
Subject: An opinion piece - Donating

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Fri, 08 Jun 2007 09:20:25 GMT

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

so, today's opinion piece relates to the !donate command.

Why is this wrong? Simple. Long-winded, but simple.

Renegade has many RTS elements to it, and that's no accident. It was designed by the company who literally invented real-time strategy.

Economy is a huge part of Renegade's gameplay, just as it is in an RTS game. Go watch a replay of a top RTS player. Do they stay in base until they can afford the most powerful units? Hell no, they go out there and perform what is known as harassment. In most RTS titles this is done by attacking your enemy's resources, and if done correctly, the end result is this: you get your powerful units out there before your enemy does.

Renegade has a direct equivalent of this. Depending on the map, it's any or all of the following:

- killing the enemy harvester
- protecting your own harvester
- C4ing or grenading enemy structures
- money crates
- the !donate command

Look at this list.

Which of the five did Westwood not specifically choose to implement?

Which of the five is physically impossible to stop your enemy doing? (in other words: uncounterable)

Which of the five does not require you to leave your base and fight for it?

What a surprise that the answer to all three questions is the same.

The economy system in Renegade is remarkably well-made and surprisingly balanced. If you were to remove the donate option from that 5-item list, then the following statement becomes true: 'The team with better infantry skills and better co-ordination is able to obtain money more quickly than their opponents'.

City Flying, for example. Let's say team A has very good shooter and pistol skills, team B doesn't. Everyone goes out to the field... and what will happen? Team A's infantry will slaughter team B's infantry. What happens as a direct result of this? Team A is able to kill the enemy harvester, save their own, and get money crates. Therefore, they get cash faster and are able to secure a good advantage as a direct result of the fact they harassed better.

So what's wrong with donating? Firstly, Westwood didn't intend it, and understandably so. They didn't MEAN for you to have to contend with an orca, apache or APC faster than it is legitimately possible to afford.

Secondly, it is perhaps the only thing in Renegade that it is physically impossible to stop your enemy doing.

The enemy's trying to kill your harvester or get boxes? You can stop that if your team's better than theirs.

They're trying to sneak into your buildings and get C4 off? You can stop that if your team's better

than theirs.

They're sitting in their own base and typing a line of text in the first 10 seconds of the game? If you were the best team in the world and your opposing team was the worst team in the world, you still couldn't stop it.

Therefore, the cash race which is a huge part of Renegade's strategy (INTENTIONALLY, I repeat) stops being about which team has better infantry and better co-ordination, and becomes about which team has a couple of people willing to simply give some credits to another player. Granted, you MIGHT regard this as teamwork, but that minor point doesn't change the illegitimacy of the strategy.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating

Posted by [StealthEye](#) on Fri, 08 Jun 2007 10:04:42 GMT

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

The crate isn't always counterable, for example on city it may spawn so much closer to one base than another, so one team obviously will be first.

"Westwood did not intend it". There is partial netcode for it, and don't say that's "because it wasn't a good idea", because there are a lot of other things cancelled as well (like other game modes etc.) I don't know, it could ofcourse be the case, but I don't think there is any reason to assume it was not implemented on purpose, nor the other way around. Renegade was quite unfinished in some aspects, this might be one.

Even if the other team stays in base and types this line of text, as you describe it. Then the other team probably kills their harvester/gets more points&credits out of attacking structures, and as a result will have (by donating or not) more credits.

The "which of the five" questions are a but useless, I could ask other of these questions matching other options. (Like: Which of the five are (atleast a bit) influenced by luck -> Money crates).

Donating can be done by both teams, it doesn't unbalance anything, nor it balances it.

Apart from all these, I prefer to have donating on in public games, but in clan/comm wars I agree that donating should be disabled.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Fri, 08 Jun 2007 10:09:45 GMT

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

StealthEye wrote on Fri, 08 June 2007 05:04The crate isn't always counterable, for example on city it may spawn so much closer to one base than another, so one team obviously will be first. That only accounts for one crate, not all subsequent crates. The better harassing team will get subsequent crates no matter which side they spawn.

StealthEye wrote on Fri, 08 June 2007 05:04 Even if the other team stays in base and types this line of text, as you describe it. Then the other team probably kills their harvester/gets more points&credits out of attacking structures, and as a result will have (by donating or not) more credits.

It's unlikely, and either way: one team earned it through effective strategy and superior skill, the other didn't.

StealthEye wrote on Fri, 08 June 2007 05:04 The "which of the five" questions are a but useless, I could ask other of these questions matching other options. (Like: Which of the five are (atleast a bit) influenced by luck -> Money crates).
see the first bit

StealthEye wrote on Fri, 08 June 2007 05:04 Donating can be done by both teams, it doesn't unbalance anything, nor it balances it.
The fact both teams can do it doesn't mean it should be allowed and doesn't mean it's balanced. Say the team clubs together for an orca - there is only one way to counter that, and that's for Nod to do absolutely exactly the same for an apache.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [puddle_splasher](#) on Fri, 08 Jun 2007 10:31:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Its here, we use it, live with it

No point crying about something that you cannot personally change

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Fri, 08 Jun 2007 10:34:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

What about the fact that GDI soldiers do more damage than Nod ones? That lends a small advantage to GDI (I know it allegedly counter-balances with Nod having the cheaper tanks, but if Nod can't secure their harvester due to the inferior weaponry, Nod can't afford their cheaper tanks anyway)

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [StealthEye](#) on Fri, 08 Jun 2007 11:12:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The first crate is usually the most important one though. And gets collected at the time where donating usually matters most (At the game start).

One team had superior skill and what not indeed, and they got more money because of it.

Seriously, if they lose the harvester, no matter how much they donate to each other, they will have far less credits than the other team. The other team can ALSO donate, so they have more credits to spend and thus still have a huge advantage.

The first bit doesn't state that these questions are the only ones that can be asked. I already proved that the westwood thing was false anyway.

'The team with better infantry skills and better co-ordination is able to obtain money more quickly than their opponents'.

This statement still applies with donate on.

The fact both teams can do it doesn't mean it should be allowed and doesn't mean it's balanced. Correct, but the following is true too:

The fact both teams can do it doesn't mean it should NOT be allowed and doesn't mean it's NOT balanced.

There are more ways to counter this orca. Note how the other team has no money left! You can kill the orca with a sniper or whatever you like, you have more money to spend and can probably (with donating or not) get multiple apaches's due to your superior start. One way or another, you will have an advantage.

Carrier, there are many of these small differences that are quite nicely balanced in renegade imo.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Fri, 08 Jun 2007 11:28:18 GMT

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

CarrierII wrote on Fri, 08 June 2007 05:34 What about the fact that GDI soldiers do more damage than Nod ones? That lends a small advantage to GDI (I know it allegedly counter-balances with Nod having the cheaper tanks, but if Nod can't secure their harvester due to the inferior weaponry, Nod can't afford their cheaper tanks anyway)

It does balance it out.

StealthEye wrote The first crate is usually the most important one though. And gets collected at the time where donating usually matters most (At the game start).

One crate doesn't come anywhere near compensating for a team donating for an orca.

StealthEye wrote The first bit doesn't state that these questions are the only ones that can be asked. I already proved that the westwood thing was false anyway.

No, you didn't.

StealthEye wrote 'The team with better infantry skills and better co-ordination is able to obtain money more quickly than their opponents'.

This statement still applies with donate on.

No, it doesn't. In a public server with donate on, a team without the slightest skill can donate for an orca, APC, whatever without even having to leave base, whereas a team effectively harrassing is

virtually guaranteed to get screwed over unless they donate as well.

StealthEye wroteThe fact both teams can do it doesn't mean it should be allowed and doesn't mean it's balanced.

Correct, but the following is true too:

The fact both teams can do it doesn't mean it should NOT be allowed and doesn't mean it's NOT balanced.

Totally irrelevant point, since nobody said the fact both teams can do it is a reason why it shouldn't be allowed.

StealthEye wroteThere are more ways to counter this orca. Note how the other team has no money left! You can kill the orca with a sniper or whatever you like, you have more money to spend and can probably (with donating or not) get multiple apaches's due to your superior start. One way or another, you will have an advantage.

If one team immediately donates for an orca, the only conceivable way to counter is for the other team to do exactly the same thing and donate too. The other team won't need money, they have a fucking orca

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [jnz](#) on Fri, 08 Jun 2007 11:33:23 GMT

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

How about if the other team donate for an APC and fail? They are pretty much screwed. They have no money, and the other team has more money from destroying the APC.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [StealthEye](#) on Fri, 08 Jun 2007 12:03:26 GMT

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

Yeah, the team with an orca wins the game, that happens ALL the time... Dream on. There is no point trying to convince you about the false/bad points you showed. I even said I agreed with you to some point in my initial post so I'll stop posting.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Fri, 08 Jun 2007 12:31:05 GMT

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

I sense whining, if you dont like it, dont join an server with it, if you have a server yourself, remove it, like tv, you see something you dont like, turn it off.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 08 Jun 2007 12:35:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I don't think it's unfair. Each team still only has X dollars. If one team is pushing the other team back and prevent harvester dumps, the total finances for the other team will still be significantly reduced, making players significantly less likely or able to donate.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [m1a1_abrams](#) on Fri, 08 Jun 2007 13:34:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I agree with Spooky. A first minute aircraft on flying maps is a huge advantage. It doesn't mean the other team can't win, but it makes a lot harder from the start. Instant map control for one side can be very difficult to overcome and they get points headstart also. It's a bit easier to counter on non-flying maps, but something like getting Arties out on Mesa is still very difficult to come back from.

Unless the other team wants to rely on being able to still win from an disadvantage, they should also donate, which can be countered by the other team donating to two people, etc. If you follow that through to it's logical conclusion, you have one half of the team donating to the other half at the start of every game. Also, it's just a bit distasteful when you see the same people begging for their donation at the start of each game, because they know how big an advantage they're getting.

Other than that, games on most servers only last about half an hour, so donations mess with the mechanics of destroying the enemy Refinery and starving them of credits. A few rich players can keep a team going long enough to close out a game, when they should be at a more serious disadvantage. In my opinion, if you lose your Refinery, that should be it, no more credits unless you already had them yourself. The economy is forgiving enough, because losing the Harvester isn't as big a deal as it should be.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [Spooky](#) on Fri, 08 Jun 2007 13:46:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

StealthEye wrote on Fri, 08 June 2007 07:03Yeah, the team with an orca wins the game, that happens ALL the time... Dream on.
...seriously, how long have you been playing this game? How can you not see what an astronomical advantage an orca would be when your opponents can't afford an apache or ramjet for a good five minutes?

StealthEye wrote on Fri, 08 June 2007 07:03There is no point trying to convince you about the false/bad points you showed.
You could start by actually refuting them...

Crimson wrote I don't think it's unfair. Each team still only has X dollars. If one team is pushing the

other team back and prevent harvester dumps, the total finances for the other team will still be significantly reduced, making players significantly less likely or able to donate.

I guess that explains people donating for an orca at the start of flying maps on the N00bstories server before the harvesters are even on the field?

Here's the point: when the enemy has an orca and all you have is basic infantry: you can't kill the harvester, you can't save your own, you can't get boxes, you can't grenade buildings, you can't buggy/APC rush... you pretty much can't do anything except wait until you have an apache and/or ramjets.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating

Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 08 Jun 2007 14:11:13 GMT

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

Basically it goes like this.

"Oh no! The enemy donated cash and now we have to deal with an Orca! THERE IS ABSOLUTELY NO WAY TO COUNTER THIS!!!!"

I'm starting to get sick and tired of all these "opinion pieces" just because some servers decide to allow something you don't like.

Get over it. There is no balance issue as if one team donates for an Orca, the other just has to donate for an Apache or something else to counter it.

Stop crying about it and learn to play the game. You are the one who is always going on about things that can counter aircraft just as effectively as a Ramjet, GET on of those other things and USE it. Problem solved.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Fri, 08 Jun 2007 14:15:45 GMT

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

warranto wrote on Fri, 08 June 2007 09:11 Basically it goes like this.

"Oh no! The enemy donated cash and now we have to deal with an Orca! THERE IS ABSOLUTELY NO WAY TO COUNTER THIS!!!!"

Besides donating too, there isn't other than simply waiting for money, which gives your opponent the massive advantage of having a completely unchallenged orca in the field for five minutes...

warranto wrote on Fri, 08 June 2007 09:11 I'm starting to get sick and tired of all these "opinion pieces" just because some servers decide to allow something you don't like.

Get over it.

Or respect the fact that I'm entitled to an opinion? You don't agree with me, fine... but try not to cry

just because I express it.

warranto wrote on Fri, 08 June 2007 09:11 There is no balance issue as if one team donates for an Orca, the other just has to donate for an Apache or something else to counter it. see the first part

warranto wrote on Fri, 08 June 2007 09:11 Stop crying about it and learn to play the game. Damn, you got me I guess I need to "learn to play the game" if I make a completely logical argument against a strategy I think is unbalanced.

warranto wrote on Fri, 08 June 2007 09:11 You are the one who is always going on about things that can counter aircraft just as effectively as a Ramjet, GET on of those other things and USE it. Problem solved. What the hell are you talking about...

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [Carrierll](#) on Fri, 08 Jun 2007 14:50:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

5 soldiers attacking an orca will bring it down, auto rifles are suprising lethal in numbers.

I'm playing on Jelly a lot right now, because they don't let you donate for the first five minutes, which I think is a fair compromise between the On/Off debate.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 08 Jun 2007 14:55:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You just gave your own solution to the problem

Use the !donate command yourself. There is a reason BOTH teams have it.

Your teammates won't donate? Guess you have to put up with it. Why should the other teams willingness to work together suffer for your teams lack of ability to work together?

"Entitled" to an opinion? Says who? You are no more entitled to an opinion on these forums than I am.

The strategy is not unbalanced, the team you are with just sucks and unwilling to donate themselves. I'm quite sure if you were with a team that would donate to counter it, you would not complain. If you expect them to get aircraft at the beginning of the game, don't wait to see it before you ask for a donation to counter it.

Unlike that whole "flaming APC" thing (which both teams have access to), there is a way to take

away that advantage with ease.

As for that last "what am I talking about", see above. You are claiming it to be unbalanced. Rather than crying about it, ask for the donation, get any unit that can counter it, and deal with it. As you always say, you don't need a Ramjet to deal with an aircraft, so there is no excuse about unbalance because you don't have to wait for 1000 credits to get an effective unit to counter the aircraft. There is no cost imbalance (ie. player total allows for enough credits to be donated for an aircraft, but not for a Ramjet)

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Fri, 08 Jun 2007 15:00:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Warranto, I think you might have mis-understood Spooky's intention behind these "opinion peices"

He intends to post his oponion and have a discussion, he's not trying to ram a "No-donate" policy down every server owner's throat.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [Spooky](#) on Fri, 08 Jun 2007 15:10:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CarrierII wrote on Fri, 08 June 2007 16:55 soldiers attacking an orca will bring it down, auto rifles are suprising lethal in numbers.
so let me get this straight: 15 soldiers > 14 soldiers and one orca?

warranto wrote on Fri, 08 June 2007 16:55 You just gave your own solution to the problem
No, I proved it's unbalanced simply because the only counter to donate is more donate. It wasn't always there, and the only counter to this thing the community introduced is to do exactly the same? How can you not see the problem here? That alone proves how much it's changed the game.

warranto wrote on Fri, 08 June 2007 16:55 Your teammates won't donate? Guess you have to put up with it. Why should the other teams willingness to work together suffer for your teams lack of ability to work together?

warranto wrote on Fri, 08 June 2007 16:55 The strategy is not unbalanced, the team you are with just sucks

Read the first post in the thread again, it seems to have gone completely over your head.

warranto wrote on Fri, 08 June 2007 16:55 I'm quite sure if you were with a team that would donate to counter it, you would not complain.

I'd still see it for the bullshit it is. Some of us are capable of thinking objectively in terms of fairness instead of how it personally benefits ourselves, as alien a concept as that might seem to you.

warranto wrote on Fri, 08 June 2007 16:55As you always say, you don't need a Ramjet to deal with an aircraft

Uh... what the fuck? Stop making stuff up, please. It's OK to admit you have no valid argument, but kindly don't make stuff up.

warranto wrote on Fri, 08 June 2007 16:55there is no excuse about unbalance because you don't have to wait for 1000 credits to get an effective unit to counter the aircraft or 900, as it were, since the only effective counter to a good orca pilot is an apache or a ramjet.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [futura83](#) on Fri, 08 Jun 2007 15:13:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I have mixed feelings about donate.

While at the start of the game, it could tilt the balance for one team, i like what some servers have done:

Stop donating for the first X mins...

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [EvilWhiteDragon](#) on Fri, 08 Jun 2007 16:15:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Spoony, nofi, but seriously, if the enemy can get vehicle X, then you should be able to get more or less the same vehicle, so that's in no way an advantage/disadvantage.

Also, in public games, you generally dont have 15 players moving out at once, thus 15 well organized soldiers would be able to take out 1 unorganized orca, and 14 unorganized soldiers. Unless you totally suck, but I don't think you do...

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Fri, 08 Jun 2007 16:22:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Fri, 08 June 2007 11:15Spoony, nofi, but seriously, if the enemy can get vehicle X, then you should be able to get more or less the same vehicle, so that's in no way an advantage/disadvantage.

uh, are you paying attention to the part where the only counter to donate is donate? You aren't disproving me by agreeing with me...

EvilWhiteDragon wrote on Fri, 08 June 2007 11:15Also, in public games, you generally dont have 15 players moving out at once, thus 15 well organized soldiers would be able to take out 1 unorganized orca, and 14 unorganized soldiers.

Unless you totally suck, but I don't think you do...

So your reasoning is you just need to hope everyone other than the orca sucks?

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 08 Jun 2007 16:46:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:No, I proved it's unbalanced simply because the only counter to donate is more donate. It wasn't always there, and the only counter to this thing the community introduced is to do exactly the same? How can you not see the problem here? That alone proves how much it's changed the game.

Gasp! Did you know that the only way to counter a unit is to use a unit as well?

Just because something has a "hard counter" does not make it unbalanced, it just means you need to change the way your tactics are done. "Unbalanced" means that there is no way to balance it out, and that nothing can be done to counter it. With this, there is a way to counter it without giving something else up in return.

Quote:Some of us are capable of thinking objectively in terms of fairness instead of how it personally benefits ourselves, as alien a concept as that might seem to you.

So am I. It IS fair that BOTH teams have it, and can use it when required. I also fail to see how having the !donate command personally benefits me. Considering I rarely do anything to benefit myself, I don't see how that would even apply to me.

Quote:Stop making stuff up, please. It's OK to admit you have no valid argument, but kindly don't make stuff up.

Sorry, but I have no time at the moment to search both the N00bstories forum and this one for the numerous posts you have about how overpowered the Ramjet is, and countering peoples arguments over it's anti-aircraft potential by stating that other units can be used. I'll do that later if you honestly can't remember stuff you have posted.

Oh, wait.. I guess that was "spoony" who posted those, wasn't it?

Quote:or 900, as it were, since the only effective counter to a good orca pilot is an apache or a ramjet.

I can take out an aircraft with a 500 sniper just as easily as I could with a Ramjet. Even if the aircraft retreats, your job is a success as you've held off the "unbalanced" tactic from doing the damage it was intended for.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Fri, 08 Jun 2007 16:56:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warranto wrote on Fri, 08 June 2007 11:46Gasp! Did you know that the only way to counter a unit is to use a unit as well?

Just because something has a "hard counter" does not make it unbalanced, it just means you need to change the way your tactics are done. "Unbalanced" means that there is no way to balance it out, and that nothing can be done to counter it. With this, there is a way to counter it without giving something else up in return.

Do you have any idea how ridiculous you sound?

The only counter to donate is donate and you don't see what's wrong with that?

warranto wrote on Fri, 08 June 2007 11:46Sorry, but I have no time at the moment to search both the N00bstories forum and this one for the numerous posts you have about how overpowered the Ramjet is

I might have said the ramjet is overpowered, but I don't think it should be disallowed - the only change I think is realistically implementable without totally changing the game is reducing their point gain

warranto wrote on Fri, 08 June 2007 11:46and countering peoples arguments over it's anti-aircraft potential by stating that other units can be used. I'll do that later if you honestly can't remember stuff you have posted.

I think you're going to have to.

warranto wrote on Fri, 08 June 2007 11:46I can take out an aircraft with a 500 sniper just as easily as I could with a Ramjet. Even if the aircraft retreats, your job is a success as you've held off the "unbalanced" tactic from doing the damage it was intended for.

Can we for a moment assume the orca pilot is a skilled player and not a total scrub?

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [Carrierll](#) on Fri, 08 Jun 2007 17:00:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I fail to see how one skilled orca could have that much effect, mind you, I've yet to see this happen, so that might be why.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [warranto](#) on Fri, 08 Jun 2007 17:05:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Because there IS nothing wrong with it. Other than the fact that you seem not to like the idea of having to give up funds to help the team in order to counter it.

Equal sniper vs. equal Aircraft is what I was assuming.

As for the posts, I'll do that later tonight, or tomorrow depending how much overtime I have to put in get stuff done.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [=HT=T-Bird](#) on Fri, 08 Jun 2007 17:07:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If you wanted to starve the other team of credits on City or City_Flying, why would you buy an Orca in the first place? 2 MRLS/Artilleries on a bridge rush + infantry chasing the enemy Harvester poses a much greater threat to the enemy's economy than 1 flying unit ever would in that if the enemy tries to save their Refinery, their Harvester dies and if the enemy tries to save their Harvester, they risk losing their Refinery. Add that to potential threats to the War Factory, Airstrip, or Powerplant, and you can see where (to a public-server team, a CW would be a different story) I am coming from.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Fri, 08 Jun 2007 17:07:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CarrierII wrote on Fri, 08 June 2007 12:00I fail to see how one skilled orca could have that much effect
Spoony wroteHere's the point: when the enemy has an orca and all you have is basic infantry: you can't kill the harvester, you can't save your own, you can't get boxes, you can't grenade buildings, you can't buggy/APC rush... you pretty much can't do anything except wait until you have an apache and/or ramjets.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [DutchNeon](#) on Fri, 08 Jun 2007 17:19:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

A group of Auto rifle guys can damage a orca pretty bad that it needs to flee (rep), although its true (especially that the gun is dam fast in killing free infantry).

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [StealthEye](#) on Fri, 08 Jun 2007 17:53:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:the only change I think is realistically implementable without totally changing the game is reducing their point gainThis bug is fixed (yes, it definitely was a bug) and implemented to be

tested in the BI servers atm.

An orca is not uncounterable. Say that the other team buys officers for in total 900 credits, don't you think all those would simply take out the orca? Even with 14 other characters, use cover and take out the orca first, then the officers+soldiers can kill the other infantry as well.

14 soldiers + 1 orca > 15 soldiers

duh, but

900 credits > 0 credits

as well, so is it strange or unbalanced that something far more expensive is better than something free? I can't imagine that you think that's true.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating

Posted by [trooprm02](#) on Fri, 08 Jun 2007 19:28:06 GMT

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

Its always fun to read your opinion pieces, but sometimes its too much. Key thing to remeber is the fact that in pub aow server (wol or gsa) the point is not really to win, but meh to play, and make the game intresting, hence the reason for more rpg and kamuix type server. But in cw's, donate, crates etc is off because it more competitive. Basically, what doesnt hurt ren, helps it

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Fri, 08 Jun 2007 19:39:16 GMT

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

Some servers run a slow-start where everyone has to minigunner-rush for the harvesters at the start of the map. On n00bstories, I have found overall it's more enjoyable to the majority of people to give them 350 credits each and donate capabilities which lets everyone get into the action right away. This thread which was started on the n00bstories forum at the same time has gone in that direction.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 08 Jun 2007 19:46:49 GMT

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

This probably has been covered, and it if has, it's still worth mentioning again...

Both teams start out with the same amount of resources, do they not? If Renegade is a game of teamwork, why is donating such a bad thing? In fact, I think it should be encouraged, since it shows a great deal of trust in your teammates. Plus, this adds a whole new tactic to the game.

In real life when you're on a team, you combine thoughts and ideas to move forward, do you not? You don't say, "use your ideas, and I'll use mine, and we'll see what we both can come up with while working as a team, but working separately."

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [puddle_splasher](#) on Sat, 09 Jun 2007 08:05:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

gamemodding wrote on Fri, 08 June 2007 06:33 How about if the other team donate for an APC and fail? They are pretty much screwed. They have no money, and the other team has more money from destroying the APC.

Thats why I usually ask for donations of 150. I will always use my initial 350 and the other donations come from the regular players that know what I am up to.

An experienced player will re-gain his initial loss in jig time. meanwhile the team plays on as normal.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Sat, 09 Jun 2007 08:18:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

StealthEye wrote on Fri, 08 June 2007 12:53 as well, so is it strange or unbalanced that something far more expensive is better than something free? I can't imagine that you think that's true. You're completely missing the point.

The point is, the money didn't come about legitimately. It wasn't earned in the way the game was designed for you to earn it, it was simply given to you by your teammates.

StealthEye wrote on Fri, 08 June 2007 12:53 An orca is not uncounterable. Say that the other team buys officers for in total 900 credits, don't you think all those would simply take out the orca? Even with 14 other characters, use cover and take out the orca first, then the officers+soldiers can kill the other infantry as well.

If 15 soldiers win against 14 soldiers and an orca, I can only assume well over half of the team containing the orca are having catastrophic PC issues at the time.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [Goztow](#) on Sat, 09 Jun 2007 08:40:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

The main point why I don't like donating is the same why I don't like start credits: it takes away one of the most fun moments in the game: the start. Instead of basic infantry rushing to harv or buildings, you can directly get vehicles/stronger characters.

It's often in the start of the game that the difference is made, though.

However, I don't find donate unbalances as both can do it. Take it that gdi gets an early orca up -> well, Nod could have gotte an early heli up. It's true that donating chanes tactics at the start of the game in a way I don't 100 % like but that's about it.

And I can understand that public servers do implement starting credits and donating to get the action going faster.

IMO starting credits are way worse than donating anyway. If you start with 0, then there's not much to donate until you saved your harv anyway, is there .

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [Tunaman](#) on Sat, 09 Jun 2007 10:58:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Both teams can do a flaming APC as well, doesn't mean that it's balanced. :\

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [sadukar09](#) on Sat, 09 Jun 2007 11:12:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Nod apc is slightly larger therefore it has a bigger area where to deploy your timed c4s and not stack (hope you know what happens when you stack a c4...) and nod apc is a bit easier to drive (bigger mass)

and btw officers are NOT good against light vehs, say orcas. Try in a LAN game and shoot 1 clip at a orca with an officer then with a soldier (2 orcas) you will see the soldier did more... dunno why but chaingun has the same warhead as ramjet

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [StealthEye](#) on Sat, 09 Jun 2007 12:13:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hmm that might be true based on warheads, you would still have an advantage to kill the infantry though. for 900, you could get 2 patches/LCG's as well, those 2 + 13 soldiers would definitely take out the orca and probably 14 soldiers. You would have more credits and probably better infantry after this as well.

Quote:You're completely missing the point.

The point is, the money didn't come about legitimately. YOU are missing the point. Because the money DID come out legitimately. Donating is perfectly legal if it's enabled, and you are stupid for not using it if you don't.

If you don't like vehicles, and you don't use them. Is it unfair that the other team does use them? Ofcourse it isn't! If you don't use donate and the other team does, is that unfair? Neither!

Gozy has a valid point saying it takes away the first part of the game, a bit more than starting

credits do, I agree there. However in public games I think the start is not that interesting usually, so that's why I said (in my initial post) that donating should be allowed too. For clan games it is different, and I agree with Gozy there.

About the flaming apc: it is balanced in that way. However it unbalances the health and damage other vehicles do. In that way it's just a superunit which is also cheap, which makes it unbalanced. Consider something that you buy and will instantly win the game for you (not a flaming apc obviously). Both teams can do it. Would this be balanced? Team wise: yes. But it makes the other part of the game useless. That would be the problem with it, not the fact that both teams can do it.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [sadukar09](#) on Sat, 09 Jun 2007 15:20:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

and consider something which costs 500 can destroy something cost 1500 (mammy) in less than 5 secs if the apc does it right...that gives the mammy NO time to react or to even destroy it! NOTHING can destroy a flaming apc in 5 secs cept what 10 gunners/tanks?

and u can donate 2 ppl via console...type Do and it come up donate person amount...

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [JPNOD](#) on Sat, 09 Jun 2007 15:52:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Not that I have the time to worry about it..

But I don't like the donate option. I prefer an old typ AOW without all the stuff that changes the game. I'm glad your allowed to choose which ever server you decide to play on. To bad the server(s) that were/was decent have changed or have died.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [puddle_splasher](#) on Sat, 09 Jun 2007 16:18:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Crimson wrote on Fri, 08 June 2007 14:39 I have found overall it's more enjoyable to the majority of people to give them 350 credits each and donate capabilities which lets everyone get into the action right away.

Personally, I believe 350 is TOO high. Instant hotty/tech and very few players want to leave the buildings to assist in support for the vehicles. All that in the name of a rec.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [puddle_splasher](#) on Sat, 09 Jun 2007 16:23:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Goztow wrote on Sat, 09 June 2007 03:40
IMO starting credits are way worse than donating anyway. If you start with 0, then there's not much to donate until you saved your harv anyway, is there .

This is a fantastic start and then you know who the team players are. A few defending and a few attacking. Meanwhile that same few are now donating.

Alternatively, do not allow donating for 2 mins after the game starts. .

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [Renegade](#) on Sat, 09 Jun 2007 16:46:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

MaidenTy1 wrote on Fri, 08 June 2007 13:07CarrierII wrote on Fri, 08 June 2007 12:00I fail to see how one skilled orca could have that much effect

Spoony wroteHere's the point: when the enemy has an orca and all you have is basic infantry: you can't kill the harvester, you can't save your own, you can't get boxes, you can't grenade buildings, you can't buggy/APC rush... you pretty much can't do anything except wait until you have an apache and/or ramjets.

Wow, thats a completey situational scenario there.

And, Even a good Orca/Apache, I always would buy a 500 sniper, because theres usually someone else who does too.

2 500 snipers, decent ability-
1 Skilled Orca/Apache.

Owned much?

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [Tunaman](#) on Sat, 09 Jun 2007 17:22:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If you guys think that 2 500s or patches can take down a skilled orca, I guess you're playing a different game than me.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Sat, 09 Jun 2007 17:38:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ralphzehunter wrote on Sat, 09 June 2007 12:22 If you guys think that 2 500s or patches can take down a skilled orca, I guess you're playing a different game than me.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [sadukar09](#) on Sat, 09 Jun 2007 18:25:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

so 2 semi skilled sniper cant his a pretty decent sized orca?

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sat, 09 Jun 2007 19:16:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I cause aircraft to retreat all the time as a 500 credit sniper, regardless of who the pilot is. The good pilots are usually the ones to get close to me, or survive to retreat.

I've been killed by an aircraft that I have been trying to destroy (as a sniper), perhaps twice. Once was when I made the stupid mistake of switching to third person from first person in the middle of reloading (you end up reloading twice before you can fire), and the other was me simply not paying enough attention and trapping myself against a ledge.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Sat, 09 Jun 2007 20:11:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warranto wrote on Sat, 09 June 2007 14:16 I cause aircraft to retreat all the time as a 500 credit sniper, regardless of who the pilot is. The good pilots are usually the ones to get close to me, or survive to retreat.

I've been killed by an aircraft that I have been trying to destroy (as a sniper), perhaps twice. Once was when I made the stupid mistake of switching to third person from first person in the middle of reloading (you end up reloading twice before you can fire), and the other was me simply not paying enough attention and trapping myself against a ledge.

wow

just wow

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sat, 09 Jun 2007 20:18:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You guys are the ones who are suggesting it is impossible, I'm just saying (or, I guess showing) that it's not.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Sat, 09 Jun 2007 20:21:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

...against an orca pilot who sucks, but you wrongly believe to be a skilled orca pilot?

How the FUCK can you be forced to retreat from a 500 sniper as an orca, let alone be destroyed by one... I simply cannot understand.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [StealthEye](#) on Sat, 09 Jun 2007 20:33:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

In open field, yes, the orca would win, but a skilled sniper can simply shoot and hide again. Then the orca is down in no time with relatively little damage to the orca. Orca's aren't invincible, you make it sound that way. And if you think that is (at least mostly) true, then shouldn't your opinion piece be about orcas instead of donating? Also, do you have any argument on nonflying maps?

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Sat, 09 Jun 2007 21:01:02 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

StealthEye wrote on Sat, 09 June 2007 15:33In open field, yes, the orca would win, but a skilled sniper can simply shoot and hide again. Then the orca is down in no time with relatively little damage to the orca. Orca's aren't invincible, you make it sound that way.
A skilled orca pilot will not lose to a 500 sniper NO MATTER HOW GOOD THE 500 SNIPER IS.

StealthEye wrote on Sat, 09 June 2007 15:33And if you think that is (at least mostly) true, then shouldn't your opinion piece be about orcas instead of donating?
no, because by the time a non-donating team has an orca, the opposite team also can afford its counter: apaches and ramjets, barring superior harrassment.

It has nothing to do with orcas being overpowered, and everything to do with orcas being available sooner than they should be.

StealthEye wrote on Sat, 09 June 2007 15:33Also, do you have any argument on nonflying maps?
How many examples do you want?

Complex, Volcano, Canyon: GDI APC blocks.
Typically, Nod has a fair chance of getting money quickly enough so that they can deploy an artillery before a GDI APC arrives on the airstrip. If they don't, GDI has a massive advantage. This

is balanced and dependent on which team performs harrassment better.
Donating completely changes that to "which team sits in their base and types the donate command", therefore COMPLETELY CHANGING THE ECONOMY SYSTEM, THEREFORE COMPLETELY CHANGING THE GAME.

Mesa: Fast anti-harvester

Once again, whether GDI or Nod gets their tanks in the cave faster is dependent on harrassment - killing and protecting the harvesters, and the crate. This is entirely dependent on which team is better organised and has better pistol ability, and that team can gain a massive advantage. But hey, if I was donated for an artillery straight away and you didn't donate too, do you know how long it'd be before you could afford a med tank? I'll give you a clue: about five minutes. Do you have any idea what the two teams' relative financial and points situations will be by then? We'll have arties all over the cave and the side covered, LONG before you have med tanks, and you won't pull the game back from that.

Not because we harrassed better, but because we donated and you didn't.

Field and Under: same principle as Mesa

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [Crimson](#) on Sat, 09 Jun 2007 21:46:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

puddle_splasher wrote on Sat, 09 June 2007 09:18Crimson wrote on Fri, 08 June 2007 14:39 I have found overall it's more enjoyable to the majority of people to give them 350 credits each and donate capabilities which lets everyone get into the action right away.

Personally, I believe 350 is TOO high. Instant hotty/tech and very few players want to leave the buildings to assist in support for the vehicles. All that in the name of a rec.

In a competitive game, I agree that the opening rush with no money is important to the outcome of the game, and even donating at the start is probably not very fair either, but as a public server owner, I watch what my players say they want. I've tried 0, I've tried 100, I've tried 200, I won't try 300 because it means buggy for Nod and no humvee for GDI... but 350 is the number that lets the game get underway, and this thread in my forums is filled with my regulars who like it that way.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [StealthEye](#) on Sun, 10 Jun 2007 00:09:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Yes, they can get things quicker, so can the other team. It really boosts the game speed a bit, but the point is, if you would do it later on in the game, you would have EXACTLY the same problems. Do you even play games where donate is on, as it is on at the BI servers and I really never had any problems with things being unbalanced because of it. Yes, some people get an orca directly, but it really doesn't make them win the game or kill any building or make many more points.

Also, I wasn't really asking for you arguments on other maps, I was merely pointing out how you are talking about the orca's only, and how invincible they are.

Sure, you say it completely changes the game. It might indeed change (mostly the start) of the game. Your point being? Mods like donations are MADE to change the game. A mod would really fail if it would change nothing. Whether you like this change is up to you, but the fact that it changes it is in itself not a bad thing. Duh! Can it be even more obvious how false that argument was?

You keep forgetting the fact that with donate on, the other team can do it too. You are comparing things like "say one team donates, and the other does not". That's like comparing "say one team uses vehicles, and the other does not". Is it really weird that it is unbalanced then?

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Sun, 10 Jun 2007 05:29:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

StealthEye wrote on Sat, 09 June 2007 19:09 Yes, some people get an orca directly, but it really doesn't make them win the game or kill any building or make many more points. They're doing something quite bafflingly wrong if it doesn't.

StealthEye wrote on Sat, 09 June 2007 19:09 You keep forgetting the fact that with donate on, the other team can do it too. You are comparing things like "say one team donates, and the other does not". That's like comparing "say one team uses vehicles, and the other does not". Is it really weird that it is unbalanced then?

You're pretty slow if you can't work this one out. The point behind the "if one team donates and the other doesn't" is to prove how overpowered it is, and how it is uncounterable save by doing exactly the same thing.

One last time:

The mod introduced a new "strategy" (for want of a better word) into the game, and the only way to counter this "strategy" if your opponent does it is to do exactly the same yourself.

If that isn't enough to prove it's overpowered and unbalanced, I don't know what will be. You can't say cheating's balanced because the other side can do the same as their only way to fight back

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [IR4p3dy0u](#) on Sun, 10 Jun 2007 06:13:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

In response to the 15 soldiers vs 14 soldiers and 1 orca comment,

14 soldiers and 1 orca would pretty much destroy 15 soldiers. Im not going to downgrade public server players here nor your strategies, but have you ever played in an actual clanwar, say an organized game? Play against some of the people spoony and myself play against on a daily

basis, soldiers vs. orca pilot who is even remotely descent = dead soldiers PERIOD.

All I can say is thank god clanwars.cc is no donate.

Personally donate values unskilled players who arent willing to work at earning a win, they want everyone else to donate the credits theyve earned by attacking. Therefore they arent willing to do anything, they want everything handed to them.

Sorry if this was already mentioned, didnt care to take the time and read all the bickering.

Quote:StealthEye wrote on Sat, 09 June 2007 19:09

Yes, some people get an orca directly, but it really doesn't make them win the game or kill any building or make many more points.

For an example. Walls_Flying take 15 vs 15 for example, GDI donates and gets 2 or even three orcas in the air, 3 orcas can easily hold down NODs whole base, easily kill a building or two, even if nod gets GDIS harvy, by the time they kill the harvy, they have 2 or three orcas camping thier strip, making it almost pointless to buy a vehicle, proly lost a building or two, so tell me how that doesnt win a game?

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [puddle_splasher](#) on Sun, 10 Jun 2007 07:45:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Crimson wrote on Sat, 09 June 2007 16:46

I won't try 300 because it means buggy for Nod and no humvee for GDI...

That answers my post, ty.

BUT!!!! Nod is supposed to have a slight advantage with cost and GDI with fire-power. Then why is it not possible for GDI to properly defend and donate until the threat from the buggy is overcome?

If the team (public 40-50 server, N00bstories) cannot defend against a few buggies by donating, then they deserve to lose.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Sun, 10 Jun 2007 09:26:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Buggies aren't the problem, GDI soldiers kill them pretty fast, plus by the time they actually get to the GDI base GDI can afford hotwires.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [sadukar09](#) on Sun, 10 Jun 2007 11:22:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

puddle_splasher wrote on Sun, 10 June 2007 02:45Crimson wrote on Sat, 09 June 2007 16:46
I won't try 300 because it means buggy for Nod and no humvee for GDI...

That answers my post, ty.

BUT!!!! Nod is supposed to have a slight advantage with cost and GDI with fire-power. Then why is it not possible for GDI to properly defend and donate until the threat from the buggy is overcome?

If the team (public 40-50 server, N00bstories) cannot defend against a few buggies by donating, then they deserve to lose.

Its true. When Nod have 300 credits they cant buy a techy unless they donate (same for GDI) then when they make it to the other base, GDI can probably afford a humvee from the 2 credits a sec.

And depending on the game type. (AOW, Marathon)AOW sometimes should have starting credits as there IS a time limit. Marathon dont so attking the harvy wouldnt hurt game time. (There is none or its 1hr etc.)

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [StealthEye](#) on Sun, 10 Jun 2007 12:57:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:You're pretty slow if you can't work this one out. The point behind the "if one team donates and the other doesn't" is to prove how overpowered it is, and how it is uncounterable save by doing exactly the same thing.I'm not slow. I know what you are saying, you have said it often enough. However I have stated that I think it is not uncounterable by other units.

You really never answered about the vehicles analogy though. What if Renegade did not support vehicles originally, and it was modded to support them. It would be the same situation, vehicles can only be countered effectively by vehicles (7 infantry vs 6 apcs + nuke?) Now are vehicles unbalanced with respect to infantry? Perhaps. But is that a problem? No, not imo anyway. Donate vs no donate is unbalanced, yes. But that doesn't make it a problem. As long as GDI vs Nod is not unbalanced and the gameplay is good. (Which is discussable, but I think it is). Simply stating that it is unbalanced proves nothing.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Sun, 10 Jun 2007 14:10:51 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

StealthEye wrote on Sun, 10 June 2007 07:57However I have stated that I think it is not

uncounterable by other units.
But you haven't supported this belief and it's wrong.

StealthEye wrote on Sun, 10 June 2007 07:57 What if Renegade did not support vehicles originally, and it was modded to support them. It would be the same situation, vehicles can only be countered effectively by vehicles (7 infantry vs 6 apcs + nuke?) Now are vehicles unbalanced with respect to infantry? Perhaps. But is that a problem? No, not imo anyway. Donate vs no donate is unbalanced, yes. But that doesn't make it a problem. As long as GDI vs Nod is not unbalanced and the gameplay is good. (Which is discussable, but I think it is). Simply stating that it is unbalanced proves nothing.
what about stating that it's unbalanced AND unintended by the designers AND uncounterable save by doing exactly the same thing AND the fact that not everybody thinks "the gameplay is good"? I happen to think it's a step of about five miles in the wrong direction.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [StealthEye](#) on Sun, 10 Jun 2007 14:15:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

- what about stating that it's unbalanced
Sure, state it, but you have no arguments other than comparing two uncomparable things (donating vs no donating).
- AND unintended by the designers.
That doesn't make it bad. What are mods made for again?
- AND uncounterable save by doing exactly the same thing
Read my vehicles analogy.
- AND the fact that not everybody thinks "the gameplay is good"?
Like I said, that is discussable, not everyone says it's bad either.
- I happen to think it's a step of about five miles in the wrong direction.
You do, I don't.

[edit]
Forgot this:

- But you haven't supported this belief and it's wrong.
I did explain myself, you didn't say anything more to prove it false. You have the same kind of belief in the opposite opinion.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Sun, 10 Jun 2007 14:22:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

StealthEye wrote on Sun, 10 June 2007 09:15- what about stating that it's unbalanced
Sure, state it, but you have no arguments other than comparing two uncomparable things
(donating vs no donating).

uh... did you even read the first post, or just skim through it until you found a fraction you could
argue against?

StealthEye wrote on Sun, 10 June 2007 09:15- AND unintended by the designers.

That doesn't make it bad. What are mods made for again?

It's a potential argument against it. It isn't enough not to do it, but it's something to consider.

Westwood designed the game's economy system and they did a damn good job of it. Donate
changes that, and strategically speaking, not for the better.

If your statement is like Crimson's: "ok, maybe not ideal for competitive clan games, but my
server's community prefer it this way", I can't touch it. If it's "it's better gameplay and more
balanced", prepare to be ripped to shreds.

StealthEye wrote on Sun, 10 June 2007 09:15- AND uncounterable save by doing exactly the
same thing

Read my vehicles analogy.

The vehicles analogy is a waste of text space, because vehicles were implemented by Westwood.

Subject: Re: An opinion piece - Donating

Posted by [StealthEye](#) on Sun, 10 Jun 2007 16:23:34 GMT

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

I read through your first post, yes. And I read all of your other posts closely. I told you that I am not
convinced by your arguments for this, and yet you are trying to convince me in your previous post
based on stating it is unbalanced. Therefore that means nothing. You are trying to convince me
that it's unbalanced, simply stating that doesn't make it any more logical.

The Westwood did not intend this is not a potential argument to me at all. Westwood did really
good, but I won't say there is nothing that can be improved. Donating could be such thing,
although I already said that I am not a big fan of it in organized games either.

My statement is something in between Crimson's and Gozy's. I did not say it is better gameplay in
organised games, I said it is faster gameplay in public games. That I like, again, in public games. I
am not stating it is better balanced, but I'm not saying it is less balanced either. I really don't think
it changes much to the balancing.

It is not a waste of text space. Please consider it seriously instead of reusing your "westwood did
not intend it" argument. IF renegade would not have vehicles, THEN what would you say about
vehicles implemented by a mod? Probably the same as you are doing now. That's what my point
is. Whether Renegade had vehicles in the first place doesn't matter to that point at all.
