

Commercial Conflict Simulation Games used for the JAPCC E&T Model so far

Title	Producer	Topic	C2 level(s)	# parties
Attack Sub	Avalon Hill	ASW (1980 to 2000)	tactical	2
Command & Colors: Ancient	GMT Games	Battles (1175 BC to 70 AD)	tactical (battlefield)	2
Command & Colors: Napoleonic	GMT Games	Battles (1807-1815)	tactical (battlefield)	2
Crusader Rex	Columbia Games	Land Campaigns (1187-1192)	strategic operational	2
Field Commander: Napoleon	Dan Verssen Games	Campaigns (1796-1815)	operational tactical	1
Hold the Line!	Worthington Games	Battles (1775-1781)	tactical (battlefield)	2
Hornet Leader - Carrier Air Operations	Dan Verssen Games	Air Campaigns (1984-2015)	operational tactical	1
Keep up the Fire!	Victory Point Games	Boxer Rebellion (1900)	operational tactical	1
Napoleon's War	Worthington Games	Battles (1800-1815)	tactical (battlefield)	2
Nemo's War	Victory Point Games	Fictitious Naval Campaign (1880-1890)	strategic operational tactical	1
Ottoman Sunset	Victory Point Games	WW I (1914-1918)	strategic	1
Phantom Leader	Dan Verssen Games	Air Campaigns (1965-1974)	operational tactical	1
Space Hulk	Games Workshop	Battle within spacecraft (Science Fiction)	tactical (battlefield)	2
Space Infantry	Lock'n Load Publishing	Fictitious Special Operations (2000-...)	tactical	1
Victory	Columbia Games	Fictitious Modern War (1960-...)	strategic operational tactical	2
Zulus on the Ramparts!	Victory Point Games	Battle (1879)	tactical (battlefield)	1

Candidates				
Title	Producer	Topic	C2 level(s)	# parties
1805: Sea of Glory	GMT Games	Sea warfare (Napoleonic era)	strategic operational	2
A Day of Heroes	Lock'n Load Publishing	Mogadischu (1993)	tactical	1 to 2
Across 5 Aprils	Victory Games	Battles of the American Civil War	tactical (battlefield)	2
Andean Abyss	GMT Games	Power struggle in South America (2000-...)	strategic operational	1 to 4
Blue vs. Gray	GMT Games	American Civil War	strategic	2
Boots on the Ground	Worthington Games	City fight (1990-...)	tactical	1 or 2
Crisis: Korea	GMT Games	Fictitious war (2000-...)	strategic operational tactical	2
Dawn of the Zeds	Victory Point Games	Fictitious battle for survival (today)	operational tactical	1
Duel of Ages	Venatic Games	Fictitious team duels (anytime)	operational tactical	2
Hammer of the Scots	Columbia Games	Scottish Revolt (1297-1315)	strategic operational	2
History of the World	Avalon Hill	Bronze Age to WW I	strategic	2 to 7
Hougoumont	COMMAND magazine	Battle for a farm (Waterloo)	tactical (battlefield)	2
Infidel	GMT Games	Battles in the Holy Land (1096-1210)	tactical (battlefield)	2
Julius Caesar	Columbia Games	The Roman Civil War (50 bc)	strategic operational	2
Labyrinth	GMT Games	War against terror (2001-...)	strategic operational	1 or 2

Medieval	GMT Games	13th century	strategic	3 to 5
Title	Producer	Topic	C2 level(s)	# parties
Persian Incursion	Clash of Arms	Fictitious air campaign (2000-...)	operational tactical	1
Richard III	Columbia Games	War of the Roses (1455-1485)	strategic operational	2
Shenandoah	Columbia Games	1862 campaign	operational	2
The Kaiser's Pirates	GMT Games	WW I (sea raiders)	operational tactical	1 to 4
Thunderbolt/Apache Leader	Dan Verssen Games	Air-Land operations (1984-2016)	operational tactical	1
Warriors of God	MMP	100 Years war	strategic operational	2
Wizard Kings	Columbia Games	Fictitious campaigns and battles	strategic operational tactical	2 to 6
Yom Kippur War	Gamers	Near East War, Sinai (1973)	operational	2

Clarification

The commercial simulation systems (board and card games) used for the JAPCC E&T model are categorized/named as Conflict Simulation Systems (CoSim).

Remarks (in no particular order)

Tactical battlefield CoSim ensure a quickly achieved high degree of player involvement as there are a lot of activities, changes and effects taking place within each game turn.

Strategic, operational CoSim offer fewer moving parts but nonetheless require a significant amount of thought and communications.

Two party CoSim instantly generate an intensive "contest" atmosphere. Spin-off: both parties immediately feel and recognize that the adversary is anything but a stupid, immobile and ignorant element.

Multi-party CoSim require the classroom split, i.e. a classic two party game requires three separate rooms (1 for each team and 1 for the "real situation". The "real situation" room hosts the genuine simulation run.

The first phase of each seminar using the E&T model is always characterized by "we do not know the rules of the system". A proven strategy for the teachers is to have a first test run through the system (i.e. a few game turns are executed), then stop and restart.

Solitaire CoSim require much less observers as there is only one party (which could be split into several competing teams, of course). Such systems always lead to an underestimating of the adversary as the latter appears to be rather dull. This reflects an ignorant perception by the players.

A key factor of the seminar preparation, CoSim selection, etc. is the number of students that will participate. Experience shows that the most effective number range is 8 to 20 per team.

The common language used for the E&T model is English, of course. The native language of the students will always enter the "stage", too. It is one of the tasks of the teacher team to consider this and turn it into an active element of the seminar.

The CoSim are used as tools. They are not a means to an end.

The CoSims used are all of the third generation. They include what NATO calls an "effect approach".

Providing the students read ahead material is definitely an appropriate approach. Experience shows that only a minority uses this to effectively prepare themselves for the seminar. Dealing with CoSim rules is a "first" for most of them.

Executing a seminar with the E&T model offers the chance to provide guidance for the students (e.g. include a C2 structure for the teams). This is always a double-edged sword. On one hand, it supports an organized execution of the C2 tasks, on the other hand it reduces the chance of an independent approach by the students.

We at JAPCC avoid to use the term "game" in the context of the E&T model. The implications of "game" offers outsiders a much too easy way to doubt the value and quality of the E&T model.