In the middle of August 1914, the world's attention was focused directly on the Western Front where German armies were sweeping into Belgium and France. On the Eastern Front however, the Russians were on the offensive into East Prussia, an important agricultural region of the Prussian homeland, and the gateway to Berlin. The Russians planned a two pronged invasion into East Prussia: one army approaching from the Niemen River to the east and one army approaching from the Narew River to the south, both aimed at outflanking German forces located therein, and the eventual capture of the strategic city of Königsberg. In their way stood a single German army, two resolute commanders, and a well developed rail network. By the time the campaign was over both Russian armies would be almost completely destroyed and thrown out of East Prussia and the campaign itself would go on to become one of the most studied and celebrated victories in warfare.
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Introduction

Near the end of the long development of *France '14*, several ideas were thrown around as to what the next title in the First World War Campaigns series should be. It didn't take long to decide that the next title should be on the Eastern Front and should feature the battle of Tannenberg, as the East Prussian campaign really is sort of a "second act" of the German initial campaigns of 1914. Not only that, but forces were moved from the Western Front to the Eastern Front during the *France '14* campaign, and both campaigns really interconnect to create a more complete picture as to what was happening August and September of 1914.

Once work began on the new title, after a quite long hiatus while my side project Squad Battles: First World War was completed, it quickly became apparent that new features and rule adjustments had to be made -- *East Prussia '14* wasn't going to be an easy project. Tough decisions had to be made, for example, in regards to how to eloquently represent the Russians in such a way that sets them apart from the other armies in Europe, and in a historical manner of course. Specifically, it would have been too easy to just simply do what every other game does: make the Russians a bumbling blob of units, totally incapable of doing anything other than getting thoroughly beaten. In reality, the Russian Army was a very capable force whose shortcomings were mainly in its logistics and leadership. Much time was spent trying to achieve this fine balance between an effective and numerically superior force, but also a force that has clearly defined drawbacks which make it difficult for the entire force to be used at its maximum potential. I think the end result might be one of the better representations of the Russian Army of 1914 in a wargame.
After those details fell into place, it become apparent that *East Prussia '14* would have much fewer scenarios than in *France '14*, but in reality the scenarios turned out to be much more challenging to get right, because they had much more overall mobility. Still, in order to give customers more value, it was decided that a second campaign would be included: the Battle of Lodz, and finally, a third bonus campaign was added near the end of development as a nod to completeness: the Second Battle of the Masurian Lakes (1915). The latter campaign was really a continuation of the East Prussian campaign, resulting in the Russians getting ejected from the last toe hold they had on German occupied territory, never to hold German territory again for the remainder of the war.

Once testing began, the general feeling was that testing would go smoothly and the game would be completed sometime in 2013, but as is most often the case, issues were discovered and changed had to be made. One such change had to do with how disrupted and broken movement was modeled, and for that I have to thoroughly thank my excellent team of testers for providing extremely useful feedback. In the end, the series became more mobile and fluid, and the battles began to seem more epic and sweeping in nature. Many other improvements were made along the way to help further refine one of my favorite wargaming series I have ever had the joy of playing and contributing to, and I hope you will feel the same way.

* * *
The Belligerents

The German Army

Summary of Capabilities

The German Army of 1914 was one of the best armies in Europe. The German Army began the war as the most balanced force: it had a large number of machine guns, field guns, and howitzers whereas other armies in Europe fell short in one type of weapon. Although the German Army was not a professional force, its conscription and reserve system was second to none; due to rigorous and frequent training, its first wave reserve formations were as effective as active formations.

Organization

German jäger battalions were an item of frustration. Some sources place jäger battalions as a corps level asset, however, other sources and historical accounts place the same jäger units in various German cavalry divisions. Thus, in 1914, it was decided to
place most of these active jäger battalions in the cavalry divisions since it is indisputable that they were indeed attached to some of these divisions at some point. However, it may be noticed that the jäger assignments are in no way uniform. Historically, some German cavalry divisions had several jäger battalions and others had none at all, and this is represented in the order of battle. German reserve jäger battalions also were a bit of a headache. Conflicting sources placed the reserve jäger battalions in specific reserve divisions, and some had them as Reservekorps level assets. Again, a decision was made which placed these formations in specific reserve divisions. However, all jäger battalions that are located in an infantry division are at division level, regardless of the fact that some sources place them in specific infantry brigades within that division. This was done because the jäger would be used where needed by the division commander and putting them in a brigade restricts their use too severely.

Pionier battalions within the pionier regiment might seem like they have the incorrect number of companies at first glance. It is true that pionier battalions had four companies before mobilization, however, after mobilization the 4th company of a pionier battalion was split off and used as the foundation of a reserve pionier battalion. The first three companies of a pionier battalion that did not form pionier regiment was divided up amongst the regular infantry divisions, and the fourth company and first and second reserve pionier
companies were divided up amongst the reserve divisions. During mobilization, ten pionier battalions were pre selected to form pionier regiments for the purpose of siege warfare. These pionier battalions were the 18-20, 23-25, 29-31 and Bavarian. When mobilization began, these select pionier battalions took on the regimental number of their original battalion designation and the first three companies in the battalion formed the I. Battalion of the regiment. The fourth company was combined with the first and second reserve companies assigned to it and formed the II. Battalion, thus making a regiment of two battalions, each of three companies and a siege train and allotted minenwerfers. For simplicity, the II. Battalion of the regiment is a matching quality of its fourth company so that the battalion can combine into one unit. It is arguable that the fifth and sixth companies of this battalion should be of lesser quality because they were in fact formed from the reserve component but this would cause unnecessary clutter. Also, just as it can be argued that these two companies should be lower quality, it could also be argued that the diluted battalion would take on the quality of its senior company once the units are combined.

When the German Army took to the field in 1914 they were lacking many of their machine guns. The equipping of the German Army with machine guns was done just prior to the start of the conflict and many reserve formations suffered from a shortage. Some reserve infantry brigades and reserve jäger battalions went to war without their machine gun companies. As the campaign progressed, these units would eventually regain their missing companies, primarily from the machine gun sections that were scattered amongst German fortress garrisons. Once the threat to the fortified areas was removed, these units were pulled from their garrison and organized into companies to
bring the machine gun complement of the army up to full strength.\textsuperscript{1} Thus, after August, there was a sharp influx of machine gun units. However, it is almost impossible to determine exactly when each missing machine gun company was regained on a unit by unit basis.\textsuperscript{2} It is important to mention that two assumptions were made in game design in regards to German machine gun troops. First, it can be reasonably assumed that any second draft reserve division or jäger battalion formed between October and December were likely given their full complement of machine guns since reequipping was a constant and ongoing process, and it is unlikely that a new unit would have been created with the same shortage that was currently being addressed. Second, as for the original units that were not at full complement at the start of the campaign, it is known that the process of stripping the machine guns from the least threatened fortress garrisons began at the end of August. It can be assumed that these units started forming and redeploying shortly after this, therefore the "late" order of battle contains these missing machine gun units. As a side note, under the reign of von Falkenhayn, and after the full complement of machine gun units had been established, German machine gun troops began to drastically expand during 1915. This expansion was Germany's long cherished plan of having one machine gun company of six guns for each infantry battalion,\textsuperscript{3} and to equip every jäger battalion with an addition company of machine guns. This was only possible after stripping virtually all machinegun companies from their fortress garrisons. In addition to the shortage of machine gun companies for reserve units, there was also a similar shortage for cyclist companies for the reserve jäger battalions. While the reserve jäger

\textsuperscript{1} Eventually the machine gun complement would surpass “full strength” in 1915 and 1916.
\textsuperscript{2} It is important to represent that this happened, rather than leave these units missing from the order of battle during the period in which they were being replaced.
\textsuperscript{3} This is referring to all types of infantry battalions; regular, reserve, ersatz, landwehr and landsturm.
battalions gained their missing machinegun companies, they never would gain the missing cyclist companies.

One unique aspect of the German Army in 1914 was its well thought out reserve system. The German Army of the period without a doubt had the most extensive, well organized and effective system of reserves out of all the armies in Europe. Unlike other armies, the Germans strictly classified and kept track of their reserves by each year in which they passed from the active army and into the reserves. This resulted in a grouping of reservists into classes by year where each class was of similar composition in readiness, physical condition and overall quality. This method allowed the German Army to organize them in such a way as to maximize their effectiveness and dramatically swell the armies ranks with highly trained reservists at mobilization time, while keeping the older reservists separated. Service in the German Army was divided into two years in the Active Army (three years for cavalry); five years in the Reserve (four years for cavalry); eleven years in the Landwehr. The Landsturm included youths between the ages of 17 and 20, too young for Active Army service, and trained and untrained men between the ages of 39 and 45, who were over ordinary military age. The reserves conducted strict annual training in order to retain their level or readiness. At mobilization, reservists in the first two year classes were utilized to fill out the ranks of Active Army units to bring them up to full strength, used as replacements and, most importantly, used to form the original Reservekorps and divisions. These initial reserve formations were comprised of the newly made reservists who were still fresh in their training, albeit many were a little

---

4 As mention in the French Army section, this was the direct opposite of the French system of reserves which kept track of the first two years and then put all other reservists in a huge pool of troops which diluted their effectiveness.

out of shape physically, and who were supernumerary to the requirements of the Active Army (in excess to the reservists used to fill out the Active Army's ranks). The remaining reservists (third to fifth year classes) were then mobilized second and used to form the "first wave" (also called "second draft") of Reservekorps which began entering the German Order of Battle in October. In East Prussia '14, the "initial reserves", which are the reserves that make up the initial Reservekorps and Reserve-Divisions, are for the most part all rated as equal quality (C) to active army units. The difference between active army and reserve infantry battalions is that the reserve infantry battalion assault ratings are slightly lower since there was indeed a real world qualitative difference between the two entities. The "second draft" follow on reserve formations which began to show up in the late "Race to the Sea" period had a slightly different divisional organization and their quality ratings are less than the "initial reserve" formations. The shock to the world in early 1914 was that the German "initial reserve" formations were almost equal in effectiveness to that of the Active Army formations because of the German's strict reservists classification system and annual training. In many cases the German initial reserve formations were the tactical equals of the French Active Army divisions. The initial German reserve formations could certainly handle any threat they were met with, but despite all of their qualitative similarities to active army divisions, reserve divisions were equipped with less artillery and the Reservekorps lacked heavy artillery and supporting troops. This shortcoming is what often relegated the German

---

6 An exception to this is with the divisional pionier units. The 1st and 2nd company of a reserve pionier battalion was composed of reservists, and the 4th company was composed of active personnel. To represent this difference, the division that contains the two reserve component pionier companies has those pionier units rated as D quality, and the division that has the 4th company has this pionier company rated at C.

7 The lower assault rating for these units helps represent the fact that even reservists who had only been in the Reserve for one or two years were still not as in shape as active army troops.

Army to use these reserve formations as follow on forces, or utilized in less critical areas (since the active formations had more combat power).

**Equipment and Training**

Countless books have been written about the quality of the German Army in World War One, so the subject will not be covered in any great detail here. It is undeniable that the German Army was one of the best all around armies in Europe at the time, second to the small professional British Army of course. The German Army was a well trained, well equipped, and well oiled machine that could accomplish almost any task assigned to it and it was operating on the pride and many past victories since Frederick the Great. The individual soldier was not necessarily better than that of the French Army, Russian Army or any other army in Europe, but it was a collection of advantages like an abundance of high trajectory artillery and machine guns, an extremely efficient reserve system, and good quality equipment and training, that made the German army a force to be feared and respected.

Special mention must be made of German jäger battalions and how they are represented in *East Prussia '14* (as pseudo motorized units). It may also be noticed that the jäger battalions which are assigned to cavalry formations are motorized type units (in the Lodz scenarios), but they should not be referred to as "motorized". These troops were not truly "motorized" in any modern sense of the word, they were simply crammed onto slow moving and unreliable vehicles when they could so that the unit could keep up with the cavalry; true motorized infantry did not come into existence until the 1930s. Before the outset of World War One, the Germans experimented with using motorized transport to move their cavalry divisional jäger battalions from point to point. Once the war started,
these experiments bore fruit, allowing the battalions to cover unprecedented amounts of ground. Jäger battalions had a true motorized transport column, but they also requisitioned wheeled vehicles (mostly wagons) as needed. These wheeled vehicles usually carried lame soldiers or the equipment of the soldiers who were marching, but nevertheless the wheeled vehicles did increase the mobility of the unit.9

**Landwehr Unit Quality**

The Landwehr formations in FWWC are typically rated as D quality units. These formations were highly trained as they were veterans of anywhere from eight to eleven years in the army. Quality wise this means that it would not be justifiable to rate them lower or higher than D quality, but these formations were equipped with obsolete equipment and rifles (since all the up to date equipment had to be sent to the massive reserve formations during mobilization), and the Landwehr combat ratings reflect this.

That said, Landwehr infantry unit quality in *East Prussia ’14* is identical to that of *France ’14* but with one exception: during the "early" East Prussia campaign only, which is the campaign in which the Russian 1st and 2nd Army are invading East Prussia and including the 1st Battle of the Masurian Lakes, Landwehr infantry units have a +1 step boost to their quality rating to represent a morale increase from defending Prussian homeland. In other words, rather than Landwehr infantry units having the standard D

---

9 *Zuber, The Mons Myth, 110-111. Zuber states that Jäger-Btl.7 was the only jäger battalion that received its motorized truck column "during the campaign". Since his book is about Mons and also covers Le Cateau, it is difficult to determine whether he refers to the "campaign" as the Battles of Mons and Le Cateau together (his topics in his book), or if he refers to something more extensive like the early campaign to the 1st Battle of the Marne. In this respect, it was decided that since it is known that all jäger infantry were taught to be self reliant, that they had a motorized column in their organization, and that they did acquire wheeled transport at every opportunity to increase their mobility, and that British historical accounts repeatedly mention aerial reconnaissance seeing truck borne jäger units during the 1st Battle of the Marne (in places which meant that it could not have only been Jäger-Btl.7), then it was decided that it was best to represent all of these German cavalry divisional jäger battalions as what could be best referred to as "pseudo motorized" units.*
quality rating in the early East Prussia campaign, they instead have a rating of C. This is justified because unit quality ratings also represent morale, so their higher morale of defending their homeland, areas in which they live and were mobilized from, effectually slightly increases their overall effectiveness. That said, the reason why this change was made in the first place is because it was necessary from a wargaming perspective in order to allow Landwehr infantry to perform historically, where they were frequently relied upon during the campaign to do limited front line fighting and to delay the Russian 1st Army advance. With the Landwehr infantry at their standard quality, they were unable to historically delay the Russians as they were being easily overrun by the slightly faster moving Russian infantry of the 1st Army.10

It is worth noting that although the Landwehr infantry do have a boost in quality in the early campaign, they are still poorly rated combat power wise, so the German commander should not heavily rely on them to hold back Russian first line troops for extended periods of time; this morale boost really only substantially serves to increase their movement speed and decrease their chance of becoming disrupted, which are both important in a delaying action. German reserve and regular infantry are still far superior to the Landwehr, but out of necessity the Landwehr infantry were frequently used to fight Russian first line troops in conjunction with regular infantry during the campaign (i.e. Landwehr-Div.Goltz near Hohenstein, bridging the gap between the I.RK and XX.AK), and they did so effectively. This morale boost helps replicate that historical effectiveness and reliability during the early campaign in East Prussia.

---
10 Since Russian first line infantry had a quality of C, they had more Movement Points than the D rated Landwehr infantry, thereby allowing the Russians to easily consume the Landwehr formations in their march to the west towards Königsberg.
Command (HQs)

The German "Hindenberg-Lundendorf" 8.AOK HQ has an extremely large command range. This was done to represent the unique dual (and in some cases triple, with Max Hoffmann) command relationship that existed in the army, when in reality the 8.Armee had multiple commanders and at least two different HQs which were located in various places throughout the campaign. This unique relationship allowed the 8.Armee to exert effective command and control over its forces which were spread out over long distances.

Elite Formations

In 1914, by far the most elite units in the German Army were the Prussian guards infantry formations. In the East Prussia and Lodz campaigns of East Prussia '14, the Germans have several guards infantry divisions which were transferred from the Western Front. In the full East Prussia campaign, the Gardereservekorps arrives as reinforcements, and in the Lodz campaign the attached 3.Garde-Div is available, also arriving as a reinforcement. Second in effectiveness is von Francois' I.Armeekorps, widely viewed as one of the best corps in the German Army in 1914, the other being the II.Armeekorps, the former recruited from Prussia and the latter from Pomerania.

Miscellanea

The HQ insignia for the German Army are insignia based on traditional military map symbols that denoted the size of unit. The colors are based on traditional colors used for the various Germanic states that made up the German Empire. The colors are mostly for artistic purposes, but they are for identification purposes and historical flavor.
Color codes:

Kingdom of Prussia: grey and black with white numerals
Kingdom of Bavaria: blue and light blue with white numerals
Kingdom of Saxony: green and white with grey numerals
Kingdom of Württemburg: red and black with grey numerals
Kingdom of Hessen: red and white with white numerals (black border)
Kingdom of Baden: red and yellow with yellow numerals (black border)
German Empire (multi): black and white with red numerals (grey border)
Minor kingdoms: black and white with gold numerals (grey border)

* * *
The Russian Army

Summary of Capabilities

The Russian Army of 1914 was not a complete incompetent horde as some popular post World War One books make them seem: it was trained and equipped and, as Russians almost always are, nearly infinite in number. Unlike other armies in Europe, the Russian Army had fully embraced the machine gun and howitzer; its machine guns were numerous, it fielded a respectable amount of howitzers, and a massive amount of field artillery. Russian infantry were also tough and effective, and extremely capable in the assault. However, the primary weaknesses of the Russian Army were in its nearly nonexistent logistics system, it's terrible command and control, and, like most aristocratic armies in Europe at the time, it's poor quality leaders. The poor logistics system is simulated as a low supply level (a level that would be more associated with a defending rather than an attacking force), and poor command and control and leader quality is
simulated with poorly rated HQ units which also have very short command ranges. Therefore, even though the Russian Army of 1914 is a formidable force on paper, essentially it is rotten at the core and this greatly degrades its overall effectiveness and limits its potential.

**First line infantry and overall effectiveness**

The Russian *first line* infantryman of the First World War was generally equal to that of most Western European armies of the period and the Russian Army as a whole was a capable force. The *first line* Russian infantryman was trained as well as any other soldier and he was well equipped with the Mosin-Nagant rifle, a sturdy and effective design that continued to be used throughout the Second World War. He was also adequately supported by a large number of regimental machine guns which were of the extremely effective modified Maxim design that continued to see service up until the Korean and Vietnam War. What failed the Russian infantryman was not his training or equipment, rather it was the previously mentioned non-functional supply system, a crude and egotistical artillery arm, and most importantly: poor command and control, and bad leadership.

In *East Prussia ’14*, the problem that will plague the Russian Army is not the quality of the individual *first line* infantry unit on the battlefield, rather the challenge is keeping these units in good order, in good supply, and in good condition despite all the other problems working against them. A successful Russian commander will, as much as possible, minimize the negative impact of all other aspects that serve to bring down the quality of the infantry battalions, thereby maximizing the power of the individual unit. However, the poor supply conditions, poor commanders, and low command radius HQ
units will make this extremely difficult. Any one of these elements will serve to drop the quality of the individual Russian infantry formation by one level, and if multiple failings exist, such as low ammo and out of command status, then the Russian infantry formations will suffer exponentially at the hands of a better supplied and better commanded force. In other words, if handled badly the Russian Army can fold like a house of cards but if handled well it can stand toe to toe with just about any foe.

The combat ratings of the Russian infantry were chosen for several reasons, but the primary decision was based on the values that helped battles play out along historical lines. Many values were tested, but in the end the values settled upon are those that provide the Russians with good firepower but increased vulnerability. Historically, and despite popular myth, the Russian rifleman inflicted heavy losses through effective rifle fire on the Germans on many occasions, most notably at Gumbinnen where von Mackensen's corps was so traumatized by heavy loss that it would psychologically limit the aggressiveness of the soldiers and leaders within that corps for weeks to come, but it was also true at Lahna-Orlau as well. In short, the Germans respected Russian firepower and given their good quality rifle, it makes more sense to rate them similar to German infantry in firepower. On the other hand, Russian infantry are a bit less effective in the defense to represent relatively poor quality leadership at battalion level and within the companies, and their propensity to use massed formations. Another reason the lower defense value was selected is because when, during testing, the Russians had a defense value equal to that of the Germans, the campaign digressed into a situation where it was very difficult for the Germans to make any progress, and it invariably bogged down after initial contact. For those that are familiar with *France '14*, the end result of all of this is
that Russian infantry ratings are somewhere in between early war French and German ratings. As mentioned, these Russian infantry ratings have a historical effect on scenarios, and in most cases the scenarios play out with the historical outcomes being easily replicated. The Russians, while of good quality and effective in the attack and (when backed up by their large machine gun companies) effective in the defense, they are still brittle enough to suffer a defeat and vulnerable to being driven off a piece of terrain if they are not used properly and if their command and control unravels.

Second line infantry

Russian infantry divisions above the serial number 52 were second line reserve divisions. These divisions were intended to only be used as rear area security forces and these are the Russian formations that most people tend to associate with the entire Russian Army of the First World War. These second line units did not so much lack trained men, rather, they lacked cadre and officers and "logistical necessities" that would otherwise make them combat effective.\(^{11}\) Also, without going into too much detail, there was a lack of trust and a concern for reliability in these second line formations which helped contribute to their lack of logistical support. For this reason, the Division HQs of these units are rated very poorly in quality, in order to represent this lack of effective leadership and logistics. The historic lack of non-commissioned officers and lesser training is represented by the infantry battalions being rated as D quality. Artillery attached to these second line divisions are also rated lower as there were no officers available to lead the battalions. In short, these divisions may be useful at garrisoning a rear area or a quiet section of the front and manning a fortified position along the line, but

\(^{11}\) General Staff, War Office. *Hand Book of the Russian Army 1914*, 34.
they were not much more functional than that. The reserve formations should certainly not be relied upon to hold valuable sections of the line since they will crack easily under pressure, and will be very difficult, if not impossible, to recover. Historically these divisions almost always disintegrated under pressure when they were relied upon to hold the line.

**Machine Gun Detachments**

Following their disastrous campaign in Manchuria in 1904, the Russian Army underwent extensive modernization programs. One of these programs which worried German war planners was their large scale adoption of machine guns. The Russian Army was one of the few European armies that integrated machine guns in massive numbers by 1914, essentially being the equal of the German Army in numbers and type, using basically the same Maxim designed weapon and employing them in large company sized formations. Each Russian infantry regiment had an eight gun machine gun company, two guns larger than their German counterparts. However, one shortcoming of these units was that in peace time the Russians adopted a system where each machine gun detachment only had enough personnel to man just two machine guns. Once mobilization occurred, these machine gun detachments would swell four times their size with reservists to crew the other six guns in the detachment, which meant that in peace time these units were only maintained at 25% strength and during war they consisted of 75% reservists.\(^\text{12}\) With the exception of the professional BEF, it is important to note that all European armies relied on reservists to fill peace time establishments to bring up their forces to war strength, but the percentage of the reservist mix was usually less than 50%. Given the

high percentage (75%) of reservists in the Russian machine gun detachments, this meant that the effectiveness of these formations were effectively reduced. This is important, because line infantry formations were typically composed of 50% reservists in all European armies and they could be quickly brought up to speed in terms of training and capability, but machine gun troops were much more technical in nature. Because of this, the approach was taken that all Russian machine gun formations in 1914 are one quality level less than their attached infantry regiment. This is similar to the quality reduction with Russian artillery units, although for a different reason. That said, this one level loss in machine gun unit quality begins to fade by 1915 however, since by that time soldiers would have been brought up to speed in terms of proficiency.

In 1914, since Russian machine gun units are one quality level less than their respective infantry regiment they support, this creates a dilemma for the Russian commander. On long advances, machine gun units will fall behind and the infantry will either have to stop and wait for them to catch up, or continue on without their support and hope that they arrive in time to assist. Essentially this creates a situation where the Russian commander should voluntarily decide to limit his advance to slower and more prudent advance rates, or throw out caution and risk over extending his position.

**Cavalry**

Although the Russian Army was a serious student of the American advancement of cavalry during the American Civil War, where the cavalry arm was advanced from more of a tactical breakthrough element to a strategic reconnaissance and raiding force, Russian cavalry of the period were arguably some of the worst cavalry in all of Europe. Although they had modernized their cavalry from the study of the American Civil War,
the cavalrymen themselves were generally poorly trained and unaccustomed to operating in large organized formations. In peace time the highest Russian cavalry formation in existence was the division, and given how spread out the empire was, these formations had very little experience in working with other divisions in training. The cavalry were also poorly led, generally by senior commanders who were either elderly and frail, or who had little energy or insight into how to employ cavalry to its maximum potential.

Their strength however was in their vast numbers and in the fact that their cavalry was a homogenous force, having been modernized to the point that they did not have specific classes (with the exception of the Cossacks, who were light cavalry and were primarily used for reconnaissance duties). This homogeneity also served as part of another weakness however, because unlike a well rounded homogenous modern cavalry force such as that employed by the Austro-Hungarians or the British, which were good at any task needed of them but a master of none, the Russian cavalry was essentially a pure force of dragoons (mounted infantry). Because of this, Russian cavalry were not particularly effective at *arm blanche*, cold steel mounted warfare; its main offensive effectiveness was based on dismounting and fighting on foot as infantry after contact with the enemy was made. This was primarily born from the fact that the evolution of Russian cavalry was based on their enemies on the southern and eastern frontiers of their empire, who were more vulnerable to mobile firepower than to massed charges.\(^{13}\) Needless to say, this put them at a serious disadvantage against enemy cavalry that were capable at mounted warfare, where the Russians would have to rely solely on their massive numbers and supporting assets to gain superiority.

\(^{13}\) Showalter, Dennis E. *Tannenberg 1914*, 147.
By 1914, Russian regular cavalry retained their class titles in their names for historical purposes only (Dragoon, Lancers, etc.). However, as mentioned previously these class titles were irrelevant in the tactical sense; all Russian regular cavalry were equipped with the same weapons and fought in the same manner regardless of unit name. The Cossack (irregular) cavalry were traditionally less equipped, less disciplined, and less trained than regular cavalry but they were useful in reconnaissance. For these reasons, Cossacks were generally used for screening, raiding, and reconnaissance, but very little else.

In *East Prussia '14*, the Cossack cavalry are unique. Historically there were three categories of Cossacks. The first category was made up of units maintained in peacetime and these were mostly the low serial number Cossack regiments assigned to the cavalry divisions. The second and third category Cossacks were activated at time of war, and these were the higher serial number Cossack regiments that were assigned to the army corps for scouting and escort purposes. In *East Prussia '14*, the first category units are identical in quality to standard Russian cavalry, but the second and third category units are rated as especially poor quality (for simplicity both the second and third categories are rated the same). As a whole, Cossacks have less combat power than regular cavalry, but they are faster and are effective at reconnaissance operations through the use of the recon spotting feature. As mentioned, the regular cavalry are considered to be of the traditional dragoon type in the sense that they have more offensive power, especially in regards to rifle fire, and quality but are not effective in the reconnaissance role (Russian regular cavalry in *East Prussia '14* are incapable of using the recon spotting feature). If you have played *France '14*, think of the Russian Cossack cavalry as the light
reconnaissance force similar to French chasseurs and German uhlans (although slower and almost totally ineffective at shock), and think of the Russian regular cavalry as being similar to the German and French dragoons (although, again, slower). The general lower quality of the typical Russian cavalryman of the period in comparison to Western European cavalry, combined with the homogenous yet still traditionally limited regular cavalry and the rough and mostly undisciplined Cossacks, served to be a limiting factor to Russian cavalry effectiveness in general during many campaigns of the Great War. This all combines realistically to make the Russian cavalry a difficult force to effectively employ.

Artillery

In the Russian Army, the command and communication structures at all levels were significantly below the standards of Western European armies. This was especially true of the command and control structure between the artillery and other arms.\textsuperscript{14} The problem was exasperated by arrogance and superiority in the artillery branch that often self inhibited artillery officers from effectively coordinating with infantry and cavalry, and this issue was most apparent in the field artillery, assigned to work directly with the infantry as a divisional asset. Because of this, all Russian field artillery are one quality level lower than they would normally be, which is usually one level below the quality of the infantry in the parent organization.

Also, as bad as it sounds, the Russians often chose to save their guns over their infantry. When it became even remotely evident than an infantry formation might be doomed, often the artillery would completely abandon them and escape to the rear. This

\textsuperscript{14} Showalter, 136.
was due to the value Russians placed on the guns over their own infantry. In *East Prussia '14*, you too may find that if your infantry formations are being surrounded, you may want to repeat this behavior by choosing to evacuate the artillery to safety and leave the infantry behind "in the lurch" in order to avoid losing valuable Victory Points for little in exchange. In a campaign, you can move these guns to safety by moving to the map edge to withdraw, or by moving them with another formation to operate, although less effectively since they will be detached.

In regards to Russian howitzer artillery units, they do not suffer from the one step quality drop mention above, however these units suffer an inherent weakness of a different sort: low numbers. Although the Russians were quick to modernize their army with the large scale adoption of modern field guns and machine guns, the Russians had debated the usefulness and cost of howitzers and this had retarded its adoption.\(^\text{15}\) By comparison to the Germans, the Russians had very few howitzers in 1914, although they did have more howitzers than some other European armies of the period however. Russian howitzer battalions had relatively few guns in total, and the battalions themselves were also few in number, being mostly corps and army level assets only, whereas the Germans employed howitzers at division, corps, and army level. This meant that Russian infantry were almost always without the desired fire support, because there was so little of it to be provided. Another weakness of Russian howitzer artillery was in their command and control, which had not developed as well as other armies of the period. Command and control problems are represented in scenarios by having smaller HQ radii which may cause howitzer units to become detached (see the "Command radius limitations (HQs)" section for more information) and is also represented with a lower

\(^{15}\) Showalter, 136.
artillery setup probability. In other words, Russian indirect fire artillery units may, on average, take a bit longer to setup than for the same units of other nations.

**Command radius limitations (HQs)**

More than any other belligerent in the FWWC series, the Russians must use HQ units to channel the focal point of an operation. On the offensive, move your HQ units to where they are needed in order to help drive the push forward in specific places and for all other places outside of their command radius you should, for the most part, keep those detached units on the defensive or at least not drive them so resolutely. You should then move the HQ units back and forth where needed to push forward on a broader front. On the defensive, move the HQs to the hardest hit part of the line. A successful German commander will try to attack on a broad front to throw the Russians into confusion and disorder, and a successful Russian commander will have to negate this as best as possible by confining the threat to small points in the line and using the HQs to shore up those hard-pressed areas.

All of this is especially true for brigade level HQ units, as you will have to push the brigade in an attack with its HQ in very close proximity in order to continue moving forward effectively. Moving the brigade HQ where it needs to be at the "hot spots" is key to maintaining the momentum in an attack and holding the critical parts of the line together in the defense. Unlike all other armies, think of the Russian brigade HQ as a sort of bonus that unlocks the full potential of their infantry, rather than a vital cog in the machine like it is in other armies. For the Russians, having the brigade HQ in the correct place is not so much a necessity as it is a bonus that boosts the effectiveness of their
infantry battalions, keeps replacements flowing at full strength, and keeps the infantry in good order.¹⁶

### Rennenkampf's cautiousness (random fixes and releases)

Throughout the East Prussian campaign, a unique problem persisted on the Russian side: Rennenkampf's 1st Army, after the first major exchange at Stallupönen and Gumbinnen, often advanced west at a snail's pace until it became obvious that something had happened to the Russian 2nd Army. Also, Rennenkampf's cavalry lacked initiative, spending a great deal of time sitting in place doing absolutely nothing (see the Battle of Gumbinnen as an example). The trouble with this historical flow of events is that in war game, hindsight is always perfect, and the Russian commander knows that it would not be prudent to be historically cautious with the 1st Army. Because of this, in the historical version of the East Prussia campaign there are a constant flow of fixes and releases for the Russian 1st Army. These fixes and releases are most severe with the 1st Army's cavalry formations, which are consistently fixed each day, and have a small individual chance of release in the morning, but this behavior also extends to the entire army too. In 0800 morning turns, the Russian 1st Army has a variable possibility of getting released, so it may just result the army getting fixed for a couple of turns at a time, or not getting released for several turns or, in extreme cases, several days. This variable release probability creates a high degree of uncertainty for the 1st Army, and requires the

---

¹⁶ This is opposed to the alternate game design approach where their brigade HQs would have further reach but, out of necessity, all Russian infantry would need to be D and E quality and their replacement rates would need to be much lower, both of which to keep the Russians from being too powerful. In the end, it was decided that the current approach with poor quality brigade HQs works best, because it forces the Russians to decide where the Brigade HQ is needed most where it can actively change the course of the fight in a given area, puts the brigade HQ in greater danger, and it helps keep Russian forces historically densely concentrated, and it also nicely represents the leadership problems within the Russian Army.
commander to react to this constantly changing situation, usually having to make do without reconnaissance from cavalry formations, or restricting the advance of the army in general, which were often historically the case during the campaign.

The 1st Army unit fixes begin on the days following the Battle of Gumbinnen. These continuous and variable fixes and releases end around September 1st, because it is rationalized that by the point in which the Russian 2nd Army was destroyed on that date, the situation was historically clear enough to Rennenkampf that he had to be more decisive, or by that point he would have made contact with the Russian 2nd Army. In other words, the end of August marks the point in which the Russian 1st Army is essentially "released" from the burden of Rennenkampf's historical cautiousness, one way or another. The Russian 2nd Army (Samsonov) does not suffer from this hindrance. Whatever the criticism of command ability that the academia loves to place at Samsonov's feet, he was, at least, not indecisive in the initial advance into East Prussia. The historical East Prussian campaign attempts to model these two different commander traits to keep the Russian 2nd Army constantly advancing and, as such, the greater threat, while the Russian 1st Army is a powerful but methodical and clumsy force that can be dealt with later.

**Samsonov's tragic suicide**

In the East Prussian campaign scenario, the Russian player has a Strategy/Operation based on the 2nd Army commander's (Samsonov) historic and tragic decision to commit suicide. Normally this would not be something I would put into a game, but it was felt that it should be present for historical purposes and mostly because
this historical action essentially cut the chain of command to what was left of the 2nd Army, and this is very important for game play. In the campaign, it was decided that this event would be based on a Strategy/Operation in the sense that if the user selects the historical outcome, then he will get reinforcements from Warsaw: the 1st Rifle Brigade and the elite 3rd Guard Division, but he will lose his army HQ on the 30th of August, at the historic time and date of his suicide. However, if the Russian player decides that the reinforcements are not needed, perhaps because things are going well and/or that the 2nd Army HQ is more important, then the other operation selections will not provide reinforcements, but the Russian player will not lose his army HQ either. This creates a dilemma for the Russian commander. If the Russian commander decides to keep his army HQ unit, for gameplay reasons the unit must still be withdrawn and redeployed so the user will need to decide where to redeploy the HQ. Consider the redeployment of the HQ as a chance for Samsonov and his staff to either sneak away to a new location, or to redeploy in a similar area to where he was before. Also, keep in mind that if the Russians decide to keep the army HQ, it will return at a higher quality to represent a more resolute Samsonov and staff, determined to gain control of the situation after passing his mortal trial.

Finally, this entire Strategy/Operation selection occurs on the 28th of August, however the specifics with Samsonov's HQ do not occur until the 30th of August. Needless to say, if the Russian commander plans on keeping his 2nd Army HQ, then he should keep in mind where he would like it to be four days from when he makes the choice. Also, it makes sense to choose the keep the HQ and forgo the reinforcements if the 2nd Army is doing well. If there is any concern that disaster may befall the 2nd
Army, then it might be preferable to choose the reinforcements, and go on the defensive in the south while the Russian 1st Army pushes forward.

Also, you may notice that Samsonov's HQ is better rated than Rennenkampf's HQ, and that is based on opinion after reading various sources outlining both commanders. The fact that Samsonov's army was destroyed and that he took his own life does not mean he was worse than Rennenkampf, rather the outcome was due more to the fact that he was isolated and defeated in detail, with no assistance afforded to him. Additionally, from a game play point of view, Samsonov's HQ has to be effective enough to provide enough incentive to actually create a dilemma as to whether or not his HQ should be saved in the Strategy/Operation selection. This incentive is further represented with his increase in quality and increased command radius when he returns, which is essentially a way of showing that he passed the crucial moment and got stronger from it.

**Samsonov and Rennenkampf's lack of cooperation (no attachments)**

Historically both Samsonov and Rennenkampf did not cooperate with each other during the course of the invasion of East Prussia which ultimately resulted in the destruction of the Russian 2nd Army, and the ejection of the Russian 1st Army from East Prussia. This historical lack of cooperation is represented in *East Prussia '14* by not allowing any attachments between those two armies: essentially they are unable to transfer units between each other during the campaign.

A popular theory as to why neither commander co-operated with each other during the East Prussia campaign is that during the Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905), Samsonov publicly accused General Rennenkampf of failing to assist him in the Battle of Mukden (a Russian defeat) and that they became bitter enemies ever since that moment.
Whether this contributed to neither army coordinating with each other in 1914, we may never know.

**Cossack Regiments (on loan from cavalry divisions) and corps level reconnaissance**

With a few exceptions, corps level Cossack formations are not present at the start of the East Prussia campaign due to the heavy mobilization burden of transporting the massive amount of horses, men, and fodder needed to field these units. Historically the advance into East Prussia commenced before most of the corps level Cossacks were in place, since the cavalry divisions had priority of transport and the corps level Cossacks were considered to be a luxury during August and September (the early stage of mobilization).\(^{17}\) To alleviate this, the Cossack regiments from the cavalry divisions were often loaned out to cover the axis of advance of the infantry corps. These loaned out units were not officially part of the infantry corps however, they were still part of the cavalry division, so naturally this created command and control issues which are presented in *East Prussia ’14* by these units being well out of range of their parent brigade HQ.

\(^{17}\) These loaned out Cossack squadrons may also appear in some of the smaller scenarios. For the most part, it is documented that the corps level Cossack formations began arriving by the beginning of September, when more rolling stock was being freed up.
Historically, it was documented that Cossack units advanced in front of the Russian 2nd Army's infantry formations.\textsuperscript{18} Since the corps Cossacks were mostly not yet available, it was decided that the Cossacks referred to were the on-loan Cossack formations from 2nd Army's cavalry divisions. This actually works out nicely because the documented Cossack units were mostly ineffectual, so the detached status helps represent this. The Russian commander in the East Prussia campaign can choose to keep these units where they are or choose to rejoin them with the cavalry divisions (or vice versa). However, the dilemma is that if the cavalry divisions move to the front of the advance, that is, if the cavalry divisions move to their Cossack formations, then the flanks will suffer. On the other hand, if the Cossack units are moved back to the cavalry divisions, then the infantry advance is blind.\textsuperscript{19}

\textbf{Wireless radio interception}

\textsuperscript{18} Golovine. \textit{The Russian Campaign of 1914}, 174.
\textsuperscript{19} It is worth mentioning that if in a situation where the infantry have no cavalry available to them for reconnaissance, then it was standard practice to send an "advanced party" in front of the advancing corps to prevent the entire corps from getting ambushed. The advanced party usually consisted of an infantry regiment and it would move forward several kilometers while the rest of the corps held back a bit and followed. You may find this tactic useful in situations were no cavalry is available.
By 1914 the wireless radio was not a new invention, it was being used in military operations as far back as the Russo-Japanese War in 1904. Almost every European power put wireless radios to use, and each power knew about the threat of having their own wireless transmissions intercepted. Actually, the message within the traffic did not have to be interpreted in so much that the volume and direction of traffic betrayed troop movements. Because of this, strong signal wireless radio traffic was kept to a minimum, with the armies instead preferring the use of secure "land lines". However, in the Russian invasion of East Prussia, the Russians were unable to maintain a network of telegraph wire through East Prussia, either through sabotage or unfamiliarity with the established German wired network. Thus, out of necessity the Russian Army in East Prussia took a risk of using wireless traffic to communicate with its subordinate units, and consequently risk being intercepted by the Germans, over the alternative of being unable to communicate with their subordinate corps and divisions.

Wireless radio intercept, which was a major factor in the historical campaign, is modeled in *East Prussia '14* as a possibility each turn that Russian high level HQ locations are reported on the map to the German side. What is useful about the rule in *East Prussia '14* is what is known about the wireless intercept map contact. Firstly, all HQs spotted by the wireless intercept rule in the FWWC are corps level and above (i.e. corps, army, army group). Secondly, the spotted HQ will have their basic details revealed in the unit card/portrait area and on the map icon, (as well as any other units in the hex with them, think of this as the HQ transmitting information about the units located at their position) and so this can be used to track specific troop concentrations and movements. Ideally you should follow up these map contacts with aerial reconnaissance missions, and
some basic note taking so you can keep tabs on Russian movement. At the very least the Germans can spot corps level HQs and have a very good idea of where Russian corps are concentrated, allowing the German commander to strategically react to them in such a way that the Germans should never be totally surprised about the unfolding situation.

Note also that, for the most part, all Russian army group (front) HQs have a very high command radius and are static (they cannot move). This further represents the use of wireless communications which sacrificed all mobility for a larger command range; essentially the reason they cannot move is because they are utilizing the high powered wireless facilities to transmit and receive information.

**Fragile Morale Nationality**

In *East Prussia '14*, the Russians are modeled as having fragile morale. This causes them to be susceptible to surrendering en masse when they are trapped and assaulted (when they are assaulted and cannot withdraw), and it makes them more difficult to recover from disruption and broken status when their units are detached from their parent HQs (outside of their command radius, and their unit names are in orange text). This represents historical outcomes and events where these armies were powerful, but for various deficiencies in command and unit quality they often chose to surrender when threatened with destruction, and their fighting formations often disintegrated or were very difficult to reform once heavy fighting commenced.

That said, keep in mind that elite formations of A and B quality units are immune from these effects as those formations were more reliable. Also keep in mind that when non-elite detached units are checking for disruption recovery, they are actually one less level in unit quality than they appear to be. So, if a unit appears as F quality, then it is
actually at "No morale". If any unit is ever at "No morale" then it will NEVER recover from disruption until it is at least F quality again. This means that Russian units with a base unit quality of D, E, and F will fall apart under stress and it will be very difficult for them to recover again since special care must be taken with reforming the units back together with their immediate HQ.

**Elite Formations**

Like the Germans, the most elite units in the Russian Army of 1914 were the Guard infantry formations. In the East Prussian and Lodz campaigns of *East Prussia ’14*, the Russians have the 3rd Guard Division, which is part of the Russian 2nd Army in both campaigns. The Guard is also present during the Lodz Campaign, as well as the very effective Grenadier Corps.

**Miscellanea**

The HQ insignia for the Russian Army are insignia based on traditional military map symbols that denoted the size of unit. The colors are based on traditional colors used for the various Russian states that made up the Russian Empire. The colors are mostly for artistic purposes, but they are for identification purposes and historical flavor. Green and gold was chosen for Russia proper, as two of the traditional Romanov family colors which appear on officer cockade pins.

Color codes:

- **Russia**: green and gold with gold numerals (black border)
- **Russian Turkestan**: green and red with red numerals (black border)
- **Grand Duchy of Finland**: green and blue with white numerals (black border)
Siberia: green and white with white numerals (black border)
Caucasus: green and white with gold numerals (black border)

* * *

* * *
The Austro-Hungarian Army:

The Austro-Hungarians play a small part in the Lodz campaign scenarios, and since they only a minor part in this title, this section is kept short and will be elaborated on in future First World War Campaigns titles where they may play a more dominant role. Suffice it to say, the Austro-Hungarian units in East Prussia '14 have just as much careful through and consideration behind their ratings and qualities as all other forces, and these units were created from ongoing work on another title.

Summary of Effectiveness

The Austro-Hungarian Army was extremely complicated, clumsy, and cumbersome, but it was an effective force when ably commanded. The Austro-Hungarian Army's primary draw back was its vast range of ethnic groups which it drew from within the empire, each of with their own level of loyalty to the dual monarchy and the army. Because of this, the quality of forces in the Austro-Hungarian Army varied immensely. For the most part German (Austrian) and Magyar (Hungarian), were just as capable,
reliable, and effective as infantry in other European armies, while infantry of less loyal ethnicities, such as Czechs and Slavic peoples were of very low quality and were often completely unreliable on the battlefield. Since the Austro-Hungarian Army usually had each infantry regiment as ethnically homogenous in nationality, it usually meant that the overall quality of a division, and of the Austro-Hungarian Army as a whole, suffered by the very fact that they were such a mixed bag when it came to fighting formations. One formation might be very effective, but its neighbors on the flanks might be unreliable and break under slight pressure, thereby leaving the reliable formation to fight a futile battle. In such circumstances, the only prudent thing to do would be the withdraw the entire force since the reliable unit's position was thus rendered untenable, consequently making it difficult to effectively coordinate and control a larger force on the battlefield.

By far the best aspect of the Austro-Hungarian Army though, other than its cutting edge siege artillery, was its cavalry arm. The Austro-Hungarian cavalry were modernized, well rounded, and had a proud lineage and tradition that dated back to the Thirty Years War of the 17th Century. Austro-Hungarian cavalry unit quality are some of the best in the FWWC series, but as with the rest of their army, their quality varies drastically depending on their ethnic composition which, like the infantry, was determined on a regiment by regiment basis. For the most part (and excluding "special" units), line cavalry regiments of two thirds German and/or Magyar composition are rated as B quality. Hungarian hussar regiments were considered to be some of the most elite cavalry in all of Europe, and as such, hussar regiments of at least 90% Magyar composition are rated as A quality. Cavalry of minor ethnic majorities are rated as C quality. Reserve cavalry are rated as D and E quality respectively, but these are not
present in *East Prussia '14*. The Austro-Hungarian cavalry's greatest weakness is that it was a finite force with very little capacity to replace its losses, and it was almost always greatly outnumbered by the vast, yet much lesser capable and lower quality Russian cavalry.

Luckily, for the Central Powers player, the Lodz campaign in *East Prussia '14* contains some of the more reliable and effective units in the Austro-Hungarian Army.

**Elite Formations**

In the Lodz Campaign of *East Prussia '14*, the best Austro-Hungarian units present are the elite Magyar ethnicity cavalry of HusarenRegt. Nr.6 and 16, in the 2.KavallerieDivision, which are part of KavallerieKorps Hauer. There are other German nationality cavalry within this same corps that have B quality which are also very effective as well. Another B quality unit is the Radfahrerbataillon (cyclist battalion) that was attached to the 7.KavallerieDivision.

**Fragile Morale Nationality**

In *East Prussia '14*, the Austro-Hungarians are modeled as having fragile morale. This causes them to be susceptible to surrendering en masse when they are trapped and assaulted (when they are assaulted and cannot withdraw), and it makes them more difficult to recover from disruption and broken status when their units are detached from their parent HQs (outside of their command radius, and their unit names are in orange text). This represents historical outcomes and events where these armies were powerful, but for various deficiencies in command and unit quality they often chose to surrender.
when threatened with destruction, and their fighting formations often disintegrated or were very difficult to reform once heavy fighting commenced.

That said, keep in mind that elite formations of A and B quality units are immune from these effects as those formations were more reliable. Also keep in mind that when non-elite detached units are checking for disruption recovery, they are actually one less level in unit quality than they appear to be. So, if a unit appears as F quality, then it is actually at "No morale". If any unit is ever at "No morale" then it will NEVER recover from disruption until it is at least F quality again. This means that Austro-Hungarian units with a base unit quality of D, E, and F will fall apart under stress and it will be very difficult for them to recover again since special care must be taken with reforming the units back together with their immediate HQ.

**Miscellanea**

The HQ insignia for the Austro-Hungarian Army are insignia based on traditional military map symbols that denoted the size of unit. The colors are based on traditional colors used for the various Austro-Hungarian states and kingdoms that made up the Austro-Hungarian Empire. The colors are mostly for artistic purposes, but they are for identification purposes and historical flavor.

Color codes:

Empire (mixed): grey and white with black numerals
Austrian/Hapsburg: yellow and black with white numerals
Hungarian: green and red with white numerals

* * *
General Notes

**Terrain, fields (farms), eastern front vs. western front**

For the sake of clarity, something must be mentioned of the "Field" terrain type. In *France '14*, the Field terrain type had a protection of -25% and a height in 3 meters, and a movement cost of 12 Movement Points. This made the hexes very defendable, and obstructed line of sight at ground level and somewhat slow to move through. The reason for that is because on the Western Front farms were heavy built up, densely packed, and usually consisted of many stone walled fields and walled chateau buildings that could act as formidable makeshift fortifications.

However, on the Eastern Front farms were generally flat and sprawling fields of grain, perhaps with a few dotted barns or an occasional wooden fence, but mostly just wide open fields. Because of that, the farm fields in *East Prussia '14*, and on the Eastern Front in general, only have a protection of -10%, a terrain height of 0 meters, and a non-mechanized movement cost equal to that of Clear terrain. This approach was taken for several reasons. Most importantly this allows non-mechanized movement to be unobstructed because, arguably, the same general rate of movement could be obtained across a large open field of grain as opposed to a wide open Clear hex which could contain any mix of intervening terrain features (in other words, "clear" terrain is not just nicely cut lawn grass). Secondly, it was desired that fields should not block line of sight, lest all battles on the Eastern Front would take place at one hex visible range given the abundance of field hexes. So, where it made sense to block line of sight with dense
Western Front farms, it didn't make sense for the sparse open pastures of the Eastern Front.

The effect of all of this is a fine balance. Eastern Front farms do not hinder non-mechanized movement, only provide a small amount of protection, and allow full lines of sight. Western Front farms are essentially the direct opposite: very costly to move through, provide a great deal of protection, and block all lines of sight.

**Winter snow vs. fall snow**

*East Prussia '14* includes a Lodz campaign that occurred in the late fall (November). Despite frequent snow fall, this campaign was historically extremely mobile because the snow on the ground was not thick enough to greatly hinder movement by this time of the year. A decision was made where snow conditions in the fall season are only a little worse on movement than normal conditions, thereby still allowing some sort of meaningful mobility. As mentioned, the idea here is the snow fall is just enough to cover the ground with snow and harden the ground itself, freeze the marshes and farms, but not yet thick enough from heavy snows that would be the case in the middle of the winter months. So, as far as preferred ground conditions are concerned in the fall season, normal conditions are of course best, followed by snow which is slightly slower, followed by soft ground, then mud, and finally frozen conditions where snow coverage is assumed to be much heavily accumulated. In the Second Masurian Lakes campaign which takes place in the dead of winter, the snow movement rates are those that have been now well established by other game titles and are more of what veteran Panzer Campaigns and Modern Campaigns series players are used to. In other words, in the actual winter season scenarios, mobility will be much more limited since snow movement conditions are
identical to soft conditions, since there is deeper snow on the ground, while the fall season snow scenarios are only moderately slower than normal movement.

**Attachments**

Veterans of either the Panzer Campaigns (PzC) or Modern Campaigns (MC) series may notice that attachments are handled differently in *East Prussia '14*. In *East Prussia '14*, attachments are made at army level, therefore, corps can be attached to different armies, and independent divisions and brigades can also be attached to different armies, but divisions cannot be attached to different corps. The decision to go with this type of attachment scheme was not an easy one to make. Evidence has shown that divisions were indeed transferred between corps and corps transferred between armies, however there was overwhelming evidence pointing to the fact that corps were reassigned amongst armies much more often than divisions were reassigned amongst corps. The fact is, most division parings remained the same amongst a corps, and when troops were needed elsewhere the entire corps was reassigned to another sector of the front, under another army’s command.

*Cavalry Units, cavalry tactics, and cavalry types*
Cavalry units in First World War Campaigns of 1914 represent the twilight period of cavalry in the traditional sense of the word. Most cavalry during this period still had its roots in Napoleonic warfare and were still training in the tactics of *arme blanche*. While cavalry met with some success on the more mobile eastern front, cavalry units on the western front had little usefulness other than dismounted infantry after 1914. However, during the fluid battles that were characteristic of 1914, cavalry were still used in their traditional role until the point in which the west front developed into a static line, devoid of any flanks.

Cavalry units in this series differ from anything available in the Panzer Campaigns series in that when they are in Travel Mode they are not classified as being in "travel mode" per se, rather they are just simply considered to be "mounted". From there it is assumed that when these units are "mounted" they would be able to move into charge.

---

20 *Arme blanche* is a French term which literally means cold steel. In this literal sense it refers to the use of thrusting or cutting weapons in battle. In regards to cavalry, it describes their sole traditional role: to be held back until the right moment as a decisive tactical striking force. In modern times this is often referred to as “shock”.
formation or column formation rather quickly, and they do not need to be micromanaged on when to do this. While this might seem like a rather abstract approach, it works nicely given the scale of the game. Cavalry can move rapidly and conduct charges while in their mounted Travel Mode state, or they can dismount and perform as if they were infantry.

Some cavalry units have specializations while others do not. However, this is said with reservation and depends on the nation in question, and the experiences they had at the time, and not necessarily related to the armament of the individual cavalryman.

During the First and Second Boer War in South Africa, the British were matched up against an opponent to which they were initially unprepared. The Boers, essentially Dutch farmers in South Africa, utilized fast mobile hit and run cavalry tactics where they relied exclusively on the carbine. Initially, Britain’s traditional cavalry were unable to deal with this threat until they switched exclusively to dragoon type tactics to match their foes. Following the war, several British military studies were conducted on lessons learned and how cavalry should evolve. Some advocated for no change in cavalry from its Napoleonic style because the Boers were hardly considered to be a similar threat that another European army would be. Others argued that with the modernization of weapons, the lance and saber needed to be discarded and that a single unified mounted infantryman type cavalry force needed to be made.

One of the first British tacticians to argue for a complete change in cavalry tactics and composition was Colonel F. R. Henderson. Colonel Henderson spent a considerable time studying the American Civil War and came to the conclusion that the Americans had "stuck the true balance between shock and dismounted tactics." Henderson pointed out that by 1861 firepower had become the dominant factor in battle, and the Americans had
adopted alterations to traditional cavalry tactics that were necessary to both counter and maximize firepower. Henderson believed that the true balance lay in the American's choice of mixing both fire and shock. The result was that by 1907 the British began modernizing their cavalry into a single homogenous force that was well rounded in dismounted warfare, marksmanship and shock tactics.

General Francois de Négrier was a Frenchman who had been an observer in the Russo-Japanese War. He believed that lessons learned in that struggle demonstrated the need for a change in the methods of cavalry as well. Similar to Henderson, Négrier was convinced from what he observed that cavalry needed to abolish the traditional distinctions among lancers, dragoons, hussars and the like in favor of a single robust cavalry force trained in both shock and fire tactics. However, he failed to reckon that the French would be the most reluctant of all to change. Despite his studies, France went into battle in 1914 with almost no change to the cavalry over their Napoleonic ancestors.

In Germany, one of the leading military writers of the pre-Great War period was General Frederick von Bernhardi and he had much to say about cavalry tactics of the future. Although he had strong faith in the value of dismounted action, he maintained that cold steel remained the chief cavalry threat on the battlefield. However, Bernhardi pointed out that modern cavalry should not rely exclusively on shock tactics, but instead should consider various methods of fighting to create a single homogenous force capable of both cold steel and dismounted accurate rifle fire. Like Négrier of France, he was to be a voice in the darkness. Other nations, such as the United States and Britain, seemed to pay more attention to their studies than their own armies did.
In the First World War Campaigns, specialized cavalry of the period were very similar to, and in some cases exact, Napoleonic period formations and were trained, or sometimes specifically equipped, for a certain style of combat. Lighter cavalry units such as Uhlans, Chasseurs and Cossacks specialized in reconnaissance, and were somewhat weaker in their shock capability than other types (the latter being nearly totally ineffective at shock). Some cavalry of the period were classified as "heavy" and consist of large men, sometimes wearing obsolete armor, and were mounted on large powerful horses. These heavy cavalry units were the Napoleonic equivalent of modern main battle tanks, and at the time of the First World War this was expected to still be the case. All of this translates into the cavalry unit ratings in First World War Campaigns; man cavalry units in the game have inherent advantages and disadvantages which determine when they should and should not be used.

The primary advantages of all cavalry is their mobility and, due to their mobility, their inherent strength in reconnaissance operations. Some cavalry have the ability to conduct the recon spotting ability, which is a unit command menu order that instructs the selected unit to expend movement points in an attempt to spot enemy units within their line of sight. This is useful when cavalry units

21 The French Cuirassiers of 1914 went into battle wearing their armored breastplates for traditional purposes and not for actual protection. The polished, shiny, breastplate was quickly covered with a brown cloth, and the breastplate was completely discarded by French cuirassiers by the end of 1914. At the start of the Great War, German and Russian cuirassier cavalry only wore their breastplates in full dress uniform for ceremonial or parade purposes.
are moved forward into areas that were not spotted at the beginning of the turn and helps you to avoid a blundering move into enemy forces. In game play terms, cavalry that have this recon spotting ability are the light cavalry units. These include, but are not limited to Uhlans, Lancers, Chasseurs, Cossacks, and the “modern” classless British cavalry units. These light cavalry units should be utilized in screening and reconnaissance, and should rarely be used in a full blown charge unless the situation is extremely beneficial to do so.

Another advantage of cavalry units is their ability to evade the enemy when mounted. When a mounted cavalry unit is assaulted, it will retreat (if possible) and avoid high combat losses. However, this is only true if all the defending units in a hex consist of mounted cavalry. These two advantages, mobility and evasion, combine to make cavalry extremely useful in a role of rear guard, covering a friendly infantry force’s retreat long enough to put a substantial distance between it and its pursuers, and then repeating this process as necessary. Perhaps the greatest advantage of mounted cavalry units is their ability to conduct a cavalry charge. Unlike other units, mounted cavalry only require 1/3 of their movement to conduct an assault, allowing them to make repeated assaults and to move almost to their full extent before assaulting. When mounted cavalry units conduct a charge, their assault rating is multiplied by four times its normal value, which, in the case of a charge en masse or in the case of a heavy cavalry charge, can result in an absolutely overwhelming result for the defender. As with every other assault,

---

22 “Mounted cavalry” are cavalry units which are in Travel Mode. See the User Manual for more information.
23 See the User Manual for more information.
the end result is of course due to the condition, size and type of the defending unit(s), and the terrain they are situated in.\textsuperscript{24}

The greatest disadvantage of cavalry units is their vulnerability when mounted. As with all other units in Travel Mode, mounted cavalry are more vulnerable to enemy fire than a deployed unit. As mentioned, Travel Mode for cavalry units is not representing that they are in column formation like standard units, instead it is an abstraction to represent that they are mounted on horseback and, because of this, a larger, much more vulnerable target. A poorly executed cavalry charge can have the opposite result that the attacker intends, and can leave the cavalry unit vulnerable to retaliatory fire on the enemy’s turn. Use cavalry charges with caution, the ability should only be used in a situation of either desperation or extreme advantage, not as norm; cavalry units should be husbanded and not wasted in futile cavalry charges. Part of the reason for this is their next weakness. Cavalry were an expensive branch of service to equip, maintain, and train; it took roughly three years to turn a man on a horse into an effective cavalry trooper. Because of this, regular (non elite) cavalry units received very little replacements, and elite cavalry units received even less. Strategically, cavalry of the period generally regarded itself as a one shot weapon, something that would only be used en masse and in force "when the time was right". The cavalry arm of all sides generally viewed itself as a force that would battle enemy cavalry on the flanks in sweeping battles where they would trade loss for loss, similar to trading knights in a game of chess, as they

\textsuperscript{24} For the class based cavalry of the early war, it is intentional that only the dragoon cavalry type has as hard attack rating. This was done because the dragoon is essentially mounted infantry, which have comparable ratings to standard infantry formations. This means that cavalry units of other classes in 1914 cannot assault fortresses, redoubts, bunkers nor armored cars. These cavalry units can push such enemies out of a hex if they are disrupted, but they are intentionally not sufficiently powerful enough to cause any other effect.
cover the flanks of the armies. Cautiously utilized cavalry as a reconnaissance force would obviously be around longer than a mass used as an offensive striking force, and this is partly why both sides shied away from committing massed cavalry in one huge decisive action. When a cavalry unit is decimated in the early period of First World War Campaigns, it will essentially be gone forever if it is an elite unit, or it will take a very long time for it to regain its strength if it is a regular unit. Also, the expense to equip and maintain the these units, as well as the high cost of potentially losing both the mount and rider, means that cavalry units are worth two times as many Victory Points as infantry formations. A successful cavalry commander of the period must always keep in mind that a cavalry charge which might cause a massive proportion of enemy infantry loss may carry with it a substantial loss of irreplaceable cavalry in the charge, possibly making the charge itself an exercise in futility. The infantry formation can usually, depending on the nationality and supply situation, recover and replace its losses with ease where as the cavalry unit cannot. In addition, the point value of friendly cavalry may actually turn out to be equal to, or higher than the loss inflicted on the enemy. The higher victory point value for cavalry loss makes the proposition of their use as stand in, dismounted infantry cannon fodder an expensive proposition; this option should only be reserved when combating and standing up against enemy cavalry formations that are

---

25 This is due to the fact that in the "early" period all regular cavalry units have a 1% replacement rate, elite cavalry units have a 0% replacement rate. In the "late" period (Race to the Sea and beyond), no cavalry units receive replacements, however at that point all units (cavalry and otherwise) begin to receive recovery. In the early period, the cavalry replacements represent the finite pool of troopers that were being trained but who had not yet completed training, or those who were being processed from the ersatz units. Recovery is set to 0% in this early period to represent the fact that both sides were on the move and had not yet established permanent rear area facilities to process stragglers and the treated wounded. The pool of treated wounded soldiers who could return to duty had also not accumulated yet. In the late period, the lack of cavalry replacements represent the "drying up" of the pool of replacements, and the start of recovery represents the fact that units began processing strength from losses at the start of the war (it represents a transitional period). See the user manual for the different between replacements and recovery.
employed in a similar manner. And finally, another disadvantage of cavalry units is that they cannot recover fatigue (rest) while they are mounted (in Travel Mode), they must dismount (deploy) before they can rest. All of these advantages and disadvantages create a dilemma where knowing when and how to utilize cavalry efficiently and effectively is a challenge, and a great deal of fun!

**Replacements**

Replacements is the strength recovery of a unit based on the individual unit's replacement rate that is applied in the Order of Battle. Replacements are in addition to the recovery rate (if any) which is specified in the parameters data. It important to familiarize yourself with replacements and how to get the maximum amount of replacements to your units. The most critical aspect of gaining replacements is the Local Supply Level. First World War Campaigns titles are meant to be played with the Virtual Supply Truck optional rule activated. By activating this rule, your supply levels can vary across the map depending on the location of the hex in relation to the nearest supply source that is providing supply to that hex. The replacement rate of the unit is directly influenced by the supply level, therefore if your units are located in an area with poor supply then you will receive a reduced rate of replacements. When the local supply is greater than 50%, you will receive 100% of the assigned replacement rate of that unit each turn, which is typically 3 or 4% strength for 1914. This might seem like a lot, but the supply levels decline a great deal by the end of 1914 and during the later periods of the campaign it is quite unrealistic to expect your units to have a > 50% local supply value level at all times. As your units advance and as the campaign progresses to the late period, the local supply level will drop and you will receive less replacements based on the local supply level. If a
unit has a replacement rate of 3% and is drawing on a local supply of 40%, then that unit will receive only 2/3rds of its maximum replacement rate (which would be 2%). The replacement rate is reduced even further (halved) if the unit in question is out of range of its parent HQ (detached). With this in mind, when resting units it is advisable to position them in range of its parent HQ and to position the units in an area that is getting a "good" supply level that is greater than 50% (this might require you to move the units out of a forested or swampy area and move them closer to a road or rail network).

**Infantry movement speed**

Early in the FWWC series, the regular infantry speed was set to 3 hexes per turn. Although this value was assigned with good intentions, it was later realized that it was too slow for early war period infantry which were relatively lightly equipped and had been documented as moving faster tactically, and it hindered the historical progress of some battles and campaigns on the Eastern Front. The original slower speed was certainly justified for the middle to late period of World War I, when what was termed "heavy infantry" were developed, but not for the early periods where mobility was paramount.

With that in mind, in the FWWC series the tactical speed of regular infantry in the early battles of this series was increased and set at a standard 4 hexes per turn, and light infantry unit speeds was set at 5 hexes per turn. This puts the non-light infantry speed in the early period at the same speed as the Panzer Campaigns series and it is rationalized that the early war infantry were as fast, and faster in the case of light infantry, as World War II infantry units, but they were of course lighter equipped and had much less firepower. Gradually these World War I infantry then became slower during the war (a

---

26 See the user manual for more information on Replacements.
speed value of 3 in game terms) as they were burdened with heavier trench warfare type weapons, thereby maximizing firepower but sacrificing mobility. Then, near the end of World War I, the Germans revolutionized infantry with the advent of assault infantry (Stoßtruppen) which balanced both speed and firepower with infiltration and small unit tactics. These assault infantry essentially became the grandfathers of World War II infantry, returning their mobility back to early World War I levels while still retaining most, if not all, of firepower of their mid-war predecessors.

**Lack of "Go On Foot" command**

Veteran Panzer Campaigns and Modern Campaigns players might notice the lack of the "Go On Foot" command in the Command menu. The reason for the lack of the Go On Foot command is because it was not desired that cavalry units be able to go on foot because, essentially, they could not abandon their horses in this way. They could dismount and move away from the horses, but they could not just totally abandon them; some of the personnel of that unit had to tend to them and keep them together, they could not just completely ditch them at the brigade HQ so their mobility, even when dismounted, must be restricted by where their horses can go. Cavalry units of the period were either foot type units, or they had horses, but not a combination of both.

That said, of course this also means that "motorized" units cannot go on foot either, but that too was desired because these units were not as flexible as true motorized infantry of World War Two, so it was thought to be a better reflection of warfare of the period to prevent them from going on foot. The short answer for why the Go On Foot command was removed in FWWC is simply to limit flexibility at this period of warfare.
Unit frontages, attack formation (1914)

A successful attack comes from knowing where and how to concentrate your forces. Typical German “by the book” attack formations of the period shed light on how you should concentrate your forces. In the attack, a German infantry regiment’s frontage was only 1 km wide, with the regiment deployed in depth. Depending on the situation, usually only one battalion would be in the front and the other two battalions would be in reserve, ready to relieve the front battalion, or ready to move forward to administer an assault. The infantry regiment’s MG companies were usually in front with the lead battalion, ready to deploy to provide a base of fire, as was the division’s field guns. The “book” attack frontage for a brigade was therefore only 2 km wide, the division was 4 km wide, and a corps was 8 km wide. It is easy to see how the Germans intended to concentrate as much force on a small area to provide for a sustained attack. The deployment in depth was a direct result of observation experience of the Japanese in the Russo-Japanese War in Manchuria. On the attack, the deployment in depth ensures that reserves can move forward to provide a fresh impetus to the momentum of the advance. The Japanese deployed on too broad of a front on the attack and did not have reserves in depth so their attacks frequently stalled. Of course, the situation did not always allow the book to be followed, but it does give the attacker a guideline to follow; attacking in depth should always be preferred to width in World War One. And if it can be spared, a defense in depth is almost an immovable force.

27 The “book” is referring to the 1909 Exerzier-Reglement für die Infanterie, the German infantry field manual.
On the attack, if you follow this strict frontage guideline where possible, then you should be able to use the front battalion to absorb fire and whittle away the defenders to get disruptions, then commit the reserve to assault and get a breakthrough. The key here is knowing when to commit the reserve for the assault and when to simply relieve the forward battalion to continue the attack by fire. The “book’s” decision point on when to commit the assault is in the cold calculated moment that the attack begins to suffer from noticeably less retaliatory fire, when it is discovered that they are disrupted or low on ammo or suffering from some other combat related stresses like high fatigue.

**Unit frontages, defense formation (1914)**

In the defense, the “book” prescribed that wider frontages could be the norm given that a defending force could spread out and still effectively hold ground. The frontages were essentially doubled in the defense, with a regiment usually holding a 2 km front (two battalions on the line, one in reserve), a brigade holding a 4 km front, a division holding an 8-9 km front and a corps holding a 16-18 km front. As mentioned, if it can be spared, a defense in depth is obviously preferred over width. It is important, much more so than is true in the Panzer Campaigns and Modern Campaigns series, to keep track of enemy formation names on enemy units with Fog of War on. In other words, you should keep a careful eye on enemy unit’s organizational names in order to determine if the defender is spreading himself too thin. It cannot be stressed enough that this can be a revealing sign on where to strike. The same is true if the roles are reversed, if you can determine that an enemy division or other formation is spread out, then you will know where you do not need to concentrate your reserves. During this period of warfare, extensive records were kept on enemy formation locations to ascertain strength.
and intentions; an effective commander in First World War Campaigns should do the same.

**Forts**

Forts come in two types: strong and weak, or in game terms, vacated and non-vacated. In the game rules, any vacated fortification is one half the normal defensive bonus applied to the fortification. The actual size of a particular fort in no way translates into the defense value of the fort, nor whether or not it is considered to be a “strong” or “weak” fort at start. Several factors are considered when determining if a fort should begin the game in a vacated status.

So, what is the rationale behind the placing of fortification types? In most cases fort strengths, whether they are vacated or not, are determined mainly by how long they historically held out in bombardments, as mentioned above. In most cases the actual size of the fort is ignored in terms of defensive ability, with the size only determining how large the garrison and gun battery is. In some cases more capable forts will also have higher quality defenders. However, as a general rule, the following guidelines are applied:

**FORT:** The most capable of forts. These were modern constructions that usually were equipped with gun turrets and modern guns but this is not always true. The most capable forts were elaborate constructions that were quite impenetrable, before the world witnessed the power of Big Bertha and other massive siege guns of course.

**Fort:** Lesser forts, either of stone construction or because they had less capable defenses either through neglect, or obsolescence. Within the rules of the game, this also represents destroyed or damaged capable forts (vacated).
REDOUBT: Redoubts, ouverages, small forts or any lesser fortification made of concrete (above or below ground). This could be equipped with guns or gun turrets but most often only contained a garrison of infantry.

Redoubt: Citadels and obsolete forts (ancient fortresses) or destroyed (vacated) redoubts. These are usually scattered across the map and are no longer garrisoned or equipped with guns.

BUNKER: Earthen bunkers and trenches.

Bunker: Primitive or damaged or destroyed (vacated) bunkers.

In cases where a supply source is present on a fortification hex and there is no fortress gun unit (static), or fortress battalion unit present then a small, static, garrison unit of less than 100 men will be present. The more capable fortified zones will also have an HQ assigned to the garrison and the less capable zones will need to rely on the currently assigned Army HQ radius for command. The sole purpose for these small garrison units is to man the fortifications and keep an accidental move that would vacate the fortification from occurring, from a user moving a unit into and out of a FORT or REDOUBT hex, and to keep LOS to such fortification hexes and make them easy to find. The SHIFT key can also be used to locate fortifications as the positions of all forts are pinpointed with labels.\(^\text{28}\)

It is important to note that fortresses in general are abstractions. Given the amount of forts located in Europe, not every single fort has been placed on the map. Only the most important ones are present and, in the case of obsolete forts, only the ones that were temporarily used for refuge or were used for landmarks are present.

\(^{28}\) The exact locations of fortresses of the period were well known to both sides. It is intentional that the enemy can note fortress locations that he does not have LOS to by using map labels.
Trenches and Improved Positions

The trenches that were dug in 1914 were extremely primitive. These early field works were simply nice straight and narrow ditches that were rarely continuous and barely capable of covering a standing man. There were no traverses, were severely overcrowded, and were extremely vulnerable to artillery fire. Many of these early trenches were the graves of many soldiers as nearby exploding artillery fire collapsed the walls and buried the men alive as they knelt for protection. For this reason, trenches in *East Prussia '14* do not have the high defensive ratings as they in no way represent the more elaborate trenches constructed out of experience in the later years of the war.\(^{29}\)

Improved hexes represent the piling of debris, manmade or natural, to create a more defensible position. It also represents a hastily dug scrape in the ground or the simple act of creating a concealed position. An alternate term for these positions might be "breast works".

\(^{29}\) The elaborate trenches that most people characterize as standard World War I trenches did not come into existence until mid 1915 and early 1916, after both sides obtained substantial entrenching experience.
Given the low entrenching value, it is the designer's intent to mainly allow improved positions to be built, with it taking a lengthy amount of time to construct a primitive trench. Engineers will be vital in order to speed up the process and make it more likely to successfully construct fighting positions. This decision is primarily due to the lack of training, doctrine or entrenching equipment that resided in the line units of 1914. This would of course change drastically in the following years.

**Heavy Machine Gun Units**

Note: "Heavy machine gun" and "machine gun" is referenced interchangeably elsewhere in the notes document but all refer to the "heavy machine gun" units that are described in this section.

It was a tedious process to determine exactly what kind of combat factors heavy machine gun units of the period should have. But before this is discussed, it is important to understand that the term "heavy machine gun" differs from the modern terminology. The term today usually refers to a heavy barrel machine gun of 12.7mm (aka. .50 caliber) or higher. However, in the early 1900's, it referred to a machine gun which was on a heavy mount to stabilize the weapon in which to provide it with a stable firing platform. Unlike World War II and later periods, the ratings for these heavy machine gun units had to be completely different and in a class of its own. The manner in which heavy machine guns were employed in an artillery type
role, combined with the limited infantry tactics of the day, results in a period where the heavy machine gun reigned supreme and necessitates that they be completely separate units, not factored into infantry battalion combat ratings. The result is a unit with combat factors that greatly differ from anything in the Panzer Campaigns or Modern Campaigns series.

The source of the formula that determined their combat ratings was based in professional military studies of the period. These historical studies calculated that one heavy machine gun was essentially worth the firepower of approximately 60-100 rifles, with the more consensual figure being around 80 rifles. This estimate was a cold harsh calculation of firepower versus the rigid early war infantry tactics and effectiveness of the day. Maxim and Maxim copy heavy machine gun soft attack and assault strengths are derived from calculations based on number of weapons per element in question, compared to the soft attack strength of an average infantry battalion in the order of battle by using a ratio of 80:1, which is determined at the maximum effective range to target. Specifically, the rating at two hexes is \((A \times E \times R) / M\), where \(A\) = average infantry Bn soft attack [2.5], \(E\) = per rifle estimate [80], \(R\) = range value denominator [3], \(M\) = number of men per heavy machine gun [15]. In other words, the heavy machine gun units have a standard attack strength directly based upon their 1914 firepower effectiveness estimate at 2,000m range. This base rating is then adjusted higher or lower to represent various different types of heavy machine guns, with the Maxim and Maxim copy being the median. The resulting high, almost artillery like, rating makes heavy machine gun

---

30 The average infantry battalion soft attack rating is 2.5, which is an average of the Gewehr 98 [2] and SMLE [3] equipped infantry soft attack ratings.
units particularly deadly during this period in the history of warfare, but a cumbersome and slow to deploy unit that is only really useful in the defense.

Deciding on the number of men per weapon was a serious headache. The idea initially was to convert these units into gun type units and avoid the issue altogether but it was decided that is more accurate to have crew casualties than it would be to have losses jump in increments of guns. This makes heavy machine gun units more effective and increases their survivability.\(^{31}\) The strength in men of the heavy machine gun unit is derived from an average so as to maintain a consistency regardless of any small variance in crew strength between the different nationalities. The actual number of men assigned to physically operate the weapon was usually six, regardless of nationality. However, there were additional soldiers that were assigned to the crew that had nothing to do with its direct operation but were still vital to the function of the heavy machine gun such as range takers, ammunition carriers, gun captains, layers, loaders, assistant loaders, and so forth. When all of these operators are taken into account, the number of men per weapon rises to approximately 15, with an average of 30 men per heavy machine gun section. This entire crew of men assigned to the heavy machine gun's direct and indirect operation would have been utilized to maintain and operate the machine gun if attrition took its toll. Therefore, in the order of battle, for every 15 men in a heavy machine gun unit there is one heavy machine gun present, so the smallest unit consists of 30 men.\(^{32}\)

**Field Guns, direct versus indirect fire**

---

\(^{31}\) This increased survivability is especially true for the smaller two gun section sized units. See the User Manual for more information on combat resolution.

\(^{32}\) The smallest machine gun unit is a section, therefore 15 men per gun, two guns per section, 15*2 equals 30 men.
Historically, field guns such as the German 7.7cm FK 96 n.A. field gun were in fact capable of utilizing low trajectory indirect fire by first determining the bearing to the target, and then determining the elevation using a "sight clinometers" to set the appropriate height. The round was then fired at such a trajectory that it flew in a low arc to the target, allowing them to fire over the heads of their own troops. This left a tough dilemma of sorts to be decided on whether these low trajectory indirect fire capable guns should be allowed to fire true indirect fire over hills and built up terrain or whether they should be restricted exclusively to direct fire only, leaving indirect capability to howitzers. The reality is that neither approach would be correct, leaving a situation where the lesser of two evils approach had to be taken. With that in mind, it was felt that these guns should be limited to direct fire only, at least in the early period of the war until the employment of the guns and the guns themselves changed. Where the conflict was mobile in the early period of the war, it was felt that it would be more correct to restrict these low trajectory guns to direct fire only in order to allow their true destructive potential to be achieved when using line of sight firing, and to allow them to be quick firing (three immediate direct fire shots versus one single "barrage" that has to be plotted with a delayed delivery).

**Machine Gun and Field Gun Unit setup**

In First World War Campaigns, a design approach was taken which requires machine gun and field gun units to expend their full movement point to exit from Travel Mode. These units only require 1/3 of their movement allowance to enter Travel Mode though. This approach was taken because this requirement to exit from Travel Mode represents the actual setting up of these units into firing positions. This setting up
involved setting up the guns themselves, stockpiling and preparing ammunition, and communicating with their local HQ. All of these required a substantial amount of time to do when taken as a whole, and this process left the unit vulnerable the enemy until it was completed.

The primary reason for this approach is game play considerations on how these units were historically used. By requiring a full turn to exit from Travel Mode, it puts the advantage of these units squarely in the hands of the defense, which is where these units excelled. These units can enter Travel Mode quickly and move away to another position, but any attempt to use these units as a leading force in an attack will intentionally subject them to enemy fire before they have a chance to deploy (since one turn must be spent in Travel Mode). This also means that these units are extremely vulnerable to counter assault by the enemy and especially vulnerable to enemy cavalry in general. In other words, if the attacker intends to move these gun units adjacent to the enemy as some sort of driving force, they can certainly choose to do so but it will come with a consequence. These units should always be accompanied by friendly infantry to protect them from assault, and the guns should expect retaliatory fire on the enemy’s turn. It also means that this vulnerability discourages these units from being able to race forward alone to a strategic location (such as a crossroads) in order to quickly plant themselves as an immovable force. This all contributes to “influencing” a more historical use for these units.

In the offensive, care must be taken with their employment so as to not subject them to too much enemy fire as they move forward. It also means that once these units are setup and rooted to the ground, you should avoid moving them unless they are
completely out of range with the enemy. Ideally, the “safe” approach would be to move these units forward to a standoff range of two hexes from the enemy, in order to safely avoid the most harmful retaliatory fire, then deploy into this hex in order to lay down disrupting fire before your infantry moves forward for the assault. If you, as the attacker, intend to be bold and bring these units up as a killing force, then you must contend with the drawback that you will ultimately lose valuable guns and men to enemy fire, and this is especially true if you decide to mass multiple such units into the same hex. You will also inherently accumulate a large amount of fatigue in the process and possibly get them disrupted as well. The defender could then wisely choose to fall back once these units have deployed, thus requiring you to move forward and repeat the same bloody process again, trading the strength of these valuable units for ground.

On the defensive, when being pursued by an enemy, you would want to use these units to move rearward, picking out your key defensive points, and screened them by friendly infantry to keep the enemy away from the machine guns and field guns until they deploy. Once these machine gun and field gun units are deployed, the screening friendly infantry should retire onto them to form the main line of resistance. As the main line gives way to enemy assault, these field gun units and machine gun units should be the first to fall back to their next position where the process repeats if necessary.

Towed Gun Limitation (stacking)

First World War Campaigns has a new feature where limitations are set on exactly how many Towed Guns can be deployed in a single hex. Towed Guns consist of all manner of artillery units, as well as machinegun units. The rationale behind this limiting is that there was a practical limit on the number of guns that could be deployed
in any one given area. This practical limit was based on the fact that the guns needed room to operate effectively, and the fact that it was very difficult to supply large concentrations of guns with the amount of ammunition they would require to be effective. The engine places a limit on the number of guns that could be effectively employed in any given hex, requiring the excess to remain in Travel Mode. Naturally this limit exists primarily to place guidelines on historical behavior and to prevent the creation of "super stacks" of guns. It is important to note that Towed Gun type units in Travel Mode do not have to abide by the Towed Gun stacking limit, these Travel Mode units reference the Towed Gun stacking limit once they attempt to deploy from Travel Mode. So, while the guns remain in travel mode, they are subject only to the normal stacking limits.

It is advised that the user examines the Parameter values under the Help menu (or by pressing the F4 key) and see what the Towed Gun stacking limit is, keeping in mind that one gun is equal to 10 men.\textsuperscript{33} It is certainly possible to subject your Towed Guns to unnecessary fire by moving a quantity of guns to one location, only to find out (after the enemy conducts their next turn of retaliation) that the number of guns you moved to that hex is in violation of the Towed Gun stacking limit. In this case you will only be able to deploy a portion of the guns and should move the rest away to another position. The current Towed Gun limit is quite generous and historically accurate, so it is not very likely that you will violate this limit unless your field gun units are stacked extremely dense.

\textit{Brigade and regimental HQ units}

\textsuperscript{33} For example, a Towed Gun stacking limit of 450 men means that 45 guns can deploy in a single hex, or any combination of guns and machine gun units that will equal that amount.
Unlike in the Panzer Campaign's series where regimental and brigade HQ units usually provide more flexibility to a division, in the First World War Campaigns series it has a different effect. Given the rather strict command system in this series where units that are out of command suffer a one step loss in morale, brigade and regimental HQ units, with their small command radius, intentionally restrict a division's effective “foot print”. This is necessary to properly represent the rigid command structures present during the First World War and to keep a division from being too intermixed which would allow a player to put battalions and MG units anywhere they are needed. A user can still choose to do this, but there are consequences if the units being "shoved into the breach" are outside of their parent brigade's range (they will not perform as effectively as they normally would). The relatively small command ranges of brigade and regimental HQs can prove to be an Achilles heel to the entire structure. If one such HQ unit is eliminated or disrupted then the entire chain is affected and attacks and defenses could falter. If, for example, you cut off the head of a division then all brigade HQs will most likely fail their command checks, which could affect their command radius or replacement and recovery levels. The command structures during this period were not at the level of capability where small units were able to operate on their own initiatives. In later war scenarios this will gradually begin to change with brigade and regimental HQ units getting a larger command radius, or possibly being removed altogether to allow greater flexibility.

When moving brigade and regimental HQs you should keep them as close to their subordinate units as possible but also out of danger as much as possible. You do not want to risk losing the HQ unit in a fight, but it is a balance between risk versus maintaining an
effective link with your units on the battlefield. Front lines can be penetrated and HQ units overrun to great effect, possibly routing or disrupting a larger force when they are further pressed.

**Off map HQ units with 0% arrival**

In some scenarios there are supreme HQ units, such as the Russian Northwest Front HQ; which have a 0% chance of arrival. Any scenario where an HQ unit is scheduled for a 0% chance of arrival on 1 January 1914, is an intentional representation that the higher HQ is out of range and remains out of range of the units that are depicted in the scenario. These out of range HQ units usually show up as arriving in one of the corner map hexes and, in most cases (but not in every case), are labeled as “out of range” to serve as a reminder of this fact. Given how the engine works, if a higher HQ is not present on the map nor scheduled as reinforcement then it is assumed that the higher HQ is off map but within range of the units on the map. By placing the HQ as reinforcement with 0% chance of arrival, it effectively breaks the link between the units on the map and the scheduled HQ unit, which represents the fact that this HQ units was very far away from the battle area.

**Congestion Markers, the use of**

Throughout the scenarios in the East Prussia area, congestion markers are used to represent civilians fleeing the war and, more importantly, their associated debris that they leave behind. This congestion only affects the Russians since it is understood that this horde of fleeing civilians would be immediately in front their advance, however the congestion can be removed after 8 turns (one day) of occupation. This congestion is present on most of the major road intersections (where at least two roads merge into one, from east to west or south
to north -- not where they diverge from those directions), and at secondary roads where four roads meet in one place in the most densely populated areas (although this is not always the case). Plan your movement accordingly to avoid these congested places if possible. However, congestion does not occur within ~15 km (or so) of the frontier, as the number of fleeing civilians would be drastically less because the frontier was sparsely populated. Congestion also becomes noticeably less frequent the further west on the map the area is, due to the fact that the fleeing civilians would gradually dissipate along the road network as they continued to move west.

**Engineer units, minefields, obstacle and rubble clearing**

During the early part of World War I, neither participant utilized mines or constructed minefields to a large degree. To a large extent mines were something that was known about, as Imperial Germany created the first modern fused land mine in 1912, however they were not widely used at this point on the battlefield. It was not until around 1917 that minefields began to see widespread use, particularly during the battle of Passchendaele of that year. From this point onward it is still not accurate to allow engineer units of this period to lay minefields or obstacles within the scope of a scenario; they were instead something that was only put into place over a long period of fortifying. The same is true of clearing obstacles and mines. Obstacles tended to be extremely thorough forms of barbed wire, which were arrayed in hellish and elaborate concentric belts. During the duration of a scenario, it was only possible to cut through them for a passage lane. These wire constructions were so elaborate that it would be impossible to completely clear the area within the scope of a several hour turn.\(^{34}\) Also, accurate and

\(^{34}\) The obstacle counters in the First World War Campaigns series represents the most elaborate wire obstacle constructions of the period, and not the often erected single strand obstacle. Unlike the Panzer
thorough mine clearing, also known as demining techniques, were not adopted until World War II, particularly with the invention of the electronic mine detector in 1941. With the exception of some units, "mine clearing" during The Great War was almost strictly limited to engineers clearing and maintaining passage lanes. In game play terms, this means that engineer units in the First World War Campaigns series do not have the capability to lay mines nor clear obstacles or minefields. It is decided that these traits are largely absent from engineer units until the battles covered in the Panzer Campaigns series.

Engineer type units are also the only units that can destroy rail lines and ferries, which is different from both Panzer Campaigns and Modern Campaigns. This was done because the line units of the period did not yet carry the demolition equipment required to conduct these tasks. It was also a desired change so that every unit in the order of battle was not capable of destroying these features, which would result in an a-historical widespread destruction of rail lines, and it also places greater value on engineer units.

There are documented cases where some engineer units in The Great War constructed boats or rafts and ferries friendly troops across the river. However, it is undesirable for engineer units to be as flexible as they are in the Panzer Campaigns, where engineers in that series can ferry infantry across rivers. The ferry ability for infantry in First World War Campaigns was removed because it was felt that, in the cases where infantry were ferried across the river, this is adequately represented by having a bridging engineer unit construct a bridge, and these rafts and boats were usually constructed by the engineers that had bridging capability. In most of the documented

Campaigns or Modern Campaigns series where obstacles usually represent a hasty abatis or several strands of rolled wire, the most elaborate wire obstacles of the Great War were elaborate and complicated constructions that could not be easily cleared and removed.
cases of engineers constructing rafts or boats, it took these engineer units a lengthy amount of time to construct such devices which would be represented by many turns. However, if engineers retained the Panzer Campaigns ability to ferry troops then they would become too effective since they would be able to move to and send infantry and cavalry across a river in the span two turns at most. The rapid engineer troop ferrying capability is more of a characteristic of "blitzkriegesque" modern warfare, not a characteristic of warfare of the early 1900s.

Engineers of this period also do not have the rubble clearing capability that they have in Panzer Campaigns and Modern Campaigns. The rationale is that these units during this period did not have the heavy equipment that "modern" engineer units had and were therefore unable to clear rubble during the course of a single scenario or campaign. This is especially true given the massive mounds of rubble that were formed from entire towns being flattened in the artillery barrages of war.

It was decided early on that only engineer units that were company sized or larger should be included in the order of battle. This means that the detachment and platoon sized engineer units of the German and Russian cavalry divisions\(^{35}\) are intentionally omitted from the order of battle. This was done primarily to cut down on counter density and the amount of units that the user must manage in relation to their actual usefulness. These small units would, historically, provide menial tasks to the division such as providing at least some sort of minimal fortifying asset. On the other hand, division level bridging detachments are included in the order of battle, but given that they were so small, they are not represented by an explicit unit. Instead, these divisional bridging detachments, if present, are represented by giving the division level engineer unit the

\(^{35}\) German engineer platoons (in the cavalry divisions) consisted of 90 men respectively.
bridging capability, resulting in a hybrid bridging / pioneer type unit. These units are capable of deploying a bridge, but the corps level bridging train units are better at this task since they can construct it quicker (the division level bridging units are small units). This approach works well since it makes the actual bridge / pontoon bridging units better at constructing bridges, while still maintaining a minimal bridging capability at bridging level. It must be noted that the Germans had exceptional bridging capability with every division formation containing its own bridging detachment. One the other hand, the Russians had very little bridging capability, relying almost entirely on army level bridging assets, which must be treated, by the Russian player, as pure gold (i.e. keep them extra safe).

**Stacking limits**

In *East Prussia '14* it may be notice extremely high stacking limits. A balance is struck between maximum physical space and maximum practical space. Also, the area stacking and road stacking limits are intentionally not a straight 3:1 ratio in relation to each other.

Area stacking: Assuming that, for the sake of simplicity, a soldier with ruck sack takes up approximately a 1 square meter area. Within a 1,000 square meter, there could physically exist about ~10,000 soldiers. This would obviously be quite outrageous. In 1914 unit formations, the appearance tended to resembled that of a Napoleonic unit so a large amount of men must be allowed to stack in one hex: much more than previous games allowed. Tactically, and with some exceptions, soldiers certainly did not march arm in arm in dense formations of infantry as their Napoleonic ancestors did, quite the

---

36 Historically the bridging detachments were indeed attached to the division level engineer units and did not operate on their own.
contrary, they operated loose skirmisher formations. However, small unit tactics that characterize modern infantry tactics did not yet exist, and tactical command and control was still as crude as it was during the Napoleonic Wars. For this reason, despite the fact that individual infantry had about two meter intervals between them, in skirmish formations infantry still had to remain relatively close together, in long ranks with subsequent ranks following one after the other, rather than small groupings of squads which characterize modern warfare and the “assault” infantry of late World War One. With this in mind, it was decided that the stacking limit should be less than one half of this "physically possible" approach, with the maximum area stacking at ~4,200 men per hex. This still might seem like a lot of men, and certainly is, but this is the extreme case and you will likely pay for high stacking with horrendous losses due to stack density.

Road stacking: Road stacking is a rather unique situation in this series. The battlefields of World War I did not have the same level of threats to rear areas like that of World War II or modern times, so units tended to move in what could be called "parade ground" columns. Around the period of World War II, infantry began to move in tactical columns along the sides of the road with substantial intervals to avoid air interdiction. However, in early World War I this threat did not exist and units would move along the road in massed, dense columns. Where it might be completely outrageous to take the maximum physically possible approach to area stacking, it is not so outrageous when it comes to road stacking since these units tried to keep the column as short as possible. In the above example of a soldier taking up a one meter square area, this means that you could fit approximately 1,000 men in a file across a 1,000 meter long road. Units tended to march in three to four files so this would mean that you could fit 3,000-4,000 men
along a 1,000 meter stretch of road. For the sake of generosity and the fact that companies often marched with a slight interval between them, this has been lowered to a road stacking limit of ~2,600 men.

In both cases, care should be taken so as not to provide too dense of a target to the enemy. Only stack more than one infantry battalion in a hex if there is a low threat level to that hex, or only if it is absolutely necessary to do so.\footnote{It may be beneficial to stack several infantry battalions or cavalry regiments in a single hex when conducting an assault, but overstacking will cause high losses to opportunity fire or on the enemy’s next turn.} In most cases it is advisable to have one infantry battalion deployed adjacent to the enemy to disrupt them and two behind it in order to execute an assault if need be.

\textit{Road march column lengths, historical vs. gameplay (road stacking limits)}

The actual length of division columns on the march is well known, particularly due to knowledge gained from training and doctrinal handbooks from the period. However, students of the subject may noticed that the stacking limit in FWWC essentially allows division and corps to require roughly half the length of road required for road marching.\footnote{The documented historical length of road required for road marching were:} Stacking limits are historically a problem in wargame design in general: as a designer do you model what is physically possible or do you restrict what is possible to what was typical?

The reason for the difference between game and historical levels in FWWC is because, as far as can be determined, the historical figures do not quite represent the shortest possible column length, rather they appear to represent typical column lengths

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{Cavalry Division:} 9 1/2 km
  \item \textbf{Infantry Division:} 13 km
\end{itemize}
which would have allowed for flexibility and would have kept congestion to a minimum, allowing for two way movement along roads to be possible. In FWWC, once the road marching commences, a division will inevitably begin to spread out to the typical road march column lengths above over time due to terrain and the different types and speeds of units within the formation. This essentially means that the historical road stacking limit would be 1300 men per hex, while game "maximum physical" road stacking limit is twice that at 2600 men per hex.

Although everything is subject to change in the FWWC series, the current design philosophy is to allow a maximum physical stacking limit in both road and non-road stacking so that the user can voluntarily decide whether to spread out his forces out of prudence to allow for more flexibility, or tightly pack the units in for less flexibility, more vulnerability, but a smaller force footprint. It is felt that this design decision is the lesser of two evils because it allows a minimal of frustration to the player since he can choose what to do, rather than forcing the typical limits onto him. This decision also makes scenario design much easier since reinforcements can arrive at the map edge in a more condensed manner, rather than one big stack of units, or many complicated arrivals spread over numerous turns.  

**Night operations**

Night operations were extremely difficult during the World War One, mainly because there was no form of hand held radio yet invented, so communication and

---

39 Of course the road stacking limit decision was not made lightly and both choices have pro and con aspects to them, neither is perfect. If one day the pros and cons of the 1300 road stacking limit outweigh that of the current 2600 road stacking limit (i.e. because time tested game play has proven that it would make campaigns play out more historically), then the stacking limit may change in the FWWC series and existing titles would be painstakingly retrofitted with new road stacking levels. In other words, there should be some confidence that these decisions are taken very seriously and weight heavily on the designer.
coordination at night had to be done very ineffectively with things like whistles and flares. Actual wireless radios of World War One were known as "wireless telegraphs" or "radiotelegraphs", and were large, primitive, fixed stations where the transmission tower either had to be constructed or already in place.\textsuperscript{40} Wireless telegraphs provided brief text based communication and were usually employed at army, corps, division and brigade headquarters. Text messaging on a modern cell phone could be considered a form of radiotelegraphy so, needless to say, even though the radiotelegraph was a technological advancement for the day, strategic level orders were slow to transmit, receive, and disseminate.

During the Great War, units lacked tactical man portable wireless radios, henceforth referred to as “modern wireless radios”. This lack of modern wireless radios meant that company and platoon level units could not effectively communicate “on demand” with their sister companies or battalion HQ. This meant that tactical level command and control was extremely difficult at best and completely nonexistent at worst.\textsuperscript{41} Anyone with military experience knows that tactical level command and control is absolutely necessary during night operations, and even with the aid of modern light amplification equipment, night operations can be a difficult and clumsy affair. In a period where effective command and control at the tactical level was nonexistent, “efficient” night movement and night combat operations was practically impossible. Night operations had not yet matured, and effective night movement was limited to following

\textsuperscript{40} Wireless telegraphs of the period were utilized at the strategic level of almost every army in Europe at the time. The Russian army of 1914 extensively used wireless telegraphs during the 1914 campaign in East Prussia. The Germans intercepted these strategic transmissions which, to the German’s delight, were broadcasted in the clear, and were able to anticipate Russian movements and determine unit locations.

\textsuperscript{41} It was not until World War II that modern wireless radios were introduced, thereby rectifying the tactical level command and control difficulties.
roads and rail lines in column formation.\textsuperscript{42} This translates into game play that, unless you are moving strategically in Rail Mode or in Travel Mode along roads, your units will become disrupted any time they move during a night turn.\textsuperscript{43}

Several realistic situations and tendencies occur because of this rule. The first is to make it more obvious that, unless you absolutely need to move your units, you should be resting them during night turns. Doing so is not only a good decision to prevent disruptions from tactical movement, but it also keeps units from gaining more fatigue during night turns. If you do need to move your units then you should only be moving them strategically to break contact, put more distance between you and a pursuer, or to move units up to the front line from rear areas. You can also choose to drive the advance forward along roads, but doing so is quite a risky proposition. The second tendency that occurs is that, during night operations, it is often wise to cover road junctions to protect against a forced night advance by the enemy. If you are conducting a rearward night march, then it can be more effective to temporarily leave some units along major roads to act as a rear guard to stop any night pursuits. Cavalry work particularly well in this regard role, and you can recall any units used as rear guards on the morning turn.

\textsuperscript{42} During darkness, it is much easier to follow in a file, one behind the other, in a column formation, along a known road, that it would be to move tactically or in a column across open terrain.

\textsuperscript{43} In other words, if you are not utilizing the road movement rate of the unit then the unit will disrupt when it moves during night turns. See the User Manual for more information about movement and night operations.
Rail capacity and Russian rail gauge limitation

Rail capacity, or the number of units that can be moved by Rail Movement each turn, in *East Prussia '14* was not easy to determine. Historically, the Germans transported a full infantry corps by rail during the East Prussian campaign (the I.Armeekorps), however it was not carried out without problems. The corps had to be sent piece by piece because of the difficulty in procuring enough rolling stock. Historically the entire redeployment of the I.Armeekorps from the northeast to the southwest took two full days to complete, however, if full capacity is given to move a whole corps, then such a move in *East Prussia '14* would only take one day to complete.\(^{44}\) It was therefore decided that

\(^{44}\)The I.Armeekorps was entrained at Wehlau (German sources, Golovine incorrectly says it entrained at Insterburg) around noon on the 23rd, then sent via Marienburg-Deutsch Eylau-Montowo, arriving mostly on the 25th, but its artillery did not arrive until the 26th (Golovine, 149. Showalter, 208.). However, from a gameplay point of view, the player has no incentive to make the historical move all the way back to Marienburg, and so he will likely go through Osterode instead, therefore the longer route is not factored
the rail capacity in the East Prussian campaign should be much less than ideal, and especially at such a level where the Germans are forced to make tough decisions in who and how they move by rail. This means that if a German commander wants to move a large formation from one point to another, then he needs to do so in segments and prioritize who gets moved in each segment. Historically the I.Armeekorps placed priority of rail transport on its infantry, and the rest of the division followed when it could, with the artillery sent last. So, with the very limited German rail capacity level, the German commander is forced to make the similarly tough decisions that his historical counterpart had to make.

As for the Russian rail capacity, they have no rail capacity in the East Prussian campaign because their rolling stock was still be used for mobilization. Also, the Russian rail capacity was determined by the fact that once they crossed the border into East Prussia, the rail gauge differed from their own, so they were unable to use their trains beyond the frontier. However, some of their units arrive by rail (mainly explicit supply units), and the Russians are able to move these units by rail up to the rail head on the frontier when the rail gauges change, which is denoted with a map label and a damaged rail hex. They are then required to disembark and move normally.

Note that if you play with Explicit Supply on then the German supply units that arrive by rail will take up Rail Capacity, so once you want to transport combat units by rail then it is recommended that you unload all supply units and move them normally until you finish re-deploying your combat formations.

45 This is part of the reason why the historically planned German counter attack on the 26th of August did not fully develop, because von Francois' artillery had not yet arrived and he restrained his corps.

46 It is interesting to note that German sources state that the corps' cavalry were some of the final units sent because the corps was getting harassed by Russian cavalry as they were waiting to embark, so the cavalry had to be used for protection. In regards to the 3.Reserve-Division, it was sent by rail from Nordenburg, to a quick hop to Allenstein. This move occurred throughout the 21st and 22nd, so it was not simultaneous movement (Showalter, 208.). These two cases further reinforces the design decision toward a very limited movement speed and capacity level.
**Rail movement speed**

A word must be mentioned about rail movement speed (Rail Allowance). Looking at the rail movement speed, it seems like a rail movement of 40 km per two hour turn would be far too slow, especially considering that locomotives of the day could achieve 90 to 100 km/h top hauling speeds. However, it is important to stress that rail movement speed does not represent the actual speed of the trains and how far they travel in a two hour span of time, it represents the overall amount of time that it would take to make the entire trip. Essentially the train's actual top speed is irrelevant for gameplay purposes, because you have to account for intangibles that are not simulated such as local weather delays, frequency of hills and steep curves along the route, severity and frequency of gradient changes, cross traffic (such as military supply columns and civilians moving perpendicular to rail lines), and other rail traffic which often required trains to stop and wait until the track section ahead was clear.

**Artillery setup parameter**

In First World War Campaigns, especially in the early years of the war, the artillery setup parameter is set to an intentionally low parameter. This was done because setting up guns for indirect fire, getting the ammo in place and establishing communication with their HQ could become an extremely time consuming process in a period before portable radios. The position of the guns had to be determined by terrain association and map reading, and this position had to be relayed to the HQ and, in many cases, wire had to be run between the artillery unit and the HQ for the use of field phones if the situation permitted. If field phones were not used, such as in the case of a period of

---

47 See the User Manual for more information about the artillery setup rule.
high mobility, then someone had to physically travel from the higher HQ’s position to the artillery unit’s position (or vice versa) in order to establish a communication link, and thus had to travel between the two to relay messages. It was not the most effective system to say the least, and the only way to model this is to have varying degrees of probability for setting up indirect fire artillery. It may take only several turns to setup an artillery unit or it may take many turns, so you should the location that you want your artillery to setup very carefully.

**Multiplayer**

As with every other game in existence, *East Prussia ’14* is definitely more enjoyable when played against a human opponent. In World War I, and especially during the early period of 1914, army commanders seldom cooperated with each other in the optimal sense, and often had conflicts of interest, rivalries, or competing ambitions (think of Rennenkampf’s and Samsonov’s relationship in the Russian invasion of East Prussia in 1914). This facet more than once influenced how the two sides advanced and, at various points of the campaign, directly influenced the front line situation. With enough users available, *East Prussia ’14* becomes more historical when there are multiple players per side, particularly for the allies. While this can be accomplished either through PBEM or through TCP/IP, I will concentrate on PBEM here because this method is usually the most practical.48

The most enjoyable situation is a balance of having the most players involved, without detracting from the length of the turn from the time it takes to email it to the participants in the chain. This problem does not exist in TCP/IP games since the general

---

48 PBEM team based play is accomplished by forming a chain of players that mail the turn to each other, with the last player on that side ending the turn and emailing it to the other side where the process is then repeated.
rule is that the more players involved, the faster the turn will be. In PBEM team games, having one player per available army produces the most exciting results, provided that the turns could be passed along the chain of players quickly enough. At the very least, *East Prussia '14* is most enjoyable with three human players assigned to the following positions: the German commander, the Russian 1st Army commander, and the Russian 2nd Army commander (this excludes the Lodz campaign). Any inclusion of further players should be used to divide up between both sides with the Russian side having more, and should NOT have an overall commander. On the German side, in a situation with multiple players, the commander of the I.Arneekorps (only) should, if possible, be somewhat of a maverick. This player should be someone independent and aggressive.

During the early half of the campaign, the Russian 1st and 2nd Army commanders did not communicate with each other in any shape or form, and this should be reflected in the multiplayer game by the Russian commanders avoiding communication with each other. The result of this is to better simulate the often general lack of cohesion and stress the amount of communication that was required to coordinate actions, which often resulted in failure.

While splitting the campaigns into multiple players creates the most excitement, smaller scenarios are also very enjoyable with multiple users per side as well.

**Listening Music**

I found that my gaming experience was greatly enhanced when I listened to period music using Windows Media Player, with the Media Player's volume at 20% so I could still clearly hear the game. The early period of the Great War was both struggling
to find its own identity as well as seemingly mimicking the tactics, élan, and appearance that characterized the Napoleonic period or, at the very least, the Franco-Prussian War period. As a result, I think that this type of music fits the early years of The Great War quite well. Some affordable and excellent CDs you might want to consider picking up and adding to your media player play list are:

- Famous German and Austrian Marches, Premium Music Collection.
- German Military Marches, Legacy International.
- Tchaikovsky: 1812 Overture - Marche Slave, Deutsche Grammophon.
- 20 Gold Hits of Russian Folk Songs, M-Classic.

Obviously, these CDs also provide great listening music for HPS' Napoleonic Campaigns series.
Conclusion

I hope you enjoy playing this game as much as I have enjoyed creating it. I can only hope that the years of toil spent will help inspire further reading and study, and revitalize interest in the history of the Great War. This work is my feeble attempt to contribute to the memory of the Great War, and to honor the millions that gave their lives during this conflict. Perhaps it is not until you play First World War Campaigns that you realize the full awe inspiring scope of the conflict, and the tragic loss of humanity.

Courage Conquers!
15 August 2014

Edward L. Williams
volcano@esimgames.com

* * *
Further Gaming

If you enjoy this game, then try these other World War One titles that I have had the pleasure to develop:

*First World War Campaigns: France '14*
*Squad Battles: First World War*
Scenario Notes

Getting Started: First Contact

This scenario is an abstract representation of the opening clash at small town of Eydtkuhnen on the East Prussian frontier.

Losses are very important in this scenario as it takes losses heavily into account on the Victory Point total (since the objectives hexes are low in point value). The idea is that the Russians need to be able to take the border crossing hexes and the town of Eydtkuhnen, and weather any German counter attack while minimizing losses (since this action was not intended to be a major battle). The Germans do not have to take back Eydtkuhnen to win, if they can inflict substantial losses on the Russians.

This scenario takes place during the mobilization period and, as such, the German infantry formations are at their peace time strength since this is before the battalions swelled to their wartime strength (which occurred days later).

The Germans should probably voluntarily fall back on the first turn giving up Eydtkuhnen, or else they will risk being surrounded. The reinforcements will then allow them a better opportunity to inflict losses, avoid losses from isolation, and the possibility of taking back Eydtkuhnen.
1914_0817_01s: The Prelude

The Russian 105th Orenburg Infantry Regiment was destroyed in the battle. When the battle opened it was on the wing of the 27th Infantry Division, attempting to advance around to the rear of Stallupönen. Instead, this brigade was hit simultaneously in the front and rear. As the German player, it is imperative to attempt to cut this brigade off from the rest of the Russian III Corps as soon as possible in order to eliminate it, then shift to counter any possible attack towards the center at Stallupönen.

As the Germans, trying to take and hold all the objectives north of Stallupönen will likely result in you not being able to hold any of them. Pick two of these objectives and harass at the third (take the third and fall back to force the Russians to divert to it to take it back).

Historically the Germans inflicted four times the casualties on the Russians, but the German I.Armeekorps was substantially bloodied in the affair. Regardless of what von Francois intended, he had little choice but to fall back at the end of the day to the German main line.

There is an intentional and slight abstraction in this scenario in that the 2.Infanterie-Division elements (Inf.Bde.4) has arrived in the south a bit earlier than was historically the case. This is done for game play purposes, in order to have it play a historical effect on the battle where it helped cut off and destroy the Russian 105th Orenburg Infantry Regiment. If this is done any differently the Russian player would always place units to block/oppose this historical surprise arrival, and the scenario would not be remotely historical.
This is the historical full campaign scenario, and as such, it has command and control issues factored in on the Russian side (random fixes and releases of formations) for the month of August. See the section of the notes on the Russian Army and "Rennenkampf's cautiousness (random fixes and releases)" for an explanation.

Before embarking on this campaign, two popular myths must be addressed.

1. During the historical Tannenberg campaign, the Russian 2nd Army was NOT entirely destroyed. It was badly handled and lost a great deal of its strength (accordingly German sources: ~90,000 men captured, and ~50,000 men killed or wounded -- about 75% of 2nd Army's total strength), but the Germans had to call off the encirclement and were unable to destroy as much of the 2nd Army as they would liked, because they were forced to shift their attention back to Rennenkampf's 1st Army in the north who was, by that time, becoming the greater threat. The Germans were forced to disengage with the 2nd Army, allow it to retreat south, cover with territorial units and move the bulk of their force north to oppose Rennenkampf. With that in mind, in this campaign the Germans are not expected to entirely destroy one of the Russian armies. They are instead expected to deal a serious defeat to one Russian army of choice, then drive the other army out of East Prussia, even if it means allowing the remnants of the first reduced Russian force to continue an advance. As was historically the case, in the second half of the campaign (about September 1st or so) the Germans should utilize Landwehr units to block the reduced Russian army while shifting to concentrate
any arriving reinforcements from the Western Front against the other Russian army. Historically the nearly destroyed Russian 2nd Army launched further offensives into East Prussia well after the Germans shifted their focus on Rennenkampf’s 1st Army. Both sides should keep it in mind that the remnants of a defeated Russian army can still be a threat.

2. The Russian 1st Army was NOT static. Although it did advance relatively slowly, by the start of the Battle of Tannenberg, it was moving on Freidland and threatening Königsberg. It was only after the disaster at Tannenberg did Rennenkampf withdraw his army into defensive positions along the Alle and Omert Rivers, in preparation for the inevitable German counter attack that culminated into the 1st Battle of the Masurian Lakes.

In the Russian 1st Army sector, Cossack squadrons from the cavalry divisions are placed behind the front line. Historically, Cossack squadrons from the cavalry divisions were frequently loaned out to the infantry corps until their own integral Cossack regiments arrived in September. The placement of the Cossack squadrons in the rear area of the Russian 1st Army is not entirely historical but it was done for the extremely important reason to work as a mechanism to trigger a release of the Russian cavalry IF the Germans make exceptional gains in the 1st Army’s rear area (it is rationalized that such an event would have caused Russian 1st Army cavalry to act with urgency). Historically the exact locations of the loaned out Cossack regiments was frequently undocumented, and once the infantry made contact with the enemy, the Cossacks usually fell back to the rear or screened the flanks. In other words, although their deployment is not entirely historical as mentioned, their deployment is made in a logical manner given the situation and it is solely for game play purposes.

Being the historical version of the scenario, the major victory condition for the Germans is determined not only by objectives, but also on their ability to trap and destroy large portions of the Russian army. Historically similar results will yield a campaign terminating victory. The scenario intentionally expects great things from the German side to achieve a Major Victory, where as the Russians should strive to overrun East Prussia and/or invest or breach Königsberg, or destroy a significant portion of the German 8.Armee, or any combination of these things for an early termination victory.

The campaign can have several inherent phases: the initial phase should consist of the Russians advancing and attacking as quickly as possible in an attempt to administer a campaign terminating major defeat on the Germans. Failing that, the second phase should consist of the Russians realizing that they have reached their limit and they should defend and try to avoid losing large portions of their forces and captured territory, while still striving to take limited objectives if possible (in this phase they are attempting to hold on to a minor victory or, at worst, a draw result). Failing that, the third phase will involuntarily consist of the Germans counter attacking into the Russians and their attempt to eject them from East Prussia, destroy large portions of the Russian Army and capture some objectives in Russian territory. In this final stage, the Russians are simply trying to avoid the campaign terminating German major victory. If the Russians suffer a defeat,
but not a campaign terminating major defeat then it could looked at as only Pyrrhic Victory for the Germans (a less than historical victory where the Russians are better off than was historically the case).

The deployment of the Russian 2nd Army at the start of the campaign was very difficult to determine. No less than five difference sources were referenced for this information, and each one of them had maps that contradicted each other. Therefore, the starting locations in this scenario may differ from what would be denoted on some maps, but the positions decided on in this scenario are more based on the areas that the corps within the army were located in by the second day of the campaign in relation to their starting locations. In other words, in this scenario, the starting location used for the Russian 2nd Army is based on where the subordinate corps and divisions were located by the 21st, 22nd and 23rd, and they were then placed in a general August 20th deployment based on the consulted maps, and on a location in which their movement would put them in their appropriate areas by the end of the first couple of days. It is rationalized that the exact starting deployment of the Russian 2nd Army is, while close to reality, of secondary importance to having them be able to reach their historical limit of advance by the first few days.

Out of the Russian 2nd Army of ~200,000 men, about 90,000 men were captured and about 50,000 men were killed. Nearly all of the 2nd Army's guns were captured or destroyed (~500 guns). These casualties and captured men, which are calculated at 10,000 VPs (minus expected German losses of about 40% of the Russian infantry losses and 25% of the Russian gun losses (~4,000 VPs in total)), are factored into the expected victory levels. This is done in order to, as mentioned above, place great expectations on the Germans in both the massive levels of casualties and captured men inflicted on the Russians, while keeping their own losses low in comparison.

While the destruction of a large portion of the Russian Army is expected to occur, the objectives on the map and their point values are such that the Russians can win immediately from an early termination victory, once they capture enough objectives to give them a Major Victory. In this campaign, several tricky considerations had to be taken into account when deciding the "major" VP levels which trigger an early termination condition. For the Russians, several options had to be possible and the scenario design has taken these into account:

- If the Russians advance historically up to the 27th of August (at the start of the Battle of Tannenberg), then the situation should be precarious for the Germans -- just "a few more major objectives" will trigger a Russian early termination victory, because this should force the Germans to act by counter attacking. The Russians are required to take most of East Prussia and invest Königsberg (in which case it would be a foregone conclusion that it would fall), or they should try to take as much as they can and penetrate and seize Königsberg (which would have likely resulted in a German withdrawal from the area as they fell back to defend Berlin).
If a large portion of the Russian 1st or 2nd Army is destroyed, then enough VPs must be available from Königsberg to provide a Russian early termination victory. For the Germans, they too had to have several considerations which are also taken into account:

- As above, by the 27th of August, if the Russians are advancing historically and are more or less unopposed, then the Germans must be forced to act, lest they lose too much ground and suffer a Russian early termination victory.
- If the Germans deal with one Russian army, then they are still required to deal with the other one AND push the Russians out of East Prussia in order to achieve a German early termination victory. Basically, the historical event of severely weakening the Russian 2nd Army and then pushing the Russian 1st Army out of East Prussia should result in the German early termination victory.

As the situation changes, Victory Point levels should be continually evaluated to change your strategy and plans. In other words, the Russian 1st Army commander, previously content with advancing safely and cautiously may have to accelerate the advance to Königsberg, abandon it altogether, or turn south to help the 2nd Army should it come under threat.

An interesting dilemma exists on the German side. Should the 8.Armee attack on turn 1, and fight the historical battle of Gumbinnen? And if so, should they break off the attack after the first day or should they continue to attack the Russian 1st Army and attempt to destroy it? Only a certain amount of experimentation would answer this, not to mention the ability level of the commanders on both sides, however, there are some things to keep in mind. Historically the Germans were forced to attack at Gumbinnen, not simply because von Francois took it upon himself to attack on the flank, but also because the Russian 1st Army had, up to that point, largely advanced uncontested. There was news that the Russian 2nd Army was crossing the border in the south, and so von Prittwitz decided that the he must strike now, or risk pulling back and having both the Russian armies advance uncontested and possibly unite, which would have disastrous consequences. Choosing to fall back immediately and not attack the Russian 1st Army would carry the consequence that the latter would be nipping at the heels of the 8.Armee, where as an opening battle would help to create some space between the two. On the other hand, if the Germans do carry out the historical battle at Gumbinnen, they can certainly choose to continue the battle beyond the first day and try to destroy the Russian 1st Army. However, this also comes with a consequence, because doing so would ensure that the Russian 2nd Army continues to advance in the south and it could possibly get into the rear of the German forces by the time that 8.Armee deals with the Russian 1st Army. Not only that, but the starting situation at Gumbinnen is such that the Germans have one good day to "get their licks in" on the Russians while their cavalry is out of action, but this would likely change on the second day when they get released. Also, the situation at Gumbinnen is such that it is a set piece battle with all Russian corps online and prepared to slug it out, where as redeploying the German 8.Armee to deal with the Russian 2nd Army would allow for a greater possibility of catching/ambushing the latter piecemeal as was historically the case. All of this means that the safest choice is to do what was historical: attack the Russian 1st Army on the first day while the Russian
cavalry is out of play, and attempt to do as much damage as you can. On the second day, start disengaging some of your corps to move to the aid of XX.Armeekorps in the south. The ability to do this will likely depend on how effective the attack at Gumbinnen is on giving fatigue to the Russians. Keep in mind that the Germans can be pushed to exhaustion and load up on trains or move on roads to the rear with their cavalry covering, and then rest when they are safely in the rear areas. The Russians have no choice but to stop forward movement of their corps to rest, lest they blunder into an ambush.

The German 1.Kavallerie-Division is critical to whatever the Germans do in this campaign. If the Germans decide to go south and attack the Russian 2nd Army, or if they decide to stay in the east to fight the 1st Army, the German 1.Kavallerie-Division needs to be cause all manner of trouble for the Russians. The division should be everywhere and nowhere, very hard to contain, constantly harassing, a constant diversion, and ready to suddenly strike if the Russians get careless. In a sense, the speed and mobility of this division is one of the primary elements in making the Russians exercise caution. A reckless Russian cavalry or infantry unit on the march should be met with a well placed charge or an ambush. A spread thin Russian Army should be met with German cavalry between the corps attempting to block supply routes, destroy stragglers, or overrunning slow howitzer units. Forcing the Russians to take mind of these things is key to slowing them down. Also, do not be afraid to push the German cavalry to the limit if need be, historically they were utterly exhausted in the fighting, constantly being pushed to the limits of the capability. In short, if the 1.Kavallerie-Division is always well rested, then you probably aren't utilizing them to effectively.

In some sources, it is said that the German 3.Reserve-Division was in Feste Boyen (specifically in Lötzen), and that it wasn't until 1200 hours that it received word to "move north". Other sources state that the division was located at Benkheim (just southwest of Goldap) by 1000 hours, but that it sat there until 1630, when it finally received a message to move north and join the battle at Gumbinnen. In either account, the division arrived on the afore mentioned battlefield as darkness fell, too late to have any effect on the outcome. In this scenario, it was decided to put the division's starting location at the midway point between Feste Boyen and Benkheim. This is the best choice available, as it allows the division to be marched to and through Benkheim, where it will arrive on the Gumbinnen battlefield on the last turn before night. Any other choice will end up with either the division being far behind where it should be by nightfall (if it starts in Feste Boyen), or a it would be far forward of where it should be on the morning of the 20th, with a "hands tied" approach where it sits at Blenkheim in fixed positions until night. The former option has a detrimental effect on the second day of the campaign, and the latter approach is too restrictive to the user (i.e. perhaps the user might want to march the division someplace else at start).

The Russian 2nd Army's commander, General Samsonov, may get removed from the map during this scenario. Please refer to the section Samsonov's tragic suicide for more information.
The Russian 3rd Guard Division was historically located in southeast of the campaign map in the area between Grodno and Bialystok. This division does not appear at the start of the campaign however, because it is instead featured as a possible reinforcement in a certain Strategy/Operation selection. If the appropriate Operation is selected, the 3rd Guard Division will arrive as a reinforcement.

The Russian 10th Army arrives in this scenario at the beginning on September. Historically it began forming from around the 4th of September to the 18th of September and it was intended to bridge the divide between the Russian 1st and 2nd Armies. Because this army was only forming up and was not fully formed before the end of this campaign, the advanced guard of the 10th Army arrives around their historical time, and the rest of the army trickles in as reinforcements. There is a 100% chance for the advanced guard units to arrive, but the remainder of the army has very low chance for daily arrival, which is designed to represent the historical forming up time that was required. A low percentage arrival ensures that the 10th Army's situation will be slow in forming up and uncertain, thus making it very difficult for the Russian side to plan around these reinforcements. Needless to say, it is intentional that many of these 10th Army units may not arrive by the end of the scenario.

On September the 1st, two German armeekorps (Garderreserve and XI) and one kavallerie-division (8.) arrives from the West Front as reinforcements. That arrival of these units was tricky to handle in this scenario. First of all, although these units arrived by rail historically, they cannot arrive by Rail Mode here because the user has no incentive to detrain them anywhere but right on the front lines. Historically, there was a logistics problem with sending these forces any further east than Elbing, Mohrungen-Wormditt, Allenstein-Osterode (there were no double tracks beyond those points), so to keep the Germans from sending these units further east by rail, they must instead arrive as if they just disembarked from the rail transports. This means that their potential arrival areas might just be infested with Russians, if the Russian advance performed particularly well. To make this work in the scenario, the Germans have two Strategy|Operations choices on where to bring in these reinforcements. The first and historical selection is to bring them in at their forward detraining areas mentioned above: Elbing (Gd.RK), Mohrungen and Wormditt (8.KD), Allenstein and Osterode (XI.AK), however these arrival hexes are NOT protected, that is, they do not have protected areas assigned to them to ensure their safe arrival. The second selection is for them to arrive in a safer more rearward area of Marienburg (Gd.RK), Riesenburg (8.KD) and Graudenz (XI.AK). The second, rearward selection IS protected by a 10 hex protected area, that is, any Russian units within 10 hexes of those hexes where they arrive will be broken. The first selection is closer to the front yet unprotected and the second choice is further to rear but safer. It is the responsibility of the German commander to check the arrival hexes of all of these units before making his choice on which option to choose. Naturally strange results may occur if the Germans choose to have them arrive in the midst of Russian formations and to discourage them being used as sudden shock troops, all of these units arrive with the Low Ammo status and with yellow fatigue, which is intended to represent the necessary time they require to reorganize after the long movement (they did not entrain with rail cars carrying full ammunition supplies for them).
The German XVII.Armeekorps has relatively moderate starting fatigue because it had just finished an all night forced march to its attack positions, which would be like moving during both night turns. Many of these units start disrupted from night movement.

The Battle of Gumbinnen is an extremely difficult scenario to get "just right". Above all, the setup of the German side must be such that the historical characteristics of the battle play out, but at the same time a designer has to avoid trying the player's hands too much. Specifically, the starting situation of the XVII.Armeekorps has been guided to the point that the battle begins under the appropriate circumstances. This means that in the center, where von Mackensen blundered into the Russians, the Germans begin (in most places) about a turn ahead of where they historically were located. This commits them to these places where they must try to adjust accordingly. The reason this must be done is because, in a wargame where the user has the advantage of hindsight and the ability to study the opposing side's setup, the tendency would be to avoid contact in this difficult sector, or to pick and choose the ideal place to commit - all from information that was not available at the time. Therefore it is more accurate to put the Germans a turn ahead of schedule at start and go from there, rather than place them in their approach areas and see them almost always avoid making contact in their historical manner. Also, since the Germans start deployed for battle in these areas, they are understood as having suffered from opportunity fire on the approach and, as such, they have losses and fatigue applied to them accordingly.

Von Below's I.Reservekorps was supposed to cover von Mackensen's right flank, but the former opted to rest his troops and to conduct reconnaissance operations before moving on. His morning reports had erroneously said that no Russians were present from his position to Goldap, and he was hearing sounds of guns in the direction of von Mackensen's corps. He decided to march towards the northeast to aid von Mackensen rather than to continue east to Goldap. This would result in part of the Russian 30th Infantry Division crashing into the flank of the 1.Reserve-Division. This scenario replicates this starting situation by having the I.Reservekorps fixed in place for the first turn to represent them changing their direction of travel to the northeast to the sound of guns. This will allows the battle to develop historically.

The German IR.129 is intentionally located at the rear of the XVII.Armeekorps, far from its parent brigade. It was detached and originally located at Dakehmen. It was moving up to rejoin its parent division when the battle started, and was sent around the right flank of the Russian 40th Infantry Division northwest of Tollmingkehmen.

The Russian 1st Separate Cavalry Brigade (Oranovski) is not present on the map. A map label denotes the area where this brigade was deployed. Historically, the brigade found itself far to the east of where it should have been on the 19th, so it rode hard to catch up and its troopers were in bad shape from the ride. On the morning of the 20th, when the Germans advanced and made contact with them, Oranovski ordered a retreat because he felt he could do no good against the German advance. His brigade retreated some 30km to the rear to the town of Schillehnen, arriving in the evening with his units utterly exhausted. Oranovski's complete abandonment of the battlefield left a gaping hole in the
Russian right flank which contributed to the almost complete destruction of the 28th Infantry Division. The only way to replicate this action, which must be replicated in order to the battle to have any semblance of a historical start to it, this brigade is not placed on the map at start and it instead arrives as exhausted at the town of Schillehnen, as fixed reinforcements in the evening of the 20th. Even though the brigade was indeed present north of the Russian 25th Infantry Division at the start of the battle, the brigade played no real part in the battle other than creating the huge gap in the flank.

The German 1.Kavallerie-Division is fixed for one turn in order to keep them from overrunning the area where the Russian 1st Separate Cavalry Brigade is located. This one turn fix represents the point where "shots were exchanged" between these two formations, just prior to 1st Separate Cavalry Brigade abandoning the battlefield.

The German XX.Armeekorps is in its historically documented August 20th starting positions at Ortelsburg and Jedwabno. Historically, this corps began to immediately move to the west towards the line Gilgenburg - Kownatki - Wiertzchowo - Lahna - Orlau (which is all just north of Niedenburg). The German commander can choose to have the XX.Armeekorps stay in their starting position and resist the Russian 2nd Army along its main axis of advance, however that position is vulnerable to being isolated by the advancing Russians. It is strongly advised that the German commander conduct the historical move to the west (behind the fortified frontier) to hold the flank of the Russian 2nd Army's advance as it will allow the Russians to advance further into East Prussia. While the outcome is in doubt, this action will at least all the possibility of flanking the Russian advance.

Historically the Germans sent the I.Armeekorps (two divisions) and the 3.Reserve-Division by rail from the Gumbinnen area to the west on the left flank of the Russian 2nd Army. These three divisions provided the western flank of the attack on the Russian 2nd Army, and they were chosen to move by rail because they had the furthest distance to travel. The other German divisions that shifted from being in the path of the Russian 1st Army to the south did so by foot because they had the shortest distance to move, and as a precaution in case the Russian 1st Army moved to pursue. In this scenario, the German rail capacity is such that one corps can be transported at one time by rail. In order to move the 3.Reserve-Division by rail, the German commander must juggle/alternate the movement of all divisions to free up enough rail capacity. The best way to accomplish this is to embark the I.Armeekorps first and move it by rail for several turns, then disembark one division, and embark the 3.Reserve-Division. Continue to move the I.Armeekorps division that is still embarked, and rest the other division. After a few turns of movement, disembark and rest the embarked I.Armeekorps division and embark its other division. Repeat this process until all three divisions have reached their destination.

This campaign works well as a TCP/IP or PBEM team based game of two (Allied) versus one (German). The Allied players should consist only of #1 [1st Army], #2 [2nd Army] -- the Northwest Front (Zhilinski) is a non entity, and should not be controlled, that is to say, there should be NO overall Allied commander. For the maximum historical effect, the Russian army commanders should NOT communicate with each other throughout the
campaign, and in the case of TCP/IP play in the same room, they should be seated as far away from each other as possible (they should not be sitting next to each other). Additional teammates on both sides could be added as corps commanders. Ideally an added second German player should take only the I.Armeekorps (von Francois), and that person should be a very independent and aggressive (maybe even uncontrollable) player, if possible, with further corps assignments going from there. On the Russian side, the ideal setup would be for additional players to take a couple of corps each, starting with all the corps in 2nd Army and then dividing up the 1st Army, most importantly in the 1st Army one player should take the I Cavalry Corps, with additional players splitting into a corps per person starting with the 2nd Army and carrying over with the 1st Army and so on. In this situation, the two Russian army commanders should control their respective army level cavalry divisions and rifle brigades. NOTE: For fun, an individual Russian winner can be determined at the end of the campaign by the Russian Army that has captured and held the most objectives inside of the East Prussia (use the Area Boundary feature and count the Russian objective points inside of East Prussia).

Changes:
0.01) Set VP levels to 2750 17250 19250 24750.
0.02) Changed VP levels to 5000, 8000, 14000, 26500, as it was considered that the previous values did not motivate the Russians to behave historically by attacking quickly and rapidly.
0.03) Changed VP levels to 5000, 9000, 16000, 26500, because it was determined that the German Minor Victory condition was too generous, and the new level allows the Russians to achieve a Draw if they are pushed back and hold at the 1st Masurian Lakes positions without giving up historically heavy losses. Also the German Minor Defeat (Russian Minor Victory) level changed to be a little more forgiving to the Russians.
1.00) Changed VP levels to 7500, 14000, 16000, 26500, to narrow the Draw range, and to be a little more forgiving towards the Russians.
1914_0820_01sA: Clash of Empires (von Prittwitz's Problem)

Read the standard notes about this campaign on the page dealing with the #1914_0820_01s_Campaign_East_Prussia scenario, since most of those notes also apply to this scenario.

The force structure differs in this scenario from the standard campaign by the following changes:

- Germans do not receive reinforcements from France.
- Germans do not replace von Prittwitz with von Hinderberg and Ludendorf.
- Russians do not receive the 3rd Guards Division, 1st Rifle Brigade, nor the reserve 54th, 72nd, 76th Infantry Divisions nor XXVI Army Corps (made up of reserve divisions) reinforcements. The rationale is that with a weaker German position and greater success by the Russian 1st and 2nd Armies, then either STAKA or Northwest Front would have redirected those units elsewhere, (Galicia or Poland).
- The Russian 10th Army is not hurriedly formed near the end of the campaign and thus is not present, since the whole reason STAKA hurried those forces to East Prussia was because 2nd Army was virtually destroyed and northern Poland was defenseless. The rationale here, again, is that STAKA would have either kept the 10th Army back to fully form up, or would have altogether sent it to Poland or Galicia.
- Russians do not sack Zhilinski (Northwest Front) and replace him with Ruzskiy, again because of the presumable greater success the Russians would have had during the invasion of East Prussia.

Essentially this campaign weakens both sides and turns it into a "pure" struggle between those forces that took to the field at the start of the campaign.

The Victory Point levels in this scenario have been adjusted over the standard campaign scenario by 1/2. The Draw condition was then spread by 1000 points by adding/subtracting 500 points from the Minor Defeat and Minor Victory conditions.

No early termination condition exists in this scenario, to represent the fact that the situation was apparently not as important as other sectors, given the redistribution of forces. The Germans would have resigned to simply trying to hold Königsberg, and a sizable portion of East Prussia (they would not have tried to push the Russians out of East Prussia, nor destroy their armies), while the Russians would have either needed to entirely destroy a passive/defensive German 8.Armee, or most of it while capturing Königsberg.

The German strategy should be to SURVIVE and hold Königsberg. With no reinforcements, their plan would have been to fight a delaying action for as long as possible, followed by a siege battle. The Germans should also be opportunistic and attempt to destroy parts of the Russian army where possible of course, but do not expect a Tannenberg like reversal and they should fall back more often than not.
**1914_0820_01sB: Clash of Empires (Schlieffen Plan 1905)**

Read the standard notes about this campaign on the page dealing with the #1914_0820_01s_Campaign_East_Prussia scenario, since most of those notes also apply to this scenario.

Unlike #1914_0820_01sA_Campaign_East_Prussia, reinforcements will arrive from France in September. Before they arrive, the Germans should take on a purely defensive role and conduct a delaying action, falling back into Königsberg if necessary. Consider holding up in Königsberg with 8.Armee, then bringing in reinforcements from the Western Front in a relief attempt from Marienburg. That said, the II.Landwehrkorps is utilized in the place of XX.Armeekorps as a defensive force.

The Victory Point levels in this scenario have been adjusted over the standard campaign scenario by 1/2. The Draw condition was then spread by 1000 points by adding/subtracting 500 points from the Minor Defeat and Minor Victory conditions.

Early termination condition does exist in this scenario, to represent a situation where the Germans simply chose Schlieffen Plan 1905, but then got apprehensive about the situation in mid August and historically redirected reinforcements from France to bolster the defenses, and also sacked von Prittwitz.

Do not directly compare this scenario to the #Grand_Campaign_EP14-A scenario. Although both scenarios cover the possibility of the Schlieffen Plan 1905, the campaign forces you to play under the exact same conditions and expectations of the standard campaign scenario, which is intentional because the Schlieffen Plan S|O decision carries its own balancing mechanism and penalties within the broader campaign (i.e. choosing Schlieffen Plan 1905 means the Germans are accepting the fact that they are more likely to be defeated in East Prussia, at the sacrifice of a greater chance of victory in France, thus the outcome of the Grand Campaign itself provides the balance). Since this scenario is a standalone experience, the situation has to be balanced within the scenario itself, otherwise there would be no reason to play this scenario since the Germans would lose every time.
1914_0820_02s: Gumbinnen to Tannenberg

Read the standard notes about this campaign on the page dealing with the #1914_0820_01s_Campaign_East_Prussia scenario, since those notes also apply to this scenario.

The VP levels have been changed from the main campaign to compensate for the fact that this scenario is shorter, therefore the Battle of the 2nd Masurian Lakes has been cut off and its VPs it would normally yield should not count towards German victory requirements. The Major Defeat VP level is not changed because the campaign ends at the Russian 1st Army high water mark.

The changes to the Central Powers VP levels are:

- Major Defeat: none
- Minor Defeat: none
- Minor Victory: 90% original level (rounded off to nearest 1000)
- Major Victory: 75% original level (rounded off to nearest 1000)

All starting Russian held objectives (except for Mlawa) have been removed from this scenario since the scenario does not cover the German counter push to drive the Russians completely out of East Prussia, and it prevents the gamey behavior of an immediate German offensive to grab a few Russian VPs for an early termination win.

Early termination exists so that either a Russian hard push forward or a German Tannenberg like victory will result in a sudden victory for that side. Essentially this scenario is a race to victory.
This scenario was extremely difficult to get "just right". Above all, the setup of the German side must be such that the historical characteristics of the battle play out, but at the same time a designer has to avoid trying the player's hands too much. Specifically, the starting situation of the XVII. Armeekorps has been guided to the point that the battle begins under the appropriate circumstances. This means that in the center, where von Mackensen blundered into the Russians, the Germans begin (in most places) about a turn ahead of where they historically were located. This commits them to these places where they must try to adjust accordingly. The reason this must be done is because, in a wargame where the user has the advantage of hindsight and the ability to study the opposing side's setup, the tendency would be to avoid contact in this difficult sector, or to pick and choose the ideal place to commit - all from information that was not available at the time. Therefore it is more accurate to put the Germans a turn ahead of schedule at start and go from there, rather than place them in their approach areas and see them almost always avoid making contact in their historical manner. Also, since the Germans start deployed for battle in these areas, they are understood as having suffered from opportunity fire on the approach and, as such, they have losses and fatigue applied to them accordingly. The end result of all of these changes, combined with careful design thought, has produced a scenario that is short, quick, provides a high degree of variation and produces historical results.

Cossack squadrons from the cavalry divisions are placed behind the Russian front line. Historically, Cossack squadrons from the cavalry divisions were frequently loaned out to the infantry corps until their own integral Cossack regiments arrived in September. The
placement of the Cossack squadrons in the rear area of the Russian 1st Army is not entirely historical but it was done for game play purposes that do not apply to this particular scenario. For more information about this, read the notes on the #1914_0820_01s_Campaign_East_Prussia campaign scenario.

Historically the German 3.Reserve-Division arrived in the southwest corner of the map before the end of the scenario. They would not begin to arrive on the south of the map until the 1600 hour turn, the last turn in this scenario, and would play no part in the battle. Because of this, only the division's cavalry regiment arrives on the last turn in this area, since the rest of the units would be too slow to do anything meaningful on that turn. Also, the area in the south of the map is impassible (the Russian 1st Cavalry Division was screening in that area to the east as well).

The German XVII.Armeekorps has relatively moderate starting fatigue because it had just finished an all night forced march to its attack positions, which would be like moving during both night turns. Many of these units start disrupted from night movement.

Von Below's I.Reservekorps was supposed to cover von Mackensen's right flank, but the former opted to rest his troops and to conduct reconnaissance operations before moving on. His morning reports had erroneously said that no Russians were present from his position to Goldap, and he was hearing sounds of guns in the direction of von Mackensen's corps. He decided to march towards the northeast to aid von Mackensen rather than to continue east to Goldap. This would result in part of the Russian 30th Infantry Division crashing into the flank of the I.Reserve-Division. This scenario replicates this starting situation by having the I.Reservekorps fixed in place for the first turn to represent them changing their direction of travel to the northeast to the sound of guns. This will allows the battle to develop historically.

The German IR.129 is intentionally located at the rear of the XVII.Armeekorps, far from its parent brigade. It was detached and originally located at Dakehmen. It was moving up to rejoin its parent division when the battle started, and was sent around the right flank of the Russian 40th Infantry Division northwest of Tollmingkehmen.

The Russian 1st Separate Cavalry Brigade (Oranovski) is not present on the map. A map label denotes the area where this brigade was deployed. Historically, the brigade found itself far to the east of where it should have been on the 19th, so it rode hard to catch up and its troopers were in bad shape from the ride. On the morning of the 20th, when the Germans advanced and made contact with them, Oranovski ordered a retreat because he felt he could do no good against the German advance. His brigade retreated some 30km to the rear to the town of Schillehnen, arriving in the evening with his units utterly exhausted. Oranovski's complete abandonment of the battlefield left a gaping hole in the Russian right flank which contributed to the almost complete destruction of the 28th Infantry Division. The only way to replicate this action, which must be replicated in order to the battle to have any semblance of a historical start to it, this brigade is not placed on the map at start and it instead arrives as exhausted at the town of Schillehnen, as fixed reinforcements in the evening of the 20th. Even though the brigade was indeed present
north of the Russian 25th Infantry Division at the start of the battle, the brigade played no real part in the battle other than creating the huge gap in the flank.

Most of the German 1.Kavallerie-Division is fixed for one turn in order to keep them from overrunning the area where the Russian 1st Separate Cavalry Brigade is located. This one turn fix represents the point where "shots were exchanged" between these two formations, just prior to 1st Separate Cavalry Brigade abandoning the battlefield. Kavallerie-Bde.41 to the west of the Inster is not fixed at start to allow them to move begin the move to the east. It is rationalized that the fixed part of 1.Kavallerie-Division is engaged with Russian Cossacks, and Kavallerie-Bde.41 is following up in pursuit.
1914_0823_01s: The Creeping Tide

Technically this battle only lasted half a day until night fell. The Russians resumed the offensive in the morning on the 24th, but only lightly, having suffered heavy casualties during the day. By noon on the 24th the Germans were withdrawing to the west to join up with the rest of the XX. Armeekorps. This scenario lasts until noon on the second day (the 24th) to cover the resumption of combat on that day, and to allow the Russians the ability to pick up the offensive until it is rationalized that the Germans slipped away to the west.

Historically the 37. Infanterie-Division was hard pressed to hold back Martos' XV Army Corps. Although Frankenau held firm, Lahna fell after a valiant defense by Jäger-Btl. I and Orlau was lost and retaken several times in a seesaw battle that lasted into the darkness. On the morning of the 24th, the 37. Infanterie-Division had received orders from the XX. Armeekorps commander, von Scholtz, to slowly withdraw to the west to rejoin the rest of the corps. In this scenario, the Germans are not expected to hold Lahna and Orlau. If they can hold those places then that is a bonus, but the Germans are instead supposed to fight hard over both places and bloody the Russians. By the second day the Germans should try to hold the Frankenau and the two objectives which, it is rationalized, are necessary locations to allow for an orderly German withdrawal which occurs when this scenario ends.
1914_0826_01s: The Rout of Samsonov's Right Wing

This short scenario is intended as part of the prelude to the starting situation for the #1914_0827_01s_Tannenberg scenario. This scenario is of course technically part of the historical battle of Tannenberg, but the latter scenario begins on the 27th, when the main fighting broke out.

By far the key to this scenario from the German side is the attack on Große Bössau and Rothfleiss by the 36.Reserve-Division. It is this attack into the Russian flank that historically forced the Russians to reinforce the area away from the other hot spots, and eventually this attack rendered the Russian IV Army Corps' position untenable, forcing it to flee south towards Ortelsburg the next day.

Another key area is the southwest part of the battlefield near Bartelsdorf (the objective north of it at 14,32 and the exit hex to the south). It is strongly advised that the Russian commander immediately dispatches the 16th Infantry Division's 1st Brigade (which starts around 25,26) to the objective at 14,32. This movement represents the historical covering action which secured VI Army Corps' rear for envelopment, as the exit hex in that area represents an opportunity for German units to get into the rear and hypothetically help seal the fate of the Russian corps. For all of Blagoveshchenskiy's blundering, covering his left rear near Bartelsdorf was one thing he did correctly, as this possibly saved his corps from total annihilation.

The Russians should hold in the north and advance whatever that can be spared to Große Bössau in order to defend it from the impending German attack from the west.

The Russian 2nd Brigade, 16th Infantry Division, (and the 16th Art Bde Dvzn #2) are withdrawn from this scenario on turn 2. This is done because these units played no part in the scenario; historically they spent the day moving south to Bischofsburg and then southwest towards Bartelsdorf on the south edge of the map. These units are removed because otherwise the Russian commander would surely commit them some place that they would have an immediate influence on the battle, such as by sending them to Rothfleiss and Große Bössau.

Historically the Germans were rather timid in this engagement. Von Mackensen's XVII.Armeekorps was a bit shell shocked and, with its high fatigue, was not interested in repeating a bloody engagement such as the one it participated in at Gumbinnen on the 20th of August. Instead, the corps attacked cautiously, with the 36.Infanterie-Division attacking immediately from Lautern, but with the 35.Infanterie-Division remaining back for several hours to rest before moving on Große Köllen in the east. Both divisions proceeded cautiously in this manner to keep casualties light. In this scenario, neither of these divisions are fixed at start. Instead it is left up the use to decide on whether to push his troops to the breaking point and possibly suffer heavily, or to attack casually with limited objects with an aim to keep casualties low.
Historically the I.Reservekorps rested and did not move out until 1000 hours. Similar to the action taken with the XVII.AK, the actions of this corps is mostly left up to the user to decide. However, this corps is indeed fixed at the start of the scenario, but it is released one turn earlier than was historically the case in order to allow the user to decide how hard to push his troops. Resting until 1000 hours will allow a chance for almost every unit to advance with "green" fatigue levels. Advancing immediately will cause the I.RK to suffer heavier losses and disrupt easier when the initial contact is made.

The exact movements of the Russian 4th Cavalry Division are different to determine, even from Russian sources. It was known that it advanced on the east flank from Sensburg to the vicinity of Große Köllen. An approach was taken to allow this to occur: some cavalry start on the map advancing from that direction, and the remainder of the division arrives as possible reinforcements from the same direction. Chances are these cavalry will play no role in the scenario other than keeping the German side "honest" in that area (e.g. keeping the Germans from abandoning the objectives they take on the east side of the map, and to keep them from ignoring flank security).
This short scenario is intended as part of the prelude to the starting situation for the #1914_0827_01s_Tannenberg scenario. This scenario is of course technically part of the historical battle of Tannenberg, but the latter scenario begins on the 27th, when the main fighting broke out.

It is recommended that the Russian commander should either push to the 200 point objective with the brigade to the northeast and try to hold it, or use that brigade to push towards the breakout in the north, but not both. Attempting both will likely make the Russians too weak to accomplish either task, depending on what the German commander does of course.
1914_0826_03s: Samsonov and the Wolves - Tannenberg: Prelude, Act, and Curtain

For a more historical situation of Tannenberg, play the #1914_0827_01s_Tannenberg scenario instead.

In addition to the notes on this scenario, please read the notes on #1914_0826_01s_Bischofsburg, #1914_0826_02s_Gross_Gardienen, and #1914_0827_01s_Tannenberg for more general information about the entire situation.

Early termination exists to represent a total victory being achieved by either side.

- In the case of the Russians, this means holding on to as much as possible and successfully attacking across the Dwerenz to turn the German flank. You should also try to capture Mühlén, and launch the historical attack on the German right flank to take Heinrichsdorf. Also, there is the option of attacking towards Osterode itself which will not be easy and will likely further weaken your position by spreading you out.

- In the case of the Germans, a successful attack deep into the rear of the Russians, thereby cutting off their escape route, and also the infliction of a great deal of Russian casualties will cause the battle to end early as it would be considered a foregone conclusion, essentially the Russian 2nd Army being considered doomed to its historical destruction at that point (the historical result). Also, most of the objectives will need to be taken except for Mława (that objective exists only to encourage the Russians to historically protect their left rear area and to encourage them to retreat the remnants of I Army Corps to that area). Certainly the capture of Hohenstein, Niedenburg, Orteilsburg, Soldau, and Allenstein are all critical to success.

This scenario differs from #1914_0827_01s_Tannenberg by having an objective at Osterode. This present because on the 26th it was still possible (and contemplated) to attack towards that area. Also, this scenario represents more of an alternate history in the sense that both sides will likely develop the battle much differently than was historically the case because of hindsight. Therefore, the objective at Osterode also provides the Russians an alternate history chance at a major victory if they can hold and attack towards it. The capture of Osterode would likely have caused the Germans to fall back as their center would have been compromised (which would have been especially importance since Rennenkampf was approaching from the north at this time. Since Osterode is present, the VP levels differ from #1914_0827_01s_Tannenberg by +1000 points.

A "bonus" objective exists in Mława. This objective is a bonus because under normal circumstances it should never fall to the Germans. Also, it is suggested that the Germans should not attack towards that area with too much strength, they should only do so if the Russians leave it undefended, because if they attack heavily towards that area then they will be giving up a higher number of points elsewhere to at Niedenburg and to the east of there. The objective at Mława exists to create a historical incentive for the Russians to
defend their left rear area. Historically Mlawa was critical to the flow of supplies so it was protected. Also, the objective encourages the Russians to retreat the remains of I Army Corps towards that place, under the protection of the 3rd Guards Division.

A major victory for the Germans is determined not only by objectives, but also on their ability to trap and destroy a large portion of the 2nd Russian army. Near historical results will yield a major victory, and anything less will be a minor victory, defeat, or a draw. The scenario intentionally expects great things from the German side, where as the Russians mostly have to try to survive total annihilation, of course with the natural goals of inflicting as many casualties on the Germans, and to hold as many objectives as they possibly can.

A Strategy/Operation selection exists for the German I.Armeekorps so that the German commander can decide how von Francois proceeds with his orders; either he attacks when he is fully ready, or he attacks immediately as ordered. Attacking early means that the battle in that area will commence immediately, however if he waits (historical) then the battle will be delayed by a day but his units will be fully rested, supplied, and prepared to attack.

In this scenario, the battle of Gross Gardienen begins two turns sooner. Unfortunately there was no way to avoid this while still retaining some semblance of historical results in that area (unit fixes will not work because both sides are in LOS, and reinforcements do not work well either since other on-map units could move into the areas where they will arrive). The issue is negligible though, given that it is only two extra turns added to the battle.

The Russian 1st Rifle Brigade begins on the right flank of the I Army Corps in this scenario. This is not a mistake, in actuality the brigade was covering the gap between the I and XXIII Army Corps, but the I Army Corps' commander decided to send it to Skurpien to advance/attack towards Heinrichsdorf on the 27th against the German right flank. He thought that this would be a better use of the brigade as a way to help secure the flank via spoiling attack. In this scenario, the Russian can decide what to do with that brigade.
This scenario begins on the 27th even though (technically) the fighting in the Tannenberg campaign began on the 26th. The early "lighter" clashes on the 26th is represented in separate scenarios which are intended to be a prelude to this main battle. The 27th is considered to be the main fighting when I.Armeekorps was now fully assembled and ready for its flank attack. Since this scenario begins with both sides already committed, this scenario is considered to be the more historical Tannenberg situation between this and #1914_0826_03s_Tannenberg+prelude (not that this is a foregone conclusion, but if you want the main battle to begin at a more historical start point then this is the scenario that you want to play, while #1914_0826_03s_Tannenberg+prelude allow more alternate history to be explored since the 26th may unfold much differently, thereby creating different objectives for the 27th).

This scenario will end on the night of 31st of August. Typically, it is understood that the historical battle ended on the night of 30th August, then the Germans began moving forces north to oppose Rennenkampf, however an extra day is allowed here to allow both sides to further develop the situation if need be. Also, on the 30th the Russian did retake Neidenburg and the Russian IV Army Corps launched a (failed) counter attack to take back Ortelsburg, so in one capacity or another the battle did continue into the 31st. That said, historically by the night of the 30th the bulk of the Russian 2nd Army was largely destroyed and in retreat to the south. Seeing the catastrophic defeat unfolding, rather than report the loss to the Tsar, the 2nd Army's commander, General Alexander Samsonov, tragically committed suicide during the night of 29/30 August. This is represented by his HQ getting withdrawn at that time.
Early termination exists to represent a total victory being achieved by either side:

- In the case of the Russians, this means holding on to as much as possible and successfully attacking across the Dwerenz to turn the German flank. You should also try to capture Mühlen, and launch the historical attack on the German right flank to take Heinrichsdorf.

- In the case of the Germans, a successful attack deep into the rear of the Russians, thereby cutting off their escape route, and also the infliction of a great deal of Russian casualties will cause the battle to end early as it would be considered a foregone conclusion, essentially the Russian 2nd Army being considered doomed to its historical destruction at that point (the historical result). Also, most of the objectives will need to be taken except for Mlawa (that objective exists only to encourage the Russians to historically protect their left rear area and to encourage them to retreat the remnants of I Army Corps to that area). Certainly the capture of Hohenstein, Niedenberg, Ortelsburg, Soldau, and Allenstein are all critical to success.

This scenario differs from #1914_0826_03s_Tannenberg+prelude by not having the objective at Osterode. This objective is removed because by the time of the 27th, Osterode was more or less out of the question given how the situation developed on the 26th. Also, since this scenario is intended to be more of a historical situation, if Osterode was present then it would encourage a-historical attacks to take it, which was not attempted at this point. Since Osterode is not present, the VP levels differ from #1914_0826_03s_Tannenberg+prelude by -1000 points.

A "bonus" objective exists in Mlawa. This objective is a bonus because under normal circumstances it should never fall to the Germans. Also, it is suggested that the Germans should not attack towards that area with too much strength, they should only do so if the Russians leave it undefended, because if they attack heavily towards that area then they will be giving up a higher number of points elsewhere to at Niedenburg and to the east of there. The objective at Mlawa exists to create a historical incentive for the Russians to defend their left rear area. Historically Mlawa was critical to the flow of supplies so it was protected. Also, the objective encourages the Russians to retreat the remains of I Army Corps towards that place, under the protection of the 3rd Guards Division.

The German commander should be aware that Russian forces in the Bischofsburg area are exhausted, due to the historical fighting the day before (you can play the #1914_0826_01s_Bischofsburg scenario if you want to experience that fighting). The Germans also are tired out in this area (mainly part of von Mackensen's corps). Historically the Russians began withdrawing south to Ortelsburg on the 27th, and on the 28th Ober Ost ordered von Mackensen to pursue and engage the enemy (he spent the 27th resting). It is recommended that the German and Russian commander examines the enemy situation in that area prior to playing the scenario, so as to be briefed on intel that was known from the day before. Also, anything the Germans can accomplish in this area with von Mackensen's corps on the first day of battle, is purely a bonus. Ideally the Germans should try to both rest and push forward in the area of Bischofsburg on the 27th, if possible, but care should be taken to not exhaust these units even further or else they
will be useless for the duration of the battle. Essentially the German commander should be go easy on these units so they can pursue the Russian VI Army Corps, while at the same time parts of these formations should rest along the way, especially during the night. The Russians will likely be scrambling to get away and will be unable to rest, so any threat to the German eastern flank by the VI Army Corps should be minimal for several days.

A major victory for the Germans is determined not only by objectives, but also on their ability to trap and destroy a large portion of the 2nd Russian army. Near historical results will yield a major victory, and anything less will be a minor victory, defeat, or a draw. The scenario intentionally expects great things from the German side, where as the Russians mostly have to try to survive total annihilation, of course with the natural goals of inflicting as many casualties on the Germans, and to hold as many objectives as they possibly can.

Out of the Russian 2nd Army of ~200,000 men, about 90,000 men were captured and about 50,000 men were killed. Nearly all of the 2nd Army's guns were captured or destroyed (~500 guns). These casualties and captured men, which are calculated at 10,000 VPs (minus expected German losses of about 40% of the Russian infantry losses and 25% of the Russian gun losses (~4,000 VPs in total), are factored into the expected victory levels. This is done in order to, as mentioned above, place great expectations on the Germans in both the massive levels of casualties and captured men inflicted on the Russians, while keeping their own losses low in comparison.

The Russian XIII Army Corps is mostly fixed on the 27th, and this represents the indecisiveness on the part of its commander Gen Lt Klyuev. At the time it is released, it was marching into and occupying Allenstein. Conflicted orders were received and so the only real force committed to battle before the 28th was the 2nd Brigade from the 1st Infantry Division which was sent on an attack towards Richenau in the Hohenstein sector.

At least two sources used offer contradicting information on the detraining area of the German Landwehr-Division Goltz. Golovine states that the division disembarked at Osterode, but Showalter states that it disembarked in Biessellen. German sources seem to suggest both areas, but the German officer assigned with coordinating the movement of the division stated (in a book he wrote in 1919) that the division detrained at Biessellen, so the latter is what is understood to have occurred here. In this scenario, the division

W. von Stefani, *Mit Hindenburg bei Tannenberg*. Berlin, 1919. In this book there is an interesting and humorous encounter where Stefani requisitioned a locomotive and moved to Allenstein to arrange for the disembarking of Goltz's division. On the morning of the 27th, the locomotive rolled up to the outskirts of Allenstein (the division's planned destination), von Stefani arriving well in advance of the division to make the appropriate arrangements. As the steam engine rolled up to the town, troops were seen along both sides of the tracks and wisely scattered out of the path of the steaming locomotive. Stefani climbed atop the coal tender and he and hundreds of Russian soldiers stared at each other in shock as the locomotive rolled by with a German officer on top with pistol in hand. Moments later the shock of the spectacle subsided and the Russians raised their rifles and began firing on the engine as Stefani went back down below. The engineers slammed on the brakes, and quickly sped away in the opposite direction. Needless to say Goltz's division
arrives by rail and the user can decide whether to disembark it at Biessellen to (historically) advance south towards Hohenstein, or to disembark at Osterode or somewhere else altogether.

Top priority for the German side should be the disruption of the Russian supply network, which is done by taking Soldau, Niedenburg, and Ortelsburg.

Historically, this battle was extremely dynamic. Both sides were attacking and defending in places. To better understand the basic flow of the battle so as to help guide players as to what they should be doing (or how well they are doing), a brief and simple timeline is listed here:

- 27 AUG @ 1300-1600: Russian XIII Army Corps occupies Allenstein and rests.
- 27 AUG @ 1200: Russian 1st Rifle Brigade takes Heinrichsdorf.
- 27 AUG: German 37. & 41.Infanterie-Divisionen attacks towards Waplitz (one brigade from 37.ID attacked immediately in morning, the 41.ID follows in the afternoon). 37.Infanterie-Division then breaks off and moves to assist in the defense of Mühlen. 37.Infanterie-Division is then through the night to Richenau area to the west of the 3.Reserve-Division to protect the extreme flank from envelopment, and from the Russian attacks across the Drewenz River in that area.
- 27 AUG: Mühlen area under Russian attack all day.
- 28 AUG: Russians continue to attack at Mühlen.
- 28 AUG @ 1100: Sensing impending disaster, Samsonov relocates his HQ to the Hohenstein area to concentrate his attention on the XV Army Corps.
- 28 AUG: German 3.Reserve-Division & 37.Infanterie-Division begin their counter attack across the Drewenz River towards Hohenstein. Fighting is bloody but by the end of the day they reach and capture Hohenstein.
- 28 AUG: Germans capture Soldau.
- 28 AUG: Germans capture Neidenburg.
- 28 AUG: Russian XIII Army Corps moves the rest of corps to Hohenstein to assist XV Army Corps, but Hohenstein is already lost.
- 28 AUG: Russian XV Army Corps pushed back from Hohenstein fall back to the south near Waplitz.
- 29-30 AUG: Russian forces (including Samsonov) begin retreating to avoid a double envelopment. XV and XIII Army Corps are the most exposed and, with Neidenburg lost, are forced to withdraw into the interior at Kurki, then try to escape destruction by passing through the area between Muschaken and Willenberg to the south. By the time they reach the area it was late: von Francois' I.Armeekorps advancing from Neidenburg just barely arrived to block the escape with all available units. XXIII Army Corps, already shattered from previous days is also destroyed (two and a half corps destroyed in total).
- 29 AUG: German XVII.Armeekorps captures Ortelsburg and the Russian VI Army Corps retreats to the east and south.
- 30 AUG @ ~0100: Samsonov commits suicide near Willenberg.

could not disembark in Allenstein; the Russian IV Army Corps had only just taken the town just ahead of the Germans. Stefani had the division disembark in the next nearest place: Biessellen.
• 30 AUG: Unaware of the fate of their leader, the Russian I Army Corps remnants and 3rd Guard Division counter attack towards Neidenburg and capture it briefly but is pushed back and forced to retreat.
• 31 AUG: Russian VI Army Corps re-organizes and counter attacks to take back Ortselsburg but fails.
• 31 AUG: Remnants of Russian 2nd Army pull back to the frontier to reorganize and go into a defensive posture for the rest of the campaign.

Just to give an idea of how precarious the situation was at the time of the battle, Rennenkampf's 1st Army was just off the map to the northeast of von Mackensen's XVII. Armeekorps near Bischofsburg. Specifically, the Russian II Army Corps, the left flank of 1st Army, had reached Rastenburg on the 27th, just some 30 kilometers from von Mackensen's rear! This should be kept in mind when discussing the stereotypical "bumbling 1st Army's advance", both Russian armies nearly linked up had von Mackensen and von Below not been in between them, and both German formations were very nearly cut off and isolated between both Russian armies!

It is interesting to note that this 1914 battle of Tannenberg actually occurred over a wide area and not much fighting actually took place in the immediate vicinity of the tiny village of Tannenberg. After the battle, Max Hoffmann suggested naming the battle after Tannenberg, to counter the humiliating German defeat in 1410 at Tannenberg in which the Teutonic Knights were defeated by what would amount to be Slavs and modern Russians. It was pure genius if you think about it: do you think of the battle of 1410 when you hear "The Battle of Tannenberg" or do you immediately think about the battle of 1914? An yet when you hear "The Battle of Agincourt" you immediately think of the 1415 battle (so it's not as if you don't think of the 1400s battle because it is so old). By naming the battle after Tannenberg, it was as if the 1410 battle was overwritten or wiped from history.
There is a game design issue abstraction with von Schettau's HQ location, and with his "Hauptreserve Thorn" unit in general. Historically, this formation existed at the start of the campaign and it, like the Königsberg division, consisted of the mobile forces of the garrison assigned to the fortress of Thorn. When the Russians invaded East Prussia, this division was rushed to the frontier to help oppose the Russian 2nd Army. During this movement, the division was split up into its sub units, with Landwehr-Brigade 5 going into battle on I.Armeekorps' right flank, and Landwehr-Brigade 20 being split with half of it (LdwIR.107) going to the XX.Armeekorps' sector, and the other half (LdwIR.19) maintaining covering positions opposing Russian cavalry at Strasbourg. This division was later combined and assigned to cover the Soldau area during the 1st Battle of the Masurian Lakes, where it was then christened as 35.Reserve-Division. During the Battle of Tannenberg, this lose formation is abstracted and its division HQ under von Schettau is kept with the division's Ldw.Bde.5. Historically this was not the case. In this scenario, von Schettau was actually on the north side of the battlefield, under the command of an ad hoc "detachment Schettau" consisting of a mixture of units from XX.Armeekorps' reserve units, the most rested and strongest units it had available to contribute to the fight. However, this historical event does not lend well to the game, and these units are instead detached from the parent formation and von Schettau is with the majority of his forces which would later recombine. This approach avoids a situation where Schettau's HQ is in his historical correct location, but in command of no units.
It is interesting to note that most accounts of the battle around Usdau make it seem like a one sided affair: the Germans imply that they out flanked the Russians in the north and the Russians were routed. However, the reality was very different when historical accounts from both sides are consulted. Historically the Germans conducted a successful fight in the north part of the battlefield at Usdau, but the Russians went on their own offensive towards Heinrichsdorf putting the Germans in the entire southern area of the battlefield on the defensive and even routed part of the 2.Infanterie-Division. The Russian attack also prevented the overall German objective from being obtained (the advance towards Neidenburg off the east side of the map), as the Germans were forced to mind the strong Russian forces to the south.
The scenario is like a revolving door with the Russians pushing for victory in the north and the Germans doing the same in the south. The German commander, while attacking as hard/fast as possible with the forces in the south, also needs to defend the Dwerenz River line. The Russian commander, while pushing to take the objectives on the west bank of the Drewenz, must also consider sending some forces to the south (Waplitz area) to prevent the German commander from capturing all objectives there.

The Russian commander should check the map labels and observe that a German Landwehr division will be arriving from the north after the scenario begins. The Russians must push west in the north, towards the Drewenz, while at the same time maintaining a brigade or so to delay the Germans arriving from the north. The Russians must attack west towards Richenau if they want to have a hope of achieving victory, because if they do not do this then the best they can hope for would be a draw. The reason for this is to force the historical advance on the Russians in that area, and making the battle less of a stagnant affair and more of a historical swirling fight.

Given that this scenario is relatively short, the Russians have no reason to be concerned with the strategic situation. This means that they will likely hold everything as tenacious as possible, and the Germans will have little chance of capturing Hohenstein at the historical time. Because of this, the battle is extended to the 29th to compensate for the fact that the Russians will likely a-historically hold at all costs in front of Hohenstein.

Note that historically the Germans redeployed the 37.Infanterie-Division to the north of 3.Reserve-Division on the 27th, in an attempt to help defend the Drewenz line. Both divisions then attacked towards Hohenstein and captured it by the end of the 28th.

It is interesting to note that the German 3.Reserve-Division was ordered to advance from Richenau to Hohenstein. This advance would have taken it directly into the Russian XV Army Corps. The division's commander, Curt von Morgen, in true von Francois fashion, surveyed the situation and decided not to carry out his orders. The coming battle in the next 24 hours would prove this to be a wise decision.
1914_0908_01s: Flank Security

This scenario takes place on the southern flank of the battle that was commencing at the First Battle of the Masurian Lakes. Both the German 3.Reserve-Division the Russian XXII Army Corps were trying to provide flank security to their respective armies, with the crossroads at Lyck being of vital importance to both force's mission.

Unless the sources used are incorrect, it is known that the 1st Finnish Rifle Brigade was one of the first rifle brigades to arrive in full to the XXII Army Corps, and it is also known that the 20th Finnish Dragoon Regiment was also present. The remainder of the forces present in this scenario are an educated assumption. Golovine states that 1 1/4 strength of a division was present for the battle around Lyck, which means that five infantry regiments were present. Also he states that artillery was nearly equal strength in artillery on each side. This means that besides the 1st Finnish Rifle Brigade, there was part of another Finnish rifle brigade, which I have chosen the parts of the 3rd.

The starting deployment of both sides is also an abstraction since it was difficult to find anything more than a vague line drawn on a map. The site of where the battle began is correct, but the individual unit placements are an educated guess.
Sources disagree as to when this battle actually started. Some state that the battle began the 8th with first contact, while others agree that it began on the 9th when the battle was joined across the entire line. This scenario begins on the 9th because the Germans spent most of the 8th closing in on the Russian positions and overpowering forward outposts. By the 9th, the battle had truly begun as fighting raged across the entire front.

This scenario ends on the evening of the 14th, which is also when the full East Prussia campaign scenario ends. By the evening of the 14th, the Russians had fallen back to the east beyond the border and back into Russia. Two days later, the Germans began sending units south to assist the Austro-Hungarians in Galicia.

The Russian situation is desperate here. The scenario is designed so that the Russian 1st Army is forced to have to fall back, rather than just hold on and dig in for the duration. Historically, Rennenkampf withdrew pretty quickly, having recognized the German flanking maneuver very quickly (see below). The Russians withdrew very quickly in the center, then re-formed, or actually, was forced to fight in the Darkehmen area where it was defeated. The Russians then took flight towards Kovno, and to the east, and escaped to Russian territory across the border. The trick here is to devote what cavalry available to help screen the rear areas, while the Russians attempt to deny the Germans from isolating and destroying main parts of the 1st Army, while at the same time, trying to delay the German advance long enough to where they run out of time and are not available to capture the rear most Russian objectives (doing so represents a Russian rout and possible isolation of the 1st Army). In the south, the Russians are essentially doomed and must do what they can, but try to save the 1st Cavalry Division to screen the German cavalry advance on the flank. It may very well be the case that the German cavalry are able to roam freely capturing Russian objectives until more Russian cavalry can be sent to drive them off later in the battle.

For all the bad things that can be said about Rennenkampf's advance into East Prussia, he must be credited with a successful fighting withdrawal from East Prussia. The First Battle of the Masurian Lakes could have had a far worse result had he not recognized the threat of the German southern movement immediately, and had he not began to fall back eastward immediately. Although his army lost nearly half its strength in the battle, it nevertheless withdrew with its units mostly intact and with Rennenkampf still in command. The alternative was complete encirclement and destruction of the Russian 1st Army, and an open gateway to Kovno and the complete collapse of the Russian northern sector.

The German Gardereservekorps, XI.Armeekorps, and 8.Kavallerie-Division in this scenario had all been pulled out of the line on the Western Front and sent east by rail. You can see these formations get withdrawn in the #1914_0822_01s_Campaign_Early campaign scenario in France '14, on ~26th of August 1914. Von Moltke's decision to withdraw these forces and send them east is a subject of intense debate and speculation in the historical community. Were these forces really needed in East Prussia? Could the
Germans have won the campaign in East Prussia without these additional forces? Could the Germans have won the Battle of the Marne if they had kept these transferred forces in the west? While it is true that the two additional corps were probably overkill, in von Moltke's defense, he dispatched them around the point in which von Prittwitz lost his nerve and the situation looked bleak in East Prussia, and these additional forces helped play an important role in late on the east. What is certain is that if OHL did not transfer these additional forces to the east, then the Germans would have had a more favorable chance during the Battle of the Marne and a much more difficult time during the First Battle of the Masurian Lakes. Anything beyond that is pure speculation (and is the subject of the #1914_0909_02s_1st_Masurian_Lakes scenario). It is doubtful whether the German 8.Armee without these additional forces could have so completely and thoroughly ejected the Russian 1st Army from East Prussia, or at least they would of had a much bloodier fight on their hands. It can be said that the cost of the complete German victory in East Prussia was its defeat at the Marne.

The southern sector of the battle was very difficult to find definitive starting deployment information on, at least for when the exact time this scenario begins. Approximately four different sources were consulted on unit locations, all of which had conflicting data in one form or another. The German locations were difficult to ascertain at the lowest level, but their division deployments are well known. On the Russian side the disposition may seem odd, but the reason for their strange deployment has to do with the events that occurred the day before on the 8th. On the 8th, the Russian 43rd Infantry Division, which is split in two at the start of this scenario, had one of its brigades (the 1st Brigade) and half of its artillery far to the south in outpost type positions to provide early warning on any enemy flanking movements. Out of the 1st Brigade, the 169th Infantry Regiment was deployed as far south as Arys, and it was quickly annihilated by the German I.Arneekorps. The brigade's other regiment, the 170th, was located at Widminnen and it too was overrun but managed to escape to the north where it took up positions with the second line 76th Infantry Division. In the area of Possessern and Kruglanken, the German XVII.Arneekorps had spent the 8th of September attacking both heavily fortified positions in what was likely a bid to be the first German unit to push in the Russian left flank. The attacks failed and this is why the corps begins with moderate fatigue (the Russians begin with half the fatigue that the Germans have). The XVII.Arneekorps flung themselves at Possessern and Kruglanken again on the 9th with costly massed infantry assaults and finally broke through in the evening. Even more difficult to determine is what units from the Russian second line 76th Infantry Division were stationed in the Possessern-Kruglanken area opposing these assaults, and where they actually were. Golovine clearly states that the 302nd Infantry Regiment was in the area of Possessern. Reading elsewhere, it is implied that only the 2nd Brigade of the 43rd Infantry Division was intact, and it too was located at Possessern in well fortified positions. This seems to further imply that the 302nd Infantry Regiment was also at Possessern, for a total of three regiments. However, Possessern is extremely far from the rest of the 76th Infantry Division, and later he states that Possessern and Kruglanken were defended by the 2nd Brigade of the 43rd Infantry Division and one brigade of the 76th Infantry Division, for a total of "3/4 of an infantry division". This means that of the three regiments, one of
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them had to be at Kruglanken. Given the location of Kruglanken and in light of the conflicting text, the scenario designer has made the decision to place the 302nd Infantry Regiment there as this seems to be the more logical choice. Kruglanken and Possessern seem to always be referred to together, so the first time in Golovine's text that it is mentioned that the 302nd Infantry Regiment was sent to Possessern, he could have either vaguely meant the "Possessern area" which includes Kruglanken, or that it was sent to Possessern and then it moved to Kruglanken a short distance away which he does not specify.

Kovno is not expected to be under threat in this scenario. The only reason its objective exists is if the Russians decide to evacuate all of their forces from the map, or do not fall back towards it, then it may be possible for the Germans to seize Kovno from the southwest.

Historically the Gardereservekorps and Hauptreserve Königsberg Division moved northeast to Tilsit (which is off the map to the north) starting on the 11th. By the 12th they would have exited the map to the north, and this move was to ensure that the Russian 1st Army did not withdraw in that direction to the northeast. After careful consideration, both of these formations were not given withdrawal orders in this scenario. The reason for this is that even though Tilsit is off the map to the north, they can and probably should be used along the north of the map to block the Russian 1st Army from escaping. **It is certainly a valid tactic for the Russians to move north and exit off the map in order to save forces from destruction and VP loss, so these formations are needed to help guarantee that does not happen.** If these two formations were withdrawn however, it would defeat the purpose because the Russians would be able to exit off the north of the map even easier, or on the north side of the map they would be able to move towards the west further into East Prussia to avoid the Germans into the opening caused by the withdrawal of those forces. Of course the Germans can do what the like with these forces as well, but it is advised that at least a corps and the Hauptreserve Königsberg Division be tasked with blocking the north.

**CALCULATIONS:**

\[+2125/4250/6375/8500 \text{ for strength}\]
**1914_0909_02s: The First Battle of the Masurian Lakes (no units from Western Front)**

This scenario covers a more numerically balanced version of the battle and, because of that, Germans victory conditions are much more conservative than the #1914_0909_01s_1st_Masurian_Lakes historical scenario. In this battle, the Germans are intending simply to expel the Russians from the territory of East Prussia for a victory, and the Russians are more able to fight a stand up battle to hold their positions here since they should have little worry of being outflanked in the south.

The victory conditions in this scenario are 66% of the victory point levels in #1914_0909_01s_1st_Masurian_Lakes.
The Battle of Lodz was extraordinary. The battle occurred in wide open terrain with very little in the way of a continuous front line for most of the battle, and there was a great deal of maneuver with widely changing weather conditions. The Germans advanced towards Lodz and the Russian 2nd and 5th Army, which were both on an "attack" towards Silesia, quickly turned about and rushed to Lodz. The battle that ensued was such that the Germans and Russians concentrated around Lodz in a mass, and the Germans pushed east and south of Lodz to bypass and "cut off the retreating 2nd and 5th Armies" by advancing towards the Pilica River, however, amazingly enough the Russians not retreating at all, but rather intending to make a stand. The overall German intent was to stop the Russian attack towards Silesia and to cut off and destroy the Russian 2nd and 5th Army between the German and Austro-Hungarian (to the far south at Cracow) pincer attacks. In the end, the battle was a tactical draw but a strategic victory for the Germans: the Russians abandoned the attack towards Silesia but the Germans did not manage to cut off and destroy any large portion of either Russian army.

This scenario ends on the evening of the 5th of December. Historically the battle is said to have ended on the evening of the 6th, when the Russians voluntarily withdrew from Lodz towards the east in order to straighten the front line. Since the Russian commander has no real reason to conduct this historical withdrawal on the 6th, it is understood that this will happen regardless and this voluntary tactical withdrawal is beyond the scope of the scenario.
When this campaign begins, the Russian 2nd and 5th armies are both on the offensive. Since the user has no incentive to make the historical advances to the west, these two armies begin deployed in the locations they were in when they were released to move back towards the Lodz area. Another astonishing thing about this battle was that the Russians reacted uncharacteristically quick to the German flanking attack towards Lodz, within just a few days the Russian 2nd and 5th Armies had turned about and were marching rapidly to Lodz, marching non-stop for two days straight. This quick thinking on the part of both army commanders saved their armies, kept the Germans from taking Lodz, and eventually stopped the German offensive. It is interesting to note that Russian high command at STAVKA and the Northwest Front levels were both frustrated and furious with the Russian 2nd and 5th Army commanders for acting on their own initiative to cancel the in progress offensive, which demonstrates just exactly how disconnected the Russian higher levels of command really were.

The Russian I Cavalry Corps begins deployed in front of the 2nd and 5th armies, as they were leading the advance to the west. Assume that reconnaissance patrols and aircraft have reported sightings of a German cavalry corps to the west by this point, and the Russian commander is advised to be withdrawing the I Cavalry Corps to the southeast to be closer to the Warta River, lest the intent is to get locked into a fight to the death in a massive cavalry battle with the HKK.3, a fight which the Russian cavalry is probably destined to lose under most circumstances. The suggestion is to withdraw to the southeast a bit, then oppose the Germans there without fear of being cut off from escape since most Central Power cavalry have faster operational movement. If you do find yourself getting trapped or flanked, begin combining your cavalry to fight as dismounted dragoons, in units of three to six combined squadrons, and utilize your divisional machine guns and field guns to block critical road junctions to keep the Germans from using the road network to get around behind you quickly. Also, always use your Cossack units as sacrificial squadrons to slow down the enemy if you must, which is one of the things they do best.

The Germans are advised not to aggressively recon towards the Warta with the HKK.3 before the 16th of November or else they risk releasing the Russian 2nd Army who was historically advancing towards and over the Warta to attack into Silesia (the Russian 2nd Army releases on the morning of the 16th). The Germans can certainly do what they like with the HKK.3, but it should at least be known that an aggressive advance towards the Warta will trigger the early release of Russian corps, who will likely flee to the east several days before what was historically the case. The triggered Russian releases are present in order to prevent a gamey German commander (equipped with hindsight) from attempting to cut off and isolate the fixed Russian 2nd Army who is committed to the historical advance into Silesia, and it allows the Russians to call off the advance early if the Germans act aggressively towards the 2nd Army.

The Russian III Caucasus Corps, Guard Cavalry Corps and 14th Cavalry Division arrive in the south near the end of the battle. The 3rd Caucasus Corps was intended to help play a decisive role at Lodz, however it was it became involved in heavy fighting near Belchatow on the 1st, as the Austro-Hungarians attacked towards Piotrkow, and as such,
it was not able to play their ordained role. These forces are included to allow that area to play out historically, or if unopposed, to possibly play some role around Lodz in the final days of the battle.

The south part of the map involved heavy thought and frustration. The trouble is, as with any mobile scenario, there was plenty of action along the edge of the map. However, at some point you have to have a cut off and stop adding forces because fighting along the map edge never works particularly well, especially when both sides were mostly "holding the flank". In the area of Radomsko, in the south center of map, the Austro-Hungarians attempted to capture the strategic crossroads near the end of the Battle of Lodz. They attacked with the XII.Korps, with one division south of the Dzialoszyn-Radomsko road (35.Inf.Div) and one to the north of it (16.Inf.Div). The Austro-Hungarian 16.Inf.Div will arrive to help hold down the Central Power's southern flank, as was historically the case, as this allowed the k.u.k. IV.Korps to operate freely to its north in its attack on Belchatow and Piotrkow. It is assumed that if the 16.Inf.Div can move forward, then so too does the missing 35.Inf.Div move east beyond the map boundary.

The German 4.Kavallerie-Division was sent to the area as reinforcements by late November, but due to supply difficulties, there was no supply of fodder for horses (all the cavalry divisions already present were consuming what little was available) so it remained at Wloclawek for the duration of the campaign. Because of this, it is not included in the scenario.

The German III.Reservekorps arrived too late to take part in the campaign and is not present here. Historically by the end of the campaign on December 6th, the corps was still moving towards the front line and was only just moving through the area between (roughly) Kutno and Plock. The omission of this corps from the scenario is meant to remove the unnecessary and useless burden of moving them, since they would not arrive at where the front line would likely be located by the last turn in the campaign.

The German HKK.1 was historically withdrawn to the Kutno area on the 26th of November. Originally the approach was to involuntarily remove HKK.1 on the 26th, at 0600 but with a very low 20% probability. However, it has been decided to not remove HKK.1 since the Germans kept it in reserve for the duration of the campaign. With HKK.1 not removed, the German commander can decide to pull the unit back into reserve as was historically the case, or keep it committed in the fighting. No doubt by the historical date HKK.1 will be greatly fatigued and reduced, and with the front line between Lodz and Lowicz likely closed, it would not make a lot of sense to keep the valuable (Victory Point for losses wise) cavalry on the front line taking sustained losses.

It is interesting to note that the head strong von Francois was given command of the 8.Armeec by this time. Hindenburg and Ludendorff prepared their Lodz counter offensive and requested that von Francois contribute his old corps, the I.Armeekorps, to the attack by transferring it to the 9.Armeec. Von Francois instead sent the newly raised and poorly trained XXV.Reservekorps instead. This turned out to be the last straw; von Francois was relieved of command in early November 1914 and replaced by General Otto von Below
(the commander of the I.Reservekorps during the campaign in East Prussia). Von Francois would never get promoted above a corps commander for the duration of the war and his I.Armeekorps was split in two and one division sent to the Lodz as reinforcement.

The supply situation in this campaign and its associated smaller scenarios is low, and this is representative to the overall supply situation of all belligerents near the end of 1914. Historically, all sides expected the war to be concluded by the end of the year, and no nation was initially able to sustain the supply of ammunition required to field their massive armies in a prolonged war that had already raged for over three months. It is especially true that the level of artillery ammunition consumption caught almost everyone by surprise and war stock piles were all but completely depleted by the end of the year. It rapidly became apparent to all belligerents that the war was going to be a protracted conflict, and they urgently began gearing up their armaments industry to supply the record levels of ammunition required to sustain operations. With that in mind, just like the late battles in France '14 where this was also the case, both sides in this scenario are inadequately supplied but commanders will have to make do with what they have, as was historically the case. However, the Germans do have a bit more supply here than they did in France '14's late battles, and the rationale is that they were better able to supply offensive operations on the Eastern Front with the newly manufactured ammunition due to the close proximity of this sector to the homeland.

This campaign works well as a TCP/IP or PBEM team based game of two (Allied) versus one (German). The Allied players should consist only of #1 [1st Army & 2nd Army], #2 [5th Army]. The Northwest Front (Ruzskiy), which is the overall commander, can be controlled by the 5th Army player. Additional teammates on both sides could be added as corps commanders. Ideally an added second German player should take all Austro-Hungarian (k.u.k) forces, along with any German reinforcements that arrive in the southern sector, with corps assignments to additional players going from there. On the Russian side, the ideal setup would be for an additional player to separately take the 2nd Army (so that the 1st and 2nd Armies are controlled by two separate people, and in that case the overall commander should be the user that has the 1st Army). Additional Russian players can take individual corps within the armies.
1914_1112_02s: The Battle of Wloclawek

It is recommended that the German side attacks very aggressively. Time is short and caution should be discarded in order to secure the objectives quickly, which represents the German intent of destroying the Russian 79th Infantry Division, which would open the advance along the Vistula. It is also recommended that the Germans utilize the forced bridge crossing rule in order to cross the river that runs southwest of Wloclawek and perpendicular to their advance.
The Russian 3rd Guard Division has had its right flight opened up due to the withdrawal of the 1st Rifle Brigade that was located at Drzewce. Historically, the 1st Rifle Brigade was on the flank but once the Germans began maneuvering around its own right flank in the morning of the 14th, it withdrew on a march back to the southeast through Leczya, stopping just short of Orzokow.

The German 22.Infanterie-Div. gets withdrawn in this scenario to simulate its historical advance southeast.
The Germans knew the Russian line was fragile opposite of where they massed HKK.1, where a Russian Cossack division held the gap between two Russian army corps. To achieve anything close to a historical result, the Germans must be very aggressive with HKK.1 and immediately overwhelm the Russian Cossacks, thereby breaking through the line and advancing to the southeast to Kutno, and the Bzura. Historically the Russian II Army Corps withdrew because of this threatened flank. If the Russians do not withdraw immediately here then the Germans have an opportunity to gain quite a few Victory Points by eliminating parts of that corps, by way of HKK.1 blocking them in place while German infantry assault them from the northwest and west.

Historically, the Russians recognized II Army Corps' precarious situation and immediately began pulling it back through Krosniewice and southwest towards the Bzura. Because of that, Krosniewice is not an objective, lest the battle devolve into a last stand in that area. Also, Kutno, although a large town, is worth only a small amount of points for the same reason. The goal for the Russian commander should be to avoid the total or partial destruction of his II Army Corps. This corps should be withdrawn at all possibly haste, and continue to conduct a fighting withdrawal/delaying action throughout the scenario. Ideally the Russian commander should try to extricate the II Army Corps across the Bzura near Piatek, failing that it should at least be withdrawn to the Bzura where it is assumed that bridging engineers could take care of the rest. The dilemma is whether or not to divert some forces from the Leczyca gap to defend the Piatek crossings.

Historically the German 36.Infanterie-Division pushed the Russian Caucasus Cavalry Division back, and then advanced towards Leczyca: the strategic crossing point at the bend in the Bzura, and the gateway to the gap between the Ner and Bzura rivers. It is recommended that the 36.ID attack vigorously towards Leczyca in order to take the objective; time is against the Germans as more Russian forces will arrive from the south. The dilemma is whether to continue to divert part of the 36.ID to help outflank the Russians near Krosniewice, or to move the entire division southeast. If the Germans fail to cut the Krosniewiece-Leczyca highway and trap part of the Russian II Army Corps and eliminate it, then failing to advance on Leczyca with haste will result a great deal of lost victory points.

The actual heavy fighting in the Battle of Kutno took place on November 15th, and the 16th was a day of German pursuit and additional Russian withdrawal. It was decided that this scenario would also encompass the events of both the 15th and 16th which featured additional Russian withdrawals and German advances to and beyond the Bzura. The reason for this extension is because the shorter the scenario is, then the more likely that a historically withdrawing side will instead just hold to the last man and try to be saved by the short turn limit. With a longer scenario, the Russian are encouraged to pull back, otherwise they risk total collapse by the second day, and giving up too many Victory Points from losing rear objectives on the Bzura and from losing heavy casualties from the units that stayed around and held too long.
This scenario ends on the November 22nd which was the high water mark of the German envelopment; the Germans had lost their chance to envelope Lodz as the Russian were then pouring in from the Lowicz area in the northeast and cut off the Germans on the 23rd. At that point the battle shifted as the Germans began withdrawing their breakout force that was now cut off and perilously close to being destroyed. It would have been a serious blow to the Eastern Front had the Russians destroyed a German corps, a guard division and a cavalry division that were isolated southeast of Lodz, but the Germans were able to conduct a fighting withdrawal back to the north and restore the line, giving up all of their gains in the breakout. This restoration of the line and extrication of those exposed German units is a the subject of the #1914_1123_01s_Lodz scenario.

As the Germans, keep in mind that Russian forces will arrive along the north edge of the map throughout the scenario, and early on in the scenario as well. Keep an eye on the protected hexes in the north so that you are not surprised.

The Germans are advised to keep some units in their rear areas (their starting areas) during the course of the scenario, there will be a Russian threat to their rear. See the shaded protected hexes for a hint on where these units will approach in the north. Historically the Germans detached several infantry brigades from their divisions in the area to act as rear security: one brigade from the 50.Reserve Div (the detached Res.Inf.Bde.99 which had been hitherto separated from its parent division north of the Vistula), Inf.Bde.74, Dragoener-Regt.19, and elements of XVII.AK. Even with their rear
threatened, the Germans are encouraged to take as many objectives as they can in the south before the scenario ends, and hold what they can to the rear with what forces they can sacrifice and scrape together. In the end it is a balancing act but if the Germans can hold in the rear and take objectives in the south for a victory, then it is rationalized that the attack could continue, precariously but safely, and Lodz could be captured.

Historically the Germans pulled back the XX.AK on the 22nd to help hold Strykow. While the Germans do not have to do this here for the same reasons (because they don't have to worry about extricating their forces to the south in this scenario), they can and probably should pull back some of this force if Strykow is heavy threatened by Russians arriving from the north. In the end, both Glowno and Strykow were lost, and the Germans had to fight desperately to withdraw their envelopment force to safety, again the subject of the #1914_1123_01s_Lodz scenario.

It was difficult to determine exactly what parts of the German XVII.AK (which were located in the impassible area northwest of Lodz in this scenario) were actually pulled back to counter the Russians arriving from the north. The most comprehensive maps and sources about the various stages of the Battle of Lodz are Russian sources, and some simply state that parts of the corps were sent that direction, but yet the maps of the battle show that both divisions of this corps still remained in place north of Lodz. After all, the Germans could not have withdrawn a substantial part of the XVII.AK, such as one of its divisions, and still effectively maintain the front line north of Lodz. Pulling back substantial parts of the XVII.AK would have been self defeating, because it would only protect the north to expose the south. For these reasons, and due to the lack of exact information on this topic, a decision was made as to what the Germans likely detached as a force to help delay the Russians coming from the north: it is rationalized that the XVII.AK would have detached all of its reconnaissance assets to this task, because the reconnaissance assets units would have been sitting behind the front line after it solidified and would have been in reserve, and one brigade from the 35.Inf.Div (the closest to the sector) because it is likely that at least a brigade would have been sent to provide a substantial opposition force. This means that in this scenario the XVII.AK detaches its divisional cavalry and jäger units and a brigade to help secure the rear area, because with the lack of information this choice is the most obvious and plausible. If more information is ever discovered then additional elements of the XVII.AK will be added as reinforcements, but currently there is nothing that shows otherwise.

Historically the entire Russian 55th Infantry Division arrived on the 20th at Skierniewice, but only a brigade of it arrives in this scenario because its other brigade was immediately sent north to Lowicz.

South of Lodz, a mysterious formation appears on Russian source maps called the "Karaulova Squad". This force consisted of a jumble of thrown together units: two battalions from the 159th Infantry Regiment, one battalion from the 20th Siberian Regiment, the consolidated remnants of the 13th and 14th Siberian Regiments (4th Siberian Division) and five artillery batteries taken from the various Siberian divisions and some components of the 3rd Guard Division (assumed here to be one brigade in
This force does not appear in this scenario as an organized force, although most of the stray elements do appear so that they can be cobbled together south of Lodz if necessary.

One particularly painful headache was caused by a Russian source map that erroneously labeled a "6th Cavalry Division" as Russian, but gave German axis of advance arrows from the Russian map symbol. Of course both the Germans and the Russians fielded a 6th Cavalry Division during the Lodz campaign, and so hours of additional research had to go into clarifying whether the map symbol or the arrows were the source of the error. After painfully translating Russian text, the decision is that the map symbol was the error, and the division belonged to the Germans. This was further reinforced by the idea that the Russian 6th Cavalry Division was north of the Vistula at the beginning of the campaign, and the German 6th Cavalry Division, combined with the 9th Cavalry Division that was confirmed present during this battle, made up the HKK.1 formation.
This scenario ends on November 25th, which was the point in which the Germans had escaped their failed envelopment positions (the subject of the #1914_1118_01s_Lodz scenario) and narrowly avoided being cut off and destroyed.

As the Russians, it is suggested that you extend the Caucasus Cavalry Division to the east, and use it to block the flow of German supplies so as to isolate the German forces, in additional to screening operations. They key to victory for the Russians is to cause the Germans forces to be isolated, which will prevent them from being able to breakout to the north. Once they are isolated, continue to try to maintain your stranglehold on the Germans, and close in and attack from the south and west. Once the reinforcements begin to arrive in the I Army Corps salient (see below), these forces can be used to move northeast to help with the blockade, or to aggressively attack into the German left flank.

As the Germans, it is highly recommended that you quickly move your cavalry formations northeast at all possible speed to attempt to drive off the Russian Caucasus Cavalry Division, and ensure that German units can trace a supply line to the north supply sources and prevent German forces from being isolated. The key to victory as the Germans is, above all else, try to maintain a supply line to the north and the best way to do this is to move the cavalry to the northeast to open the line around the Russian eastern flank! Without supplies the Germans will become isolated and their attacks will falter, rendering their breakout attempt futile, and allowing the Russians to slowly close the
noose. The Germans can afford to be isolated for some time, and will likely have to rely on the guards infantry formations to carry forward at that point, but the cavalry should continue to towards the eastern flank. Prolonged isolation will result in certain defeat since most units will become "No Morale" and, as such, will not be able to recover from disruption (essentially the entire force will begin to breakdown a whither).

The Germans have many supply sources on the north edge of the map. The ones to the northwest represent the closest point to friendly German forces, so the supply level is much higher than the sources to the east of that area. The very low supply sources running on the due north edge of the map represent the fact that if German units can maintain a corridor to that area then they would have gotten very little supply but they would have not have been cut off to the degree that total isolation effects would justify.

The reduced strength Russian 63rd Reserve Division is withdrawn on the evening of the 23rd because historically it appears to have attacked south and then retreated west into the I Army Corps' salient for refuge.

The salient formed by the Russian I Army Corps east of Lodz was used as an attack position to attack into the retreating German left flank. The 43th Infantry Division and 3rd Turk Rifle Brigade were both holding in front of the German XX.Armeekorps to the north, but once the Germans began falling back these Russian formations moved into the salient for safety, then attacked outward to disrupt the German retreat. Rather than place these units on the map in their start positions or have the arrive in their historical location, these units arrive by reinforcement inside of the I Army Corps salient ready to attack. Otherwise, with hindsight the Russian commander would no doubt move these units straight into the path of the counter attacking German force, where in reality the Russians themselves were worried about being caught in a pincer between the German retreating units and the XX.Armeekorps holding in the north.

It is interesting to hypothesize what effect the destruction of one infantry corps, a cavalry corps and a guard division (about 70,000 men and 200 guns) would have had on the Germans. It would not have been irreparable, although at the very least the Germans would have likely of had to withdraw from Lodz and the campaign would have ended in disaster. Perhaps von Mackensen may not have held any other command positions after such a failure, which could possibly have played a role on the stunning German victory in the 1916 campaign in Romania.


1915_0204_01s: The 2nd Battle of the Masurian Lakes

This is a bonus campaign and is not for the faint of heart; it is a true slog through terrible weather conditions and more like a combination of the 1st Masurian Lakes battle and the Lodz campaign battles. Control and use of the road network is vital to success.

Historically this battle was considered to be a tactical German victory, but a strategic German defeat. The Germans had inflicted serious losses on the Russian 10th Army, but had failed to destroy it as a fighting force.

This scenario ends at the end of the 21st of February. Historically, the Russian 12th Army counterattacked from the south (SW of Osowiec), and this stopped the German advance. It is understood that the battle was decided by that point already, and the Russian "counter attack" mostly stopped the Germans where they were at that point and did not actively push them back anyway.

Historically the Russian XX Army Corps was wiped out, being pushed back, then surrounded in the Augustow Forest. The destruction of the XX Army Corps accounts for 4,411 victory points (VPs), which is rounded off to 4,250 VPs and these are included in the total VP levels, so the Germans must inflict at least these historical losses to have a chance at victory. They don't have to destroy the XX Army Corps per se, but they are required to destroy the same amount of Russian forces. Achieving these historical losses but also not taking any of the additional bonus objectives would be considered a draw. Needless to say, victory for the Germans is not intended to be easy here due to what they have to accomplish, and the terrible weather conditions, and this is more or less the historical outcome of the campaign (a tactical victory, but a strategic draw, or even a strategic minor defeat, depending on how you look at it).

The Russian objective near Kovno in the northeast corner of the map is a BONUS OBJECTIVE. The Germans are not required to take that objective for victory, it only exists to influence the actions of the Russian side and to influence historical behavior. See next comment for more information.

Historically the Russian III Army Corps, under the command of General Yepanchin, withdrew to the Kovno area after his corps was engaged. This happened not only because there was a command failure at army and corps level, but also because Yepanchin incorrectly believed that the German attack was primarily directed toward Kovno, which he had been told to protect. Yepanchin withdrew his III Army Corps to the Kovno area while under pressure on the 9th and he remained there for the rest of the battle. His corps, composed of two reserve divisions, were unused to battle and disintegrated in the fighting and withdrawal to the east. The remnants of Yepanchin's corps, together with straggler regiments and battalions from other formations that escaped the battle to the northeast, reformed to the west of Kovno and ceased to play a major role on the rest of the battle, other than occupying the area west of Kovno which required the Germans to divert a contingent of forces as an observation force. From a scenario design point of view, the initial instinct was to have III Army Corps get withdrawn from the scenario on the 9th, at
a low probably like 20%. However, there are various problems with that approach. Most importantly, if III Army Corps is withdrawn, then the Germans have no incentive to devote a contingent to observe the III Army Corps, which would in turn allow them to use more forces to destroy the rest of the Russian 10th Army, or to block their retreat. Secondly, if III Army Corps is withdrawn, then its movement to the east will not delay the German advance as they cross in front of the eastern most advancing Germans, and Victory Points cannot be obtained from the destruction those stragglers. Finally, withdrawing the III Army Corps pretty much puts the scenario "on rails" to the degree that history cannot be changed, which is not always good from a wargaming perspective. So, with those issues in mind, the tough decision was made to not have III Army Corps withdraw, but rather encourage the Russian commander to withdraw the III Army Corps and any remnants of other formations to the northeast towards Kovno. This is accomplished by creating a BONUS OBJECTIVE in the Kovno area, which is worth bonus points which are not counted towards the Victory Point total. In other words, the bonus objective at Kovno is not something the Germans are required to take, rather, it is an objective that is there for the Russians to lose if they do not send the III Army Corps to that area. Alternatively, if the Germans devote a large force to take the bonus objective then they would in turn be sending an a-historically large force to deal with that area and would consequently suffer in the historical progress to the south. Also, a Russian exit hex is located at Kovno which provides several options to the Russians: they can hold the bonus objective and exit what units they can spare into Kovno for bonus points to represent units escaping destruction, or if the bonus objective falls then they can exit all forces in the area as a way to evacuate and compensate for some of the loss of the bonus objective.

The ideal Russian strategy is to withdraw under pressure and delay the Germans for as long as possible. III Army Corps should follow its historical withdrawal to the northeast towards Kovno, and gather any remnants to hold the large bonus objective located west of Kovno. Failing this, all forces in that area should withdraw into Kovno at the exit hex, but attempt to divert as many German forces that they commit to attacking the bonus objective for as long as possible since it will divert forces away from the rest of the battle. Elsewhere, all forces should delay the German attack and fall extricate forces to the south to hold the line between Grodno and Osowiec with XXVI Army Corps and III Siberian Corps, and to attempt to withdraw the XX Army Corps to safety somewhere, or to have it withdraw and then hold out until the end of the scenario, buying time for the rest of the army to escape, or withdraw to the forests, as was historical, and fight to the death - again buying more time for the rest of the army to escape in hope of a draw result. As mentioned above, historically the XX Army Corps withdrew back to the Augustow Forest, where it was surrounded and held, but was eventually destroyed. However, it is a possible strategy to repeat this maneuver in an attempt to hold out until the end of the scenario, in which case it is rationalized that the historical counter attack by the new Russian 12th Army, which occurs right after the scenario ends, will halt the German advance and therefore save the XX Army Corps from destruction due to the Germans being forced to withdraw.

That said, both sides have several options to obtain a victory. The Germans can attempt to destroy at least the XX Army Corps, and destroy additional Russian forces for a
victory, or destroy the XX Army Corps and take bonus objectives. Failing that, the Germans can take most of the normal objectives and then try to take as many bonus objectives as possible. The Russians can win by countering any of these approaches.

Historically the Russian XXVI Army Corps withdrew towards Grodno, and the III Siberian Corps withdrew to Osowiec. Like Kovno, this is represented by additional objectives in that area. If Russian forces do not withdraw to hold the line between Grodno and Osowiec, then they will surely have no chance at victory.

There are a lot of unknowns and, therefore, necessary abstractions in this scenario. Accurate maps of the Russian side are difficult to come by; the best sources available at the time of creating this scenario were corps level maps only (various English and Russian language sources).

The Germans have four Landwehr divisions during this campaign, the 1st, 11th, 10th and 16th. All four of these divisions were ad-hoc at this point, and they didn't even have their correct name either. It wasn't until March that these divisions were officially named by their numeric designations of 1., 11., 10., and 16.Landwehr-Div and brought up to their official organization. Some of these divisions have their roots in the two Königsberg divisions that are present in the East Prussian campaign. Since the exact organization of these two ad-hoc Königsberg Landwehr divisions are mostly unknown, those two divisions specifically have retained some of the original organization from the East Prussian campaign. This is an assumption however, whatever their organization was, it wasn't until March that they became official Landwehr divisions and, as such, a well documented order of battle.

The poor supply situation of late 1914 is carried over into early 1915 in this scenario, but supply levels are slightly improved. Historically supply levels of all nations did not return to adequate levels until mid to late 1915, and 1916.

This campaign works well as a TCP/IP or PBEM team based game of one (Allied) versus two (German). The German players should consist of #1 [10.Armee and OHL (overall commander)], #2 [8.Armee]. Additional German or Russian players can take individual corps within the armies.
Grand Campaign Notes

The "Grand Campaign" is a series of scenarios that are intended to be played in sequence, with the result of each deciding which scenario to play next and, eventually, collectively deciding the outcome of the war. All Grand Campaign scenarios are intended to be played as head-to-head with another player (or as a team game with a group of players).

The goal of the Grand Campaign is to provide a fun way to explore the history of the war by providing influential outcomes, continuity and, occasionally through the use of the Strategy and Operations feature, some historically based decision making. The intent is that the players feel as if they are working towards an overall objective rather than just playing a series of otherwise unrelated scenarios, and to allow some a-historical "what-if" situations to be explored where certain decisions can carry far reaching consequences.

Note that Grand Campaign scenarios sometimes feature MASSIVE amounts of reinforcements from Strategy and Operations selections. It is recommended that you utilize the "Place All" button in the Reinforcement Dialog when placing large amounts of reinforcements.

Campaign Outcome (Campaign Victory Points - CVPs)

The Grand Campaign is intended to be played across all available games in the First World War Campaigns series, and is designed around the accumulation of "campaign victory points". The sum total of Campaign Victory Points (CVPs) is what decides the outcome of the campaign.

Note that some minimal and simple bookkeeping is required for the campaign to keep track of the CVP total and progress and, if the "CVPs for prelude scenarios" optional rule is used, the number of prelude scenario major victories per side (see Optional Rule: CVPs for Prelude Scenarios).

At the start of the campaign, there are 0 CVPs; the CVP scale (above) starts in the center at zero. After each campaign scenario is played, CVPs may be obtained from the result and the Campaign Victory Point level is updated: when one side obtains points the scale moves in that direction and when the other side obtains points then the scale moves back in the opposite direction, and so on. For example, if the first campaign scenario result was +2 CVPs for Central Powers, and the second campaign scenario result is -2 CVPs for Allied Powers, then the new running total is now 0 CVPs (+2 then -2 = 0).
Once the Central Powers reach a total of +FOUR Victory Points or when the Allied Powers reach -FOUR Victory Points then the Grand Campaign is over: that side has won the war (the opposing side has capitulated)! If this has not occurred then the Grand Campaign is so far inconclusive and continues on (the CVP total carries on through the entire campaign and never "resets").

Note that all campaign scenarios do not provide the same amount of CVPs to the winner, and this represents the fact that some campaigns had greater importance on the outcome of the war. Also, some campaign scenarios may provide asymmetrical amounts of CVPs to the winner and loser and may provide no CVPs for minor victories. This asymmetrical CVP awarding is by design and represents the occasional asymmetrical level of importance of certain battles.

Some scenarios have Strategy and Operation selections that must match between several campaigns scenarios (it specifically mentions this on the strategy and in the scenario's notes in this document). The side that has these choices is bound by honor to make selections that are consistent between the scenarios. If it is determined that those selections were not consistent, then that side has forfeited both scenarios and the other side is given a Major Victory result. However, if a the Grand Campaign ends in a forfeit loss, the winning side can choose to have the campaign continue for one additional battle to see if the opposing side can push the CVP scale back and remain in the fight.

Optional Prelude Scenarios (and CVPs for Prelude Scenarios)

Prelude scenarios are scenarios that occur in the time period before and between the various campaign scenarios, and these are specifically mentioned in the "Prelude Scenarios" notes section for each individual Grand Campaign scenario. Prelude scenarios can either be skipped or played for fun (for the sake of getting the "whole picture" of the war). Alternatively, if both sides prefer that the prelude scenario results should influence the outcome of the campaign, then the "CVPs for Prelude Scenarios" optional rule can be used (see below).

Optional Rule: CVPs for Prelude Scenarios. If both sides agree, the results of the optional prelude scenarios can provide some minor influence the outcome of the campaign by introducing the possibility that CVPs may be rewarded for achieving a string of decisive victories. The process is as follows:

- Keep track of each Major Victory obtained by both sides in the prelude scenarios in a running total. These are called Campaign Prelude Points (CPP).
- Each CPP gained cancels out one CPP from the other side's total (but their CPP total can never drop below 0).
- The moment a side has obtained FIVE total CPPs, that side gets one Campaign Victory Point (CVP) in their favor (i.e. Central Powers: +1 CVP or Allied...
Powers: -1 CVP) and then that side's CPP total count is reset back to 0 (the enemy's CPP count is NOT reset to 0 when this happens however).
- Carry the total CPP count over throughout the Grand Campaign (from the France '14 prelude scenarios to the East Prussia '14 prelude scenarios, and so on).

Example 1:
The Central Powers win three major victories in prelude scenarios before the Allied Powers win any major victories. Central Powers have 3 CPP. If the Central Powers can obtain two more major victories then they will gain a CVP and their CPP count returns back to 0 and the process begins again.

Example 2:
Continuing on the above example where the Central Powers have a total of 3 CPP, if the Allied Powers can win a major victory before the Central Powers could win those other two, then the Allied Powers would have 1 CPP, and Central Powers would have 2 CPP (3-1 = 2).
It is important to note that although the Grand Campaign Scenario Progression Tree defines which scenarios to play in what order and which scenario to start from, the campaign is NOT intended to be rigid. Both sides can agree to start the campaign at any point in the tree, can skip scenarios if they want, or can agree on a result for a specific scenario and move forward. For a shorter campaign, both sides can agree to end the campaign after a certain scenario and then whoever is in the lead on the CVP scale can be declared as the winner.

**Grand Campaign Scenario Progression Tree**

version: 21 May 2014
(supersedes all previous versions)

F14-A  EP14-A

_F14-A is the START scenario._

_Normally EP-14A is played after F14-A, but it can be played simultaneously (recommended). Do not proceed further until both are resolved!_

F14-B*

_Skipped if either side obtained a Major Victory in F14-A._

F14-C  EP14-B

_Normally EP-14B is played after F14-C, but it can be played simultaneously (recommended). Do not proceed further until both are resolved!_

EP14-C

_stalemate_

_If neither side has achieved enough CVPs to win, then the campaign is so far inconclusive (a draw)._
Legend:
**BLUE** = Western Front
**GREEN** = Eastern Front
* = sometimes skipped
**grouped on same line** = can be played simultaneously, otherwise play in sequence from left to right and top to bottom (be sure to check the notes for each scenario for any prelude scenarios in between)

Notes:

1. The Grand Campaign may be expanded in future titles, at which point players can go back and play any scenarios that were newly added to the tree. In the case where additional scenarios might be added to the end of the tree, players can decide to resume their Grand Campaign and continue on playing the new scenarios with their CVP total.
2. The ideal situation is to play the Grand Campaign with a group of players and, even better, several teams of players with each team specific to a certain front. The next ideal situation would to have the same players play all fronts but at least have a different player act as the overall commander in each front. The least preferred situation would be for two people to play the entire Grand Campaign one scenario at a time (this would not be impossible, but it would take a lot of effort and time).
3. The campaign tree only exists as a graphical representation to show the flow of the campaign, in order to view the long term path of the campaign. Each Grand Campaign scenario's notes section specifies which scenario Grand Campaign scenario to play next so that you are not required to study the tree after each result.
1914: The Grand Campaign (scenario EP14-A)

This scenario is part of the Grand Campaign series, designed to cover all campaigns in the First World War series with the outcome of the war being decided by scenario results. This particular scenario is based on the #1914_0820_01s_Campaign_East_Prussia scenario, most of the notes regarding that scenario still apply and should be referenced before playing.

Although both sides can agree to start the Grand Campaign at any scenario, this scenario is intended to be played after the France '14 scenario #1914_Grand_Campaign_F14-A. However, this scenario can be played simultaneously with that scenario (Ideally it should be played as a team effort with one team playing this scenario, and another team simultaneously playing the other.)

Other than the different scenario description text, the following differences between this scenario and #1914_0820_01s_Campaign_East_Prussia are:

- Some Strategy and Operations selections are added based on the various historical war plan options, strategic force movements between fronts, and army concentration options.

Prelude Scenarios

The following is a list of optional "prelude" scenarios that can be played before this particular Grand Campaign scenario is played. The results of these prelude scenarios are
just for fun and have no effect on the outcome of the Grand Campaign, unless the "VPs for prelude scenarios" optional rule is used (see Optional Rule: CVPs for Prelude Scenarios). As many or as few of these scenarios can be played as desired:

(East Prussia '14)

#1914_0817_01s_Stallupoenen

Strategies and Operations

This section covers a description of the various Strategy and Operation selections available during this Grand Campaign scenario. Careful thought and consideration has gone into determining the grand strategic and operational selections in the campaign. Please read these notes about the different choices and choose your selections carefully.

Central Powers

---Plan of Attack---

!(selection must match in #1914_Grand_Campaign_F14-A or forfeit both)!

Plan 1905 (Massive wing, neglect Russia)

- See France '14 for specific effects on the Western Front
- Minimal forces in East Prussia, the Germans will rely primarily on Landwehr formations drawn from the surrounding region to conduct a purely defensive campaign (II.LK is utilized, and Hauptreserve Posen arrives sooner), Germans are initially deployed in a more defensive stance in East Prussia
- Aggressively tries to win in France, while all but giving up East Prussia, but can also be vulnerable to Allied war plans that place the bulk of their forces in Belgium

Plan 1912 (Strong wing, partially neglect Russia)

- See France '14 for specific effects on the Western Front
- Light defense in East Prussia, the Germans will rely more on Landwehr formations drawn from the surrounding region to conduct a mostly defensive campaign (II.LK is utilized), Germans are initially deployed in a more defensive stance in East Prussia
- Possibly vulnerable to certain types of Allied war plans, but still concentrates on a higher chance of victory in France above all else

Plan 1914 (Moderate wing, do not neglect Russia) (historical)

- See France '14 for specific effects on the Western Front
- Moderate defense in East Prussia, able to conduct counter offensive operations
- Conservatively organizes strength to counter all possible Allied war plans, while sacrificing a higher chance of victory in France

Central Powers
---Reinforcements from Western Front---

!(selection must match in #Grand_Campaign_F14-A or forfeit both)!

*Continue on to East Prussia (historical)*

- The Gardereservekorps, XI.Armeekorps and 8.Kavallerie-Division continue on to East Prussia and with the matching selection in #1914_Grand_Campaign_F14-A, these forces will not be sent back to France

*Reinforcements redirected back to France*

- The Gardereservekorps, XI.Armeekorps and 8.Kavallerie-Division are redirect back to France and with the matching selection in #1914_Grand_Campaign_F14-A, these forces will return there to assist in the battle

**Scenario Results**

The Russian invasion of East Prussia is deemed as a battle of unequal importance for both sides. If the Russians can achieve a major victory during this campaign then it would have altered the outcome of the war, as they would have been poised to advance on Berlin. If the Germans can achieve a major victory then it would have essentially only staved off the Russian advance and prolonged the war. The CVP values are asymmetrical. The historical outcome of this battle is considered to be a Central Powers Major Victory.

- **Central Powers Major Victory:** +1 Campaign Victory Points to Central Powers
  
  go to #Grand_Campaign_F14-B (unless F14-A result said skip, if so then go to #Grand_Campaign_F14-C)

- **Central Powers Minor Victory:** no Campaign Victory Points to either side
  
  go to #Grand_Campaign_F14-B (unless F14-A result said skip, if so then go to #Grand_Campaign_F14-C)

- **Draw:** no Campaign Victory Points to either side
  
  go to #Grand_Campaign_F14-B (unless F14-A result said skip, if so then go to #Grand_Campaign_F14-C)

- **Allied Powers Minor Victory:** -1 Campaign Victory Point to Allied Powers
  
  go to #Grand_Campaign_F14-B (unless F14-A result said skip, if so then go to #Grand_Campaign_F14-C)

- **Allied Powers Minor Victory or Central Powers forfeit:** -2 Campaign Victory
  
  Point to Allied Powers
  
  go to #Grand_Campaign_F14-B (unless F14-A result said skip, if so then go to #Grand_Campaign_F14-C)
1914: The Grand Campaign (scenario EP14-B)

This scenario is part of the Grand Campaign series, designed to cover all campaigns in the First World War series with the outcome of the war being decided by scenario results. This particular scenario is based on the #1914_1112_01s_Campaign_Lodz scenario, most of the notes regarding that scenario still apply and should be referenced before playing.

Although both sides can agree to start the Grand Campaign at any scenario, this scenario is intended to be played after the France ’14 scenario #1914_Grand_Campaign_F14-C. However, this scenario can be played simultaneously with that scenario (Ideally it should be played as a team effort with one team playing this scenario, and another team simultaneously playing the other.)

Prelude Scenarios

None.

Strategies and Operations

None.
Scenario Results

The Battle of Lodz is deemed as a battle of equal, but not vital, importance for both sides. Achieving a victory during this campaign would have altered the outcome of the campaign on the Eastern Front, but probably not the outcome of the entire war at this point. The CVP values are minor and symmetrical. The historical outcome of this battle is considered to be a Draw.

- Central Powers Major Victory: +1 Campaign Victory Points to Central Powers
  go to #Grand_Campaign_EP14-C
- Central Powers Minor Victory: no Campaign Victory Points to either side
  go to #Grand_Campaign_EP14-C
- Draw: no Campaign Victory Points to either side
  go to #Grand_Campaign_EP14-C
- Allied Powers Minor Victory: no Campaign Victory Points to either side
  go to #Grand_Campaign_EP14-C
- Allied Powers Minor Victory: -1 Campaign Victory Point to Allied Powers
  go to #Grand_Campaign_EP14-C
This scenario is part of the Grand Campaign series, designed to cover all campaigns in the First World War series with the outcome of the war being decided by scenario results. This particular scenario is based on the #1915_0207_01s_2nd_Masurian_Lakes scenario, most of the notes regarding that scenario still apply and should be referenced before playing.

Although both sides can agree to start the Grand Campaign at any scenario, this scenario is intended to be played after #1914_Grand_Campaign_EP14-B.

**Prelude Scenarios**

None.

**Strategies and Operations**

None.

**Scenario Results**
The 2nd Battle of the Masurian Lakes is deemed as a battle of equal, but not vital, importance for both sides. Achieving a victory during this campaign would have altered the outcome of the campaign on the Eastern Front, but not the outcome of the entire war at this point. The CVP values are minor and symmetrical. The historical outcome of this battle is considered to be a Central Powers Minor Victory.

- **Central Powers Major Victory:** +1 Campaign Victory Points to Central Powers go to STALEMATE (until campaign is expanded)
- **Central Powers Minor Victory:** no Campaign Victory Points to either side go to STALEMATE (until campaign is expanded)
- **Draw:** no Campaign Victory Points to either side go to STALEMATE (until campaign is expanded)
- **Allied Powers Minor Victory:** no Campaign Victory Points to either side go to STALEMATE (until campaign is expanded)
- **Allied Powers Minor Victory:** -1 Campaign Victory Point to Allied Powers go to STALEMATE (until campaign is expanded)
Gameplay tips

When to assault

The most important thing to know in First World War Campaigns, is when to press home an assault and when not to assault. Generally speaking, you should of course get accustomed to the particular strengths and weaknesses of the units in general. For example, an infantry unit can almost always assault a mounted (Travel Mode) cavalry unit, bicycle unit, or engineer unit with success without having to disrupt them beforehand. "Success" in this case is defined as taking the ground. You should also always to have at least a 2:1 numerical advantage when making an assault, try to avoid numerical 1:1 assaults as much as possible.

In the case of enemy cavalry, you can usually tell whether it is a pesky cavalry squadron or a full cavalry regiment by seeing what the effect is of their return fire. If the enemy is deemed to be nothing more than a cavalry squadron, then you can press home the assault to great effect, again without waiting for the enemy to be disrupted. This is also true for engineer units which might also be broken down into companies. If you have a pesky engineer unit barring the way somewhere, then simply overrun it with a massed infantry assault and you can probably rest assure that the enemy is throwing "the kitchen sink" in the line at this point if they are wasting engineer units in this manner.

And finally and most importantly, you should NEVER wait for field gun or machine gun units to be disrupted before carrying out an assault. If said units are disrupted then that is great, otherwise always try to disrupt the enemy infantry battalions at the very least. In almost every case, all you need to do is disrupt the enemy infantry
battalions, then press forward with an assault of two or more infantry battalions of your own. Such an assault will force the non disrupted field gun and machine gun units to bear the brunt of the attack and will cause them to take significant losses. This can then be followed by more assaults if possible to drive the enemy out of the hex. Either way, if you are not able to take the hex then you have likely caused a great loss to the core defense of the hex, thus making it easier to take in future turns or forcing the enemy to withdraw on his own turn altogether.

**Breaking contact, retreating**

When attempting to fall back or retreat in the face of an overwhelming attack or an unfavorable disposition, you have to first break contact with the enemy. Breaking contact with a superior force can be tricky in a period of warfare where everything moves at roughly the same speed, and is even trickier if your force is lower quality than the enemy's force. When attempting to break contact, use any method necessary that puts the most distance between your forces and the enemy. Use of a rear guard is vital in most cases and cavalry and field artillery (field gun) units work particularly well at this task. Cavalry and field artillery units can delay an enemy advance long enough to put some distance between the advancing enemy infantry and friendly forces, then mount / limber up and fall back to their next delay position which should be just behind the last friendly infantry unit in the retreating force, thus repeating the process.

When your force contains inferior quality troops then you must take into account that you will move slower than your pursuing enemy. This is also true if your force contains a large number of disrupted or broken units. In either of these cases, you must plan your retreat in advance, using good order units to act as a rear guard in order to give
these slower units time to get a head start on the movement. You must also take care not to stick around too long in any one place, lest you end up in a situation where it is impossible for you to retreat back fast enough. In all of these cases, you should try to stay close to primary roads as they are critical in your ability to fall back. Not taking these things in consideration will result in the devastating loss of many an infantry battalion.

Understanding how night movement works in this series is also the key to breaking contact. The best result is to prepare your units for movement and get them into position to move strategically along the roads during the night turn. Cavalry and field gun units can be placed at key road junctions to block any enemy units that try to pursue along the roads during the night. Night retreats come at the expense of a large amount of extra fatigue, but occasionally this is necessary in order to safely extricate forces. Unless it is in an emergency, avoid the temptation of holding a rear guard to the "last man" with cavalry and field gun units. Doing so will definitely buy more time but will also reward the enemy with a large number of victory points. If you are not careful, the victory points the enemy gains from the careless loss of valuable cavalry and artillery guns can easily make up for lost time and objectives.

**The art of taking ground**

Where possible, avoid direct assaults when trying to take ground from the enemy. The best way to take ground is by simply making it untenable. On the attack, you make ground untenable by pushing around the flanks of the strong point. By doing this you leave the defender with two options: either displace and save the units or allow them to be bypassed, isolated, and eventually destroyed. The act of making ground untenable can be done at both the tactical level (divisions, brigades and battalions), but more
importantly it can be done at the strategic level with corps and armies. Always look at "the big picture" to see where you can flank an entire enemy corps or army, thereby forcing the defender to give up ground wholesale or by causing the destruction of an entire army (which was the holy grail of objectives in the 1914 "early" campaign; in game play terms, the destruction of an army could yield around 10,000 Victory Points!). Getting tactical level "tunnel vision" and not recognizing strategic opportunities is the most common cause of failure in a campaign.

Secondly, when on the offensive you should avoid concentrating your attack at one point for a long period of time since this allows the enemy to reinforce that point with units from nearby non-threatened areas. If possible you should consider limited attacks around the central point of emphasis, and these limited attacks would have the goal of simply tying the enemy in place where they cannot move to reinforce the main attack. Another technique that works is demonstrations. Often you can demonstrate an attack in area and tie down enemy forces in that area because they are forced to defend against the looming attack that may or may not be carried out. For example, for those of you that have France '14, in the St-Gond scenario the German 1.Garde-Division intends to attack across the eastern edge of Les Marais de St-Gond. However, doing so will allow the French in the immediate area to the west to move to any threatened area and reinforce or relieve the defenders. However, the 20.Infanterie-Division to the west can move south towards the enemy and demonstrate that they are about to attack across the marsh, even if they do not intend on doing so. The French are then forced to hold units in this area for an attack that may proceed, thereby giving an easier time to the 1.Garde-Division to its east. If the French ignore the demonstration then the 20.Infanterie-Division would be in a prime
position to continue its attack. This attack can proceed forward to the point that the French begins to pay attention to the threat and shifts forces that way, whereby the Germans can pull back the attack, and continue pushing with the 1.Garde-Division, or vice-versa. Think of these types of maneuvers as a pin or skewer in chess.

**Cavalry screening**

One of the most important things on the offense and defense is to use cavalry forces to "screen" your main force. Screening accomplishes several tasks: it conceals your main force from enemy observation, and it keeps the enemy from reaching your main force quickly, which is useful in a delaying action, or when you are trying to break contact with the enemy. Of course screening can be done with any type of unit, such as regular or light infantry, but cavalry are suited best for this role because they can split into smaller units and usually have higher mobility.

On the offense, screening is relatively simple: just keep your cavalry squadrons in front of your main force and those squadrons will obstruct the line of sight of the enemy as long as they are on the same elevation, which represents tactical level harassment, diversions, and distractions.

On the defense, it is a little more complicated to screen with your cavalry, but it can be far more useful. The best employment on the defense is when the defending infantry force is attempting to withdraw some distance and the enemy in pursuit. The cavalry can slow down pursuing enemy infantry by placing themselves between the withdrawing friendly forces and enemy forces, but two hexes beyond the enemy infantry. The enemy infantry will not be able to assault at that distance, and so will have to stop
movement and engage in direct fire. The cavalry will take losses, but usually these will be worth the delay caused to the pursuit force.

**Rail lines, the use of**

Do not underestimate the importance of railroads. Rail lines were particularly vital during this period of warfare for the rapid movement of troops and materials. Care should be taken to protect rail lines with detachments of lines of communication troops to ensure that they are not obstructed or severed. Rail lines are primarily used for transporting complete corps from one sector of the front to another, but are also important for the mobility of some siege guns. When explicit supply is used, rail lines should be utilized to the fullest to transport supply units quickly to front. These supply units will arrive on map at major roads and should be moved to the nearest railhead and sent forward. Originally it was planned to make separate rail type supply units but this was abandoned because these types of units would be totally restricted to rail lines, and they would constantly occupy valuable Rail Capacity. Instead, the user has the freedom to move the explicit supply units by rail (as long as the rail capacity for that side is not exceeded) and disembark and continue to move them when necessary. If an army loses access to a rail line then it can quickly become detached from the overall strategic situation and runs the risk of being defeated by an opposing army that has access to a rail line.

In regards to using rail movement, you will likely find that you will never have enough Rail Capacity available to do what you want to do, meaning that you will almost never be able to move an entire formation as a whole. If you find this to be true, then the best thing to do is what was historically the case: move only the most important parts of
the formation first -- this is called the "advanced party". Once the advanced party arrives at their destination, disembark and go back to the rest of the formation and embark the next set of units in that same turn that you disembarked the first ones. The second set of units should be your "main body", or at least part of the main body. Continue doing this until you have the least essential units of the formation remaining at the start point and then embark and transport those last. While the formation is waiting to be reformed, take that time to rest the units and replace losses. If you find that the enemy is hot on the heels of the yet to be embarked units, then move those units along roads that run parallel to the rail line. Just be sure to have those units begin the turn on the rail line on the turn in which they are available to embark or else you will waste valuable time. Also, you can move your units by train in "hops", that is, move a section of the formation down the track for several turns, then disembark them before they reach their destination, perhaps at the halfway point. Once disembarked, embark the next group of units and move them halfway and repeat, then repeat this process from the halfway point to the destination. The only problem with this method is that you will spend extra time embarking and disembarking, but it can be a necessary sacrifice if you are trying to rapidly gain space between you and the enemy before sending the first part of the unit all the way across the map.

When physically moving the units on the map via rail movement, it can be tedious to move them one stack at a time. It is recommended that you zoom the map out to the 2D Zoom-Out View (use the mouse wheel to do this or click the appropriate selection in the top "View" menu). The zoom-out view will help you see the flow of the rail lines and allow you to move without having to scroll the map too much. Once at the zoom out
view, it is also recommended that you use the Organizational Movement's ALT + right click feature to move along the tracks. Do this by left clicking on the hex that the units are in, but do not select any of those units, and then hold the ALT key and right click on a destination hex. The units should then quickly move along the rail line as a continuous chain until they reach the specified destination or until they run out of Movement Points. This method allows you to move entire columns of units with one click, by moving connected units of the same organization (i.e. you can move a full division this way, or an entire corps if the corps HQ is in the front of the column). It is also worth mentioning that this "organizational movement" can also be used along roads. If you ever do this and see several large arrows appear on the map, then this is because you had a unit selected when you used ALT + right click to move. If this has happened, then access the "A/I" top menu and select "View/Delete A/I Orders" and then delete all entries you see in the pop up dialog, then the move again (this time without selecting a unit).

**Playing as the Germans**

The German’s strength lies in their numbers, their good quality infantry, and their massive amount of howitzers and in their employment of machine gun units. German infantry formations on the advance are almost an unstoppable steam roller. When the infantry is backed up by howitzers there is almost no defensive barrier that cannot be breached. When the Germans are forced on the defensive, their MG kompagnien can be used to solidify the line along with supporting fire from howitzers and field guns. In 1914 the biggest problem the Germans have is that they seem to be always racing against the clock and spreading themselves thin. You will need to make split decisions on when to charge home and push the enemy back at the expense of more casualties so that you can
keep your forward momentum, or engage the enemy in direct and indirect fire attacks at the expense of forward movement.

A useful tactic the German side can consider is withdrawing to draw the Russian forces into a trap or an exposed position. During the historical East Prussian campaign, especially in the Russian 2nd Army sector, the Germans (intentionally or not) withdrew in some places which gave the Russians an impression that they were making great progress. This further split Russian forces and made it easier for those forces to be flanked or surrounded. In other words, as the Germans, always consider behavior that might draw the Russians into a more exposed position, however this behavior requires a willingness to give up terrain.

**Playing as the Russians**

Playing as the Russians comes with its own set of unique problems and strengths. The Russians undoubtedly have superior strength in East Prussia over their German adversaries. As the old saying goes: the Russians are many things in war, but they are seldom outnumbered. Their army has plenty of cavalry, guns, and infantry, the latter being of good quality. However, what fails the Russians is not the rank and file of the army so much as it is a combination of a nearly nonexistent logistics system, poor quality commanders at nearly all levels. Knowing how to adapt to these problems and how to minimize them is the key to success.

In addition to the above issues, getting the most out of Russian howitzers is also very tricky. First, pay attention to unit quality. C quality howitzer units suffer no penalty to their fire, but a D quality unit will have a -20% reduction in firepower. Russian howitzer units are usually C quality, but care must be taken to keep them in command to
prevent a further loss in quality to D quality level. Also, if only detached units are spotting for indirect artillery fire, which can happen often, then the artillery fire is reduced by half. Thus, it is easy to see that if Russian howitzers are not carefully managed then they will end up having a trivial amount of effectiveness. The best thing to do is to keep the howitzer units in good order, in command, and concentrate their fire on large stacks of units. Given that the Russians are almost always having supply difficulties, it is probably not worth using your howitzers unless you are firing on an objective held by the enemy, or on a large stack of two or more infantry units in a hex. Understanding the limitations of your howitzers and how to use them is the difference between having effective indirect fire barrages and having useless artillery units that are only useful at digging fortifications.
**Glossary of abbreviations used in the Order of Battle in the First World War Campaigns Series**

**Austro-Hungarian**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.Abtt.</td>
<td>Armee-Abteilung - Army Detachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abt.</td>
<td>Abteilung - Battalion Detachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG.</td>
<td>Armeegruppe - Army Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOK.</td>
<td>Armeeoberkommando - Army HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art.</td>
<td>Artillerie - Artillery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baon.</td>
<td>Bataillon - Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bt.</td>
<td>Batterie - Battery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bh.</td>
<td>bosnisch-hercegovinisch - Bosnian-Hercegovinian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brig.</td>
<td>Brigade - Brigade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BrB.</td>
<td>Brückenbataillon - Bridge Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>det.</td>
<td>Detachement - Detachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion.</td>
<td>Division - Division of a unit, such as a division of guns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DionsKav.</td>
<td>Divisionkavallerie - Division Cavalry (detachment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Div.</td>
<td>Division - Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR.</td>
<td>Dragonerregiment - Dragoon Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esk.</td>
<td>Eskadron - Squadron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FABrig.</td>
<td>Feldartilleriebrigade - Field Artillery Brigade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHBt.</td>
<td>Feldhaubitzbatterie - Field Howitzer Battery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHD.</td>
<td>Feldhaubitzzdivision - Field Howitzer Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHR.</td>
<td>Feldhaubitzzregiment - Field Howitzer Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FJB.</td>
<td>Feldjägerbataillon - Rifle Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FKBt.</td>
<td>Feldkanonenbatterie - Field Gun Battery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FKR.</td>
<td>Feldkanonенregiment - Field Gun Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FsAB.</td>
<td>Festungsartilleriebataillon - Fortress Artillery Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FsABrig.</td>
<td>Festungsartilleriebrigade - Fortress Artillery Brigade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FsAR.</td>
<td>Festungsartillerieregiment - Fortress Artillery Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GABrig.</td>
<td>Gebirgsartilleriebrigade - Mountain Artillery Brigade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAR.</td>
<td>Gebirgsartillerieregiment - Mountain Artillery Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBr.</td>
<td>Gebirgsbatterie - Mountain Battery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBbrig.</td>
<td>Gebirgsbrigade - Mountain Brigade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHD.</td>
<td>Gebirgshaubitzzdivision - Mountain Howitzer Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GKD.</td>
<td>Gebirgskanonendivision - Mountain Field Gun Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hir.</td>
<td>Honvéd Infanterieregimemt - Regiment of the Hungarian Landwehr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRdfKomp.</td>
<td>Honvéd Radfahrkompanie - Hungarian Landwehr Cyclist Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR.</td>
<td>Husarenregiment - Hussar Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBrig.</td>
<td>Infanteriebrigade - Infantry Brigade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR.</td>
<td>Infanterieregiment - Infantry Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITD.</td>
<td>Infanterietruppendivision - Infantry Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBrig.</td>
<td>Kavalleriebrigade - Cavalry Brigade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KJR.</td>
<td>Kaiserjägerregiment - King's Rifle Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komp.</td>
<td>Kompanie - Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KTD.</td>
<td>Kavallerietruppendivision - Cavalry Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.u.k.</td>
<td>Kaiserlich und Königlich - &quot;Imperial and Royal&quot;; Austrian-Hungarian Empire, basically the term for the &quot;regular army&quot;; unless specifically stated to be otherwise, the &quot;k.u.k.&quot; title is to be assumed in front of most unit names.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIR.</td>
<td>Landsturminfanterieregiment - Reserve Infantry Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSchR.</td>
<td>Landesschützenregiment - Austria's own version of the Kaiser Jäger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lw-</td>
<td>Landwehr - Austrian Landwehr unit (prefix)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LwIR.</td>
<td>Landwehr Infanterieregiment - Regiment of the Austrian Landwehr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MaR., MaBaon., MaKomp. Marschregiment, Bataillon, Kompanie March Regiment, Battalion, Company (replacements)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGA.</td>
<td>Maschinengewehr Abteilung - Machine gun detachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nr.</td>
<td>Nummer - Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB.</td>
<td>Pionierbataillon - Engineer Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK.</td>
<td>Pionierkompagnie - Engineer Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PolL.</td>
<td>Polnische Legion - Polish Legion; volunteer Polish troops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rdfl.</td>
<td>Radfahrer - Bicyclist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rtAD.</td>
<td>reitende Artilleriedivision - Mounted Artillery Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rtBt.</td>
<td>reitende Batterie - Mounted Battery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Regt.</td>
<td>Regiment - Regiment (suffix)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB.</td>
<td>Sappeurbataillon - Engineer Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sHBt.</td>
<td>schwere Haubitzbatterie - Heavy Howitzer Battery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJR.</td>
<td>Tiroler Kaiserjägerregiment - Tyrolean Rifle Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TrD.</td>
<td>Traindivision - Supply Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UR.</td>
<td>Ulanenregiment - Lancer Regiment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**French / Belgian**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACMs</td>
<td>Auto-Canons-Mitrailleuses - Armored Machingun Cars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Bataillons “Alphabétiques&quot; - Formation of Zouaves, most likely temporary battalions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCA</td>
<td>Bataillon de Chasseurs Alpins - Alpine Chasseurs Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCI</td>
<td>Bataillon de Chasseurs Indigènes - Indigenous (Moroccan) Infantry Battalion, light infantry unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCP</td>
<td>Bataillon de Chasseurs à Pieds - Chasseurs Infantry Battalion, light infantry unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bie</td>
<td>Batterie - Battery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Btn</td>
<td>Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Corps d'Armée - Army Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAC</td>
<td>Corps d'Colonial - Colonial Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Corps d' Cavalerie - Cavalry Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chas.</td>
<td>Chasseurs - literal: &quot;hunters&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cie</td>
<td>Compagnie - Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dét</td>
<td>Détachement – Detachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAB</td>
<td>Département d’Armée de Belgique – French army detachment for the Belgian area (Flanders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIC</td>
<td>Division d'Infanterie Colonial - Colonial Infantry Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Division d'Cavalerie - Cavalry Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIT</td>
<td>Division d’Infanterie Territoriale - Territorial Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Division Marocaine - Moroccan Infantry Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td>Division d'Réserve - Reserve Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAN</td>
<td>Groupe d'Armées du Nord - Group of Armies of the North (Flanders sector)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDR</td>
<td>Groupe de Division de Reserve - Group of Reserve Divisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GQG</td>
<td>Grand Quartier Général - Supreme Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td>Groupe d'Réserve - Reserve Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mit</td>
<td>Mitrailleuse - Machine Gun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAC</td>
<td>Régiment d'Artillerie de Campagne - Campaign Artillery Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACC</td>
<td>Régiment d'Artillerie de Campagne Colonial - Colonial Campaign Artillery Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAL</td>
<td>Régiment d'Artillerie Lourde - Heavy Artillery Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAM</td>
<td>Régiment d'Artillerie Montagne - Mountain Artillery Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REI</td>
<td>Régiment Étranger d'Infanterie - Foreign Legion Infantry Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFM</td>
<td>Régiment d' Fusiliers Marin - Marine Fusiliers Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>Régiment d'Infanterie - Infantry Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIC</td>
<td>Régiment d'Infanterie Colonial - Colonial Infantry Regiment (European, not native troops)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIT</td>
<td>Régiment d'Infanterie Territoriale - Territorial Infantry Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
<td>Régiment de Marche - ad hoc Regiment; used separately in early 1914 designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMCIC</td>
<td>Régiment de Marche de Chasseurs Indigènes à Cheval - ad hoc Spahis Regiment, RMSM in 1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMT</td>
<td>Régiment de Marche Tirailleurs - ad hoc &quot;rifleman&quot; Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMZ</td>
<td>Régiment de Marche Zouaves - Zouaves ad hoc Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMZT</td>
<td>Régiment Mixte de Zouaves et Tirailleurs - Mixed Zouaves and Tirailleurs ad hoc Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTM</td>
<td>Régiment de Tirailleurs Marocains - Moroccan Tirailleurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec</td>
<td>Section - Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tir.</td>
<td>Tirailleurs - literal: &quot;sharpshooters&quot; These were African troops serving in the French colonial army</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**German**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.Ab</td>
<td>Arme-Abteilung - Army Detachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abt</td>
<td>Arbeitleitung - detachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOK</td>
<td>Arme Oberkommando - Army Command, as in the Army headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>Artillerie Regiment - Artillery Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Artillerie - Artillery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Bayerische - Bavarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bayer</td>
<td>Bayerische - Bavarian (long abbreviation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baden</td>
<td>Badisches - Grand Duchy of Baden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bde</td>
<td>Brigade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bel</td>
<td>Belagerungstrain - (preceded by &quot;Pionier&quot; or abbreviation &quot;Pio&quot;) Pioneer Siege Train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battr</td>
<td>Batterie - Battery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Btl</td>
<td>Battalion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Carabinier Regiment - Essentially these were dragoons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Div</td>
<td>Divisione - Division, a combined arms force of various types of components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td>Dragoner Regiment - Dragoon Regiment, cavalry used for dismounting and fighting on foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ErsR</td>
<td>Ersatz Regiment - Depot or replacement Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esk</td>
<td>Eskadron - Cavalry Squadron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>Fußartillerie Regiment - Heavy Artillery Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FüsR</td>
<td>Füsilier Regiment - Fusilier Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAR</td>
<td>Garde Artillerie Regiment - Guard Artillery Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>Garde du Corps - Life Guard Cavalry Regiment, Heavy cavalry, the German cavalry elite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gd</td>
<td>Garde - Guard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDR</td>
<td>Garde Dragoner Regiment - Guard Dragoon Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gem</td>
<td>Gemisch - Mixed, combined arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERSR</td>
<td>Garde Ersatz Regiment - Guard Depot or Replacement Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFUSR</td>
<td>Garde Füsilier Regiment - Guard Fusilier Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFAR</td>
<td>Garde Fußartillerie Regiment - Guard Heavy Artillery Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGR</td>
<td>Garde Grenadier Regiment - Guard Grenadier Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHQ</td>
<td>Großen Hauptquartier - Supreme Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GKR</td>
<td>Garde Kürassier Regiment - Guard Armored Cavalry Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td>Grenadier Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRESR</td>
<td>Garde Reserve Regiment - Guard Reserve Infantry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRESDR</td>
<td>Garde Reserve Dragoner Regiment - Guard Reserve Dragoon Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRZFß</td>
<td>Garde Regiment zu Fuß - Guard Infantry Regiment, literal: &quot;Guard Regiment of Foot&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRZP</td>
<td>Grenadier Regiment zu Pfrede - Horse Grenadiers, light cavalry used for skirmishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUR</td>
<td>Garde Uhlan Regiment - Guard Lancer Cavalry Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hesse</td>
<td>Hessisches - Grand Duchy of Hesse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HKK</td>
<td>Höhere Kavallerie-Kommandeur - Senior Cavalry Commander; essentially this is a cavalry corps although it worked a bit differently than a regular army corps: the HKK commander was essentially a senior cavalry commander that was only a command authority concerning tactics and strategy of the employment of the cavalry divisions and support assets within the grouping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Husaren Regiment - Hussar Regiment, medium cavalry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILR</td>
<td>Infanterie Leib Regiment - Body Infantry Regiment, literal: &quot;body guard&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Infanterie Regiment - Infantry Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kp</td>
<td>Kompagnie - Company (German spelling changed to &quot;kompanie&quot; in 1929)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KR  Kürassier Regiment - Armored Cavalry Regiment, heavy cavalry used for shock
kz  Kürze - short
Ldw  Landwehr - Militia
LdwIR  Landwehr Infanterie Regiment - Militia Infantry Regiment
LGR  Leib Grenadier Regiment - Life Grenadier Regiment
LgR  Leibgarde Regiment - Life Guard Regiment, literal: "life guard" (Hessian)
LHR  Leib Husaren Regiment - Life Guard Hussar Regiment
LIR  Lehr Infanterie Regiment - Infantry Instruction Regiment, as in the "instructors"
LKR  Leib Kürassier Regiment - Life Guard Armored Cavalry Regiment
Lst  Landstrum - Reservists / Territorial Troops
MFüsR  Marine Füsilier Regiment - Marine Regiment
MG  Maschinengewehr - Machine Gun
MGK  Maschinengewehr Kompagnie - Machine Gun Company
MGSfK  Maschinengewehr Schärfschützen Kompagnie - Machine Gun Sharpshooter Company
MöR  Mörser Regiment - Mortar Regiment
MR  Matrosen Regiment - Sailor Regiment
Mwf  Minenwerfer - Trench mortar
Nr  Nummer - Number
OHL  Oberste Heeresleitung - Supreme Army Command
Pio  Pionier - Pioneers, engineers
Regt  Regiment - comprised of several battalions; could also appear as "Rgt" to prevent text overflow
Res  Reserve
RR  Reiter Regiment - cavalry, literal: “rider regiment", usually preceded with an “s”, designating a heavy cavalry regiment.
Rtnd  Reitende - riding
s  schwere - heavy
sächs  Sächsisches - Kingdom of Saxony
stelv  Stellvertretende - Provisional or garrison formation
UR  Ulanen Regiment - Lancer Cavalry Regiment, light cavalry at this time used for reconnaissance
würt  Württembergisches - Kingdom of Wurttemberg

**Russian**

Art  Artillery
Bde  Brigade
Bn  Battalion
Btty  Battery
Cav  Cavalry
Cauc  Caucasus
Co  Company
Cssk, Csk  Cossack
Cuir  Cuirassier
Drgn, Dgn  Dragoon
Div  Division (all arms)
Dvzn, Dvn  Divizion (Russian sp., grouping of batteries or squadrons)
Fin  Finnish
FAB  Fortress Artillery Battalion
Fort  Fortress
Gd  Guard
Gren  Grenadier
Hus  Hussar
Hvy  Heavy
Ind  Independent
Inf  Infantry
Kzkh  Kazakhstan
Lncr, Lcr  Lancer
LG, LG  Lifeguard
Mtn  Mountain
Regt, Rgt  Regiment
Rfl  Rifle
Sib, Sb  Siberian
Turk  Turkestan

***
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The Blitz.org http://www.theblitz.org
(excellent site for ladder wargaming to setup play-by-email matches with others, and forums or discussing this and other Tiller games)

First World War.com http://www.firstworldwar.com
(excellent site for general facts and topics about WWI)

Mark Conrad's homepage http://marksrussianmilitaryhistory.info/
(excellent source for Allied 1914 order of battles)

Axis History Forum http://forum.axishistory.com/

Der erster Weltkrieg http://www.1914-18.info/

Die Schlacht bei Tannenberg 1914 http://www.tannenberg1914.de/

World War One Image Archive http://www.gwpda.org/photos/greatwar.htm
(excellent site for World War One photos; some of the images in this notes document came from this website)

WarCron http://www.warcron
(excellent chronological source for some hard to find information, like what general weather conditions were day by day during a campaign)
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