This document contains official errata for GMT Games' *Unconditional Surrender! World War 2 in Europe* (second edition released September 2017). The file includes corrections and changes made to improve play based on feedback.

We are sorry for any inconvenience. Our excuse is we are only human. – USE Design Team

The **Errata** section appears first. The **Questions** section appears last.

   New or **Changed** entries from the last released Errata-Questions file are labeled as such.

   Important notes appear in a blue-shaded box.

   A **game designer comment** is in *italics*, sometimes in a tan-shaded box.

   A rules **exception** is usually enclosed in brackets. [***Exception***: …]

   An *example* appears in *italics*. ***Example****: …*

Errata

Impact Summary

This file includes all corrections and clarifications, including simple punctuation errors or changes that do not impact play. To discern an item's importance, its impact on play is noted within its text. Here is a summary of the quantity and impact.

Rulebook: 40x No; 9x Minor

Playbook: 3x No; 1x Minor

Counters: 3x No

Map: None

Faction Cards: None

Flow Chart Cards: 1x No

Player Aid Sheet: 1x No

Counters

Belgium, Will 1s, Back side: Change "3" to "2". *No impact, if you used the rulebook's value.*

Netherlands, Will 1s, Back side: Change "3" to "2". *No impact, if you used the rulebook's value.*

Poland, Prod 1s, Back side: Change "6" to "3". *No impact, if you used the rulebook's value.*

Map

None

Faction Cards

None

Flow Chart Cards

Operations Phase, Supply Check Sub-Phase, start of 1st sentence: Change to "Each phasing unit in a hex". *No impact, if you followed the rulebook which states the phasing faction checks its units.*

Player Aid Sheet

Strategic Combat Results box, Note: Change "Extra Factories" to "On-Map Factory Count". *No impact.*

Rulebook

Sequence of Play Table, 1st sentence: Add a period to the end of the sentence. *No impact.*

1.3.3 *No impact.*

- Island, 2nd sentence: Delete "]" at the end of the sentence
- Examples: All the text of the examples should be in italics.

1.3.10 Between the 2nd and 3rd sentences: Delete "restricted." *No impact.*

4.2.3.3 Ground Movement and Attack, Example (*not Example Continued*), 2nd sentence: Change "attack into German unit's" to "attack into the German unit's". *No impact*

4.2.3.5 Fort Occupation *No impact*

- Add at the start of the rule: "A brief list of fort effects is also in Fort (15.12)."
- 4th paragraph (before adding the new sentence above): Add to the end: "*The sole purpose of a performing the Army Operations Action can be to simply occupy or exit a fort.*"
- 7th paragraph (before adding the new sentence above): Add "An EZOC in a fort hex does not impact a unit's ability to occupy or exit a fort. Also, a unit that starts its activation by exiting a fort in an EZOC may continue to move per ground unit rules."

4.2.4.1 Naval Movement Prohibitions, 1st bullet, Exception: Change to [*Exception*: A unit using a canal (4.2.4.2) can cross Land hexes and/or move into (but *not* end its movement in) a different, *active* friendly country.] *Minor impact*

5.1 Combat Resolution Sequence, Step 2, 1st bullet: Change "(14)" to "(14.0)". *No impact.*

5.2.2 Example, 3rd paragraph, 1st sentence: Change "France" to "French". *No impact*

6.4.3 1st sentence: Change "prevents the completion of the Action" to "ends the intercepted unit's current Action." *No impact.*

7.4.3 The paragraph before the 1st bullet, last sentence: Delete the second period symbol. *No impact*

8.2 Upgrade, 1st paragraph: This should be in a designer's note box and italicized. *No impact*

8.2.1 Upgrade Example, last paragraph, 1st sentence: Change "On next turn" to "On the next turn". *No impact*

9.0 Important Box, all sentences after the 1st sentence: Text should be italicized. *No impact*

9.2.1 Step 1, Last sentence: Delete this sentence. *No impact.*

10.1.1 Declare War *Minor impact.*

- Delete the designer's note that was in the 2017-10-18 errata file.
- Important box: Replace with the following.

Important: Remember to check Prohibitions 10.1.1.1.

- Exceptions: Delete this from 10.1.1. They are now part of a new 10.1.1.1 Prohibitions rule. See below.

10.1.1.1 Add the following. *Minor impact. This is a new section made from the exceptions previously listed in 10.1.1.*

10.1.1.1 Declare War on Country Prohibitions

- If both the Appeasement and Nazi-Soviet Pact policies are in effect, the Axis faction cannot declare war on a country. If the Axis faction wants to attack a country, it must first declare war on a faction (10.1.2) or wait for either or both policies to end by some other means (see 10.3.4.1 and 10.3.5.1).

- If either the Appeasement or Nazi-Soviet Pact policy is in effect, both the Western *and* Soviet factions cannot declare war. *Yes, either policy affects both Allied factions.*
- If the Moscow Treaty policy is in effect, the Soviet faction cannot declare war.

10.1.2 Declare War Example, 2nd paragraph: Replace with the following. *No impact.*

The Axis faction goes first in the Phase and its player decides to attack Poland now and then invade the USSR in 1940 (to delay triggering the East Invaded Conditional Event (13.3)). Because both policies are in effect, the Axis cannot declare war on a country (10.1.1.1). Therefore, it first states it is declaring war on the Soviet faction. That ends the Nazi-Soviet Pact, which allows the Axis to declare war on a country (10.1.1) and allows the Axis and Soviet factions to fight each other. In addition, with that policy no longer in effect and with Appeasement still in effect, any neutral country the Axis faction declares war on automatically joins the Soviet faction (13.1.1). With the Pact ended, the Axis faction declares war on Poland. This activates Poland, which joins the Soviet faction, and its counters are set up as per the Country Setup (13.1.2). The Axis faction could then declare war on more countries but states it will not.

10.3.5 Last bullet: Change "15" to "10". *Minor impact.*

10.3.5.1 3rd bullet: Change "from Turn Track" to "from the Turn Track". *No impact.*

10.3.6.1 2nd sentence: Change to "If the policy ends, see 'Policy Ends' in Moscow Treaty (15.14)." *No impact.*

11.1 Example, last sentence: Change "rolls for a 3 for" to "rolls a 3 for". *No impact*

13.1.1 4th bullet, sentences 3-4 (i.e., the italicized sentences): Delete them. *No impact.*

13.1.2 1st bullet, last sentence: Change "affected if has a" to "affected if it has". *No impact*

13.1.2.1 2nd bullet, 1st sentence: Change "considered conquered (13.2.2)." to "considered conquered by the phasing faction (13.2.2).". *No impact*

13.2.1.1 UK or USA, Step 5, 1st sentence: Change "apply the Political Success event" to "apply an Unrestricted Political Success event" *Minor impact. Any neutral country on the map can be selected; ignore border or Sea Zone restrictions.*

13.2.1.1 USSR, Step 9, 1st sentence: Change "apply the Political Success event" to "apply an Unrestricted Political Success event" *Minor impact. Any neutral country on the map can be selected; ignore border or Sea Zone restrictions.*

13.2.2 Important Box, last sentence: Text should be italicized. *No impact.*

13.2.2 Step 4, 1st bullet: Change ""If the East Invaded (13.3)" to "If the East Invaded event (13.3)". *No impact.*

13.2.2.1 France, Step 2" Change "apply the Political Success event" to "apply an Unrestricted Political Success event". *Minor impact. Any neutral country on the map can be selected; ignore border or Sea Zone restrictions.*

13.2.2.1 France, Step 3, 2nd sentence: Change ""If the East Invaded (13.3)" to "If the East Invaded event (13.3)". *No impact.*

14.1 2nd bullet: Change "**No enemy city** (with or without an enemy unit in it)," to "**In all other situations**". *No impact*

14.11 Political Failure

- 1st sentence: Change "Pulled Event Marker" to "Pulled Marker". *No impact.*
- 1st bullet: Change "has no Pro-[Faction] marker" to "has no Pro-[Faction] or Strict Neutrality marker" *No impact unless you allowed a Pro-[Faction] marker to replace a Strict Neutrality marker.*

14.12 Political Success

- 1st bullet, 1st sentence: Change "has no Pro-[Faction] marker" to "has no Pro-[Faction] or Strict Neutrality marker" *No impact unless you allowed a Pro-[Faction] marker to replace a Strict Neutrality marker.*
- 2nd bullet, 2nd sentence: Change "faction (13.1)" to "faction (13.1.2)". *No impact.*
- Add the following after the bullets, but not as a new bullet: *Minor impact.*

> **Unrestricted Political Success**: If specifically instructed to apply this, the faction must do one of the bullets above. However, for the first bullet, ignore the reference to sharing a land border or Sea Zone. *Simply pick any neutral country on the map.*

14.15 Designer's Note Box, last sentence: Change "for the controlling" to "for controlling". *No impact.*

14.16 1st sentence: Change "A Faction" to "A faction". *No impact.*

14.17 Last paragraph, 1st sentence: Change "end of the Actions Sub-Phase" to "end of the phasing faction's Actions Sub-Phase". *No impact.*

15.8 3rd paragraph (i.e., the one starting with "On turns when"): Change "put it six turns later" to "put it four turns later". *Minor impact.*

15.9 2nd sentence: Change "a Fac. Count" to "a Fac Count". *No impact.*

15.10 2nd sentence: Change "a Fac. Lost" to "a Fac Lost". *No impact.*

15.16 Mulberry, 2nd paragraph: Add "Treat this as a printed port on the map, except as noted below.". *No impact.*

16.0 Vichy: "Mainland" should be bold and italicized. *No impact.*

Policies Quick Reference, 10.3.6.1 2nd sentence: Change to "If the policy ends, see 'Policy Ends' in Moscow Treaty (15.14)." *No impact.*

Conditional Event Quick Reference, USSR Northern Border, 1st bullet: Change to "south of hex row 36xx" to "north of hex row 15xx". *No impact.*

Operations Phase Flowchart, Supply Check Sub-Phase, start of 1st sentence: Change to "Each phasing unit in a hex". *No impact.*

Sequence of Play Flowchart, Strategic Warfare Phase boxes: The color of any blue text should be black. *No impact.*

Sequence of Play Flowchart, Replacements Phase, 2nd box: "Change "strength, or remove" to "strength or remove". *No impact.*

Playbook

New 30.1.2.2 Rules to Read, 3rd bullet: Change "6.1 to 6.1.3" to "6.1 and 6.3.2". *No impact.*

30.3.1 Production / National Will Markers: Add: "A Prod x2 marker is put in its Faction Card's Production Multiplier box." *No impact.*

31.7.1 Special Rules/Notes, 3rd bullet: Delete "in this scenario, the Axis faction rolls a die" at the end of the 2nd sentence. Also, delete the 3rd sentence. *No impact.*

32.1.3 Set Up, USA, Counter ID 7: Change the Entry-V value to +24. *Minor impact.*

32.6.1 Control Markers, 3rd bullet: Change "Debrecen" to "Szolnok". *No impact.*

32.4.1 Special Rules/Notes, 1st bullet: Delete "unless the Moscow Treaty policy goes into effect". *No impact.*

Playtesting

The following section are rules changes under consideration but require more playtesting. If you to try them, please report your findings to the USE Design Team via email or on the USE topics on Consimworld or BoardGameGeek. Thank you.

8.2 Upgrade

This reduces the number of available Russian units later in the war. This should ease play a little for the Soviet player by having less units on the map and reduces Soviet force projection on too many fronts.

Add as a new paragraph at the end of this section, before rule 8.2.1.

Russian Guards: After replacing a Russian regular infantry unit in a hex with an Upgrade Russian Guards motorized infantry unit, the Soviet player immediately removes a second Russian regular infantry unit in a hex on the map. This second unit is also removed from the scenario. *In other words, one Russian Guards unit replaces two Russian regular infantry units.*

Weather

This deals with player concerns that published Poor weather effects are worse than Severe effects, that there are too many combats in bad weather that yield little result for the time played, and that a long string of the same weather results (e.g. six turns of Fair weather in a row) affects play balance. The changes below attempt to address these concerns.

5.3.1: Add a new bullet.

- A unit cannot conduct a Mobile attack against an enemy ground in a hex affected by Poor or Severe weather. A unit can only Assault it.

This is a new rule that mitigates the same weather occurring many turns in a row. Add:

11.1.1 Weather Limitations

Within each weather zone, the weather for the months of April, June, and November, cannot be the same as the prior month. Either continue to reroll the die until a different weather result occurs or if there is only one other Weather result for the zone, change it to that weather.

Example: In March, the weather was Severe in the Cold Zone, Poor in the Mild Zone, and Fair in the Warm Zone. For April, the weather will automatically be Poor in the Cold Zone as there is no other result for that zone. In the Mild Zone, a die roll result of 2-3 (yielding Poor again) is rerolled. In the Warm Zone, a die roll result of 1-2 (yielding Fair again) is rerolled.

Within each weather zone, if the weather for the June turn is Fair, also put a *1 Sortie* marker in the Fair box on the Weather Track. *The marker serves a reminder.* It remains there until rolling for that Zone's October weather. When rolling for Oct, remove 1 Sortie marker (putting it with other unused markers) and add 1 to the die roll to determine that Zone's weather. *This reduces the chances of a very long run of Fair weather.*

11.2: 2nd bullet: Change "combat -2 DRM" to "combat -1 DRM". *Other unit or Air/Naval Support DRM remain as listed.*

Player Aid Sheet, Ground Combat DRM: Change "-2 Attacking a unit in a hex affected by Poor weather" to "-1 Attacking a unit in a hex affected by Poor weather". *Other unit or Air/Naval Support DRM remain as listed.*

New Optional Rule(s)

26.0 Last Stand: *This is a new* optional *rule.* Add:

This represents defending forces fighting desperately to keep their country from collapsing.

If a ground combat result is DR and the defender is a full strength unit that can retreat, the non-phasing faction may choose to reduce the defender instead of retreating it. It can do this under the following conditions.

- The defender is in a city in its one of its country's Mainland or Overseas Areas.
- The defender's country would collapse (13.2) if one of the attacking units advanced after combat into that city. The phasing faction does not have to state in advance that it will advance after combat.

Questions

Question 01 – Russian Rasputitsa: In the infamous mud weather (even on the Eastern Front), there is no impact on movement. That means that an infantry army could move five hexes (~175 miles) and then attack in one month. That seems awfully good compared to their historical rates of movement and advance achieved during the Rasputitsa. What is happening here from a design perspective?

Answer 01: For those that have not heard the term before, Rasputitsa is a season when travel on unpaved roads becomes difficult due to muddy conditions from autumnal rains or spring thaw.

My studies of army level movement over the span of a month showed that over the centuries, it was enemy contact that mattered most in determining how far an army advanced. Weather, while certainly a factor, did not significantly reduce an army's movement. It averaged out over the course of a month. Fighting, however, and more so fighting in bad weather, was the important factor.

In USE, unopposed movement (i.e. not attacking) is not reduced. However, if a unit is engaged with the enemy, bad weather affects movement with its +2 MP to attack. For example, a Leg unit in Fair weather can make four ground attacks against clear hexes, but in Poor weather it goes down to two. Similarly, a Mobile can make five or three attacks, respectively. In addition, in Poor weather the attacks have a -2 attacker DRM.

Question 02 – Partisans / Airdrop: The Partisans marker appears to be the most effective weapon in the Russia chit pool as far as I can make out. They remain in the hex for the entire combat phase penalizing the defender with a -2 for each combat (all weathers) and are at no risk of being removed unlike the Airdrop marker (which also provides a -2 for the phase, but are at risk of being removed from the game on a die roll of 6).

Were the partisans really than much more effective than a couple of divisions of elite paratroops dropped behind enemy lines? Perhaps they represent other assets as well or maybe it's to tempt you to use them in combat rather than strategic warfare. I believe that they were primarily engaged in supply line issues rather than coordinating with major offensives where they show up in the game, but I could be wrong.

Answer 02: The Airdrop represents paratroopers providing direct combat support taking or denying key locations from the enemy in a short time frame. They are trained soldiers and very hard to replace if destroyed.

The partisans are eroding enemy supplies, pulling troops from the front line, and providing intelligence over a longer period than the airborne are operating. Note the partisans' -2 DRM is the equivalent of the Low Supply -2 DRM. So, imagine the partisan activity as temporarily putting the defender in a Low Supply status. The difference is that it only applies in the hex the partisans are active rather than following the defender for a whole turn no matter where it goes.

From Mark Dey (Developer): I typically use Soviet Partisans for strategic combat as I try to be patient and focus on getting the Axis to 9 lost factories as soon as possible. However, they are rather potent, and intentionally so, since to oust some German armies, you'll need that modifier. One thing to consider is that Partisans do have a placement restriction based on friendly countries, so you won't be able to use Partisans in Germany.

Question 03 – Game Play vs Luck: I notice where you responded to gamer's inquiry that you have no problem with people changing DRM to their taste if they have problems with an aspect they are concerned about.

I wanted to see how you developed your CRTs from a probabilistic standpoint. I mention the following only to show an example of how one game designer developed a weather table for MMP's Guderian's Blitzkrieg. This is an Operational look at the East Front beginning with Operation Typhoon and ending spring 1943. For their weather table, they researched how the weather was during different times of the year in Russia during the 1940s and may have included the 1930s. A Monti Carlo simulation was done to develop the Weather Table response. In developing your tables and results did you and your team develop them with probabilities in mind?

Though probabilities are involved in USE, is individual game play the major driver in results and not the results on the CRT? For instance, in the game Risk you probably know that the results on the die rolls are the major driver and not a gamer's strategy.

Answer 03: USE strives to have game play drive results. However, given the importance of such things as CRT results and weather, luck (or the dice) can be a driving force. It is hard to deny luck's effect on the outcome of historical events.

The USE tables were designed with probabilities in mind. They were then modified based on how the results affected game play. The game's simple tables and use of a six-sided die meant modifications were based more on form and results than trying to achieve historical, statistical probabilities. For example, the Weather Table needed to work within the context of the Weather Zones and how the campaigns played out. The area encompassed by the Cold Zone needed to have a higher chance of bad weather relative to the Warm Zone. These were then tweaked to create a range of results that were slightly different for each Zone. It wasn't based on studies of actual weather patterns except in the general sense, e.g. it's colder more often in Moscow than Rome.

The CRT and ground combat started with a basic premise based on the game's scale. All things being equal, if two armies fought each, then each would have about a 25% chance to defeat the other and the remaining 50% would result in a stalemate. That stalemate might still have victories and defeats by both sides, but not enough to dislodge the other by a full hex. A significant victory by one side over the other would happen based on how wide the modified combat results were. I use the dice here to simulate whatever you can think of that resulted in the big victory. Generally, if one side's modified combat result was about twice than the other side's result, they got more than a simple retreat result. Again, the results and DRM were then adjusted based on how the campaigns played out.

In terms of running computer simulations, it was Strategic Warfare that benefited from this. A gamer, Jay Muchnij, was kind enough to run many simulations of Strategic Warfare using different DRM. It gave me results as to how many and how often Germany, UK, and USSR would lose and regain factories. I examined the results and evaluated how they mirrored history and their impact on play balance.

Ultimately, USE is a game I want people to have fun with. If a player's experience with the game's probabilities and results feel wrong, e.g. they too greatly favor one side over the other, then it is easy for a player to modify the DRM accordingly. They can even add new ones to simulate something important to them. I feel this is one of USE's strengths and am pleased I could work that into the design.

Question 04 – Tempo and Weather: Just called our last Vassal game where the Russians blew a huge hole in the German lines at the start of Summer'43. The clear weather turns are too powerful, history is maintained by having the Spring, Winter and Autumn too difficult. This also makes it too weather dependent. A five or six turn Summer in 41 in Russia and the Germans win, a three and they lose. Even if they don't Collapse Russia, and why would you, you need the losses and particularly the space that the extra turns give you.

I also find the game tempo range my main issue with the game. It's all about the clear weather. Most turns are not clear weather and they are spent doing very little with the odd hex changing hands.

Answer 04: Others have experienced what looks to be a game winning Russian '43 breakthrough. Generally, it was due to an over extended Axis line without enough reserves. After they've experienced it, players do better the next time. Having said that, defending in USE is harder than attacking.

Also, players new to USE may underestimate the how well the Germans can regroup farther back from a disaster and reform a line in time for the bad weather. The Axis lose the game if Germany collapses. What looks hopeless in summer '43 might stabilize in late '43. As the front gets closer to Germany, the terrain gets rougher, the Germans get to the front faster, and because the front line is shorter, more reserves can be placed. It's a long war.

Regarding the tempo and weather, most games in this genre are quarterly or similar time periods. USE is monthly and as such the tempo and pace of advance tries to fit within that time scale. It makes for a longer game, but I find the campaigns play out closer to what they did historically (at least as I saw them).

While researching, studying maps and time scales, I was slightly taken back by what was a series of short period, rapid, and deep advances and long periods of little advance. Historical accounts tend to focus on the active periods of the war, not the quiet ones. It added perspective to some campaigns which were not as amazing (for lack of a better term) at USE's scale than we tend to imagine them. The Russian '41 winter offensive being the most prominent that comes to mind.

In my opinion, weather was a primary factor in campaigns' outcomes. Admittedly, weather was not always the primary reason, but it was a major factor. Because of this, weather plays a large role in the game. Can it be deciding factor in USE? Certainly, if a faction gets very lucky with five or more turns of clear weather, but odds are against that.

If USE had a more detailed supply system or more complicated methods for limiting offensives in locations (such as with limited range "Blitz" markers), it could simulate those other factors that paced campaigns. However, it doesn't because one of its main design goals was relative simplicity. The price for that simplicity are game effects that are broader and potentially have more impact than they might otherwise be.

As for the current set of movement costs and DRMs related to weather, they are the ones that seemed to work best over the whole war. A simple change, e.g. attacking a hex in Poor/Severe weather costs +3 MP, can have a big impact on the flow of campaigns. However, USE is easy to modify, so you can make a change and try it out. Perhaps you're willing to let France survive longer if you feel that Russia plays out better. Season to taste. Remember, the objective is to have fun.