

# French & Indian War – Scenario Designer’s Notes

## Contents:

- Al’s Notes
- Rich’s Notes
- 1758 Campaign Notes
- On Line Series
- Abbreviations and Terms
- Bibliography

This, the third title in the Early American Wars series, is a team effort brought to you by Rich Hamilton & Al Amos – and of course John Tiller. This title focuses on the events in North America during the Seven Years War, which took place all over the planet, but mainly in Europe and North America.

If you would like to do more reading on this topic please see the [Bibliography](#).

A lot of time and effort, along with more than one delay, has gone into this title. Enhancements have been made to the engine to better reflect the realities of this level of combat and add enjoyment to the player’s experience. Additionally an abundance of situations have been covered from both a historical perspective and a hypothetical one to give players as many options as possible. We hope the mix of historical and hypothetical, large and small, and stand-alone battles verses campaigns is a good one to satisfy many gamers.

The workload was loosely divided with Al taking the lead in OOB and historical scenario development. Most of the base scenarios for the game were of Al’s making and cover many diverse situations very well. Rich was responsible for map creation, hypothetical campaign creation and overall development coordination. In the paragraphs that follow you will find comments from both developers on their style, game features and over-all intent behind this project. We hope you enjoy your reading here, but most of all, we hope you enjoy your gaming experience with our latest title.

## Al’s Notes

*The Last of the Mohicans*. Roger’s Rangers. Wolfe storming the heights at Quebec. All conjure up dreams of romance and adventure.

My knowledge of the war going into this project was limited to Braddock’s Defeat, Battle of the Plains of Abraham, the massacre at Ft. William-Henry and a general feel that this was a war of forts, ambushes, Indians, and Frenchmen. Well most of that turned out to be true, but there was so much more.

Once my research started for this project, I was struck by the differences in the cultures clashing. Simplifying it greatly, there were three basic groups involved: the English, the French and the Indians. It always struck me funny how the English won a war called the French and Indian War.

England was poised at the beginning of this war to become great, and indeed was seeking an opportunity to attain that greatness. Ambitious men propelled that country into a world power by taking advantage of opportunities as they presented themselves in North America, India, the Caribbean and elsewhere. By whittling away at the edge of the French global empire, England was able to gain the position from which she would surge into a global super-power 50 years later.

France was still basking in the glow of the Sun King, although sunset was clearly nearing that country's preeminent position amongst the powers of Europe. Finances were strained and a preoccupation with domestic security all but doomed New France, as the French holdings in North America were called, before the war ever began.

Indians, called this because Christopher Columbus thought he had found India on a trip westward to that place. Now days they are called Native Americans, but that too is a misnomer as they too, immigrated to North America, years ago from Asia. They comprised many, many nations of peoples just as in Europe. Their civilizations were just as complex, rich and fascinating as those in the rest of the world. They did not have the military strength the Europeans possessed and this, in the end would cost them their way of life.

The above is a great simplification, as stated earlier. Each group subdivided down into smaller parts that had differing dreams and desires. England ruled the colonies, but they, the colonies, strove to have their own voice in the day-to-day affairs of life. Even colonists were divided in what they wished for their future, some wished to be left alone, and others wanted an active role within the fledgling empire. The French were made up of Canadians and Frenchmen each worried about the security of their homes. This would eventually put the Canadians into the care of the English Empire, as those ministers ruling France did not feel the reward of keeping New France was worth the cost. As mentioned before, the Indians were a people of many nations. There were Iroquois, Huron, Micmac, Mohawk, Seneca, Ottawa, Chippewa, Algonkin, Abenakis, Sioux, Fox, Sauk, Delaware, and many, many more. These groups would shift alliance between the French and English and amongst themselves as the war progressed to best serve their own interests.

All of the above and many more aspects created a desire in me to reflect as much of it as possible within the game. To that end, I tried to bring the different languages into the game through the order of battles. This was not an easy task as we were working with limited space for names, titles and unit designations. I hope I didn't butcher any of the Indian tongues, or French or English languages too badly in the attempt.

One stereotype I did try to break was the use of Chief for every Indian leader. Although the different tribes and clans did have Chiefs, or leaders, these weren't necessarily military titles, indeed some positions in some tribes were held by women. They were positions of leadership for the everyday life. In most tribes any brave could take up the red hatchet, lead a war party; therefore I used just a name for many of the Indian leaders. I searched the web and found a few sites on Native American languages. From these few sites I copied different words for animals, and used these for the names. The primary language I used was Algonquian and Iroquois. Here are a few web sites for those interested.

<http://www.geocities.com/bigorrin/algo.htm>

<http://www.ohwejagehka.com/lang.htm>

I also tried to get as many historical names for the French and English. The following links are for sites that were particularly useful.

<http://digitalhistory.org/marines.htm>

[http://digitalhistory.org/british\\_regulars.htm](http://digitalhistory.org/british_regulars.htm)

The war was one of raids and sieges. Forts took center place on a forest-covered stage. Waterways were the easiest method of moving troops and supplies through the wilderness, so the opposing forces would build forts at strategic locations to control these water-highways.

We were able to get a method of waterborne movement programmed into the engine to enable us to have a simplified model of troops using canoes, bateaux, boats and ships. This gives the players the opportunity to use the water hexes in the game as their historical counterparts may have. Melees on the water can be quite deadly as there is no retreat. If forced to leave the hex the defender is eliminated.

A primary feature of a fort is artillery. Without big guns projecting their power over the waterways from atop the wooden palisade walls the forts would not have been as important as they were. Another engine change introduced was emplaced artillery. These pieces operate very much like ships within the game, except on land. They can't move, and they lose automatically in melees. Fortunately, they have no victory point value when lost in melee and the army doesn't lose artillery ammunition. In fact, ships and emplaced artillery don't use artillery ammunition when they fire, but the army needs to have at least one round in 'the bank' for them to fire. They do not perform ADF either, which is a good representation of the slower rate of fire fixed carriage guns up on fort walls or in siege trenches would have. They are at times more of a liability to the owner than an asset. However, it is better to have them than not.

Another artillery enhancement is indirect fire; see the rules on how to utilize it. This will help you ferret out those players who would otherwise hide safely with their forts.

This war was a contrast between parade field trained troops and backwoodsmen. In the end the trained professionals showed they were capable of adapting their instrument of war to the new conditions they found themselves fighting in. Light troops and ranger companies were developed to assist battling against the natives – both red and white men.

The scope and scale of the war fit nicely into a game concept. Forces used overall were small thus making the battles, historical and what-if, small compared to European standards.

The theaters of the war were separated more by wilderness than distance. Events in one theater would not affect the others until the end of the campaigning season when plans for next year's operations were drawn up. Troops committed to taking Ft. Duquesne could not be recalled and sent to reinforce Ft. Edward rapidly, so early decisions made would tie one's hands as the campaigns proceeded.

This aspect lends itself nicely to mini-campaigns, a short campaign with two or three branches that may enable players to fight one to three linked battles. Mini-campaigns may fit into most players' gaming schedules a bit better, too. When playing a mini-campaign, players will find more options available to them early on than later, to reflect the importance of initial decisions. There are a few mini-campaigns included, and a few more are in the works as a later add-on. When the entire series is available a player will be able to play through the entire war focusing on one brief episode at a time.

This war also provided a great variety of battle types. A short list would be siege, amphibious assault, fortress storming, ambush, raid, and massacre and parade field

battle. Although all these activities can be found in nearly every war they often are overlooked because of the overall size of forces fielded by the armies. It is hard to design a game with one scenario involving 120 men on a supply raid and 100,000 men open field battle in another. The French & Indian War was small enough that all the various activities can be modeled effectively, and all carried weight in outcome of the war.

My approach to scenarios was two-fold. On the one hand, I wanted to present the historical battles as best I could. On the other, I wanted to design short scenarios that resulted from player's decisions within a campaign tree. Many of my scenarios won't give players open-ended choices once on the battlefield, but I think the challenges they present will cause players to play them more than once. I have tried to include all the various types of battles (raid, siege, assault, etc.)

Please indulge me for one more paragraph as I wish to thank John and Rich for allowing me to make this game with them. This was my first game to work on in this capacity and I had a very steep learning curve to master. Suffice it to say I stumbled many times in that climb, and they were very patient with me. Rich especially was very good at reaching out and helping me back up again. Thanks guys, I hope I was more help than hindrance.

- Al Amos

## **Rich's Notes**

Al covered the historical aspects very well, and his portrayal of them reflects his understanding of the situation well I think. So, my writings will focus more upon the ideas behind my contributions and also covering a few more added features in the games.

After working on my last title, The War of 1812, I had some ideas that I wanted to bring into focus. Not only did I want to create a historically accurate game recreating the times and events of this action, but I also wanted to explore some "what if's?". Additionally, I wanted to put forth a stronger campaign option than what was offered in 1812, as I feel that is a tremendously strong aspect of John's games.

Getting started on the project I had some discussions with Al and some of our play testers compiling a list of battles that should be covered in the game. My primary focus at the beginning was to create the maps for the game, some of which have been brought over from the two previous titles, 1776 & 1812, and flushed out to fit our needs. In outlining the areas that would be covered it was quickly found that many of the situations were not too far apart. So a decision was made to make several large maps as opposed to a small map for each situation. This would also allow the sub-mapping feature to be used to "cut out" small maps for the different situations. It would also allow for larger actions to be played out over the full map. Most of the maps used in the scenarios are sub-maps, so several very large maps are included with the game and can be used for custom scenario creation. There are 3 variants of the Lake George map (with varying tree cover and labels) 400 x 500 hexes, a large Random map (of no particular location) 200 x 130 hexes, and then the biggest – Quebec – covering 630 x 630 hexes. Monongahela & Louisbourg are also sizeable maps with variations included. All in all there is a ton of room for custom work to be done. One thing that will be noted about these maps is, there are very few names associated with the various landmarks. I did this on purpose to facilitate the use of

these maps in other situations. A river could be any river, and thereby be used to represent any action, but when it's labeled "The Hudson River" it narrows it down quite a bit. ;o)

Some of the additional features added to the game that haven't already been covered are the awarding of points for loss of supplies. This feature is set by the scenario designer during creation and not all scenarios utilize this. While supply losses are not carried forward in the campaigns, it will make players protect them a bit more. Another change is the "D" weapon type, which has been added for the Indian units in the game. It has a shorter range (2) and effectiveness than muskets, which will discourage players from trying to form line and fight it out with regular troops. This new weapon type also gives them a 50% increase in effectiveness during melee to reflect their use of many weapons such as the tomahawk and knife. In fact almost every one of them carried one, where rifles and muskets were far less prominent.

The "J" weapon type has also been added. This weapon is used to represent a Heavy Mortar. As AI noted, Indirect Fire has been introduced in this engine. Well, when you think of indirect fire you think of mortar's, and for sieges you need some big one's. These boy's can lob shell's 40 + hexes and so will be good to sit well behind the lines and soften up a defender prior to an assault.

Another item that has been changed based on feedback from gamers on 1812 is that Militia is typed as "I - Infantry" instead of "M - Militia". The reason for this was that Militia are allowed to go into extended line formation by the engine, but that is often too strong a formation for these units. When a unit is in this formation they suffer less casualties and fatigue and move much quicker around the field. They have a staying power that a regular line unit can't stand up to. And due to the large amounts of Militia included in both games it was determined that this feature needed to be taken away. However an engine change wasn't made so that in appropriate circumstances that "type" could still be used. In a few of the very small scenarios you will still see a few "true militia" units on the field.

My biggest contribution to the game was the creation of the hypothetical 1758 campaign. Honestly, it brings the European flavor of the Seven Years War to the game more than the true North American fighting that took place. But I thought the premise was an interesting one and worth exploring. It also provided the large campaign feature I wanted that would allow players to engage in up to 9 linked battles. Based on the players decisions it could be as few as 2 as well, but most paths will generate at least 3 engagements and often more. Below are two excerpts from the campaign, the background thoughts and the introductory text:

The Seven Years War had been raging for over two years now on multiple continents with North America not being at the center of the world's attention. The European powers had been mainly focusing on Europe and events there, with only secondary efforts being put forth in the new world. 1758 would see that changing.

This is a hypothetical campaign. In reality Britain began turning more attention on this theater during '58, but France did not. In this Campaign we will assume that both powers shifted their focus. Based on the choices the commanders make there will be a chance to recreate historical battles, hypothetical battles with the same troops, or larger scale battles with additional troops from Europe and other theaters taking part. Each commander will be given choices that make him the master of his army's destiny, and his country's empire. A failed campaign here will have far reaching ramifications and will change the face of global politics for years to come.

**Main Branch Text** - It is the beginning of the year, but not yet campaigning season. It is time for you, as the North

American Commander, to make a decision for your army. Shall you concentrate your forces or shall you split them up?

If you concentrate you can deliver some potentially decisive blows to your enemy at each engagement. Possibly even bringing them to ground and destroying them in one spectacular battle. On the flip side, you may venture off and leave your lines desperately thin, and he may begin to wreak havoc on your cities and towns while you are in the field.

Alternatively, you can spread your forces over multiple forts and regions and attempt to accomplish multiple goals at once. This will possibly allow you to hold on to most, if not all, of your territory for the year. It may also doom you to defeat after defeat as the enemies larger forces rolls over your smaller garrisons.

The choice is yours...

Many of the situations presented in the hypo campaign are large ones. Many players may find these battles too much to tackle at this small scale. However I feel the over all situation presented by the campaign is a good one, and will be an enjoyable play. And as AI noted, for those who either don't like large battles, or simply don't have the time to play them, the smaller mini-campaigns included with the game will suit them very well. Another point to consider is that this campaign would be good for Multi-Player gaming, with each player handling a different command or theater in the war.

In the scenarios I created for this campaign I approached them with the same thought process I did for the over-all campaign. Make them as open-ended and player dependant as possible. So in most of the scenarios you will find the armies starting a sizable distance apart allowing the commanders to make decisions on how their troops are deployed and even what forces to commit. For example in the opening scenario of the campaign the army that is leading off will have most if not all of their entire army on the map to begin with, arrayed by command structure. This does not mean they need to commit the entire thing, but rather that they can if they wish. This puts the burden of force management on the player, rather than in the designer's hands. The fact that it is a campaign, and will most likely last several battles should always be in the players mind. Another reason I included most if not all of the forces in each battle is that losses carry over. Again, if a commander gets reckless and commits his whole army then he will pay along the whole line. A trooper that dies today will not be there tomorrow to help you storm Quebec.

The final notes I will cover relate to pdt files. We have included a few "alternate" pdt files with this game. One is for weapon effectiveness (by Curt Good) and is the same one included with 1812. The notes for that will be inserted below. Additionally, instead of creating alternate weather variants for every scenario included with the game (over 150 of them), we decided to include the main\_w.pdt file which when switched out with the regular pdt file will incorporate slower movement rates and shorter days to model muddy/snowy ground and overcast days. A pdt file reflecting alternate movement points and costs for the overall game will also be included. Instructions for use are below:

The primary difference that players will note between the original PDT file and the optional alternate PDT file is that the alternate file will produce significantly higher casualties in certain circumstances. The alternate file is intended to take advantage of the nuances made possible by the scale of the game (125 feet/42 yards per hex) to more closely model actual historical lethality patterns. Players should be aware, however, that there may be a potential cost to their enjoyment of the game if they fail to adjust their tactics accordingly.

While the musket's inaccuracy was notorious, there is often a tendency to forget that once the range of engagement began to move inside 100 yards, that inaccuracy became much less of a practical factor and the lethality of massed musketry began to rise steeply. While longer ranged duels would tend to be attritional in nature, close range volleys by formed units were quite capable of ripping decisive chunks out of the enemy line at a single stroke. Accordingly, pressing an attack to very close range would usually result in one side or the other breaking rather quickly. Historically, the offensive role of artillery and skirmishers was to produce enough prior disorder in the defender's ranks to allow formed units to survive closing with the defender to the point where they could deliver decisive close range fire and break the enemy line. Of course, if the defender was still in relatively good order, the attack might be shredded by close range defensive fire and break instead, leaving behind a disconcertingly large pile of bodies.

To put it very simply, there is a vast difference between the likely consequences of engaging at 125 yards (3 hexes) and the likely consequences of engaging at 42 yards (1 hex).

Modeling this in the game, however, has its risks. An active debate began among the developers as to whether players would still enjoy a game in which units could be quickly torn apart and routed? Would this ruin the game? The alternate view was that tendency of play testers to close to adjacent hexes was more an artifact of tactics that they learned in larger scale games, and that in time players would learn to adjust their tactics to fit the realities of the smaller 42 yard hex scale. As such, the players themselves would preserve the playability of the game by becoming more judicious about their decisions regarding when it is or is not appropriate to press to very close range.

Artillery firepower is also adjusted in the alternate PDT to create a more historically accurate lethality footprint given the scale. Accordingly, players using the alternate PDT should take the following differences into account and be aware of the fact that the pattern of artillery lethality is somewhat different than that which they may have become accustomed to in larger scale games.

In contrast to the standard PDT, when using the alternate PDT, maximum artillery lethality is not achieved until range two (84 yards). This was done to represent the idea that the cone of projectiles formed by a canister round would need to travel a certain minimum distance before expanding sufficiently to achieve its maximum potential to generate casualties. (The standard PDT assumes a more rapidly expanding cone of projectiles than the alternate, and thus produces the same pattern as players may be familiar with from larger scale games -- i.e. maximum firepower is achieved at range one.) It is left to the player to decide which model is more appropriate.

Another difference between the standard PDT and the alternate in the area of artillery effectiveness is that greater allowance has been made in the alternate PDT for the depth of the canister footprint, especially with respect to larger caliber loads. The higher firepower values associated with canister reach out further and drop off more slowly. This means that the alternate PDT tends to make artillery more effective overall, and particularly more effective in the 84 to 250 yard range band (2 to 6 hexes). Once again, the player is advised of the potential increase in casualties to be expected when employing the alternate PDT and is cautioned to adjust his tactics and expectations accordingly.

Note that if you are contemplating a game with another player as opposed to a solitaire situation, both players must employ the same PDT file in order for the game to function. The procedure for substituting the alternate PDT file for the original is as follows.

Start a new game, we will assume it is a PBEM (Play-by-email) game. Without selecting PBEM Encryption save the file and close the game. Then go into Windows Explorer or My Computer and browser to your game directory. Find your new game file (in this example we are going to call it game.bte)

Open the game file by double clicking on it. If you have never done this before a window will pop up asking you what program to use to open the file. Choose "Notepad" and click ok.

A new window will pop up and you will be looking at the contents of the PBEM file. It will look something like this:

----- PEM Header -----

1 0 -1 -1

3

The Battle of Fort Meigs, May 5th, 1813

1813 5 5 7 45 0 0 10 24

10 20 20

10 20 20

-200 -100 100 200

2 2 0 0 20223 0

49 23

Fort Meigs.map

Fort Meigs.oob

Fort **Meigs.pdt**

The line we are concerned with is the bold one above. The game is currently looking at the Fort Meigs.pdt file. We are going to change that to Alternate.pdt once you do that you can save and close the file. You are ready to open the game back up and start playing again. Your opponent already has the Alternate.pdt file in their directory so no modification is necessary on their end.

The reason it is suggested that you make the modification to the PBEM file is, it only effects your current game. If you make the change to the .scn file before starting the game, and then forget to change it back afterward, every subsequent game you start will pull the Alternate.pdt file and your opponents may not want to use that.

A lot of time and effort has been put into this game, and both myself and the design/testing team hope you enjoy it thoroughly. Keep an eye on the HPS web site <http://www.hpssims.com> for patches and expansion packs (new maps, oob's, campaigns, etc.) and also stop in to my Scenario Design Center (SDC) at - <http://www.hist-sdc.com>

for add-on's to this game and all the others by John Tiller and HPS Simulations.

Rich Hamilton

December 5, 2002

Richmond, Virginia

## 1758 Campaign Notes

Included here are some notes on the hypothetical 1758 Campaign which should give you a background on my thought process in creating it. It will also help you play it a bit better, knowing how your force is allocated and when you can bring it to bear.

**Main Campaign Text** - The Seven Years War had been raging for over two years now on multiple continents with North America not being at the center of the worlds attention. The European powers had been mainly focusing on Europe and events there, with only secondary efforts being put forth in the new world. 1758 would see that changing.

This is a hypothetical campaign. In reality Britain began turning more attention on this theater during '58, but France did not. In this Campaign we will assume that both powers shifted their focus. Based on the choices the commanders make there will be a chance to recreate historical battles, hypothetical battles with the same troops, or larger scale battles with additional troops from Europe and other theaters taking part. Each commander will be given choices that make him the master of his army's destiny, and his countries empire. A failed campaign here will have far reaching ramifications and will change the face of global politics for years to come.

**Main Branch Text** - It is the beginning of the year, but not yet campaigning season. It is time for you, as the North American Commander, to make a decision for your army. Shall you concentrate your forces or shall you split them up?

If you concentrate you can deliver some potentially decisive blows to your enemy at each engagement. Possibly even bringing them to ground and destroying them in one spectacular battle. On the flip side, you may venture off and leave your lines desperately thin, and he may begin to wreak havoc on your cities and towns while you are in the field.

Alternatively, you can spread your forces over multiple forts and regions and attempt to accomplish multiple goals at once. This will possibly allow you to hold on to most, if not all, of your territory for the year. It may also doom you to defeat after defeat as the enemies larger forces rolls over your smaller garrisons.

The choice is yours...

**Strength Report: British** – The amounts listed here are totals for available British forces in the coming campaign. They do not include garrison troops at outlying posts nor auxiliary troops which must be left behind to support the army. These are combat ready forces. However you must maintain a presence at three points regardless of your campaign decision. Those points are listed below with the amount of troops allocated to them. If your choice takes you into the region they occupy then they will join your force, otherwise they will be a defensive force in the event of an enemy attack.

Force Total Strength:

31, 832 Infantry (20,698 Regulars & Marines and 11,134 Provincials & Militia)  
109 field artillery pieces (including siege guns)  
23 Ships of the Line  
5 Frigates  
12 Sloops

Ample supplies for the campaign, however the number of available supply wagons will decrease on scenarios that are on the assault to simulate the difficulty in maintaining long supply lines.

Force Allocations:

Defense of Albany and surrounding areas – New York and Massachusetts Provincials totaling **5070 men.**  
Defense of Western New York – New Jersey, Rhode Island & Connecticut Provincials totaling **3364 men.**  
Defense of Fort Edward and surrounding areas – New Hampshire Provincials and Battoemen totaling **2300 men.**

This leaves a total British force of 21,563 available for the various assault options. Here's the break down based on the 5 choices available to the British commander:

- B1 – Sea Assault – All available troops used. (21,563)
- B2 – Center Assault – All available troops used plus Fort Edward troops join in. (23,863)
- B3 – Western Assault – All available troops used plus Western New York troops join in. (24,927)
- B4 – Two Prong assault –
  - Abercrombies Command + Fort Edward Troops + Light Brigade + Auxillary Battalion + Marines + 3rd Brigade used in center assault. (13,264)
  - Amhersts Command + Western New York troops used in Western Assault. (12,471)
  - Sailors and British Fleet remain in Boston, but can be called to defend Albany if needed. (1136)
- B5 – Defensive Posture – Same break down as B4 with Abercrombies wing at Albany and Amhersts wing in Western New York.

**Strength Report: French** - The amounts listed here are totals for available French forces in the coming campaign. They do not include garrison troops at outlying posts nor auxiliary troops which must be left behind to support the army. These are combat ready forces. However you must maintain a presence at four points regardless of your campaign decision. Those points are listed below with the amount of troops allocated to them. If your choice takes you into the region they occupy then they will join your force, otherwise they will be a defensive force in the event of an enemy attack.

29,525 Infantry (16,881 Regulars & Marines, 11,584 Militia and 1060 Indians)  
116 field artillery pieces  
166 fortress artillery pieces (non-mobile)  
23 Ships of the Line  
9 Frigates

Ample supplies for the campaign, however the number of available supply wagons will decrease on scenarios that are on the assault to simulate the difficulty in maintaining long supply lines.

Force Allocations:

Defense of Louisbourg and surrounding areas – L' Marine + Troupes de la Colonial + Acadian Volunteers & Drucors Fortress artillery. **2395 men.**

Defense of Quebec – (2) Milice de Quebec Regiments + Quebec City Milice + Troupes de la Marine & Montcalm's Fortress artillery. **4596 men.**

Defense of Fort Oswego and area – (1) Milice de Quebec Regiment + (1) Milice de Montreal. **3192 men.**

Defense of Fort William Henry and Fort Ticonderoga – (1) Milice de Montreal + Montreal Reserves + Milice de Trois Rivières. **3480 men.**

This leaves a total French force of 16,598 available for the various assault options. Here's the break down based on the 3 choices available to the French commander:

F1 – Spread Out Defense –

Drucors Command deployed to Louisbourg + garrison (5535)

Montcalm's Command + Indians deployed to Fort William Henry & Ticonderoga (8467)

Brigade Reding + Brigade de Royal-Rousillon deployed to Fort Oswego (6695)

Brigade Saint Chamond + Brigade Piemont + Royal Artillery (European) deployed to Montreal Area. (4762)

F2 – Western Assault – All available troops used plus Fort Oswego troops join in. (19790)

F3 – Center Assault – All available troops used plus Fort William Henry & Ticonderoga troops join in. (20078)

**Force Allocation Notes:** These breakdowns allow each force to bring together a sizeable striking force, while not being totally defenseless on any front. Additionally it ensures that there are "layers" to each sides defense. So, if one force is beaten badly in the first engagement they are ensured of reinforcements at a later point. In the case of the French they will have a sizeable boost to their force in either Montreal or Quebec, or both. For the British they have a sizeable reserve force in Albany, which they'll need if the French break through.

**Situation Report: British –** Crown forces are in relatively good shape. The largest force of provincials to date has been gathered and is equipped for the coming season. They will mainly fulfill garrison duties with will free the main British forces for Campaigning. There are three potential courses to reach your ultimate objective, Quebec. They are:

Heading West through New York to Lake Ontario, attacking the forts on the Eastern shore and at the mouth of the lake. Then heading up the St. Lawrence through Montreal and on to Quebec. A long road overland, but could possibly bring rich rewards if the forts are not heavily guarded.

Heading almost due North and retaking Fort William Henry, then pushing on to Fort Toconderoga, Crown Point, Montreal and then on to Quebec. The most direct route, but also the most heavily defended in all likelihood.

Heading East by sea, attacking the fortress at Loiusbourg, then hitting some minor forts along the way like Fort Beausejour and then on to Quebec. Probably the path of least resistance, however the French are rumored to have sent a sizeable reinforcement to their naval fleet. If their Ships of the Line catch your transports underway you stand to loose thousands of men in the North Atlantic without them being able to fire a shot. On the other hand, if your force makes it in tact there will be only one major obstacle between you and Quebec. And if the French are defending another path, that might turn out to be an easy target.

As always, your orders are to drive the French from the continent while loosing as few men and material as possible. As the commander you need to decide what your best course of action is. The force at your disposal is large enough that you can advance on two fronts and still stand a reasonable chance of success. Providing they both make it to their destination. However if you choose to cover all three

possibilities you will change to a defensive stance and will not have an option to take Quebec this year. While this decision might anger your superiors, it will save your neck if the French come in strength against the colonies instead of waiting for your advance.

**Situation Report: French** – Finally, the Empire has sent a large number of reinforcements which will allow you to fight this war the way it needs to be fought. With the additional troops, supplies, money and ships that have been diverted to you things no longer seem so dim. At the end of the '57 campaigning season it looked as if your army, and the people of New France would be starving this year, but that has all changed. The Indian allies have begun to reappear as well, giving you a further needed boost.

Now a choice lays before you. Shall you reinforce your garrisons along the frontier and at the major forts? Should you consolidate your troops in the North and await the inevitable British attack on Quebec? Or should you go on the offensive? Based on your intelligence reports the British Army is strong, but not that much stronger than your own. In your current position you have scattered outposts along the major waterways in either small forts or heavy fortresses. These are good bases to build a defensive position off of, especially in the central theater around Fort Carillon. However an assault into New York would throw the British off guard and possibly get them to rethink their involvement in this war. The gamble being that you don't meet their entire army on your way south.

If you do choose to advance you will do so along one of two different paths. Either down the St. Lawrence, to Lake Ontario and in from the West toward Albany. Or due South, beginning with an attack on Fort Edward and then on to Albany. If you are successful in capturing Albany the British will be forced to negotiate for an end to hostilities and New France will be secure.

## On line Series

This series contains small (under 1,000 men per side), short (12, 24 or 36 turns) scenarios depicting generic, representative types of engagements fought during this time period instead of actual, historical battles. They should take an hour or less of real time to play to completion.

The Order of Battle has been designed to capture the flavor of era to give players an historical feel during head-to-head, or multi-player on line games.

Below is a summary of the forces in the order of battle. Totals for the individual Indian tribes are listed on the left of the numbers' column, if the tribe has more than one band then the subtotals are listed along the right-hand side of the column. Individual Indian bands are identified by where they are from with the location given in French.

Players are encouraged to design additional scenarios.

### Forces available for On Line Series

The English		Les Français	
Goldthwait's Rgt.	452	2°/Crémilles	456
Provincials	298	Milice Canadienne	304
Rangers	66	Troupes de la Colonie	85
Artillery	17	Canonier-Bombardier	17
2 lb. Guns	4	Canons de 2 livres	4
6 lb. Guns	6	Canons de 8 livres	6

12 lb. Guns	5	Canons de 12 livres	5
5.5" Howitzer	1	Obusier	1
8" Mortar	1	Mortier	1
Bateaux w/12 lb. gun	2	Bateaux w/Canon de 12 livres	2
Settlers	52	Civils	52
Supply Cart		Fournir la Charrette	

### *The Indians*

<b>Abenakis</b>	134
R de Bécancour	45
de Panouameske	29
de St Francis	60
<b>Algonkin</b>	243
de La Présentation	108
de Missikoui	75
de Trois Fleuves	60

<b>Caughnawaga</b>	
de Ganagero	98
<b>Cayuga</b>	
de Canadaigua	60
<b>Chippewa</b>	
de La Carpe	60
<b>Delaware</b>	178
de Castor	56
de Ganentaa	42
de Kittanning	52
de Magnonjan	28
<b>Fox</b>	
du Mississippi	57
<b>Huron</b>	
de Lorette	65
<b>Iowa</b>	
occidentale de la mer	66
<b>Menoninee</b>	
de l'Original	54
<b>Miami</b>	
de St Joseph	65
<b>Micmac</b>	74
d'Acadia	26
d'Amalecites	48
<b>Mingo</b>	131

### *Les Indiens*

<b>Abenakis</b>	134
R de Bécancour	45
de Panouameske	29
de St Francis	60
<b>Algonkin</b>	243
de La Présentation	108
de Missikoui	75
de Trois Fleuves	60

<b>Caughnawaga</b>	
de Ganagero	98
<b>Cayuga</b>	
de Canadaigua	60
<b>Chippewa</b>	
de La Carpe	60
<b>Delaware</b>	178
de Castor	56
de Ganentaa	42
de Kittanning	52
de Magnonjan	28
<b>Fox</b>	
du Mississippi	57
<b>Huron</b>	
de Lorette	65
<b>Iowa</b>	
occidentale de la mer	66
<b>Menoninee</b>	
de l'Original	54
<b>Miami</b>	
de St Joseph	65
<b>Micmac</b>	74
d'Acadia	26
d'Amalecites	48
<b>Mingo</b>	131

de Chaoschimagen	75	de Chaoschimagen	75
de Chequamegon	56	de Chequamegon	56
<b>Missisauas</b>		<b>Missisauas</b>	
de Kiscacous	42	de Kiscacous	42
<b>Mohawk</b>	119	<b>Mohawk</b>	119
de Sinago	44	de Sinago	44
de Toronto	25	de Toronto	25
de Venango	45	de Venango	45
<b>Nipissing</b>		<b>Nipissing</b>	
de La Loutre	39	de La Loutre	39
<b>Oneida</b>		<b>Oneida</b>	
de Techirogen	37	de Techirogen	37
<b>Onondaga</b>		<b>Onondaga</b>	
de Onondaga	36	de Onondaga	36
<b>Osage</b>		<b>Osage</b>	
de Le Chat	39	de Le Chat	39
<b>Ottawa</b>		<b>Ottawa</b>	
de la Fourche	81	de la Fourche	81
<b>Potawatomis</b>		<b>Potawatomis</b>	
de Detroit	51	de Detroit	51
<b>Sauk</b>		<b>Sauk</b>	
de Saginaw	47	de Saginaw	47
<b>Seneca</b>		<b>Seneca</b>	
de Kakiboncké	66	de Kakiboncké	66
<b>Shawnee</b>	103	<b>Shawnee</b>	103
de Loups	40	de Loups	40
de Sault St Louis	63	de Sault St Louis	63
<b>Tuscarora</b>	118	<b>Tuscarora</b>	118
de Zonneschio	76	de Zonneschio	76
du Lac de 2° Montagnes	42	du Lac de 2° Montagnes	42
<b>Winnabego</b>		<b>Winnabego</b>	
du compartiment	58	du compartiment	58
<b>Wyandot</b>		<b>Wyandot</b>	
de l'Isle au Castor	38	de l'Isle au Castor	38

## Abbreviations and Terms

This list is a key for abbreviations and terms used in the oob.

### English Ranks:

Major-General - Mgen

Brigadier-General - Bgen

Colonel - Col  
Lieutenant Colonel - LtCol  
Major - Maj  
Captain - Cpt  
Lieutenant - Lt  
Ensign - Ens

French Ranks or Titles:

General de Brigade - Gbr  
Colonel - Col  
Lieutenant Colonel - Lcl  
Commandant - Cdt  
Capitaine - Cne  
Lieutenant - Ltn  
Ensign - Ens

Unit Designations:

Company - Co  
Detachment - Det  
Grenadiers - Gren  
Independent - Ind  
Pound (for gun size)- lb  
Regiment - Rgt  
(Ct) - Connecticut  
(Mass) - Massachusetts  
(NH) - New Hampshire  
(NJ) - New Jersey  
(NY) - New York  
(Penn) - Pennsylvania  
(RI) - Rhode Island  
(Va) - Virginia

For English Regulars the name the unit was known as was given as well as the numeric designation. For example:

Fraser's Rgt. – 78th Foot  
The Blackwatch – 42nd Foot  
Royal Americans – 60th Foot

Translations:

1°, 2°, 3°, etc - 1st, 2nd, 3rd, etc  
Canonier-Bombardier – Provincial Artillery units  
Canons de 2 livres - 2 lb cannon

Canons de 6 livres - 6 lb cannon  
 Canons de 8 livres - 8 lb cannon  
 Canons de 12 livres - 12 lb cannon  
 Choagen - Oswego  
 Compagnie - company  
 de Montreal - from Montreal  
 de Quebec - from Quebec Province  
 de Trois-Rivieres - from Three Rivers  
 de Ville de Québec - from the city of Quebec  
 Détachement - detachment  
 Escadron - squadron  
 Ft. Cadaraqui - Ft. Frontenac  
 Ft. Carillon - Ticonderoga  
 Ft. Lydius - Ft. William Henry  
 Ft. St. Frederic - Crown Point  
 Fournir la Charrette - supply cart  
 Garde Avancée - advanced guard  
 Garnison - garrison  
 Lac Cadaraqui - Lake Ontario  
 Lac Sacrement - Lake George  
 Le Corps de Cavalerie – the body of cavalry  
 Les Français - the French  
 Les Indiens - the Indians  
 Milice Canadienne - Canadian militia  
 Mortier - mortar  
 Obusier - howitzer  
 Piquet - piquet

Troupes de la Colonie – troops of the colony, also known as ...

Troupes de la Marine – troops of the navy. The navy was responsible for all the colonies so all provincial troops belonged to it.

#### Indian Names and Unit Designations:

The Indians have names only. I tried to use animal names from the Algonquin tongue. For example:

Erha'r

Raktsi:a

Indian tribes are listed with a reference to the village they are from. For example:

Chippewa - de Chequamegon

Ottawa - de Detroit

# French and Indian War Bibliography

**Title:** Crucible of war: The Seven Years' War and the fate of empire in British North America, 1754 – 1766.

**Author:** Fred Anderson

**Title:** Wilderness empire : a narrative

**Author:** Eckert, Allen W.

**Title:** Forts on the Pennsylvania frontier, 1753 – 1758.

**Author:** William A. Hunter

**Title:** The Sixty Year's War for the Great Lakes, 1754 – 1814

**Author:** David Curtis Skaggs

**Title:** Readcoats along the Hudson; the struggle for North America 1754-63

**Author:** Noel St. John Williams

**Title:** The French and Indian War, 1754 – 1763: the Imperial struggle for North America.

**Author:** Seymour I. Schwartz

**Title:** A few acres of snow ; the saga of the French and Indian Wars

**Author:** Robert Leckie

**Title:** That loose flimsy order: the little war meets British military discipline in America 1755 – 1781.

**Author:** David E. Parker

**Title:** The Siege of Quebec and the campaigns in North America 1757 – 1760.

**Author:** Cpt. John Knox – Brian Connell

**Title:** Struggle for continent: The French and Indian Wars, 1689 – 1763

**Author:** Betsy Maestro & Giulio Maestro

**Title:** Wolfe's Army

**Author:** Robin May & Gerry Embleton

**Title:** Readcoats, Yankees and allies: a history of the uniforms, clothing and gear of the British Army in the Lake George-Lake Champlain corridor, 1755 – 1760

**Author:** Brenton C. Kemmer

**Title:** Losing a continent: France's North American policy, 1753 – 1763.

**Author:** Frank Brecher

**Title:** An historical journal of the campaigns in North America: 1757 – 1760

**Author:** John Knox – Arthur G. Doughty

**Title:** The French and Indian War, 1660 – 1763

**Author:** Christopher Collier & James Lincoln Collier

**Title:** Memoirs on the late war in North America between France and England

**Author:** Pierre Pouchot, Michael Cardy & Brian Leigh Dunnigan

**Title:** Empire of fortune: crow s, colonies and tribes in the Seven Years War in America.

**Author:** Francis Jennings

**Title:** An impartial account of Lieut. Col. Bradstreet's expedition to Fort Frontenac...

**Author:** John Bradstreet

**Title:** Adventure in the Wilderness: the American journals of Louis-Antoine de Bougainville, 1756 – 1760

**Author:** Louis-Antoine de Bougainville, Edward Pierce Hamilton

**Title:** Siege – 1759: the campaign against Niagra

**Author:** Brian Leigh Dunnigan

**Title:** Louisbourg 1758: Wolfe's first victory (Osprey)

**Author:** Rene Chartrand & Patrice Courcelle

**Title:** Louisbourg 1758: Wolf's first siege (Osprey Campaign #79)

**Author:** Rene Chartrand & Patrice Courcelle

**Title:** Ticonderoga 1758: Moncalm's victory against all odds. (Osprey Campaign #76)

**Author:** Rene Chartrand & Patrice Courcelle

**Title:** Quebec: the heights of Abraham 1759, the armies of Wolf and Montcalm

**Author:** Rene Chartrand

**Title:** Quebec 1759 (Osprey OOB series #3)

**Author:** Rene Chartrand

**Title:** The Fight with France for North America

**Author:** A.G. Bradley

**Title:** Freeman, Freeholders, and citizen soldiers

**Author:** Brenton C. Kemmer

**Title:** Montcalm and Wolf: The French and Indian War

**Author:** Francis Parkman

**Title:** On the road; Logistical John Forbe's 1758 Campaign

**Author:** William J. Hamill

**Title:** French Soldier in colonial America

**Author:** Renee Chartand

**Title:** French and Indian War battlesites; a controversy

**Author:** Bob Bearor

**Title:** Journal of William Amherst in America, 1758 – 1760

**Author:** William Amherst

**Title:** Savage Wilderness

**Author:** Harold Coyle