Dave Fedoruk (and anyone else too)

I haven't been posting here because I am currently playing the Coalition in the educational game *War in the West*. But if you'd like to see any of the ideas I've been working with then I'd suggest visiting the *Coalition Perspective* thread of our game. The reason why I promote this (besides the fact that I'm playing in it) is that myself and the Alliance player are posting all of our thoughts and strategies in our respective threads. The only thing both of us ask is that no one spills the beans to the other player. Oh, and I would also promote the *Alliance Perspective* thread to for people thinking about how to fight Coalition strategies.

Planning for and building SBs takes forethought, alot of EPs, fleet/construction assets and it's location must dovetail w/ the your grand strategy. For each individual empire, what locations (ie- your favorite) do you find yourself building your first one or two new SBs at and why?

I'm primarily an Alliance player, and as such, where and when isn't really the question. It's more like "if."

However, from what I've seen, these are popular for the Coalition:

1707 or 1807: Good to upgrade for reach into Kzinti Marquis and Fed NW areas.

1009: Ideal for Com-con income.

1013 or 1214: For use against Hydrans.

0218 or 0217 if the Hydrans were kicked off map.

1001 or 1202: For use against the Kzinti.

I don't know about others but I tend to try to build my SBs at planets at the same time that I drop a few PGBs or PDUs. I do this to create hard points that are devastating to counter attacks and to make it more painful for my opponent to try to stop me from upgrading the base.

As the Coalition:
1407 has long been a favorite of mine. If the Kzinti let me get a Lyran SB in place there the Coalition ability to hit all important points in Kzinti Space is incredibly magnified as it becomes almost impossible to limit the Lyrans by threatening
supply.

0416 is another favorite for the Lyrans, but requires too many forces to be tied up for too long most of the time. Usually I just get a BATs up and pound the Hydran Capital.

2106 is a good initial offensive location for a SB for the Klingons. It helps divide the Kzinti and Federation, but I actually prefer 2509 or 2610 to build full SBs (I know how hard it is). Yes they are way out into Fed Space and vulnerable till you finish the base, but if you clear the 3rd Fleet area and hold the two neutral zone planets on the Fed boarder, 2509 or 2610 create a shortcut to the Fed Capital that the Fed cannot ignore. This forces the Fed to fight you out in the open where you are not disadvantaged by fighting over Federation defenses all the time (once you take 2509 or 2610).

For the Rom I would try to take and hold 3210 long enough to build an SB before the Gorn get rolling then upgrade 4611 to blunt the Gorn attack.

That's a lot of SBs and a lot of EPs. Honestly, I feel good if I manage to get two of them in an entire game as at any given point I'm not likely to have the EPs to divert from the important task of building ships.

As the Alliance:
I have built a SB at 1202 to defend against the Lyrans once. Most people consider that insane, but it's hard to argue with success and I never lost Kzintai in that game.

That would be the only Alliance SB I built outside a capital. Every other time I have built an Alliance SB it has been to fortify the capital.

Note: As the Federation I would build SBs at 2509, 2610, and 3210 to create supper hard points against Coalition attack for the same reason that I would want to capture and build SBs as the Coalition. These minor planets are the gateway to the Federation Capital as they are 6 hexes from the NZ. If I hold these the core of the Federation is safe, but lose them and the Coalition has a chance at ultimate victory.

Ok, given this particular Lyran deployment, what would be a good Kzinti deployment?

(Kindly ignore the campaign specific names, refits and minesweepers)

Forces are represented by fleet counters, and correspond exactly (to the best of my knowledge) to the County and Ducal fleets.
0502 - Pelt Hunter County Fleet - Count Rzahk
BC 102 Bloodshedder w/ADM, CA+ 742 Scalp Hunter, CL+p 744 Carnivore, CW+ 746 Voulge, DD 750 Stalker, FF 754 Defender of the Race, MS 752 Blaster

0504 - Golden Fang County Fleet - Count Rassk
CA+p 760 Golden Warrior, CL+ 762 Ripping Fang, CW+pB 764 Battle Claw, DD 770 Black Rain, FF+ 274 Jagged Fang

0705 - Predator County Fleet - Count Prekor
CA+p 780 Enchanter, CL+p 784 Pouncer, CW+B 782 Predator's Plunder, DD+ 791 Rage, DDG 793 Streak, FF+p 795 Slammer, SC 797 Predator's Eye

0307 - MON

0404 - Black Stripe County Fleet - Count Zahn
CA 720 Lacerator, CL+p 722 Ravager, CW 724 Cruel Fangs, DD+ 730 Fervent, FF 732 Fear Render, TGC+ 721 Clawed Provisioner

0404 - Red Claw Duchy Fleet - Duke Roget
CC+p 700 Eviscerator, CF 701 Runner, CL+ 710 Ransacker, CW+B 702 Marauder, DD 711 Flaming, DDG 712 Leap, FF 713 Feral, SAV 719 Flurry, FHL 709 Patch

0404 - APT, MB

0707 - Apex County Fleet - Count Leyraf
CA 221 Vertex, CL 224 Pinnacle, DD 227 Utmost, FF 229 Summit

0707 - MS 190 Inferno, JGP 104 Lizama (in HDW-F mode)

0408 - Home Fleet - King Rahrzahk
LAV, FTL, FTSx2, SAF, PTR, DIPx3, ENG, FHL, DWT, FFTx2, FRD, MB

0408 - CW+pB 110 Blooddrinker (independent raider), CW+pB 112 Fierce Claw (independent raider)

0608 - Foremost Duchy - Arch Duke Frinkor
DN+pB 100 Stained Axe, CC 201 Necromancer, CL+ 202 Spearmaker, DD+ 210 Sagacious, DD+ 211 Blaster, DD+p 212 Slayer, DD+ 213 Killer, DDG 219 Coalition, FF 214 Firebane, FF+ 215 Cracker, FF 216 Gouger, MS 217 Silent Death, SC 218 Jade Eye, TGP+ 203 Xandarr

0608 - Nightroar County - Count Ktazh Miroov
CA+p 280 Fearstalker, CL+p 284 Deathrust, CW+ 282 Bloodslinger, DD+ 291 Terrorizer, DW+p 293 Night Howl, DW+ 295 Shadowstalker, FF+ 297 Razorclaw

0608 - Silver Moon County - Count Zaob
CA+p 240 Prowess, CL+p 242 Fear Render, DD+ 251 Quicksilver, DW+p 253 Abolition, FF+ 255 Strongjaw, MS 257 Shah Mat

0608 - Black Claw County - Count Kuhla
CA+p 260 Fangs of the Night, CL+p 262 Ripper, CW+ 264 Asian, CW+p 266 Claws of the Night, DD+ 271 Render, FF+ 273 Ferocity, FF+ 275 Primal, MS 277 Uskut

0810 - MON

0411 - White Stripe County Fleet - Count Ragha
CA 320 Death Blow, CL+ 322 Soul of Steel, DD 330 Icefire, FF+ 334 Wind Rider, SC 332 Eye of the Duke

0411 - Enemy's Blood Duchy Fleet - Duke Laarzdah
CC+ 300 Death Bringer, CL+p 302 Djinn of the Desert, DD+p 310 Bloodguard, FF 312 Bloodspiller, MS 318 Infiltrator

0411 - CF 309 Sprinter, DDG 319 Pride, APT, SAV, FHL, MB

0212 - Bloody Claw County Fleet - Count Nashar
CA+p 360 Bloody Claw, CL+p 362 Slasher, DD+p 370 Hunter, FF 372 Striker, TGC 361 Litter Queen

0413 - Hidden Dagger County Fleet - Count Kleave
BC+pB 103 Brilliant Star w/ADM, CA 342 Vicious, DD 350 Pestilence, FF+ 354 Zealous, MS 352 Tenacious

OFF MAP - Dark Storm County Fleet - Count Rippke
CA 580 Dark Storm Thunder, CL 582 Dark Storm Fury, FF+ 590 Dark Storm Fire

OFF MAP - Doomstar County Fleet - Count Karin
CA+ 520 Vengeance, CL+p 522 Rage, DD 530 Wrath, FF+p 534 Frenzy, MS 532 Fortunes of War

OFF MAP - Blood Star County Fleet - Count Ffarric
CA+p 540 Wrath's Claw, CL 542 Death's Reach, DD 550 Quick Fang, FF 556 Hrath's Whiskers, MS 552 Twilight Victory, SC 554 Familiar

OFF MAP - Night Star County Fleet - Count Iblis
CA+ 560 Midnight, CL 562 Moonreach, CW 564 Demonstar, DD 570 Firestar, TGP 561 Gehenna

OFF MAP - Far Stars Duchy Fleet - Duke Kadama
DNL+pB 500 Heartseeker, CC+p 502 Redeemer, CL 504 Blood of Heroes, DD 510 Sheekela, DDG 512 Armistice, DW+p 514 Law Giver, FF+p 516 Raver
Which rule sets are you using?

The Kzinti can't as easily leave picket forces now, if the Lyrans can raid (or do E&S mission) - and so Dukes at 1003 or 1004 - and reserve at the SB is pretty normal.

You could stack Counts on 902 and react out as and when the BATS gets attacked - although you might end up in some deep space battles then, if the Lyrans care cunning.

Only real suggestion is ensure 902 and 1001 are still Kzinti at the end of the turn!

@Paul - 2K (I don't have MMX), AO, SO, PO

Yeah, raids/E&S add a whole new animal to the zoo. Oy!

Klingon forces (which I didn't add because they really aren't relevant on T1) are pretty standard deployment more or less evenly Northwest fleet @1107, Northern fleet @1307 and Northeast Fleet @1507

Kzinti - Yeah, Dukes @1003 is a splendid idea!

Thank you for your advice. I forgot to mention (in the post) that battle hexes are resolved using SFB. This is why it took over a decade to do the GW last time.

Other thought - How about MON deployment? 1202, 1502 and possibly 1001?

Monitors can't be initial deployed in Capital Hexes (519.11) exception being the Tholians.

Has anyone played the *No Tholians* Option or engaged in an early assault on Tholia? How did it go and/or what would you do differently?
Talk to Mike Curtis (FEAR) I cannot remember the scenario at Origins (Gale Force?) but he attacked the Tholians and I defended their home-world his strategy to strip their capital away worked rather well and he turned what was left of the Tholian navy into a refugee force in Fed space.

Gale Force... Origins 2007.

A painful, but intensely enjoyable assault on a well defended home world and it's systems...

I think it was a different year, because Mike and I played Chuck Strong/Ryan Opel in Firestorm in 2007.

I know we were still in the big box. I also know it was not the last year in the big box (2005) because I played the Feds in Cloudburst. I believe that both Scott's were there from the Murfreesboro BG. Maybe 2004?

Has noone ever attacked the Tholians? I thought that my query would draw more of a response.

It's my experience that they are the supreme pain in the Octant... contrary to what the Hydran haters subscribe to. It seems to me that the Tholians represent the trader's pinky on the scale of balance- not always easy to detect or quantify, but nevertheless, subtly present in the accounting. Even some of the most experienced players admit to a slight Alliance advantage w/ regards to victory speculation for the GW, as a whole. I'd like to propose a fun scenario where the Tholians exact their price of existence and we get on w/ the game (w/ their extermination MWUuuHAhahahahahaaaaaa!!!). I'm positive every Coalition player has considered the pros and cons of a Tholian annihilation at their eariest possible opportunity. Problem is, the possible minimal cost is never convenient. I'm surprised that I'm unable to find any games on record where someone took a shot at eliminating an historic obstacle to Klingon territorial aspirations at the earliest possible moment. And all Alliance players tend to view them as some sort of free throw away.

Have any of you ever thought what a game would be like if the Rocks were just a blip on your Galaxy’s history? How would you balance it? It would be interesting to hear F&E vets muse on this subject.
In fact, a new FO rewrite would make a great home to a comprehensive Balance Options revisitation since we took some of the most important game contributions (other than extra counters) from FO and included them in 2010. And I for one, would rather have some new and/or well meaning and considered 'fun fluff' as opposed to more well haggled over rules to choose from. Balance Options are alot of fun, as they twist the percieved order of the game and let one start w/ a fait accompli for a victory point price of interesting situations w/out years of map staring. They provide an additional avenue for newbs to engage vets in competitive games. I think these are something worth considering for enjoyments' sake as opposed to some dice chisling learned lessons that take years to recognise. Call 'em Admiral's Options.

I'm surprised JS hasn't had any replies to some of these proposals... I've been wordy enough and JS seems to always cut to the quick.

---

Ted Fay (Catwhoeatsphoto) on Tuesday, April 27, 2010 - 10:39 am:

Quote:

Have any of you ever thought what a game would be like if the Rocks were just a blip on your Galaxy's history? How would you balance it? It would be interesting to hear F&E vets muse on this subject.

There is a "no Tholians" option for the Klingons. One of the Captians Logs, I think?

Matthew G. Smith (Mattsmith) on Tuesday, April 27, 2010 - 11:48 am:

It may be in a CL issue. I don't know.

But I do know that the "No Tholians" option is also described in Fighter Operations.

Thomas Mathews (Turtle) on Tuesday, April 27, 2010 - 12:11 pm:

The No Tholians option is in Fighter Options.

William Jockusch (Verybadcat) on Tuesday, April 27, 2010 - 01:53 pm:

Cost/benefit of attacking the Tholians just isn't worth it.

Mike Curtis (Nashvillen) on Tuesday, April 27, 2010 - 02:40 pm:

The attack on the Tholians at Origins was in 2006, found my notebook on it.

The victory conditions for the scenario ((608.G6) REQUIRED ENGAGEMENT If this scenario is used as part of a combined scenario then the Coalition is required to destroy 150 points worth of Tholian Bases (i.e., 5 BATS & 1 SB) or
suffer a drop of one 600-41 victory level for each 20 Base points below 150 that the Coalition does not score.) require the Coalition to attack the Tholians or the best they can do is a draw no matter what else they do elsewhere.

My friend, Scott Hofner (playing the Lyrans), came up with a plan to attack the Tholians and we decided that if we are going to attack them we need to do it right and eliminate them from the game. I was playing the Klingons.

We setup in such a way to be very close to the Federation Capital with overwhelming forces that forced the Fed (Richard Abbott) to setup very conservitively and around the Fed capital. We then took all those forces and slammed the Tholians in one turn.

We pinned as much as we could out of the capital and killed most of them except the stuff on the Romulan border which survived. Everything in the capital except for a CC, I think, died.

The butcher bill on the Coalition side was not pretty: 91.9 ep of salavage

Klingon dead: SAF, PT, C9A, 2xD7C, D7, D6G, MD5, 20xD5, 2xAD5, F5W, 11xF5L, 9xF5, F5E, 2xE4A

Lyran dead: DN, DNL, 2xBC, 2xCA, STJ

Klingon cripples: 2xD6M, 2xD6D, 2xD7, D6, 2xD5, F5G, D7V, D5U, D6V, 2xFV, 3CPC(captured)

Lyran cripples: STT, STJ

Scott kept saying to me round after round "Stay on target..." and we did. It was very painful to lose that many ships, but the strategic implications of a connected Klingon-Romulan border out weighed the loss. The salavage was used to build a SB over the crippled dyson sphere to secure that sector. What was crippled was repairid very quickly and used to keep the Feds at bay until further ships could be built, even at 0.75% economy in the later turns.

The 59 ships lost did not slow down the attacks on the other targets in the area. I don't remember what else we did, but maybe Lawrence remembers.

They ended up with only a handfull of Tholian ships surviving, they would not be of much help as homeless ships for the Feds, but they would need everything they had.

It was a very interesting exercise in taking the Tholians out, I would do it a little differently if presented the situation again, but only if the victory conditions require it. They are much easier to keep bottled up then to take!
A 60 SE loss seems to be... nearly overwhelming. The strategic implications of such a huge naval loss is fairly compelling, and I'm not sure if a guaranteed Klingon-Romulan route is worth it? Hmmm. Maybe if it allowed more Klingon support in the GTO, but after losing 60 SEs... that might be tough anyway. The income gained hardly seems worth it.

Might be an interesting thing to try to see what really happens in the long term.

Out of curiosity, Mike, do you remember how many SEs you threw into Tholian territory that turn?

Andrew

I think Mike's report and Teds insight show just why so few Coalition players attack the Tholians.

Unlike any other Capital assault, the Coalition has to self kill (due to the Web) in large numbers, and the perceived cost, outweighs the reward.

The benefits are huge (Klingon Colony refound etc) - but where do you find 60 ships to 'throw away'?

In a scenario, it's probably easier, but in the GW, you will telegraph to your enemy what your doing, at a fairly early stage!

(Which might have major implications elsewhere!).

Lastly, the Tholian homeworld is also probably the single location where good luck v bad luck could have additional major consequences (imagine if Mike failed and the Tholians got that 91 Ep's of Coalition Salvage!) - and players don't want to risk a failed assault.

RE: Tholian Extermination in Gale Force

Well part of the thing that makes this not such a "stinger" of a strategy is that they actually defeated the Tholains so the salvage was not lost. The gain in EPs would eventually boost the economy that when coupled with the salvage returned, the SEQs would only temporarily feel the dip that they felt. Two of the three of the large capital ships that were lost came from the Lyrans which have the money to make more. The Klingons lost 23 war cruiser hulls and 23 frigate hulls (slightly more than a years worth of CW and FF hulls). Not bad at all of a victorious capital assault. I have seen far worse against other Capitals (Hydran
especially).

The Alliance on the other hand lost all but a handful of Tholians, the EPs they generated and the ability to make more of them. The loss of a Dyson Sphere is significant for morale, balance, and supply roadblock they represent between the Klingons and Roms.

I will say that even with the 60 ship hit they took the Alliance was not able to grab a foothold to push them back in the time given at Origins. Ultimately the move may have cost them but as for this scenario they achieved enough VP to win and had some nice bragging rights.

A good time was had by all involved.

---

By Bill Schoeller (Bigbadbill) on Tuesday, April 27, 2010 - 10:12 pm:

I always felt the best way to get a Rom Klingon supply line was through the 7th fleet SB. Ignore the little rocks until they come out for a few turns, and decide if it is worth it to defend the major planet on the border with similar ship equivalents, i.e. let him in and blast him over your fixed defenses.

By Andrew Bruno (Andybruno) on Thursday, April 29, 2010 - 11:31 am:

Thomas-
Yup, I know about the FO option. I was just fishin' for some firsthand accounts of assaults on Tholia. When I've considered using the 'No Tholian' option, it's hard to swallow the the early benefit of the added 7 EP vs the lost use of the TBS for turns 1-6. Granted, the elimination of the Tholian thorn during the invasion of Fed space is a big 'plus' and improved LoC w/ the Roms is more secure, the -30 VP more than outweighs the benefits because of the slowed Coalition tempo early on, in my humble opinion.
I think I'll try a solo Tholian Gambit scenario to get some more info...

Thank you! 🙌

Mike-
Thanks alot for you Gale Force recap. Very interesting account and is useful as a benchmark. 😊 I was hoping to hear of an attack during an earlier turn to see how that went but I'm always excited by cool after-action reports and really any assualt info is useful! Thanks again.

By Paul Howard (Raven) on Sunday, May 02, 2010 - 03:24 am:

Andrew

You should also remember the Klingons are gaining a SB (and 3 BATS) and it's a
wider front for the Federation to defend.

The temporary loss of TBS until turn 7 is pretty big - but 7 Ep's a turn (from turn 1) provides 42 Ep's in the first 6 turns - and then 'your up' (having both TBS and the 7 Ep’s a turn 😊) plus the strategic situation is much improved.

Those 30 Option points it costs is supposted to a major cost (and is) - but it removes the Tholians for ever (so no raids when the Tholians go to war against the Coalition etc - unless the Coalition invades the Tholians - and so no Economic and ship cost to defend against them) - and so it has to be worth it!

Let us know how the Solo game goes!

I think a 30 point hit is way too low for eliminating the Tholians.

John

The Klingons also lose 17+ ships (depending on which rules sets are being used) from turn 2 to turn 6, as the TBS isn't released.

And what would 30 points give you?

20 Points gives the Kzinti Barony Fleet on turn 1 (so 2 turns early - i.e. can be used on Alliance 1, Coalition 2 and Alliance 2 on map). That probably would stop the Lyrans staying within range 6 of 1401!

20 Points stops the Klingons invading the Kzinti on turn 2. (Probably means 1401 would not fall unless the Coalition concentrate everything against the Kzinti, and the Hydrans would have a very free hand).

20 Points gets Wyn support.

But for 20 points, I would go for No Rom Carriers (ever!). That means the Romulans don't get fighters on ships - and until PF's arrive - that means no attrition factors.

The other 10 would probably be split Quest for Methane (6 - 2 extra Survey slots for the Hydrans and +3 NCL and +3 FF on turns 6 for the Feds (costs 4) or even Fatalism (+2 Hydran SB's!).

The Hydrans with 3 SB's in 617 would be very nasty to evict (Each Major Planet also has a SB, as alas they can't easily go over the capital due to the dual base rules!).
With no Rom Carriers, a tougher time to beat either the Kzinti (due to no TBS) or Hydrans (extra cash and SB's) - the Coalition would have a very much different game.

Yes, the Feds will suffer as it's another front to defend, and the Roms and Klingons can do better co-ordinated attacks - but that seems 'fair' to me!

By John Doucette (Jkd) on Tuesday, May 04, 2010 - 08:04 am: Edit

My experience has been that having the Tholian roadblock in place is worth far more than a 30 vp hit. It's not so much the Feds having to defend another front (any decent Coalition player should make sure a strong effort is made in the south), but that the Coalition starts with bases already there. I simply think there are a lot of intangibles that haven't been factored in to the No Tholians VP cost.

By Paul Howard (Raven) on Wednesday, May 05, 2010 - 02:45 pm: Edit

John

It's not not 30 VP hit - it's a 30 option point cost.

I would be prepared to play a game with no Tholians - as I think the Alliance gains do offset the losses of the Tholians!

I also don't think the rules sets (other than Strategic Operations - too many tugs!) would make it eaisier or more difficult for either side.

It would allow the Coalition Commercial Convoys to reach the Romulans - so thats something I suppose!

By David Slatter (Davidas) on Thursday, May 06, 2010 - 08:02 pm: Edit

The klingons get a lot more than 7 EP extra in the no tholians option. They also get back their lost colonies which were in Tholian space, which I think are at least a major and a minor.

It's a long time since I read those colony rules, but I am pretty sure they are there.

30 option points for no Tholians - i'd take that every time. And really - spending 20 option points on getting a Zin fleet 2 turns early is nothing like 2/3 as strong as no tholians. In the big scheme of things, that's diddle squat. Maybe 20-30 EPs extra economy will be held over the first 10 turns due to that, which is very small compared to at least 7EP/turn for the klingons and a pocketful of free bases.(up to 12+Ep/turn if my memory is correct).

If nothing else, those bases give rock solid communications with the Romulans, pun intended.
By Paul Howard (Raven) on Friday, May 07, 2010 - 09:10 am: Edit

David

From reading the no-Tholian option - I don't think the lost Colonies ever 'existed'.

Kalesta is the minor planet instead of the Tholian homeworld - which is/was/wasn't (what do you call an alterantive future universe difference? 😊) one of the 3 planets that would be in that hex, if the Tholians are defeated in the 'normal future universe'.

i.e. The Klingons only every colonised 1 planet at the 'tail end' of their empire!

If the Colonies did exist - I think the 15 Ep's a turn would make the 'deal' too good (even with no Romulan carriers). As I said though - 7 Ep's (less an Ep or so for the normal NZ zones the Klingons capture in that area) is still a good Economic boost for the Klingons.

By Kevin Howard (Jarawara) on Friday, May 07, 2010 - 10:10 am: Edit

Correct - the no-Tholian option is also a no lost colonies option. You only get Kalesta, not the other two. I don't know which thread it's in, but Steve just recently confirmed that.

By Stewart W Frazier (Frazikar2) on Friday, May 07, 2010 - 08:07 pm: Edit

The 2KX edition has the all three planets (655.4)in the No Tholian Option...

By Paul Howard (Raven) on Saturday, May 08, 2010 - 12:50 pm: Edit

Stewart -

655.4 (FO) actually confirms it just the 'colony world' Kalesta - i.e. a single Planet replaces the Colony Planets and Tholia.

511.221 (2K) confirms it's only if the Tholians exist was there Colony worlds there.

So the Klingons can either take the pain in capturing the Tholian homeworld - and they regain their Colony Worlds - or they pay the 30 Option points, and just have a Colony World (Kalesta) there.

The easy differention is the fact that with the Tholians - Kalesta is a Major planet - without the Tholians Kalesta is only a minor planet.

By Andrew Bruno (Admeeral) on Saturday, May 08, 2010 - 07:15 pm: Edit

That's right.

By Thomas Mathews (Turtle) on Saturday, May 08, 2010 - 09:26 pm: Edit

Paul, both you and Stewart are right by the wording of the (655.4).
However, according to FEAR, the 2010 rules take precedence if they modify a rule in a previously released product.

Sorry Thomas - you have lost me!

As far as I am aware - the three Klingon Colony worlds only exist if the Tholians 'take them'.

i.e. - No Tholians, no Colony Worlds.

I would support that by the 'No Tholian Option' is a specific rule, which therefore overrules the general rule (and the the underlying rule set doesn't matter).

(If 2010 said the FO 'NTO' rules were changed, I would also expect the Option cost to change aswell - that extra 8 Ep's of income is probably something like 10 Option points in value!)

The No Tholians Option was added to the 2010 rules and (655.4) was changed to match (511.221).

Was 655.4 in 2010F&E changed to match 511.221?

Steve made it pretty clear he had no intention of changing the No-Tholians option.

Quoted from the 2010 thread:

(655.4) Planet: Delete the Tholian homeworld. In that hex is the minor planet Kalesta, a Klingon colony. Should read: Delete the Tholian homeworld. In that hex are the three planets, Kalesta, Kelanon and Kordahn. Kalesta is a major planet and the other 2 are minor planets. Thomas Mathews 7 Oct 2009

SVC I don't think so. Giving the Klingons three planets is bad for balance. Really, they aggregate one minor, or three colonies..

And...

655.4 According to the LSM hex 2919 contains three planets: MAJ Kalesta, MIN Kelanon and MIN Korhahn. 14 Feb 10, Ryan J Opel

SVC: I am not aware of this data, it contradicts what was in the rulebook long before the LSM was done, it has a MAJOR impact on balance, and so the LSM is
just plain wrong. Not my fault, but somebody blew it.

Now from there, several people tried to cite references to the three planets (it is on the LSM), but it does not change the fact that the No-Tholians OPTION is an alternative galaxy -- there need not be those three planets in that hex in the alternate No-Tholians option.

If 655.4 was changed just for the sake of consistancy... well, congratulations, we just broke the No-Tholians option, as there is no way it could only be worth 30 points. Adjusting everything to match everything else, and in the process breaking the game, is sheer folly.

To quote a wise man who sometimes frequents these boards: Consistancy is the hobgoblin of small minds.

Thomas

Thanks - I missed the No Tholians section in the 2010 rules (they are not part of the options section) and so when I looked the first time - didn't see it!

Looks like (Kevin's post) though SVC has already corrected it back to the FO rules for the no Tholian option.

I am no longer confused!

Chuck

On that basis - what do you think the bid to play the Coalition would go as high as?

(Over 40 might be expensive, but low 30's would be pretty reasonable).

That's a player's call based on the player's ability and that of his opponent.

Bidding. That could be interesting...

Bidding puts your money where your empire is!
Most games I'm familiar with that use a bidding system use a system where you bid VPs. Guess it all depends how each group plays.

Some notes to myself for next game as the Coalition:

Your mission is to survive as intact as possible until a target worth attacking becomes available (Gorns or possibly Tholians). The Alliance can have higher compot lines, and direct every round and still run you out of fighters first. Every rule in the game is written to give a slight Alliance edge except maybe Diplomacy (mostly a wash)--never forget that. I'm actually surprised the rules allow the Alliance to go into economic exhaustion at all, expect a change in the 2020 rules.

Now.

G ships are sucker bets. Use existing ones and auxiliaries for Garrison duty. If a Marine General dies, don't bother replacing him. Maulers (except baby maulers) are a sucker bet. Use existing bigger maulers in pursuit only (like you'll ever get the chance). They might also be useful defending SBs later in the game. In the meantime use them as pin ships. Mauler *advantage* is a myth--he can take the rest after you direct his frigate on fighters and never, ever run out of fighters, so what value to kill a few more fighters each round by using maulers? Baby maulers are perfect for directing frigates anyway, so why build anything else? You will often be faced with the choice of directing a frigate, or doing no damage to the enemy and never running him out of fighters. Just direct the frigate without a mauler, as the extra damage will never matter and he will be directing your D6S or carrier groups in return. Never put a carrier group on the line unless overstuffed to max with the best available ships, or it is dead.

Self-kill, the Alliance can form a pursuit line as good as a weak Coalition regular line plus they'll have fighters. Overbuild every fighter you can, as usual. Never miss a carrier build. If you do this, you might be able to have fighter parity against the Gorns, and slight inferiority everywhere else, if the Alliance doesn't build more carriers than FFF allow.

Never substitute a ship if a CDR could save you money. Use ships you want to cripple in small battles, or the enemy will direct them (even Lyran DDs) just to frustrate you after you're out of D6S and anything else he wants. Don't put anything but V and scout pods on tugs. Use tugs to rescue self-destroyed ships. Build Lyran LAVs, and tow them with tugs to avoid pursuit. Save double "G" pods for late in the game to defend your homeworlds--they have no other use.

Use FRDs as bait to intercept drone raiders. Don't waste tugs hauling FRDs around for any reason--they're worthless casualties only.

Must attack Feds on turn 7 and open supply to Romulans turn 8 or the Romulans lose more than just 4 ep diplomatic income (lose 4 ep/extra delay turn).
Only Fed and/or Gorn capitals are worth taking due to Hydran free ships/free money/free fighter factors (anything the rules forgot to give them for free in case they lose the capital?), and Kzinti invincible offmap. Doubt Fed Capital can be taken through the 10+SB, so that leaves the Gorn--which stretches supply and so-called interior lines to the max. Maybe the Tholians are best as a target. Kill 6th fleet SB on turn 10 despite the disadvantages, then take the return beating, or it will only get worse each turn as Feds produce 40 ships a turn and will hardly need them elsewhere. Think seriously about the Tholians, as they are really the only "vulnerable" Alliance partner. Save your SFGs for the Gorns, where they *might* actually do some good (since he initially won't have 25 overstuffed heavy carriers and actually needs other ships), otherwise, they're only useful as a threat in-being, and to protect crippled ships from drone raids. Perhaps avoid E&S raids altogether, as you will lose more than you gain. Use your prime teams to protect from E&S raids, as Alliance has better nodes to hit you from. Coalition produces 9 more free fighters through turn two, then produces 6 less/turn from turns 3-7, then 21 less a turn for turns 7-10, then 11 less on turns 1--11, then 17 less for the rest of the game. Per turn. Coalition produces two prime teams until turn 10, then 3. Alliance produces 2 on turns 1-2, then 3/trn until turn 7 then 4 a turn, then 5/trn on turn 12.

By Stewart W Frazier (Frazikar2) on Sunday, October 31, 2010 - 11:14 pm: Edit

*snicker*

By Ted Fay (Catwhoeatsphoto) on Monday, November 01, 2010 - 10:31 am: Edit

As a fellow Coalition player, I'll contend with some of your observations for purposes of debate. Note I DEFINITELY agree the full game is slanted pro-Alliance. If I don't address an observation, basically I agree with it.

Quote:

G ships are sucker bets. Use existing ones and auxiliaries for Garrison duty. If a Marine General dies, don't bother replacing him.

Strongly disagree. Having a bunch of G ships and a MMG can make a big difference, from minor BATS busting forces to planetary assaults to SB assaults. You have an advantage here, especially early on. I have had tremendous success with G units on SB assaults - without wasting damage points. So much so, in fact,
that all three of my three opponents tend to direct on the good G ships during assaults (the ones that either bring twoGs to the table or have a high compot like the JPG or an LTT+G). That in itself is a minor victory because 1) it's saving me damage points through inefficient directing and 2) he's not directing on more valuable units as much. Heck, I've been so successful that every so often when I don't have something better to do with a D6 hull I'll build a D6G outright!

---

Quote:

Maulers (except baby maulers) are a sucker bet. Use existing bigger maulers in pursuit only (like you'll ever get the chance). They might also be useful defending SBs later in the game. In the meantime use them as pin ships. Mauler *advantage* is a myth--he can take the rest after you direct his frigate on fighters and never, ever run out of fighters, so what value to kill a few more fighters each round by using maulers? Baby maulers are perfect for directing frigates anyway, so why build anything else? You will often be faced with the choice of directing a frigate, or doing no damage to the enemy and never running him out of fighters. Just direct the frigate without a mauler, as the extra damage will never matter and he will be directing your D6S or carrier groups in return.

---

Disagree in part, agree in part. Maulers are NOT a counter-balance to fighters. Not by a long shot. You can end up trading a mauler for a FF, which doesn't make sense. That being said, I disagree because maulers are *very* useful on the attack, particularly against PDUs. They are also useful against the Gorn. Maulers can even help in SB assaults because the enemy tends to direct on them, saving you damage points to take. Maulers are also extremely useful on pursuit, not only for directing purposes, but also to get that extra roll on the capture dice. However, you are right, you don't need as many 10 point maulers as all that. Build plenty of baby maulers. They are cheaper to build, MUCH cheaper to repair (half as much) and just as effective against FFs and still fairly effective against cruisers. I'm thinking maybe a 50/50 or maybe 75/25 baby mauler to full mauler ratio (part of that, though, is limited by production limits, particularly for the Lyrans).

---

Quote:

Overbuild every fighter you can, as usual. Never miss a carrier build. If you do this, you might be able to have fighter parity against the Gorns, and slight inferiority everywhere else, if the Alliance doesn't build more carriers than FFF allow.
I'm of two minds on this. I find EPs to be very limited, and maximizing pin count and especially compot to be of high value. However, I might have to reduce the value of pincount on my venn diagram in view of Tim Linden's victory accounts.

---

**Quote:**

Never put a carrier group on the line unless overstuffed to max with the best available ships, or it is dead.

---

Later in the game, yes. Early in the game on major assaults, possibly, but I'd almost WANT to see that because of the massive loss in damage points. The result can be you take a lot less damage.

It is true the Alliance has a big advantage in terms of directing - but keep in mind he'll often have to yield the hex to you to do that. Use this fact to your advantage.

---

**Quote:**

Self-kill, the Alliance can form a pursuit line as good as a weak Coalition regular line plus they'll have fighters.

---

Depends on the situation. If you make this a rule of thumb you will run out of ships. That being said, Tim Lindon actually *won* as the Coalition (using OLD rules) doing a lot more self-killing to take stuff early. I might have to try that in my next game.

---

**Quote:**

Don't put anything but V and scout pods on tugs. Use tugs to rescue self-destroyed ships. Build Lyran LAVs, and tow them with tugs to avoid pursuit. Save double "G" pods for late in the game to defend your homeworlds--they have no other use.

---

Agree and disagree. Rescue tugs are wonderful. In fact, I maximize LTT and tug production precisely for this purpose.

Bear in mind you are limited to 3 Lyran LAVs. I strongly recommend that you stuff them with 2*CWE, DWE as escorts. Very sweet little lines that are very good for holding hexes against high fighter annoyances like the Hydrans. Also, don't need
the rescue tugs so much (which are unreliable since LAVs are much bigger than they are for purposes of rescue).

See above for G ships. With respect to pods, G pods are VERY useful to put on LTTs, particularly the D5H. The compot remains relatively high, and you get the benefit of a G described above.

---

**Quote:**

Use FRDs as bait to intercept drone raiders. Don't waste tugs hauling FRDs around for any reason--they're worthless casualties only.

---

Disagree. FRDs have their uses, particularly as retrograde points when building an AUX park that is heading towards a homeworld assault (particularly against the Hydrans where you can easily out pin them). FRDs do help with repairs. However, more self killing and a willingness to repair more slowly using PRDs and existing bases is probably also good.

---

**Quote:**

Must attack Feds on turn 7 and open supply to Romulans turn 8 or the Romulans lose more than just 4 ep diplomatic income (lose 4 ep/extra delay turn). Only Fed and/or Gorn capitals are worth taking due to Hydran free ships/free money/free fighter factors (anything the rules forgot to give them for free in case they lose the capital?), and Kzinti invincible offmap. Doubt Fed Capital can be taken through the 10+SB, so that leaves the Gorn--which stretches supply and so-called interior lines to the max. Maybe the Tholians are best as a target.

---

I'm wondering on this one myself. However, I definitely agree you need to attack the Fed on turn 7 while his outer defenses are still vulnerable. The key to keeping the Fed at bay as long as possible is to destroy or make undefendable his outer supply points so that he can't prosecute attacks against you. Tholians might be worth taking - if you do, bring a bunch of SAFs to the table.

---

**Quote:**

Kill 6th fleet SB on turn 10 despite the disadvantages, then take the return beating, or it will only get worse each turn as Feds produce 40 ships a turn and will hardly need them elsewhere.
There might be merit to this. Dunno, though.

---

**Quote:**

Think seriously about the Tholians, as they are really the only "vulnerable" Alliance partner.

---

Don't know if "vulnerable" is the right word for them. Except for SAFs and mauling fighters they keep an extremely high compot right up till the end due to the inability to direct on them. Not to mention you're forced to self kill a bunch more ships. I'm not sure at all if it's worth attacking them, but it might be necessary in order to achieve victory conditions.

---

**Quote:**

Save your SFGs for the Gorns, where they *might* actually do some good (since he initially won't have 25 overstuffed heavy carriers and actually needs other ships), otherwise, they're only useful as a threat in-being, and to protect crippled ships from drone raids.

---

Agreed on Gorn. SFGs are good on the defense if you put them on bases. SFGs are also good on B10s, particularly if you throw them against the Gorn.

---

**Quote:**

Perhaps avoid E&S raids altogether, as you will lose more than you gain. Use your prime teams to protect from E&S raids, as Alliance has better nodes to hit you from.

---

I have found E&S raids to be *very* useful, particularly against the Hydrans. Odds of success are low, but you can take out key units with a combined E&S/ drone raid. Units like the Hydran FCR tug, pretty much any scout tug, Hydran cruisers (particularly LBs and LMs), etc. The ability to take out a scout can be potentially devastating to the enemy. You might want to reconsider E&S raids as part of your arsenal.

---

*By William Stec (Billstec2) On Monday, November 01, 2010 - 11:28 am: Edit*

I've used G ships to good effect, especially on SB assaults. In one scenario at Origins (Firestorm'07?) I used a couple D6Gs + 2PT combos, with some escorting
ships to great effect.

The first group got directed on, crippling it. The second one did not. I managed to inflict I think 4-5 SIDS on the base. For some reason, I direct-SIDS'd the base a few rounds with a mauler to speed up it's destruction. In this case, inflicting that extra damage with the G units made the fight go faster.

It was a situation where I really wanted the base to go away, and inflicting casualties on the Federation was secondary (though they took some pretty good lumps there as well). It deprived the Feds of a base to hole up and resist at, and he was forced to fall back some more, allowing my advance to continue unabated.

I haven't had much luck with G units on BATS assaults; either the base gets directed upon and dies, or the defender gives it up as damage too early and the SIDS or two I scored with the G unit don't have much effect on the battle other than to allow a little more damage on the enemy fleet. Not much noticeable effect anyways.

I also have not had much luck with a commando assault with G units, but mostly because the right poorly defended target hasn't come up yet.

I've also used maulers to cause direct SIDS, combined with G attacks, to get up to 2 SIDS per battle round. SB can go down in just 5 battle rounds; saves you lots of damage. Gross.

By Chris Upson (Misanthropope) on Monday, November 01, 2010 - 04:37 pm: Edit

bill:

with two defending Gs it becomes really difficult to get sids in an efficient way with troop ships. SAFs seem to work better

paul e:

i think you're really overstating the point regarding FRDs. an FRD park in 1407 is pretty strong. a lyran SB likes to live there, for CC and supply grid purposes. protecting it from a drone raid can be done with POLs and E4s, each of which are numerous and useless. it takes more than 1 E&S to punch a raid-sized hole in the doughnut, since 2.5 pins stops 3 ships. fat kitties want to use 3 ships, 2 prime teams, 5.2 EPs, and a healthy dollop of luck to kill an FRD, i say more power to 'em. say hi to my C5A on your way out

maulers aren't worth converting, IMO, for the reasons you give. but they are
worth subbing. in a capital hex you a) *have* to run them out of fighters, b) have high-value targets to maul in the early going and c) kind of want to get something direct killed so you don’t have to cripple a bunch of quality units. maulers are also somewhat valuable in reserves.

carriers, like everything else, work a lot better defending starbases than attacking them. carriers, like everything else, are better in their alliance implementations than their coalition ones. IOW, i wouldn’t red-line my economy for the sake of an extra DVS group. lyran carrier tugs and heavy carriers are worth building, not so much for the carrier as the opportunity for zillions of DWs and FFs to go from being empty pin count to adequate for front-line duty.

G ships don’t work very well on starbases, and nothing else matters. MMG them in for damage absorption and then CDR them to something useful. 5 extra CALs/NCCs? "i could not eat another bite of this chocolaty goodness. oh wait, yes i can."

Ted, Lyrans are limited to 2 LAVs (and 2 SAVs) Annex (762) CO...

Excellent gentlemen. I wished to start a discussion, and this has happened. If a few Coalition players come together we can share our separate ideas to mutual benefit.

*Snicker*

The statements I made before are blunt and exaggerated. Please tell me why I’m wrong. I’ll clarify my ideas as they come up.

Ted Fay,

All excellent points, you and I are of a like mind in many things it seems. I’ll comment on a few points.

FRDs
I’m sticking to my guns on this one.
FRDs are great for the Alliance offmaps, and all but worthless for the Coalition. They’re the only retrograde point the Coalition can move so this is a major blunder in pre-war equipment design. The only useful similar offensive unit is of course only for the Alliance, LTFs. In fact I have used FRDs exactly as you suggest Ted---in the Hydran theatre with the auxiliaries. Only difference is, I put Ftr-modules on them to protect from ftr raids instead of ringing them with ships. Big deal. Where the Coalition actually need a mobile retrograde point is against the Feds, but we can only use FRDs against the Hydrans.
For my next game, if I get around to it, maybe I’ll tow the Lyran on-maps to the offmap where they might potentially do some good on turn 30, and the Romulans.
should definitely send theirs offmap methinks. I hear what you say about 1407, but I like building a SB or two thereabouts too, and these can handle most damage and other ships can go to the interior. In the end I find no legitimate use for Coalition FRDs so far.

G ships:
The venom in my previous post was un-warranted, I'm going to sort of agree with you in the end. I, like you, build lots of G ships (no D6Gs though, and I've been a fool to put G pods on my D5Gs instead of LTTS it seems). My opponent directs them, particularly if the VBIR goes up. I usually find that with one or two defending G ships and the SB intrinsic G, a SB can last the entire battle exchanging Gs with the G ships he doesn't direct on a neutral or positive VBIR round, and never lose a SIDS. I have tried and tried to use them as you suggest (granted, I now use them to ensure that VBIR goes down, so my dice have had some influence on my feelings here), and it has worked about 1 time on a BATS, never on a SB. Twice now, I have gone to a SB with 5+SIDS on it with overwhelming G superiority, and the intention to direct on his ships while the G's finish the SB. On both occasions, I have had to resort to SIDSing the SB after hanging around way to long waiting for some G success. He directs my Gs so it saves me damage. Sure, a good roll or two might make a difference, but my main belief is that you should never *count* on them to accomplish anything. If they score a SIDS, great and it will generally be meaningless, but don't factor that hypothetical SIDS into your plans. At undefended targets Gs can score damage, but don't ever direct fewer PDUs because you think your G will help. This normally means you direct all the PDUs and your G does nothing, or in rare cases at Major planets you can only direct two or three PDUs, and your G might actually do some good (but don't count on it). My opponent puts Monitors on every planet he can as well, and of course this screws up Gs because I'm not going to waste a round directing the Monitor so my Gs can fail miserably--I'll just direct the PDUs from under the Monitor anyway. Gs are useful for garrisoning Hydran Space and are cheaper to replace than maulers (see below). G ships are cool for the Alliance though. They can put them on the line (you're a fool to direct them unless it's a meaningless pin battle), and then have a better chance of capturing all those cool ships they get to direct!

Maulers:
Agreed on all points. They are useful v. PDUs in the capital. Your other point is more poignant though: Not only with Maulers, but with G ships and any other non-vanilla Coalition ships, their main function is to get directed on. Truth is, I'd be absolutely dead in my current game if my enemy didn't direct the best ship he can every round (unless there's nothing but vanilla on the line). I've lost at least 7 D6S scouts, one carrier group, 5 SFG ships, dozens of maulers, dozens of G ships, 6-10 each of CAs, BCs, CLs, DDs, CCs, D7Cs, D7s, D6s, a C8, 5-6 tugs (including 2 scout tugs)' and dozens of sundry others to directed damage in my current game on turn 12. (In comparison, I've directed about 20 or so escorts, one scout tug, and more recently now that the Alliance has built up hordes of his
best ships and has begun to use some of them, 5 Kzinti BCs, and 4 various CCs). The main function of any Coalition "cool" ships is to give the Alliance something fun to destroy and save you damage. The Coalition spends big money on cool ships so the Alliance can kill them. Thinking of it this way, maybe G ships are the way to go—at least for bases and planets. The Alliance will kill what it wants regardless, so send G ships to be killed because they're cheaper. Granted I don't like thinking about my ships this way, and would prefer to use my ships as intended, but the Alliance get to direct anytime they want with impunity, and usually have the compot to get what they want. On the other hand, the Coalition can really only direct in open-space or defending battles and then only if you don't care about winning the hex. No, the Coalition had better let the damage fall in order to eventually maybe run the Alliance out of fighters before he runs you out of ships. Once his fighters are gone, the Alliance might actually suffer some damage. That won't happen, because of course they'll run after they're out of fighters and then you can kill whatever was there or save whatever was there. I'm exaggerating a little (on turns 1 and 2 the Kzinti don't yet have all the fighters they could ever want) and of course the Coalition want to direct too, but you'll only get to shoot at frigates mostly anyway, so skip the big maulers mostly--there are cheaper ships that are fun for the Alliance to destroy.

**Flatheads:**
Agreed. #1 goal in Coalition game should be an attack turn 7. It's the only (admittedly tiny) chance the Coalition have. This fact is actually what detracts most from the game for me. Not only are there *not* several possible winning Coalition strategies--there might not even be one, but even with out a *winning* strategy, your hand is still forced by this overwhelming need to attack the Fed hard on turn 7. Trust me, by turn 10 the Fed basically matches you with better ships and better scouts and more and better fighters over his starbases (and of course outbuild you with better ships and essentially never get economic exhaustion, get two prime teams/trn, free "better than PFs", LTFs, unlimited 4 pt scouts, SWACS, etc., etc. ad nauseum).

**E&S missions:**
I was just angry because of my own dice results. I agree with your points. The dice are so key here though. I tried over 4 consecutive turns to get that Hydran FCP pod. My opponent didn't even bother to send it offmap. I never got it, and he will have a nice toy the rest of the game so that I will essentially never run the Hydran out of fighters in any battle ever. In my game, we've decided FCRs can always be an inner escort during raids so no love there. I try for scout tugs too, believe me. I crippled one with E&S missions two turns running in Charlie Mike. First turn rolled a "1" on the raid so it lived. Second turn it made the depot. My opponent has killed 2 tugs in two tries in this manner (although one of mine did also make the depot). He also crippled a key scout once—that can often be a useful trick for the Alliance (once in a while for the Coalition). I've also lost about 9 prime teams trying E&S raids and my opponent has only lost one--it might be wise to hold off on the raids until you build up a few prime teams so you have
some around for other things.
My serious word on E&S raids though, is that if you don't have a good target,
don't do a raid--save the EPs (particularly the Romulans). Otherwise, always steal
money if you can.

Tholians/Strategy:
I don't know how bad attacking the Tholians will be, but given what I say above,
here's what I'm now thinking: Overall strategy is to achieve your un-negotiable
offensives (All Hydran/Kzinti bases, and maybe a capital) losing the minimum
ships and especially of your "cool" specialty ships, build up massive defenses, and
go on the strategic defensive as quickly as possible. Maybe the Tholians make
sense here. This game is an economic grind. No amazing lighting campaign will
do more than slightly alter the overall (im)balance of power. There is no way to
eliminate any Alliance partner except the Tholians, and it is hard to even really
hurt any (sending the Hydrans offmap is at best an inconvenience to them--they
don't get to ravage your homelands, but it doesn't slow their production much,
and the Kzin-Fed-Gorn are connected offmap). The Alliance over-matches you.
Attempt to even the odds by making him fight you over your fixed defenses as
soon as possible so you can fight at even odds--his more numerous better ships,
mobile retro points, cheap repair, free damage, better scouts, better fighters,
more prime teams, positional advantages, etc. against your fixed defenses if you
can get some up.
As a general, looking at the two sides, it seems more and more to be my

By **Ted Fay** (Catwhoeatsphoto) On Tuesday, November 02, 2010 - 12:01 pm: Edit

---

**Quote:**

FRDs
I'm sticking to my guns on this one.
FRDs are great for the Alliance offmaps, and all but worthless for the
Coalition. They're the only retrograde point the Coalition can move so
this is a major blunder in pre-war equipment design. The only useful
similar offensive unit is of course only for the Alliance, LTFs. In fact I
have used FRDs exactly as you suggest Ted--in the Hydran theatre with
the auxiliaries. Only difference is, I put Ftr-modules on them to protect
from ftr raids instead of ringling them with ships. Big deal. Where the
Coalition actually need a mobile retrograde point is against the Feds, but
we can only use FRDs against the Hydrans.
For my next game, if I get around to it, maybe I'll tow the Lyran on-
maps to the offmap where they might potentially do some good on turn
30, and the Romulans should definitely send theirs offmap methinks. I
hear what you say about 1407, but I like building a SB or two
thereabouts too, and these can handle most damage and other ships
can go to the interior. In the end I find no legitimate use for Coalition
FRDs so far.

Heh, you're just bitter. 😊 You yourself pointed out a legitimate use in your own text. Granted, it's limited against the Hydrans, but it is there! There's another use. I will deploy FRDs on a planet deep in Klingon space (where they can't be raided) and use them to quickly repair ships after a major SB assault against the 3rd SB. After that, they're just extra capacity I'll put at 1407 or 1411.

I certainly agree, however, that FRDs have limited value given their difficulties. I don't tend to buy many (and may not buy any more after this discussion).

Also agreed on failure in technology. That issue *really* hampers anyone on the offensive against the Fed - and ironically only the Fed gets that kind of offensive capability (though you can use operational bases somewhat yourself) - but that's not till later.

---

Quote:

G ships:
The venom in my previous post was un-warranted, I'm going to sort of agree with you in the end. I, like you, build lots of G ships (no D6Gs though, and I've been a fool to put G pods on my D5Gs instead of LTTS it seems). My opponent directs them, particularly if the VBIR goes up. I usually find that with one or two defending G ships and the SB intrinsic G, a SB can last the entire battle exchanging Gs with the G ships he doesn't direct on a neutral or positive VBIR round, and never lose a SIDS. I have tried and tried to use them as you suggest (granted, I now use them to ensure that VBIR goes down, so my dice have had some influence on my feelings here), and it has worked about 1 time on a BATS, never on a SB. Twice now, I have gone to a SB with 5+SIDS on it with overwhelming G superiority, and the intention to direct on his ships while the G's finish the SB. On both occasions, I have had to resort to SIDSing the SB after hanging around way to long waiting for some G success. He directs my Gs so it saves me damage. Sure, a good roll or two might make a difference, but my main belief is that you should never *count* on them to accomplish anything. If they score a SIDS, great and it will generally be meaningless, but don't factor that hypothetical SIDS into your plans. At undefended targets Gs can score damage, but don't ever direct fewer PDUs because you think your G will help. This normally means you direct all the PDUs and your G does nothing, or in rare cases at Major planets you can only direct two or three PDUs, and your G might actually do some good (but don't count
on it). My opponent puts Monitors on every planet he can as well, and of course this screws up Gs because I'm not going to waste a round directing the Monitor so my Gs can fail miserably--I'll just direct the PDUs from under the Monitor anyway. Gs are useful for garrisoning Hydran Space and are cheaper to replace than maulers (see below). G ships are cool for the Alliance though. They can put them on the line (you're a fool to direct them unless it's a meaningless pin battle), and then have a better chance of capturing all those cool ships they get to direct!

Well, I admit that I've had a bit of luck on the dice with my G ships. I sometimes call myself "the G man!" Still, though, I personally have had success with bringing overwhelming G units to a SB assault. Saves me damage with directing (as you've noted), saves more valuable specialty ships often (if he doesn't have the damage points to direct on both), and maybe scores me a few SIDS which will end the assault sooner.

---

**Quote:**

**Fighters**

---

The key to defeating the Alliance fighter superiority is to fight with large compots in places where you know you will win. That way you chew through his fighters a minimum number of times to accomplish a purpose. Easier said than done, though.

---

**Quote:**

**Flatheads:**

Agreed. #1 goal in Coalition game should be an attack turn 7. It's the only (admittedly tiny) chance the Coalition have. This fact is actually what detracts most from the game for me. Not only are there *not* several possible winning Coalition strategies--there might not even be one, but even with out a *winning* strategy, your hand is still forced by this overwhelming need to attack the Fed hard on turn 7. Trust me, by turn 10 the Fed basically matches you with better ships and better scouts and more and better fighters over his starbases (and of course outbuild you with better ships and essentially never get economic exhaustion, get two prime teams/trn, free "better than PFs", LTFs,
unlimited 4 pt scouts, SWACS, etc., etc. ad nauseum).

Totally agreed. This is the rub. The Feds are just too powerful with all the new rules. I can't help you here, because I don't know how to do it.

That being said, there are several strategies I have NOT tried. I have not tried the mudslide in an attempt to stab the heart of the Federation with a sword. I have not tried fighting a defensive war against the Feds and then fighting the other powers to go for the three capital win.

Next Coalition game I'll try the mudslide, I think. However, I have my misgivings.

More on this below with the Tholian issue.

---

**Quote:**

It might be wise to hold off on the raids until you build up a few prime teams so you have some around for other things. My serious word on E&S raids though, is that if you don't have a good target, don't do a raid--save the EPs (particularly the Romulans). Otherwise, always steal money if you can.

---

Agreed all points. I use E&S judiciously, as I usually have better uses for the EPs.

---

**Quote:**

Tholians/Strategy:
I don't know how bad attacking the Tholians will be, but given what I say above, here's what I'm now thinking: Overall strategy is to achieve your un-negotiable offensives (All Hydran/Kzinti bases, and maybe a capital) losing the minimum ships and especially of your "cool" specialty ships, build up massive defenses, and go on the strategic defensive as quickly as possible. Maybe the Tholians make sense here. This game is an economic grind. No amazing lighting campaign will do more than slightly alter the overall (im)balance of power. There is no way to eliminate any Alliance partner except the Tholians, and it is hard to even really hurt any (sending the Hydrans offmap is at best an inconvenience to them--they don't get to ravage your homelands, but it doesn't slow their production much, and the Kzin-Fed-Gorn are connected offmap). The Alliance over-matches you. Attempt to even the odds by making him fight you over your fixed defenses as soon as possible so you can
fight at even odds--his more numerous better ships, mobile retro points, cheap repair, free damage, better scouts, better fighters, more prime teams, positional advantages, etc. against your fixed defenses if you can get some up. As a general, looking at the two sides, it seems more and more to be my conclusion.

There's a problem with your strategy: The Third Way (and late war compot lines generally). Compots get relly huge late war, allowing the enemy a decent chance to direct cripple even a SB at BIR 5 with a bit of luck. Be sure to keep a few SFGs in reserve to put on SBs.

Under the current rules I don't see how the Coalition can win using victory conditions - though I suppose it's possible. I think it's more likely to achieve a three capital win or to actually take Earth (if the Feds are knocked out, you CAN go for a VP win).

So, which three capitals? There's the Hydran, Zin, Tholian, Fed, and Gorn. The Hydran is quite doable - and more importantly you can reasonably expect to hold it the whole game. Let's put that as definite on the list of three.

If you can take Earth, you're probably going to win anyway. It's also really freaking hard - so probably just scratch that one.

So, need to pick two of the three left.

The Gorn is doable, if you can get Klingon support. That will require a long supply chain, however. The Gorn also have few carriers (thank goodness). Maybe this one.

The Tholians are a VERY tough nut to crack - you will take very heavy casualties. However, you get the booby prize of the new planets, a capital, and an unbroken supply chain to the Roms.

The Zin are also tough, but definitely doable. The problem with the Zin, though, is that it's nearly *impossible* to KEEP 1401 over the course of time because you can't pin him out of the hex. You're also committed to maintaining a very powerful fleet there in order to hold it, even with a SB, for this reason.

It's for these reasons I recommend against the Zin. Keep in mind you can still take their capital in order to strike a blow against their shipyards, you just can't keep it.

That leaves Tholian and Gorn. Conveniently, taking the Tholian also makes it
much easier to maintain supply to the Roms and to give Klingon support against the Gorns (important with SFGs).

So, I think you're best bets are against the Hydran, Tholian, and Gorn. Make inroads against the Fed and hurt him, but mostly to keep his fleets at bay for as long as possible. Harass the Zin and maybe take their capital for a short time if he makes it worth your while. Concentrate on the others.

My thinking for the moment, anyway.

Ted
what about this Idea

In a small way the Klingon and Lyran at first dont need a FRD park because they both have a small area which can be used as a back up repair area is I call it. Klingon Area is Hex 0909,1009, 1011 and 1208 are all BATS @ with 4 repair points for a total of 16 and Imn my games 1 is updated to a SB which added 12 more repair points
Lyran Area is Hex 070 and 0809 which are BATS plus the hex 0608 is a SB a total of 24 repair points
Plus in the Klingon area you got 4x Planets Hex 1010(minor),1210(minor),1112(Major) you can build PRD on plus a couple of Colony which you can add PRD too.
Lyran Area hex 0607(minor), 0509(Major),0709(minor), 0810(Major), Plus same with the Colony and build PRD too and you got the LDR 2xBATS and the Minor Planet Hex 0711

SO the Coalition do have a lagre area Repair Park now at the stared of the game till turn 7

Yeah, that works. Vulnerable, but it works. Importantly, it's cheaper.

I feel it will be to many targets to be hit at one time

Sure, at one time. But over the course of turns you'll end up losing them. Maybe even the SBs.

Great stuff everyone.

I largely agree with Ted Fay's comments above--especially about the respective merits of taking the various capitals.
Regretably, the Coalition pretty much must send the Hydrans offmap, or it takes two times their ship numbers to maybe contain them (you need separate containment fleets in Klingon and Lyran space). I agree with Ted, Hydrax is a must. This is a shame because of course the rules give the Hydrans all kinds of free stuff when they lose their shipyard. And just in case you thought this would be a good reason *not* to take the Hydran capital, they get all that free stuff anyway even if they don't lose their shipyard.

I can see the merits of destroying the Kzinti shipyard, but it seems a fool's errand to try to hold it.

In reality, the Coalition gains more income by taking out the Tholians than they do by taking out the Hydrans.

Of course the Gorns are the only Alliance partner the Coalition can fight at anything close to even odds (assuming the Feds aren't there in great strength).

I still think I will put serious thought into the possibility of an early strategic defense for the Coalition. Conventional military thinking says that a minimum of 3:1 odds advantage is necessary to successfully prosecute an offensive (unless you have qualitative superiority--which the Coalition don't). I'm not chained to conventional military thinking, but it's conventional thinking for a reason. I can't find any Coalition advantages that would mitigate this 3:1 rule.

The overall situation is that you're attacking superior, more numerous foes, and you can't actually seriously hurt any of them. In this situation, don't take the bait! Limited offensives to maximize your defensive positions and deny the enemy income, then switch to defensive once defenses are built. This has several possible advantages. First, you at least stop the devastating loss of key ships as soon as you can--so that you can build up a few to have use of on the defense when the Alliance comes with all their toys they haven't lost all game. Next, you'll force the Alliance to be more aggressive, and they might actually have to take a risk at some point--which may actually cause them to lose some ships they didn't want to lose for a change.

I'm just looking for any way to reverse or minimize the huge Coalition inferiority in the General War.

Just for curiosity's sake--I know no-one here except that Timothy guy has actually won a game, but has anybody even been able to achieve the "historical" result? It seems to me the "historical" Coalition did an impossibly good job by ending up on the original borders.
Take a look at the victory conditions before you evaluate a defensive war. They're pretty pro-Alliance if you're playing the full game (note: F&E 2010 basic is probably somewhat pro-Coalition, especially given Peter Bakija's experience).

Thinking on it, I believe part of the Alliance imbalance stems from raids, and special raids make it worse. They get more total raids and more drone raids. Most importantly, normal raids force you to spend MANY more SEs occupying territory (even taking into account things like using terrain/province borders to your advantage). Special raids are essentially invincible against vulnerable, high-value targets (cripples, FRDs, even MBs) unless you spend even more SEs to create a picket ring.

These raids force the Coalition to expend massive resources, and cause more ship losses, thereby strengthening the Alliance position later.

Sure, supposedly the Coalition gets to raid, too. However, they usually don't get the juicy targets the Alliance does as the Coalition is on the attack.

Later, the Coalition might benefit from raids. However, by then the Alliance production machine won't really care.

Assume you take the Hydran capital, the Tholian Capital, and later the Gorn capital. You still need one more. The Kzinti capital can't be held, and surely you won't have enough force left to take the Fed capital at that point. Granted, this puts you in good position if you can keep from getting cut off in Gorn space.

I was going to say of course you can hold the Kzinti capital, but I'm not really sure what parameters of 'held' you mean.

Do you mean until the war actually ends, or something different?

@ Richard: Held = held until victory. Either game end or the taking of the required number of capitals.

@ Paul: I re-read 651.2. I wasn't right. Instant victory requires only three Alliance capitals - BUT - the Tholians don't count. The Tholian capital counts only with respect to evaluating victory point conditions under 603.3, if you hold it.

So, yeah, for the instant win you pretty much need the Zin capital. If you can take the Fed you're likely to win the game anyway.
That's what I meant Ted. The Tholian capitol doesn't count. The Coalition could pull all this off beautifully, and then still lose on VPs easy.

"If you take the Fed you're likely to win the game anyway." If this is true, then the mudslide is the best strategy, period. I suspect that if you don't take the Hydran capital early, they will take Klinshai or Lyrantan before game's end by themselves--not to mention the Tigermen.

Let's say you leave the Kzinti and Hydran capitals alone and go for the mudslide. Then you can turn back on the Hydrans and Kzinti for the win.

What I don't like about this idea though is the two-front war it entails (three fronts actually--the Hydrans can threaten two by themselves), and the shifting of forces between distant theatres. My instinct says it's more "economical" to deal with the Hydrans first (before you need all those ships elsewhere), but you have to finish the Hydran capital by turn 5 in order to repair and redeploy for turn 7.

Trying to "come back" for the Hydrans after capturing Earth will be difficult--you won't be able to spare the ships, and the Hydran will be stronger than the Klingons by then anyway.

A quick reply to the various points!

Full Maulers
Worth their weight in gold! Even in small battles, a against the Gorns - and even better against the Hydrans, you can force your enemy to limit what good ships they use. The Hydrans for example - can never risk a Paladin on the line, if a mauler could show up.;

Plus it's a 10 pt ship. I would agree though that converting is only worth it at times!

SFG
Hydran front - need I say more?

The Hydrans don't have enough carriers - plus 2 SFG's could easily kill a Carrier group too.

I would swop the Federation LTF for SFG's and maulers (from turn 2) in a heart beat!

G Ships.
Ted answered this one very well. Even if they only save you 1 cripple against a BATS or Minor Planet - that will build up over time.
General Strategy.
IF (in capitals to highlight it!) the Coalition can pull it off, it probably will be very difficult to stop it.

However, several players have attempted it - and it goes wrong for various reasons (game bordem is probably a key issue....lets move 500 counters around for 10 turns....but not actually fight!).

There are several ways to win - the Alliance probably will never win by the 3 Capital route - and therefore there main chance of winning is the VP route.

The reverse is that the Coalition can win by the 3 captial route (yes, it is very hard), but a VP win is not impossible.

I think thats the only way to have it.

The fun side to play is the Coalition (who likes to have several bells knocked out of them for the bulk of the game, only to be told they can't win opn the VP route, as it's stacked against them - and if they had a chance to win via the 3 Capital route, the game will have ended several turns before that could have occured!!)

I'll also post this in General discussions (to get a wider picture) - how many VP's in front on turn 18, do the Coalition need to be, to have a chance of getting a Victory Point win? The game is just with F&E2K - but the end result should be the same (i.e. both sides can gain VP's and kill more enemy VP's, so it should be a wash, with the added rules)

(I have just counted up the position in my game with William, I'll give you the position after afew days!)

Ted Wrote:
>>F&E 2010 basic is probably somewhat pro-Coalition, especially given Peter Bakija's experience>>

The current game in progress (well, it is taking a break right now, but we'll get back to it at some point in the near future) of basic 2K10 still seems somewhat pro-Coalition (well, at least the start of the game certainly--the Coalition can wipe out the Hydrans by T5 with limited negative impact on their forces while holding down the Kzinti well at the same time), although this is the best showing I have gotten out of the Alliance in many years, and consequently, it remains to be seen what is going to happen long term. The end of the first scenario (i.e. the end of T6) was for all intents and purposes a draw based on what the game seems to think should be a draw at the end of T6, but the fleets are still considerably larger (On all sides. Except the Feds...) than what the game seems to think the various
empires should have at the start of T7, and that is with a *lot* of ships being killed by DD all game.

Peter,

Explain to me how basic 2K10 is pro-Coalition. If you can wipe out the Hydrans while holding down the Kzinti with no problems, why can't that happen with the add ons? I don't see that big of a difference.

Ted,
You and others have talked about putting 6 DNs on the line and all that, and how great it is. Don't you lose 1DN/round to directed damage? And wouldn't that run you out of DNs after 6-12 rounds? I'm pretty sure that's the way it would play out in my game. Also, all those DNs mean few or no fighters.

Paul Howard,

I'll trade you LTFs for SFGs, yes, except that by the time their available, the Coalition wouldn't need them anyway. Interesting how different games play, because the Hydrans is the least likely place I'd deploy my SFGs. If the Hydran fought with cruisers that would be great, but each SFG I put on the line is likely to freeze two HN or AH and then dies--what's so great about that? At least against the Feds, they might have a ship larger than a FF to shoot at on the line (maybe).
I still disagree about Maulers. If the Hydran put a Paladin on the line, I could still kill it without a mauler, and the excess damage goes on fighters in both cases. With maulers you would theoretically run the Hydrans out of fighters sooner--but that's a losing proposition from the start. Plus, you have to out-guess your opponent as to when he puts that Paladin on the line, and every time you guess wrong you lose a ship that cost 10eps for no gain. I can see the point in having a few big maulers around to direct on the Gorn big ships though--who can't take the excess all on fighters.

Paul
SFG's

Well, the Hydrans don't have enough Carriers to cover everywhere (especially if the SFG ship(s) are in a reserve) and if they do come across a Hydran Carrier line - the line probably doesn't have enough compot to cripple the D6J and kill the SFG ship....

And if you can get 2 SFG's in your line - the Coalition might get to kill a whole group - without needing too much luck!
Example - 4CV group - you freeze the two AH's - and to kill the group with a Mauler, you only need 44 damage - which is doable.

If you freeze the DE - it drops to 41.

And against a 4UH group, it's only 38 (and 35 with the DE being frozen).

If a third escort is frozen (or you only had 2 to start with!), the Carrier is extremely vulnerable.

Alas for the Hydrans - they don't have much choice, as the only partial defence to SFG's is EW - and other than Scout Tugs, they are very weak in this area (the Kzinti atleast have CD's!).

So lose Cruisers or carriers!

On Maulers - it means on poor rolls, Cruisers and Paladins will dice - as you will not always get 36+ compot to kill a DN on the line - but 26+ is much easier to get.

(It might be just playing styles and general luck - but I always seem to be 1 point away of killing a major hull - and far too often my opponents aren't!).

P.S. I highlighted the Paladin, but any DN is good - it's just that the Paladin is nominally 30% more expensive than most DN's - and the Gorn can get Fed aid to help replace killed and repair crippled ships - but the Hydrans can't - and 22 Ep's is at best circa 30% of the Hydran income!

By Peter D Bakija (Bakija) on Monday, November 08, 2010 - 09:52 am: Edit

Paul wrote:

>>Explain to me how basic 2K10 is pro-Coalition.>>

The basic game has historically been pretty pro-Coalition; DF+E was very pro-Coalition, F+E2K was slightly less pro-Coalition, F+E2K10 remains to be seen if it is particularly pro-Coalition, but it seems (so far) to be not *that* significantly different from 2K. I suspect that while the balance of basic 2K10 is better than even that of 2K, it is still moderately pro-Coalition, in terms of game balance. But again, it is certainly too early to tell.

>> If you can wipe out the Hydrans while holding down the Kzinti with no problems, why can't that happen with the add ons? I don't see that big of a difference.>>

I have never played with the fully expanded game, so I can't really comment with much authority on this. But indications are that the fully expanded game (i.e. all
advanced rules) tilts the balance in the direction of the Alliance. Ted seems to think it is significantly unbalanced in the direction of the Alliance. I have no reason to think otherwise.

Looking at all the advanced rules across the board, a lot of them are mostly a wash in the long term (salvage, BGs, EW, special attack vs monitors, etc.), a few of them are pro-Coalition (SFGs), and a *lot* of them seem very pro-Alliance. Such that as someone who has only ever used the basic set rules, reading the advanced rules, my reaction is "Uh, yeah, see, if the Alliance needs this much propping up compared to the basic game, it is *clearly* starting from a pro-Coalition point..."

-Fed Reaction
-Hydran treasury and DN activation
-The Gorns virtually *double* their production schedule and get half cost field repair
-Raids really help the Alliance infinitely more than the Coalition.
-Drone Raids really help the Alliance infinitely more than the Coalition.
-Fast ships mean the Expedition is actually something the Coalition needs to worry about.
-X-ships are a huge boon to the Feds.

And so on. So while, again, I have never played with all the expansion rules, I have certainly read them all, and when Ted says "the fully expanded game is wildly pro Alliance", I can certainly see where he is coming from.

---

"The Gorns virtually *double* their production schedule"

Can you elaborate on this? Looking at the order of battle, it looks like the Gorns can produce 11 ships a turn. Is this compared to previous editions?

Jose wrote:

>>Can you elaborate on this? Looking at the order of battle, it looks like the Gorns can produce 11 ships a turn. Is this compared to previous editions?>>>

In the basic rules, the Gorn production schedule is:

1xDN/BC, 3xHD, 4xBD (up from 3xBD in the first few editions).

In the expanded rules, the Gorn production schedule is along the lines of:

1xDN/BC, 1xBC, 1xCM, 3xHD, 4xBD, 1xDD.
So while "virtually double" is certainly hyperbolic, they do increase their build schedule by almost 50%, including 2 extra cruisers a turn.

Quick response to these points!

-Fed Reaction: I think this should have been in the original game - purely to game dynamics.

The game is based around a 'historical' time line - which the Coalition amends to ensure they don't make blunders (no Tholian invasion unless certain to succeed, no WYN attack etc), and so this just partially restores game balance.

-Hydran treasury and DN activation

Well, the Hydrans gain 1 good DN (as the other is PWC) and the Roms gain 2 OK DN's. The Hydran treasury is nice - and something had to be done to allow them to regain their homeworld!

-The Gorns virtually *double* their production schedule and get half cost field repair

Production - covered by Peter.

Field Repair - Well it's something the Gorn can use well, and is pretty powerful I will admit.

-Raids really help the Alliance infinitely more than the Coalition.

Actually - I think it's a wash.

Raids allow the Coalition to get ships back into supply, which would have been cut off (yes, the Alliance can do it too, but less so I think).

Plus, the Coalition has more ships initially, so can afford to use more ships on Raids.

-Drone Raids really help the Alliance infinitely more than the Coalition.

Wash again - Ted has shown me how powerful Drone Raids can be - you leave a crippled DN within drone range, and it's dead. Linked with E&S missions (to cripple the target), the Coalition has the excess PT's and cash to cripple and then auto-kill if succesful!

(Hydran Supply Tug being an excellent example - but Aux Drone Ships are also
easy targets)

So Coalition lose some crippled Ships, and the odd FRD where it hasn't drone proofed the area - Alliance loses key hulls and non-replaceble units.

-Fast ships mean the Expedition is actually something the Coalition needs to worry about.

100% Agree - Fast Ships have altered the game dynamic - this one area has made the Expedition potentially easier to do.

Needing the Dip Term though - I think not only has put the balance back to the middle, but has moved it much more so into Coalition territory (i.e. it's possible to E&S kill the Dip Team....Expedition is over!)

-X-ships are a huge boon to the Feds.

As it is to the Klingons - who crucially get them first.

The problem I think is, people (including myself) take individual rules, rather than the rule packs as being pro-one side.

For example.

Hydrans gain alot in Adv Ops (Treasury, Guild Ships and 1 cheap Paladin).

Seems pretty pro-Alliance?

But we have several good Rom and Lyran (and Gorn) ships..

....and Battlegroups I think are the most one sided rule, which in theory both sides can do.

Why?

It adds circa 6% compot to one side, for the first 6-9 turns - and the other side can't gain (Kzinti* as they use Carriers and don't gain compot - the Hydrans can use them - but both don't always have the hulls to always use the extra slot) by the same degree.

(*And one of the balancing options within AO - namely the Kzinti CVE BG option, was removed and as far as I can tell, was never corrected with something else in AO!)

It's all how we read each sides benefits - but looking at one rule at the cost of other rules, will always gets a lop sided view of the overall rule pack or game!
Paul Howard, et. al.,

The reason raids and special raids are pro-alliance is not because the Coalition doesn't have uses for raids, it's that the coalition is on the attack. This means: Enemy cripples likely to move out of range during their own turn. Certainly FRDs and Auxes move offmap. On the other side, the Coalition needs to put FRDs and Auxillairy ships in harm’s way for them to be useful at all, and cripples can only get a maximum of 6 hexes away after a battle. Therefore, the Alliance has much better targets for it's raids.

Same with regular raids. Regular raids are cool for killing lone province raiders. On the other side, the Alliance isn't putting out province raiders, and lone ships are likely to be in reaction range of big ships for defense. Even if the Coalition raids a province the Alliance calls up free police ships...weak but crucially free. So the Alliance kills more real ships with raids, the Coalition free police ships.

Some rules are pro-Coalition, no doubt, but raids aren't really a wash for the simple reason that the defender can more easily employ raids to devastating effect than the attacker can against a savvy defender.

Re: Coalition Grand Strategy

I believe I have seen the light. My mistake in my (admittedly 1st) game as the Coalition was trying for economic efficiency. I converted during repair and refused to self-kill ships or over-cripple my fleet. I added two survey ships for each race on turns 1 and 2 (and Roms using diplomatic income), and maximized survey. I've built colonies, 2 double starbases for defense, and vigorously defended my territory at the expense of offensive potential. I've over-ride built extra Lyran carriers, and built dozens of carriers without using free fighters.

I see now that none of this can help me now, the end will come swifter than in most games, and I believe this is precisely because this conservative strategy is the worst possible strategic choice for the Coalition. The few extra eps I've gotten from survey and colonies mean nothing in a sea of Federation Eps, and my efforts and money spent to build defenses was wasted against the Alliance juggernaut I'm about to face for 21 turns.

Fortunately this isn't real war, or I would have learned my lesson too late.

*****************************************************************

The Coalition cannot win except on the slim chance they can take out three non-Tholian Alliance Capitals and hold them for one turn. Admit the real situation fellow Klingons, Lyrans, and Romulans (countrymen all!), we have one slim, desperate shot at victory. Never forget this!

The only prayer the Coalition has of achieving a win is certainly to take out the Fed Capital for the simple reason that the Kzinti capital can hardly be held (at
least without luck, or compromising yourself somewhere else), especially once the Feds are in the war. To take out the Fed Capital your only chance is to attack on turn 7 with everything you have.

In my opinion, gentlemen, "maximizing the turn 7 Fed attack" makes the following preparations "must do."

Turn 1 max Lyrans in range of 1401. Turn 2 raid 1401 if possible. By turn 3 every Kzinti BATS and SB outside the capital and Marquis should be gone, and redeploy everything except slight superiority (10 ships?) to in-range of Hydrax. Of course to maximize the Fed attack means raid Hydrax trn 4 unless he literally hands you his SBs. Conquer Hydrax trn 5 or you probably will not have a chance to win the game at all. Hydrans offmap turn 6 and cripples redeploy to Fed Border en-mass. Keep about 2 extra pincount (fighters, but not your best ships) against the Hydrans, keep parity with the Kzinti (or pay dearly), and focus on killing 3rd Fed SB on turn 7 to open the offensive.

Do your best, but if you don't accomplish some or all of the preliminaries above, re-deploy turn 6 anyway and maximize the attack on the Feds Turn 7 unless you literally stand to lose your homeworlds.

*****************************************************************

* Although efficiency is good, in-efficiency is better if it provides a tiny help to the above strategy. Yes, you'd prefer to fight the Gorn, but to win, you'll need the Fed Capital, and that means forget the Gorn and go for Earth starting on turn 7 "or bust." I call this the "Earth or Bust" strategy. That's all that really matters in the end.

Fellow Coalition officers, you have your mission...

By Chris Upson (Misanthropope) on Monday, November 08, 2010 - 03:45 pm: Edit

tim, i owe you a beer.

i still don't buy the whole "self-kill and repair ships" thing, but conventional analysis of drone bombardment (which i subscribed to) is wrong. i get paid to find where conventional analysis is wrong, though admittedly not in F&E, so i'm kind of embarrassed to have missed it.

By Paul Edwards (Pablomatic) on Monday, November 08, 2010 - 08:45 pm: Edit

My proposed timetable for "Earth or Bust" is below:

Note: The following may not be the best strategy. I'm sure it's familiar to most of you. Of course it is very hard to actually implement. The key is discipline, as you'll see. I operate from two premises: 1: With all the add-on rules, the Coalition has a very slim chance of victory at all, and that only by taking the Fed Capital, and 2: I don't care how slim the odds, I want the Coalition to have a shot at actually winning with all the add-ons.

Another plan, such as the "Mudslide" where the Coalition doesn't take Hydrax prior to turn 7 attack, may in fact be better. Surely only the best Coalition plan can only offer even a 10% chance of victory, and without the best plan our
chances are close to nil. Until I verify that a pure mudslide is necessary in order to put down the Feds at all, I'm going to focus cleaning up the Hydran front prior to the Feds as this should maximize the ships you can use against the Flatards.

Proud officers of the Coalition, please give your feedback freely, and present alternatives if you are prepared to argue for them.

Set-up: Klingon North Fleet all in range of Kzintai, Klingon West Fleet 1013. Home Fleet 1413 & East Fleet at 1813 v. "waist" expedition. Lyran EB Fleet set up at BATS 0413 (in range of Hydrax). Lyran Home fleet on FM SB, and Red Claw on forward BATS.

Turn 1: Only thing that matters is keeping maximum ships in range of Kzintai for turn 2. One way I have had success doing this is Red Claw Pins Baron at SB, Home Fleet to 0803 to stay. Red Claw retreats to 0903. This is a good time to practice discipline, don't mess with the other BATS, every ship that doesn't go to 0903 increases your chances of not being able to stay there. Don't get distracted by secondary targets for at least the first 12 turns. Only take secondary targets if you can still guarantee getting your primary target (to kill enemy ships, yes, but not bases or planets).

Turn 2: First decision time. Is it worth it to go into Kzintai? You absolutely must kill all Kzinti BATS/planets west of 1805, and both Count's and Duke's SB by turn 3 (to avoid the expedition retreating, then retrograding north into Kzinti space, and to protect northern Lyran Space in their absence-Far Stars goes south I'm afraid). If the Kzinti over-defends his SB, go to Kzintai to raid or kill if you can, but make sure you get those bases by the end of turn C3. Probably you'll attack both SB instead and kill one this turn. Also upgrade 1307 or 1407 to a SB, from which you will threaten the Kzinti Homeworld for the rest of the game. Don't get fancy and try to build one on 1506. Any extra eps or effort should be saved unless it improves the turn 7 attack. It will be hard enough as it is to follow the timetable, don't bite off more than you can chew. Retro to that BATS so you can pin the Kzinti out on thier turn. Your SB will be complete T3, just when you need it. To maximize ComCon efficiency build SB at 1009 (don't want to defend 0906, and want to tempt Kzinti). That investment will pay for itself in a few short turns, and I think is worth the expense now. TBS west now to save strat moves later.

Turn 3: Finish up what you must in Kzinti space, by the end of strat movement you should have a pincount advantage of 10 ships over the Kzinti (mostly Klingons), the entire Lyran Navy on 0413, and every released Klingon not on the Kzinti Front sitting on 1013. Leave slight superiority v. the Kzinti. Keep your eye on the ball--don't put out garrisons unless you intend to fight for them. Give no easy kills to the Alliance at any point in the game. Never put out a disruptor or garrison in range of the enemy unless you have the ability to react there (or maybe one or two you plan to reserve to farther away).

Turn 4: No matter what you go into the Hydran capital. Bust his SBs if lightly defended but you must raid the capital. Your goal is to strip all the PDUs off every
planet except the capital, and then see about those at the capital. Your slow ships (all can contribute in some tiny way, even to heal "G" factors), SAFs, 1 Engineer, and FRDs from both empires can move to 0715 into range for the final assault on C5, and all your ships retrograde to that FRD park. In the North, let the Kzinti come to you, you don't really want to take cripples up here, but if he'll fight over your bases, you should welcome it. Blow up every Kzinti ship you can. Also, start moving East Fleet north to BATS 1807 6 ships per turn and consider keeping other ships nearby to protect this BATS until T7.

Turn 5: This is a key moment in the game. Hydrax must fall this turn so that you can re-deploy to the Fed border. Kill Hydrax at almost all costs. Also, you must kill all the Hydran SB by the end of this turn (use follow-up forces). Plop an LTT down for supply where your FRDs are. Your cripples from the Hydrax assault can go here and since you're not retrograding off Hydrax your fleet can react here if necessary to protect them. The good news is, you have two turns to get these cripples repaired and to the Federation front.

Turn 6: If he hasn't left of his own accord, usher the Hydran offmap and keep him there for the rest of the game. Carefully count pin and fighters and leave only what you need to face the Hydrans (hopefully all Lyrans). Once they're offmap, leave enough to pin the Hydran plus about 5 ships, and everything else redeploy to 1807 and 2517 (Lyrans to Kzinti space). FRDs should go to both locations.

Turn 7: Most important is taking out 3rd SB, and advancing two groups of FRDs towards Fed Capital. Retrograde to these two FRD parks (especially LTTs, who will become supply tugs next turn), but also leave as many ships forward deployed as you can. You can now reduce the Kzinti front to 80% of parity and send the excess against the hated Earthers.

Turns 8-12: Reduce, then destroy Earth only divert forces to ensure supply. Only attack other SB if you get them for free, and maybe not even then. Your goal is to take Earth or weaken it's defenses as much as possible. If you don't, keep trying when the Romulans join after that. Once it looks like you'll be able to take it, think about the Gorn Capital, and watch the Kzinti close.

Turn 13: Ideally you proceed with the invasion of Gorn space this turn, but if you haven't taken Earth yet play defense and focus on that above all else.

*Important* If at any point your enemy makes it worth your while to deviate, this is the ONLY time you are authorized to consider letting him delay you. Be sure the price is worth it. For me, taking out the Kzinti shipyard for free might be worth a 1 turn delay, but not even then would I try to hold it. Tigerman, what else can you offer? In other words, be open to opportunities, but deviate from the timetable at your peril.

*Also Important* This timetable is essentially more important than any amount of pincount or loss of your own bases or even SB and devastation of your planets. Thus, self-kill as necessary and avoid building more survey ships. Your game is NOT the long or even medium game, you have at best 13 turns to take Earth.

*Also Important* If the point comes where you absolutely cannot possibly take Earth, switch to defense construction immediately and pull back to defensible lines--there's no longer any point in continuing the offensive, maybe you can hold
on to your homeworlds until the Organians return. You've lost, but the Alliance still has to prove it has the cojones to come dig you out of your home territory. In the short term, if you made the decision early enough, you can fence with the enemy and maybe get him to make mistakes.

*Misc. notes on implementation.
Leave North Fleet as reserves after you turn on the Hydrans.
Use tugs to tow SAVs when you retreat, and to save key cripples. Only put battle pods on a tug when you absolutely need a command ship, and probably never use your G-pods.
Aux troop ships should all be turned into SAFs.
Build FRDs repeatedly to replace losses, but move them to 1013, and 0413 ASAP, as you don't need them up north, and will lose them before you must lose them against the Feds. You must have mobile retro points no matter the cost.
Save SFGs for pursuit only (yours or theirs). Same with penal ships. Maulers are for PDUs only. Kill enemy Monitors on homeworld with raids prior to attack or consider directing first round.

By Peter D Bakija (Bakija) on Monday, November 08, 2010 - 09:48 pm: Edit

Paul H wrote:
>>-Fed Reaction : I think this should have been in the original game - purely to game dynamics.>>

Oh, sure. But I think it is certainly a big help to the Alliance; the Coalition can't realistically even think about capturing both Alliance capitals before the Feds are in the war. Which isn't hugely possible, really, but still, this rule greatly reduces the Coalitions option in the early game.

>>Well, the Hydrans gain 1 good DN (as the other is PWC) and the Roms gain 2 OK DN's. The Hydran treasury is nice - and something had to be done to allow them to regain their homeworld!>>

More importantly, the Hydrans don't need to pay for a PAL on T4, meaning they get to build 1-2 extra PDUs on the capital that they really need and really can get important mileage out of if the Coalition are hitting the Hydran capital first.

>>Production - covered by Peter.>>

Yeah, the Gorns get a *huge* upgrade in AO. I'd argue that they get the most significant upgrade of any empire in the game. Between the field repair bonus and their production schedule being increased by 2x 10 point cruisers and a 3 cost FF per turn turns the Gorns from basically being the Fed 10th fleet into an actual empire.

>>Raids allow the Coalition to get ships back into supply, which would have been cut off (yes, the Alliance can do it too, but less so I think).>>
Again, I have never actually used raids, so take this all with a grain of salt. But on paper, what Raids seem like they will do (and what people who use these rules and discuss the impact seem to indicate) is that the raid rules, while certainly helpful for the Coalition, are *hugely* effective for the Alliance, simply 'cause without raids, the Alliance is vastly restricted in what they can affect on the board--the Coalition can (certainly early in the game) already kill anything they want with impunity. The Kzinti and the Hydrans can't really affect anything significant early in the game when not using raids due to the Coalition having such a huge ship number advantage--if the Kzinti/Hydrans try and attack anything remotely important, they get pinned (unless the Coalition has done something unfortunate). With raids, the Alliance suddenly have the ability to affect things on the map that they couldn't have otherwise. Which is *very* significant, especially with the wacky drone raid rules. Sure, the Coalition can use raids and blow stuff up, but they could have done that already anyway. The Alliance get a *lot* more gain from the raid rules, relative to what they could do without the raid rules.

>>100% Agree - Fast Ships have altered the game dynamic - this one area has made the Expedition potentially easier to do.>>

This strikes me as a very significant improvement for the Alliance, In the basic rules, the Expedition is virtually impossible, unless the Coalition go out of their way to let it happen. With the expanded rules, it is still far from certain, but at least possible. Which means that the Coalition have to do a great deal to make sure it doesn't happen.

>>....and Battlegroups I think are the most one sided rule, which in theory both sides can do.>>

Early on, yeah, BGs are a huge bonus to the Coalition vs the Kzinti/Hydrans, but they already owned that part of the game, and Fed Reaction puts some necessary breaks on the Coalition anyway. Mid-late game, BGs still help the Coalition, but the Feds get a significant boost (till they start benefiting from the Third Way) and again, provide a huge boost to the Gorns (who already got a huge boost from their significantly increased build schedule and half cost field repair).

>>*And one of the balancing options within AO - namely the Kzinti CVE BG option, was removed and as far as I can tell, was never corrected with something else in AO!)>>

Where did it get removed? The Kzinti still get to use CVEs in BGs in the AO rulebook. I mean, it might have been errataed out somewhere, but in the AO book I own, that is still part of it.

**By Thomas Mathews (Turtle) on Monday, November 08, 2010 - 10:32 pm**

The Kzinti CVEs in BGs got removed in CL37. When AO is reprinted it will be
removed from the rules to reflect the change.

Here is the link for the errata file which includes the removal of the Kzinti CVE from BG's.

Thomas wrote:
>>>The Kzinti CVEs in BGs got removed in CL37. When AO is reprinted it will be removed from the rules to reflect the change.>>>

Huh. Why did they do that? It isn't like the Kzinti suddenly got a dozen new war cruisers stuck into their fleet.

I don't have a clue. I never played with Advanced Ops before that rule was changed.

Peter.

Well, that's the Million Dollar Question!

About the best I can come up with, is SVC decided that carriers can't be in BG's - and that was that.

(It may be with hindsight, SVC considered AO too in favour of the Alliance, and that was the easy rule to kill, restoring AO to a more balanced rule environment AND restoring the 'normal' game rule)

Paul H wrote:
>>>About the best I can come up with, is SVC decided that carriers can't be in BG's - and that was that.>>>

Carriers can't be in Battle Groups already in the original rules. The Kzinti CVE was a special exception 'cause the Kzintis were, among the various empires, completely hosed in the face of Battle Groups as they start the game with very few BG capable units. So as a kludge, they let the Kzinti use their CVE groups in BGs. Which was totally reasonable.

Can't agree more....alas SVC disagreed in the end.

(Should have been clearer - in the original AO rule, only the Kzinti CVE was
allowed in BG - and that as you say, them was to stop them getting 'hosed'. It's cleaner now, in that no carriers can be in a BG!

By Timothy Mervyn Linden (Timlinden) on Tuesday, November 09, 2010 - 04:24 pm: Edit

Paul Edwards:

Regarding the DN lines and if your opponent directs to eliminate them:

The Lyrans build/convert so many it likely is not worth trying.

Lyrans start with 2DN, 2DNL. By end of turn 9 (by which you should have both kzinti/hydran capitals) they will have:

4 more built (probably as DNL's)
3 converted on turns 1-3
12 converted on turns 4-9

for a total of 23 DN/DNL. Plus two more BT. So, if you directed on 12 of those, I still have more than half that total left. Add in the 8 odd Klingon DN's/etc, and it becomes debatable if it is worth trying. Even if you managed to somehow keep up with the 6 DN's a year the Lyrans/Klingons build until the Lyrans run out of CA's to convert (which would be an awful lot - the Lyrans usually have 40 odd DN's at the end of my earlier games), they still then have all their CL>BC conversions as a backup...

You are really only going to be able to pop a DN over a major defense - you need the 36 damage all at once. That means not directing on maulers or SAF (or doing so means less DN's killed), and also - 36 kills one DN, or you can let it fall and I'll self kill 3CW and a bit. (At least at those capital battles) 12 DN's lost to DD translates into 40 more fluff SE's for the coalition. One game I was going to try this, but kept seeing not enough advantage or success as the likely outcome.

Tim.

By Peter D Bakija (Bakija) on Tuesday, November 09, 2010 - 06:23 pm: Edit

Thomas wrote:
>>Here is the link for the errata file which includes the removal of the Kzinti CVE from BG's.>>

Hrm. I can't find the reference to Kzinti CVEs not being allowed in BGs in this errata file. It isn't under the (315) section. Ideas?

By Ryan Opel (Ryan) on Tuesday, November 09, 2010 - 06:44 pm: Edit

CL37 Pg 81
"Rule (315.27), the dumbest ever written, is cancelled."
The consolidated errata posted only goes through CL32.

**By Thomas Mathews (Turtle) On Tuesday, November 09, 2010 - 06:45 pm**: Edit

Sorry, it's in the Q&A archives topic here

**By Paul Edwards (Pablomatic) On Tuesday, November 09, 2010 - 08:21 pm**: Edit

Thanks a million Tim Linden. It seems that at this moment you are THE MAN at playing the coalition, so I won't even question what you say. I assume you build a SB at the Lyran capital, and pay for the extra conversion from turn 4 in your example. A cannot argue. I wouldn't have thought it would be so important to concentrate hulls instead of fighters. I've fought most of my game with lines inferior to the Alliance, and rarely ever self-kill ships. My logic (apparently too conventional) was that it is more important to absorb free damage than anything else, and that you don't pay upkeep on ships, so the more the merrier. Also, you tend to capture both capitals and still attack the Feds on turn 10? Then as I understand it you slide a line of bases around from Klingon to Gorn space, and take out the Gorns? I wonder if you could give us a quick turn-by-turn of how that goes down, and highlight the key moves that make it possible. I don't doubt you, and I will certainly develop my own strategies, but it would be invaluable to see how you pull off your coalition victories. Also, what playing style does your opponent (your brother?) have? Is he aggressive? Conservative? Do you play with all add-on rules? I simply wish to better understand how I'm going so wrong with the Coalition. I'd actually like to win this game.

**By Michael Parker (Protagoras) On Wednesday, November 10, 2010 - 02:25 pm**: Edit

I have said it before, and I will say it again *drumroll* it is my fervent belief that the major balance issue with 2K10 + all expansions is not in the rules its in the play.

It is ALOT harder in F&E to play on the offense than on the defense. I mean ALOT harder, for the scientist types order of magnitude harder. What this means is that given equally competent players the coalition during the early to mid stages of the game (Coalition offensive time) should make about 10 errors for every alliance error. Then things begin to swing back around till its the alliance mostly on the offensive for the later part of the war.

BUT by the time the alliance is on the offensive they have a HUGE fleet. Where an error means relatively less. Errors early are relatively more costly as for one fleet sizes are smaller meaning your losing more %wise than you are later in the game. But an error in turn 1 has twice as many turns to propogate its effect than an error on turn 18.
I Think a major Alliance blunder early can lose the game for them.. getting the Kzinti Navy cut off from retrograde and losing 1401 for a song and dance is devastating. The coalition really cannot make an error like that early. But the folks on this forum don't make errors like that. So those sorts of catastrophic blunders I am not speaking of. Its the smaller ones that lose you a base, a significant ship, or a planet here and there.. those errors hit the coalition more frequently and earlier because their play is more challenging.

I could be wrong, I primarily play Alliance but I have played and am playing as Coalition now. And I know my planning for defense as Alliance is almost trivial compared to my planning for offense as either the Coalition or Alliance. As a matter of fact, the amount of planning that goes into Alliance Turns 1 and 2 is less than 5% of the planning that goes into Alliance turn 3.. all because of the enormous potential Hydran (and Kzinti) offensive that could be launched then. While admittedly I am less experienced at the Coalition my planning time for Coalition 2 (Coalition 1 is so local its pretty easy) requires at least ten times as much effort as my planning for Alliance 1 (Which needs to set up for Coalition 2).

I think the game is somewhat Alliance biased, I think this is magnified by the difficulties of playing the coalition side with relatively equally skilled players.

By Paul Edwards (Pablomatic) on Wednesday, November 10, 2010 - 03:02 pm: Edit

You know what Michael, that makes a lot of sense. As much as I want to try my next Coalition scheme, I'll try to play the Alliance next time. I'm sure the experience will be invaluable.

By Paul Howard (Raven) on Wednesday, November 10, 2010 - 05:05 pm: Edit

To add to what Michael said...

A Major Alliance error, ends the game early (and there are afew games which get published stating this).

(Losing a Capital too easily, or more than 1 SB is killed for 'free' for example - or even getting a moderate stack of ships cut off)

A Major Coalition error, doesn't necessarily get picked up on so quickly, but has a major bearing on the game by the late teen turns - and the error may well be forgotten about, and the general perception is 'the Coalition can't win'.

(Failure to destroy a key SB or major hardpoint for exaample, or getting alot of ships cut off early in the game)

By Michael Tisdal (Jtisdel) on Wednesday, November 10, 2010 - 09:05 pm: Edit

Offered as an example:

In a game earlier this year, I made a major mistake on Turn 1C which caused...
twice as many ship kills on my Lyrans than were necessary to take out the 0902 Kzinti SB. As a result, the Lyrans were basically at half strength until T4C. This error slowed down the assault on the Kzinti (to an eventual stalemate - we were only playing "The Wind") which then snowballed into not enough Lyran ships on the Hydran front plus reduced Klingon ships, which allowed the Hydran "Hail Mary" expedition to reach the Federation on the last Coalition turn.

One mistake - a big one - which threw off the timing of the whole Coalition attack. Wow; this game can be unforgiving.

Michael wrote:
>>In a game earlier this year, I made a major mistake on Turn 1C which caused twice as many ship kills on my Lyrans than were necessary to take out the 0902 Kzinti SB.>>

Huh. How were the Kzinti set up that the Lyrans even had a chance to take out that SB at all on T1? Between the Count's fleet, Duke's fleet reserve, and the rest of the the Duke's fleet that can be forward deployed and react onto the Count's SB, I can't imagine that the Lyrans could ever really take that SB unless the Kzinti specifically let them on T1.

T2, on the other hand, is a whole other matter :-) 

True - it may have been T2C; it was back in August and I didn't chronicle the game.

Ah, yeah, ok. If it is T2, then the Lyrans can kill that SB, and there can certainly be miscalculation leading to long term misery. T1, not so much :-)

It's possible to drop that SB on CT1. If the Lyrans are willing to take *lots* of damage they can do it, as the end result would be a totally crippled Lyran fleet and a mostly crippled Kzinti Count's and Duke's fleet. Using field repair and new construction should be enough to keep safe any Lyran bases during AT1. But it's a gamble, no doubt about it but it has been done.

An easier way to do it is to cripple the one scout that is sure to be in the Duke's fleet detachment, which tends to save you from fighting about half of the Duke's fleet over the SB. You can do this with an E&S raid to cripple the scout, which is pretty much guaranteed to be SC4, so the roll gets a bonus. By stopping those ships from reacting onto 902, less of the Lyran navy should be crippled in the
attack.

Both ideas however assume you do not try to actually kill any of the border BATS and that you send every single ship you own at 902. And of course it's totally debatable if it's worth it, since no matter what the Lyran's will take massive damage in dropping 902 T1.

If you can cripple the scout that lets the forward deployed Duke's fleet units react on with a raid (assuming that it is a SF, what do you need to roll for that?), and then land every ship in range of the SB on 902, that is going to get about 35 some odd Lyran's vs the Count's fleet and the Duke's reserve that is going to be almost 30 some odd Kzinti. Which, over a SB, is going to be a very ugly fight for the Lyran's. I suppose it is possible to make it happen, but:

A) The whole Lyran fleet will be crippled.

and

B) Why would you even bother, when you can probably kill it on T2 for slightly more than a song?

However, the easy fix in the full game is to include the AUX scout in the forward deployed Duke's fleet - and you can't cripple both scouts. My experience is that you're unlikely to be able to nail the AUXes if they're foward deployed (maybe one or two) - so it's a good insurance bet.

IMHO it's not worth taking out Count's SB on CT1 unless the Zin makes a terrible mistake and hands it to you on a silver platter. Otherwise, better to take it out on CT2 on the relative cheap.

Actually, the Lyran's can land 37 ships on 902 in total. And they can land an additional 36 ships between 703 and 803.

So let's think about it for a moment. If this game is like most games, the Count's fleet is mostly on 902, maybe one ship on each of the border BATS at max. Duke's reserve is at 1304 and is as heavy as possible (12 ships and fighters) and the rest of Duke's is at 1003. So assuming all of the above, there are 17 ships on 902 plus fighters (21 SE) and one each on the BATS 701/703/803. 1003 has it's scout crippled. Given that, would you always send Duke's to 902? You have a 21 SE ro 37 SE battle with a SB. Or let's say everything in Count's is at 902, including a POL, so now they have 25 SE vs 37 SE. Where does Duke's reserve go? 902 should hold, so why send the reserve there? You don't know your
opponent is going to be willing to fight to the last cripple, so in some cases you may not send that reserve to 902, but instead to 803 to push the Lyrans out of range.

So it's far from a trivial choice, since you can't know for sure what you're opponent will do. Therefore 902 can fall T1 if the reserve does not go there. But you are both right, odds are it is not worth it, but it would have the effect of shocking the Kzinti defense as almost no one has experienced that loss so early before, and any damaged Kzinti ships will have to wait another turn to get repaired, so the Kzinti is going to have to be very careful how much he/she cripples lest the Count's fleet bcome a shadow for the next turn or two, just when the Klingons are about to storm the border.

Robert wrote:

>>So it's far from a trivial choice, since you can't know for sure what you're opponent will do. Therefore 902 can fall T1 if the reserve does not go there.>>

Sure. But why would it not? If the Lyrans send enough ships there to kill the SB if the reserve doesn't show up, why would the reserve not show up? To not save one of the two BATS that has the whole Lyran home fleet on it?

The Lyrans can send a max of 37 ships to that SB. I'd imagine that most of the time, most of the Count's fleet in on the SB. The whole of the Duke's fleet can get there too (forward deployed fleet with scout, reserve fleet). If the Lyrans drop 37 ships on the SB? You send the reserve and the forward deployed ships react on (you can only pin the forward deployed units with ships that can reach the SB too, so the Lyrans could, in theory, pin those 7 or 8 ships in open space if they want, but a wash in terms of fighting at the SB). There is no percentage in possibly losing the SB on T1 to save one of the BATS that the Lyran home fleet is standing on.

The Dukes Reserve will almost always go to Count's SB if the Lyrans park 37SE's on it C1, that is just how things are.

But with that said, it might not be a bad idea to forgo that and send Duke's reserve to a BATS. With 37se's and 25+ defending it won't be trivial taking the SB. The Lyran's might not have the belly for it to be honest.

I've never seen Count's SB fall T1 even though I have had the opportunity to do so in both my last two coalition games (crippled solo scout in Duke's detachment). In both games I opted to instead be strongly forward deployed for C2.

what happens to the count's starbase if the coalition doesn't obligingly assault it
on turn 1 or 2? AFAIK the zin have to abandon it, both for the sake of the
garrison fleet and for the vastly higher priority sites: 1401, 1502, and 1304.

Chris wrote:
>>what happens to the count's starbase if the coalition doesn't obligingly assault
it on turn 1 or 2? AFAIK the zin have to abandon it, both for the sake of the
garrison fleet and for the vastly higher priority sites: 1401, 1502, and 1304.>>

If the Lyrans don't at least pin the ships there on T1, the two reserve fleets
(Duke's and Counts) go and fight somewhere else and probably do some
significant damage. And possibly the other ships on the Count's SB react on to
whatever the last thing the Lyrans move on to.

The Kzinti can keep a reasonable garrison of a battle line of sub-optimal carriers
(3xCVLs) and a CC or so on the SB to make the Coalition at least take some
damage if they want to kill it, without actually compromising their T2/3 Capital
defense, threaten to kill a couple Lyran BATS (and maybe cut someone off supply
or something) if the Lyrans just ignore the SB. If it turns out that the Coalition
are going to kill the Kzinti capital in earnest by T4 or so, the 10 or so ships on the
SB aren't going to make that any easier for the Coalition. If it turns out that the
Coalition start funneling ships to the Hydran front on T3, the Kzinti can probably
bolster the SB defenses and make the Coalition actually pay to kill it, and
realistically threaten the Red Claw SB.

Just ignoring the SB is completely reasonable on T2 and T3 if the Coalition are
going to take the Kzinti Capital, but if they aren't, killing it on T2 or T3 when the
Kzinti are understandably concerned that the Coalition might be taking the Capital
(and so the SB is under-defended) is probably the best plan.

I find that when I play, the count's starbase typically goes down on turn 1. But
that's because I'm the Kzinti, and I tend to underdefend the starbase, choosing to
beat up some Lyrans at a BATS instead.

My reasoning is this: By turn 3, the Lyrans are going to take down that starbase
for a song, because I simply won't have enough defenders to guard the capital,
the duke's starbase, *and* the counts starbase. At best I'll have a single line of
defenders, score a few hits, and down it goes.

But on turn 1, even an undersized defense force will force a multi-round battle,
and quite a few Lyrans will go into the body and fender shop. Many won't make it
home at all.

Then from turn 2 onward, my defense is simplified. I don't have two starbases to
defend, so I can put a decent defense line at the dukes while still having plenty
for the capital. The Lyrans will have repaired their damage from the count's battle, but so have will I.

And then, without further delays, they'll have to choose whether they want to take my capital or not. If they do, with the pain of a defended count's battle and a well-defended duke's starbase, I pretty much have guaranteed throwing off the timetable for taking the Hydran capital and repositioning to hit the feds. And if they don't, then I've made them pay for taking my starbases, and their fleet stood idle while my capital remained unmolested.

Most of the time they go ahead and hit the capital, but if the two starbases have caused enough pain, and I cause more in the defense of the outer planets, they decide to not face the wrath of the capital PDU's. They devastate everything else and go prepare to play with the Hydrans. That's ok with me - I caused maximum pain while preserving my capital. Hydrax will fall, but added to the pain of the Tigermen, the coalition is in no position to hit the Feds by turn 7.

*~*~*

Feel free to tell me how horribly flawed this analysis is - as I feel I have never played a really high caliber player before, so I haven't yet seen how this strategy would backfire on me.

Kevin I agree with your tactic and have used such in the past.

Sadly enough Count's SB is there to cause casualties to the Coalition not to survive. You are correct that by turn 3 defending it is usually a liability the Kzinti can ill afford and it would go down for a pittance on turn 3. If by weakly defending it on turn 1 you get to cause some casualties with it and do some damage at your BATS.. then your doing your job. Usually it does that damage C2, but nothing particularly flawed about doing it on C1, kinda sucks not to have it to repair/convert on A1 if it falls C1.

Great! I'm glad you both agree.

Oh wait, that means you wouldn't fall for it.

Crap. I don't ever want to play you then.

OK, new topic:
There's this idiot in the current game I'm in. He totally karked up, taking the Hydran capital but failed to properly cut them off. (Plus, the goofball didn't think to route the Hydrans into 0718). Note that the identity of the idiot, who goes by the name of 'Kevin', is irrelevent to the discussion.

So, the Hydrans retreated into supply, restocked on fighters, and immediately came back on their turn to retake the capital. Then, judging the general state of disrepair of my fleets, decided to stay.

So now I have to fight to retake that which should be rightfully mine, and face all those fighters *a third time*. At least now I can cut him off properly, and he doesn't have any defenses, but ••••, that's alot of fighters to burn through yet again.

So here's the question: Do I take this as a golden opportunity to reduce his fleet? Direct damage every round, kill anything of value, and some things of no value, and generally shrink his fleet until he gives up the ghost and leaves for the off-map?

Or, do I let the damage fall, let him burn his fighters for free, (and score hits on me in return, for free), but convincingly drive him out of the capital for good, as he would then have to run to the off-map to resupply and restock fighters?

Note that killing ships every round could mean several *turns* before I drive him out, as I doubt I could win that fight in one run. Especially if on his turn he reconnects his supply line and restocks fighters again. But driving him out without damage means he keeps his entire fleet intact for the long game, while I still take damage to win this fight.

All of this in the framed in the context that I would like to someday invade the Federation, maybe, hopefully before exhaustion...

Thanks for any and all advice.

By Richard B. Eitzen (Rbeitzen) on Sunday, November 14, 2010 - 05:03 am: Edit

Direct every Ranger, Horseman, Lancer and Aegis Lancer that you can. If you can kill all of those types of units you will greatly reduce his fighter capacity for the rest of the game.

You probably won't get any carriers or Paladins, but if you can cripple some of those and get them in pursuit you should try.

By Peter D Bakija (Bakija) on Sunday, November 14, 2010 - 09:14 am: Edit
Yeah, by the time that the Hydrans lose their capital, they shouldn't have any cruisers left. Every fight that the Coalition have against the Hydrans should see the Coalition blowing up cruisers. And when there aren't any cruisers left, blow up Lancers. When you attack the capital, you use maulers to kill all the PDUs, and when the PDUs are dead, you kill their cruisers. Eventually, they run out of ships to put up good lines with and they retreat.

Once they hit that point, fighting them over their destroyed, recaptured capital shouldn't really be an issue. Yeah, they have a lot of fighters, but they have a low compot battle line, so you just keep fighting and blowing up ships.

If you have taken their capital but they still have all their ships left (i.e. the first two turns of fighting the Hydrans wasn't simply directing every cruiser you can at every possible opportunity), it will be really hard to keep the capital, as you can't push them around easily.

Kevin wrote:

>>Feel free to tell me how horribly flawed this analysis is - as I feel I have never played a really high caliber player before, so I haven't yet seen how this strategy would backfire on me.>>

(Back to the Count's SB).

This is certainly an option too--under defend the Count's SB, hope the Lyrans attack it aggressively on T1, and trade it for damage. That being said, generally speaking, best case scenario for the Lyrans on T1 (assuming a reasonably well set up Kzinti) is to kill a couple BATS, don't take a ton of damage, and be set up for a good T2.

If the Lyrans go into T1 thinking that that is their plan (which it probably should be), they don't really have much incentive to kill the Count's SB on T1, even if it is under defended. If they heavily attack the two obvious BATS and just pin the Reserve on the SB (assuming that even if under defending the SB is the Kzinti plan, it is still going to have the full reserve on it), they still do what they are going to do on T1--kill a BATS or two, take fairly minimal damage, and be poised for the rush on T2.

The Coalition has *such* a huge advantage on T2 in both ships and momentum (i.e. the Kzinti need to plan for an attack on the Capital on T2, meaning that the Coalition can just spread out and kill things with impunity if they do, and crush the capital if they don't) that the Lyrans are going to be hard pressed to even *consider* blowing up that SB on T1 if it is remotely defended.

I've been playing a solitaire GW scenario, ie from the start of the General War.
I've just resolved a raid on the Kzin capital, and am wondering if my results are typical or not?

Background: it's T3C. The Coalition attacked and destroyed all BATS on the border except the one adjacent to the Marquis fleet area during T1 and 2. Both the Duke's and Count's SB are untouched. All the minor planets except 1902 are in Coalition hands.

I assumed a rather passive Kzin player, who left both the Count's and Duke's fleets at their SB, minus some of the vulnerable Aux ships, which went back to the capital.

The Home fleet and most of Marquis was pinned out of the capital, so I was facing basically the Baron's fleet which was set up as 2 reserves. The Coalition managed to get 96se into the capital versus about 30se worth of warships and auxes for the Kzin.

The Coalition initial plan was to attack and devastate all non-capital planets. This was accomplished for the cost of 5 small Klingon ships destroyed and 22 cripples total (28% casualties). The Kzin lost a CVS group to mauling and 8 cripples (plus 6 already in the hex). This was recorded as the "official result".

However, I decided for the fun of it to game out another scenario - what would happen if that same Coalition fleet attacked the capital planet, ignoring the other planets. In this scenario, I ended up destroying all the PDUs and devastating the planet, but it cost me 19 dead ships and 32 cripples (53% casualties). I didn't have along any SAF or good G-ships.

What I'm wondering is whether or not my results both ways would be considered typical or not? Good thing I didn't consider the capital assault first, as I'd be rather vulnerable to a T3A counter-attack if I had...

The flipside is that when I do come back into the capital next turn with more ships and several SAF, I'll probably be facing up to the entire Kzin fleet worst-case, best case maybe 60 more ships (assumes that the Count's and Dukes SBs are defended with minimal 10-ship lines).

So I'm not sure whether or not I should have sucked up the damage and devastated the capital, returning the following turn to attack the other planets, versus beating up the non-capital planets this turn and taking my lumps next turn or two against a 20-PDU capital plus 100+ ships possibly.

What say you all?
I think that's a major tactical blunder by the Kzinti, in attempting to pin the Coalition out.

Are you able to re-run it with an additional 30 Kzinti (and 30 Coalition) ships there?

(i.e still send some out, in case the Coalition is actually aiming to move back to the SB’s!).

Reason? - Otherwise, with only 30 ships equivalents (plus Aux) there - the Coalition could probably take the hex.

The Coalition attacks the minor planets (and then the majors when minors are gone) .... and directs on Kzinti ships - repeat until the Kzinti are able to self devastate the planets...

With less than 3 battle lines available to the Kzinti - the damage done will be similar, and so the Kzinti will either be forced to NOT defend 1 system.....which allows those planets to be devasated for low cost - or suffer the loss of hulls.

Net result - Kzinti take major damage, and do little damage in return. Coalition can then attack the Capital planet and an inferior Kzinti battle line (as key ships are already dead or crippled) meets them.

So - more defending ships, allows 3 full lines, and the Coalition can't force the Kzinti to Self devastate (unless they want to), so the pain the Coalition takes is alot higher!

Paul,

The Kzin home fleet was pinned 2 hexes out from the capital because it had just retreated from a battle on T2A and was trying to maintain a blocking position (dumb idea, didn't work anyways as the Coalition pinned them there and went around them).

The remaining Kzin forces split in half - the static forces defended the capital planet, and the mobile forces defended one major world - they caused most of the pain. The other 2 systems were undefended except for PDUs. The Klingons only had 22 fighter factors in the whole hex, so they took a fair bit of damage.

I did run the simulated capital assault past the point where the capital PDUs fell and the planet was devasated, and no, all Coalition forces were crippled/some destroyed before finishing up with the other planet's PDUs. I simply didn't send
enough force to take the hex - it was planned as a raid.

Now next turn, different story. Perhaps +50 ships, 3 SAF, 7 aux carriers (4 LAV, 3 SAV I think)...the fight ought to be a little different this time. 🤓

I still have to take out the Duke's and Count's SB...which may happen T4C or not.

Man, running a game solitaire is difficult when you have to play both sides and not screw up. 😊

I'm giving consideration to restarting anyways since the whole point of the exercise was to see what would happen with a non-traditional don't attack the 2 SB T2C, bypassing them to raid the capital approach. I'm not sure it was the greatest idea...

By Michael J. Sexton (Lb4269) on Thursday, December 02, 2010 - 11:22 am: Edit

"Man, running a game solitaire is difficult when you have to play both sides and not screw up."

I am about to play the game solitaire before I teach it in January, so I'm in the same boat as you at this point!

By Paul Howard (Raven) on Thursday, December 02, 2010 - 02:04 pm: Edit

William

Either way - very bad idea. If the enemy can pin you and get sufficient forces past you - it's not worth attempting to block.

You could re-run from the end of A2 then - retrograde those 30 ships to 1401.

It doesn't need to be much, if you want to be very aggresive - but a couple of CC's and CVL/CVE groups would be ideal

(Example 2 x CC, 3 x CVL, 3 x CVE, 3 x CLE, 3 x CL, 6 x EFF or FF's, 1 x FCR, 2 x DF and 2 x SF is 25 ships, or just under 30 equivalents - sufficient to defend one system with static ships, and 1 system with mobile -

a CC(F), CVL+CLE+FF, CVL+CL+EFF, CVE+CL+EFF, SF(S) is 57/1, making a minor planet 75/3 (4 EW if you have the EWN) - not a tough nut to crack, but will force some damage on your enemy).

And thats what you need to do!
A single round battle in deep space isn't going to do that 😊

By Thomas Mathews (Turtle) on Thursday, December 16, 2010 - 09:15 am: Edit

---

Quote:

By William Stec (Billstec2) on Thursday, December 16, 2010 - 07:00 am: Edit

Or an Engineer for no cost.

---

Engineers have a lot more value doing other things than building colonies. With the ability to save 5EPs a turn, Base upgrades or placing the 1 PDU over the limit in (433.424) or building a MSY or PRD are at the top of my list for Eng Units.

I will admit that adding that extra PDU above the limit is expensive 2 + 3 for fighters after the Eng discount, the advantage it gives is also huge.

By William Stec (Billstec2) on Thursday, December 16, 2010 - 07:57 pm: Edit

It depends. Lyrans T1-3 have nothing to do with their Engineers unless they want to build PDUs. T2-4 you could build a free colony at a convenient BATS, then T5 build a Colony base. T6 you build a PRD, then move on to another location. BATS 0502 and 0504 are good locations for this.

But you are right in that normally there are far better uses for a ENG than building a colony. But it can be done.

By Michael Parker (Protagoras) on Friday, December 17, 2010 - 08:37 am: Edit

For the Lyrans however Turn 4 you need to have the COE in place to start producing Minor shipyards, and since the COE needs to be in place in the hex where you want to build the Minor Shipyard it cannot move turn 4. So you COULD start building a colony with the COE in 411 (The only Minor Shipyard eligible spot the COE can reach operationally) turn 1.. then you would be ready on turn 4 to start building a MSY. But 411 is not an ideal place by a long shot for an early colony or shipyard. The Hydrans are already tempted to make 411 212 and 413 targets for A3. If you stick your COE there as well as a colony you can almost bet they will ponder long and hard about attacking you. You will then need to commit hard to defending 411, which makes other things more difficult such as defending the expedition and positioning for a strike C4.

I usually have the Lyran COE work on setting up MB's since the Lyran Tugs are overworked in the extreme especially if your building out your SR ration.. while its
not gaining EP's it is allowing you to build a base at 408 for the extra conversion while also using tugs in battle and scout mode in the early parts of the game. Your DWS fleet is not yet built so the Lyrans actually can really use a scout tug early.

Much later in the game once you have built out all of your shipyards and conversion facilities and if your not rebuilding/building bases then you can have the COE build colonies.. it would be a WHOLE lot easier to do if you didn't have to commit to the entire three turn process with the COE, but its sometimes hard to know if you might need/want the COE to use its 5ep discount for base upgrades somewhere during the 3 turns.

Michael

Do you used the DWT or FFT.. They can do about all the same thing a Tug can do...for the lyran they are a big help in doing the Tug Missions....and you have no limit on the number of DWT or FFT you can build or Sub or convert per turn......

MHO, DWTs and FFTs are limited. They are limited by conversion space and funds, and the fact that you need full warships to fight with. Sometimes the 6 EPs for a TGP is better than 6 EPs spent on converting FFs or DWs to FFTs or DWTs.

Also a "non combat" tug is much more useful for certain time critical tasks.

Well the DWT for DW and FFT for FF substitutions cost the same as the base hull and are unlimited. So for Colonial development I use FFT's liberally.

Although as MT points out, especially with the smallish Lyran schedule building one FF as FFT turn 1 and 3xFF as 3xFFT for turn 2 and 3 hurts a bit on your pincount totals early.

But what is the Lyran player to do? They REALLY need the extra income, and they do not have Tugs to play with. So I think it prudent to wince a little.. build the 7 Theatre transports and build colonies with them.

Once your done building colonies.. they are pincount.. I mean 4/2 or 2-4/1-2 isn't much difference they are very unlikely to see the line.. and when they do its to take some damage on most likely not to add to compot so much.

Once the Lyrans can afford the CA hull a TugP is not bad at 6ep.. but the full tug is nice, as the Lyrans can really use them for combat roles and they start with 3
TugP already I believe. But if the EP pinch is hitting you, and you need a tug to do tug stuff.. the TugP is a bargain (same can be said for the Kzinti and Klingon cheap tugs). If your rolling in cash though.. Honestly consider your once a year Tug build as an SR. Its 13ep, but your CA hulls are precious and this gets about the maximum benefit out of a CA hull as you can get. STT CV DN Conversions and SR's are the best things your CA's can grow up to be.

Risking belabouring the point. You get a 3-8/1-4 unit with 2EW natural. You can slap on CV pods to get 2ew escortable.. AND if you happen to not need the thing on a turn.. on-map survey with it! You can also take them with a single KSP pod and get a 4EW tug for scout duty. But really the best combination is KSP KVP for 1-8(6) 4ew escortable! At least until the SCP+ comes out in 179.. then you get 3-8(6)P 3ew or 2-8(6)P 4ew and its escortable!

Okay does it show that I really like the Lyran Survey Tug!

I don't have anything against the Lyran SR. It is a great multirole unit. You can build 1 per year in place of the Tug/CA build.

My point is that FFT/DWTs regardless of empire come with an opportunity cost, the same as any other speciality unit.

Do remember that you have a small number of FFT/DWTs to start with that can help you in that regard. Thoas can start on one of your colonies as well.

yes I understand what Michael and you Turtle...but now you got the Tugs and later on LTTs and at the same time when you game start the DWTs and FFTs......you can build only 1 tug (or sub or convert)....LTT you can do 1 per turn (or convert or sub)......but the DWTs/FFTss are not limited like the Tugs and LTTs......but each players has their style of playing......and now we can field more tugs type ships in the game....

Remember the DWTs/FFTss can upgrade PGBs,repair SB and BATS, ect....Like in the Lyran case, myself sub or convert 3xFFTss for the 1st and 2nd turn...then possible on the 3rd turn.....It work for me against my Brother in the games we play......but later in the game it hurt me when he get the Fed in play

But you never have the money to build or repart what you wish ...so you got to pick the way to used your money to do what you can

MHO, remember now with (509.23) Those little Theater Transports can perform some missions by themselves even though it will take longer to complete. That's not entirely a bad thing. In some cases you lose a turn or two to complete the task, but that option is there.

This may or may not mitigate the opportunity cost of your choices depending on
what you want to do and when you want to do it with regards to tug missions and available tugs.

MHO, with the exception of PDU/PGB placement which is specified as a single TT being required, I would also use my TT's in thress to get the task done in the fewest turns possible.

What I was suggesting is that circumstances may force you to choose using a tug for a 1 turn task or less than 3 TTs and taking an extra turn or two to complete the task.

Every game and every situation is going to be different. So there is no hard and fast rule.

In truth I haven't decided how much I would use TTs in groups to build a colony or colony base. Although I would probably use 3 for a colony base if I didn't have a tug close by to do that.

Other tasks would depend on a whole lot of other factors that are too numerous to mention at the moment.

I would tend to think that Mission C will mostly go away by Y180 or with the advent of the Op Base in Y175.

I was thinking you was on the same track as I was......But I think the best task for TT are colony building my self

you say this
"Other tasks would depend on a whole lot of other factors that are too numerous to mention at the moment."
I agree with

you say this
"I would tend to think that Mission C will mostly go away by Y180 or with the advent of the Op Base in Y175."
I agree with totally

MHO, PRDs would be a good choice at major planets (3 EPs), unless your using your Eng at a minor planet where they would be free after the Eng discount.
Colonies would tend to be my first choice outside of PDU placement.

By Michael H.Oliver (Mholiver) on Saturday, December 18, 2010 - 09:34 am: Edit

Good morning Turtle
I used my Eng for building shipyards and when the 2nd one come online....then the 2nd Eng do the colony thing (for free)

By Thomas Mathews (Turtle) on Saturday, December 18, 2010 - 09:47 am: Edit

MHO, in that case I still think your giving up EPs better spent on colony development by TTs or Convoys. The Eng unit can be used to single step upgrades for 5 EPs less thanks to their discount. A BATS to STB gives you 2 (3 Plasma Repair Exception) extra repair points each turn. It also makes the base a lot tougher to destroy if attacked.

Also the Eng unit can be escoted for any of these missions. Helping to protect it from Drone Raids and the like.

By Michael H.Oliver (Mholiver) on Saturday, December 18, 2010 - 09:58 am: Edit

but again you NEVER have all the money you wish to build what you wish for

By Thomas Mathews (Turtle) on Saturday, December 18, 2010 - 08:39 pm: Edit

So very true. The idea is to find ways to use what you have most efficiently then.

By Michael H.Oliver (Mholiver) on Sunday, December 19, 2010 - 07:35 am: Edit

thank you
so really nobody is right or wrong in how we play a game

By Thomas Mathews (Turtle) on Sunday, December 19, 2010 - 09:54 am: Edit

No, and that is what makes it one of the best games to play. Mostly because someone gives us new ideas to try and some have a lot of merit in them that can be very useful.

By Michael H.Oliver (Mholiver) on Sunday, December 19, 2010 - 10:09 am: Edit

very true

By Ken Burnside (Ken_Burnside) on Sunday, December 19, 2010 - 03:47 pm: Edit

My winning F&E strategy is to 'forget' to shut the door that the cat can get through when I'm hopelessly outclassed. 😊

Like when the Hydran Expedition not only gets through on T4, but does so when the Klingons and Lyrans have overcommitted on the Kzinti front and the Fed early entry takes six Klingon provinces.

I mean, I was playing the Lyrans as well as the Klingons, and I could see good arguments for the Lyrans going neutral... 😊

It was time to unleash the "Oops, the cat got in..." strategy at that point.
lil Ken. That's a good one. Was that Kitty a Pirate kitty in disguise?

Mr Fear got cats too and I got a Collie she lov to see me roll dices and she try to catch them too

Ken,

Did Wes Tower teach that to you?

Per 509.1-K1, it takes a group of TTs to deploy PDU/PGBs, not one per like in the old days. Same with upgrading them, you still need a group now.

Mholiver: I do not have "cats", I have masters...

so Mike ...can we call you Mr FEAR, the Master of the (cats) Kzinti Race then.... (smiling)

Does anybody here actually change modular ships' configurations from turn to turn on a regular basis? Except for special extreme emergencies, it doesn't seem to make economic sense to switch modules around since it costs 1ep.

I've never used that ability. I just build the ship in the needed configuration and let it be.

The 1 ep penalty never even entered my mind.

I've used modular configurations occassionally when I needed a specific mission at a location and didn't want to spend the EPs to convert another ship.

I changed the rule. In my ruleset, there is no 1ep cost to change modules back and forth.
Nevertheless, I practically never change modules. I'll unconvert SKE back to SK for a time, when and if I get overstocked on escorts. I'll swap SPH modules out whenever I am overstocked on tugs. And if I really, really need varient X and I can do without varient Y for a turn, I'll swap them out to do a particular mission.

But most of the time, I simply go with what I have, build what I need for the future, just like any other nation does.

I never change modules on Rom ships. It costs way too much and it's too easy to build all the variants you want within the normal rules.

The only exception is when producing a Demonhawk CVA with both sets of B modules.

I've never really ever tried to abuse it, but I *suppose* that you could try to engineer a position where you have say 3 shiptypes on one SB that is not on the front, and you just happen to have those same 3 base hull types on another SB on the front, so you "swap" the modules and give your opponent a bit of a suprise.

Yeah, it's lame but it could make the difference. You might have 3 crippled SPBs at Romulus that you pull the modules from to put on 3 SPs somewhere more useful. Maybe. OK probably not.

Re-reading the rule, it *looks* like you can make the conversion during the turn, whether you have the module available or not. You just pay the full cost at that point, as long as the SB can actually do the conversion. *That* could be pretty powerful. If it works that way.

You might have 3 crippled SPBs at Romulus that you pull the modules from to put on 3 SPs somewhere more useful. Maybe. OK probably not.

Definately not, as it take a turn before you can use modules removed from ships on other ships (433.432)

I guess I need to think of SPBs as "1 and 1/3 squadrons" of fighters each then. I'm not sure paying for an SPB is superior to a standard carrier with a standard squadron, since you pay for 2 extra fighters that you can't actually use on the line when you buy an SPB. Are there any Alliance carriers that have this problem? Probably not.
Pablomatic,

I do not believe there is another Empire that has this problem. Every CV I can think of with more than 6 factors is either an over-sized squadron, a special squadron (i.e. fed F-15 etc), or carries two squadrons (CVA's et al).

The Romulans have some weird squadron sizes being too large, the Klingons have weird squadron sizes being too small (until later) and the Lyrans are just happy to have a few normal sized squadrons!

My recommendations... do not build any more of them.. and convert the ones you have into SUB's which is a truly nice CV.

Michael,

While I'm tempted, I'm not sure I'll convert them. I'll have to think about it. My instinct says to convert all the VULs to VLVs before building other heavy carriers so that I can get some legitimate use out of those outdated hulks. Then, when those are gone I can start building the Condor heavy carriers.

I know the VLVs suck, but they're at least useful--as opposed to a VUL, which I don't really need unless I just stick it on the line.

Anyone care to comment?

Kevin Howard (Jarawara) on Tuesday, December 28, 2010 - 12:34 am: Edit

Stick VUL's on the line. Watch them die. Problem solved.

Build SUB.

Though I have to admit, I usually skip a second SUB in favor of just building some standard carrier and save the money. The instant the CNV is available, build build build!!!

Michael Parker (Protagoras) on Tuesday, December 28, 2010 - 01:00 am: Edit

CNV is great but the SUB is almost as great

also if your willing to build one of the modulare DN's you can use SPB modules on some of them I am sure if your not willing to convert all the SPB to SUB.

Don't waste your time with the VLV its a load. Keep the VUL as small CR 10 command ships.. The VUL has the same stats as a Lyran BC and standard BCH's it should be valued for that alone. There are plenty of opportunities to use a CR10 ship somewhere you do not want full DN to be. A VUL leading around a gaggle of
old eagle class ships can be fun too!

By Paul Edwards (Pablomatic) on Tuesday, December 28, 2010 - 01:20 am: Edit

Kevin, Michael,

Of course you're right. I need to build a CNV this year. There just aren't enough heavy carrier builds to build both unless I over-ride build. I might consider over-riding to get one more VLV going but not sacrifice a CNV this year though.

By Peter A. Kellerhall (Pak) on Tuesday, December 28, 2010 - 03:11 am: Edit

VULs make good reserve force leaders.

By Ted Fay (Catwhoeatsphoto) on Tuesday, December 28, 2010 - 11:01 am: Edit

VULs are also good for putting up as DD targets. You get good salvage from them! ;)

As an aside, VULs are fun to play in SFB. Relatively cheap way to get a pair of R torps!

BTW: I do find value in SPBs. While their fighter factors are awkward, SPB groups do fit nicely together with a SUP in the form box - and you can round out nicely with another standard carrier group. I think (IIRC) you can put a FAB in there as the 14 fighters count as an oversized squadron like any other "U" type carrier. (I think?)

By Michael Parker (Protagoras) on Tuesday, December 28, 2010 - 02:13 pm: Edit

Please don'ty build the VLV. Its a CVA class build I am pretty certain since until Y175 its a two squadron CV (6+4 yeech) you take a pretty decent hull 10/5 CR10 and make it 6-10(10) CR10 a fairly dismal CVA and pay loads to do it. Keep the VUL and make a SUB from an SPB instead.

By Ted Fay (Catwhoeatsphoto) on Tuesday, December 28, 2010 - 02:37 pm: Edit

---

Quote:

Please don'ty build the VLV. Its a CVA class build I am pretty certain since until Y175 its a two squadron CV (6+4 yeech) you take a pretty decent hull 10/5 CR10 and make it 6-10(10) CR10 a fairly dismal CVA and pay loads to do it. Keep the VUL and make a SUB from an SPB instead.

---

very much agreed, though possibly one exception.

I'm not consulting my rules, and hence might be crocked - but don't the Roms have a mothballed VLV that might be worth activating?
Oh yes, they do. Free (or mostly free) VLV are a good thing.

Do not build VLV. Use and abuse VUL. Collect salvage from VUL. Take spare parts from VUL. Transfer crews from VUL. Remove pinball machines from VUL. Do not pass Go, do not convert VUL to VLV.

Convince opponent that as a balance option, you should get six more VLV for free. Just do not pay for VLV.

If you fly the VLV and SPB together then you max your three squadron/18 fighter limit on two ships...one being CR10...just saying...

Yes there is a mothballed VLV that you get.. but you have to pay for the fighters.. and its been ruled you cannot just bring it on as another VUL (which I would do in a heartbeat) but for 10 FFF you get another CVA.. so its not horrible.. and VLV 2xFHM SKE you get a group almost at 10cpt per. Its just with the SUB you get 11 cpt per and the CNV you get 12 cpt per. So the VLV is lacking. However once Y175 comes around and VLV is considered one large squadron a group of [CNV FHM FHM SKE][VLV FHM FHM SKE] Will be nice!

Have your CNV lead your fleet to a glorious capital assault upon Earth. Look dismayed as he directs and vaporizes your entire CVA group. Look over his shoulder, say "OMG, it's ELVIS!". When he looks, swap out CNV with VLV. When he returns to game, look glum as you put VLV into destroyed pile, commenting that at least it wasn't your CNV.

Note: This is the only justification to building more VLV, based on how many rounds of directed damage you will withstand over his capital, vs how many deceased celebrities you can distract him with.

Michael brings up a good point - if the VLV is considered a single oversized squadron, that makes it much more desireable. If you're gonna do the Stevenson doctrine (build mucho mucho carriers), then having five VLV is not out of the question. Match them up with your CNV's and you're good as gold.

Does the VLV count as a CVA build? That would put a crimp on having five of them.

Kevin,

The SIT lists it as a Heavy Carrier so it would count as a CVA.
Troops,

Thanks for all the input. You have helped me see my folly here.

I already built out the VLV from mothballs, and it's now 175, so VLVs have one oversized squadron. The main problems are A: money, and B: CVA builds.

Next game, I will consider converting more VULs to VLVs before I can build other CVAs (the CNV). In fact, I'll build VLVs instead of SPBs. For this game, I would have to over-ride produce a VLV in order to also build my CNV, and I won't have the money.

Next question. Turn 15 and I'm building a 2nd SB on Romulus. I want to build a 2nd SB on Remus as well. I certainly won't try to build any SBs outside of the capitals for the Romulans. Any comments?

Paul,

Where are you getting the funds as the Roms for 2 extra SB? 😊

Can you beg some funds from the Lyrans to be shipped to you?