Danube Front ‘85 Designer Notes:

I. Design Notes

How did we come to make Danube Front ‘85

Back in 2002, John Tiller decided to create an offshoot to the popular Panzer Campaign Series called Modern Campaigns. Our first effort on this new line of games started life as Sinai ‘67, but was quickly expanded to Middle East ‘67, including the fighting in ’56 and aspects of the ’73 Yom Kippur War as well.

For the next instalment the action was moved to Europe and 1985 with the title Fulda Gap ‘85. This game was created by John Tiller, Greg “Sturmer” Smith, and a young German Wargamer named Jörg Lissa. The game explored what might have happened if one day, right out of the blue, the Warsaw Pact suddenly marched from their barracks and without any build up or warning headed for the border with men and equipment at hand. The game was accompanied by an essay written by William R. Trotter, an author with several books to his credit and someone well known for his “Desktop General” column in a Computer Games magazine.

Fulda Gap was an instant success and it attracted new players to the line of games, players who were often Cold War Veterans who served in Europe through various periods since WWII, and not always guys who were playing the WWII Panzer Campaigns. It wasn’t long before we realized there was great interest in expanding upon this “What If” conflict.

The next year, my partner in the Panzer Campaigns Series, Dave “Blackie” Blackburn asked John to provide us the Source Map info needed to create the North German Plain area. We used the same OOB sources, mainly the Jane’s book “Armies of NATO’s Central Front” by Isby and Kamps as was used in FG85, to build the game units using the same structure as was established in FG85. Furthermore, we were careful to keep this structure, so that post release of this title we could release an add-on for NGP85 that would allow players to explore the entire map for both Fulda Gap and the North German Plain. This add-on was accompanied by a number of scenarios by Mark Breed, a player who had worked with us on some Panzer Campaigns testing and was himself one of those Cold War Warriors, with a keen knowledge and interest in this aspect of Modern Campaigns.

With any add-on to any game like this, there are frequently requests for “just a little bit more map” this way, or 10 hexes on that side, and so on. It was through one of these requests for more area that we met Marc Bellizzi, yet another Cold War Warrior. Marc’s desire at the time, which we obliged him with, was enough extra map to do another add-on, this one to include events in Berlin and the battles that would take place in what was called the AFNorth Sector.

Then, for a long time, the Modern Campaigns Series in Germany sat with these two titles, somewhat joined, and with many nations’ troops respected on both the NATO and Warsaw Pact side of the battle lines. HPS next took the series to the Pacific with Korea ’85 by Ed “Volcano” Williams, on the premise that
a conflict in Europe might have given the regime in North Korea a chance to attack the south. But the market interest by far, at least according to forum discussion, lay in Europe. And by now our friend Marc Bellizzi was coming to us saying, “Hey! Are you going to do the southern part of Germany?” The area would soon become known to us as Danube Front ’85.

The problem, as it turned out, was the source map. You see, all our game maps are made using very large scale, high resolution scanned period map files which are loaded into an editor. Then each hex can be accurately hand painted using our proprietary game map making tools - but the source maps we needed were simply not available. John Tiller had ordered the pieces we needed and in the meantime, gave us the piece from the south end of the Fulda Gap, but that wasn’t enough. We had to have all the way to the Alps for this game.

Hardly a month went by that Bellizzi didn’t ask about our progress (or lack thereof), but we were stalled from the map issue as well as busy developing other new titles for the Panzer Campaign Series.

After what seemed like an eternity waiting, the map finally showed up. John scanned it and provided us the missing BMP file which was huge at 78 MB. As if by fate, within 24 hours I had heard from Bellizzi again asking when we were going to do Danube Front. But this time of course the news was different, we were ready to proceed.

The Map

Danube Front ’85 is a continuation of the story started with Fulda Gap and North German Plain; the area we needed added roughly 54,000 hexes to the south of the existing combined FG/NGP map area. As with other maps in the series, with this extension, each hex had to be examined in four passes. Once for drainage, then topography, next culture (roads, towns, forests, etc.), and finally map labels (place names).

We elected to end the map not at a national border, but rather at the edge of the Alps; because with one mile hexes the game engine does not lend itself well to drastic topography changes. Nor does the fluid fighting across the relatively flat European country side translate well to fighting in mountain passes. Besides, the focus on this war was a fight through Germany toward France and the Low Countries, not through the Alps into Italy and neutral Switzerland.
As with all the maps of the Modern and Panzer Campaign Series, we took particular care to represent the terrain as accurately as possible. The image above illustrates a good example of how well we are able to do this. It also shows some obvious issues which as designers we face. That is, not every town and hamlet can be represented, but, in a general sense, we do capture the main road network, most towns, as well as forests and small wooded areas. This image is along the Danube River with the Austrian city of Linz in the lower right corner. Note, too, that this game map has been rotated, so that North is actually UP and RIGHT, not straight up as in most other maps.

We also paid close attention to river crossings, and in this respect, you may note the circled ferry point on the Danube River. Some ferries are marked on the source map, but not all. In an area as critical as the Danube, we use multiple geographic sources, such as Microsoft Map Point Europe and Google Earth. However, these sources are not accurate to 1985, but they do give some accurate indications of the ground.

In the case of this particular ferry in Google Earth, if you look on Google Earth for the town of Ottensheim on the north bank of the Danube River five miles west of Linz, Austria (as seen above), and click on the blue dot (after you find this spot using Google Earth), you will have an option to view a copyrighted photograph by Ernst Horvath of “Donau bei Ottensheim”. This picture shows what we are depicting with the game’s ‘Ferry’ feature. It is not just the ferry boat shown in the picture; it is also the loading or embarkation point along the river bank. Full Water Ferries cannot be damaged during the play of the game, but are sometimes marked as destroyed for game playability reasons. In these cases, what we are
saying is that in some situations, even if you sank the boat, someone might find another barge along the river to assist with the crossing.

Suffice to say, a great deal of care and a number of sources are used to make any game map. As hard as we try, we still have to make choices as to what towns and roads appear and which ones are omitted, lest the map become too cluttered. The example above illustrates such an omission; the town of Ottensheim (behind the ferry), is not shown on the game map, nor does it appear on the source map in the same area.

The Original Game Concept and the Evolution

The original game idea was to do what had worked in the north for NGP85. Essentially, just move the focus south, and create the units we needed for the Danube Front as we had in the north, using the same basic templates but with a few corrections we had made over time, based, to some extent, on player feedback we had received. Unlike NGP85, where we released the combined FG\NGP Campaign after the original title came out, this time we decided to include the Master Campaign, the “Battle For Germany 1985” as bonus material with Danube Front 85.

So as Blackie began working on the Map, I began the work on the OOB, at first talking with Marc to implement his feedback on what corrections he felt needed to be done in the original OOB and, with each fix, correcting the Combined FG\NGP campaign scenario to reflect those changes.

There were a few concepts we had to come to an agreement on before we could really begin to proceed on this project. The first concept was the sliding scale between detail in the OOB file and playability of the full game. As I saw it, using my Panzer Campaign’s experience, the Germany combined Campaign for FG\NGP was already very close to being too large for many people to play. Adding more units with the addition of the new southern game, Danube Front ’85, was putting playability pressure on what was already a very large game.

Marc, to his credit, found many imperfections in the OOB that he felt needed to be corrected. Remember, each time we made any changes, the master campaign scenario had to be adjusted. What we agreed to do was to take into account as much of the detail as possible (and for NATO, being careful to build it using components that could combine), while keep the number of counters in game to an absolute minimum.

At the onset of the project, I really did not want to make extensive changes to the existing combined FG85\NGP Campaign. I felt we already had an established and accepted game in the north, so why go to a lot of work to undo that? Marc, however, had other ideas and these eventually lead to an almost complete rebuild of the game OOB and master Campaign scenario.

The OOB revisions really got started before Christmas in 2006. By this time Marc and I had gone from him showing me the data and me making the changes, through passing the file back and forth, up to the point where I gave Marc the authority to make the changes himself. I stipulated we keep a detailed diary of each change, least we have to go back and figure out something that needed to be undone.

As an example, here is one such diary entry:

2/26/07

- Changed number of men in each HQ for all sides; Brigades have 100 men, Div's 125 men, Corps/Armies/Army Grps 200 men, FAARPs 75 men.
- Raised the AA strength of Corps/Army/Army Grp HQ's to 6/2 represent Medium range AA missile assets (Patriot, Hawk, Nike, Roland, Bloodhound, SA-6, SA-2, etc)
- Updated GSFG to reflect 1985 data on types & numbers of tanks in GSFG, based on declassified document from D Glantz.
- Updated Dutch OOB to reflect more accurate data on composition from Jane's
- Updated Belgian OOB to reflect more accurate data on composition from Jane's
- Changed West German Engineer Company from Pioneer to Pionier to reflect proper spelling.
- Added Pionier Ko (Brucke) to West Germany OOB for heavy bridge engineers.
- Added M110 (Battery) to West Germany to reflect 12 gun Battalions vice 18 guns.
- Dropped 130mm gun numbers to 18 per Bn in WARPAC units to reflect real organization.

As we worked our way through the OOB changes in the older combined campaign, Marc found information that began to question the original premise set out in the FG85 campaign – that being, "One day, as if a bolt came out from the blue, the Warsaw Pact marched from their Barracks and attacked with no warning." We found that NATO war plans were confident there would be a build up period of some kind. Soviet & Polish documents seemed to support this idea as well. Ultimately US units would deploy to Europe during a period of tension, being equipped with equipment from POMCUS, “Prepositioning Of Material Configured in Unit Sets”. Using this strategy, the US would simply fly soldiers to Europe and fully equip three divisions during the build up period. Fellow NATO nations would mobilize during this time as well.

Yet there was also ample evidence that it would not be a completely smooth build up for NATO; plenty of data showed weaknesses in the REFORGER “Return of Forces to Germany” plan – such as shortages of transport aircraft, shipping, etc.

Our revised idea for this war called for something between the “Bolt from the Blue” in FG85 - but not to the point of full readiness by NATO, with all units on alert, ready and waiting for hostilities to break out. This allowed us the ability to move some NATO units around from their assigned Barracks locations, such as Recon units put out to screen the more open areas of the frontier.

Also, Marc pointed out that training never stops; so you will see a few NATO Brigades selected at random deployed to NATO's Major Training Areas.

The build up period we envisioned is outlined in a series of fictitious PDFs documents that are included with the game in a \Historical folder.

These begin with a Warsaw Pact Operations Order, or OPORDER that uses a pre-planned training exercise as cover for invasion; on the NATO side, we start with a simple memo from Secretary of Defence Casper Weinberger to then US President Ronal Reagan, regarding some abnormal looking actions by the Soviets. The PDFs then wind their way through realistic Newspaper and Wire Service articles covering openly obvious events, to various Western government intelligence documents that show the cat-and-mouse game that each side would undertake during an escalation in tension. Ultimately players see that NATO isn’t completely taken by surprise, but are certainly not fully prepared and on a total war footing, either.

Note that most of the changes during the first six or seven months of the game development, were initially to the OOB and campaign setup of the originally combined FG85 and NGP85 titles, before we started working in earnest on the Southern Campaign and Scenarios.
The Order of Battle

Suffice to say, as work on the new game continued, Marc Bellizzi made a huge contribution and without his help, this game would look very different than the final product released a year later after a great many late nights and long hours.

Marc had this to say about making Danube Front '85:

When Glenn agreed to let me work with him on the new MC title, I jumped in, fully. Having served in USAREUR as a Bradley-Infantry Platoon Leader at the tail end of the Cold War, I was familiar with all the theories of how the Soviets were expected to attack – as well as how we in NATO were to implement the General Defence Plan (GDP) to stop them. All my years of real & arm-chair wargaming over the Central Front region were coming together in the final title of the Germany series. I recognized as part of Glenn’s team we faced a Herculean task; to represent as accurately as possible all the armies arrayed across the heart of Europe.

Getting the OOB correct was my goal. This is not to be critical of the old OOB’s; remember, Fulda Gap ’85 was designed and released in 2001/2002. The OOB was based on Jane’s “Weapons and Tactics of the Soviet Army 1988” and “NATO’s Armies of the Central Front 1985”. The difficulty with relying on just these sources is they were written during a time when much of the subject matter was either still classified, in transition, or simply unknown.

Instead, I gathered as much information as I could find on the subject from as many sources as possible. I asked all my friends for any information they had. I surfed forums across the net, copying the threads. I picked up out of print board-wargames, searched the various official Army and Air Force websites, as well as procured official US & NATO documents. All this research paid off; for example, a CIA Intelligence Assessment, “Reorganization of Soviet Ground Forces in East Germany; 1983” declassified in 1999 (and still heavily redacted today) provided information that simply was not available to the original designers. A series of declassified papers came from David Glantz; one in particular detailed the exact number and type of tank in every GSFG Division and Separate Brigade in 1986 (written by Russian Army Officers in Russian, no less). This provided a level of detail previously unimagined.

More obscure sources were culled; two examples that come to mind are the US Government Central Budget Office Procurement Profile: 1979-1987, which provided production figures of US combat systems by year, and a website selling old DDR military vehicles to the public, which provided by-serial-number quantities of east German vehicle data. Both helped verify numbers down to the individual vehicle.

Players may be surprised or even disappointed at the low quantities of top-of-the-line vehicles on each side; to that I can only respond that what is represented reflects very carefully researched data up to mid-1985. The fact is, the new weapons systems being fielded were very expensive compared to their predecessors; the US did not have 100% of its tank battalions M-1 equipped, nor all its Infantry battalions riding in M-2’s; the Apache, while under low-rate production, was not deployed to Europe until 1986. The US MLRS system was way behind production schedule and the first MLRS system fielded to a non-US nation did not occur until 1989. Similarly, the Soviets did not field a totally T-80/BMP-2 equipped Army. Ample data shows that throughout the GSFG, the BTR-60 & BMP-1 were still the predominant APC; the T-64 and T-62 still soldiered on in the front lines as well. Within the Warsaw Pact allies, countries like Czechoslovakia & Poland were actually selling their T-72’s and artillery for hard currency, instead of putting them into the line.
Players are urged to scan through the OOB file; in it you will find a plethora of notes explaining why certain organizations are as they are.

A final note about the 80’s, and in particular 1985 is that it was a time of transition; the US Army was mid-way through implementing its Division ’86 MTO&E model, with some Divisions literally part H Series and part J Series MTOE. The Soviets were likewise struggling to put into place their 1983 TO&E changes (which would again be modified in 1986). The Armies of Holland, West Germany and Belgium each had ‘White Papers’ they were actively following. So a 100% accurate OOB is simply not possible; but I think we got it close enough that the true flavour of what each side had, is portrayed.

Strategy, doctrine, tactics, availability, production and money constraints all shape every nation’s armies; that means that each nation’s armies will play a little differently, enhancing the excitement.

Something Old, Something New …New Chemical Weapons Rules

With any new title in any John Tiller game, we always look for way to enhance the engine beyond what we had at the start, in part to add value to the series as a whole, but also to better capture the flavour of the battle or campaign being built. This is often harder to do in a “What If” war such as that being depicted in Danube Front 85.

One aspect that has often been discussed by designers and interested parties in the Modern Campaigns series was the way Chemical weapons were applied. Basically the way it was set up to work was that the Warsaw Pact had to fire Chemical Weapons first, and then NATO could use them in response. All the Chemical Weapons were deemed to be “Persistent” in that once a hex was targeted, it was marked as a Chemical Hex and the marker never went away. However, all chemical weapons are not Persistent (or P for short). There is a second type, called Non-Persistent agents (or NP for short), which dissipate within several hours. Furthermore these NP agents work very fast when delivered, so it is more effective, but then it goes away and the marker should be removed.

Marc found out that NATO actually did not have an effective P or NP retaliatory capability during the specific scenario timeframe of 1985. During this period, NATO was dependent upon Tactical Nuclear Strikes (Nukes) for a deterrent should the Warsaw Pact use Chemical Weapons. So, if we were going to subdivide Chemical Weapons into P and NP in the game, we needed to factor in a NATO Tactical Nuclear response. This resulted in a new set of Rules for Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) rather than just more elaborate rules for only Chemical Weapons.

Basically – here is a brief summary of Chemical Weapons history from the NATO point-of-view through the 20th Century.

From 1918 to 1969 the United States produced all types of gas. To this day the US still has some chemical stocks. However, US production stopped in 1969 and re-started in 1986. This gap is significant because the problem with gas weapons is they are corrosive and unstable in their warheads. This means the stocks on hand had a ‘safely usable shelf life’ before they started to leak, rupture, or just not work to full effect (the compounds decay inside the warhead as well). The fact that they corrode the shell they are in makes storage tricky, and a toxic leak in Europe would have the German population up in arms with protests. So at some point around 1969, someone, somewhere inside the US government, made a decision that Tactical Nuclear Weapons would work just fine in lieu of gas, without all the hassle and storage dangers, and production stopped.
All Chemical Weapon stocks in Europe were quickly withdrawn back to the US by the early 70’s. Many of those chemical warheads were sent to storage facilities in Utah, and over time they became unnecessary, not to mention very dangerous to handle. Whether they were actually 100% unusable is not known, as that is a national security issue. Even if some still worked, at the time that we picked for this “What If” war, they were not in Europe, and could not be shipped over in time to have any role in this short hot war we are doing in our game.

Anyway, the “experts” spoke up; Jane’s Defence, and Charles Kamps in particular claimed the US ‘lacked a credible response’ and declared NATO was weak because it couldn’t respond in kind to a Soviet chemical attack. Since the warheads weren’t in Europe, it might as well have been true; except they were ignoring the policy of using a nuclear response if the WP used chemicals. When Reagan became President, he started a crash binary weapons program in 1983 that planned 3 different types of chemical warheads and by 1986, the US had P and NP Gas weapons under production again. One might say the “balance of power was re-established again” as a result.

So, in 1985 there were Persistent and Non-Persistent gas weapons on the Warsaw Pact side as well as Tactical Nuclear capabilities, and on the NATO Side, basically just the Tactical Nuclear response. The Warsaw Pact’s Tactical Nuclear warheads were big warheads relatively speaking. They do not lend themselves to use on the battlefield readily. In game terms, we figured the Warsaw Pact might use many of their Tactical Nuclear weapons on non-frontline targets such as Airbases, Port Terminals, and other strategic targets, leaving the bulk of their chemical weapons for use against troops on the front line.

It is hard to say how much Chemical Stocks the Warsaw Pact had, but the estimates we found suggested something close to 40,000 tons of chemical weapons of all stocks. The gases typically filled the same sized shells as regular artillery rounds. The same held for nukes; many guns and rockets that could shoot gas, almost universally could shoot nukes.

The desired end state for the game, therefore, was to have three distinctly different types of battlefield WMD’s available to players and designers, while not adding a cumbersome or complex interface to the game. What we see in the campaign game, as well as smaller scenarios, is NATO with only Tactical Nuclear, with the Warsaw Pact mainly with P and NP Chemical, and some Tactical Nuclear Warheads.

We opted to keep the current model of NATO having to wait for the Warsaw Pact to strike first because we wanted some deterrent to keep the game from automatically going down the WMD path every time, because there would be no game reason not to use them. Players can, of course, override this as they wish in the scenario editor by removing the negative sign from the value for any NATO WMD.

Making the two types of chemical weapons work in the new game engine was comparatively easy to design. We simply made two placeholders for the number of strikes available to each side and made a pot of P and another for NP. With NP Gas the contaminated hex will disappear in zero (immediate) to two turns, and the effect is defined as four times that of Persistent Chemicals on account of how easily it can
be delivered and how fast it spreads when a hex is targeted. NP is an ideal weapon for the Warsaw Pact side because it allows them to move through the affected area once the NATO units on the defence have been affected by the gas. However, once used, NATO can use a Tactical Nuclear Response.

**Tactical Nuclear Weapons**

Both NATO and the WP had a large arsenal of tactical nuclear weapons; these could be delivered by aircraft, SSM’s, and artillery. Their destructive power was measured in Kilotons, one Kiloton being the equivalent of 1000 tons of TNT. Warheads ranged from sub-kiloton rounds fired by artillery, up to 250 kiloton warheads carried by missiles; the latter size warhead blurring the line between a Tactical and a Strategic Nuclear Weapon. While the initial decision to authorize nuclear release would have been made at the highest levels, once released, their use and delivery would have been controlled at the Army, Corps, and Division level.

In Modern Campaigns, Tactical Nuclear weapons are represented as artillery fired rounds; the more powerful warheads dropped by planes, or carried by missiles, are considered earmarked for more critical targets outside the scope of this game. Nuclear Artillery rounds were in the .1kt to 5kt range; players will find them powerful in comparison to conventional rounds, but not massively so.

In game terms, a Tactical Nuclear weapon attacks a target hex with a value X times the normal combat value, with X being defined in the Parameter Table (or PDT) as seen under the Help menu. Note that the value may be different for both sides, mainly due to the fact that nuclear artillery rounds are often of different strengths for each side. Furthermore, different Parameter tables are used for the different scenarios depending upon which side is being played by human or AI opponents. Our thinking here is not so much as we are giving the AI an advantage, rather we know, even with the additional AI programming we have done with the AI on targeting WMD, the AI will still miss more chances to hit good targets than any human player. Therefore, when it does get one, we wanted to make it have some effect, so as to make a human player think twice before using WMD, even against the AI. (Note in the previous engine, the AI never used its Chemical weapons when attacked by the other side).

Along with the extra strength attack on the hex being targeted for a nuclear warhead, all units in the hex are affected, not just a single unit as is the case with the more traditional direct or indirect fire. Furthermore, all units in the hex are immediately disrupted and lose two Morale levels right away. The hex is marked with a Radiation Marker and while radiation may eventually dissipate over time, it may take as long as several days, even longer than a week. So while radiation is not a permanent form of contamination to a hex in the game, it may seem like it is, unless the scenario being played lasts a long time, such as in the Campaign scenarios. Also, new units which enter a radiation hex, even a known radiation hex, will also be disrupted and may suffer some losses too - although not as many as the initial attack as there is no blast effect.

In subsequent turns after a hex has been hit with a Nuclear strike, a unit in a radiation hex will not be attacked, or lose more strength; in fact it may recover from Disruption, although this will depend on the quality of the units involved. This effect has been built into the game, in part to prevent players from the
“gamey” tactic of employing WMD to “protect” objectives by preventing units in a radiation contaminated hex from assaulting due to non-recovery in a contaminated hex.

Special thanks on how these rules work with the game engine goes to Ed “Volcano” Williams, who many players of the Series know well. Ed has long wanted Tactical Nuclear Weapons in the Modern Campaign Series, and he spoke with John Tiller about this subject on a number of occasions. So, even though he was not involved in the testing of the game itself, he certainly had a hand in how nuclear weapons came into being in the final product.

Additionally, thanks go to Dr. John Rushing who has, since the Panzer Campaign title Minsk ’44, been helping with the AI in this series. I think players who take on the AI will enjoy being confronted by WMD themselves, should they use them on the AI opponent.

...Something Borrowed, Something (for the) Blue (NATO) - Helicopters

Love them or hate them, you can’t really have a Modern Campaign Series without helicopters. And yet, over time these units - or the rules surrounding them - have given rise to the most bizarre and unrealistic tactics we have ever seen in either the Panzer Campaigns or Modern Campaigns games. In early iterations of the rules, players would fly them deep into enemy territory to occupy key objectives on the last turn of the game, or block the arrival of reinforcements; the list goes on and on.

Helicopters represent - more-so than any other unit - the largest abstraction in the game. When you consider a machine that flies at speeds of 150 mph or more, stays in the air for perhaps, at most, two hours at a time, and carries some heavy firepower, it can be a recipe for trouble. How do we make these units work in a game where a single turn is three hours during the day?

The first thing we did was borrow an idea from player created scenarios; that is the use of FAARP, or Forward Area Arming and Refuel Point. In Game terms a FAARP is merely another HQ unit. It is smaller, more vulnerable, and generally slower than other units, and has a short command range. Actually, the command range value used was taken from British Brigade HQs in Panzer Campaigns - Sicily ’43, where we wanted the British Army to fight within more strict organizational lines, as compared with the more free wheeling US units.

The advent of the FAARP’s generally greatly reduces the helicopters effectiveness, if it goes too deep in the enemy rear. Nonetheless, we can’t prevent people from doing it. FAARP’s alone were not enough to curb these adventurous flights, as we’ve seen in game play using the mods, as well as our test plays of the Danube 85 scenarios. Players continued to find effective ways to use these units within the game rules, which made sense, even though they were not the way we felt helicopters would be used realistically. Such tactics involved blocking retreat routes for the strategic defender (generally NATO), or using them to isolate key defence positions, as isolated units lose morale and are much less effective. Our point was - and is - that while a helicopter was a threat, and a serious one, it could not really hold ground. It could not fly over the hex for the entire three hours anyway, so in a sense it would not isolate units by hovering over a key hex at the end of the turn.
What we envisioned were rules that encourage a player to use helicopters to fly in and attack units fast, and then use their speed to move away to safety fast. Or to stand off near a key hex, where the enemy is expected to move, and then during the other player’s turn use Opportunity Fire, under AI control to attack the phasing player, in locations where they can’t easily move up units to attack them.

Here is what we came up with: First of all, we adjusted the values we had in the OOB to make these units more vulnerable to AA Fire. What we discovered was that when these units were assigned Defence values in the original Fulda Gap game, those defence values were calibrated compared to other ground units. The problem was that the ground units were normally fired at by other ground units using hard and soft values which are, in general, much higher that the unit AA values.

We didn’t want to make these units completely ineffective game wise, so we up-gunned their hard attack values as compared to the exact same ground units, to take into effect the height advantage the machine in the air will have. Missiles fired from the air will have a greater chance of hitting tank turret tops and APC decks where armour is not as thick as say the front aspect, which is normally facing the enemy. Furthermore, fast units that attack as helicopters do will have more chance of getting side and rear shots on these vehicles too.

We still needed John Tiller to adjust the code to make the old legal, but “gamey” tactics less attractive to players. So we had the Zone-of-Control effect for supply purposes removed from the helicopter units. This removed the helicopters’ ability to isolate other ground units. The second thing we did was to borrow from John Tiller’s Napoleonic Series an optional rule to prevent these key units from blocking retreats and causing extra causalities.

In the Napoleonic Series, John explained, players were using small Skirmisher units from blocking the retreat of much larger formed units. The optional rule is admittedly a “gamey” response to a “gamey” situation, whereby using such units to block will cause them to be eliminated if the blocked unit’s retreat route is cut. Pretty drastic! Yes, we know, but consider first that:

- it is an optional rule only, so players may opt out of it even though the rule will be ON by default when the game is loaded: and
- this rule can’t be exploited by the other side, since there is no way you can force the other player to use helicopters to surround you.

So, for this rule, we are quite prepared to provide perhaps a “gamey solution” to “gamey play”, otherwise why are the helicopters placed in a location to block units?

The combined effect of all the helicopter changes is you should use helicopters to move up, fire, and then move away to a safe hex where the enemy player cannot see them and get free shots at the more fragile helicopter units (That is the other side won’t have enough units or movement points to chase the
helicopters). Lower defence will encourage players to move their helicopters to more safe hexes at the end of their turn. Extra attack will make them more effective to attack or ambush units when employed as we think they would be in a modern war. In summary, the ONLY helicopter unit that players should leave next to an enemy at the end of a turn is a “Man” type unit that is Deployed, or not in Transport mode, as such a unit represents “boot-on-the-ground” soldiers, deployed, and in position to hold ground. All other landed vehicle type helicopter units, or all flying helicopter units, will not block supply and are subjected to elimination with the new rule.

When it comes to helicopters, or any other type of unit, or any rules we devise, however, we can’t anticipate everything players can do within the rules with the units we created, rules we designed for their employment, etc., but we are committed, where possible, to make changes to the game engine to encourage players to not find creative ways to use units beyond that for which they were originally created in terms of modern battles.

II. The Scenarios

General Scenario Comments

As with previous games in the series, we’ve continued the scenario files naming convention, where the filenames begins with a “#” symbol followed by a number. The # sign ensures that all the game valid scenario files appear together when the files are listed alphabetically. The numbers following the # represent a date and scenario number, using the format yymmdd_xx, where the xx portion represents the scenario number on that particular day.

As with other titles, there is a #00 Started scenario which can be played, along with the Started.PDF guide, to help get new players going with the rules without having to read all the documentation before starting. As the Danube Front campaign requires players to cross the Danube River, we’ve added three more introductory scenarios, for beginners and veterans alike!

The first of is #01; it is designed for the human NATO Player to familiarize themselves, or refresh their memory, on the rules for mining and then blowing up large, full water bridges. For this scenario players should review the “Full-Hex Bridges” section toward the end of the Engineer’s part of the User.PDF file.

The next scenario takes the other side. Here the human player will face the NATO defense along the river with the bridges blown. Now the human player must build a full water pontoon bridge over the Danube, so players should refer to the Engineer part of the rules again, but this time the building “Full-Hex Bridges” section. Also useful will be “Water Hex Ferrying”, again from the Engineer part of the rules together with the “On-Foot Infantry” Section in the Movement part of the documentation.

But we didn’t just stop there! As we added new Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) rules, we thought players might like to try them out to understand their effects before getting into the Campaigns. So the last training scenario is #03 WMD. Understand there are way too many Nukes and Chemicals weapons in this scenario to be really practical, but the objectives are to show players how they work and how effective they are. Of course, players fire WMD like they did the old Chemical Weapons and Artillery Mines, using the Command Menu | Use Alternative Fire item near the bottom of the menu option list.

The game focus is as the title suggests, the southern area of Germany, or Danube Front ’85; but in this title we have included the complete master Battle for Germany scenario, which stretches from the Danish border in the north to the Swiss and Italian Alps in the south. Two of the southern campaigns include neutral Austria as a NATO Partner, on the assumption they would join the fight if invaded. There are also a couple bonus scenarios covering Berlin and the AFNorth sector up in the Baltic. Some players of NGP
may have seen these as NGP85 add on mods, but in the title, the game now supports Denmark as a separate nation and, in fact, all the unit art has been included for all the NATO and Warsaw Pact partners. In many cases we have had our Artwork guys do new art to help the master campaign with a dressing up.

Players will notice that in most cases scenario numbers are repeated, sometimes with “b” and “s” designations. When we test these games, we play almost exclusively against the AI, using the non lettered or “default” scenarios. As most of the testers are avid Play-by-Email fans, they can spot ways where a scenario can be best duplicated, and then optimized, specifically for Head-to-Head (HTH) play. These scenarios are designated with an “a” after the number. Danube ’85 also offered a number of places where we thought the attacking AI might offer some interesting situations to a NATO defender and in these scenarios we’ve used a “b” designation.

All scenarios, including both “a” and “b” designated scenarios have a “Designer Note” at the end of the overview indicating how the scenario is best played. There is also a note on the Title line of the scenario. The setup will normally be very similar. The differences are in the intangible design issues, such as Victory Levels, Supply Levels, and strength of the fortifications. We also have three different Parameter files in this game to help give the AI a little help when facing a human opponent. Players who still need more challenge also have the advantage slider, which they can use to give one side or the other an edge in combat, but experience shows that this has been rarely used in previous games. As you can tell, what we are trying to do here is to provide scenarios that will give players a challenge and entertainment for whatever playing style they enjoy.

Finally, many of the larger scenarios have a lowercase “s” in the number. These scenarios have Explicit Supply Units in the file, so the Explicit Supply rules may be used. However, note the bulk of the testing was done using the Virtual Supply Truck, or VST Supply rules, so the “s” in the numbers isn’t so much a recommendation, as a possibility, if players want to play using those rules.

All players are advised not to miss the list of PDF Historical briefing documents that are in the folder:

\Danube Front '85\Historical

These are not just interesting reading to help you set the mood and the stage for this conflict that never happened. The Op-Orders contain a listing of possible Strategy Operations that are available to the players. Additionally, Marc wrote each Op-Order based on factual plans; the attack as laid out in the Soviet Op-Order was based on the US Army’s Soviet Area Studies Office estimate of a Soviet attack, while NATO’s plan is based on OPLAN 4102/31001, the General Defense of Western Europe. So without further ado, below is the list of scenarios in the game, followed by the overviews for those who like to look them over. Finally, the references used are at the end of the Notes.

Enjoy the game guys! A bunch of rather dedicated testers have worked long and hard to bring it to you, and offer you the very best in challenges, be it Head-to-head or in AI Play. Still, in spite of our Quality Control, no game is ever perfect when it first ships, so if you have any question, or feel there is an error in the game, please send the information to HPS Support at:

support@hpssims.com

...be sure to include with your comments, a game file, (with password if a PBEM Game), and the hex ID from the lower right corner of the map. If possible, including a battle file before, and after the event, is even better. We are committed to giving you the very best support in the industry, but it sure will help us zero in on your issue when you give us all information we need to understand the issue fully.
Thanks Guys and Good Gaming.

The Scenario List

Introductory and Rule refresh scenarios

#00_Started  Getting Started: The Advance to Cham - (WP vs AI)
#01_Blowing_Bridges  01: West Bank Started - Blowing Bridge - (NATO vs AI)
#02_Building_Bridges  02: East Bank Started - Bridge Building - (WP vs AI)
#03_WMD  03: WMD Demonstration - (Play Any Side)

Campaigns (longer and larger full battles)

#850610_01s_West_Germany  850610_01s: West Germany Invaded: War in 1985 (WP vs AI)
#850610_01sa_West_Germany  850610_01sa: West Germany Invaded: War in 1985 (HTH)
#850610_02s_Danube_Front  850610_02s: War on the Danube Front (WP vs AI)
#850610_02sa_Danube_Front  850610_02sa: War on the Danube Front - Short Campaign (HTH)
#850610_03s_Danube85_short  850610_03s: Danube Front Short Campaign (WP vs AI)
#850610_03sa_Danube85_short  850610_03sa: The Danube Front - Short Campaign (HTH)
#850610_04s_Danube_Front_Austria  850610_04s: The Danube Front with Austria (WP vs AI)
#850610_04sa_Danube_Front_Austria  850610_04sa: The Danube Front - Short Campaign (HTH)

Scenarios (shorter more manageable sized battles)

#850610_06_Bad_Kissingen  850610_06: The Eaglehorse at Bad Kissingen (WP vs AI)
#850610_06a_Bad_KissingenHTH  850610_06a: The Eaglehorse at Bad Kissingen (HTH)
#850610_08_Furth_Ardennes  850610_08: Ardennes of the 80s? (WP vs AI)
#850610_08a_Furth_ArdennesHTH  850610_08a: Ardennes of the 80s? (HTH)
#850610_09_Coburg  850610_09: Tale of Two Cities (WP vs AI)
#850610_09a_CoburgHTH  850610_09a: Tale of Two Cities (HTH)
#850610_09b_CoburgNATO  850610_09b: Tale of Two Cities (NATO vs AI)
#850610_10s_Berlin  850610_10s: Operation Stoss: The Battle for Berlin (WP vs AI)
#850610_10sa_BerlinHTH  850610_10sa: Operation Stoss: The Battle for Berlin (HTH)
#850610_10sb_BerlinNATO  850610_10sb: Operation Stoss: Berlin (NATO vs AI)
#850610_10sd_BerlinNATOPrepared  850610_10sd: Operation Werewolf: Berlin NATO Prepared (WP vs AI)
#850610_30s_AFNorth  850610_30s: AFNORTH: Battle for Schleswig-Holstein (WP vs AI)
#850610_30a_AFNorthHTH  850610_30a: AFNORTH: Battle for Schleswig-Holstein (HTH)
#850610_30b_AFNorthNATO  850610_30b: AFNORTH: Schleswig-Holstein (NATO vs AI)
#850611_01_Wurzburg  850611_01: Dropzone Wurzburg (WP vs AI)
#850611_01a_WurzburgHTH  850611_01a: Dropzone Wurzburg (HTH)
#850611_01b_WurzburgNATO  850611_01b: Dropzone Wurzburg (NATO vs AI)
#850611_02_Forsheim  850611_02: The Main Problem (WP vs AI)
#850611_02a_ForsheimHTH  850611_02a: The Main Problem (HTH)
#850611_02b_ForsheimNATO  850611_02b: The Main Problem (NATO vs AI)
#850612_01_Landshut  850612_01: High Road or Low Road? (WP vs AI)
#850612_01a_LandshutHTH  850612_01a: High Road or Low Road? (HTH)
#850612_01b_LandshutNATO  850612_01b: High Road or Low Road? (NATO vs AI)
#850614_01_Wurzburg_Counter  850614_01: The Hammer and Anvil (WP vs AI)
#850614_01a_Wurzburg_CounterHTH  850614_01a: The Hammer and Anvil (HTH)
#850614_01b_Wurzburg_CounterWP  850614_01b: The Hammer and Anvil (WP vs AI)
#850616_01_Heilbron  850616_01: The Neckar Grand Prix (WP vs AI)
#850616_01a_HeilbronHTH  850616_01a: The Neckar Grand Prix (HTH)
The Scenario Overviews

Getting Started: Advance to the Cham – (WP vs AI)

Southern Germany, June 10th 1985: Shots rang out all along the frontier as units of the Warsaw Pact began crossing into West Germany. A portion of the Czechoslovakian 2nd Motorized Rifle Div is pushing to cross the Regen river at Cham, on their way to a planned quick crossing of the Danube to the west. [Size: small] Designer Note: This scenario is designed for playing as Warsaw Pact Human vs. AI. Refer to the Started.HLP file for a quick start to this game and scenario.

01: West Bank Started – Blowing Bridges – (NATO vs AI)

Deggendorf, June 10 1985: There had been a flurry of orders when the indicators showed that an attack on a broad front by the Warsaw Pact was imminent. Engineer units were rushed to add explosives to the bridges in an attempt to stop their use by the enemy. Such was the case around Deggendorf where there were three bridges crossing the Danube. The engineers had broken all records and had just arrived on site, but the WP had an ace to be played, its airborne units. But where and when would it be played? Designer Note: This scenario has been designed to remind players how to prepare and blow full hex bridges. As such, a few adjustments to the main CG setup have been made.

02: East Bank Started - Bridge Building – (WP vs AI)

Near Deggendorf, June 10th 1985: The commander of the Czech 15th Mot Division was furious. He had been held up at the Danube waiting to cross for three hours, but he had managed to get a battalion across in boats, without their transport. The NATO engrs had been too efficient for the rapid advance to capture any of the three bridges at Deggendorf, even the paratroop close by had not helped, although they were grimly holding the bridgehead. The problem had been constant airstrikes, and the jammed roads through the forests, but now the bridging engineers were here. However, it was almost a certainty the Germans would counter attack soon. [Size, small] Designer Note: This scenario has been designed to remind players how to build full hex bridges. The main CG setup has been adjusted for this scenario.

03: WMD Demonstration – (Play Any Side)

Deggendorf, June 10 1985: There had been a flurry of orders when the indicators showed that an attack on a broad front by the Warsaw Pact was imminent. Engineer units were rushed to add explosives to the bridges in an attempt to stop their use by the enemy. Such was the case around Deggendorf where there were three bridges crossing the Danube. The engineers had broken all records and had just arrived on site, but the WP had other ideas, it could use Non Persistent chemicals on the bridge sites. However, the question was, how would NATO react to this escalation to WMD? Designer Note: This scenario has been designed to show players how to use WMD and can be played from any side with no real regard to the VPs. As such, a few adjustments to the main CG setup have been made.

850610_01s: West Germany Invaded: War in 1985 (WP vs AI)

West Germany, June 10th 1985: For four decades the armies of East and West had faced each other from across the Inter-German Border. Though initially allies, these forces had long ago become bitter rivals, each prepared to enter mortal combat with the other if need be. The armies of NATO, consisting of Land Forces Jutland (LANDJUT), the Central Army Group (CENTAG) and Northern Army Group (NORTHAG), were the single largest grouping of the Free World's military power on Earth. Comprising all
of the West German military, the NATO force also boasted the cream of the British Army in the British Army of the Rhine (BAOR), the finest of the US Army in its Vth and VIIth Corps, and the pick of the Dutch, Belgian, French, Danish and Canadian forces as well. Facing them were the best the Warsaw Pact could muster; 9 full armies comprised of troops from the Soviet Union, East Germany, Czechoslovakia and Poland. Over half a million men, 50,000 tanks, 10,000 guns and thousands of aircraft filled bases on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Each side husbanded stockpiles of fuel, ammunition, and supplies. All that remained was for a crisis to arise, and the order for war to be given. In the summer of 1985, that crisis arrived. The USSR launched its "Berserker Strategy" of attack from garrison, depending on complete surprise to gain the initial, crucial advantage over NATO. Through the Fulda, Hof, and Cheb Gaps, and across the North German Plain, the Red Forces surged, catching the West's guardians unprepared. In the far south, three armies drove for Munich, in the upper south, two armies drove towards Frankfurt and the heart of West Germany, in the mid-north, three armies crashed across the watery, wooded landscape towards the Ruhr and the Netherlands, while in the far north, two armies drove for Denmark. World War III in Europe had begun, and the fate of the Western alliance hung in the balance. [Size: huge] Designer Note: This is a special campaign that combines Fulda Gap '85, North German Plain '85, AFNORTH mod, Berlin mod & Danube '85 and has been optimized for WP vs AI play. Explicit Supply is possible.

850610_01s: West Germany Invaded: War in 1985 (HTH)

West Germany, June 10th 1985: For four decades the armies of East and West had faced each other from across the Inter-German Border. Though initially allies, these forces had long ago become bitter rivals, each prepared to enter mortal combat with the other if need be. The armies of NATO, consisting of Land Forces Jutland (LANDJUT), the Central Army Group (CENTAG) and Northern Army Group (NORTHAG), were the single largest grouping of the Free World's military power on Earth. Comprising all of the West German military, the NATO force also boasted the cream of the British Army in the British Army of the Rhine (BAOR), the finest of the US Army in its Vth and VIIth Corps, and the pick of the Dutch, Belgian, French, Danish and Canadian forces as well. Facing them were the best the Warsaw Pact could muster; 9 full armies comprised of troops from the Soviet Union, East Germany, Czechoslovakia and Poland. Over half a million men, 50,000 tanks, 10,000 guns and thousands of aircraft filled bases on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Each side husbanded stockpiles of fuel, ammunition, and supplies. All that remained was for a crisis to arise, and the order for war to be given. In the summer of 1985, that crisis arrived. The USSR launched its "Berserker Strategy" of attack from garrison, depending on complete surprise to gain the initial, crucial advantage over NATO. Through the Fulda, Hof, and Cheb Gaps, and across the North German Plain, the Red Forces surged, catching the West's guardians unprepared. In the far south, three armies drove for Munich, in the upper south, two armies drove towards Frankfurt and the heart of West Germany, in the mid-north, three armies crashed across the watery, wooded landscape towards the Ruhr and the Netherlands, while in the far north, two armies drove for Denmark. World War III in Europe had begun, and the fate of the Western alliance hung in the balance. [Size: huge] Designer Note: This is a special campaign that combines Fulda Gap '85, North German Plain '85, AFNORTH mod, Berlin mod & Danube '85 and has been optimized for HTH play. Explicit Supply is possible.

850610_02s: War on the Danube Front (WP vs AI)

The Danube Front - Southern Germany, June 10th 1985: For four decades the armies of East and West had faced each other across the Inter-German & Czechoslovak borders. Though initially allies, these forces had long ago become bitter rivals, each prepared to enter mortal combat with the other if need be. The armies of NATO were the single largest grouping of the Free World's military power on Earth. The NATO forces in south Germany consisted of the German II Korps, comprising 4 Divisions to include the elite 1st Gebirgsjaeger, the entire US VIIth Corps, and a strong showing of French and Canadian forces. Facing them were the resolute troops of the Warsaw Pact's Central Group of Forces; 2 Soviet Armies & 2
Czechoslovak Armies, plus southern elements of the GSFG. Tens of thousands of men, tanks, guns, and aircraft filled bases on both sides of this portion of the Iron Curtain. Each side husbanded stockpiles of fuel, ammunition, and supplies. All that remained was for a crisis to arise and the order for war to be given. In late spring 1985, that crisis arrived. The USSR launched its "Berserker Strategy" of attack from garrison, depending on surprise to gain the initial, crucial advantage over NATO. Through the Hof and Cheb Gaps, and across the Danube River the Red Forces surged, catching the West's guardians unprepared. The armies of the Warsaw Pact raced for the key bridges over the Danube & Main, intent on fanning out across Bavaria to "liberate" the region. World War III in Europe had begun, and the fate of the Western alliance hung in the balance. [Size: large] Designer note: This scenario has been optimized for WP vs AI. Explicit Supply is possible.

850610_02sa: War on the Danube Front (HTH)

The Danube Front - Southern Germany, June 10th 1985: For four decades the armies of East and West had faced each other across the Inter-German & Czechoslovak borders. Though initially allies, these forces had long ago become bitter rivals, each prepared to enter mortal combat with the other if need be. The armies of NATO were the single largest grouping of the Free World's military power on Earth. The NATO forces in south Germany consisted of the German II Korps comprising 4 Divisions to include the elite 1st Gebirgsjaeger, the entire US VIIth Corps, and a strong showing of French and Canadian forces. Facing them were the resolute troops of the Warsaw Pact's Central Group of Forces; 2 Soviet Armies & 2 Czechoslovak Armies, plus southern elements of the GSFG. Tens of thousands of men, tanks, guns, and aircraft filled bases on both sides of this portion of the Iron Curtain. Each side husbanded stockpiles of fuel, ammunition, and supplies. All that remained was for a crisis to arise, and the order for war to be given. In late spring 1985, that crisis arrived. The USSR launched its "Berserker Strategy" of attack from garrison, depending on surprise to gain the initial, crucial advantage over NATO. Through the Hof, and Cheb Gaps, and across the Danube River, the Red Forces surged, catching the West's guardians unprepared. The armies of the Warsaw Pact raced for the key bridges over the Danube & Main, intent on fanning out across Bavaria to "liberate" the region. World War III in Europe had begun, and the fate of the Western alliance hung in the balance. [Size: large] Designer Note: This scenario has been optimized for HTH play. Explicit Supply is possible.

850610_03s: 850610_03s: Danube Front Short Campaign (WP vs AI)

The Danube Front - Southern Germany, June 10th 1985: The armies of the Warsaw Pact raced for the key bridges over the Danube & Main, intent on fanning out across Bavaria to "liberate" the region. World War III in Europe had begun, and the fate of the Western alliance hung in the balance. This scenario is a shorter campaign focusing on the initial Warsaw Pact advance prior to NATO bringing the situation under control. Can the East overcome the NATO defenders before they have time to recover? [Size: large, but shorter than Main CG] Designer Note: This scenario has been optimized for WP vs AI. Explicit Supply is possible.

850610_03sa: The Danube Front - Short Campaign (HTH)

The Danube Front - Southern Germany, June 10th 1985: The armies of the Warsaw Pact raced for the key bridges over the Danube & Main, intent on fanning out across Bavaria to "liberate" the region. World War III in Europe had begun, and the fate of the Western alliance hung in the balance. This scenario is a shorter campaign focusing on the initial Warsaw Pact advance prior to NATO bringing the situation under control. Can the East overcome the NATO defenders before they have time to recover? [Size: large, but shorter than Main CG] Designer Note: This scenario has been optimized for HTH play. Explicit Supply is possible.
850610_04s: The Danube Front with Austria (WP vs AI)

The Danube Front - Southern Germany and Austria, June 10th 1985: The armies of the Warsaw Pact raced for the key bridges over the Danube in Southern Germany and Austria, intent on fanning out across Bavaria to "liberate" the region. World War III in Europe had begun, and the fate of the Western alliance hung in the balance. This scenario explores the campaign if the Warsaw Pact had have included an invasion of neutral Austria in its plan. How would this have affected the War? Would it stretch NATO's thin line to the breaking point? Or would it be the Warsaw Pact that may had bitten off more than it could chew. [Size: large] Designer Note: This scenario has been optimized for WP vs AI. Explicit Supply is possible.

850610_04sa: The Danube Front - Short Campaign (HTH)

The Danube Front - Southern Germany and Austria, June 10th 1985: The armies of the Warsaw Pact raced for the key bridges over the Danube in Southern Germany and Austria, intent on fanning out across Bavaria to "liberate" the region. World War III in Europe had begun, and the fate of the Western alliance hung in the balance. This scenario explores the campaign if the Warsaw Pact had have included an invasion of neutral Austria in its plan. How would this have affected the War? Would it stretch NATO's thin line to the breaking point? Or would it be the Warsaw Pact that may had bitten off more than it could chew. [Size: large] Designer Note: This scenario has been optimized for HTH play. Explicit Supply is possible.

850610_06: The Eaglehorse at Bad Kissingen (WP vs AI)

Bad Kissingen, June 10th 1985: As the Red Army swept across the frontier, surprising the NATO armies in their peace time deployment locations, it was the task of the 39th Guards Mot Rifle Divison to cover the left flank of the 8th Guards Army as they drove forward toward Fulda and Frankfurt. The task of the 39th was simple, drive forward, sweeping aside 'The Eaglehorse', the American 2/11 ACR garrison at Bad Kissingen, and cover the flank of the advancing 8th Guards Army protecting against NATO units driving north from Wurzburg. [Size, small] Designer Note: There is an exit hex in this scenario. While this scn has been inspired with Human vs. Human Play, we believe it will give a good fight in play against the AI from either side. Players looking for additional challenge can try 850610_06a for a Human Nato vs. the AI or 850610_06b for Human WP vs. the AI.

850610_06a: The Eaglehorse at Bad Kissingen (HTH)

Bad Kissingen, June 10th 1985: As the Red Army swept across the frontier, surprising the NATO armies in their peace time deployment locations, it was the task of the 39th Guards Mot Rifle Divison to cover the left flank of the 8th Guards Army as they drove forward toward Fulda and Frankfurt. The task of the 39th was simple, drive forward, sweeping aside 'The Eaglehorse', the American 2/11 ACR garrison at Bad Kissingen, and cover the flank of the advancing 8th Guards Army protecting against NATO units driving north from Wurzburg. [Size, small] Designer Note: This scenario has been optimized for HTH play. There is an exit hex in this scenario.

850610_06b: The Eaglehorse at Bad Kissingen (NATO vs AI)

Bad Kissingen, June 10th 1985: As the Red Army swept across the frontier, surprising the NATO armies in their peace time deployment locations, it was the task of the 39th Guards Mot Rifle Divison to cover the left flank of the 8th Guards Army, as they drove forward toward Fulda and Frankfurt. The task of the 39th was simple, drive forward, sweeping aside 'The Eaglehorse', the American 2/11 ACR garrison at Bad Kissingen, and cover the flank of the advancing 8th Guards Army protecting against NATO units driving
north from Wurzburg. [Size, small] Designer Note: This scenario has been optimized for Human NATO vs WP AI. There is an exit hex in this scenario.

**850610_08: Ardennes of the 80s? (WP vs AI)**

Southwest Germany, June 10th 1985: The area of operations in Bavaria is similar to the Ardennes, in so far as the Bayerischer and Bohmer Walds have the same terrain. NATO planners were mostly of the opinion that an attack here was very unlikely because of that terrain. The situation of a surprise attack is also similar, but there are differences too, the major ones being the density of forces and air superiority, particularly the use of helicopters. In this scenario, the 4th CSLA is tasked with moving through this country with the object of crossing the Danube and moving rapidly west. To win here, using surprise, they must move fast to exploit the situation before NATO can bring reserves to counter this attack. [Size, medium] Designer Note: This scenario has been optimized for WP vs AI.

**850610_08a: Ardennes of the 80s? (HTH)**

Southwest Germany, June 10th 1985: The area of operations in Bavaria is similar to the Ardennes, in so far as the Bayerischer and Bohmer Walds have the same terrain. NATO planners were mostly of the opinion that an attack here was very unlikely because of that terrain. The situation of a surprise attack is also similar, but there are differences too, the major ones being the density of forces and air neutrality, particularly the use of helicopters. In this scenario, the 4th CSLA is tasked with moving through this country with the object of crossing the Danube and moving rapidly west. To win here, using surprise, they must move fast to exploit the situation before NATO can bring reserves to counter this attack. NATO forces start with a lot of Fixed units and must use their assets wisely until reinforcements arrive. [Size, medium] Designer Note: This scenario has been optimized for HTH play.

**850610_08b: Ardennes of the 80s? (NATO vs AI)**

Southwest Germany, June 10th 1985: The area of operations in Bavaria is similar to the Ardennes, in so far as the Bayerischer and Bohmer Walds have the same terrain. NATO planners were mostly of the opinion that an attack here was very unlikely because of that terrain. The situation of a surprise attack is also similar, but there are differences too, the major ones being the density of forces and a neutral air superiority, particularly the use of helicopters. In this scenario, the 4th CSLA is tasked with moving through this country with the object of crossing the Danube and moving rapidly west, we join the attack already in progress for a few hours. To win here, NATO must use their screening forces wisely until reserves can be rushed from the west. [Size, medium] Designer Note: To optimize this scenario for NATO vs AI, more units were added to the WP and the start time adjusted slightly.

**850610_09: Tale of Two Cities (WP vs AI)**

Main and Itz river valleys, 45kms N of Nurnberg, June 10th 1985: NATO was under some pressure from the West German government to not give up ground as easily as had been happening in the first few hours of the battle. The Germans were fighting for their homeland, not some foreign country where they were posted for a couple of years. In the area north of Nurnberg, the ancient city of Coburg had already been given up, and the next historic city to go would be Bamberg, unless some sort of action was taken. It was decided to use the troops already in the area to blunt the 20th Motor Rifle Division's advance, at least until Bamberg could be more readily defended. [Size, small] Designer Note: This scenario has been optimized for Human WP vs AI.

**850610_09a: Tale of Two Cities (HTH)**
Main and Itz river valleys, 45kms N of Nurnberg, June 10th 1985: NATO was under some pressure from the West German government to not give up ground as easily as had been happening in the first few hours of the battle. The Germans were fighting for their homeland, not some foreign country where they were posted for a couple of years. In the area north of Nurnberg, the ancient city of Coburg had already been given up, and the next historic city to go would be Bamberg, unless some sort of action was taken. It was decided to use the troops already in the area to blunt the 20th Motor Rifle Division's advance, at least until Bamberg could be more readily defended. [Size, small] Designer Note: This scenario has been optimized for Human vs Human play.

850610_09b: Tale of Two Cities (NATO vs AI)

850610_10s: Operation Stoss: The Battle for Berlin (WP vs AI)

Berlin, June 10th 1985: The political importance of Berlin cannot be overstated; the city sits like a thorn in the side of the Warsaw Pact. It is from Berlin that the West broadcasts messages of freedom unabated into the East Bloc heartland, attempting to sow doubt in the minds of East German people over the validity of their system. It is from Berlin that the despised US, UK, and French Military Liaison Missions venture out into the DDR on their continual quest to detect, monitor, track and evaluate WP military activities, ever vigilant for signs of war. It is from Berlin that the hated spies of the West depart on their missions to pilfer the hard earned data, documents, and intelligence that the East has laboured so hard to attain in the race to show the better form of government. It is the cordonning off of Berlin with a huge wall, its defences facing outward to prevent East German people from defecting, that remains an unexplainable and undeniably huge question mark casting doubt on the utopian claims of the Soviet system. For all these reasons, and more, the city must be taken! However, an assault on Berlin will ipso facto draw the forces of the United States, United Kingdom, and France as well as the sovereign territory of West Germany into the war. One WARPAC option could be to simply surround Berlin with combat units thereby sealing the city off. This solution solves several sticky points, it prevents an outright attack on the French, leaving the possibility of France not entering a war, it prevents street fighting and the commensurate high casualties that come with that form of warfare, as well as prevents inevitable collateral civilian casualties (casualties that the west will play upon to show WARPAC callousness and sway world opinion), and it will free more WARPAC forces to head westward to aid in the main war effort. As attractive as this plan may seem, it is not viable, symbolically, Berlin must be taken. Further, it cannot be ruled out whether or not NATO tactical nuclear weapons are in Berlin, such weapons, if used, could easily disrupt the critical WARPAC supply lines that run to the north and south of the city, or strike the GSFG Headquarters complex, a scant 15 miles south of the city. The city must be taken! As dawn breaks on 10 June, the defenders of Berlin are on alert. When the Warsaw Pact attack comes, it will not be a question of if Berlin can hold, but of how many WARPAC forces it will take, and how long they must fight to reduce the city's defenses. Every minute Berlin stands free; the West will see a beacon of light in a sea of darkness. [Size, small] Designer's Notes: This scenario includes the East German Frontier Troops that encircle Berlin as well as NATO Police units. There is no doubt that the Berlin garrison will die.
Therefore, this scenario is about how efficiently the WarPac player can capture West Berlin. Special thanks to Mark Breed for his assistance. This scenario has optimized for WP vs. NATO AI play.

850610_10sa: Operation Stoss: The Battle for Berlin (HTH)

Berlin, June 10th 1985: The political importance of Berlin cannot be overstated; the city sits like a thorn in the side of the Warsaw Pact. It is from Berlin that the West broadcasts messages of freedom unabated into the East Bloc heartland, attempting to sow doubt in the minds of East German people over the validity of their system. It is from Berlin that the despised US, UK, and French Military Liaison Missions venture out into the DDR on their continual quest to detect, monitor, track and evaluate WP military activities, ever vigilant for signs of war. It is from Berlin that the hated spies of the West depart on their missions to pilfer the hard earned data, documents, and intelligence that the East has labored so hard to attain in the race to show the better form of government. It is the cordonning off of Berlin with a huge wall, its defenses facing outward to prevent East German people from defecting that remains an unexplainable and undeniably huge question mark casting doubt on the utopian claims of the Soviet system. For all these reasons, and more, the city must be taken! However, an assault on Berlin will, ipso-facto, draw the forces of the United States, United Kingdom, and France as well as the sovereign territory of West Germany into the war. One WARPAC option could be to simply surround Berlin with combat units thereby sealing the city off. This solution solves several sticky points, it prevents an outright attack on the French, leaving the possibility of France not entering a war, it prevents street fighting and the commensurate high casualties that come with that form of warfare, as well as prevents inevitable collateral civilian casualties (casualties that the west will play upon to show WARPAC callousness and sway world opinion), and it will free more WARPAC forces to head westward to aid in the main war effort. As attractive as this plan may seem, it is not viable, symbolically, Berlin must be taken. Further, it cannot be ruled out whether or not NATO tactical nuclear weapons are in Berlin, such weapons, if used, could easily disrupt the critical WARPAC supply lines that run to the north and south of the city, or strike the GSFG Headquarters complex, a scant 15 miles south of the city. The city must be taken! As dawn breaks on 10 June, the defenders of Berlin are on alert. When the Warsaw Pact attack comes, it will not be a question of if Berlin can hold, but of how many WARPAC forces it will take, and how long they must fight to reduce the city's defenses. Every minute Berlin stands free; the West will see a beacon of light in a sea of darkness. [Size, small] Designer's Notes: This scenario includes the East German Frontier Troops that encircle Berlin as well as NATO Police units. There is no doubt that the Berlin garrison will die. Therefore, this scenario is about how efficiently the WarPac player can capture West Berlin. Special thanks to Mark Breed for his assistance. This scenario has been optimized for HTH play.

850610_10sb: Operation Stoss: Berlin (NATO vs AI)

Berlin, June 10th 1985: The political importance of Berlin cannot be overstated; the city sits like a thorn in the side of the Warsaw Pact. It is from Berlin that the West broadcasts messages of freedom unabated into the East Bloc heartland, attempting to sow doubt in the minds of East German people over the validity of their system. It is from Berlin that the despised US, UK, and French Military Liaison Missions venture out into the DDR on their continual quest to detect, monitor, track and evaluate WP military activities, ever vigilant for signs of war. It is from Berlin that the hated spies of the West depart on their missions to pilfer the hard earned data, documents, and intelligence that the East has labored so hard to attain in the race to show the better form of government. It is the cordonning off of Berlin with a huge wall, its defenses facing outward to prevent East German people from defecting that remains an unexplainable
and undeniably huge question mark casting doubt on the utopian claims of the Soviet system. For all these reasons, and more, the city must be taken! However, an assault on Berlin will, ipso-facto, draw the forces of the United States, United Kingdom, and France as well as the sovereign territory of West Germany into the war. One WARPAC option could be to simply surround Berlin with combat units whereby sealing the city off. This solution solves several sticky points, it prevents an outright attack on the French, leaving the possibility of France not entering a war, it prevents street fighting and the commensurate high casualties that come with that form of warfare, as well as prevents inevitable collateral civilian casualties (casualties that the west will play upon to show WARPAC callousness and sway world opinion), and it will free more WARPAC forces to head westward to aid in the main war effort. As attractive as this plan may seem, it is not viable, symbolically, Berlin must be taken. Further, it cannot be ruled out whether or not NATO tactical nuclear weapons are in Berlin, such weapons, if used, could easily disrupt the critical WARPAC supply lines that run to the north and south of the city, or strike the GSFG Headquarters complex, a scant 15 miles south of the city. The city must be taken! As dawn breaks on 10 June, the defenders of Berlin are on alert. When the Warsaw Pact attack comes, it will not be a question of if Berlin can hold, but of how many WARPAC forces it will take, and how long they must fight to reduce the city's defenses. Every minute Berlin stands free; the West will see a beacon of light in a sea of darkness. [Size, small] Designer's Notes: This scenario includes the East German Frontier Troops that encircle Berlin as well as NATO Police units. There is no doubt that the Berlin garrison will die. Therefore, this scenario is about how efficiently the WarPac player can capture West Berlin. Special thanks to Mark Breed for his assistance. This scenario has been optimized for Human NATO vs WP AI play.

850610_10s: Operation Werewolf: Berlin NATO Prepared (WP vs AI)

Berlin, June 10th 1985, 'Operation Werewolf': Political tensions have been growing more stressed while Warsaw Pact units continue their maneuvers. The Berlin garrison is on alert. During the past week large containers, arriving at all three Berlin airports, have been taken away to the military training areas west of the city. Trains have brought tarpaulin covered flatcars into the city, their contents unknown. Even though the political crisis has people nervous, the tourism industry does not seem to be affected at all, as hundreds of young men in ill fitting sport-coats continue to arrive. What few people know is that these young men belong to the West German 52nd Heimatshuetzenbrigade and US 10th Special Forces. NATO has a surprise for the Warsaw Pact should they decide that now is the time to start a war. Operation Werewolf is under way. Special thanks to Mark Breed for his assistance. [Size, small] Designer's Note: This scenario has been optimized for WP vs AI play.

850610_11s: Swatting Flies in the South (WP vs AI)

Austria, June 10th 1985: This scenario covers the possible WARPAC invasion of Austria as a flanking maneuver into southern Germany. While a strike through Austria may look attractive at first glance, the drawback for the WARPAC is that the Soviet units allocated to the invasion are scattered, in various bases almost 500km away, resulting in a long road march just to reach the battlefield. The solution for the WARPAC was to put a unit 'on maneuvers' near the Austrian border. The Austrians for their part could be expected to make a decent showing until the Danube was breached. After that, the situation would collapse, with WARPAC forces racing across central Austria to reach deep into NATO's Southern flank, while "swatting the flies" that remained in their path. [Size: Medium] Designer note: Although technically 'neutral', Austrian units move and fight under the NATO player's command. Explicit Supply is possible. This scenario has been optimized for WP vs AI.

850610_11sa: Swatting Flies in the South (HTH)
Austria, June 10th 1985: This scenario covers the possible WARPAC invasion of Austria as a flanking maneuver into southern Germany. While a strike through Austria may look attractive at first glance, the drawback for the WARPAC is that the Soviet units allocated to the invasion are scattered, in various bases almost 500km away, resulting in a long road march just to reach the battlefield. The solution for the WARPAC was to put a unit 'on maneuvers' near the Austrian border. The Austrians for their part could be expected to make a decent showing until the Danube was breached. After that, the situation would collapse, with WARPAC forces racing across central Austria to reach deep into NATO's Southern flank, while "swatting the flies" that remained in their path. [Size: Medium] Designer note: Although technically 'neutral', Austrian units move & fight under the NATO player's command. Explicit Supply is possible. This scenario has been optimized for HTH play.

850610_12: The Lull before the Storm (WP vs AI)

Schweinfurt, June 10th 1985: In the northern part of the battle, the two Soviet 8th Army divisions involved had suffered different fortunes. The 39th GMRD had clashed with NATO units around Bad Kissingen and both sides had taken losses, but they were hoping to be able to push on. However, in the 79th GTD area there had been little opposition, except for airstrikes, so they were pressing on to Schweinfurt. The US 3rd ID (M)'s 1st Brigade was situated right in the path of the Soviets. They had just moved out, to hopefully stop the 79th GTD in its tracks, but had little idea of the direction of the main Soviet advance. It was the "Lull Before the Storm". [Size, small] Designer's Note: This scenario has designed for WP vs. AI play.

850610_12a: The Lull before the Storm (HTH)

Schweinfurt, June 10th 1985: In the northern part of the battle, the two Soviet 8th Army divisions involved had suffered different fortunes. The 39th GMRD had clashed with NATO units around Bad Kissingen and both sides had taken losses, but they were hoping to be able to push on. However, in the 79th GTD area there had been little opposition, except for airstrikes, so they were pressing on to Schweinfurt. The US 3rd ID (M)'s 1st Brigade was situated right in the path of the Soviets. They had just moved out, to hopefully stop the 79th GTD in its tracks, but had little idea of the direction of the main Soviet advance. It was the "Lull Before the Storm". [Size, small] Designer's Note: This scenario has designed for HTH play.

850610_12b: The Lull before the Storm (NATO vs AI)

Schweinfurt, June 10th 1985: In the northern part of the battle, the two Soviet 8th Army divisions involved had suffered different fortunes. The 39th GMRD had clashed with NATO units around Bad Kissingen and both sides had taken losses, but they were hoping to be able to push on. However, in the 79th GTD area there had been little opposition, except for airstrikes, so they were pressing on to Schweinfurt. The US 3rd ID (M)'s 1st Brigade was situated right in the path of the Soviets. They were just moving out, to hopefully stop the 79th GTD in its tracks, but had little idea of the direction of the main Soviet advance. It was the "Lull Before the Storm". [Size, small] Designer's Note: This scenario has designed for NATO vs. AI play.

850610_30s: AFNORTH: Battle for Schleswig-Holstein (WP vs NATO AI)

West Germany, June 10th 1985: The Soviet "Berserker Strategy" for the Warsaw Pact's assault on NATO involved several key elements. One was the thrust by 8th Guards Army, 1st Tank Army, and 3rd DDR Army through the Fulda Gap. Another was the drive by 20th Guards Army, 3rd Shock Army, and 2nd Guards Tank Army through the northern sector of the NATO front (NORTHAG). Additionally, WARPAC plans were to secure Schleswig-Holstein and Denmark, known as the Baltic Approaches (BALTAP), with a thrust through Luebeck and up the peninsula by the 5th DDR and 4th Polish Armies. This attack would
be supported by an assortment of Naval and Airborne forces. Two goals would be achieved in capturing the BALTP; the Soviet Navy could sortie into the North Sea, and it would provide forward bases for air raids on the UK and North Atlantic. Defending this area would be AFNORTH, a small collection of Bundeswehr and Danish Army units. NATO relied heavily on reinforcement for this sector. As night fell, communist units moved out of their barracks to their staging areas. By the time AFNORTH got the call to mobilize and deploy, it was too late; this would be a 'come as you are' fight. NATO reinforcements would be hard pressed to make it into battle in time. [Size: medium] Designer Note: This scenario has been optimized for WP vs NATO AI. Exit VP hexes are for DDR units in the northeast and Poland to the west. Explicit Supply is possible. Under strength at start units represent FRG units still mobilizing.

850610_30sa: AFNORTH: Battle for Schleswig-Holstein (HTH)

West Germany, June 10th 1985: The Soviet "Berserker Strategy" for the Warsaw Pact's assault on NATO involved several key elements. One was the thrust by 8th Guards Army, 1st Tank Army, and 3rd DDR Army through the Fulda Gap. Another was the drive by 20th Guards Army, 3rd Shock Army, and 2nd Guards Tank Army through the northern sector of the NATO front (NORTHAG). Additionally, WARPAC plans were to secure Schleswig-Holstein and Denmark, known as the Baltic Approaches (BALTP), with a thrust through Luebeck and up the peninsula by the 5th DDR and 4th Polish Armies. This attack would be supported by an assortment of Naval and Airborne forces. Two goals would be achieved in capturing the BALTP; the Soviet Navy could sortie into the North Sea, and it would provide forward bases for air raids on the UK and North Atlantic. Defending this area would be AFNORTH, a small collection of Bundeswehr and Danish Army units. NATO relied heavily on reinforcement for this sector. As night fell, communist units moved out of their barracks to their staging areas. By the time AFNORTH got the call to mobilize and deploy, it was too late; this would be a 'come as you are' fight. NATO reinforcements would be hard pressed to make it into battle in time. [Size: medium] Designer Note: This scenario has been optimized for WP vs NATO AI. Exit VP hexes are for DDR units in the northeast and Poland to the west. Explicit Supply is possible. Under strength at start units represent FRG units still mobilizing.

850610_30sb: AFNORTH: Schleswig-Holstein (NATO vs AI)

West Germany, June 10th 1985: The Soviet "Berserker Strategy" for the Warsaw Pact's assault on NATO involved several key elements. One was the thrust by 8th Guards Army, 1st Tank Army, and 3rd DDR Army through the Fulda Gap. Another was the drive by 20th Guards Army, 3rd Shock Army, and 2nd Guards Tank Army through the northern sector of the NATO front (NORTHAG). Additionally, WARPAC plans were to secure Schleswig-Holstein and Denmark, known as the Baltic Approaches (BALTP), with a thrust through Luebeck and up the peninsula by the 5th DDR and 4th Polish Armies. This attack would be supported by an assortment of Naval and Airborne forces. Two goals would be achieved in capturing the BALTP; the Soviet Navy could sortie into the North Sea, and it would provide forward bases for air raids on the UK and North Atlantic. Defending this area would be AFNORTH, a small collection of Bundeswehr and Danish Army units. NATO relied heavily on reinforcement for this sector. As night fell, communist units moved out of their barracks to their staging areas. By the time AFNORTH got the call to mobilize and deploy, it was too late; this would be a 'come as you are' fight. NATO reinforcements would be hard pressed to make it into battle in time. [Size: medium] Designer Note: This scenario has been optimized for NATO vs WP AI. Exit VP hexes are for DDR units in the northeast and Poland to the west. Explicit Supply is possible. Under strength at start units represent FRG units still mobilizing.

850611_01: Dropzone Wurzburg (WP vs AI)

Wurzburg, 0300 June 11th 1985: Elements of the 3rd US Infantry Division were beginning to stabilize the Schweinfurt area after a long night battle with the 79th Guards Tank Div around Schweinfurt. But
unknown to Allied Command, the Warsaw Pact was getting ready to unleash an airborne strike aimed at the area NE of Wurzburg. For NATO, it was going to be another long day. [Size, small] Designer's Note: This scenario has optimized for WP vs. AI play.

850611_01a: Dropzone Wurzburg (HTH)

Wurzburg, 0300 June 11th 1985: Elements of the 3rd US Infantry Division were beginning to stabilize the Schweinfurt area after a long night battle with the 79th Guards Tank Div around Schweinfurt. But unknown to Allied Command, the Warsaw Pact was getting ready to unleash an airborne strike aimed at the area NE of Wurzburg. For NATO, it was going to be another long day. [Size, small] Designer's Note: This scenario has optimized for HTH play.

850611_01b: Dropzone Wurzburg (NATO vs AI)

Wurzburg, 0300 June 11th 1985: Elements of the 3rd US Infantry Division were beginning to stabilize the Schweinfurt area after a long night battle with the 79th Guards Tank Div around Schweinfurt. But unknown to Allied Command, the Warsaw Pact was getting ready to unleash an airborne strike aimed at the area NE of Wurzburg. For NATO, it was going to be another long day. [Size, small] Designer's Note: This scenario has optimized for NATO vs. AI play.

850611_02: The Main Problem (WP vs AI)

Forsheim, 20 kms N of Nurnberg, June 11th 1985: The 1st Guards Tank Army's two tank divisions were positioned between Bamberg and Forsheim, dusk was falling and groups of bridging engineers were eagerly awaiting darkness. The Main river was the obstacle to be crossed that night, as many of the crossings had been blown. The WP was creating diversions to hopefully deceive NATO of their true intent. The problem for NATO was their thin line was cracking, but there were reinforcements on the way... if they could just hold for now. [Size, small] Designer Note: This scenario has been optimized for Human WP vs AI.

850611_02a: The Main Problem (HTH)

Forsheim, 20 kms N of Nurnberg, June 11th 1985: The 1st Guards Tank Army's two tank divisions were positioned between Bamberg and Forsheim, dusk was falling and groups of bridging engineers were eagerly awaiting darkness. The Main river was the obstacle to be crossed that night, as many of the crossings had been blown. The WP was creating diversions to hopefully deceive NATO of their true intent. The problem for NATO was their thin line was cracking, but there were reinforcements on the way... if they could just hold for now. [Size, small] Designer Note: This scenario has been optimized for Human vs Human play.

850611_02b: The Main Problem (NATO vs AI)

Forsheim, 20 kms N of Nurnberg, June 11th 1985: The 1st Guards Tank Army's two Tank Divisions were positioned between Bamberg and Forsheim, dusk was falling and groups of bridging engineers were eagerly awaiting darkness. The Main river was the obstacle to be crossed that night, as many of the crossings had been blown. The WP was creating diversions to hopefully deceive NATO of their true intent. The problem for NATO was their thin line was cracking, but there were reinforcements on the way... if they could just hold for now. [Size, small] Designer Note: This scenario has been optimized for Human NATO vs WP AI.

850612_01: High Road or Low Road? (WP vs AI)
50 kms east of Munich, June 12th 1985: For the first two days the attack in the south had gone reasonably well, but many roads were jammed, or mined, and a lot of bridges were damaged. As a result there were Czech units spread all the way back to the Danube. During the night, the Czech 4th Army commander made the decision to halt and regroup. Fortunately his rear echelons with fuel and ammunition were efficient, as were the tank recovery crews. By noon the next day the plan had been changed to punch a hole through the thin German line with 3rd Czech MRD, then launch the rested 9th Tank Div loose in the enemy's rear. The choice of whether to go to High to the NW, or Low to the SW to be made later. This short respite was welcomed by the Germans who had units trying to set up a front line, as they waited for reinforcements coming from either Ingolstadt or west of Munich, to try to stem the tide. [Size, medium] Designer Note: This scenario has been optimized for Human WP vs AI.

850612_01a: High Road or Low Road? (HTH)

50 kms east of Munich, June 12th 1985: For the first two days the attack in the south had gone reasonably well, but many roads were jammed, or mined, and a lot of bridges were damaged. As a result there were Czech units spread all the way back to the Danube. During the night, the Czech 4th Army commander made the decision to halt and regroup. Fortunately his rear echelons with fuel and ammunition were efficient, as were the tank recovery crews. By noon the next day the plan had been changed to punch a hole through the thin German line with 3rd Czech MRD, then launch the rested 9th Tank Div loose in the enemy's rear. The choice of whether to go to High to the NW, or Low to the SW to be made later. This short respite was welcomed by the Germans who had units trying to set up a front line, as they waited for reinforcements coming from either Ingolstadt, or west of Munich, to try to stem the tide. [Size, medium] Designer Note: This scenario has been optimized for HTH play.

850612_01b: High Road or Low Road? (NATO vs AI)

50 kms east of Munich, June 12th 1985: For the first two days the attack in the south had gone reasonably well, but many roads were jammed, or mined, and a lot of bridges were damaged. As a result there were Czech units spread all the way back to the Danube. During the night, the Czech 4th Army commander made the decision to halt and regroup. Fortunately his rear echelons with fuel and ammunition were efficient, as were the tank recovery crews. By noon the next day the plan had been changed to punch a hole through the thin German line with 3rd Czech MRD, then launch the rested 9th Tank Div loose in the enemy's rear. The choice of whether to go to High to the NW, or Low to the SW to be made later. This short respite was welcomed by the Germans who had units trying to set up a front line, as they waited for reinforcements coming from either Ingolstadt, or west of Munich, to try to stem the tide. [Size, medium] Designer Note: This scenario has been optimized for NATO human vs WP AI.

850614_01: The Hammer and Anvil (WP vs AI)

Bad Kissingen area, June 14th 1985: Almost five days into the battle and the NATO intelligence assessments seemed too good to be true. They were showing a large gap in the front between the 8th GA and the 1st GTA. More importantly, the 39th GMRD and the 79th GTD had taken up a defensive posture, to recover the losses taken from their aggressive advance in the north of the area. NATO had parts of the 12 PzD and the 2nd Arm'd Cav partially rested and ready to exploit the situation. The plan was to approach at night, then cross the Main with both units at dawn, swing 12 Pz to the NW and, initially, use the 2nd as a screen to the SE. 12 Pz would then become a hammer to squash 8th GA onto the US 3rd (M) ID's anvil. However, there was a chance that the WP would hit them in the flank from the E, if they could find the reserves. [Size, medium] Designer Note: This scenario has been optimized for NATO human vs WP AI.
850614_01a: The Hammer and Anvil (HTH)

Bad Kissingen area, June 14th 1985: Almost five days into the battle and the NATO intelligence assessments seemed too good to be true. They were showing a large gap in the front between the 8th GA and the 1st GTA. More importantly, the 39th GMRD and the 79th GTD had taken up a defensive posture, to recover the losses taken from their aggressive advance in the north of the area. NATO had parts of some armored units partially rested and ready to exploit the situation. WP units had taken a defensive posture and had been regrouping. [Size, medium] Designer Note: This scenario has been optimized for NATO human vs WP Human.

850614_01b: The Hammer and Anvil (WP vs AI)

Bad Kissingen area, June 14th 1985: Almost five days into the battle and the WP intelligence assessments seemed not too good. They were showing a large gap in the front between the 8th GA and the 1st GTA. More importantly, the 39th GMRD and the 79th GTD had taken up a defensive posture, to recover the losses taken from their aggressive advance in the north of the area. NATO seemed to have parts of some armored units partially rested and ready to exploit the situation. All units were on the alert, waiting for the expected counter attack. [Size, medium] Designer Note: This scenario has been optimized for Side 2 WP human defender vs a NATO AI on the attack.

850616_01: The Neckar Grand Prix (WP vs AI)

Near Stuttgart, June 16th 1985: What if the WP attack in Southern Germany had been a limited success? "If" that had been the case, units of the 1st CSLA were sprinting towards the Neckar River to try to capture the bridges at Heilbron and south west to Stuttgart. There were few NATO units in their path and, they 'believed', nothing on their flanks. NATO were swiftly trying to organize resistance to this headlong dash towards the Neckar. [Size, medium] Designer Note: This scenario has been optimized for WP Human vs. NATO AI. In this scenario there are 5 Operations from which NATO has to choose. Each one varies from the others, and each has a different number of units and make up of NATO allies. Remember most of the NATO units can be broken down into company size.

850616_01a: The Neckar Grand Prix WP (HTH)

Near Stuttgart, June 16th 1985: What if the WP attack in Southern Germany had been a limited success? "If" that had been the case, units of the 1st CSLA were sprinting towards the Neckar River to try to capture the bridges at Heilbron and south west to Stuttgart. There were few NATO units in their path and, they 'believed', nothing on their flanks. NATO were swiftly trying to organize resistance to this headlong dash towards the Neckar. [Size, medium] Designer Note: This scenario has been optimized for WP Human vs. NATO Human. In this scenario there are 5 Operations from which NATO has to choose. Each one varies from the others, and each has a different number of units and make up of NATO allies. Remember most of the NATO units can be broken down into company size.

850616_01b: The Neckar Grand Prix (NATO vs AI)

Near Stuttgart, June 16th 1985: What if the WP attack in Southern Germany had been a limited success? "If" that had been the case, units of the 1st CSLA were sprinting towards the Neckar River to try to capture the bridges at Heilbron and south west to Stuttgart. There were few NATO units in their path trying to block this headlong dash towards the Neckar. [Size, medium] Designer Note: This scenario has been optimized for NATO Human vs. WP AI. In this scenario there are 5 Operations from which NATO has to choose. Each one varies from the others, and each has a different number of units and make up of NATO allies. Remember most of the NATO units can be broken down into company size.
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http://www.usmlm.org

Scramble on the Web: All the World’s Air Forces
http://www.scramble.nl/index.html
Google Earth - www.maps.google.com
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