


☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆
The AVALON HILL

GENERAL

Publication Office: 4517 Harford Road, Baltimore, Maryland 21214

Vol. 7, No. 2

July-Aug 1970



\$1.00 PER ISSUE

Earliest Known "Troop Counters"

FULL YEAR \$4.98

★ ★ ★ ★ ★
The AVALON HILL **GENERAL**

... a losing venture published bi-monthly pretty close to the first day of January, March, May, July, September, and November.

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 merchandise, 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 consideration, 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 (overseas 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 1970 The Avalon Hill Company
Baltimore, Maryland. Printed in USA

Avalon Hill Philosophy - Part 22

Wargamers' Wargaming Poll — Results

While results from Contest No. 36 contain inherent biases, enough "satisfactory" information has been gleaned to be worthwhile to the policy-makers of this magazine.

The Wargamers' Wargaming poll, devised by the IFW, was run in several wargaming newsletters and magazines. Results published here only reflect those submitted through Contest No. 36 and may vary considerably from those that would be reported by the other periodicals.

The staff of this magazine is grateful for the large turnout. Already, the results have influenced the content of this issue; witnesseth the proportionately high number of articles this month dealing with "Battle Plans." For it was this category of question No. 9 that was voted *most preferred* by subscribers.

This comes as a great surprise. Especially since we had been gravitating away from this type of article in favor of more *historical* articles, only to find that this category placed no better than 5th among the seven.

"Let me make one thing perfectly clear," to paraphrase an already infamous remark, "we're going to give subscribers of *The General* what they want to read, not what we think they ought to read," cleverly expostulates Vice President A. Eric Dott. "We're not going to use *The General* as a sounding board for our own opinions and prejudices," he continues. "We're proud of the fact that we steer clear of editorializing. After all, if its to be a magazine *for* the people then let it be *by* the people."

Here, then, is how all seven categories ranked in their order of preference: Battle Plans, Tactical Articles, Variants, New Rules, Historical Accounts, Technical Data, and Humor. Future issues of this magazine will contain an editorial-mix in precisely this order.

Much of the popularity of an article quite obviously depends on who writes it. Results to question No. 6 produced a few surprises notably the fact that 76 different authors were mentioned. We didn't realize we even had that many contributory authors. Within the broad field, Alan Augenbraun emerged "triumphant" garnering an impressive 15% of the votes cast. A surprising 13% went to George Phillies; surprising in that very few of his articles have even appeared in *The General*. His pull was obviously affected by his recent series, "D-Day Thesis," which was a reprint from his original Panzerfaust Magazine manuscript.

Let's hear more from you, George.

Jared Johnson (9%), James F. Dunnigan (8%), S/Sgt Lou Zocchi and Gary Gyax (7% each), Donald Featherstone (6%) rounded out those deserving singular attention. The voting signified that subscribers had not limited their selections to those contributing only to this magazine.

Heading the list of those who made up the remaining 35% were Scott Duncan, T. Fowler, J.E. Pournelle, and Myron Brundage among the other 69 selectees.

As to which magazines were the best in question No. 5, a captive bias was so prevalent as to make the results rather meaningless. But for the

record, *The General* received 34%, S&T 27%, The International Wargamer 12%, Panzerfaust 10%, SICL Monthly 7%, D-Elim 6%, eleven others collectively 4%.

These figures can be misleading. What actually did the survey author mean by "Best Wargaming Magazine?" Interpretation is wide open in this area. All magazines mentioned provide a service. But because the circulation of each varies, a better evaluation could have been made by equating responses to actual readership. Unfortunately, these facts were not at our disposal.

Just as nebulous was the response to question No. 4 which asked for selection of the best club. While the response overwhelmingly favored the IFW (60%) this response must be qualified by the fact that it happens to be the largest of all the wargame organizations.

The relatively low (18%) tag on Spartan International must reflect organizational problems within, and not an indictment of its leadership. For it is their leader, Russell Powell, who far and away led the pack for question No. 2 in determining the person who "did the most towards furthering the hobby in 1969." His 26% was almost double that of the second in line. Second, third and fourth places went to IFW leaders; Bill Hoyer (15%), Gary Gyax (10%), and Len Lakofka (7%) respectively. James F. Dunnigan, the power behind S&T, garnered 5% with an additional 12% split evenly among S/Sgt. Lou Zocchi, Jared Johnson, Phil Pritchard, and Don Greenwood. The remaining 25% was split among 20 others.

It was not surprising that honors in question No. 1 (the individual who has done the most to further wargaming over the past five years) fell again to Russell Powell (28%). Our own beloved Marketing Director placed second with 14% (and he doesn't even do anything but write letters) giving some indication of the bias that creeps into any captive-type survey. Subscribers weren't short on memory in selecting former S&T editor Chris Wagner (now in wargam obscurity) at 9%. Zocchi and Hoyer followed with 8% each as did Dunnigan and Gyax with 5% each. Seventeen others accounted for the remaining 23%.

Our staff at this time would like to express our gratitude to the above mentioned for their involvement in the art of wargaming. Too bad so few must do so much. We earnestly hope that many, many more will take an active part in spreading the gospel. Wargaming is still very much in the infancy stage of exposure. It requires diligent pursuit by the game fanatics themselves. No one else is going to do it.

And speaking of the game fanatic, it came as no surprise that not one subscriber is engaged in either the "Diplomacy only," or "Miniatures only" categories listed under question No. 8. Nor did "Diplomacy and Miniatures" get a single vote. Neither was the 42% response to the "Avalon Hill only" category a surprise. Significant, however, is the comparison between "AH & Diplomacy" at 31% and "AH & Miniatures" at only 14%. We would have guessed it to be the other way around. Those engaged in all three totaled 13%.

COVER STORY

by Gary Gyax

Illustrated by Don Lowry

Where did wargaming originate? When did this mania begin? Your guess is probably as good as the next fellow's. Perhaps the Egyptian board games involving captures are the earliest recorded examples found of warfare abstracted to a formal game. In any event, the prehistory of wargaming is rather sketchy. Edward Falkener's book *Games Ancient and Oriental and How to Play Them*, as well as Henry A. Davidson's *A Short History of Chess* (1949), are recommended as sources for further research if anyone desires to pursue the study. However, the first attempt at actual simulation of battle, with its various component arms, has been established as being *Charuranga*, the first Chess game!

Professor Duncan Forbes in his *History of Chess* (1860) expands upon earlier work by Cox,

(continued page 3)

Of greater significance was *what* they played. Question No. 7 asking for the "best single war-game" listed Blitzkrieg at the top by 24% of the respondents. Anzio in second place at 21% made no sense to us at all. The reg-card analysis reflects a lower-than-average "Friend's Recommendation" rate of only 16% for Anzio compared to 30% for Blitzkrieg. Considering the fact that Anzio shows up a substantial 8% below the AH median for all games each at 24%, we were amazed that Anzio was even mentioned in the poll. Perhaps its relative newness contributed to this astounding statistic. A more plausible explanation might be found in analysing the personality of the survey-respondent himself. It is now apparent that subscribers to *The General* are *not* the typical wargamer. We think the subscriber is one who revels in complexity at any cost. Further evidence of this adjudgement is in the fact that the most complex game of all, 1914, received 6% of the "best game" votes while performing at a *below*

average "Friend's Recommendation" rate of 22% by purchasers at large (reg card analysis). In view of the later situation one would not expect 1914 to have been mentioned, much less 7th best at 6%.

Blitzkrieg's first place finish *did* make sense. As did Battle of the Bulge in third place, (13%) followed in order by Stalingrad (12.5%), Afrika Korps (8%), Waterloo (7%), 1914 (6%) and D-Day (3%). Seven others split the remaining 4.5%.

The brand new title Kriegspiel was not mentioned. Mainly because no one's got it yet (not even Avalon Hill after the first run came and went.) Actually, Kriegspiel did get one vote, but that was from the designer.

It would be newsworthy at this junction to state why Kriegspiel was designed like it was. There is an old axiom in the industry that "you stick with a winner." And after all these years of being on the market - 10 to be exact - Football

Strategy continues to reflect the highest "Friend's Recommendation" rate (31%) of any game in the line. To those who were lucky enuff to get ahold of a copy of Kriegspiel know that it is Football Strategy under another guise. A complete, introspective analysis of the why's and wherefore's of designing Kriegspiel the way we did will unfold in the next episode of The Avalon Hill Philosophy.

To those who will be with us for another issue, look for the behind the scenes expose entitled "The Matrix Matrimony." In the meantime, ye olde marketing statistician would welcome comments and theories relative to the discussion of the Wargamers' Wargaming Poll. We particularly invite an exchange of analyses among all other organizations who ran this same survey in their respective newsletters.

Cover Story - continued from page 2

substantiating the claim that the first form of Chess was invented in India. Forbes established that *Chaturanga* was the granddaddy of them all. Although many people have asserted that Chess was discovered in places ranging from South America to China, there is no real evidence on which to base their claims. Persia, one of the most serious contenders for the honor of having invented Chess has been ruled out by all competent authorities of the history of the game. As Davidson says: "Iranologists concede Persia learned the game from India." Even their name for Chess, *Chatrang*, or *Shatranj*, is a graft word foreign to the Persian language. Both Forbes and H.J.R. Murray, in his monumental study *History of Chess* (1913), detail the evidence for the various claimants and dismiss all but the Hindu contention. A brief outline of the game they invented will be of interest to modern wargamers, for such may reveal the thinking behind the first attempt at battle gaming, and the concepts behind it may be observable in wargaming today.

Chaturanga, or "four arms" [of the army], was played on an 8 x 8 square board, albeit uncolored, by either two players just as modern Chess is, or it was a four party game played by two teams as shown in Figure 1 below. There is

considerable argument as to which of these two forms is the older and therefore the original, but Forbes presents a strong case in support of the latter, and Murray - at least in part - backs him up. Assuming that the four player game is the primeval form, further consideration of it will undertake to both explain its play and reinforce the assumption that it is the original Chess game.

Partners set up their forces diagonally from each other, Red (*R*) in the lower left corner and Yellow (*Y*) in the upper right corner allied against Black (*b*) in the lower right corner and Green (*g*) in the upper left corner. Each force consisted of eight men: the King, *Hasti* (Elephant), *Ashwah* (Horse), *Roka* (Ship) - later *Ratha* (Chariot), and *Pedatum* (four footmen or Pawns). The King, Elephant, and Horse had moves corresponding to the King, Rook, and Knight of modern Chess, except that no Castling was allowed, Kings could stand next to each other, and they could be taken just as any other man. The Ship, or Chariot, is the subject of much debate and will be covered later. The Pawns moved as do Chess Pawns, but lacked the two square opening move, the ability to capture *en passant*, and Queened in a more restricted manner. Upon reaching the eighth rank the Pawn became the piece in front of which it originally stood. Thus, the Elephant's Pawn became an Elephant when it completed its march across the playing field. It can be seen that the value of each Pawn differed greatly depending on its starting position. It is doubtful that the King's Pawn was allowed to become a King unless the army to which it belonged had already lost its sovereignty. There is speculation that the King's Pawn, upon reaching the eighth rank, became a piece of half the strength of the King, or it stood awaiting the eventual loss of the King so that it could assume that role. In any event, the loss of the King and the King's Pawn will be dealt with a bit further on.

Because parts of India were flooded during major portions of the year, much value was placed upon the ships that formed an arm of the military. Keeping this in mind, it is not incon-

gruous to have a piece called the Ship on the battle field. It is probable that when *Chaturanga* spread to parts of the subcontinent where such flooding was uncommon that the piece was changed from a Ship to a Chariot, for that vehicle also formed a major arm of a typical ancient Indian army. The move of the Ship is variously claimed to be: A) two squares diagonally, leaping over the interposing square and any man thereon; B) one square diagonally or straight ahead; or C) two squares orthogonally, leaping over the interposing square and any man thereon. These moves are diagramed in Figure 2.




Figure 1.




Figure 2.

The first of these moves, move A), is the most likely candidate, for it is the one that comes down to us as the move of the ("Lame") Bishop of the Medieval European Chess game. This move is also seen as the move of the Elephant (*Pil*) in several varieties of Asian Chess games. In order to reconcile the move with the Elephant of *Chaturanga* which moved as a modern Rook, it is helpful to understand that at some time during the development of the game, when the two partners' forces were combined into a single army, the Chariot and Elephant changed positions. However, they kept their names — the names originally associated with the square upon which they stood at the start of play. The piece moving like the Rook became the *Ratha*, or Chariot, while the *al Pil* (Europeanized as Alpin, or Fool), the Elephant, took on the hopping move which was originally that of the Ship or Chariot.

Move B) is seen in some Asian forms of Chess, particularly in the Japanese game *Shogi*, where it is the property of the Silver General. The main claim for this move being later associated with the Elephant is that the five spaces possible to move to represent the four feet and the trunk of the beast. This a weak claim at best.

Finally, there appears to be little evidence for move C) as that of the Ship. The only regular game that it is seen in is Great Chess. We can dismiss it from consideration entirely. It is a strong possibility that moves were originally determined by casting a die. This would reflect the unpredictability of units during battle. Where a man moved was at the player's option, but which man was to be moved was subject to chance. Thus, we note the following regarding the Ship: Although each traveled on a different set of squares, and so could never meet, if all four Ships came together in the center of the board the last one moving in captured the other three! Such an unlikely happening can best be explained by the suggestion of movement determination by dicing. The move is illustrated in Figure 3.




Figure 3.

All four of these pieces could cover only half of the playing area, and each Ship commands only a maximum of five spaces, with a total movement possibility of only eight squares. A limited piece indeed. Note the areas of "dry land" where no Ship could move shown in Figure 4. Unlike most versions of Chess, *Chaturanga* may also have limited the capture potential of the men. There is evidence pointing to the possibility that while Pawns and Ships could take and be taken by each other, and they could be captured by the other pieces, they could not take Horses, Elephants or Kings. This line of thinking is




Figure 4.

typical of wargaming today. For example, in board games a 1-3 attack cannot possibly succeed in eliminating the defender, and in ancient miniature games a chariot is helpless before the elephant.

Gambling certainly played a part in the game. Each man had a monetary value when captured, and an additional (often large) wager was at times staked on the outcome of the game. Now no one would care to hazard the loss of his Rajahdom on the play of a bumbling partner, so a provision was made whereby a partner could capture his ally's King and then assume command of the now leaderless forces. Forbes speculates that this was one of the factors which lead to the amalgamation of the four separate forces into two armies and a single commander for each. The excess King was then relegated to the position of advisor and halved in power (commanding either the diagonals or the orthogonals, one square per move). This is a line of reasoning which has no little merit.

Returning to the four player version again, consider once more the King's Pawn. It may be that if it stood upon the eighth rank at the time its King was taken the Pawn could be given immediately as ransom for the captured sovereign, regardless of whether the captor was enemy or ally. Chess histories mention a number of possible

exchanges of captured King for captured King. It seems unlikely that such would often take place, especially considering the betting involved. However, the weaker player of a team could have sought to restore his stronger ally, so if the King of his partner's force had been captured it may also have been allowed for the surviving monarch to travel to the seat of power of his ally (King's square) and assume command of any men remaining. Of course, seeing as how any men on the board were subject to capture, there may not have been much to take over. But if the ally's King's Pawn was still on the field he could advance it to the Queening rank and restore his partner to play!

The earliest documentation of *Chaturanga's* existence in India is circa 600 C.E. About a century later it arrived in Persia in the basic form that we know as Chess today, but with the differences already noted in the foregoing paragraphs. The game was simply two-player *Chaturanga*. The spread of Chess, eastward and westward, is quite interesting to study. Davidson's book contains an excellent map on the inside cover which diagrams and dates this movement, and Murray goes to great lengths establishing the times of arrival of Chess in various countries. Over the ages Chess has been forbidden as a sinful passtime, frowned upon as frivolous, and the like. Players have been mocked, scorned, or worse . . . sound familiar? Regardless of when and how the game spread to the rest of the world, we should all be glad it did. Finally, in the Nineteenth Century a large Chess and variants following developed, and much literature was produced. Most certainly, Chess is the oldest true wargame and gave impetus to the eventual design of the battle games we play today. Hats off to the grand old game of kings!

The preceding has been compiled by Gary Gygax at the request of The General. As the reader will note, much research-in-depth has gone into the presentation of the discourse. Avalon Hill grants permission for the reprinting of this article wholly or in part providing the credit line, "reprinted from The General, Vol. 7, No. 1" is included.



No, Rajah . . . Soak-offs at greater than one chariot against 6 Elephants is not allowed . . .

Club of the Month

SPARTAN INTERNATIONAL (SICL)

Referring to the "Spartan International Monthly", the journal of Spartan International, a prominent review magazine stated, "This issue is so much better in appearance, lay-out, and contents than the previous issues that it's hard to recognize it as the same magazine retitled (was formerly SNCL Monthly)."

This objective appraisal from an independent third party would lead one to believe that the Spartan International has finally come of age. They would, of course, be correct in this surmise. All has not been rosy within "Sparta" — it has had many failures and set-backs since its inception four years ago. Spokesman Dan Hoffbauer readily admits that, "there have been arguments and feuds with other organizations, failures with personnel and services, periodic major reorganizations and the like."

When an organization finally comes to terms with itself and is able to publicly recognize its problems, it is axiomatic that it is finally on the right road to its goal — "to advance and professionalize wargaming competition to a level comparable with Master's Chess. We can count on the fingers of one hand the actual number of wargame clubs actively and sincerely pursuing the conviction that such a goal is attainable. For Spartan International much of the road has been strewn with rocks — they have often been accused of bribing people with lavish expenditure, have been accused of engaging in petty bickering with other clubs and organizations, and have even been accused of setting up a dictatorial method of operation."

Charter Founder, Russell Powell, has been the main target of much personal abuse. It is to his credit that he has been able to absorb the brickbats without letting it affect his original convictions. Despite the many verbal storms, Powell has continued to build a responsible, personalized organization for the advancement of wargaming both as a hobby and as a sport.

"The members count more in the SICL than any other single factor," relates Hoffbauer. "That is why the functions of the lower three levels of Spartan administration — international, national and conferences — are primarily to maintain an increased communication with the members. The essential services of publications, tournaments, arbitrations, etc. all operate within the Charter Founder's office. These can be performed by a relatively small number of dedicated, talented people. The grass-roots response to the rank and file so tremendously absent in other postal groups, must be carried out by a larger structure of administrators well attuned to the needs, desires, and problems of each and every member," Hoffbauer continues.

In order to implement their philosophy, Spar-



Sparta founder Russell Powell, (right) looks on pensively during typical trophy awards ceremony. Helping chair the event is Bob Wilson (left) and Dan Hoffbauer.

photos P. Pritchard, T. Hurwood

tan International operates on five levels of administration:

1) BOARD OF DIRECTORS — with ultimate control over the entire organization,

2) CHARTER FOUNDER'S OFFICE — Charter Founder post is filled by Russel Powell who acts as a liaison between the board and the rest of the SICL. His office includes the services of records-keeping, publications, tournaments, conventions, and rules arbitration. Assisting him in his tasks are the Advisors — the hardest-working, most dedicated people in the organization. They carry out special assignments and spot checks,

3) INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION — determining policy, subject to Board approval, overseas administrators, makes sure projects run smoothly,

4) NATIONAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE — Coordinates and controls the Conferences as directed by the Commission. Personal services, common to all conferences, such as individual game matching, is handled through this level,

5) CONFERENCES — group of people (25-50) in a certain geographic location. Currently there are three: Los Angeles, Pacific, and Atlantic. Officers in charge of these bodies carry out most of the personal contacts in the SICL.

These last three levels each consist of four posts — Affairs, for lateral control of each level or conference, Personnel, Public Relations, and Procedure.

This is all fine and dandy, but what really makes Spartan International go is the fact that members actually benefit, even financially, from the services provided. For example, between the period of January 1969 to January 1970, there were a total number of 22 tournaments with cash prizes totaling \$579.44, trophies and medals awarded valued at \$250.00. Equating this with the total cost of entry fees charged, \$18.25, it takes no mental giant to realize how beneficial membership has been. In addition, there have been a total of seven tournaments exclusively provided to the SICL members only. Cash prizes, trophies, and medals awarded totaled approximately \$200.00 and at no cost to SICL members.

There's more. Their monthly publication, Spartan International, runs 24 pages of photo-offset material supplemented by the "Gladiator Report", a varying-sized monthly, plus the "Chronicle" appearing irregularly with information such as ballot results and specialized news that is sent free to the Spartan members.

The SICL maintains a point system for reflecting work contributions to Sparta. Although a rank carries no meaning as far as authority goes, it does show how much a person is doing for the rest of the members. The SICL also maintains skill rating system for the gamer, which is compiled from his won-loss record in Spartan competition only.

These are reasons enough to have selected Spartan International as the "Club of the Month". Further reasons are reflected by the number of new members joining the ranks of Spartan while maintaining their own activities in organizations such as the IFW, St. John's University Military Strategy Club, and members of Poultron Press.


While California based, plans are currently in operation to organize Spartan groups all over the United States. Information on this as well as general facts on the organization itself are available from Russell Powell, 5820 John Avenue, Long Beach, California.

Not content to merely reach a level of equilibrium, Sparta is continuing to expand the scope of their services and to this end welcomes increased membership.



Boasting the sunny climes of "baja" California, Spartan conventions often spill over into the outdoors. Paintings by Dan Hoffbauer (foreground) epitomize the variety of member-interests and talents that grace the Club of the Month.

Plan of the Month



Hit Hard and Keep Driving . . .

by Kevin Thomason

Contrary to what most German commanders in the Bulge will tell you, your primary concern on the first few turns should not be to destroy as many units as you can — rather, it should be to open a gap to let your Panzers through.

Obviously, the best way to do this is to block the roads so no troops can be rushed to the stricken area. Doing this is no problem, as you shall see.

The American set-up leaves one gap which should be used as the German breakthrough point. This is the area between NN23 and 0017. To exploit this gap, however, roads must be blocked and troops must be tied up so that no reinforcements can be brought up to plug the gap. The following is what to do to accomplish this on the first turn:

South

Four of the nine infantry divisions allotted to the South should attack the 4/8 and the 4/12, each at 1-1. With a little luck, this should block that road, thereby preventing the 4th Division from reaching the battle for the first few crucial turns.

The remaining five southern units, plus one infantry unit from the East, should attack the 9/CCR at 3-1. The 3rd Parachute Division, also from the East, should be moved to RR29 to attack the 9/CCB at 1-1. These attacks will not only block the Vainden-Diekirch road, but if you're lucky and you rolled an engaged for either of them you will have tied up desperately needed armored units.

North

In the North, your main objective should be to block the Monschau-Elsenborn-St. Vith road,

thereby delaying the 2nd, 9th, and 106th Infantry Divisions from reaching the breakthrough point. To do this, put three infantry units each on SS7 and SS8. One unit on SS7 should attack 2/38 at 1-1; the other two, along with two from SS8, should attack 99/361 at 2-1. The one remaining unit at SS8 should attack 99/393 & 395 at 1-2. Presto! You have blocked that road.

Three infantry units should attack the 14th Cav., and the heavy armor should take care of the 106/422 & 423.

East

Two infantry units should be moved to PP19, so as to cut the vital St. Vith-Clervaux road. The six heaviest armored units should be put at OO24 and OO25, attacking 28/110 at 6-1. If you get to

advance more than one square, put one stack at MM25.

The remaining nine units should attack 28/109 at 5-1. If you get to advance three or more, put a stack at MM27, surrounding the unit in Clervaux.

Summary

As you can see, if all has gone well the Americans are virtually paralyzed, and can get no help to the stricken center for a good number of turns. Clervaux will be surrounded, most of the 9th Armored engaged, and vital roads blocked.

The majority of the 99th and the 106th Infantry Divisions will also be engaged.

If you keep driving from the first turn, without letting up for a moment, even airpower and reinforcements will be unable to stop your onslaught.

Except for minor attacks designed to tie down as many American units as possible, ignore the Northern and Southern routes. Drive West to La Roche, then wheel Northwest to Meuse crossings at Andenne and Namur, thereby cutting off Spa.

Keep driving hard from the beginning and you might have Christmas in Antwerp.

Kevin Thomason
5516 So. Hoover Ave.
Whittier, California 90601

Realism and Play-balance

by John Ellsworth

Most wargamers today are divided into two camps; the Realists and the Play-Balance buffs. In this article I will attempt to realistically incorporate play-balance in STALINGRAD and GUADALCANAL. As you will see, some of these ideas have been around before and some have not.

Starting with STALINGRAD: the worst part about this game is the ease with which a good Russian player can win. In the real campaign, surprise was complete. Therefore, a First Turn Surprise Table is certainly realistic.

To use this table, merely move the combat results over two columns. Thus, a 1-1 attack becomes 3-1, etc. This table is used only by the Germans and only on the first turn. It creates a massive disorganized withdrawal, and the Russian will be hard pressed to win. When you compute an exchange with this table, use the normal combat factors of the Germans.

Guadalcanal is a different story. Here, the problem is that the side that lost in real life wins all the time in the game. To remedy this, I adjust the point system.

Revised Point System

Japanese:
2 points for artillery within range of Henderson
7 points for each turn the Japanese occupy Henderson

3 points for completely destroying a U. S. Unit
United States:

3 points for each turn the U.S. occupy Henderson

2 points for completely destroying a Japanese Unit.

You will notice that by using this system, much lower scores will result. This results in a much closer game. A U.S. unit worth 15 before is worth 3 now. A Japanese unit worth 8 before is now worth only 2. While this system affects both sides, it is more beneficial to the U.S. Try it and see!

For added complications, try this:
U.S., Japanese: instead of giving all units the same value, use the size as the guide.

When you completely destroy a battalion, you get 3 points.

When you completely destroy a regiment, you get 3 points.

When you completely destroy a company, you get 2 points.

When you completely destroy a section, you get 1 point.

I find that these changes really help the only 2 AH games with really serious problems.

John Ellsworth
528 Countryside
Wheaton, Ill. 60187

Offense vs Defense

The author of this fine article chose to remain anonymous — probably not by choice. Our immediate impulse was to claim this for ourselves. Will the real author, please stand up...

In regard to Mr. Henderson's article, "The Strategy of Defense" (Nov-Dec '69), I feel that the author has overrated and overstated the case for the defense. A total defensive posture should only be adopted when one cannot take the offensive with a reasonable hope of success. The "cordon" defense advocated in the article gives the opponent first option to apply the principles of war. It gives the attacker the choice of objectives, enabling him to apply maximum combat power at the point of his choosing without hinderance from the defender. He is able to maintain freedom of action and maneuverability. He is able to make or break contact at will. The major weakness of the cordon defense is that it lacks flexibility and is vulnerable to penetration and envelopment. Napoleon's campaign against Beaulieu in the spring of 1796 illustrates the inherent weakness of this type of defense. Napoleon himself rarely fought a defensive battle (Leipzig in 1813 for example).

After conceding the initiative to the opponent (Blue), Mr. Henderson outlines a basic defensive strategy which merits some critical observations. The first major weakness of this plan is the deployment of his forces along the FEBA (the river running North-South). They are up against the FEBA trace and are concentrated at two major and two minor points on that trace. Because of the river the defenders have no security area forward of the FEBA and thus Blue has an unrestricted capability for lateral movement along the river line. On the other hand, the proximity of Red's North-South road to the river (adjacent to it) is a major weakness. A single Blue unit crossing the river can easily cut the Red's lateral line of communications. Further, the presence of an East-West river in the middle of the board splits the Red defensive line into two segments (resulting in a Napoleonic "Double Battle" situation). The concentration of Red forces at the four points is a violation of the principle of mass. Blue could easily assign a few units to fix three of those concentrations in position and bring overwhelming mass to crush the fourth for a "defeat in detail" and a subsequent "manoeuvre su les derrieres." The two flank elements are especially vulnerable because of their small size and relative isolation from the bulk of the Red forces.

A second major error in the Red defense plan is in the area of counterattacks. Unless you determine that a counterattack is to be the decisive battle, never attack with "all available resources." Attack with only those elements required to meet the situation. Determine in advance where and how much of a penetration you can stand and counterattack only those you cannot accept. There is a great danger in committing your reserve to a counterattack too soon. What would you do if the force you had counterattacked proved to be a diversion with the main attack to fall somewhere else? With your reserve committed, there isn't much you could

do. Napoleon's maneuvers to the enemy's flank and rear were largely predicated on the assumption that the enemy had already committed his reserves. Napoleon is reputed to have said the "God is on the side of the last reserve." There are not enough units in most games to man a strong line and still have a respectable reserve (generally one-third to one-quarter of total strength).

If the nuclear war option is being used, the concentrations used by Mr. Henderson would be very tempting nuclear targets. This is especially true of the mobile reserve force which could be destroyed or neutralized in support of an attack on one of the other concentrations. Official military doctrine states that units fighting under nuclear conditions will be widely dispersed until massing just prior to the attack. Under such conditions, a defense in depth would be much more appropriate.

"Care and Feeding" of Regiments

by Geoff K. Burkman

The most potent "weapons" of the German Army in *Anzio* are its regiments. These hardy little devils are able to add extra points to the defenses, absorb extra losses in battle, and facilitate the reinforcement of a weak line much more efficiently.

Do It The Easy Way

There will come a time when the German must hold a line with every unit he can spare, and still be able to "repl" his forces at will. When a regimented unit is below strength, don't send it back a square to "repl" and try to hold with trash. Instead, break the division down to its appropriately weakened regiments and send one of those regiments back to "repl." Repeat the process, interchanging regiments for "repling" until the unit is back on its feet.

Two Twirps Beat a Bruiser

Often the German player will find it advantageous to break a division down, even though it may all stay on the same square. For instance, the logical breakdown for "HG" as a 4-5-12 is two 2-3-12 regiments, thus adding an extra factor to the defenses. In the interests of realism, I suggest that if a breakdown can be made exactly, that such a breakdown be required.

The Case of The Missing Point

The two medium strength PG divisions, 29th and 90th, are very handy when it comes to counterattacking. Notice that when these units split into regiments they are then only worth two stacking points each, instead of their normal

Finally, the attacker must keep in mind the principle of the objective. From FM 100-5, Field Service Regulations: Operations, "Every military operation must be directed toward a decisive, obtainable objective. The destruction of the enemy's armed forces and his will to fight is the ultimate military objective of war." All movements must be directed to the "bloody decision."

Defense is fine in its place, but a all-around defense gives the initiative to the opponent. If defense is to be used, than defend in one area to attack in another (applying the principles of Mass, Economy of Force and Maneuver). On the defense make use of spoiling attacks, feints, raids, retrograde movements and deceptive maneuvers to conceal your intentions (principles of Surprise, Security and Economy of Force). Only offensive action can achieve decisive results. The force that takes the initiative, that gains and maintains contact with the enemy and is able to develop the situation to his advantage through the sound application of the principles of war, will achieve final victory.

three when in division status. The optional stacking rule neatly negates this advantage, but if you find a sucker Allied player who'll use this system, suppress your snickers, and slaughter him.

A Lot Plus Two Equals More

There are other advantages to breaking up a division and leaving the regiments on one square. Such breakdowns will result in the addition of steps to the square. In most divisions (except all of 4th Para and part of "HG") each regiment has a reduction counter and an inverted step. Thus a square with 15th PG (a 6-step force) will convert to a 9-step force if regiments are used.

"Repl" That Armor With Infantry

The "HG" division is unique in the game, as it breaks down from a "pure" armor division to an armored regiment and two PG regiments, which can be reinforced with infantry "repls." So, when Hermann needs troops, break him down, "repl" those PG regiments, and then combine him into armor again.

Last Words

It is true; the use of regiments will greatly affect the game. Regimenting capabilities should be restricted to September and October of 1943, the first month of the second invasion, and any time a hole is created in the Allied line. Also, never let the Allies have Italian Morale unless you get regiments full-time.

Geoff K. Burkman
715 Myrtle Avenue
Terrace Park, Ohio 45174

An old hand at wargaming, Bruno Sinigaglio is a past master at Play-by-Mail. His group boasts a won-lost record approaching the 100 & 0 mark although, he confided, "we are on the throes of our first defeat." Taking advantage of the close proximity of his Penns Grove, New Jersey home to the AH factory in Baltimore (a scant 60 miles distance) Bruno is often found at the factory picking up various AH odds and ends. He now holds the distinction of owning the very first Kriegspiel game to come off the initial assembly line. He also holds that distinction with Anzio purportedly among his favorite games. Despite his passion for being "first in line," he has not abandoned the older games. Here's how he has adapted Jutland to Play-by-Mail in its simplest of terms . . .

An action filled game like Jutland should have a simple and precise system for play by mail. The system described below fulfills both of these requirements.

Equipment needed

1. A square of cardboard, 30" by 30".
2. A compass for drawing circles.
3. One 18" ruler, and one 12" ruler.
4. Adhesive tape.
5. A pad of paper, at least 9" by 9". A very good size to use is 11" by 17". The 11" by 17" pad is available in most stationary stores.

Jutland playing board

Before two people can play mail, they need a good playing board. It's easy to make a good board without drawing a symmetrical hexagon. On your piece of cardboard draw a circle 12-1/2 inches in radius, and then draw in primary direction lines (see figure 1). Include a concentric circle 4.5" in radius for night fighting.




Figure 1

As you can see, the scale utilized is 3/4" equals 1000 yards. This is the same scale utilized by the AH range finder. In addition, the diameter of the circle is 36,000 yards, which equals the distance across one hex.

Jutland range finder

In order to play by mail, you need a range finder more accurate than the one supplied by AH. This is very easy to make. Take your adhesive tape and cover the inch numbers (1 to 18) printed on your 18" ruler. The 1/16"

graduations should not be covered. Now label the 18" ruler to the same scale that the AH range finder is graduated (3/4" equals 1000 yards). Your new range finder will be easier to use, and it will be accurate to a distance of 83.3 yards (1/16" equal to 83.3 yards).

Jutland PBM sheet

On your 11" by 17" pad, draw a circle 4-1/2 inches in radius, and then draw in primary direction lines (see figure 2).




Figure 2

As you can see, the PBM sheet scale is 9" equal to 36,000 yards. Therefore, 1/4" equals 1,000 yards, and 3/16" equals 750 yards or the length of one ship counter. Since PBM sheets are only good for one turn, you will have to make a couple every turn. However, this is simple as Pi if you have a compass.

PLAY BY MAIL PROCEDURE

STEP 1. You must first determine the exact position and direction of each ship on the Jutland playing board. This may take from 5 to

15 minutes, but it's worth it, because the system is simple and precise. To accomplish the above, consult Figure 3 and the directions that follow.

(a). Place your 12" ruler down the length of the ship counter, and mark the points where the ruler intercepts the two nearest axis. In figure 3, the two nearest axis are the EW and NW-SE. The ruler is represented by the broken line. Point A is the EW intercept, and point B is the NW-SE intercept. The bow of the ship counter is labeled point C.




Figure 3

(b). Measure distances OA, OB, and AC with your premade 18 inch range finder. It is not necessary to measure these distances to an accuracy of 83.3 yards (1/16"). Reading to an accuracy of 3/32" is desired (3/32" equals 125 yards); however, an accuracy of 3/16" will suffice (3/16" equals 250 yards).

(c). Assume that the following measurements were taken for the ship counter in figure 3.

- OA=6" = 8,000 yards.
- OB=5-1/4" = 7,000 yards.
- AC=3" = 4,000 yards.

STEP 2. It is now time to transfer the ship onto the PBM sheet. This should be fairly obvious. On the EW axis mark point A using the appropriate scale (1/4" equal to 1,000 yards). Now mark point B on the NW-SE axis. Using a pencil, lightly connect points A and B to form line AB. On line AB, measure 4,000 yards from point A and mark point C. Now draw a dark line 750 yards long (3/16") from point C towards point B, and put an arrowhead on point C. Figure 4 is an illustration of step 2. A numeral has been placed next to the darkened 3/16" line to facilitate ship identification.


STEP 3. After all ships have been transferred to the PBM sheet, list attacks and firing ranges, and stocks for each attack.

REALISM IDEAS

In order to obtain an actual scale, AH suggests stacking ships three high. This represents a minimum average interval between ships of 633 yards. A more realistic way would be to stack ships two high, and have no interval between stacks. This represents an average interval between ships of 1050 yards (AH recommends 1000 yards in Battle Manual).

In playing Jutland, the British player has an

1/4" = 1000 yds



- OA= 8000yds
- OB= 7000 yds
- AC= 4000 yds

↑ = POSCN

Figure 4

unfair advantage in that he can maneuver his ships after the German player has moved. It isn't difficult to jot down your maneuvering plans simultaneously, and then maneuver according to them. Alternatively, players should take turns maneuvering first.

Broadsides in Jutland are unrealistic. Richard

Witmer's suggestion of making a fifty degree broadside determination card is simple and historically accurate.

Bruno Sinigaglio
20 East Pittman Street
Penns'Grove, New Jersey 08069

How to Reduce Units Quickly

or, (Guadalcanal made easy).
by Davidson & Drayner

The major reason for Guadalcanal's lack of popularity is that it's just too much trouble to keep track of which units have been weakened. Leaving the original unit on the board and playing with it as if it is weakened is extremely confusing. Furthermore keeping track of its true strength is a very tedious, involved process.

The (SRT) goes a long way towards solving this problem. Unfortunately the time involved in finding the correct substitute, and in switching the units on and off the board causes a serious delay in the game, and irritation for the players.

Obviously the desirable situation would be to leave the original unit on the board and mark its new combat value. Unfortunately most war gamers are reluctant to mark their units as they are unable to use them again. This would tend to become very expensive.

We believe we have hit upon a way of overcoming this problem. The solution lies in being able to mark and remark the counter without ruining it. We were able to accomplish this by covering the counters with clear scotch tape, which can be written on with a nylon tip felt pen (red or black work best). This produces a recognizable number which can easily be rubbed off by a finger, damp cloth or kleenex.

This technique has many valuable applications. For example in Guadalcanal a unit (4-4) which

has been weakened by artillery fire can be marked over with its new reduced strength (3-4) with a flair pen. The marking (3-4) can be erased and remarked should the unit incur any further losses. This can be done indefinitely with no damage to the counter and takes only a small amount of time depending on how neatly you mark the unit. This technique may be applied with equal ease to (SRT) games (i.e. 1914). The original unit can be remarked according to its new strength instead of taking time to replace it with its correct substitute. Earlier games not originally designed for use with (CRT) or (SRT) can easily be adapted by use of the method i.e. Waterloo, and Arika Korps as it would require no new units. This could open new possibilities of realism for the owners of these games.

A set of counters can be covered quickly by putting 1/2" magic transparent scotch tape (this is the only kind that can be written on) over the unit designation side and trimming the edges with a razor blade (1/2" does two sides for you). This takes under an hour as it took two of us 20 minutes to convert 155 counters for Waterloo. This small investment in time is repaid many times over.

Allen Davidson
David Drayner
New College, Saratoga Flr.




Figure 3



Strategic Bombing the Key

by S. C. Griffin

In Blitzkrieg, as in any armed conflict, the advantage of striking the initial blow is inestimable when seen with the broad spectrum of strategic and tactical advantages it inherently produces. In taking the initiative by blitz, Great Blue can with a judicious employment of airpower and efficient application of mobile ground forces decisively defeat the enemy and unlock the door to an early Red capitulation.

In lightning warfare, the importance of airpower can not be under-estimated. Effective strategic and tactical use of Blue airpower can paralyze Big Red's counter-offensive and reactionary forces, as well as, releasing Blue's armored spearheads for the lightning advances so characteristic of true blitzkrieg.

Although the air forces of Great Blue and Big Red are equal in quantity and quality, the potential deployment and topographical locations of city/air bases provide a favorable imbalance for Blue.

The relative concentrated positions of Blue air bases within range of initial objectives allows the fullest efficiency and use of Blue TAC and SAC air arms during the initial turns. Unlike Big Red with only five widely-scattered city squares of any operational value, Great Blue has a mutually-supporting triangle of bases, (s-25, v-33, Op-29) in the south and a flanking tri-city cluster (pq-16) in the north.

This initial Blue superiority in concentrated air logistic capacity permits a farther-reaching utilization of air power while also permitting maximum dispersement without range penalties. This initial imbalance and decisive Blue advantage must be exploited immediately, as it is possibly neutralized upon Red's occupation of its buffer state cities. This superiority can however be counted on up to the third turn (1st turn, capture; 2nd, deploy; 3rd, utilize) and later, depending upon Blue's quick success in the field and the speed in which Blue air units can shift to the more forward occupied bases without a drop in efficiency.

There are several important functions that the Blue Air Force must serve during the opening phases. In the traditional tactical air support role, the shorter-ranged TAC and available MDM aircraft should be employed in capturing the lesser important, "backwash"* cities (u-11, m-14, x-27) in which a more permanent utilization and location of ground forces are not needed. This prevents a drain-away of striking power and a straggling or slowing of the advancing columns. The farther-reaching SAC units should be directed

against the Red military timetable. Contrary to some popular strategems, the temporary and inefficient effectiveness of an employment of vital SAC airpower against enemy and pro-enemy cities makes city-bombing of secondary importance when considered with the impact of air interdiction during this crucial period of rapid field movement and unopposed armored advances. It is during this period that objectives are most often secured by default or being merely "firstest with the mostest" than by major confrontation.

Emphasis should then be placed upon the reduction of Red's offensive flexibility, mobility, and momentum, and therefore, the general disruption of Red's timetable and logistic network. Target gifts of high concentrations of enemy aircraft or ground forces should not be ignored or spared the devastating effect of strategic airpower. Certainly as battlefield situations change and target opportunities open, tactics and priorities should also be amended, for the adaptability of SAC in exploiting negligence and weakness is one of its greatest assets.

The lightning-like crippling power of long-range nuke and conventional bombing gives the first-striker a tremendous tactical and psychological advantage. The mere possibility of an initial strategic strike in any sector necessitates major deployment modifications of enemy attack formations and reduces the reliability of pre-planned invasion directives.

To analyze the strategic paralysis and dilemma that effectively employed SAC can create, one should examine the tactical techniques and strategic possibilities open to Great Blue due to its initial invulnerability.

Without the threat of initial bomber attacks, Great Blue can safely and effectively concentrate its bomber forces in tactically superior locations over the normal security margin of eight or nine air unit factors per city square. Bomber dispersement is a calculated risk in which air attack readiness is inversely proportional to the safety gained from enemy strat or nuke attacks. It must be assumed that given a concentrated priority target and a determined attacker, a single if not more enemy SAC factors could logically penetrate the air defense screen. Thus the purpose of dispersement is to make each individual target as unworthwhile as possible such that its destruction would not entail a crippling blow in a single attack.

Due to Great Blue's initial high concentration of prime air logistic capacity, this favorable

advantage is of lesser importance than it would be for Big Red. With insufficient close-range air bases and the added burden of necessary maximum dispersement, Big Red must protect its advancing spearheads from Blue air-interdicted delays and strategic punishment with extensive fighter protection while also allowing logistic supply for its own TAC and SAC missions. It is a case of eating the cake and having it too. To provide adequate air defense the FTR units must take priority. This necessitates that the bombers be based farther in the rear and sadly out of range. The inverse would result in the near same dilemma plus the BAF with virtual control of the air. A happy median would result in the ineffectiveness of both air priorities.

The element of tactical and strategic surprise is also reduced by the strategic air interdictive threat. Great Blue, in its initial position of "King's X", can through the use of dual-movement deployments and efficient expenditure and use of movement factors and roadways camouflage and de-emphasize the direction, strength, and scope of its initial blitz. Blue, unlike Red, can predict with 100 per cent accuracy the exact movement requirements that a given unit needs to reach its pre-planned objective. Blue units can thus be dispersed into fake garrison or multi-objective positions at the outer limits of their particular combat radii. Ground units apparently and logically stationed for internal defense unexpectedly at H-hour capture the nearer buffer cities while units apparently deployed for that attack bypass it and penetrate deeper to more advance objectives.

Big Red, however, can not count upon the clearance of the vital roadways of its invasion avenues of advance. A single well-placed interdictive air strike can so significantly alter movement requirements that efficiently detailed plans cause units to suffer fatal delays in reaching initial objectives. Traffic bottlenecks quickly build up tempting concentrations which invite additional strat and nuke attacks resulting in movement paralysis and heavy losses.

This dilemma forces the Red command structure into shorter-sighted, more general plans for deployment. Planned participating-attack units will most always involve little movement and be very close at hand. The result is a lowering of fighting strength and efficiency, reduction of combat radii, and the abandonment of surprise as an integral factor. Except for extensive use of sea zones as invulnerable air bases and avenues of attack (The use of sea zones incur serious time-consuming deportation procedures and limited capacity and efficiency) Blue Intelligence can thus foresee enemy intentions in time for adequate modifications, reinforcement, and re-deployment.

In Blitzkrieg, with armies so very similar, fighting efficiency and strategic application of innate advantages is the road to victory. Judiciously-employed strategic airpower can create the fatal Achilles heel in the Red military machine. Coupled with the first-strike advantage, strategic bombing is the key to early victory. If Big Red survives the opening phases militarily intact, a dreadful war of attrition is likely to continue. Personally I like war short and sweet.

Steven Griffin
Box 127
Stillwater, Okla. 74074

Question Box

KRIEGSPIEL:

Q. You state in Game I instruction that "No square may hold more than one unit - stacking of units on the same square is not allowed." My question is can a supply wagon be placed on a unit for protection as is the case in Afrika Korps?"

A. Yes. In this case, the supply wagon retreats with the combat unit and can be captured only if (1) the combat unit is elim AND (2) attacker advances into sq containing the supply wagon.

Q. In game II under the heading of Advances and Retreats - "Ignore all terrain movement restriction. Instead, consider all terrain as clear terrain when ordered to advance or retreat." Therefore, can an armored infantry go through a forest square or a mountain square?

A. No. Advances that were prohibited before are still prohibited. Advances are not slowed down, however.

Q. To capture a nuclear launch area must I remain in that square (example JJ-11) until the end of the turn or can I simply pass right through the square to capture it?

A. Remain until end of turn.

Q. If I just captured his rocket launch area (on let's say turn 4) may I fire the rockets that I captured on turn 4, or must I wait until turn 5? If after I leave his rocket launch area which I just captured, and he now recaptures his rocket launch area by placing a unit there are the remaining rockets which were not destroyed or shot off by me - his or mine?

A. Wait until turn 5. Yours - you move them immediately to your launching site.

Q. I have just captured H4 and released my prisoners. My question is what if my capital city is in enemy hands - can I reactivate my prisoners at another city or what?

A. You must wait until your capital is back in your hands.

Q. Under air power in Game two - air power factors may only fly once, attack and then are destroyed. Is this true? Or can they be used again?

A. They may be used only once.

Q. If my opponent controls my prisoner square H-4 does this mean that whenever I am forced to take prisoners that they are automatically reactivated in my opponents capital city?

A. No. Keep them in your dead pile until your opponent moves off H-4. On a following turn he can move back on and release his prisoners.

Q. Can Replacement factors and air power factors combine to form replacement factors?

A. No.

Q. I have a unit on GG8. Can my opponent travel by sea from DD8 through GG8 and land on beach square III0?

A. Yes.

Q. Under "Fortifications" you state that a fortified unit does not have to retreat. My question is if the attacker call Blitzkrieg can he advance 4 squares (or go in some other direction) when the fortified unit doesn't retreat?

A. Yes.

Q. Can a paratroop move into a city in one turn and still fly that turn?

A. No.

Q. Does this apply to sea movement too?

A. Yes.

Q. Can a supply wagon fly with a paratroop or can they travel long distances by sea with a special forces units?

A. No. They cannot fly, but they can move 10 squares over any terrain (including seas).

Q: May a surrounded unit use the abandon position or fighting withdrawal cards?

A: Yes.

Q: Under Game 2 Rules, may paratroops be used to free prisoners (even though it would be behind enemy lines); where would they start?

A: Yes. Start at normal place.

Q: May paratroops be used to capture missile centers (behind enemy lines); and where would the missiles be placed?

A: Yes. Home missile center.

Q: If Special Forces Units are on a coastal city square, can they invade any beach square, even if the beach squares are *not* connected to the city by water squares?

A: Yes.

Q: When troops are on mountains during snow, do they have a zone of control?

A: Yes.

Q: May Mountain Units retreat or advance from these squares during snow after battle?

A: No.

Q: Are troops in general allowed to advance or retreat after combat through otherwise illegal squares because of weather and, or terrain?

A: No.

Q: If the inferior side wanted to call his opponent to a round-table, why would the opponent ever choose other than Option D?

A: Situation at hand often dictates a better deal with options A, B and particularly D.

Q. May rockets be fired when no attacks are allowed?

A: No.

Q: What is to prevent someone from refusing to leave the enemy country if he is negotiated to do so, but he is behind and knows that the other person will eventually wish to forfeit 8 units to continue the game?

A. He is required by rules to abide by the ruling for at least two turns as stated bottom page 12.

Q: If you currently hold the enemy's prisoner of war camp and some of your forces surrender, do you just get them right back the next turn on your capital city?

A: No. The enemy must recapture the prisoner of war camp and then you recapture it to free prisoners.

BULGE:

Q. Can German units reach SS-9 on the 16 AM turn?

A. Yes. They start on UU-8, move to TT-9, and take the road to SS-9.

Q. Do new units entering from edge squares like HH, I, and 7 enter at the road bonus rate?

A. Yes.

D-DAY

Q. Can Allied units go beyond the 17-square supply limit?

A. Only paratroop units can.

ALL GAMES WITH ZONES OF CONTROL

Q. Can one friendly unit move into an enemy zone of control (and attack no unit) while a second friendly unit attacks the enemy unit?

A. No. All units in enemy zones of control MUST attack some enemy unit.

BLITZKRIEG:

Q. Can FTRs intercept paratroops?

A. No.

Q. Can FTRs intercept bombers along their flight path or only at the target?

A. Only at the target.

Q. Can paratroops go to sea?

A. No.

Q. Can paratroops be air transported and then jump 20 squares from the terminal city in the same turn?

A. No.

Q. If I attack a unit with one combat factor at 3-1 odds, isn't that an Automatic Victory, since the defender must be eliminated?

A. No. Automatic Victory is DEFINED as being 5-1 or 6-1 odds if the defender has no retreat, or 7-1 or better in any circumstances.

Q. Can airborne units move after landing in woods and mountains?

A. Yes, subject to regular movement restrictions, of course.

Q. Are the beaches north and south of cities BB-31 and RRR-54 considered as two separate beaches?

A. Yes, in both cases.

Q. How do aircraft get Automatic Victory?

A. If they participate in an attack tactically, it takes 5-1 or 6-1 wnr (with no retreat) or 7-1 otherwise. If they participate strategically (no ground units), it is necessary to achieve 7-1 odds for Auto Victory.

Q. If I attack a unit of one defense factor at 3-1 odds, do I have Automatic Victory, since the defender is bound to be eliminated entirely?

A. No. Automatic Victory is *defined* as being achieved at 5-1 or 6-1 wnr, or 7-1 or better in any circumstances.

WATERLOO:

Q. Are attacks at worse than 1-6 allowed?

A. Yes.

Q. Exactly where may French units start the game?

A. They may start on TT-15, SS-15, RR-15, RR-14, QQ-15, PP-15, OO-16, OO-15, PP-14, PP-13 and on the road to and including JJ-13.

Q. Exactly where may Prussian units start the game?

A. They may start on row EE or north of EE, and ON or east of Y-26, Z-25, A AA-25, BB-24, CC-24, DD-23, and EE-23.

Artillery at Waterloo

by Richard D. Thurston

One of Napoleon's greatest assets in his long string of victories was his understanding of and skill in deployment of his artillery. Unfortunately, this asset is denied to the would-be "Boney" by AH's limitation on artillery range. At the same time, the very real limitations of Napoleonic-era artillery are not well portrayed in the game of WATERLOO. We are frequently treated to the spectacle of the Imperial Guard Field Artillery launching an assault on a hilltop position and, being successful, charges onto the hilltop, presumably dragging their cannon behind them! By modifying the rules slightly, I believe that a measure of realism can be returned without destroying the play balance, (in fact the slight advantage it gives to the French compensates for the normal small PAA advantage).

Basically, this consists of recognizing the longer range capability of artillery. My primary rule is that an artillery can fire, at half its normal Combat Factor, into squares located one square removed from its normal zone of control, effectively giving artillery a 2-square range as opposed to its AH range of 1 square. This 2-square firing will be termed "long-range" firing hereafter. Short range firing will be conducted in the same manner as normal combat. Long range fire may be conducted in one of two ways; first as an additional source of firepower in regular combat, secondly as a totally separate action. When conducted as part of a ground attack, half the combat factors of the long range artillery firing is added to the attack strength. When long range artillery is firing on its own, half the CF is matched with the defensive strength of the unit under attack.

The following limitations apply to long range artillery only:

1. Long range artillery firing without ground support may not be conducted at odds of less than 1-2.
2. Long range artillery may not be fired from river squares.
3. Long range artillery fire may be conducted over the heads of friendly forces unless these friendly forces are on a slope square.
4. Long range firing may not be conducted by a unit in an enemy zone of control.
5. Long range artillery units *never* take casualties when attacking. If a unit firing at long range rolls a "A Elim" or "A Back 2", this counts as "no result". An exchange result is converted to a "½-D Elim". A roll of "D back 2" also counts as "no result". When using a decimal system CRT, (see my "Combat Results - Equilibrated" in the Mar-Apr 1970 *General*), the attacker casualties are ignored and no retreats required.
6. When long range firing is conducted along with ground attack in the same battle, all attacker casualties are taken from the ground

Official Avalon Hill Game Clubs...

The clubs listed below supplement the initial listing made in the Jan-Feb 1968 issue. Only those organizations listing at least 4 members are shown. Subscribers looking for new clubs are urged to contact those listed here and in previous issues.

Alaskan Elite
1431 Oxford Drive
Anchorage, Alaska 99503
Dennis Hall - Pres.

Strategic Games Society
645 E. University
Tucson, Arizona 85705
Hans Helley - Pres.

United World Army
4777 Versailles Pk.
Fremont, Cal. 94538
Craig Mills - Pres.

Clauswitz Club
1001 Hackberry
Vandenberg AFB, Cal. 93437
Phillip Supasa - Pres.

2ndSS Panzer Div., Das Reich
3661 Haven Circle
Colo. Springs, Colo. 80917
Mike McClellan - Pres.

Kampfgruppe Pieper
219 Middaugh Rd.
Clarendon Hills, Ill. 60514
Tom Sobottke - Pres.

ICD
304 S. Franklin St.
Decatur, Ill. 62521
Bill Owen - Pres.

The Nikedh Zumboorak Korps
228 Collen Dr.
Lombard, Ill. 60148
Harry Geldon - Pres.

Juggernaut
305 N. Goodwin
Urbana, Ill. 61801
Jeff Stein - Pres.

The Western Front
210 Duke of Kent Lane
Apt. 104
Cockeysville, Md. 21030
Mike Lincoln - Pres.

Newton Wargame Society
83 Eldredge St.
Newton, Mass. 02158
Steve Hawks - Pres.

The Tenth Legion
Room 225 - Abbot Hall
M.S.U.
E. Lansing, Mich. 48823
Michael A. Cox - Pres.

Stonewall Brigade
701 N. Knis
Luverne, Minn. 56165
David Hauge - Pres.

The Strategists
191 Merritt
Bergenfield, N.J. 07621
No Pres.

II Confederate States of America
523 Margaret Drive
Statesville, N. Carolina
No Pres.

A.H.S.O.H.
454 Karl Drive
Zanesville, Ohio 43701
Jac Carney - Pres.

Les Guerries
904 College St.
Norman, Okla. 73069
Joseph Ryan - Pres.

The Dunedain
c/o Jo MacGregor
Apt. F, 424 Waup Drive
Satet College, Pa. 16801
Paul J. Horn - Pres.

Zhukov's Staff
1629 Canty Lane
Charleston, S. Carolina 29407
Stephen Paul Herchak - Pres.

742nd Tank Battalion
4545 Sunrise
El Paso, Texas 79904
Robert Olinski - Pres.

The Last Alliance
3219 N. Airn
El Paso, Texas 79925
Paul Brent - Pres.

21st Panzer
6028 South Cory
Cudahy, Wisc. 53110
Mike Diehl - Pres.

71st Nehelwerfer Brigade
5329 Morningside
Greendale, Wisc. 53129
Mark Nies - Pres.

units in contact with the enemy; this may result in uneven exchanges.

The following special rules apply to all artillery units whether firing at long or short range.

7. Artillery units cannot retreat under any circumstances. (Such retreat would involve abandonment of the guns and loss of all firepower.) A result which would demand retreat of artillery unit in an enemy zone of control would mean elimination of the unit.

8. Artillery units can not cross the side of a square which consists entirely of woods. They can enter a partially wooded square but only through a side which is at least partially open terrain. They can move on a road through woods but cannot leave the road.

9. Artillery units can not fire through a wholly-wooded side of a square, either at short or long range.

10. Artillery units cannot advance after combat, regardless of whether the combat was long-range or short range.

For PBM, long-range artillery attacks are indicated by asterisk (*) next to the firing unit.

Long range artillery may fire across a river. Defending units are not doubled against such attacks. This does not affect the normal doubling against ground unit attack from river squares. In cases where long-range firing is combined with ground attack, apply the whole CF of the long-range artillery to the attack strength and double the defending unit's strength.

Defending units located on hilltop squares retain their doubling against long-range artillery fire if the unit is firing across a slope square. The hilltop doubling, for all attacking units is removed if the defending unit is under ground or artillery attack from an open terrain square side.

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

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

July-Aug 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. 38

The Mapsheet below shows a hypothetical situation in a Kriegspiel game. It is the start of Black's move in this tactical problem. Avalon Hill has already taken Black's turn in what we consider the most logical move to make. Your job is to duplicate what you think we did. Here's all you have to do: simply move the Black units to wherever you think we have moved them, doing so simply by writing the following symbols in the proper squares: JG-1 representing the JG-1 unit; B-17 for the Blakbutte - 17 paratroop unit; E- 9 and E-10 for the two Elitegruppe Special Forces units. Rationalize your move in 25 words or less, then return the entire Mapsheet postmarked no later than August 16, 1970. Ten contestants coming closest to matching Avalon Hill's move will be declared gift certificate winners. Ties will be resolved according to best 25-word or less rationales. Make sure you also list what you feel are the three best articles in this issue.



This is the best move because _____

Headlines of 3 Best Articles: _____

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____

Letters — Yes, We Get Letters

Dear Sirs:

I am a devout wargamer, and I have been for a number of years. I purchased my first game (Avalon-Hill) in 1962. This one, Gettysburg (hex), is still one of my favorites. I now own an almost complete list of Avalon Hill games and I enjoy them whenever I find the time to do so.

It was not until I subscribed to the General and received my first issue (Sept-Oct) that I realized what a following these games had. I must admit that for several years I had kept my hobby a secret. At least now I realize I am among thousands of nuts with my "phobia."

Okay, that is all fine, and we are all "brothers under the skin." Or are we? I venture to say that I am different than most wargamers, much to my dismay, in that I am a pacifist through and through. This is despite the facts that I own sixteen Avalon-Hill wargames alone, that I am a veteran of Viet Nam, and that I am now a subscriber to the General. Now for a shock. Not only am I a pacifist, and proud of it, but I am an active, crusading pacifist. The worst kind huh? Currently I am working with a Moratorium Committee to end the war in Viet Nam.

Now that I have established the facts that I deem important, I wish to go on and commend the makers of wargames. I personally feel that wargames allow a person a chance to relax, to release tensions, and to help a person to release pent-up hostilities, hopefully against the counters and not your opponent. To me a wargame far surpasses the real war. I am sure most readers will agree here, or else more letters and articles would have APO addresses. The wargame is more humane, easier to control and terminate, less costly, and much easier on my conscience.

Three last notes. I believe that Anzio is the best product of Avalon-Hill to date and I hope to see more of its kind. Secondly, I would like to hear from anyone sharing my views that I have set forth. And last of all, I would like Mr. and Mrs. Zocchi, my cousins, to know that we are alive and well.

Tom McVey
3518 Wilton St., Apt. 4
Long Beach, California 90804

Dear Sir:

There is one important flaw in Mr. Pelto's otherwise excellent plan for incorporating the strategic nuclear element into Blitzkrieg. (The Pessimist's Blitzkrieg, Vol. 6, No. 6) His ICBM Results Table is highly inaccurate in that it gives the missiles far less reliability than they should have. The standard reliability figure given by DOD for both U.S. and Soviet ICBMs (i.e., the probability of a given missile getting at least a near miss) is 50%, while Mr. Pelto's is 16.7%, or one out of six. To attain realism, the chart should be adjusted accordingly.

Stan Kaplan
15-56B Plaza Rd.
Fair Lawn, N.J. 07410

Dear Sir:

You stung me again. Last year when I bought your superlative 1914 game it took me six days to figure out how to play it.

This year I bought Kriegspiel which didn't take me six minutes. Mainly because there wasn't anything in it. Oh yes, I did locate the Battle card which was hidden under the plastic tray, which contained a few pieces of paper and a few troop counters (very few) and a Battle Manual of sorts. This is an \$8.00 value???

Alright, so I played it and, all kidding aside, will concede that you've published a classic game. Really. In fact, now that I've gotten hooked on it my only real criticism is the way you pandered to the Nazi vernacular in those atrociously named troop counters (Blakbutte and Elite-gruppe), to say the least a move in very poor taste...

Charles Debaugh Sp-3
Det 2, 9393 TSU
WSPG, N. Mex.

The designer only wanted you to play it, not eat it.

Dear editor,

In your Nov-Dec. issue, Mr Burkman's criticism of my article would have been welcome, but only in 10 words! It was almost in the same category of a telegram of a contest, "Explain to me in 10 words or less" —

Not only that, but 16 words were used as a challenge to a game. What else could I do, but fight in defense of my (Sept-Oct.) article. To you readers interested on how we have progressed so far; here it is:

Using my described Russian force, they moved into Finland. Four months later, after exchanges at 4-1, att. elim., and withdrawals to the Western Front, the smoke cleared on the German Sept. turn to reveal that out of the original total 14 corps on both sides, only one remained; a heavy Russian inf. corps.

Needless to say, he quickly made for the Western Front. Of course, all was not quiet on the front either as Mr. Burkman's Wermacht smashed into my Russian defenders.

By his Aug. turn, he was across the southern end of the Prut River and in Sept. had advanced across the Nemunas River to X-19. Lwow also fell.

As it stands now; the Wermacht controls almost all of Russian occupied Poland and west of the Dniester River. Of course we have exchanged social amenities to the count of 19 Russian corps lost v.s. 23 Axis. It would seem that with those losses, the Russian line would collapse, but because of its shortness, it remains intact. A few more months is all the Wermacht needs you say? Well time will tell.

Mr. Burkman is an excellent player, so if any of you would like to learn some interesting ideas for the German player, contact Mr. Burkman.

William B. Searight TMC (ISS)
U.S. Naval Torpedo Station
Keyport, Wash. 98310

Dear Sir:

Thank you for presenting wargaming fans everywhere with such an ideal sounding board as the General. Since face-to-face opposition is hard to come by around my locality, your "opponents wanted" section has not only saved the flames of my imperialistic desires from being extinguished but also succeeded in fanning them to new heights. My subscription was a good investment.

Raymond K. Witmer
224 Lincoln Avenue
Lancaster, Pa. 17603

To Whom It May Interest.

Concerning Your "AFRIKA KORPS" game.

Having played this game twelve times and discussed it with experts on armor and infantry combat, I would like to make the remarks following on your game.

1. German supply should be rolled for twice. In case of the second roll being successful the received supply unit may not be moved until the following turn. This applies only if the first roll is unsuccessful, if not no second roll is allowed.

2. Since the Italian infantry was not motorized their Road Bonus should be set at a maximum double ordinary speed.

3. Your standard Combat Results Table does not fully apply to armor-combat in desert terrain. For instance, elimination at the odds between 1-3 to 4-1 is not realistic. The only way to wipe out armor and armored infantry is to surround them whether to fight them or to isolate them.

Using these remarks as rules I find the game more flexible and challenging but still as realistic as I am sure You wanted it. Please do not regard this as criticism, your GAME-SYSTEM IS UNBEATABLE.
Steffan Kullengren
Ostergaten 1
Malmö C
Sweden

Dear Mr. James E. Smith
(President)

I have in front of me a copy of your letter informing me that my subscription to the General has expired. All I can say is thank God. I know you must be very busy, but did you take the time to read the latest issue? The cover story, both paragraphs, was so irrelevant to the purpose of the General that it shouldn't have even been in the want ad section. Next came the most assinine part of the magazine: the worthless "Avalon Hill Philosophy" which I didn't even take the time to read except the line "it was a terrible issue." It wasn't the only one. Out of the next twelve stories, "Plan of the Month" and "Playmates of Tobruk" were the only two that seemed to have a workable plan behind them, despite the catchiness of the term OCOKA, whatever the hell it means. Then came the "Question Box" which almost saved the advertisement, but then came the clubs, and the letters, AND the infamous Infiltrators Report.

Sir, did you ever stop to think that the General was a magazine for those customers who also just like to play your games? Do you realize the not everyone who subscribes to it is a nut about more rules, clubs, and the policies of your company? Whatever happened to the good ole' days when people wrote about plans to Stalingrad, or that nutty guy who wrote about "The Second Front?" Until your magazine returns to this more simple and direct line, I won't have anything to do with it or any of your other products.

Since I have the paper in the typewriter, I might as well tell you that the last two games I purchased, "1914" and "Anzio," are entirely unplayable. The rules can be understood, sure, but while your playing, you can't make a single move without referring to them. The troops take thirty minutes to set up and each turn takes at least that long. I haven't even played 6 turns in Anzio yet! Again I ask, what happened to good easily played games like Stalingrad?

Please don't send me any further material. I can see if any of your policies change by reading your advertisements that my friends, who will stick it out for a little longer hoping for some miracle, receive.

Paul Hiltbold
505 Brawner
Corpus Christi, Texas 78411

Dear Sir,

Concerning my article entitled "Plan of the Month" in the May-June issue of *The General*: we goofed. My carbon shows that there were two 1-2-2 listed on V-40, but you only have one listed there. That was your mistake.

My mistake is the fact that I have misplaced several units which allows the allied player to get a 2 to 1 in Britany. To correct this all the German need do is move the 3-3-3 on X-42 to S-33; move the 1-1-3 on LL-44 to Y-41; and take the two 1-2-2 from S-33 and put one on LL-44 and one on X-42. That alternation will make the set-up completely 2 to 1 proof on coastal squares.

My apologies to any players who used this set-up and found themselves with a 2 to 1 in Britany.

Tyrone Bomba
405 Fireline Rd.
Bowmanstown, Pa. 18030

Gentlemen:

I would like to make the following comments on Vol. 7, No. 1, May/June 70.

Lt. Roach's article "For Want of a Horseshoe Nail" really provides an answer to the AH question "What if...?" In any of their games (AH) there has been that missing suspense of command, control and communication. Lt. Roach's proposals add that suspense because in

any military situation today (as yesterday) if a unit fails to move on time, does not receive its orders or doesn't move far enough fast enough, the whole battle situation could change drastically. In addition throwing in a hero's and coward's option further enhances the command, control, communication suspense (because how often does the corps commander tell his divisions to hold a piece of real estate against odds like Bastogne?). However, it should be noted that some of Lt. Roach's proposals have been answered by AH's new CRT in *Kriegspiel*.

"Concealed Movement Madness" —

Mr. Gilbert's article is an answer to the heretofore absence of realistic combat intelligence in board games. In any situation, though you might have a complete order of battle of your enemy, you never know where every enemy unit is all the time. (Just think of the beginning of the Battle of the Bulge). However, even with some of AH's optional hidden movement rules, the opposing players still have an unblocked view of every front line and rear area unit. Mr. Gilbert's plan is a very realistic approach — however, it requires at least three players — if not more. For the 2 player fanatics — this would never work. However, it would be wonderful for tournaments and conventions. I especially like the umpire mistakes and options of mysterious movements — because I could name a few examples of such real life problems. (Remember that English speaking infiltrators created some confusion during the Battle of the Bulge.)

All of this issue was very good.

Paul M. Sivecek
Capt. U.S. Army
304 Aerobee
WSMR, N.M.

Gentlemen:

I enjoyed the PBM wargaming and thank you very much for so often settling questions and disputes. You have often done this even when I forgot to include a stamped self-addressed envelope. I enclose a small check in appreciation of this for you to use in any way you see fit, and I will try to remember to enclose the self-addressed envelope from now on. M.D.

William J. Gleckler, M.D.
38 N. San Mateo Drive
San Mateo, California 94401

We see fit to send you our latest *Kriegspiel* PBM material in return for your kindness... but now we know why you don't have time to make house calls...

Gentlemen:

The fact that you have not produced a single game with Asians fighting in Asia has been preying on my mind for quite some time. On a board of China one could play three distinct games. One on the famous (infamous?) Long March, one on the Nationalist-Communist-Japanese struggle (fought under the guise of World War Two), and one on the final National-Communist confrontation of the late forties which directly led to Korea and Vietnam.

The three-way struggle between the Nationalists, the Communists, and the Japanese is a situation completely new. First of all, it needs at least three players which is something new in itself. Secondly, it gives the players a chance to exercise some diplomatic skill making limited alliances. It would revolve around the fact that each player will be trying to pit his opponents against each other so he can profit from the bloodshed and win the game by controlling the most cities and provinces at the end of World War Two.

A logical extension of these games would be the final civil war between the Nationalists and the Communist. One side would have a small number of strong units (the Communists) while the other side would have a large number of weak units (the Nationalists). The game would then be a regular game with a slug-fest between the two.

Three full-fledged games on the same board, all within a ten year time span thus making board changes unnecessary. Certainly this would make a great game which would contain many new and novel ideas in wargame design.

Stephen Tang
1533 Silverwood Terrace
Los Angeles, CA 90026

Food for thought... let's hear the pros and cons from you subscribers.

Infiltrators Report

FOR SALE AND TRADE Opponents Wanted are conspicuous by their absence in this issue. The section grew too large. Thus we had to cut out all such material so that the column could better be put to the use for which it was originally intended. To the many hundreds of subscribers whose "For Sales" were deleted we can only say, "sorry 'bout that, fellow, "but we warned you."

CONTEST 37 WINNERS were led by John J. Van De Graaf, Jr. (what better name for a U-Boat commander) whose torpedoes blasted the destroyer with four direct hits. The destroyer had moved into squares O4 and N4; other contestants whose torpedoes made contact in those squares were: Hank Helley, Tucson, Arizona; Paul Hutchins, Needham, Mass.; Jay Leone, San Francisco; Baron August, Aliquippa, Pa.; Lawrence Burman, Baltimore; Rick Talbot, Cedar Rapids, Iowa; Kazimierz Rybak, Waterbury, Conn.; Bob Peterson, Homewood, Illinois; and Tyrone Bomba, Bowmanstown, Pa. . . \$6.00 gift certificates to the skillful ten have been awarded.

LITERARY KUDOS to Donald Cogswell, San Francisco, for award winning "Italy . . . I, II;

Other authors whose literary efforts merited gift certificates were, in order: 1/Lt Harry Roach, USAF, for "For Want of a Horseshoe Nail;" "Larry Custead of Calgary, Canada, for "Invade Belgium or Switzerland?"; "R.B. Springer of Irvington, New York, for "On the Trail;" and Tyrone Bomba of Bowmanstown, Penna., for "Plan of the Month."

ANOTHER GREAT PATTON BOOK hits the bookstands; "When the Third Cracked Europe" is General Paul D. Harkins' account of the infamous general's part in the Battle of the Bulge. In cooperation with the Army Times Publishing Company, this brand new book is another in the excellent series of military books put out by The Stackpole Company, Cameron & Kelker Streets, Harrisburg, Penna. 17105. Write them today for complete info on their entire series . . .

ALL SPORTS DIGEST is to sports fanatics what *The General* is to the military buffs. But ASD is branching out and broadening their editorial policy to include the military field. Their April issue included a book review of Young and Lawford's "Charge, or How to Play War Games." Every issue features a two-column report on Avalon Hill Games and wargaming in General. Gary Gyax, the veritable editorial workhouse, has his \$.02 worth in a cover story for their June issue. If you're a sports game nut, and really dig the BLM sports games, you would know all about this popular magazine. But with its broadening interests, ASD would appeal now to all teenagers and adult table-top strategists. Sample copies go for \$.60 first copy, \$.30 each additional copy; available from Editor Keith T. Henriksen, 4532 London Road, Duluth, Minn. 55804 . . . (Sorry 'bout that, Gary, but \$.60 divided by 1/30 the space = \$.02.)



photo R. Sidorsky

"NOT BAD FOR A FIRST TURN MOVE," echoes the cadets in one of their 12 victorious matches over St. Johns. Unfortunately the cadets also *lost* 12 matches as the two-day rematch between West Point and St. Johns Military Strategy Club (see May-June 70 General) ended in a 12-12 draw. To the cadets' credit, however, was their fantastic comeback from a 0-6 deficit. (Translation: St. John's blew a 6-0 lead.) At the close of the first day, the score stood at 7-7. On the following day, with the lead changing hands three times, time ran out at the 12-12 deadlock. Correspondent Richard Sidorsky, who will replace Damian Housman as guiding light of the St. John's MSC, looks to bigger and better college-sponsored wargame matches. Those desiring to test the superiority of the men from St. John's need only drop Sidorsky a line to: St. John's MSC, Dean of Students Office, Box 56, Grand Central and Utopia Parkways, Jamaica, N.Y. 11432 . . .

CONGRATS TO RICHARD SIDORSKY, who replaces Damian Housman as president of St. John's MSC — not because Housman's team failed to pickup a victory at West Point, but because he is heading for Air Reserve duty. Sidorsky brings to the presidency a driving zeal for getting things done. Presently attending Pace College as a Marketing Major, Sidorsky took time off to "work the booth" for Avalon Hill during the national Stationery Trade Show held during May at the New York Coliseum. He is also a seven year veteran of wargaming and was one of the original three who formed the Military Strategy Club . . .

TWO-UPSMANSHIP. S&T has done it again. Now they've given subscribers two free games instead of the usual one with each issue. May-June features the tear-away-games titled "Flight of the Goeben," and "Chicago, Chicago." How do they manage to do it all, you ask. Easy. Just run-down their lineup of editorial credits and you'll see that they've corralled just about all the

top wargaming talent around. The staff is headed by Art Director Red Simonsen, whose graphic contributions are nothing short of superb. Staff editors listed include Lou Zocchi, Dave Williams, and Larry Ruseicki — all venerable Avalon Hill devotees. Listed as the company "astrologer" is Phil Orbanes the man who brings order out of administrative chaos. James Dunnigan fans who fear he is out of the picture because of the absence of his name, take heart: near the bottom of the credit list we see, "Choreography — Busby Berkeley." Ahah; that's him. "Berkeley" and Dunnigan philosophies are synonymous. "Busby" comes from Buzz Busby, the staccatic Village Rockabilly entertainer whose stock in trade is that he never stands still. James F. Dunnigan is one who never stands still. It is his indefatigable efforts that really makes S&T go. Write to Poultron Press, Box 396, New York 10009 and see for yourself . . .

WARGAMER'S NEWSLETTER, that granddaddy of all wargame publications, gave the perfect answer to those who find ways to chastise us for supporting the hobby, "Terrible as war may be," quoting from Donald Featherstone's brilliant editorial, "it has the saving grace of arousing such admirable qualities in man as nobility, courage, self-sacrifice, fortitude, humor, and devotion — all of which go a long way towards wiping out the baser aspects of human conflict." Featherstone, by this recital, does not defend war per se. All he is saying is that war has been "an inevitable reflection of the failings of human nature for as long as man has existed" and it is simply unrealistic, sometimes hypocritical, to assume that if we stop talking about war that it might go away. More about this mature approach to wargaming is available by writing direct to Wargamer's Newsletter, 69 Hill Lane, Southampton, Hampshire, England, SO1 5AD, a yearly subscription costing only \$5.00 postpaid . . .

LAST CHANCE to register for the major Summer tournaments: the 3rd annual Long Beach (California) convention is set for August 15-16, featuring naval miniatures, armor miniatures, Napoleonic, Diplomacy, and Blitz Module sessions before noon, followed by an afternoon of "free" gaming. The Saturday's events close with an informal lecture on the history of wargaming scheduled far into the night. Sunday's activities will feature much of the previous day's activities plus "infantry street fighting" added to the morning session; play of Avalon Hill's Stock Market game to the afternoon session. An explanatory brochure may be obtained from Spartan International (sponsor) through Russell Powell, 5820 John Avenue, Long Beach, California . . . the 3rd annual Lake Geneva convention follows one week later. The setting of the August 22-23 meet is the Horticultural Hall located in this beautiful Summer resort area. Beginning at 7:30 A.M., Saturday, August 22, the highly publicized convention kicks off with a Dawn Patrol game of "Fight in the Skies," followed by an agenda that will keep the tourists' pace quickening. Register with President Len Lakofka, IFW, 1806 N. Richmond Street, Chicago, Illinois 60647. There you have it. Two consecutive weekends of wargaming ecstasy . . .

