Avalon Hill Philosophy Part 97

On Page 23 of this issue can be found the results of our latest masochistic effort to determine how the collective readership (or at least those who responded) view the labors of the designers and artists at Avalon Hill. There were 884 response sheets returned (which represents only about 4% of The GENERAL's current list of subscribers), enough to provide a valid sampling. Indeed, a few continue to trickle in with each day's mail, weeks after my arbitrary cut-off. This was both surprising and gratifying—well beyond my cynical expectations. Before proceeding, for the awesome task of tabulating the thousands of numbers that this figure represents, a word of thanks is tendered to our secretary, Karen Knevezich, and to Richard Hamblenh's programmable calculator—both for dedication above and beyond the call of duty.

A word on the WARGAME RBG is in order to preface this presentation. As explained in AH Philosophy 94 (Vol. 19, No. 4), the titles here evaluated are ranked according to the reader-generated Overall Value, ranging from the best-accepted downward. In general, the lower the numerical average for a title in a category, the better the cumulative view of the respondents. However, in the case of Complexity, the lower values represent games of adjudged ease in mastering; in the Game Length category, the lower values indicate shorter periods necessary to play the game to conclusion (in terms of ten-minute multiples; hence, a rating of 9.00 reflects the consensus that an hour-and-a-half is required to complete play). The column Number of Responses merely lists the total number of readers who rated that particular title. The Percentage of Total indicates what fraction of the total 884 respondents considered the game (a barometer of popularity).
PENNANT RACE!
IS HERE

PENNANT RACE!, Avalon Hill's revolutionary new baseball game, is available both by direct mail and in your local hobby shop! The latest addition to AH's SPORTS ILLUSTRATED line of games, PENNANT RACE! scientifically evaluates all of the teams and players of the fabulous 1982 season and allows you to recreate this magic on your gaming table, either by yourself, with a friend, or at a Friday night gathering of gamers. This game is intended to allow players to replay an ENTIRE baseball season according to actual schedules and the eccentricities of the weather. Each of the 26 teams will play a complete 162-game schedule; as General Manager of a given team, you must trade players to improve your club's weak spots, bring players up from the minors to replace injured veterans, establish a pitching rotation that is both effective and physically durable, and most important of all -- keep winning!

Most baseball games on the market concentrate on a play-by-play system that is fine if you are recreating a World Series or are participating in a league with a limited schedule. But if you want to recreate the actual baseball year in all of its confused and hectic glory or wish to understand more of what makes a good team click and a bad one bomb, then PENNANT RACE! is for you. The game system is based on a game-by-game rather than play-by-play concept; as such, you can replay a three-game set between two clubs in a minute or two. Game resolution takes all of baseball's vital elements into account: pitching, relief, power, speed, defense, endurance, ballparks, weather, the minor leagues, right-handed and left-handed pitching and batting, and more! With a little record-keeping, you'll find that you can simulate an entire baseball season in a remarkably short period of time.

PENNANT RACE! is available from the Avalon Hill Game Company, 4517 Harford Road, Baltimore, Maryland 21214 for $14, plus 10% shipping and handling (20% for Canadian orders, 30% overseas). Maryland residents please add 5% state sales tax. PENNANT RACE! will be a regular feature in ALL-STAR REPLAY — optional rules and great seasons of the past will be regularly featured.

1982 HOUSTON ASTROS (NL WEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STARTERS</th>
<th>POS</th>
<th>BAT</th>
<th>POW</th>
<th>SPD</th>
<th>FLD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHIL GARNER</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAY KNIGHT</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONY SCOTT</td>
<td>CF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAN ASHBY</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENCH</td>
<td>POS</td>
<td>BAT</td>
<td>POW</td>
<td>SPD</td>
<td>FLD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANNY WALLING</td>
<td>OF/1B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE IVIE</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIKO GARCIA</td>
<td>INF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PITCHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R/L</th>
<th>START</th>
<th>END</th>
<th>REST</th>
<th>RELIEF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOLAN RYAN</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB KNEPPER</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE LACOSS</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANDY MOFFITT</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BILLY SMITH | R | -   | -   | -     |
On March 1, 1815, the exiled Emperor Napoleon Bonaparte landed with a small escort on French soil at Cannes, having escaped from the island of Elba. For the next 100 odd days, he would once again terrorize Europe at the command of the feared imperial French legions. Surrounded on all sides by armies of the great European powers, Napoleon’s plan was to march north to Brussels, separate the Prussian and Anglo-Allied armies from each other, and defeat each in detail. Destruction of these armies would probably mean peace for France and the saving of the Emperor’s Crown. Failure was unthinkable.

HUNDRED DAYS BATTLES is Avalon Hill’s new strategy game for two or three players which recreates the climax of the Hundred Days Campaign. The division sized units of both sides are represented on the map by leaders who command their corps and army formations. Leaders march, force march, and influence combat according to their individual abilities. Combat is resolved by rolling a die on the Combat Results Table. To win, the French must exit units off the map towards Brussels, or destroy the Allied armies. The Allies win by preventing French victory.

HUNDRED DAYS BATTLES comes complete with a colorful map of the historic battle areas of southern Belgium, 100 playing pieces, and a short rules booklet.

Playing Time: 2 hours

Complexity Rating (from 1-10, 10 the highest): 4

HUNDRED DAYS BATTLES is now available for $6.00 from the Avalon Hill Game Company, 4517 Harford Road, Baltimore, MD 21214. Please add 10% for shipping and handling (20% for Canadian orders, 30% for overseas). Maryland residents please add 5% state sales tax.
FIRST IMPRESSIONS
An Introduction to Squad Leader Plus Three
By Bob Medrow

INTRODUCTION
Just as GI: ANVIL OF VICTORY is the fourth installment of the Squad Leader system, this article is the fourth in a series. The original appeared in Vol. 14, No. 5 of The GENERAL shortly after the publication of SL itself, and set the pattern generally followed since. (The first gamette, COl, was the subject of an article in Vol. 15, No. 6; Vol. 17, No. 2, contained what I had to say about COD). In the past, my articles in this series have contained a detailed look at the way parts of the rules worked, as well as views on some of the scenarios.

The character of the "how it works" portion of these articles grew out of my playtest experiences, all those years ago, with the original SL. I learned the rules, mastered the routines, but, frequently, found myself having a hard time making up my mind about how the game should be played in the light of these things. With a game like STALINGRAD, a glance at the CRT showed one just what you had to worry about when you attacked at 2-to-1. On the level at which the SL system operates, however, things are a lot more complicated. For example, looking at that village on Board 3, just what kind of a chance do I have of running a tank through it if there's an enemy squad sitting there in a small building I'd like to go past? Or, playing a point purchase scenario, just what's an artillery module worth to the Russians? How many shots can you really get off with those crummy radios? And how much damage will they be likely to do?

Practically speaking, the typical scenario places the player in a position comparable to that of a battalion commander if one considers the range of weapons systems available. However, as in the bad old days when officers purchased their commissions, in the SQUAD LEADER system that rank comes with purchase of the game. The experience required in order to handle such a command well does not also, unfortunately, come in the box. This, of course, is true, to varying degrees, in all wargames and we usually cope on the basis of some combination of study and playing experience. Unfortunately, with respect to the latter, there are two problems for the SL system fan: the number of different situations and the wide range of possible outcomes. The weapons systems used, the time at which the scenario takes place, the character of the opponents, the nature of the terrain and the weather are all variables, apt to change radically from scenario to scenario. As to the range of possible outcomes, my favorite example involves a stack of three identical squads stacked with a leader and fired upon twice. Until GI, there were 30 possible ways that attack could end, and the relative probabilities of each of those 30 distinct outcomes depended upon the troops, the leader, the terrain occupied, and the weight of the fire brought against them. With GI, the number went up.

With those sorts of variables, it would take a whole lot of remembered experience in order to really grasp what might happen and how often you could expect to see it. That observation caused me to start examining, mathematically, the outcomes of various basic happenings in the game.

Most of the time it's not too difficult to calculate exactly the probability of a particular event taking place. To illustrate, consider that squad sitting in a building on Board 3, just waiting to have a shot at immobilizing my tank. In order to even make such an effort, the squad would first have to pass a basic morale check. If the squad has a morale of '8', the chance of passing is 26 out of 36. The probability that the MC will be passed is just the ratio of those two numbers, 0.722. Then, under the original rules, if the MC was passed, the attempts would be successful if the attacking squad rolled '3' or less, which happens thrice in 12, for a probability of 0.083. The probability of both passing the MC and making a successful immobilization attack is found by simply multiplying those two probabilities together. The result is 0.060. Expressed as a percent, then, the squad would stop my tank a mere 6% of the time.
I chose this particular example for three reasons. The first was to illustrate the type of calculation which has played a major role in the preparation of these four articles. The second was to emphasize the fact that knowing the rules does not, directly, tell you how much effect a given unit will have on the game. The rules governing the success of this particular activity have been revised in GI. One of the purposes of these articles (except, of course, for the first one) has been to point out the extent to which changes introduced by the current gamette into the older game system should do is represent any major values (-2, 0, 4, 8, and +4) feature German forces with ELR values, and one of the scenarios includes German 5-4-8.

The first column of the Table shows the Power value. Values of 6, 8, 16 and 24 are FP values which correspond to me representative of low, medium, heavy and super-heavy attacks. DRMs ranging from -4 to +4 were considered, although only values (-2, 0, and +2) are used here. (The reason for this will become clear shortly.) Column three, headed "OK", states the probability (expressed as a percent) that a given attack will net absolutely no effect upon the defender (in the sense that the defender is neither killed nor broken). At the opposite end of the spectrum, column four is the "KIA" probability. The result in a broken (0%) or killed (100%) unit breaking. Allowing for round off errors, these three numbers should always total 100%. To illustrate, a FP attack of 8 with a DRM of 0 made against a unit having a morale of 7 will have no effect 54% of the time, will kill 8% of the time, and will result in a broken unit 38% of the time.

With the ELR rules in effect there is some chance that a broken unit will break-to-green, and that's the information contained within the next five columns. Those numbers give the probability that a particular unit will, for a given attack and some specified ELR, break-to-green if it breaks. To stick with the previous illustration, if a unit with a morale of "7" breaks as a result of a FP of 8 when the DRM is 0, it will break-to-green 74% of the time for an ELR of 1. For ELR's of 0 through 2 the probabilities, should a break occur, for a break-to-green are, respectively, 50%, 51%, 16% and 7%. An ELR of 5 is about as high as one can go before the chances of this event become small, but statistically, they are essentially zero.

The reason why only three DRMs are used begins apparent when you consider what happens for a given attack when the only thing that changes is the DRM. As an example, let's look at a morale "6," modified for an ELR of "4." As the DRM goes from 0 to +2 the probability of the squad surviving alive and unhurt goes from 44% to 89% while the probability of a KIA result drops from 17% to 0%. The three values in the next column show the probability of a broken result falling from 39% to 11%. However, for an ELR of 2, the probability that a particular broken result will produce a break-to-green changes by only 6%, from 59% to 53%. Over the same DRM range the maximum change anywhere in the Table is 12%, and only a few cases show a change of 10% or more. The obvious conclusion is that the relative likelihood of a break-to-green depends only slightly upon the DRM.

Moreover, considering all four of the FP attacks, I don't think that the FP value itself has a particularly large influence on the likelihood of a break-to-green. For the FPs used and an ELR of 2, the chances of a broken unit breaking-to-green varies only between 53% and 77% for a morale 6 unit. This observation led to the construction of Table 2. Here, as a function of unit morale, I've supplied my estimate of the average chance that a unit having a particular ELR will break-to-green when it breaks. Generally speaking, without regard to the FP or the DRM, a 6-6-7 squad with an ELR of 3 will break-to-green around 35% of the time it breaks.

To see what effect these observations might have on play, let's go back to Table 1. The extent to which, for a given morale unit in a particular scenario, the probability of a broken unit breaking-to-green units certainly depends most strongly upon the general likelihood of any kind of broken result. In a scenario in which the enemy will have low-to-moderate firepower, green units will be more common when the GIs are attacking (at which time the DRMs will generally favor the defender) than when they are defending. Generally speaking, the higher the FP the more nearly the probability that broken unit generation will become independent of the DRM. Then, neither attacking nor defending will be a significant factor in this area. Moreover, as we can see by looking at the percentages, the only time that a DRM of some sort of broken result rises with the FP value is when the likelihood of a broken result is 0%.
the ELR idea agree well with what we should expect. Against light fire, unit performance stays fairly uniform as long as the units are under good cover. As the intensity of fire rises, however, the force, on either attack or defense, begins to disintegrate at a faster and faster rate. For my money, the ELR concept does what it’s supposed to do.

MORALE CAN BE A TWO-SIDED ISSUE

Ever since the appearance of the SS, inexperienced Infantry and Parisinos in COI, we have had to deal with infantry having a different morale on its broken side than it had on its unbroken side. With SL itself, there were just three morale combinations for crews and squads since morale didn’t change when the units went over. Now, however, looking at crews, half-squads and squads, there are ten combinations ranging from +2/+4 to -2/-6. There are two significant areas in which the front-side/flip-side morale combination has an effect which might be important to our play. The first of these involves the danger present in stacking with a leader. The second has to do with the question of the desirability of a single, large fire attack versus a couple of smaller ones.

Because of the introduction of half-squads begun in GI, these matters have increased in importance. All half-squads have a flip-side morale either one or two levels poorer than that which they possess in an unbroken state. As Rule 13.6 makes clear, what you’ve got showing is what you go with.

Leaders Can Be Hazardous

One of the first things to be learned in playing SL should be that a leader will always increase the probability that a unit stacked with it will be destroyed. This is due to the fact that a leader is of no benefit against a KIA result, and that a MC combat result could break the leader and, thereby, cause the unit to take two MCs as the result of a single fire attack. By virtue of Gs’ 142.312, a broken squad that breaks again is replaced with a broken half-squad. For half-squad and crews, elimination is still the penalty for a double break.

Table 3 provides some interesting data about the hazard to various types of units as a function of the leader with which it is stacked when subjected to a single attack. In the morale column the two numbers are, respectively, the normal and broken morale values. Under the “none” heading, “G” (for ‘‘Gone’’) represents the KIA probability, while “O” (for ‘‘Okay’’) is the probability of surviving the attack alive and unbroken. For the eight leaders listed, “G” represents the KIA probability plus the probability of double-break elimination (for crews and half-squads) or (for squads) the probability of reduction to broken half-squad.

Because the effects of leaders on 6/6, 7/7 and 8/8 units were discussed in the initial SL article, the results for a single attack presented here are provided for just two purposes. The first of these is to give us a look at the typical effect of variable flip-side morale. The second is to provide a set of values that demonstrates one of the most important aspects of good play. I’ll look at these two aspects in order. With respect to the double-break question, the leader modifiers are of no importance. For example, for a 7/7 and either an 8-0 or an 8-1 leader, the probability that the unit will be “Gone” is 36%. Now consider how the “G” values change as a function of flip-side morale. As the morale of the leader goes up, the range of the “G” values goes down rather sharply. For example, with a 6+1 leader, a 6/4, a 6/5 and a 6/6 will be “Gone”, respectively, 59%, 55% and 49% of the time. With any 8-9 morale leader the corresponding values are 41%, 40% and 37%. Qualitatively, this is the trend in all of the cases I looked at: flip-side morale is not a major factor as far as double-break elimination is concerned.
concerned, and the effect falls off rapidly as leadership goes up.

One of the simplest and, also, most important conclusions of the first article was that the 8-1 leader was the "neutral" leader with respect to the probability that a unit would survive alive and unbroken. Looking at the three "O" column numbers for an 8-1 leader you'll see that they are within 1% of those in the "O" column when no leader is present. Stacked with any leader poorer than an 8-1, a unit has a reduced chance of being fully functional. In all of the different FP/DRM combinations I've looked at, it works out the same way. For this reason, the 6-1, 7-0 and 8-0 leaders should only be used to man radios, accelerate troop movement, and rally broken units-with those latter two activities carried out only where the hex occupied cannot be hit by enemy fire of any importance. If there's anything approaching an absolute rule of play in this game, that's it! Yet, in six years of playing this game and watching it being played, I've seen stacks exposed with these inferior leaders time after time. If this article convinces you of nothing but the desirability of avoiding this mistake, you'll have gotten your reading time's worth.

Two Little Versus One Big

This was one of the first, and most frustrating, problems I faced in playtesting SL. Because of the rules, adjacent stacks have the option either of firing together at one target or of taking separate shots. At an elementary level, it's like this: you have some stacks exposed with these inferior leaders time after time. If this article convinces you of nothing but the desirability of avoiding this mistake, you'll have gotten your reading time's worth.

The Table presents six comparisons: "2x2" versus "4x1", "4x2" versus "8x1", "6x2" versus "12x1", "8x2" versus "16x1", and "18x2" versus "36x1" for three different DRMs: -2, 0 and +2. To look at things from the American point of view, from which the typical FPf is 6, the 6x2 versus 12x1 comparison tells us what is best. Let's suppose that the target is a 7/7 morale unit. For the two units firing separately, the enemy will be "Gone" 58% of the time if the DRM is -2. For the other DRMs the probabilities of this happening are 24% and 2%. The corresponding numbers in the 12x1 column are 28%, 8% and 0%, all of which represent KIA results. Even allowing for the fact that all of the "G" outcomes will not involve complete elimination of the enemy, it's pretty clear that for the DRMs of -2 and 0, the separate attacks are best. This is a generally valid observation for all of the comparisons made. The only point of departure (and it's not by much) comes with the highest FP attacks versus the 8 front-side morale units.

Returning to the specific example already used, the three different DRMs yield untouched survival for the target 16%, 41% and 73% of the time when separate attacks are made. For a single fire the comparable numbers are 25%, 44% and 66%. These values are the important ones when a break is as good as a kill. This particular example reflects the common reality: as the cover value goes up, the influence of leadership. Just flip through any of the scenario sets and you'll discover that there just aren't many leaders with leadership modifiers of -2 or -3. This means that you'll seldom have the luxury of even considering the possibility of a large FP attack directed by a great leader. In general, since the other guy is just out to shoot back, putting a lot of goodies into one basket has its risks. Concentration is one of those principles some people like to talk about in connection with war, but it does not mean that you should create attractive targets. Moreover, many scenarios require that you give careful thought to both fire and movement. The bigger the shot you take, the more units and weapons you pin down by that effort.

What you've just read doesn't mean that you should never concentrate firepower into single, big attacks. What it does mean is that you should not make the mistake of forgetting your basic doctrinal. I'm still working on trying to produce a more flexible and effective doctrine. If and when I find one, you'll read about it here.

IMMobilization

One of my treasured moments in playtesting SL came when a villainous opponent decided to force the usual victory conditions and establish the elimination of the Cpl. Medrow counter as his highest priority. In what I can only regard as a truly just result, I rolled snake eyes when he thought to make that sort of thing your basic tactical doctrine. Here, in the previous place we considered it, we also find that the flip-side morale is not a major factor. You might think of that as negative information. At least, though, it means one less thing to worry about.

My personal rule-of-thumb in this area is to stick with multiple attacks so long as the DRM is +2 or less. Now, there are several factors not considered in the above. The most obvious one is the influence of leadership. Just flip through any of the scenario sets and you'll discover that there just aren't many leaders with leadership modifiers of -2.
The best way to illustrate this fact is to compare the numbers in the column below the first '6' and those below the third '6'. The first gives us the probability of success for a single, morale "6", squad stacked with leaders. The latter has the same information for three-morale 8 squads. In the first part of the table, where we have the success probabilities if the dice roll must be two, a single morale "6" squad stacked with an 8-1 leader does better than three morale "8" squads.

Continuing on through the various dice rolls required, compare what happens, for the same leader, to the ratio of the value in the far right column to those below the third '8'. The first gives us the probability of a single, morale "6", squad stacked with leaders. The former does, compare what happens, for the same leader, to the ratio of the value in the far right column to those below the third '8'. The first gives us the probability of a single, morale "6", squad stacked with leaders. The latter has the same information for three-morale 8 squads. In the first part of the table, where we have the success probabilities if the dice roll must be two, a single, morale "6", squad stacked with an 8-1 leader does better than three morale "8" squads.

The net effect of the new rule is to increase the hazard to AFVs in congested terrain. As a natural consequence, this also emphasizes the importance of combined arms in such terrain. Armor and infantry, supported by such artillery and/or air power as is available, must work together. Understanding how the rules work in a situation like this is the true test of the expert player.

### THE TO HIT TABLE

Here we have what is, I think, the place where the GI changes have the biggest impact on how the game is played. After all these years of seeing things grow more complicated, here's a place where, at least on the surface, things get simpler. Figure 2, part (a), shows the TO HIT TABLE as it was in COD, while the second half displays the current one. The most obvious difference is that the new one has fewer rows. Where earlier both infantry and vehicles had three separate lines they are now reduced to one apiece. The entry "Guns" has vanished entirely.

This magic has been accomplished by establishing a single line for each basic category of target. Here, "basic" is defined in terms of the first shot probability of hitting that particular type of target. The net effect of the new rule is to increase the hazard to AFVs in congested terrain. As a natural consequence, this also emphasizes the importance of combined arms in such terrain. Armor and infantry, supported by such artillery and/or air power as is available, must work together. Understanding how the rules work in a situation like this is the true test of the expert player.

### Table 5. The probability of successful immobilization of an AFV by a Defensive Fire Phase attack.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of squads</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Squad morale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net DRM = 0 without leader modifier.**

| None             | 3 | 4 |
| 8-1              | 5 | 6 |
| 9-1              | 7 | 8 |
| 10-2             | 9 | 10 |
| 10-3             | 11 | 12 |

**Net DRM = -1 without leader modifier.**

| None             | 12 | 13 |
| 8-1              | 14 | 15 |
| 9-1              | 16 | 17 |
| 10-2             | 18 | 19 |
| 10-3             | 20 | 21 |

**Net DRM = -2 without leader modifier.**

| None             | 12 | 13 |
| 8-1              | 14 | 15 |
| 9-1              | 16 | 17 |
| 10-2             | 18 | 19 |
| 10-3             | 20 | 21 |

**Net DRM = -3 without leader modifier.**

| None             | 17 | 18 |
| 8-1              | 19 | 20 |
| 9-1              | 21 | 22 |
| 10-2             | 23 | 24 |
| 10-3             | 25 | 26 |

**Net DRM = -4 without leader modifier.**

| None             | 24 | 25 |
| 8-1              | 26 | 27 |
| 9-1              | 28 | 29 |
| 10-2             | 30 | 31 |
| 10-3             | 32 | 33 |

**Net DRM = -5 without leader modifier.**

| None             | 30 | 31 |
| 8-1              | 32 | 33 |
| 9-1              | 34 | 35 |
| 10-2             | 36 | 37 |
| 10-3             | 38 | 39 |

**Net DRM = -6 without leader modifier.**

| None             | 35 | 36 |
| 8-1              | 37 | 38 |
| 9-1              | 39 | 40 |
| 10-2             | 41 | 42 |
| 10-3             | 43 | 44 |

**Net DRM = -7 without leader modifier.**

As an example of the first, any condition (other than height advantage) which would give the infantry unit a favorable TEM with regard to fire from the vehicle's adjacent position now makes the immobilization effort possible. Thus, infantry separated from an AFV by a wall, or sitting in a smoked hex, can now take a crack at it. The increased effectiveness is reflected in the fact that the maximum effective dice roll possible (before any leader effects are considered) has risen from SL's "4" to GI's "9".

Because of the interesting things discovered in connection with the treatment of this topic in the COI article, I just had to dig out the old program and rerun it for the additional cases. Table 5 contains all of the material from the earlier article as well as that required by the revised rule. One of the most striking features of the way the original rule worked was the extent to which the results were so extremely leader dependent, with both numbers of squads and their morale being quite secondary.

The best way to illustrate this fact is to compare the numbers in the column below the first '6' and those below the third '6'. The first gives us the probability of success for a single, morale "6", squad stacked with leaders. The latter has the same information for three-morale 8 squads. In the first part of the table, where we have the success probabilities if the dice roll must be two, a single, morale "6", squad stacked with an 8-1 leader does better than three morale "8" squads.

The net effect of the new rule is to increase the hazard to AFVs in congested terrain. As a natural consequence, this also emphasizes the importance of combined arms in such terrain. Armor and infantry, supported by such artillery and/or air power as is available, must work together. Understanding how the rules work in a situation like this is the true test of the expert player.

#### THE TO HIT TABLE

Here we have what is, I think, the place where the GI changes have the biggest impact on how the game is played. After all these years of seeing things grow more complicated, here's a place where, at least on the surface, things get simpler. Figure 2, part (a), shows the TO HIT TABLE as it was in COD, while the second half displays the current one. The most obvious difference is that the new one has fewer rows. Where earlier both infantry and vehicles had three separate lines they are now reduced to one apiece. The entry "Guns" has vanished entirely.

This magic has been accomplished by establishing a single line for each basic category of target. Here, "basic" is defined in terms of the first shot probability of hitting that particular type of target. The net effect of the new rule is to increase the hazard to AFVs in congested terrain. As a natural consequence, this also emphasizes the importance of combined arms in such terrain. Armor and infantry, supported by such artillery and/or air power as is available, must work together. Understanding how the rules work in a situation like this is the true test of the expert player.

### Table 5. The probability of successful immobilization of an AFV by a Defensive Fire Phase attack.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of squads</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Squad morale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net DRM = 0 without leader modifier.**

| None             | 3 | 4 |
| 8-1              | 5 | 6 |
| 9-1              | 7 | 8 |
| 10-2             | 9 | 10 |
| 10-3             | 11 | 12 |

**Net DRM = -1 without leader modifier.**

| None             | 12 | 13 |
| 8-1              | 14 | 15 |
| 9-1              | 16 | 17 |
| 10-2             | 18 | 19 |
| 10-3             | 20 | 21 |

**Net DRM = -2 without leader modifier.**

| None             | 12 | 13 |
| 8-1              | 14 | 15 |
| 9-1              | 16 | 17 |
| 10-2             | 18 | 19 |
| 10-3             | 20 | 21 |

**Net DRM = -3 without leader modifier.**

| None             | 17 | 18 |
| 8-1              | 19 | 20 |
| 9-1              | 21 | 22 |
| 10-2             | 23 | 24 |
| 10-3             | 25 | 26 |

**Net DRM = -4 without leader modifier.**

| None             | 24 | 25 |
| 8-1              | 26 | 27 |
| 9-1              | 28 | 29 |
| 10-2             | 30 | 31 |
| 10-3             | 32 | 33 |

**Net DRM = -5 without leader modifier.**

| None             | 30 | 31 |
| 8-1              | 32 | 33 |
| 9-1              | 34 | 35 |
| 10-2             | 36 | 37 |
| 10-3             | 38 | 39 |

**Net DRM = -6 without leader modifier.**

| None             | 35 | 36 |
| 8-1              | 37 | 38 |
| 9-1              | 39 | 40 |
| 10-2             | 41 | 42 |
| 10-3             | 43 | 44 |
The Changed Status of Infantry Targets

Upon seeing the new table, one of my first thoughts was that the effect of this change upon infantry targets would be the tricky thing. Consider the first line. In COD, infantry in a building was, generally, a spot harder to hit than was motionless infantry out in the open. If hit in a building, infantry would enjoy a favorable TEM. Now, however, the TEM influences the likelihood of a hit, and has no effect whatsoever upon the IFT roll. That makes infantry in a building harder to hit, but easier to hurt if you do hit them.

Table 6 presents a comparison of how things work out in the common case of infantry in a wooden building. The basic information presented is the probability that a unit will be killed or broken when fired upon. The COD results are presented for the case in which there is no net TO HIT modifier. Correspondingly, the GI case is then the one for which the only modifier is that due to the TEM. In both cases the black TO HIT numbers were used.

Since ordnance uses the TO HIT procedure, the results columns are headed by four of the most common gun calibers. The parenthesised values show the IFP equivalent of each fire. Only three ranges are included because I feel that 18 hexes represents a rather long engagement range given the typical board arrangement. Fortunately, there are few enough variables so that the results for all three front-side morales can be included.

Let's first consider the case of 40mm HE. For a unit morale of "7", the probability of the unit ending up dead or broken falls from 7% to 4% as

**Figure 1.**

**Table 33.3.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Type/Range</th>
<th>1-6</th>
<th>7-12</th>
<th>13-24</th>
<th>25-39</th>
<th>40-59</th>
<th>60+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INF in building, shellholes, entrenched</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF in woods</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF in other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle is hull down</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle is in woods/ldge</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle is in other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gun</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.**

**Table 145.1.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Type/Range</th>
<th>0-6</th>
<th>7-12</th>
<th>13-18</th>
<th>19-24</th>
<th>25-30</th>
<th>31-36</th>
<th>37-42</th>
<th>43-48</th>
<th>49-54</th>
<th>55+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infantry, Aircraft</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building, Smoke</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.**

**Table 145.5.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range/Type</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>APCR</th>
<th>APDS</th>
<th>Smoke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-12 hexes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-24 hexes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-36 hexes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.**

**Table 145.6.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range/Type</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>APDS</th>
<th>Smoke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-12 hexes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-24 hexes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-36 hexes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5.**
range goes up. Under the GI rules the corresponding numbers are 14% to 49%. (By the way, all these numbers do include the possibility of a critical hit.) Moving up to 70mm fire we see even better agreement. The important thing to note, however, is that in order to move closer together, the GI numbers have fallen with respect to the COD ones. As the strength of the fire goes up this trend continues. By the time we've moved to the 150mm column, that fire is only from about one-half to two-thirds as effective as it was a gamette ago.

From that we draw our first lesson: HE fire from on board artillery has gone down in effectiveness in this case. Moreover, there is a clear trend to be seen in that any given fire will now decrease in effectiveness more rapidly with increasing distance than was the case before. Yet a third conclusion can be reached by looking at the corresponding numbers as a function of target morale. Compared to COD, target morale is much less important than it was earlier. This latter effect is due to the fact that the IFT roll is no longer modified in favor of the defender, resulting in the increased probability of a KIA, a morale-independent result.

One of the other things that quickly caught my eye was that Movement Case J had now been broken into two categories: one for vehicles and one for infantry. On general principles, this was a change of which I heartily approved. Movement attracts the eye—thereby, I feel, increasing the likelihood that someone hostile to your side will notice you and decide to try and do something about you. Vehicles, by virtue of their greater speed, should be harder to hit when moving while infantry, by virtue of the fact of drawing attention to themselves, should be easier to hit. Thus, in a fairly painless way, we have a fact of life built into the system.

For infantry, the resulting situation is now the opposite of the one just considered. They will be easier to hit when moving in the open, but harder to hit once hit, to hurt. This comes about from the fact that, having been used in the TO HIT process, the moving TEMs are no longer used when the dice roll is made upon the IFT.

The results are shown in Table 6, which is laid out in the same way as was Table 5. As far as the COD results are concerned the only DRM is that for the old Case J, and the infantry suffers from a -2 TEM when rolling on the IFT. The GI set of results incorporates a -2 DRM on the TO HIT TABLE by virtue of the new Case J for infantry while the IFT DRM is gone. (Note that, in the First Edition GI rules, the last example following 13.4.11 is in error; the movement and woods DRMs cancel.) This, then, is the typical Defensive Fire Phase attack against an infantry unit moving in the open as seen by the two sets of rules. In this situation the 40mm results are not significantly different, just as was true for the previous case. This time however, we see that the new rules lead to an increased threat to life and limb as the weight of fire goes up. Another reversal is to be found when we observe that the new way of doing things shows more variety with morale than did the old way. These changes seem reasonable.

Comparing the last two tables also shows some interesting things. If you look at the last two HE sizes, you'll see that, under the COD rules, there was about as much risk to be found sitting in a wooden building as when one was moving around in broad daylight. In the 1- to 6-hex range the new rules generally show the hazard to be about twice as great. As the range opens up the ratio rises to around four. The first of these facts doesn’t bother me, but I’m not especially comfortable with the second one. My gut feeling is that there should be more attenuation of effect as the range opens up.

The other combinations of infantry position and activity can be worked out fairly easily. For instance, the TO HIT numbers for infantry in woods are about the same in both sets of rules, but, in GI, there is no beneficial terrain modifier. The net result will then be to increase the HE hazard for troops in woods.

Looking at the results obtained, I'd have to say that the new way of doing thing is smoother to use. The fact that it yields somewhat more satisfying results is more than enough justification for the change.

Vehicle Target, Before and After

This topic can be handled by just considering the two TO HIT TABLES, which makes the comparison a lot easier. For the most part, over normal engagement ranges, the new Vehicle TO HIT numbers are the same as the old values. For example, since being in the woods now yields a +1 DRM, which has the same effect as that produced by a drop of one in the TO HIT numbers. Comparing the old “Vehicle in Woods/Bldg” entry with the new “Vehicle” one shows that we end up, then, with the same net TO HIT number.

In fact, the only substantial difference I've found has to do with Hull Down vehicles. However, this change is a major one. It is now necessary to roll the appropriate “Vehicle” TO HIT number and have the colored die come up greater than or equal to the white one. For any given TO HIT number this condition will be met more than half the time.

Long range armor duels are much more common than are long range attacks on infantry. Looking for elevated firing positions is just about automatic for everyone who's learned to use German armor intelligently. For that reason, the results in Table 6 came as something of a shock. Because of their importance I've given, in Table 8, the results for both sets of numbers out to a range of 42 hexes.

Since the DRMs which can effect such duels are the same under both sets of rules, the table gives a...
very complete picture of the situation. In each of the four results columns there are two numbers separated by a "/". The first of these is the probability of a hit using just the "Vehicle is in Other" (for COD) and the "Vehicle" (in GI) lines on their respective TO HIT Tables. The second value is the probability of a hit against a Hull Down vehicle at that range. To illustrate, in the 19–24 hex range, the Black "Vehicle is in Other" TO HIT number is an "8". As shown, rolling an eight or less with two dice happens 72% of the time. The "Vehicle is hull down" number is "4", which will come up just 17% of the time. Under the GI rules the corresponding numbers are 58% and 33%.

First of all, let's look at, for the Black TO HIT numbers, the numbers to the left of the slash. Out to 18 hexes the numbers are the same. Beyond that, the basic chance-to-hit falls off more rapidly under the new rules than it did under the old. To the right of the slash, where we find the Hull Down hit probabilities, the same trend is there, but the GI rules show a much more slowly decaying hit probability. As a result, the virtues of being hull down have been much reduced. As is to be expected, the same trends are to be seen for the red TO HIT numbers.

The scenario that immediately came to my mind demonstrates this change very clearly. In "Paw of the Tiger", the Germans can open up at 24Hexes against the oncoming Russians. Even if the target is not in a bore-sighted hex, the hit probability is 72%. Under the COD rules, any Russian unit stopping to plug things out at long range had but an 8% chance of scoring a hit. Thus, from the ratio of those two numbers, the German player had a nine times better TO HIT advantage. As things now stand the same two probabilities are 58% and 25%, for a ratio just about half that. In the 7–12 hex range, the German player used to enjoy an edge that was still almost five-to-one. Now, that advantage has fallen to just about half that. All in all, a major change. Is it in the right direction? Well, that'll be one of the things I'm sure will be debated on the road to the revised rule book.

CLOSEUP

And there you have some of what I’ve learned about how the SL system stands with the addition of COD. I hope some of these figures and colors will help you to play this game with more insight and more success. If, after you’ve had a chance to think things over, you have any comments concerning similar material to be included in the revised rule book, drop me a line at 1322 Highland Drive, Rolla, Missouri 65401.

CIRCUS MAXIMUS 2nd Edition

The rules of CIRCUS MAXIMUS, adjudged by the readership of The GENERAL one of Avalon Hill’s best games (see the RBG of next issue), have recently undergone a beneficial facelift. A number of rule changes—some merely cosmetic, others quite important—make this classic game of chariot racing even more exciting and complete than before. Henceforth, the second edition rules will be included with current press runs of CIRCUS MAXIMUS and will be considered the official rules for all tournament play. For owners of the game, copies are available for $3.00 plus normal shipping and handling costs. Maryland residents please add 5% state sales tax to their remittance.

CONVENTION CALENDAR

July 2-3-4
Texcon 1983, Austin, Texas
Contact: Martha Ladyman, 8028 Gessner 
#1805, Austin, Texas 78753.

July 14-15-16-17
Origins ’83, Detroit, Michigan
Contact: Metro Detroit Gamers, 083 Info, P.O. Box 787, Troy, MI 48099.

July 29-30-31
Nanccon 88-VI, Houston, Texas
Contact: Frank Joines, Convention Coordinator, 118 Briargrove Square, Houston, TX 77057. (713) 783-4055.

July 29-30-31
Peercicon III, San Diego, California
Contact: Larry Peery, The Institute for Diplomatic Studies, P.O. Box 8416, San Diego, CA 92102. (714) 238-0893.

July 29-30-31
Omaccon 3, Omaha, Nebraska
Contact: Greg Dorn, 2007 Betz Road 6C, Bellevue, NE 68005.

NOTE: Emphasis is placed on Science Fiction, both print and games.

SECOND EDITION

BATTLE OF THE BULGE ’81

Taking advantage of a reprinting of this popular game, a number of changes were incorporated into the rulebook. As described in Vol. 19, No. 2 of The GENERAL, several significant changes to the Basic and Advanced games as well as additional Optional Rules are to be found here. The Second Edition of BATTLE OF THE BULGE ’81 can be ordered from The Avalon Hill Game Company, 457 Harford Road, Baltimore, MD 21214, for $4.00 and the usual 10% shipping and handling fee (20% Canadian, 30% Overseas). Maryland residents please add 5% state sales tax.

CONTEST 113

Once again valiant squad leaders are thrown into the breach! It is the last player turn of a DYO scenario, the beginning of the American player turn. The German player has done his worst, obtaining a KIA on one of his few remaining squads. Only Board 3 is in play; only the counters shown remain. Normal environment and weather conditions prevail. The players have agreed to use all rules through those of GI with the exception of Command Control, Equipment Possession and Battlefield Integrity. To win, the American player—you—must solely occupy two of the following three buildings: 3T1, 3T3 and 3S5. All dice rolls will equal "9" (nine); and all single die rolls, "1" (one).

Your task is to guarantee an American win. List each American action during this crucial last turn in the appropriate phase. Be sure to specify the routes used by any unit in anticipation of a large number of contest entries, the correct solutions will be further winnowed by selection of those which use the fewest US infantry MFs.

The answer to this contest must be entered on the official entry form (or a facsimile) found in the insert of this issue. Ten winning entries will receive AH merchandise credits. To be valid, an entry must be received prior to the mailing of the next issue of The GENERAL and include a numerical rating for this issue as a whole, as well as listing the three best articles. The solution to Contest #113 will appear in Vol. 20, No. 2 and a listing of the winners in Vol. 20, No. 3 of The GENERAL.

SO THAT’S WHAT YOU’VE BEEN PLAYING

Titles Listed 158

Rank Total Responses: 823

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Pub</th>
<th>Last Time</th>
<th>On List</th>
<th>Freq Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Squad Leader</td>
<td>A2H</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>G.I</td>
<td>A1H</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Third Reich</td>
<td>A1H</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Civil War</td>
<td>A1H</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>War &amp; Peace</td>
<td>T1H</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>A1H</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>D&amp;D</td>
<td>A2H</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>A2H</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>A2H</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>A2H</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>A2H</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Panzerblitz</td>
<td>A2H</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Panzer Leader</td>
<td>A2H</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Diplomacy</td>
<td>A2H</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Midway</td>
<td>A2H</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Afrika Korps</td>
<td>A2H</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>WISIM</td>
<td>A2H</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANVIL OF MY EYE

GIs in the Maelstrom
By Mark C. Nixon

Mark Nixon, author of the delightfully true "They Shall Be Playesters", headed one of the most prolific G.I. playtest groups. His play balance reports were every bit as detailed and insightful as this article. Which, of course, is why we asked him to write it.

Any praise which may be generated by what follows is due in large part to the efforts of a veritable cadre of G.I. heroes: Tim Fuchs, Russ Hall, Ken Stein, and Pat Nicely. Only through their industry was I able to accumulate a substantial number of high quality playings of the fifteen scenarios—both initially for the playtest and subsequently with revised rules. However, any outrage with the ensuing account need look no further than this writer, who alone has construed the fine work of this crew to suit his own ends in preparing this article, so published without opportunity for their comment. I have glossed over and excluded many worthwhile ideas, strategies, positions and concepts for the sake of presenting in a reasonable amount of words what are to me, at this point in time, the most obvious and basic considerations for each of the fifteen scenarios.

In all honesty, I confess it may be presumptuous to subject the reader to the following treatment of detailed analysis without defining and illustrating my personal philosophy of "How to Play SQUAD LEADER". However, fortune smiles and the gentle readers will not be subjected to anything so potentially oppressive. Rather, the scenario analyses will hopefully be as interesting and fun to read, perhaps study and even criticize as they were to produce. As a matter of fact, the very concept of detailed analysis for a game offering the scope of the SL family may seem a contradiction in and of itself. The instant I specify that 6M6 is the ideal location to hide an ATG is the instant someone (usually my opponent) will maul the position with HE, avoid it altogether or contrive some other means to nullify the pronouncement. That he may go out of his way to "do me in" may be small consolation for losing the opportunity to fire myself, even though it may have already served a better purpose by distracting. The plethora of strategies which may revolve around such a circuitous set of reasoning ensures that the SL system shall long retain its appeal for those willing to invest the time and effort intelligent play demands.

Nevertheless, analysis is forthcoming. Through the lengthy process of printed word, continued play, rebuttals, improvements and even mere time itself our calibre of play shall improve such that we may approach that level which sees us declare ourselves "experts", only to be dashed on the shores of frustration by some whippersnapper novice who has not read all the analyses and has not put in his ten years plus of wargaming experience, but who does bring into the gaming world a fresh outlook with new ideas and strategies and employs them well. This then, is the first step.

Scenario 33
A Belated Christmas
Rating: 50%-50%

Attraction: A real free-for-all. Some abstraction in the US set-up works very well while German mobility provides the cutting edge for a mad dash to the gliders which deposit their cargo of troubles for friend and foe alike as they land with unbridled abandon.


If you could win by sitting snugly in the nine entrenchments and mauling the German assault, there would be no contest here at all. Instead, you must force your troops out of their nests and entice them forward to occupy portions of Board 4 in order to keep the enemy at bay and claim enough gliders for
a win. However, once established in these forward areas, your combination of superior firepower versus an advancing foe ensures victory in the vast majority of engagements. The key is, naturally, to make such a successful advance before German countermeasures and defensive fire nullify your only partially developed defense. Only if you bring the approximate area east of and including 4G3-4O1-4T4-4AA4 within your grasp can you be reasonably certain of controlling enough gliders and of placing the crucial enemy approach areas within two hex-hex contact of the move to bolster your firepower. Certainly, the securing of the gliders may necessitate adjustments to this perimeter, but the general idea should be clear and adequate to provide a viable objective for establishing a sound defensive posture.

**American Disadvantages: Dispersed. Must Advance. Lack of Mobility. Must Control Gliders.**

Since the gliders land at random, your force must be spread either singly or in small groups along the length of the west edge of Board 5, permitting your movement across a broad front and subsequently move to rapidly control as many gliders as possible, and at least shield with firepower those you cannot immediately possess. I advise against stacking exclusively in one area and embracing the hope that a disproportionate share of the gliders land nearby—the "Hell" Gambit. Odds are overwhelming that the number of gliders will land within reach and that German units blitzing across undefended sections of the board will not roll right over you are not great, and certainly not worth inverting time and energy which could be better spent on serious play.

The first must advance in order to realize the full potential of your advantages has already been emphasized. It is the one obstacle most likely to prove insurmountable. Though there is no question of your ability to advance, to do so quickly and on a wide front without suffering excessive casualties is your objective. Your degree of success in meeting these three facets of your advance—speed, scope, and integrity—will indicate your chances of winning this scenario.

Unfortunately, once in these forward positions, you suffer a lack of mobility—in part due to the relative freedom of movement enjoyed by your opponent, but also because your geographic position is constrained by the terrain of your front line. The east edge of Board 4 is not conducive to north-south movement, meaning once a flank goes it is most difficult to leave powerful forces out of the main engagement for even a few turns. The solution is to position your reserves such that they immediately provide a viable objective for establishing a sound defensive posture.

**German Advantages:**

American Set-Up:

As outlined above, your initial placement should cover the entire length of the front from north edge to south edge. By this, I do not mean that you should string units from A to G; rather, you should set up such that your units can bring the entire area under heavy fire after the first turn. To risk here should be obvious: units which break during the first turn and do not reach their intended objectives may not be able to provide defensive fire against the German first turn advance. In this event, your only recourse is to adapt the movement of flanks, to establish a one-hex fire base which threatens the German heights of enemy troops. This one hex is S54, the most important single hex on the playing area. In this hex you should place entrenchments, a 9-2 leader, and MGs and two squads. Even should one of these squad break, nothing is lost by firing both heavies with one squad at the ranges involved here. From this hex, one can hit the enemy heights and Level 3 positions on Hill 612 with a 16-(-1) or 16(+even) attack versus any entrenched enemy, lower die doubled in both cases.

Opposing this, the German 9-2 leader directing the HMG fires at S54 with a 2(+1) attack with the lower die doubled. The AA gun can manage only a 4(2) fire. Singly, one of these heavy enemy weapons may not even be placed on Hill 621. Maybe they'll set-up on Hill 538, won't change their fire, but will you still enjoy an 8(+1) or 8(+even) attack and have effectively chased them away from their best locations. Of course, the 20L can opt for two shots at you from an 18-hex range, gambling for two 1(+even) attacks. But again, he knows he will have to weather your prep fire first.

I personally believe this US commitment of troops, leadership and firepower is worth keeping the enemy off Hill 621. But considering the German countermeasures, a strong case can be made for heighting and placing only one HMG and/or a 1- leader in this position. Without detailing the mechanics again, we can surmise that only one HMG, the 9-1 and only one or two squads probably will not keep the Germans off Hill 621, but will still give them ample cause for concern and has the added advantage of freeing your 9-2 and one HMG for front line duty.

Put entrenchments in 5EE1 and 5CI to cover the extreme flanks. Hexes S51, S54 and S51 are good entrenchment locations only if because they make interior movement easier for your forces. Hex S51 has already been recommended for other reasons, we will note only that once one HMG and/or a 1- leader in this position. Without detailing the mechanics again, we can surmise that only one HMG, the 9-1 and only one or two squads probably will not keep the Germans off Hill 621, but will still give them ample cause for concern and has the added advantage of freeing your 9-2 and one HMG for front line duty.

Put entrenchments in 5EE1 and 5CI to cover the extreme flanks. Hexes S51, S54 and S51 are good entrenchment locations only if because they make interior movement easier for your forces. Hex S51 has already been recommended for other reasons, we will note only that once one HMG and/or a 1- leader in this position. Without detailing the mechanics again, we can surmise that only one HMG, the 9-1 and only one or two squads probably will not keep the Germans off Hill 621, but will still give them ample cause for concern and has the added advantage of freeing your 9-2 and one HMG for front line duty.

As with the US force, the existence of a few reserves may allow you to take advantage of an opportunity which might otherwise have disappeared ahead of your reaction time were all your troops on the firing line. Also, because of your maneuverability, this reserve can be centrally located such that the entire force may be hurled at whatever point you desire. Because it can be formed from those units which break during the initial advance and subsequently rally, it is not even necessary to leave any units behind for this reserve.

**German Disadvantages:**

**Receive First Fire.**

In 5EE1 and 5CI to cover the extreme flanks. Hexes S51, S54 and S51 are good entrenchment locations only if because they make interior movement easier for your forces. Hex S51 has already been recommended for other reasons, we will note only that once one HMG and/or a 1- leader in this position. Without detailing the mechanics again, we can surmise that only one HMG, the 9-1 and only one or two squads probably will not keep the Germans off Hill 621, but will still give them ample cause for concern and has the added advantage of freeing your 9-2 and one HMG for front line duty.

Put entrenchments in 5EE1 and 5CI to cover the extreme flanks. Hexes S51, S54 and S51 are good entrenchment locations only if because they make interior movement easier for your forces. Hex S51 has already been recommended for other reasons, we will note only that once one HMG and/or a 1- leader in this position. Without detailing the mechanics again, we can surmise that only one HMG, the 9-1 and only one or two squads probably will not keep the Germans off Hill 621, but will still give them ample cause for concern and has the added advantage of freeing your 9-2 and one HMG for front line duty.

As with the US force, the existence of a few reserves may allow you to take advantage of an opportunity which might otherwise have disappeared ahead of your reaction time were all your troops on the firing line. Also, because of your maneuverability, this reserve can be centrally located such that the entire force may be hurled at whatever point you desire. Because it can be formed from those units which break during the initial advance and subsequently rally, it is not even necessary to leave any units behind for this reserve.

**German Advantages:**

Height. Second Placement. Mobility.

Hills 621 and 538 offer such commanding positions it is difficult to avoid placing substantial forces there, namely the 9-2 leader, HMG, AA gun and maybe a few LMGs as well. But if the US player utilizes the HMG formation I went to great lengths to describe above, you must realize the risks you are taking by exposing these important units to the initial US prep fire. Your main advantage is that you get to see the US set-up before placing your own units on the board.

If the enemy HMGs are split and within normal range of your own HMG, you do not give away too much by placing this weapon on the heights. Adding an entrenchment with a few LMGs on the hill will fill out the position. The AA gun can be at ground level near your front line allowing it to fire at gliders during the first three turns without risking enemy return fire. Subsequently it can be pushed into a new hex offering fire opportunities at enemy squads. Hex ZV1 is an ideal location, with a move to 4V6 on Turn 3.

If the SS4 position is fully manned, you should not expose anyone to its initial prep fire. Take comfort in the knowledge that the GIs will struggle for many turns to relocate their HMGs while you can transport your own heavy to 406 on Turn 1, courtesy of a friendly halftrack. In effect, you have been denied your height advantage and the American first turn advance will be much more successful than you would like. But his substantial forces in SS4 are now out of the fight for several turns, an advantage you must exploit before they are brought back into play. You have no way of knowing which HMG in SS4s MS2 and the AA gun in 214. Their fields of fire are partially blocked by woods in their immediate vicinity, but they still have plenty of shots (although at extremely long range) and are not exposed to fire from the deadly SS4.

The German is assured of the advantage of mobility. This is embodied not only in the two halftracks, but also in the relative ease of your troops advancing across the west half of Board 4 as compared to the more difficult advance of the US forces. Once in the forward positions, you enjoy an interior mobility far superior to your American counterparts due to the open road. This superiority will be even more pronounced if you have managed to maintain any machine guns on the heights in good order.

As with the US force, the existence of a few reserves may allow you to take advantage of an opportunity which might otherwise have disappeared ahead of your reaction time were all your troops on the firing line. Also, because of your maneuverability, this reserve can be centrally located such that the entire force may be hurled at whatever point you desire. Because it can be formed from those units which break during the initial advance and subsequently rally, it is not even necessary to leave any units behind for this reserve.

**Receiving the first fire is basically whatever you make it.** The German player can set up out of enemy LOS, thereby suffering no casualties but consequently enjoying very few, or even no, defensive fire opportunities during the US first turn movement. But since this would forfeit your best chance to hit the enemy as they move onto Board 4 when they move onto Board 2 there is no advantage in such a placement can hardly be considered admirable. You must carefully balance the US set-up and prep fire opportunities with your own requirements of self-preservation, a first turn advance and the need to cover enemy lines of advance. Fortunately, it is a transitory disadvantage. It can only affect the balance of forces if you are unable to issue signs and permit US prep fire to blow you away, or if you play it too conservatively and allow an unopposed US advance on Turn 1.

Your only long term disadvantage is evident if you close within a four-hex range of the GIs. At such close quarters, you are outgunned squad for squad. So, do your level best to remain at a five- or six-hex range where your 5-4-8s and 4-4-7s are equal in firepower (squad for squad) to the 7-4-7s and 6-4-7s.
German Set-Up:
The dilemma of your second and third level positions has already been presented. Since the majority of your force is going to advance on the first turn, you must position them to do so behind blocking terrain features dominating the middle of Board 4, which also conveniently happen to be your territorial objectives. At the same time you must be in position to deny those objectives to a US Turn 1 assault and to attempt to keep the GIs out of their own front line objectives.

Take a look at the following entrenchment hexes: 2C1, 2E1, 2M5, 2Q1, 2Q2, 2W1 and 2DD1. The LMGs in 2C1 and 2E1 cover the line all the way to the crucial 4P2-R2 area as well as the northern board edge. The HMG in 2M5 enjoys an array of targets hampered only by the 2M4 woods, which graciously shields your force from 5A4. Hex 2I4 is another good spot for the AA gun offering many fire opportunities on the southern half of Board 4. Hexes 2Q1, 2Q2 and 2W1 do a reasonable job in the center of the mapboard, while 4DD1 is most certainly your only decent position in the south, presuming the US presence in 5A4 has convinced you not to scale the heights of Hill 538.

Except for 2E1, all the other entrenchments should be manned by LMG-wielding 4-6-7s, taking advantage of the 12-hex long-range fire of the latter. I'd use a 5-4-8 in 2M5 to man the HMG. The extra morale factor may come in handy, precluding the need for two squads with a morale of "7" here. Naturally, the 9-2 leader directs the HMG, while an 8-0 leader on each flank completes your firebase. This leaves a 9-1, two 8-1s, two halftracks, five 4-8s, eight 4-4-7s and two LMGs for your assault on the 415 woods, building 406 and the southern hedge line. Do not make the mistake of stacking your 5-4-8s together for the sake of mere uniformity. You need them spread throughout the advance to provide smoke, and you don't know where it may be desired until the critical moment of need. And, a 5-4-8 may pass a morale check where a whole stack of 4-4-7s may have failed, thereby averting a disaster. In short, spread them around.

The southern hedge line is easy to reach. Units beginning in 2E1 will not even be exposed to fire unless the GIs have successfully skipped through all your defensive fire and occupied the hedge themselves. This is unlikely. You will have to use the halftracks to transport units into the 415 woods mass. Drop off the infantry and move the AFVs to fire on enemy positions which are inadequately covered. Or, locate them to modify enemy fire at your units moving from 4K9 to 4I6, or from 4N9 to 407. Needless to say, avoid the bazookas like the plague.

It should take two turns for you to occupy 406. Units destined for this area should have begun in 2M1 and 2Q1. They may require help from the halftracks and will certainly bear the brunt of enemy fire.

Conclusion:
With all this in the way of preparation, there is little to say about the balance of the scenario. Once both forces manage to reach their front line positions in the middle of Board 4, possessing and destroying the gliders will consume the remainder of the game energies. Only if one of the combatants does not reach his initial objectives in force or part of his line countering the gliders land with unusual favor for one side or the other will the scenario end before the eighth turn.

Scenario 34 Climax at Nijmegen Bridge Rating: 40%-60% Pro-German

Attraction: Call this one a bloodbath in the true sense of the word. This will become most evident should the Allies begin to despair of meeting the criteria of Special Rule 34.5, and proceed as madmen in their attempts to bring on the Guards Armed.


The new HE rules make occupation of even a stone building a hazardous pastime. Your four heavy guns will scare away the bravest Allied squad leaders, even if the sky devil is using both the M35 and the M16 smoke. You may realize seven shots per player turn with this equipment speaks volumes about your potential to annihilate enemy units.

In contrast, the advantages you enjoy on defense in stone buildings against a foe with no large weapons need hardly be itemized here. However, even against stone buildings, the Allied Turn 1 fire can hit you with the following attacks: 24 (+1), 24 (+2), 24 (+2) again, 20 (+2), 12 (+3), nine mortar shots, three PIATs and three bazookas. The forces can be rearranged to produce a 36 (+2) shot or greater number of 12 (+3) and 16 (+2) attacks, but one thing should be obvious. You need those stone buildings.

In the north, your forces will be able to make things exceedingly hairy for the US reinforcements. After your first turn (Turn 2), you should have units at 4B3, 4B6 and 8F9P. Don't move into 4A4 and 4A7, for the reinforcements will plop right onto you from off-board in the Advance Phase (out of "Nowhere", so to speak). You will probably have a few turns to try out your shovels before picking up your weapons to fire at the intruders. The first opportunity will certainly be the German Prep Fire Phase, as the US will not enter until his own Advance Phase. If you simply can't send the 4-3-6s to 4B3, you might think about moving in.

German Disadvantages: Receive First Fire. Brittle­ness. Leaders.

Disadvantages? That's hard to believe! However, Turn 1 features an awesome Allied prep fire which more or less forces the SS to back off their front line positions, leaving them with little depth to contain the Allied assault on the bridge.

But the alternative of setting up in the front line as a target for the initial Allied potential knockout punch is even less appealing.

Ordinarily, three leaders would be adequate for the needs of ten squads. In the city, where movement from building to building is exceedingly hazardous, you may well find your leaders spread too thin. They cannot be everywhere at once along your lengthy perimeter and invariably will never be where you need them to rally broken units or, in the case of the 9-1s, to lead a crucial counterattack. Britteness and leadership are also twin problems in the north. You have not the resources to hold off a five to one frontal attack. By defending the west board edge as outlined above, you may deny the reinforcements at least one turn of movement—perhaps enough to keep them out of the fight for the bridge itself. If only three or four squads enter, your force may be able to blow them away immediately and, in any case, should be able to deal with whoever breaks through.

German Set-Up:
There is no good reason to avoid placing the HMG on Level 3 of the Valkhof. Remembering your initial shortage might make you think twice about committing a 9-1 leader with it. One leader on Level 3 leaves only two leaders to manage the bulk of your forces. You will have either one or two squads with the heavy, depending on your personal preference; thus, you must ask yourself whether an 8-0 and a 9-1 are adequate to handle the other eight or nine squads and roughly 90% of your line.

The answer is a definite "No"—but I'd put a 9-1 leader on the third level anyway. That -1 modifier simply demands to be coupled with the HMG. Granted, after the first turn or two you may well have to pull the leader out for service elsewhere; but you should at least have yourself the opportunity to try this combination.

In fact, the tremendous amount of Allied firepower the position attracts may justifiy this commitment by virtue of the quantity of enemy forces engaged. Obviously, this logic will wither in the face of US-made hot lead should the enemy roll an untimely KIA—but in this scenario you run that risk all over the board with the powerful stacks the Allies can muster.

Forget about manning the northeast corner of Board 1 and the east edge of Board 8. Forget about buildings I12, I74 and I84. Look at building I1W and the magnificent fire lanes down the roads hemming in building I3X, but forget it for purposes of your initial placement. Maybe later, when it is evident the Allies cannot hit I1W with a 24 (even) or a 36 (+1) attack, you might think about moving in. But if you set up there, I guarantee you'll get mauled.

Building I3X is the Allied jump-off point. Key or not, it cover the flanks as well—159 area and the road to I1G6. You should defend the buildings at I0Q, I3Q, I51, 8M2 and 8J2. If you begin with two squads in each of these buildings, you have a reasonable opening position. I like to place the 8-0 in 8K2, second level, out of harm's way but handy to rally broken squads manned the second levels of 8K2 and 8J2. Only LMGs and possibly one PSK go on Board 8.

This leaves you six squads, two 9-1s, the HMG, two MMGs, two LMGs and one PSK to defend the crescent from I1SI through I1Q4 to I1Q6. Hex I1SI is a crucial hex for the Germans because the Allies can't prepare a position out there, but you can be there anyway in ground hex from I1T1 to I122. Two squads with a MMG and a LMG will cast an ominous shadow on any premature northern thrust from building I1X. The balance should be in buildings I0Q and I1Q6 making certain to avoid stacking more than one squad in each. If you have the Allies initial fire at a MMG in I1P5 and the HMG should prevent the Allies from crossing the street to building I1P7.

The PzJag, StuG and AT gun have many options. Wherever you put them, just be sure they can hit the majority of the second level hexes of building I1X. Hex I1X itself is the only one you may not be able to strike, but your HMG draws a bead on it. Check out the PzJag in I1J9. It enjoys a +3 TEM to incoming fire, is beyond most inland Allied squad range (barring enemy units in the region of I159), and threatens the second level of hexes I1X2, I1W4, I1W5, I1X5, I1Y7 and I1Y8. The StuG in I1J3 zeroes in on the second level of I1W4, I1X2, I1X4, I1A4, I1A7,
10070.

Deduct the deal of trouble bringing it all into action in the form of firepower, you will experience a great amount of smoke and utilize assault movement. You have been avoiding his. The PzJag and StuG softening the SS where you want them. The smart herding the SS where you want them. The smart countermeasures are made effective. The tanks have not arrived. Therefore, you must begin by actually planning to eliminate enemy squads, and double-breaking them when you can't obtain an outright KIA. A half squad is as good as a dead squad. Although you can't do much about two half squads combining into a full squad, you will at least see one squad gone for your efforts. If you kill one enemy squad every turn for the first three game turns, you then have only three SS squads to kill, break or demote to half squads on either player turn of Turn 4 to keep on the Guards. A dead SS squad is money in the bank.

Obviously, the stacks you create to attain such killing attacks will themselves be targets of the best the German has to offer. Herein lies your disadvantage. You will be shooting at only one enemy squad per attack, while he returns fire at three of your squads per attack. His small arms fire will not be as great as yours since he is shooting with only one- or two-squad fire groups, but his ordnance fire can be deadly to you.

Allied Set-Up:

As stated, your initial objective is not necessarily to advance but to inflict casualties. Units in hexes 1X2 and 1Y3 may be able to blow away anyone in 8K2 or 8J2, while those in 8R7 and 8S7 and 8T6 can nail the Valkhof. If you are presented a target containing more than one squad, throw everything you have at it. Two dead SS on the first turn may be all you'll need to satisfy 34.5 by the third turn and be ahead of schedule.

Stay out of sight of the big guns as much as possible, especially that 88L. You should also try to avoid wooden buildings, but in the case of 1S7 and 1T6, I'm afraid it is unavoidable. When you return to the battlefield, this rule, that 75mm ATG may give you a nasty surprise; wooden buildings are the most susceptible to such. Your American 8-1 leader and his radio belong well in the rear, perhaps in 1Y8, second level. You may also debate leaving one squad with a bazooka on the turn before your 1T6. In this area to prevent the StuG from running in to block 1Y10 on the turn your tanks are due.

Conclusion:

The onus of attack rests heavily on the Allies. Whenever necessary the German can pull back during his own movement phase to avoid enemy fire, advance back into position and gain an extra Rally Phase to return a few squads to good order and perhaps delay the British tanks yet another turn. German preparations in the north do not allow the US reinforcements much long chance of success. The verdict in this scenario will be determined by how well the German guns deal with the enemy as few SS tanks attempt to manage their hard-pressed troops while the Allies tip toe through smoke and across enemy fire lanes to bring their unwieldy numerical superiority to bear. The sentence will be exactly by tanks of the 2nd Grenadier Guards, or refused by their late arrival.

French Disadvantages:

French morale becomes a problem when squad start breaking, which compounds the disadvantage of being outnumbered. Unless the unit in question is threatened by capture, a DM of "2" is not even worth the chance of rolling a casualty MC if you have good reason to suspect the unit will not be
DM'ed in the next Rally Phase. If it will be under DM again, go ahead and try for the "2".

There are not enough defenders to cover the three groups of advancing US troops as effectively as the French would like. After a few of the defenders have broken, at least one of the screening forces will dissolve, leaving the US a path onto Board 14, where he can bring the airstrip and surrounding areas under fire. If the US can hit 14L5 with normal range squad fire from both sides of the airfield on Turn 6, you are in serious trouble, all other things being equal.

French Set-Up:
The HMG, 9-1 leader and one squad go in that 3rd level. Put another squad in the 2nd level of the same building. Obviously, the second squad will man the HMG if the first one breaks. Place the ordnance on Board 14, where it can bring the airstrip and the northern end of Board 14 under the 14OS simply demands the 75mm in a trench. From here it can sight the airfield and fire at any spotting plane brave enough to zero in on the airfield defenders, and can also bring fire on a very large percentage of the playing area. Your squad are too few to cover everything, and it would take pages to enter into even a cursory analysis of each worthwhile position. Sufficient to say that hexes worth special attention are: 415, 4NS, 406 (1st level), 4P6 (1st level), 4R5, 4MS, 4TG, 4Y8 and 4BB; 14Y3, 14T3 (crest), 14R1, 14Q4U through the woods in 14H0, 14I10, 14H10, all the airfield buildings and 14F1; 631, 65X, 63X3 to 6TO, 6Z6 and 6Z7. Certainly other locations are equal to some of these and deserve study. You do not have the option of setting up strong forces on one side of the airfield and a screen on the other with the intention of a quick elimination of the foe on one flank followed by reinforcement of the other to bolster its defense. Even the relatively weaker US force #3 cannot be ignored, as it has ample firepower to force you out of 14L5, especially if within a six-hex range. In this respect, the time constraint limits your options, because by the time your hypothetical strong side force had eliminated any threat from the US group in question, it would be too late to get the troops back for a last ditch stand at the airfield.

American Advantages: Firepower, Rally Ability, Mobility.

The firepower of 22 American squads is awesome. In fact, it is twice the inherent firepower of the 16 French squads in that it is an overwhelming advantage at a six-hex range! Admittedly, it is unrealistic to consider the quadrupled firepower advantage other than for illustrative purposes, but the doubled advantage is very real. The defensive strength of well-placed French MGs, ordnance and artillery, as well as the fact that all of the US squads will not be on-board until Turn 3 at the earliest—and even then will be moving almost as often as they stand and fire—are some of the reasons why the US player doesn't simply crush the French with firepower.

As always, the lack of Desperation Morale for non-green squads gives them an overwhelming advantage over their opponent in first-chance rally. This was true to some degree against the SS in Scenario 34, and against the French broken morale of "6" ("2" with DM), it is the single greatest advantage possessed by either side. The American units usually have no reason to rout from their front lines to rally if already stacked with a good order leader. The AFVs are reasonably free to move as they please, provided they avoid the French ordnance. It's also a good idea to keep the halftrack 17 hexes away from the HMG and 9-1 leader in the 3rd level building. The French will respect the vehicle MGs more than the main armament, as MG fire limits his movement. Look for fire lanes to hem his troops in. Remember that your mobility advantage is offset by his interior line mobility, so whatever you can do to curtail his freedom of movement in the center—which will involve using your AFVs in the early going—will be well worth the effort and will reward you with a "gaggle" of prisoners, broken units unable to rally because they can't rout to a leader, and KIAed enemy squads.

American Disadvantages: Time.

What can I say? Is time the US player's disadvantage; is it the tough Victory Conditions; should we suggest that he may require additional AFVs, squads, leaders and/or MGs to fulfill the conditions in the allotted time? The US force itself suffers no disadvantages; it is well equipped to meet the Victory Conditions which, in themselves, are a realistic concept. The problem is to meet these in eight game turns. So my preference is to suggest that the time constraint places the greatest and only penalty on reducing the outer defenses (Board 6 and the 406-4210 region), because they will not have enough time left to actually meet the Victory Conditions if they do. After all, these preliminary opera-

Scenario 36
Weissenhof Crossroads
Rating: 45%-55% Pro-German
Attraction: Two SIG 38Hs provide a real fireworks display while a winterized American "Rat Patrol" covets through the mayhem of the opening stages of Hitler's last western offensive.

American Advantages: 60mm Mortar, HMGs.

The mortar is your single greatest advantage. If the SIGs are in LOS, you have a fair chance for a stun, or at least of forcing them to move away. Due to the artillery barrage versus open-top AFV modifier, the German will probably not leave his vehicle in LOS for long. But, more importantly, this weapon rates first class when engaging infantry in the woods.

As always, the US rally capability must be balanced against their normal morale. The ERL of "3" means you will quickly inherit some of those blasted green squads. Compared to the German morale combination, it might be argued that the American comes out ahead, but certainly not with anything approaching what I'd term a real advantage. The defense of hex 13I8 may hinge on the interaction of your squads breaking/turning green and their percentage of first-chance rally. That is, it will hinge on these factors if a SIG doesn't demolish the hex first.

American Disadvantages: Dispersal, Time.

Your defense is sufficient to prevent the enemy from blitzing across the board in one fell swoop, but can fall considerably short of stopping a nine-turn assault. Although you will enjoy some fire at the SIGs, you should not count on any effects, so you'll probably have to put up with them. But if you get within bazooka range, thank your lucky stars and blow the thing apart.

Your best chance is to conduct a fighting withdrawal, buying time for your free units to fabricate a defense in your rear. Starting units in the west of Board 5 is no solution, as your forward areas would then be too weak. Be sure to time your retreats well, such that some units fire while others move back under their cover. If you simply move them all on the same turn, you may end up leaving a string of broken units behind with none left to provide fire support while the leaders desperately strive to rally them.

American Set-Up:
Your first concern is to locate the jeeps somewhere they cannot readily be destroyed, while your T-4 and a squad create HSs to man them. The middle of the forest road is the best spot, since the jeeps will easily be able to move either north or south of your main line of defense.

Because the German player can win on either the north or the south section of the playing area, you must spread your force much too thin for an adequate defense of both areas; anticipate that on Turn
2 or Turn 3 your troops covering the area not attacked by the Germans will be moving to protect the rear of the area he does choose to attack. You can not risk waiting too long making this move, but to be premature is to invite disaster, as your foe can switch objectives and outmaneuver you. The danger of this is very high if he is attacking in the north and you haven’t defended the forest road. In essence, you must keep your eyes on his forces and not allow them to set up one exit defense until you can actually count that the hexes his units would have to traverse to move off the other exit are greater than the time limit allows.

Should the German attack both north and south, you will be hard pressed on both ends of the board but you should be able to counter to one exit defense until you can actually count that the hexes his units would have to traverse to move off the other exit are greater than the time limit allows.

Due to the importance of the 5Y10 to 1319 road, it is best to defend the north flank strongly. Hex 1316 is the best forward position, but regrettably it is difficult to rout or move out once the pressure is on. At least two squads, a MMG, a 9-1 leader, and a bazooka go here—and will probably die here, but should slow the assault considerably. A squad with M MG and a bazooka has a great fire lane all the way to 13R1, which will make any German rush to the elevated road a chancy affair. You also need to put a few units in the 5X9-5Z10-5X10 area to cover the Victory Condition.

The south is not as hard to defend as the north; hexes 13E8, 13E9, 13F1, 13F2, 13F3, 13F4, 13F5, 13F6, 13G1, and 13G2 are good locations. I prefer to stay out of 1377 due to the difficulty of retreat/rout. The center might hold units at 1308 or 588, this latter ready to move either way as the developing situation demands.

German Advantages: HE. Concentration of Forces. Leadership.

The SiGs are what make your offensive feasible. Without them, you would certainly be at a disadvantage. It may therefore seem prudent to commit them with the assault force. However, if you leave them on Board 2, they will have a hard time hitting anything and you will be denying yourself the greatest advantage in the game. Be brave, be bold, be sure to avoid bazookas.

Hit the GIs hard and fast on one flank, preferably in the north unless it is loaded with enemy forces. Send a few squads around the other way, which you may consider a nuisance force. I prefer to use 4-6-7s for this since the 4-4-7s are less effective on their own, but make good cannon fodder for the assault on 1318. Your quantity of leaders permits a two-pronged attack, but this generally carries less chance for victory than one large effort. If you can get it close enough, the FT carries its standard benefits and headaches (has anyone ever managed to use one twice without rolling a nine or greater)? Send this little jewel toward building 1318.

German Disadvantages: None.

The terrain is adequate for your advance (indeed, the new terrain on Board 13 is a major attraction of this scenario). You will have some trouble breaking through the first line of defenders: the line based on 1318, 5H10 to 13EB9 or 13U9 to 13TT areas; but with the aid of the SiGs these will fall and, unless your opponent is very skillful or very lucky, most of his strength will be exhausted from defending these positions. If he is successfully fighting a coordinated retreat, turn on the pressure and overwhelm him with your superior numbers. Don’t let him stall your attack. Time is on your side, for you can wear him down and still have plenty of it left to get off the board. But if you are overly cautious, if you don’t press the GIs at every opportunity, you are wasting your time and handing him an undeserved victory. If you lose, it should be due to losses sustained, not because the time ran out.

German Advance:

Basically, you should examine the US fire lanes and rush across whichever end of the mapboard is least covered. Take the M MGs with you, for there are no Americans within your twelve hex range and you’ll need the firepower when you close. Don’t put the SiGs on Board 2 hills; move them forward! Don’t move them within four hexes of a bazooka nor within six hexes of an enemy squad; and don’t go CE until your Advance Phase. The elevated road is a great spot for these beasts. When they’re located such that the GIs can fire at them, get your infantry in position to fire at these same US troops.

You should present him with so many targets he will not be able to shoot at half of them. I’m talking about targets in woods or buildings or on the elevated road, of course—not moving across open terrain. Your forces should either scare him away (unlikely), or blow him away (likely). The north approach is your best bet, you can lessen the victory condition by occupying the 5Y10-1319 area. Assault 1318 from the elevated road, 13F5 and 13F6, and through the 13H1 ford. These may not be able to break the enemy in 1318, but will draw fire away from your SiGs which are zeroing for the kill.

Conclusion:

So much depends on the SiGs, it is difficult to imagine a German victory without them. Certainly, should both of them fall early, the prospect of German victory changes from favorable to abysmal. Yet the American player cannot allow himself to fall into the trap of concentrating solely on the SiGs, for enemy infantry is present in sufficient numbers to walk all over him if unopposed for a turn or two.

Scenario 37

Medal of Honor

Rating: 40%-60% Pro-Alled.

Attraction: Replacing Board 4 with Board 6 in the Second Edition has turned a guaranteed American victory into a dynamite confrontation between a large and powerful but poorly-led American defender and a desperate but well-led SS attacker forced to play his role of aggressor to the hilt in order to have any chance of blowing the bridge.

American Advantages: Firepower.

It is rare that a defender enjoys such a firepower advantage. Adding up the squads and machineguns proves that you field 133 factors versus your opponent’s 92 factors, calculated at normal range. Naturally enough, these raw facts indicate that something else must give the Germans a chance in this scenario. That something else is the Panthers. But what you want to remember is that wherever you can avoid the Panthers and bring your firepower to bear on the enemy squads, you ought to realize a tremendous advantage. They do not share with you the luxury of defense, but must constantly forfeit fire opportunities in order to advance on your positions. They have a guillotine timetable to follow, meaning a fair number of your attacks will be answered with movement—not return fire.

American Disadvantages: Leaders.

Three leaders simply cannot keep fifteen squads in good order during a normal firefight! Fortunately, however, your first and second leaders can direct and S-1 in directing the fire of the five MGs. His importance will become even more pronounced should the leaders be called out of the lines to assist the 8-0 with rally duties. You cannot afford to lose any of your leaders, which may force you to abandon a squad here and there and depend on a leader to rally troops. With fifteen squads, you have this kind of breathing room, especially since you will probably nail as few enemy squads during their initial advance.

American Set-up:

Your choice of excellent defensive positions is something a mixer would envy. Your number one outpost is 8FF9 with entrenchment, squad, HMG and Pvt. Towlie. Start the 9-1 in 8BD9, 1st level of the building, with a squad and two M MGs. The 8-1, a squad and HMG go in the second level of 8BE8, while M MG and entrenchment go in 3D3. These four positions should keep the SS off your back long enough for the bulk of your force, strung out every other hexrow, to move forward and occupy the gaps.

Since the Panthers are capable of a first turn romp (3D3 is particularly vulnerable), you must cover the open areas with squads and bazookas. Hexes 3B3, 3F7, 3H2 and 3J4 protect the road and Hill 547 about as well as possible. Hex 3C9 is such a powerful position that I often start with an entrenchment there with hopes of occupying it on Turn 1 with the squad in 3F7. Units on Board 8 will spend the first turn moving for both 8BD9 and the Board 3 central woods mass. The 33J road pass is very important. Units beginning in Q3 and O4 can move to J2 and J4 to assist the unit already there with entrenchment attempts, although you may already have placed an entrenchment there at the start. Once entrenched, a unit on each side of 313 and the HMG in 3M2 should ensure that no enemy infantry will ride through the pass to carry their demolition charge to the bridge.

The 8-0 leader goes in the Board 3 central woods mass so that he may move wherever needed for rally purposes. Obviously, you must avoid exposing him to enemy fire. If he is lost, one of your –I leaders will have to fill the gap.

German Advantages: Panthers.

If anything is going to happen, you will have to force it with your tanks. Overrunning a position such as 3D3 if inadequately defended would be ideal, but not an opportunity you expect you might pull up to 6DDB and 6E8 to blast away at 8FF9 and 8BD9. Even laying smoke into these positions will greatly aid your infantry advance. Just don’t allow any side or rear bazooka shots, and be leery of frontal ones as well.


There are three avenues of approach to the American lines. The north and south approaches require you to move through open ground. The central wheatfield eliminates the open ground problem, but if you can get it close enough you can expect you might pull up to 6DDB and 6E8 to blast away at 8FF9 and 8BD9. Even laying smoke into these positions will greatly aid your infantry advance. Just don’t allow any side or rear bazooka shots, and be leery of frontal ones as well.


There are three avenues of approach to the American lines. The north and south approaches require you to move through open ground. The central wheatfield eliminates the open ground problem, but if you can get it close enough you can expect you might pull up to 6DDB and 6E8 to blast away at 8FF9 and 8BD9. Even laying smoke into these positions will greatly aid your infantry advance. Just don’t allow any side or rear bazooka shots, and be leery of frontal ones as well.
bridge. Equally difficult will be eliminating twice as many GI squads. Should you actually manage to demolish a span of the bridge, there should be no doubt in anyone’s mind that you have just won a big victory.

**German Advance:**
You cannot simply run your squads up to the American MGs; but you can’t afford to give all fifteen enemy squads time to occupy the front lines either. You must do something to advance quickly without taking all that enemy fire. As will so often be the case in this scenario, your Panthers provide the solution to this dilemma.

The first act should be to run the tanks loaded with infantry as far forward as possible without exposing the vehicles themselves to danger. This will probably get you to either 3B7 or 3B4, whichever is least defended. If you don’t draw sufficient fire to break the infantry, unload into the woods and move your armor to fire positions such as 6D26 and 6E28. The remainder of the infantry will have to assault move or choose their movement paths very carefully around fire lanes of those enemy units which have not yet fired.

On the other hand, if the mounted troops took heavy fire and maybe were even eliminated, do not allot their demise to have been in vain. There should not be a very substantial amount of defensive fire remaining, so you can move forward with all speed. You don’t have the strength to draw fire in this manner again, so you must take full advantage of this one-shot affair. By your next movement phase, there will be twice as many enemy squads in the front line to oppose your assault.

**Conclusion:**
The GIs have good reason to feel even a bit cocky about their chances in this scenario. The German is going to have to work hard to breakthrough the American lines. The procedure for blowing the bridge is so encumbered, he should set his sights on eliminating enemy squads and preserving his own with the alternate end of the Victory Condition in mind. The fact that he can expect his own losses to be high is testimony to the difficulty of that mission.

**German Advantages:**

- **Rain:** Mostly covered above, the rain curtails your range as you attempt to cut down US squads moving in the open. Reasons have also been covered which explain aspects of the rain which aid the German player. The ultimate verdict is that, without the rain, the GIs would never be able to advance on the village in force within the allotted time.

- **American Disadvantages:** Rain.

- **German Set-Up:** Can you resist fortifying hex 1207 and placing the 81mm Infantry Gun there? With the hedge, this gives a +7 DRM to infantry fire coming from buildings 1209 and 1219; boresight one of these with that 75mm. Consequently, the 76L AT gun ought to be covering approaches not in the LOS of the 75mm. Hex 12Q4 is probably the best central location, but I’d rather try to stop the Americans before they get that close. Hex 12S5 also offers a central location and provides a better LOS array to the outlying areas, at least to the southwest of the village. But 12U6 rates as my favorite spot for this weapon. Although it lacks the central location advantage of Q4 and S5, it does a great job covering the southwest flank, while at the same time allowing a rout path for the crew and a chance to reoccupy the gun, which other locations lack. Rally with a leader when possible is still more certain than self-rally. Take a look at 12V5 and boresight with CC7 also. If no one enters the south edge, you can always move the gun.

- **Put your machineguns, squads and -1 leaders in second and third levels. I don’t favor getting fancy with a 9-1 and 8-0 in the third level of 12U5, simply because you’re going to need the leaders spread out for rally purposes. Hexes 1204, 1207, 1277 and 12V5 are your best locations for a second level force. Hex 12Q8 (ground level) is ideal; and consider placing the sniper in 12S9 on the second level. At least from here he should have plenty of fire opportunities and is a modest deterrent to any American rush on that building. The panzer might shoot in 12Y3 with VCA facing X2-Y4, and TCA covering Z2-Z3 or Z3-Y4 with hex 12CC7 boresighted. This will give you the required antitank weapon on the south side of the village to make the US player think twice before entering forces there, with the added advantage of being able to move in the likely event that they don’t.”

- **Build buildings:** You anticipate will be the American jump-off points for the final assault into the village. Sightings on 12N8, 12O9, 12P9, 12S9 and 12T10 are ideal. Remember that your medium machineguns can only bore sight six hexes away due to the rain. If you can nail him in this sector, he probably won’t be able to’, or have enough GIs at all. I prefer boresighting the two guns for infantry targets, since it is unlikely they will be offered the pleasure of vehicular targets. The panzer would do likewise, were it not for the superiority of the 12Y3 location, which casts an ominous shadow on American thoughts of a southern entrance.

- **Victory conditions:** Think of the victory conditions in terms of precisely which five buildings you intend to hold for the win. This may not be even vaguely evident until the GIs are attempting to enter the village proper—maybe Turn 4 or Turn 5. His best approach is across Board 14. And, with a standard assault from 12X7 to the 12S7, you be trying to hold onto 12U5, 12R2 and three of the following: 12M3, 12O4, 12P3, 12Q4 and 12S5. A great deal will depend on how he uses his tanks. If they manage to transport infantry into town, highly unlikely to be sure, you may find your troops scrambling for five buildings anywhere, wherever they may be free. On the other hand, he tries the southern approach, you will have a much easier time since you need merely hold five of the northern victory buildings. His only avenue of approach is through the graveyard, where many of his troops will take up permanent residence as you easily stall him there.

- **American Advantages:** Armor. Quantity. Lack of DM and Possible Smoke (as always)

- **American Disadvantages:** Smoke.

- **Hand-in-hand with armor goes the advantage of mobility. However, the rain curtails this to the point of making tanks a liability for your vehicles, one which does not disappear even should the skies clear. Use your tanks to transport infantry and equipment. Keep away from the 75mm guns. Don’t move too close to enemy infantry until your own infantry support arrives. But bear in mind that once you have used these vehicles, they cannot readily be shifted to a different sector of the playing area. A hex such as 12S17 gives wonderful fire opportunities at a six-hex range to the second levels of 1204, 1206 and 1207 without exposing yourself to return fire from any 75mm on the ground level of the buildings. Regrettably, it takes three turns to get there using movement and CE.

- **With 20 squads and the leaders too, you have a chance to win despite the expected heavy losses. It is this depth which allows you to be a bit reckless and run two squads and a 9-1 leader, the HMG and a MMG forward on the tanks. After all, you are going to be even more reckless with the GIs who have to advance on foot. If you plan to move through 12110 with these vehicles and there is a 75mm gun which might possibly have the hex boresighted, either change your mind or at least send the halftrack through first and the tank with the leader last. Likewise, be suspicious of both bridges. I don’t advise going up the center either. You’re taking chances on that road. Try bypassing through, even though it is dreadfully slow. Another option is to bring the M10/HMC and 7-0 leader on 4C10, advance the 7-0 and 4C10 which will be concealed at the end of Turn 2, and begin indirect firing. When the rain stops you can shoot WP.

- **Your infantry will be running across the open as outlined above. Bring up the rear with the 8-l leaders to rally your broken units. The remaining two 9-1-s and the 8-1 will have to get to the edge of Board 12 to lead the infantry assault. This certainly won’t be easy as they will be prime targets. Therefore, it is imperative that you get the squads forward as quickly as possible so that they can draw and return fire, allowing the leaders to advance more safely. You must get as many people to cover as possible before the rain stops; then use the smoke option and pay that toll accordingly.

- **American Disadvantages:** Must Cross Open Terrain. Defenders Tough to Subdue.

The cardinal sin of moving in the open is here.
permitted due to the rain; and you won't win this one unless you do. The German has so few weapons with sufficient range to hit your troops that sheer numbers dictate many of your squalls will get onto Board 12. You must avoid leaving large clusters of units for off board artillery to target however. Be thankful the dead are only cardboard pieces as your losses may be high.

It's difficult to put numbers on things, but if your AFVs are zeroing in on the strongpoints and you've reached Board 12 by Turn 4 or 5 with ten or twelve full squads, your assault of the village should pay off through fire alone. You need to cross the street and into the buildings. Additional squads should be trickling forward as the rear leaders rally them. Once you have even a modest force inside the village, you must position the troops for the endgame, which involves crossing more streets and entering more stone buildings and fortifications as you try for the last few buildings needed for victory. Here is where it might pay to drive the AFVs into the streets between your squad and the enemy, especially if your smoke capacity is depleted or the rain continues.

You could not have gotten so far without the rain, but once on the edge of the village in force, you desperately need it to stop so that you can bring your superior fire to bear and lay smoke. Also, this would allow units in the middle of Board 4 who have railed and are headed for the village to bring additional fire into play. If the German fires at these particular units, so much the better for your people already at the village outskirts.

Scenario 39
Sweep for the Bordj Toum Bridge
Rating: 35%-65% Pro-Allied
Attraction: A 1942-style chase between a mobile assault force and prepared defense complete with armor reserve.

The 37LLs on fourth level hexes 15N4 and 15Y6 command a great deal of respect. It is unreasonable to calculate that American success will largely be determined by these guns. Should the Germans manage to knock them out before suffering any substantial armor losses, their resultant freedom of AFV movement and ability to then concentrate on the American tanks and halftracks should swing the balance in their favor. All this despite the apparent ineffectiveness of a 37LL, especially with the obsolete ammo, versus the Pzkw IIIs and IVs. But when the height advantage, number of shots, multiple hits, boresighting, acquisition, and possible shock are all considered, these 37LL ATs aren't all that bad.

In fact, the strength of these positions is so pronounced that I would not move the guns even when returning to this scenario and utilizing the Hidden Gun rule. This is because the full strength of the guns is demonstrated only when their imposing presence is employed as a deterrent force against enemy armor. Your knowledgeable opponent is aware of the abilities of the 37LLs, which will slow his assault considerably. An unknowing opponent is likely to suffer an unacceptable loss of armor in a very short time.

So long as the enemy AFVs are held at bay, your height advantage enables the GIs to likewise hold off the enemy infantry. Should one of the 37LLs be knocked out early, you must then rely on the Lees to fill the gaps. Certainly, two of these should head for Board 15 on Turn 1. You should feel confident enough on Board 6 moving only one Lee to the chateau, leaving the fourth tank at the bridge to bide his time and see which side of the river may require his services.

Although not an advantage in and of itself, your Board 6 contingent should have no trouble containing enemy forces north of the chateau. This should allow your fourth Lee to eventually move onto Board 15; although to do so before at least one of the enemy tanks on Board 6 is knocked out may be asking for trouble.

American Disadvantages: Brittle ness.

In view of your armor reserve, this is not much of a disadvantage. However, should one or both of the 37LL guns on Board 15 malfunction or succumb to fire in the first turn, the Lees may not arrive in time to prevent an enemy armored blitz to the heights of Board 15. Even a second or third turn loss of one of the ATGs may allow the German to effect an advantage at one point of your line and subsequently exploit into your rear areas.

American Set-Up:
As already emphasized, the 37LLs go on 15N4 and 15Y6. The HMC goes in 15F2 because it can retreat from there easier than from F3. The unmanned M2 goes most anywhere you like. MMGs go into 15W6, 15L3, and 15Q4 or E3, with entrenchments in 15L3 and 15W6. The mortar is in 15Z4. There are plenty of other worthwhile positions.

With each play of this scenario, you should vary your boresighted hexes between the vast array of choices. You must anticipate enemy armor on Level 3 of Board 2 as well as around the north and south board edges, and even through the road pass. The offboard artillery is great for hitting the third level if you should the enemy armor appear there. This will not only keep them buttoned up, but has a chance to actually knock them out. Laying smoke is not a bad option if you can obscure a tank or two.

The Lees can either move to plug the central pass, and then on to Board 2 if enemy deployment permits, or gain height on the western slopes of Hill 783. Hexes 15E5 and 15N7 are usually good spots depending on the specific situation. The tanks are best used as a "back-up" for the ATGs. Gaining the crest of Hill 783 will usually not be advisable, as they then present too easy a target for German armor. Naturally, this depends on the situation at hand as determined by the success of your 37LLs and the resultant reluctance or daring of the enemy armor commander.

The struggle for Board 6 revolves around the chateau. The 37LL gun goes in 6N3 or 6M6. Use of the tanks to transport your heavy equipment should be considered of im-

Conclusion:
Rain is such a fickle thing, both helping and hindering friend and foe alike. In the end, it may be the ultimate undoing of the GIs if it prevents their use of smoke in the village. They may still force a win due to sheer numbers alone, but the price may total something resembling a disaster in human terms—for those gamers who notice such things.
German Disadvantages: Time. Firepower.

Ideally, you should pull all six tanks onto the third height of Hill 621 and not expose your infantry to enemy fire until the tanks have knocked out the 37LLs and maneuvered to chase the GIs from the eastern slopes of Hill 783. Unfortunately, you simply don't have the time for this and will have to move the infantry forward from the outset. Furthermore, you may require some MMG fire to help nail the ATG crews.

Thus, you may find your infantry on the receiving end of a murderous exchange of infantry fire if you are not careful in some areas the GIs have scoped out. This imbalance is even more pronounced than a mere comparison of forces might indicate, because you have wisely positioned a small force in trucks and halftracks just behind Hill 621, ready to hurl themselves at the enemy lines when your tanks gain the upper hand.

German Advance:

Little hope can be placed in your chance of a breakthrough on Board 6. The most you should attempt is to position the MMG, radio and Pzkw IIJ in the northeastern corner of Board 7 and harass the GIs on the crest and western slopes of Hill 783. The rest of this force should fight a holding action against the engineers. If you achieve this deployment, the Americans will most assuredly come after you, probably committing two Lees with the assault. Attracting the extra tank and any inconvenience you cause the armored infantry are about the most this force can expect to accomplish. Nevertheless, once the enemy leaves the chateau to come after you, be alert for any opening which may allow you to burst through to the bridge.

The main thrust from the east will take on one of the first two points. You will either go for the throne in a full-blown blitz against one part of the enemy defenses; or you will play a more cautious (and smarter) game, taking the time to maneuver onto Hill 621 or around the north or south edge of Board 15, sliding infantry into forward positions yet not exposing them to the full brunt of enemy fire and establishing a mobile assault force, ready to lash out at the enemy and capitalize on any advantage the armor can manage.

The scope of your offensive provides an excellent opportunity to exercise tactical muscles grown lethargic in the course of preceding scenarios which featured more limited engagements. For, at one time, you must duel enemy guns to achieve a locked down bridge which advanced infantry can secure, while freezing the balance of the enemy line in place with the threat of a motorized infantry assault.

Conclusion:

Due to the size of the opposing forces, the 65% pre-Allied rating is not as devastating as it would be in a smaller scenario. Each side can afford sizeable losses and still possess the instruments of victory. The tanks and 37LLs are the most important pieces on the board, followed by the other AFVs and finally the infantry. However, in the end, the game is won and lost by the sixty infantrymen. Everything else is merely hardware employed to attain some brief advantage over opposing infantry.

Given an even distribution of AFV and ATG losses, neither side successfully gaining an armor advantage, whatever remains of these will either continue to engage one another or each will concentrate on their own infantry. Everything else is merely小学 employed to attain some brief advantage over opposing infantry.

Given an even distribution of AFV and ATG losses, neither side successfully gaining an armor advantage, whatever remains of these will either continue to engage one another or each will concentrate on their own infantry. Everything else is merely school employed to attain some brief advantage over opposing infantry.

American Advance:

Little hope can be placed in your chance of a breakthrough on Board 6. The most you should attempt is to position the MMG, radio and Pzkw IIJ in the northeastern corner of Board 7 and harass the GIs on the crest and western slopes of Hill 783. The rest of this force should fight a holding action against the engineers. If you achieve this deployment, the Americans will most assuredly come after you, probably committing two Lees with the assault. Attracting the extra tank and any inconvenience you cause the armored infantry are about the most this force can expect to accomplish. Nevertheless, once the enemy leaves the chateau to come after you, be alert for any opening which may allow you to burst through to the bridge.

The main thrust from the east will take on one of the first two points. You will either go for the throne in a full-blown blitz against one part of the enemy defenses; or you will play a more cautious (and smarter) game, taking the time to maneuver onto Hill 621 or around the north or south edge of Board 15, sliding infantry into forward positions yet not exposing them to the full brunt of enemy fire and establishing a mobile assault force, ready to lash out at the enemy and capitalize on any advantage the armor can manage.

The scope of your offensive provides an excellent opportunity to exercise tactical muscles grown lethargic in the course of preceding scenarios which featured more limited engagements. For, at one time, you must duel enemy guns to achieve a locked down bridge which advanced infantry can secure, while freezing the balance of the enemy line in place with the threat of a motorized infantry assault.

Conclusion:

Due to the size of the opposing forces, the 65% pre-Allied rating is not as devastating as it would be in a smaller scenario. Each side can afford sizeable losses and still possess the instruments of victory. The tanks and 37LLs are the most important pieces on the board, followed by the other AFVs and finally the infantry. However, in the end, the game is won and lost by the sixty infantrymen. Everything else is merely school employed to attain some brief advantage over opposing infantry.

Given an even distribution of AFV and ATG losses, neither side successfully gaining an armor advantage, whatever remains of these will either continue to engage one another or each will concentrate on their own infantry. Everything else is merely school employed to attain some brief advantage over opposing infantry.

American Disadvantages: Time. Firepower.

Ideally, you should pull all six tanks onto the third height of Hill 621 and not expose your infantry to enemy fire until the tanks have knocked out the 37LLs and maneuvered to chase the GIs from the eastern slopes of Hill 783. Unfortunately, you simply don't have the time for this and will have to move the infantry forward from the outset. Furthermore, you may require some MMG fire to help nail the ATG crews.

Thus, you may find your infantry on the receiving end of a murderous exchange of infantry fire if you are not careful in some areas the GIs have scoped out. This imbalance is even more pronounced than a mere comparison of forces might indicate, because you have wisely positioned a small force in trucks and halftracks just behind Hill 621, ready to hurl themselves at the enemy lines when your tanks gain the upper hand.

German Advance:

Little hope can be placed in your chance of a breakthrough on Board 6. The most you should attempt is to position the MMG, radio and Pzkw IIJ in the northeastern corner of Board 7 and harass the GIs on the crest and western slopes of Hill 783. The rest of this force should fight a holding action against the engineers. If you achieve this deployment, the Americans will most assuredly come after you, probably committing two Lees with the assault. Attracting the extra tank and any inconvenience you cause the armored infantry are about the most this force can expect to accomplish. Nevertheless, once the enemy leaves the chateau to come after you, be alert for any opening which may allow you to burst through to the bridge.

The main thrust from the east will take on one of the first two points. You will either go for the throne in a full-blown blitz against one part of the enemy defenses; or you will play a more cautious (and smarter) game, taking the time to maneuver onto Hill 621 or around the north or south edge of Board 15, sliding infantry into forward positions yet not exposing them to the full brunt of enemy fire and establishing a mobile assault force, ready to lash out at the enemy and capitalize on any advantage the armor can manage.

The scope of your offensive provides an excellent opportunity to exercise tactical muscles grown lethargic in the course of preceding scenarios which featured more limited engagements. For, at one time, you must duel enemy guns to achieve a locked down bridge which advanced infantry can secure, while freezing the balance of the enemy line in place with the threat of a motorized infantry assault.

Conclusion:

Due to the size of the opposing forces, the 65% pre-Allied rating is not as devastating as it would be in a smaller scenario. Each side can afford sizeable losses and still possess the instruments of victory. The tanks and 37LLs are the most important pieces on the board, followed by the other AFVs and finally the infantry. However, in the end, the game is won and lost by the sixty infantrymen. Everything else is merely school employed to attain some brief advantage over opposing infantry.

Given an even distribution of AFV and ATG losses, neither side successfully gaining an armor advantage, whatever remains of these will either continue to engage one another or each will concentrate on their own infantry. Everything else is merely school employed to attain some brief advantage over opposing infantry.
Pre-registered fire is your ultimate delaying weapon. Unfortunately, you cannot simply steer the Germans into it as they will be wary of any easy route you do not defend. You may not even get to choose the turn it begins to land, so don't pre-register any hexes into them unless you feel like challenging German chances of rolling a "12" after placing a starshell. Instead, you should endeavour to hold off the enemy at your rear while plastering the flank with HE. This illustrates another advantage of a north or south retreat—you have only one flank to protect.

German Advantages: Morale. Starshells. LMGs. I will choose a force with morale "8" over one with morale "6" and no DM status 99% of the time. With a broken morale of "9", the SS give away practically nothing to US initial rally attempts, and are far superior when it comes to non-DM rallies. But the main point to be made is that with a normal morale of "8", you will not suffer a great deal of broken units in the first place and will be able to pursue more aggressively than would units with a morale of "6".

Quite naturally, you want to reter the Night rules before playing this scenario. Pay strict attention to the mechanics of placing starshells. This will often determine where you want your leaders positioned. When you reach the river bank, you should be able to illuminate the entire river—and everything in it. Enjoy the starshells; they are one of the very few things in life you get automatically (not even a die roll for malfunction!) Finally, we have a situation in which the limitations of the American proclivity for heavier machineguns are fully demonstrated. They cannot haul the mediums westward at full speed, nor can they fire the turn they move. They almost certainly will be left behind. Once you have bypassed or broken their gunners, your own LMGs become the most valuable counters on the mapboard, due primarily to their long-range fire. They enable you to hit anything you can see with at least some firepower. Even a "1" attack carries a substantial threat against a moving target, especially when coupled with a -1 leader DR.

German Disadvantages: Entrance. If the GIs haven't covered the east board edge, you still have to keep pace with their retreat and should have no trouble extending the game unless you feel like challenging German chances of rolling a "12" after placing a starshell. Instead, you should endeavour to hold off the enemy at your rear while plastering the flank with HE. This illustrates another advantage of a north or south retreat—you have only one flank to protect.

German Advantage: You cannot allow the GIs to gain a complete movement phase on you. There are two ways to prevent that—either move as far and fast as they move or slow them with firepower. Most likely, circumstances will dictate you avail yourself of a combination of these since enemy delaying tactics will be able to pursue more aggressively than would units with a morale of "6".

Surprisingly, in our sophisticated age, the hardware of a game—the components—often form, and dominate, the first impressions of a title among buyers. The attention to detail and graphic talents of Avalon Hill's fine cadre of artists and craftsmen is not surprising. Few elements of new techniques and new policies are always greeted with acclaim. But in a value conscious time, Avalon Hill's logo still means quality for the price. The average, given the range of ratings for Components, is 3.23, indicative of this perception among the survey respondents. The following, the ten titles with the best ratings, are therefore truly remarkable in their eye-pleasing detail and utility:

Components

1. CROSS OF IRON
2. THE LONGEST DAY
3. CRESCENDO OF DOOM
4. G.I.: ANVIL OF VICTORY
5. MIDWAY
6. BATTLE OF THE BULGE '44
7. THE RUSSIAN CAMPAIGN
8. SUBMARINE
9. THIRD REICH
10. ANZIO

To my mind, the software—rules and systems—of any game are vastly more important than the hardware. The physical components of a game can be upgraded with relative ease (an Avalon Hill specialty with previously released titles acquired from other publishers); not so the intangibles. Often no amount of developmental skill can save a game with unplacable rules, vague and contradictory rules, or that is neither competitive nor exciting in play.

Nothing is more exasperating for the novice (and the veteran too, for that matter) than rules which raise more problems than are resolved, or that have flaws and failings obvious even to the player. The best rules can be better than utilizing the rules above as an introduction to our hobby. A bonus lies in the appreciation that these ten titles span the gamut of level of simulation (from tactical to strategic) and complexity (from 1.19 to 8.52). Taken together, these games provide an intensive "short course" initiation for the novice wargamer.

The acclaim of Avalon Hill's Line:

Completeness of Rules

1. CAESAR ALESIAS
2. WAR AT SEA
3. THE RUSSIAN CAMPAIGN
4. BATTLE OF THE BULGE '41
5. STORM OVER ARNHEM
6. TACTICS II
7. MIDWAY
8. STALINGRAD
9. VICTORY IN THE PACIFIC
10. ARAB-ISRAELI WARS

A further important consideration for the novice, and for anyone searching for the elusive good "game", is the Playability of a title. This amorphous quality has no simple parameters. However, it appears that this tenuous relationship can be sketched between this and "Completeness of Rules" since six titles are common to both lists of the ten best in the respective categories.

Playability

1. THE RUSSIAN CAMPAIGN
2. MIDWAY
3. VICTORY IN THE PACIFIC
4. WAR AT SEA
5. STORM OVER ARNHEM
6. BATTLE OF THE BULGE '41
7. NAPOLEON
8. WATERLOO
9. WOODEN SHIPS & IRON MEN
10. STALINGRAD

For the historian-gamer, the "simulation" is the key to enjoyment. No make no mistake, the historical aspects of our titles provide much of the fascination for novice and expert alike. Gone are the days when Avalon Hill games "put in" compulsive players with previously released titles acquired from other publishers); not so the intangibles. Often no amount of developmental skill can save a game with unplacable rules, vague and contradictory rules, or that is neither competitive nor exciting in play.

Nothing is more exasperating for the novice (and the veteran too, for that matter) than rules which raise more problems than are resolved, or that have flaws and failings obvious even to the player. The best rules can be better than utilizing the rules above as an introduction to our hobby. A bonus lies in the appreciation that these ten titles span the gamut of level of simulation (from tactical to strategic) and complexity (from 1.19 to 8.52). Taken together, these games provide an intensive "short course" initiation for the novice wargamer.

The acclaim of Avalon Hill's Line:

Completeness of Rules

1. CAESAR ALESIAS
2. WAR AT SEA
3. THE RUSSIAN CAMPAIGN
4. BATTLE OF THE BULGE '41
5. STORM OVER ARNHEM
6. TACTICS II
7. MIDWAY
8. STALINGRAD
9. VICTORY IN THE PACIFIC
10. ARAB-ISRAELI WARS

A further important consideration for the novice, and for anyone searching for the elusive good “game”, is the Playability of a title. This amorphous quality has no simple parameters. However, it appears that this tenuous relationship can be sketched between this and “Completeness of Rules” since six titles are common to both lists of the ten best in the respective categories.
Of prime interest in our fast-paced world is the
time commitment demanded by many titles. Avalon Hill has long catered to the adult gamer,
whose profession, education, family and other pursuits make their leisure time precious. Luckily, Avalon Hill’s extensive line can
satisfy their requirements in this regard, spanning the range from RICHTHOFEN’S WAR to THE LONGEST DAY. The basic scenario of a number of games can be played to conclusion in under two hours (tournament organizers, take note). The following are the ten quickest-playing games, a library of tactical challenge:

**Shortest Game Length**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Overall Value</th>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Map</th>
<th>Counters</th>
<th>Play Balance</th>
<th>Authenticity</th>
<th>Game Length</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. G.I.: Anvil of Victory</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cross of Iron</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Third Reich</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>19.90</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Caesar Alesia</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Wooden Ships &amp; Iron Men</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Wooden Ships &amp; Iron Men</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Battle of the Bulge ’81</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The Longest Day</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Victory In The Pacific</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Submarine</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Submarine</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Most of the impetus for embarking on this task was my interest in what the readers are familiar with and, therefore, would like to see dealt with in these pages. I desired some manner of obtaining a percentage—field a controlled data base—determining how their favorites fare, the ratings for the 'median game' are:*

**Overall Value:** 3.44  
**Components:** 3.23  
**Map:** 3.55  
**Counters:** 3.09  
**Complexity:** 4.98  
**Completeness of Rules:** 3.28  
**Playability:** 3.20  
**Excitement Level:** 3.28  
**Play Balance:** 3.34  
**Authenticity:** 3.51

**Basic Scenario Game Length:** 14.67  
**Advanced/Campaign Game Length:** 39.34

Due to space limitations, this has been only the most superficial of reportage on our efforts, containing little of insight or analysis. We are currently delving deeper into the mass of numbers generated by this and I have come to some intriguing conclusions to pass along—all of which must wait until the ADVENTURE GAME RBG is completed. I hope to take a look at what is of crucial importance in various types of games (tactical, strategic, operational, naval, W&W, etc.) and what is of but passing interest. Too, we’ve here only looked at the best of our titles; as important is to acknowledge the failings of some releases and look critically at the categories in which, should they be updated, effort should be spent to bring them up to the high standards that hobbyists today demand. In summation, it is thought that the new RBGs reflect the perceptions of our readers rather well.

---

**WARGAME RBG**
James Collier is one of the newest members of the SL playtest and development teams. He was originally just a contributor, his interest in the game being more than just casual. Unfortunately, as the reader will soon see, Mr. Collier's experience was apparently not an altogether happy one. Frustrated by his inability to get more of his experience and opinions stored, he has published a series of articles in which he has presented his views. One of these articles, "A Dissenting View of G.I.: GLASS ANVIL," has been particularly influential in the game development effort. In this essay, Mr. Collier makes several excellent points which will address the needs of the game system as a whole. The following project continues to evolve. On the other hand, we do disagree with the majority of his opinions and will summarize these disagreements following his presentation. Regardless of whether the reader is more influenced by Mr. Collier's criticisms or the rebuttals, I wish to publicly thank him for his participation in the playtest. The game is better for his involvement and contributions made in the past, and we wholeheartedly welcome his participation in future endeavours. His critique makes fascinating reading and offers us a better chance, in rebuttal, to give the players an inside look at the design process than could be accomplished with mere Designer's Notes.

There is no doubt in my mind that having paid $30.00 plus for a GI "gamette", I would be satisfied with what I got. No game is without its faults in the eyes of the individual player. Each individual will have biases, preconceptions and expectations; it would be unreasonable to expect to satisfy them all. This dissent therefore addresses itself to two major and fundamental concerns only, the philosophical direction of the rules development and the soundness of the American design. By now it should be generally recognized that the SQUAD LEADER series is virtually unique among WWII board games by being a game in evolution. The succeeding gamettes have not been mere additions to the original, but instead have introduced substantial revisions to the original parameters. This is even more true with GI where the bulk of both components and rules represent revisions rather than new material. There are, for example, only 300 more counters than provided with CRESCENDO OF DOOM, and well over half the GI counters represent replacements for counters previously introduced (only a handful of the original SL counters are still usable in their printed form). Despite their variety, many of the new vehicle and ordnance pieces are still replacements for the original US counters; except for the heroes, all the new infantry counters are replacements or just US versions of existing types.

Though one must pay the price of forfeiting obsolete materials above and beyond the purchase price, the loss can be accepted as the cost of progress. There are few who would quibble with the willingness of the SL to undertake new materials and details. The very nature of the project has necessitated the introduction of new rules and ideas to the original SL playtest and development teams.

The first module (on the following page) contains two versions of rules providing for what was originally labeled a "morale challenge" and finally published as "Rally Phase Surrender". As I read the newly proposed rules appear quite complex (Mr. Greenwood's term was "horrid"). But if a few moments of thought is given to the historical and psychological considerations which prompted them, they become much clearer. The initial observation was that, despite entertainment media demonstrations to the contrary, it is only the stalwart or fanatic of souls who will face the lethal assaults of an enemy force of obviously great superiority. Crediting victory to a player who only manages to salvage a handful of survivors in a supposedly important building while a horde of enemy infantry gathers there is not realistic. The need for constraint is completely arbitrary. How it aids the EvPh but cannot perform the simple task of summoning a space or destroying a building. But the truly illogical and inconsistent aspect is that it ought to be a simple matter to summon a vehicle just down the road or out behind the building. But the truly illogical and inconsistent fact is the prohibition of both loading and unloading in the AdPh. A squad can carry a MMG out of a house, over a wall and up a wooded slope in the AdPh but cannot perform the simple task of jumping down off the open deck of a tank. This sort of constraint is completely arbitrary. How it aids playability is unfathomable, and it is certainly frustrating to the realist who "sees" men dully sitting on an idling tank while danger lurks on a nearby ridge.

Though my efforts in GI to introduce conventions for "command control". This would only seem reasonable in a game which by its very nature prompts to emphasize the role of the small unit commander. The evolutionary trend has been to increasing portray the battlefield psychodynamics of both individuals and groups. But the command control rules provided are so ludicrously simplistic as to be contemptible. Apparently playtest comments and general correspondence have indicated a negative desire to emphasize command control. This is certainly a difficult aspect to simulate mechanically. But the information seems to imply that only a select group of hard-core simulators are ever encouraged to use such rules. Other players will simply ignore them if optional. If such rules are to exist, they ought to respond to the requirements of those who actually desire them.

The first module (on the following page) contains two versions of rules providing for what was originally labeled a "morale challenge" and finally published as "Rally Phase Surrender". As I read the newly proposed rules appear quite complex (Mr. Greenwood's term was "horrid"). But if a few moments of thought is given to the historical and psychological considerations which prompted them, they become much clearer. The initial observation was that, despite entertainment media demonstrations to the contrary, it is only the stalwart or fanatic of souls who will face the lethal assaults of an enemy force of obviously great superiority. Crediting victory to a player who only manages to salvage a handful of survivors in a supposedly important building while a horde of enemy infantry gathers there is not realistic. The need for constraint is completely arbitrary. How it aids the EvPh but cannot perform the simple task of summoning a vehicle just down the road or out behind the building. But the truly illogical and inconsistent fact is the prohibition of both loading and unloading in the AdPh. A squad can carry a MMG out of a house, over a wall and up a wooded slope in the AdPh but cannot perform the simple task of jumping down off the open deck of a tank. This sort of constraint is completely arbitrary. How it aids playability is unfathomable, and it is certainly frustrating to the realist who "sees" men dully sitting on an idling tank while danger lurks on a nearby ridge.

Though my efforts in GI to introduce conventions for "command control". This would only seem reasonable in a game which by its very nature prompts to emphasize the role of the small unit commander. The evolutionary trend has been to increasing portray the battlefield psychodynamics of both individuals and groups. But the command control rules provided are so ludicrously simplistic as to be contemptible. Apparently playtest comments and general correspondence have indicated a negative desire to emphasize command control. This is certainly a difficult aspect to simulate mechanically. But the information seems to imply that only a select group of hard-core simulators are ever encouraged to use such rules. Other players will simply ignore them if optional. If such rules are to exist, they ought to respond to the requirements of those who actually desire them.
tion Morale. In theory this should have imposed a different sort of thinking and tactics on the US player but still have permitted a competitive chance for victory. In practice, I have found this to be untrue and infer the same of other players. Subsequent scenarios, commentaries, contests and replays have generally favored use of US paratroops with ML7 and virtually ignored the 6-6-6s. (Part of this neglect may be due to the design blunder in two of the original six US scenarios which virtually required players to hunker on the floor like children to play on four end-to-end boards, to the considerable detriment of their more vulnerable backs.)

The conclusion is that the 6-6-6s are not competitive without a lot of special help. It doesn't matter how well a unit might have rallied if it is eliminated by a double-6. Being a ML6 engenders a significantly greater fragility and provides a relative handicap to rally attempts subsequent to the first. Theoretically, broken US units ought to be able to stay in the line being free from repeated imposition of DM. In practice, this would only invite more casualties, a fact reinforced by the sacrament of the leader-loss induced MC to which troops attempting to rally are necessarily vulnerable.

COD and now GI have introduced new levels of sophistication into the activities of infantry units. In general, these have conspired to compound and recoup the inherent weaknesses of the US forces. The newest and most profound of these changes is the "greening" concept, whereby units may suffer permanent impairment of ability from a given level of morale failure. Though potentially applicable to any combatant, it is mandatory for all US units and in only one of the fifteen off scenarios is it ever applicable to a non-US force. In my opinion, this represents a double penalty. I concur, as would most students of the era, with the basic premise that US units were more reluctant to take casualties than other armies and were thus more likely to break off an engagement against stiff resistance. There is also the issue of inadequate preparedness for the rigors of combat. But this latter was a problem universal to all combatants to some degree. And US soldiers overcame these problems as witnessed by ferocious fighting performances Bataan, Salerno, Cassino, Utah Beach and Bastogne—to name a few.

This lesser morale has many more subtle consequences than just the obvious vulnerability to fire. US units are more likely to lose concealment or be discovered when hidden. They are less likely to survive movement to close combat or pass a PAAMC (though more likely to obtain a KIL). They are less likely to succeed in placing a Demolition Charge and more likely to lose possession of their SWs, especially for DP purposes if hit by prep fire. (It may be argued that the US has the advantage of the inherent LMG—the BAR. This is probably more of a design convenience since it represented what would probably have to be a ML-11 LMG counter. In tactical deployment and contribution to total firepower it is just not that significant.) US units are less likely to create Scouts or Snipers or to deploy into Half-Squads—and US HSs are weaker and thus less likely to be desired, especially from Second Line infantry squads. (Whether by design or by limitations of counter space, the Second Line US squads must be deployed as green HSs and may only reform into green squads regardless of their experience in the current game. This uncovers one of the little absurdities of this game system. When reformed into green squads, these units will have a higher smoke-making capacity than their unit of origin.) The erosive effects of Suppression Fire will tell on them more and they are more likely to suffer casualties and, thus, lose Battlefield Integrity. As a consequence, they are more likely to be susceptible to surrender. There are a variety of terrain and

The originally proposed "Morale Challenge":

153.4 If at any time in Prep Fire Phase the phasing player can confront an individual squad/halfsquad/crew/SMC with the potential to deliver an attack with at least 3 times the firepower possessed by the unit, including any defending SW (EXE: FT, DC) and FFE (must have current radio contact and be out of access and out-of-place Red SR or FFE), then the attacker can challenge the defender's morale, provided the defender is not within 4 hexes or its normal range LOS of an unbroken friendly unit. The 3XFP is not just the summed attacker's FP but rather the ability to deliver a modified IFT equivalent to 3X FP accounting for TEMs (Ex. a 12 IFT against Infantry in woods is equivalent to 8 IFT). Against a leader or Hero, the potential must be equivalent to an unmodified 16 IFT. Ordinance may not be counted for the attacker unless a direct fire hit is certain. A winning challenge results in an exclusionary breakdown. A multi-unit defending hex can be challenged providing each and every unit in the hex can be challenged. Weapons which always affect every unit in a hex may be counted against each unit. At least one attacking squad equivalent must be able to move adjacent to the defending hex in the following Movement Phase.

153.41 The defender, if correctly challenged, must then make a MC against each unit challenged. There is a -1 DRM for each other unbroken counter in the hex and leader DRMs apply. There is a +1 DRM for any other broken counter in the hex, +2 if the checking counter is itself broken, -1 for each multiple of FP superiority above 3X. Any broken leader's DRM becomes a + DRM.

153.412 Check the morale of the current highest morale level unit first, then any others in declining order. Leaders of current ML equal to a MMC roll first. If the current ML of other units are equal, that with the highest BPV rolls first. Always check broken units after all unbroken units have checked. The DRMs apply at the moment each unit checks. (EXAMPLE: 8-1, 8-3-8 with 2 ML loss and 4-6-7 with 1 ML loss in the same hex. 8-1 checks first with -2DRM for two other unbroken units in the hex and passes. 8-3-8 and 4-6-7 have same current ML (6) so 8-3-8 checks first as it has highest BPV. It fails despite -3 DRM: -1 Ldr DRM, -2 other unbroken units in hex, 4-6-7 now checks with net -2 DRM: -1 Ldr DRM, -1 other unbroken unit in hex (which is also the leader) and +1 for other broken unit in hex. Had the leader failed at start, each other unit would have had a +2 DRM: +1 other unbroken unit, +1 reversed Leader DRM.)

153.413 Any unit failing is broken, regardless of other outcome. If all units in a hex fail, mark them with a DM counter of the attacker's color. Those so marked will surrender provided 153.21 is met by the following Rout Ph. Challenged units suffer no further penalty other than being made temporarily susceptible to surrender.

153.42 If the attacker has challenged but either is shown to have not met the criteria, or all challenged units in the same hex did not fail, then the potential FFP must be carried out. Surviving defending units behave as usual.

153.421 If the challenge is successful, the challenging units may then move provided that they could deliver the same strength attack in the following AdVF, disregarding any movement penalties but accounting for any new PBP potential. The moving units may actually AdVF against any target of their choice. Their only requirement is to maintain the potential LOS.

153.422 If as a result of DF or other hazard (e.g. mines) neither the criteria, or all challenged units in the same hex did not fail, then the potential FFP must be carried out. Surviving defending units behave as usual.

Module 1

153.23 RALLY PHASE: At the conclusion of every Prep Fire Phase the units subject to surrender (hereafter referred to as the inferior force) will be out of the LOS of, or are a number of hexes behind the current morale from a friendly unbroken leader or friendly AFV are subject to a surrender NMC if within the inherent normal range and LOS of opposing infantry. The dominant force (i.e. the opposing infantry) would have to be able to conceivably attack them in their next fire phase from their present positions with four times the inherent FP (five times if the defender is in possession of functioning ordinance or MG's) of the inferior force (once). No actual attack need take place, nor are the units involved deprived of any movement/fire possibilities in subsequent phases. Should the dominant force play feel that a surrender possibility exists, he merely points out the susceptible unit(s) and those units of his own which can supply the necessary inherent FP, being sure not to use any of his own units more than once. Inferior force units thus selected must take a NMC (HS's check morale with a MMC), and are broken if they fail. Such units are not subject to DM unless they are subsequently fired on. The dominant force need not necessarily be the more numerous and powerful side in play.
weather factors for which passage of a MC is required for optimal performance, or even survival, in which US units are less likely to succeed.

And still, that is not all. There is a stated principle that US leaders will be valued less than their counterparts in other armies. As a result, US forces will be functioning with 7-0, 8-0 and 9-1 leaders while their opponents will have 8-0, 8-1 and 9-2 leaders in command. In tandem with the above, this is no minor handicap. These lesser leaders are themselves more likely to break and, as a consequence, force even more MCs on their already more fragile troops. Recognizing this risk, the smart US player will be most reluctant to stack leaders with MMCs, thus foregoing the benefits of the leader movement bonus, avoidance of cowering and long-range MG fire. What is more, not being stacked with their leaders, broken units are less likely to end up stacked with leaders during the first available Rally Phase and thus lose their supposed compensation of quicker rally. And since US leaders will often have a negative DRM, US units will often be trying to rally with a lesser ML, especially as the greening process continues. Finally, if the command control options are used, the weaker US leaders will more often be broken and their units thus out of control.

The second chart (next page) presents some statistical analyses of the fourteen GI scenarios which feature US troops. The major emphasis is on infantry comparison. The first column of the chart indicates which type of infantry is most numerous in the scenario, generally by Morale Level. (ELR) denotes scenarios where non-US units are subject to Green Unit Replacement. The second column is the ratio of leaders to squads (total number of leaders divided by total number of squads, including half-squads and crews as 1/2 squad each). The higher the number, the greater the likelihood of leaders being available to help a particular squad (direct fire, rally, move, etc.). The next column is simply the average morale level of the leaders engaged; the fourth, their average leadership DRM. These should provide some idea of the quality of the leaders. The fifth column is a ratio of the total leadership DRMs divided by the total number of squads. This gives some indication of the effectiveness of the leaders in that a higher number implies that a given squad is more likely to benefit from a leader DRM at various times in the game. The last column shows the general direction of changes made in the scenario during the playtest from the originally proposed draft to the published version. (Significant) implies that the scenario had to be drastically changed to substantially add strength or modify the victory conditions for the side indicated, in my judgement. The final entry on the chart is the average of the lines above (excluding the French forces in Scenario 35).

Looking over the chart, several observations emerge. The designer's philosophical bias is that German small unit leadership is superior to the US. This was to be reflected by both fewer leaders and lesser Morale Levels and Leadership DRMs among the American leader counters. Accordingly, for the whole GI package the average German leader DRM is significantly greater than the US and the German squads correspondingly benefit from better leadership per unit. However, the overall average leader to squad ratio and leader Morale Level are nearly equal. Furthermore, during the course of the playtest it was necessary in four of the fourteen scenarios to add or improve US leaders and to devalue one German leader. (Conversely, in one scenario a US leader was devalued; in another scenario the number of German leaders was increased. (ELR) Conditions were also significantly increased.) Thus, in practice it was necessary to compromise the original bias.

Of more pertinent interest are the observations that in virtually all -12 of 14 - scenarios some US elite squads are required for balance. One third of the six US infantry units are exclusive; in more than half of the remaining scenarios it was necessary to add additional elite infantry to assure balance. (Of the two scenarios without elite US units, one features a distinctly green German force. The other is a night scenario in which the German, as attacker, is actually outnumbered; even in this instance, some of the US infantry were upgraded from Second Line to First Line.) And finally, the course of scenario revision required changes to favor the US in two-thirds of the total. And, of five scenarios judged to be significantly changed, only one was changed to favor a German scenario.

It can be argued that the purpose of a playtest is to adjust the balance of forces allocated in each scenario to arrive at a parity of victory opportunities. Therefore, it would be expected that some changes will be necessary. One assumes that the scenarios were designed based on a reasonably detailed historical research to delineate with accuracy the historical terrain and force composition. If that is so, then it would follow that a faithful design should reproduce, by simulation, the historical outcome fairly often and that adjustments should most often need only be made to favor the historical loser or affect either side with near equal frequency. The foregoing analysis indicates conclusively that this was not the case in this playtest. Most of the historical sources were American victories. But in most of the simulations, the initially allocated U.S. forces lost most of the time.

Though this could reflect that the research and/or design were faulty, the consistency and the magnitude of the inequities suggest that another factor is at work. It is simply my contention that the other factor is inaccurate assessment and depiction of U.S. capabilities rather than inaccurate force composition. The implication is that, in actual play, the philosophical assumptions by which the scenarios were designed could not be adhered to and provide balance. The obvious conclusion is that the original philosophy is wrong. Following it without substantial modification leads to scenarios which are neither historically correct nor playably balanced.

Not just the US infantry have been so maligned. Again, there is no argument that in terms of gun-power and armor, the US AFVs were inferior to the German and Soviet AFVs. But, in GI the values assigned to many US vehicles are so poor as to render them little more than rolling junk. The example in the third chart (see right) demonstrates that a front-to-front engagement at the relatively short range of 300m (7 xes), a PzIV is 240% more likely to obtain a first shot kill on a Sherman than the reverse.

To heap insult on injury, the decision has been taken to rate bow MGs on AFVs as 2FP instead of 4FP. I dispute that decision and consider it another double penalty. BMGs already suffer from shorter range, lack of leadership modification, motion penalties and a restricted field of fire, though they were usually the identical weapons to the infantry MMGs. AFV MGs have certain advantages not allowed for: larger and cleaner ammunition supplies, the security of being armored, at least as stable a mount, and a slight height advantage. It
was also surprising to see that the US halftracks are subject to Excessive Speed Breakdown at the lower level (red Movement Factors). This will give them a poorer performance than the German HTs (and the identical Russian vehicles). It is generally acknowledged that the SPW 251 was under-powered and that the German road-wheel interleaved suspension caused excessive mechanical breakdown. No modern AFV uses the German-style suspension, while the M5 HT is still in active in the armed forces of several nations. In analyzing these armored aspects, we must return to our previous considerations of realism. There are actually two categories of realism: detail and outcome. The two are not necessarily compatible. I doubt the authenticity of the Allied 75mm tank gun ratings; but, even if they are accurate in detail, their use in SL yields an unrealistic outcome. (It is a little difficult to assess this outcome in the GI scenarios however. In not a single scenario do the Allies enjoy an actual AFV superiority of numbers over their Axis opponents. Historically, they generally did.) Despite the ravages of total air superiority and tank destroyers possessed of superior ballististics technology, a great many German AFVs were actually knocked out by Allied AFVs. Such a fact is not very likely to be repeated in the SL system. In the chart are some considerations of tactics for redistributing the dismally lopsided odds to parity can be achieved by keeping the Sherman in motion—if it is fortunate enough to have a usable gyrostabilizer. This was, of course, the historical tactic used. But it doesn’t work out in SL for two reasons. First, there will always be an initial DF shot at the attacker (which the Sherman will have trouble surviving). Second, attempts to maneuver to flank or rear can be thwarted simply by pivoting the defending vehicle in DFP to again present the front facing. Possession of a more agile tank with fast turret and gyrostabilizer will not defeat this simple countermeasure. Finally, the uses of maneuver or ambush at close range are limited due to the highly detailed knowledge the potential prey will have of his hunter’s whereabouts and condition in this type of board wargame.

Similar arguments are relevant to the issue of BMGs. The origin of the tank and the theory still prevalent in WWII was the concept of an anti-infantry weapon. In this concept, the role of the tank was often that of an MG carrier. Though described as secondary armament, the MGs were often the weapons with which the primary mission was accomplished. Limiting the majority of medium and heavy tanks to 4FP total MG makes it difficult to recreate this effect. If we pay attention to the other compelling arguments presented by Hal Hock (“Tobruk Defended”, The GENERAL, Vol. 19, No. 2), then perhaps it is the CMGs which have been undervalued and the BMGs overrated. In either event, the impact of tanks on the infantry will be lacking in realistic outcome. (Mr. Greenwood may stress that Point Blank Fire is more likely for mobile tanks. This is true for the early war; but, as the use of potent infantry anti-tank weapons became common in the later years, this option is less viable.)

Since SL is a game, playability cannot be ignored. The quest for realism must make some concessions to the need for equality in competition. One of the problems of this evolving game is the lack of uniform change for all nationalities. Though it may be planned for the future that all BMGs will be devalued and all HTs will be subject to lower ESB, for the next two or three years only the US (and some British) units will suffer the penalties. Once again the US player loses a little competitive edge.

The inescapable conclusion from all this is that the US Army in SL is not just different. It is distinctly second-class. It suffers from a cascade of penalties to which other combatants are much less susceptible—if at all. Though the penalty concepts may be based on historical fact, the actual mechanisms employed result in overkill both from a realistic and a playability viewpoint.

This polemic is not to say that there is nothing of value in GI. There are a number of new terrain features and improved procedures. But the major purpose of the game is to provide a meaningful simulation of the high order of realism. Though it may be planned for the future that all GI scenarios have been revised to accommodate the US inferiority, for the prospective DYO player, it might be just as well to select a Russian—or even Republican French—force. Perhaps DYO BRVs for US units will be 30% less than corresponding German components? Otherwise, squad for squad, tank for tank, the US player should expect to lose.

Finally, there is left the even more philosophical question of where SQUAD LEADER is going. The expansion game features have introduced a policy of not just introducing new boards and counters with which to play by the same old and tried rules, but of adding to and enlarging upon those rules. But, with this added complexity there is an undue hesitancy to make a firm commitment to a truly high order of realism. Players who really stress ease of play will reject this complexity anyway, while those who seek realism will be frustrated. If both “gamer” and “simulator” are disappointed, the entire project will stall and may well perish.☆

**BUMPER STICKERS**

Now you can proclaim your gaming status to one and all with bumper stickers from Avalon Hill. Select from any of the following:

**WARNING:** Avalon Hill Game Thinkers! Brain Engaged.

**CAUTION:** I stop at Avalon Hill Game Stores. I break for Avalon Hill Games.

**WANTED:** Opponents for Avalon Hill Games.

**CANDY:** Don't Rot Your Teeth.

The bumper sticker(s) of your choice are available from The Avalon Hill Game Company, 4517 Harford Rd., Baltimore, MD 21214 for $1.00 each plus 10% for postage and handling (Canadians 20%, Overseas 30%). MD residents please add 5% state sales tax.
The G.I. Design Team Replies

By Don Greenwood, Bob McNamara and Jon Mishcon

First, from Don Greenwood, who needs no introduction:

At the outset, I must admit that I am not familiar with all the systems Mr. Collier is referring to. I am, however, familiar with the historical background of World War II. It seems clear to me that Mr. Collier's criticisms are based on a misunderstanding of the rules and an overemphasis on the importance of individual actions. My own experiences as a soldier in World War II led me to believe that it is not always possible to achieve tactical superiority through individual actions alone.

On a more specific matter, Mr. Collier cites a vivid example of how he believes the game system unrealistic in not allowing loading and unloading in the Advance Phase. His statement is easy to agree with on the surface, until you put it in context with what this change means to the game system as a whole. The current rulebook states that if you move a unit in the Advance Phase, it cannot load or unload. Mr. Collier seems to be implying that this is not practical in the real world, but I believe this rule is necessary to maintain the integrity of the game system.

In addition, Mr. Collier raises questions about the M1 Garand and the two extra men in the squad. I believe that the two extra men in the squad are a significant improvement over the M1 Garand, as the latter is a powerful weapon that can deal a great deal of damage. However, I do agree that the M1 Garand is a very effective weapon and deserves its place in the game system.

As an aside of relatively little consequence, I would like to point out that the BAR is not a weapon that is used in the game. While the BAR is a very effective weapon in the real world, it is not a part of the game system.

Finally, I would like to address the matter of Command Control. I will point out that in my experience as a soldier in World War II, command control is an important factor in achieving tactical superiority. It is not enough to have a superior weapon system; the command structure must be well organized to ensure that the troops are able to use the weapons effectively.

The information James so carefully documents in Module 2 is totally unnecessary. I am quite certain that the German forces in World War II were not as well organized as Mr. Collier implies. Virtually all the historical evidence points to the Germans being less well organized than the Americans.

I am quite confident that the game system will continue to evolve and improve as we gain more experience with it. The G.I. Design Team is committed to providing the best possible game system for our players, and we will continue to make changes as necessary to ensure the integrity of the game system.

THE G.I. DESIGN TEAM REPLIES
my way of thinking. The initial scenarios are just starting points. Blending troop types within a scenario Order of Battle to achieve the historical performance is not only a valid design tool, but extremely effective also. That James wishes to attribute more significance to these changes is a matter that I do not feel any particular need to defend.

"US tanks are rolling junk." While Mr. Collier accurately points out several problems, I think he overstates his case. I will leave the point-by-point rebuttal to Bob McNamara (whose reply follows) who answered with much more expertise and skill that I could hope to muster. I will limit my response to two items of limited agreement. First, the matter of "First Shot" opportunities cited by Mr. Collier is a valid problem, although it is by no means limited in nature to the German's benefit.

An experimental rule is found elsewhere in this article (Module 4) dealing with the very point you make. Secondly, GI does suffer by pitting state-of-the-art rated American AFVs against CROSS OFT ORN German ones. However, the old ratings of the German vehicles conceived prior to such things as German ones. However, the old ratings of the German vehicles conceived prior to such things as "Turret/Upper Superstructure" armor inferiority does not always work to their advantage. The capabilities of some German AFVs will be enhanced while others are lessened. There is no denying that it would be nice to have the new German OB in GI; but there is a limit to how much you can stuff in a box—let alone how much you will be willing to spend for that box's contents. The publication of these revised counters in the next gamette will doubtless be of great help.

In summary, because I chose to depict relatively even situations, the overall image of US-German battles may be distorted; but the game system remains more factual than Mr. Collier's perceptions. That may offend generations of Americans nurtured on John Wayne movies, Sgt. Rock, Rock comics, and episodes of Rat Patrol and Combat in which the Germans invariably oblige Sarge, Little John, Kirby, Caje, the Duke, et. al. by standing erect to catch a bullet before performing their '60's" into the dirt... but it is historic.

Speaking from the Playability Viewpoint

By Jon Mishcon

Mr. Collier's comments are made from the viewpoint of a playtester who is entrenched solidly in the realistic camp with an extreme distaste for the arbitrary decisions made bringing about a game. Far too often the playability concerns of the final product overrule the historical accuracy of the components. The playability excuse that has always irritated me is that of Mr. Collier to change the rules to make it more realistic. However, the game is not being designed to be realistic. It is a game designed to be played. I do not see why Mr. Collier, or any other person, should be more concerned with the realism of the game than the ordinary person who wants to play the game. The game is not being designed to be realistic. It is a game designed to be played. I do not see why Mr. Collier, or any other person, should be more concerned with the realism of the game than the ordinary person who wants to play the game.

I believe the game is a valid representation of the European in 1944-45. However, the rules are far too disorganized and complex, and the ordnance TO HIT and HIT/TO KILL rules need revision.

Point by laboried point then:

1) Boarding a moving vehicle: Summoning a vehicle and then boarding it should have been a simple matter. Frequently it was not. If changed, this capability will give motorized infantry unrealistic mobility in battle.

2) Loading and Unloading in the Advance Phase: It is not the motion itself that is in question—rather the ability to do so without the exposure to fire penalties of the Movement Phase. The vulnerability of dismounting troops is a recurrent theme.

3) Command Control: I totally agree that good rules would be of great benefit. However, any such rules must take into account unit formation (line or column or dispersed), terrain (city or open field), exposure to fire, morale, leadership, training, environment, and exhaustion. Any rules we've come up with may have been overly complex or unrealistic.

4) Morale Challenge: I feel this proposal is very complicated and time consuming for little added realism. The attacker will start 'counting factors' to qualify every turn. The end result is that this would slow play to a near standstill. And, I hate 'counting factors'.

5) US Army "Second Rate": I certainly agree that in every possible way the GI was less "warlike" than the others on the European battlefield. If you try to use the GI as you would a Briton, you will—and should—get a bloody nose. However, the US player has certain tremendous advantages. Key to the successful use of American forces lies in use of different tactics.

6) Module 2: I feel the Module 2 comparisons are most unfair. No account is taken of the incredible changes in the rules that accompanied the changes in forces. A designer's eye for balance must change in line with the rules change. Furthermore, I feel the scenarios are still unbalanced—now being pro-American.

7) US Armor Effectiveness: Notwithstanding my feeling that a redo of the TO HIT/TO KILL system is overdue, and my agreement that the scenarios represent atypical situations, I think US armor is NOT "rolling junk". The M4A3 has frontal armor equal to that of a Tiger I. The ability of gyro-stabilized guns to move and shoot is, if anything, overstated. Again it depends on the proper use tactically. Yes, the 75mm is darn weak and the M1917 is more than a match for a single Sherman in GI. Yet, it is interesting to note that Colonel T.N. Dupuy in his Numbers, Predictions & War Stories (for example: a German 11th Panzer at more than 150% Combat Effective (CEV) as compared to the 1st US Armored—number of vehicles withstanding, I don't dispute a BMG factor of 2. Considering the extremely limited view from the vision slit and the distractions of a jolting tank in battle, a BP of 2 certainly sounds reasonable. Rather, other AFVs should have their BMG downgraded. I have to admit I was surprised about US half-tracks being subject to excessive speed breakdown.

8) Why was the US Army so successful if it was "second class"? I steal a quote (to the best of my memory) from a German who had first fought the Russians, then the British, before being captured by the Americans. When asked to compare the three armies, the German said the Russians were fanatical in attack or defense but inflexible, the British and courteous and tended to do things slowly and pause between tasks. The Americans, well it was hard to say, all he recalled was the endless artillery strikes and fighter-bomber attacks. Not that he hadn't attacked or been attacked while facing Americans, just that it was hard to see them through all the explosions.

My answer to the problem of US play has been to develop more scenarios which may yet see print in 1983. Hopefully these will allow players to see more of the tactical problems encountered in Northwest Europe. Perhaps these, and time, will resolve the differences Mr. Collier and I share.

I'll close with what I think is the best non-US evaluation of the GI. In Robert Woolcombe's Lion Rampant: The 15th Scottish Division, Normandy to the Elbe, he describes his time with an American unit in Holland. An American patrol was doing recces for the British in the woods when the GI's were mortared. "As soon as they reached the woods there were bangs, and all the little figures came tumbling out... . We [the American Captain] was not scared; it was simply the straightforward realisation that if there were bangs in a place the first thing to do was to get the hell out of it... We'll go back, Cap'n, if you say', said the tubby little engineer readily, panting away. And have gone back they would. I had only to say. The panting little captain—'We'll go back... if you say'. . . . Mr. Collier represents the Americans, as we saw them, in 1944."

I guess I agree.

Rechecking Our Sources

By Bob McNamara

Now we turn over the defense to Bob McNamara, who was ultimately responsible for much of the historical research and hardware data on which the design was based, as well as being judged the most valuable playtester in GI.

My first reaction after reading Mr. Collier's article was to check the GI Design Credits out of curiosity to see if he had cited as a major playtester. Knowing from experience how much work and dedication is necessary to achieve this, I feel it is truly unfortunate that in spite of all the time and labor he expended, he is very disappointed with the final product. However, from the content of his article, I must infer that his disappointment with and criticism of the gamette derive more from his own preconceived notions and expectations than from research and analysis of the subject matter, especially insofar as the AFVs are concerned. His position is that since the "feel" of the Americans don't comply with his own impressions of what should be, the gamette's treatment of the GI is therefore wrong. I disagree with his overall conclusions (though not with all his contentions) and I believe that GI is a valid representation of the
American Army in WW2. I say this not to disparage Mr. Collier nor to present myself as some self-appointed expert—not at all. His opinions are pertinent and thought-provoking, and in the following pages I mean to examine some of them, not so much to refute them as to give the reader the view from this side—the type of research done and the reasons the players have come to one version of the game. I wish to preface my remarks by stating that I am not a Germanophile; like Mr. Collier, I am interested in simulating a "correct" version of "reality", although the interpretation of this presents somewhat of a problem since there are roughly 230 million versions of reality in this country alone.

How we formulate the various "national characteristics" of our cardboard troops is a totally subjective process—history is, after all, nothing more than the currently accepted judgements of past events, so the prejudices of both the designer and his research materials cannot be escaped, and can only be mitigated by consulting with as wide a range of sources as possible. In my research, I attempted to acquire a balanced picture of the Americans by collating material from U.S., British and German sources, and I must admit that I had a few of my own preconceived bubbles burst in the process (perhaps the two biggest bangs came from reading about the poor design of both our early optical equipment and our halftracks). The upshot of this research was that the Americans were generally inferior to both the Germans and the British in individual disciplines, patriotic fervor, and military tradition—but superior to both in raw firepower as well as quantity (and in many respects, quality too) of material. Simply put, the GIs could dish it out a lot better than they could take it; their 6 ML is, in my opinion, a completely valid representation of this. In fact, Mr. Collier's paragraph which cites the "subtle consequences" of the 6-ML rule, which is part of what he terms "overkill!"—is to my mind a nicely stated proof that the game simulates the above-mentioned inferiorities rather well; in terms of the relative lack of discipline and aversion to authority among the GIs, a 7 ML would have caused a much more pervasive lack of realism than is presently, for example, the flak which makes it harder for them to push ordnance through mud or deep snow (really now, how often is it necessary to attempt this).

On the other hand, I am not (and never was) a fan of the "greening" process. During the playtest, I suggested several changes to Mr. Collier—none of which got off the ground (in retrospect, perhaps just as well)—and having only about a million other things on my mind, I didn't press the issue further. What I'd like to see is the 5-3-6 treated as just inexperienced and he makes the supreme sacrifice, then you have a good leader/squad ratio with a huge leadership DRM when coupled with a small squad. Perhaps this creeping tendency toward uniformity in tactical premises is one of the underlying reasons for Mr. Collier's disenchchantment with the GI Americans, for they cannot be used like the Germans. If one plays the GIs like them, he will quickly be shown the errors of his thinking by a competent German player. The new GIs have been given their own feel and any player who cannot adapt his tactics to their unique qualities will lose with them a most expert opinion on the Americans' competitive aspects. I defer here to Bill "Fish" Conner, the 1982 COD tournament winner, a playtester of both COD and GI, and the epitome of a competitive player if ever there was one:

"While agreeing with Mr. Collier's analysis of the Americans in that their 6 ML and greening process are major liabilities, I feel that they are successfully able to compete because of other offsetting assets—"

1) Mechanical reliability and repairability of Sws.
2) Excellent range and firepower of Sws, the .50 cal. HMG is without peer.
3) Radios with "9" or less to make contact and "11" or less to maintain it.
4) Superior smoke grenade ability, plus WP from squads, ordnance and office board artillery (although I think WP should be more potent).
5) No DM for squads or crews—if used correctly, the American tactical asset.

"Tactics for the GIs must differ because of those advantages and disadvantages if maximum effectiveness is to be obtained. All players must, of course, always try to maximize firepower at the enemy while minimizing their own exposure to fire—but the GIs, because of their increased fragility (the 6 ML and the greening) must be more concerned than other nationalities about exposing themselves to fire. The 6-6-6 and 4-6-6, psychological reason, WINNING—and would not use them as much as I do if they weren't competitive."

If one can't win with the Americans, Fish doesn't seem to have discovered it yet!
Now, on to the GI AFVs. My inference from Mr. Collier's sardonic remarks is that he has passed judgement on the game effects of these vehicles' historic character. He has written little about what these characteristics were. He mentions three specific areas where he believes the use of U.S. AFVs yields unrealistic results: the Sherman vs. the PzKpfw IV; the BMG FP; and the halftrack ESB. However, to corroborate his feelings that their traits are misapplied in the game, he notes that for most one gets a 50% less ground contact area than expected. In addition, the BMGs are more effective (in terms of probability-but I was looking but. And while it's true that U.S. halftracks were not underpowered as was the SDkFz 251, that was about their only virtue. Their armor plating (and most everything else) was continually vibrating loose (one writer described driving one on an improved road as "rather like driving a ten-ton kitchen cabinet on a washboard"). Their floors were unarmored and gave no protection against mines—unlike their German counterparts; their side armor could be pierced by .50 cal. AP rounds at over 1000 meters, and even by .30 cal. AP rounds out to 600m, while the Brits were armored and ballistically well-sloped SDkFz 251s are about 600m and 30m respectively. And their tracks had about 25% less ground contact area than those of the SDkFz 251 (although the U.S. halftrack had driven front wheels while the German didn't). Speaking of tracks, the German tanks were very sophisticated, expensive, and maintenance intensive—but I've never read anywhere that they were plagued by frequent breakdowns. They did have a tendency to bind up if packed with mud or snow, but this seems to have been a problem only when the vehicle had been motionless long enough for the suspension to sag. On the other hand, U.S. tracks were out quickly due to their construction, which consisted of steel plates attached to a loop of steel cables, with the whole assembly being covered with vulcanized rubber. At high speed (even on paved roads) or in loose terrain, the rubber was flung off by centrifugal force and/or abraded by the ground material, thus exposing the plates and cables and causing thrown tracks and damaged boogie wheels. "Even with good tracks, good boogie wheels, and proper tension, [hal/track] tracks were often too loose for the convenience (or whatever)." The writer of the 1st Armored Division stated in a report to Allied Forces HQ (dated 13 June 1943) that halftracks "have been continually subject to the throwing of tracks" and went on to declare that they were more trouble than they were worth and should be replaced by trucks! This might sound generous here with the Americans. Meanwhile, one key fact to consider is that every German medium and heavy tank (as well as many of the light) had an all-round vision cupola for the commander, which greatly improved the AFV's fighting efficiency. In contrast to this practice, Sherman with vision cupolas didn't see action until mid-1944, and even then only the 76mm versions had them as standard equipment until cavalry production became sufficient. As a result, many Shermans finished the war without one. This visibility problem, while not directly factored into the game, is nicely reflected in Mr. Collier's probabilities; the Sherman is often forced to remain CE in order to increase its effectiveness, as was the case in reality.

In relation to both main armament and optics, mention must be made of the U.S. gyrostabilizer. Although speaking, we have again been generous to the GIs, for the gyro was used much less in reality than we permit in the game. Many sources state this lack of usage, and perhaps it can be reflected in the game. "Later, in France, 1944, another officer reported that 'experience has proven that tank crews have no faith in gyrostabilizers and will not use them. No amount of training seems to convince the tank's crews of the value of firing while moving... It could be left out of tanks scheduled for theaters of operations'". Fortunately they weren't omitted, and with constant emphasis on training their use slowly but steadily increased in 1945. To compensate for our generosity, it can be rationalized that the gyro's frequent availability helps simulate the far faster traverse rate of the Sherman. Overall, Mr. Collier's remarks regarding traverse specifically to benefit the Sherman, but comparative data proved too difficult to find for many other tanks; on the other hand, mention of the slow traverse rates of many tanks was much more common, so it was decided to use this method of differentiation instead. It's true that the combat asset of the Sherman was thereby lost, the fact that 50% of the Shermans used in 1944 scenarios should have functioning gyrostabilizers is a definite and deliberate compensation. After all, the Sherman was designed and used as a weapon of maneuver and exploitation, not for armored slugfests or for trading frontal blows with a more powerful enemy, and its game capabilities en-
As for the PzKpfw IVH, hopefully the reader noted earlier that its front turret armor was weaker than its hull front. Unfortunately, the counter doesn't reflect this since the HD DRMs hadn't yet been "invented" in COI. The simple truth is that the COI counters are outdated and require a major reworking. This is currently in progress and, when completed, the PzKpfw IVH will have front -HD. This will raise the M4's first shot kill probability to .23—not a great change statistically but a considerable aid to the Sherman when it hits the PzKpfw IV turret.

One final concern is front armor—although not the Sherman's: an M4's first shot kill probability versus a Tiger I (in the same situation as with the PzKpfw IV) is .14 and .23 at six hexes. This is junk! In reality, the M4's gun could only penetrate about 87mm at 250 yards and zero slope, leaving an unpenetrated 13mm-25mm on a somewhat annoyed Tiger. Obviously, there is a flaw here; more on this later also.

Size: This is perhaps the biggest liability to the M4's survival. It's usually easier to hit than its opponent, and easier to destroy. The tank's thick front armor, and the thicknesses of the lower hull, are illusory, even compared to the 37L needing a "5" to knock out a PzKpfw IV at six hexes, or the aforementioned ability of a Sherman 75 (or T-34/76) to destroy a Tiger at six hexes, and a roll of "5". Using both the Advanced TO KILL Table and the revised German vehicles, these TO KILL numbers will change to "8" and "3" respectively ("2" for the T-34/76 vs. the Tiger), and pursuing the Sherman/Tiger example further, the latter's return shot will have a TO KILL die roll of +13 compared to the M4's +12. The current advanced TO KILL condition is junk?

In the M4/PzKpfw IVH confrontation we've looked at, use of both the Advanced TO KILL Table and revised German vehicles will yield respective first shot probabilities of .39/.69 (.39/.50 if using an M4A1 or M4A3(75)W, while the standard TO KILL table will yield .64/.50 respectively), as opposed to the GI probabilities of .42/.40.

The lowered efficiency of AFVs with two-man turrets, which is alluded to in GI, will be more fully dealt with in the next gamete. In addition to slow traverse, 2MT tanks will also suffer some additional losses in the form of a lower rating for the turret by the evaluation of as many action reports and authors' opinions as could be obtained. The +2 armor DRM of the M4A1 and other Sherman models results not from heavier armor but the more consistent protection afforded by their two-piece cast or rolled front hull.

The +1 versus +2 hull armor DRM raises a point which must be considered when viewing Mr. Collier's probabilities. Of the total number of 75mm Shermans retained by U.S. forces (excluding the late-war Sherman for comparison, it would be still the main AFV of our western allies. When using a late-war Sherman for comparison, it would be more correct to use the M4A1 or M4A3(75)W, which will lower the first shot kill probability of the PzKpfw IVH to .40.

Looking at the turret armor of the +1 Sherman, it would appear to rate a +2 but does not, partially because all the earlier models had less protection (and differentiating between them and the intermediate models would have meant another 26 or so Sherman counters) and partially because a +2 just didn't "feel" right in view of the tank's reputation. The reader is advised to know that originally the Sherman's front turret and hull armor DRM had been 0 (+1 for the M4A1); the increases to +1 and +2 didn't occur until the beginning of 1942 and were accepted with some question as to their correctness and necessity.

The +76mm and +12mm turret armors are +2 turret armor originally but were somewhat borderline; in view of objections raised during the playtest to Shermans being rated frontally equal to Tigers, the +2 was lowered to +1.
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This rule of thumb is from: G.S.O. Playfair, The Mediterranean and Middle East, Vol. 2, in the "History of the Second World War", London, 1956, p. 342. Incidentally, the calculations for the M3 gun exactly matches the figure given it for 500 yards and zero slope in FM-1914.

C. M. Green, H. C. Thompson, P. C. Roots, The Ordnance Department: Planning Munitions for War, from "The U.S. Army in World War II, The Technical Services" series, Washington DC, 1955, pp. 334-342, 346. Harmon, op. cit., pp. 36, 47; this reads in part, "At the present time the German has approximately four times the range of our tank gunners".


Chamberlain et al., op. cit., p. 98; D. Crow, ed., op. cit., p. 96.

Hunnicutt, op. cit., pp. 154, 544.


Hunnicutt, op. cit., pp. 142, 149, 150, 222.

Ibid., pp. 141, 150, 311, 525, 526.


---

SECOND EDITION

G.I.: ANVIL OF VICTORY

The Second Edition of G.I.: ANVIL OF VICTORY is now available, incorporating the errata and changes generated by extensive play since its release. Significant changes were made to the G.I. rulebook and the scenario cards, as noted in Vol. 20, No. 1 of THE GENERAL. Both are priced similar to the original edition: $4.00 for the rulebook, $5.00 for the Scenario/CRT Card Pad. Order may be made directly from The Avalon Hill Game Company, 4517 Harford Road, Baltimore, MD 21214. Please add 10% shipping and handling (20% for Canadian orders, 30% for overseas orders); Maryland residents must add the usual 5% state sales tax.

---

FACTORY OUTLET

Whenever in the Baltimore area feel free to drop in at our Factory Outlet store located in our design offices at 900 St. Paul and 20 E. Reed St. This store is the world's only retail outlet featuring a complete selection of Avalon Hill games, parts, magazines and accessories. Pay by cash or check or bring your credit card, and if visiting on Saturdays feel free to stay and attend a gaming session with Interest Group Baltimore and get involved with whatever playtesting happens to be going on. Just drop by and play or talk the games of your choice on Saturday with any of the locals and enjoy the competition.

---

GUN DUELS

Mr. Collier raises a valid point concerning the inability of an advancing Sherman to get in the first shot on an enemy target. In reality, if both saw each other simultaneously, the Sherman's fast traverse often did allow it to fire first, which greatly increased its probability of survival (from: Hunnicutt, Sherman, p. 184). In the game, the sudden encounters are non-existent due to the players' omnipotence of enemy movements and the strict alternation of shots. Below is presented a rule which will add tension and excitement while at the same helping to minimize a deficiency which has been rightly brought to attention.

X.1 A turreted AFV which either pivots or moves to another hex during its MPH might be able to fire its MGs and/or turret ordnance before the DFing player can fire. At the end of the AFV's MPH, its owner declares whether or not the AFV wishes to fire, which weapon(s) it will fire, and at what target(s). The DFing player then announces which (if any) weapon(s) in one hex he wishes to fire at the AFV, and what ROF he will use (including whether or not he will use Intensive Fire). Both players then make a dr, using the following DRMs which pertain to each player's own unit and apply to each player's own dr.

**BOTH PLAYERS**

- any Acquisition DRM
- armor leader or applicable leader/hero DRM
- if German AFV in pre-1944 scenario
- if AFV has 1MT, 2MT or ST (regardless if firing outside of CA)
- if in buildings or rubble or woods
- buttoned-up
- +2 if in Motion

**MOVING PLAYER**

- if AFV has functioning gyrostabilizer

**DFing PLAYER**

- if concealed or hidden
- if non-vehicular weapon (n.a. to ordnance +120mm)
- any gun traverse DRM (144.8)

X.2 The player with the lower modified dr must then immediately fire all the weapons he had prep designated; when his fire is concluded, the other player must then immediately fire all of his prep designated weapons (EXC: X.3). Place a Prep Fire counter on the moving AFV after it fires. If both players' modified drs are equal, both must fire all their prep designated weapons but no results take effect until both have fired all such weapons.

X.3 Sustained Fire may not be used during a Gun Duel but Intensive Fire may; however, the Intensive Fire shot (or any second shot for multiple ROF guns) may not be made until both players have fired once. If both sides Intensive Fire or have multiple ROF guns, their fire alternates (i.e., the player who fires first will also fire third—if still surviving; EXC: if both players' Gun Duel drs were equal, X.2).

X.4 Once a Gun Duel is finished or the moving AFV declines to make a Gun Duel dr, all remaining DF against it is conducted normally. If an AFV engages in a Gun Duel during its MPH, it is then no longer considered to be a moving target for DF unless it remains in Motion; also, it cannot then fire any armament during the AFPh. DF Immobilization attempts against an AFV are always made before any Gun Duel involving it is resolved.

X.5 If the DFing player has no weapons which can fire on the moving AFV, or if he wishes not to fire at it, the DFing player can still attempt a Gun Duel So as to be able to fire at a target before it can DF. In this case, the DFing player must still make his dr but receives no drms and need not pre-designate any hex (since none of his units are firing). If the moving player loses the dr, his AFV may not fire until the AFPh, when it must then do so at its pre-designated hex(es).

These rules have been playtested by members of Bob McNamara's local group and have worked very well. Up until now, the DFing player, knowing that no enemy units can fire at him until he has fired first, could unrealistically defer his shot until all movement was ended, thereby allowing himself to leisurely weigh the merits of the enemy's move and how to best coordinate his DF to annihilate the new "frozen" enemy. Use of Gun Duels forces the DFing player to consider firing before each vehicle ends its movement, in order to deny the moving player a possible first shot. This helps to diminish the unrealistic amount of coordination allowed to the DFing player, and thus restores to the moving player some of the advantage of initiative which the defender's present abilities deny him. Another realistic effect of the rule is that it re-creates the occurrence of chance encounters in which the defender doesn't notice the approaching enemy—something which was very common in both the chaos of battle and in the laxness of a quiet position "behind the front lines", but which has heretofore been impossible in the game. There is also lots of room for expansion in these rules (e.g., allowing use with any vehicle carrying FP which can be used in the AFPh; or infantry moving with SWs; or for that matter, any unit possessing FP which can be used in the AFPh). I guess it depends on how gross you want to get! We would like to hear the reaction of anyone trying this experimental rule in their games, as it is being contemplated for inclusion in the Advanced SQUAD LEADER Rulebook; address your comments to the attention of Mr. Don Greenwood.
VICTORY IN THE PACIFIC
Allies: David Sinay
Japan: Steve Resman
Commentary: James Lutz

This Series Replay utilizes the PBM system described in the preceding issue. All standard rules mentioned were in force throughout the game, and no optional rules were included. The Random Number Table was used to resolve speed rolls, attacks and damage (although the mechanics of the derivations will not be presented—only the results).

TURN 5

The I Mar reappears at Pearl Harbor and the 2 Mar is brought back at Australia. The Hulmar, Warprige, Resolution, and Revenge are withdrawn.

JAPAN, AFTER PATROLLERS: This turn will be crucial for the Japanese. I must take Midway, which will not be easy since the Allies have amassed ten air units and will no doubt fortify Midway with a good number of them. At first glance it seems that I should invade the area with both marine forces that I have at Truk; but, it would almost surely give him Guadalcanal and Port Moresby from the two marine units at Australia. I have decided to safeguard my positions in the south and send only one marine to the Central Pacific. His patrolling force will give me a better picture of his strategy, but the more I look at the board, the more I see an invasion of the South Pacific aiming for the capture of Lae, a move that would really flank the UN's perimeter this turn, I should be able to end the war in 1944, saving the atomics for the Nazis.

JAPAN, AFTER RAIDERS: Looking over the Allied raiders, one thing stands out—the complete lack of interest in the Central Pacific. Not even one land-based air unit! Does this mean that he will come in force to stop my expected invasion? Or will he be for the Marshall? Or will be try to push the single marine unit at Australia into the South Pacific for a surprise invasion of Lae? Or will he not invade and save his three marine units for next turn for a large operation? I am perplexed as to his goals! I must take Midway and I must protect the Marshalls and the South Pacific from possible invasion, and yet I do not have enough units to cover two of these areas, let alone three. I am sure that Dave is aware of this quandry and expects me to split my forces to cover these areas. If I did this, he would be guaranteed a good POC gain with limitations on mine so that we would break even. Since I need to grab as many POC as possible for the coming turns, my strategy will be to raid, and at the same time to garrison the ever important South Pacific with enough units to hold the area and Guadalcanal/Lae.

I have sent carriers into the Aleutians and cruisers to the North Pacific on raids, as well as the Marshalls, I would take Midway and the establishment of an Allied base in the Marshalls. These problems I can live with. The Japanese cannot afford to engage in any operations! The fact that I can concentrate only in the Coral Sea or the South Pacific is just too obvious. These areas surely are the ones where he will concentrate his forces. My objectives this turn are to keep Dave guessing about the Japanese intentions. The negative results could be the failure to eliminate the air unit in the Aleutians, but just like flies to his fire, and his are impervious to any raids that the Japanese win the desired surface action and then withdraw. In the Marshalls, the 22 AF is eliminated in an air action, only damaging the I Mar in return; but, the I-Boat disables the marines, thus preventing the Allies from securing a new base. In the Bay of Bengal, it is all Japanese as the Ramilies and Royal Sovereign go down in two successive air actions. In the Aleutians, after six air rounds, the tenacious RNZAF is finally eliminated after disabling the Hiryu in the first round and the Zuikaku in the sixth, just as it was eliminated itself. (The last four rounds took only one mailing since Steve and Dave agreed to a continuous air action until the situation was resolved.)

JAPAN, AFTER RAIDERS: The Allied move is cautious in that Allied forces are awaiting Japanese activity. The Allied position in the game makes the resulting dispositions appropriate ones. Dave should have brought the 2 Mar back at Samoa where it would be more threatening than at Pearl Harbor. Steve expected the marines elsewhere, and although two marines at Pearl were not necessary, the move demonstrates the difficulty in anticipating where marines will return, generally an advantage to the Americans given the major bases at Pearl Harbor, Samoa, and Australia while the Japanese basically have Truk as an option (for the Home Islands in the end game). Steve's move is not aggressive enough since he is not forcing the action. He might have patrolled to the Hawaiian Islands, gambing on a weak defense. In addition to the 5 POC swing, JIN control would bottle up the American Turn 6 reinforcements, permitting him to solidify his perimeter for the inevitable assault. At worst, he might force a major fleet action while he still has clear superiority. Such a move would be risky, but he must take such risks.

JAPAN, AFTER RAIDERS: Pluses and minuses are present for both sides after the raider placement. The Japanese will be able to capture Midway cheaply, and no major bases are in danger. Allied control in the North Pacific, Bay of Bengal and the Aleutians should be negated—saving such POC for the Japanese. I am uncertain as to why Steve is so concerned with the British fleet given its limited mobility. The Japanese need to inflict serious casualties and the moves have precluded that possibility, so the Allied fleets, including the British, will remain intact. Dave avoiding the chance of an unequal action in the South Pacific to maintain his fleet. One advantage for Dave is that he is intentionally changing his raiding tactics sufficiently to keep Dave guessing. He may be able to be cautious next turn having now demonstrated his willingness to split his fleet.

THE BATTLES: In the North Pacific, the lone Allied cruiser was disabled. In the Central Pacific, the Mikuma is sunk, but Midway falls. In the Coral Sea, the Japanese win the desired surface action and then withdraw. In the Marshalls, the 22AF is eliminated in an air action, only damaging the I Mar in return; but, the I-Boat disables the marines, thus preventing the Allies from securing a new base. In the Bay of Bengal, it is all Japanese as the Ramilies and Royal Sovereign go down in two successive air actions. In the Aleutians, after six air rounds, the tenacious RNZAF is finally eliminated after disabling the Hiryu in the first round and the Zuikaku in the sixth, just as it was eliminated itself. (The last four rounds took only one mailing since Steve and Dave agreed to a continuous air action until the situation was resolved.)

JAPAN, AFTER RAIDER: Again he has shot down one of my land-based air units with a single hit. This borders on the ridiculous. My air units fall like flies to his fire, and his are impervious to damage from my forces. I finally managed to eliminate the air unit in the Aleutians, but just barely. My air unit in the Marshalls failed to stop his moves. The I-Boat takes a single hit today, however, by disabling the marines before they could land.

This turn is a good one for the IANs as they break control in the Bay of Bengal and the Aleutians. The Japanese gain 3 POC to total 19 POC. I would like to have more, but I have won before without sur-
passing a 20 POC lead. I would like to have more to be sure, particularly given the carrier losses I have suffered. My victories in the past were achieved with a relatively inactive carrier force. Turn 6 lies ahead, and that means the start of the Allied offensive.

ALLIES, AFTER COMBAT: I am only down 19 POC, my fleet is intact, and there are numerous lanes into his inner areas. What more could an Allied commander ask for at this point in the game?

NEUTRAL COMMENTS, AFTER COMBAT: Neither Dave nor Steve has been able to deliver a knockout blow through the first half of the game. Dave has kept himself in a position to win (the best an Allied player can aspire to do against a competent opponent). On Turn 6, the initiative passes to Dave, and if he can handle being on the offensive, he is in a good position to win. One of Dave's marine units might have been better placed by being returned to Samoa rather than Australia. Steve's return of units to the Indonesia ports at least forces Dave to worry about defending the Bay of Bengal and the Indian Ocean.

TURN 6

The Sasono marines appear at Singapore, and the victorious winning.

JAPAN, AFTER PATROLLERS: I have patrolled all main areas with land-based air and kept almost the whole of the surface fleet on raid status to await the disposition of his units. I have sent a decoy force into the Bay of Bengal, hoping to draw his forces into Australia into the area to defend against a possible Japanese follow-up raid. Of course, there will not be such a raid.

ALLIES, AFTER PATROLLERS: My basic strategy is to patrol the rear areas with land-based air while raiding into his inner areas with surface forces. Nothing fancy. Depending on how he patrols, I will try to control at least one area from among the South Pacific, Central Pacific, or the Marshalls.

NEUTRAL COMMENTS, AFTER PATROLLERS: Steve's patrolling forces are again a little weak as he leaves himself open to the loss of important POCs. The weak patrolling forces are particularly a problem since he is forced to remain on the defensive. Japanese land-based air and the presence of the rear areas (the central and North Pacific) are problems. Dave has to start to be concerned about blocking raiding lanes to his rear areas and securing advanced bases. The initial part of his move can accomplish these goals.

JAPAN, AFTER RAIDERS: The Allies have sent out eight fleet units as raiders, which does not give him that much to raid with. The disposition of his forces looks as though he will raid into the Marshalls (including a marine unit) and also into Indonesia (including two marine units), linking up with the British forces. My reasoning on the latter course is that Dave must think Indonesia is ripe picking since he will assume that Bengal is my target. My two cruisers patrolling Bengal have given me an advantage. If he goes into Bengal expecting me there, I gain an extra turn of peace in Indonesia. If he goes to Indonesia, he will find the whole Imperial Navy there. I am massing my forces from Truk and Singapore, plus the two marine units, in this area, hopefully to destroy Allied sea power in the Southwest Pacific—the Allied sea power that I am almost sure will appear. If he invades the South Pacific, my two marine units will ensure my control of Lae.

Elsewhere, I am trying to negate his control and save POCs or sending minor reinforcements to areas that threaten where I have a chance of control. This turn could be another good one for the IJN.

ALLIES, AFTER RAIDERS: If he could use land-based air units as raiders, I am sure that he would do so! His powerful surface fleet still makes him extremely dangerous. The fact that I can only concentrate in the South Pacific (of the forward areas) makes that move too obvious. I am thus splitting my forces with the following objectives: (1) negate control in Indonesia (and with some luck, take the Philippines); (2) capture a forward base in the Marshalls from which I can launch future sea attacks from closer range; (3) negate control in the Marianas so that I have another access route to Indonesia; and (4) reinforce the patrollers in the Central and North Pacific with expendable units. Knowing my opponent's offensive tendencies, I doubt he will support his land-based air unit in the Marshalls, thus giving me a good shot at stealing 2 POCs. Also, his patrolling of the Bay of Bengal illustrates his offensive characterizations. I have chosen to attack due to the relatively unimportant strategic considerations. Steve mates his amphibious marines at Saigon pose a threat to Port Moresby and the Adaman Islands, but his lack of land-based air along with my own abundance of the same reduces the value of such a move for him, although this move is what I anticipate from him. Lastly, a back door raid into Guadalcanal by the I Mar would indeed be nice!

NEUTRAL COMMENTS, AFTER RAIDERS: The raiding turn has clearly favored the Japanese. There is an opportunity here for an important Japanese victory, and the threat to the weak Japanese POC position could potentially have been much worse. Steve may be able to control most areas and has a chance of hurting the Allied fleets. Although Dave correctly assessed the relative minor importance of control in the Bay of Bengal, he jumped the gun in Indonesia. Steve baited a trap and Dave sailed into it. It was gamble that need not have been taken! The American forces and the marine unit committed in Indonesia could probably have been defeated. Calculating the POC situation, Dave could have used a more cautious step by step approach to win the game—slowly compressing the Japanese position, safeguarding the rear areas, and establishing new bases for his superior land-based air. If inclined to gamble, he might have ventured a raid into Japanese waters from Pearl Harbor instead of going into Indonesia (replacing the carriers in the Marshalls from Pearl with ones from Australia). Depending upon the battles, Steve may have increased his chances of victory significantly.

THE BATTLES: In the North Pacific, an air round nets nothing. In the surface round that follows, the Minneapolis is disabled and the Boston damaged. Another air round sinks one Japanese cruiser, but in another surface round the damaged Boston is disabled. In a final air action the Oi is sunk. In the Central Pacific, Steve gets his preferred surface action—attacks on four different land-based air bases, while the Japanese lose only the Kako in return. The surviving Allied cruiser then retires. In two air actions in the Marianas, one light carrier is disabled and the other sunk. The Allies score two hits on the 22 AF, but it survives. In the Marshalls, Steve again gets his preference, and in an air action the marines are disabled, although the Allied carrier aircraft shoot down the land-based air. In the Coral Sea, the Japanese lack does not hold as the I-Boat misses the marines, and Guadalcanal falls. In an air action in the South Pacific, the Canberra is damaged and disabled, and the California suffers maximum damage while withdrawing. In the Bay of Bengal, the Japanese win a preference for a surface action, and the two cruisers successfully withdraw. Dave's air action and Steve's land-based surface. The tie in the preference roll resulted in a day/night action. Only two British cruisers were not sunk or disabled in the combined action. Allied air sinks the Zuikaku, and the combined firepower of the fleet sinks the Kumano and disables a number of other ships. A final air action sinks the two British cruisers.

JAPAN, AFTER COMBAT: Again my strategy paid off as Dave sent all of his Southwest Pacific based forces into Indonesia. The IJN virtually annihilated a major Allied fleet, which will definitely thin out his forces during the remaining game turns. Japanese losses, on the other hand, were light. Turn 7 will find the IJN in good shape. The Allies still have not established themselves in the Japanese perimeter, except in the South Pacific by the acquisition of Guadalcanal. With only three turns remaining it will be difficult for Dave to overcome the IJN lead. He needs a major victory and a major base inside the perimeter. I will be looking for him to invade the Indonesian area again. A simple example of what I mean since he has nowhere else to go! A confident Japanese commander now awaits the Allied patrollers.

ALLIES, AFTER COMBAT: (Expletives depleted by neutral commentator.) What a disaster! Nothing worked! I got caught in Indonesia! Failed to take Kwajalein! Could not negate control in the Marianas! I very cleverly snatched defeat from the jaws of victory—maybe. A lapsed game turn is a desperate struggle. The two hits I got on the 22 AF in the Marianas while losing a CVL in the process really shook Allied morale.

NEUTRAL COMMENTS, AFTER COMBAT: Dave took an unnecessary gamble and lost big. The results were even worse than he deserved. He not only lost preferences, he shot very poorly. The air/surface action in Indonesia at least gave Dave all his outnumbered forces a chance to fire. Eight missed shots against a 30 POC turn in a desperate struggle. The two hits I got on the 22 AF in the Marianas while losing a CVL in the process really shook Allied morale.

ALLIES, AFTER COMBAT: I have used the barest minimum forces for patrolling duty. I really do not know what to expect from Dave this turn. At first glance, the Indonesian area looks like a likely target, but the South Pacific and Central Pacific also look good for invasions. His patrollers will tell me much more.

ALLIES, AFTER RAIDERS: I will start the Allied offensive all over again by taking smaller bases. I am racing the I-Boat (I have mine having superior firepower of course), I am in a big trouble. The main objectives this turn are to control the Marshalls (causing the fall of Kwajalei and Maloelap) and/or controlling the South Pacific. His patrolling air units could disrupt both plans. He is concentrating the tempo of...
game, which is bad news at this point for me!

NEUTRAL COMMENTS, AFTER PATROLLERS: Steve again sends out minimum patrollers. He has gained nothing with this as often as not, particularly last turn given Dave's dispositions, but he is still asking for trouble. A stronger commitment in the Marianas might have been justified. He has apparently decided against any Fentis this time. The Aoba and the damaged 22 AF were apparently sent out against the new pattern of control areas. The new victory in Japan serve as excellent raiders since they are very useful in contesting areas with land-based air.

After having bit off more than he could chew last turn, Dave is moderating his appetite. His key concerns should be to capture new bases (such as in the new pattern) and, secondly, to set up a barrier of Allied-controlled areas to permit minimal garrisoning of his key rear POC areas. In this regard, the Wichita in the Central Pacific is insufficient. Such a barrier would permit him to concentrate his fleet and air units in forward areas where they will be needed. The forces in Australia should definitely not get pinched between them and the forces in the other areas. Japan may draw Japanese forces into that area. A good gamble this turn might be for Dave to send two or three CVLs to the Japanese Islands, escorted by a fast battleship and a cruiser from Pearl Harbor. He has indicated no interest in the pass in this type of raid, and thus he might take Steve by surprise. There is a definite advantage in changing tactics in mid-game. The loss of three POCs to the Japanese total might well be worth the gamble, and since the ships involved are fast ones, they can return to Pearl Harbor or Australia and still be involved in key areas on Turn 8.

JAPAN, AFTER RAIDERS: After seeing the Allied dispositions for patrollers, I am again feeling optimistic about the upcoming turn. The Allies will probably again push into Indonesia to coincide with a raid into the Marianas that would secure the Philippines. He may also go after Midway this turn with his marine unit based at Pearl Harbor. The mission for the JIN this turn is to keep Lae and the Philippines off the map. To accomplish this task, I sent a strong fleet and the two marines into Indonesia. I must stop his marines in this area. In other areas, I have sent the carriers, cruisers, and Kure marines into the Coral Sea to attempt to take Guadalcanal and negate his air forces in the South Pacific. In the Aleutians, the three new CVLs may save a POC.

It is the JIN's intention to hit the Allies where they are vulnerable. If he gains two POCs in one area, he should lose two POCs elsewhere to my raiders. If I come close to achieving this goal, the Allies will find this as disheartening as I find the turns in the JIN's turn remaining. Also, keeping the remaining units of the JIN intact until Turn 9 will help to assure a Japanese victory. I should be in great shape this turn since the only major battle looms in Indonesia, and my losses should be light. This turn could be another good one for the JIN.

ALLIES, AFTER RAIDERS: No surprises for his patrols—as usual! I have quite a carrier advantage but have only two Japanese carriers and would be able to raid safely with carriers lacking sufficient escorts as long as the areas are already US-controlled, giving me a +2 DRM for preferences. My most important objective is to open up a lane to Indonesia with the key being negation of his control in the South Pacific. To do this, Guadalcanal must be held. I will try to get marine reinforcements ashore from the Coral Sea side where Allied air cover is likely to be more effective. As a backup to this operation, I will try to capture a new base in the Marshalls either by amphibious assault with the 2 Mar or, even better, by isolation. I should be able to match up well in carriers in either area, and, with a +2 DRM on the preference roll, have a decent chance against his fleet which will more than likely show up in superior numbers in either the South Pacific, the Marshalls, or the Coral Sea.

NEUTRAL COMMENTS, AFTER RAIDERS: An excellent raiding turn for Dave. The Allies will gain the bases in the Marshalls, and the marines in the area will be available for movement into the inner Japanese areas next turn. Sending the marines was an excellent safety precaution. Allied control of Guadalcanal and the South Pacific seems assured (remember that marines land simultaneously, not Japanese marines first). Half of the remaining Japanese marines with modifying strikes are in jeopardy in the Coral Sea. Dave apparently bluffed a move into Indonesia, although he did not state this as his motive. Even the raid to the Japanese home waters would have worked (although admittedly the neutral commentator has an advantage for these suggestions having read all the previous comments). All in all, this was a fine turn. For Steve, he placed too much confidence in his evaluation of Dave's probable moves. He guessed wrong and will probably pay the price. Sending the three CVLs to the Aleutians is a standard, but still wise, action.

THE BATTLES: In the Aleutians in a number of air actions, the Chitose is sunk and the Chiyoda disabled. The Ryuho then retires gracefully. In the Central Pacific, Dave wins a surface action and the cruiser retires. In the North Pacific an air action results, and the Minneapolis survives the pursuit while the Aoba falls. There are too many air strikes, and Kwajalein and Maloelap fall to the Americans. In the Coral Sea, a surface action occurs. The Soryu and two JIN cruisers are sunk with one cruiser disabled, with minimal damage to the Allies. Kure and the crippled 3 MAR land (simultaneously) cancelling each other. The fast Japanese carriers run, sacrificing the Myoko, damaged in the preceding surface action, to pursuing Allied ships. In the South Pacific, in successive air rounds the 23 AF down the Naval AF and damages the 5 AF before being shot down.

JAPAN, AFTER COMBAT: Not much to say about the turn except that I am pleased with the results. I must confess, however, that his raiders did surprise me. The raid into the Coral Sea was something I did not expect, especially this late in the game and with the JIN 17 POC in the lead. His raid in the Coral Sea was more a help than a hindrance. It diverted attention away from Indonesia and the bases of Lae and the Philippines to an operation that was to be quite successful for the Allies. Thus, Dave's raiders were appropriately placed to contest the South Pacific, which was logical, since the potential gains from victory far outweighed the losses. Both sides are still in the game, but the Japanese could hardly have been more badly hurt, but the losses suffered on the turn cost the Japanese more.

TURN 8

JAPAN, AFTER PATROLLERS: I must be careful with my land-based air this turn since any that are lost will not return. I must be able to withdraw them from any area that seems doomed. I will need them for the "Turn 9 Allied assault. I have sent two air units to Indonesia and the Marianas, with the crippled unit patrolling the Japanese Islands. Dave will, on the other hand, have no air to the Marianas. I will, of course, want to pressure these areas, but the Allied CA at Dutch Harbor would have required surface units of my own to guarantee my control. My surface units are better off as raiders.

ALLIES, AFTER PATROLLERS: His deployment in the Philippines with the accompanying threat to patrol the Bay of Bengal and/or the Indian Ocean may draw Japanese forces into that area. My most pressing need is for another forward base, the best of which would be the Philippines. Second best would be a combination of Lae and Saipan. As far as POCS go, I need to control the Marianas (primarily for defensive purposes next turn) and negate control in Indonesia, while holding on to what I now have. The Japanese have no amphibious units from the Marianas as soon as possible. He will simultaneously control the South Pacific and the Marshalls, or the Coral Sea. The fast Japanese carriers run, sacrificing the Myoko, damaged in the preceding surface action, to pursuing Allied ships. In the South Pacific, in successive air rounds the 23 AF down the Naval AF and damages the 5 AF before being shot down.

JAPAN, AFTER COMBAT: Not much to say about the turn except that I am pleased with the results. I must confess, however, that his raiders did surprise me. The raid into the Coral Sea was something I did not expect, especially this late in the game and with the JIN 17 POC in the lead. His raid in the Coral Sea was more a help than a hindrance. It diverted attention away from Indonesia and the bases of Lae and the Philippines to an operation that was to be quite successful for the Allies. Thus, Dave's raiders were appropriately placed to contest the South Pacific, which was logical, since the potential gains from victory far outweighed the losses. Both sides are still in the game, but the Japanese could hardly have been more badly hurt, but the losses suffered on the turn cost the Japanese more.

TURN 8

The JIN map looks as follows:

JAPAN, AFTER RAIDERS: I must be careful with my land-based air this turn since any that are lost will not return. I must be able to withdraw them from any area that seems doomed. I will need them for the "Turn 9 Allied assault. I have sent two air units to Indonesia and the Marianas, with the crippled unit patrolling the Japanese Islands. Dave will, on the other hand, have no air to the Marianas. I will, of course, want to pressure these areas, but the Allied CA at Dutch Harbor would have required surface units of my own to guarantee my control. My surface units are better off as raiders.

ALLIES, AFTER PATROLLERS: His deployment in the Philippines with the accompanying threat to patrol the Bay of Bengal and/or the Indian Ocean may draw Japanese forces into that area. My most pressing need is for another forward base, the best of which would be the Philippines. Second best would be a combination of Lae and Saipan. As far as POCS go, I need to control the Marianas (primarily for defensive purposes next turn) and negate control in Indonesia, while holding on to what I now have. The Japanese have no amphibious units from the Marianas as soon as possible. He will simultaneously control the South Pacific and the Marshalls, or the Coral Sea. The fast Japanese carriers run, sacrificing the Myoko, damaged in the preceding surface action, to pursuing Allied ships. In the South Pacific, in successive air rounds the 23 AF down the Naval AF and damages the 5 AF before being shot down.

JAPAN, AFTER COMBAT: Not much to say about the turn except that I am pleased with the results. I must confess, however, that his raiders did surprise me. The raid into the Coral Sea was something I did not expect, especially this late in the game and with the JIN 17 POC in the lead. His raid in the Coral Sea was more a help than a hindrance. It diverted attention away from Indonesia and the bases of Lae and the Philippines to an operation that was to be quite successful for the Allies. Thus, Dave's raiders were appropriately placed to contest the South Pacific, which was logical, since the potential gains from victory far outweighed the losses. Both sides are still in the game, but the Japanese could hardly have been more badly hurt, but the losses suffered on the turn cost the Japanese more.
control in those areas. Come Turn 9, the IJN will only have to prevent the Allies from controlling the Home Islands to gain a win, or at least a draw. The damaged Haruna and Haruna are sent to a suicide mission into the Marianas to reinforce the air units and hopefully get a shot at the two Allied patrollers there.

My one great fear is that Dave will hit Indonesia hard and break control, taking away the 3 POC that I am counting on. Another fear, of course, is that Dave would retain some of his heavy units in the Hawaiian area—a disaster for the raiding carriers.

Since I will not fight for Indonesia or the Marianas next turn, the two marine units I have in the Philippines become expendable. So these will be sent to the Home Islands to reinforce the landings there, though the Guadalcanal, disabling his two land-based air units, and costing him 1 POC. The Allies will surely capture both the Philippines and Saipan, and I will not try to stop his marine landings. I will concentrate instead on his carriers and escorts. The more I knock out, the fewer I will see come Turn 9. I hope my units in the Marianas might be able to prevent control before they are withdrawn or overwhelmed in a round of combat.

ALLIES, AFTER RAIDERS: The obvious move is to mass in the Marianas where I can have my best shot at air and sea superiority. If I mass in the Marianas, however, the only good thing that can happen is for him to mass there also. Upon which I would lose my marines on an air roll (he gets the +2 DRM for preference), and possibly my patrollers as well. If a surface action results, I will lose carriers to his superior surface gunnery. I am wondering what is so good about even that! My gambling in one area also leaves the door open to a Japanese raid in the South Pacific with the possible fall of Guadalcanal. Quite possibly I will take my chance and amenable and split my fleet. The suicide CV and CVL mission in Indonesia has a chance of negating control while at the same time possibly catching an IJN backdoor amphibious reinforcement of Lae. I think he will depend on his land-based air and the +2 DRM for preference to negate landings in the Marianas. I am obviously expecting the brunt of his power in a raid in the South Pacific; although, a carrier raid on the Hawaiian Islands could negate control there, put me in a horrible POC position, and cause a sharp increase in Exedrin sales!

NEUTRAL COMMENTS, AFTER RAIDING: The Marianas were so obvious that neither side went there in strength, an indication of what may happen with simultaneous movement. Dave’s patrollers in the area may have looked like a trap to Steve, but they turned out to be something of a feint; although Dave’s comments indicate that he did not initially intend them to serve that purpose. Ships have obviously become expendable this turn for Dave a solid defensive measure to be the Hawaiian Islands, Marianas, and the South Pacific and the Allied incursion into Indonesia demonstrate this fact. I would argue that marine landings are more important than Steve conceives. A forward base at Saipan will permit the slower battleships in the area to be available for combat in the central Pacific if the necessary bases for air units, then surface ships must perform patrolling duties and these ships will be needed elsewhere on the critical Turn 9.

The Japanese raiders may have been ill-used, even if they take away the 3 POCs in Hawaii. Their placement leaves Dave a solid defensive measure the Hawaiian Islands, US Mandate, North Pacific, and Coral Sea (uncontested POC) on Turn 9. Depending on combat in the Marianas, the Marshalls could also be secure. Thus, Dave will be better able to concentrate his forces. Steve could also have attempted to negate control in the Central Pacific, opening up raiding lanes for Turn 9. At the very least, he should have spared the Yamato for the Indian Ocean. Negation of Allied control in this single area could have permitted fast carriers at Singapore to threaten Allied control of the Coromandel. The Japanese carrier forces could be badly decimated on this turn, leaving Steve with little to defend the Home Islands on Turn 9. The incursion into Indonesia looks bad in retrospect, but it was a worthwhile gamble. Since the Japanese fleet is there, it cannot be elsewhere—to the other battleships look more promising. If the bulk of the fleet had gone elsewhere, then the carriers would have a chance. At least one carrier was needed so as to have shots at any marines that might have been attempting to reinforce Lae. The F-Boat will have numerous targets, but Dave might consider sending it to Bengal where a surface action would prevent potential disabling or sinking of a Japanese carrier and a greater chance of retention of Allied control.

The battle in the Hawaiian Islands will be a key one this turn. The surface units could make a difference. A night action, if it comes first, would virtually eliminate the chances of a successful outcome for the IJN. Since Allied control of the Central Pacific is assured, the battle around Hawaii will be very important.

The BATTLEs: In the South Pacific, the two Japanese marines are sunk in a surface action and Lae fails to the American marines. In Indonesia, Steve gets his preferred surface action, and the American carriers are slaughtered. In the Bay of Bengal, Steve again wins a preference roll, getting an air action. But, only one land-based air unit is knocked down with only the Hiryu being disabled in return. The remaining three carriers are then sunk in the surface action, damaging the Wisconsin in return. In the Marianas Dave wins his first preference roll, getting an air action. But, only one land-based air unit is shot down, with the other being damaged. Dave concentrates on the patrolling patrols, and the Japanese planes, and the Queensland is damaged. The next round is Steve’s preferred surface action. Both Japanese battleships fire on the Iwo, the last patrol. It is damaged and disabled, as is the Fusou. Steve then withdraws his damaged air unit, and the Haruna is easily sunk by the pursuit shots of the Allied ships and air strikes.

JAPAN, AFTER COMBAT: Praise to Buddha and Shinto! For the loss of three carriers, I have broken control in the Hawaiian Islands. The IJN forces in the Marianas even managed to cost the Allies a very important POC, again with only modest losses. These two strategic victories almost automatically assure the Japanese of at least a draw in this game since the +14 POC lead means the Allies will have to control the Home Islands for a draw. In fact, I will only have to stop Allied control of the POC.

I must comment on the Allied strategy this turn. I expected the Allies to come out charging this turn to put as much hurt on the IJN as possible. The more losses he would have inflicted this turn, the less units he would have encountered come Turn 9. Also, I do not believe them to be ignored with raiders in the Marianas or at least attack in strength in Indonesia? I still wonder why Dave played a semi-defensive turn this late in the game. Of course, I am looking at his move from one side of the coin, and everyone wishes they had foresight. The beauty of pow VTP is that anything can happen at any time. His moves were unexpected to me, but he did expect mine in Hawaii, so Dave’s strategy was not all that bad.

ALLIES, AFTER COMBAT: I could not find enough Excedrin to cure the headache he gave me in the Hawaiian Islands. I was sure that the land-based air units could hold at least one round and give me a second chance to knock out his carriers with surface gunnery. That first preference roll in Hawaii really hurt.

NEUTRAL COMMENT, AFTER COMBAT: Steve’s move was great in retrospect. The key was the fact that he won the preference rolls, ultimately including the one in the Marianas since his surface craft (well-placed) did have an opportunity to fire. Other than the Bay of Bengal, he also shot well. The carrier forces could be badly decimated in the Marianas and the Hawaiian Islands and Dave won them both. Thus, an element of luck has left him in great shape. If the Allied carriers in Indonesia had negated Japanese control, it would be a different game. It must be added, however, that Steve made a move that permitted him to have the opportunity for the good results that he got.

TURN 9

The Kure marines appear in Japan.

JAPAN, AFTER PATROLLERS: My returns for Turn 8 placed a large number of units in the Philippines in the hope of luring some of his forces away from other than the Home Islands. All my units will patrol this area. The units in the Philippines all have a speed factor of seven or better, so they all can patrol to the Japanese Islands. The IJN still has considerable battleship strength and remains a formidable foe. More than likely I will seek a surface action at first opportunity to make use of this still potent force.

Here the drawback of not attacking in force in the Marianas will become apparent to Dave. His large fleet in the South Pacific is incapable of reaching the Japanese Islands for patrol. This fleet should have been in the Marianas for use on Turn 9 (as potential patrollers, that is).

ALLIES, AFTER PATROLLERS: Being down 14 POC instead of 11 (Hawaiian Island loss) almost guarantees my losing any chance of surprise. The guessing is gone. The only way possible to get 14 points is to control everything I have now, plus the Marianas and Indonesia, while at the same time negating his control in the Japanese Islands. These facts are surely just as obvious to Steve. If his entire fleet patrols the Home Islands, which I think he will patrol this area. The units in the Philippines all have a speed factor of seven or better, so they all can patrol to the Japanese Islands. The IJN still has considerable battleship strength and remains a formidable foe. More than likely I will seek a surface action at first opportunity to make use of this still potent force.

Here the drawback of not attacking in force in the Marianas will become apparent to Dave. His large fleet in the South Pacific is incapable of reaching the Japanese Islands for patrol. This fleet should have been in the Marianas for use on Turn 9 (as potential patrollers, that is).

ALLIES, AFTER PATROLLERS: The Japanese Islands are the key for this turn as both Dave and Steve correctly surmise, but both moves could be better. Steve’s move is too cautious. A few carriers such as the Chitose or Katsuragi could have been kept as raiders to force Dave to worry about control of the Alutuars or the Marianas. He might be forced to divert ships from the Home Islands as a protective measure. Such a raid could even give Steve a victory if IJN control of the Japanese Islands is negated. These carriers may even have been sent as raiders to the Home Islands. It is possible that Dave could have been ignored as targets in an air action in any event. Since Dave knows that he must fight in the Japanese Islands, he should have sent in the few patrollers that he could muster. It would make Steve’s selection of targets more difficult. There is nothing worse than being forced to allocate air strikes to a light American carrier that has received maximum damage but is still
area anyway, if for no other reason than to make him waste shots at lousy targets. Fortunately, he played the last turn as bad. All those preference rolls I lost on Turns 7 and 8 (and 9) finally evened out as my shooting was quite a bit better than his. Because of the kind of guy that Steve is, I am sure that he will refrain from any reference to luck!

I clearly had a hand in sinking Turn 6 due to some of his tactical errors, foremost of which I thought was his taking on the British in the Indian Ocean. However, my untimely and weak foray into Indonesia on Turn 6 pretty much erased any edge I might have had at that time.

Anyway, the only way I thought it was an exciting game, typical of most PBM Victory in the Pacific games.

**NEUTRAL COMMENTATOR, EPILOGUE:** So, one year later (typical playing time for the game by mail), the contest ends in a rare draw. While it took great expertise on the part of both players to bring about this conclusion, the outcome does reflect the closeness of the contest. Both players generally did well while on the defensive and less well when they had the advantage. Thus, their basic strengths and weaknesses evened out.

Steve in the early turns failed to build up a large lead. He never forced Dave to fight on his terms for key positions or POCs. His effort to isolate American forces was not entirely successful, but his tactical implementation was weak. Dave was able to negate control in the Indian Ocean or the Coral Sea. A few patrolling battleships or two patrolling land-based air units might have changed the game. Thus, the tactical implementation of the strategic goal was ineffective. For instance, the game appears to have had the edge in terms of anticipating Dave's moves, yet he could never really capitalize on it.

Steve's strategic goals seemed to be the same as I could have enjoyed, although this conclusion can only be inferred from his comments. It is not a bad approach for an Allied player—parry the Japanese moves early and then go on the offensive. Dave's gamble in the Central Pacific on Turn 2 was one exception. He survived the battle, but failure could have cost him the game. Midway was not that important, and he could not afford to lose the battle. Steve's attack on the Home Islands in Indonesia was a second exception that hurt him badly. The lack of patrollers in Japanese waters on Turn 9 has received ample comment from Dave himself. A few raids early in the game might have borne results for the Allies. Dave did do a good job of planning for the upcoming turn, for this the Japanese have less concern with given the centrality of Truk as a major port.

Since Steve brought up the luck factor, a comment is in order. Granted that Dave had good rolls on Turn 9 (and Turn 2 in the Central Pacific), Steve had forgotten his good shooting. The Allied land-based air units in the Hawaiian Islands on Turn 8, as did the patrolling ships in the Marianas. Then, there was the very poor Allied shooting on Turn 6 in Indonesia. In fact, Steve's shooting was generally excellent everywhere on Turn 6. All but one marine unit was turned back through a combination of preference roll victories and shooting. Poor air shooting in the Indian Ocean on Turn 3 also permitted the escape of numerous IJN fleet units that might otherwise have been sunk. Thus, Steve's early luck helps to explain his position on Turn 9. On the whole, it does not seem to me that Lady Luck chose a side in the game.

Notwithstanding the presumed inexactness of these comments and the ones made during the game, it is always easier to see the "correct" moves when one is not actually playing the game and when the comments from all the previous turns are known. My ultimate conclusion is that it was a well-played game, although doubtless many out there are sure that they would have done better.

**JAPAN, AFTER RAIDERS:** Either Dave did not count POC correctly or he is trying for a draw the hard way. I think the former is obvious since he is wasting ships on patrol duty and does not even attempt to send patrols into the Japanese Islands. I doubt that Dave can overcome the large IJN fleet along with five-land-based air units with his raiding forces. One thing is clear—the Japanese will not lose this game!

**ALLIES, AFTER RAIDERS:** Steve made it easy for me by patrolling with all his ships in the Japanese Islands. All available ships will sail there and hope for the best. He will have more surface ships, so I have to do with a series of air actions.

**NEUTRAL COMMENTS, AFTER RAIDERS:** After the patrolling moves, the dispatch of the raiders was a simple task. Dave did not neglect to guard against the movement of the marines into the Marianas. If I turn on the same turn that the Philippine Islands are invaded, the two air units will be disabled since simultaneous landings permit land-based air to remain at the same base. Negation of Allied control in the Marianas would ensure a Japanese victory regardless of the outcome of the battles in the Japanese Islands.

**THE BATTLES:** In the Marianas an air action is the preference and the Japanese marine is disabled preventing a major Japanese victory. In the Home Islands the first action is on the surface. When the smoke clears, six Japanese surface units have been sunk and an additional six disabled. Only seven cruisers remain for future actions. Only four American ships are sunk and four others disabled, including one of the two CVLs fired upon. The F-Boat then sinks the Shokaku. In the air portion of a day/night action on the second round of combat, four of the Japanese land-based air units are eliminated, and all the carriers except the Chitozo and Ryudo are sunk or disabled. Seven American carriers are sunk or disabled, but six remain. In the following surface action of the Japanese, the cruisers are sunk or disabled while only three American ships are put out of action. Another air action results in the downing of the last land-based air units might have changed the game. Thus, the tactical implementation of the strategic goal was ineffective. For instance, the game appears to have had the edge in terms of anticipating Dave's moves, yet he could never really capitalize on it.

Steve's strategic goals seemed to be the same as I could have enjoyed, although this conclusion can only be inferred from his comments. It is not a bad approach for an Allied player—parry the Japanese moves early and then go on the offensive. Dave's gamble in the Central Pacific on Turn 2 was one exception. He survived the battle, but failure could have cost him the game. Midway was not that important, and he could not afford to lose the battle. Steve's attack on the Home Islands in Indonesia was a second exception that hurt him badly. The lack of patrollers in Japanese waters on Turn 9 has received ample comment from Dave himself. A few raids early in the game might have borne results for the Allies. Dave did do a good job of planning for the upcoming turn, for this the Japanese have less concern with given the centrality of Truk as a major port.

Since Steve brought up the luck factor, a comment is in order. Granted that Dave had good rolls on Turn 9 (and Turn 2 in the Central Pacific), Steve had forgotten his good shooting. The Allied land-based air units in the Hawaiian Islands on Turn 8, as did the patrolling ships in the Marianas. Then, there was the very poor Allied shooting on Turn 6 in Indonesia. In fact, Steve's shooting was generally excellent everywhere on Turn 6. All but one marine unit was turned back through a combination of preference roll victories and shooting. Poor air shooting in the Indian Ocean on Turn 3 also permitted the escape of numerous IJN fleet units that might otherwise have been sunk. Thus, Steve's early luck helps to explain his position on Turn 9. On the whole, it does not seem to me that Lady Luck chose a side in the game.

Notwithstanding the presumed inexactness of these comments and the ones made during the game, it is always easier to see the "correct" moves when one is not actually playing the game and when the comments from all the previous turns are known. My ultimate conclusion is that it was a well-played game, although doubtless many out there are sure that they would have done better.

**ALLIES, EPILOGUE:** So it wound up as a draw without a game. I gave Dave little chance in the Home Islands last turn. But again, the weak approach for an Allied player—parry the Japanese moves early and then go on the offensive. Dave's gamble in the Central Pacific on Turn 2 was one exception. He survived the battle, but failure could have cost him the game. Midway was not that important, and he could not afford to lose the battle. Steve's attack on the Home Islands in Indonesia was a second exception that hurt him badly. The lack of patrollers in Japanese waters on Turn 9 has received ample comment from Dave himself. A few raids early in the game might have borne results for the Allies. Dave did do a good job of planning for the upcoming turn, for this the Japanese have less concern with given the centrality of Truk as a major port.

Since Steve brought up the luck factor, a comment is in order. Granted that Dave had good rolls on Turn 9 (and Turn 2 in the Central Pacific), Steve had forgotten his good shooting. The Allied land-based air units in the Hawaiian Islands on Turn 8, as did the patrolling ships in the Marianas. Then, there was the very poor Allied shooting on Turn 6 in Indonesia. In fact, Steve's shooting was generally excellent everywhere on Turn 6. All but one marine unit was turned back through a combination of preference roll victories and shooting. Poor air shooting in the Indian Ocean on Turn 3 also permitted the escape of numerous IJN fleet units that might otherwise have been sunk. Thus, Steve's early luck helps to explain his position on Turn 9. On the whole, it does not seem to me that Lady Luck chose a side in the game.

Notwithstanding the presumed inexactness of these comments and the ones made during the game, it is always easier to see the "correct" moves when one is not actually playing the game and when the comments from all the previous turns are known. My ultimate conclusion is that it was a well-played game, although doubtless many out there are sure that they would have done better.

**JAPAN, EPILOGUE:** Japanese players are not known to be particularly accurate in the PBM game, but his tactical implementation was weak. Dave was able to control the Indian Ocean or the Coral Sea. A few patrolling battleships or two patrolling land-based air units might have changed the game. Thus, the tactical implementation of the strategic goal was ineffective. For instance, the game appears to have had the edge in terms of anticipating Dave's moves, yet he could never really capitalize on it.

Steve's strategic goals seemed to be the same as I could have enjoyed, although this conclusion can only be inferred from his comments. It is not a bad approach for an Allied player—parry the Japanese moves early and then go on the offensive. Dave's gamble in the Central Pacific on Turn 2 was one exception. He survived the battle, but failure could have cost him the game. Midway was not that important, and he could not afford to lose the battle. Steve's attack on the Home Islands in Indonesia was a second exception that hurt him badly. The lack of patrollers in Japanese waters on Turn 9 has received ample comment from Dave himself. A few raids early in the game might also have borne results for the Allies. Dave did do a good job of planning for the upcoming turn, for this the Japanese have less concern with given the centrality of Truk as a major port.

Since Steve brought up the luck factor, a comment is in order. Granted that Dave had good rolls on Turn 9 (and Turn 2 in the Central Pacific), Steve had forgotten his good shooting. The Allied land-based air units in the Hawaiian Islands on Turn 8, as did the patrolling ships in the Marianas. Then, there was the very poor Allied shooting on Turn 6 in Indonesia. In fact, Steve's shooting was generally excellent everywhere on Turn 6. All but one marine unit was turned back through a combination of preference roll victories and shooting. Poor air shooting in the Indian Ocean on Turn 3 also permitted the escape of numerous IJN fleet units that might otherwise have been sunk. Thus, Steve's early luck helps to explain his position on Turn 9. On the whole, it does not seem to me that Lady Luck chose a side in the game.

Notwithstanding the presumed inexactness of these comments and the ones made during the game, it is always easier to see the "correct" moves when one is not actually playing the game and when the comments from all the previous turns are known. My ultimate conclusion is that it was a well-played game, although doubtless many out there are sure that they would have done better.

**ALLIES, EPILOGUE:** The Japanese Empire is history! As long as I have been playing Victory in the Pacific, I have never been conscious of the fact that the Allies get three POCs for controlling the Japanese Islands! I picked a good time to find out. I feel like an idiot! I should have sent patrols to the
The Two New Winners
Coming This Summer

**NATO:** The Next War in Europe
$15

Poised on the West German border, the Warsaw Pact juggernaut is ready to make the dash to the Atlantic. The NATO nations are in disarray, and their commitment to withstand aggression is in question. When the armored columns advance, will NATO be able to stop them?

NATO allows you to simulate a potential NATO/Warsaw Pact confrontation in Central Europe. Designed to be played in one sitting, this operational level game is of moderate complexity and yet recreates the major problems facing each side — from maintaining supply lines to transporting troops to potential nuclear warfare. Each of the three basic scenarios can be played in an evening. NATO offers a combination of flexibility and ease of play that is certain to make it a classic.

---

**The Next Generation of Great Games**

**AMBUSH!** The Solitaire Game with Guts
$24

At last, the game players have been asking for!

An American squad trudges across the devastated French countryside on their way to the Rhine. Suddenly, bullets start buzzing around them! A German patrol has them spotted. Then, mortar fire explodes all around! They have walked into an ambush! Time to start fighting!

Ambush! is the unique solitaire wargame that lets you recreate small unit tactics during World War II. The ground-breaking game system puts you in charge of an American squad — faced with a variety of missions against an ever-changing, hidden German foe. A number of scenarios are included, each recreating a different kind of small unit operation.

---

**Join the Victory Games Line**

**GULF STRIKE**
$30.00

Comprehensive land, air and naval combat in the Persian Gulf, depicted on strategic and operational levels. Comes with three big mapsheets, 910 playing pieces, and five scenarios. For two players, or more with division of command.

**HELL'S HIGHWAY**
$20.00

Operation Market-Garden — the Allied race to seize a bridge across the Rhine in World War II — recreated on an operational scale. Includes two large maps, 520 playing pieces, two player-aid cards, and three scenarios.

**THE CIVIL WAR**
$18.00

America’s epic struggle from the bitter campaigns in the East to the skirmishes in the West — the decisive strategic level game of the whole war. Contains two big maps, 520 playing pieces, four yearly scenarios, and campaign scenario.

---

From the Company That Makes It Happen...

Victory Games, Inc.
43 West 33rd Street
Suite 603
New York, NY 10001
Dear Mr. Martin:

I was amazed at, and somewhat surprised, reading letters expressing dissatisfaction with the style of play on the 1983 edition of "Basic Arms And The Man" (Vol. 18, No. 3). Mark Swanson does not mention the 3-2 and 1-1 style of attack, although he does state that the presence of a leader gives one large attack the highest possibility of winning. The reason the dual attack is not mentioned in the MGMs can be found here, while they are of no benefit in the 2-1 attack.

R. L. St. George
Linthicum, Woodburn

Dear Editor:

While I agree that "Basic Arms And The Man" is a good game, I have some serious doubts on your credibility as editor of this fine wargame magazine. You have stated that the game is "not a wargame". By including this article, you have cast serious doubts on your credibility as editor of this fine wargame magazine.

The article titled "The History of Wargames: From the Ancients to the Present" is written by Mr. Alten, who has a reputation as a wargame expert.

John G. Allen

I am not interested in apologizing for the piece on OH-WAH-REE. I will spare a moment to elucidate, although the ratings for the individual articles are not covered in detail here. This periodical has been published by the Avalon Hill Game Company since 1983.

The editors of this periodical have included articles that discuss the wargaming community. It is my understanding that the editors of this periodical have included articles that discuss the wargaming community.

Dear Mr. Martin:

The article entitled "The Naval War of 1812: Naval Rules Changes for WAP & PEACE" (Vol. 19, No. 4) is well written and should be read by all wargamers.

W. A. S. Nightingale

Respectfully yours,

Dear Mr. Martin:

The editors of this periodical have included articles that discuss the wargaming community. It is my understanding that the editors of this periodical have included articles that discuss the wargaming community.

Dale A. Sheaffer

The Avalon Hill Game Company

I have a question that has been bothering me for some time. What is the purpose of the "Napoleon's War at Sea" section of this issue?

Bill Nightingale

Dear Mr. Martin:

The editors of this periodical have included articles that discuss the wargaming community. It is my understanding that the editors of this periodical have included articles that discuss the wargaming community.

W. A. S. Nightingale

Respectfully yours,
The following changes in content will be made to the second edition of GI. Additional cosmetic changes will be made but are not listed here.

COUNTER ERRATA:

U.S. 12.7 Aa is missing the 360 degree symbol. The M4A3 survival listing should be 66, not 57. The M4A3E2 counter A is missing a red 4 turret armor modifier.

The M3Mb counter F should have a MF of 14; not 15.

The LVTA(A) should be shown as an OT vehicle. DURW counters C & D should have red stars; not black.

Delete the A4A5 listing of the British M4A3E2.

Delete the A5A6 listing of the British M10.

Scenario Errata:

34 Change "target" to "target hex"; everytime it appears in the Clarifications, Add: "(Rec: 133.52) between "obstruction" and "although" in Special Rules 34.1.

35 Incorrect versions of certain counters are shown. Replace the French 2-3-7 crew and all French MG's with the proper corresponding counters for their nationality. The Stuart I tank counter should be the version with a 4 BMG factor.

37 Insert "or" between "row" & "adjacent" in the U.S. setup instructions. Change board "4" to "6".

38 The M4A3(75)w counter should have a MF of 15; not 14. Add to the Victory Conditions: "Control is gained by being the last sole occupant of the building. If an enemy occupies a higher level of the building, the U.S. player must also be the last sole occupant of that level."

41 Change the U.S. HS in 205 to a 2-3-7 crew, and the 4a bazooka in 1030 to a 42b version.

42 Insert "ground level" between "each" & "building" in the victory conditions. The two U.S. HS's should be crewed.

QRDC Errata:

Delete the triangle symbol from the 144.8 chart.

Add: "or" between "row" & "adjacent" in the Victory Conditions.

Delete the word "same" from 169.2 chart: Add: "More near the objective;" between "hex" & "Turretted.

Delete the Cannister depletion chart.

Delete: "same" from chart.

Delete "adding" to "subtracting".

Delete: "the Cannister depletion number has been exceeded, the attack must be repeated with HE or IFE but using the same DR as a To Hit DR." between "Table" & "Cannister".

Add: "or changing their VeA in" between "Table" & "Cannister".
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42 Insert "ground level" between "each" & "building" in the victory conditions. The two U.S. HS's should be crewed.

QRDC Errata:

Delete the triangle symbol from the 144.8 chart.

Add: "or" between "row" & "adjacent" in the Victory Conditions.

Delete the word "same" from 169.2 chart: Add: "More near the objective;" between "hex" & "Turretted.

Delete the Cannister depletion chart.

Delete: "same" from chart.

Delete "adding" to "subtracting".

Delete: "the Cannister depletion number has been exceeded, the attack must be repeated with HE or IFE but using the same DR as a To Hit DR." between "Table" & "Cannister".

Add: "or changing their VeA in" between "Table" & "Cannister".
Our issue featuring STRUGGLE OF NATIONS—Vol. 19, No. 5—drew raves all around. Indeed, it proves to be the best rated issue in over three years (since Vol. 16, No. 1) with an overall rating of 2.75. Whether this is due to the Napoleonic theme, to the mixture of articles devoted to the old and the new (WATERLOO and STRUGGLE OF NATIONS), to the mix of tactical and strategic (WOODEN SHIPS & IRON MEN and WAR & PEACE), or simply to the joy of the SL community at having four new scenarios to chew, it is most gratifying. The ratings for the individual articles of this issue—based on a random sampling of two hundred responses with values of “3,” “2” or “1” assigned to the first, second and third choices of those responding—are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article Title</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLAYING BOTH SIDES OF THE ELSE</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS/JM OF THE LEVANT</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPOLEON'S WAR AT SEA</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRO-FRENCH NAVAL STRATEGY</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRITISH NAVAL STRATEGY</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPOLEON'S MARSHALS</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE COMPLETE DIPLOMAT</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOGISTICS OF THE STRUGGLE</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AH PHILOSOPHY</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and the Hiittite antifreeze, Guttenkunst-subsidized, did fall upon the forces of Pharaoh and fettered them and laminated them and did cut them to pieces... With that, most readers would surmise that Richard Guttenkunst has again worked his magic in offering top-quality counters of a recent variant that has graced these pages—in this instance, the A&L “Ramses” (and Pete’s 19, No. 4). These laminated counters will be sent to those who forward to Mr. Guttenkunst the sum of $2.00 a set, plus a self-addressed, stamped envelope. Mail check or money order to Mr. Richard Guttenkunst, Box 3301, Traffic Station, Minneapolis, MN 55403.

Politesse is the newsletter of the extremely active Dale City (Virginia) “telephonic” DIPLOMACY organization. Devoted to club news and reports of completed games, the ‘zine serves the interests of DIPLOMACY gamers in the Northern Virginia and Maryland region. Currently, a Metro-DC area telephone game is being organized, with turns scheduled in weekly to the gamemaster. In a unique departure, the editors of the ‘zine offer subscriptions for any duration and price the subscriber feels is fair. Those residing in the Mid-Atlantic region searching for something out of the ordinary are urged to contact Mr. Ed Wrobel, 3932 North Forestdale Avenue, Dale City, VA 22193.

The third annual Northeast Gaming Association Playoffs (NGAP) are now complete. This is the annual team gaming event, utilizing the Association’s Team Gaming rules (3rd edition available for $2.00), which involves many of the best overall gamers anywhere. Among the six games utilized for the 1982 competition were SQUAD LEADER, VICTORY IN THE PACIFIC, WOODEN SHIPS & IRON MEN and RUSSIAN CAMPAIGN. The finals of the NGAP were won in convincing fashion by the Southwestern Massachussets Gamers, pitted against the Mid-Hudson Valley Games Club. Their victorious four-man team was comprised of Seth Owen, Mark Rogol, David Drucker, and Scott Landry. Plans are being finalized for the 1983 competition, with scheduling to begin in August and the finals to be played in December. A $10.00 entry fee will be imposed for each four-man team. The specific games which will be featured have not yet been announced. Those interested in learning more of team gaming or in placing a team in competition are requested to contact Mr. Jeff Cornett, Commissioner of the NGAP, 11 Robert Frost Drive, Shelton CT, 06484 (203-928-6147). Finally, the NGA plans a meeting coinciding with ORIGINS in Detroit to consider extending these playoffs to encompass the Midwest.

After almost a year of negotiations, Avalon Hill has acquired the rights to distribute Chaosium’s popular fantasy games RUNEQUEST and its line of play-aid and supplements. The agreement requires Chaosium to develop a third edition RQ for publication by Avalon Hill in early 1984. The new edition is to be followed by quarterly publication of new supplements, which will initially combine new game material with re-edited material from previous publications. The Avalon Hill editions will all have a new boxed format.

RUNEQUEST was first introduced in July 1978 as a softcover book. Since then, the game system has been available in hardwood and boxed set versions. Its second edition won a 1979 Strategist Award for outstanding game design.

The 1983 edition of the Black and Blue Book is now available. Containing almost three times the number of counters as the 1982 edition, it is an indispensable aid for the serious student of the devious world of DIPLOMACY over 300 FFT and PBM players in California are listed by name, address and telephone number, along with brief summaries of the state’s eleven DIPLOMACY “zones” and their publishers. The BBB uses a unique cross reference system based on telephone area codes and postal ZIP codes to help players make local contacts when searching for opponents. The BBB is available for $2.00 postpaid, from The Institute of Diplomatic Studies, Box 8416, San Diego, CA 92102.

In Redondo Beach is a group of active and talented game enthusiasts, styling themselves the Random Wargamers. Their regular club “zine,” The Random Wargamer, is an effort that would make many others envious. It contains club news, information on their official playtests, articles and reviews of new games and news of the hobby. Those residing in the area interested in top-notch games are urged to contact Mr. Charles Cran, Editor, The Random Wargamer, 2413 Mathews #b, Redondo Beach, CA 90278.

It is obvious that many players of STRUGGLE OF NATIONS suffer from an excessive attack of the elan that brought Napoleon low. Of the numerous entries to Contest No. 111, but six agreed with Mr. Zucker’s opinion that the best French strategy is a defensive one. This is not to say that the French merely sit in their initial positions, accept the Allied onslaught; the occupation of key defensive terrain and adjustment of lines is necessary. Bernard Wodzinski came closest to recognizing that superior French play in the Dresden Scenario demands an “offensive, defensive” strategy. The following are awarded their March, Roger D. Ditko, Detroit, MI; Scott Hess, Hocksett, OH; Bill Eggis, Cedar Rapids, IA; Danny McCarthy, Phoenix, AZ; Tom Scholle, Eldon, MO; and Bernard Wodzinski, Pittsburgh, PA. And Ruth Glasser is awarded an Honorable Mention for her lengthy and well-considered justification for selecting the offensive—even if it is wrong.

In Contest #112, the Japanese player faces an almost incredible plethora of fine options. From the surprising placement of the Allied patrols, it seems obvious that the American player has decided not to attempt control of the Japanese Islands, but is instead striving to guarantee a draw by seizing all areas worth POCs. The Japanese player, on the other hand, is defending them with raiders. [Note that the New York was inadvertently listed as under repairs at Pearl; in point of fact it enters play on Turn 9 at Pearl. Although this error has no effect on the solution, apologies are tendered for the confusion.] Simplicity is the best policy. The player must insure that the Japanese retain enough POCs, as the readers will have noticed, this is precisely the situation faced by the Japanese player in our current Series Replay (which resulted in a draw). To now win, the Japanese player need merely retain control of any area or deny Allied control of any area in addition to that of the Japanese Islands (which the Allies cannot control without patrollers!)

Thus, the Japanese player may commit large forces to the Japanese Islands or Indonesia as long as these are aimed at diluting the Allied concentration of forces (certain to bring the massive Allied fleet out from Lae); or he may go for control of a region the Allies have little interest in (the Central Pacific or Indian Ocean)—although this too will bring a descent of Allied raiders en masse; or he may commit a large force to the Japanese Islands and try to block Allied control permanently, or he can attempt to block Allied control in numerous areas, placing his opponent on the horns of a dilemma—but in so doing diluting his own force and risking loss of all piecemeal. In point of fact, all are good strategies. However, the third option above is virtually foolproof.

Where to take on the Allies? Where else—the Aleutians. Given the placement of the Allied forces, the Aleutians are the one area on the board that can be reached by the bulk of the Japanese at Yokosuko and not by the Allies at Lae. This gives the Japanese player the balance of power at this one crucial point. To dilute the Allied effort and distract the Allied player, some effort must be made during the patrolling phase. The forces in the Philippines are the perfect sacrifice given your future move. Thus, send a ship to the Indian Ocean, another to the Central Pacific, a couple patrol at Lae; or he may go for control of a region the Allies have little interest in (the Central Pacific or Indian Ocean)—although this too will bring a descent of Allied raiders en masse; or he may commit a large force to the Japanese Islands and try to block Allied control permanently, or he can attempt to block Allied control in numerous areas, placing his opponent on the horns of a dilemma—but in so doing diluting his own force and risking loss of all piecemeal. In point of fact, all are good strategies. However, the third option above is virtually foolproof.

Thus, the answer for Contest 112 hinges on the commitment of a minimum of 16 ships to the Aleutians. The dispatch of the other ships, the Marines and the air units is a matter of little import, as long as these are aimed at diluting the Allied concentration of force.
GENERAL BACK ISSUES

Only the following GENERAL back issues are still available. Price is $2.50 per issue plus 10% postage and handling charges (20% to Canada, 30% overseas). Maryland residents please add 5% state sales tax.

GENERAL postage coupons may not be used for this or other back issues. Due to the low quantities of some back issues we request that you specify alternate selections should your first choice be unavailable. Below is a listing of each issue by subject matter. Game abbreviations are indicated and found in the

OPPONENTS WANTED

OPPONENTS WANTED

OPPONENTS WANTED

The "Opponents Wanted" advertisements appearing on this page continue as a service to the readership of this periodical. This service will continue in long as current editorial regulations are adhered to. The editors of The GENERAL reserve the right to excise any part of an advertisement should the editors deem it appropriate. Wantads will be accepted only when printed on the appropriate form or a reasonable facsimile. Such an advertisement must be accompanied by the appropriate postage fee. This may take the form of an uncolored US postage note or foreign postage is not acceptable. No Wantads will be paid for, and the publisher reserves the right to refuse any Wantads not in conformance with these guidelines.
WHAT HAVE YOU BEEN PLAYING?

Top ten lists are seemingly always in vogue these days. Whether the subject is books on the Best Seller List, television’s Nielsen ratings, or even games, the public never seems to tire of seeing how their individual favorites stack up numerically against the competition. Our preoccupation with this national pastime is almost akin to routing the home team on to victory every Sunday. So to further cater to your whims (and to satisfy our own curiosity) we unveil THE GENERAL’s version of the gamer’s TOP TEN.

We won’t ask you to objectively rate any game. That sort of thing is already done in these pages and elsewhere. Instead, we ask that you merely list the three (or less) games which you’ve spent the most time with since you received your last issue of THE GENERAL. We can generate a consensus list of what’s being played . . . not just what is being bought. The degree of correlation between the Best Selling Lists and the Most Played List should prove interesting.

Feel free to list any game regardless of manufacturer. There will be a built-in Avalon Hill bias to the survey because you all play Avalon Hill games to some extent but it should be no more prevalent than similar projects undertaken by other magazines with a special interest-based circulation. The amount to which this bias affects the final outcome will be left to the individual’s discretion.

The games I’ve spent the most time playing during the past two months are:

1. 
2. 
3. 

CONTEST NO. 113

Ten winning entries will receive certificates redeemable for free AH merchandise. To be valid an entry must be received prior to the mailing of the next GENERAL and include a numerical rating for the issue as a whole as well as list the best 3 articles. The solution will be announced in the next issue and the winners in the following issue.

Issue as a whole . . . (Rate from 1 to 10, with 1 equaling excellent, 10 equating terrible) Best 3 Articles

1. 
2. 
3. 

NAME ___________________ PHONE ___________________
ADDRESS _______________________________________
CITY ___________________ STATE _______ ZIP _______

RALLY PHASE

PREP FIRE PHASE

MOVEMENT PHASE

DEFENSIVE FIRE PHASE

ADVANCING FIRE PHASE

ROUT PHASE

ADVANCE PHASE

CLOSE COMBAT PHASE

WANTED OPPONENTS

Opponent Wanted $0.50

1. Want-ads will be accepted only when printed on this form or a facsimile and must be accompanied by a $0.50 token fee. No refunds. Payment must be made in uncancelled U.S. postage stamps.
2. All ads for sale, trade, or wanted to buy will be accepted only when dealing with collector’s items (out of print AH games) and are accompanied by a $1.00 token fee. No refunds.
3. Insert copy on lines provided (25 words maximum) and print name, address, and phone number on the appropriate lines.
4. Please PRINT. If your ad is illegible, it will not be printed.
5. That so many ads as possible can be printed within our limited space, we request that you use official state and game abbreviations. Don’t list your entire collection, list only those you are most interested in locating opponents for.

ODE TO PANZERBLITZ

The dawn had cast its shadow o'er the plain.
The engines hum, their mighty roar is felt.
The guns are set like eagles taking aim;
As treads start pounding, earth begins to melt.
With speed and skill and infantry arose.
The monsters came with God-defying speed.
The men were set to beat this mighty foe,
A false idea in which they had believed.
The first tank in the column was destroyed.
The shells were coming from the side unseen.
Commanders moved their tanks as to avoid
Destruction that would terminate their means.
Then victory was set with the final kill.
I'm glad 'twas just a game from Avalon Hill.

By Gerald McVey & Thomas Meadowcroft

EDITOR'S CHOICE AWARDS

This issue marks the beginning of Volume 20 in the life of The GENERAL. It is time once more for the editors to offer their nominations for the best articles of the past year. The winner receives a lifetime subscription to The GENERAL, in addition to a $100.00 bonus. Please vote for only one of the nominees and vote only if you have read all the articles nominated. Eliminating those articles written by paid AH staff members from consideration, we have the following articles to select from:

- THE LONGEST DAY, AN OVERVIEW by Jim Burnett, Nos. 1 and 2
- BATTLE OF THE BULGE by Bruno Sinigaglio, No. 2
- THEY SHALL BE PLAYTESTERS by Mark C. Nixon, No. 3
- A QUIZ ON BASIC INFANTRY TACTICS, ANSWERS by Bill Nightingale, Nos. 3 and 4
- PLAYING BOTH SIDES OF THE ELBE by Steven McHenry, No. 5
- VITP PLAY BY MAIL WITH SIMULTANEOUS MOVEMENT by James Lutz, No. 6
- DIPLOMACY IN THIRD REICH by Larry Bucher, No. 6
S.C.I.M.M.A.R.'S (Surface Contra-Gravity Individual Manned Mobile Anti-Vehicle Raiders) ... A game of gladiatorial armor combat in the far future. Heroes drive personal combat vehicles more akin to modern jets than tanks, with immense speed and acceleration. It is combat of maneuver, reflex and quick thought, where only the best survive.

T.A.C. An acronym for Tactical Armor Command. Avalon Hill's Microcomputer Game of Armored Combat during World War II. You control individual tanks, anti-tank guns, and infantry squads. For one or two players featuring outstanding Hi-Resolution graphics, enhanced sound, and stimulating challenge. Five different scenarios are available from Meeting Engagement, Rear Guard, and Static Defense to Breakout and Stalemate. The players control up to eight vehicles, guns and squads simultaneously, utilizing the equipment of either the German, British, Russian or American forces. A simulation for the most demanding wargamers. Atari, Commodore, IBM versions available later this summer.

Computer Football Strategy The action is animated, on a large scrolling football field; watch the quarterback drop back to pass, as the defensive players move on the intended receiver. You have offensive and defensive formations to choose from, as a detailed timeclock ticks away. This is truly football's best.

Paris in Danger A simulation of Napoleon's 1814 campaign in France. One of Napoleon's finest, against the invading Allied Armies (Austrian, Prussian and Russian). You can choose to take the role as Napoleon, Commander Schwarzenberg, or play both sides to re-create the actual campaign. PARIS IN DANGER is unique, in that it allows the players to compete on both the strategic and tactical levels, on a full-color scrolling map of France and surrounding countries.

Parthian Kings Feudal civil war is coming, and many nobles are declaring themselves king of Parthia. The whole situation is wide open for a brilliant commander, a great strategist, and a leader of men, for YOU!! A 1 to 4 player game, in which you create, buy and command your own army, and use a great wizard, to do your bidding and casting of terrible spells on your enemies. A brilliant world of pageantry and conquest awaits you with PARTHIAN KINGS.

Fortress of the Witch King Enter the Fortress of the Witch King, realm of a dark and mysterious lord, whose slightest whim gives you great treasures or plunges you into deadly combat with the vicious hacker. Your quest is to find the arch rafter and slay him, thus gaining the orb, scepter and crown, and releasing the land from his thrall. But beware, there are conditions to be met and battles to be fought. Your small band of scouts and warriors will be in constant danger, for there are others who will not hesitate to raid and steal, seeking the same rewards. So if you are ready, come ... the WITCH KING waits!

T.G.I.F. (Thank Goodness It's Friday)! Welcome to T.G.I.F., a fun party game (1 to 4 players) re-creating a typical week in the lives of the working class. MONDAY comes hard with bills due. TUESDAY is lottery day; buy 3 tickets, if you feel lucky. WEDNESDAY (hump day) may bring you windfall profits, or go out like a bump. THURSDAY is investment day, tempting you with boats, timber rights, and land; do you dare take the chance? FRIDAY comes, T.G.I.F., and that means PAYDAY. SATURDAY brings a treasure hunt worth digging for, SUNDAY is the day of rest.

Computer Diplomacy A computer simulation of Avalon Hill's classic board game of the same name. It's the turn of the century, and the world is preparing for WWI. A solitaire or multi-player game in which each player controls one of the major powers—Germany, Austria, Hungary, Turkey, Russia, Italy, England and France. The goal is to spread your influence and control over other territories, with diverse methods, from diplomacy and political strategies, to back-stabbing and psychological intimidation.

New Additions: Just Released! Commodore 64 Arcade Games: Moon Patrol, Flying Ace

Coming August 1:

**B-1 Nuclear Bomber** for Timex/Sinclair, and TI99 cassette, $16.00
Completely redesigned **B-1 Nuclear Bomber** for Vic-20 & C64, $16.00

**HOT!** Commodore 64 Telengard and Redesigned Nukewar

TRS-80 Color & Atari VC cassette
Commodore 64 Deluxe version of **Computer Stocks and Bonds**
Finally, Video Games that really defy boredom!