IMPROVING PACIFIC WAR
Markus Stumptner
99-09-02

These are the house rules our group uses to play Pacific War. They are divided into three sections. Section I deals with important alterations that we consider necessary for play. Section II deals with "chrome" and experimental rules. Section III lists rules developed by other players or published in the General, and which we use.

I. NECESSARY ALTERATIONS

Over time, our playings of the campaign game have uncovered some issues in the Pacific War campaign game that directly influence the validity of the game as a historical simulation. The result is that we now play the game in an improved version that incorporates a number of house rules, and this has greatly increased our enjoyment in what was already a top product originally. The changes we made satisfy five (to us) important criteria:
- they correct loopholes in the rules which reward strongly ahistorical behavior by players
- they are SHORT - there is no increase in playing time or recordkeeping
- they have been tested using multiple scenarios and partial campaign games (although the campaign games we started after most of the changes were introduced have not progressed into the second half of the war yet)
- they are cautious, i.e., whenever there was a discussion whether the alteration was sufficient, we chose to err on the side closer to the original design.
- they are significant, i.e., they are not mere chrome, but exercise a direct influence on the strategic planning of the players (with the naval combat rule being the exception).
The last remark does not mean that we feel the game is not good unless it has been significantly altered, but that unless an alteration was significant, it was better to leave the original alone. If it ain't broke, don't fix it. Note that the first rule change below (which is clearly the most momentous one) is in our opinion also the one most needed to give the full campaign (the Strategic Scenarios) more historical accuracy.
The section below presents the rules. The historical (and game-related) rationale for the rules follows afterwards.

Rule changes

1. Ground Unit Movement (19L-7):
During battle cycles, ground units can only move once per week. The player can choose in which particular battle cycle to move. Contact phase movement does not count against this limit. Each unit can only be involved in combat as attacker once per week (on the first turn when the standard conditions for combat apply). Unloading and loading a ground unit in one week or vice versa is allowed if no ground combat occurs in between. An empty installation is considered overrun even if a ground unit ends its move in the hex via naval movement but does not unload.
Each player can move one division by railroad movement (that is, by continuous movement along roads or clear hexes) inside India, between Rangoon and China, and in Australia south of Cairns during the Strategic Transport Phase.

Note: weeks are already kept track of on the Time Display by the Op End markers. Only the first week of an operation is not marked on the track by an explicit marker. We use the inverted Penalty time marker for this purpose.
Note also that the rule does not limit combat in a hex to happen once per week. After a unit has attacked in a hex, a new force of the same side (that has not attacked this week) that enters the hex will still have the choice to attack or deactivate in the next ground combat phase. The unit that attacked previously will not take part in the attack.
Finally, note that the requirements for movement and combat are independent, i.e., a unit that starts a week in a hex with an enemy, attacks, and remains alone in the hex after combat, can still move in that week (although it cannot initiate combat again before next week even if it should move into another enemy-held hex). During the first month at least, we've found it advantageous to put markers on them (choose any from any other game), since there's more going on at the same time than in any later month. The increase in the fumble factor is offset by the fact that now you don't move or attack so often. In general though we haven't found using the markers a necessity.

2. Air strikes against ports and fortresses (27L-4).
Air attacks on ports and fortresses are not made on the AIR VS INSTALLATION line of the Air/Naval Combat Results Table, but on the AIR VS GROUND UNIT line. For the purpose of these attacks, a 'T' result is interpreted as '1', '1' as '2', '2' as '3'. Attacks on air bases and OSB's ("soft installations") use the AIR VS INSTALLATION line.
During the first operation of the Strategic Scenario, the AIR VS INSTALLATION line is also used against the Allied port which is the target of Special Rule 6. (the "Pearl Harbor" attack) to simulate the special surprise conditions.
The Singapore fortress is rated as having 10 steps instead of 3 and is rated 2-4-10 for gunnery.

3. Special 4E bomber effects:
Any 4E air unit attacking a ground unit uses its NAVAL rating instead of its ground rating.
The range of 4E air units does not increase from 20 to 26 hexes in June 1942 (as specified by Special Rule 7 of the Strategic Scenario). Instead, it increases by 2 hexes to 22 and by 2 hexes every June thereafter (i.e., it reaches the maximum of 26 hexes in June 1944).

4. Submarine Combat (23R-2).
ASW-capable units in a TF attacked by submarines can screen against submarine attacks.
After the submarine player has rolled to determine the number of actual attacks and assigned a target to each eligible attack, the owning player can use each unit described above to screen against one attack. Not more than one unit can screen against one attack (but if multiple escorts are present, each can screen against a separate attack).
The success of the screening is checked by rolling against the unit's ASW rating). A 'hit' result means that attack does not take place, but no damage marker is placed on the submarine.
ASW combat is performed normally after all submarine attacks have been executed (or averted).
Damage and ASW strength: The ASW value of a DD or DE unit does not decrease with every hit. Rather, it decreases by 1 when the unit has suffered 3 hits, and again when the unit has suffered 5.

5. Task force organization and target selection in naval surface combat.

No unit other than a DD or DE may be placed in the screen of a task force unless no DE or DD is in the core of the task force. AA's (but not APD's) and all CV, CVL, CVE, CVS, and ST units must *always* be in the core of a Task Force.

In naval combat, all screen units must be placed on the Naval Display before any core units are placed.

The following restrictions apply to target selection for naval gunfire:

- Only BB's and BC's may fire at BB's at long range.
- Only CA's, BB's, and BC's may fire at BB's at medium range, or at CA's, BC's, CV's, and US CL's at long range.
- DD's cannot use gunfire against BB's at any range.
- CA's, BB's, and BC's firing at DD's and APD's at night have their gunnery rating reduced by 1.

Note: There are no such restrictions on torpedo targeting.

6. Submarines

All submarines except for the STO submarine cannot search (not even in their own hex). The STO submarine cannot search on the first turn of the Strategic Scenario.

7. Airfield construction.

Airfield construction cannot be aborted by breaking the constructing engineer unit. Airfield construction is aborted by gaining the requisite five hits on the airfield under construction, UNLESS the constructing player pays another 2 (Japanese player) or 4 (Allied player) command points immediately. If the CP's are paid, the damage markers are removed.

Discussion

1. The rule on moving units only once per week basically drops ground unit movement during battle cycles to a quarter of the original value. This is a drastic change that we introduced because it became obvious to us that the ahistoric rapidity of ground movement strongly skewed play in the Strategic Scenarios (although our playings of Campaign scenarios have also profited from the change).

Consider the following situation (describing the actual December 15 battle cycle of one of our Strategic Scenarios).

- The Japanese have broken through the mountains near Imphal into India, with a single half-strength quality 5 division blocking their way into Calcutta.
- Manila has fallen in the first week of December.
- Singapore has been interdicted (by two bomber attacks on December 9 and 11). There are no Japanese units in Malaya except one 5 TQ division blocking the Isthmus.
- The Central Pacific HQ has been interdicted. Enterprise has been sunk (on turn 4, despite the fact that she started running away on the first turn of the game). The initial Pearl Harbor attack went in against the submarines, two more turns interdicted the port.

All of these were achieved with Japanese forces activated for a three-week operation (basically, 83 points worth of units), with several battle cycles left to complete the conquest of the cities in India. They are good, but not exceptional. In other words: Mainland India has a good chance of falling in December (experiments showed that at least three Chinese armies must be activated to slow the Japanese down enough to have a chance to prevent this from happening). The campaign on Luzon (which historically took till April) is finished in December. Burma and mainland India fall into Japanese hands in December, and there are command points left to try attacks on Mindanao, Sumatra, Rabaul, and alternately Dutch Harbor or even Noumea. ABDA HQ and Malaya fall in January. If Malaya were attacked in December, it would also fall within a month, as even the designer himself agrees. But India is of course a better target.

In theory, the chance of being deactivated following a failed combat result might be considered sufficient to slow the Japanese down in their conquests. Especially at the beginning of the game though, their numerical and TQ advantages, together with the ability to use their armor brigades on Luzon, in Malaya, and all through Burma right to Imphal and onto the Indian plain allow the Japanese to keep their offensives going, even with average dierolling. These amazing results are also not the result of the defenders' inexperience. Our group includes seven people with a total experience of about 9 to 10 (at least partially) played Strategic Scenarios. And finally, the historical Japanese successes are generally credited as amazing by historians. Yet, they took months instead of weeks. Why (apart from the fact that the players in the game have a somewhat better knowledge of their opponent's initial positions) such a huge difference?

[Note: I am aware that a Pacific War "Day" does not correspond directly to a calendar day. For the following discussion, this is not a problem as it deals with movement over the span of a whole month, so the variations are covered.]

The first reason is that a ground unit in Pacific War can effectively advance at a pace of 300 miles per battle cycle - this exceeds the best efforts of the German Wehrmacht in France and Russia, but here we are dealing with a mostly infantry force advancing on jungle roads. There is also a full move in the contact phase. To illustrate the point, the following table gives some rough estimates of the pure movement ability of a typical Japanese infantry unit for three different games: Operation Cannibal (on the Burma theatre), Singapore (on the fall of Malaya), and Pacific War. The Operation Cannibal numbers assume relatively good weather and average chitpulls. It is assumed that no combat occurs. The Pacific War examples assume a two-week operation with a 6-step (2-day) contact phase (leaving 6 battle cycles) and a three-week operation with a six-day (17-step) contact phase, leaving 8 battle cycles (this is easily sufficient for the initial operations in the game).

	in jungle	on roads
Op Cannibal	400 mi/month	1000-1200 mi/month
Singapore	170 mi/month	512 mi/month
PW 2 weeks	1400 miles	2100 miles
PW 3 weeks	1800 miles	2700 miles

It will be noted that even if combat slows the Japanese in Pacific War down by half, they are still far too fast. Even if only mixed terrain (the worst that occurs on the PW map apart from impassable mountains) were present, this would reduce the totals to 700 miles and 900 miles, respectively - still far more in 2-3 weeks than the two operational-level games allow in a month.

The second problem is supply. Historically, the Japanese had significant problems in pushing beyond Rangoon - they needed to reorganize their supply network, and their later, last offensive into India basically was expected to feed itself on captured stores. In Pacific War, this is theoretically represented through the activation mechanism, but given the ground movement rates (which let an infantry division outrace a transport ship!), a division that starts December 1941 in Indochina can move into Thailand, attack into Burma, and push on into India, all in one month, still running on the two command points that were originally spent on it over a thousand miles away.

Why was movement designed the way it was? It appears that despite the thorough playtesting (which involved multiple full campaigns), the development of the game did not experiment with a Japanese strategy that ignored Malaya to get at India early on. This is excusable given the effort that was obviously spent on the game and the strangeness of the strategy, but the strategy works - for very "gamey" reasons, and now that the problem has been found, it needs fixing.

And the effect of the new rule? The reduced pace on land produced by the change is amazingly historical. The theoretical top speed of marching infantry is still fairly fast (900 miles in a two-week operation on roads), so there is no risk of falling below historical advance rates, but we have a fourfold reduction over the original "jet-powered" land units with a very simple rule. The

pace of the game overall is not actually slower, since naval operations still proceed without change. The reduction in combat frequency also means that supply is spent in more direct proportion to the number of attacks one can attempt with a unit. One-hex island battles now can approach their historical duration unless the attacker gets some "rout" (i.e., very good) ground combat results. Ultimately the slower movement slows the Japanese down in the beginning of the game, and will slow the Allies down during the Japanese collapse (which went extremely fast with the original rules, too - now, with four attacks per month, there should be some prolonged fights over well-defended islands, lasting more than a month just as the real thing). It should be noted though that we have not tested the rule for the last two years of the war yet - the campaign games we have started since we introduced the rule some months ago have not progressed far enough yet due to external time constraints (read, we've got a life). Nonetheless, we consider it a drastic improvement. The reason for the exceptions is to still provide a limited rapid transport capability behind the front, and to avoid too much of a slowdown for amphibious operations.

Rule 2 (reducing the effectiveness of air attacks on ports and fortresses). This rule was introduced because it proved too easy to interdict headquarters with airpower alone - the Malaya headquarters in Singapore was previously routinely interdicted entirely by airpower in our games (2 attacks by three 2E planes are usually sufficient). The same will be done to Japanese ports in the second half of the Strategic scenario, again far too easily. Why spend effort on the Japanese merchant marine when you can simply interdict any port that contains a Japanese HQ with B-24 attacks in a few turns?

With the change, it's still quite possible to take a port out by air, but it requires some effort. Note that historically, the Japanese bombarded Rangoon throughout December 1941, and the port was a shambles, but reinforcements were still arriving by "strategic transport" - the same goes for Singapore in late January (actually, the British fed reinforcements in virtually up to its fall - so obviously the Japanese were not able to interdict the port).

The Singapore fortress got an extra upgrade because its installations (10 battleship-caliber guns, 40 8" guns, and still more smaller ones) warranted it. The IJN treated Singapore with respect. When playing PW with the original 3-step fortress, a couple of CA units plus destroyers were often able to take out the fortress and Force Z within a single naval combat. Mark Herman's justification for this was that the land-based guns were at a disadvantage when fighting ships - but all my reading indicates that while land-based artillery made for nonmoving targets, it also made for far more stable gun platforms with better rangefinding equipment - and you had to take every emplacement out by itself instead of all turrets going silent when the ship was damaged enough.

Rule 3 (reduced 4E air unit capabilities). What is the best ground attack aircraft and ground support aircraft in the game? The B-17! Great for flushing enemy battalions out of the jungle or breaking divisions in New Guinea. Have you ever played the Guadalcanal Campaign scenario and wondered why the US did not historically simply blast Guadalcanal for months with B-17s before wiping the broken Japanese remains off the island? Because this was not what 4E bombers could be used for - they were used for searching and bombarding infrastructure.

With this rule change, 2E and 1E units will be preferred for ground support, just as in reality. (Note that previously there was little reason for the Allies to build 2E units - now there suddenly is a place for tactical airpower.)

As for the bomber ranges, Mark Herman notes that such long-range missions were flown and the reduced bombloads are already incorporated in the rating, which is true, but even B-24s with the reduced bombload flew 2600 mile roundtrip missions only rarely, and only from 1944 onwards (when the required fuel-saving flight procedures had been learnt, partly developed by British Liberator crews in India). Source: Alwyn Lloyd's "Liberator."

Rule 4 (ASW screening). Previously, apart from the ASW sweep rule, which represents the US intelligence advantage as much as anything else, ASW capability in the game is absolutely passive. This has led to players successfully sailing around the seas in task forces that contained only carriers, because it is often possible to keep out of the range of submarines, and Destroyers are not used for escort duties, merely for naval combat, and the points thus saved are used for other purposes. I was appalled when I saw this done the first time, but I have to admit it works in the game although it would have been anathema for any WW2 admiral. The altered ASW rule gives escorts real *protective* capacity and encourages players to carry around at least one DD per carrier in a TF without drastically reducing the submarines' chances. The damage rule for the ASW value is based on the fact that ASW combat is not really formation work, so 5 DD's will be nearly as effective at it as 6.

Note to Steve Crowley: Given that most DD's have an ASW value of 2, losses to screened ships will sink by 30% (e.g., take a DD per carrier and 30% of the sub attacks on that carrier will be screened). If you feel subs are still too powerful, make the screening value equal to the ASW value +1 (i.e., a ASW=2 DD will screen on a roll of 0-3). Every additional +1 shift will reduce the sub attacks through that screen unit by 10%. Try it out to find what value you like. For us the unadorned ASW value was enough.

Rule 5 (naval combat restrictions). A complaint that is seen occasionally is that in Pacific War, naval combat is too bloody in general and capital ships in particular die too quickly (because all other ships simply gang up on them). There is little sense of the clashes between escorts that preceded and accompanied virtually every naval engagement in the Pacific, because there is no need - a DD hits a BB at long range just as well as another DD. These rules reduce lethality and encourage a balanced ship mix in task forces without requiring a separate armor penetration table or similar detail. (In particular, the -1 modifier to big guns firing at DD's shows the reason why both sides, and the US in particular, built CL's at all - they used faster-firing guns with shorter range than heavy cruisers, because they were intended as destroyer killers. Now it's exactly what they are good at in the game.)

Alternately, one could also halve the anti-DD shooting at night instead of -1. Take your pick.

If you find players *still* focusing all fires on one BB per battle, try experimenting with forbidding doubling up against targets until all targets are covered. We don't use this at the moment though.

Something similar to the "put DD's into the screen" rule was also printed in the GENERAL back with Mark Herman's article.

Rule 6 (no submarine searches). There is a special rule in the Strategic Scenario that forbids the Japanese carrier strike force to search for the US carriers on the first battle cycle. However, the Japanese player knows the exact location of two of the US carriers, so he can simply pile submarines into those hexes and conduct in-hex searches with them, making a detection result for at least one carrier very probable. This is of course completely artificial. The Japanese had no idea where the US carriers were.

In fact, we currently play with a stronger rule which says that submarines may not search for task forces at all (since submarines only provided strategic search information, but not pinpointing for airstrikes). I recommend it, but it is not as drastically important as on the first turn of the game.

Rule 7 (Airfield construction). So, how many airfields do your Japanese construct in the game? It is extremely easy to break the Japanese engineers (and even the Allies have trouble till 1943 to just improve an airfield if the Japanese don't want it). Historically, airfields, once built, were virtually indestructible, and the game shows this. However, while being constructed, the same was true - bulldozed terrain largely stayed that way even under attack, and as late as 1943, determined Allied air attacks to prevent construction of the airfield at Munda were a failure. All that was needed was sufficient determination of the constructing player to keep shipping in troops and equipment if his preparations were discovered - which is represented by the CP payments. The CP

payments for the US are higher because the Japanese airfields were built on a shoestring anyway (that's why they took so long).

Those are the rules and the reasons why whe introduced them. Overall, they have made the game more historical, and more enjoyable, but not slower or more complex. I recommend trying them in your next game, and comments are appreciated. While developed in the context of the Strategic Scenarios, some of these rules (in particular the reduced ground movement) make some of the early Campaign scenarios (e.g., Malaya and the Philippines), which used to be highly unbalanced and boring, into actual nailbiters. Now the Japanese players have to work to replicate the historical Japanese advance rates instead of having them dropped in their lap. At the same time, the ability to reach or exceed the historical performance is still well within their grasp.

II. CHROME AND EXPERIMENTAL RULES

Here are several "chrome" rules (rules that are recommended but not critically necessary, so we didn't put them on the list with the other rules) and "experimental" rules (that we think add a bit of feel to the game, but have not tested their overall effects on balance.).

Chrome Rule 1: Manila/Luzon
The Manila hex is CLEAR terrain. The Corregidor hex also includes the Bataan peninsula, which is MIXED. Activated units can move from Bataan to Corregidor freely by ground movement. Place the Corregidor fortress marker on top of forces on Corregidor and place forces on Bataan on top of the fortress marker for clear distinction. Units cannot attack "across", i.e., they actually have to move to the proper part of the hex to attack, and such an attack counts as amphibious assault. An amphibious assault on either is not possible unless the other is controlled (i.e., the Japanese cannot land troops on Bataan to prevent a retreat there). The Japanese cannot use Manila as a port except as a submarine-protected anchorage until Bataan is free of Allied units.

Why this rule? The resistance level of the US forces on Luzon now corresponds much better to their historical performance, but the SW Pac HQ (and with it, Allied control of the Manila port) now survives much longer than it did historically. That is because the Manila terrain is "mixed". Historically the vicinity of Manila was considered indefensible, so the troops retreated to Bataan, while the city was declared open and surrendered to the Japanese in December. It is arguable whether minor terrain details should figure in a strategic game, but the survival (or not) of an Allied HQ in the first three months of the war does have some strong repercussions on the first year of the war, so this special rule is presented for those who are willing to live with the stacking in the Corregidor hex. As for the port rule - the port entrance to Manila was directly beneath the guns on Corregidor, so the Japanese will have to land on Corregidor to use Manila for strategic transport.

In theory, the important part of the rule is declaring the Manila hex clear - when Manila falls, the Allied troops could just as well retreat into South Luzon and the Bataan part could be omitted. But a crafty Japanese player could prevent that by an auxiliary landing there, whereas the Japanese had no inkling of nor intent to refuse a retreat to Bataan. So, when giving the Japanese a break in taking Manila, it's only appropriate to give the Allied troops the chance to retreat somewhere to continue as a thorn in the Japanese side for some time. Note: This last modification will again make the Fall of the Philippines scenario quite a bit easier for the Japanese since US units will be Isolated from December onwards unless Manila does not fall.

Chrome Rule 2: Unknown carrier positions at war's start.
This is an addition to rule 6. Allow the US player to set up two dummy task forces within two hexes of the two fixed carrier TF setup hexes near Oahu. Allow any of the task forces to contain the actual Enterprise and Lexington TFs (but the TF composition should not be altered). This setup happens *after* the Japanese has placed his carriers and submarines. The dummies cannot set up closer to Oahu or the Japanese carriers than the corresponding original setup hex for that carrier.

The Japanese did not know where the US carriers were - they should have to search for them just as in reality. This is a variant that we currently use but are not perfectly happy with.

Chrome Rule 3: Strategic Transport.
(a) If a unit is strategically transported across a distance of 20 hexes or less, it arrives immediately.
(b) If it is transported across more than 20 but no more than 40 hexes, it arrives on the 15th of the month.
(c) If it is transported across more than 40 hexes, it arrives during the Strategic transport phase of the next month.

Keep track of units transported according to (b) and (c) on a sheet of paper or on the Month Track. Make a note of the intended port of arrival. If the port has fallen to the enemy in the meantime, has been interdicted, or is within 2 hexes of an enemy air unit, switch to the closest alternate target. If no alternate target port is available, put the transported units on the reinforcement track for the next month.

A unit transported according to (b) and (c) can absorb replacement steps while in Strategic Transport as if it were present in the port of arrival during the Replacement Phase.

Chrome Rule 4: Building OSB's
OSB's can be built in unnamed locations. To simulate the necessity of building the necessary infrastructure, costs are doubled (to 20 CP's). In addition, an unbroken engineer unit must be present. (The engineer may still be engaged in building an airfield). These requirements hold even if another OSB existed at the same location before (and was destroyed or disbanded).

With the rules as written, OSB's can only be built in named locations or Linked Ports, but the choice of Named Locations on the map seems to be based on historical choices, not on necessity.

Experimental Rule 5: OSB transport costs
For every OSB occurring as part of a command link that traces its own command link over water or over land directly to a port without OSB, multiply the points spent by 1.5. (E.g., a 1-point unit that is linked only via 2 OSB's would cost 2.25 points to activate; a 3-point unit, 6.75.) Round up the activation totals (do not round per unit and then add up).

The purpose of this rule is to counteract the ploy of building up an OSB network that covers the whole map, and then assign all command points to a single HQ so no CPs are ever lost because they were assigned to a HQ that did not get a chance to use them. I would recommend against using it unless you are dealing with an opponent who insists on using such a strategy. The problem with the rule is that it drastically increases costs for units farther inland, in particular in mainland China (where costs are already high). This is why the rule only affects OSB's tracing over water. An alternative would be to penalize every OSB, but to drop the tripled Japanese command costs in China and to halve the activation costs of Chinese armies to 2.

Chrome Rule 6: Dutch Troop Quality

All Dutch ground units have a TQ of 2 for all purposes until the end of March, when they change to their printed rating of 3 (assuming any have survived).

For a justification of this rule, see the analysis on my webpage concerning the Japanese landings in the Dutch East Indies.

III. "Foreign" house rules that we use.

1. China (Gregg Belevick)

Upon conquest of China, the Japanese player must maintain at least 90 steps of ground forces in China at all times. there must be at least one ground step within two hexes of every Chinese city. The units satisfying this requirement may be in China, Manchukuo, Korea, or Indochina. The Communist units remain in play but are now considered isolated until a Chinese city is recaptured.

Nationalists: If isolated, will only suffer attrition down to one half of their starting strength.

Communists: Communist units are considered linked if they can trace a path free of enemy units and not within 2 hexes of enemy air units to the north board edge. If isolated, they take troop quality checks but NEVER suffer attrition.

2. Reinforcement delays (Gregg Belevick)

US reinforcements appear west of the Australian east coast appear with one month of delay. British reinforcements appear east of the Australian west coast with one month delay.

Note: This can be complemented by using the restrictions of Experimental Rule 3 (Strategic Transport).

3. Reckoning post-op penalty time (Steen Kastoft Hansen)

After the Operations player has deactivated all units, the Day Marker is only advanced once (after the first Battle Cycle on which the Reaction player can still attack), but for the other four Battle Cycles it is not advanced. They have to be kept track of by other means. The operation player has to announce that he has deactivated all units when this has happened, and the reaction player can then deactivate or activate accordingly. During the latter four Battle Cycles, submarines of both sides cannot move although they can still attack.

Using this rule, the Reaction Player can no longer delay an operation by a full week by simply keeping a rear area unit active. The submarine rule was added to keep the range of submarines from increasing over the span of a month.

4. Intercept Condition Operation Player Contact Movement (Chris Perleberg, F&M 101)

When the Operational Intelligence Condition is Intercept, the Reaction Player cannot automatically stop the Contact Phase after the second Naval Movement Impulse. He can stop it the moment that a task force of the Operation Player is within search range of one of his units and that unit searches for it, regardless of whether .the search is successful or not. Weather modifiers are ignored.

Note: Mark Herman thinks this will make late-war deep strikes by the US too easy. It will certainly lead to religious deployment of LRA's by the Japanese. It will also allow the Doolittle Raid to proceed even under an Intercept condition, which I consider a good thing. This rule should be considered experimental.

5. Rules from The General

Arrival of US Special Forces units (replace arrival times given in the Scenario Booklet):
1 SF: Jul 42, 2 SF: Aug 42, 3 SF: Jul 44.

The alternate (actually: historical) SF arrival times should be used since with his more realistic advance speeds, the Japanese does not need the aggravation of having these units stand in his way six months ahead of their historical arrival tmes. The other OOB changes are unclear in terms of balance so we do not use them. (Although the Australian restrictions and the British withdrawals should probably be used if you have an Allied player who is hardy enough.) The distinction between fast and slow units from the same article is a nice chrome rule but hard to apply in practice unless you mark the counters.

Modification History

98-10-30: Generalize screening to all ASW-capable units. Submarines cannot move during the four "additional" battle cycles.

98-11-02: Add Perleberg rule for Interception. Submarines cannot search. Add list of General house rules used.

98-11-06: Subs cannot attack into Manila port even if Corregidor is still held, so Japanese units can safely Deactivate.

99-01-04: Strengthened PH dummy carrier setup, easened amphibious movement restrictions.

99-01-11: Simplified alternate ports.

99-09-02: Switched to empty installations on naval overrun. Changed Strategic Transport (Exp.Rule 3) to Chrome. Added Chrome Rule 6 (Dutch TQ). Altered comment on variant carrier setup (Chrome Rule 2).