

Saturday, 15 January 2022

## **Re: The Background to the Salamis ad Actium Expansion**

Some explanation about the background to the Expansion to Salamis ad Actium, is required, at least for the modifications to the Ramming rules.

Back in the mists of time in about 2001 or 2002, when the rules were being prepared for publication, David's original draft did include a section concerning "Weak Bows", which was intended to cover the effect of the use of ramming in the earlier period.

As editors, at the time we were directly involved in the physical production of the product, which means that the content (i.e. page count) is a factor in the production costs and after that the price of the product. These were the days when the primary source of the product was in printed form. Online sales in PDF form where the page count is no longer an issue had yet to become the accepted norm. Therefore, some things had to be edited out.

We looked at this rule section and asked ourselves whether the use of weak bows, and therefore almost certain damage to or destruction of the ramming vessel was what is desirable in a game. Why would I, as a player, contribute to my own defeat? Our view was that there were other methods already covered in rules that could be adopted by an attacking ship, by using oar rakes or boarding the opponent.

For this reason, we decided that the weak bows rules would be left out and this in turn led to our introducing the remark in the fleet lists for the earlier period prohibiting ramming. This was not part of the original draft.

After 20 years of the rules being in circulation the absence of early ramming has been "spotted" by one of our players and that led the expansion which has now appeared.

We confess that the decision to leave out that section on Weak Bows now appears to have been the wrong one. On the other hand, it is also likely that players have ignored the prohibition, constructed their fleets using the construction rules, and happily rammed away to their hearts' content.

We apologise to David for this error on our part.

"A", and "A"