
Subject: Re: RenegadeX-Pre-release --> "Is the GDI/Nod autorifle thing balanced?"
debate

Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Wed, 09 Sep 2009 21:51:22 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Goztow wrote on Wed, 09 September 2009 19:44The easiest thing to do in Renegade is repairing, yet it seems to me you propose to give a lot of points for this, compared to other things. Repairing is as boring as camping, yet you find it more "valuable"? Or am I seeing this wrong?

How often do you get engi support on a RANDOM public (where you ARE NOT known)? I would suggest perhaps once in five tries. The remaining four being deaths for your vech. (NOTE: these are estimates, not, for obvious reasons, accurate statistics - they serve to illustrate the point)

Pawky, it is the game's fault if they see they get more points with a solider than a PIC - how is anyone supposed to know that the game is broken and this is the wrong thing to do. You'd only find out if you went online, and read a load of text on random wikis. How many players are going to want to do that? Not many, it's a game - broken games are a relative rarity (Or, better put, the best selling games are rarely broken, leading to a misconception amongst gamers who play the larger titles that games are tested and working).

Furthermore, telling everyone to aim at the artillery on the left (standard strategy, it's the first in view, apparently I don't know this so someone else has posted this in here) isn't going to get everyone doing that. Once again, the game does not make it obvious that that is the way to go. This can be fixed by educating the playing public, that's easier for RenX, UT players are used to tutorial gameplay videos, make one of those for the basics, and more for the advanced, and the average cooperation will rise (Also, VoIP is standard in UT3).

Also, you are correct (Data from public servers has too many confounding variables), but then trip yourself up over which data we should look at. CW games are played between 8 people at most, often just 4. Totally different strategies apply in larger servers, if you want proof, try singlehandedly beaconing a structure using hummer/buggy (a potential strategy in a smaller game, due to less resistance and less chance at getting seen) in a 40+ player server. Player count also influences strategy.

You're correct, there is no problem if it were obvious that the "pro" strategies are the best move. It isn't, that is the problem, and this is why I'm suggesting some ideas (many of which are not meant to be taken seriously or in their entirety or their present form, and were just ideas, don't get worked up, I'm not on the RenX dev) which may help to make the better strategies more obvious, as well as promoting constructive behaviour, like repairing. Of course, the ultimate answer is in education, and a better multiplayer tutorial would be ideal. (Hint, RenX, hint).

JohnDoe, I'll respond to you when you post actual content (Something I can reply to), and not just ad hominem. OK? (Havocs on first harvester? I though CW settings were quite tight on the old finances)

Utterly boring moderator's point - we're still off topic, this is supposed to be about whether the GDI/Nod 7 vs 5 autorifle thing is balanced. Goztow is right, it's about harvesters, and it should stay as it is.
