

Military Muddling

Volume 13 Issue 2

Chestnut Lodge Wargames Group Newsletter

January 2002

Editorial

Apologies for the delay in getting this issue out. I've been rather busy moving house over the last month or so.

This issue contains reviews from the Conference, the November meeting at Arthur Harman's and the December meeting and Christmas party at John Rutherford's. Many of the games played in December were re-runs of those played at the previous two sessions with modifications, so don't be confused by two onside reports about the same game!

There is still a lack of cartoons, but this is because I've not yet unpacked my scanner. John Rutherford kindly sent me a load of cartoons that he'd kept. If you have any please send them.

Contributions for Military Muddling

To: James Kemp, preferably by e-mail to milmud@chestnutlodge.org.uk but you can also send paper or disks to me at 19 Castlegreen Street, Dumbarton, G82 1HG (note change of address)



DEADLINE FOR NEXT ISSUE: 18 January 2002

Trevor Farrant (Events Organiser) 020 8577 2573

Mukul Patel (Games Organiser & Admin Officer)

Michael Dollin (Treasurer)

Chestnut Lodge Wargames Group

CLWG Diary 2002

Date	Venue	Game	Author	Blurb
Sun 6 Jan 2002	Jim Wallman's Office	Against the Nature of Gentleness	Nick Luft	Wars of the Roses - see the preview later in this issue and the enclosed rules.
Sat 2 Feb 2002	Bedford Park Pub from 12:00	ACW Game tryout	?Mukul	Tryout of a system for a megagame to be run at SELWG.
Sun 3 Mar 2002	Bedford Park Pub from 12:00	Hussite Wars	Brian Cameron	Game inspired by Brian's recent visit to the Czech Republic to visit Terry Martin.

Venues

Jim Wallman's Office

The Wells
7-15 Rosebery Avenue
London EC1R 4SP
Telephone: 020 7841 3660

You need to press the button for "One Plus One Partnership" to get in.

Nearest train station is probably Farringdon.

Bedford Park Pub

The pub is located on Streatham High Road opposite Streatham Station. It opens from 12:00 and the games will be in the upstairs room.

Games Organiser

Message From Mukul

Email mukulpatel@37.com

Phone 020 8769 0538

Post 215 Valley Road

London SW16 2AF

Things I need when you do make an offer

- Participant numbers how many people do you need
- Venue - how many rooms needed, equipment needed such as tables or phones or intercoms etc,
- Is the session (game or whatever) ready to go and be included in the programme or is it still under development. If it is still under preparation when will it be ready
- When do you want to put it on or when do not want it put on.
- How much time do you want

Letters to the Editor

Dear Sir,

I wish to respond to your comment I the last issue 'we all know John R doesn't do numbers.' This is fair comment, I guess, as I am not famous for my mathematical ability (the game where my magician built a six-sided pentagram is but one example...) but I do claim I am not scared of numbers. Indeed, I find complex mathematical ideas intriguing. I wouldn't mind having a bash at calculus, binomial theorem, spherical trigonometry or whatever if he game asked for it.

Where I part company from some designers and players is that I have a low tolerance for routine computation. I find game jobs like working out a 10% reduction by attrition to be OK at first, but annoying by the hundredth time, and

want someone else to do it. Similarly, a game that involves adding up the points values on cards, repeatedly, quickly palls for me. I can see that such mechanisms are necessary in some cases, but for me they should be a means to an end – whether that is exciting game-play, realistic simulation, or a roleplay opportunity. Luckily the 'Hell' {Mukul/Pickles} game did provide sufficient rewards, but that won't stop me kvetching!

Many game systems deliberately reduce the calculation necessary – single-sheet rules, pre-calculated result tabulations ... and perhaps the ultimate, computer games where the machine does an immense amount of maths for you. 'Avalon Hill'-style number crunching seems to be on the way out. Or is it? Discuss.

Yours faithfully,
John Rutherford

Dear Sir,

I am writing to thank the members who came to the 2001 Christmas meeting at my house. It was a companionable and enjoyable day and for me one of the highlights of the 'festive season'. Even my wife agreed that the CLWG boys behaved themselves nicely, with only a few yelled obscenities, and a minimum of pretzels ground into the carpet. So, Happy New Year to you all!

Yours faithfully,
John Rutherford

How come John is the only person that writes to the editor?

On/Offside Reports

World War Three in One to Thirty Die Rolls

Rob Cooper

While test playing my nuclear war game (SIOP) I was asked by someone what the situation in Europe was at one point. I answered by rolling a single die (1-4 Warsaw Pact winning, 5-6 NATO winning). It was pointed out there were highly expensive sets of games and rules on this subject and that I was boiling that all down to one roll!!

Actually I happen to think that is not a bad thing, but it also made me consider developing a slightly more detailed game for the European element of SIOP. So, entirely on the spur of the moment I set about trying to design something. In a short time I had some ideas, and had play-tested it twice, to the general satisfaction of the players in both cases, and with some very useful input from Jim, Brian, Nick and Michael. This sub-game will now become a feature of SIOP as soon as I get the theatre weapons details and the cards for the European conflict printed up and sorted onto cards.

For those interested, the game consisted of a simple abstract map divided into bands (a bit like an American football field) labelled from Poland through to the Channel ports.

Each player is given a fixed number of "ammunition/resource points" plus some hidden bonuses depending on scenario. This total is secret and reflects how long players can continue to fight. Each turn of combat represents about two days, and a player needs to spend one ammo point to conduct operations. Spending a second point gives a bonus to a die roll, reflecting throwing in extra resources. In addition the players have a number of special cards

each of which give combat bonuses. Some of these cards require a die roll to be used (e.g. use of Nuclear weapons). One or two cards can be spent each turn, but when used they are given up (unless their use was not granted by the die roll). But, given that there are a limited number of cards and ammo points, players have to judge for themselves how quickly or slowly to spend them.

One additional twist is that the granting of Theatre Nuclear release (i.e. Nuking the rear areas) will also eliminate enemy ammo points, further limiting the length of the war. Once the cards and ammo are played a single die is rolled and modified by the bonuses. The score allowed the front line to remain stationary or to move east or west by 1-3 "areas". One additional development I have in mind is allowing players to trade in cards for more ammo points. Future ideas are very much appreciated. Just remember I want to keep it simple. Very simple.

Next will be the War at Sea (ready to be tested), as well as other regional conflicts.

The first game stalled in a nuclear exchange with the front line having hardly moved. The second game resulted in a successful drive into the Low Countries by the Warsaw Pact, finally blitzing NATO to the point where the West just ran out of ammo. It will be interesting to see how this fits into a game that allows for even higher levels of escalation.

The experience of designing and developing a game with the help of a few like-minded players and experienced hands was a very pleasant experience. This was one of the easiest ad hoc design sessions I have ever done. Final thanks therefore go to CLWG itself for providing this opportunity.

SIOP - Onside Report

Rob Cooper

I've been working on this game for several years now, as an offshoot of the Strategic Triad R+D game. This newer design is based on actual force strengths at various times during the Cold War. Rather than designing a Strategic Force from scratch players are confronted with the forces available from 1968 to 1988 (eventually 1963 to 1998) together with the C3I infrastructure, and a set of counter-value (urban-industrial) targets.

The game develops from basic peacetime deployment into a random scenario as a crisis develops to the point where the players are asked to plan a strategic nuclear attack. The players represent the military commanders tasked with implementing the plans chosen by the politicians (the plans are based on the doctrines of the superpowers at the time) throwing a random element into the game, but forcing the players to consider planning an actual attack.

The games can vary from wars with both sides at peace (a bolt from the blue) to nuclear attacks coming out of conventional wars in the world.

The forces themselves are broken into units of 300 warheads split into either hard or soft kill weapons (depending on accuracy). Hard kill weapons go after hardened silos and bunkers, while soft kill weapons go after ports, airfields and cities. Some targets are *half-size* so that two can be struck with one "unit" of 300. The game I hope gives a feel for the way in which the force structures and thus plans of the USA and USSR were so different, and shows how hard it is to achieve a disarming first strike. Without this the enemy will simply rain down mutually assured destruction on your civilian population.

The first half of the game is about alerting forces and infrastructure to provide the best capability for an ensuing exchange. Much of the game is then about targeting strategies, planning your attacks to maximum effect while maintaining an adequate reserve. I will probably put more emphasis on pre-planning possible strikes to allow players a choice of options when the balloon goes up. In addition I will probably look at giving briefs to individual commanders to allow them to best alert and deploy their forces. Finally I hope to tag on a European war element, and run the whole thing as a multi-room/player game at a later CLWG meeting. It can then probably accommodate up to 4 per side, and volunteer umpires would be useful.

The game still has some tweaking to do in the way in which flight times are handled, and the cleaning up of the cards to make them more user friendly to those unfamiliar with the nomenclature and forces of the Cold War. Nevertheless there was a lot of interest in developing the game further. The last time I played Strategic Triad several players felt it was only playable the once, with nuclear war being too horrible to even conduct, and impossible to win. I wanted this to be more of a simulation than a game, and to show players that for 40 years real people really did contemplate real wars of this nature, discussing strategies and tactics, and ways to win, or at least to prevail.

So, what happened in the test out?

It was 1983 and USA was losing a conventional war in Europe after a couple of weeks of fighting. During the war several Russian submarines had been destroyed and their Air Defence system degraded. In response several US bomber bases had come under heavy sabotage attacks. President Reagan ordered his planners to launch a pre-

emptive strike against the Evil Empire. However, as they were doing this the Russians detected US preparations and chose to launch first before the US got their attack underway. The Russian massive attack almost got through US warning systems without triggering a full alert. But, right at the last moment, warning was achieved and in a record-breaking 4 minutes Reagan ordered a response. US missiles were leaving their silos as the Russian missiles arrived, most of them escaping to devastate Russia. Most of the Russian attacks, having singularly failed to blunt the US strategic forces, fell upon US cities, aiming largely at industry. US counter-attacks aimed largely at degrading the Russian military.

Final tally was over 60 million US citizens killed with another 60 million to die within 6 months (that's almost half of the US population), and 70% of US industry wrecked. Over 50% of US military strength had been destroyed too, but they did retain over 1500 Trident warheads for future use and their nuclear C3 architecture was largely unscathed. The Russians lost 25 million citizens, another 25 million to die in the next 6 months, and 25% of industry. 85% of the Russian military had been destroyed and the Russian nuclear forces had been fully expended. I'll leave it to you to decide who "won".

Thanks to everyone who participated and who added their thoughts and suggestions. I will be making several changes, and cleaning things up, but the enthusiasm for the game was such that I will definitely be running it again.

***I DON'T SAY WE WOULDN'T
GET OUR HAIR MUSSED****

***Offside Report on Rob Cooper's
Nuclear Options game***

John Rutherford

Rob had a set of cards summarising the various nuclear weapons and systems available in 1973. He dealt them to us, telling us we were the military of the Soviet Union; what would we recommend; and in particular, what would be the outcome of a nuclear war?

Having done the sums, we reported back; I forget the exact numbers, but we reckoned that with luck every Soviet city might get paged only twice, killing eighty million people, or similar horror.

Rob then offered us a few new systems, and checked if we felt this changed anything fundamental; not really.

Rob then switched sides and asked us to be the U.S. military - wow, what shiny toys! Still, it had to be American mega deaths, even if we went first strike and chose to believe the optimistic anti-submarine forecasts.

Russian dead? Who's asking?

Hmmm. I think Rob was making a point about the gulf between the politicians, who are there to make moral judgements, and the amoral military technicians who are -allegedly- able to ignore the inhuman horror of nuclear planning. If marking a target list is 'just a job' and some subterranean geezer can write 'option A: 60 thermonuclear warheads on Moscow' as if he were a Sainsbury's manager requesting frozen pizza delivery, then he can sleep at night. It's somebody else's problem to worry about the consequences of the existence of this apparatus of holocaustic, genocidal death. MAD!

Still, a good game in the sense that it was very quick, simple and thought provoking. Makes me more certain than ever that every education should include '*Dr Strangelove' and perhaps also HMG's 'Protect and Survive' about

nuclear fallout. There's a gallery in the Imperial War museum where that little public information gem runs, alongside other displays about the threat of global nuclear warfare in the second half of the twentieth century.

It all seems oddly dated now; but this week two nuclear powers square up over Kashmir. Let's hope sanity prevails...

Offside thoughts on Rob Coopers nuclear planning game

Mukul Patel

Rob Cooper and Michael are interested in doing a Megagame about the cold war. My first reaction is wow I'm interested, but make sure you know what you letting yourself in for, time and effort wise, I wasn't, and still am not.

One of the more chilling aspects of the cold war was the prospect of nuclear war. Robs game concerns making target plans for that prospect in the context what could and would be a much larger Megagame.

The biggest difficulty with the game was the very concept of planning for nuclear war. This required players to take dive and not think about the consequences or morality of this, all we had to do was our job and leave the really hard thinking to others who would give us orders. The game specifically took out of the planners' hands the recommendation for or against and the triggers for nuclear war.

This small game itself, was quite simple, we were given an easy to understand format a list of available resources, warhead delivery systems, command and control systems and potential targets. We were also given the approximate effectiveness and vulnerability of those systems. We had the task of coming up with a targeting plan for nuclear war. The plan had to meet a certain policy condition such as first strike, launch on

warning, launch under attack, ride out and so. This simple task gave us a lot of debate about to how achieve these goals.

The game or test of a Megagame system provoked one big question, why did not the USA when it had the monopoly of the bomb attack the USSR? Militarily it could have. We guessed the answer was linked with the probability that nuclear war had a very large moral dimension even then, probably greater than other weapon systems even at that time when nuclear winter as concept did not exist and mutual assured destruction was a distant thought.

Whatever I enjoyed the session and think Robs game would fit in nicely into Megagame. I hope it happens.

COLD WAR POLITICAL THRILLER by Michael Dollin.

Offside by John Rutherford.

A design session for a large-scale political game of the Cold War. I found it hard to follow exactly what Michael was after here (not helped by me dipping in and out because of hosting duties) but I think the key idea was the creation of a series of political scales to show how foreign or domestic policy in the U.S. could swing 'left' or 'right' depending on how Cold War events transpire; allowing a replaying of the entire post-war period up to 1989 or so.

My reaction was mostly that it was very complex, and I thought there was unlikely to be enough time to do any meaningful decision-making in the short turns (twenty minutes?) Michael was aiming for. But I enjoy political games so I hope he perseveres and brings this one back. I understand the plan is for there to be a Soviet team too (less affected by the need to win elections!) Perhaps there is scope for this game to be combined with Rob's Nuclear game (see above) into one big

CLWG Cold War Extravaganza at some point?

Some thoughts on Michael Dollin's American Politics game

Mukul Patel

Again, Rob Cooper and Michael are interested in doing a Megagame about the Cold War. They rightly consider that the Internal Political life of the USA needs to be portrayed. The biggest question about this sub-game is how much detail is depicted in the game and so how much players are needed and how much time will it take.

Michael presented a small sub-game that whilst fiddly in certain areas I believe that it will work OK.

Firstly there is a game about electing a president from amongst a small pool (4) of players. These players play the moderate and radical wings of the two dominant political parties, the Democrats and Republicans. They get various potential candidates with differing attributes, such as moderate, southerner, female, Catholic, governorships, member of the senate and so on.

Players jockey the presidential hopefuls to get an election race they believe they can win. Finally there is a mechanism to resolve the election.

My only problem with process was I thought the election mechanism took too long to resolve, frankly though I suspect that was because it was unfamiliar and maybe not. Also in retrospect and this a little contrary to what I just written maybe some aspects of the candidates should be hidden and not open. I am thinking in this of the electioneering ability of a candidate. Having a slightly hidden system does slow down the game, and Michael's current system does have random factors but whatever I'd like a

little bit to be hidden. Who knew before Harry Truman or Ronald Reagan got going how great campaigners they were?

I shared other players views was that this grab for power the presidential race should be portrayed, it will be very good game material. I clashed with others over how much detail and colour should be included in this sub-game. How much detail is included in the game has got to depend on what else players are doing once they grab or fail to grab power.

However Michael and Rob decide things, I like what I have seen. I liked the concepts, and I love the subject.

Do the Megagame!

Celtic Meetings – a discussion led by Jim Wallman

John Rutherford

This meeting at Arthur Harman's was the usual 'quality not quantity' event, attended by me, Mukul Patel, Jim and of course Arthur.

Jim had asked us to ponder useful ideas and mechanisms for tribal gatherings, possibly for use in the next outing of his megagame on the Roman Conquest of Britain by Claudius. He'd given us a good background on what is known historically (not a lot, in essence) and given us the challenge that, ideally, it should work as a 'stand alone' game on Celtic gatherings and hence help game pre-Roman politics.

My basic idea, which I think gave Jim food for thought although he was not completely enthusiastic, was to introduce modern theory on 'effective meetings' by dressing it up as Celtic myth. I know something about 'meetings' as I work occasionally as a management trainer on this topic; I used a sort of simplified 'Belbin Role Analysis' if anyone's interested... I thought not. My idea was

that in this way the game would reward 'effective' meetings while adding a role-play/cultural flavour.

However, as Jim pointed out, with a yes, but... ancient Celts did NOT, as a general rule, use techniques that we would recognise today as 'effective' (setting objectives, creating plans, summarising clearly etc). Instead they would grandstand, boast, bully, get pissed and roll in the mud biting each other's ears off. Now I know that's how the CLWG Admin. Meeting always turns out, but I was hoping that a megagame might actually overtly reward teams that functioned better "as teams in the real world." I do have a deeply held belief that a) teams which function better tend to produce better results and therefore more is achieved, and b) more achievement is more satisfaction and fun for the players. In this case it seemed to me there is a clash between 'optimal' techniques, and 'celtic flavour' techniques. Jim made clear he is looking for the latter, with the mechanism being a simple one of players 'winning support' in a simulation of crowd-pleasing, rabble-raising oratory in front of a mob of unruly warriors; and not a cool, technocratic problem-solving meeting. Fair enough, it's horses for courses!

Where I think we made more progress was my idea of using myth as a game mechanism. This turned out to be building on ideas Jim had used in previous games, which I had not played, such as druidic runes. I had created my own artificial myth, after digging through Larousse and some basic texts on Celtic myth. I tried to give it a celtic flavour of dream-like heroism, magic and symbolism. My idea being that players could identify 'useful' behaviours and roles in the myth with their own behaviour, saying e.g. 'I am being like the druid!' -and in some way be rewarded for it. Jim was concerned about game balance

and he disliked my notion that 'king' players should award game money for useful meeting contributions. But I think he was intrigued by the idea of making up myths for game use. In discussion it seemed perhaps it could progress with some kind of culture-points as used in Jim's Japanese games, rather than individual rewards.

Jim said he took away - on his utterly cool 'new' motorbike - some useful points from this symposium and I look forward both to some playtests and the megagame itself, scheduled I believe for October 2002.

This was play tested at the Christmas game in the early evening shortly after the alcohol had been cracked open. It was an interesting game, although we just 'played' the feasting part of it. Live role-playing at CLWG - whatever next?

"Culture Among The Ancient Britons

The Ancient Britons were by no means savages before the Conquest, and had already made great strides in civilisation, e.g. they buried each other in long round wheelbarrows (agriculture) and burnt each other alive (religion) under the guidance of even older Britons called Druids or Eisteddfods, who worshipped the Middletoe in the famous Druidical churchyard at Stoke Penge. The Roman Conquest was, however, a Good Thing, since the Britons were only natives at that time."

- *Sellers & Yeatman, 1066 and All That*

Offside Report On Jim Wallman's Britons Game

by John Rutherford

Another go at helping Jim design a 'Tribal Council' sub-game for his Megagame about Britannia at the time of the Claudian Invasion. I don't think I was the

only one to have a fair few drinks by the time this game began, and I think Jim was wondering whether any points which came out of this would be transferable to a daytime megagame where just about all the players would be sober. Well, that's for Jim to ponder, in this case tiddleness was inevitable running a game in the evening of the Christmas meeting.

The basic mechanism was a big meeting of the 'Dafti' tribe, taking turns to make speeches, and winning 'supporters' in the form of playing cards, which increased one's status.

I had a great time doing completely over-the-top role-playing, ranting, yelling and bullying the other players, and managed to get a job as King by the end; I must say I had an advantage of having a fair notion what Jim would reward in terms of role-play so I was able to win extra cards a few times; for example by being most boastfully aggressive; and by being first to sacrifice a golden torque to the river-gods.

As each player prospered or otherwise, cards were distributed from a central pack, representing gradual 'mobilisation' of the tribe for war, as each noble's personal war-band grew bigger. This mechanism worked well and it was an interesting model of how entirely selfish behaviour would help to make the whole tribe stronger.

Each player had a personal brief, and I got the impression they varied widely in difficulty; my brief was to be 'pro-Roman' which was in effect no brief as the Romans had not yet arrived, and we were debating war with a neighbouring tribe. Jonathan Pickles had a 'sensible, peaceful' brief, which made him an easy target in a game based on bellicose ranting. Well done to Pickles for persevering. Although when I attacked him for being 'like a

woman' I thought someone might have pointed out immediately that female warriors were not unusual in this culture, and there was nothing wussy or dweeby about Cartimandua or Boudicca!

Another fun element was the Druid, or Eisteddfod, played initially by Rob Cooper, who had to do a sort of Celtic 'star signs' or I-Ching type of rune-magic to give tribal guidance; which strangely enough might sometimes match his own personal or religious objectives, I suspected. [*Having the wrong bag of runes helped this I suspect!*] This was most entertaining and added a lot to the atmosphere. Though we didn't burn or even garrotte anyone!

Did we add anything to Jim's store of ideas about this game? Perhaps not, but I think we all enjoyed ourselves. [*That would be a fairly certain bet*]

Arthur's Gladiator game

John Rutherford

Oppugno! {I attack!}

I hope Arthur will republish the rules for this one, which is a fun and addictive card/manoeuvre game that gives the flavour of Roman gladiator combat, complete with Latin names for the moves. He tells me it was in MilMud a while back but I can't find it. I was a big armoured guy and my opponent was a fast, sneaky net waver, but with a glass head. Eheu, retiarius mortuus est. Having defeated Mucullus Patellus a couple of times, I was keen to try a tag tournament or fight a tiger or something like that, and I hope we could have a session extending the options on it one of these days, which would be interesting...

The game mechanism works well, as long as you remember to shuffle the cards carefully, for the main luck element lies in having a good variety of moves.

The only thing which puzzled me was that if this was *Gladiators*, how come there was no balancing on a rubber mushroom hitting each other with giant cotton-wool buds? I remember Russell Grant, sorry Russell Crowe, doing that in the movie, or was that a dream?

Slave Trading – a design session by Mukul

John Rutherford

I think Mukul's idea was to build another game on the success of his excellent '1849' traversing America game, and he suggested to Arthur and me the eighteenth-century Slave Trade as a setting. Although I certainly had misgivings about how "difficult" this game could be for the squeamish or Politically Correct [no awful joke about 'black' games, please] we reckoned there was the makings of a game. It would have players running a ship or even a small fleet on the triangular trade route England-Africa-Caribbean, with a fair amount of detail involved in crewing and provisioning. The whole thing ideally would run on 'incident cards' requiring little or no umpire input.

We debated whether there were player roles for African slavers [yes] London/Liverpool/Bristol arms dealers and sugar traders [yes] Caribbean sugar planters [no] and Royal Navy [probably no, but depending on exact period chosen.] When we got into detail about food, slave-packing, disease and cruelty, we realised just how disgusting and shocking this subject is, but we thought that it could be educational and a real eye-opener if handed carefully. To explore the mind-set of such folk as slave-traders is a reasonable objective, and TV and Hollywood have not shied away from it, so why should we? Clearly it has the potential to be controversial and I would be interested to hear a slave-descended black person's views on the

notion of "gaming" a slave-ship. In any event, I think Mukul left feeling a bit motivated (he borrowed my books on slavery anyway) so I hope we'll see more of this idea anon.

Game Previews

Against the Nature of Gentleness

Nick Luft

The rules are in a traditional style, with recruitment, movement and combat mechanics. I shall be the umpire and will move the game on, introducing rules as they are needed. There is no need to read the rules before the game.

I intend to run the game in an open style, the only hidden factors, will be Army / Fleet sizes and written movement orders, which are revealed simultaneously. The game map will be laid out on a table and all players will be able to talk to each other without hindrance.

I have designed the game to run with any number of players that turn up. I have seeded the major roles and created groups of Lords who could be played by one player. The game can run with between four and ten players - hopefully coping with the flexible CLWG turnout.

For those not familiar with the Wars of the Roses I have chosen a less well known part of the wars, Edward IV's return from exile in 1471. During the Readeption Period (1469-71) only a few of the Lords were irreversibly tied to a faction. Most Lords had tacitly or actively acquiesced in the overthrow of Henry VI, and then later the Earl of Warwick's coup against Edward IV.

The rapid changes had been bloodless leaving no bitter legacy, as had the battles St. Albans (1450) and Towton, (1461).

All Lords, except a few close followers, have a history of disloyalty, of literally "turning their coats".

With this background each player will be able to determine their actions without recourse to "understanding" the history and background of the other players. You will only need to know what is in your brief to play the game.

Your brief will contain details about your background, your financial status, your estates, strongholds and retainers.

There is no need for players to read the rules before the game, but if you do wish to read the players' rules follow this link:

<http://www.thelufts.freemove.co.uk/atnog/atnog.htm> (a copy of the rules is included with milmud)

Colonel Waugh-Gaymer The Voice of Reason



Now look here, I AM in the SAS, I AM I tell you! I know all the jargon – I am a 'Head Greenhouse' [sub-ed check please] and I can cabby at a jundie/argie/beardie while tabbing whenever I like, so there! And I have got a really hard tattoo, look at that portillo/dagger combo! Anyone who denies that I'm elite special forces will get a nasty letter from my publisher. You see the third from the left 'Kabul woman in burka' in yesterday's Express? That's me, that is! What? I am not a cross-dressing fantasist, you naughty man! See you later in the 'secret' bar in Hereford to compare scars!

HURRAH!