



We are considering a fourth edition of **GURPS** and would like your input on a variety of issues. In the questions below, "**GURPS 4/e**" refers to a revision of **GURPS Basic Set, Third Edition Revised** -- likely incorporating material from **Compendium I** and **Compendium II** (but we want your input on that, too!). "Core rules," means "**GURPS Basic Set, Fourth Edition**," although this may end up being more than one volume.

I. And The #1 Question Is . . .

Do you think that **GURPS 4/e** is needed?

- Yes.
- No.
- I don't run **GURPS**; I buy the sourcebooks and worldbooks for the background.

Assuming we were to go ahead and revise **GURPS** anyhow, please share your thoughts on the following questions.

II. Organization and Content

How would you like to see **GURPS 4/e** reorganized?

- Revise **GURPS Basic Set** only. Leave everything else alone.
- Revise **GURPS Basic Set, Compendium I**, and **Compendium II**, but leave the content in three separate books.
- Reorganize **GURPS Basic Set, Compendium I**, and **Compendium II** into two large volumes: **Player's Guide** and **GM's Guide**.
- Reorganize **GURPS Basic Set, Compendium I**, and **Compendium II** into one massive (and therefore expensive!) tome.
- Don't care.

What mix of revision and retention would you like to see in **GURPS 4/e**?

- Fix problem rules, no matter what the cost to backward compatibility . . . and I'd be happy to buy new editions of all my old **GURPS** books!
- Fix problem rules, no matter what the cost to backward compatibility . . . but don't expect me to buy new editions of worldbooks and so on!
- Fix problem rules that would have little impact on backward compatibility, but leave the rest alone.
- Retain backward compatibility at any cost.
- Don't care.

How much detail would you like to see in **GURPS 4/e**?

- More than in **GURPS 3/e**. The system is too coarse-grained, and here's your chance to fix it.

- The same as in **GURPS 3/e**.
- Less than in **GURPS 3/e**. The system is too crufty, and here's your chance to fix it.
- Don't care.

Which statement best describes your priorities when it comes to the **GURPS** rules?

- I want the rules to be accurate and suited to simulation, even if this comes at the cost of some ease of use.
- I want the rules to be streamlined and suited to drama, even if this comes at the cost of some accuracy.

On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being "I hate this!" and 10 being "This is my favorite type of gaming!", how do you feel about each of the following? (There is no need to assign an unique number to each item; for instance, if you have three favorites, feel free to give them all a "10.")

- Alternate histories.
- Cinematic action (whether Hollywood or wuxia).
- Fantasy.
- Historical (swashbuckling pirates, the Old West, etc.).
- Horror.
- Illuminated and conspiracy.
- Introspective science fiction (cyberpunk, biopunk, and transhuman).
- Post-apocalyptic.
- Realistic action (real-life commandos, cops, and spies).
- Space science fiction.
- Supers.
- Time travel.
- Other.

Do you run or play in a lot of different genres, even if your individual games do not cross genres?

- Yes, I run or play in **GURPS** games in multiple genres.
- No, I only run or play in **GURPS** games in my favorite genre(s).
- I don't play **GURPS**, but I buy sourcebooks and worldbooks for multiple genres to get the background material.
- I don't play **GURPS**, and I only buy sourcebooks and worldbooks for background material for my favorite genre(s).

On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being "Never" and 10 being "Every Time," how often do you play in or run cross-genre games? (E.g., a space-opera setting with magic and dragons, or a cyberpunk setting with Cthulhuoid monsters.)

On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being "Never" and 10 being "Every Time," how

often do you play in or run world-hopping games? (Settings that feature dimension-traveling fantasy heroes, time-traveling bounty hunters, etc.)

3

Should **GURPS 4/e** be designed around a specific world-hopping, multi-genre setting that "shows off" the game's capabilities?

- Yes. Please use the Infinite Worlds setting from **GURPS Time Travel**.
- Yes. Please use the following existing setting: .
- Yes. Please invent a whole new setting.
- No. Why would a generic game need a setting?
- Don't care.

How much "color text" should appear in the form of vignettes and similar non-rules material?

- Lots. Earlier editions were boring because there wasn't enough color.
- Things are just right the way they are.
- None. That would be a waste of space that could be used for more rules.
- None. That would be extra verbiage that could be cut out to make the book smaller and cheaper.
- Don't care.

How much space should be devoted to examples?

- Lots. Have running examples throughout the book, with a continuing character or characters to add color.
- Lots, but featuring many different characters, for maximum coverage.
- Some, to illuminate key points or those that have caused confusion in the past.
- Few. Concentrate on making the rules as clear as possible instead. Examples eat up space that could be better used for content.
- None.
- Don't care.

How would you feel about "How **GURPS Works**" text boxes that explain the assumptions behind the rules? (E.g., what skill and attribute levels the designers assumed were "realistic," how to price an Unusual Background, how the designers justify combat actions such as the Dodge roll vs. bullets, and how to build a Job Table.)?

- Yes, please. That would make **GURPS** a better game.
- No, thanks. That would be a waste of space.
- Don't care.

Should **GURPS 4/e** include "Random Characters" rules similar to those in Chapter 11 of **GURPS Basic Set, Third Edition**?

- Yes.
- No.
- Don't care.

Should **GURPS 4/e** include guidelines for designing character templates (similar to those in **GURPS Warriors** and **GURPS Wizards**)?

- Yes.
- No.
- Don't care.

Should **GURPS 4/e** include a condensed version of the magic system?

- Yes. Reprint a limited spell list, just as in **GURPS Basic Set, Third Edition**.
- Yes. Reduce it to a few advantages with appropriate costs, similar to the Knacks rules on p. C138.
- No. Magic rules belong in a book about magic, not in the core rules.
- Don't care.

Should **GURPS 4/e** include a condensed version of the psionics system?

- Yes. Reprint it with fewer options to save space, just as in **GURPS Basic Set, Third Edition**.
- Yes. Reduce it to a few advantages with appropriate costs. (E.g., a 70-point "Telepath" advantage that assumes Telepathy at Power 10, Mind Shield at IQ, Telereceive at IQ+2, and Telesend at IQ+2, but simply says, "You can send and read thoughts at distances of up to 100 yards on a successful roll vs. IQ+2. Your supreme mental control means that others are at -10 to read your thoughts unless chose to let them.").
- No. Psi rules belong in a book about psi powers, not in the core rules.
- Don't care.

Should **GURPS 4/e** include **GURPS Supers'** system of enhancements and limitations for turning advantages and disadvantages into "super-equipment," or a system like it?

- Yes.
- Yes, but only if those rules are substantially revised.
- No. This kind of thing belongs in a book about supers, not in the core rules.
- Don't care.

Should **GURPS 4/e** include the gadgeteering rules, or something similar?

- Yes.
- Yes, but only if those rules are substantially revised.
- No. Gadgeteering rules belong in a book about technology, not in the core rules.
- Don't care.

Should **GURPS 4/e** include a sample adventure?

- Yes.
- No.
- Don't care.

Should **GURPS 4/e** include sample characters?

- Yes.
- No.

Don't care.

How should we handle cross references?

- With page references, the way it is done now; e.g., "see p. B22."
- With reference to rules sections; e.g., "see *Military Rank* in **Basic Set**."
- With case numbers; e.g., "see 1.4.30."
- Don't care.

Should **GURPS 4/e** be integrated with a CD-ROM release?

- Yes! Even if that means it will take a lot longer to create!
- Yes, but only if that will not slow the revision process appreciably.
- No. **GURPS** on CD-ROM should be a separate product.
- No. I do not have any use for a **GURPS** CD-ROM.
- Don't care.

III. Characters

Do you use a character-design program?

- Yes, I use **GURPS Character Builder** (GCB).
- Yes, but not GCB.
- No, because I don't like any of the existing options.
- No, and I don't want one.
- Don't care.

GURPS is currently slightly biased toward 100-point characters with -40 points of disadvantages. Should we do away with that?

- Yes. The rules should assume characters of points with - points of disadvantages instead.
- Yes. State that the GM can set any point limit and any (or no) disadvantage limit, and then rewrite the rules so that they do not assume a power level. That would be more generic.
- No. I like the current bias.
- Don't care.

Should Basic Speed, Perception, and Will be explicitly treated as "secondary attributes," with point costs, instead of being adjusted using advantages and disadvantages?

- Yes.
- No.
- Don't care.

Should we base fatigue points on HT and hit points on ST? (This would be the reverse of what we do now. Note also that this will mean significant changes to the way we handle very small and very large animals.)

- Yes.
- Leave it optional.
- No -- and don't even mention the option.
- Don't care.

Should explicit scale rules be added to handle tiny and huge creatures more elegantly? (Those familiar with the fan-authored GULLIVER project should take note: these would be simple rules, designed to fit on a page or two, not a whole chapter!)

- Yes.
 No.
 Don't care.

Should we scale DR so that it gets progressively cheaper after the first two levels ("Toughness"), and scale hit points and ST so that they are cheap at low levels, expensive at moderate levels, and progressively cheaper again at high levels, so that one can build giant creatures and "brick" supers who can take damage as well as dish it out on a reasonable points budget?

- Yes.
 No.
 Don't care.

Should dice of damage from ST be assigned a "virtual point cost" that is used only to calculate the cost of enhancements such as "Armor Piercing" for supers and nonhumans? (E.g., a gigantic super with ST 90 might apply Area Effect (+50%) to his 10d thrust damage to reflect huge fists. If we were to assign a "virtual point cost" of 6 points per die of damage, then calculate the enhancement as costing 50% of that, he would pay 30 points. Right now, there is no way to work this out!)

- Yes.
 No.
 Don't care.

Should we make ST quadratic for lifting purposes? (Damage would remain linear in ST, and Contests of ST would not change, but every doubling of ST would increase lifting and carrying ability by a factor of 4, making ST 14 approximately twice as strong as ST 10, ST 17 roughly three times as strong as ST 10, etc.)

- Yes.
 No.
 Don't care.

Should advantages, disadvantages, and skills that are redundant or special cases of other traits, or that could easily be combined, be "condensed" into fewer traits?

- Yes. Simplicity is good.
 No. Variety is the spice of life.
 Don't care.

Should **GURPS 4/e** present a "meta-system" that defines effects that can be used for advantage and disadvantage design -- perhaps even for building, vehicle, and weapon design? (E.g., the descriptions of super-powered blinding attacks, flare grenades, and searchlights might all say, "Victim suffers 1d seconds of Blind at HT-3," referring back to generic "Blind" effect that defines the HT roll results and suggests durations and HT roll modifiers.)

- Yes.
- Yes, but only for character abilities.
- Yes, but only for buildings, vehicles, and weapons.
- No.
- Don't care.

Should racial and super traits be rationalized and carefully integrated into the core rulebook(s)?

- Yes. Fix them and integrate them.
- No. Put them in their own supplement(s).
- Don't care.

Should we require that advantages be taken with qualifiers -- "Natural" (inborn trait, mutation, racial trait, biomod), "High-Tech" (cyberwear, robotics, etc.), "Magic," "Psionic," "Chi," "Spirit," "Divine," "Cosmic," etc. -- some of which would require enabling advantages or enhancements, so that it will be clear which abilities are affected on worlds where magic, psi, technology, etc. do not function?

- Yes.
- No.
- Don't care.

Should advantages become progressively cheaper at tech levels where they can be easily simulated with off-the-shelf technology? (E.g., we might include a TL in certain advantage descriptions, and have a general rule that says cost is halved for characters of that TL, halved again for characters of higher TL.)

- Yes.
- No.
- Don't care.

Should the default mode of use for advantages that require activation be altered from "requires a turn of concentration, and activates at the start of your next turn" (like a spell) to "requires an action, but activates on this turn" (like an attack)?

- Yes.
- No.
- Don't care.

How should we handle the interaction between Eidetic Memory and mental skills?

- Eliminate its effects on skills completely. Retain only the roll to remember things.
- Allow it to double or quadruple skill points, but only for Knowledge skills that depend on pure memorization (Area Knowledge, Hidden Lore, etc.).
- Give a small bonus to mental skills -- perhaps +1 per level -- but get rid of the double and quadruple skill points.
- Leave it the way it is; there is nothing wrong with doubling and quadrupling skill points!

Don't care.

Should Literacy be linked to specific alphabets?

Yes. Charge 1 or 2 points per alphabet for Literacy instead of 10 points to read and write all alphabets.

Yes. Do away with the Literacy advantage and have Language skills for spoken use and Alphabet skills for written use.

No, except for especially complex alphabets, which would require a separate Knowledge skill (not a Language skill) in addition.

No. The current system is just fine.

Don't care.

Should we handle Allies, Contacts, Dependents, Enemies, and Patrons using a single set of "Related NPC" rules that take into account the NPC's relationship and power level, and the PC's point value?

Yes.

No.

Don't care.

Should we offer rules for pricing Patrons by building them from individual bits and pieces that reflect specific perks, powers, and privileges? (Note that this very likely means not including Patrons in the "Related NPC" rules referred to above!)

Yes.

No.

Don't care.

Should Wealth be modified to include an Independent Income advantage, Debt disadvantage, etc. so that cash reserves, earning power, debt, and hours of work can be varied independently?

Yes.

No.

Don't care.

Should we associate skill modifiers with canonical difficulty levels for standard tasks instead of leaving that entirely up to the GM?

Yes.

No.

Don't care.

Should attribute-enhancing skills such as Jumping, Lifting, and Running be simplified to "replaces the relevant attribute," and use a common set of extra-effort rules?

Yes.

No.

Don't care.

Should each skill offer alternative names, for color? (E.g., Bard can also be called "Oratory" and "Public Speaking.")

- Yes.
- No.
- Don't care.

Should Knowledge skills (Area Knowledge, Hidden Lore, etc.) lose their IQ base and instead be based on a flat 10 for everyone so that geniuses cannot become "instant experts" at rote-learned material?

- Yes.
- No.
- Don't care.

Should skills such as History and Law require specialization by region (e.g., History (European))?

- Yes.
- No.
- Don't care.

Should Social skills require specialization by culture (e.g., Savoir-Faire (Klingon))?

- Yes.
- No.
- Don't care.

Should the detailed Soldier, Tactics, Operations, and Strategy rules from **World War II** become the standard rules for military skills?

- Yes.
- No.
- Don't care.

Should the IQ bonus be dropped for the Beam Weapons, Black Powder Weapons, Gunner, and Guns skills?

- Yes.
- No. It's realistic -- or at least too much trouble to change.
- No. In fact, expand it to certain other physical skills, such as Driving and Piloting . . . and maybe consider giving DX bonuses to certain mental skills while you're at it.
- Don't care.

Should maneuvers be built into the core rules, with basic examples given for many skills?

- Yes.
- No.
- Don't care.

Should optional specialties be replaced with maneuvers? (E.g., instead of taking Physics-15 and declaring he has 20 with particle physics and 14 with all other physics, a scientist with Physics-15 would improve a Particle Physics maneuver, which defaults to Physics and can be bought up to +5 for perhaps 1/2 point per level.)

- Yes.
- No.
- Don't care.

IV. Combat

Should optional combat rules, such as those for firearms in **GURPS High-Tech** and those for hand-to-hand combat in **GURPS Martial Arts**, be integrated into the combat system or left to separate books?

- Yes. Integrate them.
- No. Leave them in their own supplements.
- Don't care.

Should we remove Passive Defense (PD) and give armor that used to have high PD thanks to its shape or reflectivity a better DR against certain attacks?

- Yes. A swashbuckler in a silk shirt shouldn't get a better Dodge if he puts on a breastplate. If you want to make active defenses viable, just increase them for everyone.
- No. Instead, add the rules from **GURPS High-Tech** that reduce PD for high-damage attacks, so that the PD of a leather jacket doesn't help against a .50-caliber machine gun.
- No. Leave PD alone!
- Don't care.

Should retreating as part of a defense reduce the defender's allowable movement on the following turn, negating the "Step" portion of "Step and" maneuvers, and giving -1 to Move on Move maneuvers?

- Yes.
- No.
- Don't care.

How badly do we need a really quick way to deal with melee combat for groups of 10-20 on a side?

- Desperately!
- It might be nice, but it isn't a priority.
- Not at all.
- Don't care.

Do you use miniatures in your games?

- Yes.
- No.

Should miniatures be an important part of the combat system?

- Yes.
- No.

Would you use miniatures if the combat rules were optimized for them?

- Yes.

No.

V. Hardware

What level of detail do you prefer for TL4-7 firearms statistics?

- One set of completely generic statistics for each class (e.g., generic assault rifle).
- Statistics for the key archetypes within each class (e.g., generic 5.56mm assault rifle, generic 7.62mm assault rifle).
- The current level of detail: several examples of each type of weapon (e.g., different statistics for Colt M16, Galil, Steyr AUG, and SA-80 5.56mm assault rifles).
- As much detail as possible, with all the variants (e.g., M16A1, M16A2, M16A3, and M16A4 5.56mm assault rifles).
- Don't care.

Should damage from high explosives and nuclear weapons be revised so that they are based on armor penetration (like most damage) rather than simple weight of explosive?

- Yes. The current system -- with bombs that do thousands or even millions of dice of damage, necessitating squared armor DR -- makes vehicular combat and supers games far too cumbersome.
- No.
- Don't care.

How do you feel about **GURPS** rules for designing vehicles?

- They should be much simpler.
- They are fine as is.
- They are at the right level of complexity, but could use some tweaking.
- They aren't detailed enough.
- Don't care.

What would you change about the vehicles rules in Chapter 16 of **GURPS Basic Set** (p. B138), if you could?

- Increase the detail. Define generic statistics (hit points, speed, crew, cost, weight, DR) for a few generic vehicles (car, wagon, etc.), and include some simple rules for maneuvering.
- Keep them as they are, with a few minor changes for continuity with later books and other revisions.
- Avoid giving statistics for specific vehicles -- simple or otherwise -- but



include guidelines on how to read vehicles statistics so that I can understand and use vehicles that appear in other books.

- Get rid of them! Save vehicles rules for a specific fourth-edition volume that addresses vehicle design and action.
- Don't care.

Submit

TOP OF PAGE