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Hello and welcome to the latest issue of VFTT. As seems to be the norm, it’s a couple of weeks late – maybe I should adjust the release dates!

It’s not long now ‘til INTENSIVE FIRE, so no doubt I’ll see some of you there.

‘Til next issue, roll Low and Prosper.

Pete Phillipps
MMP REPRINTS BEGIN
ASL Journal 10, is expected to be placed on pre-order within the next month. Among the numerous articles will be one on Festung Budapest, along with a Series Replay of ‘FB17 Stalingrad Redux’. There will be 12-16 new scenarios, including at least one for Festung Budapest.

Work on Rising Sun is close to being finished, and it is expected to be placed on pre-order soon after ASL Journal 10. Rising Sun brings the Pacific battles to ASL, and combines the original Code of Bushido and Gung Ho! modules. Included will be complete Japanese, Chinese and USMC orders of battle, a revised Chapter G updated with the latest errata and Q&A. 32 scenarios (the original 16 plus 16 out-of-print ones), 7 mapboards, and several sheets of overlays. It will also include the Gavutu-Tanambo scenarios and campaign game (Sand and Blood) from the ASL 93b Annual, with the battlefield being represented on a new mapsheet, rather than several overlays placed on the Ocean overlays.

Decision at Elst is the first ASL Historical module and covers the fighting between British and German forces in the area known as “The Island” located between Nijmegen and Arnhem during Operation Market Garden. Playtesting is complete and it is in the final proofing stage for the components. These will include a 22” x 34” map, the latest ASL rules set, four stand-alone scenarios, a Campaign Game, specific rules for the Elst ASL HASL, charts, and enough counters to play the entire module without having to own any other ASL product.

SCHWERPUNKT RALLY
New issues of Schwerpunkt and Rally Point are due to be released at ASLOK at the start of October. Schwerpunkt 18 will contain 12 new scenarios, along with the usual articles and scenario analysis, and will cost $27.00. Rally Point 7 is subtitled “Schwerpunkt! Greatest Hits” and contains one scenario from each of the first ten issues of Schwerpunkt. All are un-changed from their original design, apart from ‘RPT63 Wollershiem!’ (from Schwerpunkt 3), which has a Sherman tank deleted from the Americans and a 5-4-8 added to the Germans. The pack will cost $21.00.

NEW CELLAR FROM FRANCE
Le Franc Tirez have released From The Cellar 7, the latest scenario pack, which contains ten new scenarios. Most are late-war western front actions, with no scenarios featuring the Russians or the PTO. Four of the scenarios are set on the Walcheren Island, with one using the LFT1 mapboard, and another a portion of the St. Nazaire map to represent the town of Flushing. Priced $20 it is available from http://www.lefrancetirez.org/.

BOUNDING TO HURTGEN
A historical module on the battles in the Hurtgen Forest is being worked on by Bounding Fire Productions. Some 16-18 scenarios are under-going playtesting, with just under half taking place on the Vosserack historical mapsheet and the remainder on the Schmidt mapsheet. There will also be a CG for the latter mapsheet covering 7 CG scenario dates covering the German assault on Kommerscheidt over the period 4-7 November after their capture of Schmidt proper.

At least one countersheet will be included in the module, mostly to represent captured US and Russian equipment in German colours. Also represented will be the M29 Weasel all-terrain light tractor which was used during the battles and was originally included in GI. Anvil of Victory, but not included in Tanks!

Also in the pipeline is a HASL focusing on the battles in the Umurbrogul Mountains in the centre of the island of Peleliu. The three part map depicts the mountains themselves, the airfield and landing beaches, and part of the southern portion of the island south of the airfield, and is about 3.5 x 7 feet in size. Some 25-35 scenarios (some taking place on regular mapboards to cover the action in the areas not shown on the mapsheet) are undergoing playtesting, as well as several CGs, including one depicting the landing and first ten days of fighting, and another covering the battle to clear the Japanese from the mountain redoubt.

FROM CANADA WITH RUSSIAN LOVE
Lone Canuck Publishing are hoping to release Ozeryka Breakout (Oz:B) in the next couple of months. The module is similar in style to the Purple Heart Draw module, in that it is primarily a Campaign with 8 CG Dates over four days, although four smaller scenarios are planned to be included. It covers the break out, after the night time amphibious assault.

Also in various stages of development are two new scenario packs, LSSAH #5 and To Battle By Air #3, and several other Campaign Games (Crossing the Moro, Bloody Baron, Drive for St. Lo, Lurking Panthers, and Juno Beach - Bloody Victory).

BUNKER BASHED OUT
Dispatches from the Bunker 35 is due to be released the Bunker Bash at the end of September, and will contain four new scenarios. Both ‘The Gin Drinkers Line’ and ‘The Gateway’ are tournament-sized scenarios, the former set in Hong Kong in 1941, with a reinforced company of Elite and 1st line Japanese infantry trying to wrest the board 62 village from the 7th Rajput (Indian) Regiment. ‘The Gateway’, sees the American 42nd Rainbow Division assaulted by Panzer Grenadiers and Pioneers, supported by Stugs and a Flame-Hetzer in Hatten, France during Operation Nordwind.

‘A Willingness to Die’, the next scenario in the 6th Panzer Division series, sees elements of the Russian 48th Rifle Division stand in the path of the German advance at Paitaisum, Lithuania on the second day of Operation Barbarossa, while ‘Les Homme de Neige’ sees French and German troops fighting over the mountain tops near Storvtn, Norway in May 1940. Boards 2, 9 and 15 are featured, along with Alpine-style hills, Deep Snow, and snowshoes.

Dispatches from the Bunker is a 12 page ASL Newsletter produced by the New England ASL Community, and released twice a year, around March and September. It typically contains four new scenarios, an analysis of each one, an article on an aspect of the game system, Tactical Tips, ASL news and tournament updates from the region.

With the loss of their printer expected in the next year, and the cost of alternative printers being too much, the producers of Dispatches from the Bunker, have made the decision to stop the paper edition and be available only in electronic format. The next two issues will be printed as usual, but after issue 36 PDF copies of each issue will be emailed to subscribers in March and September. Existing subscriptions will be increased by one issue, and the price for new subscriptions will be lowered to $15.00 for everyone.

Four issue subscriptions (starting with the current issue, number 34 are available for $16.00 ($20.00 outside the USA). Issues 1 to 20 are out of print and the www.aslbunker.com website which previously hosted PDF versions is unlikely to return – plans are being made to make them available in the future. Other back issues are $4.00 ($4.50 outside the USA) or $4.00 ($5.00 outside the USA) for a complete set of issues 21-34. A complete set of issues 21-33 and a subscription for issues 34-37 is available for $50.00 ($60.00 outside the USA). Cheques should be made payable to Vic Provost and sent to Dispatches from the Bunker, P.O. Box 2024, Hinsdale MA 01235, or you can pay by PayPal to Pink Floyd Fan 1954@aol.com. You can email them at aslbunker@aol.com.
**SASL: Operation Sealion**

A hypothetical campaign game for the solitaire system

In honour of the memory of Ian Dalglish

Nick Smith

Operation Sealion [Fall Seelöwe] was Hitler’s plan for the invasion of the United Kingdom, in the wake of the latter’s refusal even after Dunkirk to make a separate peace with the Nazi dictator. As virtually every ASL aficionado and amateur historian knows, the operation never took place for various reasons including Goering’s failure to destroy the RAF, the Kriegsmarine’s extreme reluctance to throw their support behind it and Hitler’s own pusillanimity in whether he wished to destroy the British (whom he half admired, unlike the Slavic nations whom he only wished to destroy). Several “what-if” accounts have been written since, whose conclusions have varied wildly from a complete German victory to the hastening of Hitler’s downfall.

The late Ian Dalglish produced a series of ASL scenarios based on one of these books. As far as I am aware nobody has seriously looked at an SASL campaign based on Sealion, which certainly reached the advanced planning stage even if it was abandoned in late 1940. The interest in such a campaign lies in using a variety of units (including German Fallschirmjäger [paratroopers] and early-war SS, and British Home Guards and elite Guards units) and also somewhat extending the use of early-war British and German ordnance and armour, which normally only otherwise sees use in 5-6/40 scenarios in France (EG the Matilda I).

The following campaign also introduces variables depending on whether the player is currently winning or losing on campaign points or reflecting non-battlefield but still related elements, such as the Royal Navy interfering with German supply lines or the Luftwaffe doing likewise to British logistics.

There are two possible campaigns, both of which can be played as either the German or British/Commonwealth player.

**July 1940**

This presupposes, perhaps far-fetchedly, that Hitler, Goering and the Army chiefs seize the moment and try for a coup de main by dropping a division of Fallschirmjäger on/near London while the bulk of the British Army is either escaping from France or still training or awaiting weapons at home. This possibility was mooted by no less an authority on military matters than Kenneth Macksey, so has some plausibility. The scenarios are weekly.

**German**

The German player starts off in the first week of 7/40 with a standard German Fallschirmjäger company (S17.). First scenario to be played is (unsurprisingly) “20 Airlanding”. If he wins this, the next scenario is (Random Selection) “6 The Fortress” or “7 Block Party”, to reflect the fact that such a paradrop would have been with the view to seizing control of London. Should he lose the initial scenario, roll for an Offensive scenario normally [EXC: Airlanding and Amphibious Assault scenarios are N/A]. If the German player wins the first two scenarios, the campaign ends in a German victory. If he loses the first but wins the second, he rolls for a third scenario on the Offensive column. Winning this scenario allows him to play scenario 6 or 7 (Random Selection) as if playing either as for the second scenario, ie winning this fourth scenario will result in a Campaign Victory. Losing three scenarios in a row means that the next scenario will be rolled for on the “Defensive” column. Thereafter selectively which column a scenario is rolled for on. At the end of each subsequent scenario, make a dr: a Final dr of 1 ends the Campaign. There is a drm of -1 for each scenario subsequent to the third having been played. British player wins the first scenario, he rolls for the next one on the “Defensive” column. Should he lose both the initial scenarios, the Campaign ends in a German victory. Should he win both the first scenarios, he rolls for the third scenario on the “Defensive” column, otherwise the third scenario is randomly selected from either column. Winning the third scenario allows him to play an Offensive scenario for the fourth scenario which if he wins it will result in a British victory. If the fourth scenario is not won, he continues to randomly select scenarios and play them in the same manner as the German player (see above) until the campaign ends on a Final dr of 1 (the same drm apply to the British as the German player).

**Special rules for the June 1940 campaign:**

For the first two scenarios, any German S? resolved as 4-6/7-2/4-7 or better counters are automatically 5-4/2-3-8 instead, and any RE resulting in armoured reinforcements or OBA are rerolled.

After the third scenario for the German player, and the fifth scenario for the British player, should the Friendly side be losing the Campaign on points, Ammunition Shortage applies on a pre-scenario drm of 1-3.

---

infantry company (S17.) or a Home Guard company (see below). The first scenario is rolled for on the “Defensive” column [EXC: Beach Defence and Tank Attack are N/A; reroll for a different scenario]. If the British player wins the first scenario, he rolls for the next one on the “Defensive” column, otherwise he rolls again on the “Defensive” column. Should he lose both the initial scenarios, the Campaign ends in a German victory. Should he win both the first scenarios, he rolls for the third scenario on the “Defensive” column, otherwise the third scenario is randomly selected from either column. Winning the third scenario allows him to play an Offensive scenario for the fourth scenario which if he wins it will result in a British victory. If the fourth scenario is not won, he continues to randomly select scenarios and play them in the same manner as the German player (see above) until the campaign ends on a Final dr of 1 (the same drm apply to the British as the German player).
September 1940

This campaign presupposes that Hitler, Raeder and Goering steered themselves to launch Sealion in the period 19-26/9/40, when sea and winds in the Channel would have been most favourable to a crossing of the improvised barge craft the Germans were forced to use for the invasion fleet. Unlike the July campaign, which is mainly based on paratroopers, this involves regular Wehrmacht (and possibly some SS) forces.

German

The German player may start with a Fallschirmjäger company, a regular infantry company, a Gebirgsjäger company (substitute 4-6-8s for 4-6-7s) or an early-war SS company. For the first scenario, play “Air Landing” if a Fallschirmjäger company, otherwise “Amphibious Assault” [EXC: the SS starts with any Offensive scenario except these two]. Thereafter play scenarios normally: a win in a scenario means the next scenario is selected on the Offensive column [EXC: Air Landing and Amphibious Assault are N/A after the first scenario], otherwise it is selected on the Defensive column.

If the German player has negative Campaign points by the end of 10/40, the Campaign ends in a German defeat (this reflects failure to seize adequate port and air-landing facilities before the tides in the Channel become too rough to allow naval supply). If the German player has neither negative nor plus points by the end of 10/40, play “Escape” as a Night scenario but with the FBE board set up with a Beach Overlay (S13). Winning this scenario still results in a Campaign defeat but allows the German commander to return home with his unit and prestige relatively intact.

British

The British player may start the campaign as a regular British infantry company, a Canadian or Guards company (substituting 4-5-8s for 4-5-7s) or a Home Guard company (see below). The first scenario is played as Beach Defence. As for the German player, a win in a scenario means the next scenario is selected on the Offensive column [EXC: Air Landing and Amphibious Assault are N/A after the first scenario], otherwise it is selected on the Defensive column. If the British player is winning on Campaign points by the end of 10/40, the result is a British Campaign victory; if a draw, continue to play one scenario per week. If he slips to -1 Campaign Victory points, play “Escape” as the next and final mission. Winning this scenario still results in a strategic British loss but your company escapes to be conveyed by the Royal Navy to North America to carry on the fight.

Special rules for the September 1940 campaign:

Scenarios are weekly, starting in the third week of 9/40 [EXC: SS company starts in the fourth week of 9/40].

After the third scenario for the German player, and the fifth scenario for the British player, should the Friendly side be losing the Campaign on points, Ammunition Shortage applies on a pre-scenario dr of 1-3.

LDV/Home Guard

The Home Guard (initially the Local Defence Volunteers) was first officially raised in 5/40, although it suffered initially from both debate over its proposed role and over the need for the recently escaped Army to receive priority in receiving weapons. Because of the latter reason most units were poorly armed and equipped to start with, although the older members had at least often had the benefit of military or naval training.

Home Guard units were divided into sections, platoons and companies, but leaders apparently did not receive commissions nor have the authority to command regular military units. Under SASL, this allows us to create a Home Guard company whose SMC’s should be recorded separately since, properly speaking, they should not be able to exert any influence on non-Home Guard units. If this seems a bit harsh, treat Home Guard SMC as Allied (A10.).

To reflect shortage of weaponry and training, all initial MMC for a Home Guard company are 4-3-6’s and are treated as Conscript units. However the MF of a Home Guard MMC should always be 4, not 3, reflecting the fact that most if not all of the units were indeed local and thus knew their way around the area.

A Home Guard company has two (2) SMC to begin with. Roll for both of these as per S17., not forgetting the modifier.

Finally, make a dr for SW for the company as follows, rolling once each for LMG and Lt. Mtrs:

- SW
- LMG
- 2” Mtr

| ≥6 | 2 | 2 |
| ≥5 | 1 | 1 |
| ≥4 | - | - |
| ≥3 | - | - |
| ≥2 | - | - |
| ≤1 | - | - |

There is a -1 to this dr if the campaign begins before 9/40, and a +1 from 10/40 onwards.

Finally, make a dr for SW for the company as follows, rolling once each for LMG and Lt. Mtrs:

EX: Original dr of 5 and 6 in 9/40 would result in Final dr of 4 and 5 respectively, resulting in no LMGs and one 2” Mtr being received. The same dr in 10/40 would result in Final dr of 6 and 7, resulting in 2 LMGs and 2 2” Mtrs.

Home Guard units are considered inherently armed with Molotov Cocktails (A22).

If Home Guard reinforcements are received, roll for SW normally and use the above rule on Home Guard SMC, i.e treating them as Allied.

In sum, if you have elected to play the Sealion campaign with the Home Guard company, you have taken on a tough assignment – but if you win, you will have achieved all the greater kudos. As somebody once said, “any fool can win with Tiger tanks and elite troops”.

Notes

The idea for these campaigns came from reading fictional accounts of Sealion as well as reading their historical background. The Ammunition Shortage rules apply earlier to the German player because of the difficulty that the Germans would have faced in real life in supplying the divisions it intended to put ashore. The SS company starts later as the sole SS unit, the Leibstandarte (still only motorised regimental strength at that stage of the war) was not due to land until the second wave of the invasion.

Although I have tried to keep within the bounds of historical likelihood, there is some elasticity. For example, in reality the Fallschirmjägers would have been rebuilding their forces after the losses suffered in the Dutch campaign, so a lowered ELR or replacement of some 5-4-8s with 4-4-7s might have been more realistic. Similarly I have not introduced rules for reducing the quality of British troops, even though in July certainly many would have been without the equipment abandoned at Dunkirk. Instead I have taken the approach that the weaknesses of both sides roughly balance each other out, and besides, it gives players an opportunity to play British vs. German scenarios in a time frame which they would otherwise not had.

Image: Panzer IIs driving up the Mall, London, 23 days after Operation Sealion
INTENSIVE FIRE is the UK’s longest running tournament dedicated to the play of Advanced Squad Leader. 2012 sees us well into our second decade and players of all standards are invited to attend.

**Format**
The well-established Fire Team Tournament is the main event and offers the chance for competitive play on the Saturday and Sunday. In addition, the Friday mini-tourneys offer the chance for glory in more specialised fields of warfare. There will also be a Training Camp for inexperienced players. For those not interested in tournament play, or not able to make it for the whole weekend, there is always room for pick-up games and friendly play.

**Venue**
The Kiwi Hotel, centrally located in Bournemouth, offers both excellent gaming facilities and reduced accommodation rates (£46 per night for a single room or £36 for a double room). The hotel is within a short taxi-ride of Bournemouth rail station and ample parking is available. To book contact the hotel on (01202) 555 889 (+44 1202 555 889 from outside the UK). You can also book online at [www.kiwihotel.co.uk](http://www.kiwihotel.co.uk).

For foreign visitors, lifts can often be pre-arranged to and from major airports. For those contemplating an extended stay, Bournemouth offers an excellent base for the military historian, being within easy reach of important military museums at Bovington Camp, Winchester, Portsmouth and Aldershot.

**Cost**
Weekend registration for the tournament costs just £15, or just £10 if you register before 1st October. The tournament program listing the weekend’s scenarios and events is available from late September to anyone registering in advance.

**Further Details / Registration**
Contact Pete Phillipps, 9 Pier Road, Kilchoan, Acharacle, Argyll, Scotland, PH36 4LJ. Telephone (01972) 510 350 (+44 1972 510 350 from outside the UK) or email [if@vftt.co.uk](mailto:if@vftt.co.uk).
As an Army officer, I am sometimes asked how realistic I think ASL is. I have given that much thought over time, and have also intended many times to contribute to one of the magazines or websites dedicated to the game. This article will take a several-fold approach. I’ll consider the question of my thoughts on the realism of the game. I will then outline some of the utility of ASL to my work, and then outline a useful real world military planning tool which I apply to this game (and others which I indulge in). Finally, I’ll apply the tool to a playtest game for the forthcoming Kohima HASL, and write a condensed AAR. As the military lives in a world of acronyms – much as ASL and wargamers in general do - I added a key to military specific abbreviations at the end. All abbreviations not covered in the key will be familiar to ASL players.

I joined the South African Defence Force in 1988, serving as an officer cadet section commander in the last flicker of the Bush War on the Angolan-SWA border in 1989, and then as a Motorised Inf Pl Comd until I left in 1991. In 1996 SA rejoined the Commonwealth, and I flew over and joined the British Army, commissioning into the Royal Irish Regiment as a Pl Comd. I have been in the British Army ever since, and am currently serving as a Lt Col in Staff in London – my last job bar one having been 2nd-in-command of 1 R IRISH through their last Afghan tour. In July I take command of the same battalion. Some of you may be familiar with 1 R IRISH through their motto of “Faugh-a-Ballagh” (Clear the Way!), which is the name of an ASL scenario set in Sicily in which they appear. I was an avid fan of SL, and played quite a bit of it whilst at university (keeping busy between armies). I noticed then that you could roll badly against somebody playing with no real tactical sense (this is not to suggest you can’t still be diced). I was also always quite good at the Estimate (planning) process. Many struggle with the Estimate, so I have partly concluded that much of my ease of use was down to thought processes accumulated from wargaming. The corollary might then apply – wargaming could serve as a process for training the Estimate. I’ll return to this theme later.

ASL is a fantastic game. I wish I had more time on my hands to play it (don’t we all). I have to juggle it against a very busy job and my family. Sadly, it scores third place in that hierarchy, and thus I usually only get to game when I can make it to conventions – and the odd occasion outside of these; although VASL has opened up game opportunities again. I confess to not really enjoying the tournament scenarios. They seem, to me, to unhinge the game from reality more than the big scenarios. They lend themselves more to rules aficionados and to unrealistic (IMHO) play. I don’t mind if a player’s skill rests heavily on their intimate knowledge of the rules, but I also find these are often players who will nit-pick over the meastliest interpretations and take hours in setting up. Just not fun really, which is what the game should be about. When I read elaborate articles laying out statistical probabilities of hits/effects etc in magazines, I shudder. To me it is a game, not an exercise in statistics. When a soldier engages the enemy, he does so on instinct or the basis of determined arcs within feasible ranges. There is no scope for statistical analysis. Enjoy, and go with your instincts. If you lose, so what – nobody dies! Your name will not enter the history books as being synonymous with tactical ineptitude and failure. I say again, on a battlefield you don’t have time to consider the probable likelihood of hitting your target vs. what the result might be against the odds of breaking your weapons or initiating a sniper check etc. Short scenarios lend themselves too much to a single dice roll changing the whole balance of a scenario, or to a final turn “all or nothing” charge, or to discarding a key weapon system because it is too heavy and no longer seems useful as the end turns approach (I was the Anti-tank Pl Comd for a while – this would not happen unless you were being routed!) or dismounting from a perfectly serviceable armoured vehicle to plonk the crew in a victory location (imagine a Challenger 2 crew hopping out of a perfectly serviceable MBT to occupy a house covering the approaches to Basrah Bridge; I don’t think so). For me, these game activities detract.

Another really significant unreality is the time/distance scale of the game (each turn is 2 minutes; any idea how long it takes to manoeuvre under fire just to get into a reasonable fire support position?). In Normandy, it took troops 15-30 minutes just to cross each field from hedgerow to hedgerow. But there has to be a trade off to allow for a playable game. The dice, to me, represent the incredible vagaries of conflict. It doesn’t matter how good you are, that stray piece of shrapnel can kill you just as easily. The dice – they are the frictions within war, and I have no issue with their use in ASL. The craziest rule is the missed hit attempt of ordinance. Where does that HE or smoke round end up then? I’m also not convinced about being able to fire through another of your sections (no matter how many may be stacked in a single hex), and accurately deliver your fire to an enemy beyond – not when on the same level. Ever heard of fratricide? Doesn’t stop me doing it in a game setting, though. Still, for some of the annoying unrealties, it remains a game first and foremost, and that should never be forgotten.

The ultimate for me are HASL CGs, where the Principles of War really can apply; where long term, objective planning and prioritising, task organizing and force preservation and contingency planning, are essential.

As a BG 2ic, or Chief-of-Staff (COS) as they are now referred to (given that BG HQs on current ops are bigger than Bde HQs were 12 years ago), it was my responsibility to train and develop the HQ in the planning process, and coordinate and direct it on the CO’s behalf when planning. The 7Qs estimate was the primary tool. These are the British version of the Military Decision Making Process (MDMP).

THE 7Qs
1 What is the enemy doing and why?

This includes full consideration of the threat, threat overlays, IPE (Intelligence Preparation of the Environment), balance of forces consideration, and consideration of other environmental factors such as refugees/civilians/weather etc (might equate it to Interrogation and Weather rules in ASL, and how they might affect the scenario/CG). Also considers enemy likely and worst courses of action (COAs). The end state is the BG Comd having a picture of the potential of the environment and an understanding of its role, for the enemy and friendly forces, in time and space. A BG Comd should now have an idea of what enemy is likely, where they are, and when they are likely to appear. A COG (Centre of gravity) analysis of the enemy might also be conducted (for example, in an early Russian game, or even ‘Hill 621’; you might ID Russian leadership as being the COG, and deliberately plan to target leaders in setting targeting priorities).
2 What have I been told to do and why?
This is what we call the Mission Analysis, which includes consideration of a variety of other factors which we tackle in a 3 column format; Factors – Deductions (the So What part) – Tasks/Constraints/Clarification. This should also consider the Question 4 moment – what could go wrong/fundamentally change that would require a significant re-think in the analysis and conduct. When you hear military personnel referring to a Q4 moment, they mean what has/could significantly change that requires a dramatic re-think.

3 What effects do I want to have and what direction is required to develop the plan?
This is where the commander produces his Effects Schematic, outlining the effects he wants to achieve and giving direction on the plan he wants to have worked up by his staff, under direction of the COS. The direction can be based on various planning criteria, such as the functions in combat or principles of war or the type of operation being conducted. This really kicks off the second phase of planning. If Q1-3 cover mission analysis, Q4-7 are about Course of Action (COA) development.

4 Where can I best accomplish each effect?
Q3 is effects based and enemy focused, not terrain focused. Using terrain analysis and assessment of the threats from Q1, planning staff now consider where best these effects can be achieved within the battle space.

5 What resources do I need to accomplish each action/effect?
Speaks for itself really. This is where the Task Organising (Task Org) process kicks in. What do I have at my disposal and under what command relationships (as some assets cannot be guaranteed, and therefore success cannot hinge upon their availability or non-availability would become a Q4 moment – think of OBA or air support, or even variable reinforcements in ASL). It should produce a thorough Task Org table and ISTAR (Intelligence, Surveillance, Target Acquisition and Reconnaissance) overlay.

6 When and where?
This entails the production of a synchronisation matrix, from which a Battle Captain (who conducts the battle from the HQ Ops room on behalf of the CO) should be able to fight the battle, in conjunction with the ISTAR overlay. It details the interaction of the resources allocated in relation to each other. For example, in ASL, you may have an Arty task during T1, with a MG section in overwatch on a key point, while a platoon seeks to advance into a piece of key terrain. A Decision Point (DP) might then be the occupation of that key terrain, which initiates the release of the MG section to relocate to a new position in a phased advance.

7 What control measures do I need?
This is all about coordination to ensure proper command and control and de-risk likelihood of occurrences such as fratricide.

That sums up the 7Qs. It is a simple and elegant tool, well proven from Pl to Div level, but has many working parts to it with a variety of products and outputs. By the end of Q6, the COS will have conducted a COA comparison (against whichever planning principles/criteria were directed) if more than one COA is being considered, and a favoured COA would be opted for and presented to the CO for a decision. Once this is worked up, it will be wargamed to determine where problems/issues might lie, to ID what contingency planning might be necessary and to determine whether the synch matrix is realistic. It may also ID potential requirements for planning for subsequent activities. Many of the control measures are ID’d during the wargame. It is a crucial element of the planning process, and a COS should always try and make time for a wargame when drawing up the planning and operational timelines.

I’m sure there are no surprises that wargaming is a key tool in military real world planning. It is very different from the wargaming we do as a hobby, but many principles remain the same. As such, it struck me that wargaming might be a useful tool in training young officers in the 7Qs.

I also commented by reading articles whereby a USMC engineer gammed the breach of the berm during the 1st Gulf War using his Gung Ho module. In the Army, we train officers on the 7Qs, amongst other ways, by conducting TEWTs (Tactical Exercises Without Troops). These comprise hypothetical scenarios in made-up countries usually fighting against GENFOR (Generic Enemy Forces – based on old Warsaw Pact style forces) opponents, and are usually met with scant enthusiasm by young officers. I thought: “What if instead of the tired old GENFOR TEWTs, I use ASL to get them to plan and actually conduct engagements against each other?” This would add elements of real historical encounters and competitive instinct would (hopefully) be aroused. So, as a rifle company commander, I ran my 3 platoon commanders and company 2ic through basic infantry rules when we were on a tour in Northern Ireland in 2004, between Iraq tours, and then gave them scenarios to plan around. I’ll give an example of one of these – ‘3 The Czerniakow Bridgehead’.

This was a great scenario. The planners had to consider the principles of urban warfare, obstacle crossings, withdrawal under contact and defensive and offensive operations – from opposing perspectives. They were then given a fixed time to plan, after which they were required to brief me on their planning considerations, COAs and chosen COA, along with all the standard product required from the 7Qs (IPE, Threat Overlay etc). They would then conduct operations. As they did not have full knowledge of the rules, I impured proceedings – so long as they conducted activities in a sound tactical fashion adhering to the various principles of the operational activity they were engaged in, I was content. I would only run it into 2 or 3 game turns, as we didn’t have the luxury of too much time (given we were actually deployed on operations). This was enough time for things to start going wrong (the “no plan survives contact with the enemy” bit), and to test their contingency planning. The proof was in the pudding – 2 of them went off to score top in junior command courses for the planning process, and one went off to complete special forces selection where he did well on Officers’ Week (the extremely rigorous week of planning and presentations, which few of the survivors by that stage actually pass). Significantly, they enjoyed the process (albeit somewhat begrudgingly), something which would not have been said of TEWTs. It was agreed that it was far more stimulating than TEWTs. I firmly believe the utility of ASL as a real world planning tool contributed to their respective achievements, and I’m informed by all of them that so do they.

USING THE 7Qs IN ASL
When I set up a game of ABFT’s big scenario, ‘God Save the King’, against Shaun Carter, I conducted a condensed 7Qs estimate. I like to think this contributed to his conceding on turn 4 of this scenario. This is not intended to be a boast or to knock Shaun’s play, but it was very clear that he had given little planning consideration to his defence as the Brits, and he admitted to this. I have been similarly guilty playing ‘Hill 621’ against Dave Schofield, in which he manhandled me out of the game by about turn 5. For a playtest game at Kohima called ‘Octopus Trap’ against Shaun Carter, I conducted a (non-detailed) 7Qs as the Brits, with a brief AAR to see how things went.

“Octopus Trap” sees my British attempting to clear Japanese remnants out of the caves and summits of several hills on Kohima Ridge in May 1944. Sadly, the map is still a work in progress, so I have no clear
Q1: What is the enemy doing and why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>DEDUCTION</th>
<th>TASK/CONSTRAINT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I’m facing els of 2/58 Inf Regt and 2 Mt Arty:</td>
<td>Wpn ranges 3-4H effective</td>
<td>C: Japanese will use SWs to deny freedom of movement to me and inflict casualties by establishing fire lanes, putting down cones of residual fire and boresighting key approaches. Mortars will use smoke and WP to suppress and blind my key weapons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed 1st line and elite</td>
<td>Must find/clear/avoid. Will be bore sighted; entrenchments, pillboxes.</td>
<td>T: Find his SWs and screen with Smoke, artillery and MGs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong mix of MMGs/HMGs 50mm mortars</td>
<td></td>
<td>T: Maintain concealment; use assault movement and advances to close distance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ltd lt arty sp (70-75mm)</td>
<td></td>
<td>T: Bring up FTs to use on PBs – keep protected and save for use on fortified locations; don’t expose until necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well entrenched</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boresighting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillboxes and bunkers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terrain:</strong></td>
<td>Good killing areas (KAs) for enemy.</td>
<td>T: Plan unexpected approach routes; use extensive smoke and suppressive fire. Methodical pace of advance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steep, open ground.</td>
<td>Gives some cover from fire/view. This must be secured from enemy fire – is the underlying purpose of the assault. From here, Japanese have ability to interdict MSR with fires. Provides outstanding fields of view out over most of battlefield. Japanese can use to conceal and move units to attack my rear and flanks. I must therefore keep any cave moths discovered covered by fire.</td>
<td>T: Clear and secure MSR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken terrain – palm debris, gullies.</td>
<td>T: Must defeat enemy on these features.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vital Ground – MSR</td>
<td>T: Destroy where possible, or keep covered with fire when found to prevent Japanese counter-attack opportunities out of caves. Have DCs and FTs grouped and on call to eliminate units in caves.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Terrain – hill summits of Jail Hill, FSD and DIS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pimple Hill.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weather:</strong></td>
<td>Will assist me in crossing the Japanese KAs to close the gap.</td>
<td>T: Plan on closing right onto Jap positions in LV hindrance turns; use opportunity fire rather than Prep on GT1 to force Jap to strip concealment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mist/poor light in early and late turns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Most Likely COA (Course of Action):**
Hold key positions to deny me approaches onto key terrain and interdict MSR. He will boresight all suitable SW onto key avenues of approach, or lay down fire lanes down the slopes or spray to create KAs of residual fire. Most positions likely to be on west edge of hills to engage my INF, with caves to rapidly manoeuvre to interdict the MSR on the eastern side. Likely to use INF to move through caves to cut off rout routes or counter-attack from flanks and rear.

**Most Dangerous COA (Course of Action):**
As above, but with a plan to concentrate an INF counter-attack when he has sufficient of my forces pinned/broken/suppressed; likely to be a Banzai attack coming out of cave complexes and supported with MGs from PBs.

**Selection:** I will plan to be prepared to counter his most dangerous COA.

Kohima map images taken from the article “The 1st Queen’s In The Battles For Kohima” ([http://www.queensroyalsurreys.org.uk/ww2/burma/003.shtml](http://www.queensroyalsurreys.org.uk/ww2/burma/003.shtml)), which is posted on the website of The Queen’s Royal Surrey Regemental Association.

Many of the features are named after British and Indian encampments. The three abbreviated ones are:
- G.P.T. Ridge - General Purpose Transport Company Ridge
- D.I.S. - Detail Issue section Royal Indian Army Service Corps Ridge
- F.S.D. - Field Supply Depot Hill
**MISSION ANALYSIS RECORD**

**2 Up Msn:**
I won’t expend effort on these, as *ASL* doesn’t really provide anything other than the opportunity to surmise on them and refer to history books (and it is complex as the Brit forces comprise elements from different brigades). At BG level, 2 Up is invariably a Div Comd, and 1 Up is the Bde Comd. Here, a BG Comd considers the intent of his superiors 2 and 1 up, and his role within these.

**1 Up Msn:**

**BG Mission:** Clearly in this scenario, it is a Div Msn (unless the 6 Bde elements are attached to 33 Bde for the operation in question), and within that each of the Bdes has a mission, which in turn provides operational orders for its constituent BGs etc. The *ASL* Brit player controls elements from 4 different BGs of two different Bdes, so no simple mission statement is feasible here. However, the Div mission statement may read something like this:

"?? Div is to ATTACK: To DEFEAT the Japanese remnants on Supply, Detail and Jail Hill by conducting a simultaneous, deliberate 2 x Bde assault in order to DENY the enemy the ability to interdict the MSR.

**Main Effort (ME):** Deny Japanese ability to interdict the MSR.

**End state:** Hill features clear of Japanese, and MSR secure from interdiction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASKS</th>
<th>DEDUCTIONS</th>
<th>RFIS/CCIRS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specified</td>
<td>Attack Jail Hill</td>
<td>I need clear and secure these hills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attack Detail Hill (DIS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attack Supply Hill (FSD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deny Japanese interdiction of MSR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimise FF casualties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implied</td>
<td>Co-ordinate JAAT (Joint Air &amp; Arty Task)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protect armour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clear MSR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedoms</td>
<td>No air threat – air superiority and regular call on air.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Armoured assault.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I hold the initiative.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-registered artillery.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Space – Japanese need to interdict MSR on east, but at same time deny me taking the hill features from west.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>British units set up entrenched if in suitable terrain (maximise this opportunity to ensure opportunities to move around battlefield under cover).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constraints</td>
<td>Japanese hold high ground.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of covered ground and approaches.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time – 18 turns (plenty of time – more a freedom than constraint).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Casualties – keep below 40 INF CVP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weather – LVs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese FP (less than 16FPF covering road).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artillery – barrages restricted to East-West orientation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q3: What effects do I want to have and what direction is required to develop the plan?**

This is where a Comd will give direction to his staff, articulating to them the effects he wants to achieve and leaving the BG COS to then direct the staff in formulating the plan, while the CO goes to do one of several things; backbrief his own comd 1 Up, conduct a recce or start working on his draft scheme of manoeuvre (SOM) and his mission statements and tasks. I will
Q4: Where can I best accomplish each effect?
Q5: What resources do I need to accomplish each action/effect?
Q6: When and where?

Questions 4 to 6 are about where the desired effects can best be achieved, and with what resources operating in what time and space to each other.

As a BG COS, I would lead the planning on these. It generally takes place over the bird table where the map of the operational area sits, overlaid with such information as unit locations, coordination and control levels (boundaries between units etc). I found the best way to do this was to place a fresh clear plastic sheet over the map (with the enemy Threat Overlay in place), and then begin to consider where best on the ground the CO’s effects can be achieved (it is the Effects Based approach to planning, which focuses on the enemy rather than on the ground – you can see how this can be a little problematic in ASL, where often victory conditions are based on taking and holding various locations … and leading to one of my least favourite activities of debussing crews from vehicles or dropping SWs to move more quickly to “own” a building). Identifying where best to achieve what the CO has declared as his Main Effort (ME) is always the start point, along with which of the enemy COAs has been selected to plan against. I then tended to write within each Effect “box” the Task (T) and purpose (P), of what is being sought, and then look to resource it (Requirements – R) from what is in the BG Task Org. This is referred to as Task Organising. Usually there is not enough to do everything, and that is why resources must be organised in time and space (producing a Synchronisation Matrix – Synch Matrix). Control measure will be ID’d along the way, but many more usually come out of the wargame of the plan.

At this point you are wondering why an ASL gamer would put himself (and his very patient opponent) through this. It is a time consuming affair. However, when I game ASL, I make the usual recce of terrain and SSRs (to determine any constraints, freedoms etc), and then go straight into a quick sketch illustrating the Q4-6 element (as illustrated below). This is a 10-15 minute process, but I always do it for ASL, and I think it has utility.

It is then a simple task to allocate your available forces to the tasks identified (or not so simple, as there is never enough – hence why synchronisation and multiple tasking). In the effects schematic below, terrain features of note are in the ovals.

I’m not going to provide Synch Matrices within this article – given the turn based system of the game, it is less pertinent. I will also not go into a detailed analysis of different COAs. I considered 3 here:

COA 1: Simultaneous attack on all 3 features.
COA 2: Concentrated attack on a single feature, then rolling each of the other up consecutively.
COA 3: Concentrate on 2 features, isolating the third, then coordinate a final max effort on the last objective when flanks and rear secure.

What is clear is that DIS is the Japanese vulnerable point – their weakest position. It gets its security from the approaches being covered by personnel on the other two Japanese held hills. Attacking it without suppressing the other two positions would thus open the flanks of the assaulters to enfilading fire from both of the other Japanese positions, which are well situated to provide mutual support. The strongest and most dangerous position is Jail Hill, which holds a Japanese MG Coy(-), an INF Pl(-), and a couple of INF guns. My armoured support comes in from the north, so it makes sense to maximise its use by linking up and clearing a way forward to bring these assets to bear as soon as possible. I thus opt for COA 3, with primary objectives being FSD and DIS, while Jail Hill is suppressed and isolated. The ME throughout remains securing the MSR, so everything goes towards this. Here is my plan:

SoM:
Ph 1 Isolate the positions by denying them the opportunity to provide mutual support (SMK barrages, Mor PI SMK and concentration of 51mm mortars to smoke off FSD and DIS). Enter armour and engineers on road to find mines and provide fire sp. Mor PI, FOO and MG PI provides FSG (Fire Sp Group) from the Pimple. FTs and DCs concentrated with Left (Northern) BG (some DCs with Central) to enable systematic
clearance from north to south of objectives.
Central BG reinforces Left BG for encircling assault on FSD.
Left BG Pl(-) link-up with armour to assist the CLEAR.
Central BG assault DIS.
Right BG manoeuvre and suppress Jail Hill, secure flank.

Ph2 Systematically clear FSD, then DIS.
Bring armour fwd.
Suppress Jail Hill.
Switch assets as they become available (FTs, DCs, mortars, FOOs).
Assault move and advance to gain ground on Jail Hill.
Reinforce for final assault on Jail Hill.

Ph3 Final assault on Jail Hill; slow and systematic to minimise casualties.

AFTER ACTION REPORT

T1: The Break-in Battle commences

Pre-registered artillery delivers smoke barrages running east to west between FSD and DIS, and between DIS and Jail Hill (hereafter JH), to deny the Japanese providing effective mutual support to each others separate hill positions. Commonwealth (CW) troops are on their lines of departure (LD) and in Assembly Areas, eagerly waiting to close with the Japanese. Platoons have been designated tasks and given specific objectives on the first two main objectives of FSD and DIS. This is where the break-in battle will be fought by the 1BERKS (1st Bn the Berkshire Regiment) and 4PJBI (4th Bn Punjabis) BGs, while 4RGR (4th Bn The Royal Gurkha Rifles) prepares to isolate JH using the Mor Pl (3 x 81mm), a FOO, and a MG Pl (2 x HMG, MMG, 9-1) from the Pimple.

Fire opens from the Pimple, with WP from the Mor Pl impacting on the south edge of JH to create obscuration and suppress the enemy forces (EF). The EF takes its first casualties here. Very few to no EF positions are visible, so most SWs hunker down to wait for opportunity fire targets to present themselves, and the assaulting troops begin a slow advance, maintaining concealment by using assault movement through palm debris and gullies. Pincers from north, west and south seek to close around DIS and FSD to encircle any EF located. The task is to find the EF positions at this stage.

A section (sect) from 4PJBI uncovers AT mines along the MSR and warnings are sent to the reinforcing armoured columns of 149 RAC. This unit boldly sends a scout car forward which is promptly obliterated by an AT mine. A Daimler AC then attempts to traverse the steep slopes to the east of FSD and is punished for its impatience by rolling and being destroyed – there are no survivors. The Grant troop following on hunkers down to provide fire support onto the north and east edge of FSD while waiting for engineers to be called forward for mine clearance tasks.

On FSD, advancing troops locate an entrenched 75mm INF gun; 2 x sects (squad) advance into CC and destroy it. The break-in battle on FSD has been successfully achieved, with no casualties (although the RAC may have something to say about this assessment). On JH, a FB strafing run causes some casualties to a Japanese HMG position.

The Japanese opt to stay hidden, fearful of exposing themselves to our well sighted and concentrated SWs. I use this opportunity to consolidate my initial gains.

Bill Slim sends warmest congratulations on a good start.

T2: Battle for FSD

Once again, a paucity of targets sees most SWs declaring “watch and shoot” [Opportunity Fire] and observing for targets to present themselves. A FT team manages to reduce a Japanese sect on the east edge of JH. Now recce probes on FSD and DIS identify several EF positions. On JH, troops that had made some advances are reigned in and ordered to fall back into cover to get out of the danger area and allow for more artillery and air softening up. The engineers enter along the road to start manoeuvre support ops by clearing mines, whilst a sect of 4PJBI does likewise in the MSR vulnerable point running between DIS and JH (to be referred to as “The Bottleneck”).

On FSD, a Japanese trench is encircled and whittled down. During CC, two trenches and PBs on FSD and DIS are cleared.

The Japanese respond with some ferocious PBF, breaking several sects. A foolish Japanese team firing from a cave on the east edge of FSD to try and hit the engineers is obliterated by a CH on the cave mouth from a Grant. It is getting bloody. An INF sect fires a PIAT at a Japanese bunker, scoring a CH and casualty reducing the MG crew inside. A FT is then called up to finish them off, which it does, but also runs out of fuel. The Japanese, feeling cornered, fling a sect into HtH CC against two elite sects on FSD. To my horror, the Japanese are left victorious, leaving the remnants of two smashed and bloody sects to drag themselves away. A shocking reminder of how brutally effective the Japanese, even starved as they are, can be in CC. The message goes out to the assaulting troops to avoid getting into unnecessary CC – wear them down with sustained FP.

T3: No plan survives contact!

Turn 3 starts off with some pretty ineffectual artillery adjustment, with SRs falling well wide of the targets. Throughout the battle thus far, the CW have exhibited a pretty poor logistics chain – most of the 51mmns appear to have deployed without smoke ammo, and some of the 81s also seem to have deployed with low stocks of WP and smoke. Poor planning! The Logistics Supply Officer has an interview without coffee on his immediate forecast. One of the 81s had prepared well (a pat on the back for the Mor Pl Comd), and he drops a WP on target to eliminate a Japanese MG crew and wound a leader on JH. The EF positions on JH have been effectively isolated and suppressed to the point of having no supporting effect on the neighbouring Jap positions of FSD and DIS.
Across the battlefield, Jap positions are being systematically identified and hammered with fire, whittling them down. The MG PI on the Pimple does some good work raking positions on JH and casually reducing EF there. Tragedy strikes on the MSR though, as an engineer HS is atomized setting off a mine whilst trying to clear it. The INF show them how the job is done by clearing an AT minefield in the Bottleneck. On FSD, a CW and Jap HS mutually destroy one another in a bloody bayonet fight.

It has been noted that the Japanese have experienced some MG problems, but they manage to repair two on FSD and bring them back into the fight. The Japanese have anchored a strong position centred around three trenches/bunkers on the plateau of FSD. They have broken a PI of my troops from these positions, which have streamed back to their own trench positions to rally and regroup. The centre of mass of this position comprises three HMGs/MMGs. I am cullminating on this hill.

I realise that the first part of the “no plan survives contact with the enemy” adage to ring true for me is on FSD, where I have lost over a PI to CC and morale breaking. I decide to consolidate on FSD, mop up on DIS to free up troops to reinforce 1BERKS, and to capitalise on the effective suppression achieved on JH to start a cautious advance there.

On JH, things are going well – a CW sniper casualty reduces a crew there, and the MG PI identifies and sweeps away a Jap .50 HMG position with concentrated fire. On DIS, an enterprise HS destroys a Japanese cave with a DC, wiping out a squad and a leader. On the MSR, the surviving engineers clear another minefield – the armour is beginning to inch forward – ahead of schedule too. I will soon be in a position to bring Grants up the track on FSD to gain the summit and blast the Jap positions there with PB 75mm and 37mm fire, plus MGs. I can afford to consolidate and hold. On DIS, where the feature is largely cleared and secured, a PI and leader are dispatched to reinforce 1BERKS. It is merely mopping up that remains to be done.

**T4: Victory on Jail Hill**

This turn, I will do the following: Consolidate on FSD and reinforce. Clear DIS. Advance to contact on JH.

On FSD, I hold the north edge; the Japanese the centre and south edge. They have been wiped out on the east edge by accurate gunfire from the Grants on the MSR. Reinforcements are en route, whilst leaders do their job trying to steady the nerves of those who have recently decamped from the appalling fight for the summit.

Mopping up on DIS continues, with DCs blasting identified cave mouths into collapsing. On JH (the unexpected early success story) accurate fire from the Pimple continues to sweep Japanese from cave mouths and out of trenches on the summit. 4RGR are steadily advancing onto the west and north edge of the summit, moving one cautious bound after another – gaining 50m of ground at a time and taking no casualties.

On the MSR, the 4PJBI sect which valiantly cleared the mines in the Bottleneck races down the road to assist the engineers. At this point a Jap 50mm in a cave on the south side of FSD opens fire and succeeds in causing 50% casualties to this bold but reckless sect.

Some last desperate fighting flares up on DIS, as some hidden Japanese expose themselves to engage the Gurkhas steadily advancing up JH. Jap positions on the west of JH are finally smashed by accurate arty fire, and the Gurkhas clear three trenches. On the south east edge of JH, the MG PI gets excellent ROF to obliterate two Japanese HMG positions identified there. The Japanese on JH are a spent force.

**T5: “Position CLEAR!”**

What is the Japanese for Gotterdammerung? It is upon them. Artillery destroys an INF gun position on JH with a CH, while a DC wipes out the last position in a cave on DIS. The CO of 4PJBI radios “position clear, objective secured”. On JH, my troops have attained the summit – the break-in battle there is achieved.

FSD is the thorn in my side. I pause to regroup and reinforce. Armour is en route, moving up the hill track from the east. At this point the Japanese realises he would be incapable of victory. His position on DIS has ceased to exist; that on JH is a bomb and bullet shattered remnant of a force, and on FSD the writing is on the wall. There would not be sufficient capability to bring the required amount of fire to bear on the MSR to interdict it effectively, and the CW INF has only suffered 16CVP.

We call the game at this point, player turn 1 of GT5. The Japanese cannot win. Interestingly, in a previous playtest of this scenario that Shaun conducted, the British apparently tried to swarm the Jap positions and had lost 40 CVP by T5. So, is the scenario an unbalanced dog? We made the following changes to the scenario:

- 2 x snipers each, starting 10H apart.
- No LV hindrances.
- Widened Brit setup area, with no change to Japanese setup, so that armour isn’t forced to enter map straight into a mined hex.
- Increased CVP to 50, but to include armour (it seems ridiculous that the Brits would have a CVP cap, and yet be impervious to losses amongst their precious armour).

On a replaying, it went to 5 turns again. The Brits were a lot more cautious with their armour, but had still attained an overwhelming victory by T5 again, with only 6 CVP against them. I played it slightly differently, but with a similar Scheme of Manoeuvre. The synchronisation of assets was the major difference, and thus the sequencing of the attack. Asset allocation (task organising) also differed somewhat. I still don’t think it is a dog, and would love to play the Japanese next time to see how it plays out. Either way, I think 18 turns is...
probably too long, allowing the Brits just too much time luxury.

As the Japanese, I would take the following approach:
Boresight every SW possible, ensuring all key approaches are covered, and don’t fire until a decent target presents itself in the target hex. Fire discipline!
Obstacles not covered by fire are worthless – boresight an INF gun onto the first AT mined hex and hopefully kill the engineers as they try to clear. The Japanese must delay and block armour as long as possible (and even try to kill some of it).
Use LMG to establish fire lanes down the slopes, using interlocking arcs where possible.
Once SWs are used, establish a zone of residual FP to deny advances to the British.
Use the INF to move through the caves to keep threatening the flanks and rear, and when opportunity presents, to deny rout routes.

HtH CC under concealment when opportunity is there.
On GT1, use the 50mm mortars with WP to hit every ID’d enemy mortar or MG stack position identified – break or kill at earliest opportunity the personnel manning these.
Avoid setting up in locations where you know the Brits can stand off and pulverise you at range.

Careful positioning of PBs, especially the concrete ones with 360° arcs (these must house key SWs).
Fire 50mm mortars from caves, so they can be withdrawn into the cave complexes when threatened and reappear to wreak more havoc when needed.

Sacrifice concealment to keep the British at arms length and kill at every opportunity – don’t waste a fire phase, especially when the Brits are moving. Don’t wait for a stack to build up to hit in the DFP – use DF when he is moving to leave residual in a hex and keep him at bay.
Set high value targets (HVT) – wait for a stack to build up to hit in the rear, and when opportunity presents, to deny rout routes.

Recommended changes were:
As given above before the replay, and in addition:
Don’t allow the British setup to be within 2H of the Jap setup perimeter – it is too close.
Reduce overall time to 12T – puts too close.

CONCLUSION

I wrote the article to give a view on how I transfer a real world military planning tool to use in the ASL gaming world. On the face of it, it may appear like a tailor-

made way to suck the life out of the game. For me, it actually enhances the gaming pleasure, and if not utilised in the detail that a HQ ops planning staff would, it is not too time consuming. It helps to focus thought in making your plan. Of course, it is not foolproof – the enemy has a vote too! But it does provide a useful handrail to tactical thinking. I tend to conduct a bit of IPE (to understand the battlefield and enemy), a brief Mission Analysis to ensure I’m clear on SSRs and what victory conditions entail, and then do an effects schematic with Task, Purpose and Requirements captured. Simple – and to be honest – enjoyable. So try it, and then scream as you get diced or a rules guru gazumps you…..

Key to Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbrv.</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Advance</td>
<td>Effects term – to advance towards the enemy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asslt</td>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>A mixed group of all arms based upon, usually, an INF Bn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Battle group</td>
<td>Military grouping, usually of 3-4 companies (incl a Support Coy) and a HQ; if has brackets after with symbol + or -, it means a Bn(+/-) understrength or Bn(+/-) overstrength/augmented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cas</td>
<td>Casualties</td>
<td>Typically, the CO of a Bn or BG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>Commanding Officer</td>
<td>Relates to an analysis of the enemy, and what is perceived as the factor wherein lies their greatest source of cohesion and strength. It needs to be something which can be physically affected/attacked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COA</td>
<td>Course of Action</td>
<td>Of any distinction – could be from a sect or vehicle upwards (eg BG Comd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COG</td>
<td>Centre of Gravity</td>
<td>The officer responsible for running a HQ for a commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comd</td>
<td>Commander</td>
<td>Military grouping, usually of 3-4 platoons and a HQ; if has brackets after with symbol + or -, it means a Coy(+/-) understrength or Coy(+/-) overstrength/augmented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COS</td>
<td>Chief-of-Staff</td>
<td>Relates to an activity which then triggers another planned action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coy</td>
<td>Company</td>
<td>An officer/SNCO specifically tasked for directing indirect fires or aircraft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW</td>
<td>Commonwealth</td>
<td>A tool used for providing EF ORBATs and doctrine for planning and wargaming, based on Soviet era forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESTR</td>
<td>Destroy</td>
<td>This is a thorough intelligence analysis of all environmental (human, physical, terrain, weather, EF etc) factors relevant to the battle space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>Decision Point</td>
<td>A plan and assets used to FIND, FIX and track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF</td>
<td>Enemy Forces</td>
<td>Combined use of artillery fires and air strikes within same battlespace – the most complex of arrangements requiring careful coordination and control to avoid aircraft flying into falling artillery shells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOO</td>
<td>Forward Observation Officer</td>
<td>A pre-determined area of ground in which a significant kinetic effect is to be achieved against the EF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENFOR</td>
<td>Generic Enemy Forces</td>
<td>Route down which line of communication is maintained – usually a road or track, but could be, for eg, a river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPE</td>
<td>Intelligence Preparation of the Environment</td>
<td>The troops/assets available within the command chain, and how they are organised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTAR</td>
<td>Intelligence, Surveillance, Target Acquisition and Reconnaissance</td>
<td>Varies – if has brackets after with symbol + or -, it means a Pl(+/-) understrength or Pl(+/-) overstrength/augmented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAA</td>
<td>Joint Air and Artillery Task</td>
<td>How a plan will be executed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KA</td>
<td>Killing Area</td>
<td>Planning exercises used for training comds without requiring the actual use of troops on the ground (map based, with real ORBATs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Main Effort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSR</td>
<td>Main Supply Route</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORBAT</td>
<td>Orders of Battle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB</td>
<td>Platoon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl</td>
<td>Platoon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOM</td>
<td>Scheme of Manoeuvre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEWT</td>
<td>Tactical Exercises Without Troops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig: The Japanese commander – clearly contemplating the joy of his impending seppuku. (Photo courtesy of Ian Pollard)
This is a brief look at Soviet hand grenades used in World War 2.

**Stick Grenade M1914/30**

The M1914/30 was the first grenade produced by the Soviet Union, and was based on the M1914, a World War 1 design. It was a simple stick grenade with a TNT charge and a detachable grooved fragmentation sleeve. The basic grenade weighed 595g, the sleeve 227g. Without the sleeve it was lethal within a 10 metre radius, with the sleeve it was dangerous up to 25 metres, and able to throw odd bits of shrapnel much further.

Essentially a dual purpose grenade, it was used without the sleeve when attacking so that the thrower would not be harmed by fragments. On the defence the sleeve would be fitted and the grenade thrown from a trench, building, pillbox or other location providing adequate cover from the fragments. It was easy to use, and undeniably lethal. The fuses were a bit erratic, the delay ranged from 3.6 to a full 5 seconds.

Against an AFV grenades would be thrown into open hatches or crew cockpits, gun barrel, and against tracks or vision slits. Targeting the air intakes or vision slits could do some damage to early war vehicles. More often grenades were used as distractions to cover assault with more effective weapons. Thrown range would be around 40 metres, a certain amount depends on the skill of the soldier, and against armour accuracy was more important so range would be reduced.

They were often carried in one, two or three pocket canvas pouches that could be attached to a soldier’s belt. In defensive positions they would be stored in boxes. In the field grenade string or wire and sometimes hooks were attached to any type of grenade to make it catch on wire, netting or vehicles.

The Germans issued captured stocks as Handgranate 336 (r). The Finns also used any Russian grenades they could get hold of.

Existing stocks of the M1914/30 were mostly depleted in 1941. It’s hard to say how many were produced or even when production stopped.

**Stick Grenade M1933 (RGD 33)**

The M1933 was a replacement design for the M1914/30. Its most peculiar feature was a complex arming mechanism that required the head and handle to be turned and pulled and a safety slide operated. It worked but was overly complex. The fuse was a simple times of 4.5 to 5 seconds, activated by inertia when the grenade was thrown.

The charge was 85g of TNT and either relied on blast for effect, or could be used to create fragmentation by fitting a grooved sleeve. Blast radius would be 10 metres, or 15 metres with the sleeve fitted. Thrown range would be 30-40 metres. Against armour there’s a slim chance of
damaging up to 10mm of steel, or being more effective against a vision slit, or engine grating. Occasionally fragments from the sleeve would travel extraordinary distances, up to 100 metres.

In the field the M1933 wasn’t seen as much of an improvement on the earlier M1914/30, but it worked, and suited the Russian preference for short range combat.

**Fragmentation Grenade F1**

The F1 was probably the best fragmentation grenade produced by the Soviet Union during World War 2. It was designed sometime between 1937 and 1939, and owed something to a French World War I design also called the F1 and something to the British Mills bomb; both had been used by Red Army and White Russian forces. Any Russian word with an F in it is almost certainly foreign in origin. The design though was different to both ancestors and used components manufactured in Russia.

The body was a cast iron pineapple shape, with a fuse having a 3.2 to 4.2 second delay. From 1942 an improved more reliable fuse, the UZGR, was fitted. The grooved body of the grenade aided grip. As it was cast and Soviet wartime production standards were a bit lax the finish could be pitted and thicker or thinner than designed. As a result fragmentation was variable. Further the explosive TNT filling could be anything from 46g to 60g. Generally on detonation fragments were lethal to 15 metres, effective out to 30 metres. That said odd non lethal fragments might be hurled 200 metres. One Russian post war eyewitness account cites an accidental explosion within a tank that shredded equipment but only lightly wounded one crew member. Usually the F1 performed as designed, a loud bang and lethal fragments. It was accepted though that as soon as you threw it you took cover.

Range would be 35-45 metres depending on the skill and strength of the thrower.

The weapon was popular, and earned the nickname Limonka or Little lemon based on the shape. It was used post war by the Soviets and their allies and customers.

**Grenade RG 41**

The German invasion of the Soviet Union overran some grenade factories and also greatly stimulated the demand for hand grenades. The Soviets looked for simple designs that could be quickly and cheaply manufactured. The RG41 put explosives and a fuse into a tin can and made use of canneries production capacity. With an explosive filling of about 150g TNT it worked as a defensive grenade, with enough explosives to be useful against light armour and fortifications. A fragmentation jacket was fitted and was lethal to 15 metres.

It was fitted with a UZRG OR UZRGM 3.2 to 4.2 second fuse and could be thrown 35-40 metres. Despite looking like a tin can (because it was a tin can) it was effective. The charge of TNT was larger than most hand grenades making it more likely to damage armour.

**Grenade RG 42**

Also known as the RTD1942, this was another jam tin grenade but better designed with improved safety features. Like the RG-41 it was fitted with either a UZGR or a UGRGM fuse, and about 120g of TNT. Despite using less explosive the blast radius was improved to 25 metres.

Both RG-41 and RG-42 variants existed, slightly different sized tins, painted and unpainted, and with slightly different fittings. Pretty much if it was a tin with explosives in and a fitted fuse it’s a grenade and will work as such.

Some sources describe the RG-41 and RG-42 as anti-tank grenades. Although used against armour they were designed as anti-personnel grenades.

**Rifle Projected Fragmentation Grenade VGD1930**

Rifle grenades proved popular during World War 1, as they allowed grenades to be delivered more accurately and at greater range than by throwing by hand. Another advantage was some types could employ impact fuses. The disadvantages were complexity, employing the weapon effectively required practice and training.

The VGD1930 was a Soviet pre-war design, fired from a Mosin-Nagant Rifle fitted with a special grenade launcher. Any type of bullet could be fired, as the grenade had a tube cut through its middle. The projectile looked like a miniature artillery shell. Five different filling were used; amatol, ammonal, melinite, schneiderite (the French name for amatol), and tritol. Weight was roughly 340g. It’s doubtful there would be much difference between the blast and fragmentation effects caused by different explosive fillings. Amatol and Schneiderite are chemically very similar. Melinite contains picric acid so may have caused a high pitched whine when exploding, though anyone on the receiving end probably wouldn’t notice.

It was fitted with a delayed action 3 second fuse, although in practice it was prone to long delays, sometimes as much as 11.5 seconds total before detonation. Range was decent, up to 300 metres (8 hexes), and blast radius 15 metres.

It could be used against tanks, but it lacked an impact fuse so would usually bounce off before detonating. It would still be marginally effective against very light armour.

Although important in the 1930s; by World War 2 the VGD1930 was becoming less popular. Light 30mm mortars were becoming more common and had a higher rate of fire, and better range than the VGD1930. Cost was also a factor as the VGD shell was complex and difficult to manufacture. It remained in service on the principle it was better than nothing.

Signal versions of the VGD1930 existed in red, blue, green, and yellow. They were used in a similar fashion to flare pistols for signalling and to mark targets or friendly positions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Jones</td>
<td>90 Biddick Lane, Fatfield Village, Washington, Tyne and Wear, NE38 8AA</td>
<td>(04 Apr 2005)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Sayers</td>
<td>21 Barlea Avenue, New Moston, Manchester, M40 3WL</td>
<td>(21 Nov 2008)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Savage</td>
<td>73 Penrhyn Avenue, Middleton, Manchester, M24 1FP</td>
<td>(10 Mar 1998)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Overton</td>
<td>68 Brantingham Road, Whalley Range, Manchester, M18 8QH</td>
<td>(18 Sep 2002)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joss Attridge</td>
<td>Newtown Linford, Leicester, Leicestershire, LE6 0AA</td>
<td>(02 Jun 2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Brown</td>
<td>53 Henley Crescent, Braunstone, Leicester, Leics., LE3 2SA</td>
<td>(15 Nov 1996)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Hartland</td>
<td>38 Cunningham Drive, Lutterworth, Leicestershire, LE17 4YR</td>
<td>(03 Jun 2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Austin</td>
<td>86 Lindsey Way, Stowmarket, Suffolk, IP14 2PD</td>
<td>(04 Jan 2000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Gookey</td>
<td>95 Willingdale Road, Loughton, Essex, IG10 2DD</td>
<td>(17 Feb 2001)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Kellington</td>
<td>12 Clayton Fields, Huddersfield, West Yorkshire, HD2 2BA</td>
<td>(21 Apr 2007)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm Hatfield</td>
<td>336B Alexandra Ave, South Harrow, Middlesex, HA2 9DB</td>
<td>(01 Feb 2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Cansell</td>
<td>24a Upper Queen Street, Godalming, Surrey, GU7 1DQ</td>
<td>(17 Mar 1997)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Garlick</td>
<td>23 St. Annes Road East, Lytham St. Annes, Lancs., FY8 1TA</td>
<td>(04 May 1998)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigel Brown</td>
<td>3 Chepstow Road, Blackpool, Lancs., FY3 7NN</td>
<td>(31 Oct 1996)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Pollard</td>
<td>19 Doria Drive, Gravesend, Kent, DA12 4HS</td>
<td>(05 Sep 2008)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John McLintock</td>
<td>B25 434 St Georges Rd, Woodside, Glasgow, G3 6JW</td>
<td>(30 May 2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Kassian</td>
<td>Flat 14/2, 20 Petershill Court, Glasgow, G21 4QA</td>
<td>(01 Jan 1996)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Saunders</td>
<td>59 Grampian Gardens, Arbroath, Angus, DD1 4AQ</td>
<td>(03 Sep 2008)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Gibson</td>
<td>107 Queen's Drive, Hazelhead, Aberdeen, AB15 8BN</td>
<td>(24 Jan 2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Murray</td>
<td>29 Middle Street, Nafferton, Driffield, S. Yorks, YO25 4JS</td>
<td>(02 Sep 2008)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Clark</td>
<td>Wold View, East Heslerton, Malton, N. Yorks, YO17 8RN</td>
<td>(12 Feb 2002)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Price</td>
<td>19 Upper Green, Yettenhall, Wolverhampton, W. Mids., WV6 8QN</td>
<td>()</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Lynott</td>
<td>Woodlands Parkway, Cheshire, WA15 7QU</td>
<td>(10 Dec 2009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Dagnall</td>
<td>480 Chertsey Road, Twickenham, Middlesex, TW2 6PS</td>
<td>(22 Sep 2011)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Groves</td>
<td>7 Dover Road, Castleford, West Yorkshire, WF10 1BN</td>
<td>(09 May 2004)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Kendall</td>
<td>5 Borda Close, Chelmsford, Essex, CM2 1TE</td>
<td>(25 Apr 2007)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Standbridge</td>
<td>31 Hunstanon Drive, Bury, Lancs., BL8 1EG</td>
<td>(09 Mar 2006)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Ward</td>
<td>Backbarrow, Kendal, Cumbria, CA11 0PH</td>
<td>(14 Jan 2002)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul O'Donald</td>
<td>13 Archway Court, Barton Road, Cambridge, Cambs., CB3 9LQ</td>
<td>(07 Aug 2002)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Fraser</td>
<td>66 Salcombe Gardens, Millhill, London, NW7 2NT</td>
<td>(26 Apr 2009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Ambler</td>
<td>399a Eglinton Avenue, Bury, Lancashire, BL9 0LQ</td>
<td>(09 May 2004)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Neetherton</td>
<td>36 Range Road, Whitchurch, Hants., RG22 1YF</td>
<td>(26 Oct 2006)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Corby</td>
<td>8 Boundary Road, Whitchurch, Hants., RG22 1YF</td>
<td>(26 Oct 2006)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Waddilove</td>
<td>14a Boundary Road, Whitchurch, Hants., RG22 1YF</td>
<td>(26 Oct 2006)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Richards</td>
<td>15 Boundary Road, Whitchurch, Hants., RG22 1YF</td>
<td>(26 Oct 2006)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ON THE CONVENTION TRAIL

There are more and more ASL tournaments cropping up all over the world. In fact, it is possible to be involved in an ASL tournament at least once a month, often more, if you were so inclined (and had the financial means to live such a life - I wish!). If you plan on holding an ASL tournament, please let me know and I’ll include the details here, space permitting. If you contact anyone regarding these tournaments, please tell them that I sent you!

SEPTEMBER
A BRIDGE TOO FAR

When: 20 – 23 September
Where: Stay Hotel, Dietzenbacherstr 27, Arnhem. There are 30 pre-booked 30 beds at the hostel, which will be offered on a first-come first-served basis. If you wish to organise your accommodation at the tournament venue through ST management, pay in full by latest 1st of August. 2012. Accommodation for the three nights in a 4-bed room, including breakfast and dinner, is €135.00; add €40 for a room from Wednesday night, and €50.00 by paying by PayPal.
For: €30.00.
Format: 6 rounds of gaming. On Thursday and Friday, all players take part in the main tournament. On Saturday and Sunday, half continue in the main tournament, while the rest compete in a variety of mini-tournaments.
Contact: Peter Steijn at psteijn@vftt.co.uk. You can also check out the website at http://www.arnhemasl.com for the latest details and scenario details for each round.

OCTOBER
ASLOK XXVII

When: 30 Sept. – 7 October
Where: Holiday Inn Airport, 4181 W 150th St., Cleveland, OH 44135, phone 216-225-7700, fax 216-225-3649 or visit www.holidayinns.com/cle-airport. 2012 room rates are to be confirmed but in 2011 they were $75.00 plus tax. Check the ASLOK web page for the hotel discount code to book on-line.
For: $25.00 in advance, $30.00 on the door.
Format: Same as always. Weekend tournament plus numerous mini-tournaments. There is also an informal USA vs. World Cup where everyone keeps track of their game and a plaque is presented to the winning side.
Contact: Brent Hildreth, 17810 Gonzaga Lake Rd, Chagrin Falls, OH 44023-2208 or by email brent.couillard@arnhemasl.com. Check out the web site at www.arnhemasl.com for the latest details.

INTENSIVE FIRE 2012

When: 25 – 28 October
Where: The Koni Hotel, West Hill Road, Bournemouth, England, BH2 8EG. Telephone (01202) 355 889 or fax (01202) 789 567 to arrange accommodation. Single rooms are €43.00 per night, double rooms €60.00 per night per person if booked prior to 1 October – thereafter normal rates apply. Remember to mention INTENSIVE FIRE when reserving to qualify for this special rate. You can also book online at www.koni.bournemouth.co.uk.
For: €10.00 if registering with the organizers before 1 October, €15.00 thereafter and on the door (entry is free for those only able to attend for one day). In addition to a discount on the entry fee, players pre-registering will receive a tournament program in September.
Format: Three round Fire Team tournament (two rounds on Saturday, one on Sunday). There will also be some mini-tournaments on the Friday. Open gaming is available for those who do not wish to take part in the tournament.
Contact: For more details or to register contact Peter Phillips, 9 Pier Road, Kilchoan, Argyll, Scotland, PH36 4LJ. Phone (01972) 510 350 (evenings only) or email pphi@doubleone-2013.co.uk. For up to date information check out the UK ASL tournament web site at www.doubleone2013.co.uk.

NOVEMBER
Grenadier 2012

When: 1 – 4 November
Where: Gundahaus Heinebach*, Schloßfurth 6, Hergarten. Hergarten is a little town in the German part of the Eifel. It is 10 Km to Zülpich and around 40 Km to Cologne. There is a train station in Heinebach which is the neighboring town and you can reach it from Cologne by train, which goes every hour. From Heinebach you need to take a taxi to Hergarten which is about 6.5 Kilometers. The location offers sleeping rooms nearly 60 persons, a huge kitchen (where our Marketknecht Andrea will continue her cooking business for us), a big playing area and an additional separate big room which we will use for eating. Rooms are mostly and four bed rooms with shower (you will need to bring a sleeping bag or blanket and pillow). Bed and breakfast is 645 per night - single rooms are €65.50 extra.
For: €5 per day.
Format: The tournament will be again a Swiss-style five Round tournament. We will offer again an event for players who don’t want to participate in the tournament.

Wales

Andrew Wharton, 6 Aquilla Court, Cynwyn Road, Cardiff; CF11 9QA (015 Sep 2006)
Paul Jones, 9 Cwm Sylfaen, Rhuthun, Cardiff; CF74 6KN (22 Nov 2002)
Martin Corley, 1 Thomas Court, The Highway, Horden, Shropshire, TF1 1AA. It's quiet and has space for up to 40 players. We are located in the lower ground floor of Starbucks, 32 Fleet Street, London, EC4Y 1AA. It's quiet and has space for up to 20 games.
If you want to come along send your name and contact details to brendan@doubleone-2013.co.uk to arrange a game and ensure there are no last minute problems.

Contact: Christian Koppmeyer, Hagebauserweg 8, 41564 Kuurst, Germany. You can email him at Christian.Koppmeye@bundeswehr.de. Check out the Grenadier web site at www.asltourneys.co.uk for up to date information.

2013 MARCH
HEROES 2013

When: 19 – 23 March
Where: Colinv Hotel, 569 New South Promenade, Blackpool, England, FY4 1NG. Tel 01253 341 024. Room rates to be confirmed, in 201 we paid £25.00 for a shared room or £30.00 for a single room and include breakfast. Bar meals and good beer are also available at the hotel.
For: £10.00 per day if registering with the organizers prior to 1 March, £15.00 thereafter and on the door (entry is free for those only able to attend for one day). In addition to a discount on the entry fee, players pre-registering will receive a tournament program in February.
Format: Five round tournament beginning Friday morning (arrangements will be made for those unable to arrive until Friday afternoon), with three scenarios to choose from in each round. Players will be expected to have knowledge of the first half of the Chapter G rules to play in the tournament. CG and friendly games can also be found throughout the weekend. There will also be opportunities for new players to learn the game and friendly games available.
Contact: For more details or to register contact Peter Phillips, 9 Pier Road, Kilchoan, Argyll, Scotland, PH36 4LJ. Phone (01972) 510 350 (evenings only) or email pphi@doubleone-2013.co.uk. For up to date information check out the UK ASL tournament web site at www.doubleone2013.co.uk.

JUNE
DOUBLE ONE 2013

When: 28 – 30 June
Where: Witle College, Chelmsford, Essex, CM1 3RR. On-site facilities include on-suite and standard bedrooms, free car parking on application, mini-market, cash points, a self-service cafeteria and licensed bars. Bedroom rates start at £30.00 for a single room and breakfast. Bar meals and good beer are also available at the hotel.
For: £15.00 if paid before 30 April, £20.00 thereafter.
Format: A two day tournament with two rounds on Saturday and one on Sunday offering a choice of scenarios. A number of mini-tournaments are also planned for Friday, and friendly games will also be available.
Contact: For a booking form contact Derek Cox, 2 Crampom Walk, Chelmsford, Essex, CM1 2BD or by email at derek.cox@virgin.net. Check out the web site at http://www.doubleone-online.net.htm for the latest details.
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HEROES 2013
ADVANCED SQUAD LEADER TOURNAMENT
7TH - 10TH MARCH (THURSDAY THROUGH SUNDAY) 2013
HOTEL SKYE, SOUTH PROMENADE, BLACKPOOL, ENGLAND

THE EVENT
Following its success in previous years HEROES continues in 2013 to fill the gap for UK ASL action in the first half of the year. As normal the action starts on Thursday and continues through to Sunday so you can play in an ASL tournament and/or play friendly games (or even try your hand at a campaign game if you can find an opponent). The focus of the weekend will be the main tournament, in which players of like record are paired off to allow us to determine the winners - depending on numbers attending there will be four or five rounds. The first round will start on Friday afternoon and each round sees players choose from three carefully selected scenarios. Main tournament entrants are to be familiar with the rules through to the first half of Chapter G.

BOOT CAMP
Don’t worry if you are a new player (someone who has only ever played five or fewer games against a live opponent), as a special tournament based on the ASL Starter Kit will be available on Friday. You can learn the game with an experienced player nearby to offer advice on rules. There will never be a better time to try your hand at ASL!

Remember, you can also drop in just for part of a day if you can’t make it for the full weekend.

THE VENUE
The Hotel Skye is familiar to those who have attended in the past and offers plenty of gaming room for the whole weekend. Meals and good beer are also available in the hotel, and numerous alternative food outlets are close by. The hotel is easily accessible from the M55 and the train station is a 5 minute walk away. Bed and breakfast is just £31 per person for a shared room or £34 for a single room.

THE COST
The weekend, whether you enter a tournament or just play games with the people you will meet, is fantastic value at only £15.00, or just £10.00 if you register before the beginning of March 2013.

HEROES 2013 HOTEL BOOKING FORM
To book your room simply fill in this form and send it with a cheque for £10.00 to cover your deposit (payable to HOTEL SKYE) to Hotel Skye, 571-573 New South Promenade, Blackpool, England, FY4 1NG. You can also telephone them on 01253 343220 to book your room.

| NAME |
| ADDRESS |
| NIGHTS ROOM REQUIRED FOR (tick each one) |
| THURS | FRI | SAT | SUN |
| SINGLE ROOM | DOUBLE ROOM |
| NAME OF PERSON SHARING WITH |