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One proposition and three challenges

1. **“Why?”**: Wargaming is useful

2. **Purpose**: Educational wargaming

3. **Form**: Board + Map (manual wargaming)

4. **Procedure**: Adjudication

Example: *Boardgame MechBn* (since 2011) by Johan Elg at SNDC
Adjudication

a) Argumentative
or (and)
b) Rule-based (with probabilities)

Combat shock – Reduction – Eliminated
Adjudication

c) Simultaneously execution of turns

d) Simplicity: Game Director driven

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME (one turn)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alt. 1</strong> (Fire) Remain in position (Fire)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alt. 2</strong> (Fire) Reverse movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alt. 3</strong> Move forward (Fire)(Move forward) (Close combat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>X</strong> (Indirect Fire)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Board + Map
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Educational Wargaming

1. Adversarial
2. Friction + Fog of war
3. Reflection (by “playing out the plan”)

“Purpose: to expand the cadets’ tactical understanding by using the military pedagogical methods of staff rides and **wargaming**.

The cadets analyse different tactical problems – individually and in teams – within the framework of their prepared solution. Their ability to turn ideas into action and give orders with little time of preparation is also trained.”
## Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>08.30-12.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>Game Directors 1, 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>GD 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>GD 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wargaming lecture</td>
<td>Team 1 <em>(blue)</em> vs team 2 <em>(red)</em></td>
<td>Team 5 <em>(blue)</em> vs team 6 <em>(red)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction to the game</td>
<td>Team 3 <em>(blue)</em> vs Team 4 <em>(red)</em></td>
<td>Team 7 <em>(blue)</em> vs Team 8 <em>(red)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13.00-16.30</strong></td>
<td>Preparing the <em>(red)</em> plan</td>
<td>Team 3 <em>(red)</em> vs Team 4 <em>(blue)</em></td>
<td>Team 7 <em>(red)</em> vs Team 8 <em>(blue)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Team 1 <em>(red)</em> vs team 2 <em>(blue)</em></td>
<td>Team 5 <em>(red)</em> vs team 6 <em>(blue)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16.30-17.00</strong></td>
<td>“”</td>
<td>Reflection Team 1-4</td>
<td>Reflection Team 5-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why wargaming?
- A combined view from army officer cadets 2011

**Advantages:**
+ Focus on tactics
+ Illustrate frictions (chain of command) and the importance of combat principles (firepower etc.)
+ A chance to practice giving orders
+ A chance to test oneself and the team
= we want more (manual) wargaming

**Risks:**
- Too much focus on the game (rules) rather than on tactics
- Too slow (adjudication or multi-player)
Why wargaming?
- My own thoughts

• The game director’s role is of immense importance: it allows total control of the manual wargaming process

• Military theory is made explicit – for example “the empty battlefield”

• Adversarial WG: Training audience gets motivated which generates activities before and after working hours: good for learning
Questions?

Johan Elg