[1.0] CHARIOTS

GENERAL RULE:
Chariots are vehicle units that can be used by BW, IB, SK and Leader units to increase their Movement Allowance. Chariots move during the Chariot Phase, which precedes the Fire Combat Phase of each Player-Turn and during the Movement Phase.

PROCEDURE:
To embark on a Chariot unit, units must begin their Friendly Chariot or Movement Phase adjacent to a Chariot unit. They are first placed in the same hex as the Chariot unit, without expending any Movement Points and before any movement occurs. The units are then moved up to the Chariot’s Movement Allowance. The carried unit forfeits independent movement during the Movement Phase.

At the end of the Friendly Chariot Phase or Movement Phase, units may disembark from Chariot units by merely being placed in any non-Enemy occupied hex adjacent to the Chariot unit. Units may embark and disembark in the same Chariot Phase or Movement Phase. Disembarked units are liable to normal Defensive Fire.

CASES:
[1.1] Chariots have no direct effect upon combat; they are modes of transportation for BW, IB, SK and Leader units.
[1.2] The Chariot Phase in no way alters the Sequence of Play; it precedes the Fire Combat/Movement/Melee Combat/Disruption Recovery Sequence.
[1.3] Units on Chariots do not have to disembark to take part in Fire or Melee Combat. They must, however, await the appropriate segment of the Sequence of Play to take part in combat.

For instance, if a BW unit moves on a Chariot during the Chariot Phase, it could take part in Fire Combat immediately after the Chariot movement. An SK unit could move with a Chariot during the Chariot Phase, fire during Fire Combat, and continue moving with the Chariot during the Movement Phase. Or an SK unit could move during the Chariot Phase, move again during the Movement Phase, and then Melee Attack.

[1.4] The one Movement Allowance of a Chariot (nine Movement Points) is the total the Chariot has available for both Movement Phases of each Player-Turn. Therefore, if a Player uses six Movement Points of the Chariot in the Chariot Phase, he would have three Movement Points left for the Movement Phase. Or, a Player could use all of the Movement Points in one, or the other, phase.

[1.5] Chariots are “stopped” by undisputed Enemy fire units’ Zones of Control only for that phase; e.g., a Chariot that moves adjacent to an Enemy fire unit in the Chariot Phase could then move elsewhere in the Movement Phase unless, of course, it was disrupted by Defensive Fire during the Fire Combat Phase. Chariot units must also cease movement for that Player-Turn upon entering a stream hex.

[1.6] Units may embark only onto Friendly Chariot units. There is no way to “capture” Enemy Chariots.

[1.7] Chariots follow the rules for disruption recovery.

[1.8] Only one unit may be embarked on a single Chariot unit at any one time. For these purposes, Leader units (CM) do not count; i.e., Leader units may be carried by Chariots freely in addition to any other single unit. Chariots themselves do count for stacking limitations.

[1.9] At the end of a given Friendly Chariot or Movement Phase, Chariot units may not be stacked with any other units, except units embarked on the Chariots, or Leader units.

[2.0] LEADERS

[2.1] In addition to the standard four levels of Leader units, there are two categories of civilian Leaders in Chariot: Levels 5 and 6.

[2.2] In a Leader reduction situation (see 10.3), a level 5 Leader may be reduced one level lower to a “6”. Civilian Leader “6”, forced to be reduced, is eliminated instead.

[2.3] If using Rule 13.0, Panic, “5” and “6” level Leaders are given the powers of “3” or “4” level Leaders in respect to preventing panic and rallying (see 13.0).

A level “4” Leader unit may never be reduced to a “5” or “6”. It is eliminated instead.

[3.0] OPTIONAL RULES

[3.1] RANGE EFFECTS

The efficiency of missile weapons drops off drastically with increased range to their target. Consult the accompanying chart to find the corrected Fire Strength of all fire units cross-indexed with the distance to their target. All fire units have full strength at a range of one hex (hexes adjacent to themselves). SK (Skirmishers) units are not included; their maximum range is only one hex, at which they fire with full strength.

UNIT DISTANCE [hexes] FIRE STRENGTH
BW Bowmen 1 2 3
IB Improved Bowmen 2 2 1
HB Horse Bowmen 1 ½

[3.2] UNIT CAPABILITY CHART

Effect on Melee Defense Strength: a. Attacking Unit:
Defending Unit: MS, MI AX, SD MC
BW, Bowmen x1 x½ x2
IB, Improved Bowmen x1 x½ x2
HB, Horse Bowmen x1 x½ x2

The type of Attacker should be cross-referenced with the type of Defender; the Melee Defense Strength is multiplied by the indicated factor. Any combination not covered in the Unit Capability Chart is assumed to engage at normal Combat Strengths.

In the case of more than one category of Attacker, benefits are given to the Attacker. Thus, if the Attacker was using two Swordsmen (SD) and a Light Troops unit (LT) and the defending hex had Militia Spearmen (MS) and Light Troops (LT), the Militia Spearmen would be halved. Fractions are retained in any modifications.

[4.0] THE BASIC SCENARIO, ROME (753 BC)


Game Length: 10 Game-Turns.

Victory Conditions: Control of hex “D” by the end of Game-Turn Ten.

Terrain Modifications: Ignore all Slope and Hilltop hexes on the mapsheet.

Special Rules: Do not use Leader rules; all units are considered in the Movement Control Radius at all times. Do not use any Optional Rules. There are no Panic Levels given.

Historical Notes: Rome, traditionally, was founded by a band of rude farm boys, cut-throats, shepherds and other undesirables. In fact, they were so undesirable that no one would marry them. Romulus (753-716 BC according to legend), their king, therefore engineered a massive kidnapping expedition known to history as “The Rape of the Sabine Women.” Not without reason, the Sabines men objected and a war ensued, supposedly ended by the intervention of the erstwhile Sabine, now Roman, women who pointed out that whoever won they would lose, either their fathers and brothers or their new-found “husbands.” This scenario is purely conjectured and is designed primarily to introduce the techniques of play and to allow us to write some interesting historical notes.
[5.0] GAME PLAYER'S SCENARIOS

[5.1] THE DELTA (1675 BC)

Game Length: 10 Game-Turns.

Victory Conditions: Control of hex "K" by the end of Game-Turn Ten.

Historical Notes: The Hyksos domination of Egypt began during the Seventeenth Century BC. Bringing horses and chariots with them, the Hyksos managed to overwhelm less mobile Egyptian forces. This scenario illustrates a hypothetical battle fought between the Hyksos and rebellious Egyptians somewhere in the Delta region on the edge of the desert. The Hyksos army is attempting to capture the oasis before nightfall, after a long desert march.

[5.2] BABYLON (1595 BC)
Babylonians: 16MI, 4MS, 4AX, 4MC, 4BW, 8CH, 1"3", 3"6", VP 64, PL 20. Deploy: L-S. Stacking: 1.

Game Length: 15 Game-Turns.

Victory Conditions: The Hittites must eliminate twice as many Babylonian units as they themselves lose by the end of Game-Turn Fifteen, with a minimum of twelve Babylonian units being eliminated. The Babylonians must prevent these conditions.

Special Rules: Babylonian Chariot units have a Movement Allowance of 6. Hittite Chariot units have a Movement Allowance of 10.

Historical Notes: In 1595 BC, Musulis I of Hatti (1620-1590 BC) raided into Syria and Mesopotamia, sacking Aleppo, Mari and Babylon itself. Just as swiftly as he had come, he then turned around and returned home, leaving Babylon a powerless city. From the swiftness of his conquest it seems likely that the King of Babylon, Samsu-ditana, did something foolish. Samsu-ditana (1625-1595 BC) offered battle to the Hittites, rather than attempt to sit it out behind the walls of Babylon. On a raiding expedition, it would have been unlikely that Musulis would have the resources or time to attempt a siege. In any case, a major battle seems to have occurred not far from Babylon in which the Hittites, using newer, swifter chariots, iron weapons, and a cohesive, regular army, overwhelmed the Babylonian levies. In this situation, the Hittites must decisively defeat the Babylonians to avoid a siege.

[5.3] MEGIDDO (1469 BC)
Syrians: 18MI, 6MS, 12AX, 4SK, 4CH, 1"2", 3"5", VP 74, PL 23. Deploy: E-S. Stacking: 1.

Game Length: 12 Game-Turns.

Victory Conditions: The Egyptians must prevent the Syrians from having five or more units south of the stream by the end of Game-Turn Twelve. The Egyptians must control hex "A" by the end of Game-Turn Twelve. If neither condition is met, or both, the game is a draw.

Historical Notes: The greatest Egyptian monarch was Thutmosis III (1491-1449 BC). He carried Egypt's frontiers as far as the Euphrates River and conquered all of Syria and Palestine in seventeen campaigns. Around 1470 BC, a number of Egyptian subject kingdoms in Syria revolted, among them the Kingdom of Kadesh. In a swift campaign Thutmosis rapidly brought the rebels to battle at Megiddo (also known as Armageddon) in Syria. Personally leading one wing of his army, he overthrew the rebels in a flanking attack. This is the first battle in recorded history.

[5.4] KADESCI (1294 BC)
Hittites: 12MS, 12AX, 4BW, 4IB, 6SK, 10CH, 1"2", 3"3", 3"4", VP 107, PL 43. Deploy: May enter on any Game-Turn, with any part of their force beginning with their first Player-Turn from the West, North, or East edge of the map sheet and may continue to bring on the remaining force (if any) on subsequent Game-Turns. Deploy secondary. Move first. Stacking: 3.
Egyptians: Deploy: P-3: 4MI, 6MS, 6AX, 4IB, 4CH, 2"5", 2"6"; Deploy: E-4: 2MI, 3MS, 3AX, 2IB, 8CH, 1"1", 2"6"; Deploy: A-5: 2MI, 3MS, 3AX, 2IB, 8CH, 1"3", 1"4", 1"5", VP 110, PL 33. Deploy first, move second. Stacking: 2.

Game Length: 15 Game-Turns.

Victory Conditions: The Hittites must destroy 25 or more Egyptian units while losing 15 or fewer of their own, by the end of Game-Turn Fifteen. The Egyptians must prevent these conditions.

Historical Notes: Ramses II of Egypt (1299-1224 BC) made several attempts to conquer Syria. In one of these he was surprised near the city of Kadesh by an army of about 20,000 Hittites under King Muetiela (1306-1282 BC). The Egyptian army, also of about 20,000 men, was strung out considerably, and the two leading divisions were hard pressed when, primarily as a result of good luck, some additional Egyptian troops came up and some Syrian allied troops as well. The battle ended in a draw, but Ramses managed to convince Egypt that he'd won a smashing victory and put up monuments telling of his heroic deeds. This is one of the few battles for which we have any information and the scenario more or less follows what we know.
[5.5] SINA (c. 1225 BC)


Game Length: 12 Game-Turns.

Victory Conditions: Control of hex “E” by the end of Game-Turn Twelve.

Historical Notes: The “Sea Peoples,” probably of Indo-European origin, made several descents on Egypt during the latter portion of the Thirteenth Century BC, but were successfully kept at bay by Pharaoh Ramses II and his son Merneptah (1224-1214 BC). A major battle was fought by Merneptah on the coast of the Sinai during which the "Sea People" were defeated in an attempt to invade Egypt from Palestine. Historically, the Philistines, and perhaps Homer’s Achaeans, were “Sea Peoples.” In this scenario, the two armies are contending for control of a vital oasis.

[5.6] QARAR (854 BC)

Assyrians: 12MS, 4AX, 2SD, 3IB, 2HB, 10CH, 2"2", 3"3". VP 64, PL 32. Deploy: C-3. Stacking: 3.


Game Length: 15 Game-Turns.

Victory Conditions: Control of hex “E” by the end of Game-Turn Fifteen.

Historical Notes: With the threat of imminent conquest by the Assyrians staring them in the face, the Kingdoms of Israel, Ammon, and Damascus put aside their petty differences and joined together to oppose a strong Assyrian army which had begun the conquest of Syria. At Qarar, the Allied forces met the Assyrians and were overwhelmed; but troubles had sprung up in other parts of the Assyrian Empire and the Assyrians, rather than complete the conquest of Syria and Palestine, marched home. They did not finally subdue all of Syria and Palestine until nearly a century later, although they had large parts within five years.

[5.7] TABAL (706 BC)


Assyrians: 6MS, 4AX, 2SD, 2IB, 4HB, 4CH, 1"1", 2"2", 4"3", VP 49, PL 25. Deploy: Enter on South edge of the mapsheet on the Assyrian first Player-Turn. Stacking: 3.

Game Length: 15 Game-Turns.

Victory Conditions: Control of hex “E” by the end of Game-Turn Fifteen.

Historical Notes: The Cimmerians, an Indo-European people, invaded Anatolia from the Caucasus in the early First Millenium BC. Sometime before 700 BC, their presence began to concern the Assyrians. In 706 BC Sargon II of Assyria (722-705 BC) led a punitive expedition against the Cimmerians in the region of Tabal as depicted in this scenario.

[5.8] CHARCHEMISH (608 BC)


Babylonians: 8MS, 8AX, 8MC, 4BW, 4IB, 10CH, 2"3", 3"4", 3"5". VP 90, PL 27. Deploy: D-5. Deploy first, move second. Stacking: 2.

Game Length: 6 Game-Turns.

Victory Conditions: Control of hex “A” by the end of Game-Turn Six.

Historical Notes: Just a year after Necho’s Egyptians had overthrown the Judeans at Armageddon they came up against the rising Neo-Babylonian Empire at Charchemish in northern Syria. Nebuchadnezzar, son of Nabopolassar (625-605 BC) of Babylon defeated the Egyptians, who were allied with the remnants of the once-mighty Assyrian armies, and ended centuries of Egyptian influence and control in the area.
[6.0] HISTORIAN’S SCENARIOS

[6.1] BUBASTIS (c. 3000 BC)
Game Length: 15 Game-Turns.
Victory Conditions: Upper Egyptians must control both village hexes at the end of Game-Turn 15. Lower Egyptians must prevent this condition.

Historical Notes: A.D. 219 BC, one of the last notable Pharaohs, revived Egyptian power long enough to undertake a campaign in Palestine after the fall of the Assyrian Empire. At Armageddon, a favorite battlefield of the times, he met and defeated the forces of the Hebrew Kingdom of Judah. In this scenario, the Judeans are attempting to prevent the Egyptians from advancing through some hills into their fertile fields.
[6.3] LAKE REGILLUS (c. 496 BC)
Romans: 16M1, 9MS, 6AX, 4SD, 3MC, 8SK, 1"1", 1"2", 3"3", 1"4". VP 90, PL 27. Deploy: D-5. Stacking: 2.
Game Length: 15 Game-Turns.
Victory Conditions: The Etruscans must get 20 or more units off the south edge of the map sheet by the end of Game-Turn Fifteen. The Romans must prevent this condition.

Historical Notes: According to legend, Rome overthrew Etruscan domination in 509 BC and confirmed this in a great battle near Lake Regillus, at which the Romans defeated their former overlords. As legend has it, the gods Castor and Pollux fought alongside the Romans that day. Historically, some such encounters seem to have actually taken place. The outcome seems to have been very different, however, for there is considerable evidence that there were Etruscan rulers in Rome even after 496 BC. In this scenario, the Romans must attempt to prevent the Etruscans from cutting their line of retreat.

[6.4] THE AEQUI (458 BC)
Romans: 8MS, 8AX, 4SD, 4MC, 2BW, 4SK, 1"2", 2"3", 2"4". VP 71, PL 22. Deploy: K-3. Deploy first, move second. Stacking: 3.
Game Length: 10 Game-Turns.
Victory Conditions: The Romans must hold the line of eight hexes from hex "G" to hex "J" inclusive, by the end of Game-Turn Ten. The Aequi must prevent this.

Historical Notes: In her long climb to power, Rome encountered the most serious difficulties during the conquest of Italy. Several other peoples successively challenged Rome for control of first Latium, then Central Italy and, finally, all of Italy. One of these people was the Aequi, living in the Apennines northeast of Rome. At one point, the Aequi threatened to take a Roman fortress. A Roman army was quickly gathered under the command of Cincinnatus and marched out to defeat the Aequi. This scenario assumes that the Aequi were attempting to force a pass in order to send raiding parties into Roman territory.

[7.0] DESIGNER'S NOTES

[7.1] GENERAL SYSTEM COMMENTS
PRESTAGS is, of course, an attempt to unify five older games, namely Armageddon, Phalanx, Centurion, Dark Ages and Renaissance of Infantry into one compatible system. Many of the older games differed widely in their levels of complexity and their attempts to simulate the various periods of warfare. For example, in the original Phalanx system, each counter had an actual stacking point value and it was necessary to compute these values not only at the end of the Movement Phase, but also during the course of movement, in the Movement Phase. There were also more restrictive leadership rules, that forbade a unit from effectively doing anything outside of leadership control radius (which was also more limited). In that game, a unit could not even turn facing to meet an enemy attack without leadership.

A great deal can be learned from these games, the old five and the new five, by the game player about how and why game systems develop. The first two games, Renaissance of Infantry (originally published in S&T nr. 22) and Centurion (published in S&T nr. 25), were originally done by a consortium of talent headed by James Dunnigan, Al Nofi, and R. A. Simonsen. These produced many innovations, but the games essentially concentrated on certain mechanical aspects, while ignoring the human; thus facing was invented in this period, as well as feudal cavalry charges, etc., but there were no effective leadership control rules. Then John Young took over the leadership in pre-Seventeenth Century tactical games and designed and developed Phalanx, and cooperated with S. B. Patrick on the Dark Ages game. These games essentially built on the basis of the prior two games, and continued expanding by incorporating innovations such as contact and very restrictive leadership factors.

Finally, Armageddon (S&T nr. 34) was done. This was a complete reversal from the complexity levels that had been incorporated into Phalanx and Dark Ages. The feeling at that time was that the simplest game possible would be most widely accepted. The period lent itself to this since almost nothing concrete is known about the warfare.

During this series we gradually realized that SPI had made a number of mistakes, both in the actual production and the game design conceptions. Insufficient quality of development and basics such as proofreading made these games suffer. Additionally, although people (some of them at least) enjoyed many of the game restrictions (leadership, feudal cavalry, etc.), this could be overdone.

In this latest attempt, PRESTAGS is attempting to satisfy almost all the people who will buy these games. There are at least two or more levels of complexity in every game. The scenarios have been checked for accuracy at least three times. Many of the inhibiting rules have been changed to moderate their influence. New scenarios have been included, and others revised.

Most importantly, these games are also completely homogeneous. Although many people independently have "linked" the previously published games, this system has been designed from the ground up to demonstrate the ebb and flow of military systems, throughout most of recorded history, and to permit the game player to match them in any way desired. For the first time it is possible to match the pharaoh's armies against a Spanish tercio, or Alexander the Great against Scipio Africanus. This is possible only due to the earlier games, and the advance of the state of the art.

[7.2] CHARIOT DESIGNER'S NOTES
Chariot is perhaps the cleanest of all the PRESTAGS games, in terms of the number of potential optional and scenario rules. The only two items which are exceptional in this period are the existence of the chariot and the civilian leaders.

The chariot was a weapon by which the limited strikepower of missile weapons could be accelerated by movement, and rendered less vulnerable to return fire and melee. Civilian leaders were a phenomenon of Ancient Egypt wherein class distinction was fairly important. The civilians were responsible for organizing and supplying the troops, and were their recognized leaders. In case of battle (a rare occurrence), the military leaders took over. However, the civilian leaders seem to have organized the troops for marching and formation prior to any attacks.