

Table of Contents

Professional Soldiers	1005
Morale in GGDM Combat	1006
➤ Morality vs. Morale.....	1008
➤ Naval Combat	1009
Surrender at Planet Dawn	1009
No Surrender, No Retreat	1010
➤ Win, Place or Show.....	1010
Over My Dead Body	1011
➤ Massacres	1012
➤ Flag of Truce.....	1013
➤ Battles Without, Battles Within	1013
➤ Armistice	1013
➤ Unconditional Surrender	1014
Kalderan Surrender	1014
➤ Beating the Machine	1015
➤ Sorry, Not	1015
Surviving the Horde	1016
Endnotes.....	1016

See Appendix CST – Combat Shifts & Situations Tables

“The action, the impact of flesh and bone, the clash of steel upon steel – all these are but the leverage used by generalship to release far more powerful moral forces. Even in ancient times, when it may be supposed that instincts were more primitive, few warriors fought for the love of fighting. The large majority fought to win, and their will to struggle waned at the moment when victory was apparently snatched out of grasp.

The test may be found in statistics indicating that most armies lose aggressive spirit before their casualties have reached 30 percent. They are not physically crushed, since seven men out of ten are still able to bear arms. They are not necessarily overwhelmed, since the survivors may still be more numerous than the enemy’s whole force. They are simply convinced! The threat of ultimate defeat has convinced them, and it is the business of the tactician to supply the threat. If this can be accomplished by means of a military illusion, so much the better. Armies of superior numbers have been put to flight before one man out of ten has fallen. They were not beaten by blows which became more than flesh could bear. They were beaten in spirit according to laws as old as the human heart, and the victor is the one who can best apply those laws.” – Lynn Montross, War Through the Ages (3rd Ed., 1960), p. 36

Professional Soldiers: The Roman legionnaires were professional soldiers (not warriors, which is a somewhat derogatory term in military thinking, despite the common vulgar perceptions), in addition to superior armor, weapons and kit, they also had better unit cohesion, purpose, will, leadership and were known to be very tenacious in the fight. These latter counted far more.

- ✓ [Narrator] “Conflicts usually took the form of minor skirmishes between neighboring tribes and featured little in the way of tactics; two armies would meet and exchange a hail of javelins, at which point both sides would charge one another and engage in a chaotic melee. *Individual heroism was valued over unit cohesion, and it was not uncommon for warriors to seek one-on-one combat during the heat of battle.* As Etruscan society evolved, so did its military. As a byproduct of trading with the Greeks, the Etruscans slowly developed a distinctly Hellenic style of arms, armour and warfare. ... More disciplined than their Villanovan ancestors, the Etruscan hoplites fought primarily in a phalanx, protected on the wings by cavalry, a universally effective formation that even the Romans used before the adoption of the maniple.” – András Szente-Dzsida (narrator), “Etruscans: Italian Civilization Before Ancient Rome,” Kings and Generals YouTube Channel, February 20, 2020 (emphasis added).
- ✓ [Interview translated from French by English subtitles] “In fact, the tactic of the Gauls, the warrior practice of the Gallic War, consisted of attempting to achieve victory and then leaving. It was not a flight, but a departure once they had confronted each other and could not achieve victory. There are many examples of this in the Gallic War, and when they saw that they could not gain victory after the third battle, the Gauls departed, abandoning Vercingetorix and his men in the citadel.” – Professor Yann Le Bohec, Sorbonne, Under Siege series, Episode 1 (documentary, 2008).

As one commentator noted in relation to the First Punic War – and I am sorry that I do not remember where I heard this exactly – the Roman leadership was willing to gamble all to win big or lose everything – thus tenacity of purpose was an important trait – and this set them apart from other kingdoms of their time who always sought dynastic self-preservation first and generally took lesser risks.

- ✓ Without a doubt, morale was one of the major differences between the Romans and the Gauls in the Gallic Wars. Time and again, it is disappointing to see the Gauls abandon good positions or fail when they had superiority. The Romans campaigned in the Gallic tribes' home territory and were able to move at will, burn farm fields, and destroy villages, retaliating directly against tribes that joined the insurrection.

Morale in GGDM Combat: Morale is a fickle subject – filling tens of thousands of pages of military discourse¹ – that is best left to the sound discretion of the Concierge. But this is perhaps a good starting point:

- ✓ “One field-grade deserter expressed the feelings of many: ‘What’s the point of going home if you’re just going to get sent out to fight again?’” – Traveller News Service (Traveller RPG), Imperium Date 083-1122.

However, the GGDM setting, and science-fiction or space-opera settings in general, present unique questions when considering morale in combat with aliens, whether the humanoid kind (i.e. Americans in rubber suits) or in cases of extreme alterity:

- ✓ Is this an existential situation for the species? ^{2,3}
- ✓ Do the **aliens** have the concept of surrender and will they understand the attempt to surrender?
- ✓ Because of physiological differences, will the aliens be able to provide sufficiently for their captives? Would they even try?⁴ This is especially important in Ground Combat situations.
- ✓ In Colony and Ground Combat, retreat for certain units is not possible.⁵
- ✓ If you are on a ship, where are you going to run? The crew goes where the ship takes them and that is in the hands of the bridge crew.
- ✓ If you are on a fighter, where will you land if you flee? Where would you go?
- ✓ If you attempt to retreat from a combat in space, you might die anyway.
- ✓ If the attackers in a Ground Combat are attempting to retreat, do they have the ability to retreat from the planet surface? Or is landing a one way ticket?
- ✓ Is this the type of situation where surrender or retreat is even an option? If not, what are the options if the situation seems hopeless?

Inexperienced military leaders will generally think their situation is worse than it actually is and the enemy's situation is better than it actually is. Civilian leaders may see the opposite. Both are a sort of Dunning-Kruger effect in military thinking and civilian leadership. Neither is helpful.

- ✓ “For a strong adversary (corps) the opposition of twenty-four squadrons and twelve guns ought not to have appeared very serious, but in war the psychological factors are often decisive. An adversary who feels inferior is in reality so.” – Field Marshal Carl Gustav Baron Von Mannerheim, “Father of Modern Finland.”
- ✓ “Since the 1942 campaign was Hitler’s own, any criticism ultimately devolves to some description of his character and ability. He certainly had a retentive memory, an appreciation for technology, some flair for operations at approximately corps level, and an extremely strong will. With more military experience and more self-restraint, he might have become a competent corps commander, but he was a hopelessly inept strategist. He was incapable of adapting his plans to an objective reality of space,

time, and opposing forces. Instead, he retreated into an infantile dream world where his will alone was decisive. Because he refused to admit restraint on his own will, Hitler vastly overestimated the role of morale in warfare.... Hitler found it easy to make any demands because he had no real sympathy or affection for the soldiers whose lives he recklessly sacrificed.” – The Second World War: Europe and the Mediterranean, The West Point Military History Series, Dept. of History, U.S. Military Academy, West Point, NY (1989), p. 135.

- On the latter point, the editors echo Albert Speer’s book Inside the Third Reich (1969).⁶
- “[Gen. Henry H.] Arnold [USAAF] recorded in his diary ‘Our secret weapon is Hitler, hence do not bomb his castle. Do not let him get hurt, we want him to continue making mistakes.’” – from Wikipedia article, “Bombing of Obersalzberg,” citing to Despina Stratigakos, Hitler at Home (2015).

There are two situations in GGDM where “morale” is out of the hands of the Concierge: First, positions may choose to retreat from combat (or in the opposite, no retreat option exists for System Boats and Defense Bases), and second, the larger issues of when positions decide to stop fighting, concede territory and/or submit to demands of other positions, all are story arc events.⁷

- ✓ “As the German shells rained down on the French positions, Napoleon III wandered aimlessly in the open around the French positions. One officer of his military escort was killed, and two more were wounded. A doctor accompanying him wrote in his notebook, ‘If this man has not come here to kill himself, I don’t know what he has come to do. I have not seen him give an order all morning.’ ... After the war, when he [Emperor Napoleon III] was accused of having made a ‘shameful surrender’ at Sedan, he wrote: ‘Some people believe that, by burying ourselves under the ruins of Sedan, we would have better served my name and my dynasty. It’s possible. Nay, to hold in my hand the lives of thousands of men and not to make a sign to save them was something that was beyond my capacity....my heart refused these sinister granddeurs.’” – from Wikipedia article, “Napoleon III,” captured November 2, 2018.⁸
 - German artillery bombardment at Sedan seemed to have this effect on Napoleon III (*ut supra*). Napoleon III was defeated psychologically.
- ✓ “The real target in war is the mind of the enemy command, not the bodies of his troops. If we operate against his troops it is fundamentally for the effect that action will produce on the mind and will of the commander; indeed, the trend of warfare and the development of new weapons – aircraft and tanks – promise to give us increased and more direct opportunities of striking at this psychological target.” – Captain Sir Basil H. Liddell Hart, 1944.

In addition to the above, each soldier or warrior brings everything civilization provides:⁹

- ✓ “Throughout the film, Wings [Hauser] displays a worrying enthusiasm for machine-gunning ‘dinks’ (as they’re charmingly referred to) at every opportunity. It’s meant to portray patriotic fervour, but more readily suggests an urgent need for psychiatric care.” – Jafo, review of Siege of Firebase Gloria (1989), explodinghelicopter.com, May 25, 2016.

The Concierge should be aware of and weigh each position's Fundamental Realities, Enlightenment, Writs, Meanings, and any other factors relevant to morale 'on the ground.'¹⁰

- ✓ “Moltke was the first great captain to break with the past. In his emphasis on planning, he located his headquarters far back in the rear, leaving the supervision of the fighting to subordinates. And since there is no more convincing justification than victory, the method gained converts as armies swelled in numbers. In some respects the benefits were apparent. Modern staff work can hardly be said to have begun until after Moltke showed the way. Military cartography developed into a science, while precision and coordination improved in every army which followed the Prussian model. Yet in his genius for specialization Moltke went to such lengths as to create a gap between staff and regimental officers – a tendency which his imitators accepted along with the tactical virtues. Obviously the generalissimo of several million troops cannot charge at the head of his men in the eighteenth-century manner. But when even the divisional staffs of 1917 sought comparative comfort and safety, combatants felt that they were being thrust and not led into battle. Resentment of such conditions ate like a canker at the fighting spirit of every World War army; and to complete the sad paradox, most of the commanders were too far removed from war's realities to know the truth.” – Lynn Montross, *War Through the Ages* (3rd Ed., 1960), pp. 729-730.¹¹

See previous discussion in *Interdisciplinary Approach*, 4 Colleges, p. 507, *supra*. Moltke's stark stratification of officers between army HQ staff and tactical command simply finished a process that had begun centuries earlier. HQ staff is the bridge over the gulf between the political power and combat command.

- Morality vs. Morale: The very first concept that must be shed is the idea that morality is morale, the juvenile fiction idea that the good guys, the morally right, the righteous, will be victorious in combat. It arises from the erroneous idea that the man who knows he is morally right or is convinced of his righteousness will not quit and thus will always be victorious. I shed this Saturday morning cartoons delusion when I was about 13 or 14 years old, I think Montross or Summers discussed it somewhere.

- ✓ There came a day when I was perhaps in my late teens or early 20s (most likely the latter) when the realization dawned on me how close we were to losing WWII in 1940. Once I got past the patriotic 'rah-rah, we're the good guys and we won' that is the common view taught in public schools, once I understood the situation, I remember the flush of sudden understanding in that moment. Our leaders almost blew it. Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor in December 1941 may have sealed Germany's fate. That year and a half in between was a twilight, by December 1941, the Germans had failed to encircle and capture Moscow and their initial onslaught had petered out.

The juvenile fiction and Saturday morning cartoon ideas are related to another much older idea: That victory in combat (or any struggle) is confirmation of moral rightness or divine sanction (e.g., Trial by Combat). That is, that the man who is not on the right side of the dispute will lack will, is weaker (dumber), will not receive divine assistance or good luck. See *Might Makes Right* discussion, 2 Government Titles, p. 590, *supra*.

- ✓ If you think that being 'right' or on the 'right side' will give a man moral courage not to surrender or flee, then what about all of the Allied units that surrendered during

WWII, especially those who were defending their homelands (e.g., France, Russia?). We teach that we (and the Allies) were on the morally right side, right? Bataan Death March.

It has been said many times, but probably not better:

- ✓ *Thoughts of an intergalactic mercenary after a hot combat landing*: “They sit in their hallowed halls of government and talk of righteous causes but in the white heat of combat, good and bad, right and wrong melt away. Only the money keeps you going. Yet now, for me, the tide has turned and the one grim reality of this profession seals my fate... that all of the fortunes spent on death cannot buy me one more breath of life.” – B.K. Taylor (story) and James Fox (art), “Retrospect,” *Epic Illustrated*, Vol. 1, No. 4, Winter 1980.
 - Cf. “And all your money will not another minute buy.” – Kansas, “Dust in the Wind” (1977).
 - See also related Expendability discussion in 3 Combat, p. 980, *supra*.
- **Naval Combat**: Most of the crew in a naval combat have no idea what is going on; most are below deck with no view of the outside, each has a specific job to do, nowhere to run, with the captain in control of the ship, and they have to keep on doing their job, knowing that each second, a shell, missile, torpedo or bomb could come crashing through the ship’s armor. *There is no reason to believe that spaceship combat will be any different, whether in our solar system or in a space-opera setting.* Star Trek DS9 fans will recall that Nog was counseled to not worry about the enemy ships, but to just concentrate on doing his specific job during the coming battle (“Sacrifice of Angels” (1997)). They were outnumbered 2 to 1 and Nog knew it only because he was on the bridge, the rest of the ship crew probably did not.

“A relief force consisting of the 36th and 84th Fleets, with attached reserve squadrons, arrived today to engage Lucan’s forces here. Lucan’s fleet retreated with minor casualties, leaving behind the ground forces it had landed more than a week before. With assistance from close orbital bombardment, Belumarese defenders easily overcame the abandoned ground forces, who surrendered en masse before planet dawn.”

– Traveller News Service (Traveller RPG), Imperium Date 088-1118

Surrender at Planet Dawn: In GGDM terminology, the Ground Units were left on a hostile planet without a Log Ship to supply them each Regular Turn and without fighters for Combat Screening against enemy fighters. With low morale, a stalling offensive, and no reason to hang on, it took only one more push from the defenders to cause surrender (at Concierge discretion).

- ✓ The Traveller RPG civil war was between humans on mostly Earth-like planets, both sides using the same technology, equipment and organizations. This is very different from most situations in GGDM.
- ✓ “Historians relate that the French garrison, feeling abandoned by an uncaring Republic, gradually abandoned the high standards of conduct and service characteristic of the French Revolutionary Army. Many soldiers refused to renew their oath to the Republic, or did so half-heartedly.” – from Wikipedia article, “Siege of Alexandria.”

No Surrender, No Retreat: Within the scale of GGDM and space-opera fiction in general, ground combat (on a planetary surface, that is, planetary invasion) is very similar to Pacific Island combat during WWII.

The Japanese were able to extract their ground forces from Guadalcanal because they still had transport capability and retained enough control of the seas to create and maintain a corridor for evacuation; as is well known from history, in later battles, Japanese troops were trapped on small islands unable to be extracted and with nowhere to retreat except into tunnel networks. With their refusal to surrender, defender casualties were usually 95%.

Page | 1010

Perhaps more on point as to planetary invasion, paratrooper units (and special forces) that are inserted have no way out other than linking up with friendly ground forces, or being extracted. In WWII, extraction by helicopter was not available, thus situations occurred like those at Crete, D-Day and Arnhem. At the invasion of Crete, the Fallschirmjäger were victorious but took heavy losses, at D-Day, the paratroopers linked up with invading ground forces and were extracted to the rear, at Arnhem, such was not the case, the red berets took a beating, the town was partially destroyed, they withdrew across the river under heavy fire, leaving the wounded to be captured.

In February 1943, Orde Wingate's Chindits marched overland into Japanese-occupied Burma on Operation Longcloth to test long range penetration missions and had to make their own retreat out; a year later, Merrill's Marauders hiked over 1,000 miles into Burma over a mountain range *with no extraction plan*. The Marauders were disbanded in August 1944, having been reduced to 130 men from 2,997 that entered Burma six months earlier.

➤ **Win, Place or Show:** Ground Units on the surface of an enemy planet have nowhere to retreat if they cannot be extracted from the surface to transports and there is no friendly colony on the planet (as may occur on Balkanized Planets). Without transports, Ground Units are usually stranded and must win, die or surrender, even if they can be supplied by Log Ships.

- ✓ “A little religious communication might not be a bad idea at this stage of the game. Now myself, I don't take any chances, I talk to Mohammed, Buddha, Mr. Jesus H. Christ Himself and any other religious honchos I can come up with.” – Sgt. Maj. Hafner, Siege of Firebase Gloria (1989).

As detailed below, the Concierge, taking the view of the *local commanders* and not the interstellar governments represented by the players, will determine realistically if and when stranded Ground Units surrender or scatter, *after* formal surrender demands are made.

“I, Arvast Nade, Commander Battle Fleet IV, hereby demand your immediate surrender. Failure to comply within one hour, your time, following receipt of this ultimatum, as determined by my communications center, will open your planet to pillage by my troops. Any attempt at resistance will be crushed without mercy, and your population decimated in retaliation. Any damage, or attempted damage, by you to goods or facilities of value on the planet will be avenged by execution of leading citizens selected at my command. By my fiat as conqueror, your status, retroactive to the moment of transmission of this ultimatum, is that of bond-sleg to the conquering race. Any lack of instantaneous obedience will be dealt with accordingly. Signed, Arvast Nade, Battle Fleet Commander.”

– From “The Claw and the Clock,” by Christopher Anvil (1971)

Over My Dead Body: A colony that surrenders to the attacker becomes a Conquered Colony and is transferred from its previous owner's Public Space to the new sovereign's Public Space (see Conquered Colony, 2 Order, p. 539, *supra*). Determination of if or when a colony surrenders is at the discretion of the Concierge.¹² The most relevant factors will be whether the colony has any remaining defenses:

- ✓ If the colony has lost the Colony Combat and has no Ground Units, it will probably surrender under threat of occupation by Ground Units or Orbital Bombardment.
- ✓ If the colony has lost the Colony Combat, but has Ground Units, they may conclude that there is nothing they can do if the enemy wants to Orbital Bombard the colony, but if the enemy wants to rule them, they will need to send down troops and fight.
- ✓ Or the threat of Orbital Bombardment may cause the defending Ground Units to surrender to avoid massive civilian casualties.
 - In an Orbital Bombardment, possibly no one will be left in charge to surrender. Or as Capt. Moreau said in *By Dawn's Early Light* (1990), when ordered to the Grand Tour, "You do not kill the enemy's leaders, we know that, they know that, somebody's gotta be there to turn it off!"
- ✓ A colony most likely will surrender if 1) the attackers are not an existential threat, 2) the colony's defenses have been significantly reduced, and 3) the attackers have occupied most of the colony (e.g., Germany, May 1945). If any Ground Units remain and they are disbanded by the new sovereigns, the population in those units is released and the RPs lost or transferred.
- ✓ A colony which is 100% occupied by enemy Ground Troops (see Ground Combat Resolution, 4 Combat, p. 993, *supra*) has no choice but the surrender (or alternatively, their surrender is irrelevant at that point).
 - In March-April 1945, Heinrich Himmler attempted to surreptitiously negotiate a surrender of Germany through the Swedish Red Cross. Although Germany did eventually formally surrender on May 8, 1945, it was at that point nearly *completely occupied*; thus in March-April 1945, the Allies were certain of victory – what leverage did Himmler have in his attempted negotiations? See further 3 Order, EN 6 discussion, p. 562, *supra*.

Other factors may include the Native Population Types of the attackers and defenders, Habitability Classes, fear of the unknown, fear of death, the reputation of the attackers for cruelty or kindness, the apparent intent of the attackers, the loyalties and responsibilities of the defending colonial government, self-interests and cultural issues, and the possibility/expectation of rescue or relief or being held responsible later by the population or the interstellar government.¹³

- ✓ We have come to take for granted – because it is actual history and because of frothing-at-the-mouth Nazi stormtrooper stereotyping – the German refusal to surrender in the face of massive and overwhelming Soviet attacks on central Berlin in the last two weeks of April 1945, but one has to wonder at the stoic resolve of the individual soldiers defending the Kroll Opera House, the Reichstag, and the Brandenburg Gate. They could not have thought that somehow heroic defense would lead to German victory in the war – Germany had lost too much, even if the Germans had won the Battle of Seelow Heights, the outcome of the war would not have been changed. Did they think they simply had no other choice no matter how grim the outlook? It is also

what makes Hitler's refusal to surrender, refusal to be held personally accountable in the end (along with the Goebbels killing their own children), so poignantly irresponsible. Eventually, after the commander and most of the troops evacuated the Reichstag, about 100 remaining German defenders, out of ammunition, surrendered after Hitler had committed suicide. There are many factors to consider in whether beleaguered defenders surrender, what they might do if given opportunity or if death is pointless.

History is full of surprising surrenders when it seems the defenders could have held out, and others where defenders have held out against great odds either until they were relieved¹⁴ or until they surrendered and sometimes marched out with their colors and arms intact. Or until they were overrun and massacred, or taken prisoner, enslaved, or paroled or committed suicide.

- ✓ “On 2 February 1943 the remainder of Sixth Army capitulated. Upon finding out about Paulus' ‘surrender,’ Hitler flew into a rage and vowed never to appoint another field marshal again. He would, in fact, go on to appoint another seven field marshals during the last two years of the war. Speaking about the surrender of Paulus, Hitler told his staff: ‘In peacetime Germany, about 18,000 or 20,000 people a year chose to commit suicide, even without being in such a position. Here is a man who sees 50,000 or 60,000 of his soldiers die defending themselves bravely to the end. How can he surrender himself to the Bolsheviks?!’ Paulus, a Roman Catholic, was opposed to suicide.

During his captivity, according to Gen. Max Pfeffer, Paulus said of Hitler's expectation: ‘I have no intention of shooting myself for this Bohemian corporal.’ Another general told the NKVD (the public and secret police organisation of the Soviet Union) that Paulus had told him about his promotion to field marshal and said, ‘It looks like an invitation to commit suicide, but I will not do this favor for him.’ *Paulus also forbade his soldiers from standing on top of their trenches in order to be shot by the enemy.* Shortly before surrendering, Paulus sent his wedding ring back to his wife on the last plane departing his position. He had not seen her since 1942 and would not see her again, as she died in 1949 while he was still in captivity.” – from Wikipedia article, “Friedrich Paulus,” captured June 11, 2019 (emphasis added).

- Massacres: Surrenders sometimes result in massacres, even in ages that consider themselves very civilized. At the Battle of Fort Griswold in 1781, a **British** force led by Brigadier General Benedict Arnold – the infamous traitor – attacked and captured Ft. Griswold held by Connecticut militia, which they outnumbered 6 to 1. The American commander, Lt. Col. Ledyard attempted to surrender the fort when the Redcoats had entered the fort and opened the gates. One of the two British captains present took Lt. Col. Ledyard's sword offered in surrender and killed him with it. A confused situation ensued in which the British killed nearly all of the militiamen in the fort in the next several minutes. Various explanations have been offered. Benedict Arnold excluded the massacre from his initial report, was not present when it occurred, but was criticized for the British casualties in taking the fort. The Battle of Fort Griswold was both the last battle commanded by Arnold and the last British land victory.

- ✓ Players should avoid thinking that because *they* wouldn't do it, it *wouldn't happen*.

The only explanation necessary in GGDM is a Concierge Intervention; situations such as the Nanjing Massacre (1937) can be (unfortunate) story events introduced in appropriate circumstances (see discussion of bad events in Entropy is Not Constant, *et seq.*, 1 Entropy, pp. 214-

216, *supra*). The Japanese considered themselves very civilized, as did the Europeans before them (whom the Japanese considered barbarians); the rest of the world did not agree.

- ✓ [Narrator Jack Fortune] “The fight for Ciudad-Rodrigo was over, and the town was Wellington’s. Victory didn’t mean an end to the bloodshed, however, and the conquering army rampaged through the town on a sustained orgy of rape, looting and violence. ... [Interview with Miguel Martin Mas, Curator, in Spanish, translated in English subtitles] ‘For us, the Spanish, it is very painful to remember the scenes after the siege, and there is still some resentment against England for Ciudad-Rodrigo and Badajoz. Once the soldiers passed the breach, they were out of control and the first thing they did was look for alcohol. They were looking for warehouses stocked with cognac and brandy; food and women as well. This led to the rape of a vast number of the civilian population. This was very sad for the Spanish because these were the people who had defended the city against the French two years previously. It was very, very unfair.’” – Under Siege series, Episode 2 (documentary, 2008).¹⁵

- Flag of Truce: At any time during a siege, Colony Combat, or Ground Combat, the attackers may transmit to the defenders (the position that currently owns the colony) and to the Concierge, a surrender demand (see *featured example*, above). The Concierge may not, except in extreme circumstances, consider whether or not the colony will surrender until a demand is received; that is, the Concierge will not spontaneously decide the colony surrenders when no demand has been made by the attackers (or offer by the Defendants).

- ✓ Of course, in alien Earth invasion movies, the humans never surrender, no matter what the cost. In fact, it is not even clear how we could signal surrender in most movies; the alien invaders rarely communicate with us and never ask for surrender. Most alien attackers of the Earth seem to regard us unconcernedly as insects.

Conversely, if no surrender demand is made, the attackers may not accept any surrender attempt. The position that owns the colony may or may not choose to respond to a surrender demand, and the Concierge may take that into consideration, along with the demand, in the whole context of the situation.

- Battles Without, Battles Within: The attacker and defender both represent the wishes and will of their position’s *interstellar government* and to a larger extent, their civilizations. As such, in many games, the attacker and defender would act unrealistically in the view of the people on the ground, especially in certain old games where population is just numbers to produce warships. The Concierge in this situation must think about and represent the people on the ground, the *local view* of the situation, their own capabilities, what they believe to be true or likely, and to a larger extent, consider the story arc of the game.
- Armistice: One or both sides can call an armistice during any ongoing combat situation by submitting Combat Orders to do nothing on their side. Orders to not attack in a combat are risky, because the other side could still fire and do other actions in the Combat Round. The Concierge will not enforce any supposed armistice by refusing to process firing orders or other actions; the armistice – whether unilateral or agreed – is the problem of the players. Units which are not given orders will still defend themselves against Fighters and Missiles and are not automatically hit by enemy attacks (they can still dodge and maneuver). Ground Units may be considered to be still defending.

- ✓ Orders to do nothing are still orders, therefore, this would prevent the defender from activating the Combat Power to Seize the Initiative (see 3 Combat, p. 971, *supra*). The Concierge may need to adjudicate if this is being abused or doesn't make game sense. Units ordered to do nothing still need supplies and that could be a factor.
 - ✓ Nearly 3,000 Americans were killed on the Western Front between 5:10 a.m. November 11, 1918 when the Armistice was signed and 11:00 a.m. when it went into effect. Notification of the Armistice to local commanders left ambiguity on what they should do until 11:00 a.m. Ambitious officers continued attacking in the early morning fog. See Joseph E. Persico, "World War I: Wasted Lives on Armistice Day," MHQ: The Quarterly Journal of Military History, Winter 2005 (reprinted on History.net).¹⁶
- **Unconditional Surrender:** For game purposes, colony surrenders are assumed to be unconditional and will be treated that way by the Concierge. If the parties made some agreement limiting the conditions of the surrender, it is up to them to do or not do, to enforce or try to cajole or threaten each other to obtain compliance with the terms of the surrender. This is consistent generally with the way diplomacy is handled in GGDM, see Greys Diplomacy, 1 Diplomacy, p. 1097, *infra*.

Surrender of colonies in GGDM should be and *must be considered unconditional for game purposes*. With the history of the early 20th Century well behind us, there should be no question what unconditional surrender means.

- ✓ "We call upon the government of Japan to proclaim now the unconditional surrender of all Japanese armed forces, and to provide proper and adequate assurances of their good faith in such action. The alternative for Japan is prompt and utter destruction."
– Potsdam Declaration, July 26, 1945.

Such demands may prolong resistance. But of course, there can still be an insurgency and resistance on the ground. Are they terrorist or freedom fighters?

"After ten years of fighting, the Kalderans had nearly driven the Vedrans out of the entire Magellanic Cloud. The war ended abruptly when the Vedrans viciously bombed the Kalderan capital, Kalderash from orbit with atomic weapons, turning most of a continent into an uninhabitable wasteland. Shortly after the bombardment, the Kalderans surrendered and the Kalderan people and their government became part of the Vedran Empire. While the Kalderans may have lost the war, it was the first time in history that any species provided real resistance to Vedran imperialism. It was a sign of the discontent that was felt for the Vedran Empire by the entire galaxy.

The wounds left by the Kalderan-Vedran war took centuries to heal and in some ways they never have. When the Vedran Empire was transformed into the Systems Commonwealth, one of the Commonwealth's first acts was to launch a restoration effort to the Kalderan homeworld Kalderash which still bore the scars left by the Vedran's atomic attack thousands of years before."

– from Andromeda Wiki article, "Kalderan-Vedran War," captured August 10, 2019

Kalderan Surrender: The preceding commentaries only apply to specific, point-in-Galactic Space instances of morale and planetary surrender.

The Concierge cannot – and will not attempt to – make a position surrender or become a vassal to, or be annexed by another position. These are larger game story arc issues for the position players; positions may sue for peace or continue fighting until extinction, none of which requires

any communication with, involvement, or Intervention by the Concierge. Positional morale is the state of the players.

- ✓ Peace happens only when one or both sides of a conflict can see no better alternative; prior to that point, it's all posturing and propaganda.
 - “Just last week Griffiths had welcomed what he described as ‘one of the quietest periods of this conflict,’ in a briefing to the UN Security Council in which he warned the lull could not be sustained without political progress.” – AFP, “More than 100 killed in Yemen missile, drone attack,” January 19, 2020.
- ✓ Admittedly however, there is a point in game circumstances at which the two possibilities could merge: That is, if the last world owned by a position were under attack, and the decision by the Concierge as to whether the colony surrenders is also a decision as to whether the position becomes politically extinct (see *Countdown to Extinction*, 1 Resolution, p. 1462, *infra*) in the game. Theoretically, positional extinction should have no bearing on the Concierge's appreciation of the plight of the colony.
- Beating the Machine: It is difficult to hold or prevail against a position that has dedicated everything to warfare. It may seem hopeless, the enemy has superior forces, a combat college, planning, the initiative, and possibly surprise. World War II, well-studied and dissected, provides an example, especially the Soviets, of how to defeat a war-machine position. Time and space are the enemies of aggressive war machines, each movement, each colony to be conquered or obliterated, takes Acts, Scenes, Regular Turns, no matter how small the colony. The Russians survived both Hitler and Napoleon because of their vast geography and time, willingness to take losses and endure, to trade hits with the enemy even when they were sure to lose. Time was key for production and other events to take effect. The only caveat to this argument is that in GGDM, superior technology, the material superiority, and non-material abilities of a true war machine could be very problematic for the defenders to endure.
 - ✓ “Mommy's alright, daddy's alright, they just seem a little weird. Surrender, surrender, but don't give yourself awayyyy...” – Cheap Trick, “Surrender” (1978).
- Sorry, Not: There is always a lingering suspicion where the losing side is the initial aggressor that the losers are sorry only for the fact that they lost. Female aviation pioneer and top test pilot for the Third Reich, Hanna Reitsch said in a 1981 interview with Ron Laytner:
 - ✓ “I am not ashamed to say I believed in National Socialism. I still wear the Iron Cross with diamonds Hitler gave me. But today in all of Germany you can't find a single person who voted Adolf Hitler into power ... Many Germans feel guilty about the war. But they don't explain the real guilt we share – that we lost.” – *The Deseret News*, February 19, 1981, Page 12c (available on Google newspapers).

This is the same suspicion that bedevils the *Conversos* and any forced religious conversion, marital disputes, childrearing, and pre-sentencing apologies of convicted criminals, our inability to determine the absolute truth or falsity of *apparent* contrition. Within GGDM, this may be an issue considered by the Concierge for example, in Naturalization of colonies.

This suspicion continues to affect current events, from the motive questions behind the admission of immigrants and refugees to Germany under Angela Merkel, the German-backed bailout of Greece, to reaction to Japan's recent turn to militarization, foreign military support deployments and historical revisionist ultra-nationalist groups in both countries.

“They [the Mongols] attacked Russia, where they made great havoc, destroying cities and fortresses and slaughtering men; and they laid siege to Kiev, the capital of Russia; after they had besieged the city for a long time, they took it and put the inhabitants to death. When we were journeying through that land we came across countless skulls and bones of dead men lying about on the ground. Kiev had been a very large and thickly populated town, but now it has been reduced almost to nothing, for there are at the present time scarce two hundred houses there and the inhabitants are kept in complete slavery.”— Giovanni de Plano Carpini, 1246 A.D.

Surviving the Horde: The Republic of Novgorod holds the unique historical record of having preemptively surrendered to the Mongols in 1241, without resistance and before the Mongols had even come close to the Republic’s borders. As a result, Novgorod was never besieged or attacked by the Mongols (avoiding the usual savage results), most of the Republic’s lands were untouched by the Mongols, and Mongol census and taxation officials didn’t arrive in Novgorod until 18 years later. The Prince of Novgorod became the Khan’s tax collector in the area, but the city retained its religion, culture, and was mostly independent as long as they paid the annuals.

The eventual fall of Novgorod in 1478 coincides with the military growth of the Grand Duchy of Muscovy and the decline of the Hordes; the Grand Prince Ivan III of Muscovy stopped paying tribute in 1476 and ‘defeated’ the Tarter Khanate in 1480 (the Russian guns blocked all crossing attempts, the two armies stared at each other across the Ugra River for a month, then both retreated in early winter ending the Tarter domination of Muscovy) and established the full independence of Muscovy and all of the adjacent lands it had annexed in 1478 and 1485, or over which Ivan had dynastic control or influence due to inheritances.

- ✓ By comparison, Kiev surrendered to the Horde after a siege in 1241, followed by a massacre, was ‘liberated’ and ruled by Lithuania from 1362 to 1471, then was transferred to the Crown of Poland in 1471 to 1686, when it was finally ceded to the Tsar of Russia, and was fully absorbed by Russia in 1775.

“The contact was immediate and shocking. One of the rebel ships lumbered into the path of the interceptors, spraying fire from what seemed as many points as a man has pores. The Service ships promptly riddled it and it should have drifted away – but it didn’t. It kept on fighting. It rammed an interceptor with a crunch that must have killed every man before the first bulwark, but aft of the bulwark the ship kept fighting... It was a pounded tangle of wreckage, and it had destroyed two interceptors, crippled two more, and kept fighting. Finally, it drifted away under feeble jets of power.... It was going somewhere – The ship neared the thin-skinned unarmored, gleaming hospital vessel, rammed it amidships, square in one of the red crosses, and blew itself up...”

– Cyril Kornbluth, “The Only Thing We Learn” (1949)

Endnotes.

¹ **Citation:** “You are well aware that it is not numbers or strength that bring the victories in war. No, it is when one side goes against the enemy with the gods’ gift of a stronger morale that their adversaries, as a rule, cannot withstand them. I have noticed this point too, my friends, that in soldiering the people whose one aim is to keep alive

usually find a wretched and dishonorable death, while the people who, realizing that death is the common lot of all men, make it their endeavour to die with honour, somehow seem more often to reach old age and to have a happier life when they are alive. These are facts which you too should realize (our situation demands it) and should show that you yourselves are brave men and should call on the rest to do likewise.” – Xenophon, The Persian Expedition.

² Citation: You know what’s coming ... “We shall not go quietly into the night!” – President Whitmore, Independence Day (1996) from Dylan Thomas’ 1951 poem, “Do Not Go Gentle Into That Good Night” and/or from any of Churchill’s famous speeches and broadcasts in the summer of 1940 (what <http://allthetropes.wikia.com> calls ‘The Eternal Churchill,’ as seen in Independence Day and The Return of the King speech at the West Gate of Mordor).

³ Commentary: At the end of Mike Resnick’s 1982 book Birthright: The Book of Man, at the end of 18,000 years of galactic rule, the last humans are stranded on a distant backwater planet surrounded by hostile alien fleets. The humans threaten to blow up the planet if the aliens land. My recollection is somewhat hazy, but I recall that the planet somehow blew up, eliminating the last of humanity, leaving the post-human galaxy to the aliens.

⁴ Commentary: e.g., scene in Space: Above and Beyond (1995-1996) where the Marines capture a Chig warrior. Assuming that the one thing they have in common is the need for water, they attempt to give it water. The Chig dies quickly afterward. The Marines either accidentally killed the Chig or inadvertently assisted it in committing suicide.

⁵ Citation: “As to what happened next, it is possible to maintain that the hand of heaven was involved, and also possible to say that when men are desperate no one can stand up to them.” – Xenophon, Hellenica Bk. 7, as translated by Rex Warner in A History of My Times (1979), p. 398.

⁶ Citation: “Karl Brandt and his wife Anni were members of Hitler’s inner circle at Berchtesgaden where Hitler maintained his private residence known as the Berghof. This very exclusive group functioned as Hitler’s *de facto* family circle. It included Eva Braun, Albert Speer, his wife Margarete, Theodor Morell, Martin Bormann, Hitler’s photographer Heinrich Hoffmann, Hitler’s adjutants and his secretaries. *Brandt and Hitler’s chief architect Albert Speer were good friends as the two shared technocratic dispositions about their work. Brandt looked at killing ‘useless eaters’ and the handicapped as a means to an end, namely since it was in the interest of public health. Similarly, Speer viewed the use of concentration camp labor for his defense and building projects in much the same way.*

As members of this inner circle, the Brandts had a residence near the Berghof and spent considerable time there when Hitler was present. In his memoirs, Speer described the numbing lifestyle of Hitler’s inner circle, forced to stay up most of the night listening to the insomniac Nazi leader’s repetitive monologues or to an unvarying selection of music. Despite Brandt’s closeness to Hitler, the dictator was furious when he learned shortly before the end of the war that the doctor had sent Anni and their son toward the American lines in hopes of evading capture by the Russians. Only the intervention of Heinrich Himmler, Speer, and the direct order of Admiral Doenitz after Brandt had been captured by the Gestapo and sent to Kiel in the war’s closing days, saved him from execution.” – from Wikipedia article, “Karl Brandt,” captured May 17, 2020 (emphasis added).

⁷ Commentary & Citation: Why Not is implicit in any direct threat. The Why Not question was used to great effect by Delenn in Babylon 5, “Severed Dreams” episode (1996): **Delenn**: This is Ambassador Delenn of the Minbari. Babylon 5 is under our protection. Withdraw or be destroyed! **Earth Force Commander**: Negative! We have authority here. Do not force us to engage your ship. **Delenn**: Why not? Only one human captain has ever survived battle with a Minbari Fleet. He is behind me. You are in front of me. If you value your lives, be somewhere else!

⁸ Commentary & Citation: Why civilian leadership doesn’t go to the front: “After the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War in 1870, Eugenie remained in Paris as Regent while Napoleon III and the Prince Imperial travelled to join the troops at the German front. When the news of several French defeats reached Paris on 7 August, it was greeted with disbelief and dismay. Prime Minister Émile Ollivier and the chief of staff of the army, Marshal Leboeuf both resigned and Eugenie took it upon herself to name a new government. She chose General Cousin-Montauban, better known as the Count of Palikao, seventy-four years old, as her new prime minister. The Count of Palikao named Maréchal Francois Achille Bazaine, the commander of the French forces in Lorraine, as the new overall military commander. Napoleon III proposed returning to Paris, realizing that he was doing no good for the army. The Empress responded by telegraph, ‘Don’t think of coming back, unless you want to unleash a terrible revolution. They will say you quit the army to flee the danger.’ The Emperor agreed to remain with the army. With the Empress directing the country, and Bazaine commanding the army, the Emperor no longer had any real role to play. At the front, the Emperor told Marshal Leboeuf, ‘we’ve both been dismissed.’” – from Wikipedia article, “Eugénie de Montijo,” captured November 1, 2018.

- ✓ Napoleon III had maneuvered himself into limbo. If he did not have the ability or intent to assume command, he had no business at the front, and further, was risking his entire dynasty by taking his under-aged son along. His futility was a metaphor for the French defeat at Sedan in 1870.

- ✓ The Prince Imperial, born in 1856 and the only son of Napoleon III by the Empress, was killed in 1879 serving as a British officer during the Zulu War; his recon party was ambushed in an abandoned village.

⁹ Commentary: Exhibit A to any modern argument about material vs. morale is the shameful performance of the new Iraqi army in early 2014 where heavily armed divisions fled before highly mobile, light-armed, and motivated ISIL forces probably numbering no more than 800 fighters on pick-up trucks. Iraqi army commanders fled, leaving their soldiers without direction; in June 2014, ISIL captured the major city of Mosul, looting banks and capturing stores of tanks, vehicles, missile launchers, and other Iraqi army-abandoned expensive U.S.-supplied equipment.

¹⁰ Commentary: Morale in the real world. The Pittsburgh Pirates are a team that has enough talent to be competitive for most of the first half of the season. They are a team that must live on the edge in the edgy NL Central, if they play hard and all the guys are there, all in, they might just have a magical season. But when injuries take players out of the game, and early-inning pitching isn't quite performing like it used to, and as the season wears on with the gap widening, an observer can easily see that despite pride and brave talk, the team just isn't quite there anymore, the focus and discipline fades, errors pile up, base running mistakes happen more frequently, more caught stealings as they press for little advantages, strikeouts pile up, batting averages don't produce key hits, homeruns fall off. The effects snowball into a 14GB deficit. At some point, they are just playing it out. If the Pirates won 20 games in a row – almost unheard of in modern baseball, they would just be at .500 for the season. When paired with another team in the same situation, it is no surprise – it is sad, but it is no surprise – that brawls broke out between the Pittsburgh Pirates and Cincinnati Reds in April and July 2019, the latter leading to many suspensions and fines.

¹¹ Commentary: This frustration is also what it's like when you are pressing the wall. Anyone with ambition or a goal knows this experience. And you resent it, it's like an isometric exercise in your mind, on a sit 'n spin, you think you are working, but really just going in circles. Being thrust, but not leading anywhere. I had to read The Scarlett Letter in 11th Grade, I was determined to finish the book (one of the few school reading assignments I honestly finished); I was laying on my bed, pressing to the end, I thought I finished the book, then woke up with the lights still on, and discovered I had 30 pages to go. I had dreamed I finished it.

¹² Citation: **Capt. Flanagan**: What kind of animal are you!? **Cpl. DiNardo**: Animal? Lady, do you have any idea what Charlie would do if he came in here? He would rape you and your nurses until you're all dead! But you know what? They'd have to kill me first. Animal? I'm no animal. – from *Siege of Firebase Gloria* (1989).

¹³ Commentary: The anime series *Crest of the Stars* begins with a planetary surrender. Rock Lin, the father of the main character Jinto Lin, is the president of planet Martine of the Hyde star system. The Abh fleet arrives and demands surrender of the world. People on the ground wanted to resist, despite their weak defensive capabilities (they had 10 missiles and some police forces); the Abh are not interested in planetary occupation, but seek to control space routes, leaving planets to govern themselves. Jinto's father went up to meet with the Abh and subsequently surrendered the planet to the Abh Empire, accepting a hereditary title of Count of Hydal. Jinto was spirited off the planet to avoid angry mobs. Later, Jinto's father was executed for treason by the Hyde parliament after the planet was 'liberated' by the Four Nations alliance (like Soviet liberation) while Jinto served with the Abh armed forces.

¹⁴ Citation & Commentary: [Narrator Jack Fortune] "The history of man's inhumanity to man has many dark chapters, but none worse than the war on Germany's Eastern Front. ... Army Group North was ordered to destroy a strategically important city high on the Baltic coast. Hitler was intent on obliterating it at all costs and ordered that its inhabitants be shelled and starved to death. The siege that ensued lasted nearly 900 days and cost the lives of nearly 1 million civilians. But the city would not yield to the mighty force at its gates, Leningrad, 1941. ... [introductory theme music & scenes] Having reverted to its old imperial name, St. Petersburg is once more a vibrant, beautiful city, which boasts a rich cultural heritage. It is perhaps difficult for the contemporary visitor to imagine the horrors that took place on its streets just six decades ago. But they are etched on the fabric and consciousness of the city, many of whose inhabitants are able to recall them all too vividly." – *Under Siege* television series (2008), Ep. 5.

The Siege of Leningrad from September 8, 1941 to January 27, 1944, is considered the costliest and most destructive siege in history. The German commanders were ordered to reject any negotiation on surrender of the city:

- ✓ "Subject: the future of the City of Petersburg: The Führer is determined to erase the city of Petersburg from the face of the earth. After the defeat of Soviet Russia there can be no interest in the continued existence of this large urban centre. Finland has likewise shown no interest in the maintenance of the city immediately on its new border. It is intended to encircle the city and level it to the ground by means of artillery bombardment using every calibre of shell, and continual bombing from the air. Following the city's encirclement, requests for surrender negotiations shall be denied, since the problem of relocating and feeding the population cannot and should not be solved by us. In this war for our very existence, we have no interest in maintaining even a part of this very large urban population." – Hitler's directive to Army Group

North, September 29, 1941, reprinted by Anna Reid in Leningrad: Tragedy of a City Under Siege, 1941-44 (2011), pp. 134-135 (from free copy on Google Books).

- ✓ “Hitler – ‘the hardest man in Europe’ as he liked to call himself – was only irritated by this ‘sentimentality.’ ‘I suppose,’ he declared over supper on 25 September, ‘that some people are clutching their heads trying to answer the question – How can the Führer destroy a city like St. Petersburg? Plainly I belong by nature to quite another species!’” *Id.*, p. 134, probably from Hitler’s Table Talk recorded by his private secretaries and published in 1951.

The Soviets were desperate to hold it, tying up 26 German divisions and aircraft and to prevent Army Group North from circling behind Moscow, survivor interviews in Under Siege (2008), Ep. 5 indicated that they never entertained the idea of surrendering to the Germans, and thus, no offer was made. Many of the Soviet divisions were militia divisions. The Soviets however, were able to keep a narrow strip of coastal land along Lake Ladoga open and also to supply the city by flotilla, and when it froze over, to drive trucks across the lake on the “Road of Life.”

¹⁵ Citation & Commentary: [Narrator Jack Fortune] “The French defeat had also yielded some 1,300 prisoners. What Wellington did with these men was to prove very costly. The convention of siege warfare was that those defenders who were captured should be put to death. In another break with convention, Wellington decided to spare the men, a move that he later deeply regretted. [Interview with Ian Fletcher] ‘If you were a garrison, if you were inside a fortress, and the walls were breached and the breaches were deemed to be practical, i.e. they were indefensible in many ways, then you were summoned to surrender, and you were allowed to march out with all the honors of war. Now, of course, if you chose to fight even though you knew the breaches were practicable and indefensible, then you effectively waived all rights to mercy. By allowing the garrison to get off scot free, certainly, the garrison at Badajoz would look at this and say, hey, we can defend these walls without fear of retribution afterwards. The same happens at Burgos and, of course, at San Sabastian. Now Wellington knew this problem, and years afterward he wrote – after Badajoz, he certainly was moved to write in a private letter. He said that if I had slaughtered the garrison of Ciudad-Rodrigo, I would have saved myself the flower of my army at Badajoz, which is where, of course, they got really butchered.” – Under Siege series, Episode 2 (documentary, 2008).

- ✓ This issue is still in debate – there are plenty of loot-motivated conquerors through history who committed massacres, sacks and mass executions for terror effect – but the official position of the U.S. armed forces, and which was drilled into our consciousness starting in boot camp at Parris Island in 1985, is the opposite of that expressed by Wellington and explained by military historian Ian Fletcher in the interview above:

The U.S. government teaches that if the defenders know they will be executed after surrendering, why would they surrender instead of fighting to the death? Thus it is believed that lives on both sides are saved if the enemy knows they will not be killed or mistreated for surrendering. This then creates a curious question: Why did the French defenders of Ciudad-Rodrigo lay down their arms in the market square if they believed that they would be executed afterwards as part of the normal convention on prisoners captured during a siege? Why would they not resist to the last bullet, the last man, street to street, house to house? Certain death vs. probable execution? Still, the U.S. armed forces don’t want enlisted men on the ground debating this point, so the official policy is stated unequivocally and forcefully backed by conventions signed by the United States and ratified by the Senate.

 - I believe that the Ian Fletcher interviewed in Under Siege is the military historian who writes popular books on the Napoleonic Wars for Osprey books. He is described in an article for the Independent as “a 38-year-old, self-taught historian with nearly a dozen works of popular history to his name. They come with titles like In Hell Before Daylight, The Waters of Oblivion and Fields of Fire. (He financed the writing of his first book by working as a motorbike dispatch rider.) With only a couple of O-levels to his name, Fletcher is the sort of historian regarded with considerable sniffiness by the academic branch of the profession. He worked for 13 years carting books around the British Library for other scholars, and has learned history the hard way.” – Matthew Gwyther “Meeting their Waterloo (again),” July 9, 1995 (article is still available online in 2019).
- ✓ In the case of Benedict Arnold at Ft. Griswold, the issue that caused him to omit the massacre from the initial reports may have been that technically, those killed were still English citizens, even if considered treasonous and in armed rebellion, who had surrendered and had been killed without due process.
- ✓ Within GGDGM, the Concierge may sometimes need to decide how the issue is viewed by those involved with regards to possible surrenders.

¹⁶ Commentary: In total, about 11,000 were killed that day between all sides. Pvt. Gunter was killed at 10:59 a.m.