



Military Muddling



Volume 17 Issue 6

Chestnut Lodge Wargames Group Newsletter

1st Quarter 2009

It took quite a while to decide whether sleeping below decks on the Belfast is or is not something one just has to do. Dinner in the Admirals quarters was obviously not to be missed. Even Florence chose to be there. Chestnut Lodge has once again risen proudly to the challenge of wargaming in such a prestigious location and I was glad to see many of you there. Meanwhile each month the meetings continue to challenge and entertain. Thanks to MilMud contributors, so I can catch up on those I miss...happy reading.

Daniel T Shaw

Contributions for Military Muddling

To: Daniel T Shaw, preferably as ASCII Text or Word documents, by
e-mail to MilMud@chestnutlodge.org.uk or clwg@ProjExpertise.com

but you can also send paper or disks to:

La Montvallièrre 3 rue du Capitaine Lacuzon, 39150 St Laurent en Grandvaux France



Officers

Events Organiser: Jim Wallman events@chestnutlodge.org.uk

Games Organiser: Brian Cameron games@chestnutlodge.org.uk

Military Muddling Editor: Daniel T Shaw MilMud@chestnutlodge.org.uk

Treasurer: Andrew Hadley

Admin Officer: John Rutherford

Events

Saturday 4 - Sunday 5 April PET, London Bridge Annual Games Weekend 2009

Sunday 3 May Anerley Methodist Church Ocean, Thunder, and Great Disaster - a savage war devastates a nation - Andrew

Sunday 7 June Anerley Methodist Church Balkans Wars - the operational system. Fits with the peace negotiation game run previously. Pete Merritt

Saturday 13 June Anerley Town Hall MEGAGAME: Crusade of Yendor - Fantasy campaigning megagame

See also <http://games.groups.yahoo.com/group/clwg/> and <http://www.chestnutlodge.org.uk/>

CLWG December Meeting – Report by Brian Cameron

This started with James' "Hot Blood and Cold Steel" game, a trench raid in WWI, a few days before the first day of the Somme. The raiding party consisted of two officers, a sergeant, a corporal and a solitary private. Our mission was to conduct a night time raid, determine the extent of wire cutting (I don't know why, General Haig had assured us it was completely cut...) and take a prisoner.

Although intended as a skirmish game, it rather turned into a role playing game but then Dave Boundy and I were playing so it would do, shade of "Oranges & Lemons". I was the junior officer and thought Nick Luft as senior officer was rather gung-ho so took a rather more 'Blackadder' approach, intending to do my bit without unnecessary danger!

We penetrated the wire belt and I took the opportunity to halt at nearby shell crater so as to be able to guide the party which would raid the trench back to the gap; there had been some talk of tapes to guide us but the senior officer didn't follow through so I felt I had to 'cover the gap' literally and plan-wise. Nick and his equally gung-ho sergeant (John R) raided into forward sap and John brought out a prisoner who certainly led a charmed life. Three times they were shot at and three times the prisoner took a light wound while John escaped unscathed! Nick decided to prevent pursuit by attacking up the trench and was engaging some Germans in the front line. Pickles had been grenading the trench and it was perhaps unfortunate that he'd gotten the range by this time! Dave meanwhile had attempted to make it back to safety in a quick dash and fell dead, conveniently in my shell hole. I shot at a German machine gun with my pistol and, by coincidence, it ceased firing, enabling me to claim a hit! Pickles and John had made it back through the wire so I took my leave, dragging Dave's body with me, in the pretense of acting heroically to save the chap.

Part of the conversation during the game was along the lines of having a good narrative for after the raid, so mine goes along the lines of:

"We moved up to the wire belt and found a gap and all moved through, me leading the way. As I realised that Lt. Luft had not brought along the promised tapes I remained by the gap so that the party would be able to find it again on our return journey; too many parties had met a terrible fate by not being able to identify their return route. I could also usefully fire on the German trenches from this position to provide cover.

Corp. Pickles and Pte. Boundy also took up covering positions. Lt Luft and Sgt Rutherford daringly leapt into the forward listening post and an altercation could be heard. Unfortunately the Germans were alerted and started firing. Cpl Pickles did a splendid job grenading the trench. A machine gun opened up which I was able suppress with several shots from my pistol. Pvt Boundy made a dash for my shell hole but just at that moment the landscape was lit up by a star shell and he was hit, virtually dropping at my feet. I did the best I could with his wounds while trying to guide the rest of the party with shouted instructions. I waited while Rutherford, with the prisoner, and Pickles, made it back through the wire, letting off more rounds from my revolver to cover their retreat. I then inched my way back, dragging Pvt Boundy with me. Sadly, on reaching our front line, I discovered that he had died during the return journey. I later learned from Sgt Rutherford that he had last seen Lt Luft dashing into the German trench system to bravely engage the enemy; I will give no credence to the rumours that his family name was actually von Luft and he had defected. I'm sure that we'll learn the truth when we achieve our magnificent in a couple of days time."

Very entertaining but, like Oranges & Lemons, I may be banned from playing again!

Andrew did his session on Tenth century Scottish Kingship, a subject about which I know nothing but hopefully Andrew got a chance to air some of his ideas and get some feedback; I look forward to a session for the programme!

Dave had brought along a game, snappily titled 'First World War' from Phalanx Games which had led to some discussion about a possible WWI megagame on the mailer. Dave seemed to think that I knew the rules better than he did so I ended up 'running' the game (a very loose description for trying to look up the

rules) while he played so he definitely won that one! The game was rather interrupted by ordering pizza so we left it on a cliff hanger with the 'German Allies' having started badly but made up a lot of ground. I like the game, its pretty straightforward but offers some hard choices. The amount of movement represented on the western front is much too great but it suits the eastern front. As a board game its undoubtedly the best I've seen on the subject, much better than e.g. 'Paths of Glory' . We didn't get around to really discussing other settings for the 'war tracks' mechanism though I have it in mind for my Renaissance & Reformation game.



Jim then turned up with the 'Airfix Multipose' game which Tim Gow had run at the last Wargames Developments conference. This involved us pairing up and taking turns to secretly pull an Airfix figure from a pouch and then adopt the pose of the figure; the other member of the team then had to guess which set the figure was from. If he was unable to do so it was thrown open to the other teams. If you had some knowledge of Airfix OO/HO figures it was a lot of nostalgic fun; if, like Dave, you clearly had a deprived childhood it was probably rather more baffling. I'll just casually mention that James and I won convincingly and leave it at that... Actually I must add that there's an excellent website: <http://www.plasticsoldierreview.com/Airfix.html> which Dave will love, which covers all the sets and has pictures of not only the original sets but the re-mastered versions as well!



There was insufficient time to do Pickles' "French & Indian Wars from a Speculators Point of View" game or Dave's football game but it had been a varied and enjoyable day, my thanks to John (and Sue) for hosting.

CLWG Sunday Meeting – 4th January 2009 by Peter Merritt

Jim's WW1 Logistics game was great; from my limited perspective on railways front, it was fascinating to see the situation develop. True, there may be scope for more variability and therefore tension, but it really doesn't need a combat element; I was fully engaged right from the start (and pleased when by phase 2 I thought it might actually work, as well!).

Speaking of scope for improvement... I have to also say a big thank you for trying the partial 'systemic negotiation' game. Sorry that the big power interactions were by no means fully developed (hah! understatement #1), and the laying of cards/positions should have had more subtlety (or even some; #2), but CLWG is about development, and I was very pleased with all the constructive comments afterwards. And the fact that more than one player took on the concept for other negotiating situations made it worthwhile. I will definitely be fleshing-out the rest of the campaign rules with a view for a fuller trial ('War and Peace. And War Again...') later this spring, the intention being to eventually make it part of a Balkans megagame (with 1/2/3 conferences).

Somme Logistics – Jim Wallman

The players were either British Army commanders or the civilian railway builders preparing the railway network for delivery of supplies immediately prior to the battle of the Somme. The railway team seemed to have the most to do, laying track and setting up railheads, while the army commanders initially struggled to feed some of their troops but then amassed enormous stockpiles of ammunition. The system seemed to function really well, but the game could do with a little more tension, either from disruptions to the railway network or threats from the Germans. The army teams don't need to be very large as there are few decisions.

Offside Report – Jim's WW1 Logistics Game

Alternative Title : The Militarisation of Ivor the Engine

In theory, this should have been doubly hard work. A World War One game? Surely it's all mud and trenches (or biplanes, if you're lucky)? Logistics? Just glorified accounting... But I have to say that it was as entertaining and informative a game as I've played in a long time.

The premise was the British logistical preparations before the Somme offensive in July 1916. In (I think) monthly or bi-weekly turns, three groups of players represented the staffs of 3rd and 4th Armies, and those unsung heroes of the Railway directorate (i.e. myself and Brian Cameron). I'll leave Jim to describe the system in more detail.

Anyway, it may sound ludicrous but the site of the 'Big Push' had been chosen more I think for the 'lie of the land' than any minor considerations like if the place had any infrastructure worth a damn (must add that to my reasons-for-shooting-Haig list...). So poorly served was the place with roads and railways that we had the 'entertainment' at the start of 3rd Army announcing that one or two of their more exposed divs '...might have to starve for a bit...!' At that point, I knew we were on to a winner.

The armies had certain organic supply distribution facilities, namely truck and horse-drawn units. The latter were being replaced (being very 'short-ranged'), but were still important. These would draw supplies from a single forward dump and/or one of the three railheads in the area. For 250,000 men. And 100's of guns. Plus stockpile and prep a huge offensive. In three month's. Hmmm....

The Railways Directorate's job was to deliver enough supplies to maintain the existing front, while at the same time extending both the rail network (the real 'heavy lifter') and depot facilities. Of course, trains which carry building supplies do not carry food & ammo.... I didn't realise that Brian had actually played and part-designed the system, and so he adopted a very 'either/or' approach to planning, suggesting options but acquiescing quite quickly to any firm ideas from yours truly.

The interesting part early on was that all three ‘teams’ became engrossed in their particular problems. Yes, we were all ‘getting on with the job’, but there was little cross-flow of information. By this I mean that it took some time for the army teams to realise that (a) the depot capacities for different types of supply had to be fixed some time ahead of construction(!), and (b) the Railway Directorate had no idea of their detailed load requirements, other than one army was ‘...about 70% bigger than the other...’. And so it was that, for the first two turns at least, the Railway Directorate simply looked at the overall situation and built what we thought was ‘reasonable’. We did consult about the location of railhead/depots (as close as possible), and there was little or no rancour at any stage about favouring one army or the other. Despite the ‘historical’ doom and gloom at the start, we quickly developed long-term building plans several turns ahead (especially when we knew what was required), and suffice to say that by the end, capacity had increased so much that Jim ran out of lego bricks, and you can’t say fairer than that!

At the end of the game Jim showed everyone the historical solution, and also said a few words about previous outings of the game (including one at the Royal Corps of Logistics!), and variations on choices. I was pleased that we got most of the depots and ‘branch-lines’ right, although we/I had opted to double-track an existing main line, as opposed to building a new line down the centre (as in 1916, and advocated by ‘Casey Jones’ Cameron). But there was no right or wrong solution, just options to explore – as in any great game.

For the future, a number of suggestions were made of a minor nature. Many or all (including me) wanted to try it again, but this time extending it through the offensive period (with some suitably simple combat system). There were also plenty of volunteers for a slightly more variable delivery schedule – some random loss (0-10%?) on the theoretical delivered capacity which would require some juggling on the planning front. Even bad weather and unsuitable geology were considered to knock-off the odd railway build point, without adding too great a complexity.

“The Party Of The First Part...” - Systemic Treaty Negotiations

The idea is to make complex conference negotiations simpler (and faster) for multiple teams of players in megagames by reducing the key treaty issues to essentially a game of ‘rummy’! By collecting and laying a set of cards relating to each major, pre-defined (key) issue, all players can see how they are doing, and can focus on ‘trading favours’ with others. Basic cards can be augmented with various bits of ‘gloss’ depending on time available and the problem being depicted. For example:-

Issue: Province of Alsace	Big Power #1	Issue: Province of Lorraine	Big Power #2
<i>Counts as 1x vote in your favour when played on the issue track</i>	General Favour – 1 Vote <i>They are more than pleased to support your ‘legitimate claims’.</i> <i>May be played anywhere without restriction.</i> <i>For now</i>	PROBLEM! <i>Outside agitation is causing rioting in several towns – now demanding tax cuts etc etc – negate one vote already played</i>	General favour 1 Vote – BUT <i>jealousy (or fear) means it cannot be played on the same track with one from a different Big Power!</i>

The idea is that complex issues with multiple, conflicting possible results will involve larger sets of cards, and possible results should be represented by multiple ‘tracks’ on the specific issue chart (see below):-

ISSUE: The Schlesswig-Holstein Question					
RESULT → (number of cards played on track by the end of voting)	<i>Derisory claim – ridiculed in the Courts of Europe as sheer fantasy!</i> = CB	<i>Some international support – postpone for next conference</i> = CB	<i>General acceptance of position; other states still need to be convinced</i> = CB	<i>All but your bitterest enemies now accept the result; gain popularity</i>	<i>International treaty signed – all states must recognise the result.</i>
Denmark gets Schlesswig; Prussia gets Holstein	<i>Card #1</i>	<i>Card #2</i>	<i>Card #3</i>	<i>Card #4</i>	<i>Card #5</i>
Denmark gets the lot!	<i>Card #1</i>	<i>Card #2</i>	<i>Card #3</i>	<i>Card #4</i>	<i>Card #5</i>
Prussia gets the lot!	<i>Card #1</i>	<i>Card #2</i>	<i>Card #3</i>	<i>Card #4</i>	<i>Card #5</i>
S-H to gain independence; joins the new ‘Northern League’	<i>Card #1</i>	<i>Card #2</i>	<i>Card #3</i>	<i>Card #4</i>	<i>Card #5</i>

RUNNING THE CONFERENCE – EXISTING VERSION

Once the issues (and possible results) are decided and card sets readied, the cards need to be distributed. Some of this should be dictated by ‘start position’, i.e. if one state already occupies a lot of a province or has great influence in the region they should get a card or two. The remainder could be distributed in a semi-random manner designed to kick-start the ‘negotiations’ phase, or left in the ‘pot’ should the situation warrant it (i.e. if larger, external forces may lend an indirect hand)!

EACH ROUND

Allow (?) x minutes of chat and the trading of cards

TRADE RULES:

- (1) deal may consist of two or more cards (no maximum)
- (2) must be honest about at least one of the cards being offered
- (3) states may also surrender 1 or more ‘internal influence’ cards to the Big Powers, in return for some favours. This is not to be taken lightly, as once surrendered it affects govt. popularity and their ability to make decisions...

EXAMPLE: “I’ve got three cards, one of which is ‘Alsace Province’; I want ‘Free-Trade in Baltic’ or any ‘Big Power’ favours...”

When the bell sounds, each player/team may lay cards on one of the various issue tracks

END OF CONFERENCE – THE TREATY

After a number of rounds (when all teams ‘pass’ on a lay-down, or have walked-out), check each of the issues for full completion. If a track is 100% completed this implies total international acceptance, and that issue may not be used as a ‘Casus Belli’ for further action.

Check also for partial completion – may not be enough to go into the Treaty, but will warrant a mention in the preamble and could well influence future decision-making/policy objectives.....

FIRST TRY-OUT: 'THE BOSROVIAN CRISIS'

The six player teams were all thinly-disguised versions of the Baltic states in 1912, with the usual collection of joked-up names (Slobodia, Ruritania and of course, good old Freedonia etc), plus a highly stylised map. The situation was a variation on the end of the 1st Balkan war, when the states had combined (for perhaps the first and only time in recorded history) to take-out some juicy bits of real estate on their borders with Turkey. Sorry, I mean help their brother nationals throw off the yolk blah-blah-blah.... Problem was, they were all more successful than they'd dared to hope in the planning stage, which then switched them into total ‘delusions of grandeur’ at the peace conference (even while their armies were now low on ammo, food and ravaged by disease).

I have to admit that the large turn-out surprised me, and so apologies to Dave B and Jim for the very adhoc nature of the ‘Big Powers’ rules. But – as I expected – they seemed to take to their role as behind the scenes power-brokers, running the conference for their own agendas of stability and personal advantage (no change there then). I do have more draft rules and cards for the BP, and will certainly address this next time.

Well, after only a few rounds of negotiation and play (which was the idea to get a reasonably fast result), I called a halt as the conference neared a natural end. Some states had done well, the ‘Portean Empire’ (Turks) had done deals and come back from the brink (even retaking a province at the conference which they hadn't a hope in hell of getting back militarily). Slobodia had sold it's soul to the devil (i.e. Slater-Wallman-Boundy, Inc) by surrendering all influence! It was good to see that even bitter enemies saw the advantage of negotiating (I had emphasised that one province with full rights was worth far more than simple occupation with no international recognition), although by the end the next war was brewing between Nick's ‘stabbed-in-back Slobodia’ and it's neighbour, Mukals small but crafty ‘Greater Messerovia’. Assuming, of course that Nick gets permission to fight from his new owners....

So, changes then? To say that the system has rough edges is wrong – it doesn't really have *any* edges at the moment, being more a chunk of raw material! Still, for a first outing I was very pleased, and next time intend to:-

1. Most importantly, make the *lay* of voting cards both more flexible (i.e. on any issues), but also more tense (maximum lay in any one turn, to avoid sudden ‘grand slam’ plays which make outstanding cards almost worthless)
2. Greater control of number of cards – there were too many in play (although this did lead to some tense moments with four ‘issues’, as rival claims and ‘spoiling cards’ came up the back stretch)
3. More involvement of the Big Powers, perhaps even allowing a new resolution track to be added to an issue (if players ask them nicely, of course). I have several rules and cards already defined, but Mr Stupid didn't think they'd be necessary for the try-out...

In any event, I will flesh-out the system and return for another bash (perhaps with a smaller number of multi-player teams) later this Spring. At this time I especially hope to also show the longer-term effects of the Big Powers, which can include ‘re-cycling’ of internal influence cards to specific players in a team, representing the distortion of domestic politics (where one General/minister effectively gets 2+ votes when deciding policy, or resolving public confidence/revolutionary votes [stolen, unashamedly, from Brian's excellent ‘Barricades & Borders’]). Of course, what the BP forgot was that it was one thing to feed such extreme nationalism and unrealistic reliance on purely military solutions (which must fall short of

dominating 80% of the whole area), quite another to control it when a tiny crisis unexpectedly lights the spark to World War...

Many, many thanks to all the players; as ever, I learnt so much from actually seeing the thing fly for a few turns, as opposed to long hours over a word-processor. And it was also pleasing to hear more than one player talking about how the basic system could be adapted to simplify other complex 'treaty' negotiating issues in games without resorting to scribbled notes; that's what CLWG is for!

Balkans Wars Negotiation – Pete Merritt–Offside report by aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa

We played the various Balkan states, the Ottomans and the Great Powers (although with different names) in a post-war conference deciding the future of a number of provinces. Each province was an 'issue' with a number of different solutions, for which players laid down cards in support of the different solutions. The fierce and effective trading of cards meant that many issues were resolved in one burst, with only a few more marginal provinces still being disputed towards the end of the session.

I really enjoyed the card mechanism for negotiation - I can see it being pinched or adapted for a lot of games. What I especially like about it is that it is so flexible - you can have any number of possible outcomes and different 'thresholds' for success. The trading system was good fun, and with the extra colour that the military angle would bring it will be especially interesting.

Some suggestions:

- **More specific cards that can be played on more than one issue** (*Roving bandits* - Krum OR Bora), or that can be used only to counter specific lays by other plays (*Support from judiciary* - negate PROBLEM in Pela, Illyria or Thun). This will generate some really interesting decisions by players about priorities, and mean that cards can still be used after one or two issues are sewn up.
- **Varied numbers of cards and thresholds** (maybe Bora is less critical than Pela, and thus has only 3 or 4 as its final position, but less cards in total). This will mean that the big and/or controversial issues require more effort to solve.
- **Cards that can only be played in specific slots or situations on one or more issues** (*Local hero* - Initial slot only on Gratz); (*Merchants back the winner* - only playable where an outcome is 2 or more ahead of the other outcomes, in Alba OR Pela), (*Domino effect* - only playable where a neighboring issue has been decided in your favour). Again this will give a wider range of options and considerations for players. I always find powerful cards that can only be played with certain conditions add a huge amount of spice to the game.
- **Knock on issue preparation** - i.e. if Krum goes to Ruritania but Varna to Bosrovia, it may be worth having a secondary issue sheet printed up for Varna, which is likely to be a potential source of friction in future disputes/agreements.
- **Preparation for potential divisions**. If some territories can be divided, then perhaps this should be indicated in advance, to limit the number of new options that open up during the game.
- **Rough 'ethnic' weightings**, perhaps given to players in secret, showing the numbers of 'their' people in each territory. E.g. Alba - 30% Freedomian, 40% Albanian, 30% other
- **Rough Economic levels** in each province to be available. E.g. Alba 3, Pela 2.

Ad-Hoc Design Day Sunday 19 October 2008 Report by Jim

The ad-hoc design day was run very successfully in lieu of the autumn game design weekend, which had to be cancelled. All those who had said they could come to the original weekend were invited to a replacement one-day event. We ran a fairly open agenda of discussion items that the attendees brought with them on the day.

During the day we covered:

- Wargame Mechanisms – the promised follow-up to my design methodology workshop last year.
- Multi-track games – a session by Mukul on how to design a game about a simultaneous series of parallel missions or quests. He used the examples of Mongol raiding columns on China and Operation Barbarossa.
- Cold War Game development discussion by Rob.
- A test of the ‘Old Trousers’ Napoleonic battle system brought along by Arthur.

The day was most stimulating and we did see some serious designing – I’m hoping to see extensive write-ups of each session in MilMud of course!

In general, the smaller group and flexible agenda seemed to work well for those of us there. I wonder if more frequent and smaller one day ‘Design Days’ along similar lines might be worth experimenting with in 2009. I’d be interested in feedback from members about this as I can’t help wondering if the weekend format has become harder to sustain these days.

WARGAME MECHANISMS WORKSHOP by Jim Wallman

I promised to do this session after the wargame design methodology session last year. The more I think about this, the bigger the subject seems. This is an outline of the approach and a little of what was discussed – if I’ve missed out any important areas I do hope those who were present will correct me.

To help discussion, I decided to refine the generic head ‘wargame mechanisms’ a little and break down mechanisms into sub-genres.

Definition

For the purpose of the discussion we defined ‘wargame mechanisms’ as specific game rules that are applied to **wargames primarily designed for play with toy soldiers** (though in many figure games the models can, of course be replaced by counters).

So – we explicitly excluded traditional board games, megagames and role playing games because they have their own specialised mechanisms (though obviously there is often overlap).

We also focussed on the low level of rules ‘mechanism’ – as distinct from overall game structure – although we considered the way a collection of mechanisms integrates to become a game ‘system’.

Genres of mechanism

In common with the classic ‘old school’ wargame most of us grew up with; I broke the genres down into:

- Movement
- Shooting
- Melee
- Morale

Plus the later ‘new school’ additions of:

- Command and control
- Logistics

The questions

In the sort session (or even in a day long session) there isn't time to address all of the genres, so I suggested we pick one or two to look at in detail. In this session the sub-genre selected was 'Movement'.

I asked the group to explore three questions:

1. Often we use mechanisms from our personal 'library' of techniques, either borrowed from games we like, or of our own devising. We could perhaps each explore our own personal libraries of mechanisms for the genre, to see if there are some generic themes or common methods. **How many different ways have you approached the genre?** (Concentrating on methods actually used in rules rather than imagining brand new ones, and avoiding mechanisms you feel don't work at all – i.e. that you'd never consider using yourself).
2. What are the criteria that most often need to be considered in selecting the mechanism to use (or modify)?
3. How do we know what works?

The Answers

I was expecting a discussion about movement rules to be quite short and straightforward. As it turned out we fully used up all the time we'd allocated talking about how movement can be reflected in wargame rules.

We talked about the different ways movement can be reflected in game rules and came up with the list below. Of course it is possible to mix them up and there are cross-overs – but it is a start.

- **Measured movement** – this is typically fixed by troop type, and might be any means of measurement – using rulers or hand-spans etc. The key aspect here is that units are moved largely freely across the playing area, by measurement.
- **Randomised movement** – a variant of measured movement where the distance moves has a random element – for example "1d6+3 cm per turn."
- **Movement by areas / grid** – this might be done by dividing up the playing area by squares, hexes or more broadly-defined areas. Movement over the playing area is restricted by the pre-defined areas.
- **Critical Event movement (or 'Variable Length Bounds')** – we discussed physical movement determined by the next critical event on the battlefield – units movement (by measurement or area) distance is ongoing until a critical event
- **'No Movement' Movement** – there are some games where the respective armies do not need to be moved at all – the battle is fought based on initial deployment

We also discussed the relationship of movement to other aspects – such as the use of command points and command and control to limit or restrict free movement.

Each of the various areas had advantages and disadvantages and features that characterised them – we made a first attempt at identifying these. The table below is not the final word – I expect readers could add to the table and even expand on it – and I would welcome feedback (in MilMud or direct).

Movement type	Key Characteristics	Good for	Not so good for
Measured Movement	The classic wargame movement system. Mostly all units can be moved a fixed distance each game turn.	Straightforward games without too many elements to move at once.	Large games with lots of elements to move
Randomised Movement	Usually as above, except players roll dice to determine how far each element can move.	Where is it important that unit coordination is poor or you want to reflect realistic lack of coordination	Where there are lots of units to move. Or where the randomness is irrelevant to the model.
Movement by Areas	Movement is generalised	Broad-brush approach, where minor variations in unit position are not critical – i.e big set-piece battles.	Games were small variations might be critical to a realistic model – i.e. skirmish games
Critical Event Movement	We discovered that nobody present had actually played a working example of a critical event game. Perhaps this is an experiment to be conducted in future?		
‘No Movement’ Movement	Deployment is the key part of this sort of game – in some periods it is argued that battlefield movement is pretty well determined by the set-up (eg. in Renaissance battles).	Particular periods where battlefield movement is relatively unimportant.	Battles of manoeuvre (obviously).

A number of other ideas came up in discussion – particularly how the movement mechanism integrates with Command and Control mechanisms and the general model and style of the game.

We discussed my irrational antipathy towards the ‘Command Points’ style of command and control mechanism – and I was convinced by the others that my objections were primarily aesthetic. This is something we will return to in later workshops discussing Command and Control, as well as the other areas such as firing, melee, morale and logistics.

If anyone is interested in a further Mechanisms Workshop, contact me direct or on the mailer and if there are enough people I’ll run another one.

Friday 27 Feb - Sunday 1 March 2009 HMS Belfast HMS Belfast Wargames Event

Chestnut Lodge Wargames Group and Wargame Developments held a one day Wargaming Event onboard one of the most impressive military venues in London, HMS Belfast. Visitors had the opportunity to be part of short participation games, spanning across a range of military history including naval wargaming classics such as the Fred Jane Naval Wargame and the Fletcher Pratt Naval Game as well as a Napoleonic battle, a World War 1 Trench Raid and even Doctor Who! Also a selection of short talks during the day: Phil Sabin, Professor of War Studies at Kings College London 'Using Wargames to Understand Military History' and Tim Price MBE, Wargaming in the Modern British Army.



Friday 3 through Sunday 5 April Annual Games Weekend 2009

FRIDAY 3 APRIL Pub: The Shipwright's Arms, Tooley Street SE1

Pre-Conference Dinner and discussion session : 7.30pm onwards : Theme : Wargaming as Art

SATURDAY 4 APRIL PET, London Bridge

Morning World War I ?

13.30 - 14.00 SHORT LUNCH BREAK & GENERAL DISCUSSION / SOCIALISING

Including a lightweight lunchtime plenary activity

Afternoon "A Speculator's Guide to the French & Indian Wars & other Opportune Markets" – Pickles

After Dinner Games "In Which the Plot Thickens" (Swashbuckling role play) – Jim

SUNDAY 5 APRIL PET, London Bridge

Morning Somme Trench Assault – Jim

Afternoon Orange or Lemon? - James Kemp

Orange or Lemon? General Briefing by James Kemp

Recent Events

Towards the end of last year (1688) the wife of King James VII and II gave birth to a son. This brought home to those that he had upset with his toleration of Roman Catholics and Protestant dissenters that this policy would continue. Accordingly a number of English nobles and bishops invited his son-in-law, Prince William of Orange, to come to England and replace James as King[1].

The relevance of this to Scotland is, of course, that both Kingdoms share a King. When Prince William of Orange landed at Torbay in the extreme South West of England the Scots army (then commanded by General Douglas with John Graham of Claverhouse as Lt General) marched South. The Scots army mustered in Wiltshire where it joined elements of the English army in the path of William's army. A large number of defections took place before the King decided to disband the armies rather than putting Britain through another bloody civil war.

The King fled to London, where he made some attempts to persuade William not to proceed. When it became clear that William was still coming James threw the Great Seal of England into the Thames and took flight for France. The English Parliament declared that this was evidence that King James II had abdicated and that William was now King of England in February 1688.

William then called the Scots Parliament into session to repeat the exercise in Scotland. Meanwhile King James gathered together some troops and has landed in Ireland.

Scots Convention

Legality

Normally when the King calls Parliament he nominates a High Commissioner who acts as the President of the Parliament. However this time it is not a Parliament as it has not been called by the King, but by Prince William of Orange who is hoping that they will declare him King. It will be necessary for the members to decide * who their President ought to be; and * whether or not they have any legitimate authority to act

Once that has been done then they will (assuming that they do decide that they can legitimately act) be able to make a decision about their King and any other relevant matters that are introduced.

Structure

There are three estates in the Scots Parliament but unlike the English Parliament they all sit as a single body and vote together. In total there are about 150 members.

There is no real consensus for either William or James, although both have their supporters. There is a consensus for having a King, the memory of the inter-regnum and the chaos that was caused by English Commonwealth armies is strong and universally negative.

No-one wants to be on the wrong side, but apart from a few extremists no-one wants to be in the vanguard of showing their disloyalty to the Stuart King. (Remember that the Stuarts have ruled Scotland since 1370 - about as far back from 1688 as it is from now).

Religion

Religion is a very big factor in life for a large section of the population. Even those that do not care much for organised religion, which includes some of the main public figures, need to take account for public opinions on the subject. There has been almost continuous religious strife in Scotland since the start of the reformation.

Church of Scotland

The established Church of Scotland is currently episcopalian²), as is the Church of England. This has not always been the case. From 1638 to 1660 the majority of the Church (or Kirk as it is usually known) were presbyterian³). Even in the early 1660s it took some time for the Episcopalian ministers to be re-established in many parishes because it was difficult to find them. There is still tension between the officially sanctioned episcopalians and the presbyterians in the Kirk.

Conventicles

These are the descendants of the many covenants that were common amongst Scottish protestant dissenters through the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. By the 1680s they are largely confined to the South West but have increased in both religious and political radicalism. The Covenanters, lead by Richard Cameron⁴), refuse to accept the King's authority over their religion and want to re-establish a republic.

In 1685 following King James VII's accession to the throne it was declared treasonable to take or defend the Covenants. The death penalty was introduced for all those who attended field assemblies. In response the Cameronians held their own field parliament and agreed a Protestation against the accession of James, who was described as a murderer, idolater and a subject of the Anti-Christ. The Cameronians saw King James VII as the ultimate nightmare - a Catholic king as the supreme arbiter in civil and religious matters, about as remote from the Covenanter ideal as is possible.

Roman Catholics

Until recently Catholics were forbidden to hold public office. King James VII over-turned the Test Act by an order in council and instead used royal prerogative to put in place a simple oath of allegiance to the Crown. This benefited the protestant dissenters as well, but was deeply unpopular with the established church. The King is himself a Catholic, hence his policy of enforced religious toleration. There have also been a number of conversions from unscrupulous and ambitious members of the nobility, most notably from the Drummond brothers.

Notes

[1] Technically they invited his daughter to be the queen but Prince William insisted on being the King and not a prince consort

[2] i.e. it has bishops and an internal hierarchy. Ministers are appointed either by a bishop or by the local laird

[3] In this form the minister is chosen by the parish (or sometimes the Laird) and acts merely as a facilitator in their worship rather than as an interlocutor

[4] Who formed the Cameronians, the only regiment in the post-restoration British Army raised specifically to overthrow a monarch.