



NATO: AMENDING A SIMULATION

Nato is an extremely popular game to play, but if it is a true simulation it explains why they (the Soviets) haven't attacked: it isn't worth it. Too many casualties for too little ground and making the war nuclear just increases the losses. I would agree with this result if the Soviets went to war with just their regular troops in East Germany and Czechoslovakia. The pre-hostilities allow the Pact to build up, but this allows NATO to mobilize at full speed as if war had been declared.

My first amendment allows a surprise build-up and attack. In the 1968 invasion of Czechoslovakia and the 1973 October War the aggressor disguised his intentions by calling them large scale maneuvers. The Soviets would probably continue their first two successful operations. They would also be likely to use their airborne as in every crisis, these are the first mobilized and are the shock troops. The changes are as follows:

Roll the die to see on what turn NATO calls the bluff.

1, 2 = Turn 1 (normal)

3, 4, 5 = Turn 2

6 = Turn 3

All units are moved as if they were stationed there, all mobilization is speeded up accordingly. All Soviet airborne may be used on Game-Turn 1. All normal rules apply.

The second point is the large amount of Soviet troops necessary to garrison Denmark. The Danes are not vehemently anti-Soviet, it is difficult to imagine mass uprisings against troops merely securing a flank. So roll the die to see how many divisions are needed. And for victory conditions the divisions do not need to be in supply.

The last point is that regardless of which side escalates to nuclear weapons the Pact is penalized. Do not use the nuclear victory chart, but charge the escalating Player 50 points.

In conclusion I have to say I am surprised at the scarcity of articles on an outstanding contemporary game like **NATO**. The "what-ifs" alone are mind-boggling. SPI, which usually has a field day on hypothetical situations has fallen short in this game, the only one with an infinite number of viable scenarios. We'll see what develops in their **WWIII**.

—Ray Thorne

