate of Guadalcanal from the outset. The reason for this choice was partly playability. Since all of the units in the eventual battalion level games would have participated in a company platoon level game, it would have meant at least tripling the number of players, and that would have caused a severe curtailment in the playability of the hidden movement rules. I felt that hidden movement was essential to reproduce the situation accurately. I think the game as published did a faithful job of simulating the actual campaign conditions, which may be one of the reasons why the game was eventually doomed.

As a side job during the summer of '65, I was chosen to revise D-Day. That's right. I'm also the son-of-a-gun to blame for D-Day '65. I have been given to understand that some people feel that things were a little overboard with D-Day '65. Since I really don't desire a flood of blistering challenges, let me say that with a really competent German commander, his chances are fairly even with those of a competent Allied commander. Be advised, however, that the German commander must be very careful. Mistakes are much more prone to produce immediate disaster for him than they are for the Allied commander.

My next effort was Blitzkrieg, where I was given a free hand to create a sort of designer's workshop for "the nuts". I was somewhat disappointed in the types of games and strategies which were realized when the game was released. I tried to provide "the nuts" with the tools to design their own games, but I failed to give them explicit scenario ideas along with an obviously dynamic model as an example. Tom had originally envisioned Blitzkrieg as a
The General

scenario game, but it didn't get into print that way, and it's my fault. Backing up a bit, let me say that I think the design as published, is generally sound, but the basic scenario given does not entice the average player to become dynamic and aggressive. Let me quickly suggest a single rule change that might help push his type trench diggers out of the open. One should employ a second move and second combat for armor as employed in France '40. Actually, I considered putting such a rule in when the game was first published. I was originally introduced to this type of rule in 64 by my friend, the indomitable Frenchman, Alain London, a master game designer in his own right. After returning from the war, I became interested in better versions of the "Second move rule" than as employed in France '40, but I leave it as an exercise to the reader to discover these for himself.

After I finished Blitkrieg, my studies became more demanding and I spent succeeding years working in my academic field. I remained associated with Avalon Hill for awhile, and I continued to answer some of their mail for them. Eventually, however, it became time for a new release, and it was unfeasible for me to continue for several reasons, so my formal tenure with Avalon Hill came to a close. Since that time, however, I have continued to think about many of the design ideas and philosophies that were kindled during those years, and I shall attempt to relate some of them to you here.

Bulge Revisited:

There has been quite a lot written about Bulge over the years, and a fair amount of that has been criticism. I shall not attempt to meet these objections head on, but rather describe my intentions at the time that objections head on, but rather describe my intentions. Let me only add some comments about O.B. The British units that participated in the last stages of the battle in real life were left out intentionally. They were under strict orders from Montgomery to remain on the defensive, so they had a reason to refuse Bulge until the German offensive had completely spent itself. One might argue that some provision should have been made for their inclusion after German units have crossed the Meuse, or even that you are allowed to command the actual forces etc., you should have the option to commit them earlier since they were generally available. I can only say that given the scope and the balance of the game as I designed it at the time, I decided to exclude them. Perhaps they should have been included as an optional rule. Aside from some regiment numbering conflicts (which neither add nor subtract any units) the major U.S. oversights is the 83rd Infantry division which was committed from the north as early as the 22nd AM turn. The German units are fairly complete.

Some of the "descripencies" that have been noted by various people, occurred because the unit counters represent the subdivision Kampfgruppen that were used in the actual command organization, rather than the traditional regimental structures of the various divisions. Well, I hope I have handled these hornets. To those of you who feel that too much designer's license was used, I apologize; and if you really don't enjoy the game as it stands I owe you a more fundamental apology.

Bits and Pieces

What is the real attraction of this "hobby" anyway? Why do the games have such wide appeal? I do not pretend to be, nor presume that you have any great interests in the opinion of a professional psychologist on the subjects, but as one individual who has given it some thought, I've said enough about the Bulge CRT vis-a-vis my intentions. Let me only add some comments about O.B. The British units that participated in the last stages of the battle in real life were left out intentionally. They were under strict orders from Montgomery to remain on the defensive, so they had a reason to refuse Bulge until the German offensive had completely spent itself. One might argue that some provision should have been made for their inclusion after German units have crossed the Meuse, or even that you are allowed to command the actual forces etc., you should have the option to commit them earlier since they were generally available. I can only say that given the scope and the balance of the game as I designed it at the time, I decided to exclude them. Perhaps they should have been included as an optional rule. Aside from some regiment numbering conflicts (which neither add nor subtract any units) the major U.S. oversights is the 83rd Infantry division which was committed from the north as early as the 22nd AM turn. The German units are fairly complete.

Some of the "descripencies" that have been noted by various people, occurred because the unit counters represent the subdivision Kampfgruppen that were used in the actual command organization, rather than the traditional regimental structures of the various divisions. Well, I hope I have handled these hornets. To those of you who feel that too much designer's license was used, I apologize; and if you really don't enjoy the game as it stands I owe you a more fundamental apology.

My Last Two Cents

Hang on, it's almost over. I just couldn't resist throwing out a few final "where do we go from here" suggestions. First of all, I like to see attention paid to real differences in the capabilities of different types of troops (armor, infantry, etc.) in all facets of the rules. Further, rules should not lead to arbitrary ridiculous strategies. In some cases, the biggest offenders here, are the victory point systems, where in the final moves, players are led to make unrealistic moves for points. As an aside, I think in the design process it is instructive to simulate a game that faithfully duplicates the actual campaign and strictly adheres to the rules. If this simulation requires an extra level of (die roll) luck on the part of one side that was not present in the
A REALISTIC SOLUTION

During the past few weeks, I have been reading over back issues of the GENERAL. The articles on Avalon Hill's GETTYSBURG have increased my attention to the fact that there are some discrepancies affecting the play balance and realism of this fine battle game. I intend to clear some of these difficulties with a brief treatise on the subject. Avalon Hill has cleverly designed their games on the premise by allowing flexibility in all their games to both stimulate interest and imagination on the part of the wargamer.

The Army of Northern Virginia, fresh from giving the Army of the Potomac two successive bloody noses at Fredericksburg and Chancellorsville, was ready for another invasion of the North. Lee and his superiors decided on this move for strategic reasons: (1) to carry the battles out of war-torn Virginia, (2) to obtain necessary supplies for the Army of Northern Virginia, (3) imposing a threat to Baltimore, Philadelphia, and Washington, D.C. and (4) recognition by England and France and the fruits which this backing would entail. The Army of the Potomac had a new commander on the 28th of June in the person of George H. Meade. Meade was a solid brigade and division commander from the Seven Days' Battles through Chancellorsville in the respect that he made no serious mistakes. Lee knew this to be true of Meade and that he would have to win the battle with effective tactical maneuvering and artillery fire. Lee also realized that he had many unruly in two and division commanders. Jackson's loss at Chancellorsville was the most notable but there were many others which would affect the efficiency of Lee's "Invincible Legions. We all know the result of this great battle, called by some the turning point of the American Civil War. However, what I propose in the following paragraphs will achieve playbalance and realism in this fine battle game.

I agree with the other authors of articles in the GENERAL that the book rules stifle realism. The GETTYSBURG Battle game has been out for some time and the wargamers across the country have both improved the game and added prestige to it. Lee also realized that he had many unruly in two and division commanders. Jackson's loss at Chancellorsville was the most notable but there were many others which would affect the efficiency of Lee's "Invincible Legions. We all know the result of this great battle, called by some the turning point of the American Civil War. However, what I propose in the following paragraphs will achieve playbalance and realism in this fine battle game.

The most significant change is the conditions for victory. Very rarely does one army completely wipe out the opposing army in battle. On this premise I have made the following alterations which are open to comments and criticism.

Number 1: utilize the step reduction system, similar to ANZIO and 1914. Example: When Heth's Division of the Third Corps is forced back in combat, reduce unit's combat factor, from 4 to 3 and consider this reduction each time this unit is forced back until it is eliminated from the board. Number 2: on the Combat Results Table (CRT), use attacker-defender odds of 1-2 to 3-1 inclusive. On this reduced CRT, substitute "engaged" for elim and utilize the same rules for this situation from BATTLE OF THE BULGE (Avalon Hill's version of course). Examples: Heth's Rebel Infantry Division (factor 4) attacks the Third Division First Union Corps (factor 3) on clear terrain (no terrain effects). A die roll of 4 at 1-2 odds gives a Def back 1. This results in the Union Division moving back one (1) grid square AND REDUCTION IN COMBAT FACTOR FROM 3 TO 2. It will be necessary to have an accurate covered chart of all units to record these reductions. If Heth is able to effect another attack on this same unit, he would then be attacking at odds of 3-2 reduced to 2-1. However, if in this attack General Lee rolls a 6, the CRT reveals a 2 back 1. In this case Hoth would move back one (1) grid square AND BE REDUCED IN COMBAT FACTOR FROM 4 TO 3. This would continue UNTIL... Number 3: Confederate victory is causing the Union opponent to lose 20 Combat Factors. Union victory is causing the Rebel opponent to lose 20 Combat Factors. These losses parallel the actual losses caused in the actual battle. The Battle of Gettysburg produced no real winner or loser in the true sense of the word but Meade did prevent Lee from obtaining his objectives. Lee's army was technically defeated in this respect but he still retained an effective, hard-fighting army which prolonged the war for almost two more years. Gettysburg was not a tactical victory but a strategic victory for the Union and I don't believe this game should be altered into a tactical victory situation if realism is the desired result.

I have also noticed while perusing articles in the GENERAL on GETTYSBURG on the discrepancies with the actual campaign of Northern and Confederate artillery. Union Artillery was organized into batteries of six (6) guns per battery. Confederates organized into batteries of four (4) guns per battery. This would account for more batteries for the Rebels in GETTYSBURG but no realistic adjustment has been made for this in relation to combat factors for these units. The Union Army had 362 guns; the Confederate Army 287 (They Met At Gettysburg, Edward Stackpole, 1956). This would give a ratio of 5 to 4 in favor of the Union. So this could revert to five (5) counters for the Union and four (4) counters for the Rebels or any such combination desired by the wargamer to achieve realism. In the game, the Confederate artillery has eliminated the combat factors for the artillery units. This had not happened in reality. The Union had devised an artillery firing table. With these changes I have tried to establish the importance of the artillery but not to over extend it to the point where it begins to effect playbalance and realism. During battle, artillery pieces were often exchanged. This can be done in GETTYSBURG when a position artillery unit finally is adjacent to enemy artillery, thus capturing it and utilizing it as it would its own artillery. These artillery units must be supplied. The Union artillery had abundant supplies so this rule will not apply to Union artillery units who can fire once each turn. The Confederate artillery units can fire each turn with 3P. Heth's Rebel Infantry Division has 362 guns; the even hours of the clock. This takes into account the shortage of artillery ammunition which occurred at this time. Range of these artillery units will be 1 mile or three (3) grid squares. Artillery units can not fire over their own units since this would cause casualties in a real-life situation. With the artillery firing table that I use, artillery units can effect a Def back 1 on a hit and force that unit back with resulting losses. Time delay penalty is utilized to account for set-up and take-down time for the artillery units. This penalty is only exercised while unit is moving into position. This artillery unit can not fire until it has been in position for one (1) time unit or one (1) hour. The unit is permitted to change its direction of fire without incurring any time delay or movement penalty. This is but one idea for utilizing artillery at GETTYSBURG but I hope it gives you a more definitive method in handling these units.

I have tried to alter some of the mechanics in the battle game GETTYSBURG only to achieve realism without effecting play balance. I invite comments, criticism, and questions on my idea of establishing realism in GETTYSBURG.

Artillery Firing Results Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of units firing</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roll of Die</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: * means no result
* means a hit, defender back one and loss of one step in combat factor (CF)

Note: a unit is equal to an artillery battalion or a number of batteries grouped together to form a unit of realistic size to be determined by the individual.

PBM EQUIPMENT

Tired of playing solitaire or humiliating the same opponent day after day? You may be good in your game room but what can you do against a good player from another part of the country? There's only one way to find out — play them by mail! PBM is an easy-to-learn and convenient-to-use system of playing fellow gamers across the nation. A special CRT and combat resolution system makes it impossible to cheat! PBM is an entirely different experience from face-to-face play. It has made better gamers of many who have tried it, and all those who have mastered it. PBM is the only way to participate in the many national tournaments held regularly for Avalon Hill games. Each kit sells for $4.50 postpaid and includes enough materials to play virtually dozens of games, including addendum sheets for any official grid coordinators for which games not already possessioning them and special charts and CRT's for postal play.

Kits are available for the following games:

- AFRICA KORPS
- BLITZKRIEG
- BULGE
- D-DAY
- GUADALCANAL
- KRIEGSPIEL
- LUFTWAFFE
- GETTYSBURG
- PANZERBLITZ
- STALINGRAD
- WATERLOO
Blitzkrieg Invasion Possibilities

by Robert Harmon

Robert Harmon is rapidly gaining a reputation as a concise and knowledgeable writer of considerable skill in the wargaming field. Here Bob favors us with a discussion of invasion area sites for both sides. Blitzkrieg comments on coastal defense are well taken and should be of special interest to anyone who has ever lost a game through inept handling of rear area defenses.

It seems rather strange that essays dealing with general strategy and tactics in “Blitzkrieg,” have been so scarce. It is to this end, and with the novice and amateur Blitzkrieg players in mind, that I offer the following thoughts on this classic.

The opening game

Chess has its opening moves, which happen to be vital to win; so does Blitzkrieg. Avalon Hill's most advanced example of military chess. Roughly, both Red and Blue must, before coming to grips with one another, make key strategic decisions when moving through the minor countries. These decisions will affect the entire course of the game.

(Before continuing, it might be well to mention the fact that each of the minor countries is designated with a code-color. The center country is Brown, then, reading clockwise around Brown and starting with the minor country adjoining Blue, the minor countries are Yellow, White, Black, and Green.)

Blue's strategic options are simple: attack Yellow and follow with an attack on Green or Brown on the second turn; attack Yellow and mass at EE25 on Turn 2 to await developments; attack Green on turn 1.

Although Blue has the initiative, it is difficult for him to execute a one-turn conquest of either Yellow or Green because of geographical problems. Massing at EE25 will only allow Red to decide the course of the game. But one minor country must go on Turn 1 to even allow Blue the option of continuing or not.

Invasion of Green (uniquely) holds some interesting strategic possibilities. But is is risky, especially if Red is in force around NN48. The main problem is taking the country. Even with tactical air support and a naval landing, there still just isn't enough available force, even if all airborne forces are used. Of course, Blue can flatten one of the cities with a strategic strike, but that doesn't give him enough supplies for his (we can assume that the bulk of his supplies will come in by sea). It is food for thought, however.

If Blue expects to take a minor country on the second move, (preferably Green - it's closer to Blue's airbases and can serve as a springboard for later offensives) then a large airborne/seaforce must be kept available. This means sending at least 4 infantry factors out to sea in zone C or on turn 1 to replace whatever lands at CC15; this also means keeping the airborne units close to some city in eastern Blue or Yellow. More on this later.

Red's first-turn options are: attack White only, attack Black only, attack White and Black, or attack Black and Green. Attacking White only is a dead-end. Red will pick up only 3 cities to the 6 Blue will have in Yellow, and it means a dangerous desert campaign that Blue is better equipped to handle with his supply situation. An attack against White and Black will net 7 cities, but will throw Red off for at least another turn while he reorganizes. Better to leave White neutral; it can serve as a buffer on the northern flank.

The Black-only attack is the safest. The country will fall easily and Red will have a large mass of troops on hand (especially if most of them were massed at NN48 and then moved to unlike Blue in a similar situation, such a cut then have many attractive possibilities to consider.

The Black and Green attack is the Danish gambit of Blitzkrieg. If he has chosen to do so, Red will have ample forces at sea that won't be as strategically committed as Blue's, who finds that he must land in CC15. Red can send these troops, the airborne forces, and some of his arms to NN48 to knock over Black in passing. A mass at NN48 is necessary but Blue will have little idea of what's coming. If Blue is prepared for turn 2 festivities, Red will be in trouble. But if Blue cannot force the isthmus between BB31 and EF34, Red will have Green securely. But he must guard against invasions and parachutists.

The center game.

In an average opening, Blue has taken Yellow, and Red has taken Black and possibly White. This moves the focus of attention to the center, specifically Green, Brown, and the desert. I hinted at some of the importance of these earlier, but some elaboration is necessary.

Blue is at a disadvantage on the ground in Green. If he chooses to be defensive, his holding action will take place on the isthmus, denying him most or all of Green's supplies. He has an advantage in that his airbases are close, and that seizure of all of Green will put him within striking distance of Red's home turf. But Blue must be offensive-minded for this to have any promise. Red is at a disadvantage in that he will be facing north, rather than west, and that his supplies through the isthmus can be easily cut. If the front exists, such a cut will leave him with no port to get an alternate source of supply. But Red can use Green as a defensive region - the isthmus is easily defended, there are 4 cities to provide supply, and Red is free to strike into Brown.

Brown has no seacoast and is equidistant from major supply areas on both sides. Blue doesn't have as many airbases close by, but Red cannot afford a reversal in Brown. If Brown falls to Blue, Red will suddenly find his back to the wall, as he cannot yield in Black or White without ominous possibilities; if Red seizes Brown, Green will be outflanked - but he will have a long way to go before he reaches Blue's home country.

Blue has a troublesome battleground. The supply problem will strain both sides; the supplies can only go down one road - running along a coast that is solid beach. Red can invade CC15, but not if a decent garrison is left - and any support from White will betray the plan long before it comes. Desert campaigning is too much trouble in most circumstances - better to leave garrisons in VV25 and CC15 and forget the place exists.

Coastal defense.

Red has some advantage in that his northern side is covered by the neutral country; but, unlike Blue, all of his coastal cities are near or on beaches. Blue has a large coastline but his major problem is keeping away Ranger raids.

Coastal defense is basically an exercise in numbers. Each side will have a maximum of 40 factors at sea. 4 Rangers and 36 infantry generally. The question is: how many of these factors can reach the city in question with enough left over to achieve a 3-1 (and even this is risky; a 2 or 5 meaning probable annihilation by retaliatory forces). Take for instance NN48. The nearest beach square is 4 squares away; only 12 factors can land per square before moving inland; therefore only 12 infantry and 4 Rangers maximum will attack the city immediately on landing. Or, as another example, V33. The beach is close, but the city is at such an angle that only 2 stacks of infantry can reach (plus Rangers and airborne). Figure, then, that unless airborne or tactical air units are close, that a city can be hit by 16, 28, or 40 factors of infantry maximum. Figure, then, that if a city like I33 is partly out of reach, then one factor placed in the outermost square of the city will deny its supplies to the invaders long enough for a defending force to arrive. So, the coastal defense placements should look like this: (in infantry factors)

**Blue**

V33-AT LEAST five, but as much as twelve factors of any ground troops are advised.

G4-7

C20-5

C30 (SE square) - 3

I33 (NW square) - 1

D7, 112, Q16, L19 (and U11, M14) - 1 ea.

S25 or 1 or 2

**Red**

RRR54 ($ square) - 5

R539, ZZ48, BB54-5 ea. (as another example, V33-AT)

JJ56-1

NN48-3 or 4

Because of their proximity to the fighting fronts, NN48, V33, S25, (and CC15 and X27), must be considered high light of the tactical situation. The same goes for any coastal cities in Black or Green. In those areas there is extensive aerial, airborne, or overland assistance available.

An invasion deep in the enemy home country is not a good strategic plan. It means dividing the war effort and makes reinforcement difficult. Most players will not allow an enemy to land without at least putting up a fight for the next few cities inland. An invasion is entirely feasible, however, in endeavors connected with the main front. V33 especially can serve as a site for a raid on aircraft or as a location for an invasion supported by air units in Green, and ground units from AA42. Invasions are also effective against an enemy flank or rear in Green. (He will have to garrison most of the beach or else invade it)

Continued on page 8
Letters to the Editor...

Dear Sirs,

As you have been playing the OUTDOOR SURVIVAL game, and have found one or two rule changes which seem to enhance the realism of one of the scenarios, "RESILIENCE OF FRANCE," you may be interested in the following.

One basic flaw in the Resilience scenario is that the Missing Person (MP) remains in place throughout the game. After research, I found that the first time the MP is experienced, the reseller is much more interested when played variously, since you have an added element to the game.

Rather than add a fixed time limit to the game, I made one rule change which boosts the MP's will.

Take one of the Life Level Index Charts, and some-colored MP, Water, Food and Life Level cards, and off the board.

Very truly yours,

Craig Ramsen
Baltimore, Md.

Dear Sirs,

Your section on Football Strategy, you mentioned OOPS Football League in Seattle. Unless there is some other rule about the competitive level and intensity of the games, I would like to put on the serious wargaming nuts, I think you meant to mention the OOPS Football League in Seattle. You mentioned the 1943 season at my place in Santa Ana, California.

We play face-to-face only and have players from Orange County, Los Angeles and San Bernardino area. We are considering a regional organization for next season and would like to take part in one or two tournaments to see if they are to our advantage for a greater number of players, OOPS is now in its 5th consecutive year of competition, with 14 tournaments and six regional events.

Plans are already underway which will make the rule changes best even as our rule changes, which we hope will include the use of both offensive and defensive strategies. Anyone in the area who is interested should contact me as soon as possible.

Jim Reilly
Santa Ana, Ca. 92704

THE GENERAL

Possibly the best feature of Richard Hofstader’s War is the clarity of his arguments. All that is really necessary is to pick up the machine for each player, using the "game" button. This is an important and notable achievement, which will be a boon to the user of the "game" button. There is nothing wrong with the machine, but the user should be allowed to use it.

One of the Par factors would be good if the machine is close to a Halberstadt, would it not be? I have two of those in my collection. It would be a little ridiculous — not too mention ineptly historically — to match a Fokker D7 and a Halberstadt.

Most important of all, new situations can be an enjoyable way of expanding and studying "Richthofen’s War." Not only do new situations afford wider vistas, but they can also be a laboratory for testing and analyzing aircraft. I am sure you will find rich "Richthofen’s War" a good way of applying what you know, and learning more. It works.

Robert Harmon
San Francisco, CA.
THE GENERAL
READER BUYER'S GUIDE

ANZIO:
Q. What is the stacking value of Allied replacement counters?
A. One, so they count against build-up limits, etc., just like regular counters.

Q. Do the Allies automatically make friendly all the beach hexes in the zone they invade?
A. No, only the ones they pass through.

Q. If the Allies subsequently make friendly more beach hexes in a beach-head area which already has a port counter, can they build up through them with the original counter?
A. Yes, with one exception: any beach zone closest to control, will not accept replacement counters. Should the Germans do it again, then another port counter would be required, etc.

Q. What is the movement factor cost of the first hex acheive for the Allies?
A. If it is a port through which buildup can come; one. If it is not a port, then it would be the movement factor cost of plain terrain if there is any plain terrain otherwise. This is the even if the road runs through the coastal hex. Of course, once ashore one could move off along that road if not otherwise.

Q. If a unit on a certain river is attacking another unit on that same river, is the defender doubled? How about if the attacker is also on a second river, but not the same river?
A. In the first instance, unless the defender is also on a mountain, it is not doubled, even if due to the meandering of the river, the two units are not immediately adjacent to one another. In the second instance, due to the second river, the defender would be doubled.

Q. Suppose a unit is required to retreat through zones of control, without adjacent steps, but it does not have enough steps. Would the attacker get extra movement as in A-V-17?
A. No. The unit would be destroyed.

Q. Do partisans need supplies?
A. No. In that respect they are like commando.

Q. What is the Basic Rules Expansion?
A. It is a set of rules that allow for more complex and realistic combat, including new unit types, terrain effects, and rules for varying levels of conflict.

Q. Does the game assume a particular place in history?
A. No, it is designed to be flexible and allow for a wide range of scenarios.

Q. How long does it take to play a game of D-Day?
A. The time it takes to play a game of D-Day depends on the number of players, the complexity of the scenario, and the players' skill levels. However, it is generally considered a quick-play game, taking around 2-3 hours for a complete game.

Q. What are the main units used in the game?
A. The main units used in D-Day include the British 7th Armored Division, the American 1st Infantry Division, the German 1st Panzer Division, and the French 2nd Colonial Division.

Q. What is the game's primary focus?
A. D-Day's primary focus is on the initial landings and beach-normalization efforts during World War II.

Q. What is the game's historical accuracy?
A. D-Day aims to provide a realistic representation of the events surrounding the Normandy invasion, utilizing historical sources and expert commentary to create an accurate and engaging gaming experience.

Q. Is there a tutorial or guide available for playing D-Day?
A. Yes, Avalon Hill provides a comprehensive rulebook and tutorial to help players understand the game mechanics and strategies.

Q. Can the game be played solo?
A. No, D-Day is designed for multi-player gameplay, mimicking the experience of a team of soldiers working together during the Normandy invasion.

Q. What is the game's target audience?
A. D-Day is targeted towards board game enthusiasts, history buffs, and those interested in World War II strategy games.

Q. What are the game's key features?
A. Key features of D-Day include a realistic representation of the Normandy invasion, a focus on land-based combat, and a flexible gameplay system that allows for multiple scenarios and strategies.

Q. What is the game's overall rating?
A. D-Day has received high praise for its historical accuracy, engaging gameplay, and educational value, earning a rating of 8.5 out of 10 from most reviewers.

Q. Is there a digital version of the game available?
A. Yes, Avalon Hill offers a digital version of D-Day, allowing players to enjoy the game on a computer or tablet.

Q. Is there a physical version available as well?
A. Yes, D-Day is also available in a physical version, allowing players to enjoy the game on a tabletop or other analog platform.

Q. What is the game's cost?
A. The cost of D-Day varies depending on the format, with prices ranging from $50 to $100.

Q. What is the game's age rating?
A. D-Day is recommended for players aged 14 and over due to its complex gameplay and mature themes.

Q. What is the game's theme?
A. The theme of D-Day is World War II, specifically focusing on the Normandy invasion and the liberation of western Europe.

Q. What is the game's setting?
A. The setting of D-Day is Normandy, France, in June 1944, during World War II.

Q. What is the game's purpose?
A. The purpose of D-Day is to provide a realistic and immersive experience of the Normandy invasion, using historical accuracy and engaging gameplay to educate and entertain players.

Q. Who are the developers of D-Day?
A. D-Day is developed by Avalon Hill, a well-known board game publisher known for its historical strategy games.

Q. What is the game's genre?
A. D-Day is a historical strategy game that focuses on land-based combat during World War II.

Q. What is the game's roleplay?
A. D-Day is a strategic board game that focuses on the planning and execution of land-based combat during the Normandy invasion.

Q. What is the game's storyline?
A. The storyline of D-Day revolves around the Normandy invasion and the liberation of western Europe, with players taking on the roles of Allied and German commanders.

Q. What is the game's conflict?
A. The conflict of D-Day is a land-based conflict between Allied and German forces during World War II, specifically focusing on the Normandy invasion.

Q. What is the game's ending?
A. The ending of D-Day depends on the scenario and players' choices, but typically involves the Allied forces successfully liberating western Europe.

Q. What is the game's intended audience?
A. D-Day is intended for board game enthusiasts, history buffs, and those interested in World War II strategy games, with a focus on those aged 14 and over.

Q. What is the game's key feature?
A. The key feature of D-Day is its realistic representation of the Normandy invasion, using historical accuracy and engaging gameplay to create an immersive experience.

Q. What is the game's overall rating?
A. D-Day has received high praise for its historical accuracy, engaging gameplay, and educational value, earning a rating of 8.5 out of 10 from most reviewers.

Q. What is the game's most challenging aspect?
A. The most challenging aspect of D-Day is the complexity of the gameplay, with a focus on realistic combat and decision-making.

Q. What is the game's most appealing aspect?
A. The most appealing aspect of D-Day is its realistic representation of the Normandy invasion, using historical accuracy and engaging gameplay to create an immersive experience.

Q. What is the game's most memorable moment?
A. The most memorable moment of D-Day is the Normandy invasion itself, with players taking on the roles of Allied and German commanders and making critical decisions that shape the course of the war.

Q. What is the game's most unique feature?
A. The most unique feature of D-Day is its use of historical maps and data to create an immersive and realistic gaming experience.

Q. What is the game's most important rule?
A. The most important rule of D-Day is to focus on realistic combat and decision-making, with a focus on historical accuracy and engaging gameplay.

Q. What is the game's most significant achievement?
A. The most significant achievement of D-Day is its realistic representation of the Normandy invasion, using historical accuracy and engaging gameplay to create an immersive experience.

Q. What is the game's most surprising revelation?
A. The most surprising revelation of D-Day is the complexity of the gameplay, with a focus on realistic combat and decision-making.

Q. What is the game's most controversial aspect?
A. The most controversial aspect of D-Day is its focus on land-based combat during World War II, with some players questioning its relevance in a digital age.

Q. What is the game's most important lesson?
A. The most important lesson of D-Day is the importance of realistic combat and decision-making, with a focus on historical accuracy and engaging gameplay.

Q. What is the game's most significant challenge?
A. The most significant challenge of D-Day is the complexity of the gameplay, with a focus on realistic combat and decision-making.

Q. What is the game's most significant achievement?
A. The most significant achievement of D-Day is its realistic representation of the Normandy invasion, using historical accuracy and engaging gameplay to create an immersive experience.

Q. What is the game's most important feature?
A. The most important feature of D-Day is its realistic representation of the Normandy invasion, using historical accuracy and engaging gameplay to create an immersive experience.

Q. What is the game's most significant innovation?
A. The most significant innovation of D-Day is its use of historical maps and data to create an immersive and realistic gaming experience.

Q. What is the game's most significant contribution?
A. The most significant contribution of D-Day is its realistic representation of the Normandy invasion, using historical accuracy and engaging gameplay to create an immersive experience.

Q. What is the game's most significant impact?
A. The most significant impact of D-Day is its realistic representation of the Normandy invasion, using historical accuracy and engaging gameplay to create an immersive experience.

Q. What is the game's most significant impact?
A. The most significant impact of D-Day is its realistic representation of the Normandy invasion, using historical accuracy and engaging gameplay to create an immersive experience.

Q. What is the game's most significant development?
A. The most significant development of D-Day is its use of historical maps and data to create an immersive and realistic gaming experience.

Q. What is the game's most significant change?
A. The most significant change of D-Day is its realistic representation of the Normandy invasion, using historical accuracy and engaging gameplay to create an immersive experience.

Q. What is the game's most significant improvement?
A. The most significant improvement of D-Day is its realistic representation of the Normandy invasion, using historical accuracy and engaging gameplay to create an immersive experience.

Q. What is the game's most significant advancement?
A. The most significant advancement of D-Day is its realistic representation of the Normandy invasion, using historical accuracy and engaging gameplay to create an immersive experience.

Q. What is the game's most significant contribution?
A. The most significant contribution of D-Day is its realistic representation of the Normandy invasion, using historical accuracy and engaging gameplay to create an immersive experience.

Q. What is the game's most significant impact?
A. The most significant impact of D-Day is its realistic representation of the Normandy invasion, using historical accuracy and engaging gameplay to create an immersive experience.

Q. What is the game's most significant development?
A. The most significant development of D-Day is its realistic representation of the Normandy invasion, using historical accuracy and engaging gameplay to create an immersive experience.

Q. What is the game's most significant innovation?
A. The most significant innovation of D-Day is its realistic representation of the Normandy invasion, using historical accuracy and engaging gameplay to create an immersive experience.

Q. What is the game's most significant contribution?
A. The most significant contribution of D-Day is its realistic representation of the Normandy invasion, using historical accuracy and engaging gameplay to create an immersive experience.

Q. What is the game's most significant impact?
A. The most significant impact of D-Day is its realistic representation of the Normandy invasion, using historical accuracy and engaging gameplay to create an immersive experience.

Q. What is the game's most significant development?
A. The most significant development of D-Day is its realistic representation of the Normandy invasion, using historical accuracy and engaging gameplay to create an immersive experience.

Q. What is the game's most significant innovation?
A. The most significant innovation of D-Day is its realistic representation of the Normandy invasion, using historical accuracy and engaging gameplay to create an immersive experience.

Q. What is the game's most significant contribution?
A. The most significant contribution of D-Day is its realistic representation of the Normandy invasion, using historical accuracy and engaging gameplay to create an immersive experience.

Q. What is the game's most significant impact?
A. The most significant impact of D-Day is its realistic representation of the Normandy invasion, using historical accuracy and engaging gameplay to create an immersive experience.
FOOTBALL STRATEGY was the most asked for game this past Xmas season which really didn’t surprise us. It’s by far the favorite of our office personnel and received rather poor distribution to the trade due to the proliferation of football games on the market. It appears that everyone recognizes the fact that Avalon Hill is the leader in battle games but when it comes to sports, they stock the television advertised item even though it may be an inferior product. This is why we chose FOOTBALL STRATEGY as the subject of our Thanksgiving window display promotion for Brentano’s 5th Ave. store in New York. Avalon Hill salesmen Erwin Lewis (above left) and VP Tom Shaw (above right) challenged passersby for a free game. AH’s staff of experts lived up to its billing by posting a 42-3 record during the week and proved that FOOTBALL STRATEGY really didn’t surprise us. It’s by far the most exciting gridiron game on the market, and Tom Shaw’s Baltimore Colts (1-3-3) won the prize in the NFL basis of “beat the expert” at FOOTBALL STRATEGY. For winning, the challenger received a free game. AH’s staff of experts lived up to its billing by posting a 42-3 record during the week and proved that FOOTBALL STRATEGY, unlike its many imitators, is not a game of luck.

Back in Baltimore the Avalon Hill Football Strategy League drew to a close after 14 weeks and found AH designers R. Reed, T. Shaw, and D. Greenwood among the play-off contenders. As the play-offs progressed and Super Bowl week drew near the league drew major newspaper coverage in the Baltimore area as the local media picked up on the novel idea. Super Bowl week found Tom Shaw’s Baltimore Colts (13-3) facing the 14-2 Packers of Don Greenwood’s Green Bay franchise with the latter triumphant 22-21 in an exciting battle played before dozens of mesmerized fans.

Greenwood received $100 plus possession of the prized SICL Super Bowl Trophy (below) which is the league’s symbol of supremacy and rotates from winner to winner each year. Spartan International’s sponsorship of this league marked the first time that Avalon Hill and S.I.C.L. have combined in a competitive event. The league has raised its franchise fees and has already sold out for 1974. However, if you want to be put on the waiting list or join a similar league for sister game BASEBALL STRATEGY contact Don Greenwood c/o Avalon Hill.

Seventy-five Northeastern gamers braved the weather to attend Winter Con II, sponsored by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Strategic Games Society and the American Wargaming Association. 12 January 1974, on the MIT campus in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Traveling to the Boston area from as far away as Maine and Pennsylvania, the gamers came to compete in events ranging from a single elimination Stalingrad tournament to Diplomacy-Hill (a variant crossing Stalingrad’s movement and combat with Diplomacy’s player interaction and situation) and Tactics II (eight player super Blitzkrieg). When the dust had cleared, Paul Siragusa (of Burlington, CT) had placed first in Stalingrad. Virtually the entire fourth floor of the MIT Student Center had been reserved for the use of conventioneers, but owing to poor weather that week and to the gas crunch in the Northeast, total attendance was below the originally anticipated level. Nonetheless, Winter Con II was still quite successful, yielding a profit to the sponsors and a full day of gaming to all who attended.

A ray of wargaming light is being shed in Houston, TX where Ross Callender has started his own Interest Group Houston which meets every other Friday to play AH games and armor miniatures. For more info we suggest you write Ross at his 2601 Esther, Pasadena, TX 77502 address.

Although 60% of the entries correctly went after the exposed German supplies, approximately 80% of these ruined their chances with faulty tactical placement. A drawing had to be held to determine the winners from the remainder. Those surviving the luck of the draw were: J. Cox, Flat River, MO; N. Topolnicki, Baltimore, MD; B. Kindig, Davenport, IA; M. Gilmartin, Olmstead Falls, OH; E. McKenna, Mt. Pleasant, MI; D. Parshall, Wilmington, DE; T. Hertz, Bremerton, WA; K. Neill, Iowa City, IA; T. Kuhn, Indianapolis, IN; and G. Rubin, Utica, NY.
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OPPONENTS PLANTED

Not once again." a very true saying. For the die is cast and the game is over. We have no choice but to accept the consequences."

2085

New York: On the 25th of September, there will be a major event at the Metropolitan Opera House. This will be a charity concert featuring some of the best vocalists in the world. The proceeds will go to the local food bank. The concert will start at 8 PM and tickets are available for $50.00. For more information, please call 123-456-7890.

2086

Washington: President Johnson will be signing a new federal budget on the 26th of September. The budget includes significant funding for education and healthcare. It also addresses the ongoing conflict in the Middle East. The signing ceremony will take place in the East Room of the White House. The public is invited to attend.

2087

Los Angeles: The Los Angeles Lakers will be playing a home game against the Golden State Warriors on the 27th of September. The game will start at 7 PM and tickets are available for $50.00. For more information, please call 123-456-7890.

2088

Chicago: The Chicago Bears will be playing a home game against the Green Bay Packers on the 28th of September. The game will start at 8 PM and tickets are available for $50.00. For more information, please call 123-456-7890.

2089

New York: The New York Yankees will be playing a home game against the Boston Red Sox on the 29th of September. The game will start at 8 PM and tickets are available for $50.00. For more information, please call 123-456-7890.

2090

Washington: The United Nations will be holding a special meeting on the 30th of September to discuss the ongoing conflict in the Middle East. The meeting will be attended by representatives from all member countries. The public is invited to attend.

2091

Los Angeles: The Los Angeles Dodgers will be playing a home game against the San Diego Padres on the 1st of October. The game will start at 7 PM and tickets are available for $50.00. For more information, please call 123-456-7890.

2092

Chicago: The Chicago Cubs will be playing a home game against the Milwaukee Brewers on the 2nd of October. The game will start at 8 PM and tickets are available for $50.00. For more information, please call 123-456-7890.