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

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Thu, 10 Sep 2009 22:28:40 GMT

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

Goztow wrote on Thu, 10 September 2009 02:41

If you're really convinced of this, then take the individual scores out of the game and only keep the team score. That's a REAL solution for your problem, opposed to biasing the way points are rewarded (even more). Think out of the box.

First of all, I never said it was a problem. I just stated that there are two different games in play. I like the idea of it being that way. Just one needs to be balanced with the other is all.

Second of all, I'm the only one who is thinking outside the box. Actually, I'm the only one thinking at all! Everyone here is "conformlolpointsfixomgomg!" I'm just suggesting random ideas (that I don't expect to be implemented because the current scoring system in RenX is awesome). I just want an open discussion of constructive ideas. Instead, I'm just getting "your ideas fail and your a moron for trying to think differently." Which, by the way, is why I keep replying.

Goztow wrote on Thu, 10 September 2009 02:41The whole reason why people got this "loose the WARF" idea in the first place is due to the lack of pointfix! With points == damage, noone would have gotten the idea of letting the WARF die when it's being attacked because they would never have any way to get back on points in the first place. However, thanks to the biased points system, people noticed that you often have a better chance of winning without tanks than with tanks in a public game on field. If this wasn't the case, people would probably get tanks to destroy the artilleries instead of letting the war factory die. That is: people that want to win the game.

So you just gave another good example of why point fix should be instated.
You haven't read all the posts that I've made in this thread.

I fully support the pointsfix! It's a good idea and makes sense to use. (But then again, I've never really played specifically for points in a match, so I never took notice that there was a problem (or big problem) in the first place.) What I'm talking about is simply different methods of points just to keep the games different. Why? I don't know, I'm just curious to see what people come up with..

Goztow wrote on Thu, 10 September 2009 02:41I got the impression everyone from Ren-X except R31 has given up on this topic by now, which is a pity.

They haven't given up. They probably just don't have anything to say any more. This thread is completely tangent from what it was when it started. The only reason I'm still here is because people are directly replying to me.

JohnDoe wrote on Thu, 10 September 2009 05:09 Contrary to R31's opinion, shooting a building actually helps your team in 95% of instances. 1. You're increasing your team's lead by roughly 1000 points every minute (with an art), 2. you're occupying at least 1 member of the opposite team, 3. you're building up ridiculous amounts of money which can be used if i.e. the powerplant and/or ref were to be destroyed. Renegade is about balancing the attractiveness of winning my base destruction and winning my points. Neither tactic should be dis-/encouraged, they're complementary...the maps do a good enough job themselves at being biased towards one or the other.

No, no, you misunderstood my meaning. I said previously that there are two different games going on in timed matches. The objective game requires more of an emphasis on base maintenance and repair. The score game requires more emphasis on offensive attack. These two attributes need to be balanced so that the game can flow in a fun and enticing way. Obviously any one action you make in the overall game will effect the later plot of the battle. It's a real-time game so that goes without saying.

When I mentioned the two different aspects, I was trying to explain why I felt that repairing your base was more important than attacking the enemy base (or in other words, why would someone fall back to their base that's under attack when they are already busy attacking the enemy base?) When I said that, I was speaking in terms of instant results. Not what repercussions it will cause somewhere later in the battle. (Meaning, the instant result of failing to repair a structure is the fact that you lose that structure for the rest of the match. The instant result of failing an offensive is that you lose your invested credits and you give the enemy points. Those instant results have different values (Obviously, losing a structure is more of a problem than losing a few hundred credits.)

Now, yes, you would be correct that by attacking an enemy structure you are contributing to your overall team's score. But the score doesn't really matter until the game is in fact over. You can be winning by 5,000 points the entire match, but it won't matter if the enemy team manages to come back in the last 3 min and beat you by 10 points. Therefore, I consider the points you earn as long-term results rather than instant ones.

What you read me saying was strictly based on instant effects of your actions. That's how I structured it. (And, no, I'm not just saying that, you can read so yourself in my earlier reply I made to Pawky.)
