

## STRATEGIC SIMULATION AND GAME DESIGN

By John Prados

### With a Game Development Addenda

By Donald Greenwood

Strategic simulations are still a recent innovation of gaming but they seem to be catching on rapidly. There was a time, only a couple of years back, when people at game companies were saying that strategic games ought to be avoided like the plague. The few that had been done were largely regarded as failures. Today I can think of several strategic games already out and as many more that are still in various stages of development.

It may be that what makes a grand strategic game is its great scope. But it is precisely this scope that makes the strategic game the most difficult to handle in terms of design and development. In this article I want to address some of the problems of designing the strategic simulation, framing the discussion in terms of the *Third Reich* game. *Third Reich* is, I think, a groundbreaker in bringing certain types of activity within a game framework.

### Strategic Simulation and Realism

Fundamentally, a game tries to be realistic in two ways; for war games the ways are simulating the battlefield environment and duplicating the forces involved in an actual situation. The historical evolution of game design, however, has made realism more difficult to secure in the design of a strategic simulation. *Tactics II*,\* the first of the widely distributed designs, was an operational level game, using division-sized units. The early *Gottysburg* amounted to a tactical game which was only slightly different than the operational design of *Tactics II*. Since then, considerable progress has been made in the direction of refining tactical and operational designs, but strategic design has lagged.

Why has it been easier to improve tactical designs, having started from the operational game? Much of the answer lies in the fact that designers had a natural advantage working from the operational level to the tactical one. The divisional-equivalent units used in the operational simulation contained a mix of units within its own structure. As designers moved down the TOE ladder from the division to the platoon and squad game they found that at each point improving a design was a case of distinguishing the functions of different types of units for weapons. By the time of *Panzerblitz*, one could see a countermix with a number of different types of infantry, armor, or artillery units, each with specific rules governing its employment. The tactical simulation may lay the claim to being closest to reality because once the different patterns of using weapons were distinguished from each other and worked into a design, the game as a whole was able to give an excellent impression of the development of a battle.

The strategic simulation offers a different problem. With the strategic simulation the difficulty lies in the fact that the tactical uses of formations must be aggregated and brought together rather than separated and distinguished. The strategic game enthusiast will agree that it is impossible to learn much about World War II as a whole from playing *Panzerblitz*. In fact the strategic simulation seeks a different aim altogether than the tactical one. This has been the dilemma of strategic game design. With the tactical design one can make design decisions with a reasonable confidence of their accuracy. For example, the ability of an anti-tank unit to destroy an approaching tank unit is a function of a few variables that can be controlled with fair ease. The number of variables involved in a strategic simulation is much greater, and the variables themselves tend to be more difficult to deal with.

### STRATEGIC VERSUS OPERATIONAL

Designers have tried two approaches to simulations that might be of strategic scope. The first of these is the simple expansion of the operational-level simulation to a massive set of thousands of pieces and many boards. This has been the operational freaks' dream by and large, with Eastern Front games leading the pack. The trouble with this approach is that a player has to make so many individual decisions, regarding attacking and so forth, on his turn that a game takes forever to play. At the same time, the game itself is frozen within a certain defined context that ignores events of even more global importance that could affect the operational situation being portrayed in the game. Consequently, massive expansion of an operational simulation is not the answer to the strategic simulation dilemma.

A second approach has been to design games that are explicitly strategic in their orientation. Here a start has been made with *Third Reich*. Here again, however, major differences in approach are apparent, basically because of the difficulties confronted by the strategic designer. The strategic designer must figure out exactly which factors are important enough to simulate.

A good example of the problem for a strategic designer is the selection of a unit size for the countermix. A division-level unit is clearly too small for his purposes, but an army-level unit may well be too large. In the case of a simulation of World War II in Europe, army-size units would mean that some armies like the Norwegian and Dutch would be overrated. These countries' forces would then be more powerful than warranted by history. It was with this in mind that the *Third Reich* counters range between a corps and an army in size, depending upon the nation a piece belongs to and that nation's military system.

Another difficulty of the strategic simulation is the selection of a mapboard. As the simulation increases in scope the rationale for a hexagon system disappears. Hexes are supposed to allow representation of terrain with minimal distortion so that terrain can serve as a playing area. The importance of terrain is that it channels maneuver. But in the strategic simulation one

reaches a certain stage at which terrain tends to lose all importance. Consider the case of a global mapboard, in which all of Western Europe might cover only three to five hexes. What maneuver can there be on such a scale? Strategic designers have made the error of not giving thought to the usefulness of an area game system in cases like this.

In *Third Reich*, the track taken was somewhat different. Here it was felt that the players' strongest identification with the game would come through such opportunities for maneuver. The idea was to make sure there was board space to move around a little, in every country. It was necessary therefore, to provide a map with the largest play area possible, and to divide that area into hexagons. The relatively smaller size of the units that counters represent in the game fitted quite easily into this pattern along with the breakthrough rule and air rules that create the operational fine points of *Third Reich*.

## SELECTING VARIABLES FOR STRATEGIC SIMULATION

*Third Reich* used three key variables: war effort, airpower, and armored capability, to recreate the atmosphere of World War II in Europe. The game works off a Basic Resource Point (BRP) base because World War II was a technology war. Offensive capability, in fact any capability, had to be purchased with labor and raw materials and then maintained. Trained manpower was the same. In the real war, German resistance continued to be coherent until February, 1945. Then the Germans suddenly collapsed, not just their army, but everything. In game terms, this is exactly what happens to the German player who spends himself out of BRPs. But in game terms, the BRP system might have been managed in other ways as well; take, for example, a BRP Force Pool set-up where the player had to wait a certain number of turns to *receive* a new unit *after* he has paid for it. This of course is a more realistic system than that actually in *Third Reich*, but to make it work requires paperwork and extends play. Waiting for the new unit makes for tension and frustration in the player. And to make a system like this really interesting requires the use of many distinct types of units, thus making play more complicated. A good strategic game has so intricate and varied a pattern of possible strategies to follow, that every effort must be bent to make the mechanics of play as straightforward as possible. And the course we decided upon; i.e., to give the player his newly created units *after* combat does indeed represent a 3 month delay.

Airpower and armor were injected into *Third Reich* in order to give a feel for the style of operations in the war. In a simulation of this scope the pressure is on the designer to knock all the intermediate steps out between the start of a campaign and its results. One might instead call combat results tables in these games "campaign results tables." Combat under such a system was too cerebral, perhaps a fine quality in a diplomacy game, but not in a simulation that was expected to be a good war game at the same time. (I might say parenthetically that *Third Reich* is best as a wargame using the 1942 Scenario in a coalition version

with two players.) In World War II, it was the correct application of a *sequence* of techniques (tactical air, concentration, breakthrough, and armored exploitation), that won all the great battles. Armor and airpower were deliberately made the most important offensive forces and the playing area of the board was made as large as possible to permit maneuver.

In a given historical situation there are a few elements, maybe even one, which exercised a determining influence. Game design has sought to capture the historical situation, recreating the feeling for the player. But if the historical *result* of the real world were the outcome of the game each time, then it would not be a game. The point has been made that "quirky" things happen in *Third Reich*. There is no quiriness here, there are only players unwilling to adhere to sound strategies. Here we are speaking of turns that represent three months' time. Can you think of a minor country in the war which was not overrun in less time? Greece is the lone exception, but even then only against the Italians. In the game they can. The point is that in *Third Reich* practically everything is left up to the players. The rules are no more than an agreed method of procedure and resolution. I would argue that this is the only way it can be. The alternative amounts to no more than an operational game system illegitimately expanded to strategic scope. This has been precisely the problem in most of the strategic games I have seen.

Different historical situations have different determinate elements. World War II, because it was technological, was a war that depended on industrial base and raw material. The Punic Wars, on the other hand, were decided far more upon manpower mobilization and population. The game has to represent that element to recapture the past, like the great photo it conveys a feeling of a time when things were happening. The fascination of the strategic game is its glimpse at the possible worlds there might have been.

## PLAYABILITY AND THE GLOBAL SCALE

Ideally, the strategic game approaches chess in its number of plausibly winning strategies. A good player will analyze several different lines of play. For this reason alone turns take some time. Ever wonder why it takes so long to play a good fourman *Risk* game? This characteristic of strategic games means the designer should make the mechanics as simple as possible. This is the old "playability versus realism" argument at a new level. Realism must distinguish every function, but is not that approach impossible at the strategic level? You could turn phases ad *infinitum*. The truth is that strategic games will never be realistic *enough*. Strategic realism is impossible to achieve in tactical terms.

Granting the impossibility of such realism, what can a game design do? This game design chose to emphasize free choice and player identification elements. For this purpose armor and airpower-use were made "tactics" and units were given identifications. The system teaches much about the dynamics of World War II, but the game has to be played' before it can be appreciated. Playability is a valid alternative to realism. It was

for playability that navies were deemphasized and strategic attrition substituted for unit combat. Playability also means no bookkeeping and that precluded a time-creation BRP system for activating units in the Force Pool. The cost, in game time, from such a system outweighs the gains in realism.

Before rejecting realism completely, there is one important point which I must make. Realism of a sort is possible in strategic simulation. It is possible for players in the course of the game to make the same maneuvers as actually occurred in 1939-45 for their own purposes. This amounts to saying that realism in design consists of establishing a logic in the game which leads players inexorably to decisions similar to those of history. Realism cannot be imposed by rules for such a game would simulate nothing. This is the measure of the strategic simulation. The wheel, however, comes full circle for this realism must be the result of playability.

## CONCLUSION

Recently some figures were shown to me that indicated a third of gainers are mostly interested in strategic simulations. This was quite an encouraging figure because it showed substantial interest in a gaming field that has been little touched in the past. We can expect to see a great number of new strategic designs. This is important for two reasons. First, designers must be much more conscious of “infrastructure” elements within which events occur (things like BRPs). Second, and of greater importance, now is the time to begin to articulate and refine concepts of strategic design in the literature of the hobby.

## GAME DEVELOPMENT ADDENDA

*Third Reich*, perhaps more than any other game we’ve ever done, underwent much playtesting to eliminate possible “perfect plan” solutions which might stagnate play possibilities. A game of this scope and with such bizarre mechanics is especially prone to such problems. Such was our concern with weeding out these “solutions” that it preoccupied the greater part of our development time, time that could have been used for a restructuring of the rules in a more concise format. Given time limitations however we decided to spend our “game design BRPs” on further witch hunts for perfect plans and merely amended or added to the original Prados rules rather than completely reorganizing them. The result was a bulky, albeit largely complete, set of rules which bears several readings for full comprehension.

Many questions have arisen as to why certain aspects of the design are handled the way they appear in the game. This article will attempt to answer those queries as well as list the most frequently asked questions on the rules. I hesitate to refer to this as an errata list (although many of you will claim it so) because most of the questions asked are answered in the rules. However, for the sake of listing the most common questions conveniently in one place they are presented below for the edification of all

involved. What follows is not undertaken in any precise order but rather is a frank, behind-the-scenes rational answer for the many decisions which went into making *Third Reich*. And lest it appear otherwise, let me hasten to add that the game has been widely acclaimed as a stunning success.

The gameboard has drawn its share of criticism for being simplistic and not encompassing the super realistic 4 color printing of a 1914 or 1776. Our defense can be readily anticipated from the Prados design prologue above. High piece density is so paramount a feature of *Third Reich* that it was considered imperative to do whatever was possible to make the terrain readily recognizable at a glance without lifting stacks of counters. Thus, the mountain symbols fill each hex rather than following a more picturesque natural curve. Similarly, the usual tan press varnish is not present for fear of obscuring the beach hexes. And for those who dislike the “cuts” in the board created by the different board sections we can only offer you your choice; a mounted board or a paper one. The latter would certainly save us a lot of money, but the vast majority of gainers still favor mounted boards. This remains true even in the case of *Third Reich* where the board is so large that the panels can’t be taped together due to excessive pressure on the tape during assembly.

It is ironic that a game as complicated as *Third Reich* draws most of its criticism for being too simple. The realism advocates desire explanations; why battalion sized actions can’t be recreated in game, increased technology isn’t present, and so on. The most recurring complaint involved the simple exchange of air and naval factors with only token differentiations made in losses for superior forces. Such critics would have been even further distraught had we not amended the rules as they now exist. Prados originally called for straight exchanges of naval and air forces with automatic naval interception capability and unlimited freedom to choose the level of casualties. It took considerable effort to get him to compromise to the present system. All of which is to say that there are almost infinite additions that can be made to the game to increase realism, but each one will detract from playability to some degree. The playability/ realism line had to be drawn someplace, and having drawn it we’ll leave it to others to overstep it in their own variants of the game.

Others attack certain historical aspects such as the Allies being free to attack Minor Neutrals. They point out, quite correctly, that Britain would not have invaded Belgium having just fought the Great War to guarantee Belgian neutrality. Yet, other areas are not nearly so clear cut. Britain did plan to invade Norway and was saved the label of “aggressor” only by the fact that the Germans beat them to the draw. However, rather than create artificial rules which limit the strategic options available, we chose to let common sense be our restricting rule. An Allied invasion of the Low Countries is an extremely foolish move which will be rewarded in the game by granting the German what amounts to free declarations of war against buffer states which she must take to get at France anyway; plus the bonus of Allied-neutral Casualties that would otherwise oppose the

German. Generally speaking, the game reinforces sound strategic decisions without imposing additional limiting rules and time tables for the players to adhere to. In the *Questions & Answers* segment which follows rulings which constitute changes or especially frequent questions will be designated by a Δ

**Q.** Why are air units flying Defensive Air Support (DAS) eliminated if the battle is lost? Similarly, why can't fleets fire shore bombardment defensively?

**A.** Keep in mind that these are 3 month turns. Flying DAS implies an overall commitment to battle which if unsuccessful carries with it elimination as an effective fighting force. Even if the opposing player hasn't used air units-his attack is considered to have normal token air support from local accompanying air units not represented on the board. And in game terms it is necessary to keep the game from bogging down into a defensive slugfest. The defender must be willing to pay the price for DAS-lest he use it freely without fear of loss and rob the game of its movement. Fleets can't fire Defensive Shore Bombardment because they can't move in their opponent's turn except to intercept and no fleet stays anchored in port to provide artillery support while a hostile army approaches. In short, the initiative is a prime requirement for effective use of shore bombardment and thus it is allowed only as an offensive option.

**Q.** How do you redeploy to an island without a port?

**A.** This is a legitimate foul-up in the rules. You may Strategically Redeploy (SR) to and from *islands without ports* only if they are friendly to you. Otherwise, they must be amphibiously assaulted.

**Q.** Why isn't Helsinki a port?

**A.** Making Helsinki a port makes it too easy for the German to reinforce Finland. A strong German commitment of force in Finland makes it extremely difficult for the Russian to defend his entire front and subsequently to stay in the game. Note that the German can deploy up to 20 factors in Finland at the start of the game; see 3.582.

**Q.** Why are so many obvious historical ports inactive in this game?

**A.** Again, simplicity ... rather than rate each port differently (and virtually every hex would have had a port) we gave all ports a set capacity. If every actual port were given that capability, any one coastline would have far exceeded its total advisable capacity. Resorting to variable port capacity would have in turn broken down the basic 9 factor fleet simplification. So ports were selected to give a reasonable spread along any one coast. The same reasoning applies to beaches, for example, Anzio. On this scale, practically every hex could have been invaded at some point which would have made any *attell'npt* at shore defense impossible. Thus, token landing areas were chosen that represented the % advisability of amphibious operations along that particular coastline.

**Q.** The two hexes south of Oslo are obstructed by the red boundary line. Can fleets move up the water area of these hexes to bombard Oslo?

**A.** No, this is why the red boundary line was drawn in such a way as to obstruct the water hexes. Although possible to pass large forces up the Oslo Fjord in peacetime, such action was suicide against the strong Norwegian coastal defenses. The Germans tried it during their invasion and lost the heavy cruiser Blucher for their trouble. The force was turned away with heavy losses and was not able to enter Oslo until two days later after the city had been already taken by land forces. In no case are fleets allowed to penetrate rivers such as the Nile regardless of the width of the opening.

**ΔQ.** Is a unit in the Maginot Line assumed to have the advantage of fortification if attacked from the rear? Do other fortresses extend their defensive benefits to an invader after he has captured them?

**A.** French forces in the Maginot Line are still quadrupled on defense when attacked from the rear or flank and similarly unaffected by ZOC of German armor units to their rear. The same applies to German units in the West Wall of the '44 scenario. Permanent fortress hexes bestow fortress benefits to whoever controls them.

**ΔQ.** Does a ZOC extend out of a fortress? across red arrowhead crossing areas? across the Suez? across rivers?

**A.** Yes, no, yes, yes.

**Q.** May an intercepting fleet in turn be intercepted by uncommitted naval forces of the moving player?

**A.** Yes but note this applies to naval interception but not air.

**Q.** May both the American & British player allocate 40 BRPs to Murmansk in one turn or is the total Allied limit 40?

**A.** The latter

**Q.** Can Italy declare war on Poland and thus obtain a state of war with England & France for only 10 BRPs?

**A.** No, 3.6 of the rules states that 10 BRPs are assessed for a declaration against a minor neutral. Since Poland starts the game at war in an active alliance with England and France it is no longer neutral and thus a declaration against it is considered the same as an attack on a colony and costs 35 BRPs.

**ΔQ.** The rulebook and situation cards contradict each other as to when Russia can declare war on Germany. Which is correct?

**A.** The former. The Soviet Union cannot declare war on Germany until the Fall, 1941 turn.

**Q.** May Germany refuse to conquer Poland just to keep the Russians from taking their half?

**A.** Not really. If the Germans don't occupy Warsaw on the first turn, the Russians are free to attack from the east, overrun the

boundary line and take it themselves. Regardless of who takes Warsaw, the spoils are divided as usual along the dotted border and neither side gets any benefits until Warsaw is taken by one side or the other. However, Germany must continue to attack with either offensive or attrition options until Poland falls. Note that Germany must have 25 factors on the Eastern Front at all times, not just at the end of his turn and that combat of some type is mandatory. If Germany does not place sufficient forces there to meet these criterion she is in default of the rules and thus forfeits the game.

**ΔQ.** Suppose the Germans isolate the bulk of the French army in France. Can the British supply them through a friendly port?

**A.** No. As long as Paris is controlled by the French, French mainland forces must trace their supply from Paris. If Paris falls, a supply line from Britain can be traced for one turn to attempt a counterattack.

**ΔQ.** Suppose the Germans take Marseilles, are the French fleets stationed there eliminated?

**A.** No, they would go to a French overseas possession awaiting Strategic Redeployment to a French port in the Atlantic. When Paris falls they return to mainland France and suffer reduction in the normal manner when determining Vichy forces. If all 3 fleets survive intact, two become Vichy and one is scuttled. The rule is necessary to keep the French from turning their fleet over to the British by gambling on it becoming Free French.

**Q.** Reference: 3.583; is “through” the same as “into”; i.e., if Russia declares war on Rumania but doesn’t actually attack it, can Germany then garrison it?

**A.** Yes, in which case the Russians could not proceed with their attack on Rumania prior to Fall, 1941.

**Q.** Reference: 6.2, what constitutes occupation of the Nazi-Soviet Pact area and how long does the Russian have to accomplish it?

**A.** Occupation of all cities in the “ceded” area must be accomplished within 2 turns or the Russian must declare war on the areas separately, if at all. Such occupation, of necessity, requires an offensive option so it is to the Russian’s advantage to complete the occupation in one turn.

**Q.** Can air units lend DAS to other air units being subjected to Counterair?

**A.** No

**Q.** I know the Soviet Union cannot be taken by capture of Moscow but in this event where does the Russian draw his supply from?

**A.** Off the east edge of the board.

**Q.** Can you move freely overland from the mainland to an island in the same hex? If so, can Athens be attacked overland from two hexes?

**A.** No to both.

**Q.** Can supply be traced at any point in a turn or only at the beginning?

**A.** Only at the beginning.

**Q.** Does the Anglo-French cooperation rule prevent the British and French from combining naval and air attacks and using British armor in exploitation after French breakthrough? Does it prevent British ships from carrying French troops and vice versa?

**A.** Yes

**ΔQ.** Are Italy’s BRPs added to the Axis total to determine who moves first even before the Italians declare war on the Allies?

**A.** Yes ... unlike the Russians who are not counted until they are at war with the Axis.

**Q.** Can defending survivors of Counterair missions engage in offensive options in their half of the turn?

**A.** No

**Q.** If forced to counterattack at odds worse than 1-4 is the defender eliminated?

**A.** Yes

**Q.** Can neutrals attack forces across their border?

**A.** Yes, as long as they do not leave their country and are at war with the country in question...

**Q.** In the 1942 Scenario it is impossible to stop Germany after adding everything she gets at start for conquest of captured territories.

**A.** Read the 2nd paragraph on Pg. 6 and try playing again. Nothing is added to her BRP totals except 45 for her German Minor Allies and whatever she is able to conquer from that point on.

**Q.** The Germans have taken Paris and the French counterattack results in an exchange which destroys all units involved. Neither side occupies Paris. Who controls it?

**A.** The Germans who were last to occupy it. France falls.

**Q.** France conquers Spain and then falls to Germany. What happens to Spain, the French forces there and on Corsica?

**A.** Spain and Corsica are now German possessions. All French units are divided between Vichy status and elimination. Only the French African possessions are rolled for to determine Free French status. German units can SR into Spain at will.

**Q.** Must Minor German Allies in the Mediterranean exercise the same option used by Italy on that front?

**A.** Yes, or take a pass option.

**Q.** At least 1 minor neutral ground unit must be placed on its capital when first invaded. Must it remain there?

**A.** No

**ΔQ.** Can you amphibiously assault any port or only those on beach hexes?

**A.** Only those on beach squares. Gibraltar is a special case and like all ports, if garrisoned by a fleet, is immune to amphibious assault.

**Error:** The list of objective hexes on Pg. 13 lists Kharkov twice. One of them should be replaced by Krakow.

**Q.** If more than 4 units occupy a breakthrough hex and proceed to attack an adjacent hex, can the exploiting player move more than 2 units into that hex?

**A.** No, unless one is an airborne unit whose elite status allows it to ignore stacking limits. The only time pieces can be stacked in excess of the stacking limits is when the situation has been caused by an attrition option-and the defender must correct this situation in his very next move.

**Q.** Are the hexes containing Antwerp and the Hague and the hex northwest of it, considered adjacent for purposes of ground combat?

**A.** Yes

**Q.** Do the Allowable Builds limit what you can replace each turn such that France cannot replace any air units?

**A.** No, losses are always replaceable subject to BRP limits. Allowable Builds merely show the maximum number of new forces it is possible to build beyond those given At Start.

**Q.** In the '42 Scenario can Italians be set up in Greece despite German possession or Axis units in Vichy French possessions?

**A.** No, they can be deployed there during play however. Forces must start in the areas they control as listed on their Scenario cards.

**Q.** Can more than two armored units attack out of a bridgehead, as the result, of a breakthrough?

**A.** Yes, but only in Exploitation, unless one is an airborne unit.

**Q.** If France is conquered do the Free French colonies or conquered Vichy colonies add to British BRP totals?

**A.** Yes and if Free French or conquered Vichy colonies are taken by the Germans the BRPs are added to Germany. But while Vichy, no one gets their BRPs.

**Q.** Apparently, the Turkish navy cannot be used in the Black Sea to stop a Russian invasion.

**A.** Correct, unless Turkey is allied with Rumania in which case they can base their fleet in Constanta.

**Q.** Does the Suez Canal require naval assistance to cross?

**A.** No, treat it exactly the same as a river. The only difference is that fleets can traverse the Canal whereas they cannot enter a river. Suez itself cannot be used as a port if enemy forces occupy either bank of the canal.

**ΔQ.** If a fleet sails from Kiel through the Baltic and launches an invasion in southern Norway do the Germans have to pay for an offensive option on both fronts or just one?

**A.** Just one, the western. The front which receives- the action must be paid for. See 3.2

**Q.** If Russia invades Turkey, can Italy intervene without involving Germany?

**A.** Yes, if Italy and Germany are not yet actively allied. However, doing so would be a very foolish move because it would prohibit Italy from ever activating its alliance with Germany for fear of bringing the Russians down on the German rear too soon.

**Q.** If Russia declares war on Germany, does Germany have to declare war on Russia (pay BRPs).

**A.** No, only the initiator of war pays.

**ΔQ.** Why didn't you underline the 6 and 9 or variant counters? It is impossible to distinguish them otherwise.

**A.** Oops! Suggest you do so.

**Q.** If naval losses are taken in Shore Bombardment to satisfy an exchange are they taken fleet = 9 factors or the shore bombardment rate fleet = 3 factors?

**A.** The latter.

**Q.** If a bridgehead is attacked and a CA is result do 2 or 5 units CA?

**A.** All 5. This is a different situation than an attack from a beachhead. Since all 5 units defended beachhead all 5 must CA.

**Q.** Can you put replacements adjacent to armor units at your border if not yet at war.

**A.** Yes

**Q.** Is reduction of BRPs due to strategic war permanent?

**A.** Yes, if reduced below the base BRP level it is a new base until further strategic warfare economic growth changes it.

**Q.** Can the intervening power in Belligerent Intervention use SR to move directly into country in question and stack with their fleet and ground units?

**A.** Yes

**Q.** Assuming the Germans retake the Baltic does the Russian subtract the 25 BRPs immediately or is this a special situation where you don't BRPs for losing an area?

**A.** Immediately ... however all cities of east Poland and Bessarabia must be taken as v Incidentally, Bessarabia was not

part of the N Soviet Pact. Russia grabbed the province war in the west and a Hungarian-Ruman incident distracted attention. It was only later Hitler, concerned for his Rumanian oil supply cemented relations with the Rumanians and enlisted them in an anti-Soviet crusade.

**ΔQ.** Can the U.S. make Strategic Warfare build the 1942 Year Start sequence even though doesn't come into the game until Spring?

**A.** Yes

**Q.** Suppose the Russians take Turkey and wish sail their fleet into the Mediterranean and hence the Baltic. Are they allowed to use British ports the way?

**A.** Yes, in this case the restriction against basing in English ports is lifted, but only for fleets from the Black Sea.

**Q.** Once fallen, can the Axis take a German Minor Ally and resurrect its forces for the German force pool?

**A.** No

**Q.** Are air units eliminated without loss to attacker in a counterair mission if attacked in turn of construction since they can't be used?

**A.** No

**Q.** What do you do with captured Russian air counters after Moscow falls?

**A.** Place them to the east of the Urals from where they must be strategically redeployed to be constructed again closer to the front.

**Q.** Can Italy & France build forces in their possessions such as Sicily or Corsica?

**A.** No

**Q.** If a land unit uses all of its movement factor to get to a port is it allowed to make an amphibious assault that turn? And if a land unit uses only part of its movement factor to get to a port, may it use the rest after landing on a Naval Transport Mission?

**A.** No, Yes

**Q.** If Russia refuses to take the Baltic States can Germany do so at the same cost and rewards as the Russian?

**A.** Yes, but Germany need not occupy Kishinev or Cernauti as these would remain under Rumanian control.

**ΔQ.** Can out-of-supply units take part in Attrition Options?

**A.** Yes, but they cannot move and thus cannot force a defender to vacate his hex. A unit must be supplied to move into the defender's hex.

**ΔQ.** Are there any exceptions to the Russian winter rule?

**A.** Yes, it doesn't affect Finnish forces and is in effect only through 1941.

**Q.** Can units be attritioned out of Luxemburg?

**A.** Yes, because it has no capital.

**Q.** When can Option 10 on the Axis Minor Variation Chart be played?

**A.** During the 1943 Strategic Warfare sequence.

**Q.** Can German units pass the Nazi-Soviet partition lines as long as they withdraw after the fall of Poland?

**A.** Yes

**Q.** If Turkey is a German Minor Ally do German units there count towards the East Front garrison? **A.** No

**Q.** The British 1939 air allotment is confusing.

**A.** The British get two 5-4 air units and four 1-4 air units to meet deployment requirements. They may build another 5-4 air unit and if all the 1-4's are eliminated or combined they may build 1 additional factor for a maximum strength of four 5-4 air units.

**Q.** The supply rules allow Egypt and Libya to be used as supply sources but if it isn't defined further units can never be surrounded in these countries.

**A.** Supplies must be traced to any port in these colonies.

**Q.** Are partisans subject to normal supply requirements?

**A.** No, partisans are never isolated.

**Q.** May a fleet be Strategically Redeployed and provide Sea Escort in the same turn?

**A.** No

**Q.** What is the maximum number of air factors which can be based in I hex?

**A.** 15 in hexes such as Portsmouth or Essen which already contain two bases.

**Q.** Can naval units be taken as losses under the Attrition Option?

**A.** No

**Q.** When the German Minor Allies are activated in the Summer '41 turn are they considered automatically at war with Germany's enemies or must they pay Declaration of War costs?

**A.** They are automatically at war.

**Q.** An invasion fleet forces a sub-9 factor defending fleet from a beach/port hex. Can it choose to remove none of its own force and if so what happens to the defending fleet?

**A.** Yes. The defending fleet merely moves to another port although it could choose to intercept and force an exchange.

**Q.** 5.7 states partisans cannot be created two turns in a row. Does this mean all partisan units or just those in a particular country?

**A.** The latter.

**Q.** Does rule 8.3 apply prior to 1944 in the Campaign Game?

**A.** Yes

**Q.** Under Axis Minor Variation Chart Option #2 how does the British player divert his 10 factors to Ireland?

**A.** Either by Naval Transport or Strategic Redeployment.

**ΔQ.** Can units exploit off an undefended beach?

**A.** Only armor and the beach is considered the breakthrough hex and must be occupied by at least one armored unit.

**Q.** Can the British amphibiously assault Copenhagen without a port on the Baltic?

**A.** No

**Q.** When the German gains control of either Suez or Gibraltar does he have to hold it against any counterattack before deducting the BRPs?

**A.** No

**ΔQ.** Explain the U.S. BRP situation.

**A.** The U.S. cannot loan BRPs until the SR phase of the Spring, 1942 turn when they enter the game. U.S. BRPs can be used in the 1942 Year Start sequence for Strategic Warfare builds but otherwise the U.S. is not considered in the game at that point and must pay Declaration of War costs in the Spring turn. As such, her BRPs are not totalled for determination of who moves first. The 1942 Scenario is an exception in that the U.S. is considered already at war and need not pay for a Declaration of War.

**Q.** In a Second Conquest situation does control of all unoccupied (and hence "freed") hexes of the country revert to the new conqueror immediately upon taking the capital or must you wait until the original conqueror has had his chance to retake it?

**A.** The latter. In addition, since in a Second Conquest situation there is no minor country army to disappear, all hexes of the country do not automatically become friendly to the new conqueror—only those hexes behind the lines of the new conqueror are friendly to him. Those behind the retreating original conqueror are still his until he gives them up. The same principle applies to Belligerent Intervention forces also.

**Q.** If the "one chance to retake a capital" should come in a following year after the next Year Start Sequence does the conqueror get gypped out of his points for a year?

**A.** No, in this case the BRPs can be added/subtracted after the Spring turn of the new year.

**Q.** The "initiative" rule wherein players are constantly checking their BRP totals and that of their opponent to secure or guard against two moves in a row is a drag on the action. Can the game be played without it?

**A.** Yes, if both players agree beforehand. We were in favor of making this an optional rule but gave way to Prados' objections. The initiative rule does strange things to the game, some good and some bad. You should play both ways before making up your mind.

**Q.** Russia can get around not attacking Germany until Fall, 1941 by declaring war on Italy and thus being at war with Germany.

**A.** Come on now, a little common sense should prevail! If Russia isn't allowed to attack Germany why should she be allowed to attack Italy when it automatically results in a Declaration of War against Germany also?

**Q.** If the Italian has lent 10 factors to the German for use in Africa, are they considered to be supplied by the German; i.e., if the Malta rule is utilized are these forces considered part of the 18 maximum German factors in Africa and can they be moved given maximum British strength on Malta?

**A.** No, Italian lent forces are not counted against the 18 factor limit, although the Italians were not supplied any better than the Germans, (in fact, usually when petrol was in short supply it was the Italians who were left behind). The purpose of the rule is to limit overall strength capabilities in Africa rather than limit individual units. Nationality just happens to be the most convenient way of doing that. Also note that German units unable to "move" because of Malta can still be strategically redeployed.

**Q.** Is the hex NE of the port in East Prussia obscured by the board edge traversible?

**A.** No

**Q.** Can German units be SR through or into Italy while it is neutral?

**A.** Yes ... providing the Italian player allows it.

**Q.** Can Italy lend SR to Germany while the former is neutral?

**A.** No

**Q.** Can naval units change bases during a Pass Option?

**A.** No ... unless there are no enemy fleets presently based on that front. Fleets can always change bases through SR.

**Q.** If Spain or Turkey are to become Axis Minor Allies can the Axis move forces into or through them before they become active?

**A.** No, unlike German Minor Allies—they are not inactive—they are neutral until activated. Were the Axis to move through them before they were activated it would be tantamount to a Declaration of War despite the chit drawn.

**ΔQ.** It is becoming a “perfect strategy” for the Axis to mass his airpower in the channel ports and attempt a 1-1 air assault on London which cannot be prevented, at least on the first turn of the ‘42 Scenario. The Italian air force then provides DAS during the British turn making it impossible to get better than a 1-1 counterattack.

**A.** This is a genuine problem which was not brought out during the playtest and does lend itself to the “optimum solution” school of thought which can ruin a game, although it is primarily true only of the opening turn of the 1942 Scenario. Most problems the British experience in defending Britain are rooted in too much trust in the Navy and the Channel to protect them such that they send the army and airforce in too large quantities to the Mediterranean and thus are inviting disaster. Britain must stabilize the situation which takes time, before she can go on the counteroffensive. The British player who forces his recovery of the initiative too soon is merely leaving himself open for the “unrealistic” fall of England. He must wait until the German has been committed to other fronts and other battles. Yet, we will grant that England would probably have continued to fight on after the fall of London especially if the only opposition was a German airborne corps. Yet, rather than obstruct the game system we will make official two slight changes which do not\* take away the possibility of the airborne landing but merely make it more expensive. To wit:

**Δ4.71** The elimination-every-time aspect of the CRT does not mean that every man in the units involved has been killed. Rather, the force has suffered enough casualties and disorganization that it is no longer effective and must be withdrawn for rest and refitting at the expense of the game’s BRP system. There would always be some remnant of a unit upon which to rebuild. However, any airborne force unsuccessfully dropped in Britain would be subject to complete annihilation. Therefore, if an Axis airborne unit is lost in Britain it cannot be replaced until Britain actually falls.

**Δ5.31** Reflect the nature of the more determined resistance of the English people by allowing the British to stack their replacement (1-0) units 6 high in London, in addition to the normal stacking limit of 2 units per hex. The British player may also opt to start the ‘42 Scenario with all 6 replacement counters on board in lieu of two 3-4 infantry counters which would be Allowable Builds instead. If attacked by conventional ground forces the British player may defend London via the normal stacking limits and any excess defense factors caused by overstacking are ignored.

These rules make the maximum attack on a well defended London in Spring ‘42 a 36-33, chancy 1-1. The British player in his turn could muster a guaranteed 10-6 counter-attack which would give them an 83% chance of retaking London. Failure by the German may well cost him the game just as it certainly would for the Allies. It is now a much less palatable risk for the

German, yet a possibility for a coup still exists if Britain does not defend realistically.

**Q.** Why didn’t you include a PBM system?

**A.** Between the different phases and defensive intercept capabilities, PBM didn’t look very likely for this game. In addition, the charts printed on the mapboard would make a comprehensive grid system difficult to print without adding another feature of the mapboard to be explained and confuse the novice. However, for those of you attempting to play the game by mail we offer the following grid system courtesy of Tom Oleson.

The horizontal rows are lettered A-NN from North to South. The diagonal columns are numbered 1-66 starting in the Southwest corner and running to the Northeast. Reference points would be: Marrakech-EE2, Lisbon-V8, Dublin-1422, Rome-Y22, Berlin-L31, Helsinki-D41, Moscow-H47, Stalingrad-N49, and Perma-D61.

**Q.** Can fleets exercise shore bombardment in support of an exploitation battle?

**A.** No

**Q.** If a capital is captured what good does it do to have a turn to counterattack? With all your forces out of supply, you could only attack with those forces directly adjacent to the capital.

**A.** Not necessarily. You still can trace a line of supply from a colony or ally.

**Q.** Can airborne units take a port and then use Naval Transport to bring in forces that same turn?

**A.** Yes, but only if the port is ungarrisoned. If combat is necessary to take the port you could not utilize Naval Transport into it that turn. You could Strategically Redeploy into it if it is not adjacent to an enemy however.

**Q.** Can British units set up in France at the beginning of the game?

**A.** No, initial set up is limited to areas controlled by each country in question.

**Q.** Suppose a beach hex is being amphibiously assaulted in conjunction with a normal ground attack from an adjacent hex. Is the defender doubled or tripled?

**A.** Tripled.

**Q.** Assuming partisans are able to regain control of their capital and hold it against attack for one turn, and the Germans are unable to forfeit the BRP’s derived from that country, what happens?

**A.** The German BRP track is reduced to 0 and the balance due plus an additional 10 BRPs is subtracted from the amount due the German in the next Year Start Sequence. This does not affect his BRP base, only the sum total of BRPs he can expect in the coming year. Note also that the German cannot lose BRPs in

this manner in the 1942 or 1944 Scenarios because the German already controlled the territories at the start of the game.

**Q.** Are units which start their turn in supply but end it out of supply eliminated at the end of the turn?

**A.** No, See 4.3 which states that units which are not in supply and *remain so* at the end of their turn, are eliminated.

**Q.** If a capital falls, how can you counterattack it if your units are out of supply?

**A.** See 4.3 which states that units are in supply whenever they can trace a line of hexes free of enemy ZOC overland through controlled hexes to .a conquered nation, or an allied country” at the *beginning* of their turn.

**ΔQ.** Does the “at least 1 hex away from enemy units” criteria Apply across sea hex sides also?

**A.** No, for example, the Germans could SR into Calais despite British units in Dover.

**Q.** Suppose an airborne unit drops on an enemy unit and both are lost in the exchange. Who controls the hex?

**A.** The defender.

**Q.** When sending BRP’s from the U.S. to Russia, must the required Sea Escort fleets be based in the U.S.?

**A.** Not at the start of the turn. Remember, fleets can change bases within a front during the movement portion of a turn. So fleets in Britain could move to the U.S. and still perform the required Sea Escort that turn. Their homebase would then be the United States and they would have to return there at the conclusion of SR. This means that these fleets are at the maximum interception range for any interception attempt on the Western Front during the opponent’s next move.