

☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆
 The AVALON HILL

GENERAL

Publication Office: 4517 Harford Road, Baltimore, Maryland 21214

VOL. 6, NO. 6

MAR-APRIL 1970



\$1.00 PER ISSUE

Kriegspiel - Stock Market

FULL YEAR \$4.98

☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ **GENERAL**

The AVALON HILL **GENERAL**
... a losing venture published bi-monthly
pretty close to the first day of January,
March, May, July, September, and Novem-
ber.

The General is edited and published by
The Avalon Hill Company almost solely for
the cultural edification of the serious game
aficionado. It also helps sell our merchand-
ise, too.

Articles from subscribers are considered
for publication at the whim and fancy of
members of our erudite editorial staff and
company baseball team. To merit considera-
tion, articles must be typewritten double-
spaced and not exceed 1,000 words. Accompanying examples and diagrams must be
drawn in black or red ink. Payment for
accepted articles is made according to the
dictates of the voting subscribers.

A full-year subscription costs \$4.98 (over-
seas subscribers add \$6.00 to cover airmail.)
Back issues cost \$1.00 each: out-of-stock
issues are Vol. 1, No's. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6; Vol. 3,
No. 1; Vol. 4, No. 4.

Printing — oh... say 17,000 give or take
a few thousand.

To facilitate correspondence, we suggest
that all envelopes to Avalon Hill be marked
in the lower left-hand corner as follows:

Purchases of *The General*: Subscription
Dept.

Purchases of games, play-by-mail kits, and
game parts: Order Dept.

Questions concerning play: Research &
Design Dept.

Articles for publication: Editor-in-Chief.

Requests for Brochures: Advertising Dept.

Requests for Parts Lists: Parts Dept.

Letters to the Editor: Editor-in-Chief.

Miscellany: Marketing Dept.

Copyright 1969 The Avalon Hill Company,
Baltimore, Maryland 21214.

Avalon Hill Philosophy - Part 20

Game Designing — Playtesting

It's that time of the year again. The time when
Avalon Hill makes its annual pilgrimage to the
market place to unload its cache of new games.

It has been traditional for Avalon Hill, and
most other toy and hobby manufacturers, to gear
their new introductions to the Spring of the year.

1970 will be no different. They'll all follow
the same pattern of exposing their new products
at the annual toy and hobby trade exhibitions at
which time dealers will be placing orders for
shipments between now and August.

And every year, it's the same old advertising
and promotional malarkey... everything is always
"new, revolutionary, better than before"... the
endless stream of fancy platitudes always ac-
companying the unveiling of the new products.

For instance, here's what came out of the
Avalon Hill publicity grist mill in their Press
Releases on *The Stock Market Game*: "a sensa-
tional departure from the fantasy aspect which
characterizes other games based on the machina-
tions occurring everyday on Wall Street, Avalon
Hill's offering actually shows players HOW to
make a fortune in the stock market — and why
it's possible."

Here's another beauty, this one in their Press
Release on *Kriegspiel*: "Bursting upon the market
with the combined explosives of military savvy
and diplomatic maneuvering, *Kriegspiel* is Avalon
Hill's ultimate weapon in reaching a wider inter-
est group of war-gamers... truly an international
success d'estime."

Pretty fancy rhetoric, what???

It's one thing to make explicitive advertising
claims; another thing to back them up with facts.
With many manufacturers the people who write
these epitaphs often never see the products much
less test them. Often the advertising agency is a
separate entity in a separate city from the
manufacturer of the product they are paid to
eulogize.

Ad agencies usually receive a fee of 15% of the
ad budget. It is the rare manufacturer who
employs his own advertising experts mainly
because expert advertising people can do much
better for themselves working for an agency.
Thus a creative team for your product may
handle products of many other manufacturers as
well. In this light it is the rare agency that
displays the inclination or the time to get all
fired up over one company's products.

Fortunately for Avalon Hill this is not the
case. Recognizing the need for greater rapport
between advertising and designing, Avalon Hill
writes its own publicity, promotion, and advertis-
ing. These same people, however, also recognize
that such rapport can lead to a lessening objec-
tivity. That's the reason why Avalon Hill places
great emphasis on the Playtesting program as the
absolute final criteria in determining what they
should say in their promotional literature.

A great amount of time, effort and expense
goes into the consumer testing program. Naturally
this expense has to be built into the cost of
publishing the game, a cost which ultimately gets
passed on to you the consumer. But were it not
for an expensive playtest program, Avalon Hill

could not truthfully advertise the realism and
authenticity of its products.

We have learned by experience that a *consumer*
play test program is an absolute must. We
emphasize *consumer* because it is important to
differentiate between factory testing and con-
sumer testing. Factory testing which would in-
volve the game's designers is lacking in many
ways. In his very introspective article published
recently in the IFW Monthly, Scott Duncan hit
the nail on the head when he stated, "the
designer assumes that others who test the game
will have the same understanding of the game
that he has and this is simply impossible." What
Scott is saying is that the designer is so familiar
with the game by the time it reaches play test
stage that he can no longer be objective. Rules
which are duck soup to him will be ambiguous to
the novice; but unless the novice gets to test it
the designer will never realize this.

That's why we emphasize *consumer* testing.
Himself an amateur game designer, Scott has
encountered these pitfalls himself. "Testing by
persons not associated with the design is the best
form of playtesting... the most important factor
is disassociation from the game; impersonality in
the approach to the evaluation."

There are, of course, drawbacks to consumer
testing. Since the time element precludes out-
siders from testing the games at the factory, most
all consumer testing must be done "at home."
This presents some problems. A major problem
deals with approach to testing. Some simply sit
around and hash over the rules as to whether
they are good ones or not without really taking
the time to play the game, then reserving judge-
ment until later. To avoid this, it is necessary to
involve a large number of people in the testing
program. This is why Avalon Hill calls on
registered wargame clubs. In this manner a small
number of prototypes, which are expensive and
time-consuming to produce, can pass through a
maximum number of hands.

One of the many organizations called upon to
test prototypes was the IFW. Here's how a
typical session was recorded: "There were three
test members, two played while one kept notes.
The rules were read until fully understood and a
sample game played. The set-up time and observa-
tions on ways to cut this down were recorded
and then the game begun. Each turn a listing was
made of the number of units on the board and
eliminated as well as any other factors entering
play such as time to play an average turn. As we
went along we made on-the-spot comments which
were recorded by the third player. Later all
commentary was re-evaluated and corrected if we
had made any rash judgements early in the game
which proved to be wrong later on.

"As the evening progressed and the game
ended we recorded the total game play time and
began to analyze the data. For instance (as we
were doing the playtesting for LUFTWAFFE) we
studied the chance for easy, mid-range, and tough
bombing assignments and the point values
assigned to each..."

Space limitations preclude us from relating all

COVER STORY

Available April 1 -
Kriegspiel,
Stock Market

Now in various stages of delivery to retail
stores all over the country are Avalon Hill's two
new games: *Kriegspiel* and *The Stock Market*
Game. Subscribers will soon receive complete
descriptive literature on both titles in our annual
Spring mailing. Direct orders will be honored
starting April 1 — not before. However, most
stores will have these titles in stock during most
of March. If your favorite dealer does not have
them, make sure he knows of your displeasure.
Beginning April 1, direct shipments to customers
can be made @ \$9.98 for *The Stock Market*
Game and \$7.98 for *Kriegspiel*. Please add 75
cents if you wish special delivery.

that took place. It is sufficient to note that there were many bugs still floating around in the various design elements; so many that in the final analysis it was not possible to ready Luftwaffe in time for a 1970 introduction as previously planned.

Instead, Kriegspiel — tested earlier and found to be in excellent playtest shape — was substituted as the 1970 title. The Stock Market Game, as most of you will recall, has been on the design and development stage for several years. It was no surprise to many to see this game offered too.

This brings us to the question; "How do we know that what we said in our advertising is true?" The answer lies in the critique comments made by the Playtest groups, themselves.

Pen Orton whose Der Deutschland Wehrmacht club has 103 members in Eugene, Oregon, wrote about Kriegspiel... "the perfect game would be a game such as this one with only basic rules listed as mandatory and the rest of the rules optional letting players chose the rules they want to use. This way the game could be as playable or as realistic and complicated as players wanted it to be."

From the Philadelphia and Baltimore IFW groups monitored by Scott Duncan the concensus was... "overall, with suggested changes, Kriegspiel is a real winner in my book and I'd recommend it to anyone who plays games because it is so uniquely simple in mechanics yet complex in competitive value."

Raymond Myers, a press secretary in Senator Glen Beal's Washington office, monitored the Washington IFW testing. His group, while not overly enthused because Kriegspiel is not a historical setting, conceded that... "this game looks very playable and enjoyable and a good novice game."

Probably the most thoroughly controlled testing of all was conducted by Spartan International, whose founder Russell Powell noted... "Kriegspiel has several great aspects to it: a new board innovation long overdue; new methods of combat; simple to play not that realistic games aren't great but there is a need for this type too; you can play it in one setting; our whole club would purchase this game just because of the aforementioned facts."

With The Stock Market testing, an even greater number of playtesters were enlisted. The comments were spectacularly favorable. Otherwise, we would not have stopped at Prototype VII. Of all the eulogies we think that of Gary Gyax, Chicago IFW chapter, best summed it up when he said, "While the basic and advanced games are good, and the Solitaire game included for true market addicts is really quite enjoyable, their final optional rule is absolutely the greatest. All wargamers must have at least some sense of history — a feeling for the subject and times past. Well, A.H. has outdone itself with their "1929" variant game situation... some day when you have three or four friends around, sit down with them for a couple of hours of exciting play — the great stock market crash of 1929. See if you can end up leaping from a window, joining a bread line, or among the well-healed."

To turn a popular phrase, with comments like these who need an advertising department...

19(41)14???

By William B. Searight TM I (SS)

Masses of German infantry move forward, towards the enemies lines. Suddenly artillery and machine gun fire open up. The earth tremors, fountains of dirt erupt upwards as explosions flicker across the landscape. Small arms fire increases to a deafening crescendo. Then silence descends; the smoke drifts away to reveal the enemies lines breached, but at what cost! 7-10 corps shattered across a broad front.

Sounds like the tactics from W.W.I., but in reality this is the tactics most written about for the initial German-Stalingrad offensive. Masses of I-2 attacks against a doubled Russian defense. The time and place has changed, but not the tactics. Why seemingly the do or die?

The German Commander is mesmerized by the great number of units under his command. He generally tries to advance his whole front simultaneously with the hopes of opening large gaps through the Russians lines. Even with these losses during the summer the German still appears strong because of his short interior lines and because his forward units fill the double role of an offensive and defensive line.

As combat progresses, German armor remains intact, but his infantry gradually loses strength, forcing him to rely more and more on his Axis allies. It has been said the further into Russian territory the Wehrmacht advances, the more the Russian line is stretched. This is true, not only of the Russians, but the Germans as well. For as he advances his lines become longer, forcing the gradual flaking off of infantry units to maintain a decent defense line. Already weakened by his summer losses, the German must now create a separate offensive and defensive line. His attack points become more narrow and separated, especially during the winter when he is unable to switch units quickly to aid each others salients.

Coupled with the above the Leningrad Russian Army arrives, after mopping up the Finns, to reinforce the Northern Army near Riga-Minsk. This, I feel, is the key to a German success or defeat. You have noticed that during the summer, German advances normally, but with the arrival of the Finnish Russian Army, the German advance begins to slow down.

A revised Finnish defense could be effective against up to 7 Russian corps. Instead of a delaying slaughter, the Finns could inflict casualties from Russian soak-offs or an exchange. He may have to take a few more months, (critical months) than normal to eliminate the Finns or even be trapped into a static defense.

Finland

Russian: six 4-6's north of Lake Ladoga; one 5-7-6 at Leningrad.

Axis: 3-3-4, 2-2-6, 3-3-6, plus Finns, placed in stacks of 5 factors on A-34, C-33, D-33, I-31 with a 2-2-4 on F-33.

The Russian cannot safely attack the stacked units without a possibility of some loss, so he would normally over kill the lone unit.

Finns 2cd. turn: Remaining 4 stacks shift to B-34, D-33, F-32, I-31. The Russians can attack one stack at 4-1 odds which could eliminate them, but from past experience, when attacking the Russians at the same odds, how many times was he just pushed back 2 squares? Say the stack

at B-34 was successfully eliminated. The Finns next defense would be at D-30, F-31, I-31. Of course you may continue to lose a stack each attack, but the odds are such that you stand a better chance for an exchange or a D-back 2 rather than the old way of sacrificing two delaying units with no hope of surviving an attack. It has been written about stretching the Russian defense, etc., with maps covered in arrows, showing the victorious Wehrmacht advance to victory, but what they do not depict are all those stubborn Russian defenders blocking the way with no intention of letting any German Panzer Corps make tank tracks all over the Russian landscape.

The following are not step by step plans for a German victory, but they may help you win in planning your own campaign. For some excellent ideas, I recommend reading Richard A. Shagrins article (item 3-7) in Vol II, No. 5.

One thing you should remember is in a war of attrition the Russian will win, for the Soviets recuperative powers are three times as great as yours within a short time, so you must maintain as much strength as possible.

Many times an unnecessary exchange of uneven factors causes just that much more chipping away of the Wehrmacht's strength. Over a period of a game these lost factors could add up to much needed corps that you could have benefitted by the use of later on.

In frontal attacking 3 doubled stacks of units on an open plain, it might be to your advantage to attack one in each stack at I-2 in order to attack the other 3 units at better odds. This is more successful in the south where the Russian generally does not have a large reserve.

River attacks v.s. River city attacks, (frontal).

It is much easier to attack across a river against 2 stacked units rather than 2 units in a river city, even though their strengths may be equal. In a river attack a 3-I is brought against one unit with the other a I-2. This assures a 100% chance of breaching the river.

The same is not true with a river city such as Riga or Kiev. The same attack of 3-I and I-2 will generally leave you adjacent to the city. The Russian, in his turn, can just move back one square and still have the river between you and himself. If you must attack a river city, use the I-2, then the 3-I attack. If you reverse the order you cut your chances of advancing after combat from 40% to 20%, (P.B.M.)

Against a competent Russian Commander, Leningrad will be the hardest to capture. An excepted theory is to capture Moscow, (if you are able to) then strike towards Stalingrad and Leningrad. Leningrad is extremely hard to assault, so to save time and casualties; the best way is by isolation. This must be done by the end of your Sept. 1942 turn at the latest. The fastest isolation method would be a line running adjacent to the Luga, around the S.E. side of the Volkov and Svir, with units blocking the Onega Lake north passage. To prevent a last minute attack by the Russians to crack your isolation, you could have two lines, one behind the other, so if he did crack the first line, he would still be isolated.

If by chance all remaining Russian units were in the Leningrad encirclement, with Moscow and Stalingrad captured, you could extend your isolation date to April 1943.

William B. Searight TM I (SS)
U. S. Naval Torpedo Station
Keyport, Washington 98345

Chicken Yamamoto

This article is dedicated to those poor fellows who despite the reams of good advice printed in the General from the Neo-IJN still find themselves on the short end of the bloodletting.

by Lincoln Clark

Being stacked up against a superior fleet, you must agree that the United States was lucky to win the battle of Midway. Yet despite the numerically larger fleet that Japan committed to Midway proper, she simultaneously sent another powerful fleet to the Aleutians. Suppose Isoroku Yamamoto had a sudden attack of the heebie-geebies just after the sortie of the Combined Fleet from Japan in late May. The sudden increase in U.S. radio traffic indicates that maybe the enemy knows of his secret plan to seize Midway and destroy the American carrier fleet. Maybe he should recall the Aleutian squadrons already steaming toward Dutch Harbor, Attu, and Kisha. Suppose he does...

CL JINTSU enters with 0500 June 4 fleet
3-1 defensive value
2 hits to sink
2 points

This ship was flagship to Invasion Fleet, not ATAGO, but why argue?

1st night turn (0300) June 5--

CVE RYUJO 7T, 5F
2-1 defensive value 2 hits to sink 7 points

CVE JUNYO 7D, 8F
2-3 defensive value 3 hits to sink 7 points

CA NACHI
6-3 defensive value 4 hits to sink 3 points

CA MAYA, TAKAO
6-3 defensive value 3 hits to sink 3 points

for those who employ destroyers:

DesDiv 7 (3 DD's) plus 2 DD's (DesDiv?)

If appearing this turn, enter at A-1. Each turn delayed permits ships to appear in one area farther east or south, i.e. if ships enter at 0700 June 5, they can enter at C-1 or A-3.

0700 June 5--

BB HYUGA, ISE, FUSO, YAMASHIRO
13-7 defensive value 7 hits to sink 7 points

CL OI, KITAKAMI
4-1 defensive value 2 hits to sink 2 points

CL TAMA
3-1 defensive value 2 hits to sink 2 points

CL ABUKUMA, KISO
3-2 defensive value 3 hits to sink 3 points

DesDiv 20, 21, 24, 27 (4 DD's each) plus DesDiv 6 (3 DD's)

ABUKUMA and KISO are flagships for Attu and Kisha landing forces. More on their use later. Same entry as for other force.

This adds up to an impressive total of Japanese strength, but don't despair, USA'ers. A heavy wergild accompanies it. It is an historical fact that the Japanese did not know the location of the U.S. carrier fleet until 0728 June 4. The operational plan of the First Carrier Striking Force flatly discounted the possibility of contact

with the U.S. fleet before the capture of Midway. Why then, dear reader, is the U.S. player treated to the sight of the Japanese carrier fleet trucked around in a corner for at least twelve hours on June 3 and making no attempt whatever to close the range on its target? Ahh soo, inside inflamation. Don't count on it!

You are charged, Admiral Nagumo, with carrying out an air strike no later than 0700 June 4 on Midway Island. If you don't, hand ten points to the U.S. player and add five more to the kitty for every turn you fail to meet the deadline. All your ships will enter at their specified times; no earlier, no later. If you spot any U.S. surface vessels before 0700 June 4 inclusive, you are freed from your obligations. If you don't find him, he doesn't exist; he isn't within a thousand miles of you; you will follow the operational

plan: attack and seize Midway, then wait for the U.S. fleet to come to you.

The two northern landing forces each contain about 1200 men (for those who incorporate transports, ABUKUMA had one, KISO had two.) So even if ATAGO is sunk, an invasion can still be made. There are 5000 men in the ATAGO fleet. If only half that number land, six turns are required to capture Midway; if 1200, eight turns; if 6200, 3 turns; if 7400, 2 turns. If less than 5000 men land, one battleship must stay on Midway to lend artillery support.

This version, as do all, complicates things. It is an improvement, I think, over others I have seen because there are no new rules to learn, just more ships to incorporate. The very real fault in the Japanese plan, ignoring the U.S. fleet, is apparent. But even if the first four carriers are sunk, Japan can still lean on her "second platoon."

Snarl at —
Box 138
Gettysburg College
Gettysburg, Pa. 17325

The Intelligence Factor

by E. D. Henderson

Wargamers planning a campaign in Stalingrad or Blitzkrieg (or many other Avalon Hill games) immerse themselves in matters of G-1 (administration), G-3 (operations) and G-4 (logistics). Missing is G-2: intelligence.

To the casual observer G-2 may seem an added headache to the already rule-heavy business of wargaming. Red puts out his units, Blue puts out his units and the fight is on! Why make things more difficult?

An avid student of wargaming and military science can answer that immediately. In the real thing an enemy doesn't lay out cardboard squares so you can see and record his every unit. Security is clamped on everything so a very minimum of information becomes known about a combat formation prior to action. Since wargaming is the transfer of real combat to a game situation, combat intelligence and security remain part of the art of military science.

This is not to say that an intelligence rule should be thrown blanket-like on every wargame. As with many other complex rules it should be up to the individual player to decide if he wants to play with the added burden (and reality) of G-2 on his staff duties.

To institute a system of combat intelligence you first need combat security. This, at least, is easy to put into effect. At the start of a game every unit marker will be placed on the board upside down. From this point it's up to each side to find out what it can about the other.

There are many methods of gathering information about opposing military forces. Any or all can be employed in a game situation. Some of these are as follows:

1. Initial identification: before actual hostilities begin a certain amount of information would be known about the enemy. This would come from such sources as military attaches in embassies located in a future opponent's country. At the outset of a game ¼ of all units will be unmasked. These units ("known" units) should be spread out over the board evenly and not concentrated in one area.

2. Land reconnaissance: when any "unknown" unit advances to within two squares of an

opposing unit it becomes subject to reconnaissance patrol action. One patrol could be sent out from each unit and could identify only one opposing unit. If the patrol route runs through zones of control of a known unit the reconnaissance can be considered a failure.

3. Air reconnaissance: in games with air forces such units could fly reconnaissance missions within their normal range and identify one unit per flight. Such flights would be subject to interception and would be unable to conduct normal operations (i.e. bombing, escort) on the same turn.

4. Agents' reports: this would get the spys into the picture. Before each turn each player will pick a number and roll the die. If his number comes up he can uncover one unit of his opponent's forces.

There could be other intelligence methods not listed above. These are only the most obvious. In games with specialized units such as Rangers and paratroops a long range reconnaissance option could be put into effect. Other games which include a naval capacity could add observation of port and beach squares.

In addition to combat intelligence, there should be ways to thwart its activities. In the case of land reconnaissance this would be a picket line of known units whose zones of control screen an unmasked concentration. Air recon could be intercepted by a combat air patrol over another such concentration. The chances of rolling the right number on the die is its own safety valve.

A unit once identified would not have to remain known. If it could clear itself of all reconnaissance activities for one complete turn it would have the option of returning to the unknown category.

If all of this sounds like work, it is! It may even amount to another full hour to the playing time of a game. It has its drawbacks (such as the flipping and re-flipping of all those cardboard squares). It also has its virtues. Chief among them is that it adds another factor of reality to the business of wargaming: the intelligence factor.

The Pessimist's Blitzkrieg

By Charles B. Pelto

There can be no doubt that Blitzkrieg is one of the largest and most complex wargames to ever come out of Baltimore. For a fictionalization of the Second World War it cannot be beaten. It has every type of unit that was used in the actual conflict. If anything has been left out I'm sure that somewhere some other enthusiast is working on another variant to include the missing counters.

But, I'm not going to discuss strategy for a style of warfare that disappeared in a cloud of dust over Hiroshima. If you'd like to have a command position with the US Army for the next time they play "Over There," you should learn how to win a nuclear war. Preferably without losing your forces under a growth of mushrooms raised by the Other Side. To put it bluntly, this article will describe the addition of elements to Blitzkrieg that will bring it out of the 40's and into the 60's.

The greatest advances in weapons development that came out of WW II were the famous, or infamous depending on your point of view, V-2 rocket and the nuclear fission bomb. During the 50's the major powers put these two devices together and created an even greater engine of destruction, the Inter Continental Ballistic Missile (ICBM). By the early 60's both the US and the Soviet Union were deploying their own special brands of missile systems.

Blitzkrieg accounts for the first Bombs that appeared near the end of the war, but it stops there. To bring it up to date requires the addition of three counters to both sides. These represent three hard-stand missile sites. There are three underground silos per site, each housing one ICBM with a thermonuclear tip. Before the opening of hostilities the sites are placed within the home countries on clear terrain or city squares. Being hardstand sites they are made of concrete and steel and once placed cannot be shifted, transferred, or in any way moved from their squares until the game has ended.

During any turn either Blue or Red may launch ICBM attacks on any target within 45 squares of the site. These attacks are limited in their number and intensity by the number of missiles that exist at the beginning of the turn. The Standard Operational Procedure (SOP) for an ICBM attack is as follows:

Step 1: Player A, at the beginning of his turn, launches a group of ICBM's at a target within range of their site(s).

Step 2: Player A informs Player B of the number launched and their target.

Step 3: Player A continues with the rest of his land, sea, and air actions for the turn.

Step 4: At the end of his turn Player A returns to the launched missiles and rolls the die to determine the effect of the attack with the aid of the ICBM Results Table.

Friendly units may not be adjacent to squares that are going to be hit by incoming warheads. Subsequently, no ICBM attack may be made in conjunction with a land battle or air strike.

ICBM's are replaced at a rate of one complete site, three missiles, every defense turn. So at the opening of every third turn a player may have a

full complement. The missiles may be accumulated, but no more than nine can be launched in a turn.

The defense of a site is governed by the rules for the defense of grounded air units, with a few modifications. A site is constructed so well that in case of a nuclear attack only what is called a "direct hit" would put it out of action. Therefore, during either SAC nuclear or ICBM attacks only a roll of the die that indicates the defender eliminated will destroy one. Once a site is destroyed it cannot be replaced or rebuilt.

ICBM Results Table

No. Launched	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	M	M	M	M	N	N	N	N	N
2	M	M	M	N	N	N	N	N	D
3	M	M	M	N	N	N	N	D	D
4	M	N	N	N	N	D	D	D	D
5	M	N	N	N	N	D	D	D	D
6	N	N	D	D	D	D	D	D	D

Die Roll

M - Miss, no damage.

N - Near Miss, 1/2 factors eliminated, no movement from or through that square for one complete turn. 1/4, for mountain or city squares.

D - Direct Hit, all factors eliminated, no movement through that square for one complete turn.

If used against a vacant city to reduce supply;

M - no loss.

N - 1/2 supply capacity lost for three complete turns.

D - all supply capacity lost for three complete turns.

ABM Results Table

Odds	1-3	1-2	1-1	2-1	3-1	4-1	5-1	6-1
1	1	1	2	2	3	4	E	E
2	-	1	1	2	2	3	3	E
3	-	-	1	1	2	2	3	3
4	-	-	-	1	1	1	2	3
5	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	2
6	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1

Die Roll

Odds worse than 1-3 are not allowed. Odds greater than 6-1 are considered ICBM's eliminated. Odds are determined in favor of the ICBM's.

For PBM a last digit of 7 corresponds to a die roll of 1; 8, to 2; 9, to 3; and 0, to 4.

The only trouble with this variant is that Blue has the advantage of striking the first blow. He could conceivably eliminate whole stacks of BRKTH and airborne. To avoid this Red should not leave any of the important units in stacks that would draw the fire. SAC and other air units should be placed out of range at the opening of the game and kept well dispersed for the remainder of it. But the real problem is the protection of the sites from the devastating blow.

There are two things that can be done. One is to place the sites out of Blue's range. This, however, will prevent Red from reaching some

targets in Blue's territory. The second is to adopt a form of simultaneous movement.

Away to the north of us lies a network of radar installations called the DEW Line. In the event Ivan made a nuclear attack it would, theoretically, give our forces time to retaliate. It is logical to assume that any nuclear power that was opposed by another such power would have this warning system in its defenses. A warning of this nature would give Red time to launch its own missiles before those of Blue hit.

Adding this feature to the game would change to SOP of an ICBM attack to look like this:

Step 1: Player A launches his ICBM's and follows the SOP.

Step 2: Player B, once informed, has the option of retaliating at this point in the play. If he does he informs Player A of the number of missiles launched and their target(s).

Step 3: Player A finishes his turn.

Step 4: Player B has his turn. At the end of it, the missiles he launched earlier strike their target(s).

Some people will want to bring the game up to the present phase of the arms race. This can be easily arranged by adding six more counters to each side. These will stand for ABM sites that are similar in design, construction, and placement limitations to the ICBM sites. Their only difference is that the silos house Anti-Ballistic Missile missiles.

Like the FTR's the ABM's are to be used during the defense part of a turn. Any ICBM that passes within six squares of an ABM site can be intercepted by the missiles of that site. Saying "intercept", I'd like to do away with the idea that defense mechanisms can only function over the target areas. Our own Safeguard system is designed to knock down incoming warheads over Canada and the Pacific Ocean.

When it comes time to resolve ICBM attacks and the warheads will come within range of an ABM site the defense player will inform the attacker whether any counter-attack is being launched. If one is, the attacker, player with the ICBM's, will roll the die and consult the ABM Results Table to see how many bombs were destroyed. Any remaining warheads then continue on their way to the target. The spent ABM's are replaced during the offense part of the turn.

The defense of ABM installations is subject to the rules on the defense of ICBM sites.

Inaccuracy is the chief problem of the ABM. It is the best policy to group the sites so they provide mutual protection in the event the opponent tries to pick them off every third turn. Grouping will also allow for stronger counter-attacks on incoming warheads. A player may line his ABM's up along his border. This will furnish not only a strong concentration against ICBM's but also create a shield for lands behind. Or he could cluster all of his sites, ABM and ICBM, in one section of the country leaving the ICBM's in firing range of the opponent's sites and the ABM's just out of range to provide them with cover.

Whichever way it's worked the addition of the ICBM and the ABM to Blitzkrieg will give those who try them the chance to fight a war that could be just around the corner.

Charles B. Pelto
2040 E. Manor Dr.
Lincoln, Nebraska 68506

German Defense of Normandy Part IV

by Alan Augenbraun

In this, the final installment of the four-part series, Mr. Augenbraun winds up by explaining the German attempts and lures aimed at preventing total Allied breakout. Previous installments, starting with the Sept-Oct 1969 issue (Vol. 6, No. 3), highlighted Hitler's obsession with an "Atlantic Wall," followed by the "Eve of Liberation" during which the German High Command was unable to agree on overall strategy, and "The Battle for a Bridgehead" demonstrating the confusion that reigned in the German High Command.

PART IV: The Road to Paris

A scant two weeks after D-Day, the situation had turned critical. To avoid a total Allied breakout, the Germans attempted to remove the Allied pressure on Normandy by enticing them to invade Calais, held by the Fifteenth Army. The lure was the V-1 flying bomb, launched from the Calais area. Because the V-1 was inaccurate and unsuited to pinpoint targets, the main flying bomb assault was launched against London, which provided a larger target than the shipping and staging areas of southern England. Hitler reasoned that the terror bombings of civilian populations would provoke the Allies into an attempt to silence the V-1 launchings by invading Calais, but he miscalculated. The British, who had suffered so much in the early years of the war, were steadfast in their resolve to crush the enemy through Normandy; they would not turn aside from their primary objective.

On June 17, Hitler conferred with Rommel and von Rundstedt in Soissons. At first, the field marshals suggested that Hitler sue for peace with the Allies, but, when Der Führer stormily refused, they then urged him to withdraw the Seventh Army to the Seine, where it would form a defensive line in conjunction with the Fifteenth Army. Hitler demanded that the Seventh Army hold its ground. Rommel then proposed that the infantry divisions facing the British pull back, keeping panzer units west of Caen, but out of range of the Allied naval guns in the bay. When the Allies advanced against the retreating German infantry, the panzer units could thrust against the Allied flank. Hitler made no decision on this proposal; he left Soissons hurriedly when an errant V-1 dived to earth nearby.

On June 20, Hitler ordered an armored counterattack. Spearheaded by the 9th and 10th SS Divisions of the II SS Panzer Corps, and flanked on the left by the 2nd SS Panzer and on the right by the 1st SS and 2nd Panzer Divisions, the armored force would mass southeast of St.-Lo and then drive northeast through Bayeux to the coast, cutting the Allied bridgehead in two. But the armor could not easily withdraw from the

fighting line where they had been committed. Even when sufficient infantry forces did replace them, they had already suffered such heavy losses as to make a counteroffensive impossible. This planned attack too was aborted.

The British, meanwhile, sought to deter the German armored buildup preparatory to Hitler's planned counterattack by attempting once again to encircle Caen. The plan this time was to cut the German lines between Caen and Tilly with the British 7th Armored and 49th Infantry Divisions and by crossing the Odon and Orne Rivers southwest of Caen with the British 15th and 43rd Infantry. The British 11th Armored would sweep behind Caen, establishing itself on the Caen-Falaise road. This would pose a simultaneous threat to Caen and Paris and would draw German armor to the British sector, allowing the Americans to achieve a breakout.

As the British offensive began, led by the 15th Infantry, Rommel ordered all available armor thrown against them instead of assembling for the Bayeux offensive. When the British failed to follow-up on June 27 with another assault, Rommel, believing that the British were beaten for the time being, changed his orders and called for a continuation of the Bayeux preparations. It was then that the British moved in strength across the Odon, securing their west flank with their 50th Infantry. With Rommel and Rundstedt at a conference in Germany, Seventh Army's General Dollman had to deal with the critical British threat. Leaving an order for the 10th SS to attack immediately, Dollman collapsed and died; the strain had proved too much for him.

The understrength Germans were not prepared for an offensive, but, with no senior commander present at the front to countermand Dollman's last order, the directive had to be carried out. The Germans, after all, only followed orders. The attack resulted in great losses for the German armor, as did a second futile assault on July 1. The main punch of the Bayeux offensive was spent before it was launched. Further, the British offensive succeeded in drawing 7½ of eight German armored divisions to their sector and away from the Americans. Rommel could do little now to stop the eventual American breakthrough.

The German field commanders now prepared for a withdrawal, but Hitler decreed that their present positions were to be held at all costs. Further, he replaced von Rundstedt and Schwepenburg (Panzer Group West) with other men, bypassing the able Rommel. Hitler also assigned the Seventh Army to the American sector and Panzer Group West to the British sector.

Although the Americans were not hampered by German armor, it was becoming increasingly important for the British to take Caen so that the threat to Paris could be maintained; a stalemate in their sector would allow the Germans to concentrate armor against the Americans. Therefore, after securing their west flank with the British 43rd Infantry and a thrust against Carpiquet airfield by elements of the Canadian 3rd Infantry, the British, on July 8, launched a frontal attack against Caen with the Canadian 3rd and the British 59th and 3rd Infantry Divisions converging on the city.

The Americans, on the other hand, met stiff resistance in their attempt on St.-Lo, but their heavy artillery and air support slowly took an irreplaceable toll among the Germans and ultimately broke the back of their resistance. The Wehrmacht found itself powerless to stop the massive Allied ground assaults coupled with Allied air power. Caen fell on July 9; St.-Lo was encircled on July 18. The wide sweep through middle France was about to begin and would culminate in the encirclement of the Seventh Army in the Battle of the Falaise Gap. At any rate, the Battle of the Normandy Bridgehead was over; the road to Mantes and Paris was about to be opened.

It is clear that the Germans lost the crucial Battle of Normandy, not because of a simple Allied superiority, but because of the mismanagement of the German effort. It was difficult enough for the overextended Wehrmacht to hold France against the Allied might under the circumstances of 1943-1944. Strategic selection dictated a withdrawal to a defensive line close to Germany. Hitler, however, forbade this. Then, too, the lack of centralized command significantly contributed to the eventual German defeat in France. Because of the diffusion of command, intelligence data could not be acted upon promptly and effectively, and interservice operations were not coordinated. In effect, the German effort was a classic example of "too many cooks spoiling the broth."

The field commanders cannot be blamed. Rommel, von Rundstedt, and all the rest did the best they could under the circumstances. Rommel, for example, constantly pleaded with Hitler and OKW for reinforcements. He was turned down. Instead of reinforcements, Rommel was assured of Kriegsmarine and Luftwaffe support. Needless to say, Rommel never received this support. Of the 200 German bombers in Northwest Europe, only a handful were used, and most of their missions were mine-laying operations in the Bay of the Seine. Moreover, the one factor which might have swung the battle in favor of the Germans — the Fifteenth Army — was denied the Field Commanders by Hitler until July 25, the day the Americans broke-out from St.-Lo toward Avranches.

Clearly, then, the whole Normandy fiasco must be blamed on the mad Hitler. If not for his costly intervention in German military matters, the Allied invasion might have been repulsed and Europe, if not the world, would still be under the swastika today.

Alan Augenbraun
909 Eastern Parkway
Brooklyn, New York 11213

Plan of the Month

Defense Plan III

by J. R. Norman Zinkhan

I have grown tired of many people complaining about the gross imbalance of *D-Day*. What really made me mad was a comment in the General from one person to the effect that he played *D-Day* because he liked a sure win as the Allies.

The following is a defense line based on the Meuse River line and its extensions. I call it plan 3 because it is the third plan from my files on *D-Day*.

With a fairly ordinary starting line-up, this position can be completely in position by the eighth week and with virtually no losses to the Germans. While, unlike Plan Red in Vol 1, No. 1 of the General, it does not guarantee a German victory, it will at least force the Allies to work hard for a victory if indeed they do achieve it.

Statics	4-4-3's	5-5-4's	3-3-4's
(3) F13	G12	M15	N15
(3) G14	T18	N17	X16
(3) H15	V18	V17	
(3) I16	W19	X19	2-2-4
(3) J17	Y18	Q18	Z15
(1) K18	AA18		
(2) K17		6-6-4's	
(1) H14	5-5-3	N18	
(1) M17	O17	K15	
(1) P17		Q16	
(1) Q18	3-3-3		
(1) R18	L17	7-7-4's	
(1) S18		R16	
(1) T18	1-1-3	P15	
(1) U18	J16		
(1) W19		H.Q.'s	
		D10	
3-4-3's	4-4-4's	I15	
K18	I13	M13	
L17	T16	R14	
P17	S18	T14	
R18	M17		
U18			
Z18			

With the above set-up, the losses that can be afforded in the withdrawal operation are: 6 statics, 3 H.Q.'s and one of the units with a 4 defense factor. However, it would be preferable if you could hang on to the last one. If any of the statics or H.Q.'s can be saved, use them for additional airborne defense, especially in the Brussels sector after the reserve Panzers are fed into the line.

I will leave it to the reader to devise a primary defense set-up suitable for withdrawal into the secondary defense listed above. It's really not too difficult.

I would like to note a few things about the above defense that are essential to its operation:

- (1) Nearly all of the armour is in reserve.
- (2) The North Sea guard is available to draw on depending on the strength of the units the Allies still have in reserve in England. Of course it can be dispensed with once the second invasion has been made.
- (3) As long as Antwerp is held, the Allies

cannot cross the Rhine at the southern end of the German line due to supply restrictions.

(4) The best odds the Allies can get are 2-1, and that only in one place. The 3-1 available against the 5-5-4 in X19 is sort of a bait for the Allies to commit six armoured divisions to the south. The line is easily withdrawn to the rear, and the armoured divisions are then no more valuable than infantry to the Allies in that Area.

Now, getting back to the vital part of the front, between Antwerp and one square south of Sedan. This line must be held, as there is virtually no defensive positions behind it until the Sigfried line. The 6-6-4 in Brussels is difficult to get a 2-1 against, and the allies lose a lot of armour if they roll a six. For this reason, they could try bombing it. Note that the other two 6-6-4's in the rear can reach Brussels in one turn. If the Allies take the original out with bombers, just move another one in until they are all gone. This could cost the Allies anywhere between 3 and 5 of his SAC attacks. Once the Namur-Brussels position falls, retreat to Liege, while guarding the river positions on either side of it. By rights, unless the Allies are very extravagant, the Meuse river position and the islands position should be intact, because they are hard to break without severe losses to the Allies.

Counterattack where feasible, because this position is vital, as mentioned. I would suggest to not try too hard to hold Brussels, but fight to the

death for Liege, because it is easier to get good odds against without exposing anything to the Allies. When counterattacking, avoid stacking armour together. Note that the two 7-7-4's are in a position to counterattack almost anywhere along the vital sector of the front. Also note that this defense is proof against airborne attack.

One more thing. When the Liege position is broken, a 7-7-4 must be available to place in the city of Maastricht. It can then only be attacked at 2-1 maximum and serves to give the Allies one more position to break before they reach the final defenses of the Sigfried line and the Rhine.

I think anyone who plays *D-Day* must get the idea by now. Try to get the Allies to use up their air attacks, while not losing too much in the process, and try to hold the Meuse position as long as possible, especially in the sector mentioned. Once the Allies have used up 6 or 7 air attacks, and you have managed to hold them without disastrous losses, the reserves which start arriving the 16th week should give the Germans half a chance to win.

In the hands of an experienced *D-Day* campaigner, the above defense will present the Allies with a very rude surprise. He will have to use up a lot of air attacks which will not contribute to breaking the line, but only to wearing down the German reserves while the front line remains as formidable as ever. After the 16th week the German can start bringing back his key troops, and the Allies will lose whatever advantage they ever gained from their air attacks.

Norman Zinkhan
1634 Ashley Drive
Swift Current
Saskatchewan, Canada

Jutland Hidden Movement

By David C. Bell

A major problem of realism in wargames is that of visibility. It is usually totally unrealistic for opposing players to know the locations of enemy units or task forces prior to actual contact. Here I present a method of hidden movement for application to Jutland. It can be used face to face or by mail. It can be directly applied to other naval games without change, to 1914 with minor modification, and to other land games with major alterations.

First list the search squares in a column — this will take several sheets of paper. Then take two old books of about five hundred pages each. Black out the odd pages in the one and the even pages in the other and cut off the corners. You are now ready to assign non-recurring random code numbers to the search squares. Draw one number for each search square. It is useful to repeat this process several times so you have six or so different columns of code numbers corresponding to the search squares. Each player has a copy of this list.

After determining his move and writing down the code numbers of squares he has ships or reconnaissance craft in, a player puts his list away. He then either calls out the numbers or mails them to his opponent, who reciprocates. Code numbers are compared and any identical numbers refer to opposing units in the same square without also revealing locations of other units.

Since by mail one postcard per game hour is a lot of cards, 6 columns of code numbers could easily be used for 6, 12, 24, or 48 hours at a time without undue danger of *inadvertent* compromising of the code.

Because of the possibility presented by completely hidden movement, that nobody finds anybody anytime, an option is to list the initial, intermediate and final squares in a turn to increase the probability of sightings. Another suggestion is that task forces and reconnaissance be listed separately, the assumption being that meetings between reconnaissance craft — submarines, airships, destroyer flotillas, or detached single ships — would not affect the movements of fleets and can be ignored. Meetings, however, between reconnaissance craft and task forces are significant events calling for adjustments in projected fleet movements.

This method should be reliable for face to face games, since each player can be certain the other doesn't leaf through the list to find the square corresponding to a given code number. Exception: if your opponent can memorize 3000 number pairs, forget it. Use of this method is appropriate for friendly games by mail, but for grudge or challenge matches, the requisite trust cannot be expected.

David C. Bell
Peace Corps
Monrovia, Liberia

George Phillis, now a post-grad student at MIT, finishes what he began in the last issue. Part II concludes the masterpiece that was voted "most outstanding article" when published in its original form in Panzerfaust several years ago.

PART II by George Phillis

Forces: The German forces are distinctly inferior in number to those of the allies. The Germans have 165 attack factors and 212 defense factors in units of varying quality. The allies have 376 factors of armor, infantry, and paratroops. The bulk of the German troops are not of great value for a powerful offensive; while the German armor is qualitatively superior to that of the allies, the allies have a numerical superiority.

If all of the forces were on the board at the same time, the Germans would be outnumbered by about 7 to 4. However, the real disparity between the 2 forces is less than this:

1. The allies are able to stack pieces 2 high; the Germans are able to stack units 3 high. (Some players have suggested that the Allies should be able to stack 3 high once they are ashore. I haven't tried this, but am advised that the effect on play balance is strongly dependent, on German strategy. Strategy 2 is more affected than Strategy 1.) The use of rivers running between squares makes this effect more prominent than it would in other AH games; to get across a river one must destroy all of the pieces on the square and cross, rather than being able to sit on a river and dispute the doubling squares. (Compare, for example, the strength of a 7-10-4 and a 2-3-6 behind a river in Stalingrad, as opposed to the strength of a single 7-10-4.)

2. The Germans have a replacement rate of 5 factors per turn, starting the 16th turn. Counting this the German forces are essentially equal to those of the allies, if the game lasts long enough. The Allied replacements and strategic bombing rule of the '65 version tend to restore the original imbalance in forces.

3. The allied force is essentially homogeneous; there are no small units for soak-offs, no large units to spearhead attacks.

4. The German replacement rate is by attack factor. In the '61 version this effectively doubled the value of the German replacements; since the Germans tended to replace static divisions whenever possible. This option is not available to them in the '65 version.

General Considerations: The German commander is limited as to available strategies by the relative force strengths and by the terrain. His objective is simple — he must prevent the Allies from crossing the Rhine in force. There are 2 basic ways in which he can do this:

1. He may prevent the allies from landing, or, if they land, he may push them back into the sea.

2. He may delay, stop, or destroy the advancing allied armies, thus stopping them in front of the Rhine.

The viability of each of the 2 strategies depends on the rule interpretation in use. Rules favoring strategy 1 include "No landing or supply from disputed or unoccupied squares," soak-offs at 1-6 being legal, and paratroops may not be landed next to enemy troops regardless of terrain. The 17 square supply rule is not of great value, although it may prove helpful. The strategic bombing rule, other interpretations of the supply, soak-off, and paratroop rules militate against the

use of this strategy.

Strategy 2 is particularly assisted by the "units 1 square back from a river are doubled if attacked by units crossing the river rule." The "stack fights as a stack on defense" rule essentially forces the use of this strategy.

However, except for the '65 basic game, neither of the strategies is absolutely forced by the rules. Some rule combinations permit or strongly encourage the use of an almost pure strategy; in other cases the Germans get a better pay off if they adopt a mixed strategy; 1 for the North, strategy 2 for the rest. Given the German choice of Strategy this initial set-up, the Allies must choose a line of action. The allies should consider themselves to have a force superior to that of the Germans. They thus have the following objectives:

1. They must get ashore and stay there. In landing, their strength advantage is minimized by supply limitations and the landing rates, so this is not necessarily simple.

2. Having landed, they must advance rapidly to and across the Rhine, preferably achieving this before the weight of the German replacements can make itself felt.

3. Failing at No. 2 and while trying to achieve No. 2, the Allies must cause as many German casualties as possible while advancing as far as possible before their advance bogs down. This will put them in the best possible position for the resulting war of attrition.

The Allies may launch their invasions in any of the 7 beaches (effectively 6 in the '65 tournament game). Unless they launch their first invasions as a feint to confuse the Germans, the key factors in choosing a beach are the strength of the beach defenses and the value of the beach. The latter is measured by the distance of the beach to Germany, the number of units landable per turn, and the capturable supply.

In general, the Allies should attack a beach at which they have a reasonable chance of staying ashore. In games where 2 landings are available, the Allied commander may choose to make a risky first invasion. However, this should be considered carefully first. If the invasion fails, the Allies will not have a 3rd invasion to hang over the German's head as a threat; while if the Allied player is successful the first time, the German player must worry about the 2nd invasion. Furthermore, if the first invasion fails, the German defenses will be stronger the second time around.

1. The units in Germany at the start of the game will be on the beaches (or close to them), where they will immediately be available for landing.

2. Static divisions may be placed inland.

3. In general, the allied army will be short a few paratroop divisions.

4. If the German favors a Rhinewall defense, he will be able to move into it with a minimum of Allied interference. Further, he will have gained the equivalent of half-a-dozen turns of delaying action, and will be that much closer to the time when his replacements start arriving.

In most cases, I have found the choice of beach to be governed by tactical considerations. Almost always, there is some error in the German defenses — inadequate reserves, a gap in a paratroop screen, a possible 3-1 into a double position — which allows me to say "The Germans can't keep me from getting ashore here." I do not believe in intuition; before I decide that a weakness is real, I will play out 6 turns of the

The D-Day The

game while sitting on the German side of the board.

Terrain and Tactical Considerations — Let us look at each of the beaches in turn SOUTH FRANCE: This beach is unique in many ways. It is absolutely worthless in the '65 version of the game, because of the 17 square supply rule. It is the only beach where the landing rate on the 2nd turn exceeds the landing rate possible thereafter. It is essentially isolated from the rest of the German army. Units at South France can't reinforce other beaches; if the German player keeps most of his forces on or near the beaches (as most players apparently do) the only forces within 6 moves of the beach are those in the southernmost supply center. Even armor from any of the other areas will in general take several turns longer to arrive.

However, there are also problems for the allies. The Rhone Valley is for much of its length only 7 or 8 squares wide. The mountains reduce this to 2 or 3 squares wide at several points; these and other doubling positions are of great value to any German defense. The gap in the mountains west of Sete is quite narrow, but the allies will still find it profitable in most circumstances to send 8-10 divisions through the gap and around towards the Bay of Biscay.

Alternately, the Germans can put a delaying-blocking force in the Rhone Valley. A typical force is 4-6 infantry and 3-4 HQs. If nothing goes wrong, this force can hold until the Germans bring up additional forces. Paratroop envelopment coupled with frontal attack using 2-1s may rapidly destroy this force, at least if the Allied player is lucky. The Allied player will then have a chance to advance to and across the Rhine, dropping a cordon of paratroops in front of himself to block German delaying units. Defenses putting no forces in South France are frequently even more vulnerable to such a strategy. The Allies ought not to have a supply problem once they have taken Marseille. If the Germans can deny them this port, their buildup and advance will be greatly restricted.

BAY OF BISCAY: After the war was over, the Germans indicated that this was the area where they most feared an invasion. Many players do not even attempt to defend the beach, preferring to set up defenses along the Loire.

Any defense is handicapped by the length of front to be defended, the lack of doubled positions on or near the beach, and the distance to the beach from any German reserves. On the other hand, except for the 3 ports St. Nazaire, La Rochelle, and Bordeaux, there is very little supply available to the allies. If the ports can be kept in German hands, a German mobile force would have no great difficulty in crushing the Allies ashore. If the Allies are to succeed, they must capture 1 of these 3 ports early in the battle. Bordeaux is relative less useful because of all the B squares which can be disputed. The low Allied landing rate allows the Germans more turns to build up and counterattack when on other beaches.

BRITTANY: Brittany is also a difficult beach for the Germans to defend. However, the large ports are fortresses, so the German can hold them from front attack. If the German holds Avranches and Rennes, he has a good series of delaying

esis - Conclusion

positions to the South. The German who loses either of these cities in the first 3 turns (most frequently to paratroop attack against a lone HQ in Rennes) is in trouble, as the Allies can march due East cutting off and destroying the slower moving German pieces before they can be evacuated and/or force the German to lose an excessive number of delaying units. If the Allies have a reasonable Inland Port Rule they may try to take Nantes (especially by para operations against a careless German) and achieve the same effect.

NORMANDY: Normandy is superior to Brittany in landing rate; it is about equivalent in position. While the outer parts of the peninsula are quite difficult for the Germans to defend, Carentan, Caen and Bayeaux provide a solid line at the base of the peninsula. Many, including Avalon Hill, render Caen and Bayeaux 1-1 proof against sea invasion.

Even with strategic bombing, the Allies have distinct bombing problems in breakout from Normandy. The Germans have a pair of doubled lines in the Vire and Orne rivers; the key to breaking out, as in the real campaign, is in Avranches. The attrition tactic used in the real battle is not applicable. The Germans need far fewer units to hold the line than were necessary in the real battle; the CRT does not favor even odds attacks; unlike the real world there is no gap in the doubled line between the Vire and Argentan. The only problem the Allies don't have is supply — the Allies have more supply than space for units.

If the Germans defend the area seriously, the key to a successful invasion frequently lands in paratroop attack. If the Germans have not shielded themselves against it properly, paratroops can collapse river defenses or take key points before the Germans occupy them.

LE HAVRE: As Avalon Hill points out, the Germans should be able to defend the 3 northern beaches successfully. The fact that they don't is just another proof of human fallibility.

In general, Le Havre will not be useable as an invasion beach. While it is superior to Normandy in landing rate, and has entirely adequate supplies, it is tightly surrounded by doubled positions. If the Germans do not hold the beach with overwhelming strength, the keys to the beach are the cities of Dieppe, Rouen, and the Seine. The German paratroop shield must be perfect.

If the rules are favorable and they held Dieppe, the Germans may counterattack, blocking allied landing and destroying their supply outside of the fortress of Le Havre. If the Allies manage to take Dieppe or Rouen, their situation is greatly improved. The Germans are unable to counterattack effectively.

PAS DE CALAIS: More units can be landed per turn in Pas De Calais than on any other beach. As a result, many allied players are tempted to invade this area without considering the strength of the opposition. This opposition is greatly stiffened by the 3 fortresses Dunkirk, Boulogne, and Calais. Unless the German defense is deeply flawed or the Allied Commander owns the stock market, the Allies will be unable to take or even seriously attack the 2 fortresses. As a result the Allied invasion will be separated into 2 sections, each containing 1 city. The Germans will find that a proper defense of Dieppe is also a

vital part of any defense of Pas De Calais, while a proper defense of Ostend will also protect square K19 against Allied attack.

To stay ashore, the Allies must generally be able to take 1 of the cities or fortresses, or find a hole in the German paratroop proofing. Otherwise, unless the German reserves are completely inadequate, the German will be unable not to counterattack with devastating results.

If the Allies do get ashore, the German must contain them at once. If he fails at this, the Allies can go inland or head East, threatening either to cut off large numbers of German units or to head across the Rhine. In either case the German's position is not good, since he has relatively little force in the places to stop the Allies.

NORTH SEA: As mentioned earlier, there are 2 different mapboards. The lake greatly changes the situation. When it is there, it becomes extremely important for the Allies to take I16. Its absence complicates paratroop defenses. The North Sea is the most important beach for the Germans to defend and is also the beach most frequently improperly defended. If the German beach defenses collapse, the German is in extremely serious trouble. Players most usually avoid this problem by placing 3 high stacks of pieces on the coastline, with solid paratroop proofing in the rear. Players believing in subtlety may put their defenses in the city of Amsterdam & Rotterdam rather than 1 square forward on the beach. This can be dangerous.

The Allies will usually find it impossible to land in the North Sea. Airborne troops are frequently useful; many games are won when paratroops take small units on D10. The main Allied problem is supply — in the Northern half of the beach the Allies will have relatively little success unless they can capture Amsterdam or Rotterdam for use as port cities. The Allies will occasionally be able to capture sufficient supply by dropping paratroops into Germany.

Landings in the southern part of this beach are seldom rewarding. K18 has no supply capacity, and K19 is adjacent to Ostend, generally a strong point of the German defense. If the Allies can take Ostend their problems are solved. As long as there are Allied units in Ostend, the Allies can attack out from the adjacent squares without the danger that low odds attacks will leave fatal gaps in their line. If the Allies do take Ostend, the Germans are in the position of needing to attack doubled Allied units — usually impossible for them at 3-1 or higher — or alternately making either a low odds attack or withdrawing. Fortunately they have a good defensive set-up close to the city, unlike Dieppe.

THE FRENCH INTERIOR is somewhat suitable for German resistance, particularly if the defenders are doubled 1 square back from rivers. The Germans must take care against letting the faster Allied units cut them off. The German need not abandon the whole of the French interior automatically; from a good position the German can use the territory for a good deal of successful delaying. The German must avoid suffering excessive casualties; he must keep careful count to insure that his forces are not reduced below the level where they will be able to halt the Allies in front of the Rhine.

In many areas, e.g. the Loire East of Orleans, retrograde movements by the Germans are apt to produce heavy casualties. If the Allies are on the other side of a river from the Germans, then (in

the absence of mountains) there is no way for the Germans to retreat such that the Allies will not be adjacent to at least some of their units at the end of the complete turn. If there is no river there, the Germans are going to suffer.

THE MOUNTAINS IN FRONT OF THE RHINE form the key defense for the German who by error or by choice fails to stop the Allies on the beaches. The standard first line of defense is **Besancon-Vesoul-Meuse-Namur-Brussels-Antwerp-Olean**. The German should realize that it takes 3 squares (with no soak-offs) for the Allies to get a 3-1 on a doubled 7-7-4. The German can't, however, fall back more than 1 square every 4-5 turns along a front of any width if he is to win. The rivers around Brussels & Antwerp complicate the problems of making a line. Because of the lake, this area is much easier to handle in the '61 game than on the '65 board because of the lake.

Static positions are of particular value. In the '61 game, where they may be replaced, they provide more defense factors per replacement point than any other type of unit. In the '65 game, since they may not be replaced, they become of great value to the German army. A dead static unit is gone forever. For this reason I suggest that 3 high stacks of static divisions, particularly in German defenses behind the Meuse, area suitable target for strategic bombing. Also, while advancing through the main part of France, there are distinct advantages to killing statics over other types of units.

The reverse is true in the '61 game. There the most valuable targets, at least in the first 16 weeks of the campaign, are the 6-6-4 and 7-7-4 armored divisions. If the Germans lose a few of these, their Rhine defense will acquire definite weaknesses, especially to the South.

In attacking a Rhine defense, the Allies should give careful thought to the turns ahead. Attacks which can not be continued to the Rhine — which end up in dead ends — are of no value. It is fun to knock off the most exposed points of a German line, but such strategy won't take you to the Rhine unless the whole German line is pushed back that far.

Caution must be taken against German counterattacks. The German in some ways has a superior force. If there are a few Allied combat units available for counterattacks in a given portion of the line (particularly in the South near Vesoul & Besancon), the German may choose to emerge from his defenses, destroy several Allied units, and withdraw before the Allies can mount a decent counterattack. This is difficult because of the standardized, short distance which the Allies may move in a single turn.

Several tactics have been suggested for knocking out chunks of the German line. If nothing else is available, the Allies can always try a series of simultaneous low-odds attacks against some portion of the Allied line, especially into points where the Allied units will be doubled when and if the German counterattacks. Paratroops are frequently more effective as a threat than as actual units; the same is also true of strategic bombings and the 2nd invasion (rules permitting). If the German reserves are drawn in for an attack, gaps may appear in the German paratroop-proofing, especially in the games where HQs are not used.

ADDENDA — In some early versions of the rules, units could not retreat across rivers — if there was no other alternative, the units were considered destroyed.

While the trend this year at AH has been to simplify the combat tables, Captain Thurston leans in the other direction. Here's why. His primary duties involve battle damage analysis while assigned to the 25th NORAD Division at McChord AFB, Tacoma, Washington.

The outstanding weakness of the AH Combat Results Tables used for *Waterloo*, *Stalingrad*, *AK*, etc. is that the luck element is exaggerated beyond reason. Granted that real combat results depend to a great extent on luck and other elements which are not readily reproducible in a wargame, the extreme variations in possible results found in the AH CRT remain indefensible. How often, in a real-war situation, is a unit (with retreating room) completely destroyed or rendered wholly ineffective? How often does a unit under heavy attack (3-1 or 6-1) escape totally undamaged? How often can a real unit conduct a "soakoff" type attack at 1-3 to 1-6 odds and escape unscratched? The answer, of course, is almost never in the real world, but such absurd results are routine in the AH world. I recall one *Waterloo* game when I attacked with the same unit on five consecutive turns at 1-3 or 1-4 odds and still had the unit at full strength at the end! Aside from giving my opponent ulcers, this incident pointed up the real absurdity of the AH CRT. Such incidents are all too common in the older AH games and a run of luck will often prevail over a superior game strategy. Let's face it; there are people who have lucky streaks and unlucky streaks and many games are won and lost that way.

Recent AH games have reduced the overall luck element, but what about us old-timers who still enjoy the vintage games? (Those who say, "Buy the new ones," haven't seen my checkbook recently!) What we need is a new CRT that will reduce the luck element to its proper proportions. A 6-1 attack should always do some damage to the defender and a 1-6 should always hurt the attacker. In the same way, a 1-1 or 2-1 attack should do some damage to both sides. The degree of damage, of course, will depend somewhat on luck but the parameters will change along with the combat odds? no more all-or-nothing as the present CRT gives.

Figure 1 shows my proposed CRT for PBM use; Figure 2 is the FTF CRT. The mathematicians reading this can prove to themselves that both tables provide exactly the same expectation of losses for attacker and defender as the current AH CRT. The essential difference is that the great disparities in results have been smoothed out so that catastrophic differences in results are no longer possible. There is enough of a luck factor to retain interest, but not enough to let a few lucky picks or die rolls throw a whole game out of balance. (Note the 1-2, 1-1 and 2-1 tables in particular.)

To use the new CRT, multiply the decimal loss factor by the original strength of the attacker or defender and subtract the loss from the original strength to find the factors remaining; this will always be a figure such as 5.1, 4.0, 6.8, 11.7, etc. For example; a ".2 A Elim" on 26 CF will yield a loss of 5.2 factors, which gives a remaining strength of 20.8 CF; A ".8 D Elim" on 7 CF yields a loss of 5.6 factors which gives a remaining strength of 1.4 CF. For those who dislike mathematical manipulation, I have prepared a "Factors Remaining" Table, a portion of which is shown in Figure 3. To use this table, enter the left column with the original strength

Combat Results Equilibrated

by Capt. Richard D. Thurston

of the force and read the factors remaining directly from the line in the appropriate loss column. For example; a 0.3 D Elim on 13 CF will yield 9.1 remaining factors.

This table will usually produce a loss figure which cannot be dealt with by simply removing the appropriate number of units. There are two methods which can be used to come up with the correct figure:

a. Method No. 1 - (This method is mandatory for computing attacker results in PBM and is optional for all defenders and for FTF attackers.) Remove sufficient units to bring the surviving strength to or below the figure obtained from the "Factors Remaining Table" and credit the remainder to the player's replacement balance. Thus, in *Waterloo*, if a "6-4" and an "8-4" sustain a ".2 A (or D) Elim", thereby incurring a loss of 2.8 CF and a balance remaining of 11.2 CF; the "6-4" is removed from the board and 3.2 CF credited to the player's replacement balance.

b. Method No. 2 - (Optional for all except PBM Attackers). Replace some unit(s) with smaller units and credit the balance, if any, to the players replacement balance. Using the same example; the "6-4" could be replaced by a "2-4" and 1.2 CF credited to replacement balance, or the "8-4" could be replaced by a "5-4" and 0.2 CF credited to replacement balance. All such replacements must be taken from the "dead pile" and replacements must not have a higher degree of mobility than the original, (for example; a "2-4" could be used to replace a "4-6", but a "3-6" could not be used to replace a "5-4".) The mobility restriction does not apply to units reactivated at replacement centers on subsequent turns.

Factors represented by replacement balances may be brought onto the board at any time after posting and must be taken as units from the dead pile. Normal rules for replacement, placement and movement are followed unless a specific exception is noted below. Replacement factors may be accumulated.

Terrain factors are used for determining combat odds; they also affect the decimal factors used for subsequent calculations. If the game in question does not allow retreat though blocking terrain and a unit must be retreated in such a manner that it would normally be eliminated, the decimal losses are doubled, the unit removed from the board and any remaining factors credited to replacement balance. Thus if a "6-4" incurs a ".4 D Elim" and is surrounded or forced to retreat off board, it is removed, and the effective loss assessed at .8, thus causing the loss of 4.8 CF, with the remaining 1.2 CF credited to replacement balance. Method No. 2 cannot be used in this case.

In all cases, the unit which suffers the greater proportionate loss must retreat at least one square. If the available retreat squares are fully occupied, survivors are retreated two or more squares until a square capable of holding them is reached. Units may not be retreated onto or through blocking terrain if unblocked routes are available. If both sides suffer equal proportionate losses the attacker is retreated. Examples: in an attack, the attacker suffers ".3 A Elim" and defender ".6 D Elim," defender survivors must be retreated; if a ".5 A Elim, .3 D Elim" is rolled, attacker survivors must be retreated; if a ".2 A Elim, .2 D Elim" is rolled, attacker survivors are retreated. Movement after combat (if allowed) is not affected except that attacker may advance if otherwise entitled to do so when defender elects to use Method No. 1 for losses.

For *Stalingrad*, the methods shown above are used in all cases except for Russian attacks. In the case of decimal losses to Russian units on the attack, the *defense* factor is used for computation of forces remaining. After using the offensive factors count for determining combat odds and results, take the defense factors for the attacking units and enter the "Factors Remaining" table in the normal manner. For example, if a Russian "4-6-4" and a "5-7-4" suffer an ".3 A Elim," enter the "Factors Remaining" table with 13 thus getting a loss of 3.9 defense factors or 9.1 defense factors remaining. Using Method No. 1, remove the "4-6-4" and credit 2.1 defense factors to the Russian replacement balance. Additions to the replacement balances in *Stalingrad* are treated in the same way as those credited by the AH rules.

In *Waterloo*, Charleroi is designated as the French replacement center. If any part of Charleroi is occupied or within a PAA unit's zone of control, no French replacements may enter until the turn after it is cleared. PAA replacements may enter as Prussian units from Wavre or as Anglo-Allied units from Hal. If either Wavre or Hal is occupied by or in the zone of control of a French unit, no replacements may enter from that center. NOTE: After 7:00 AM, June 18 turn, PAA player may bring in up to 8 CF per turn on the road to Brussels from his replacement balance. These may be either Prussian or Anglo-Allied units, but such units may not move more than three squares (no road bonus allowed) in the turn in which they were brought on. Normal movement is allowed on following turns and there is no movement restriction on units brought in from Hal, Wavre or Charleroi. The units which are designated as units to be brought on at specified times may not be brought on early as replacements for units lost in combat; all units brought on under replacement balance rules must be those previously lost in combat.

In *Afrika Korps*, units brought in from replacement balances must enter from designated home bases. Replacement units may not go to sea on the turn in which they were brought on. British composite units may be broken down into their components under Method No. 2 if desired. Italian losses are calculated on the basis of *offensive* combat factors, even when on defense. The same method (in reverse) is used as for the Russian attackers in *Stalingrad*. British composite units may not be brought on ahead of schedule as replacements.

Capt. Richard D. Thurston
Route 2, Box 2643-5
Spanaway, Washington 98387

Is Simultaneous Movement Necessary?

by Steven List

Most of the ideas in this article have already appeared in some form in the *General*. I have tried to combine the best features of several play procedures after analyzing their defects. There will undoubtedly be criticism of these by other amateur game designers.

Reducing battlefield reality to a game board abstraction necessarily produces some departures from realism. The two most often cited for criticism is each player's unlimited knowledge of his opponent's moves, and movement by consecutive turns. While these are in the main independent, there are occasions when they can influence each other and to some extent compensate for the other's inherent lack of realism.

When the board gamer makes a move, he can be sure his opponent will eyeball him carefully, studying deployments and tactics. Just as surely, he knows his opponent is constrained to wait for his turn, perhaps watching a mistake in placement turn into a major defeat. Many proposals to correct the former defect would burden the game with complex rules for hidden movement and limited intelligence, while others would do the same for simultaneous movement. This often requires a third party or very involved procedures.

But there is, in the tactical realm, a functional relation between the two. This lies in the reaction time of a unit's command structure. Marshal Apopleksei is aware of the presence of Colonel-General Bock-Bier's Panzergruppe in his vicinity. He receives reports that the enemy has begun to move, and preliminary reports on the direction of the move. He must attempt to guess his opponent's purpose and destination, he must prepare his own countermove, confirm or revise his estimates on the basis of further reports, and begin moving troops in response. Transmissions of reports and orders, and the making of decisions take time during which he cannot move.

Thus in a game in which the turn length approximates the reaction time, the use of consecutive moves is the best workable procedure as far as movement is concerned. The defender is not allowed to react until he could have realistically done so anyway.

In a game in which the turn length is much greater than the reaction time, each player could be expected to gather a great deal of data on his opponent. While he is prevented from reacting as swiftly as he could in a real situation, he at least rightfully possesses enough data to avoid tactical surprises, though this can sometimes break down. I have won several games of STALINGRAD as the German by sending the Roumanian Cavalry Corps through a gap to the rail line near Dnepropetrovsk and from there to Stalingrad, capturing the city before the start of Russian replacements. Can you visualize 10,000 horse soldiers appearing at some rural train station, buying tickets on the 3:10 to Stalingrad, and seizing the city when they get there?

In view of this analysis, game designs can be tailored to take advantage of these circumstances so that while realistic play mechanisms are not employed, realistic results are obtained. This can be accomplished in existing games by dividing the turn into several phases — the number of phases

should be no more than the largest movement factor in the game, while each phase should be approximately as long as the reaction time. Players move consecutively by phases, resolving combat after each phase — all advances and retreats are one square. Time is checked off, reinforcements enter, etc., after the specified number of phases, similar to the dual time scales in JUTLAND or BISMARCK.

STALINGRAD has a turn length of one month, and movement factors of 4 and 6.

Delayed Return Move

By David Mattson

Has this ever happened to you? You're playing by mail with an opponent who suddenly without warning and without any apparent reason — unless it's the fact that he's losing and doesn't have the (take your choice)

- A. courage
- B. brains
- C. guts

to admit it — doesn't answer your letter(s). What would you do or what DO you do in a case like this? Do you:

- A. drive five hundred miles to battle him out — one way or the other
- B. Send him poison-pen letters
- C. notify the Missing Persons Bureau (PBM with the M placed first)
- D. calmly gather up all his units into a small pyramid and desecrate them
- E. cry?

For those of you who have — or fear having — this problem, I would like to propose the Delayed Return Move (DRM).

In actual combat a lull, standstill or period of apparent "non-activity" by the enemy may be interpreted by various people in government and civic life on the opposing side as

- 1) an enemy build up
- 2) a "digging-in" of the enemy in preparation for a long slow campaign or bad weather
- 3) a serious national disaster (decease, earthquakes, etc.)
- 4) a change in the upper ranks of the military or political structure
- 5) internal disorder
- 6) internal indesion over whether to sue for peace, surrender, or adopt a "wait and see what happens" policy.
- 7) a religious or national holiday.

Since a similar reason could be holding up on opponent's move, I propose that any time after three weeks from the date of a player's move, that player may write a postcard or letter to his opponent asking him to move within the week or be subject to the DRM, Delayed Return Move. This move entitles 1) the player who last moved to move again one week after his warning letter's postmark and in no less than four weeks from his last move's stock market date; 2) to resolve the battle(s) from the last turn and; 3) after eliminating the dead units according to his newspaper for

Reaction time was, however, on the order of a day or less. Obviously the procedure breaks down in cases like this, and we must then depend on the compensation of unlimited intelligence aiding the player in avoiding sticky situations brought about the excessive delay in reaction due to the use of consecutive moves. As I previously noted, a lack of vigilance can lead to a disastrous absurdity due to this and other defects in the design.

Apt. 3, 554 Main St.,
Beacon, N.Y. 12508.

the stock date listed and; 4) retreating enemy units as he (the attacker) sees fit (advantageously or not); 5) may move, set up battles and write out another set or orders with new stocks and a new stock date. These five points will hereafter be referred to as the DRM.

While one of the joys of Avalon Hill play by mail wargaming is being able to move at your own convenience and spend hours, if necessary, studying the best moves, it isn't fair to game opponents to keep a move too long. Surely a month should be long enough for any player to decide and write up a move. Even if a player moves every two weeks and receives his response in two weeks, Gettysburg could be player for four years by cautious players! Have no fear AH fans, few Gettysburg games need take more than a year if each player makes his move every other week and one player at least is aggressive.

If a good opponent *really* gets so busy, sick, etc. during a four week period he may ask and expect to receive a week's extension. However, should a DRM take place after the fourth or fifth week all is not lost as the defender will continue to "stockpile" reinforcements and replacements. The attacker also has all the benefits of his normal turn for that hour, day or month.

The possibility exists, especially in the "line-defense" games (Stalingrad, 1914, Anzio, etc.) for a good defending player against an average attacking player who doesn't get the best stock results to just sit back and build up a counter attack while their attacker wears down his units. He might even win the war! Acknowledged superior players or extremely cocky or fanatical players could use the DRM as an excellent handicap by simply telling the "inferior" player he may have a DRM move for one (or two!) turn(s)! The less experienced player would then move, record all battles and movement, list stocks, etc. and send his normal move to his antagonist BUT without waiting for a reply would resolve all according to his own newspaper of the date selected and move *again*, bring on fresh troops, record the battles, etc. as in a normal move for that time period and then send this DRM move to the (over?) confident player.

If you do run into the player who decides not to move or answer because he sees or suspects

the handwriting on the wall, he may now be soundly defeated by an attacker who will still be able to have the joy of intellectual movement of units into the best combat positions for the earliest defeat and not feel that he's wasted months on a game with no end. He cannot throw caution to the winds however, since he will still, once a month have to send his opponent a warning post card and his moves while the defender, if he bothers to follow these needling notes may one day be goaled into attempting a counter attack with all his accumulated replacements and reserves — what a surprise for the attacker who has blissfully been marching along on his third or fourth DRM and hasn't yet achieved a decisive victory!

Military might seldom come to a screeching halt because of a prolonged hush across the trenches and neither should wargamers who strive for start to finish semi-realistic war games.

DRM assures that a game can be satisfactorily finished by the victor, (no more unofficial quitting nor non committed surrenders from the person who feels he's loosing and would rather not face the responsibility of moving into the deciding turn.)

DRM develops a challenging and interesting handicap for the gamer who is introducing a newcomer to the wonderful world of AH gaming.

DRM gives the egotist and fanatic a justifiable reason for being what they are — IF they win. (I can hear it now, "Hey, put your DRM up or shut up!")

DRM gives the genuinely delayed gamer a fair chance to honestly not delay the game yet leaves him with a poor to good chance of recovering or winning, depending on the game and the situation at the time of DRM.

Since cronic losers and poor sports would never agree to accepting the Delayed Return Move, I propose at this time to establish it as a "lay-lay" (law of a layman — not an AH rule) which must be enforced by all who wish to practice the DRM. Who knows, general agreement by *General* readers might even get AH to adopt it as an official rule in their PBM kits!

Question Box

AFRIKA KORPS

Q. Do the Germans roll for supplies on the first April turn?

A. No. They do not control their home base.

Q. Do the British get a second supply unit on their first April turn?

A. Yes. At Tobruck.

Q. Can an automatic victory attack be made on a combat unit in order to get to and capture a supply unit which will then sustain THAT automatic victory?

A. Yes.

1914

Q. Where are units returning from the Eastern Front placed?

A. At Coln.

STALINGRAD

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

A. At least 14.

Official Avalon Hill Game Clubs...

The clubs listed below supplement the initial listing made in the Jan-Feb 1968 issue. Due to space limitations, we have not repeated any prior listings although many have forwarded us updated information. The purpose of this listing is simply to provide basic information to those readers looking for new clubs.

CLUB	PRESIDENT	MEMBERSHIP
Waffen SS 3249 Ridgely Drive Birmingham, Alabama	Eric Ackerman	4
West German 1st Division Box 38, Pasyon, Arizona	Carl Weiss	10
Civil War Society 5524 Illinois Court Concord, Calif. 94521	Bill Dobbins	2
Foundation 536 Jennings Avenue Vallejo, Calif.	Mike Harmon	9
Fleet Air Arm 4359 Camello Road Woodland Hills, Calif. 91364	J. Kuhns	6
Swiss Guards N.C.H.S., South Ave. New Canaan, Conn. 06840	Robert G. Moseley	8
The Military Industrial Complex 1198 Chapel Street New Haven, Conn. 06510	Edward T. Veal	18
Special Service Forces 40 Coe Street Winsted, Conn. 06098	Doug Zimmerman	8
1st British Wargamers 49 Newminster Road Morden, Surrey, England	R. Rowley	3
International Security Force 749 S. 10th Avenue LaGrange, Illinois	Thomas E. Graczyk	5
Baltimore's Organized Wargamers 8201 Bellona Avenue Towson, Md.	Clay Dulaney	4
Kriegkunstklub 7231 Marth Road Bloomington, Indiana 55431	Dan Christianson	20
Grand Alliance Wargaming Assn. 305 45 Avenue, South St. Cloud, Minnesota 56301	Tom St. Onge	11
The Samarai 1610 So. 7th Street Fargo, N. Dakota 58102	Niell Goltz	15
Hopeman Hanibals Box 342, Grove City College Grove City, Penna. 16127	Ray Woloszyn	7
742nd Tabk Battalion 3804 Quill St., El Paso, Texas 79904	Robert Olinski	4
Springfield Tactical Army Command 6813 Highland Street Springfield, Virginia	Ronald Block	10

Reader Book Service

The jacket of *ADVANCED WAR GAMES*, newest of four titles on the subject by Donald F. Featherstone, notes that "As a means of military training, war games have long ago proved their worth, but it is as a form of skillful relaxation that the subject is considered in this book."

Among the four books, every phase of war gaming is covered in detail and most comprehensively.

All four titles are now available to readers of

THE GENERAL through an arrangement with the U.S. distributor,

ADVANCED WAR GAMES — \$11.00
WAR GAMES — \$8.00
NAVAL WAR GAMES — \$8.00
AIR WAR GAMES — \$8.00

Send your order with checks or money orders payable to The Avalon Hill Company. Your order will be processed promptly through our Reader Book Service program.

Club Registration

All Avalon Hill clubs are urged to register officially with The General. Those submitting the following form will be listed in the next issue.

Club Name _____

Mailing Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Name of Newsletter or Magazine (if any) _____

Total Membership _____

President's Signature _____

(Check One:)

This is a first-time registration.

This is an address change, only.

This Issue's Best???

Don't forget to vote on what you consider are the three best articles in this issue . . . record your selections where provided on the Contest Entry Blank below.

Subscriber Discount

The coupon below is for the benefit of the full-year subscriber. As soon as you have accumulated 4 such coupons, you are entitled to a \$1.00 discount applied to the purchase of any Avalon Hill merchandise; including games, play-by-mail kits, parts, and copies of The General. Each coupon is worth 25 cents. However, to be valid your order must be accompanied by a minimum of 4 coupons (\$1.00's worth) per order. Of course, you may send along any number above the 4 minimum. No photostats please . . .

GOOD TOWARD THE PURCHASE OF ALL AVALON HILL PRODUCTS

25¢ 25¢

SAVE THIS COUPON

GOOD TOWARD THE PURCHASE OF ALL AVALON HILL PRODUCTS

MAR-APRIL 1970

OPPONENTS WANTED ADVERTISEMENT

Please print or type your advertisement on the spaces provided below, maximum (including your name and address) 35 words per ad.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31	32	33	34	35 WORDS

All ads are inserted as a free service to full-year subscribers. Only one ad per subscriber per issue is allowed. Ads will not be repeated from issue to issue, however, subscribers may re-submit the same ad, or new ads, for each succeeding issue. Ads received after the 15th of the month preceding publication will appear in the following issue. No ads will be accepted unless printed on this form.

Contest No. 36

Here is YOUR opportunity to help decide who's who and what's what in wargaming. In cooperation with major wargaming organizations and publications also running this survey, The General is providing you this chance to make your opinions known. Your answers will be compared with all those taking part and the overall results will be printed in a future issue.

As an incentive to complete the survey, all entrants will be eligible for a "grand drawing" on April 15, 1970 in which ten names will be drawn at

random. These winners will receive a \$6.00 gift certificate good towards the purchase of any Avalon Hill product.

All entries must be postmarked no later than April 13, 1970. Entrants must also list what they feel are the three best articles of this issue. This selection has no bearing on the contest results but entries not bearing this information will be voided. Those who do not wish to mutilate their magazine may submit photostats - only one entry to a contestant.

WARGAMER'S WARGAMING POLL

- Over the past five years what individual has done the most to further wargaming? _____
- In 1969 what individual wargamer did the most towards furthering our hobby? _____
- There are three broad categories of wargaming listed below. Name your choices for the best known figures in each category (in order of renown):

Avalon Hill _____, Diplomacy _____, Miniatures _____.

- Which wargaming organization or club is the best in your opinion? _____
- Name in order the three best wargaming magazines: _____, _____, _____
- Who are the three best writers on wargaming subjects? _____, _____, _____
- Which is the best single wargame? _____
- Check the combination of games played that best applies to you:

<input type="checkbox"/> Avalon Hill only	<input type="checkbox"/> AH & Miniatures
<input type="checkbox"/> Diplomacy only	<input type="checkbox"/> Diplomacy & Miniatures
<input type="checkbox"/> Miniatures only	<input type="checkbox"/> All three categories
<input type="checkbox"/> AH & Diplomacy	
- In reading I prefer (number in order of preference 1-8):

<input type="checkbox"/> Battle plans	<input type="checkbox"/> Tactical articles	<input type="checkbox"/> Historical accounts	<input type="checkbox"/> Technical data
<input type="checkbox"/> Humor	<input type="checkbox"/> Variants	<input type="checkbox"/> New rules	<input type="checkbox"/> (specify other) _____

Headlines of 3 Best Articles:

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____

Letters — Yes, We Get Letters

Dear Sir:

I feel it is about time someone stuck up for Guadalcanal. In letters of previous issues readers have attacked some of its rules and physical quality.

Road movement? With movement factors no lower than 10, any road at all should at least triple the speed of units — the equivalent of nearly travelling its whole length. Why go through the formalities, a la Bulge?

Experience is all that is needed to remedy the Casualty Reduction Blues. All players should have at least enough memory to necessitate consulting the pad only once per unit per turn. Considering the relatively low number of units on the board at one time, and the speed at which this can be done after a little practice, how much of a price is this for exciting competition?

The troop counters look all right to me. All is really required is that they be neat, or at least legible. And who needs a bigger board? Every game I have played has had all the action concentrate around Henderson Field. Nor has the artwork ever sent me into convulsions. The ridges are drawn the same way as Waterloo, and have to be placed accurately, not in the symmetrical patterns most pleasing to the eye. Having seen the color conglomeration on Anzio's board, I don't see how more colors would benefit its appearance either.

My only criticism is that the luck factor is high. This in no way hinders the playability of the game, or its uniqueness, making it worth every cent of its price.

Gordon Neufeld
2548 Chicoutimi Dr., N.W.
Calgary 44, Alberta

Dear Mr. Shaw:

I've read your comments in the Avalon Hill philosophy — Part 17, dealing with Guadalcanal. I don't agree with your analysis of the cause of its unpopularity. I believe that its unpopularity is in the mechanics of the game.

Simply stated, the game moves too slowly for the following reasons; (1) the need for constant referral to the step reduction pad, (2) searching for the range of artillery and (3) keeping track of the hidden movement pieces. The first two problems can be resolved by (1) a complete set of counters to replace the reductive pads so that the strength of every unit on the board is known by looking at the board only and (2) the rotation of range on the artillery units. These two changes really speed up the game and make it more enjoyable. A side benefit would be that the opponent no longer feels that the game is stacked against them when they miss a units reduction on the pad.

The third problem is not so easy. I think it can be solved by printing a sheet showing all squares as was done for Jutland. This could be done via pad or by using a plasticized sheet and either a felt or china marker. I feel that the game has a good basic appeal but that the sheet work involved in playing the game stops people from playing and enjoying it.

Joseph F. Seliga
15 Windswept Drive
Trenton, New Jersey 08690

Sir:

In Mr. Witmer's article on *Jutland Rebuttal and Six variations*, he has included a section that, I think, is misleading. Specifically, the section on additional forces, he makes the statement that the ship SMS Prinz Adalbert should be added to the German forces. According to one source on the subject, *A History of the World War, Vol X*, Halsey, F. Funk & Wagnells C., N.Y., 1920 the Prinz Adalbert was sunk in November of 1915. While literature on this incident is lacking, it would be wise to double check the existence of the Prinz before including it in your battle lineup.

Another fault, of omission rather than commission, is the ignoring of what is possibly a larger asset to the German command. Contemporary reports from the actual combatants on

the British side indicate that one of the German ships of the line was a brand new one, just completed and mounting 15" guns. At the beginning of the war, the Germans possessed no such ships, although two were under construction. From what fragmentary evidence there is indicates that this ship was the Hindenburg or the Bayern, a ship of 28,000 tons and mounting 8-15" guns. If their reports were true, this would give the Germans a much greater asset than an additional cruiser.

If anyone has information of the above, it would be appreciated.

Stuart D. Gilbert
1540 San Altos Pl.
Lemon Grove, California 92045

Dear Sir:

I read with much interest Mr. Witmer's article. I have adopted or adapted them for my use. However, there are some points that need further discussion and clarification. My references are Bennett's *The Battle of Jutland*, the 1914 edition of Jane's, and Ian Allan's *Warships of World War I*.

First, is Mr. Witmer's paragraph 3, "Additional Forces." No doubt the German Baltic Fleet could have been into the Battle, just as the British could use their Dover/Harwich Forces. This would help with "play balance," but would the Germans abandon the Baltic to the Russian Baltic Fleet. In no way could the move be done without the Russians and British knowing about it. Perhaps an adaptation of the 1914 Eastern Front Rule would solve the problem.

Second, and most important are Mr. Witmer's errors concerning the additional British ships. The mine layer "Abdiel" was actually a modified "Marksman" class Destroyer, mounting three (3) 4" guns, no torpedo tubes, and carrying 72 mines. It should be rated at one gunnery factor and have a speed factor of 14.

Also, the "Oak" is a destroyer, not an auxiliary. The error is easy to make as she is often referred to as a "tender." For instance, Bennett's book lists her as "Destroyer tender to Flagship." It should read, "Destroyer (comma) tender to Flagship." Unlike the American classifications a tender in this sense serves as an admiral's yacht and/or messenger ship. The "Oak" is an "I", or "Acheron" class destroyer similar to a number of destroyers present in the Battle. It displaced 790 tons, mounted two 4" and two 12 pdr guns, had two 21" torpedo tubes and a speed of 32-35 knots. It should be rated as having one battle factor and with a speed factor of 14.

Unfortunately, I could find no data on the "Engadine," but Bennett's book does have a good picture opposite p. 69. I matched the picture with a similar ship in Jane's which mounted six 3-pounders. Do not sink it automatically, but give it a flotation value of one, thus requiring it to be hit at least. *Profile* No. 74 states that the "Engadine" carried two (2) Short 184 and two (2) Baby Sopwith aircraft. These should be permitted a range of 12 squares, i.e., six out and six back, or similar combination, at the rate of three (3) squares per hour. To reflect the radio trouble "Engadine" had, throw the dice. A 1, 2, or 3 means the Engadine got her radio message off, therefore the Germans have to identify the number and type of counters in the square(s), i.e., BB, B, DD, etc., but not the specific names. If the "Engadine" is escorted, then the sighting report has to be given regardless of the die throw, as we can assume there will be one radio working. Launching of aircraft should be limited to a roll of 1 or 2. The reason being that they had to take off from the sea and sea and wind conditions severely restricted their use.

Another seaplane carrier, the "Campania," could be introduced on the British side, also. It missed the sailing orders and when finally ready to sail, Admiral Jellicoe said, "forget it." Its characteristics would be similar to "Engadine," except for the number of aircraft. According to *Profile* No. 74, "Campania" carried ten seaplanes. This may be high or low, but for the present assign a speed of six (6) factors. During Search Procedure there would be no movement on any

hour divisible by three. Use this for both ships.

In the future I will submit proposed changes to the Submarine Rule, Ship towing, and rescue. I have found them to be very realistic and add to the game.

Robert E. Thorne
31330 Hathaway Ave.
Livonia, Michigan 48150

Sir:

"When Artillery is Effective" (General, Jan-Feb) was an interesting, but technically lacking article. I have four points of consideration that conflict with the article's suggested rule changes.

1. RANGE: Since artillery has different ranges for its different size shells, you cannot accurately categorize all artillery into one range limit. Using modern US artillery as examples, the smallest (105 mm howitzer) is used at 5000 meters, the largest (8 in howitzer) is used at no more than 25,000 meters. (I ignore the 175 mm gun because its 33,000 meter range is offset by maintenance problems from the high gas pressure produced in the tube.) Despite this, if you assign an average effective range to all artillery of, say, 20,000 meters or 12 — 13 miles, you might use this to determine the control zone for a game counter. However, although I do not know the range of TAC air — which Cpt. Nichols used as a yardstick — I think it must be more than the 24 — 32 miles which he specified by giving the artillery half to three-eighths of an airplane's range. In short, one square is just about on the dot for artillery range.

2. EMPLOYMENT: The type of artillery conceived by Cpt. Nichols is already incorporated into other Blitz units. The basic indirect fire artillery unit is the battalion, usually assigned to one particular infantry or armor brigade. In addition to one battalion per brigade, the division has "spare" battalions for special missions. All this artillery, however, is an integral part of the division and brigade, not independent. Thus, that 1-4 infantry or 1-6 armor brigade already represents a certain amount of artillery (if a div. splits into brigades, the general support arty is assigned to the brigades directly). At any rate, we do not employ artillery in anything larger than battalions — certainly not in divisions.

3. BREAKTHROUGH ARTILLERY does not have a modern equivalent in the NATO military (to my knowledge, that is). I believe (comments, corrections AH??) this unit is a representation of the German self-propelled artillery and anti-aircraft guns which were used in a virtually point-blank direct-fire employment. These weapons acted like large-caliber tanks, moving up to a defensive line and blasting open holes by sheer weight of explosive. Thus, you see a basic difference between "artillery" and "assault guns" (a better name for the Breakthrough artillery weapons) — both, I believe, are adequately covered by the AH rules.

4. Finally, sir, I wish to correct the slur on artillerymen the world over, contained in Cpt. Nichols next-to-last paragraph. The artillery could drive out to the aircraft and shoot from the airstrip if so required; also, the time elapsed in one Turn would appear to be no less than two days (admittedly, an estimate) — certainly an unrealistic delay.

To plug my favorite game: Blitzkrieg is one of the finest on the market. The rules specified by AH are highly realistic and provide excellent complexity-playability balance. Take a bow, design department.

Peter I. Menconi
2215 Claremont Road
Carmichael, California 95608

Dear Sirs:

I think I have a simple solution to the Guadalcanal problem of hidden movement. Merely enclose a hidden movement pad similar to the type enclosed in 1914. The front of the pad would have a miniature map of the Guadalcanal board. On the reverse side would be the casualty tables for both the U.S. and Japanese players. The map would be used as in 1914. Both players would fill in their moves and then make a simple comparison. This would probably cost only pennies more to produce than your present casualty

pad and yet give the purchaser a feeling that he is getting his \$6.98 worth.

John Kato
2014 Butler Ave.
Los Angeles, Calif. 90025

Dear Sir:

Your magazine provides a valuable forum for those who are interested in the theory of your games, and I very much enjoy reading it. But at the risk of repeating an opinion that you have undoubtedly heard many times before, I must protest the blatant militarism that pervades your classified section and so often creeps into your articles. War, in any historical period, has never been the glorious thing that much of your readership apparently imagines it to have been.

As a boy, I was one of the earliest devotees of your games, and I was also a member of one of the earlier clubs specializing in Napoleonic miniatures. I can readily understand the kind of immaturity that would glorify Nazi Germany and its military units. I can also understand the psychology that would lead boys to gather in clubs that are essentially fascistic in tenor. But I cannot understand why the adults who head your publication should allow its tone to be influenced by this unfortunate, if numerous, element of your readership.

I believe that a publication such as *The General* has a responsibility to lead America's young men away from the romantic glorification of war. This type of romanticism is precisely what made it so easy for Hitler to turn a generation of German youngsters into ardent Nazis, and I can only regard its presence in American youth with considerable foreboding.

Certainly, those of us who are interested in serious strategic analysis would view with relief a decreased emphasis on these less adult aspects of adult wargaming.

Airman Mark F. Moss
Route 3, Box 419
Biloxi, Mississippi 39532

Dear Sirs,

Thank you for publishing my article on Jutland in the January-February issue of the *General*. Unfortunately, since it was submitted some six months ago, much has changed. I am no longer in any capacity affiliated with Aggressor Homeland because of the practiced policy of the Levittown branch which allowed me to set up a small convention of sorts and then failed to show up. In addition, they quit no less than five PBM games midway through. On the basis of these and other shortcomings, I resigned to become an independent and have been doing quite well, thank you. Should I ever join a club again, it will be I.F.W. Their adult approach to wargaming is quite refreshing.

To the many of you who wrote to me about my variations, please be patient in waiting for your reply. I have some twenty odd letters now and more are being forwarded each day. Another change is my address: I've gotten married and moved. To those waiting in the wings to make corrections, sorry, but I know now that those German Baltic B's should have hit boxes like an armored cruiser and a speed of "6." Look for more variants in the future.

Does anybody out there have any information on naval miniatures, rules for same, or WWII in the Pacific?

How did you decide what two games to vote for in contest 35? I ruled out Leyte Gulf, France-40, and Tannenberg as either still in research or too bulky according to earlier *General* issues. There were, I believe, three basketball strategy games on AH's shelves, none of which they really liked from a marketing viewpoint although they must be mechanically sound, so that one went, too. Bunker Hill will be released during the bi-centennial to take advantage of the fervor and Korea was void of heroes and other necessary selling points, according to the *General's* own editor, about a year ago. Could it have changed so quickly? What is left but Luftwaffe and Stock Market. The former had excellent set up, move, and total game times as well as a manageable number of pieces in a published time-motion study while the latter was to come out this year in AH's own words. Would they lie to us? After all this, the two new games will probably be Trench Foot and Camp Follow. You'll know how I did as soon as I do.

Thank you for a terrific magazine. I am:

Raymond K. Witmer
186 Old Mill Road
Ephrata, Pennsylvania 17522

Infiltrators Report

SICL is the name, A \$300 TOURNAMENT is the game. Previously known as the Spartan Wargamers, nee Sparta, nee SNCL, this burgeoning west coast wargaming organization has officially changed its name to "Spartan International Competition League," SICL for short. The SICL are celebrating their official name-change incorporation, in the state of California, by sponsoring a \$300 tournament with entries accepted up to June 1, 1970. Entry fee for members is \$4.00, \$5.00 for non-members. Entrants are asked to submit a list of five games they wish to play, listing them in order of play-preference for matching purposes. Contestants will play a total of six matches, taking both sides in three different games. Apply at their 5820 John Avenue, Long Beach, California 90805 address. Also, ask for info on their 3rd annual Long Beach convention tentatively scheduled for August 8-9 at Houghton Park.

SPECIAL KUDOS to Dan Hoffbauer. As Editor-Artist for the SICL Monthly, his special talents have gone far toward improving the visual aspect of the magazine. The December 1969 issue, now old-hat to many, is featured by an excellent editorial headed "The Professional Wargamer," posing a question to the cultists that should lead to a most interesting pot pourri of answers.

MAGAZINES ON THE MOVE: In alphabetical order, here's what's moved across our desk in the last several weeks . . . AERODROME, published by the IFW's Fight-in-the-Skies Society (see IFW monthly, "International Wargamer") edited by Paul Cote . . . D-ELIM, organ of the St. John's University Military Strategy Club (open to non-students), Grand Central & Utopia Parkways, Jamaica, N.Y. 11432 . . . DER LAGE, official newsletter of Die Deutesches Wehrmacht, Seaton Hall, Box A22, Albion, Michigan 49224 . . . INTERNATIONAL WARGAMER, monthly offset magazine by IFW (January "Club of the Month"), 4658 N. Spaulding, Chicago, Illinois 60625 . . . KOMMANDEUR, voice of the Avalon Hill International Kriegspiel Society (AHKS), Editor R. E. Johnson, P.O. Box 134, Whippany, New Jersey 07981 . . . PANZERFAUST, Editor Donald Greenwood, Box 280, RD 2, Sayre, Penna. 18840 . . . SPARTAN INTERNATIONAL MONTHLY, Editor Dan Hoffbauer, 4749 Denny

Avenue, N. Hollywood, California 91602 . . . STRATEGY & TACTICS, professional magazine on all phases of wargaming Poultron Press, Box 4267, Long Island City, N.Y. 11104 . . . TRI-COLOR, newsletter on Napoleonic, Bill McDuffie, 20 Gail Drive, Nyack, N.Y. 10960 . . . WARGAMER'S NEWSLETTER, British publication devoted to table top wargaming, Editor Donald Featherstone, 69 Hill Lane, Southampton, Hampshire, England SO1 5AD.

OUR NORTHERN MOST SUBSCRIBER could very well be Mark Teehan, the son of a retired Army officer and himself attending St. Mary's University in Halifax, Nova Scotia. Opponents are few and far between, he states. We don't wonder. His zeal at advancing the art of AH wargaming seems unmatched by any other person we've ever corresponded with — he solicits help from state-side clubs regarding their efforts at promoting wargaming; write to his address at Saundrie, Marlborough Woods, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada.

IT'S NOT TOO EARLY to register for MILCON II. Sometime in July, tentatively July 11-12, the St. John's U. Military Strategy Club will sponsor another of its highly successful military game conventions. A unique point system to determine winners will be employed, one that does not penalize those who are caught in long, hard games which normally preclude them from participating in the minimum number of matches. Details from Damian Housman at the St. John's address found elsewhere in this column.

AT A TRAINING TABLE meal at the University of Rochester the conversation turned to adult games. "What's the name of that game little old ladies in Brooklyn play in the afternoon?" asked the coach. One of his players answered, "handball."

THE INTERNATIONAL WARGAMING SOCIETY, not to be confused with the IFW, has put its money where its mouth is. According to National Editor, Dan Lombardy, the society represents a complete overhaul of Der Totenkopf SS now "offering something to wargamers instead of demanding something out of them." What they are offering is cash for winners of specially monitored tournaments. One just about completed was begun in August, 1969 and included participants from 32 other wargame clubs. A

special tournament newsletter is available by writing the editor, 954 Kittiwake Lane, Chula Vista, California 92011; ask for particulars on their upcoming 1970 tournament.

CONTEST NO. 35 WINNERS were numerous in number; over 250 had selected the correct titles (Kriegspiel and Stock Market). The entries of the following were selected for their rationale in why Avalon Hill decided to publish these numbers. Eric Doberstein, Simi, California; Joel S. Davis, Cambridge, Mass; Jay Williams, Glen Ellyn, Illinois; Jeff De Troye, New Canaan, Conn; Patrick Wilson, Oklahoma City; Paul Mankiewicz, Downey, California; John Kolak, Sacramento, California; David McClellan, Madison, New Jersey; Norman Maitland, Huntsville, Alabama; Ronald Garland, Johnson City, Tennessee.

CONGRATS ALSO to Thomas Fowler, Ottawa, Canada, for scoring first among the elite authors whose "Tactics of Defense" took honors as the best article from the Jan-Feb issue. Other winners include Raymond K. Witmer, Lancaster, Pa. for "Jutland Rebuttal;" Michael Paluszek, Rye, New York for "On Calculated Risks;" George Phillies, Williamsville, New York for "The D-Day Thesis;" and Alan Augenbraun, Brooklyn, New York for "German Defense of Normandy — Part III."

CLUB DISCOUNTS: As of this issue Avalon Hill must negate all club discounts offered in the past. Parts discounts offered in Vol 4, No. 3 which applied to revised rule changes are no longer applicable. Current discounts offered to clubs and wargame organizations must be revised in accordance with regulations recently handed down by the Federal Trade Commission. Avalon Hill, in its effort to support its retail customers under the Fair Trade Agreements, can no longer offer discounts below full retail on game purchases by clubs. However, Avalon Hill will grant a discount of 10% off list price on all game parts as long as such orders are written out on club letterhead and accompanied by a check or money order in the total amount. Such orders sent in by individual members of clubs cannot be honored for the discount.

MACHINE DESIGN Magazine's excellent feature on adult games has resulted in a most gratifying number of direct inquiries for our brochure. Needless to say, Avalon Hill was mentioned foremost in the article by this specialty magazine that caters to the computer crowd. Machine Design is sent at no cost to management, design and engineering personnel whose work involves design engineering of machines, appliances, electrical and mechanical equipment, in U.S. and Canadian companies employing 20 or more people. Copies are sent on the basis of one for each group of four to five readers. Inquiries generated by this feature article include those from the Engineering Computer Center at the Zenith Radio Corporation and the Manned Space Flight Center at Houston, Texas who consider adult games perfect items as leisure time activities for astronauts-in-training and other highly skilled technical personnel. Can't you see it now: 360 different Blitzkrieg Troop units floating around inside Apollo 13 . . .

