

---

Subject: Unit Balance

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sun, 25 Apr 2004 01:29:35 GMT

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

---

drkhazel was thinking the same thing as spoony at the start of this topic. In the best interests of this game, yes, by all means tone down the amount of damage ramjet rifles do to aircraft. But the weapon arms on the aircraft should not be changed. If we armed all orcas and apaches with small arms made for a "quick attack and back", that wouldn't work in smaller games. This would be a good idea, if we were playing a 50 v 50 game. Which will not happen. Games like tiberian sun and red alert enabled you to built tons and tons of units. In Renegade, lets say the average game is going to be a 10 v 10.

Now, if we keep the weapon arms on the aircraft the same, I strongly think the balance would come in the fact that rocket soldier officers / MRLS / stealth tanks / mammoth tusk missiles etc done "a lot" of damage to aircraft. How about 1 rocket does the same amount of damage as a ramjet would have? Which is, 2 squares of damage per rocket hit. This would keep the pilots cautions (especially of MRLS -- 2 or 3 of the 6 rocket barrage always homes in at the moment) but it would also prevent the "instant hit" crap that comes from ramjets.

Also, if possible, keep the chance of a missile homing in at 50%, otherwise travelling straight ahead. This would prevent you happening upon an aircraft and taking it out too quickly with your 6 missile barrage.

It's not about small games. A LOT of tactics don't work in small games. So what? Why should the entire game be adjusted so that it works optimally in smaller games?

Aircraft need to be like they were in C&C, or flying becomes unenjoyable garbage because you get shot down the moment you leave your base.

Doing it the way I said makes the game like C&C, what it was meant to be, and balances out without a problem.

---