

---

Subject: Re: Pointfix poll. Bug or Balance?

Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Thu, 24 Dec 2009 05:08:27 GMT

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

---

Spoony wrote on Wed, 23 December 2009 23:30 actually, a ped nuke is on the same level as basekill since it trumps the points situation.

It is, it does, I agree. Did I say otherwise?

Perhaps I did word it a bit confusingly. Perhaps I should have said it this way:

-Main victory condition: destroy enemy base

--Alternative: pedestal placement

-Secondary victory condition: points victory

Spoony wrote on Wed, 23 December 2009 23:30 I think my "perspectives" have always held up pretty well.

Ok? I'm not saying you're wrong. I'm saying that at Renegade's heart is a C&C game.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 23 December 2009 23:30 If that's how you came to "deduce" it then there's something wrong with the method, since you arrived at the conclusion that ped nuke is equivalent to a points victory, both trumped by basekill. It's quite clearly the case that a ped nuke is equivalent to basekill, both trumping a points victory.

No, you misread (which again, was probably my fault.)

I see ped placement as a secondary means to achieve base destruction. (Achieve the main objective a different way).

You asked me my opinion on that hypothetical opinion you detailed, which I did. You said, hypothetically, that the pedestal was the main objective in itself. That is what I disagreed with.

It's like calling the difference between using nuclear weapons in a war as opposed to using infantry and armor. I understand what you were trying to do with that statement in trying to get me into a position where I'd have to choose between two options that are physically different but are still the same in the long run.

However, linking the difference between those two things and linking the difference between base destruction and points victory call upon two different forms of opinions.

1. Destruction vs Points calls upon the ideal of whether you believe you should focus on trying to score more than your opponent rather than trying to simply destroy their base.
2. Destruction via manual assault vs pedestal placement calls upon the ideal of which method you prefer to reach base destruction.

I would agree with a person who prefers pedestal placement over points victory but not over the idea that pedestal placement is the MAIN FOCUS of the game.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 23 December 2009 23:30 I didn't suggest otherwise. I wasn't necessarily directing that at you. However, because of my indifference on the matter it's the only possible

reason I can think of for people to keep on finding something to pick on in what I say. I feel like I'm the rope in a game of tug-o-war.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 23 December 2009 23:30"meeting everyone in the middle" is a common threat to these kind of debates, i find.

You would be correct if this 'debate' wasn't about a video game. The point of a video game is to provide entertainment. As such, you should try your best to make sure everyone can reach some mutual agreement.

You aren't debating over taxes or employment, it's about a video game.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 23 December 2009 23:30and if you do think that basekill is crucial and points are worthless, then the pointsfix should still suit you simply because of the economy situation and the fact you are much less likely to win games by playing defensively... after all, with the original renegade points system, crippling the enemy's economy is actually a valid option, destroying their WF is actually an advantage, etc.

I don't believe points are worthless... just not as important. I mean, they play a role but aren't exactly the 'main goal' if you get what I'm saying.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 23 December 2009 23:30what's more, when the points are added up at the end if bases are still standing, then with the original renegade points system, the points are a direct indicator of which team did more damage - in other words, which team came closer to the goal of basekill. when you let people get points for absolutely no reason, that clearly is not the case.

I can agree with this as it will call more focus onto the battle's view rather than the points view.

---