

War in the Pacific 1941-1945 errata & questions 4.19.2017

The following is a current list of clarifications/errata (with particular thanks to rallen and Robert Crawford):

Extended Example of Play

The reference to "...1A on Formosa ..." two lines up from the bottom of the second page in the second column should read "...1A on Saigon ...".

Unfortunately, we seem to have published the draft immediately before the final version of the Extended Example: but, fortunately, neither of the other amendments that we made to that draft when preparing the final version are material.

Player Reference Card/Initial Set Up

The suggested initial location of Allied depots is missing from the Player Reference Card (Rule 5.1, final paragraph). The six hexes are: 0207, 0509, 0607, 0710, 1205 and 1407.

Q: What is the Japanese depot setup?

A) This is a "free set up". The number and location of depots he/she deploys at the start of Turn 1 is entirely up to the Japanese player (subject to RP limitations, of course).

This is to ensure that he/she has the flexibility to position the depots so as to facilitate whatever strategy he/she elects to adopt.

References to Countries/Territories

References in the Rules to "Mainland America" include Alaska and Canada, including Prince Rupert. .

References in the Rules to "India" include Ceylon; but, not Rangoon.

Bases [Rule 1.3]

Q: If a friendly Base (flag) is conquered but subsequently unoccupied, does control return to the original (flag) owner? Assume yes by 1.3, but want to be sure.

A) Correct.

Victory Conditions [Rule 2.2]

Q: The Victory Conditions mention winning via the Atomic Bomb, it is referring to the random event card, correct?

A) Yes, that's correct. The Allies have to play the "Enola Gay" REC, which is no. 1945-3.

Q: Rule 2.2 is missing a statement of circumstances for Japanese victory. I assume the Japanese win if the last turn: (T16) is reached and the Allies have not achieved an automatic victory (as defined by 2.2). Is that correct?

A) Yes, that's correct: the final sentence of Rule 2.2 applies.

Depots [Rule 5]

Q: Is the counter mix a limit on how many depots I can deploy? I assume that it is, but seeking clarification.

A) Correct.

The limit is important as it obliges players to deploy depots efficiently by incorporating logistical planning within their overall strategy and to protect them lest their lines of communication are severed. It also means that, just as happened historically, as these lines extend so strategic options tend to diminish.

Q: Supply depot that's eliminated, like other units, cannot be rebuilt? The rules state that a supply depot is "eliminated" when it is alone with an enemy ground unit. Other unit types cannot be rebuilt after they are "eliminated"?

A) Correct.

When play-testing we didn't allow depots which had been eliminated to return to the game. As far as I am aware, this did not cause any particular issues during testing. However, prior to production we needed to reduce the number of counters slightly so that they would fit onto a single sheet; and, I think I'm correct in saying that we did this by removing one (or two?) Japanese depot counters. During testing the Japanese had seven (or eight?) depots available so I'm assuming that there are fewer in the published game. We felt able to make this reduction because the Japanese never seem to use their full quota of depots.

By way of background, the more my friends and I read about the war, the more that the importance of logistical considerations and constraints became apparent. The long distances involved made it impractical to supply front-line troops directly from the initial point of supply: principally, Japan, the West Coast of America and South Africa (for the British). So, the belligerents tended to establish chains of "depots". The main "rear area" depots were substantial and intended to be permanent, and depot counters are intended to represent these. Their location was crucial if a campaign was to be conducted in the most efficient and effective manner. Some of the Japanese strategic disasters in particular reflected a failure to pay sufficient attention to logistical constraints.

(The rear area depots fed much smaller depots - "supply dumps", in effect - at or close to the front lines that were often fairly temporary arrangements. These do not feature in the game.)

Q: The rules (5.1) regarding the removal of depots are imprecise. Can I remove 1 depot in total during the Depot Actions Phase, or can I remove 1 depot each time I have a chance to take an action during the Depot Actions Phase?

A) Depots. You can only remove one (1) depot in total during the Depots Action Phase. Rule 5.4 is meant to clarify this.

Campaign Movement [Rule 8]

Q: Rule 8.5 says that an unaccompanied air unit does not impede movement into or through its hex. Does this apply to land movement or sea movement also?

A) An unaccompanied Air unit does not prevent either enemy Fleet or Land units' entering/traversing the hex upon which it is situated.

Q: What must it be accompanied by, a land unit, fleet unit or either?

A) If an Air unit is accompanied by a Land unit, Rule 8.3 bp 3 applies; if by a Fleet unit, Rule 8.3 bp 4 applies. The Air unit itself does not restrict enemy movement other than per the answer to the following question.

Q: Do you then still pay the extra RP for moving adjacent to it?

A) Yes, the cost of moving adjacent to an enemy Air unit (whether accompanied or not) is one (1) RP.

Q: For that matter, the rules only say you pay 1 extra RP to move adjacent. How about moving into the hex with the air unit?

A) There is no cost for moving onto a hex containing an enemy Air unit.

This is because in most such instances the Air unit will either be obliged to re-locate (in which case it would not harass the friendly force) or a combat will ensue (in which the Air unit's presence will be reflected).

Q: What happens then if say, on turn 1, a single Japanese naval unit enters the Wake hex, which only has an air unit in it. There is no land unit so the air unit does not displace. Do they just ignore each other? There seems to be no mechanism for just air vs. naval combat in the game.

A) Correct, there is no mechanism in the game to reflect this. As you surmise, an Air unit on the same hex as an enemy Fleet unit would "ignore each other" during the combat phase.

There are two reasons for this. The first is practical. Such a situation arises only rarely as it involves a Fleet (not transporting a Land unit) ending its campaign moves on a hex that does not contain an enemy Fleet. You will appreciate that the circumstances in which it is sensible to spend valuable RPs moving a Fleet to such a hex - and, presumably, incurring an additional RP cost for moving adjacent to an Air unit - are limited.

The second is more theoretical. The scale of the game with each hex covering 550 miles, or thereabouts, is such that there is a reasonable chance that no conflict would have occurred between the two units.

So, during play testing, in the interests of simplicity we simply ditched the Rule covering Air v Fleet combats.

Q: I assume you cannot join two stacks during movement into 1 and then treat them as 1 for the rest of the movement?

A) Correct, a moving stack cannot "collect" other stacks en route. Each would have to move separately to the common destination hex.

Q: During the campaign phase, can you use land movement to move between: Manila and Leyte? Kure and Okinawa? Rabaul and Port Moresby? Hakodate and the mainland?

A) The intention when writing the Rules was to preclude movement by Land units between two parcels of land within the same hex separated by only a narrow expanse of sea (unless being transported by a fleet, of course). However, arguably, a strict reading of Rule 8.3, bp 2 permits such movement. And, post-publication play-testing suggests that such a strict interpretation does not create any issues in terms of game-play or balance. So, the short answer is, provided that it is applied consistently throughout a game, either interpretation is valid.

I should explain that the published map is far more accurate than that upon which the Rules and play-testing were based. In particular, some of the sea distances between portions of land are markedly shorter because when drawing the original map we took some liberties with geography in order to better align coastlines with the hex grid.

Campaign Combat [Rule 9]

Q: When you apply hits as per 9.4.1, you can apply hits there to carriers correct?

A) Yes, hits under Rule 9.4.1 can be applied to carriers.

Bearing in mind, of course, that the owning player can choose to which unit(s) a hit(s) is allocated so it is unusual for him/her to select a carrier.

Q: 9.4.2 Additional Hits. When there is a Carrier involved, a die roll of 6 results in an EXTRA hit that is applied to carriers and there is NOT 2 hits applied to any air unit(s) involved, correct?

A) Yes, that's right. A D6 score of six (6) results only in a carrier being hit. No hits are allocated to air units.

Q: If there are air units adjacent to a hex with combat, do you have the option to withhold those air units from participating in the combat and thus saving them from the possibility of receiving a hit?

A) The Rules are worded so that all air units eligible to join a given combat automatically do so.

This is deliberate as it ensures a realistic level of casualties amongst air units and prevents some gamey tactics, centering upon not committing air units, which play-testers began to employ during development.

Q: When an air unit is damaged, it is immediate and may not participate in any more

combats that have not been resolved, correct?

A) Correct, hits are applied to units immediately as they occur. So, an Air unit already damaged as the result of a previous combat in the Turn cannot take part in a subsequent one.

Q: Rule 9.2.2. It's clear that a damaged unit has 0 combat value (cv) and it can't be used to calculate max # of hits, but does it still generate a combat die roll?

A) Correct. A combat dice roll is made in respect of a damaged unit(s) although, such a unit cannot inflict any hits upon enemy units. In the case of a stack comprising only damaged units the roll simply mitigates or negates the number of hits and/or combat outcome that it would otherwise suffer.

Q: The rules state that when losing a combat by more than two the owning player retreats to an adjacent hex free of enemy units. Would the retreating unit be able to retreat into the hex that the attackers moved into the battle hex from?

A) No. As you suspect, a "retreat" towards the direction of an attack is not permissible; although this prohibition is not explicit in the Rules. On reflection, I think that it should be to avoid any doubt.

Stacking/Re-deployment and Restoration [Rule 10]

Q: Do stacking limits apply to reinforcements?

A) Reinforcements/Stacking. Stacking limits do apply; but, of course, neither Panama nor South Africa have any limit [Rule 10.4, Exception].

And, of course, the Japanese receive relatively few reinforcements. So, during play testing I don't think that stacking limits for reinforcements was ever much of an issue.

Q: There are no stacking limits in a continuing battle. The Japanese amphibious assault Port Moresby and the result is a continuing battle. Can the Japanese redeploy one or more air units into the Port Moresby hex? May the Allies redeploy more than one air unit into Port Moresby?

A) Yes, additional air (and land) units can be re-deployed to join the battle on Port Moresby subject to the stacking limit for air units specified in the "Exceptions" listed in the second paragraph of Rule 10.4. Note that there is no such limit for land units. Where the outcome of an amphibious assault is not decided on the Turn that the assault takes place a continuing combat begins and will be ongoing for the purposes of Rule 10 (Re-deployment) later in that Turn.

(For the subsequent combat phase(s) the continuing combat will be governed by the Rules relating to land combat (See Rule 9.1 under "Continuing Combats".))

The thinking behind these Rules is to simulate the drawn-out battles that occurred for some islands where both sides continued to feed in reinforcements over a long period. Guadalcanal is an obvious example.

It also rewards a strategy of isolating an island before undertaking an assault

so that the defenders cannot receive reinforcements. As you know, such an approach was often adopted, particularly during the Allied advance.

Q: As per 10.4 may bases be amphibious assaulted with 4 or more land units?

A) I'm not quite sure that I understand your question. Subject to Rule 8.4, there's no limit to the number of Land units that may participate in an amphibious assault. If, following the assault, both sides remain in situ per Rule 9.5.3(ii), a continuing combat occurs and the exception to stacking limits in the second paragraph of Rule 10.4 applies. If, however, the defenders are forced to retreat Rule 9.5.3(iii) takes effect and the attackers will be left in sole occupancy of the hex. In this circumstance, the attackers may have to re-deploy some of their units per Rule 10.3 in order to meet the stacking limit of three land units per Rule 10.4.

Q: Once a combat unit is destroyed there is no way to rebuild it. Is that correct?

A) Correct.

China [Rule 12.2]

Q: The only Allied country that can be conquered is China, correct? There are no rules regarding the conquest of India or Australia.

A) Correct. Simply occupying a base in either Australia or India is sufficient for the Japanese to gain an advantage (Rule 12.4).

Q: As per 12.2 may Chinese units redeploys to a hex with ONLY Japanese units in it?

A) Rule 12.2: "yes", Chinese units may be so deployed.

I thought that this was specified at 12.2; but, I've just re-read the Rule and it isn't, so apologies.

Q: Chinese units that are destroyed may not be rebuilt?

A) Correct. Once eliminated Chinese units are removed from play.

By way of background, in designing WIP we wanted to ensure that both sides have a variety of viable strategies. So, for instance, in reflecting the Japanese commitment to the war in China we introduced an element of "what if" by allowing the Japanese player some discretion about the level of that commitment. In order to do this, we had to give the Japanese a chance to actually win the war against China (or else they would simply deploy the minimum possible number of units to the Asian mainland.) This is the thinking behind the Japanese being able to destroy the Chinese army by permanently eliminating Chinese units.