

Two shots - Surprise Attacks

Author: Keith Lowman ()

Date: 12-07-06 06:38

Hi Game designers,

I like your game and now use it exclusively for my WWII gaming but I would like to know the logic of;

Why does the defender gets two shots at an advancing attacker? I would assume it is to "guide" the players into using fire and movement tactics rather than the human wave and hope you get lucky tonight attack? But I am not really certain and in the last game a defender who is new the Battlefront was a bit put off by the defenders apparent two free shots before the attacker can return fire.

Keith

Re: please explain the logic

Author: Mark Hayes ()

Date: 12-07-06 11:27

Hi Keith,

This is a common response by folks new to Battlefront. The short answer is that we found that, in the larger scheme of things, the squnce of play provides a good balance between the attacker and defender.

Also, one should take into consideration other game mechanics that give the attacker options and mitigate the advantage of "two free shots" by the defender.

1. Between the two shots by the defender, the attacker is able to use close combat, which if prepared, supported, and executed well, can eliminate a defender before he gets the second shot.
2. Overwatch fire allows the attacker to respond to a defender after his defensive fire phase. This is most important when covering an advance on a hidden enemy.
3. A well-executed maneuver can force the defender to choose between evacuating his position and taking that second shot but dieing in place.

Like you said, good use of fire and maneuver tactics are crucial to success in BF, and we believe that when viewed all together, the game mechanics encourage that.

Mark

Re: please explain the logic
Author: Brian ()
Date: 12-07-06 11:41

Hi Keith,

If I may, I'd like to comment.

As an infantryman, I know that the hardest part of winning a fire fight is locating the enemy. If I have seen him coming, and get first shot, I have a huge advantage, both tactically and psychologically.

If the enemy gets first shot, I need to spot the enemy, communicate it to the rest of my section/platoon, and coordinate effective return fire. This can take 30 seconds or 5-10 minutes, depending on terrain, range of engagement, casualties, comms, etc....

This is very well represented in BFWWII, and as Mark has stated, if you understand the fundamentals of fire and movement, you will succeed. We use the phrase "one foot on the ground". It means that no one moves without someone else stationary and watching their arcs.

My \$.02 CAD (1.75 cents US)

Brian

Re: please explain the logic
Author: Dan ()
Date: 12-07-06 14:04

Hi Keith

You are correct. By itself, the "two shots for the defender" seems unrealistic, but the design concept (I believe) is to encourage the players to use effective and authentic 'fire and manouver' tactics of the modern era of combat. I find BF is the best system to-date that I've played that simulates this level of combat.

BTW, Brian the value of the CAD is rising, so your sage advice will be even more valuable in the future:)

Cheers,

Dan

Re: please explain the logic

Author: Steve Burt ()
Date: 12-08-06 04:57

Indeed - the rules reflect that fact that attacking in WW2, generally against enemy you couldn't see, was hard. You need to prepare with fire, smoke and artillery before attacking.

For what it's worth, Squad Leader and its derivatives have exactly the same fire sequence, giving the defender two shots, I suspect for the same reasons.

Some WW2 rules actually make it easier to attack than defend, which may make for an exciting game, but sadly bears no relation to reality.

Re: please explain the logic
Author: Paddy Green ()
Date: 12-08-06 05:48

This sequence of play does not well represent the situation of a surprise attack against a somewhat inattentive and outmanouevred enemy.

This situation occurred in the 12th SS HJ vs Canadian Sherbrooke Fusilers battle around Authie on 7th June 44. To represent this when writing a scenario Richard and I (as a scenario specific rule) allowed the Germans to claim the +1 ambush bonus in both the German and Canadian players phases of turn 1. This allows the Germans to roll into the midst of the Candians and then defensive fire with an ambush bonus. Nasty but historically accurate effects result.

Were I ever to write a Villers-Bocage scenario I think I would probably give Michael Wittman's ME the same ability.

Paddy

Re: please explain the logic
Author: Keith Lowman ()
Date: 12-08-06 06:22

It proves there is no such thing as a dumb question, in Mark's answer it has clarified how overwatch works for me. The guys I game with tend not to use overwatch and it would appear they have misunderstood were in occurs in the phase sequence. I have been guilty of following there lead rather rechecking for myself. Barring Paddy's observations about one situation it confirmed my opinion (and others) that Battlefront WWII is a damn good set of rules.

Keith

Re: please explain the logic
Author: Steve Burt ()
Date: 12-11-06 07:40

Surely a simple way to represent surprised defenders is just to start them out Disordered?

They will be more vulnerable to fire (as they should be), fire much less well, less able to manoeuvre, and much more likely to panic.

Re: please explain the logic
Author: Bill Slavin ()
Date: 12-11-06 09:14

That's an excellent thought, Steve. When I was trying to design a scenario around the night surprise attack on Villa Reggia in the Moro Valley, I couldn't figure out a way to represent the German defenders, many of whom were sitting around at their suppers! Disordered would start to get close, as they essentially fled in panic. I guess it would depend on the level of preparedness represented in the scenario.

Bill

Re: please explain the logic
Author: Luke Willen ()
Date: 12-11-06 10:54

Could have a dice roll per ME to see how surprised they are. This could be modified eg by a +1 if troops are in dugouts sheltering from a bombardment, a surprise attack like on the first day of Cambrai in 1917 or, as in the Villia Reggia case sitting around eating supper :-). You could have additional modifiers taking into account distance the defending ME is from an attacker at the point the dice roll is made.

Surprise levels would be as follows

- 1 - 3 No surprise. Troops may act as normal
- 4 - 6 Surprised. Troops are suppressed
- 6 - 9 Substantial Surprise/ Troops are disordered.
- 10 Total surprise. Troops are disordered and may not fire. Will surrender if contacted

Surprise level would reduce at one level per turn.

This should allow for the possibility of having a surprise attack situations while still giving a decent game for the defender.

Luke

Re: please explain the logic
Author: Paddy Green ()
Date: 12-11-06 12:21

Just some random thoughts.....

The trouble with using disordered to represent "surprise" is that generally it only lasts a turn or troops run away! (i.e. Once the troops have made a successful manoeuvre roll then they are back to good order or they are off the table). Given that a hostile enemy has to move to close in this means that either they cannot take advantage of having closed to a lethal distance and fire at them before their opponents regroup following a manoeuvre roll or their opponents have gone and its not much of a game for anyone!

Also the disorder = surprise option assumes that surprised troops are more likely to run away. Was this the case? My impression is that they often tried to put up a confused and ineffective form of defence or were destroyed trying. Often this resulted in them running away - but only after a period of fighting.

Finally, from my reading surprise was often quite long lasting 20-30 minutes before a steady defence was formed and order restored. The disorder = surprise option may not be long lasting enough.

Paddy

Re: please explain the logic
Author: Steve Burt ()
Date: 12-12-06 07:45

You could just say the troops can't recover from their disorder till the period of surprise ends.

Re: please explain the logic
Author: Luke Willen ()
Date: 12-12-06 08:13

Paddy

What I was in fact envisaging was that an ME that was taken by surprise would not be able to rally off the disorder result as it notmally would

Instead an ME that had suffered a "Total Surprise" would suffer the effects outlined for this on turn 1. On turn 2 this would reduce to substantial surprise, the on turn 3 it would suffer the effects of Surprised. This would result in the effect of surprise lasting for up to 20 - 30 minutes as you have suggested.

Depending on the level of surprise achieved the impact of this on the unit would be directly dependent on the degree of surprise achieved.

Steve

Saying that troops cannot recover from the disorder (or for that matter suppression) until the period the surprise ends is exactly what I am suggesting. The only difference is that the effects will gradually wear off over time unless a worse result is incurred in the meantime.

On a general note there would be a need to consider situational factors when rolling for initial surprise taking into account enemy proximity, whether the defenders were in dugouts sheltering from a bombardment etc.

Luke

Re: please explain the logic
Author: Paddy Green ()
Date: 12-12-06 08:35

Luke - That would probably work.

Paddy

Re: please explain the logic
Author: Mark Hayes ()
Date: 12-12-06 10:03

To reflect the effects of surprise, there are a few of other ideas a scenario designer could consider in addition to starting the surprised units out in disorder.

- 1) Deploy the units away from their forward firing positions to reflect the fact that only sentries would be occupying them (not applicable in all cases).
- 2) Reduce the discipline rating of the MEs to RAW, similar to the way we reduce the discipline rating to account for the effects of night combat.
- 3) Eliminate some of the positive modifiers, like +2 for no enemy in sight, for the duration of the surprise.

4) Start the scenario with the attacker close to the defender, at the point where the fighting begins. It may cut down on the options the attacker has, but this is an option I especially favor as it gets things in the game going right away (always a plus at convention games).

Mark

Re: please explain the logic

Author: Luke Willen ()

Date: 12-12-06 14:47

Mark

Yes, I agree with most of the points you mention and I have certainly been assuming that scenario designers would be employing points 1 and 4. Possibly point 3 as well.

An alternative to Point 2 would be to impose a penalty on the defender which is what the subsystem I suggested would do and, in my idea, a variable degree of surprise would be possible.

Paddy

The only issue might be keeping track of the "Surprise Status" of affected units. Some form of marker system would be needed

I would be interested in any alternative ideas that would allow a variable degree of surprise that might be simpler to administer or in additions and variations to the system I outlined.

Regards

Luke

Ambush fire rules modification

Author: Mark Hayes ()

Date: 11-30-06 17:07

I am considering a more strict definition of what units may qualify for the ambush fire modifier to direct fire.

The original intention of the rule was to give hidden and prepared units an advantage when they open fire on moving enemy units. In particular, we instituted the modifier when we felt panzerfaust-equipped infantry in a town should have a better chance of knocking out enemy tanks attempting to move up to or past them. We decided when writing the rule to simply qualify hidden units as eligible for the bonus. This included units that moved from the position they were from which they first fired with the ambush modifier, and then required their hidden status.

However, I have noticed over the years astute players using the modifier when moving units during the game and placing them in position to block an advancing enemy. I was particularly concerned in a game I played at the last convention when a German player, whose position was being outflanked by a Soviet infantry company advancing through some woods, moved some stands of infantry to block the enemy path, which he could observe on the table. The Soviet infantry tried to bust through, and of course the Germans opened up with the ambush modifier. Being veterans with a weapons modifier of +2 this gave each German unit a net +3 (-1 for the light cover of the woods) or a 40% chance of knocking out a Soviet troop stand.

Under such conditions, should the defender qualify for an ambush fire modifier?

It seems to me that a unit should be hidden AND prepared to ambush the enemy to get the bonus. Otherwise, the player is able to take advantage of the fact that he can see the units of his opponent, even in dense terrain, and position his units to intercept "on the fly". The defender already gets the advantage of first fire, as well as the opportunity to fire in his subsequent offensive fire phase if the moving attackers did not declare close combat.

What I am considering is stating that a unit must be hidden AND in a prepared position (improved position, dug-in, or pill box) or built-up sector in order to qualify for the ambush modifier.

What do you guys think?

Mark

Re: Ambush fire rules modification

Author: Bill Slavin ()

Date: 11-30-06 23:58

Mark,

If the concern is that units reposition, especially to ward off attacks that reasonably they would not be aware were coming, would it not make more sense to say that an ambush can only be activated by a hidden unit that has either not moved from it's starting position or been aware of a target (spotted or suspected) prior to moving. This would still allow units to move into a position where they can target the enemy (like a panzerfaust maneuvering through a built up area), while keeping units from moving against targets they can't reasonably suspect.

It just seems to me you should be able to maneuver, say, behind a hedge or other obstacle to get in close and still gain the modifier, especially the poor PIAT which has a hard enough time of it already!

Bill

Re: Ambush fire rules modification

Author: Ken Natt ()

Date: 12-01-06 04:06

I think the rule is ok as is in most cases, and a change may well cause more unintended ripples.

The problem seems to be the German player reacting to the Soviet movement. Although the German has the advantage of a birds eye view, that advantage is shared with the Russian, who could have triggered the ambush by advancing a squad, or using a recon asset. The German player also needs to reposition with a certain amount of speed, as otherwise he will risk being spotted moving, so all in all I don't think there is a problem.

Ken

Re: Ambush fire rules modification

Author: Stephen Uden ()

Date: 12-01-06 05:02

There are quite a lot of situations where a player can take advantage of a helicopter view of the battlefield and unless you use markers and dummies for unspotted units throughout, I don't think that the rules can eliminate them without creating a number of issues the other way, such as a PIAT stalking a tank that it can see.

Stephen

Re: Ambush fire rules modification

Author: Paddy Green ()

Date: 12-01-06 06:14

Mark,

I understand what you are trying to do - but think you may be wielding a sledgehammer to crack a nut! I'm not sure it requires an IP to ambush - this is too long a process and preparing an IP is (in my mind) not the same as preparing an ambush firing position (which may actually be rather exposed i.e. being a crest of a hill or round a corner etc...) It certainly requires the ambushing unit to be stationary and hidden but IP may be too stringent a requirement. Possibly (and here is an alternative to the IP rule if you think checks and balances are necessary) you could require moving units to be in an IP or "Emplace" before they qualify for ambush modifiers - at least this would eliminate the die roll whilst ensuring that the unit is stationary, hidden and settled - which I interpret as being the intent of the ambush rule.

In our games we often get to a situation where one of us makes a move or claims an ambush etc. and gets asked "can you explain why you are doing....." If the player can't legitimately justify it then the move gets reversed. Often one or two questionable events are permitted but the third attempt is almost never successful. In the case you outline above if the German player could legitimately answer that question (as he seems to be able to if he moved some infantry to block the enemy path which his commander or Recon forces could observe on the table.) Then I have no objection to him using the ambush modifier - indeed the Soviets probably had it coming! If he was using the table top (10,000 ft helicopter) view to be a bit of a gamesman then I just wouldn't play with him again or rebreif him over a beer! It does not necessarily need a new interpretation of the rule.

Where I think the ambush fire modifier is vital is where the stationary defenders are up against an advancing enemy who (often in rapid advance) move, spot and then close to CC, all in a single turn. Here the ambush is vital for stopping the rapid advance and hence the close to CC or gaining the upper hand in the CC by suppressing or disordering the attacker. Without the ambush +1 I can see a slight advantage being handed to the attacker as it will, to a certain extent, weaken the second line of defence.

Paddy

Re: Ambush fire rules modification

Author: Dan ()

Date: 12-01-06 11:01

Hi Mark

The ambushing unit is suppose to be lying in wait for the enemy, hence it would be reasonable to expect, as Bill mentioned, that the ambushers be stationary.

I would suggest the ambushers be allowed to move in previous turns, but they must remain stationary for its turn (no movement, fall backs, etc.) immediately prior to declaring hidden/ambush status. This would allow for ambush situations during a battle as units redeploy, but reduce the 'ambush on the fly' gamesmanship.

My reasoning is: 1) The turn for no movement simulates the ambushers selecting suitable firing positions; 2) Although the game mechanics of BF is sequential turn-based, the events in each 10-minute turn are concurrent. Thus it may seem unreasonable to allow a unit to so quickly set-up an ambush to counter enemy movement; 3) Since both players have a bird's eye view, the no movement requirement encourages the ambushing player to anticipate (two turns ahead) where his opponent will likely move next.

If the remain stationary solution is too restrictive, then alternatively, the hidden unit may qualify for ambush status if it did not rapid advance the previous turn. This would reduce the radius of a unit's ability to block and ambush an enemy's advance.

What do you think?

Dan

Re: Ambush fire rules modification

Author: Luke Willen ()

Date: 12-01-06 11:49

What about a "Prepare to Ambush" action for troops wishing to set a hasty ambush. If this is still counted as a movement action for any opportunity fire this would make it more difficult to achieve in the face of the enemy, An enemy stand would still have to be able to spot the stand preparing to ambush which would be more difficult in certain types of terrain. The other thing we would need to consider is how this would be affected by the "Creep" action.

We could say that a stand using a "Creep" action followed by a "Prepare to Ambush" action would not be counted as performing two actions.

Luke

Re: Ambush fire rules modification

Author: Bill Slavin ()

Date: 12-01-06 12:40

Dan,

The only problem with a stand not being able to move the turn before (which I like, in principal) is that it makes our ambushing PIAT take two turns (move, stay still) to get the bonus, by which time the target will most likely have moved on.

I think Paddy is right in suggesting that the onus should be on the player to justify their move to ambush. My thoughts about needing to be a suspected or spotted target previous to moving to an ambush position was sort of moving in that direction, but formalizing the terms in which one could do it. But a simple querie might achieve the same result, without messing with the rules.

Bill

Re: Ambush fire rules modification

Author: Chris Ginn ()

Date: 12-01-06 12:47

This will need a marker, or a fairly good memory in a large game. It can be difficult enough to remember what moved the move before, let alone which moved the move before that. Besides which, if you run to the edge of a wood and hide behind a big bush with your MG42 or whatever, infantry approaching across an open field are not likely to see you. You are going to get the first fire in without noticable return fire, which is surely the point of the modifier. What you need is a rule that prevents infantry in defense reacting to what they cannot see. However, since they could claim to be conducting an outflanking counterattack, I do not think that will solve your problem. If you used specific order markers, that would solve the problem, but that is a major rewrite of the rules. I think you are just stuck with it, as you are with the overveiw problem with wargames in general.

However, since veterans and well trained units would probably have pickets out to cover lines of approach, and the moving elements would represent the reserve section, you could argue the move is perfectly legitimate. In which case, I do not really see your problem. Possibly, raw units would be less likely to react, but that is covered in the rules anyway. The more I think about, it the more I think the 'beef' is that veterans are good. Surely thats the way it should be!

Re: Ambush fire rules modification

Author: Matt Laing ()

Date: 12-01-06 15:53

We limit the use of the ambush modifier to once per game per unit providing the units begin the game hidden.

The rationale according to one who strongly argued against the perpetual ambush modifier is that once the lead start flying the troops are expecting to run into more

trouble; they surely expect there are more enemy in the area and will be more vigilant and take precautions to lessen the effects of an ambush or an unexpected attack etc etc etc.

I simply find that the game is easier with this limit in place.

Matt

Re: Ambush fire rules modification

Author: Stephen Uden ()

Date: 12-01-06 16:29

Your house rule might work well for some scenarios, but wouldn't necessarily work in general. We've just done a Goodwood scenario where the Becker batteries repeatedly snipe and ambush from cover through the game (though obviously moving to a different location once detected), as they did historically.

If troops want to be more vigilant then let them single move and be cautious on the table top, rather than limit defenders' ambush fire. Also, the rationale would imply that it should be one ambush per attacker (to reflect their increased caution) rather than per defender.

I've still seen nothing to suggest that changing the rules would do any more than create new anomalies.

Stephen

Re: Ambush fire rules modification

Author: Matt Laing ()

Date: 12-01-06 20:52

Well it works in general for us.

Re: Ambush fire rules modification

Author: Mark Hayes ()

Date: 12-01-06 22:28

I appreciate the feedback you are all giving. This issue was troubling me, but I knew I needed others' perspective. You are talking me out of my original ideas for change. However, I think I like Paddy's idea of requiring a unit to "emplace" once it has moved to get the benefit from the ambush modifier.

By all means, let the discussion continue.

Mark

Re: Ambush fire rules modification
Author: Dan ()
Date: 12-01-06 22:44

Chris

Thanks for the input. When I suggested restricting movement requirements, I anticipated the potential need for/problem with markers. I don't see a marker system as onerous though. For smaller games, memory is adequate already. Most (experienced) players are able to track a company or two and remember who rapid advanced, moved, etc. for spotting and subsequent firing purposes. For larger games, inexperienced players, or games involving a high ratio of units to players, then a marker system is likely needed anyhow, just to make sure players aren't double moving units.

Luke's suggestion of requiring a unit to take an action to acquire ambush status may solve the "markers everywhere" problem.

A unit declares as an "ambush action", thus only this unit(s) receive the ambush modifier on subsequent a fire action. We already mark units on overwatch in this way. Also, this may address Bill's concern that the "no movement" requirement is too restrictive, which I tend to agree. (Those peasky panzers don't stay around long enough for my PIATs either.)

Note: However, this may mean placing an ambush marker on all hidden units at the start of the game:(The number of markers would diminish as the battle proceeds, as casualties mount and the defenders redeploy.

I'm undecided as yet as to whether the "ambush action" qualifies as movement.

I will continue to ponder this issue, as to avoid creating more ripples in the fabric of BF.

Cheers,

Dan

Re: Ambush fire rules modification
Author: Nigel Perry ()
Date: 12-03-06 18:21

Changes to the ambush rule need to consider its impact in all theaters and not just NW Europe.

In the SWP theater, it is easier for units that moved to take up "unseen" positions and ambush moving enemy troops and would be reluctant to see rule changes alter this.

Its hard enough to reproduce the sorts of ambush that were possible in jungle conditions as it is.

Nigel Perry.

Re: Ambush fire rules modification

Author: Paddy Green ()

Date: 12-04-06 04:54

I've been thinking about this over the weekend and think that Mark is right to be concerned that it is currently too easy to assume an ambush position and some sort of check is probably appropriate to qualify for the relatively large bonus of +1. Given that "emplacing" a unit only takes one manouver action and no die roll, I don't think that this restriction is too onerous a requirement to qualify for the ambush modifier. (i.e. a unit with 2 manouvre actions can move then emplace to qualify for ambush fire.) However, this would stop a rapid advance to cover and then immediate defensive fire with an ambush modifier the following turn - which would address Mark's gripe. However, I also think that in order to preserve some degree of mobility for the ambusher and maintain the threat of the PIAT, sneak moves should possibly be allowed whilst retaining the possibility of ambush fire. I see using the "Empace" rule as being identical to Luke's "Prepare to Ambush" action but uses the existing framework of the rules and hence makes it more streamlined.

Markers everywhere? Possibly, but I don't think so. I regularly play games with a battalion+ per side and having been shot up can remember exactly which of the enemy units have ambushed fired. Also with hidden deployment it tends to be that if they are not on the table they have yet to ambush - the moment they are placed on the table they have prebably done the damage!

I would propose the following:

"In order to conduct ambush fire units must be hidden and in IP or Emplaced. If an unit direct fires or performs any other manoeuvre action other than regroup or sneak or is involved in close combat it must move to a different location and empaced or IP before it qualifies for another ambush modifier. Troops that are emplaced may conduct sneak manoeuvre actions whilst retaining their emplaced status and their ability to conduct ambush fire (but not indirect fire)."

Paddy

Re: Ambush fire rules modification

Author: Luke Willen ()

Date: 12-04-06 07:39

Thinking about it perhaps a "Prepare to ambush" (or whatever we want to call it should take two actions rather than one. This would represent a squad moving into the ambush area on turn 1 then moving into position and concealing themselves on turn 2.

For units in position at the start of a game we prefer to mark this on a map. Concealed movement can be done on the map and/or using markers.

Regards
Luke

Re: Ambush fire rules modification
Author: Mark Hayes ()
Date: 12-04-06 09:40

I'm in agreement with Paddy's proposal and his reasoning behind it. I don't think it should be placed on the website as an optional rule just yet, but I will institute it as a "house rule" for my games to see if it does what I want.

You guys have convinced me that I was over-reacting with my initial idea. Thanks for all your comments.

Mark

Re: Ambush fire rules modification
Author: Ken Natt ()
Date: 12-04-06 12:21

I think we are getting into difficult territory here.

Yes an ambush can be a well prepared situation where the defender has spent a lot of time getting everything right, spending time and effort to settle in, camouflaging his positions etc, but it can also simply be the shock of receiving unexpected fire on the target, before the target can react and get to cover. I can understand the idea of a prepared ambush taking time, but why should the devastating first volley on unprepared troops also take so long?

Ambushes are easy to avoid, or rather they are easy to reduce to causing minimum casualties by taking suitable steps and receiving your routes

KISS suggests either play the whole game with hidden unit counters etc, or accept that these situations can exist but both players can take steps

Ken

Re: Ambush fire rules modification

Author: Mark Hayes ()

Date: 12-04-06 14:01

Ken,

I'm a little unclear. Are you saying that requiring a unit to spend one movement action to emplace and therefore receive ambush modifier is too much?

My main concern was that one side should not receive the significant benefit of an ambush fire modifier in situations that are essentially a meeting engagement. Requiring a unit to emplace (in other words, no rapid advance) seems like a reasonable way to do that.

Mark

Re: Ambush fire rules modification

Author: Bill Slavin ()

Date: 12-04-06 17:05

I would agree that the need to emplace is not an onerous requirement. It will stop ambushes on the fly, yet still allow some movement, including, and especially, the sneak move.

My real problem with the ambush rule, as it stands, is that units can be seen moving into an area (behind a high hedge row for instance, as happened in a game last week) disappear for a turn and then achieve the ambush modifier from essentially the same area (give or take an inch) where they disappeared, on troops who should be expecting them to be in that general location.

Perhaps there is no rule that can mitigate this situation, and should simply be left to the discretion of the players whether to allow it (I would be inclined not to). This discussed rule change doesn't really effect this situation one way or another, and perhaps it's just opening a completely different can of worms.

Bill

Re: Ambush fire rules modification

Author: Chris Ginn ()

Date: 12-08-06 10:15

Surely the solution to this is the suspected targets rule. Ie suspected targets should not be able to ambush. Troops seen moving into an area should be suspected targets.

Re: Ambush fire rules modification
Author: Bill Slavin ()
Date: 12-08-06 21:48

Chris,
If they were suspected targets, you're right, they would be prohibited from ambushing. But technically, as I read the rules, once they move behind a high hedge, they disappear from sight and I think would no longer be suspected. They could move a mile or 40 yards (1" in game terms) behind the hedge, and no one would be the wiser. But I would agree that they should be considered suspected, at least as far as the ambush goes, and denied it if they fire from the general locale where they disappeared. It's just one of those things that falls into a grey area, in my opinion, and it's the grey area stuff that drives me nuts.

Bill

Re: Ambush fire rules modification
Author: Ken Natt ()
Date: 12-12-06 04:10

I think that the game as is seems to work nine times out of ten, which is a good result as far as I am concerned.

If my opponent starts to ambush, then displaces, then moves again to a new ambush position, I think that I will be all over him like a rash while he moves around. I would use whatever indirect assets I have to shell or smoke that hedge, even with the minus mods, and then try and either assault or outflank, or set myself up a nice firebase to overwatch and blow him away when he tries again.

The 1000ft general does have two sides to it. I know that he is there, even if he is just a hidden movement marker, so I can plan accordingly.

Ken

Re: Ambush fire rules modification
Author: Peter ()
Date: 12-17-06 13:47

Oddly enough, the situation you described, Mark, is pretty close to how the Germans operated against the Soviets. It did not always work so well against the Amis or British, thanks to their copious amounts of aerial reconnaissance, but the shifting of small groups to ambush positions was necessary to keeping the Soviets off-balance.

The US used the same tactics during the Ardennes fighting to slow the Germans and strip their inexperienced infantry support away from their armor.

If I were to make a change, I would allow the ambush modifier to be used only if the troop quality were at least experienced. (In all cases, as raw or poorly-trained troops did not necessarily fare well even against an opponent that they knew was coming at them).

Just my two pfennig

Re: Ambush fire rules modification

Author: Keith Lowman ()

Date: 12-19-06 06:05

I like Peter's idea, but all troops of any quality should get the ambush modifier if they start the game in fixed positions but once they move they can not claim the ambush modifier if their quality is below experienced.