

turns, going round and round until a fixed time limit has elapsed or someone has "won", or it is the "Diplomacy" type in which all players (or teams) make simultaneous decisions and play proceeds in rounds, each one of which reflects the decisions of the previous round. Table 15 divides the simulations we are considering into these three categories, and Table 16 details the activities in which the players are involved.

Interactions

The kinds of interactions called for in the games you use will influence greatly the kinds of learning which take place among the participants. Table 17 categorizes the simulations according to the ways in which players deal with one another.

The advantages of one-to-one or small-group interaction are that most players will be active most of the time and there is less likelihood of physical or emotional drop-out. However, games that stress small groups tend to be confusing to players because they have little opportunity to step back from their

TABLE 15 Types of Activities

Continuous Interactive Play, Often with Game Progressing by Stages	Sequential Turns	Rounds of Activity in Which All Interact in Specified Ways
<i>Czech-mate</i>	<i>The Haymarket</i>	<i>The Ch'ing Game</i>
<i>Gateway</i>	<i>Case</i>	<i>Congress of Vienna</i>
<i>Liberté</i>	<i>Nuremberg</i>	<i>Grand Strategy</i>
<i>Destiny</i>	<i>Seneca Falls</i>	<i>Origins of WWII</i>
<i>Panic</i>		<i>Czar Power</i>
<i>Waging Neutrality</i>		<i>Trade-Off at Yalta</i>
		<i>Alpha Crisis</i>
		<i>Scramble for Africa</i>
		<i>American Constitutional Convention</i>

own activities and look at the game as a whole. Games that make extensive use of large groups or have the entire class debate an issue together make it easier for participants to monitor events, but some of the less vocal players may move into the background and participate only marginally.

Issues and Player Initiative

Each of the simulations we are looking at focuses on a series of issues, most of which stem from the particulars of the historical circumstances that prompted the creation of the simulation. Some of these are limited in scope; some are rather wide in potential. Table 18 shows the major issues these simulations treat and notes which present the issues ready-made for players to consider and which require players to develop issues before they can begin work on possible solutions. In some cases the issues are presented in only outline form and the players must fill in the details before substantive solutions are possible. Whether your interests call for games in which issues are all ready for consideration or, alternatively, for games in which students give considerable attention to the process of problem development as well as problem solving, this table should help you select games that best fulfill your needs.

TABLE 16 Major Activities

Simulation	Sequence
<i>Alpha Crisis</i>	3 or more rounds of negotiations, reactions to previous activity, policy decisions.
<i>American Constitutional Convention</i>	1 to 5 rounds of 5 stages each: (1) state caucuses to decide approaches to issues; (2) convention meeting to make proposals to entire body; (3) informal discussion among delegates; (4) second stage of state caucuses to decide votes; (5) voting in full convention by state
<i>The Ch'ing Game</i>	4 or 5 rounds of activities, determined by roles, which include preparing for and taking exams, trading goods and services, collecting and administering taxes, deciding questions of social propriety, and adjudicating disputes.
<i>Czar Power</i>	4 rounds of 5 stages each: (1) select 4 major problems for discussion; (2) players consider alternative solutions; (3) small groups discuss solution alternatives; (4) decision by Czar; (5) winning or loss of points. Other events as a purge or overthrow of Czar can also occur
<i>Czech-mate</i>	Generally continuous play in response to Sudeten crisis may involve conferences or declaration of war. No set order of response.
<i>Destiny</i>	In introductory section players perform tasks related to information gathering, 3 rounds of negotiation, reaction to new events, arguments before President; Congressional debate and vote on President's decision.
<i>Gateway</i>	4 stages: (1) identification of immigrant roles and transition to the U.S.; (2) experience of passage through Ellis Island authority; (3) Congressional debate on immigration laws; (4) case study of integration of public school system.
<i>Grand Strategy</i>	3 or more rounds of Declaring sessions, in which action is announced, and Conferring sessions, in which decisions are made and negotiations undertaken.
<i>The Haymarket Case</i>	Prosecution and defense take turns questioning witnesses and defendants at trial followed by jury deliberation and decision.
<i>Liberté</i>	(1) economic phase: trade, pay, or collect taxes, try to earn points in a quiz; (2) legislative phase: discuss up to 12 issues; (3) trial phase: decide fate of Louis XVI; (4) terror phase: arbitrary arrests and "executions" by Robespierre
<i>Nuremberg</i>	(1) assignment of roles and major research of evidence or arguments used by roles; (2) prosecution and defense attorneys take turns questioning witnesses and defendants, followed by judges' decision
<i>Origins of WWII</i>	In each of 6 rounds each player in turn places political factors on various territories, attacks or defends territories, seeks to establish control of certain territories, and negotiates with others on future moves

TABLE 16 Major Activities (Cont)

Simulation	Sequence
<i>Panic</i>	(1) assignment of roles, buying and selling stocks, market crash, and bank closing; (2) congressional hearings and voting on bills to solve economic crisis.
<i>Scramble for Africa</i>	6 to 10 rounds of three phases each: (1) negotiations, (2) write orders for movement of military and civilian units and sign treaties; (3) publish plans and resolve conflicts.
<i>Seneca Falls</i>	After initial speeches by principals at conference, participants take turns speaking and voting on four resolutions.
<i>Trade-Off at Yalta</i>	5 rounds of negotiation and conferring on five major issues of conference.
<i>Waging Neutrality</i>	2 rounds of 3 phases each (1) commercial action: negotiate, trade, and conduct business, (2) operations meeting: separate groups decide on policy and strategy; (3) open forum discusses issues in public

RESOURCES AND SCORING

One of the critical factors to keep in mind when you select a simulation is the incentive-reward system built into the game. The major lessons of a simulation often come not from the particulars of content but from the way the game is played. If players recognize that a certain type of behavior and interaction produces positive results in a simulation, they will assume that a similar type of behavior would have produced similar results in the real-life prototype. If you want to teach that cheating the system was the only way of winning in a particular historical situation, you should select a game in which cheating can produce a win. If competition is a critical factor, then look for a simulation in which competition over resources is a fundamental part. If cooperation is the goal, then cooperation ought to be the method whereby players succeed. And, finally, if you wish to concentrate upon the process of play and to diminish the importance of "winning," then look for an incentive system that promotes that end. Players give their major attention to those aspects that promote their own interests within the context of a simulation, and you should be extremely conscious of this factor in your selection, use, or creation of simulations.

MODEL VALIDITY

In using historical simulations, one of your most important considerations will probably be whether the simulation does in fact do a good job of modeling the historical event or conditions you want to teach. There are three levels at which we might assess the historical validity of a game: (1) does it portray facts and major historical relations correctly, or does it mislead players by leaving out important figures or groups, by skewing the facts to produce an unrealistic outcome, or by giving erroneous information? (2) does it promote a valid analysis of the cause and effect relations of the historical situation, or does it mislead by oversimplifying conditions and suggesting monocausal solutions to complex questions? (3) does it lead to a valid understanding of the historical patterns of thinking and value systems, or does it allow players to transpose their modern values onto an historical stage where they are inappropriate?

We are critical of the validity of these games for different reasons. Let us outline some of the most important difficulties for you. First, we have categorized *Congress of Vienna*, *Grand Strategy*, and *Scramble for Africa* as limited because they concentrate too much on the territorial conflicts of their respective times. *Congress of Vienna* is the worst offender in this respect, the other two including some political issues in their format, but all of them leave out important considerations of ideology, personality, and economics.

Waging Neutrality is limited to some extent in its treatment of ideological issues, concentrating as it does upon economic considerations. While these were of critical importance to the American decision to remain neutral and later to enter World War I, they were not as overwhelming as the game would suggest.

Seneca Falls and *Haymarket* fall into the "limited" category because they are limited in scope. They fail to draw sufficient attention to the larger movements of which their foci are a part—the long-range struggle for women's rights in the former instance, and the labor and anarchist movements in the latter. In addition, *Haymarket* uses purposely distorted historical facts in the case. These alterations are minor—changing the names of streets and buildings, for instance, and not using the real defendants—but they seem unnecessary and draw attention away from the true information upon which the case hinged.

TABLE 17 Kinds of Interactions

Primarily One-to-One	Primarily Between Individuals and Small Groups	Primarily Between Small and Large Groups	Entirely in Large Groups
<i>The Ch'ing Game</i>	<i>Czar Power</i>	<i>Czech-mate</i>	<i>The Haymarket Case</i>
<i>Origins of WWII</i>	<i>Gateway (1)</i>	<i>Congress of Vienna</i>	<i>Gateway</i>
	<i>Liberté (1)</i>	<i>Grand Strategy</i>	<i>Nuremberg</i>
	<i>Panic (1)</i>	<i>Trade-Off at Yalta</i>	<i>Seneca Falls</i>
	<i>Alpha Crisis</i>	<i>American Constitutional Convention</i>	<i>Liberté (2)</i>
	<i>Waging Neutrality (1)</i>	<i>Destiny (1)</i>	<i>Waging Neutrality (2)</i>
	<i>Scramble for Africa</i>	<i>Panic (2)</i>	<i>Destiny (2)</i>

Key. (1)(2) Refer to the first or second phases of the simulations in question, since these differ considerably in the types of interactions called for.

TABLE 18 Issues and Player Initiative

Simulation	Major Issues	Amount of Player Initiative
<i>Alpha Crisis</i>	issues center on Austrian ultimatum to Serbia, conflict of international prestige and power	P
<i>American Constitutional Convention</i>	rights and powers of executive, legislative, and judiciary branches of government; federal state relations; procedure for amendment	S
<i>The Ch'ing Game</i>	social, economic, and political interactions among representative citizens of China	P
<i>Congress of Vienna</i>	territorial division of Europe after 1815	S
<i>Czar Power</i>	internal political dissidence; land distribution, foreign policy and internal policy and internal minorities; military needs; church-state relations, taxation, censorship; trade monopolies; government organization	S
<i>Czech-mate</i>	territorial and diplomatic response to crisis of 1938	P
<i>Destiny</i>	whether the United States should go to war with Spain in 1877-1878	P
<i>Gateway</i>	experience of nineteenth-century discrimination against immigrant ethnic groups	S
<i>Grand Strategy</i>	territorial and diplomatic response to crisis of 1914	P
<i>The Haymarket Case</i>	fate of the Haymarket defendants	S
<i>Liberté</i>	causes of and progress of French Revolution; legislative power in France; fate of Louis XVI and others	S
<i>Nuremberg</i>	fate of the Nuremberg defendants; responsibility of individuals to act on basis of their own values	S
<i>Origins of WWII</i>	diplomatic control of Europe in 1939	S
<i>Panic</i>	economic rise and fall; fluctuations of U.S. economy in 1920s and 1930s	I
<i>Scramble for Africa</i>	military and civilian control of and conflict over African cities after 1882	S
<i>Seneca Falls</i>	equal rights for women; equal job opportunities; elimination of double work standard, suffrage—all as applied in 1898	S
<i>Trade-Off at Yalta</i>	Polish political system; control of Germany; creation of United Nations	P
<i>Waging Neutrality</i>	U.S. neutrality, economic opportunities at time of war; role of economic factors in U.S. involvement in WWI	P

TABLE 19 Resources and Scoring

Simulation	Resources	Scoring
<i>Alpha Crisis</i>	no individual resources; power is military and economic, but only on paper	no specific scoring procedure; emphasis on play
<i>American Constitutional Convention</i>	no identifiable resources	no specific scoring procedure; emphasis on quality of play
<i>The Ch'ing Game</i>	money and land distributed unequally at start, prestige represented by social position	maximization of personal position—wealth is less important than influence
<i>Congress of Vienna</i>	no identifiable resources	teams can accumulate points depending upon treaties signed and distribution of territory
<i>Czar Power</i>	rubles, titles, land distributed unequally at start, positive and negative points for quality of life	players attempt to accumulate points measured against a common standard rather than against one another
<i>Czech-mate</i>	troops and ships	no specific scoring procedure; emphasis on process of negotiation; simple formula for determining winner if war breaks out
<i>Destiny</i>	no identifiable resources	players score Presidential Advice Points based on personal and group performances and on results of conferences and Presidential decisions
<i>Gateway</i>	no identifiable resources	no explicit scoring procedure beyond scores on quizzes; emphasis on quality of play
<i>Grand Strategy</i>	troops and ships	simple formula for determining losses and wins, but emphasis on process of diplomacy and negotiation
<i>The Haymarket Case</i>	no identifiable resources	no explicit scoring procedure; emphasis on quality of role play
<i>Liberté</i>	money and land distributed unequally at start	points lost or gained by taxation, fate, scores on quizzes, emphasis on relative improvement.

TABLE 19 Resources and Scoring (Cont)

Simulation	Resources	Scoring
<i>Nuremberg</i>	no identifiable resources	no explicit scoring procedure; emphasis on researching and playing roles
<i>Origins of WWII</i>	political factors distributed unequally at start	points for gaining understanding or control factors in territories designated by national objectives chart at beginning of game
<i>Panic</i>	wealth points distributed unequally at start	points lost or gained by speculation, investment, fate, performance on quizzes, fate of congressional bills, taxation
<i>Scramble for Africa</i>	each country receives two military and two civilian units at start	points for control of certain tours by military and civilian units and for successful signing of treaties
<i>Seneca Falls</i>	no identifiable resources	no explicit scoring procedure; emphasis on quality of play
<i>Trade-Off at Yalta</i>	no identifiable resources	no specific scoring procedure; emphasis on quality of play
<i>Waging Neutrality</i>	money, cargo, destroyers distributed unequally	no specific scoring procedure; emphasis on quality of play

The difficulties with *Gateway* and *Trade-Off at Yalta* lie with the sequence in which the games are played. The first two sections of *Gateway*, in which the immigrants travel across the ocean and land at Ellis Island, are good historically, but the transition to the third and fourth parts is poor and tends to confuse players. *Yalta* falls down in its artificial division of the issues with which the delegates are confronted. The way the game is currently set up, players are unable to make deals across issues, whereas in the real situation such divisions were not present. This difficulty is easily remedied with a change in the rules to permit such negotiation and allow players to consider all the issues simultaneously, at least as they prepare their general strategy.

Liberté and *Origins of World War II* present more serious problems. *Origins of World War II* deals almost entirely with territorial issues, and while it makes use of markers symbolizing "political" and "understanding" factors, these are for all practical purposes still tied to territorial control as if they were military units. The game is intriguing as a game of pure strategy, but it teaches little about the true origins of war. It

TABLE 20 Historical Validity

Low	Limited	High
<i>Liberté</i>	<i>Congress of Vienna</i>	<i>The Ch'ing Game</i>
<i>Origins of WWII</i>	<i>Gateway</i>	<i>Czech-mate</i>
	<i>Grand Strategy</i>	<i>Czar Power</i>
	<i>The Haymarket Case</i>	<i>Destiny</i>
	<i>Scramble for Africa</i>	<i>Nuremberg</i>
	<i>Seneca Falls</i>	<i>Panic</i>
	<i>Trade-Off at Yalta</i>	<i>Alpha Crisis</i>
	<i>Waging Neutrality</i>	<i>American Constitutional Convention</i>

skips over any changes in the political climate from 1935 to 1940 and ignores internal factors such as the role of popular support for a particular policy, ideology, or internal political conflict, such as that in the USSR in the 1930s.

Liberté poses several problems of historical validity. First, it leaves out the sans-culottes, the urban poor of eighteenth-century France, who played such a critical role in the Revolution, and lumps them in with the peasantry, thus perpetuating one of the most common misperceptions beginning students have about the French Revolution. Second, the game employs poor transition between sections, leaving it unclear how or why the Revolution developed in the way it did. And finally, it gives Robespierre almost arbitrary power to purge anyone he wants from the game, thus distorting both the political dynamics of the purge, in which Robespierre was only one of the many actors, and the reasons Robespierre himself had for leading the country in the direction he did. He was far from the totally arbitrary megalomaniac which the game presents. While the quizzes help clear up some of these oversimplifications, the play of the game leaves too much room for potential misunderstanding.

DEBRIEFING

The ultimate success or failure of a simulation exercise often depends upon the character of the debriefing session, the discussion after play of what happened, why it happened, the changes in feelings and attitudes players experienced during the game, the strengths and weaknesses of the simulation itself, and the simulation's historical validity. Some of these simulations provide a guide for the debriefing session, listing important questions to ask, issues to confront, and points to note. Others provide only sketchy suggestions. Still others leave out this component altogether, assuming that you will be able to fend for yourself.

While one cannot automatically equate quantitative suggestions for evaluation and debriefing guidelines, the two are almost always congruent. Simulations are by nature less predictable in their outcomes than other types of classroom activity, and therefore they require careful listing of possible alternative outcomes and issues that might be confronted in a debriefing session. A simulation that does not take the time or devote the space in its published description to such examination does a poor job of handling the debriefing process.

Our simulations vary greatly in the amount of space they

devote to debriefing suggestions and, as a consequence, in the quality of their debriefing section. One cannot always predict from the general character of the simulation its approach to debriefing. Even games like the *Ch'ing Game* or *Panic*, which in most other respects are outstanding in their conceptualization and description, brush only lightly by debriefing with a few suggested issues and a general admonition to the instructor to hold a debriefing session. Others, such as *Haymarket*, even though less sophisticated than some of the other games in our listing, carefully and completely lay out the issues, questions, and problems an instructor might deal with in debriefing.

Whether or not debriefing comes as part of a packaged game, you should pay careful attention to the debriefing session, noting in the course of the game items or develop-

ments to which you would like to return later for analysis. Remember also that what does not happen in a game may be just as significant as what does. Likewise, a shortcoming that participants note after the simulation is over may result in their learning as much as they would have if the left-out factor had been incorporated into the exercise.

FLEXIBILITY

Games that lend themselves to adaptation are often more useful in the long run than those that depend upon a rigid playing out of the game as presented in the package you buy. It is important, therefore, if you are going to invest in one of these games, to know how you might modify it to suit your own purposes or how much you can use the format it suggests to create your games. In Table 22 we will look not only at the built-in flexibility of each simulation concerning length, number of players, outcome, and issues, but we will also examine some of the ways changes might be made without destroying the game's dynamics and suggest which games are best suited as prototypes for developing simulations of your own.

PUBLICATION AND PACKAGING

In selecting a commercial game, you must pay attention not only to the content and character of the game itself but to the way it is put together. Simulations come in all sizes and shapes, some well packaged, durable, and reusable, some shoddy and easily worn out. Some games come only as des-

TABLE 21 Debriefing Outlines

<i>Inadequate</i>	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Adequate</i>	<i>Excellent</i>
(no guidelines)	(a few questions)	(several paragraphs of suggestions—over 10 questions)	(several pages of suggestions and questions)
<i>Congress of Vienna</i>	<i>The Ch'ing</i>	<i>Grand Strategy</i>	<i>Czech-mate</i>
<i>Scramble for Africa</i>	<i>Panic</i>	<i>Liberté</i>	<i>The</i>
<i>Origins of WWII</i>	<i>American</i>	<i>Nuremberg</i>	<i>Haymarket</i>
<i>Czar Power</i>	<i>Constitutional</i>	<i>Gateway</i>	<i>Case</i>
	<i>Convention</i>	<i>Destiny</i>	<i>Alpha Crisis</i>
	<i>Seneca Falls</i>		<i>Waging</i>
			<i>Neutrality</i>
			<i>Trade-Off at</i>
			<i>Yalta</i>

TABLE 22 Flexibility

Simulation	Flexibility					Value as Prototype
	Length	No. of Players	Outcome	Issues	Possible Alterations	
<i>Alpha Crisis</i>	L	H	M	L	might change role descriptions to correspond more to real persons; have students research real leaders and events	H
<i>American Constitutional Convention</i>	M	H	M	N	might allow students to develop issues more on their own rather than following historical pattern so directly	M
<i>The Ch'ing Game</i>	M	H	H	M	might add crises or change crises cited in the game	L
<i>Congress of Vienna</i>	M	M	M	N	might have student research roles, personalities of leaders, and national goals; allow players to select how their priorities rank and points may be won; inject issues other than territory	M
<i>Czar Power</i>	M	M	H	L	might have students select attitudes to be expressed by roles based on research; add more roles representing workers	H
<i>Czech-mate</i>	M	M	H	L	might have students research roles, personalities of leaders, and national goals; base roles on real leaders rather than prototypes	M

TABLE 22 Flexibility (Cont)

Simulation	Flexibility					Value as Prototype
	Length	No. of Players	Outcome	Issues	Possible Alterations	
<i>Destiny</i>	M	H	M	L	high flexibility in time students spend researching issues and roles	H
<i>Gateway</i>	L	H	H	M	might play first two sections only, have players use personal family background as basis for roles	M
<i>Grand Strategy</i>	M	H	H	L	might allow students to research national goals; pattern roles after real persons; inject other issues	M
<i>The Haymarket Case</i>	L	M	M	L	might allow players to determine more the character of play, have players research case as background for roles	M
<i>Liberté</i>	M	M	L	L	might play only third section on trial of Louis XVI or second section on legislation	L
<i>Nuremberg</i>	M	M	M	L	might try only some of defendants, concentrating on selected issues; specify more directly	H
<i>Origins of WWII</i>	L	L	M	L	might tie roles more to real leaders; add other countries, inject factors other than territorial control	M
<i>Panic</i>	L	H	H	M	might assign roles more specifically or have players pattern roles after real experiences	H
<i>Scramble for Africa</i>	L	M	H	N	might increase complexity by creating new roles or potential conflicts, by developing background information, or by modeling roles more realistically	L
<i>Seneca Falls</i>	L	H	M	L	might define roles more explicitly; stretch time factor; allow negotiation on issues	L
<i>Trade-Off at Yalta</i>	M	H	M	N	might use only some of issues; allow players to negotiate on all issues simultaneously; allow outside conferences among aides while major leaders negotiate in control session	M
<i>Waging Neutrality</i>	L	M	M	L	might inject more political or ideological issues, suggest impact of public opinion by adding roles	M

Key H = High M = Moderate L = Low N = None

criptions, requiring you to supply all the props and paraphernalia necessary to run the game properly. Others contain everything from the rules to the pencils and name tags. And, last but not least, costs vary.

The games we selected for review here are within a general educational materials budget, but we recognize that not all of you will be in a position to afford the more expensive games.

Consequently, price will influence your selection. In general, as in making any purchase, you should make sure that you are getting the most for your money in content and design. A poorly packaged and overpriced game is not worth getting even if it does meet other criteria outlined in the earlier part of this essay.

TABLE 23 Packaging

Simulation	Kind of Packaging	Approx. Cost	Completeness	Durability
<i>Alpha Crisis</i>	book	\$2.00	d	high
<i>American Constitutional Convention</i>	student handbook	\$1.55 each	d	average
<i>The Ch'ing Game</i>	book	\$2.00	p, c, d	high
<i>Congress of Vienna</i>	pamphlet	£.50	d	average
<i>Czar Power</i>	kit	\$68.50	complete	high
<i>Czech-mate</i>	manual	\$14.00	d	average
<i>Destiny</i>	manual	\$14.00	c, d	average
<i>Gateway</i>	manual	\$14.00	d	average
<i>Grand Strategy</i>	kit	\$39.00	complete	high
<i>The Haymarket Case</i>	manual	\$15.00	d	average
<i>Liberté</i>	manual	\$14.00	c, d	average
<i>Nuremberg</i>	manual	\$14.00	d	average
<i>Origins of WWII</i>	kit	\$10.00	complete	high
<i>Panic</i>	manual	\$14.00	d	average
<i>Scramble for Africa</i>	pamphlet	\$3.95	d	average
<i>Seneca Falls</i>	manual	\$10.00	complete	average
<i>Trade-Off at Yalta</i>	kit	\$35.00	complete	high
<i>Waging Neutrality</i>	manual	\$14.00	c, d	average

Key: p = purchasing required c = construction required d = duplication required

OVERALL STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

If none of these simulations is perfect, likewise, none total flop. In the closing section of this essay, therefore, would be useful for us to review the games we are considering for their most critical strengths and limitations. In the

TABLE 24 Major Strengths and Limitations

Simulation	Strengths	Limitations
<i>Alpha Crisis</i>	confronts complex issues with minimum of confusion; roles very well developed.	no initial statement of purpose; rules not systematically laid out for instructor.
<i>American Constitutional Convention</i>	presents excellent role analysis, giving perspective of delegates on variety of issues	issues limited and simplified; format restricts freedom of initiative as students are called upon to follow historical pattern rather than confront issues openly
<i>The Ch'ing Game</i>	good introductory material; roles carefully constructed and accurate, format carefully thought through and thoroughly researched; highly effective at achieving goal of simulating twelfth-century social relations in China.	rules are highly complex and require high level of player understanding; requires purchase or construction of additional materials; heavy responsibilities for instructor
<i>Congress of Vienna</i>	good mixture of formal and informal negotiation; rules clear and point allocation fair and unambiguous.	background to Congress is limited; issues entirely territorial, thus leaves out issues like Concert of Europe or Holy Alliance, tends to stress competition among countries rather than drive for great power balance; no discussion of de-

run whether these characteristics are of critical importance depends primarily upon you. Major strengths to some will be only minor benefits to others; a glaring weakness to one will be a minor inconvenience to another. The strengths and limitations we have identified are shown in Table 24. We leave the final judgment up to you.

TABLE 24 Major Strengths and Limitations (Cont)

Simulation	Strengths	Limitations
		briefing process, roles not clearly defined and not based on real personalities
<i>Czar Power</i>	good at addressing issues of Russian autocracy and critical problems of late nineteenth-century; roles well articulated; moves and point allocations complicated but easy to follow.	lone worker's role tends to underplay influence of urban workers, roles sometimes too prescriptive of actions.
<i>Czech-mate</i>	good introductory and background material; emphasis on process of negotiation, not winning war; clearly constructed and well outlined; good debriefing section	roles not based on personalities of real leaders; tends to be heavy load on instructor; suggested schedule tends to produce overcrowded activity
<i>Destiny</i>	excellent timing and format, background information good.	poorly defined attitudinal goals; shift of roles near end of game tends to diminish impact of presidential decision; students have hard time abandoning earlier positions.
<i>Gateway</i>	excellent goals; sections 1 and 2 well outlined and clearly developed	poor transition among sections; sections 3 and 4 only superficially developed.

TABLE 24 Major Strengths and Limitations (Cont)

Simulation	Strengths	Limitations
<i>Grand Strategy</i>	stresses diplomacy and negotiation process, not strategy of war; nicely packaged, good debriefing section.	roles not tied to real-life prototypes; downplays influence of personalities; issues mainly territorial and political rather than ideological or internal; issues like Pan-Slavism, Young Turk Revolt, or Austria-Hungarian rivalry not discussed
<i>The Haymarket Case</i>	case carefully outlined; roles strictly defined; gets well at issues of jurisprudence; good debriefing section.	fact sheet contains insufficient background information, role descriptions too detailed in direction of player actions; tends to be difficult to pick up attitudes of 1880s
<i>Liberté</i>	excellently articulated goals, good initial section on nature of resolutions, good trial and legislative sections.	tries to do too much in one game, poor role division leaves out critical role of sans-culottes; economic activity in first section stilted; uneven transitions between stages; oversimplified explanation of Terror; information in quiz sections not effectively mirrored in play
<i>Nuremberg</i>	excellent goals; good concentrations on issues; good role assignment (stresses not what to do but how to approach issues); rules well constructed.	minimal description of possible roles for witnesses leaves options too open-ended.
<i>Origins of WWII</i>	excellent as game of strategy.	territorial conquest too much the goal of game; thus bypasses nonquantifiable causes of war such as national pride, ideological conflict, internal affairs, rules complicated; no sense of change in political circumstances from 1935 to 1940; background essay historically misleading.
<i>Panic</i>	excellent goals; format and timing clear, gets well at both feelings and facts.	roles poorly defined and little background information.
<i>Scramble for Africa</i>	intriguing game of strategy.	poor general description; distorts motives of explorers by lumping riches, religion, and glory together in single category; con-

TABLE 24 Major Strengths and Limitations (Cont)

Simulation	Strengths	Limitations
<i>Seneca Falls</i>	defines issues to be debated well.	centrates too heavily on military conflict to detriment of political or ideological issues, rules initially confusing
<i>Trade-Off at Yalta</i>	issues well articulated; good background information; format clear and rules easy to follow.	roles not clearly defined; perspectives of leading characters vague; requires outside research or careful briefing by instructor; limited in scope of issues debated.
<i>Waging Neutrality</i>	excellent focus on critical issues of commercial causes of American neutrality and later entrance in WWI, roles well defined; rules clear and well organized.	issues artificially divided, actions by players uneven.
		leaves out political issues and personality of Wilson or other leaders as factors.

CONCLUSION

Some of the criteria we have considered in this review are geared to match your requirements with simulations that best meet them. In such cases only you can rate which are better. In other cases, however, we are able to make an overall judgment, and we have attempted to do so in Table 25.

Of the eighteen simulations we have reviewed, we would rate nine as outstanding, with scores of 18 to 20. Four more we would rank as good, and five with scores of 10 or below as only adequate. Even the strongest have weak points, although in most cases they are not glaring, some of the exceptions being the debriefing segment of the *Ch'ing Game* or the role descriptions in *Panic*. However, these do not detract from the overall balance of the more outstanding games; that quality is what brings them their rating. The games to which we have assigned lower scores exhibit increasing imbalance or, in the cases of *Gateway*, *Haymarket*, or *Seneca Falls*, less well-developed characteristics across the board. These lower scores, however, should not keep you from considering the games we have designated as good or adequate. Time and budgetary considerations or more limited pedagogical goals may make these more appropriate for your needs than the more fully developed simulations.

When all is said and done, as we have stressed time and again in the course of this essay, your needs are what make a simulation truly worthwhile or not, and no matter how we might rate them, we cannot make an absolute judgment. As we noted in our opening remarks about the nature of history and

TABLE 25 Overall Evaluation

Simulation	Breadth of Content	Effectiveness in Carrying Out Stated Purpose	Rules	Role Description	Role Involvement	Internal Order and Conversion	Historical Validity	Debriefing	Flexibility	Packaging	Cost	General ^a	Total
<i>Alpha Crisis</i>	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	20
<i>American Constitutional Convention</i>	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	0	0	1	2	1	14
<i>The Ch'ing Game</i>	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	1	1	2	2	20
<i>Congress of Vienna</i>	1	1	2	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	2	0	10
<i>Czar Power</i>	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	0	1	2	0	2	18
<i>Czech mate</i>	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	20
<i>Destiny</i>	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	19
<i>Gateway</i>	2	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	16
<i>Grand Strategy</i>	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	2	0	1	10
<i>The Haymarket Case</i>	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	2	0	1	1	1	14
<i>Liberty</i>	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	9
<i>Nuremberg</i>	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	18
<i>Origins of WWII</i>	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	2	2	2	0	10
<i>Panic</i>	2	2	2	0	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	19
<i>Scramble for Africa</i>	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	7
<i>Seneca Falls</i>	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12
<i>Trade-Off at Yalta</i>	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	0	2	18
<i>Waging Neutrality</i>	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	0	1	1	2	18

a. Subjective and informed overall judgement

Key: 2 = very good
1 = good
0 = limited

the role simulation has played in the study of the discipline, we must all select those tools that best help us to investigate, learn, and communicate the history in which we are interested.

No simulation, no matter how well conceived, how lavishly packaged, or how good a bargain, can serve effectively unless it meets our goals. No simulation can be used effectively in a course if it is simply stuck on as a last-minute appendage to the syllabus. It must be integrated into the flow of the course, it must reinforce the ideas and issues upon which the course as a whole is built; it must complement the lectures, discussions, readings, or audiovisual activities in which the course participants are engaged. Its use therefore requires careful planning.

You may have to modify the games you buy; you may find even with the variety of games on the market, that none meets your needs and you have to create your own, either using some of these simulations as models or starting from scratch. In either case, the time you spend analyzing your needs, looking over the available simulations, and planning for the integration of simulation activities will be time well spent and will, if done properly, result in greater variety of context, greater interest in issues, and greater learning for some of the game participants. Simulation is, as we noted early on, the primary tool of the historian's trade; the use of these simulations only broadens the effectiveness of our apparatus and offers to make us in the long run more complete historians and more consummate teachers.

SOURCES

Alpha Crisis

William A. Nesbitt
1973

Center for International Programs
and Comparative Studies
The University of the State of New York
Albany, NY 12210
\$2.00

American Constitutional Convention

Leonard Stitelman and
William Coplin
1969

Science Research Associates, Inc.
155 N. Wacker Dr.,
Chicago, Ill. 60606
Student Handbook, \$1.95 each

The Ch'ing Game

Robert B. Oxnam
1972

Learning Resources in International Studies
60 E. 42nd St., Suite 123
New York, N.Y. 10017

Congress of Vienna

B. Barker
R. Boden
1973

Longman Group Ltd., Resources Unit
9-11 The Shambles
York, United Kingdom
£6.75

Czar Power

R. G. Klietsch
1971

Systems Factors, Inc.
1940 Woodland Ave.
Duluth, Minn. 55803
\$68.50

Czech-mate

Daniel R. Place
1976

Interact
P.O. Box 262
Lakeside, Calif. 92040
\$14.00

Destiny

Paul DeKock and
David Yount
1969

Interact
P.O. Box 262
Lakeside, Calif. 92040
\$14.00

Gateway

Jay Mack
1974

Interact
P.O. Box 262
Lakeside, Calif. 92040
\$14.00

Grand Strategy

Clark C. Abt and
Ray Glazier
1970, 1975

Games Central, Abt Publications
55 Wheeler St.
Cambridge, Mass. 02138
\$39.00

The Haymarket Case

David DalPorto
1979, 1972

History Simulations
P.O. Box 1775
Santa Clara, Calif. 95051
\$15.00

Liberté

Sister Marleen Brasefield
1970

Interact
P.O. Box 262

Lakeside, Calif. 92040
\$14.00

Nuremberg

Arthur Pegas
1971

Interact
P.O. Box 262
Lakeside, Calif. 92040
\$14.00

Origins of World War II

The Avalon Hill Company
1971

The Avalon Hill Co.
4517 Harford Rd.
Baltimore, Md. 21214
\$12.00

Panic

Paul DeKock and
David Yount
1968

Interact
P.O. Box 262
Lakeside, Calif. 92040
\$14.00

Scramble for Africa

B. Barker and
R. Boden
1973

Longman Group, Ltd., Resources Unit
19 West 44th St.
New York, N.Y. 10036
\$3.95

Seneca Falls

Paul DeKock
1974

Interact
P.O. Box 262
Lakeside, Calif. 92040
\$10.00

Trade-Off at Yalta

Daniel C. Smith
1972

Prentice-Hall Media
150 White Plains Rd.
Tarrytown, N.Y. 10591
\$35.00

Waging Neutrality

Russ Durham and
Virginia Durham
1970

Simulation Systems
Box 46
Black Butte Ranch, Ore. 97759
\$14.00