LINE OF COMMUNICATIONS

EDITORIAL

We're going to have to reverse our field from what we told you last time. Due to financial difficulties not directly related to either magazine we just will not be able to to continue with CAMPAIGN. We've tried to find someone who would take it over, but so far no takers. So until we do find someone or from here on out if we don't, CAMPAIGN is now re-united with PANZERFAUST. We really hate to do this but be have no choice. Neither magazine is self-supporting. That is, they don't make enough profit to pay for my time or that of the rest of the staff. Myself, Julie, Pete Bennett and Tom Wham all worked on the magazines in between our duties with Lowrys Hobbies and Guidon Games. Unfortunately the whole triad just hasn't been making enough to support us all, so reluctantly we've had to lay off Pete and Tom. With such a reduction in the work force we have to eliminate some of the work load. Julie and I just can't do it all. It is difficult enough to find time now to put out one magazine let alone two.

So CAMPAIGN subscribers are recieving this issue of PANZERFAUST in lieu of a full issue of CAMPAIGN and will continue to recieve PF on an issue-for-an-issue basis unless we find someone who wants to take over and revive CAMPAIGN. Those of you who subscribed to both magazines will not receive duplicate issues. We'll extend your PF subscription one issue for each CAMPAIGN issue you had coming. We realize this is not exactly what you paid for but is is the only solution immediately within our capabilities. Perhaps one of you subscribers has the ability and desire to take over CAMPAIGN. If so, write me for details.

Now for some more bad news. We've been holding the line against inflation for as long as we can. Subscription rates are going up. We probably should have done this when we raised the cover price to $1.50 (#58) or even before. Anyway, a one-year sub will hence-forth cost $6.00 instead of $5.00; two years $11.00 and three years $15.00. Not a soul took us up on the 5 year sub and we're dropping that. Instead, we're now offering *LIFETIME SUBSCRIPTIONS* -- for $75.00. That's right, PANZERFAUST for the rest of your life at the cost of 5 3-year subscriptions! So if you plan on living longer than 15 years it's definitely a bargain. Also it saves you the bother of renewing and insures against further increases in subscription rates. And we'll send you a fancy certificate, suitable for framing, with which you can prove to us, or anyone, your "lifer" status (and impress those people who are easily impressed by fancy certificates). You can cancel a current term subscription and replace it with a Lifetime Subscription. Just send in the $75.00 and we'll refund $1.00 for each issue remaining on your current subscription. (NOTE: Lifetime Subs will be available for a limited time only -- maybe a year, maybe only a few months, depending on how fast they come in. Our goal is 100 "lifers".)

Another new offer is a *First Class Subscription*. This means your PF will be sent via first class mail instead of third class. It will arrive one or two weeks sooner and be less likely to be lost. And will be forwarded if you move, go off to college, or return home for the summer, etc. (In spite of what the Post Ofiice says, they very seldom forward magazines. (Besides PF goes third class instead of second class, the normal rate used by large circulation magazines.) For first class service, just add $2.00 per year to any regular term subscription (thus 1 year for $8.00, 2 years for $15.00 or 3 years for $21.00). The ultimate in PF subscriptions, *THE FIRST CLASS LIFETIME SUBSCRIPTION*, goes for a mere $100.00 even (thus saving a further $5 from the cost of 5 three-year subs). and your "lifer" certificate will also indicate your first class status.

The "Return Fire" results from the last PF are very interesting:

Issue #59, as a whole	6.93
The Future of Wargaming	6.56
Thumbnail Analysis	6.46
Design Analysis	6.44
ANZIO's Heirs	6.43
The Fog of War	6.33
Battle of Finger Ridge	6.16
Strategy in OVERLORD	6.05
Passing in Review	5.56
Airpower in FRANCE, 1940	5.55
Game Design	5.52
Line of Communications	5.48
Reconnaissance In Force	5.46
DUNKIRK Openings	5.37
G2 Reports	5.35
Afterthoughts On ALEXANDER	5.33
Some Gripes With OPERATION GREIF	5.23
And Then There Were Three	5.19
Miniature Warfare	5.14
Mail Call	5.12

Once again all articles are rated above 5. And once again the "overall" rating is up (from 6.78). But what's really unique is that the "overall" rate is higher than any single article! This means that no one article was the universal favorite, but that almost everyone was well pleased with the general "mix" of material. Another fact worth noting is the very high placement of one of our staff-written columns: "Thumbnail Analysis". I assume this is due to interest taken in the games being reviewed. (Incidentally, some of you who ordered QUEBEC or WAR OF 1812 on our discount coupon are, at this writing, still

Continued on page 37

Sample

panzerfaust

Games of Strategy • Strategy of Games

FOUNDED BY DONALD GREENWOOD

A POINT IS A POINT..., by Richard Hamblen 6

MORE NUTS AND BOLTS, About Game Design, by Thomas Nowak . . 12

THE CAVALRY QUANDRY, by Richard Hamblen 16

SGC WATERLOO RULES CLARIFICATION, by the Simulations Games Committee 19

MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING, by Jack Scruby 20

GAMES FOR THREE, by Bill Gale 24

Game Review: KASSERINE PASS by Norris L. Darrall 25

Game Review: NORAD by Tyrone Bomba 26

TACTICAL ANALYSIS IN BULGE by Paul D. Mills 27

THE TONKIN WAR 1950 - 4 by Guy Hail 30

THE IMPERIAL ROMAN LEGIONS by Thomas Coveney 35

JETS AND ROCKETS AND OTHER FANCY STUFF IN LUFTWAFFE by Marvant Duhon 38

FANTASY WARGAMING A'LA TOLKIEN by Gary Gygax 40

Game Design: The Cohesion Factor by Bill Gale 41
Diplomacy: How to Play the Youngstown Variant by Rod Walker 44
Thumbnail Analysis 46
G2 Reports 47
Passing in Review 48
Mail Call 49

PANZERFAUST magazine is copyright '1973, Donald S. Lowry. Printed in U.S.A. All rights reserved. Not responsible for unsolicited manuscripts or artwork unless accompanied by sufficient postage for return. Advertising rates on request. For subscription rates, see page 47.

Publisher & Editor - Don Lowry
Asst. Publisher & Art Director - Julie Lowry
Illustrators - George Skoch, Don Lowry & Joe Tovar
Miniature Warfare Editor - Gary Gygax
Diplomacy Editor - Walter Buchanan

Sample file

A POINT IS A POINT...

BY RICHARD HAMBLEN

Don't believe it.

In a historical war game, based on a real battle, what does a combat factor represent? Is it a measure of men, of machines, or of morale? A few extra combat factors added into a unit can be disproportionately valuable - an 8-point unit is worth more than two 4-point units, as any STALINGRAD veteran will agree - so how is this taken into account? On the other hand, in an Elimination-type combat results table (as opposed to an Attrition-type table) the two smaller units are twice as hard to kill because there are twice as many of them. In other words, the playing of the game itself can make a given amount of combat factors worth more or worth less in a unit. How should this affect the assignment of combat factors to units?

What do combat factors stand for? What do they mean? How are they chosen?

We can look at two existing (or semi-existing) Civil War games put out by Avalon Hill to see the two extremes in assigning combat factors. The units of CHANCELLORSVILLE have combat factors based on the numbers of men and cannon in the units. In GETTYSBURG, the combat factors are based on the game designer's subjective judgement of how much each unit was worth in a fight - the judgement based partly on how the unit did in the actual battle, partly on the quality of the unit's corps and division commanders, partly on the unit's previous battle record, and only partly on the number of men present in each unit (at least, this is how it appears that the combat factors were obtained. It's always possible that they were just drawn out of a hat, but if they were then the hat made a certain amount of sense this time - as we shall see). These are two examples of two extremes - the formula method of calculating combat factors. versus the free-lance judge-

sample file

ment method. One method must be perfectly reasonable and justifiable, while the other is questionable at best; the only question is, which is which?

In CHANCELLORSVILLE the formula is: one combat factor represents 1000 fighting men or eight cannon in the real battle. The number of effective "fighting men" in each Federal Corps and Confederate division is not precisely known, and different historians have estimated different numbers for the real strengths. All the estimates are pretty close together, however (and believe me, THAT ain't the case in all Civil War battles), and the combat factors in CHANCELLORSVILLE are all within 1000 men or so of the consensus estimate of the historians. To get the exact values used, CHANCELLORSVILLE'S designer evidently took a few estimates from one historian, a few from another, or else he made his own estimates of the units' strengths - or he decided to add or subtract a combat factor arbitrarily, possibly because of a unit's morale or commander. In any case, CHANCELLORSVILLE'S figures do not agree exactly, all up and down the line, with any other estimate I have seen.

The interesting possibility is that CHANCELLORSVILLE'S designer fudged the combat factors just a little for certain units, in order to allow for morale or other non-numerical considerations. In the first place, we can say that all of the figures appear to be rounded down to the lower number of thousands of men. Allowing for this, the historians' estimates agree with the total combat factors in the Federal IC, IIC, VC, and VIC, the Confederate divisions of Colston, Anderson, and Early, and the cavalry divisions and brigades for both sides. The Federal IIIC could be all right, depending on what estimate was used, but it probably is short a combat factor - possibly due to the eccentricities of the overzealous Corps commander, Sickles, or the large number of inexperienced 9-months soldiers in the corps. It should be noted that IC, IIC, VC and VIC all had fine commanders and all are rated in the game at their full strength. The Federal XIC is from one to three combat factors light. This certainly squares with the unit's performance in the actual battle, and in fact the German-flavored corps was looked down on by the rest of the army. The corps' failings might better be traced to the failings of its commander, Howard, who let the whole outfit get flanked and routed, but in any case the

A Little Information About Two "Semi-Existing" Games

CHANCELLORSVILLE and GETTYSBURG are two games which are really not quite all there these days. CHANCELLORSVILLE has been cancelled by Avalon Hill and is only available as a "collector's game", and the original GETTYBURG has been considerably modified through the changing of the frontages of the units. This article is about the original versions of both games, and it is very likely that you have never seen both of these games.

This article is really more about combat factors than about these two particular games, however. Consequently, with a little explanation of what the games were like, you should be able to follow the article and understand it fully.

CHANCELLORSVILLE was a hex-style game, normal Avalon Hill type with the STALINGRAD - D-DAY CRT, no automatic victory, but with fortifications that could be variable placed at the beginning of the game. The mapboard was of the Wilderness-Fredericksburg area of Virginia, with the Rapidan and Rappahannock Rivers seperating the upper third (Federal side) of the mapboard from the lower two-thirds (Confederate side). The Confederates have six infantry divisions averaging 9 points a division, one 4-point cavalry division, and twelve 2-point or 3-point artillery battalions. The divisions can also break down into 1- or 2- point brigades. Thus, the Confederate army can concentrate into a powerful small mass or spread out.

The Federal army must cross the rivers (via special ford squares, or by crossing around Fredericksburg on pontoon units or assault boat units) and defeat the Confederates to win. The Federal army is much larger but not so concentrated: twenty-one infantry divisions averaging only 5 combat factors, ten artillery units averaging 5 points each, and 12 points of cavalry in five units. The Confederates have the advantage of fortifications and of the mapboard, which is mostly woods. The oversized Federal army cannot really deploy, all hemmed in by the woods squares.

GETTYSBURG was a free-style game unlike any other board game in existence. It played like free-style minatures games. Effectively, there were no "squares" or "hexes" on the board; the units just moved around on the board, moving up half an inch or so, turning around a few degrees. The units were rectangular, not square, and they had a front, a back, and flanks; it made a big difference in a battle which side the attack was coming from. You can think of it like a minatures naval game, where one side of the ship is the "front" of the unit and the other side the "back" (the ends of the ship are the "Flanks") the unit can move any amount of inches, or hunredths of inches (up to its movement distance - given in inches) in any direction, and can rotate as it wants. Units can and must attack anything within a inch of the front of the unit. The units are described in the article.

Sample File