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REPUBLIC OF ROME is a multi-player, diplomacy game set in ancient Rome which spans more than 200 years of the republic from the Punic Wars to the assassination of Julius Caesar and the onset of the Empire. Three to six players vie to control the Senate while also cooperating for the good of the state against Rome's enemies. It is this constant balancing act between personal advancement and the welfare of the state that sets REPUBLIC OF ROME apart from ordinary games. If the players allow their personal goals to interfere too heavily with the republic's best interests, the people may revolt or the state may fall to foreign conquest and all players will be put to the sword. Not since KINGMAKER and CIVILIZATION have so many innovative concepts appeared in a multi-player boardgame.

Be forewarned! REPUBLIC OF ROME is not a wargame in the traditional sense. It is a game of political intrigue with military overtones that literally oozes the rich detail of the period's history. A deck of 192 illustrated cards sets the scene for the panoramic spectacle that was the Roman republic. As that history unfolds before them, each player's faction of influential Senators vies for political power, military commands, and economic advantages against the backdrop of a turbulent world. Deals and counter-offers abound. Short the necessary votes for Consul? Trade the Armaments Concession for a faction's support. Spartacus has destroyed your villa? Send Pompey off with ten legions to crush him. But is that too much power to entrust to one man? What if Pompey rebels and marches on Rome? Such checks and balances abound in a game replete with moves and countermoves as historical figures with special capabilities appear and die with the passing years. All of the great names of Rome and those who opposed them appear once again to contest control of the Mediterranean. Wars, revolts, droughts, epidemics, and a host of other random events flash before your paper time machine as fortunes rise and fall.

The game contains three scenarios which divide the color-coded cards into decks simulating the Early, Middle, and Late Republic. Those wishing a larger game can combine them into a Campaign Game of truly epic proportions. A solitaire and two-player version are also included for those unable to muster more players.

REPUBLIC OF ROME is available now for $35.00 from The Avalon Hill Game Company (4517 Harford Road, Baltimore, MD 21214). Please add $5.00 for shipping and handling (Canadian orders, $10.00; overseas, $15.00). Maryland residents please add 5% state sales tax.
Dear Sirs,

Re: RED BARRICADES

I have been wargaming for around fifteen years, and during that time have accumulated 50 or so Avalon Hill board wargames, almost to the exclusion of any others. There are two main reasons for this: firstly, the quality of game design; and secondly, the quality of production. Several years ago whilst playing the "Tractor Works" scenario in basic SQUAD LEADER, my opponent and I discussed the wonderful possibilities of a scaled-up version of this, with a realistically scaled mapboard and increased troop numbers.

At last it has come! RED BARRICADES seems to me to be the "coming of age" of ASL from small snippets of historical engagements fitted onto standardized mapboards to a full simulation of real events. However, I wouldn't write just to say how good it is, would I? The one thing that has ruined RED BARRICADES is the paper map. Paper maps move easily, lie unevenly, blow away when a window is opened, and cannot overlap a table edge without extra support. If mounted, they never achieve the quality of pre-mounted mapboards. I appreciate that the price would be higher if a "proper" mapboard was included, but personally I would rather pay the money for a product worth buying than enjoy the false economy of poor quality goods. I believe that use of rigid mapboards has been a major contributory factor in Avalon Hill's success when compared to companies such as failed SPI. Presumably you would not have continued to produce them for as long as you have if you did not share this belief.

Therefore, my questions are:

1. Are all future Avalon Hill wargames going to include these non-functional and unimpressive paper boards?

2. Does, or will, your spare parts catalogue include better quality versions of the RED BARRICADES map, properly mounted on mapboards?

Faithfully,
J.N. Silk
Oakley, Bedfordshire

Mr. Silk's letter is typical of the comments we receive about unmounted mapboards. All such writers share the same naivete—they would be willing to spend "a few" dollars more for a mounted map. But there's the rub—we aren't talking "a few" dollars here. To mount a map the size of RED BARRICADES would virtually double the price of the product.

Gamers rarely stop to analyze what goes into the pricing of a game. Adding a dollar's worth of material to a game does not just add a dollar to the price. There is a geometric effect called "mark-up" that increases the price to the consumer many-fold. Mark-up is necessary so that after salesmen, wholesalers, retailers, advertising outlays and shippers all get their cut and the overhead is paid, there is something left over called "profit". At least, theoretically. Of late in this age of game proliferation and inflation, the mark-up for wargames has had to be pushed even higher to compensate for declining sales. Suffice it to say that after adding the necessary materials, labor and shipping charges for a mounted mapboard that size and then multiplying the cost by the required mark-up, the increase in price is astronomical. Witness the $85 pricetag of THE LONGEST DAY. While there are those who would prefer mounted mapboards at even those prices, there are many more who would not and would forego purchase of the game altogether. Thus, paper maps are substituted whenever their size dictates it.

Moreover, the issue of "quality" is not cut-and-dried. We have also received letters of complaint about mounted mapboards. The larger boards tend to have problems with warping, or gaps where the printed sections do not match exactly (with RED BARRICADES where LOS is a critical aspect of the game, this could be extremely aggravating). And I won't even mention the accordion-like appendages of such absurd experiments as the map for STRUGGLE OF NATIONS. To those writers, paper maps were superior to mounted boards— even without consideration of the price factor. Paper maps have other advantages as well. In planning our next historical ASL module we have even considered the possibility of back-printing the maps for twice the terrain at a much reduced price. Yet, obviously, I agree with Mr. Silk to a point. Mounted mapboards are usually preferable to paper maps especially for the casual gamer. That's why such are included in every game where practicable. I personally share Mr. Silk's dislike for paper maps and regularly avoid playing on them. However, by simply laying a sheet of plexiglass over it, any paper map can instantly be transformed into a gleaming, mounted mapboard—with the additional advantages of absolute protection from liquid spills and gathering dust, and the ability to move all pieces at once so as to check the terrain underneath simply by sliding over the cover. Such sheets can be purchased in local hardware stores in sizes large enough to accommodate any game for an amount less than we would have to charge for mounting a single mapboard the size of RED BARRICADES. The game thus equipped is prepared to save approximately $25 on each purchase he makes of our large-map games. Isn't this infinitely preferable to paying an extra $25 for every such game you buy? Granted, casual gamers aren't likely to have much need for large sheets of plexiglass... but then games like RED BARRICADES and SIEGE OF JERUSALEM are hardly casual fare.

So, to finally answer Mr. Silk's question: No, most Avalon Hill games will continue to use mounted mapboards; but yes, those requiring map too large to be practically mounted will go the paper route. As for offering it both ways, it is not possible for us to stock mounted versions of paper maps for separate mail order sale since the demand for such high-priced components would be insufficient. Mounting mapboards is not a slapdash affair. Sensitive equipment has to be painstakingly prepared for each job—requiring running thousands of boards at once the correct settings have been made. Taking the time to mount just one or two— would be a major expense which would be reflected by charging what would surely be perceived as outrageous prices.

I hope I have succeeded in placating Mr. Silk's concerns about component quality, while pointing out that the negative features he perceives could actually be viewed as a positive cost-saving step for not only Avalon Hill, but the consumer as well. A single sheet of plexiglass will save him and us money, while transforming that paper map he so dreads into a deluxe mounted mapboard the likes of which we could not provide—at any price.

POSTAGE INCREASE

With the publication of the August 1980 Games & Parts Price List our shipping/ handling fees have been adjusted in response to the increase in postage/ parcel costs over the past decade (and further projected increases). Henceforth, all costs imposed on direct sales of Avalon Hill/Victory Games merchandise will conform to the following schedule:

USA, APO, FPO (add $1.00 for SAM or PAL)
If Order Totals: Add:
up to $10.00 $ 3.00
$10.01 to $25.00 $ 4.00
$25.01 to $35.00 $ 5.00
$35.01 to $50.00 $ 6.00
$50.01 to $75.00 $ 7.00
$75.01 to $100.00 $ 8.00
$100.01 to $125.00 $ 9.00
$125.00 or more $10.00

CANADA or MEXICO
If Order Totals: Add:
up to $10.00 $ 6.00
$10.01 to $25.00 $ 8.00
$25.01 to $35.00 $10.00
$35.01 to $50.00 $12.00
$50.01 to $75.00 $14.00
$75.01 to $100.00 $16.00
$100.01 to $125.00 $18.00
$125.00 or more $20.00

Other FOREIGN
If Order Totals: Add:
up to $10.00 $ 9.00
$10.01 to $25.00 $12.00
$25.01 to $35.00 $15.00
$35.01 to $50.00 $18.00
$50.01 to $75.00 $21.00
$75.01 to $100.00 $24.00
$100.01 to $125.00 $27.00
$125.00 or more $30.00

To insure an order: $.25 per $10.00 for postage USA Guaranteed Delivery; Canada and Mexico $.50 per $10.00; Foreign, $.75 per $10.00. Postage rates for GENERAL subscriptions remain unchanged.
NEW WORLD is a simple, multi-player game which re-creates the Age of Discovery in the 15th-18th centuries as the powers of Europe explore, conquer, and ultimately colonize all of the Americas. The game compresses 300 years of westward expansion into a few hours of playing time...spanning the decades from the maiden voyage of Christopher Columbus and the Pilgrims landing on Plymouth Rock through the conquests of Cortez and Pizarro and the ultimate wars of imperialism which followed as Spain, England, and France clashed time and again over the riches of the New World.

The game is played on a map of the Americas divided into 26 hexagonal areas. Each area has a combination of natural resources, native population, climate, gold, and proximity to home which makes it unique. The relative merits and dangers of each must be weighed carefully as the game progresses against the backdrop of circumstance—a task made even more challenging by hex tiles which mask the identity and contents of each area until it has been explored.

More than just another game of conquest, players must possess diplomatic, economic, and military skills in equal proportions to triumph because the game is won in several contrasting ways—any of which invites incursions by others. The player who remains at peace while his opponents quarrel can overcome deficits in gold, resources, or territory.

Each player builds and maintains a fleet with which to transport his soldiers and colonists to the New World and his gold and crops home again. Storms and pirates may take their toll—especially on the Spanish treasure fleets—so nothing can be taken for granted.

Once ashore, colonists may raise crops, mine gold, or push on to new lands. Soldiers may search for gold, conquer native civilizations, protect colonists from foreign incursions and native uprisings, or embark on military excursions of their own. The ensuing balancing act always yields a tense battle—further stirred by the whims of fate in the form of climatic attrition.

NEW WORLD is now available for $25.00 from The Avalon Hill Game Company (4517 Harford Road, Baltimore, MD 21214). Please add $4.00 for shipping and handling (Canadian orders, $8.00; overseas orders, $12.00). Maryland residents please add 5% state sales tax.
Alexander (known as "the Great") of Macedon conquered west and central Asia, snatching it from the Persian Empire during the latter part of the 4th Century AD. After his death, his generals contested for control of this empire... and eventually divided it into a number of successor states (for which reason they are usually labeled the diadochi or "Successors"). 

By Stephen Weiss

Alexander (known as "the Great") of Macedon conquered west and central Asia, snatching it from the Persian Empire during the latter part of the 4th Century AD. After his death, his generals contested for control of this empire... and eventually divided it into a number of successor states (for which reason they are usually labeled the diadochi or "Successors").

Yehuda ("Judaen" in English) was fought over by the Egyptian Ptolemaic and the Seleucid diadochi dynasties. Judea eventually wound up as part of the Seleucid Empire of Antiochus III, around 198 BC. This in turn resulted in the Hellenic settlement of a number of Judean coastal cities, with subsequent hostility high between these new settlers (who spoke Greek) and the original native populace of the Jewish cities of the interior.

As Antiochus was extending his domain in Asia, a new power was arising to the west. Following its victory over Carthage in the Second Punic War (218-201 BC) and its conquest of Macedon in 197 BC, Rome turned its attention to the Seleucids. Antiochus sought to establish a defensible western frontier by invading Greece in 192, but the Romans defeated his forces at Thermopylae in 191 and again at Magnesia in Asia Minor in 190, so bringing him to sue for a peace that eventually resulted in the Hellenic settlement of Judea.

The Hasmonaeans established an independent dynasty which ruled Judea until the last king of its line (Aristobulus) was overthrown by the Roman triumvir Pompeius Magnus in 63 BC. The Romans brought Judea under progressively tighter control, ruling first through the Hasmonaeans and then through the Idumean king Herod who, with his successors, presided over Judea until the destruction of Jerusalem. Herod's grandson, Agrippa I, ruled Judea from 37 to 44 AD and his son, Agrippa II followed him, ruling until 66 AD.

The Jewish revolt against the Roman influence which erupted that year is one of the most tragic events in that people's history. Its origins appear to have lay in the continued hostility of the Hellenic settlers living in Judea's coastal cities towards the indigenous Jewish population. Anti-Jewish feelings there were encouraged and further inflamed by the writings of Greek intellectuals who viewed monotheistic Judaism as incompatible with established Greek and Roman pantheism.

Initially, the Republic of Rome's leaders were favorably disposed towards Judaism. But as the Empire replaced the Republic and worship of the emperors was mandated throughout the imperium, Jewish refusal to follow this tenet strained relations. Quite simply, the Romans interpreted this refusal as disloyalty to the state. Deteriorating Jewish-Roman relations were exacerbated by the Greeks of Alexandria, who revolted against the Jews of that city in 40 AD. Hellenes of the coastal cities of Judea, who constituted much of Judea's aristocracy, saw Roman emperor-worship throughout Judaea.

The revolt portrayed by SIEGE OF JERUSALEM began on 8 June 66, during the administration of one of the worst of the Hellenic procurators, Gessius Florus (the Romans had recruited most of their Judean procurators from among the most vengeful anti-Jewish Hellenes of Asia Minor). Florus oppressed the Judeans, and to benefit his chronically corrupt and insolvent administration, raised their Temple treasury periodically. Eventually, the Hellenes of Caesarea launched a pogrom aimed at the Judeans residing there, which spread to Jerusalem itself. The local Roman commander did nothing to slow the genocide, and even took advantage of the disorder to have his troops loot the Temple and the Upper City. It appears that it was this action which finally drove the nationalist (Zelot) party (as we might term it) to arms. A major revolt spread throughout Jerusalem and beyond, to engulf the entire Roman province of Judea.

As we review the events of the revolt and the siege, it should be noted that these have been very poorly recorded. Tacitus' account has not survived, nor have any Jewish accounts save that of Flavius Josephus, the Judaean soldier-scholar who deserted to the Romans. He was eventually adopted by the emperor Vespasian and came to write the only surviving first-person memoir of this conflict; however, historians consider his work to be tendentious and generally unreliable. But, in the absence of anything better, it is this book which provided much of what we know of these events.

The Zelots (also called Sicarii), led by Menachem ben Yehuda and subsequently by Eliezar ben Yair, managed to capture several desert fortresses (including Masada, which provided a base...
command of the Roman army now arrayed before Jerusalem (with Tiberius Julius Alexander, a trusted friend and former procurator of Judaea, as second-in-command).

The Judeans had been unable to take advantage of Rome's internal struggles because of their own concurrent diurnity and factional violence. Within the walls of Jerusalem were less than 25,000 rebel warriors, split into mutually hostile groups—of which the principle factions were ben Yair’s Zealots, Shimon ben Giora and his soldiers in the Upper City, and Yohanan ben Levi and Gischala’s troops (who included many Idumaeans). The majority of the citizens of the city, including many refugees from the north, appear to have been entirely unenthusiastic (and even unwilling) allies of the nationalists. Perhaps the real tragedy of the action was that, had there been a generally accepted leader of the Judeans, he well could have made some sort of peace with Vespasian, who would have welcomed any stabilizing of the Roman state. Conversely, such a leader might have been able to rally the people against the Romans, conducting harassing operations against their extended lines to drive them back to the coast during the year of her civil war. But no such leader arose, and the Judeans lost a golden opportunity and instead vitiated their strength throughout 69. During the course of this internal struggle for control of the revolt, many of the city’s granaries were looted a major reason for the famine which eventually wiped the city during the siege.

By the spring of 70 AD, Titus had reassembled an army of four legions before Jerusalem. With his Hellenic and Syrian auxiliaries, Titus commanded an army of some 60,000 infantry and cavalry. The Judeans on the walls, on the other hand, had about 23,000 fighters, supplemented by a horde of militia of dubious military value. Titus established his headquarters (and that of the Xth Legion) on Mount Scopus, commanding a fine view of the Temple quarter from the northeast. He deployed most of the Xth on the Mount of Olives, a ridge extending south from Mount Scopus to the eastern walls, from which it is separated by the Kidron Valley. The Xth approached from the west, and established its encampment before the Yafe Gate, while the Xth and XVth arrived to the north. The city was now virtually surrounded.

Jerusalem was an ancient city even then, and had been the growing capital of Judaea for a millennium. The city had begun on the Ophel Ridge, of what was called the “City of David”. From there it expanded, receiving its greatest influx of population by absorbing refugees from the northern kingdom of Israel after it fell to the Assyrians in the 8th Century BC. The city was surrounded on its eastern, western and southern sides by powerful fortifications overlooking deep ravines. But in
the north, the recently-expanded New City was guarded by relatively weak walls. The land beyond these walls was level, forming a natural avenue of approach of which Titus determined to take advantage.

But while the Xth Legion was preparing its positions on Mount Scopus, it was struck by a surprise Judaean sortie and suffered serious losses. Another sortie from the Women's Gate discomfited the XVth and XIIth. Recovering from this and disciplining his troops for having been surprised (which the common Roman soldier was sure to pass on to his enemy), Titus deployed his forces for the attack. He concentrated the Vth west of the Hippicus Tower outside the Yafo Gate, the Xth on Mount Scopus, and the others along the walls of the New City. He set up his own headquarters to the west of the Psephinus Tower, from where he planned to coordinate the assault.

Inside the city, factional strife continued between the forces of Yohanan in the Temple quarter and Shimon ben Giora, whose forces held the walls of the New City. Even as he strove to limit Yohanan's influence, Giora's men bombarded the maneuvering Romans with artillery captured from the ill-fated Gallus. The threat presented by the Roman siegeworks finally ended (or at least suspended) the civil war amongst the city defenders. Now united, and joined by recently-arrived Jewish volunteers from Babylonia, the Judeans counterattacked through the Hippicus Gate, destroying some Roman siege towers. There were heavy casualties on both sides in the fighting, and Titus himself was slightly wounded.

Undeterred by this minor setback, Titus ordered the equipment rebuilt. On 25 May, Roman battering rams made their first breach in the walls of the New City, a short distance northwest of the Yafo Gate. This Roman attack is the beginning of the events reflected by the First Assault Period of the game. Recognizing the threat this posed, the Judeans struck back defiantly, with Shimon's men in the north and Yohanan's near the breach itself. But they had only limited success. The Romans carried on, penetrating the second wall north of the Damascus Gate to enter the Tyropean City. Here the heavy infantry were disoriented by the maze of narrow streets and alleys in this commercial district and Judean counterattacks finally sent the legionnaires reeling back through the wall with many losses.

Titus almost immediately sent his men back into this, and other, breaches—as the Second Assault Period simulates. In some fierce fighting, the Romans carried the Tyropean quarter. Titus then ordered the quarter razed to make room for further maneuvers and equipment.

In terms of the game's Third Assault Period, Titus planned to attack the Antonia Fortress and the Temple quarter prior to an assault on the Upper City—not only for their own obvious value, but to prevent counterattacks. Yohanan's forces, reinforced by the Zealots, defended the Antonia, using captured artillery to bombard the attackers. It appears that one of the Judean faction leaders, Esron ben Shimon, was killed during this phase of the siege somewhere in the environs of the Antonia Fortress. For 17 days the Romans labored on their siegeworks, driving mines towards the imposing walls. But Yohanan's men had been busy during this time also, digging a tunnel from the fortress towards the siegeworks. They filled the completed tunnel with inflammables and capped it; the tunnel collapsed—and so did the Roman siege engines gathered above, which were consumed in the fire.

Roman morale suffered, and was further damaged when a Judaean sortie two days later destroyed more artillery and rams. Roman losses were now substantial, and their spirits low. The activities of the past fortnight (during the assault period interphase) had brought Titus' army to a critical stage. Titus called his commanders together to discuss the latest reverses. They were unanimously in favor of a much tighter blockade to let famine weaken the defenders, before attempting another direct assault. Titus concurred, and ordered the legions to construct a siege wall to encircle Jerusalem. The Judeans had suffered from persistent hunger throughout the Siege, but it now became acute. Starvation claimed thousands, and the Judeans fighters themselves were weakened by lack of food. Yohanan's force conducted still another sortie from the Antonia but, weakened by hunger and outnumbered, failed to make any impact.

Now began the events climaxing in the game's Third Assault Period. The Romans, never daunted, had extensively mined, and had brought up more war engines (notably, armored towers). The Xth Legion attacked the Yafo Gate. And, despite punishing Judaean fire, the Xth Legion battered its way into the fortress, only to find the Judeans fanatically determined to resist their further advance. Sensing that his men were in danger of being demoralized, Titus delivered a stirring oration (of the type so favored by the Romans) calling for volunteers to reach the Temple wall. Twelve came forward. All were quickly killed or wounded, but their example so fired the Roman legionnaires that they broke through the weakened defenders, overran all of the Antonia, and entered the Temple itself. Zealot warriors and the remnants of Yohanan's and Shimon's factions thrust back, driving the Romans back into the Antonia.

Titus paused, and ordered portions of the Antonia pulled down, allowing more room for the XIIth to deploy in support of the Xth against the Temple. He then sent Sextus Cerianius and a select Vth Legion assault force in a surprise storming of the Temple walls. But the Zealots were not to be surprised and repulsed the Roman attack, inflicting severe casualties. The Roman assault on the Temple now neared its conclusion. Roman engineers had erected timber embankments supporting a huge earthen ramp, the top of which could reach the summit of the Temple's northern walls. Realizing that the outer works were thus compromised, the Judeans abandoned the area connecting the Temple proper with the Antonia. Frustrated again, the Romans sought to reach the Temple portico with scaling ladders, but were again repulsed.

Titus launched his troops at the Temple for six days without cessation, and met only defeat. But the Judeans were being worn down in a battle of attrition they could not hope to win. On the eighth day of the Jewish month of Av (probably 27 August), the Romans succeeded in setting fire to the Temple Gates and forced an entry. A Judaean foray blazed their advance, although Titus was able to deploy
CONTEST 152

It is the final turn of a Full Siege Assault Period (Turn #10, Night) during which the Roman Legion XII Fulminata under personal command of Titus has, in a vicious see-saw battle, seized control of the Temple Quarter. Things do not look good for you, the Judaean commander. Roman Defensive Fire has been weathered for this turn. Now it is up to you to mastermind a last counterattack which will:

1) Break Roman control of the Temple Quarter;
2) Destroy as many Roman pieces (combat, HQ and siege equipment counters) as possible;
3) Accomplish these with no more than 15 die rolls.

Each die roll is not left to chance! A cyclical sequence of results is to be used. Entrants may select any result between "1" and "6" inclusive to begin the cycle, but after that the order must be strictly followed, with "1" following "6" in the order. (For example, with an initial selection of "4" to resolve the first roll, the next must be "5", then "6-1-2-3-4-5-6" etc.) Each die roll is the "base result", to which appropriate modifiers are added and/or subtracted. Any Judaean attack on the entry form must have a statistical chance for success (i.e., at least one-in-six), although not all attacks need be successful; "No Effect" results are admitted as allowable resolutions.

The action begins with the tenth turn's Judaean Offensive Fire phase and concludes with the Judaean Melee Combat phase, or when you execute the 15th die roll, whichever is first. Use the following guidelines for entering your solution:

1) Offensive Fire: Each resolution must be listed separately. Indicate for each the firing units and target by grid-coordinates, the "die roll" and result.
2) Movement: Designate new grid coordinates for units which leave their current hexes only. The sequence in which Judaean units move must be indicated.
3) Melee Combat: Again, each combat must be listed separately, in order of resolution. Indicate attacking units' coordinates and strength, defender's coordinates and strength, odds, die roll and result. You may choose Roman CRT resolutions to the Judaean's best advantage (EXC: Roman HQs are last to suffer "E" results and first to vacate a hex).

Finally, enter the Total Number of destroyed Roman units and their combined Victory Point value. Remember, quantity of eliminated pieces—not their VP value—is the main goal. However, if a tie results in determining winners, the entrant with the higher VP value destroyed will prevail.

Any solution is limited to the units listed below. All Roman units are of Legion XII Fulminata (except the armored towers and Titus); all Judaean units are of the Shimon ben Giora faction (except artillery, and Eliezar ben Yair). Note that all hexes behind the Roman lines (i.e., between them and Tadi Gate wall) are Roman-controlled. Unit positions for the challenge are shown in the illustration, but due to the density of pieces, are listed here hex-by-hex:

Judaean Forces:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hex</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QQ41</td>
<td>5-7, 1-4 (routed), Onager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QQ40</td>
<td>2x5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QQ39</td>
<td>2-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP41</td>
<td>5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OQ42</td>
<td>2x2-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OO40</td>
<td>5-7, 1-4, Cauldron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NN42</td>
<td>7-7, 5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NN41</td>
<td>2x5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NN40</td>
<td>5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM41</td>
<td>2x1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM39</td>
<td>2x5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL41</td>
<td>5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL40</td>
<td>7-7, ben Giora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL37</td>
<td>5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK41</td>
<td>2x3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK39</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK38</td>
<td>5-7, Cauldron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ43</td>
<td>2x7-7, ben Yair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ41</td>
<td>7-7, 5-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roman Forces:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hex</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QQ38</td>
<td>7-8, 6-8, 5-8 (cohort)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP39</td>
<td>3x3-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP38</td>
<td>3x2-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP37</td>
<td>tower (facing OO38) with 2x5-8 beneath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP36</td>
<td>tower (facing OO37) with 3-9 beneath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP35</td>
<td>3-5, 4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OO39</td>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OO38</td>
<td>2x3-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OO37</td>
<td>2-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OO36</td>
<td>1-8, 2x1-6, Cestius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NN39</td>
<td>2x5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NN37</td>
<td>7-8, 6-8, 5-8 (cohort)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM39</td>
<td>2x7-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM38</td>
<td>7-8, 6-8, Titus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM37</td>
<td>5-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM36</td>
<td>3x1-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL36</td>
<td>3-9 &amp; catapult on armored tower (facing LL37) with 6-8 beneath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK37</td>
<td>7-8 &amp; catapult on armored tower (facing KK38) with 5-8 beneath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ37</td>
<td>5-8, 3-9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Building the Structure

Design Notes to Siege of Jerusalem

By Fred Schachter

Avalon Hill's Siege of Jerusalem is the latest version of a project begun over 15 years ago by Stephen Weiss, myself, and a group of wargaming friends with whom we'd meet each week. In 1974, Stephen had just returned from a stay in Israel. He had always been fascinated with Jewish history (and is still), and had long been a wargamer. The cataclysmic siege of Jerusalem during 70 AD which resulted in the destruction of the Temple proved to be the inspiration in combining his two hobbies, abetted by his recent walks over the very ground where the action took place. One Tuesday evening in the Bronx, where our group of friends would meet each week, in walked Stephen with a rough game-map depicting ancient Jerusalem, some hand-made counters, and a draft of a few rules. His enthusiasm was contagious, the spark crossed the gap to me, and we agreed to cooperate in designing a simulation of Titus' siege of Jerusalem.

Initially, it was intended only for our little group's amusement. We experimented with all sorts of "chrome" and complex rules, but just could not find the right combination. We would take our prototypes home and play them there. But we were determined to complete the project. After years of delay, during which Stephen and I-through a partnership (1969-1972), Stephen and I-through a partnership named "Historical Perspectives"—printed approximately 2000 copies of The Siege of Jerusalem, 70 AD. These were assembled and boxed in my home, and handed in Stephen's overladen truck to Avalon Hill's Panzerfaust headquarters. Stephen's original play test map used archeological research by Hebrew University's renowned Michael Avi Yonah as its primary foundation. (His work was used as the basis for a three-dimensional model of ancient Jerusalem, which can be seen at the Holyland Hotel in Israel; we were unaware of this reconstruction when the original SIEGE OF JERUSALEM map was designed—a fan advised us of its existence after acquiring a copy of the game.) For the map we also consulted works by the 19th Century British archeologists J.T. Barclay and Edward Robinson. And, after Israel's victory in the Six-Day War in 1967, Benjamin Mazor of the Hebrew University commenced a dig of the Temple Quarter, uncovering and reconstructing the site from the 8th Century BC through the period of the Ottoman Empire. Readers may wish to consult the New York Times. This revelation gave us pause, for it seems that a research team had discovered the existence of a gate to the east of the Gate of the Essenes leading out of the Lower City. After some discussion, we agreed that this portal was small enough to be totally sealed by temporary Masonry barriers; it would have been logistical for the defenders to leave it accessible to the Romans. This doorway is consequently not depicted on the map.

Hopefully, you have now some appreciation of the extent to which we labored over the map. One final example concerns the staircases. In light of previous explanations, one might ask why we depicted the staircases if the Judeans could have sealed or blocked them. Our interpretation of the flow of the historical Roman attacks was that they would try to seize weakly-held bastions and/or fortresses, and then use them as bases for exploitive attacks into the city proper. If we didn't have staircases as such, the only alternative to simulating this tactic (and vice versa for Judean counterattacks) would have been an additional game mechanic—perhaps a sort of "Esclade Down" attack. All felt this only layered on more complexity, so the use of artwork on the map itself in this instance seemed our best route to keeping the game as playable as possible.

Turning to the pieces of play, let's look at the Judeans first. Other than leaders, the Judean player is given cauldrons, zealot, regular and militia infantry on which to base his defense. These units are all standardized, although this was certainly not the case historically. The original design of SIEGE OF JERUSALEM had variable-strength Judean infantry, making use of two-sided counters (similar to the "untried units" the Soviet is plagued with in Panzergruppe Guderian). Judean units ranged from a "0-6" militia to a "9-7" zealot. The problem was to differentiate functional types while remaining "realistic"; it provided an uncertainty about each Judean unit's abilities until its first combat of an assault period, and eliminated the homogenizing quality of the Judean forces. On the other hand, speed of play was dramatically slowed for players.
were spending far too much time toying with optimum melee odds for/against face-down units. Additionally, the new revision brought in “Disrupted” markers, which, when the Roman attacked six Judaean units in a fort, made for cumbersome stacks of cardboard. We therefore regretfully rejected the incorporation of “untried units.”

Players should quickly notice the Judaean potency in the first assault period; a thing that has to be done in a particular order; different types of Judaean missile troops (i.e., bowmen, slingers, spear-chuckers, etc.) would have complicated the mechanics and slowed play. Suffice to say that all factors involved were juggled about until the desired Roman vulnerability in certain situations was achieved. We knew the effect we were after, and eventually got it. The Judaeans, as one of the irregular armies of the day in that part of the world, did stress firepower. It was their best chance to deter the professional soldiers of Rome. It also reflected a military tradition going back to the days of the Maccabean War against the Hellenic Seleucids.

Some may question why Judaean light infantry, supposedly fleeter of foot than the armor-laden legionaries, are unable to exit Roman Heavy Infantry ZOC under certain circumstances. There are two reasons for this game mechanic. First, doctrinally the Judaeans were hesitant about fighting the Romans in any sort of traditional open-field battle, preferring to do their thing at night in themes of painful losses. So they would stand rather than withdraw in the face of the better disciplined and ordered enemy. Secondly, the rule simulates the Roman ability to relieve tired troops (i.e., disrupted or demoralized units) with fresh in the midst of a melee—an ability even the most fanatical and experienced zealot infantry did not have in their battle drill. This simple rule reflects one of the most basic reasons the Roman legions were so often victorious.

The Judaean order of battle—or more specifically, the number of pieces the Judaean player is capable of having on the map—is limited by his “At Start” forces, replacements, reserves and the counter—mix itself and is based upon our interpretation of several historical factors. Although Stephen and I took Josephus’ numbers with more than a grain of salt, we did agree that Jerusalem’s population would have swelled to prodigious proportions during the Roman advance. Consequently, there was a substantial manpower pool from which the Judaeans could recruit. This was reflected in our design concepts of:

**The Counter-**Represents the limit of Judaean field forces effectively capable of control by the rebel command structure. Even if more bodies were available, the Judaeans couldn’t have armed or managed more troops (playing pieces) on the map than those provided.

The Reserves are intended to show the Judaean troops not brought into active play due to command structure limitations and, more importantly, due to the factionalism within the defense. To simulate the interminable struggle for control of defense of their city, we chose to factor pieces “out” of the “At Start” forces (rather than complicate the game by creating a mechanic—in effect a third side—which would have Judaean units actually combat each other) and used the Reserve rules to reflect this squandering of military strength. This is why some good quality, which cannot be represented by units that can appear late in an assault as a quarter’s reserve is released. These fighters, if available, have been tied down contending with fellow Judaeans of a different stripe. They do not fight the Romans until literally being forced to do so. Reserves also, in the course of the battle, might be sent to neighboring Judaean groups that don’t rally to the colors until the enemy is right on their doorsteps.

**The Replacement.** Within the 25-week time limit, it is assumed that there is sufficient food and other supplies to keep all “At Start” Judaean forces, plus any released reserves, in the field at full effectiveness. Additionally, the city’s manpower pool is large enough to replace battle losses so long as Jerusalem remains completely under rebel control. Of course, the Judaean problem is that, as areas of the city fall, their ability to generate replacements and reserves declines. An area’s replacement value was predicated on both objective (such as the remaining warehouses in the Tyropean City) and subjective (private ownership) factors. This particular mechanic encourages the Judaean player to conduct his defense along historical lines: fighting fanatically without undue regard for eliminated units early in the game or for particularly valuable sections as the Temple. Knowing when further losses might be unnecessary; the enemy’s efforts reflect the idea that one of the most challenging decisions a Judaean player has to face.

In first approaching the Roman side, we briefly toyed with the idea of having each legion at slightly different strength and organization to reflect previous activity, but there was insufficient historical justification for this—and why complicate the play unnecessarily? Our regiments, machine-like Roman legions (the heavy infantry) fit well the preconceptions of wargamers. This was not the case with the Allied units (the Fœderati). The numbers of them provided only include those soldiers between the ages of 15 and 50, and not the elderly, convalescent, or the very young. It was assumed to be with its battering ram.

For the Romans we also flirted with more unit differentiation. The original game design had such items as 4-10 Fœderati infantry. And was there a temptation to put in their slingers, spearmen and even heavy infantry. However, all these specialized units, while colorful, did little but slow down the pace of play without any practical effect. Similar considerations were given to the Roman cavalry and velites. Ultimately, we kept these classes homogeneous within themselves. The 3-9 Velites, however, were unique in that they were intrinsic to each legion. These drilled with the heavy infantry and could, when called upon, construct and operate siege equipment. Roman players will find these Velites, in particular, ready for action as soon as the troops of the army are deployed. The more experienced soldiers from the empire’s outlying provinces—among their most useful pieces if handled properly.

A legion’s artillery consisted of a wider variety of weapons than we have provided in the game (for instance, the tormenta and the scorpion). The units that are shown should be better viewed as groupings by artillery class; all the light pieces are grouped as catapults (easy to assemble, and therefore greatest in number). By the time the action of SIEGE OF JERUSALEM’s first assault period begins, the area for miles around the city had been almost entirely stripped of lumber usable for siege equipment. The fact that each legion’s intensely competitive esprit de corps, the siege towers are assigned to each individual legion. Due to the effect of this competition for raw materials, the Roman player replaces lost artillery, towers and/or rams haphazardly and for each legion individually. When an armored tower arrives or is captured, it is at random; it is one of the auspices of Titus to assign to any legion desired.

Returning to our consideration of the infantry, readers might be interested to know that the original game did not differentiate each cohort within a legion. “Cohort Integrity” was obtainable by stacking identical units. As the actual melee strength was not only representative of his ability, but of the additional veterans comprising the legion’s 1st Cohort (historically, an imperial legion’s 1st Cohort was its most powerful) which he fought with; whichever heavy infantry cohort the leader was stacked with in the original game became the 1st Cohort. However, I was convinced by a “team” majority concerned with the realism of such tactics that specific cohort identities was a better approach.

One interpretation regarding heavy Roman infantry which never became part of the game concerned the pilums (spear) carried by each legionnaire. In open battle, the initial shock of a pilum “barrage” was fearsome. The heads of these spears were deliberately crafted to bend and render any enemy shield they were caught in nigh useless. This made them a one-time throw-away weapon, which in game terms would have required some bookkeeping (“OK, who hasn’t thrown their plums yet, boys?”) or additional markers. Further, our research did not include many of the special ways helmets and other armor might be used in siege warfare, so whatever effect such pilum attack might have had was factored into the combat mechanisms of the units.

Earlier editions of the game had Roman artillery capable of breaching Jerusalem’s walls. In the current edition, none of this bombardment is affected by mining operations during the interphases preceding each assault period. Only battering rams can damage/breach elevated walls while an assault is in progress; the thought of ancient artillery projectiles smashing down stone fortifications of this stature is absurd. As with towers, the battering ram pieces may be bought in multiples of three, and also abstractly represent, certainly in effectiveness, other methods of breaching the walls employed by the Romans during an assault. A legion’s engineering assets, not committed to manning artillery, are assumed to be with its battering ram.

The 1989 edition’s interphase and reliance upon mining is far more realistic. The gist of this procedure historically was for the Romans to dig in to a wall, hollow out a cavity beneath its foundations, prop up the wall above with timbers and then, right before launching an assault, pull down or set fire to those supports to cause the cavity to collapse under the weight of the wall above—taking it down and opening a breach. Judaean counter-measures to Roman mining are accounted for in the Preparation Chart’s repair entry. Players should realize that Judaeans, as a matter of fact, were not so much a quick construction job as it is successful counteracting operations which lessen the amount of breach damage inflicted by the Romans.

The published “Preparation Chart” (Rule 19.1) assumes historic Roman losses and pace of operations throughout. But this operation can be justified by a player’s (particularly the Roman’s) inexperience with the game system. I could write volumes concerning recommended Romani tactics. However, some players—until they have a better “feel” of the system—may perceive a Judaeans bias in the chart. To offset this, players may wish to use the Optional “Preparation Chart” that we once considered:

**PREPARATION CHART**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week Before Assault</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Roman’s Remaining Equipment</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armour Points Remaining</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armored Tower Value</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons and Vehicles</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramps Built</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miners (2)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judaean Repair DBF</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In concluding our look at the Roman component, their excellent training and unit cohesion is reflected by their superior stacking limit in open ground, dice roll modifiers for firepower and melee, and ability to employ unique formations (the testudo and esbusculum), which would allow the Roman to present the legion’s virtual invincibility against the Judaeans in any pitched open field encounter (easily borne out by any who might wish to tinker with conducting such with these counters), and that the walls of Jerusalem were the great equalizer. In combination with the pressure of time and need to minimize
casualties, it is what makes SIEGE OF JERUSALEM an interesting contest for both.  

The strategy rules and siege mechanics, in our opinion, accurately shows the relationship between firepower and close-in melee in ancient combat. The ol’ one-two punch—shoot ‘em, then close in for the kill—is certainly there. The tactical effect is there as well, for without adequate reserves to replace units hit during defensive fire, an attack will simply falter and die.

At first, I was dubious of Don’s Multiple and Continuous Combat rules. However, these swifty proved a useful addition. The Multiple Attack rule (11.9), which provides so much movement and opens the game to some dramatic events, does unfortunately provide one design anomaly which can manifest itself from time to time. Through a series of successful “Multiple Attacks”, a unit could traverse the map, moving to a position unattainable through simple normal unopposed movement! In effect, successful multiple attacks can award a movement factor bonus, violating the “time/space” relationships built into the game’s scale. This was a conscious design decision on our part, rationalized by the greater movements possible when following up a routed enemy.

However, purists familiar with the battle could be aggrieved to observe the system allowing events occurring in such an unstructured manner. Things can be accomplished and objectives taken in a single day’s attack that historically took far longer. But, as I noted earlier, we designed a simulation game. In this instance, a solution allowing players to duplicate an assault “period” where minimal playing time was opted for in lieu of rigid restriction. This course wasn’t lightly accepted, and we hope that readers will agree and appreciate why it was done this way. This philosophy was behind all our decisions to accept the occasional anomaly (such as the Multiple Attack rule, and the mining and breach procedures).

Hopefully, this article has responded to any curiosity or concern you may have regarding a particular facet of SIEGE OF JERUSALEM. If I have missed something of interest to you, please feel free to contact us with your questions.

The Foundation...Cont’d from Page 8

his cavalry and hold the line. Then, apparently against orders, Roman soldiers set fire to the Temple. Emboldened by the blaze, the Romans finally broke through the Temple’s defenders, who had lost heart. So ended the third assault.

But Shimon, Yohanan and some of the survivors had cut their way through to reach the Upper City, where they rallied the populace. Titus moved his siege engines and engineers to a point opposite the Palace of Herod. The remaining Judaean defenders moved into the Hippicus, Phasael and Mariam Towers in strength, while a screen of others were positioned in the Upper and Lower City, and in fewer numbers still in the City of David. It was at this point that the Fourth Assault Period began. On 30 August, Roman forces based in the Temple quarter occupied the City of David’s northern walls and achieved some penetration into that quarter. And the Lower City was overrun, thereby isolating the last defenders in the Upper City.

On 25 September, Titus’ siegeworks opposite the Upper City were completed. The Xth Legion quickly secured a breach against the hunger-weakened defenders, and set to an indiscriminate slaughter of all they encountered in their advance. By the 26th, they had razed the Upper City and seized all the remaining survivors of that once prosperous quarter. Yohanan and Shimon with their fighters abandoned the three towers of the fortress triangle before the Romans assaulted them there, probably because they were too debilitated to continue the fight. Both leaders were captured and taken to Rome in chains.

But the Zealot ben Yair and some of his warriors fought through the Roman ring and escaped from the stricken city, in an adventure which is the central subject of the Fifth Assault Period. Eliezer ben Yair reached the fortress of Masada in the desert, where he and some 900 Zealots (fewer than half of whom were warriors) would hold off 2000 Romans of the Xth legion under Flavious Silva for over two years. There the tragic Judaean Revolt ended, in 72 AD, with the death of all in Masada.

For the Judaean, the defense of Jerusalem (like Masada after it) was an epic of defiant courage. The outcome was disastrous as they were vanquished by one of the finest military forces in history, and yet the success of the Roman military was seen by anyone who could have imagined the time, since Jewish sovereignty in the land would not be established for almost 1900 years! For the Romans, it was an expensive victory, but one which established the legitimacy of the illustrious Flavian dynasty after the extinction of the Julio-Claudians. The rule of Vespasian, Titus and his younger brother Domitian who followed were periods of peace and unparalleled prosperity for the Roman Empire. The successful siege of Jerusalem had laid the foundation for Rome’s unchallenged rule in the east.

InterPhase Sequence of Play

By David Williams

1) *The ROMAN Player calculates Victory Points lost due to casualties in the last A. P. (18.5)

2) The JUDAEAN Player secretly notes (i.e., presets) the location of all his Artillery (including cauldrons) on any Elevated Hexes, including isolated Fortresses. (18.34) He then places one infantry unit of any type in each isolated Fortress he wishes to garrison at the beginning of the next A. P., and he must place an infantry unit there. (The JUDAEAN must occupy such Fortresses at the end of the last Assault Period, and continue to occupy them during the entire Interphase, if he wishes to set up in them. Otherwise, they default to the ROMAN.)

3) The ROMAN announces his initial preparation time (# of weeks). (19.1, 19.2).

4) *The ROMAN builds a ramp, if he wishes. (If less than five hexes, he must specify what hexes will be added if he later decides to use extra preparation time.) (18.81)

5) *The JUDAEAN makes repairs (19.6 and Preparation Chart.)

6) *The ROMAN engages in Mining:
   A. He makes a Mining Die Roll to determine number of completed shafts. (19.2)
   B. He sites shafts (19.21)
   C. He makes Engineering Die Roll for each shaft to determine hexes affected. (19.21)
   D. He rolls two dice to determine damage to each hex affected. (19.22)
   E. At the end of each mining sequence (A. thru D.), except the last the JUDAEAN may again secretly preset his artillery and may also switch units to, from, and among isolated Fortresses.

7) The Roman decides if he will assault:
   If “NO,” the Interphase is extended one week. (Go back to 6.) (19.2)
   If “YES,” and if the ROMAN has extended his preparation time, the ROMAN completes his Ramp (see 4, above); then the JUDAEAN may make additional repairs rolling one die for each additional week. (19.6) (Then go to 8)
   If “YES,” and the ROMAN hasn’t used extra preparation time, go directly to 8.

8) The ROMAN has committed himself to Assault! *He now calculates and draws replacements. He draws only once, calculating replacements based on his total preparation time. (18.5, 19.3)

9) The ROMAN rolls to build Armored Towers. *Optionally, he may return Siege Towers or Rams from the dead pile. (19.5)

10) *The ROMAN may exchange siege equipment as per 18.51. He may bring on Armored Towers not yet in play, or Armored Towers, Siege Towers or Rams from the dead pile. He may not exchange equipment brought on in 9 above, nor equipment involved in an exchange already in this Interphase, until next Interphase.

11) The ROMAN rolls to build one Elevated Hex per week. (19.7)

12) Both the ROMAN and JUDAEAN replace HQs. (18.52)

13) The JUDAEAN checks the External Influence Table to see if he has lost the game due to delay. (18.6)

14) The ROMAN sets up. For the first A.P., he may set up off-board, on or board no closer than five hexes from any exterior city wall. For subsequent A.P.s, he may also set up on friendly controlled walls and in controlled city areas. Units on walls or inside the city may set up on any hexes not adjacent to JUDAEAN controlled walls. Units outside the original perimeter may also set up closer than five hexes to an Isolated Fortress, as long as they aren’t adjacent to it, and aren’t within five hexes of any other non-isolated JUDAEAN controlled wall. (3.3, 3.4; control 18.3)

15) JUDAEAN sets up. He places his preset artillery as noted, then places his other forces in any controlled city areas or elevated hexes, including adding reinforcements to isolated Fortresses.

16) The JUDAEAN now conducts a Free Fire Phase. This is identical to a normal Fire Phase, except the ROMAN may not shoot back.

17) The A.P. now begins with the ROMAN Player Turn: Go to 4.1 of the rules.
In June of 66 A.D., the depredations of Gessius Florus, Imperial Rome’s Procurator in Jerusalem, had driven a desperate Judaean populace into open revolt. Judaean freedom-fighters, many of whom had been secretly arming for some time, rallied to their respective faction’s leader. Florus’ garrison was composed primarily of foreign troops (veilae and foederatti); he had relatively few seasoned legionaries available. The light infantry was spread about the sprawling city, manning positions at Jerusalem’s various gates; the tough and disciplined heavy infantry was concentrated at the Antonia Fortress and Herod’s Palace. The isolated Roman fort and gate garrisons swiftly fell to the vengeful Judaean. After parrying a tentative Roman advance upon the Temple, a Judaean horde from the southern quarters of the city stormed the Antonia Fortress. Surviving Roman and allied troops fell back to the Palace, which provided a coalesced defense that proved too much for the Judaean to overwhelm. A truce was agreed upon; after some further weeks of negotiation, what remained of Rome’s garrison in Jerusalem was afforded the “Honors of War” and allowed to depart the city. Jerusalem was at last free of foreign occupation!

### Roman Forces:

**Antonia Fortress Garrison:** may be placed in any hex of the fortress or on its walls (including those congruent with the Temple). Place one catapult in each Antonia fortress hex.

**Herod’s Palace Garrison:** may be placed in any hex of the palace (including those congruent with the Temple). Place one catapult in each Antonia fortress hex.

**Optional Placement:** Each gate hex, with the exception of those of the Temple Quarter’s inner and outer walls, must be garrisoned by at least one unit. After fulfilling this requirement, all other units may be placed in any fort or fortress hex (save those of the Temple Quarter, Antonia Fortress or Herod’s Palace), or in any build-up/non-edifice hex of Jerusalem.

### Judaean Forces:

The Judaean forces set up second. Initially, only the four faction leaders are placed, in any non-Roman occupied built-up hex. All other units form a “pool” for Reserve Activation. (See the Special Rules.)

### Turn Record Track

1 2 3 4 5

### Special Rules:

1. **Judaean Reserve Activation:** Activation of Judaean combat units takes place as per 18.611 before play commences, as well as each turn. No more than two Judaean leaders may ever occupy a single quarter for purposes of Reserve Activation. In this scenario, note that there are no “Judaean activation modifiers”. Normal activation is followed by a Special Judaean Leader Reserve Activation; each leader occupying a built-up/non-edifice hex not adjacent or in LOS to any Roman unit may activate additional reserves each Judaean Rally Phase. Each leader takes a DR, using the usual Activation Table (18.611) to determine types of units; however, only Zealot and units of the respective faction may be placed. There are no reserve limits (18.612) for each Judaean quarter in this scenario. Finally, during the pregame and first turn Reserve Activation attempts, Roman control of a quarter does not prevent such; thereafter, Roman control will prevent new Judaean Reserves from being taken.

2. **Roads:** All roads inside and outside Jerusalem exist. Movement rates along roads outside the city, whether in clear or sloped terrain, is .5 MP for both Roman and Judaean units.

3. **Roman Refuge:** Refuge (15.4) is defined as any Roman-controlled quarter of the city or any mapedge, whichever may be closest to the affected Roman unit when it moves. If more than one legitimate refuge is equidistant, the choice is the Roman Player’s.

4. **Judaean Unit Disruption:** Only Zealot and leader (7-7) units may be disrupted by combat. All other Judaean units are immediately eliminated when disrupted.

5. **Judaean Escalade:** Judaean units within Jerusalem (any ground-level hex, including built-up and edifice hexes) may make escalade attacks and movement per all printed rules normally allowed the Romans. Any Judaean unit may serve as an escalade “base”.

6. **Roman Cohort Integrity:** A cohort’s integrity +1/-1 DRM applies to any melee involving at least one fresh Roman heavy infantry unit. Should all three units of a cohort attack the same hex, shift the odds of the Melee Combat resolution by two columns. (For example, a 1-1 becomes a 3-1 attack.)

7. **Roman Hesitation to Attack the Temple:** No Roman unit may enter a hex of the Temple Quarter or its exterior perimeter walls (except those congruent with the Antonia Fortress) until Turn 3.

8. **Command Control:**
   a. In addition to the four leaders, each Zealot unit may serve as a leader for any faction; they do not, however, provide rally DRMs to other Zealot units.
   b. Each heavy infantry unit may serve as a leader capable of providing Command Control to any Roman unit; these units themselves require no Command Control. As such, Roman heavy infantry may provide a rally DRM.

9. **Control of Quarters:** Unless a city quarter is controlled by the Romans (as per 8.2), it is automatically presumed to be Judaean-controlled. Roman control of the various areas are determined as follows:
   a. Temple: at the end of any Judaean Melee Phase if at least one of its edifice hexes is occupied by a fresh Roman unit of any type.
   b. Tyropean, New, David’s, Upper and Lower cities: at the end of any Judaean Melee Phase if at least one unit is between two edifice hexes within the wall perimeter are occupied by fresh Roman units of any type.
   c. Antonia Fortress: so long as both edifice hexes and at least two of its fortress hexes are controlled.
   d. Herod’s Palace: so long as all edifice hexes are controlled.

10. **Victory Conditions:** The scenario is played for five turns; it is not an “Assault” and, consequently, players should ignore all rules ending an Assault Period early.
   a. Judaean Victory: If the Romans control only one quarter at the end of play, it is a Judaean Historic Victory; if the Romans do not control any quarter, a Judaean Decisive Victory.
   b. Roman Victory: Should the Romans end the Judaean Melee Phase in control of the Temple Quarter, the game ends in an immediate Roman victory. Failing this, the Romans win by control of two or more quarters at the end of the play.
One of the fascinating aspects of our hobby lies in its ability to permit the exploration of historical "what-ifs". The Judaean rebellion against Roman occupation in 66 A.D. offers one plausible alternate—what if the Romans had moved forces toward the restive province, perhaps (as probable) a legion of the Syrian garrison. Of course, with the approach of such an imposing force, the rebels would likely have risen immediately (or not at all) in an effort to seize the city and barricade the gates in the face of Cestius Gallus. In effect, this scenario is a combination of two others—"The Assault of Gallus" and "The Rebellion"—yet proves to be a challenging and unique game in its own right.

ROMAN FORCES: The Romans set up the forces depicted in "The Rebellion" under the same requirements and restrictions first. In addition, add the following, to arrive as reinforcements (see Special Rules):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roman</th>
<th>Catapult</th>
<th>Ballista</th>
<th>Onager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

JUDAEAN FORCES: The Judaens set up the forces depicted in "The Rebellion" under the same requirements and restrictions. In addition, add the following, to be drawn as reinforcements during "Reserve Activation" (see Special Rules):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amphora</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TURN RECORD TRACK

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

SPECIAL RULES:

1. Unless specified otherwise, all scenario Special Rules for "the Rebellion" are in force.

2. ROMAN HEAVY INFANTRY: Due to their long march and recent arrival, the XII Legion’s heavy infantry do not receive combat modifiers or act as leaders like those within the city. Disregard "Rebellion" Special Rules #6 and #8b for the heavy infantry of the XII Legion.

3. ARRIVAL OF THE XIIth: The arrival of the XII Legion may take place on any turn, commencing with Turn 2. Its arrival is at the discretion of the Roman player, who selects both a mapboard edge to enter and a turn of entry—both recorded secretly before play begins. Once chosen, the mapboard edge of the entry may not be changed, although turn of entry may be delayed if desired. All arriving units are in automatic CC on the turn of arrival. Units of the XIIth arrive subject to the following table, based on mapboard edge and turn:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roman MPh North, hexes E-XX</th>
<th>East/West</th>
<th>South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turn 2</td>
<td>Gallus, Cav &amp; Lt Inf</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn 3</td>
<td>All Available</td>
<td>Gallus, Cav &amp; Lt Inf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn 4</td>
<td>All Available</td>
<td>All Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn 5</td>
<td>All Available</td>
<td>All Available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. JUDEAEN CAULDRONS: On any Activation Table (18.611) dr of "6", one Cauldron may be taken in lieu of a 7-7 unit. A new Cauldron must be placed in any Judaean-controlled bastion/gate or fort/gate hex, subject to stacking limits. Like Judaean regulars and militia, a Cauldron is eliminated rather than disrupted.

5. JUDEAEN ACTIVATION DRM: Use the following modifiers for Judaean Reserve Activation for this scenario:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>drm</th>
<th>Cause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Activation in Upper, Lower or City of David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>No Roman unit within/upon exterior walls of Temple Quarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Fresh Roman unit within exterior walls of Temple Quarter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. EXIT OF CITY: Until at least one unit of the XII Legion is placed upon the map, no Judaean or Roman unit may leave Jerusalem, except as a retreat from combat. Once outside the city, the retreating unit must return once rallied—unless the XII Legion has arrived in the meantime.

7. VICTORY CONDITIONS: The scenario is played for seven turns; it is not an "Assault" and, consequently players should ignore all rules ending an Assault Period early. The Roman player wins immediately should any Judaean Melee Phase end with the Romans in control of the Temple Quarter. Otherwise, apply the following:

- Roman Victory—Romans control three or more quarters
- Draw—Romans control two quarters
- Judaean Victory—Romans control one or less quarters
ASSAULT ON THE TEMPLE

Titus' brutal final assault on the Temple Quarter and Antonia Fortress during August 70 A.D. was the siege's penultimate clash. Both sides concentrated every available resource for what was a desperate, merciless battle. Despite the Judaean's inspired defense of their faith's holiest monument, the mining, siege engines, discipline and numbers of Rome's legions prevailed; the Temple was overrun by victorious and vengeful legionnaires. During the looting that followed, the Temple somehow caught fire. This razing of the heart of Jerusalem symbolized Rome's crushing the Judaean revolt. Today, only a single temple wall remains (the "Wailing Wall"), and the ninth day of the month of Av (around 27 August) is each year observed as a commemoration of that cataclysmic day for the Jewish faith. This scenario is, in effect, an abbreviated version of the historical Third Assault Period, with a limited portion of the map and forces in play.

JUDA’EAN FORCES: The Judaean set up second within and/or upon exterior walls of the Antonia Fortress and Temple Quarter.

Roman forces: The Romans set up first anywhere within the New City, Tyropean City or outside Jerusalem, adjacent to Judaean-controlled exterior walls, within Command Control of either the legion commander or Titus.

TURN RECORD TRACK

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

SPECIAL RULES:
1. Unless modified by the following, all Full Siege campaign game rules are enforced. The portion of the map in play encompasses the New City and Tyropean City, both under Roman control, the Antonia Fortress and Temple Quarter (and walls), both under Judaean control, and all areas outside Jerusalem's exterior walls. The New City and Tyropean City are considered "cleared" (as per 18.37). All other sections of the map are inactive. On the inactive portions Judaean units may move, retreat and rally only; Roman units may not move, retreat or make any sort of attack upon a hex in the inactive sections.

2. The following pre-game procedure, organized in sequential "steps", determines the situation on the map:
   a. FIRST ASSAULT MINING: The Roman player executes one mine shaft against New City exterior wall hex QQ31 (resolving the effect as per 19.21 and 19.22).
   b. SECOND ASSAULT MINING: The Roman player executes two mine shafts, at least six hexes apart, against any eligible hex of the Temple Quarter's eastern wall, or—if hex QQ33 or QQ34 have been breached first—any inner Temple Wall hex within five hexes of either of these. After completing both mine resolutions, the Roman player rolls two dice, the total of which is afflicted (at his discretion) as additional breach damage to any elevated hexes except those of the Temple's inner wall. No one hex, however, may receive more than one-third of its original "Breach Defense" strength as damage.
   c. THE GREAT RAMP: The Roman player next places five Ramp counters on the map (per 18.81). These may be placed against any Judaean-held exterior wall of the Temple Quarter or Antonia Fortress.
   d. JUDA’EAN ARTILLERY: The Judaean player secretly records the locations of his artillery units. These must be placed exclusively in controlled, unbreached elevated hexes of the playable portion of the map.
   e. THIRD PERIOD MINING & BREACHES: The Roman player makes a dr (+1 drm), which indicates the number of breaches available for placement in any Roman-controlled wall hexes of the New and Tyropean cities. Next, the Roman player executes a further two mine shafts, at least six hexes apart, against any eligible hex of the Temple Quarter's eastern, northern or western exterior wall, the Antonia Fortress' eastern or northwestern wall, or—if a previous breach has been made first to any exterior Temple wall—any inner Temple wall within five hexes of such an exterior breach.
   f. ROMAN PLACEMENT: As per the above listing under "Forces", the Roman player places his units onboard.
   g. JUDA’EAN PLACEMENT: As per the above listing under "Forces", the Judaean player places his units onboard. Too, at this point he places all surviving Judaean artillery units in their previously-recorded elevated hex positions.
   h. ROMAN ATTRITION: To reflect previous losses, the Roman player must execute an "attrition" of his forces, half of which will return to play as reinforcements. Attrition is conducted by classes. For the combined artillery and towers/ramparts of all units, roll one die; the number rolled are removed (armored towers count as two units), Roman player's choice—half (rounded up) as reinforcements, and the remainder permanently and count towards "Mutiny". The Roman player then does the same for each of the following groups for each of the two legions: heavy infantry, velites and cavalry, foederatti and Syrian archers.

3. ROMAN REINFORCEMENTS: All Roman units set aside due to attrition return to play during the Roman Rally Phase on Turn 5. These reinforcing units may be placed, per stacking limits, within any hex of the New or Tyropean city not adjacent any wall of the Temple or Antonia Fortress. Such begin play fresh, and may function normally for the duration of the scenario.

4. JUDA’EAN REINFORCEMENTS: If at least one fresh Roman unit is within the Temple Quarter's exterior walls at the beginning of a Judaean Rally Phase, the Judaean player makes an unmodified dr (+2 if a fresh Roman unit is within the inner Temple walls). This dr determines the number of reinforcing Judaean units; a subsequent dr (as per 18.611) determines type units; Judaean units may be taken from units eliminated during the course of play only. Finally, a third dr determines which inactive quarter produces these: 1-2, City of David; 3-4, Lower City; 5-6, Upper City.

5. VICTORY CONDITIONS: The scenario is played for eight turns (only the first five of which may be day turns). The Romans win by controlling the Temple Quarter (per 18.32) at the end of any Judaean Melee Phase, or by controlling the Antonia Fortress and at least one hex of the Temple edifice at the end of play. The Judaean win by avoiding Roman victory, or immediately by inflicting sufficient casualties to trigger a Roman Army Mutiny (18.94).
SIEGE OF JERUSALEM matches a military machine of deadly proficiency against a force that, though definitely a mixed bag, has some impressive units of its own and, very importantly, cannot only sustain massive casualties and maintain its superior size but actually grow larger as reserves are committed. The situation on this paper battlefield is far more complex than just another case of quality pitted against quantity.

Nor does this alone entirely define this unique game. Jerusalem itself is more than a single city surrounded by walls. It is more like an array of tactically semi-independent cells, with the walls dividing them also serving as roads to facilitate the movement of the defenders (or even for raids deep into the enemy rear). These fortifications are the Judaean player's most crucial asset, and the Roman's greatest problem—and, indeed, the troop differences, are the central feature defining SIEGE OF JERUSALEM.

Because of its complicated tactical and strategic situations, the game is quick to punish errors in judgement, usually in a dramatic fashion and more than almost any other simulation. This is especially true for the Roman player, as he bears the burden of attacking an extremely daunting objective with minimal forces. Four reinforced legions might be an overwhelming preponderance of force on the open field, but this city and its fortifications are definitely anything but. What is called for is a "combined arms" approach, just as mandatory in 70 AD as in World War II or the modern era. The arms might be different, yet there remains a need to coordinate different types of units, each used when and where appropriate if the Roman is to conquer this city.

For the Romans, the task is obvious: to exploit to the utmost the advantages in unit quality enjoyed by the legions and the special equipment carried to the siege, offsetting the marked disadvantage in numbers the enemy enjoys. The Judaean's aim is more conservative: to get the most out of his units at their disposal is the first step for the players coordinating them effectively.

ROME:

Heavy Infantry: The classic professional infantry of the legion is the mainstay of the Roman might. To win, the player will be forced to rely heavily on their abilities in melee combat. Conversely, excessive casualties to this arm (the ones most likely to suffer the heaviest losses) will mean defeat, regardless of much else you may do. The Roman heavy infantry are the quintessential shock troops of any army dedicated to melee.

Better armor gives them benefits when attacked by either missile fire or melee; forming units into testudo formation, though depriving them of the ability to initiate melee, makes them even more resistant to missile fire in the open. Still, prodigious strength is the Judaean infantry's greatest, and the Roman player should thus take care before sending his most valuable troops into clear terrain where the Judeans, comfortably positioned on their walls, can cut them down without much fear of a counterblow. Your heavy infantry might be more capable than other units of going into harm's way, especially having turned "turtle"; but they can (and do) still die in frightening numbers before the walls and should never be thrown away.

With the highest melee strength and the best ability to rally from Disorder, the 7-8 veteran units are the obvious choice for breaking through the walls, where only one unit can be stacked (most obviously, the siege towers). But it should be remembered that all three components of a cohort constitute a team, and whenever possible should be kept together to receive the cohort integrity die roll bonus in melee.

Veltiae: These are the running mates of the legion's heavy infantry. They provide stacks of them, including testudos, with a missile capability, and are in fact the only Roman light infantry that can operate stacked with the heavy infantry. Furthermore, these are the only other units that can hold the ladders for escusals—a suicidal means of assaulting well-defended positions, but an excellent way to take advantage of the ground stripping of one section of wall to reinforce another.

Integrating the veltiae with the heavy infantry comes with a cost of course: cohort integrity. Because of casualties, some may not have this benefit in any case, and such cohorts are obviously suitable for forming up with the legion's missile troops. Forming other such packets depends on the player's immediate aims, and a keen appraisal of whether missile capability is worth more at the moment than the enhanced melee capability of a unified cohort.

Foederatti: The foederatti are another variety of auxiliary light infantry, equal to the veltiae in nominal missile strength, with slightly better mobility, and a little less suitability in melee. This does not tell the whole story, however. These irregular troops lack the veltiae ability to work with heavy infantry (such as providing missile fire from the front ranks of the attackers) or support escusals. They do have one important asset, however: exemption from command and control constraints when the Judaeans try to flee the city when its doom is assured. For this, they are secondary to the cavalry in importance, but are still not to be squandered earlier in the game.

Syrian Archers: These are entirely worthless for melee, and any Roman commander who allows them to be so engaged has made a grave mistake indeed. They are, however, the best Roman missile infantry and should be restricted to the same supporting role as the foederatti. Most unfortunate for the Roman player, there are only 12 (at most) in the game—whereas the Judaeans start players play with 56 of regular infantry, the equal of the Syrian archers in missile strength.

Cavalry: The mounted Roman troops can be descriptive in the open, after the enemy has been attrited and driven from his walls in some disorder by the other arms. Their melee strength is doubled in clear terrain, and possibly multiplied further in concentric attacks. Cavalry is often contestable against a group of broken units, destroying all in a single melee phase through multiple attacks.

Jerusalem, however, provides little of the open terrain in which cavalry thrives (most of it within the walls concentrated in the New City). The rest is a jumble of buildings, alleys, and hidden enemies. Furthermore, unless the Roman player has achieved an unlikely and costly prize in seizing a gate, the only way for cavalry to enter a district is through adjacent breach hexes. Without mining operations, often unavailable in the first assault period (when most attack the New City), this takes time.

The cavalry are nonetheless far from irrelevant in our combined-arms attack in SIEGE OF JERUSALEM. Each time the Romans secure a portion of the city, they level it, thus providing themselves with the clear terrain ideal for employing the cavalry. There, the horsemen make excellent reserves for protecting the rear echelon, most notably the artillery. But where the cavalry really comes into its own is outside the walls, during the Judaeans escape attempt. Besides their manifest advantages in meele in the open, they are extremely mobile and, like the foederatti, at that time are not subject to command constraints.

A Judaeans escape attempt, properly countered by the Roman player, can turn an exercise in simple butchery into a final game-winning strategy. For this reason, when it is clear that the Judaeans will soon be able to declare his mass escape attempt, all the Roman cavalry should be stationed outside the city, where they can do the most good.

Siege Towers: These wooden constructs are indispensable for assaulting the fortifications. In the game, particularly their artillery may be very important to the Roman cause, but getting the Roman infantry into melee is more so. The towers get them to the enemy, and even facilitate it by doubling the melee strength of the one unit permitted atop the tower when attacking. Hence, their critical role in Roman strategy. The towers, serve best when combined with two of a legion's three combining against one Judaean position (normally, a tower in the wall). The towers also have surprising mobility, allowing them to be pushed quickly to targets of opportunity along the wall.

Rams: Sometimes the Roman can damage or breach long sections of wall in one mining attempt between assault periods. Far more frequently, however, he is forced to level it one by one at a time during an assault, battering the walls down with his ram. It is generally necessary to obtain at least two adjoining breaches to penetrate the hard shell of a district in any significant manner. To hurry this process along, it is advisable to attack with two rams against the same hex, then shift over to the next hex when the first breach has occurred. Rams too are highly mobile (even more so than siege towers), and it is possible for the Roman player to quickly shift the weight of a legion's attack. The rams are absolutely necessary to the attack, as no part of Jerusalem will likely be captured against a competent Judaean player without breaching its wall.

Armored Towers: These combine, of course, the capabilities of both tower and ram, with not only enhanced defensibility, but the ability to mount a catapult—making it the most mobile piece of artillery available on your side. They are reminiscent to tanks for your WW2 gaming partner, encourage his delusion—by the time he figures out the differences, he'll be hooked on the game.) Their only discernible fault lies in their low mobility. This is not really much, since the fortifications they are aimed at aren't going to anywhere. Armored towers are fairly rare in the game.
the Roman player starts with none in his OB, and can acquire them only by rolling the die between assault periods— with the chance of obtaining one increasing with the duration of the interphase. But, in combination with mining operations (likewise dependent on the number of weeks between assault periods), they can make short work of even the strongest position.

**JUDEA:**

Zelots: These are the closest thing the Judean side has to heavy infantry, but lacking the Roman units' armor benefits and cohort integrity to be considered on a par with the veteran legionaries. However, in compensation, they do have superior flexibility as they can be under command of any leader, regardless of faction, whereas the heavy infantry is tied to one headquarters. In the neighborhoods of Jerusalem, where units can stack only two high (and cohort integrity is thus out of the question), a body of zealots is a match for just about any force that the Roman player can send against it. Aiding their own efforts against the enemy is the possible entrance of reserves into virtually any built-up hex not occupied by Roman forces, making concentric attacks a must.

Cauldrons will have three primary roles in **SIEGE OF JERUSALEM.** First, they occupy vital defensive positions, such as forts, fortresses and corner towers. The loss of such positions usually bodes ill for the Judean cause, and the best units should be stationed there, along with some missile-firing regulars. Moreover, the forts and fortresses are exceedingly hard to capture, and they can be made impenetrable by defending them at maximum strength. Early in the game, especially, the Judean player will have sufficient strength to so defend all the most valuable and likely-attacked positions. And since, perhaps surprisingly, the Judean fortresses between assault periods regardless of who controls the adjacent hexes or city district, he has very good reason to do so.

Second, zealots make excellent tactical reserves, stationed behind threatened sections of the wall. It is certain that units initially deployed on the defensive works will be disordered by Roman attacks; so to maintain the integrity of his defense, the Judean player relies on supply of good units to rotate in place of them. Simply replacing good quality units with inferior ones plays right into the hands of the Roman.

Finally, the zealots are the backbone of any counterattack against a Roman breach or captured fortress. Missiles are very important in blunting the Roman effort, but success in fire combat is best reinforced by success in melee. The zealots are the best you have for initiating melee. Particularly around the first breach, this means that the Romans must be expelled or destroyed rather than simply contained. Since the Judean regulars also appear in large numbers; no other type of unit is quite so helpful to the Judean cause, nor so frustrating to the Roman.

Their place is basically everywhere that needs protection. The Judean player can sacrifice some to delay the Romans or to gain a momentary tactical advantage. But, despite their hefty numbers early in the game, he should not send too many to destruction with little or nothing to show for the effort. As sectors of Jerusalem fall to the legions of Flavius Titus, the high Judean replacement rate is eroded, so that by the third assault period the Judean may no longer take heavy losses in stride. Too, after the Romans take the New City (their easiest objective) and then the Temple (their hardest), miltia become more likely to appear as reserves than regulars. Nonetheless, the wise Judean player will use his regulars with flair, certainly, but be ever mindful that there is not an endless supply of them.

Militia: What is there to be said about the Judean militia? Not much. They are the worst units in the game: weak in melee, slow, and hard to rally. To make matters even worse, just as Roman heavy infantry in a stack makes the other unit(s) stronger against missile attacks, so the presence of militia entails an unfavorable die roll modifier. So, militia units are best kept away from critical positions (or anywhere else the Roman player is likely to seriously attack). Militia comes in large quantities, but quality is abysmally low.

Militia does have its uses though. Any time the Judean player is going to send out units to certain destruction to gain a tactical advantage (say, a raid on the Roman siege engines), militia should definitely be considered—though not if inclusion jeopardizes an important mission. Militia units also serve as the last line of defense, and can be committed when not much else is available or to cover the flight of better units to the next district of the city. They are Judaea's sacrificial lambs. In all fairness, though, it must be admitted that they do have one role they can exercise as well as any Judean unit—they can drop rocks.

Cauldrons: In the rules of **SIEGE OF JERUSALEM,** cauldrons are classified as artillery, but in practice they are a unique type of unit that enhances the Judean rock-dropping. One cauldron can be in any stack in a fortress, or in any other elevated hex where there is no artillery. And, though not as strong as the Roman heavy infantry in a stack, the cauldron makes the other unit(s) stronger against attacks (besides making the rock attacks from it more effective). Cauldrons have the standard rock attack factor of "2", plus they add a "+1" DRM to any rock/muzzle attack in which they join. Unimpressive at first glance, this trait is an effective and abundantly available means of making the Judaeans' most important combat capability all the stronger.

And there is some flexibility in the Judean use of cauldrons. Alone among the Judean artillery, the cauldrons can move along the walls, albeit slowly. Therefore, they should be deployed in the near vicinity of those walls, low, this may be the only way to make a strong position just a little better against melee (besides making the rocks able to attack from it more effectively). Cauldrons have the standard rock attack factor of "2", plus they add a "+1" DRM to any rock/muzzle attack in which they join. Unimpressive at first glance, this trait is an effective and abundantly available means of making the Judaeans' most important combat capability all the stronger.

Both: Commanders: Eliezar ben Yair, Flavius Titus (and Cestius Gallus in the Introductory Scenario) and Titus' possible replacement Tiberius Alexander are similar in that they all provide a favorable die roll modifier in melee combat and, more importantly, greatly aid the rallying of disordered units and can exercise command control over any other units they can reach. But there are some major differences in their appropriate employment. The Roman player has a little more leeway, although not that much, in using Titus aggressively. He can join in important efforts, such as a thrust through a double-breached, lifting his HQ's high melee strength as well as his own combat bonus. He can direct the towers and ram directly, from the front rank, when others must hang back. In short, he can operate well when most at risk. Losing Titus can be a major setback, necessitating a crippling one as Tiberius Alexander is available to take his place. In spite of such a replacement waiting in the wings, the Roman player cannot afford to throw away his primary commander for any reason that does not carry the possibility of deciding the outcome of an attack on a district.

If Titus is too valuable for idle risk, Eliezar is too valuable for almost any hazard at all. He has no deputy to step in upon his death, and since his escape is worth 250 victory points, his survival to fight another day in another place should be a major priority whatever the fate of Jerusalem. He is simply worth too many points in the long run to risk any short-term benefit, even though this means that all his capabilities and advantages will not be exploited.

Commanders on both sides have a very important task in helping to rally disordered units, especially those suffering from Rout or Panic. The Roman player has in his OB to start with a large portion of his forces rendered offensively impotent and defensively vulnerable. This action of rallying is best carried out in the rear, where the commander and his disordered mob are at their safest, and ideally where missile fire is unable to interfere with the process.

Leaders: These headquarters are charged with keeping their respective Roman legions or Judean factions in command and, like their superiors, can influence rally attempts. However, they do lack the influence of other command, so don't expect them to be in front lines. Losing a leader is inconvenient, but seldom catastrophic as it is replaced at the commencement of the next assault period. Loss during an assault does put an extra burden upon the side's commander, who alone can keep the legion or faction in command for the rest of the assault period.

Artillery: There are three types of artillery in **Siege of Jerusalem,** in ascending order of potency, these are: catapults, onagers, and ballistae. In most siege games (and there really are not that many, despite their impact on military history), artillery is used to breach the walls, but in **Siege of Jerusalem** it can also be used as a last line of defense, and can be committed when not much else is available or to cover the flight of better units to the next district of the city. They are Judaea's sacrificial lambs. In all fairness, though, it must be admitted that they do have one role they can exercise as well as any Judean unit—they can drop rocks.

A legion's artillery complement is best concentrated against a primary objective for melee, "pre firing" to disrupt the defenders and make the assaulting infantry's job much easier. The Roman units are reasonably mobile, though each time one moves it becomes "disordered" and so must be rallied before it can fire again. This will certainly divert an HQ from other tasks to make this, never a sure thing, a little more probable. Flexible and powerful (especially the ballistra), artillery is a vital part of the Roman order of battle. It must be protected accordingly; conversely, the Judean player should always be watching for an opportunity to sortie its destruction, depriving the Roman player of some important weapons and, not incidentally, garnering some victory points for himself.

Judaeaca artillery has two important differences from the Roman that govern its use. It suffers an adverse modifier when firing beyond the shortest range; though, in practice, the Judean's greatest worry is being overpowered by the Romans, or overwhelmed at adjacent and other nearby units, mitigating this disadvantage. More serious, it is completely immobile. Even more so than the cauldrons, artillery pieces have to be carefully sited where the Judean player expects to make
Since my last report there have been some encouraging developments for AREA members. The level of interest shown in a number of games has led to the appointment of “Commissioners” or “Contact Persons” for specific games. Henceforth, AREA members who may wish to participate in Championship competition in one of the games listed below should write directly to the indicated person:

**Stalingrad**

The first round pairings for the ladder tournament are:

- Championship rung: Dave Kopp (#1) vs Don Burdick (#2)
- Second rung: Kevin McCarthy (#3) vs Greg Smith (#4)
- Third rung: John Grant (#5) vs Harry Hollern (#6)

First round matches are now underway for the top three rungs. Joe Beard has joined the ladder in position #7; if no one else joins in time for a Round 1 match, Joe will have a “bye” to position #6 for Round 2. If you want to join, you should write immediately to the “Stalingrad Ladder” commissioner: John B. Grant, Jr. (196 Brookdale Road, Stamford, CT 06905).

**Battle of the Bulge**

Round 1 of the BULGE ladder is now finished. John Grant has defeated John Malaska and advances to the top rung to challenge Don Burdick for the Championship in Round 2. Dale Garbutt and John Malaska have decided not to participate in the second round. Therefore, the two new members—Greg Smith and Dan Schnell—will be matched on the second rung in positions #5 and #4 respectively. Play is scheduled to commence on 1 July, but you can probably still join the ladder by writing Donald S. Burdick (1112 Huntsman Drive, Durham, NC 27713).

**Waterloo**

The rules for the “Waterloo Ladder” have been finalized. The current champion is Kevin McCarthy, and he will also serve as the ladder commissioner. (His address is 8000 Wallingford, South Euclid, OH 44121.) So far, Patrick McNein, Mark Gutfried, Gerald Pinningan and Arthur Bright have applied to participate. The first round is scheduled to start in late July. I don’t have the first round pairings yet, but they will be available by next time.

**Anzio**

The “Anzio Ladder” rules are still under development. If interest among the membership warrants, there may be two Anzio ladders: one each for the Basic and the Advanced versions. The “ladder commissioner” is Tom Oleson (Orsavagen 31, 16142 Bromma, Stockholm, Sweden). To participate in either, write to him.

**Afrika Korps**

Joe Beard has successfully defended his title in a two-game match with Dale Garbutt. Meanwhile, the following five players have expressed a desire to participate in championship competition in AKA: Greg Smith, Patrick McNein, Randy Holler, Dave Kopp, Mike Crowe and Mark Gutfried. This is certainly the nucleus for an “Afrika Korps Ladder”. The next order of business is to find a volunteer to serve as contact person to help get the organizational process moving. In the meantime, applications can be sent to Don Greenwood.

**D-Day**

The McCarthy-Burdick match in the finals of the original tournament is still in progress, but applications to join in the post-tournament ladder have already come from Patrick McNein, Harry Hollern and Steve Sutton. The “D-Day Ladder” rules are formulated already, so it is not too early to write if you are interested in participating. We don’t have a commissioner yet for it, but for now applications and queries should be sent to me. When one more participant joins, a decision will be made whether to wait for the completion of the McCarthy-Burdick match or begin Round 1 immediately with that as the top rung.

**Advanced Squad Leader**

The good news here is the availability of an enthusiastic “commissioner”. He is Russ Gifford (Tri-State Strategists, 320 East 27th St., South Sioux City, NE 68776). Russ would like to organize a face-to-face AREA tournament in ASL to determine a Nebraska “state champion”. He has also volunteered to organize and run “state championships” for Iowa and South Dakota. Players in those states who might like to compete in such should write to Russ. Residents in other states who would be interested in organizing ASL state championship tournaments should also feel free to contact him. He has experience with ASL tournaments, both as organizer and as competitor, and would be happy to share his ideas.

Russ is also enthusiastic about electronic mail. ADVANCED SQUAD LEADER is awkward to PBM, but works just fine as a PBM game. Russ has organized a round-robin AREA tournament in ASL under the GENIE system. Besides Russ, the other participants are Geoff Engelman, Kevin Sheen and Carlos Lourenco. The tournament is just getting underway as this installment is being written. Russ estimates it will take about six months to complete. Anyone who would like to communicate with Russ via e-mail can reach him at his GENIE address: SHANGRI.
Dear Mr. Martin,

I really must apply the stand you took concerning the article format of *The General* in Vol. 26, No. 1. Too often it has appeared to me that the articles are too long and that the format is not kept consistent. For example, the article on the latest in competitive gaming, which appeared in the same issue, was far too short. I believe that this is a problem that needs to be addressed in order to keep the magazine more interesting and readable.

Sincerely,

Michael Hudson

New Hampshire

---

Dear Mr. Martin,

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the format of *The General* in Vol. 26, No. 1. I believe that the magazine should be more consistent in its article lengths and that the articles should be more engaging. I also believe that the magazine should be more focused on providing useful information to its readers.

Sincerely,

Paul Worthington

LaPorte, Indiana

---

Mr. Rivas,

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the format of *The General* in Vol. 26, No. 1. I believe that the magazine should be more consistent in its article lengths and that the articles should be more engaging. I also believe that the magazine should be more focused on providing useful information to its readers.

Sincerely,

Michael Williams

Salem, Indiana

---

Dear Mr. Martin,

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the format of *The General* in Vol. 26, No. 1. I believe that the magazine should be more consistent in its article lengths and that the articles should be more engaging. I also believe that the magazine should be more focused on providing useful information to its readers.

Sincerely,

Rex

---

Dear Mr. Martin,

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the format of *The General* in Vol. 26, No. 1. I believe that the magazine should be more consistent in its article lengths and that the articles should be more engaging. I also believe that the magazine should be more focused on providing useful information to its readers.

Sincerely,

Robert Buchanan

Charlotte, North Carolina

---

Letters to the Editor...
THE GREAT & NEAR-GREAT

An R&D Chief’s Hall of Fame

By Don Greenwood

Sometimes, being the head of Research & Development at a modest sized game company isn’t all it’s cracked up to be. I don’t think I was ever cut out to be King Solomon . . . or even Steve Spielberg for that matter, but on an admittedly less-grandiose scale. But such is the position in which I am placed nearly every working day. You see, as head of R&D at Avalon Hill, a position I’ve held more or less by default for nearly 20 years, I make the lion’s share of the decisions on what gets published and what doesn’t. To me must go the blame for many of my screwing objections. There still are. Management here has always taken on a one-on-one relationship with its design staff. If a designer wants to do game X, and he’s persistent enough, he’ll probably get to do it. And if Management wants to see a game in print, there’s no “probably” about it. But, by and large, I have enough pull to get a game published if I like it; which sort of puts me on a level at the right hand of God (or the Devil) . . . at least in the eyes of many free-lance game designers.

Game designers are by nature creatures of large egos. Over the years I’ve turned down a good number of them, and I know this for a fact. As tact has never been my long suit, I’ve probably made more than my share of enemies in the process. But I digress . . . suffice it to say that you need to develop a thick skin in this line of work. But what does that mean? Ah, you are wondering. Let me try to clarify.

So, what qualifies me to pass judgment on what should and shouldn’t be published? I often ask myself that same question; I’m sure the people I turn down ask it even more forcefully. I wish I could say with confidence that I had a good answer. I don’t. Like most folk, I judge games by my own personal criteria, the most important of which is: “Did I enjoy it?” Naturally, what I enjoy, others don’t—and vice versa. Not a very objective way to go about the selection process, is it? Oh, there are some other factors involved to be sure—most notably, do the words “IOException” and “OutOfMemoryError” appear in the assistant’s report? But we’ll come to that later.

Game designers are by nature creatures of large egos. Over the years I’ve turned down a good number of them, and I know this for a fact. As tact has never been my long suit, I’ve probably made more than my share of enemies in the process. But I digress . . . suffice it to say that you need to develop a thick skin in this line of work. But what does that mean? Ah, you are wondering. Let me try to clarify.

So, what qualifies me to pass judgment on what should and shouldn’t be published? I often ask myself that same question; I’m sure the people I turn down ask it even more forcefully. I wish I could say with confidence that I had a good answer. I don’t. Like most folk, I judge games by my own personal criteria, the most important of which is: “Did I enjoy it?” Naturally, what I enjoy, others don’t—and vice versa. Not a very objective way to go about the selection process, is it? Oh, there are some other factors involved to be sure—most notably, do the words “IOException” and “OutOfMemoryError” appear in the assistant’s report? But we’ll come to that later.

So, what qualifies me to pass judgment on what should and shouldn’t be published? I often ask myself that same question; I’m sure the people I turn down ask it even more forcefully. I wish I could say with confidence that I had a good answer. I don’t. Like most folk, I judge games by my own personal criteria, the most important of which is: “Did I enjoy it?” Naturally, what I enjoy, others don’t—and vice versa. Not a very objective way to go about the selection process, is it? Oh, there are some other factors involved to be sure—most notably, do the words “IOException” and “OutOfMemoryError” appear in the assistant’s report? But we’ll come to that later.

Game designers are by nature creatures of large egos. Over the years I’ve turned down a good number of them, and I know this for a fact. As tact has never been my long suit, I’ve probably made more than my share of enemies in the process. But I digress . . . suffice it to say that you need to develop a thick skin in this line of work. But what does that mean? Ah, you are wondering. Let me try to clarify.

So, what qualifies me to pass judgment on what should and shouldn’t be published? I often ask myself that same question; I’m sure the people I turn down ask it even more forcefully. I wish I could say with confidence that I had a good answer. I don’t. Like most folk, I judge games by my own personal criteria, the most important of which is: “Did I enjoy it?” Naturally, what I enjoy, others don’t—and vice versa. Not a very objective way to go about the selection process, is it? Oh, there are some other factors involved to be sure—most notably, do the words “IOException” and “OutOfMemoryError” appear in the assistant’s report? But we’ll come to that later.
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So, what qualifies me to pass judgment on what should and shouldn’t be published? I often ask myself that same question; I’m sure the people I turn down ask it even more forcefully. I wish I could say with confidence that I had a good answer. I don’t. Like most folk, I judge games by my own personal criteria, the most important of which is: “Did I enjoy it?” Naturally, what I enjoy, others don’t—and vice versa. Not a very objective way to go about the selection process, is it? Oh, there are some other factors involved to be sure—most notably, do the words “IOException” and “OutOfMemoryError” appear in the assistant’s report? But we’ll come to that later.
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Game designers are by nature creatures of large egos. Over the years I’ve turned down a good number of them, and I know this for a fact. As tact has never been my long suit, I’ve probably made more than my share of enemies in the process. But I digress . . . suffice it to say that you need to develop a thick skin in this line of work. But what does that mean? Ah, you are wondering. Let me try to clarify.
5. Playability: Are the game's pleasures readily obtainable, or do the players have to invest more time and effort than it's worth? Do the components do as much of the work as possible, or are the players forced to remember too much detail? Well-designed and developed playing aids and a concise overall design are a must.

6. Playing Time: Can it be played in an afternoon? I like my entertainment in evening-sized chunks—so does most of America. If I can't finish it in a day, it's not a game, it's an occupation.

7. Aesthetics: The best boardgame design in the world won't ever be played if it is ugly. The components have to make you want to play it. Prospective game designers should keep this rule paramount in their planning if they ever expect to lure a contract from a publisher. If you can't draw, get someone to draw what making your prototype. Don't expect a reader to find the time to play something that looks like it came out of a crappy box. If the prototype is attractive, the chances of it being tested are much better.

8. Innovation: Does the game offer something new in the field, be it subject, scale, components, or design? A game which offers nothing new really offers nothing at all. Some 90% of the designs submitted to me fail this test. Usually they are nothing more than an existing game system thrown on top of a different subject. Some try to disguise it by taking an existing game and a combat system from another, and an OB/scale from a third—but the result is still the same.

9. Impact: Has the game affected the field of simulation design? Did its appearance spark imitation? A sense of history is important even in games about history.

10. Rules: A brilliant design has failed because the written rules fail to convey the necessary information to the players. It is the rare game that makes it to the marketplace with a complete and clear set of rules. I've never played a game submitted to me that I thought was ready for publication as submitted. Rules which are eminently clear to the author leave an element of doubt for nearly everyone else. When that someone else is a competent game developer, the element of doubt should be reduced by more extensive research. Then he's finished rewriting the rules. But that's still not enough. Players are lazy. Few people enjoy reading rules. If I playtest locally, I can explain the rules, but that doesn't test the rules; it just tests the design. Every individual looks at the written words differently. That's why I send out "blind" playtest kits to a dozen volunteers. They have no choice but to test the rules, because there's no one else to ask. Anyone who thinks his rules are complete without undergoing this sort of test is fooling himself.

THE GREAT

These ten criteria together compose the simple, most important question of any boardgame: Is it fun? Depending on your particular sensibilities, a poor showing in any one of these categories may cause you to answer with a resounding "NO!" However, if I required perfection, there would be no occupants in my Hall of Fame, so I can forgive a game one failing—maybe more if it is truly exciting. Of course I'm biased toward the Italian Theater just isn't good box office. But what a game! It is the only operational game that I still play regularly. Step losses gave a sense of realism totally absent from "D Erim" type CRTs, and truly created the atmosphere of this defensive-oriented slugfest while still providing possibilities for devastating breakthroughs. Of course I'm biased because I've learned it at the knee of the master, Tom Oleson. Our postal games over the years continue to bring excitement to my mail box on a regular basis. A limited number of turns and pieces makes it the perfect PBM game. The map is both beautiful and extremely functional, with hexides conveying information as vital as the contents of the hex itself. Unfortunately, the map itself is highly ambiguous because those same hexides are not always clearly delineated into one terrain type or another. A terrific concept which was flawed in execution. Now out of print... I'm glad I have my four copies.

BISMARCK: Jack Greene's design was a far better simulation than the original AH version, but there is no contest as to which I'd rather play. Let's see Craig Taylor, who unlike me is a big Civil War buff with no axe to grind, lists it as his favorite game (with over 100 games played). That's good enough for me.

ANZIO: This game was never a commercial success—even in the boom of the 70s. I blamed it on an ugly box and convoluted rules, so we brought it back in a second edition with a different box and reorganized rules. Still no sales. I guess the Italian Theater just isn't good box office. But what a game! It is the only operational game that I still play regularly. Step losses gave a sense of realism totally absent from 'D Erim' type CRts, and truly created the atmosphere of this defensive-oriented slugfest while still providing possibilities for devastating breakthroughs. Of course I'm biased because I've learned it at the knee of the master, Tom Oleson. Our postal games over the years continue to bring excitement to my mail box on a regular basis. A limited number of turns and pieces makes it the perfect PBM game. The map is both beautiful and extremely functional, with hexides conveying information as vital as the contents of the hex itself. Unfortunately, the map itself is highly ambiguous because those same hexides are not always clearly delineated into one terrain type or another. A terrific concept which was flawed in execution. Now out of print... I'm glad I have my four copies.

A House Divided: This one is here largely by virtue of its reputation. I've simply heard too many favorable comments about it to exclude it. Co-worker Craig Taylor, who unlike me is a big Civil War buff with no axe to grind, lists it as his favorite game (with over 100 games played). That's good enough for me.

AFRICA KORPS: I can hear the howls already: "He's picking that old chestnut for a Hall of Fame?!!" You betcha. I know, the old "D Erim" games of the early '60s (that the hobby has ironically come to refer to as the "classics") really don't compare to today's wargames. Or do they? There is something to be said for a game with only four pages of rules. I owned this game for several years before I appreciated it. At first, there didn't seem to be much to it. Then, as I was exposed via postal mail play with expert players across the country, I began to understand and appreciate it. Players do not move pieces—they shifted them, from one carefully calculated position to another—positions memorized over years of play—like the grand Chess masters. Too much sentiment from past enjoyment of a bygone era? Perhaps, but few games have aged as gracefully. As for the World War II "Air War" rule made its first appearance here; and as simple as it seems today, it was revolutionary back then. I'm told that the game's historical research is suspect, but it has enough perceived realism for me and I've read more books on the desert war than most people who will play the game. The game's luck factor is out of whack, with too much importance placed on a few crucial die rolls, but an expert player gets around that by not making many die rolls; he outmaneuvers his opponent and gains position by threat rather than battle. AK is still the ultimate game of maneuver, and for that reason it makes my Hall of Fame.

Big League Manager Baseball/Basketball: These two are an admission due to my "automatic entry for 100 playings" rule of thumb. It's been over 20 years since I was into statistical solitary sports games in a big way. Replaying an entire American League season will rack up 100 games in a hurry,
especially after you’ve memorized a 50-by-50 result matrix. I pass no judgment over this out-of-print system’s performance versus present-day systems. All I know is that I enjoyed it once. Chalk it up to sentiment.

Cosmic Encounter: Back when D&D was making its first big waves, I thought this game was the one that could top it. So much so, that I gave Eon the best acquisition offer I’ve ever made. Fortunately for me and for Avalon Hill (because it never came close to competing with D&D or even SQUAD LEADER for sales), they turned me down. That doesn’t change my original opinion though. An elegantly simple design relying on each player having its own unique special power for its chrome.

DIPLOMACY: I haven’t played this game in 20 years, and I doubt I’ll ever play it again because I don’t like it. Games based primarily on one’s powers of deceit don’t turn me on, nor do all-skill games, nor do games of its length. However, there is no denying its place in wargaming’s pantheon of great games. It has been a distinct branch of the hobby all own for nearly 30 years, fostering a network of postal games, and over 1000 officially recorded variants (at last count). And all of this for a game that requires seven players. Amazing!

ENEMY IN SIGHT/MODERN NAVAL BATTLES: I always thought NAVAL WAR was silly, but there was more to that. My first play of it just didn’t go well... so what the heck? If gamers wanted to abandon history and sit around a table taking turns throwing each other away, who was I to argue with their sense of enjoyment. When I developed ENEMY IN SIGHT however, I was determined to make it more than just a game of avoiding the lead until the end. I thought the design needed something to enable a leader to fight off the concentrated challenges of the pack. If he was clever and lucky enough. That was impossible in NAVAL WAR—wherever led the scor­ring was just a floating target. By using UP FRONT principles of varying hand sizes and a few other decision points (such as adding a captured ship to your line instead of taking it for a prize), a player could both avoid the lead while building a big hand and develop a defense imposing enough to overcome united opposition. My experience with the similar Modern Naval Battles is brief, but what I saw of it made me wish we had published it. A bit less cerebral I think, but every bit as clever.

FOOTBALL STRATEGY: Perhaps the best example ever of a simple concept yielding complex strategy. Although this game could easily qualify six times over under my “100-play admission”, it doesn’t have to. Simply put, this game has generated more fun for me than any other. As a simulation of foot­ball, it’s probably better than average; but as a game of skill it is without peer. This is about the only game which actually makes me nervous when I play. Of course, that is due to my participation in league play, where each game has meaning far beyond that one day’s encounter.

Hearts: What college grad hasn’t whiled away the hours in many a marathon card session? Pinochle, Pitch, King’s Game, Gin, Rumney, 500 Bid. I loved all of them, but I’m a Heart as.

KREMLIN: An other example of how you can turn a simple concept into a great game without excessive chrome and complexity. This is one of the all­time greats for practicing deception and enjoying a good laugh while still playing a game of strategy. I include KREMLIN with a qualification though; we’re talking the Advanced Game only. The Basic Game is OK for learning the system, but has little repeat play value in my opinion. Without the Intrigue Cards, the game rapidly becomes stereotyped because there are only two main strategies. That remains true to some degree even with the Intrigue Cards, but strategies have a far greater chance of being effective. It poultry of further or deviating because of them. This game’s main claim to fame is that the best way to win the first game you play is probably to do nothing at all! Unfortunately, that doesn’t make for much fun once all the other players figure that out too. So, without the Intrigue Cards, this game doesn’t make my list unless you plan to oppose new players every time you play.

Nuclear War: OK, it’s silly... and probably in bad taste to boot. But, let’s face it—it’s fun. By keep­ing it simple and short, anybody can and does play. Always a quick play alternative when good gamers gather.

PANZERBLITZ: The rules were far from perfect; the play balance was terrible; and the realism, by D&D standards, is laughable ("PanzerBush" anyone?). But who can deny its place in the history of the hobby? It was one of the first true tactical games. It birthed a generation of imitators, and its scenario format set a precedent still followed today. At the time, it had more “sex appeal” than any game seen to date. The darn thing looked so good, even I played it solitaire... the first time I’d ever lowered myself to play a wargame without an opponent. Avalon Hill failed to follow this breakthrough design with a successor for over seven years, and this remains one of our biggest marketing mistakes. By the time PANZER LEADER made its appearance, the bloom was off the rose.

RAIL BARON/HERCUT OF VENUS: RAIL BARON is another great example of simple concepts yielding intricate strategies, and it has remained popular for years. I’ve been told that Empire Builder and 1830 have eclipsed it as the best of the railroad games, but I prefer its elegant simplicity to the intricate implications of either. Despite the wide variety in subject matter, MERCHANT OF VENUS is really a RAIL BARON variant with far greater sophistication. Its subject matter turns me off, but any exposure to the game itself turns me on again. This is one of the best crafted systems I’ve ever seen, a brilliantly flexible design with variable playing times, and a truly great one. I’ve never seen a game which loses so little from one version to the next.

REPUBLIC OF ROME: Usually diplomatic games leave me cold because I’m a lousy liar, but this game has so much chrome on my favorite historical period plus such innovative mechanics that I can’t help but include it (even though at this writing it is unpub­lished). The real claim to fame here, however, is that the players are pitted against each other while also relying on their opponents to prevent the game system itself from defeating them all. It makes for an exciting balancing act. The whole thing is held together by a marvelous system of checks-and-balances. A unique gaming experience that widens the envelope of simulation gaming.

SPEED CIRCUIT: The last “desert isle” columnist I read chose SPEED CIRCUIT as the dean of racing games, provided he had the 3M version—not the one Avalon Hill “massed up” by including Chance Tables for cornering. Different strokes for different folks. I’d have included it only if I could have the AH version. I like games of skill as much as the next guy, and SPEED CIRCUIT is certainly that. But like I said before, if I’d wanted strictly games of skill to play I’d have stuck with Chess. In the 3M version, a driver in the lead who makes no mistakes can’t be passed. I’d rather have my games tinged with luck, and let the skill come in deciding when it is necessary to take a chance.

SQUAD LEADER/ASL: Few games evoke as much reaction as these. People either love them or hate them. There is not much middle ground. The original SQUAD LEADER took the hobby by storm, and became the most successful commercial wargame of all time. This success was very unexpected. My “blind” testers were lukewarm (at best) towards the hobby. I discovered later, this was because the testers were all from the old “D Elim” school, and unaccustomed to a game which held as many unpredictable turns of fortune as this one did. Rich in atmosphere, it created more excitement than conventional wargames. I still remember the first review I read of the game, wherein one player (I believe it was John Lang) said... “he won’t be around to send his men into that fire-swept street!” This game also makes my Hall of Game Fame for a strictly per­sonal reason. It was the last rules manuscript I did without a word processor.

ADVANCED SQUAD LEADER: The commercial success of SQUAD LEADER brought about a number of additional modules which fleshed out the OB and grafted on more detail to the system. Each module built on its predecessor, and the result became increasingly top heavy and un­necessarily a revision of the entire system. Thus, ASL was born, and to my mind remains the most im­pressive combination of game and simulation ever created. The improvements in organization and ease of play alone were worth the transition, but the actual improvement of the design made it no con­test for inclusion here. The innovative new Sniper and Rate of Fire rules by themselves bettered the play remarkably, but the overall spectacle of a full­colored, illustrated rules presentation was supposed to set the hobby on its ear. Despite the ravages, ASL isn’t for everyone. The detail is so immense that it cannot be learned and enjoyed by the casual player. If you’re looking for a game to pass an afternoon, buy SQUAD LEADER. If you’re looking for a game system to pass a lifetime with, get ASL. The latter is the perfect game with which to be shipwrecked on that proverbial isle.

TURNING POINT: STALINGRAD: All right, I admit I’m fickle. My favorite game accedes change from one year to the next, but at the moment this one takes top honors. I also admit I’m biased; I designed this game and so I’m predisposed to like it (after all, I designed it to cater to my own tastes). I was an instant admirer of Courtney Allen’s semi­simultaneous movement system games as tops in combined playability and competitive realism. The excitement level generated by these games is higher than anything else we’ve ever experienced. However, STORM OVER ARNHEM suffered from a limited situation; and THUNDER AT CASINO, despite improvements to the system itself, suffered from flawed map, scale, and excessive playing time. TPS has none of these flaws, and the excitement level generated by this system is more than sufficient and it goes right off my scale. Moreover, the perceived realism is greater, to me anyway, than any hex game I’ve ever played. Instead of unrealistically having total freedom of movement of all of your pieces in any given turn, the player must choose which area of the many to take action in—and usually the requi­sites for action come flooding in from all along the front. Instead of shifting every unit three hexes across the front, you must choose a single area to influence before your opponent does likewise. All
of which makes artificial Command Control rules obsolete; the entire game system is Command Control. The single outstanding feature of this game, though, is that you can count on both players stating that they don’t have a chance of victory at some time during the game, and soon afterward being sure they are going to win. The fact that I have three of these set up in my basement for ongoing postal and phone games is testament enough.

TV WARS: This game is probably the biggest commercial flop to make my list, and will probably be discontinued. The version I have is a prototype. Quite simply, it is the perfect blend of strategy, luck and innovation in a family boargame as far as I am concerned. I’ve never met anyone who played it who came away dissatisfied. I only wish more people would try it.

UP FRONT/BRANDAL: This system’s reception was the biggest disappointment in my career as a game developer. I was thoroughly convinced that it would take wargaming by storm, make a bigger splash than PANZERBLITZ and SQUAD LEADER combined. Boy, was I wrong. Although it has a fanatical following, their numbers are nowhere near what it truly innovative and exciting design deserved. Much of the blame for that can be laid at my feet. So enamoured was I with the design that I tried to present a complete game system (including armoured vehicles) when in reality the heart of the game is infantry combat. In the process, an intimidating rulebook was born that scared away many a potential player before he started, despite the basic simplicity of the game. Still others never gave it a chance, dismissing it as a mere card game (if it had no hexes, then it certainly couldn’t be realistic)! Hah! For my money this is the most realistic game ever designed, in terms of capturing the true meaning of “fog of war” and that includes ASL. It would also make my list by the “100-plays” route, even discounting playtesting (something no other game I’ve written could ever claim). That is this system in the future by giving it a map to simplify the concept and overcome wargamers’ prejudices against card games.

WAR AT SEA/ VICTORY IN THE PACIFIC: Another example of simpler is better. The variables in WAR AT SEA are kept to a minimum so the players can manage their decisions. This is a game that players play, not a game that plays the players. As such, it is one of the most analyzed of wargames, with deep thought given to each deployment. Its detractors refer to it as “Dice at Sea” but, while luck certainly plays a big role, the number of dice rolls argues against it being a critical flaw. Despite its simplicity, this is among the most cerebral of wargames because players are able to manage all the variables which must be considered to play masterfully.

CIVILIZATION: Another example of simpler is better. The variables in CIVILIZATION are kept to a minimum so the players can manage their decisions. This is a game that players play, not a game that plays the players. As such, it is one of the most analyzed of wargames, with deep thought given to each deployment. Its detractors refer to it as “Dice at Sea” but, while luck certainly plays a big role, the number of dice rolls argues against it being a critical flaw. Despite its simplicity, this is among the most cerebral of wargames because players are able to manage all the variables which must be considered to play masterfully.

DOMINUS OF THE LOST WORLD: The simple elegance of this game stood out with me as did the innovative nature of its outer track progression being tied to point accumulation and the dictation of what actions could take place on the inner track (to be determined by the play balance). The combination of its location being known from the outset and its use as both a source of Allies and escape from the plateau make the Indian Caves the overwhelming best choice for an Adventure. The explorer who plans for this by taking an optimum assortment of tools is likely to do very well there. None of this detracts from the fun of casual play, and in a game of this type it’s probably OK because few players will get too serious—but no game makes my Hall of Fame with an overwhelmingly “best” strategy inherent in the design.

KINGMAKER: This is the CIVILIZATION of its decade, a game so different from that which had gone before that it not only widened the envelope—it created a whole new class of simulation games: power politics. KINGMAKER was the first wargame to use cards in a way that impressed devoted wargamers, and the first that lured them away from their beloved hexes. As such, it probably deserves a place on my list, but its length and difficulty in determining a winner argue against it.

To conclude, a rather old joke: “I don’t think the Romans made any money at CIRCUS MAXIMUS. As I remember, the lions ate up all the prophets.” In other words, the relation of a game’s quality is not always reflected in its sales. And that is, of course, the ultimate test of any of the above.

**AVALCON**

23-25 August 1991
Camp Hill, Pennsylvania

For the first time in its 33-year history, AVALCON will be hosting its own boargaming convention. Although we started the ORIGINS concept back in ’75 when we hosted the first national convention, that was a different event altogether and was attended by all companies in the field. This year we’re concentrating on what we do best and hosting a convention strictly for the play of Avalon Hill boargames. Call it our “National Championships”, or call it the rebirth of the boargaming hobby, or simply “The Last Crusade”. However you term it, we’re determined to host a weekend of boargaming for boargamers. A dedicated hall is being set aside as a special insert in Vol. 26, No. 3 of THE GENERAL. If you missed it, send us a stamped, self-addressed envelope. In the meantime, check out the highlights of AVALCON.

**Three days of Championships run by experienced, volunteer GameMasters**

**Plaques to the 32 Winners of events**

**Team Championship**

**No Event Fees**

**Unlimited Participation—play in the events of your choice**

**AREA-Rated Tournament Play**

**Free Admission to non-playing spouses and children 14 and under**

**Junior tournaments**

**Special Non-Tournament Events**

**Only $20 Pre-Registration Fee**

And if that isn’t enough to entice you, check out the expanding AVALCON Bulletin Board inside the wrapper of every issue of THE GENERAL for the latest developments.
Let not our babbling dreams afront our souls,  
Conscience is but a word that cowards use,  
Devised at first to keep the strong in awe.  
Our strong arms be our conscience, swords our law.  
March on, join bravely, let us 't pell-mell;  
If not to heaven, then hand in hand to hell!  
William Shakespeare, Richard III

The only thing I miss when playing KINGMAKER is the possibility of being a pretender with a will of his own, rather than taking on the role of an anonymous faction of nobles. I think it would be intriguing to take the role of cruel Margaret of Anjou, brave Edward IV, proud Richard of York, ruthless Richard III, or even that idiot Henry VI. These are the names that ring, if not through the histories of the time, through the popular literature. Although the game may be titled KINGMAKER, it would eventually prove that the King wielded the power, not the "makers".

I am more a Shakespearean expert than an authority on the complicated social structure and Machiavellian politics of the English in the 15th Century. Thus, I've tried to craft a set of rules which compel the players to behave with a "Shakespearean" flavor. When designing this variant, my idea was to reflect the course of the Wars of the Roses, beginning with the struggle between the two families, and then to later allow for the possibility of a fight for the throne among the surviving members of the prevailing family. And, this would give arrivals like Beaufort and Stafford an opportunity to actively seize the crown, rather than passively waiting to claim it by default. In the process, I've learned a bit of history as well. Thus, I came to show that some noble families favored the House of York and others the House of Lancaster, reflecting the fact that south and central England was predominantly Yorkist while northern England and Cornwall were predominantly Lancastrian. Finally, the rules presented below are designed to be used in conjunction with the original ones of the Advanced Game; I cannot pledge how they will mesh with the Basic or Optional rules.

1. Players: Each of the seven (or fewer) players takes the role of one of the Princes (royal heirs) in the game. Each player is represented on the board by that heir's counter.

2. Setting Up the Game: The Princes are placed in the following locations at the beginning of the game:
   - Henry of Lancaster & Margaret of Anjou: London
   - Edward of Lancaster: Kenilworth
   - Richard of York: York
   - Edmund of Rutland: Dublin
   - George of Clarence: Cardigan
   - Richard of Gloucester: Calais
   - Edward of March: Harlech
   - Edmund of Rutland: Dublin
   - George of Clarence: Cardigan
   - Richard of Gloucester: Calais

   2.1 At the beginning of the game, each player takes a specific number of noble and crown cards (randomly dealt), dependent upon his role and the number of players. First separate the nobles from the deck (removing the Plantagenets), shuffle these and then deal out the proper number; set the remainder aside. Next, deal out the proper number of crown cards, as follows:
   - 4 Players: Henry & Margaret: 3 nobles; 12 cards
   - Richard of York: 1 noble; 8 cards
   - Edward of March: 1 noble; 8 cards
   - Edmund of Rutland: 1 noble; 4 cards
   - Margaret of Anjou: London
   - Edmund of Rutland: Dublin
   - George of Clarence: Cardigan
   - Richard of Gloucester: Calais
   - Edward of March: Harlech
   - Edmund of Rutland: Dublin
   - George of Clarence: Cardigan
   - Richard of Gloucester: Calais
   - Edward of March: Harlech
   - Edmund of Rutland: Dublin
   - George of Clarence: Cardigan
   - Richard of Gloucester: Calais
   - Edward of March: Harlech
   - Edmund of Rutland: Dublin
   - George of Clarence: Cardigan
   - Richard of Gloucester: Calais
   - Edward of March: Harlech
   - Edmund of Rutland: Dublin
   - George of Clarence: Cardigan
   - Richard of Gloucester: Calais
   - Edward of March: Harlech
   - Edmund of Rutland: Dublin
   - George of Clarence: Cardigan
   - Richard of Gloucester: Calais
   - Edward of March: Harlech
   - Edmund of Rutland: Dublin
   - George of Clarence: Cardigan
   - Richard of Gloucester: Calais
   - Edward of March: Harlech
   - Edmund of Rutland: Dublin
   - George of Clarence: Cardigan
   - Richard of Gloucester: Calais

   2.2 The Plantagenet nobles are now given to the senior royal heirs of each family. Otherwise, these operate as per usual rules.

   2.3 Princes who may enter in play during the game do so at any castle, town or city belonging to their family. If the family hasn't any, the Prince enters in any area not occupied by the opposing family that the player may choose.

   3. Movement:
   - 3.1 Princes move in the same manner as a noble, alone if desired, with the following changes:
   - 3.2 A Prince can enter any unowned town, city, or royal castle, and can freely depart even if the owner should enter play. Princes cannot enter any noble's castle should that noble not be in play.
   - 3.3 To enter any town, city, royal castle or noble's castle belonging to another player, a Prince needs the owning player's permission. Further, the Prince cannot leave without the owning player's permission, unless he can defeat the garrison (along with any troops stationed inside belonging to the owning player); if he does defeat the garrison/additional troops, he may then if he wishes continue his movement.

   3.4 A Prince may move by sea without a ship (as if he had one), but he is still affected by Storms and Gales at sea. Should the naval combat rules be used, a Prince is attempting recruitment and a -2 if a "6" on one die. Thus, if available, it is usually better for a Prince to move by ship, rather than resort to such "shipless" movement.

   4. Event Cards: Remove all cards reading "Royal Heir Escapes" and "Royal Death" from play. Otherwise the Event cards are drawn and implemented as usual.

   5. Crown Cards: The Crown cards for the nobles are set aside, and the remaining Crown cards after the deal become the Crown Deck. Otherwise, the Crown cards are drawn and used as usual. To enter play, nobles not assigned at the beginning of the game must be "Recruited".

   6. Recruiting: For a noble other than those originally dealt to enter play, he must be recruited by a Prince. To do so, the Prince must enter any area with a castle of the noble and end his turn there. Upon the next turn, he may roll two dice; if the result is "10-12", the noble joins the Prince immediately and the noble's card is given to that player.

   6.1 To recruit help recruit a noble, the Prince may offer some or all the Crown cards he has in hand. These cards will modify the dice roll according to the Recruiting Modifiers Table.

   6.2 Also modifying the recruitment dice roll may be certain situations (attacks and execution of family members, sole king, Henry acting in concert, etc.). These are also listed on the table below:

   Recruiting Modifiers Table:
   - (All modifiers cumulative)
   - +1 any Office (including the following)
   - +4 Chancellor of England
   - +2 Constable of the Tower
   - +2 Chamberlain of Chester
   - +1 Admiral of England
   - +1 Warden of the Cinque Ports
   - +1 Marshall of England
   - +2 Title
   - +2 Archbishop
   - +1 Bishop
   - +1 combination of three other cards (Town, Castle, Ship, Mercenary, etc.)
   - +1 per Noble in faction of intrinsic strength of 50 or more
   - +2 if Prince is sole king
   - -2 if Prince has attacked family member (applied once)
   - -4 if Prince has executed/killed family member (applied once)
   - -3 if Henry or Lancaster and acting without Margaret of Anjou or Edward of Lancaster present

   6.3 Further, the Nobles Modifiers Table (below) has two lists of nobles, one for each family. Each of these has the indicated dice roll modifier for recruitment—positive for the family on whose list the noble appears, and negative for the other. (For example, Percy has a +2 modifier if a Lancastrian Prince is attempting recruitment and a -2 if a Yorkist Prince is doing so.)

   Nobles Modifiers Table
   (Positive for and Negative against)
   - Lancaster
   - York
   - Percy: 2
   - Neville: 5
   - Beaufort: 5
   - Mowbray: 3
   - Talbot: 3
   - Fitzalan: 2
   - Roos: 2
   - Pole: 3
   - Holland: 3
   - Bourchier: 3
   - Grey: 3
   - Hastings: 4
   - Courtenay: 3
   - Herbert: 2
   - Clifford: 4
   - Howard: 3
   - Berkeley: 2
   - Serpe: 3
   - Stanley: 2

   6.4 A Prince cannot attempt recruitment of the same noble in consecutive turns if unsuccessful, although he may remain in the area for a turn between attempts.

   6.5 If a noble is successfully recruited, all cards offered must be placed with him. If later taken away without compensation, the effects of 6.6 are applied.

   6.6 If a Prince wishes to take cards from one noble to attempt recruitment, he must compensate the "owning" noble with cards of equivalent total Recruitment Modifiers (immediately placed with the
noble). If taken without compensation, the player must roll two dice for that noble. A result of "2-7" makes a "Vaclamoting Noble". Any noble made a "Vaclamoting Noble" loses this condition when he dies or the recruiting Prince dies.

6.7. Should a noble die, his card is returned to those not yet recruited. To enter play again, he must be recruited again, with all rules above enforced.

7. Capture of Princes: Princes defeated in battle must roll a single die. Upon a roll of "3-6", they escape and may be immediately placed in any friendly town, city or castle within a range of three areas; there should be no such friendly haven, they must be placed in any open, unoccupied area within three. With a "1-2", they are captured by the opposing player.

7.1. Captured Princes may be executed at any point in a player's turn, immediately or anytime thereafter. Alternately, a captive Prince can be freed by ransom (any agreement between the two players not contravening the rules); if freed, the Prince immediately is placed in the nearest area containing one of his nobles (if none, in the nearest area not occupied by any other player's pieces). Captured Princes can, of course, be held captive indefinitely.

7.2. The nobles of a captured Prince will move and function normally. The only restriction upon the player is that he may neither recruit nobles, be crowned king (if not already), or summon Parliament without the express permission of his captor.

7.3. Should a stack guarding a captured Prince itself be defeated, the Prince becomes the captive of the victor. All the above apply, with the exception that he may not attempt escape.

8. Death of Princes: When a Prince dies for any reason, the player rolls two dice. On a result of "2-7", the Prince remains in play (he leaves heirs). On any other result, the Prince is considered to be eliminated from play. However, Henry of Lancaster, Margaret of Anjou and Richard of York, if killed, are always removed from play. Regardless of the result, all nobles and played Crown cards are returned to their respective decks.

8.1. Should a player actually see his Prince removed from play, he may take on the role of the next of kin (if any) and may move separately. Should Margaret of Anjou be eliminated from play, the player representing the pair (now Henry alone) suffers the following:

All nobles controlled by the player remain in play.

Henry alone has a -2 recruitment modifier (as indicated on the table) unless with Edward of Lancaster.

Before moving each turn, the player must roll two dice. With a result of "2-6", Henry (and any nobles accompanying him) may not move nor launch any attack for the turn. Other nobles of the faction may operate normally.

10. Beaufort and Stafford: The Beaufort and Stafford families were related to the Plantagenets—and they may try to put in a claim for the crown themselves.

10.1. Should all Lancaster Princes be in play or dead, a Lancastrian player who loses his Prince automatically recruits Beaufort, regardless of his current status. Beaufort, if a member of another faction at this moment, retains all Crown cards currently with him. The Beaufort playing piece is immediately placed in any castle or town friendly to him; if none available, in any open area in England the player desires.

10.2. Stafford is handled in the same fashion, but he may be the last claimant to act as Prince of either family (i.e., if taken as replacement for an eliminated Yorkist Prince, he is considered a Yorkist—and vice versa). Stafford is the last in the Yorkist succession and follows Beaufort in the Lancastrian succession.

10.3. A Lancastrian player does not have the option of choosing between Beaufort and Stafford. He must assume the role of Beaufort if available.

10.4. Once in play as a Prince, all rules above apply to Beaufort and/or Stafford, including death, capture and recruitment. If eliminated from play after being a Prince, they are not returned to the Nobles deck and will not return to play in any manner.

11. Murder: When a Prince kills a relative in any manner, for any recruitment attempt he makes thereafter, he suffers a negative modifier as listed on the Recruiting Modifiers Table. Regardless of the number of family members he does in, this is applied but once (cumulative with all other modifiers on the table)—but it is applied for each recruitment attempt hereafter. So long as the Prince remains in play (even as per 8. above).

11.1. The bloodstained Prince may try to avoid the negative modifier found on that table by rolling two dice. Upon a roll of "2-5", rumors of great cruelty have caught up with him; add an additional "-2" modifier to his Recruitment Modifier total for this attempt only. Upon a roll "5-9", no effect and no change. Upon a roll of "10-12" he has managed to soothe the noble's suspicion and the negative modifier for killing a family member is not applied to this recruitment attempt. A player is never obliged to try this, but it is always an option after he has executed/killed a family member at any point.

12. Victory: The last Prince left alive who is sole crowned King wins the game.

12.1. In addition, when one of the two entire families is eliminated (including Beaufort and/or Stafford), a Parliament may decree the game's end by unanimous vote of all nobles/Princes present. In that case, the game immediately ends, with the following "Victory levels":

King—Absolute Victory
Immediate Heir to King—Substantial Victory
Other Family Relatives—Marginal Victory (you get the pomp but not the power)

12.2. EXCEPTION: Players controlling Beaufort and Stafford may be considered victorious only if sole King. They are never considered an immediate heir, or even a family relative!

In conclusion, the group with which I play finds this variant an interesting change of pace. In your very first playing, you'll find how different the feel, as you race about the map building a faction—rather than trusting to simple luck to bring you a Percy or Neville. Indeed, able recruitment is one of the most visible keys to victory. Many's the battle that will rage outside the castle of a powerful noble as would-be kings fight for the right to recruit him. But that's only the most obvious way this variant will affect your strategy; there are others more subtle. Unlike other variants in issues past, this one requires no new components. So there should be no reason you can't be a "King" rather than a "Maker" the next time you play KINGMAKER.
Desert Shield
EXPANSION MODULE

The New Strategy Game that Re-Creates the
Day-to-Day Gulf Strike Crisis!

Gamers can follow the day by day crisis as it unfolds with Victory Games' new Desert Shield expansion module for the GULF STRIKE™ simulation game. The new expansion module answers the questions that the country is asking. Does the US have enough force today to stop an Iraqi invasion of Saudi Arabia? When will the US have enough force to throw Saddam out of Kuwait? With Desert Shield gamers will be in the know.

Desert Shield comes with new rules which adapt GULF STRIKE to the current situation. New rules for Decapitation Strikes aimed at Saddam himself, Long Range Missiles, Tomahawk Cruise Missiles, Nuclear and Chemical Warheads, Strategic Targets, Long Range Artillery, and much more. Desert Shield lets one choose what forces the US sends to the Middle East while allowing one to follow the real deployment with today's newspaper. Desert Shield is a must have for all Americans interested in this country's foreign policy and its military ramifications.

Desert Shield comes with a rules booklet and 200 new counters.

GULF STRIKE (3rd Edition) with the Desert Shield module retails for $40 at better game, gift, and hobby stores everywhere. Desert Shield as a separate module retails for just $8. Both items are available for immediate delivery.

Prayer of a Soldier in Saudi Arabia who is Afraid:
Lord, take my cold feet in your hands and warm them.
THE BADLANDS

New Battlelands for TITAN

By Bill Scott & Gerald Liebert

TITAN is a most intense, challenging and enjoyable game (some readers might claim the most). From its first appearance, it has been one of our favorites. However, after playing several hundred games and fighting several thousand battles over the last few years, we have grown a bit weary of the same 11 Battlelands. Too, we came to feel that the brush and jungle creatures tend to dominate. The best remedy for these two minor faults seemed to be the creation of some new Battlelands. On the following pages, readers will find ten of our initial attempts.

No doubt many fans of TITAN have already crafted their own new boards. It is fairly easy to do. First, duplicate the originals at your local copy shop or library. Make four or more copies of each, and 20 or so of the Plains. Get sharp scissors or a hobby knife, glue, a fine-point black marker, and perhaps a pair of tweezers. Study the original Battlelands, noting the principles of layout. Decide how you wish to alter these for variety. Remember that a small change can have a large impact on tactics; resist the temptation to clutter your new boards with too much terrain. Cut out the individual hexes of your photocopies, and then arrange them on the Plains board as you’ve planned. Glue them down when satisfied, and use your marker to correct any flaws (or even draw your own new terrain type) on your final version. (Shading to show the different levels is the most difficult to reproduce, but with a little effort and practice can be created.) Now take the finished “master” to the copier and duplicate them onto stiffer stock (colored or not).

The following are examples of our work. We have quite an assortment these days, but for those who want to experiment with the joys of refighting old battles over new terrain, institute the following rules to get these into play:

For certain (Tundra, Marsh, Swamp, Jungle, Woods, Brush and Desert) Battlelands, upon a battle occurring in each terrain type, a single die roll will determine which card is used. The defending player, before setting up his pieces, rolls a single die. On a roll of “1-3”, the new board is substituted for the original. (Players may, in fact, use any die roll division to indicate which of the two Battleland boards is to be used, so long as there is a 50% chance for either being in play.) All other rules remain in force.

The most distinctive difference will come in the play when a battle occurs in the Plains. It has always seemed strange to us that the plains of TITAN are so uniformly featureless. Hence, we’ve crafted three new boards. Should a battle occur in the Plains, the defender rolls one die, which will determine which of the following boards is to be fought over:

**Die Roll “1” = Waterhole**
**Die Roll “2” = Town**
**Die Roll “3” = Fort**
**Die Roll “4-6” = original Plains**

These three new Plains Battlelands contain one new type of Hazard, the Lake. Add the following to your Hazard Chart:

**LAKE**

**EFFECT ON MOVEMENT:** Entry forbidden to all non-flying characters. A flying character cannot end his movement on a Lake hex.

**EFFECT ON STRIKING:** No effect.

**EFFECT ON RANGESTRIKING:** No effect.

All rules for battle remain the same, and mustering done on any of these new Plains Battlelands is allowed in the same fashion as though it were plain Plains.

For even more variation we have at times, and upon consent of all the players prior to the game, altered Rule 10.1 for the defender. In effect, if using the “Waterhole” Plains, he must place his characters on the Battleland first in such a manner that all defending characters are adjacent to at least one Lake hex. In a case of the “Town” being used, the defender places his characters in or adjacent to the “town”, Bog and/or Lake hex. For the “Fort”, the defender must place his characters in or adjacent to the “town” and/or Lake hex.

With these alternative Battlelands, players will have the chance to sharpen their tactical skills. While several of the excellent points made by Mr. McAllister in his article “The Tactical Titan” (Vol. 20, No. 2) so many years ago remain quite valid, the details change. The challenge lies in how well players can adapt. No more need a battle in the Plains resemble two lines slugging it out, or degenerate into a “Custer’s Last Stand”. Nor does McAllister’s suggestion regarding leaving weaker creatures out in order to bring in the more powerful (especially as they contribute little) necessarily hold water, for even a weak creature may make taking a fort or town costly. Rangestrikers do not have unlimited fields of fire. Some creatures not normally native to the Plains may come into their own in a battle therein. The tactical problems, and possibilities, are expanded.

We have now embarked upon the task of crafting enough additional boards for the non-Plains, non-Tower Battlelands to have six for each type. There are several methods of using these. The first, and most obvious, would be simply to roll a single die each time a battle occurs, with the board number corresponding to the die number. Another possibility is to label the specific hexes on the main mapboard (a small number in each should serve) to show which of the Battlelands are used should combat rage there. Still another possibility would be for the defending player to be allowed his choice of which can be used, with none repeatable until the full cycle of six have been used. We are sure that the inventive sorts who play TITAN can devise other methods of randomizing the use of the variant Battlelands.

But the key is that this is an extremely easy variant to incorporate, requiring little in the way of new rules, and does not significantly alter the style or feel of play. Those who wish to craft new Battlelands may, of course, devise new Hazards. We experimented with several. But the range of possible effects on movement and combat have already been pretty well covered. (Should you stumble upon something truly unique, we’d love to hear of it.)

So, we’d hope that next time you sit down to a game of TITAN with your buddies, you bring out this issue. Then watch the fun as they struggle through their first battle at the Waterhole. It should give you some new stories for your gaming lore.

As there are no plans to produce a variant kit for the game, full permission is given by the authors and The Avalon Hill Game Company to photocopy (for personal use only) the following TITAN variant battleboards. Those readers interested in learning more about crafting variant battleboards for TITAN may wish to contact Mr. Scott at 2317 Barracks Road, Charlottesville, VA 22901.
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CIVILIZATION games seem to always go two ways, depending on who you play with. Some players relish the thought of acquiring Metalworking, Clothing and Astronomy, and then launching wars of vengeance and conquest across the Mediterranean. Others (luckily, the majority) wish to simply expand peacefully, establish fair borders, and trade with all the other players more or less equitably. In a game with players of the latter type, there is a lot of buying power to be accumulated in trade, especially if the Expansion Trade Deck is used. With so much "credit" available, it is often possible to acquire all the highest valued Civilization cards, and still have a few turns left to gather trade cards and pad your treasury. This type of comfortable endgame, and how to achieve it, is the subject of this article.

The rules state that "the first player to move his marker onto a finish square wins." That is a great optimistic player that expects to be the sole first to finish. More often, several reach the end of the AST simultaneously; in this case, the player with the most points in treasury, trade cards and Civilization cards claims victory. Thus, we can see the importance of having a high point total, and having the highest possible point total in Civilization cards (1460) is the most likely path to victory in such a "tiebreaker". So the objective to keep in mind is the purchase of only the 11 highest valued Civilization cards. An astute player will work toward this end from the very beginning of the game.

Even during the selection of nations and F.C.O. play, a potential winner is making decisions that will affect his chances of having a favorable endgame position. Babylon and Egypt are ideal nations to play, if not for their early epoch transition requirements. They both possess fertile hinterlands dotted with nearly as many city sites as they need. One would therefore assume that these two nations have an easy road to victory. Actually, the two-city requirement to enter the Early Bronze Age (only four turns into the game) is a major stumbling block. And, if either of the controlling players thinks that being held back on the AST is a clever idea (so they can build three or four cities the next turn), then they are hoping for a non-site space, which is much better in the game. But their other option—to build two cities as soon as possible—severely limits growth since it will take at least two more turns until a third city can be built and supported. Keep in mind that, at this stage of the game, other players could have as many as five cities. Now, don't take me wrong; I've seen both Babylonian and Egyptian victories, in games where every player at some point is held back on the AST. But it doesn't make much sense to limit yourself, and then hope for good trade deals to pull you out of barbarism.

I also tend to avoid playing Africa or Crete. They don't require only 1200 victory points for nothing. These nations are geographically deprived, and often can't maintain the number of cities required to "max out" on Civilization cards. So even if the African or Cretan player flies straight through the AST, they can be nearly certain that another with more points in Civilization cards is right alongside them.

Of the rest of the nations, none stand out as the best choice. However, why anyone would choose to play Asia if Assyria was available is beyond me. It is best to select a nation with the most favorable epoch entry requirements. Of these, the most important seems to be the seven-card requirement to enter into the Early Iron Age (followed closely by the 1000-point requirement for entry into the Late Iron Age), since it is the hardest to achieve without pause in progression. Entry into the Early Bronze Age should not be a hardship for any nation except Egypt or Babylon. Getting three colors of Civilization cards should also not be a problem given even mediocre trading.

The endgame player next turns his attentions to expansion. I think of this part of the game as merely a prelude to the trading (for it is trade that makes or breaks you). The objective is to establish as many cities as possible, along with a healthy amount of population to support these cities and absorb calamities (or aggressive moves from neighbors). The key to strategy here is to know how many cities to build, and when to build them. As stated before, one should avoid building the two cities required for entry into the Early Bronze Age until the turn after your population has risen to 16 tokens (at least). Building two or more cities at the same turn is an option for the endgame player, since all cities out of the controlling players thinks that being held back at a later point in the game-trading. City construction should be continued with vigor. During each of the next two turns, two more cities can be built, bringing the total to seven (the point at which stable borders form). If you have the sites for cities #8 and #9 within your border, you're doing quite well; but you should expect that at least one of your cities (and hopefully not more) must be built by sacrificing 12 tokens in a non-site space. These final two cities are built one at a time, a less vigorous pace, because it's likely that no one else will have nine cities by this point either. However, you should hope that some others keep pace with your city-building simply so that you have some possibilities of trade for the higher valued cards.

The 3-5-7 city-construction progression is ideal for several reasons. The first, as mentioned above, is that during the first turn of collecting trade cards, a "3" is obtained to be traded away for something better later. On the next turn, collection of a higher-valued commodity can begin in earnest. In situations, a clever endgame player chooses to collect Cloth, and so trades away his two Salt cards for a Grain and a Cloth—and then trades the Grain for another Cloth. He has parlayed that extra Salt card into something of higher value (the multiplier for his Cloth set). Don't bother with the low-value commodities unless cornering the market is right alongside them. In the meantime, try collecting cards of the next commodity in which you wish to attempt to corner the market. There will be nothing to be gained by trading away a non-site space. These final two cities are built one at a time, a less vigorous pace, because it's likely that no one else will have nine cities by this point either. However, you should hope that some others keep pace with your city-building simply so that you have some possibilities of trade for the higher valued cards.

The trick to "maxing out" on Civilization cards is to avoid buying cards that can be bought with a discount if you don't yet have it. For instance, buying Literacy and then Architecture costs 185 points; whereas, if these cards were obtained in the opposite order, the cost would be but 175 points—a ten-point saving. Having acquired both these cards, the endgame player now receives a 40-point discount on Law, Democracy and Philosophy. To maximize discounts, the latter two should be purchased last (no problem since this is the natural way of things in

TAKING THE LONG VIEW
Playing CIVILIZATION for the Endgame
By Jeffrey Suchard

Acquiring Civilization cards is the most important phase for the endgame player, since a mistake here lasts for the rest of the game. To obtain the maximum value in Civilization cards, a player must avoid buying any card below a value of "80". Such low-value cards have only marginal utility, and will only pay for themselves in rare and unforeseen circumstances. The reason most players grab low-value cards is that they either don't have quite enough points to purchase better ones and lack the patience demanded of the best players, or that they have a surplus of funds which they feel compelled to spend in one turn. Yet a third, game-induced impulse for purchase of low-value Civilization cards is certain of the epoch entry requirements, but proper planning can eliminate fear of losing a step on the AST for those faced by this.

The endgame player will plan to collect a certain number of points in low-value cards during the first turn in which he plans to purchase the trappings of civilization; on alternate turns he will be seeking to corner a market item. For example, the accomplished endgame player has ten tokens in his treasury and wants to obtain Astronomy and Architecture for Late Bronze Age entry (a total of 160 points is necessary). He manages to collect five Bronze cards during the trading, but doesn't expend too much effort in seeking the sixth and last Bronze card. In this case, the extra 66 points aren't needed, although many players would be tempted to acquire Music or Drama & Poetry with the surplus. A better solution is to buy Agriculture and Literacy for 220 points instead of his original plan, thus fulfilling the three-color requirement while taking in no cards below a value of "80".

The trick to "maxing out" on Civilization cards is to avoid buying cards that can be bought with a discount if you don't yet have it. For instance, buying Literacy and then Architecture costs 185 points; whereas, if these cards were obtained in the opposite order, the cost would be but 175 points—a ten-point saving. Having acquired both these cards, the endgame player now receives a 40-point discount on Law, Democracy and Philosophy. To maximize discounts, the latter two should be purchased last (no problem since this is the natural way of things in
Table #1: The 11 Highest-Value Civilization Cards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sciences</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Medicine</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Craft</th>
<th>Metalworking</th>
<th>Coinage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Astronomy</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coinage</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>140 (also a Craft)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A total of 120 points in discounts is obtained when these cards are acquired in any order.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Crafts: Metalworking—80
Agriculture—110
(A total of 30 points in discounts is obtained when these cards are acquired in any order.)

Arts/Civics: Architecture—80
Literacy—110
(Architecture should be acquired before Literacy for maximum net discount, and Literacy acquired before Law for maximum net discount. Together, Architecture and Literacy grant a 40-point discount off the other Civics cards.)

Civics: Law—170
Democracy—200
Philosophy—240
(Law is required for the purchase of the remaining Civics. Holding the Crafts cards gives an additional 30-point discount towards Democracy; holding the Sciences, an additional 80-point discount for Philosophy.)

Table #2: Purchasing Plans

Following are two suggested schemes for acquiring the 11 highest Civilization cards, including the cost each turn. Attempts were made to keep the total outlay each turn in the range of 100-200, since it seems easiest to gather trade card sets with values in this range. Prices shown below reflect all discounts applicable if the cards are taken in the order given:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture &amp; Astronomy</th>
<th>160</th>
<th>Architecture &amp; Metalworking</th>
<th>160</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metalworking &amp; Coinage</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Astronomy</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Literacy</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>Literature &amp; Coinage</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Law</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>Medicine &amp; Law</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are, of course, other schemes for purchasing this collection. Note that in some cases, actual order is interchangeable and should be dictated by your trade sets and the supply of specific Civilization cards (for instance, the acquisition of Democracy and Philosophy).

**Civilization** It seems). As far as the Science and Craft cards go, they can be purchased in virtually any order with no loss of discount. Using the maximum discounts available, 1460 points of Civilization cards can be obtained for only 1065 in trade cards and treasury. No other combination of Civilization cards gives this 395-point discount—and, of course, any other combination will total something less than 1460.

Architecture should certainly be one of the first purchases due to its relatively low cost, discount offered, and two-color nature. Either Astronomy or Metalworking can be purchased along with it, depending on the current situation. Agriculture and Coinage should be purchased as soon as possible, because they are so useful in a variety of ways, these limited cards might quickly be taken by other players. Literacy should be acquired before Law. The remaining Sciences and Crafts are bought for their discounts on the other Civics cards. If you are one of the first five players to get the Law card, the chance of obtaining Democracy and Philosophy are fairly good. It is possible to grab these two highest valued cards on the same turn for 250 points—if you have planned well.

Around this point in the play, the 1000-point barrier for the Late Iron Age is near—but even without Democracy and Philosophy, 1020 points in Civilization cards is possible. In the ideal situation, the wiser endgame player will have all 11 highest value Civilization cards on the turn after he reaches the 1000-point requirement. Now he can concentrate on collecting trade cards to push his total even higher.

If, at this point, each of the other players has acquired low-value Civilization cards, the endgame player has all but won. Only if one or more players have also “maxed out” is there any real competition. But even if another reaches the 1460 mark on a later turn, the endgame player has the advantage of a finite number of turns to complete his final trade card set. Since only six trade cards can be held after the "Alber ASTM Phase", it is good form to corner the Bronze market for an additional 216 points. That, combined with a full treasury (minus the 18 tokens to support your nine cities) gives a total value of 1705 points (or 1713 in a six-player game)! Of course, the others—especially if they have read this article—will realize why you are so interested in collecting Bronze and may band together in order not to trade it to you. An alternative ploy is to collect Spice, and hold onto one Bronze card so no one else (your competitor with 1460) can corner it. Gems are another possibility, especially if you can also get two Gold cards; or collect both Spice and Bronze to block any cornering of either market. A particular nifty ploy is to collect the Grain cards; with six in your hand, a Civil War will occur every turn (providing the Expansion deck is not in play). This may prove such a hassle that the others will trade Bronze to you simply so they can recycle the Grain back into the deck.

In practice, a player’s point total will rarely reach 1700. If you can regularly exceed 1600 points, congratulate yourself on a job well done. This will likely bring you the victory. By playing for this endgame from the very first decision you make (selection of nations), you have an excellent chance of reaching that level every time you play.

**Expanding The Expansion**

While I’ve your attention, I’d like to briefly touch on a concern which relates to the above discussion. When I heard about the Expansion Trade Deck for my favorite game, I rushed out to buy it as soon as it became available at the local game store, and it was great—for awhile. I really enjoyed having two commodities in each trade card stack. This certainly led to more frenzied trading sessions. I fondly remember the first time I heard, “What do you mean you don’t have the last Salt?” and “You want to trade me what?” But after several games with the Expansion deck, the immediate novelty wore off and I began to notice previously unencountered problems. For instance, only the trade stacks #2 and #9 seem to get depleted, and the calamities occur much less frequently. These together result in an increased number of trade cards being held by the players; since their cities are less likely to be calamities, one trade card for every city will be collected. In a seven-player game without the Expansion deck, however, one can expect the trade card stacks to run out much more frequently, putting a limit on the purchasing power available.

Without the Expansion set, each successively higher valued stack has less trade cards. Presumably, this reflects the “Law of Supply and Demand”; those commodities in least supply are worth the most. But addition of the Expansion deck alters this pattern. Each of stacks #3 through #9 gets a number of new cards equal to one less than the number of non-Calamity cards originally in that pile. Stacks #1 and #2 get only one more card each. So, instead of maintaining a nice progression of smaller stacks, stack #3 is larger than stack #2. Thus, it is more likely that players will run out of the low-value cards, contrary to economic theory. Assuming that economies have not changed drastically in the last couple thousand years, something should be done.

The most obvious solution is to create third commodities for trade stacks #1 and #2. Not only will this restore the proper progression in the size of the stacks, but it will also increase the amount of cards between calamities in these stacks. Unfortunately, there are not enough blank trade cards for owners of the game to readily do this. So, until Amber and Copper trade cards (my suggestions for new cards for the two values, respectively) are available, another “home-grown” solution must be found.

Normally, when using the Expansion deck, the Ochre and Iron cards from the original deck are removed and replaced with the new sets containing one more card each. Instead, I propose that the new cards are simply added to the old ones. This will not completely solve the problem, since stack #3 will still have one more card than stack #2, but it does have the advantage of ease of implementation.

It is unlikely that anyone will actively collect Ochre or Iron, but here’s how that situation is handled should that occur. No player is allowed to turn in a set of Ochre larger than eight cards, or a set of Iron larger than six. The rest of these cards comprise a second set of the commodity that may be turned in on the same turn if desired, by the same player or another. Thus, if some player manages to completely corner the market in Ochre, he will have one set worth 64 points and a second worth 49 points. At first glance there may seem to be a slight problem because the original cards don’t list the value of an eight-card set of Ochre or a six-card set of Iron; but players will readily note that the only way to collect this many of these is to hold at least one card from the Expansion set, and these do list the maximum values.

Because only the cards in stack #9 can be bought with treasury, this stack is depleted more often than the others. There are two methods to alter this situation. The first is to simply allow players to purchase other high-value trade cards, paying two tokens from their treasury per point value of the card purchased. Only cards from stacks #6 through #9 can be bought. (Otherwise, a player could force a red-handed calamity upon another player of his choosing.) Too, no more than one card may be purchased per player per turn. This approach has merit,
but may allow players to too readily buy the type of card they are attempting to collect.

Another solution is to increase the number of #9 trade cards. The number in play should not be increased by more than one or two, since more would allow players who make a poor decision regarding taxation a guaranteed outlet for their excess treasury. We have added a single card titled "Slaves" to the #9 deck. If this is yet not enough for you, simply add other rare commodities of your own devising—but only single ones of each type. This will decrease the number of times a player with nine cities fails to collect even one card from the #9 stack. But, since the value of "Slaves" (and others you may create) is only nine, spending 18 tokens from the treasury to get a #9 card may involve the loss of nine points in purchasing power. This potential loss tends to discourage indiscriminate buying of these trade cards, meaning more remain to be drawn, which is the goal of the exercise.

Following any of these suggestions, you will find your CIVILIZATION game more balanced, and—dare I say—more realistic. The epoch entry requirements remain reasonably difficult goals, and not simple milestones on unrestricted movement along the AST. But expanding the Expansion Trade Deck gives the endgame players (those who use it) more decisions to make and alternative routes to acquiring that final magical total of 1705 points.

OPTIMISM:
The most successful leaders in history have been optimists. The great Spartan general Leonidas was an optimist. A spy, behind enemy lines, told Leonidas upon his return that the enemy had so many arrows that they would darken the sun. "Then," replied Leonidas, "we will fight in the shade."

EXPANSION KITS
For some time, players of the popular CIVILIZATION have searched for ways to improve the already classic game. In 1982, Mick Uhl introduced the Expansion Trade Cards: a deck of 50 cards that brought in new commodities. With these in play, calamities occur with less frequency. Empty trade stacks occur far less often; players with a large number of cities would not be penalized by the exhausting of the lower valued cards. It was more difficult to build up sets of the same commodity. In short, the new cards made the game more challenging, and—dare I say—more realistic. The epoch entry requirements remain reasonably difficult goals, and not simple milestones on unrestricted movement along the AST. But expanding the Expansion Trade Deck gives the endgame players (those who use it) more decisions to make and alternative routes to acquiring that final magical total of 1705 points.

SEAHIWKS
SEAHIWKS is a game for one to four players depicting the golden age of Piracy in the Caribbean Sea (as well as the Indian Ocean and along the Gold Coast of Africa) around the turn of the 16th Century. Designer Richard Berg has captured much of the unique flavor of the period while separating fact from fiction with a minimum of fuss to create an interesting four-hour spectacle. SEAHIWKS is one of those games that plays more than you play it; because it is constantly springing surprises; no lead is ever safe.

Each player controls up to three Pirate captains, although usually a player has only one in play at a time. Each Pirate is rated for Leadership, Ability, Cruelty, Cunning, and Duelling and operates one of four different types of ships. The game ends when any one player loses his third Pirate or another triggers the Sudden Death Victory Conditions. However, each player wears two hats and is on both sides of the law—controlling various King’s Commissioners with which he endeavors to bring his opponent’s rogues to justice. During each turn, a player may move his Pirate or his King’s Commissioner—not both, and therein lies the player interaction in a game which might otherwise resemble four simultaneous solitary games.

Players do not alternate turns in the conventional sense. Instead, turns are awarded randomly by card draw—a device which ensures that players know neither when they will move nor even if they will move. Although each player’s chance to move is equal, they seldom enjoy the same number of turns. This, coupled with a reduced movement rate for the King’s Commissioners, reflects well the haphazard occurrence of events at sea before the age of radar and modern communications. It also combats the omniscient-player syndrome without having to resort to hidden movement in the quest for realism. This means that a Pirate in the same hex with a Merchant has no guarantee of reaching that prize before his opponent—even though the latter may be several "turns" away. This can be frustrating because Merchants have a way of popping up all over the map, and disappearing just as you reach them. However, watching a King’s Commissioner bear down on you with several turns in a row can be downright frightening.

Pirates have a lot of other problems to contend with. Warships of the various navies are constantly on patrol and can do in any Pirate without a "Letter of Marque" from their government. Storms, natual uprisings, plague, scurvy, bull rot, double-crossing Governors, and mutiny also can conspire to ruin a Pirate’s day. And if that weren’t enough, a fellow’s pursuit of a good time can get him killed in a duel, or at least hung over with a Man-of-War looming on the horizon.

SEAHIWKS uses a variation of the Fast Action cards first popularized in STATIST-PRO BASEBALL to present a lot of information in different categories in a highly playable format. Rather than wading through numerous charts to determine the outcome of their actions, players merely draw a card and check the result. This constant turnover in the deck, somewhat akin to Random Number draws in UP FRONT, keeps the action constant. Frequent re-shufflings for Random Events makes card counting more trouble than it’s worth and keeps things truly random.

Pirates can win outright by amassing 100 Notoriety points—a score usually requiring such unsavory pursuits as torture of hostages, winning a duel or two, sacking a port, and beasting a King’s Commissioner in open combat. However, Notoriety is a two-edged sword. Not only is it dangerous to come by, but once you get it, Notoriety attracts warships and King’s Commissioners like a moth to flame. Usually the winner is the Pirate who has amassed the most loot and managed to retire, while his contemporaries take that long step from the gallows. In essence then, SEAHIWKS is akin to a race rarely won by the swift. You can win with less money than your opponents provided you track down opposing Pirates with greater wealth before they can retire or the game ends. Because the game ends as soon as a player not already in the lead runs out of Pirates, “alliances” are subject to sudden change as players move against the leader. It then becomes necessary for the leader to change venue and move on to a different sea where he can operate unopposed again until the Crown sends more King’s Commissioners to stomp out the new Pirate nest.

SEAHIWKS is a very colorful game which is quite different from anything you’ve seen before. Piece density is low but the action is swift and the end can be on you without warning. The vignettes of the various Pirates depicted on the back of their cards make fascinating reading and bode well for a Richard’s historical article that will grace these pages when the game is featured in The GENERAL. Look for SEAHIWKS in the spring.

Don Greenwood
August 1990

PLAYTESTERS WANTED
Avalon Hill is looking for yet more “blind” playtesters for two games currently under consideration for development. Hockey Strategy is a fast-based, statistically-based game of NHL action using players from the most recent season; however, the rules are relatively straightforward, and the average game can be completed in 60-90 minutes. Mr. Candidate is an extremely simple and quick-played election game dealing with the American presidential primaries. Playtest volunteers must be willing to spend a minimum of 20 hours per month in the testing, for a period of several months, and to be willing to submit written reports at regular intervals. Applicants are cautioned that the playtest materials are pre-publication quality and may involve some effort to assemble for use. Remuneration is limited to a free copy of the published game for each group coordinator. Applicants for either playtest should send a short letter of introduction to Don Greenwood, c/o Avalon Hill Game Company. Please be sure to mention which game you’d like to playtest. We regret that, due to the volume of mail such invitations generate, we are unable to reply to any but those actually accepted for the playtest.
BACK ISSUES

Only the following back issues of The GENERAL remain in stock; price is $4.00 per issue (plus the usual shipping and handling charges). Due to the low quantities of some back issues, if ordering, please specify alternative selections. Below is a listing of each in-stock back issue by subject matter; game abbreviations are italicized and standard (a partial listing may be found on the 'Opponent's Wanted' form on the insert of this issue). Type of article is indicated by the following abbreviations:

- H: Historical, DN—Designer's Notes, V—Variant, SR—Series Replay, S—Strategy, Q—Questions, P—PBM (postal), Sc—Scenarios, A—Analytical. The featured game for each issue is always the first one listed. Those printed in red indicate color reprints of previously out-of-stock issues.

ELITE CLUB

Members of the club earn a 10% discount for LIFB on mail order purchases of any product from The Avalon Hill Game Company, Microcomputer Games, or Victory Games. This includes games, play-by-mail kits, parts, magazines . . . everything. This 10% discount will apply to any single order each year—a true savings for the buyer in these days when every penny is important. The best just got more affordable than ever.

You become a member by making a one-time initial order amounting to $90.00 minimum. This order must be made direct from The Avalon Hill Game Company (purchases from retail stores do not qualify one for the ELITE CLUB). Be sure to enclose a check or money-order for the full order, usual shipping and handling fees.

When you receive your order, an ELITE CLUB Coupon Ticket will be enclosed. The coupon, if attached to the order form, will allow you a 10% discount on everything listed on your order. Note that this can be applied to any single order each year. Obviously, it pays to make a multi-item order to obtain the maximum savings possible. And, upon use of the last coupon (1993), another ticket—good for an additional five years of savings—will be sent with your last shipment.

The scheme brings you the best in gaming pleasure—your favorite games, The GENERAL, with its in-depth coverage of them, and the pbm issues, together, and are knowledgeable about our games, how to play them, and nothing else. Be sure to submit your efforts for the consideration of our editors. The GENERAL was founded on the efforts of gamers themselves, and for over 25 years has relied on their good works. We encourage all such free-lance submissions. The GENERAL will pay $6.00 per running ten-inch column of edited text upon publication. (Letters to the Editor are not subject to remuneration.) Alternatively, authors may elect to take their remuneration in the form of our products, at the rate of 150% of the cash remuneration. At the end of each volume year, an EDITOR'S CHOICE article is selected by the readership. The author of this best article of the year will receive a $100.00 bonus and a lifetime subscription to The GENERAL.

FAME & FORTUNE

Well, maybe not much fortune . . . but certainly a little fame. We want you to write for The GENERAL. If you can string words together, and are knowledgeable about our games, there's a good chance you're just the person we're looking for. You can supplement our literary staff with articles on strategy and tactics, game analyses, Series Replays, historical commentaries, new scenarios or variants for any of our extensive list of titles. If you've ever had the urge to see your name in print, and feel competent to write on your favorite game, consider submitting your efforts for the consideration of our editors. The GENERAL was founded on the efforts of gamers themselves, and for over 25 years has relied on their good works. We encourage all such free-lance submissions. The GENERAL will pay $6.00 per running ten-inch column of edited text upon publication. (Letters to the Editor are not subject to remuneration.) Alternatively, authors may elect to take their remuneration in the form of our products, at the rate of 150% of the cash remuneration. At the end of each volume year, an EDITOR'S CHOICE article is selected by the readership. The author of this best article of the year will receive a $100.00 bonus and a lifetime subscription to The GENERAL.
SO THAT'S WHAT . . .
A Reprise of The GENERAL's Popularity Survey

By Geoff Flett

A rather unique anniversary passed virtually unnoticed with the appearance of Vol. 26, No. 1 of The GENERAL. Therein the 50th installment of "So That's What You've Been Playing" saw print. I have maintained a subscription to Avalon Hill's magazine for gamers for ten years, and still eagerly await each coming issue. One regular feature that I always pause to read upon my initial fads and fancies.

Of the survey each issue displays the number of what the collective readership is playing. Begun probably well aware, the "Times on List" column of the survey each issue displays the number of consecutive times a title has shown on the list; it does not reflect the total number of times the game has appeared. I have used this total, however, as the basis for my organizing the chart below. Thus, "Total Times" is the first column. The "1st Time" and "Last Time" entries record the first and last appearances of the specific game by volume and issue. And "Average Position" is obtained by totaling the numerical positions the game occupied, and then dividing by the number of times on the list.

I briefly considered averaging the "Frequency Ratio" (originally called the "Popularity Ratio", but changed with the second installment). This ratio for each column is derived by dividing the number of votes each title received from readers that time by the number received by the 20th placed game. However, given the differing number of votes each time, the result would prove both awkward, and of questionable worth. A couple of interesting facts did come to light while considering this. The average number of responses per issue was 559.36 (this is down considerably from the 723 reported in Mr. Kiczek's "The Rating Game" back in Vol. 20, No. 3—a sad commentary on apathy). The largest response was 1201 (which appeared in the first listing in 17-6); the lowest was 289 in Vol. 22, No. 3 (although this may well have been caused by a delay in the printing of 22-1). The list seen each issue is compiled from responses sent in from the number received by the 20th placed game. The list seen each issue is compiled from responses sent in from the issue published two previous.

While no astounding revelations spring forth from this effort (and readers are cautioned not jump to unbounded conclusions regarding popularity of a title), the chart does lead to a few interesting observations. First off, 85 different titles have been on the list over the first 50 installments. All except seven (four VG, two ADG and one TSR) have been Avalon Hill games when they first appeared—not surprising considering the demographics of the response base. One of these games from another company, EMPIRES IN ARMS, now bears the TABGC logo. And the relationship of Victory Games to Avalon Hill needs no explanation surely. There have been 18 different titles that have occupied the Number 1 slot at some time or another. SQUAD LEADER is the undeniable leader with 13 times in that position, but its last first-place showing was in Vol. 22. No. 1. It is interesting to note that ASL, which first appeared in Vol. 22-5 in position #13, has already placed first 11 times. Third in first-place listings would be claimed by THIRD REICH (four times). Do not be misled by the "Average Position" entries, however; some of these other games may have a high average simply because they appeared less frequently.

Obviously, many older titles feature prominently on the chart below due to their availability when

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Total Times On List</th>
<th>1st Time</th>
<th>Last Time</th>
<th>Average Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magic Realm</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>20-4</td>
<td>15.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil War</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21-6</td>
<td>26-4</td>
<td>14.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG Codex</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21-3</td>
<td>22-1</td>
<td>9.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britannia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24-2</td>
<td>25-4</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kremlin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25-3</td>
<td>26-1</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gettysburg '88</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22-2</td>
<td>26-1</td>
<td>11.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circus Maximus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18-1</td>
<td>18-4</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napoleon</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18-5</td>
<td>24-1</td>
<td>13.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naval War</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21-5</td>
<td>21-6</td>
<td>13.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tac Air</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25-4</td>
<td>25-6</td>
<td>7.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dauntless</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23-3</td>
<td>24-1</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24-2</td>
<td>25-3</td>
<td>10.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedgerow Hell</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23-3</td>
<td>26-1</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luftwaffe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23-4</td>
<td>26-1</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22-5</td>
<td>25-3</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struggle of Nations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19-5</td>
<td>20-3</td>
<td>14.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick the Great</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20-5</td>
<td>21-2</td>
<td>14.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bull Run</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21-1</td>
<td>21-6</td>
<td>14.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dune</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17-6</td>
<td>23-6</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enemy in Sight</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25-6</td>
<td>26-1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thunder at Cassino</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24-5</td>
<td>25-3</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World in Flames</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25-2</td>
<td>26-3</td>
<td>10.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banzai</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21-4</td>
<td>22-4</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1776</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20-5</td>
<td>26-1</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP-Stalingrad</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25-6</td>
<td>26-1</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starship Troopers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17-6</td>
<td>26-1</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Day '77</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18-2</td>
<td>18-5</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA Africa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22-3</td>
<td>24-8</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets of Fire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17-5</td>
<td>26-1</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PanzerKrieg</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21-1</td>
<td>21-6</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladiator</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18-6</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab-Israeli Wars</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22-2</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Hurrah</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25-5</td>
<td>26-3</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Pigs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21-3</td>
<td>26-1</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devil's Den</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23-1</td>
<td>26-1</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knights of the Air</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23-6</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21-4</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wizard's Quest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18-1</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gettysburg</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19-2</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom in the Galaxy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20-6</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25-6</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-Days Battle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21-6</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"So That's What You've Been Playing!" was started. However, it should be observed that some of these have also proved to be very popular, hence their high ranking on my list. Any game released over the previous three-four years in this changing industry seemingly stands little chance of reaching the "Top 20" in appearances here unless it is wildly successful (such as ASL). A quick glance at this issue's "Times on List" part of the column reveals the difficulty of maintaining a regular position these days. And, of course, fluctuations in the listings—as has been pointed out frequently in the past—are directly influenced by articles featuring the game in The GENERAL. For those readers who may be unable to live without things reduced to percentages, simply multiply the "Total Times on List" by two to obtain a percentage of appearances; only the venerable, and original, SQUAD LEADER can claim 100% (while there are a flock of titles appearing but 2% of the time).

Speaking of which, it is interesting to also note that the three SL gamettes still occupy slots in the "Top 20" even though none have shown on the listing for some time. Given the rapid proliferation of modules for ASL, I doubt that any of its "gamettes" will. One game's showing that was rather surprising (at least to me) was GUNS OF AUGUST which, though discontinued, seems to have a strong following among the GENERAL's readership. In fact, it is interesting to note that several of these games have been, or are slated to be, dropped from Avalon Hill's ever-expanding line.

Looking at the subject of the games, not surprisingly, 46 of the titles which have appeared on the survey deal with World War 2 actions. But after that, some revelations are noteworthy. Nine of the titles cover the AWI-Napoleonic period. Rising in popularity are the Post-WW2 games; eight had appeared by the time the 50th installment was published, most have seen print in the past couple of years. Civil War themes, which I would have expected to fair better, have only six representatives. Five Ancient/Medieval titles, four (including DIPLOMACY) covering Post-ACW through WW1, four fantasy and three science-fiction titles fill out the subject breakdown. Given Avalon Hill's leanings toward competitive play, 62 of the titles are designed for two players, 19 for multi-player action, and only four solitaire designs have made the list.

While receiving its fair share of criticism in the past, the "So That's What You've Been Playing!" column has managed to survive for some eight years now. The column will always be influenced by GENERAL articles and features, but the bottom line is that a good game will still appear regularly without the aid of any coverage (note the appearances of DIPLOMACY and FLAT TOP, for instance). I have always found the column unique and will continue to follow and chart its progress. However, if the total responses continue to drop (as is the current trend), I fear that sometime in the future this column may be dropped due to interest. It is one of the few features of The GENERAL dependent on us, the readership; so please take the time to send those responses off so we can keep the column that is ours. After all, the more responses Rex Martin receives, the more accurate the column will become.

In conclusion, let me again warn readers of making too much of this little exercise. The financial success or quality of any game has little bearing on its popularity, and vice-versa, especially for such a stratified audience as those who respond to each issue's "What Have You Been Playing!" polling. Perhaps the most important point I might leave readers with is my hope that more of you will take the time to fill out and send in your survey forms. With that continued broad-based support, some day the column might indeed show us the "best" game of all time.

---

**COMPUTER CORNER**

**Unraveling LEGENDS**

By John Huff

We've received quite a few letters on our newest offering on the Mac, LEGENDS OF THE LOST REALM. Many have asked for some hints on play, composition of parties, and insights into various characters. I have tried a number of strategies in setting up my beginning parties. With all the hours I have spent playing the game, I can now make just about any mix succeed. However, going back to my first successful batch of characters, the group I used did work well enough—despite casualties, due to my relative inexperience.

If you are having a problem in getting through your first excursion, try using three "fighters" in the front rank, with two "shamans" and a "thief" in the back. Equip the thief with a crossbow when possible, or a short bow when no bolts are available. Short bows are useful because a large number of other parties you meet and defeat will drop short arrows. I have had an excursion where the thief went through 213 short arrows! The crossbow has the advantage of accuracy and firepower, but bolts are rather scarce.

While we are on the subject of the thief, first-level ones almost never make a successful surprise attack. Instead, give the little sneak a pole arm (such as a spear or halberd); then they can strike at the front rank of the enemy from the safety of the second rank. This was standard fare for the Saxons at Stamford Bridge, and it works well still. If for no other reason, appear to back up a bow in case you run out of arrows is a good idea.

You can give the shamans a short bow as well, but they are not very good shots. It is better to use shamans for hand-aids and casting the occasional "Dancing Knife" spell. Until they gain a few levels, avoid hand-to-hand combat using them and don't try anything too elegant early on (it probably won't work). The reason for not putting a "mage" in the initial party is that magicians are very wimpy. Once you can get the rest of the party to the fourth level or so, substitute a magician for one of the shamans and then protect him (or her) until they can gain some ground. By the time your party gets beyond the eighth level, the magician will have acquired much more than enough experience to make up for his late start.

If you are trying to build a "sorcerer", don't use your first mage to do it. It is much easier to graduate your first mage into witchcraft. "Witches" gain more powerful group-effect spells at lower levels. Also, most other types of magic casters are not effective against undead creatures. If you ascend the north side of the Great Keep, this will be very important!

When you feel ready to assault the Great Keep, you will first need the key. The North Gate requires the "Cap of Mind Shielding" worn by a magician.

The East Gate demands the "Ring of Quickness" worn by a thief. The South Gate requires the "Bracers of Ogre Strength" worn by a fighter. The West Gate requires the "Mirror Cloak" worn by a shaman. Each of these items is found on the second level of the appropriate guard tower. The Cap is guarded by an old Hag; the ring by a series of trapped corridors. The Bracers are protected by an ogre, and the Mirror Cloak by three very tough shamans. Good luck. By the time you can take on any of these, your party should be able to stand a chance surviving in the Great Keep.

Finally, should worse come to worst, you can bring favorite characters back into the game. However, a surprising number of players have experienced a problem resurrecting dead party members. This is accomplished quite easily by dragging the body to one of the three temples, and then clicking on the alter.

I have recently answered a number of questions concerning LEGENDS from a fanatical group of players on CompuServe. They can be found in the "Mac Fun" area. One problem that seems to be occurring is that parties are too under-powered to handle the Red Dragon or the Dark Sorcerer at the end of the game. A couple of hints:

To kill the dragon, you will need a Dragon Sword re-forged by a good Blademaster. Since you must have the dragon's tooth to complete the quest, you have to deal with the dragon one way or another. But you don't have to kill the dragon to get that tooth.

The Dark Sorcerer casts a fantastic number of spells per turn (all the while summoning demons). It is probably best to smash him (the sorcerer) as quickly as possible and then deal with the demons. If you have not yet started a Samurai or a Barbarian, do so now! They are essential to kill the Dark Sorcerer. In battle, use whatever means you have to stun or slow him down; he is very dangerous.

**DIPLOMACY**

And, for those players of the classic multi-player game interested in PBEM, negotiations with GEnie for the first authorized version of an Online DIP game are nearly complete. This will include customized front-ends for all the popular computer systems. If this works as well as we hope, look for more Avalon Hill game titles in the future. In addition to online games, we also hope to soon have our own area for questions and conferences with gamers and designers. For those readers with local access to GEnie, lots of possibilities open up.
You’ve made the Final Four!

Gamers can now replay an entire 64 team NCAA college basketball tournament.

Game comes with pressure-sensitive labels and rating formulas which allow you to transform the game pieces into the actual team colors of every team in any future tournament field.

MARCH MADNESS uses a combination of statistically-derived player ratings and specially color-coded dice to enable replays of whole games from the opening tip to the statistical wrap-up in a matter of minutes. Competitive players will also enjoy the fact that it’s more than just a dice game. Their decisions really influence the outcome by play of strategy cards at critical moments. Great solitaire rules allow enjoyable play whether alone or in the company of other players. For those craving more statistical accuracy and star appeal, the Advanced Game includes 120 rated Final Four teams of the past 30 years. Now one can span the decades to pit the college teams of Magic Johnson, Larry Bird and Michael Jordan against the greats of a bygone era: Jerry West, Bill Russell, Wilt Chamberlain, Elgin Baylor, Oscar Robertson and dozens of other hoop greats, past and present. One can even match the UCLA of Lew Alcindor against the Bruins of Bill Walton...or hold a fantasy tournament of the greatest teams of history to determine which was truly the best collegiate basketball team of all time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>Players</th>
<th>Ages</th>
<th>Complexity</th>
<th>Solitaire</th>
<th>Suitability</th>
<th>Suggested Retail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9265 Madness to 4 &amp; up</td>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Wholesalers note: 6 to a master pack, 12 lbs.)

The Avalon Hill Game Company
DIVISION OF MONARCH AVALON, INC.
4517 Harford Road * Baltimore, MD 21214 * 301-254-9200
Call TOLL FREE 1-800-999-3222 to order.
Points for Position:

1: 20
2: 19
3: 18
4: 17
5: 16
6: 15
7: 14
8: 13
9-16: 12

Notice that these seeding bonuses add in the Base Score (Rule 6.), and therefore this rule is not used. This modification was turned down in the playtest, as the developer wished to retain more of the possibilities for a lower-ranked team to win. Its main fault is the assumption that a team’s ranking is truly indicative of its current playing potential. This is not always true, as certain teams seem to peak or collapse just at tournament time.

For those readers interested in the Advanced Game and the rating of teams, I offer the following. The team “Offensive Ratings” were generated on a scoring average of approximately 80 points per game. This is a reflection of performances typical of the last two decades; it is becoming less the case under the current NCAA rules. The shot clock, the three-point play, and the new attitude of teams such as the 1990 “Cinderella” Loyola-Marymount have combined to push the scoring averages higher, in the case of Loyola, to over 120 points-per-game. MARCH MADNESS conversely penalizes those teams which play tight defense and, thus, limit their own scoring. To bring some balance, I offer the following.

A team’s Offensive Ratings are generated per the game’s rules after the following modification. A team’s PPG (points-per-game) is divided by “80”, to establish a conversion base. This number is then divided into each player and bench average to come up with their modified ‘scoring average’. For example, “Bozo Tech” averages 100 PPG. Its players would be rated by dividing their actual PPG by 1.25, and the following would be generated:

**BOZO TECH:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Player</th>
<th>Average Scoring</th>
<th>Modified Scoring</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RF-A</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF-B</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-C</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RG-D</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG-E</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bench</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that only the first three players are actually affected by these changes, but this is certainly enough to bring Bozo Tech into line with an ‘average’ team. The defensive and coaching ratings are not affected by these trends such that they require any modifications.

Players will find MARCH MADNESS an intriguing challenge, packing all the excitement of the highlight of college sports into a few hours. The first new offering for the sports buff from Avalon Hill for some time, it promises to be a popular game— and I anticipate doing further columns on it if the readers desire.

ERRATA: The red and blue factions of the Basic Game team counters of MARCH MADNESS have been transposed. This makes no difference unless trying to duplicate the 1989 NCAA tournament. In this case, simply set up the red teams on the blue seeds, and vice versa.

**GENERAL INDEX 1964-1989**

Updating the previous effort at listing every article and author in these pages, the new 16-page Index of The GENERAL brings 25 years of continuous publication into sharp focus. From the AH Philosophy to the contests, from the Series Replays to those excellent gamers featured in the “Meet the Fifty”, every important facet of wargaming’s oldest periodical is divided for ready reference by those interested in a specific game. The major portion of this new index is devoted to a game-by-game listing of every article that has appeared in these pages since the early enthusiasm of this hobby flared in the 1960s. Whether for the aficionado of a particular Avalon Hill or Victory Game seeking every word printed on it by the experts, or for the collector looking to insure that his AH collection is complete, or simply for the gamer wanting a new (though old) idea for winning, the GENERAL Index is a must. The GENERAL Index is available now for $5.00 direct from The Avalon Hill Game Company (4517 Harford Road, Baltimore, MD 21214). Please compute shipping/handling/fees of your order in accordance with the instructions found on the current Parts List and pre-paid order forms. Maryland residents please also add 5% state sales tax.

**COPY SERVICE**

If the reader should need a copy of an article from an out-of-stock back issue of The GENERAL, the Avalon Hill Game Company does provide a photocopying service (black/white only). The charge for this service is $1.00 per page, with a minimum order of five pages required. Please specify the article title, volume and number of the issue it appeared in, and the pages on which it can be found; the new 25-year GENERAL Index is invaluable for this. Standard Avalon Hill postage rates must be included to cover the total of the order. Maryland residents please also add 5% state sales tax.
THE POWER AND THE GLORY
Triple Alliances in DIPLOMACY

By Mark L. Berch

DIPLOMACY is the game of alliances par excellence. Forming, maintaining, evaluating, controlling, and terminating alliances are at the core of the diplomat's craft, and the DIP player's primary path to victory. While other game designs feature alliances, none are as successful in giving them such a central role in how the game is won. And yet, for far too many players, 'alliance' comes to mean 'two-way'. This narrow thinking drastically reduces a player's options. He may not have even considered one sort which might give him the best growth.

I think that part of this is because of the number of combinations involved. A French player, for example, has six two-way alliances to ponder, and one of these (France-Turkey) provides scant prospects for cooperative military action at gamestart. But he has 15 possible triple alliances! And all of them offer possibilities of joint military action, much from the start. Indeed, over half of these provide two or three different paths that French action could take. Beyond that, there is such a welter of feasible triple alliances (35 in all) that we must strain to get a comprehensive view. How do they resemble, and differ, from each other? How can we make sense of them?

I propose that triple alliances fall into three basic sorts: "Closed", "Open" and "Disjointed". These each have different topologies and different dynamics. Let's look at each. (But first, a definition: 'Two countries are neighbors if you can go from one to the other without passing alongside a home center of a third country.

There is one exception I'll touch on shortly.)

CLOSED: In a "closed" triple alliance, each country is the neighbor of the other two. In this sense, these alliances are symmetric. There are six of them: Austria/Germany/Russia (the "Central" alliance), Austria/Italy/Germany ("Southern"), Russia/Austria/Turkey ("Eastern" or "RAT"), England/Italy/Russia ("Western"), England/Germany/Russia ("Northern"), and Austria/Germany/Italy ("Interior"). The sole exception to this strict definition is the last one, but I treat Germany and Italy as "neighbors". The two nations are close and, in this configuration, Trieste and Vienna are not hostile home centers.

As expected, these are the most popular triple alliances, and the ones most written about by DIPLOMACY thinkers. These are quite hard to disguise from other players in a game, since all feature the spectacle of three people all allying with two neighbors. They also feature reduced freedom of action. Players normally attack their neighbors—but now two of them are off-limits. For example, a Western Triple locks Fance into attacking Italy, and England must attack Russia. Germany, meanwhile, must either attack Russia, find an outcome against Austria, or launch an awkward attack on Italy. This is perhaps the extreme case, but most Closed triple alliances are so cramped that certain pairs cannot act jointly at the onset. Thus, a Northern Triple provides no coordinated English-Russian activity until late in the game; an Eastern may never see any Russian-Turkish cooperation. These triples are, in a sense, the least complete, the least fully realized.

But these boast some outstanding advantages too. The division of nearly all neutrals can be settled diplomatically, not militarily. For instance, in an Eastern Triple, there will be no debilitating scrap over Rumania or Greece. A certain level of stability comes from knowing that you are in the same sort of position as the other two members. On the other hand, there are three different ways that two players can gang up on the third, a fairly common mid-game occurrence for Closed triple alliances.

This is not to say that such alliances are totally symmetrical. Except for the Austria/Italy/Germany combination, these alliances have at least one country involved which has a board edge and at least one country without one. Those with a corner position (England and Turkey) involved will be somewhat safe, but not threatened in their expansions. Thus, in the Southern Triple, once the Turkish player gets his share of Russia, unless he can sneak into Scandinavia he faces the awkward task of arcing around Austria to get into Germany. Another asymmetry comes from the fact that one country of the triple often has to locate an ally outside the triple alliance. This gives him an 'outside ally' for his primary German alliance. The Italy usually will start the game by attacking Turkey or France, but not both, leaving Germany or Austria to look elsewhere for an ally against the remaining power.

These are not alliances for active diplomats because they are fairly claustrophobic. But they can still be very effective. One of the most ruthless is the underdressed and little used Northern Triple. This divides the entire northern tier of neutrals from Sweden to Belgium. France is targeted in the west, and the Russian player must find an outside ally for an attack on Austria or Turkey. He might even act on the Germany against Austria; but the most effective route to victory is to knock out Turkey first, ideally drawing the Austrian and/or Italian fleets east. In the second stage, Russia/Germany pressures southward, while England sails her fleets into the Mediterranean. At the end, they all sit down for some Greek food.

OPEN: In an "open" triple, one country is neighbor to two allies but they are not neighbors to each other. Open triples tend to be a lot more stable than Closed ones. They are not alliances for active diplomats because they are fairly claustrophobic. But they can still be very effective. One of the most ruthless is the underdressed and little used Northern Triple. This divides the entire northern tier of neutrals from Sweden to Belgium. France is targeted in the west, and the Russian player must find an outside ally for an attack on Austria or Turkey. He might even act on the Germany against Austria; but the most effective route to victory is to knock out Turkey first, ideally drawing the Austrian and/or Italian fleets east. In the second stage, Russia/Germany pressures southward, while England sails her fleets into the Mediterranean. At the end, they all sit down for some Greek food.

OPEN: In an "open" triple, one country is neighbor to two allies but they are not neighbors to each other. Open triples tend to be a lot more stable than Closed ones.

Some new issues arise here which are seldom present in Closed triple alliances. Three of these Open triples—Italy/Russia/Turkey, England/France/ Russia and England and France/Italy—pose a serious problem for the central power. After the dispatch of the first victim (Austria, Germany, and Germany respectively), the central power can be completely boxed in. Special provisions need to be made at the outset to avoid this dead end. For example, in a Italy/Russia/Turkey triple, Italian and Turkish fleets can form a joint armada for assaults on Siberia and the Mid-Atlantic spaces.

Another issue is that of the "blitz". All three allies attacking one power. For a few, like England/France/Italy or France/Italy/Turkey, this is impossible. But in general, the Open triple is the ideal configuration for a blitz attack. For some, like Austria/Italy/Russia, it is not only an appealing prospect but may even be the impetus for forming the alliance in the first place. The allies must, however, consider whether other powers should be invited into the attack or, indeed, if they can be kept out (and ways to accomplish this). Thus, if Austria/ England/Germany decides to lynch Russia, the allies may want to promote an Italian-Turkish war rather than see Turkey grow on the spoils of their action. In two cases (France/Germany/Russia against England and Austria/Italy/Russia against Turkey) this is not a worry.

The alliance members must also decide whether to run a second attack concurrent with the blitz. For instance, Austria/England/Germany could stomp Russia, even while England/Germany opens a second front against France at more or less the same time. Such circumstances may give the triple alliance some camouflage if another power can be persuaded to stage a second attack. Thus, in this scenario, Italy joins in the attack on France. Or perhaps a France/Germany/Russia triple corners England and a side attack by Germany/Russia on Austria is developed (both Germany and Russia can spare an army for that by Spring 1902); Germany/Russia then recruit Italy and/or Turkey to join the latter.

The "odd" man in a Disjointed triple has a different problem to face than any other player. He can't take on England, while he concentrates all his initial strength on Germany. His allegiance should be made to appear reluctant to undertake early in the game. A fifth in­volves a common neighbor usually arises when one partner wants to be able to ally with the "not-to-be-blitzed" country. If Germany/Russia/ Turkey, say, decides not to blitz Austria, then Germany/Russia will likely attack England and leave Turkey to ally—temporarily—with the reprieved Austria. In this case, the problem is that Austria will be attacked, but by then Turkey (having taken the Aegean, Ionian and Naples spaces (and possibly Tunisia) will be an excellent position to move on Austria across a broader front.

The alternative, then, is for two of the triple's powers (not all three) to attack while the third party is busy elsewhere. This sort of restraint sounds strange in DIPLOMACY I know, but in some cases it works well. In an Open triple with Germany and France, the Russian may find it prudent to let them take on England, while he concentrates all his initial energies in the south. He figures, of course, that he can pick up Norway any time.

DISJOINTED: In this form of alliance, two involved powers are neighbors but the third is not. There are 15 of these possible. Commonly, one power allies with two others on the far side of the board (e.g., Turkey allies with any two of the western powers). These are the most stable of triple alliances, and the most difficult for others to spot.
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that Austria will be busy fighting Russia or Turkey, plans to acquire Marseilles and Spain. England takes Brazil and Portugal, and Germany nets Belgium and Paris. The triple then shifts its stance to take on the dominant eastern alliance. The other two possible configurations both involve a blitz of Russia by England/Turkey, with either Austria or Germany involved as the third partner. In the case of England/Germany/Turkey versus Austria, Russia and Turkey would probably remain a scrap war, which Turkey can probably instigate. England/Turkey/Austria may have an easier time keeping Germany busy and out of the Russian campaign on either side. Indeed, England may not even have to join the attack on France if Italy/Germany can be convinced to go along without an English/Czech protectorate.

Another kind of action by a Disjointed triple is for two non-neighbors to sandwich an enemy, with a side campaign conducted by the two neighbors. Of course, this means that one power will be involved in two conflicts. There is a tremendous amount of flexibility here, too, and this is probably the most common form the Disjointed triple alliance takes. For example, in an England/Italy/Turkey union, Italy and England squeeze Austria while France/Russia and Turkey take on Germany. Alternatively, you may choose to shorten things, such that England/France/Turkey is fighting two of the three aroused countries, none of which has been seriously damaged by events.

I'd like to close with some general comments on triple alliances in DIPLOMACY. The ease of forming alliances means that face-to-face conferences differ from postal DIP. The complexities of sorting out three different interests can be handled more efficiently in a face-to-face conference. On the other hand, three powers huddled together is such a dead giveaway to FTF DIPLOMACY that experienced players frequently avoid it. Instead, one person acts as a relay, with the usual risk of accidental or deliberate misinterpretation. Of course, once the triple is exposed, such shuffling is dispensed with.

If you have a firm two-way alliance, keep alert for the possibility that your ally is actually operating a type of three-way. That is, he may be building two concurrent primary alliances. If so, it behoves you to contact the other power and explore an alliance with him as well.

The triple alliance approach can give you added flexibility once a campaign ends. In situations, if you have a two-way alliance, you have three choices: 1) stick with the alliance and select a second victim; 2) form a new alliance in order to tackle your former ally; 3) take him all on by yourself. The second two have obvious problems. The triple alliance will usually give you a fourth choice — viz, ally with one of your partners against the other. If the alliance is a closed one by then, you'll have two such possibilities to negotiate.

Keep in mind that the biggest danger facing a tu-rk against another opposing country is that it would sound impossible to exchange DIP players, but they arise occasionally... and can stop the triple cold if the alarm is sounded early and heeded. Once the triple has gained the upper hand, and it is unlikely that it can be prevented from sweeping your board, you must evaluate your own safety carefully against the outside world. On a map, two powers can likely recruit others to join in the attacks. Otherwise, the uninvolved powers will probably be propping up the besieged.

Which country is to be involved in two wars is a function of how aggressive the individual players happen to be, and what forces are available. In a France/Russia/Turkey for instance, Russia could be comfortable as part of both Russia/Turkey versus Austria and France/Russia versus England. But if the Turk instead wants to be involved in two wars, we have France/Turkey against Italy and Russia/Turkey against Turkey. This is not a good prospect, for Turkey might not want to face both Italy and Austria at once.

The third, and most spectacular, option for action is for all three countries to be involved in two wars each, against three common enemy powers. I dub this the “Ring of Fire”. Here is the triple alliance in its full glory, the grand exception, the Disjointed triple can pull this off. (In theory, Austria, Turkey/Austria/Russia could do so as Austria/Germany versus Russia, Germany/Italy versus France, Easy/Italy versus Turkey, but, as noted in earlier writings, this puts an extreme burden on Italy’s back.) A good example of the “Ring of Fire” would be England/France/Turkey taking on, in pairs, Germany, Italy and Russia. Replacing England with Russia in this example would give France/Turkey versus Italy, Russia/Turkey attacking Austria, and France/Russia against Germany.

This is a highly aggressive style of play, and will require some rather belligerent 1901 moves and a willingness to take risks. Three-on-three odds do not seem very promising in DIPLOMACY. But, the alliance can improve these by: 1) gaining the element of surprise, especially multiple 1901 stabs; 2) forming a war against an archenemy; 3) receiving the seventh power to join in (the England/France/Turkey example can see Austria join in any of the three proposed wars). This path is, in a sense, the exact opposite of a blitz, which targets military power on one victim. He’ll go down fast, but the other three players may be so horrified by this unusual turn at the start of a war that they immediately craft a counter-triple. This is especially true when the victim of the blitz is Austria or Germany. The result is often such that, while the original triple is stronger, it is not strong enough to overcome the new opposing triple before they can craft a stalemate line. In the “Ring of Fire”, no one country is eliminated, but all three are (hopefully) weakened fairly evenly. Having the upper hand in all three wars may be enough to prevent the formation of an effective counter-alliance—especially if the seventh power tries to help them out. By contrast, if the triple alliance faces three aroused countries, none of which has been seriously damaged by events.

Finally, note that the three categories of triples I presented above only relate to the opening stages of the game. As troops build and all three men are off the board, are worthy of much more study than I’ve given them here. But, the best way to study triple alliances is to experiment yourself. You will likely be the victim of one at some point, and can see the effects from the outside. Try, next time you play, enjoying their options and power from the inside.

DIPCON REPORT

The States’ first World DIP-Con (which also served as this year’s national competition) was held on the campus of the University of North Carolina at Chapel-Hill on the weekend of June 21-24. All the best players from around the globe were there, as well as quite a few of the hobby luminaries. Drawn by some excellent publicity in the amateur press, nigh 100 hard-core devotees of this most popular of all multi-player strategy games spent the weekend before ORIGINS engaged in a four-round, round-robin tournament.

After three days of vicious back-stabbing, Jason Bergmann (Atlanta GA) emerged as the overall winner of the DIPLOMACY tournament. He also grabbed two of the “Best Country” certificates, given to each whose play saw their country attain its highest level among all the games played in competition. Also presented at the event were the four hobby awards: Fred Davis Jr. was voted the Don Miller Award for “service to the hobby”; Gary Behen, the John Koltanowski Award for “Outstanding Play”; Larry Botimer and Francois Cuerrier tied in the polling for the Rod Walker Literary Award (both will be presented plaques); and Melinda Holley won, not surprisingly, the new Melinda Holley Award for “hobby participation”.

Of all the awards, David Hood, Tom Nash and Ken Peel (the “DIP-Con Administrative Committee”) are to be congratulated. The site and accommodations were pleasant, the competition well and smoothly run, and the fellowship fun and free. Thanks should also be extended to Randy Grigsby (Canada), John Cain (Australia/New Zealand), Peter Sullivan (United Kingdom), Per Westling (Sweden) and Jef Bryant (Belgium) for promotion and travel organization. Too, for the first time, a concentrated effort to publicize a convention by E-mail was undertaken—by Eric Klien and Tom Nash. The selfless efforts of these and others made the convention a resounding success, and set the standard for all others to follow.

The bid for the next bi-annual World DIP-Con was accepted at the usual DIP-Con Society meeting there; although a specific site has not been determined as yet. The next event will be held in Australia in 1992. Next year’s regular DIP-Con is a continental affair; the committee has determined that it will be held at the University of Scarborough in Toronto on the first weekend of August 1991. Readers interested in more information on any of these events or awards are urged to contact David Hood (104-F Terrace Drive, Cary, NC 27511).
Perhaps the only disappointment with the much expanded, 2nd Edition rulebook for MAGIC REALM was the lack of an index (or even table of contents) for this massive work. Being a fan of the game, and never one to back off from a challenge, I crafted one. For the past two years, I have been providing copies of it to local players of the game. Now, it is hoped, it may also prove as useful to the readership of The GENERAL.

The index was inspired by, and patterned after, the one found in the rulebook for Advanced SQUAD LEADER. It has been designed to additionally serve as a "style book" for those writing about MAGIC REALM, as each entry has been listed in the same form in which it is used in the rules. Terms which should be italicized or capitalized have been entered accordingly. Most of the references included in this index are prefixed with a short identifier. The references for the various game day "periods" (Birdsong, Sunrise, Daylight, etc.) constitute a special case, as I've elected to simply list each rule in which the term appears rather than try to formulate meaningful identifiers for these.

Format for the index is as follows:

- Entry (any detailed description/definition): main rule references [other applications of entry] references to related rules, illustrations, tables

The 2nd Edition rulebook has a few instances of duplicate rule numbers and mis-numbered rules. In all such cases, this index uses what would be the correct numbering (in anticipation of a corrected reprinting in the future). If you find my index referring to an apparently non-existent rule number, a close look at your rulebook should quickly indicate what it should be. You may also notice that the index can be quite redundant at times. This is due in part to the "programmed" nature of the rules—four separate "Encounters", each modifying or repeating rules from the previous sections—and in part to my desire to err on the side of completeness. I'd much prefer being accused of including too much than of omitting something crucial.

So, below first find a brief "Table of Contents" for the 2nd Edition rulebook of MAGIC REALM. I have assigned alpha-prefixes to most of the adjunct material ("G", "P", etc.); if no letter prefix appears, the rule will be found among those under one of the four encounters. This is carried throughout the index proper which follows. I solicit any comments, suggestions or notification of any remaining errors that readers may have. Hopefully, this index will prove as useful for you as it has for us.
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WITH FRIENDS LIKE THESE
The Axis Minor Allies, 1941-1945
By David Meyer

In the realm of power politics, it is easy to look upon the smaller nations as mere pawns of their larger, more powerful neighbors. And, while some major powers often do look on their smaller neighbors in this light, reality can be surprisingly different. Small countries have their own political agendas, and it is sometimes difficult to determine who is using who. This was frequently the case between Germany and its “allies” during the Second World War.

Although there was certainly no doubt about who the senior partner was, even the direct threat of military action by the Germans was not always enough to get their allies to toe the line. The Finns, in a well-known example, used the German attack on Russia as a means of regaining the territories lost during the Winter War (the Finns called their 1941-44 conflict the “Continuation War”); and when these territories were reoccupied after the first few months of fighting, the Finns—no matter how much Berlin cajoled or pleaded—refused to move further. But even in the Balkans, where Germany could find itself short of neighbors, its allies were more than just pawns. Regional disputes often took precedence over Germany’s anti-Communist “crusade” in Russia, limiting the overall effectiveness of these allies. The Hungarians, Belgians, and Rumanians could fight well at times; unfortunately for the Germans, this was most often when they were fighting each other.

In general, these nations suffered from similar military shortcomings as the minor Anglo-French allies and neutrals: lack of heavy artillery, automatic weapons, motorized transport, aircraft and modern communications ... in short, a general lack of the hardware to fight a major conflict. Even the Finns, generally recognized as tenacious soldiers, never really made up for a serious shortfall in heavy artillery, AFVs and transport. But, as highlighted in PARTISAN, these nationalities can be intriguing, often being more than a little ironic that Rumania, as we have seen, had been Germany’s most important ally on the Eastern Front. The Rumanians not only fought against Germany in the First World War, but were threatened by pro-German Hungary and Bulgaria, both of which made territorial claims on Rumania. Although the Rumanians had a treaty with France and Britain, the influence of those nations in the Balkans was minimal. When the Soviet Union occupied the provinces of Bessarabia and northern Bukovina by force, Rumania found itself isolated. To avoid complete annihilation, Rumania made an accord with Germany in 1940, although this meant giving up half of Transylvania to the Hungarians and a strip of territory to Bulgaria.

Pre-war French influence in terms of tactics and organization on the Rumanian Army was distinct in the early months, although German influence became more pronounced as the war progressed. This was more or less the pattern of all Germany’s satellite armies. When the Germans took control of the war, rather than promote experienced men up from the ranks, the Rumanian General Staff brought in inexperienced and inadequately trained officers, but of the required social standing. This led to a distinct decline in the level of leadership in Rumanian units after the winter of 1941/42. It was practically unknown, for example, for an officer to lie down beside a common trooper to correct his aim. The bravery of the officer corps could not be criticized, however. Until the debacle of 1944, the German opinion of the Rumanian soldier was generally positive: modest in his needs, resourceful in the field, and capable of tough fighting.

The bulk of the Rumanian Army was used for security purposes in the rear areas. Nevertheless, the Rumanian contingent on the Eastern Front was the largest of Germany’s allies, eventually totalling more than 250,000 men. Three motorized divisions, and the 3rd and 4th Armies participated in the opening campaign under the control of the German 11th Army. The Rumanians pushed into the southern Ukraine, but by December 1941 had suffered 130,000 killed and wounded. As a result, ill-prepared rear area formations were often required to hold the front line during the winter months that followed.

And these losses meant a reduction in troop strength. The typical division in 1942 had two regiments, each with three battalions; plus a recon battalion (equipped with VW Jeeps, horses and bicycles), a cavalry regiment, two artillery regiments (three batteries each) and an ATG platoon of six guns (mostly 37mm). From October 1942, the Germans supplied another six 75mm ATG to each Rumanian division to alleviate the critical lack of anti-tank capability.

The Soviet offensive of November 1942 at Stalingrad was initially concentrated against the Rumanians, which the Russians correctly assessed as the weak link in the enemy line. Nevertheless, the Rumanians fought back bitterly. Three generals were killed at Stalingrad leading bayonet charges! But, outnumbered nine-to-one, the Rumanian forces were overwhelmed. In six weeks, they suffered 173,000 casualties. The Royal Rumanian Army never recovered.

The 3rd and 4th Armies were pulled back for home defense; but as the Soviets approached the Rumanian frontier in the summer of 1944, anti-German members of the government, including King Michael himself, were in secret negotiations with the Russians. In August 1944, a coup overthrew the pro-German Antonescu and the Rumanian forces joined the Russians. Some 540,000 Rumanians participated in this last phase of the war, seeing action in Transylvania (some bitter fighting with the Hungarians), Slovakia, Austria and Moravia. Casualties were 170,000 men killed and wounded.

The Hungarian Army:
Hungary had been among the losers of the First World War, which meant that there were scores to settle in the Second. A previous ally— in the form of the Austro-Hungarian Empire—of Germany, Hungary was one of the first small nations to join the Axis. Hungarians in the First World War were the largest of Germany’s allies, eventually totalling more than 150,000 men. Three motorized divisions, and the 3rd and 4th Armies participated in the opening campaign under the control of the German 11th Army. The Rumanians pushed into the southern Ukraine, but by December 1941 had suffered 130,000 killed and wounded. As a result, ill-prepared rear area formations were often required to hold the front line during the winter months that followed.

The pride of the army was the cavalry. This was divided into two forces: the Rosiori and the Calarasi, the former regular troops and the latter recruited from among the wealthy landowners. Six regiments of Calarasi provided the divisional and corps recon regiments. Hungary also had a cavalry corps, which was organized as a horse artillery regiment. Three brigades at the start of the war each had one regiment transported in half-tracks. The cavalry brigades were later designated as divisions, but organization did not change radically. Although a cavalry brigade had only 6000 men with 1575mm field guns and nine 37mm ATG, its mobility made it the most effective Rumanian unit committed to the Russian Front.

The single armored regiment in 1939 was combined with a motorized infantry regiment to create the Rumanian 1st Armored Division. It was later built up on the German model, with two motorized regiments and an armored regiment and a motorized artillery regiment. Pre-war Czech tanks were used (the skoda LT vz 35), but most were lost eventually around Stalingrad. German-supplied Pz 38s and PzKw IVs were generally used as replacements. The Rumanian aristocracy played the dominant role in the Royal Rumanian Army. Officers were frequently accompanied by a large retinue of servants. The Royal Rumanian Army was not used in the southern Ukraine in October 1939, picked up a piece of Transylvania in 1940, and participated whole-heartedly in the invasion of Yugoslavia in April 1941. Thus, the royal government, under the regency of Admiral Horthy, had achieved its aims of regaining all the so-called “lost territories” but at the expense of alienating most of its neighbors.

At least one German author has called the Hungarian Army the worst trained, organized and equipped of all the Balkan armies. And this view is not completely without support. Although the Hungarian kingdom looked upon itself as a suc...
In its place five of the recently created "security" divisions were committed. These were brigade-sized units, of about 6000 men, with two reserve regiments supported by just one battery of artillery and one squadron of cavalry. Grouped under the 8th Corps (which the Hungarians took to calling the "Dead Army"), the force was largely responsible for guarding communications in northeastern Ukraine against Partisans. But sometimes they were committed to the front line (such as the 108th Security Division, which took heavy losses near Kharliv in early 1942). The Hungarian units were not generally implicated in massacres of civilians in the rear areas; indeed, their officers objected to German massacres of Jews and when possible acted to prevent them.

The 2nd Hungarian Army was formed in the spring of 1942 when the Germans requested more troops from their allies; nine light divisions and the newly created 1st Armored Division (with one armored and one motorized infantry regiment, plus three artillery, one ATG, one engineer and one recon battalion). As of October 1942, a recon battalion of cyclists, cavalry and light armor was also attached to each light division in Russia. The armored division had been formed out of the two motorized brigades, and was equipped with 83 LT vz 38s, two Toldis and 22 PzKpfw Is. These AFVs were certainly no match for the T-34s, but the Hungarians later acquired some PzKpfw and PzKwVs; and while there was a kernel of experienced cadre, the bulk of the personnel had only eight weeks training. By 1944, Hungarian armored divisions more or less followed the German organization, but these were equipped with Hungarian-made Turan I and II (licensed versions of the Czech LT vz 35 and 38). Eight assault-gun battalions were raised, two equipped with the Hungarian Zrínyi AG and the remainder with StuG IIIIs. The 7th Battalion distinguished itself by destroying 67 Russian T-34s at Arad on the Rumanian-Hungarian border in late 1944.

At the end of 1942, the Hungarian contingent in Russia held the front near Voronezh. Manpower shortages were so severe that the average battalion was required to hold a front 3.5 kilometers long. The Soviet offensive of January, crossing the frozen Don, smashed the 2nd Army. Similar to the Rumanians, there was a critical lack of AT guns and weaponry. The Hungarians took some 148000 casualties, and thereafter saw little front-line service. The Hungarians refused to participate in the suppression of the Warsaw uprising in 1944; and in October of that year, the Hungarians signed a provisional cease-fire with the Soviet Union.

The Germans, however, with the lesson of Rumania still before them, launched a coup and put in place a pro-German puppet government. Hungarian forces fought under German control, seeing action in Vienna, Breslau, Kustrin and on the Oder. After the coup, however, desertion was widespread and there was little will to fight—although considerable resistance was put up against Rumanian units participating in the Russian invasion of Hungary.

Perhaps the most bizarre unit in the Hungarian Army was its parachute force, raised in April 1941 despite the fact that Hungary had no transport aircraft. This company was eventually expanded to a regiment, and in the final stages of the war became the 1st Parachute Battalion, 1st and 2nd Elite Infantry Training regiments, 1st and 2nd Armored Training regiments, 1st and 2nd Recon Training regiments, two river defense battalions and an AA battalion. It apparently was only used as conventional infantry, and fought with some distinction until it surrendered to the British in Austria in May 1945.

The Slovakian and Croatian Armies:

In 1939, the people of Slovakia were given the choice of becoming an "independent" state or becoming part of Hungary. The first course was chosen, and exploiting the anti-German sentiment there, a small pro-German army was established. In fact, in organization, equipment and personnel, it was virtually a recreation of the disbanded Czechoslovakian Army in miniature.

While only three divisions strong, the Slovak Army initially managed to maintain quite respectable standards of the former Czech army. This, in part, was a result of the Slovak practice of rapid rotation of units from the home army to units serving in Russia. (Before mid-1943, these units are best represented as first-line German squads, rather than the Axis Minor ones.) By mid-1943, however, due to a variety of factors, the army virtually collapsed. By August 1944, all Slovak combat units (many men had gone over to join the anti-Nazi movement which staged a major uprising), were disarmed and thereafter used as construction troops.

But, throughout the first part of the war, the Slovak Army was generally impressive. It participated in the invasion of Poland, taking back those territories occupied by the Poles in 1938 (which had been Poland's payoff for acquiescence to the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia). And the 1st and 2nd (with a mobile brigade each) participated in the opening of Barbarossa. In August 1941, the two infantry divisions, which due to their small size had mostly been used for security, were withdrawn and reorganized into the 10000-man "Mobile Division" (the tank battalion was equipped with the Czech LT vz 38, as might be expected) and the 6000-man Security Division. This latter unit served in the Ukraine, while the Mobile Division was virtually destroyed near Krasnodar covering the German retreat from the Caucasus after Stalingrad.

Even before the Germans had completely overrun Yugoslavia, Croatia declared itself independent on 10 April 1941—and promptly aligned herself with the Axis. By 1942, it had raised an army of six divisions, comprising some 46 battalions. There were two types of units: mountain rifle brigades (two regiments and two battalions of artillery) and rifle brigades. Various anti-partisan units were also created, called Ustaši battalions, which were later to be regularized according to discipline. In the war, the remnants of all these forces were to form one combined army, the Don—"Special" or the Croatian "Storm" Division.

The Bulgarian Army:

The Bulgarians were perhaps the most overt in pursuing their own interests, considering that they never were sovereign to the Turks or the Bulgarians, which owed its independence from the Turks to Russian intervention, was always pro-Russian in sympathy. They even had their own Czar; but also, somehow they always seemed to end up on the side fighting against their fellow Slavs. In 1940, for instance, Germany was the dominant force in the Balkans, and if Bulgaria was to achieve its territorial objectives (she had claims against Greece, Yugoslavia and Rumania), its leaders felt they had to align with Berlin.

---

**Minor Axis Powers:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>LG</th>
<th>ELR*</th>
<th>SW**</th>
<th>MMG</th>
<th>MMG</th>
<th>LT.</th>
<th>MTR</th>
<th>ATR</th>
<th>DC***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rumania</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* 1 for elite; 1 for 2nd Line
** 1 for elite; 1 for 2nd Line
*** assault engineer squad (or equivalent)
**** +20L ATR
they returned to Finland). The Finns had, by late 1941, attained all they wanted from the war—despite Hitler’s promises of turning over Leningrad and the entire Kola peninsula to them after Germany’s victory.

The long period of inactivity between late 1941 and the massive Russian offensive that opened on 9 June 1944 apparently had not helped Finnish morale. The army of 1944, although better equipped with artillery and AT guns, was not greatly different from that of 1940. Meanwhile, Soviet forces had much improved. The Finns were caught by surprise and, faced with overwhelming numbers, some reserve units even panicked. The T-34s of the armored division were no match for the 800+ T-34s and assault guns that spearheaded the Soviet drive. Despite this drawback, the Finns eventually stabilized the front, more or less along the 1940 frontier, helped by a German assault gun brigade and emergency supplies of some 9000 panzerfausts and 5000 panzerschreck. The Russians showed little interest in pushing further into Finland, knowing that the fierce resistance which had halted them would only grow in intensity as they penetrated the hinterland.

By the time the two nations agreed to a cease-fire, the Finns had lost some 65000 men killed and wounded in the “Continuation War”.

By terms of the agreement, German units were to be withdrawn. The Finns basically were content to leave the Germans alone, but a foolish German attempt to seize the naval base at Sursaari was vigorously repulsed. Meanwhile, the rather independent Finnish General Sillanpää, who was “escorting” the German 20th Mountain Corps to Norway, found the Germans were not moving fast enough; the result was a hard fight near the border town of Tornio on the Swedish frontier. With that, Finland’s role in the war came to an end, and she set about the task of rebuilding.

**SO THAT'S WHAT YOU'VE BEEN PLAYING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Advanced SL</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TP: Stalingrad</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Third Reich</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Diplomacy</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5th Panzer</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Red Barricades</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Squad Leader</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Panzer Leader</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Air Force</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Afrika Korps</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Russian Campaign</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Up Front</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>MBT</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Henschel '38</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>PanzerBlitz</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>B-17</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Magic Realm</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>VSP</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>War &amp; Peace</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>W&amp;K</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite the paucity of the input from our readership (due, no doubt, to the pace of publication of the periodical), the Valdai Hill Game Conference this time provided a handful of venerable favorites (AFRIKA KORPS, B-17, PANZERBLITZ, PANZER LEADER, WAR & PEACE) resting on the listing, and a couple of new “hits” (RED RAILROADS and MBT) also made their presence felt. TURNING POINT: STALINGRAD, which had already made a strong showing, jumped up in this informal “popularity poll” to first place in these pages. I suspect that it, and several other 1989/90 releases, will continue to compete with the “classics” for space on wargaming tables, and continue to appear here frequently.

**CONVENTION CALENDAR**

The **GENERAL** will list any gaming convention in this space free of charge on a space available basis provided that we are notified at least four months in advance of the convention date. Each listing must include the name, date, site, and contact address of the convention. Additional information of interest to our readers such as tournaments or events utilizing the Avalon Hill Game Company’s games is solicited and will be printed if made available.

The Avalon Hill Game Company does not necessarily attend or endorse these gatherings, nor do we guarantee that events using The Avalon Hill Game Company’s games will be held. Readers are urged to contact the listed sources for further information before making plans to attend.

**NOVEMBER 3-4**

**UMF-CON**, Farmington, Maine
Contact: Table Gaming Club, Student Center, University of Maine, 5 South Street, Farmington, ME 04938.

**DECEMBER 1**

**ASL FIREFIGHT ’90**, Denver, Colorado
Contact: Tom Sliwinski, 1330 W 84th Place, Arvada, CO 80005. (303) 423-5700.
Note: One-day, three-round ASL tournament billed as “The Hottest Day in December.”

**1991**

**JANUARY 19-20**

**PANDEMONIUM VIII**, Toronto, Ontario
Contact: D.A. Richards, Pandemonium VIII, 17B Wright Avenue, Toronto, ON, M3T 1Z2. (416) 597-1934.

**JANUARY 25-28**

**CANCON ’91**, Canberra, Australia
Contact: Wes Nicholson, CANCON, GPO Box 1016, Canberra City, ACT, 2601, Australia.
Note: One of the biggest conventions in the country, with numerous wargaming events (both boardgames and miniatures).

**FEBRUARY 15-17**

**GENGHIS CON XII**, Lakewood, Colorado
Contact: Denver Gamers Association, P.O. Box 440058, Aurora, CO 80044. (303) 680-7824.
Note: Events include VITP, ASL, KM and CIV.

**FEBRUARY 16-18**

**SUMMIT ’91**, Darmstadt, Germany
Contact: Pat Fenesssey, CMLR, APO NY 09175. (06151-314125).
Note: ARISTA-ranked play available. Events include competition in PL and SL. No entrance fee.

**APRIL 6-7**

**WINDS OF WAR ’91**, Greensboro, North Carolina
Contact: Raymond Woloszyn, 7162 Matlock Drive, Kernersville, NC 27284. (919) 996-5677.
Note: Third annual ASL tournament, with the theme “Barbarossa ’41”.

**MAY 25**

**CALIFORNIA UP FRONT STATE CHAMPIONSHIP**, Concord, California
Contact: Pat Cook, 355 Parkview Terrace #H-5, Vallejo, CA 94590. (707) 552-8538.

**JUNE 28-30**

’91 ASL EUROPE, Kaiserlautern, Germany
Contact: Make Offutt, Bldg. 1112, Apt. B, Vogelweihen 6750 Kaiserlautern, Germany. 0651-50823.
Note: While all competition will be ASL, open gaming of SL welcomed.
Eldarad
THE LOST CITY

"There was a time, a time of greatness, when the elders walked this land, tall with glory. The great marble towers of the city, held aloft by the dwellers' magics, reached huge white hands up to the embrace of Father Sky. This was the time of Eldarad in the flower of its youth."

—Teachings of an Immaril Tribal Shaman

Now, all that remains of the city builders is a vast, chaos infested ruin, surrounded by rich tombs. Multitudes have come here seeking hidden wealth. Some have succeeded, but most, the failures, settled within the ruin. Over time, these people began a rebuilding in Eldarad. It is now a working ruin, devoid of law and order, where the minions of chaos walk freely in the night, preying on the dregs of society.

Yet, still they come, the greedy and the innocent, seeking the tombs of the ancient builders, tombs rich in gold, and the magics of a race, long dead.

For all the risks, one good find can make the searcher rich beyond dreams of avarice. The ship leaves tonight for Eldarad. Will you be on it to seek your fortune, or to delve into secrets, old beyond imagination? Decide with care, for the dangers are legion, and the rewards, incredible.

GOOD LUCK, AND FAREWELL.

Eldarad contains:
• A 54 page book detailing the city and its dwellers.
• A 62 page book on the lands around the city, and several fully detailed adventures.
• A 32 page book of maps for Gamemaster use, and as player handouts.
• An 11 x 16 game aids card, full of important charts and tables from the text.
• An 11 x 16 full-color, painted map of the lands around Eldarad.
• A 17 x 22 full color, painted map of Eldarad.
• Two 8½ x 11 full-color maps of the Artisan's quarter and the Lost quarter.

Eldarad is now available for $16.95 from The Avalon Hill Game Company (4517 Harford Road, Baltimore, MD 21214). Please add $4.00 for shipping and handling (Canadian orders: $8.00; overseas orders: $12.00). Maryland residents please add 5% state sales tax.

You must own Deluxe Edition RuneQuest to fully use Eldarad.
The following games are ranked by their reader-generated overall Value rating. Further aspects of reader response to our titles are indicated by the ratings in other categories. By breaking down a game’s ratings into these individual categories, the gamer is able to detect the strengths and weaknesses of their favorite game. The RBG in the future.

**TURNING POINT: STALINGRAD**

**Battleship-Level, Area Movement Game of the Pivotal Front Battle**

**$25.00**

TP: STALINGRAD seems to be a study in contrasts, if the reader-generated ratings below are to be taken at face value. While granted with some of the best graphics ever (only a hand-full of titles have a better “Components” rating, and none approaches the “1.56” for “Map”), the game falls short of the average in terms of “Completeness of Rules” (3.56) and “Play Balance” (3.53). And yet... despite the reader's perception of Balance (many, I suspect, have not yet discovered all the nuances of polished play), the rating for “Excitement Level” was quite good. In sum total, the positive far outweigh the negative in the minds of our respondents; the final result is a “Vanguard” (2.10) was enough to place it in the sixth slot on our list of 72 titles.

**SIEGE OF JERUSALEM**

7.311/17.23 Can't make Judaea units leave a ground-level Heavy Infantry ZOC when routing/pointing?

A. No.

9.11 Do both the top and bottom units in a tower use the “Tower” row in the Missile Table as long as they're on a different elevation than the pushing poses of reserve activation?

A. Yes. No.

11.1 Can a catapult atop an armored tower fire over intervening units, can rams for it, and then swap one tower and one ram they claim it? to regain the armored tower?

A. Yes.

14.1.4 Can I play two “Box Type against a hex like “Double Team” equal to the number rolled?

A. Yes, applicable IPC effects can be combined.

18.5.1 & 19.5 Can the Roman player gain one armored tower from a construction die roll, substitute three replacement normal towers and/or units for it, and then swap one tower and one ram to regain the armored tower?

A. No. The substitution must be made before the roll.

18.6.11 Is the elevated hex mine-saturated around PPS7 part of David's City or the Lower City for purposes of reserve activation?

A. The Lower City.

**WARGAME RBG**

**READERS BUYER’S GUIDE**

The following games are ranked by their reader-generated overall Value rating. Further aspects of reader response to our titles are indicated by the ratings in other categories. By breaking down a game's ratings into these individual categories, the gamer is able to detect the strengths and weaknesses of their favorite game. The RBG in the future.

**MARCH MADNESS**

14.1.4 Can I play two “Box & One” defense cards in a half?

The “Box & One” defense may be played only on a half, if you have both cards in your hand.

14.1.4 & 14.2.6 Does the “Box & One” void “Clutch Free Throws”?

A. Yes.

14.2.9 Is the “Fast Break” die roll in addition to that Position’s regular score?

A. Yes, and the extra dice roll is modified by other offensive or defensive cards.

14.2.9 Is there a defensive foul on a “1” or “2” when the opposing position is “Fast Breaking” and not “Taking a Charge”?

A. Yes.

14.3.10 Is the extra scoring provided by cards like “Double Team” equal to the number rolled on the “1.16” for “Map”, the game falls short on average in terms of “Completeness of Rules” (3.56) and “Play Balance” (3.53)?

A. No.

14.4 Does the “Box Type” attack an enemy which retreats adjacent to it during the Melee Phase?

A. Yes.

15. Can an eligible unit attack an enemy which retreats adjacent to it during the Melee Phase?

A. Yes.

17. & 18.6.11 During the Judaea Rally Phase, is there a sequence for releasing Judaea reserves and rallying units on the map?

A. Yes. Execute all reserve releases first; then rally Judaea units.

17.3 Can both a unit’s leader and the commander affect a die roll?

A. Yes, applicable IPC effects can be combined.

17.3 & 18.4 Are garrisons affected by leaders?

A. No—only the commander can affect the rally die roll of a garrison unit.

18.4 Can Judaea garrison units move enemy units outside their garrison area as long as they do not advance after combat?

A. Yes.

18.51 & 19.5 Can the Roman player gain one armored tower from a construction die roll, substitute three replacement normal towers and/or units for it, and then swap one tower and one ram to regain the armored tower?

A. No. The substitution must be made before the roll.

18.611 Is the elevated hex mine-saturated around PPS7 part of David’s City or the Lower City for purposes of reserve activation?

A. The Lower City.

**MARCH MADNESS**

14.1.4 Can I play two “Box & One” defense cards in a half?

The “Box & One” defense may be played only on a half, if you have both cards in your hand.

14.1.4 & 14.2.6 Does the “Box & One” void “Clutch Free Throws”?

A. Yes.

14.2.9 Is the “Fast Break” die roll in addition to that Position’s regular score?

A. Yes, and the extra dice roll is modified by other offensive or defensive cards.

14.2.9 Is there a defensive foul on a “1” or “2” when the opposing position is “Fast Breaking” and not “Taking a Charge”?

A. Yes.

14.3.10 Is the extra scoring provided by cards like “Double Team” equal to the number rolled on the “1.16” for “Map”, the game falls short on average in terms of “Completeness of Rules” (3.56) and “Play Balance” (3.53)?

A. No.

14.4 Does the “Box Type” attack an enemy which retreats adjacent to it during the Melee Phase?

A. Yes.

15. Can an eligible unit attack an enemy which retreats adjacent to it during the Melee Phase?

A. Yes.

17. & 18.6.11 During the Judaea Rally Phase, is there a sequence for releasing Judaea reserves and rallying units on the map?

A. Yes. Execute all reserve releases first; then rally Judaea units.

17.3 Can both a unit’s leader and the commander affect a die roll?

A. Yes, applicable IPC effects can be combined.

17.3 & 18.4 Are garrisons affected by leaders?

A. No—only the commander can affect the rally die roll of a garrison unit.

18.4 Can Judaea garrison units move enemy units outside their garrison area as long as they do not advance after combat?

A. Yes.

18.51 & 19.5 Can the Roman player gain one armored tower from a construction die roll, substitute three replacement normal towers and/or units for it, and then swap one tower and one ram to regain the armored tower?

A. No. The substitution must be made before the roll.

18.611 Is the elevated hex mine-saturated around PPS7 part of David’s City or the Lower City for purposes of reserve activation?

A. The Lower City.

**MARCH MADNESS**

14.1.4 Can I play two “Box & One” defense cards in a half?

The “Box & One” defense may be played only on a half, if you have both cards in your hand.

14.1.4 & 14.2.6 Does the “Box & One” void “Clutch Free Throws”?

A. Yes.

14.2.9 Is the “Fast Break” die roll in addition to that Position’s regular score?

A. Yes, and the extra dice roll is modified by other offensive or defensive cards.

14.2.9 Is there a defensive foul on a “1” or “2” when the opposing position is “Fast Breaking” and not “Taking a Charge”?

A. Yes.

14.3.10 Is the extra scoring provided by cards like “Double Team” equal to the number rolled on the “1.16” for “Map”, the game falls short on average in terms of “Completeness of Rules” (3.56) and “Play Balance” (3.53)?

A. No.

14.4 Does the “Box Type” attack an enemy which retreats adjacent to it during the Melee Phase?

A. Yes.

15. Can an eligible unit attack an enemy which retreats adjacent to it during the Melee Phase?

A. Yes.

17. & 18.6.11 During the Judaea Rally Phase, is there a sequence for releasing Judaea reserves and rallying units on the map?

A. Yes. Execute all reserve releases first; then rally Judaea units.

17.3 Can both a unit’s leader and the commander affect a die roll?

A. Yes, applicable IPC effects can be combined.

17.3 & 18.4 Are garrisons affected by leaders?

A. No—only the commander can affect the rally die roll of a garrison unit.

18.4 Can Judaea garrison units move enemy units outside their garrison area as long as they do not advance after combat?

A. Yes.
Infiltrator's Report

Ken Peel, the Zine Register (a bi-annual) is now produced by Tom Nash (202 Settler's Road, St. Simon's Island, GA 31522). If interested in seeing what is available from your peers in the hobby, or if seeking to get involved in postal multi-player games, this is the place to start. Copies of the new Zine Register are available for $1.50 by writing Mr. Nash.

As some are aware, PBEM of our brand of games is growing by leaps and bounds. Indeed, on the CompuServe Information Service can now be found a PBMGAMES forum. Mr. Christopher Prysock has recently become the “Wargame Section Leader” for that effort, and leapt into the task with enthusiasm and many plans on expanding the CompuServe coverage. One of his hopes is to encourage more AREA- and AHKX-rated games being played and recorded in the forum. And he has uploaded (with permission) some material from The GENERAL to the forum. Finally, he is also serving as moderator for WSS/M PBEM games thereon—the first, a multi-player scenario of the Battle of Kamperduin (RN-3 from Vol. 23, No. 4). Game reports, as well as other news of interest to the players of WSS/M, can be found in his electronic “zine”, The Admiral’s Purse, in the CompuServe PBMGAMES forum (in the Log Entry portion of TARI). Readers who subscribe to CompuServe, or those simply wishing to learn more about Mr. Prysock’s efforts, are encouraged to contact him (3401 West 123rd Street, Alsip, IL 60486; or via the net: T7680,2556).

For those readers who like to make plans for the future, it should be noted that the latest issue of the GAMA newsletter (May 1986) reports that ORIGINS ‘91 will be held at the Baltimore Convention Center on 4-7 July next year. It might also be of interest to some that GAMA has decreed that the “National Convention” will no longer be administered by local organizations who bid for the privilege. Seems that GAMA has instead its own creation—GEMCO—to handle the task now, insuring a more “professional” approach to hosting the annual hobby get-together. The recent issue notes that the contract between GAMA and GEMCO was accepted unanimously by the GAMA Board of Directors. And, just to insure that there is no confusion as to the role of this new body, the following quote from the same issue should be indicative: “Because of the recent decision to contract GEMCO to run future ORIGINS, the function of the Site Selection Committee will change considerably, and may not be needed.” In fact, the Site Selection Committee was disbanded; that announcement came at ORIGINS in Atlanta. To learn more of GEMCO or next year’s ORIGINS, write GEMCO, P.O. Box 809, Randallstown, MD 21133.

While we’re on the subject, the GEMCO Newsletter has been created—a “new newsletter for all gamers interested in conventions and clubs”. Published by the Game Expo Management Company (i.e., GEMCO), the newsletter will highlight ORIGINS, but will also focus on all convention and club activity within the hobby. Those interested in subscribing may contact GEMCO (at the address above) for a sample copy.

Contest #150 proved a real dilemma for our entrants. With so many options available, we anticipated a fair proportion of mistaken solutions. Especially as we attempted to mislead all by listing only the Fresh Russian units on the entry form, although the contest text noted that the solution might entail more than one. But we hadn’t foreseen that only two readers would tumble to the designer’s solution—to withdraw and regroup the spent units in the Red October. To Phil Rennert (Hyattsville, MD) and Jared Roach (Waldron, WA), our congratulations and a merchandise certificate. A marginally acceptable choice would have been to attempt the solution for the Battle of Kamperduin (RN-3 from Vol. 23, No. 4). Game reports, as well as other news of interest to the players of WSS/M, can be found in his electronic “zine”, The Admiral’s Purse, in the CompuServe PBMGAMES forum (in the Log Entry portion of TARI). Readers who subscribe to CompuServe, or those simply wishing to learn more about Mr. Prysock’s efforts, are encouraged to contact him (3401 West 123rd Street, Alsip, IL 60486; or via the net: T7680,2556).

For Contest 151, we decided to try something a bit different—a challenge that, while relating to MBT, demanded in-depth knowledge of its rules, and was thus “accessible” to any reader. Sort of a “theoretical” challenge this time, with a “modern-era” flavor. Asked to identify silhouettes of modern AVFs, the correct response should have carried the following:

1: M73 1A1 "Chaparral" (USA-5A1)
2: ASU-85 Air Portable Assault Gun (USSR-6A)
3: FlakPZI "Gepard" AA Vehicle (FRG-6A)
4: Luchs-2 Recon Vehicle (FRG-4A)
5: Leopard 2 MBT (MBF-18B)
6: T-80A MBT (USSR-7A)
7: ZSU-23" Shilka" AA Vehicle (USSR-8A)
8: M1 Abrams MBT (USA-1A)
9: SA-9 "Gaskin" AA Vehicle (USSR-7A)

By the way, for those who may have wondered, the vehicle silhouettes were taken from the counters of TAC AIR (thus the reason all the NATO equipment faced right, and the Soviet left). If the entrant was clever enough to tumble to this fact, half his work was done for him.

Mr. Bill Anspach (2716 Parkway Circle, Sterling Heights, MI 48310) is an avid fan of our game BRITANNIA, to such an extent that he has been busy developing various “player’s aids” for the game. His latest project has been “Victory Point Records” for the three-, four- and five-player versions of the game. Each is a full-page, ruled chart showing where VP are accumulated by each person, along with spaces for noting points for “Breitwals” and “King”. Mr. Anspach crafted the forms using FORMTOOL, and prints them on a Hewlett Packard DeskJet printer. He is offering copies of these three forms (suitable for photocopying) to other fans of the game if they will but send him a SASE plus $.25 (postage stamp or coin).

The sixteenth issue of the Zine Register is now out. For those who may be unfamiliar with this publication, it is an attempt to list (in some sort of comprehensible form) as many of the hobby’s amateur periodicals as possible. Each entry carries subscription and content information along with a brief review. While many of these “zinies” are devoted to DIPLOMACY, there is a burgeoning number that are devoted to other games (for example, there are no fewer than a dozen dedicated solely to the play of railroad games—mostly 1830—by mail). For several years the project of
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WINNER OF THE CHARLES ROBERTS AWARD

“Best 20th Century Game”

AMBUSH ... The game that first introduced guts into solitaire wargaming! Players build squads, assign weapons, and set out on hair-raising missions through World War II France.

Contents: Rules booklet; paragraph booklet; two 16” x 22” mapsheets; 218 counters; 82 character/vehicle cards; 19 mission cartridges; one cartridge view sleeve; one squad record sheet pad; one player aid card; two decimal dice; one counter storage tray.


Three Modules—More Missions!

MOVE OUT! — MOVE OUT! is the first follow-on module for AMBUSH! The package contains four entirely new adventures, all of which can be played using the maps and playing pieces already in AMBUSH! Note that you must already own AMBUSH! in order to play MOVE OUT!

Contents: 60 new character/vehicle cards; 11 new mission cartridges; new paragraph/mission booklet.

PURPLE HEART — Another exciting AMBUSH! follow-on module adds new components to the original game to produce six astounding new missions. New maps and counters expand the scope of this award-winning solitaire system to introduce new challenges and dangers.

Contents: New paragraph/mission booklet; 60 new character/vehicle cards; 13 new mission cartridges; one new 16” x 22” mapsheet; two new 8” x 22” mapsheets; 108 new playing pieces.

SILVER STAR — Welcome to Italy! Now you can take your squad into the rugged Italian terrain with six new AMBUSH! missions. If you think your squad has had it tough before, just wait until you find yourself outside of Monte Cassino—with nowhere to run!

Contents: New paragraph/mission booklet; 70 new character/vehicle cards; 9 new mission cartridges; one new 16” x 22” mapsheet; two new 8” x 22” mapsheets; 108 new playing pieces.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Players</th>
<th>Ages</th>
<th>Complexity</th>
<th>Suggested Retail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30001</td>
<td>AMBUSH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 &amp; Up</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30007</td>
<td>MOVE OUT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 &amp; Up</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30010</td>
<td>PURPLE HEART</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 &amp; Up</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30021</td>
<td>SILVER STAR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 &amp; Up</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>$19.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 FOR THE PRICE OF 1...

Pick any 3 issues—pay only the single issue price of $4.00. If you want more—fine—pick out 3 more issues. In fact, select as many sets of 3 issues as you want! Then pay just $4 for each set of 3 issues. Offer expires December 31, 1990 or when supply runs out, whichever comes first. Select from these 25 great issues of past years; featured game is indicated under each...

---

The Avalon Hill Game Company
DIVISION OF MONARCH AVALON, INC.
4517 Harford Road ★ Baltimore, MD 21214

Check issues desired. Make check or money-order payable to The Avalon Hill Game Company. Enclose $4 for each set of 3 issues. BE SURE to add postage and handling: 10% USA; 20% Canada, Mexico; 30% foreign.

☐ Vol.14 No.5 ☐ Vol.17 No.4 ☐ Vol.18 No.5 ☐ Vol.19 No.6 ☐ Vol.20 No.1
☐ Vol.14 No.6 ☐ Vol.17 No.5 ☐ Vol.18 No.6 ☐ Vol.19 No.1 ☐ Vol.20 No.2
☐ Vol.15 No.4 ☐ Vol.18 No.7 ☐ Vol.19 No.2 ☐ Vol.19 No.7 ☐ Vol.20 No.3
☐ Vol.15 No.5 ☐ Vol.18 No.8 ☐ Vol.19 No.3 ☐ Vol.19 No.8 ☐ Vol.20 No.4
☐ Vol.16 No.1 ☐ Vol.19 No.4 ☐ Vol.20 No.5 ☐ Vol.20 No.6 ☐ Vol.20 No.7

NAME ____________________________
ADDRESS ____________________________
CITY, STATE, ZIP ____________________________

Please Indicate Method of Payment: ☐ Check ☐ Money Order ☐ Charge
☐ American Express ☐ MasterCard ☐ Visa

ACCOUNT NUMBER __________
Exp. Date __________ SIGNATURE __________

Offer good while supply lasts—expires December 31, 1990.
WHAT HAVE YOU BEEN PLAYING?

Top ten lists are always in vogue—be the subject books, television, shows, movies or even games. The public seems never to tire of seeing how its favorite way of spending their leisure time stacks up against the competition. So, to cater further to your whims (and to satisfy our own curiosity), this is The GENERAL's version of the gamer's top ten. From the responses to this form the editors produce the regular column “So That's What You've Been Playing” found elsewhere in this issue.

We aren't asking you to subjectively 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 fewer) games which you've spent the most time playing since you received your last issue of The GENERAL. With the collation of these responses, we can generate a consensus list of what's being played by our readership. This list can serve both as a guide for us (for coverage in these pages) and others (convention organizers spring instant to mind). The degree of correlation between this listing, the Best Sellers Lists, and the RBG should prove extremely interesting.

Feel free to list any game of any sort regardless of manufacturer. There will be, of course, a built-in bias to the survey since the readers all play Avalon Hill games to some extent; but it should be no more prevalent than similar projects undertaken by other periodicals with special-interest based circulation. The amount to which this bias affects the final outcome will be left to the individual's own evaluation.

1. 
2. 
3. 

OPponent Wanted

INSTRUCTIONS: Rate each category by placing a number ranging from 1 through 9 in the appropriate space to the right ("1" equating to excellent; "9", average; "0", terrible). EXCEPTION: Rate items 7a and 7b in 10-minute increments. (Example: If you've found it takes two and a half hours to play the basic scenario of HITLER'S WAR, enter "15" for category 7a.) For an explanation of the categories, refer to the AH Philosophy of Vol. 24, No. 5. Enter ratings only for those categories relevant to the game in question. Note that AH's ratings for Complexity, Year of Publication and Type (2P=two player; MP=multiplayer; SO=solo) have been provided for your information.

1. Overall Value
2. Components
3. Rulebook
4. Play Balance
5. Authenticity
6. Playability
7a. Game Length
7b. Shortest
8. Year of Publication
9. Type

CONTEST #152

As described on Page 12, the Judean player must complete his tenth turn, beginning with his Offensive Fire. The answer to this contest must be entered on this entry form (or a reasonable facsimile); attach additional sheets as necessary. The solution to Contest 152 will appear in Vol. 26, No. 5 and the list of winners in Vol. 26, No. 6.

Offensive Fire:

Movement:

Melee Combat:

DESTROYED ROMAN UNITS:

VP VALUE:

Issue as a whole (Rate from 1 to 10, with "1" equating excellent and "10" terrible). To be valid for consideration, your contest entry must also include the three best articles, in your view:

1. 
2. 
3. 

NAME ______________________________________ PHONE ____________________________

ADDRESS __________________________

CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP ____________
Great New Avalon Hill
T-SHIRT
...with award-winning
Tank-Eating Panther Design

"We sold almost as many of these
T-Shirts at the game convention
as we did games."  BOOTH PERSONNEL

Unaccustomed as we were to the unexpected,
unbelievable, and unabated demand by gamers at
the national game convention, we grossly
underestimated the underpinnings of a growing fad
item that left us unprepared to fulfill. Unruffled, our
mentally unendowed marketing director has
unleashed an undetermined amount of T-shirts for
resale to the general public. Not just underwear, our
new unostentatious T-shirt is an unequivocal
reflection of the quality for which our games have
been noted for 30 years.

We unhesitatingly offer them for the unconventional
price of $7.90 (plus postage & handling).

New Avalon Hill
CAP
...with embroidered
Avalon Hill name & logo

This luxurious black corduroy sport hat has the
Avalon Hill name and logo embroidered in red and
white. Adjustable head band. One size fits all!
Yours for only $12 (plus postage & handling).

AVOID PAYING POSTAGE—order BOTH the
T-Shirt and the Cap!

The Avalon Hill Game Company
DIVISION OF MONARCH AVALON, INC.
4517 Harford Road ★ Baltimore, MD 21214

Indicate number of T-shirts for each size:
_Small @ $7.90 _Medium @ $7.90 _Large @ $7.90 _X-Large @ $7.90
Add postage: 10% USA; 20% Canada, Mexico; 30% foreign. (No postage
when ordering T-Shirt & Cap.)

Indicate number of caps @ $12.00:_____

Please Indicate Method of Payment:
☐ Check ☐ Money Order ☐ Charge
☐ American Express ☐ MasterCard ☐ Visa DO NOT SEND CASH

ACCOUNT NUMBER
Exp. Date
SIGNATURE
NAME
STREET ADDRESS
CITY STATE ZIP

For quick credit card purchasing call TOLL FREE 1-800-999-3222
The GENERAL

Legends of the Lost Realm®

A Computer Fantasy Role-Playing Game Unlike Any Other!

Some features that prove why...

Enemy Abilities: While many enemies will simply attack, some will instead choose to steal a prized possession or two from you. Others will cast deadly spells, while still others leave you feeling quite ill (or worse). Some will change shape in the middle of a battle, and some will be quite immune to many of your charms (and weapons). Some will develop a split personality if attacked the wrong way, and still others can only be vanquished with a specific weapon. AND you won't have to go looking for the enemy—just wait around and they'll come to you. Some will track you by the amount of noise you make, others will literally sniff you out, and still others have the patience to simply hide and wait. Of course, only a few are above attacking from behind.

Martial Arts: Certain characters can be taught different martial arts techniques which will enable them to become especially effective fighters. Among these skills is the ability to summon "ki".

Thieving Skills: In addition to being able to pick locks and dismantle traps, thieves can climb overwalls, steal from the enemy, and attack from behind.

Weapon Making: The unique blade master character lives up to his name by being able to identify, sharpen, and even improve the quality of bladed weapons. A samurai can make arrows out of sticks and feathers and, if he has it, give them all a mithril tip.

Enchanting Items: The enchanter, another unique character, cannot only cast spells, but also place them into an item.

Spell and Item Usage: Forget about "combat-only-spells".

In LEGENDS OF THE LOST REALM the only limiting factor in using spells and items is your imagination. If you think using a certain spell or item might help you out of a situation—try it! The results could be quite interesting.

These features and more are found in LEGENDS OF THE LOST REALM as you plunge deep within the walls of a forgotten keep in pursuit of a long lost staff! LEGENDS OF THE LOST REALM is ready to play on your MACINTOSH computer with at least one 800k disk drive and one meg of memory.

microcomputer games DIVISION
The Avalon Hill Game Company
A MONARCH AVALON, INC. COMPANY
4517 Harford Road • Baltimore, MD 21214 • 301-254-9200

Legends of the Lost Realm is available for $39.95 wherever good software is sold... or call TOLL FREE 1-800-999-3222 to order.
Some early Questions & Answers for AvalonCon:

1. Who do I call to reserve my lodging?
   A. All reservations must be made directly with the Penn Harris Inn & Convention Center (717) 763-7117. However, reservations should not be placed prior to 1st June 1991 when the special $60 convention rate will be in effect. Current rates are $92 per day.

2. I had an AREA membership years ago but let it lapse. Should I apply for a new generic membership?
   A. If you have not moved in the interim or if you can recall and list your old AREA Membership number, you will not need another one and can register using that number. However, if you have moved in the interim you will need to pay the $1.00 change-of-address fee. Otherwise, you will have to apply for a new free generic membership number as part of your registration instead of getting a free specific game membership.

3. Will my $20 registration fee be refunded if I'm unable to attend?
   A. Requests for refunds will be honored if received by 1 August 1991.

4. Can a standby attend in someone else's place using his paid admission?
   A. No.

5. If a teammate is unable to attend, can a replacement be substituted?
   A. Yes. Replacements can be made with the substituted person's permission provided the replacement is reported to Tournament HQ before the substituted person's pre-registered tournament choice begins.

6. Can additional t-shirts be purchased for non-pre-registrants?
   A. Yes. A limited number of extra shirts will be available for purchase. However, it would be wise to reserve them on the Pre-Registration form to be sure that they are available in the correct size.

7. If a player arrives late, after the first round begins, can he get into later sessions?
   A. That will be up to the format and GameMaster of the individual tournament in question. In most cases, the answer would be "No". However, even if pre-registered, he would not be considered to have lost a game for rating purposes.

8. If a player is present at the start of a tournament, wins his first round, but later drops out without playing further rounds, is he considered to have lost a game for AREA purposes?
   A. No. AREA does not award points for forfeits. The opponent(s) affected would be given a bye in the later round.

9. What qualifications are needed to run for a position on the Advisory Panel?
   A. Only an interest in the furthering of the hobby and a willingness to volunteer time and effort to improve future AvalonCons. You can start by showing up at the AfterCon Action Seminar Saturday night to share your impressions and views of the convention with your fellow attendees. It is hoped that the nine members elected to the panel would remain active throughout the year in communicating with one another and others in their specific groups and interest areas to advance ideas and recruit GameMasters for future AvalonCons.
GAMA Members—Retail Division

As a member of GAMA (Game Manufacturers of America) we encourage readers to visit these GAMA member stores for their Avalon Hill and Victory game needs.

If your favorite store is not listed, it's only because they are not members. We suggest you encourage your retailer to join so we can include his name in a future GAMA listing.

Contact GAMA, 3304 Crater Lane, Plano, Texas 75074.

CANADA:
- Silver Snail Toronto
- The World House Corporation Toronto
- Sentry Box West Hobbies Vancouver
- Pendragon Games Winnipeg

MASSACHUSETTS:
- New England Comics Brockton
- The Spare Time Shop Marlboro

MAINE:
- Wizard of Comics Bangor

NEW YORK:
- Crazy Ego Hilton
- The Complete Strategist New York
- Adventure & Hobbies Rochester
- Collector's Comics Wanaque

 PENNSYLVANIA:
- Jenkintown Hobby Center Inc. Jenkintown
- M. Foner's G.O.E. New Cumberland

NEW JERSEY:
- Recon Co. Clifton

 VIRGINIA:
- The Standard Bearer, Inc Charlottesville
- Campaign Headquarters Norfolk
- S & S Services Staunton

NORTH CAROLINA:
- Here to Infinity Greensboro

 ARIZONA:
- Desert Hobbies Phoenix
- Reaming Panther Game Company Mesa
- Things for Thinkers Tucson

NEVADA:
- Eltenacon Enterprises Las Vegas
- Etnyre Inc, Wargame Division Reno
- Four Play Cambrin
- Hobbies of Reno Reno

CALIFORNIA:
- E.O. Enterprises Alta Loma
- Alpha Omega Games Ltd Bellflower
- The Zone Chatsworth
- All Star Games Diamond Bar
- Camelot Games Downey
- T Shirt Expressions Downey
- The War House Long Beach
- Something Unusual Los Angeles
- The Last Grenadier Northridge
- Adventurer's Guild Pomona
- Riverside Hobbies Sacramento
- Fantasia Games San Francisco
- Games People Play San Luis Obispo
- Games*Alot Santa Cruz

OREGON:
- Endgames, Inc Eugene

WASHINGTON:
- Eagles Games, Models & Sailings Bellingham
- Infinite Frontier Comics & Games Kennewick
- Book World Kent
- Lady Jayne's Comics & Books Tacoma
- O'Leary's Books Tacoma